



# International Journal of Research in Agronomy

E-ISSN: 2618-0618  
P-ISSN: 2618-060X  
© Agronomy  
[www.agronomyjournals.com](http://www.agronomyjournals.com)  
2023; 6(1): 15-17  
Received: 07-10-2022  
Accepted: 09-11-2022

**Hemin Verma**  
Department of Agronomy, D.K.S.  
CARS Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh,  
India

**Panch Ram Mirjha**  
Associate professor of Agronomy,  
D.K.S. CARS Bhatapara,  
Chhattisgarh, India

**Ramprakash Chandravanshi**  
Department of Fruit Science  
RSKVV Gwalior, Madhya  
Pradesh, India

**Kiran Manikpuri**  
Department of Soil Science, S.G.  
CARS Jagdalpur Chhattisgarh,  
India

**Thakkar Singh**  
Department of Agronomy, D.K.S.  
CARS Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Hemin Verma**  
Department of Agronomy, D.K.S.  
CARS Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh,  
India

## Weed management in field pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) under vertisols condition of Chhattisgarh

**Hemin Verma, Panch Ram Mirjha, Ramprakash Chandravanshi, Kiran Manikpuri and Thakkar Singh**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2023.v6.i1a.156>

### Abstract

An experiment was conducted at DKS College of Agriculture and Research Station, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh to judge the profitability and suitability of different weed management in field pea clay loam soil. Experiments with 12 different treatment combinations indicate that depending upon the availability of labour, the profitability of rabi field peas could be achieved through 2 hand weeding 20 and 40 days after sowing. The study also reveals that application of, Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE), Oxyfluorfen 23.5% EC @ 200 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE), Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE)+ Hand weeding 30DAS, Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Quizalofop-p-ethyl 5% EC @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 9.3% EC @ 100 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE)-Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE).

**Keywords:** Field pea (*Pisum sativum* L.), weed, herbicides, profitability, productivity

### 1. Introduction

Pulses are 2<sup>nd</sup> important cultivated crop after cereals. Variety of pulse crops grown in India and the world. Among the crops, the major ones are gram, pigeon pea, lentil and field pea etc. Pulses crops are grown across the country as sole crop, intercrop, mixed crop, catch crop, relay crop and utera crop, depending upon the agroclimatic conditions of the place where they are cultivated. Field pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) is primarily used for human consumption or as livestock feed. Field pea is highly nutritive and contains a high percentage of protein (6.2 g 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) and carbohydrate (16.9 g/100 g of fresh wt.) with minerals and vitamins A, B and C (Makasheva 1983) [6]. It is well understood that weeds interfere with crop growth and reduce yield and quality either throughout the competition for light, food, water, nutrients and space, allelopathic effect or harbour insects and diseases (Dittmar and Boyd 2015) [5]. Weeds are big constraints in crop production and responsible for heavy yield losses. The available herbicides viz., Pendimethalin, Oxyfluorfen, Imazethapyr, Quizalofop-p-ethyl, Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl, Imazethapyr + Imazamox pre mix are able to check the emergence and growth of annuals grasses and broad leaved weeds. This study was carried out to evaluate the efficiency of different pre-and post-emergence herbicides when applied alone or in combination with cultural operation in field pea.

### 2. Materials and Methods

The field experiment was conducted in the form of DKS College of Agriculture and Research Station, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh in *rabi* season of 2020-21 to evaluate weed management in field pea. The experimental soil was clay loam in texture and slightly alkaline with pH 8.0 and EC 0.20 dS<sup>-1</sup>. It was low available nitrogen (113.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), medium available phosphorus (12.72 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and high in available potassium (384 kg<sup>-1</sup>). The range of mean maximum and minimum temperatures 9.2 to 10.3 °C and 35.2 to 38.4 °C during the crop growth and development period was respectively. The range of the relative humidity 28.9-81.4%, bright sunshine 1.9 to 6.8 hrs day<sup>-1</sup>, wind speed 2.1 to 4.8 km hr<sup>-1</sup> and daily evaporations 3.1 to 6.8 mm was respectively.

The experiment comprised 12 treatments viz., T<sub>1</sub>: Weed check, T<sub>2</sub>: hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS), T<sub>3</sub>: Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE), T<sub>4</sub>: Oxyfluorfen 23.5% EC @ 200 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE), T<sub>5</sub>: Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) + Hand weeding 30DAS, T<sub>6</sub>: Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>7</sub>: Quizalofop-p-ethyl 5% EC @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>8</sub>: Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 9.3% EC @ 100 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>9</sub>: Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>10</sub>: Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>11</sub>: Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), and T<sub>12</sub>: weed free, were replicated thrice in randomized block design. The field variety paras were sown on November 12, 2020 at row spacing 30 cm using seed rate 100 kg<sup>-1</sup>. The gross and net plot size was 6 × 5 m and 5.40 × 4.80 m, respectively. The entire dose of fertilizer i.e., the starter dose of nitrogen 20 kg<sup>-1</sup>, phosphorus 50 kg<sup>-1</sup>, and potassium 30 kg<sup>-1</sup> was applied at the time of sowing through urea, SSP and MOP, respectively. Pendimethalin and Oxyfluorfen was applied next day of sowing whereas Imazethapyr, Quizalofop, Fenoxaprop and odyssey were applied at 30 DAS. Snow-melt water, the only source of irrigation was used to irrigate field pea through sprinklers, and rain gun. The crop was harvested on 5th march 2021. Other practices were in accordance with the recommended package for the region.

Weed density, dry matter accumulations, yield attributes, green pod yield, productivity, cost of cultivation, gross returns, net returns, B:C ratio and profitability were recorded or computed after the harvested of the crop. Weed control efficiency and weed index were worked out using the following formula:

$$WCE (\%) = \frac{\text{Weed dry weight in control plot} - \text{Weed dry weight in treated plot}}{\text{Weed dry weight in control plot}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Weed index} = \frac{(x-y)}{X} \times 100$$

Where, X = yield from weed free plot. Y = yield of particular treatment plant.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The experiment field was heavily infested with different weed flora. *Phalaris minor* (L.). The predominant sedges were *Cyperus rotundus* (L.) Whereas, the *Parthenium hysterophorus* (L.) was the pre dominant broad leaved weed followed by *Medicago denticulata* (L.), *Chenopodium album* (L.), *Anagallis arvensis* and *Vicia sativa* (L.). Similar weed flora in the field pea field has also been reported by Kumar *et al*, 2015; Rana *et al*, 2004 [8, 11].

The results revealed that different weed management practices exerted a significant influence on the growth and yield of field pea (Table 2). The treatment T<sub>12</sub> (Weed free) significantly enhanced growth and yield attributes viz., plant height, branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, pod plant<sup>-1</sup>, seed pod<sup>-1</sup>, seed weight plant<sup>-1</sup> and 100-seed weight, and ultimately increased seed yield and stover yields, however, it was found statistically at par with the treatments T<sub>2</sub> (2 hand weeding 20 and 40 DAS), T<sub>11</sub>: Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>10</sub>: Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>6</sub>: Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>8</sub>: Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 9.3% EC @ 100 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE),

**Table 1:** Intensity and dry weight of weeds under different weed management practices in field pea

Treatment	Total weed density (No. m <sup>-2</sup> )			Total dry matter accumulation (kg m <sup>-1</sup> )			WCE (%)	WI (%)
	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS		
T <sub>1</sub>	12.9	13.4	11.2	5.14	7.15	11.90	0.00	57.0
	(166)	(181)	(126)	(26.1)	(53.2)	(141)		
T <sub>2</sub>	4.61	4.06	3.63	2.70	4.20	3.91	90.5	2.98
	(20.7)	(16.0)	(12.6)	(6.80)	(17.2)	(14.7)		
T <sub>3</sub>	7.39	6.50	6.10	3.68	4.78	7.71	72.4	39.4
	(54.1)	(41.8)	(36.8)	(13.0)	(22.3)	(32.1)		
T <sub>4</sub>	7.76	6.62	7.0	3.83	4.94	6.48	69.7	40.7
	(59.7)	(43.4)	(48.6)	(14.1)	(24.2)	(41.4)		
T <sub>5</sub>	6.96	6.12	5.92	3.59	4.65	6.08	79.1	35.3
	(47.8)	(36.9)	(34.6)	(12.4)	(43.7)	(36.5)		
T <sub>6</sub>	5.84	5.32	4.80	3.38	4.21	4.75	87.1	20.7
	(33.6)	(27.8)	(22.5)	(10.9)	(21.7)	(22.0)		
T <sub>7</sub>	6.48	5.97	5.68	3.65	6.07	5.86	80.9	27.3
	(41.5)	(35.2)	(31.8)	(12.8)	(36.8)	(33.8)		
T <sub>8</sub>	6.31	5.64	5.27	3.44	5.65	5.12	83.7	24.8
	(39.3)	(31.3)	(27.3)	(11.3)	(31.8)	(25.8)		
T <sub>9</sub>	7.08	5.91	6.84	3.51	4.72	5.23	76.0	35.7
	(49.5)	(34.4)	(46.3)	(11.8)	(21.9)	(26.7)		
T <sub>10</sub>	5.38	6.20	4.11	3.95	4.13	4.13	90.0	19.2
	(28.4)	(37.9)	(16.4)	(15.0)	(16.5)	(16.5)		
T <sub>11</sub>	5.02	4.49	4.25	3.11	4.19	4.06	90.3	12.7
	(24.7)	(19.7)	(17.6)	(9.1)	(17.1)	(16.0)		
T <sub>12</sub>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0
S.E(m)±	0.20	0.14	0.10	0.07	0.35	0.15	1.821	1.242
CD (P=0.05)	0.60	0.40	0.30	0.20	1.03	0.44	5.206	3.550

Where the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check), registered significantly the lowest growth and yield of the crop. The lowest crop weed competition was noticed T<sub>2</sub> (2 hand weeding 20 and 40 DAS)

followed by Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE) throughout the growth stage crop and created favourable

environment for plant growth. Thus enhanced availability of nutrients, water, light and space, which might have accelerated the photosynthesis rate, thereby increasing the supply of carbohydrates leading to an increase in growth and yield. These findings are in agreement with those of Ved *et al.* (2000) [3], Rana *et al.* (2013) [1], Different weed control treatments significantly influenced weed density recorded I 30, 60 and 90 DAS, (Table 1).

All the weed management treatments significantly reduced the weed density compared to weedy check. Next to the weed free T<sub>12</sub>, followed by 2 hand weeding (30 and 40 DAS), Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly lowest weed density which remained statically at par with the treatments T<sub>10</sub>: Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), T<sub>6</sub>: Imazethapyr 10% SL @ 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PoE), Dry

weight of weeds was significantly influenced due to different weed management practices (Table 1). Besides the T<sub>1</sub> (weed free) the lowest dry weight of weeds was observed under the treatment T<sub>2</sub> (2 hand weeding 20 and 40 DAS) through it was found at par with the treatment T<sub>11</sub> Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup>. Significantly the highest dry weight of weed was observed under the treatment T<sub>1</sub> weedy check, Reduction in dry weight of weeds under the treatments T<sub>2</sub> hand weeding 20 and 30 DAS (90.5%). The might be attributes to the effective control of weeds under this treatments. The weedy check T<sub>1</sub> recorded significantly highest weed dry weight owing to uncontrolled condition favoured luxurious weed growth leading to increased weed dry matter. Halker *et al.* (2001a) [7] also reported 44% yield loss in pea due to weeds in the USA.

**Table 2:** Effect of different weed management treatments on plant growth and seed yield parameters of field pea

Treatment	Plant height(cm)	Pod plant <sup>-1</sup>	Seed pod <sup>-1</sup>	100-seed weight (g)	Seed yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Stover yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	49.15	11.38	3.86	14.43	690.0	2734.06
T <sub>2</sub>	64.40	28.71	4.89	15.89	1558.0	3461.60
T <sub>3</sub>	54.23	17.40	4.55	15.17	979.0	2866.03
T <sub>4</sub>	49.50	14.63	4.46	15.16	952.0	2826.02
T <sub>5</sub>	56.91	22.46	4.66	15.47	1032.0	2982.62
T <sub>6</sub>	58.58	26.46	4.81	15.73	1207.0	3154.27
T <sub>7</sub>	57.19	24.32	4.54	15.55	1166.0	3038.27
T <sub>8</sub>	58.22	24.60	4.79	15.67	1172.0	3051.97
T <sub>9</sub>	56.22	21.51	4.43	15.27	1029.0	2934.80
T <sub>10</sub>	59.59	28.25	4.84	15.80	1297.0	3186.68
T <sub>11</sub>	62.87	27.40	4.85	15.86	1401.0	3247.12
T <sub>12</sub>	68.16	29.49	5.36	16.22	1606.0	3732.58
S.E(m)±	0.16	3.50	0.10	0.07	29.16	4.83
CD (P=0.05)	0.48	10.26	0.28	0.20	85.53	14.16

A perusal of data presented in Table 1 indicates that besides the weed free T<sub>12</sub>, weed free maximum WCE was obtained under the treatment T<sub>2</sub> (2 hand weeding 20 and 40 DAS), followed by treatment T<sub>11</sub> Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 1000 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (PE) - Imazethapyr 35% + Imazamox 35% WG @ 70g ha<sup>-1</sup>, minimum WI was obtained with the treatment T<sub>2</sub> (2 hand weeding 20 and 40 DAS). This might be due to estimation of weed by hand weeding and herbicides. These finding are in close conformity with those reported by Nagi *et al.* (2001) [9], Bharat *et al.* (2006) [10] and Kumar and Singh (2014) [8].

#### 4. Conclusion

It is concluded from the present investigation the weed free treatment (T<sub>12</sub>) was the most effective for controlling weeds and obtaining higher seed yield and quality in field pea cv. Bhatapara (Chhattisgarh) conditions but B:C ratio is very low as compared to T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>10</sub>. Through the B:C ratio of T<sub>2</sub> is maximum but seed yield and quality in this treatment are significantly lower than T<sub>12</sub> while treatment T<sub>12</sub> is at par with T<sub>2</sub> in the quality and yield parameters with higher economic returns. Therefore 2 hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAS (T<sub>2</sub>) followed by is recommended for pea weed management to obtain higher seed yield and quality with high B:C ratio (2.52) and less chemical use.

#### 5. References

1. Rana MC, Manu N, Rana SS, Sharma GD. Influence of post of post – emergence herbicide on weeds and productivity harden pea under mild hill conditions of Himanchal Pradesh. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2013;58:226-230.
2. Tiwari AN, Sanjay S, Batham AK. Weed management in field pea with special references to wild safflower Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2008;40(3-4):140-143.
3. Ved V, AK, Singh RD, Mani VP. Integrated weed management in garden pea under hills of North West Himalayas. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2000;32(1):7-11.
4. Kundra HC, Singh G, Brar LS. Efficacy of weed management practices in pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). Indian Journal of Weed Science. 1993;25(1):1-6.
5. Dittmar PJ, Boys NS. Dittmar PJ, Boyd NS, Kanissery R. Weed Management in Bean and Pea (Bush, Pole, Lima Bean, English Pea, and Southern Pea). HS188, UF/IFAS Extension, University of Florida; c2015.
6. Makasheva RKH. The pea. Oxonian press pvt. Ltd, New Delhi; c1983. p. 267.
7. Harker KN. Snbvirvey of yield losses due to weeds in central Alberta Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 2001a;81:339-342.
8. Kumar P, Singh RK. Effect of agri-horti systems and weed management practices on density and biomass of weeds in mungbean in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2014;10:152-156.
9. Negi SC, Rana MC, Rana RS. Chemical weed control in pea in dry temperature zone of Himanchal Pradesh. Agricultural Science Digest. 2001;21:135-136.
10. Bharat R, Dawson J, Singh SS. Effect of different weed control method on weed density, weed dry weight and yield of field pea cv, Rachna. Environment and Ecology. 2006;24:839-842.
11. Rana MC, Kumar N, Sharma A, Ran ASS. Management of complex weed flora in peas with herbicides mixture under Luhaul valley condition of Himanchal Pradesh. Indian Journal of weed Science. 2004;36(1-2):68-72.