www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; 11(4): 320-324 © 2022 TPI www.thepharmajournal.com Received: 05-01-2022

Accepted: 09-03-2022

Pushpendra Yadav

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Ravi Shanker Singh

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Pravesh Kumar

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Naveen Kumar Maurya

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Ravikesh Kumar Pal

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Himanshu Verma

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: Pushpendra Yadav

Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Effect of weed management practices on weed flora of wheat crop (*Triticum aestivum* L.)

Pushpendra Yadav, Ravi Shanker Singh, Pravesh Kumar, Naveen Kumar Maurya, Ravikesh Kumar Pal and Himanshu Verma

Abstract

The field experiment was conducted to study the effect of weed management practices on productivity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) during *rabi* season of 2016-17 at Agronomy Farm of Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad (U.P.). Post emergence application of Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ being at par with hand weeding @ 20 & 40 DAS and Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin @ 100+75 gha⁻¹ where significantly reduced the density and dry weight of weeds as compared to other treatments. The post emergence application of Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron (Total) @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ significantly increased, all the growth and yield contributing characters *viz.*, Plant height, leaf area index, dry matter accumulation, length of spike, effective shoots, no. of grains spike⁻¹, test weight, grain, straw and biological yield obtained. Nitrogen and protein content in grain was not affected significantly. Thus Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ were found higher than the rest of treatments. Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ and benefit cost ratio (1.76) followed by Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+4 g ha⁻¹ Rs. ha⁻¹ and benefit cost ratio (1.63).

Thus, it is concluded that for effective weed control and higher return of post emergence application of Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ herbicide applied at 25-30 days after sowing may be adopted in wheat crop.

Keywords: Post emergence, herbicides, weed, wheat

Introduction

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is staple food of the world and falls under *poaceae* family. It is primarily grown in temperate regions and also at higher altitude under tropical climatic areas in winter season. Wheat ranks first in the world among the cereals both in respect of area (219.42 million hectare) and production (758.38 million metric tonnes) with productivity of wheat 3.46 t ha⁻¹ (FAS/USDA 2017-18) ^[15]. In India, it is cultivated on an area of 30.79 million hectare having production of 98.51 million metric tonnes with a productivity of 3.20 t ha⁻¹ (FAS/USDA 2017-18) ^[15].

Currently, India ranks second in wheat production in the world next to China in terms of area and production, producing 90-95 million tonnes of wheat from 29-31 million hectare area (Kamboj *et al.*, 2017) ^[5]. Among various factors responsible for low yield, weeds infestation and their management is one of the important factors. Weed competes with crop plants for water, nutrients, space and solar radiation resulting in reduction of yield by 20 to 50% (Bhan, 1998) ^[2]. Herbicide have shown to be beneficial and very effective means of controlling weeds in wheat because they are quite effective and efficient (Azad *et al.*, 1997) ^[1]. In economic terms, the value of grassy herbicide portion of the total herbicide market is estimated to be around 70%.

Weeds, the unwanted plants produce large number of seeds which remain dormant in the soil and become alive in favourable climatic conditions and compete with wheat crop for nutrition, water, sun light, space, air and are also fast in growth. The major constraints for wheat are poor crop stand, late planting, poor soil condition due to puddling, imbalance use of fertilizer, problem of weeds specially *Phalaris minor, Avena ludoviciana*, high cost of production due to excess tillage etc. (Pal *et al.* 1996)^[7].

The prominent weeds noted in wheat fields are *Phalaris minor, Chenopodium album, Anagallis arvensis, Avena fatua, Convolvulus arvensis, Lathyrus aphaca, Cyperus rotundus* and *Cynodon dactylon* etc. which alone cause 33 per cent reduction in wheat yield. Rice-wheat is one of the most important cropping systems in northern part of the country. The Phalaris minor is one of the very serious problems in wheat in this cropping system and sometimes almost 65 per cent crop losses have been reported, (Chhokar et al., 2008)^[4] some broad leaved weeds are also causing a threat but their control is comparatively easier and effective but control of Phalaris minor has become a serious challenge. Some of the resistant types of the Phalaris minor were reported against isoproturon in 1990s from Haryana and western U.P. and later on some new herbicides molecules eg. Sulfosulfuron, Clodinafop, Isoproturon and fenoxaprop Pethyl were registered and recommended to control the Phalaris minor in wheat Walia, U. S and Brar, L. S (2006) ^[12]. After 2010 these herbicides have also been proved ineffective to control this weed. Likewise, due to the repeated application of grassy weed killer molecules, infestation of broad leaved weeds becoming a serious problem in the wheat fields. Under such circumstances, there is an urgent need to find out some other molecules which may be quite effective against not only to grassy weeds but also take care of broad leaves weed. In the present investigation, some of the new herbicides molecules (combinations) having its very high potency at lower doses to kill grassy along with broad leaved weeds have been developed as ready mixed. These molecules may be proved more effective to control various weed species as well as relatively safer for environmental pollution point of view.

Weed infestation is one of the main causes of low wheat yield not only in India but all over the world, as it reduces wheat yield by 37-50% (Waheed *et al.*, 2009) ^[11] which may be minimized to a greater extent simply by adopting an appropriate weed management practices. Many methods of weed control are being practiced but no one is absolute. The manual weeding besides expensive and pains taking cannot be practiced until weeds put forth sufficient vegetative growth. Introduction of herbicides has made it possible to control a wide spectrum of weeds in wheat effectively. Herbicide like Sulfosulfuron + Metsulfuron @ 0.096 g ha⁻¹ registered highest weed control efficiency of 82.27% (Singh *et al.*, 2017) ^[10].

Materials and Methods

The field experiment was conducted to study the effect of weed management practices on productivity of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) during rabi season of 2016-17 at Agronomy Farm of Narendra Deva University of Agriculture Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad (U.P.). and The experiment consisted nine treatments viz., T₁- Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha⁻¹, T₂- Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+4 g ha⁻¹, T₃-Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha⁻¹, T₄-Mesosulfuran methyl + Idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha⁻¹, T₅- Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹, T₆-Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na @ 1000+500 g ha-1, T7-Metribuzin @ 175 g ha⁻¹, T₈- Hand weeding @ 20 & 40 DAS T₉-Weedy check. The experiment was conducted in Randomized block design with three replications. The soil of the experimental field was silt loam in texture, low in organic carbon (0.32), nitrogen and medium in available phosphorus and potash having pH 8.0 and EC 0.93 dsm⁻¹. The wheat variety HUW 234 was sown on 07th December, 2016. Nitrogen 120 kg N ha-1, Phosphorus 60 kg P2O5 ha-1 and Potassium 40 kg K₂O ha⁻¹, were applied through urea, single super phosphate and murate of potash.

S. No.	Particulars Values Methods of analysis				
Α	Physical properties				
1	Sand (%)	28.5			
2	Silt (%)	54.00	Hydrometer (Bouyoucos, 1962)		
3	Clay (%)	17.5			
4	Textural class	Silt loam	Triangular method, (Lyon et al., 1952)		
S. No.	Particulars	Values Methods of analysis			
В		Chen	iical properties		
1	Soil reaction (pH) (1:2.5 soil water ratio)	8.0	Glass electrode pH meter (Jackson, 1967)		
2	Organic carbon (%)	0.32	Walkley & Black's method volumetric (Walkley & Black, 1934)		
3	Electrical conductivity 1:2.5 (dSm ⁻¹)	0.93	Electrical Conductivity bridge meter (Richards, 1954)		
4	Available Nitrogen (kg ha ⁻¹)	180.0	Alkaline permanganate method (Subbiah & Asijah, 1956)		
5	Available phosphorus (kg ha ⁻¹)	18.0	Olsen's method (Olsen et al. 1954)		
6	Available Potassium (kg ha ⁻¹)	260.0	Flame photometer method (Jackson, 1954)		

Experimental details

The treatments were allocated to different plot at random in all the three replications using the random tables.

S. No.	Details of treatments	Symbols
1	Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha ⁻¹	T1
2	Clodinafop + Metsulfuran (RM) @ 60+4 g ha ⁻¹	T2
3	Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha ⁻¹	T ₃
4	Mesosulfuran methyl + idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha ⁻¹	T4
5	Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha ⁻¹	T5
6	Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na (POE) @ 1000+500 g ha ⁻¹	T ₆
7	Metribuzin @ 175 g ha-1	T ₇
8	Hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS)	T ₈
9	Weedy check	T9

Result and Discussion Weed Flora

The major flora recorded in weedy check was viz. Phalaris minor of grassy group, Chenopodium album, Anagallis arvensis, Melilotus alba, Convonvulus arvensis were of broad leaf group and *Cyperus rotundus* of sedges group. The other less important weeds were *Cynodon dactylon, Vicia hirsuta, Lathyrus aphaca, Avena fatua.* Similar weed flora of wheat crop under normal sown condition have also reported by Rahaman and Mukherjee, (2009) ^[8].

	Weed species	Common name	Family	Habitat			
A- Grasses							
1.	Phalaris minor	Canary grass	Poaceae	Annual			
2.	Avena fatua	Wild oat	Poaceae	Annual			
3.	Cynodon dactylon	Bermuda grass	Poaceae	Annual			
B- Sedges							
1.	Cyperus rotundus	Nut sedge	Cyperaceae	Perennial			
		C- Broad leaf weeds					
1.	Chenopodium album L.	Lambs quarter	Chaenopodiaceae	Annual			
2.	Anagallis arvensis L.	Blue pimpernal	Primulaceae	Annual			
3.	Convonvulus arvensis L.	Field binder	Convonvulaceae	Annual			
4.	Melilotus alba Medikus	Sweet clover	Leguminaceae	Annual			
5.	Coronopus spp.	Lesser swine-cress	Brassicaceae	Annual			

Table 3: Weed flora of experimental crop

Weed Density

Species wise weed density recorded at 30^{th} , 60^{th} , 90^{th} day stages and at harvest stage have been presented in Table-4. that weedy check recorded the highest weed density while the lowest was recorded by Sulfosulfuran + Metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ at all the stages of crop growth. At 30 DAS, before application of herbicide highest density of *Phalaris minor*

followed by *Anagallis arvensis*. were recorded. At 60 and 90 days' stages, the density of all the weed species decreased due to various herbicidal treatments. Effective weed control in wheat by the use of sulfosulfuron alone or its combination with other herbicides by Mishra, P.K. and Kewat, M.L.A. (2007) ^[6]

Table 4: Effect of various weed control treatments on weed density at different growth stages

Treatments		Weed Density (No. m ⁻²)				
	1 reatments	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	
T_1	Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha ⁻¹	11.78** (137.9)*	10.92 (118.4)	12.0 (143.2)	7.21 (51.1)	
T_2	Clodinafop + Metsulfuran (RM) @ 60+4 g ha ⁻¹	11.86 (139.7)	9.20 (83.8)	10.57 (110.9)	5.74 (33.0)	
T_3	Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha ⁻¹	11.89 (140.4)	9.51 (89.5)	10.83 (116.3)	6.15 (36.9)	
T_4	Mesosulfuran methyl + idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha ⁻¹	11.98 (142.6)	9.86 (96.2)	11.03 (120.7)	6.32 (40.0)	
T 5	Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha ⁻¹	11.93 (141.5)	8.35 (68.8)	10.14 (102.0)	5.37 (27.9)	
T_6	Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na (POE) @ 1000+500 g ha ⁻¹	9.24 (84.5)	10.24 (103.9)	11.36 (128.2)	6.66 (43.4)	
T 7	Metribuzin @ 175 g ha ⁻¹	11.71 (136.3)	10.80 (115.8)	11.85 (139.6)	7.04 (48.6)	
T_8	Hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS)	8.22 (66.7)	9.76 (94.4)	10.41 (107.4)	5.66 (31.1)	
T9	Weedy check	11.95 (141.9)	14.13 (198.8)	14.70 (215.3)	14.29 (203.4)	
	S.Em ±	1.75	1.93	1.91	1.23	
	CD at 5%	5.25	5.80	5.73	3.83	

* The value in parentheses are original value.

** Value transformed by $\sqrt{x+1}$

Among herbicides as post emergence Sulfosulfuron + Metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ has been found most effective to reduce the population of almost all species of weed flora followed by Clodinafop + Metsulfuran 60+4 g ha⁻¹ and both the treatments were found significantly better to control weeds of different species as compared to weedy check and other weed control treatments.

Weed dry matter (g m⁻²)

The data presented in the Table-5 and illustrated clearly reveal that weed dry matter was not affected significantly at

30 days stage as the herbicides were applied in pre emergence and post emergence, weed dry matter was recorded at 30, 60, 90 days after sowing and at harvest. The minimum weed dry matter was recorded in Sulfosulfuron + Metsulfuron @ 30+2g ha⁻¹ followed by two hand weeding and Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+2 g ha⁻¹ both the treatments showed significantly lower weed dry matter than rest of the treatments. At harvest, the maximum weed dry matter of 17.38 gm⁻² was recorded in weedy check control which was significantly higher than all the treatment. Similar findings were also reported by Chippa *et al.* (2005) ^[3].

Table 5: Effect of weed control treatments on Dry matter accumulation of weed flora at different growth stages

Treatments		Weed Dry Matter (g m ⁻²)				
	Treatments		60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	
T_1	Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha ⁻¹	6.31 (38.9)	10.12 (101.50)	11.35 (127.90)	8.42 (69.90)	
T_2	Clodinafop + Metsulfuran (RM) @ 60+4 g ha ⁻¹	6.44 (44.5)	9.17 (83.10)	10.77 (115.51)	5.20 (26.10)	
T 3	Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha ⁻¹	6.50 (41.3)	9.40 (87.40)	11.10 (122.4)	5.55 (29.90)	

http://www.thepharmajournal.com

T_4	Mesosulfuran methyl + idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha-1	6.67 (43.5)	9.55 (90.30)	11.38 (128.7)	5.88 (33.60)
T 5	Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha ⁻¹	6.20 (37.5)	8.01 (63.20)	9.86 (96.3)	4.58 (20.00)
T_6	Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na (POE) @ 1000+500 g ha ⁻¹	5.48 (30.06)	9.69 (92.90)	11.60 (133.6)	6.04 (35.50)
T 7	Metribuzin @ 175 g ha ⁻¹	6.38 (39.8)	9.96 (98.40)	11.93 (141.4)	7.94 (62.10)
T_8	Hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS)	5.28 (26.90)	8.08 (64.4)	10.10 (101.2)	4.91 (23.2)
T9	Weedy check	6.60 (42.60)	17.62 (309.7)	18.57 (344.20)	17.38 (301.10)
	S.Em ±	1.21	1.93	0.91	1.01
	CD at 5%	3.63	5.80	2.74	3.03

Weed control efficiency

The data presented in Table-6 clearly reveals that the highest W.C.E. was recorded with post emergence application of Sulfosulfuron + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ (93.35%) closely followed by hand weeding (92.29%) and Clodinaf of + metsulfuran @ 60+4 g ha⁻¹ (91.33%) while minimum efficiency was recorded in Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha⁻¹ (76.78%). This was mainly due to lowest weed dry weight under the effects of above treatment. Chhipa *et al.* (2005) ^[3], Wallia *et al.* (2011) ^[13] have also reported increase in weed control efficiency with use of herbicides in wheat.

Weed index: The data presented in Table-6 clearly reveal that the weed index which denotes the percent reduction in grain yield as compare to weed free plot, indicate that infestation of weed reduced the grain yield of wheat by 40.51% and the reduction in grain yield was reduced with control of weeds through herbicides ranging from 5.73% to 19.08%. The minimum reduction in grain yield was noted with hand weeding and post emergence application of Clodinafop + Metsulfuran 60+4 g ha⁻¹ closely followed by Fenoxaprop Pethyl + Idosulfuran methyl @ 100+75 g ha⁻¹. The results are in agreement with Chhipa *et al.* (2005) ^[3]

	Treatment	W.C.E. (%)	W.I. (%)
T_1	Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha-1	76.78	19.08
T_2	Clodinafop + Metsulfuran (RM) @ 60+4 g ha ⁻¹	91.33	5.73
T ₃	Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha ⁻¹	90.06	6.90
T_4	Mesosulfuran methyl + idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha ⁻¹	88.84	8.07
T 5	Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha ⁻¹	93.35	0.00
T_6	Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na (POE) @ 1000 + 500 g ha ⁻¹	88.20	10.53
T_7	Metribuzin @ 175 g ha ⁻¹	79.37	17.44
T_8	Hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS)	92.29	3.39
T 9	Weedy check	0.00	40.51

Economics

The highest cost of cultivation of Rs.38359 ha⁻¹ was incurred under hand weeding against the lowest cost of cultivation of Rs.32359 ha⁻¹ of weedy check. All the treatments higher gross return, net return and benefit cost ratio over weedy check. The maximum gross income of Rs.93460 ha⁻¹ was obtained with Sulfosulfururon + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ followed by hand weeding (Rs.90159 ha⁻¹) against lowest gross income of Rs.55955 ha⁻¹ of weedy check. Sulfosulfururon + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ recorded the highest net return of Rs.59641 ha⁻¹ closely followed by post emergence application of Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+4 ha⁻¹ (Rs.54627 ha⁻¹) and against lowest net return of Rs.23596 ha⁻¹ noted with weedy check. Sulfosulfururon + metsulfuron @ 30 + 2 g ha⁻¹ as well as Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+4 g ha⁻¹ treatments also recorded highest benefit cost ratio of 1.76, 1.63 as compared to weedy check of 0.72. The results are in agreement with Sharma *et al.* (2015) ^[9].

	Treatments	Grain yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Total cost of cultivation (Rs ha ⁻¹)		Net return (Rs ha ⁻¹)	B-C ratio
T 1	Sulfosulfuran @ 30 g ha ⁻¹	34.55	33759	75284	41525	1.23
T ₂	Clodinafop + Metsulfuran (RM) @ 60+4 g ha-1	40.25	33459	88086	54627	1.63
T ₃	Fenoxaprop P-ethyl + Metribuzin (RM) @ 100+75 g ha ⁻¹	39.75	33479	86834	53355	1.59
T_4	Mesosulfuran methyl + idosulfuran methyl (RM) @ 12+2.4 g ha-1	39.25	34034	85729	51695	1.51
T 5	Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha ⁻¹	42.70	33819	93460	59641	1.76
T ₆	Pendimethalin (PE) fb 2,4-D Na (POE) @ 1000+500 g ha ⁻¹	38.20	33634	83515	49881	1.48
T 7	Metribuzin @ 175 g ha ⁻¹	35.25	33134	77069	43935	1.32
T ₈	Hand weeding (20 & 40 DAS)	41.25	38359	90159	51800	1.35
T9	Weedy check	25.40	32359	55955	23596	0.72

Conclusion

The highest grain yield 42.70 qha⁻¹ was achieved by application of Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron (RM) @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ followed by two hand weeding at 20 & 40 days after sowing and lowest yield is found in weedy check. Among the different herbicides application of Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron @ 30 + 2 gha⁻¹ was found most effective to control of all types of weeds followed by two hand weeding.

Among different weed control treatments application of sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron @ 30 + 2 g ha⁻¹ was most suitable for improving growth, yield and quality of wheat followed by two hand weeding. Sulfosulfuran + metsulfuron @ 30+2 g ha⁻¹ was recorded highest net return (Rs 59641 ha⁻¹) and highest B.C Ratio (1.76) followed by Clodinafop + Metsulfuran @ 60+4 g ha⁻¹ net return (Rs 54627 ha⁻¹) and B.C. Ratio (1.63).

References

- 1. Azad BS, Singh H, Gupta SC. Effect of plant density, dose of herbicide and time of nitrogen application on weed suppression and its efficiency in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Environment and Ecology. 1997;15(3):665-668.
- 2. Bhan VM. Status of research on weed science and its impact. Presented at seventeenth meeting of the Governing Body of the ICAR, New Delhi, 1998 Jun.
- 3. Chhipa KG, Pareek RG, Jain NK. Evaluation of metsulfuron-methyl and sulfosulfuron alone in combination with other herbicides against weed in wheat. Haryana Journal of Agronomy. 2005;21(1):72-73.
- 4. Chhokar RS, Sharma RK, Verma RPS. Pinoxaden for controlling grassy weeds in wheat and Barley. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2008;40(1&2):0253-8040.
- Kamboj NK, Hooda, Gupta VS, Gaurendra, Sangwan Meenakshi. Weed Management Studies in Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) with Herbicides under Different Planting Methods. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;6(2):1742-1749.
- Mishra PK, Kewat MLA. Effect of sulfosulfuron alone or its 72 combination with other agro-chemicals on weed density, weed dry weight and economics of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Environment and Ecology. 2007;25S(Special 3A):875-878.
- Pal SK, Kaur J, Thakur R, Verma VN, Singh MK. Effect of irrigation, seeding rate and fertilizer on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Indian Journal of Agronomy. 1996;41(3):386-389.
- 8. Rahaman S, Mukherjee PK. Effect of herbicides on weed crop association in wheat. Journal of Crop and Weed Science. 2009;5(2):113-116.
- Sharma N, Thakur N, Chopra P, Kumar S, Badiyala D. Evaluation of metsulfuron methyl and clodinafop alone and in combination with other herbicides against weeds in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Research on Crops. 2015;16(3):447455, 15.
- 10. Singh S, Singh AK, Yadav A, Shivam, Harikesh. Assess the effect of different combinations of herbicides on weed population and economic feasibility of treatments in late sown wheat crop. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(5):648-651.
- 11. Waheed AR, Qureshi GS, Jakhar, Tareen H. Weed community dynamics in wheat crop of district Rahim Yar Khan. Pakistan Journal of Botany. 2009;41(1):247-254.
- 12. Walia US, Brar LS. Current status of *Phalaris minor* resistance against isoproturon and alternate herbicides in the rice-wheat cropping systems in Punjab. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2006;38(3):207212.
- Walia US, Kaur T, Nayyar S, Kaur R. Performance of ready mixtures on weed control in wheat. Indian J. Weed Sci. 2011;43(1&2):41-43.
- Sharma N, Thakur N, Chopra P, Kumar S, Badiyala D. Evaluation of metsulfuron methyl and clodinafop alone and in combination with other herbicides against weeds in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Research on Crops. 2015;16(3):447455, 15.
- 15. USDA FAS. United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agriculture Service Circular Series Office of Global Analysis WAP5, 2018.