



Effect of Pre and Post Emergence Herbicide Molecules on Weed Control Efficiency and their Phytotoxicity on Maize (*Zea mays L.*)

A Subba Ramireddy, A S Rao, G Subba Rao, T C M Naidu, A Lalitha Kumari and N Trimurthulu

Department of Agronomy, Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University,, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Lam, Andhra Pradesh during *rabi* season of 2013 and 2014 to evaluate the efficacy of pre emergence herbicides atrazine, pendimethalin and post-emergence herbicides tembotrione and topramezone combinations on weed control efficiency and their phytotoxicity on maize. Lowest weed dry weight and high weed control efficiency was recorded in application of atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T₆), pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T8), atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@120 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T₇) and pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@120 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T9) where sequential application of herbicides at all stages of crop growth. The herbicides used in the present investigation didn't cause any phytotoxicity symptoms during both the years of investigation.

Key words: Atrazine, Maize, pendimethalin, Tembotrione, Topramezone, Weed management

Maize (Zea mays L.) is one of the most important crops among the cereals in the world agricultural economy both as food and fodder crop. In India, during 2014-15 maize was cultivated in 9.2 M ha with 24.17 M t production, and with a productivity of 2.56 t ha-1. In Andhra Pradesh, the crop is cultivated in an area of 0.99 M ha with 4.23 M t production and 4257 kg ha⁻¹ (AICRP on Maize, 2016). Among the several factors, most dominant factor responsible for the lower yields of maize are weeds, which competes with crop for nutrients, water, sunlight and space. Wide spacing, intensive use of inputs and initial slow growth of maize are some of the factors responsible for increased weed growth. Use of herbicides to manage weeds forms an excellent alternative to manual weeding. In India, till date only pre-emergence application of atrazine / pendimethalin has been widely recommended for the control of weeds in maize. There is a need of post-emergence herbicide usage for management of weeds which occur at 15-25 days of crop and offer severe competition for growth resources, thereby lowering the productivity of maize. Hence, it is proposed to test the new post emergence herbicides without residual effect in maize has greater field applicability. In most farming systems, competition for N is the most important factor than that of for all other nutrients and it is well known that large fraction of the millions of tonnes of nutrients added to soils every year are not taken up by crop plants, as up to 50% of added nitrogen and 0.4 to 90% of added phosphorus going waste from crop fields (Simpson et al., 2011). Keeping all these in view, the present investigation was proposed to evaluate different pre and post emergence herbicides against mixed weed complex in maize at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Lam, Andhra Pradesh during rabi season of 2013 and 2014.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Lam, Andhra Pradesh during *rabi* season of 2013 and 2014 in split plot design with nine weed management treatments as main plots and three fertilizer treatments as sub plots and all the treatments replicated thrice.

Main plots

- T₁- Weedy check,
- T₂- Atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence
- T₃- Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as preemergence
- T_4 Topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence
- T₅- Tembotrione@110 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post emergence
- T₆- Atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence, fb Topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence
- T₇- Atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb Tembotrione@110 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence

 T_8 -Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as preemergence fb Topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹

at 20 DAS as post-emergence

 T_{0} - Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-

emergence fb Tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at

20 DAS as post-emergence

Sub-Plots

F1-50% RDF+ bio consortium (Azospirillum (5

- kg ha⁻¹) + phosphate solubilizing bacteria (5 kg ha⁻¹) + potash solubilizing bacteria (5 kg ha⁻¹) + vasicular arbuscular mycorrhiza (12.5 kg ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (500 kg ha⁻¹)
- F2-75% RDF+ bioconsortium (Azospirillum (5 kg ha⁻¹) + phosphate solubilizing bacteria (5 kg ha⁻¹) + potash solubilizing bacteria (5 kg ha⁻¹) + vasicular arbuscular mycorrhiza (12.5 kg ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (500 kg ha⁻¹)

F3-100% RDF

Maize crop variety pioneer 30 V 92 used for the study in both the years in main plots of size 9.6m x 4.8m and sub plots 4.8 m x 2.9 m. Herbicides were sprayed with Knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle. The different cultural practices recommended for maize crop were adopted during the crop growth period.

Weed sampling was done randomly by placing a $0.5 \ge 0.5$ m quadrate at two different locations in the experimental unit to assess the weed dry weight at 30 DAS and harvesting stages. Dry weight of total weed species was recorded after drying and expressed in g/m².

Weed Control Efficiency (%)

Weed control efficiency (WCE) was worked out on the basis of weed dry matter recorded in each treatment at 30 DAS and at harvest using the formula suggested by Sankaran and Mani (1974).

WCE =
$$\frac{DWC - DWT}{DWC} \times 100$$

- WCE Weed control efficiency in percentage
- DWC Dry weight of weeds in unweeded check
- DWT Dry weight of weeds in weed control treatment

Crop Injury Score

Phytotoxic effect of herbicides on maize crop, if any, was assessed at 7 and 14 days after spraying by using simple rating scale of 0-10 (Table 3.5) suggested by Rao (2000).

Effect	Rating	Description on crop
None	0	No injury, normal
Slight	1	Slight stunting injury or discolouration
	2	Some stand loss, stunting discolouration
	3	Injury more pronounced but not persistent
	4	Moderate injury, recovery possible
Moderate	5	Injury more persistent, recovery doubtful
	6	Near severe injury, no recovery possible
Severe	7	Severe injury, stand loss
	8	Almost destroyed, a few plants surviving
	9	Very few plants alive
Complete	10	Complete destruction

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The original data on weed densities and weed weights were subjected to square root transformation (Vx+0.5) before statistical analysis. The original values were given in parentheses. Statistical significance was tested by applying F- test at 0.05 level of probability and critical differences (CD) were calculated for those parameters, which turned significant (P \leq =0.05) to compare the effects of different treatments (Panse and Sukhatme, 1954).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Total weed dry matter

Total weed dry matter was recorded at 30 and harvesting during both the years of investigation and the results are discussed herewith. At 30 DAS (Table 1) all herbicidal treatments were significantly superior over weedy check in both the years of studies. Significantly, the lowest weeds dry weight $(2.9 \text{ and } 3.3 \text{ g. m}^{-2})$ of total weeds was recorded in atrazine @ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as postemergence (T6) as compared to all other treatments except, treatments topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T4), tembotrione @110 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as postemergence (T5), pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha-¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone (a)25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T8), atrazine @ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T7) and pendimethalin (a) 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as postemergence (T9) with which it was at par. This could be attributed to reduced weed competition in the initial stage and control of late emerged weeds by sequential spray which led to lower weeds density and lower weed dry matter. Similar findings were reported by Patel et al. (2016) and Ahmed (2012). Significantly lower weed dry weight was recorded in topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T4) and tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as postemergence (T5) treatments because of the postemergence spray at 20 DAS which effectively controlled the weeds and resulted in low weed dry weight at 30 DAS. The highest weed dry weight (12.7 and 13.4 gm⁻², respectively) was recorded in weedy check during both the years

of study. The same trend was continued at harvest (Table 2) also during both the years of study. Significantly, the lowest weeds dry weight (5.7 and 5.8 g. m⁻²) of total weeds was recorded in atrazine (a) 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as postemergence (T6) as compared to all other treatments except, treatments pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha-¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone (a)25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T8), atrazine (a) 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T7) and pendimethalin @ 0.75kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as postemergence (T9) with which it was at par. There was no significance among the nutrient management treatments in sub plots during the two years of study and there was no interaction affect among the treatments. An appraisal of the data indicated that the weed dry matter showed gradual increase up to harvests.. This may be because of accumulation of more dry matter in weeds was due to lower competition among weeds for resources.

Weed control efficiency (WCE) denotes the efficiency of applied herbicide or treatment effect in reducing the dry weight of weeds compared to unweeded check. Data pertaining to WCE at different stages presented in Tables 3 to 4. All the weed control treatments significantly influenced the weed control efficiency at 30 and at harvest. At 30 DAS (Table 3), the highest (77.3 and 75.5%) weed control efficiency (WCE) was recorded in atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha-1 as preemergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T6) during both the years of studies and this was superior over all other treatments except pendimethalin (a) 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone (a) 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T8), atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as post-emergence (T7) and pendimethalin @ 0.75kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by tembotrione@110 g a.i ha-1 at 20 DAS as postemergence (T9). The lowest WCE (58.1 and 56.6 %) was observed in pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence (T3) and atrazine(a) 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence (T2) (58.2 and 56.7 %) when compared to other treatments. The main attributing factor might be that, these two herbicides

nce
nc
ੁ
<u>n</u>
5
Š
-
Q
0
H
5
-
3
5
<u>0</u> 0
9
e e
50
~
ف
N
. H
ï.
•
9
3
1
_
Ξ
0
2
Ħ
2
ప
ŏ
ĕ
-=
_
3
· 🗖
-9
9
ï.
Ξ
ă
7
CC
\mathbf{r}
ف ا
Q
e,
2
le
÷
n
•=
$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{i}}$
3
63
ž
•
3
R
·=
÷
- ⁻) ii
n ⁻²) ii
m ⁻²) ii
<u>;</u> m ⁻²) ii
(g m ⁻²) ii
; (g m ⁻²) ii
S (g m ⁻²) ii
AS (g m ⁻²) ii
DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
) DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
30 DAS (g m⁻²) ii
tt 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
s at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
ds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
eds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
eeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
il weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
tal weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
otal weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
f total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
t of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
it of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
zht of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
ight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
eight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) i
weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
y weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
ry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) i
Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) ii
1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
e 1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
ole 1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
able 1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) in
fable 1. Dry weight of total weeds at 30 DAS (g m ⁻²) i

			2013	-14 ·			-	$\frac{2014-15}{2}$	1
	Weed management practices (Main)	н 1	Nutrient Lev	/els (Sub) F2	Meen	ц Ц	Nutrient Lev	/els (Sub) F2	Magn
	ŝ	1.1 0% RDF+	75% RDF+	100%RDF+	IVICALI	50% RDF+MI	75% RDF+	100%RDF+	INTCALL
		IM	IM	IM		MI	MI	MI	
T1-	Weedy check	13.1	12.5	12.7	12.8	13.6	13.1	13.6	13.4
		(171.5)	(156.4)	(159.7)	(163)	(184.8)	(173.1)	(184.4)	(180.8)
Т2-	Atrazine $@$ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹	5.3	5.5	5.2	5.3	5.8	5.9	5.7	5.8
	as pre-emergence	(27.8)	(31.6)	(26.8)	(28.7)	(33.8)	(34.2)	(32.0)	(33.3)
Т3-	Pendimethalin $@ 0.75 \text{ kg ai ha}^{-1}$	5.7	5.4	5.4	5.5	6.6	5.7	5.7	6.0
	as pre-emergence	(32.5)	(28.6)	(28.3)	(29.8)	(43.2)	(31.8)	(32.5)	(35.8)
Т4-	Topramezone $@$ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
	at 20 DAS as post-emergence	(10.7)	(14.3)	(11.8)	(12.2)	(14.9)	(16.1)	(14.9)	(15.3)
Т5-	Tembotrione (\underline{a}) 110 gai ha ⁻¹ at	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.1
	20 DAS as post-emergence	(14.3)	(16.1)	(11.6)	(14.0)	(14.3)	(15.7)	(18.3)	(16.1)
-9T	Atrazine(a) 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.3
	fb topramezone @ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	(6.7)	(0.0)	(8.2)	(8.0)	(6.9)	(10.7)	(11.3)	(10.6)
	post-emergence								
-77-	Atrazine $@$ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.6
	fb tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	(9.5)	(10.7)	(10.1)	(10.1)	(10.8)	(13.9)	(13.6)	(12.8)
	post-emergence								
T8-	Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.4
	pre-emergence fb topramezone $@$	(8.5)	(11.4)	(8.1)	(9.4)	(10.1)	(11.2)	(12.7)	(11.3)
	25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence								
-9T	Pendimethalin $@ 0.75 \text{ kg ai ha}^{-1}$ as	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6
	pre-emergence fb tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹	(10.5)	(12.0)	(10.0)	(10.9)	(12.8)	(12.1)	(12.8)	(12.6)
	at 20 DAS as post-emergence								
Mea	u u	4.8	4.9	4.7		5.2	5.2	5.3	
		(32.4)	(32.2)	(30.5)		(37.2)	(35.4)	(36.9)	
		SEm+	CD (0.05) CV%		SEm <u>+</u>	CD (0.05)	CV%	
	Weed management practices (Main)	0.3	0.9	18.4		0.3	1.0	19.1	
	Nutrient levels (Sub)	0.1	NS	10.8		0.1	NS	12.6	
Weed	d management practices X Nutrient levels	0.5	NS			0.6	NS		

Table	e 2. Dry weight of total weeds at harvest (g	/m ⁻²) in maiz	ze as influence	d by herbicides	and microbi	al inoculants	on <i>rabi</i> maize	-greengram (rop
			2013-14				2014-15		
	Weed management practices (Main)	Nut	trient Levels (Su	(q)		2l	itrient Levels (S	Sub)	
		F1	F2	F3	Mean	F1	F2	F3	Mean
		50% RDF+ MI	75% RDF+ MI	100%RDF+ MI		50% RDF+ MI	75% RDF+ MI	100%RDF+ MI	
E E	-locale viboral	16.0	771	C 71	16 5	2 L I	0.21	15.0	165
	weedy clieck	10.8 (281.0)	(2.77.6)	7.01 (266.0)	(0.75.0)	(305.0)	(0.57.0)	(255.0) (3	C.01
T2-	Atrazine (a) 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	8.5	9.4	8.5	8.8	(0.00) 9.0	9.3	8.8	0.6
))	(73.5)	(91.2)	(74.5)	(79.7)	(79.9)	(87.1)	(78.8)	(81.9)
Т3-	Pendimethalin $@ 0.75 \text{ kg ai ha}^{-1}$ as	10.3	9.1	9.7	9.7	10.1	9.6	9.8	9.9
	pre-emergence	(108)	(82.8)	(93.0)	(94.5)	(103)	(92.9)	(98.4)	(98.0)
Т4-	Topramezone @ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	8.1	8.2	7.9	8.1	8.8	8.1	8.0	8.3
	post-emergence	(65.0)	(67.5)	(63.3)	(65.3)	(76.3)	(65.3)	(65.7) (69.1)
T5-	Tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	8.5	7.5	8.6	8.2	8.3	8.2	8.4	8.3
	as post-emergence	(71.9)	(56.4)	(74.1)	(67.5)	(66.6)	(67.5)	(70.1) (69.2)
T6-	Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	5.5	6.4	5.2	5.7	5.6	6.4	5.4	5.8
	<i>fb</i> topramezone $(0, 25 \text{ g ai ha}^{-1} \text{ at } 20 \text{ DAS})$	(30.1)	(41.5)	(26.4)	(32.7)	(32.0)	(41.7)	(28.7)	(34.1)
	as post-emergence								
Т7-	Atrazine (a) 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	5.8	6.6	5.9	6.1	6.0	6.7	6.0	6.2
	<i>fb</i> tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	(33.2)	(44.5)	(34.0)	(37.2)	(35.4)	(45.7)	(35.9) (39.0)
	post-emergence								
Т8-	Pendimethalin (a) 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as	5.5	6.4	5.7	5.8	5.6	6.6	5.8	6.0
	pre-emergence fb topramezone (a) 25 g ai ha ⁻¹	(29.9)	(41.0)	(31.6)	(34.2)	(30.7)	(43.8)	(32.7) (35.7)
	at 20 DAS as post-emergence								
-9-	Pendimethalin $@ 0.75$ kg ai ha ⁻¹ as	6.2	6.8	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.9	6.1	6.5
	pre-emergence fb tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹	(38.0)	(45.5)	(35.8)	(39.7)	(40.0)	(48.0)	(37.3) (41.8)
	at 20 DAS as post-emergence								
Mea	U	8.3	8.6	8.2		8.6	8.7	8.3	
		(81.1)	(83.1)	(17.6)		(85.7)	(83.3)	(78.1)	
		SEm <u>+</u>	CD (0.05)	CV%		SEm <u>+</u>	CD (0.05)	CV%	
	Weed management practices (Main)	0.5	1.6	18.7		0.5	1.5	18.1	
	Nutrient levels (Sub)	2.6	NS	16.1		0.2	NS	9.6	
	Weed management practices X Nutrient levels	0.9	NS			0.9	NS		
		Note: Data tra	nsformed to $$	x+0.5 transforma	ttions. Figures	in parenthesis a	are original valu	ues	

2018

Effect of Herbicide molecules on weed control in Maize crop

	e
	ы П
	ne
	P.
	š
	do
	Ľ
	Ē
	ar
	50
	en
	re
	р0 Г
	Ze
-	
-	
	13
	Ē
	Ï
_	8
	B
	ğ
•	
7	a
-	
	ž
•	Ĕ
	3
	es
-	
•	
-	ă
	Ž
2	
	ĕ
	ĭ
	ne
ε	E
•	
1	as
	e,
•	
	Ë
•	
4	Ĩ
ſ	Ŋ
5	R
	1
	3
1	?
	<u> </u>
	S
	en
•	Ē
Ę	Ē
_	е –
	2
	nt
	3
-	5
	e
	\$
	.
Ì	به
	0
E	-

		2 Nutrient	(013-14 Levels (Sub)			Nutrie	2014-15 ent Levels (Sub		
	Weed management practices (Main)	F1 50% RDF+MI	F2 75% RDF+MI	F3 100% RDF	Mean	F1 50% RDF+MI	F2 75% RDF+MI	F3 100% RDF	Mean
T1-	Weedy check		1				1		
Т2-	Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	59.7	56.1	58.7	58.2	56.8	55.4	57.8	56.7
Т3-	Pendimethalin \textcircled{a} 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	57.7	57.6	59.2	58.1	57.3	58.7	53.8	56.6
Т4-	Topramezone @ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence	74.6	70.8	70.9	72.1	66.2	68.4	0.69	67.9
T5-	Tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence	68.2	67.4	75.1	70.2	67.0	67.3	67.5	67.3
-9T	Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb topramezone @ 25 σ ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as not emergence	75.0	80.2	76.5	77.3	76.7	75.0	74.7	75.5
T7-	Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as post-emergence fb tembotrione@ 110 oai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as nost-emergence	75.7	73.9	73.5	74.4	75.1	70.9	72.7	72.9
Т8-	Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence <i>fb</i> topramezone @ 25 σ ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as nost-emergence	77.8	73.1	76.5	75.8	76.0	74.1	73.9	74.7
Т9-	Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence <i>fb</i> tembotrione @110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	74.5	71.6	74.2	73.4	73.1	73.1	73.7	73.3
	Mean	62.6 SEm+ 0	61.2 CD (0.05)	62.7 CV%		60.9 SEm+	60.3 CD (0.05)	60.3 CV%	
Weed Nutri Weed	l management practices (Main) ent levels (Sub) l management practices X Nutrient levels	2.2 1.1 3.8	6.6 NS NS	9.1		2.1 0.9 3.7	6.4 NS NS	8.1	

	sequence								<u>-</u>)
			2013-14 Nutrient Level	s (Sub)			2014-15 Vutrient Leve	els (Sub)	
Ħ	/eed management practices (Main)	F1 50% RDF+MI	F2 75% RDF+MI	F3 100% RDF	Mean	F1 50% RDF+MI	F2 75% RDF+MI	F3 100% RDF	Mean
T1-	Weedy check					ı		ı	I
T2-	Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	49.5	31.2	47.7	42.8	40.6	41.8	45.5	42.6
Т3-	Pendimethalin $\textcircled{0}$ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence	39.3	41.4	39.4	40.0	41.9	40.1	33.5	38.5
Т4-	Topramezone $@$ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence	45.5	50.4	49.8	48.6	49.8	49.3	44.6	47.9
T5-	Tembotrione@110 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence	49.4	54.4	40.5	48.1	52.7	48.5	42.3	47.8
-9T	Atrazine (a) 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb topramezone	67.5	61.3	63.3	64.0	62.4	58.5	62.1	61.0
-77-	(w, z) g at narration zor DAS as post-entergence Atrazine $(w, 1.25 \text{ kg at ha}^{-1} \text{ as pre-emergence } fb tembotrione$	65.4	56.0	63.4	61.6	57.2	53.6	64.0	58.3
T8-	Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as prost-currengence fb	67.1	58.4	64.5	63.3	68.0	55.9	59.2	61.0
Т9-	topramezone ($@$ 25 g at na ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence Pendimethalin ($@$ 0.75 kg at ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb tembotrione@110 g at ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence	63.0	59.1	58.2	60.1	60.8	53.1	59.1	57.7
Mea	Ľ	49.6 SEm+	45.8 CD (0.05)	47.4 CV%	34 IS	3.2 +m+	44.5 CD (0.05)	45.6 CV%	
Wee Nutr Wee	d management practices (Main) ient levels (Sub) d management practices X Nutrient levels	2.9	8.7 NS NS	18.2	Э. Г . У.	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	5.8 NS NS	14.7 14.3	

Table 4. Weed control efficiency (%) at harvest in maize as influenced by herbicides and microbial inoculants on rabi maize-greengram crop

		2013-1	4	2014-	15
Treat	ments	7 days aftr application	14 days after application	7 days after application	14 days after application
T1-	Weedy check	1	·	ı	,
Т2-	Atrazine $@$ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as	0	0	0	0
Т3-	Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹	0	0	0	0
Т4-	Topramezone @ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	0	0	0	0
Т5-	Tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	0	0	0	0
T6-	as post-emergence Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence <i>fb</i> topramezone @ 25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	0	0	0	0
Т7-	post-emergence Atrazine@ 1.25 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as	0	0	0	0
Т8-	post-emergence Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence fb topramezone @	0	0	0	0
Т9-	25 g ai ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS as post-emergence Pendimethalin @ 0.75 kg ai ha ⁻¹ as pre-emergence <i>fb</i> tembotrione@110 gai ha ⁻¹	0	0	0	0
	at 20 DAY as post-silicized				

0-No injury
1 - Slight stunting and yellowing of leaves
10 - Complete kill of crop
Treatment without herbicides

growth stages.

Table 5. Phytotoxic effect of different herbicide treatments on maize crop at various

doesn't controlled the later emerged weeds unlike sequential treatments. The highest weed control efficiency at 30 DAS also reported by Srividya *et al.* (2011) and Deshmukh *et al.* (2014).

However, in treatments where only preemergence herbicides were applied weed control efficiency (WCE) decreased with time up to harvest as late emerged weeds beside, resulting in reduced weed control efficiency. Similar results were also reported by Sinha et al. (2005) and Ramadevi (2013). Similar trend was recorded at harvest (Table 4) in both the years of study. The WCE was in the decreasing order of T6 >T8>T7>T9 during both the years. There was no significant influence of nutrient management treatment on weed control efficiency at any stage of the crop during both the years. Interaction among the treatments was also non significant at any stage. Weed control efficiency gradually reduced from 30 DAS to harvest in all the treatments it is because of the gradual increment in the weed dry matter which reflected in gradual decline in weed control efficiency in all the treatments.

Observations on Maize Crop Crop Injury Score

The data on phytotoxicity scoring (crop injury score) as effected by different herbicide treatments recorded at 7 and 14 days after application are presented in (Table 5).

The herbicides used in the present investigation didn't cause any phytotoxicity symptoms during both the years of investigation. It can be concluded that application of atrazine@ 1.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹ as pre-emergence followed by topramezone @ 25 g a.i ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS as postemergence (T6) is very effective in reducing the weed dry matter with high weed control efficiency.

LITERATURE CITED

- Ahmed A M A and Susheela R 2012 Weed management studies in *kharif* maize.*The Journal of Research.* 40 (3): 121-123.
- AICRP on Maize 2016 Director's review, Annual Maize Workshop at UAS, Bangalore, 10-16 April 2016. (<u>http://www.iimr.res.in/</u> <u>documents/Directors%20Review%202016</u> .pdf)

Deshmukh J P, Singrup P, Dandge M S, Bhale V M and Paslawar A N 2014 Integrated

weed management in maize. In Proceedings of Biennial Conference of Indian Society of Weed Science on "Emerging Challenges in Weed Management" February 15-17, 2014. Directorate of Weed Science Research, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India. P-33

- Panse V G and Sukhatme P V, 1954 Statistical methods for agricultural workers. *ICAR Publication*, New Delhi, pp.359.
- Patel B D, Chaudhari D D, Patel V J and Patel R B 2016 Pre- and post-emergence herbicides for weed control in greengram and their residual effect on succeeding crops. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 48(1): 40– 43.
- Rao V S 2000 Principles of weed science. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. 84.
- Rama Devi B 2013 Performance of baby corn as influenced by nitrogen levels and weed control practices. *M.Sc (Ag) Thesis.* Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad. India.
- Sankaran S and Mani V S 1974 Comparative efficiency of physical, chemical and combination methods of weed control in grain sorghum. *Madras Agricultural Journal*. 61(4): 244-252.
- Simpson R J, Oberson A, Culvenor R A, Ryan M H, Veneklass E J and Lambers H 2011 strategies and agronomic interventions to improve the phosphorous use efficiency of farming systems. Plant soil 342 (1-2): 89-120.
- Sinha S P, Prasad S M and Singh S J 2005 Nutrient utilization by winter maize (*Zea*mays) and weeds as influenced by integrated weed management. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 50(4):303-304.
- Srividya S, Chandrasekhar K and Veeraghavaiah R 2011 Effect of tillage and herbicide use on weed management in maize. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal.* 58 (2): 123-126.

(Received on 06.12.2016 and revised on 11.04.2018)