

EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT HERBICIDES ON THE YIELD AND YIELD COMPONENTS OF MAIZE

S. M. S. HAIDER¹, M. M. KARIM¹, I. M. AHMED¹, M.R. SHAHEB² and M. SHAHEENUZZAMN¹

¹ Scientific Officer, Agronomy Division, ² Scientific Officer, Seed Technology Division, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Gazipur-1701

Accepted for publication: March 15, 2009

ABSTRACT

Haider, S.M.S., Karim, M.M., Ahmed, M.I., Shaheb, M.R., and Shaheenuzzaman, M. 2009. *Efficacy of different herbicides on the yield and yield components of maize. int. j. sustain. crop prod. 4(2):14 - 16.*

A research work was conducted at the Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute Joydebpur, during rabi season of 2006-07 to find out the appropriate herbicide for successful control of weed in Maize field. Five treatment viz. T₁ = No weeding; T₂ = Hand weeding (weed free). T₃ = Dual gold 960 EC @ 1.0 l/ha, T₄ = Dual gold @ 1.5 L/ha; T₅ = Ronstar @ 2.0 L/ha. The maximum (8400kg/ha) grain yield was recorded in hand weeding plot which is statistically at par with Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha treated plot. The minimum (6400kg/ha) yield was recorded in no weeding check plots.

Keywords: *Herbicide, Weeds, Maize, Yield*

INTRODUCTION

Maize is well adapted to the climate and soils of Bangladesh and is now the third most important cereal crop after rice and wheat. The area of production of maize is increasing day by day due to our linear increase in demand for poultry feed and others. The feasibility to increase per unit yield is more as there is a large gap between potential and actual yield per hectare. Besides other factors, yield is greatly affected by weeds in the field. Weeds being injurious, harmful or poisonous are a constant source of trouble for the successful growth and development of crops. Weeds compete with crops for light, moisture, space and plant nutrients and other environmental requirements and consequently interfere with the normal growth of crops. Weeds pose severe problem for crop husbandry, reducing the soil fertility and moisture and develop a potential threat to the succeeding crops. Miller and libbey (1999) reported that maize yield generally responded positively to increased weed control. Knezevic *et al.* (1996) reported that grain yield was significantly increased by herbicides treatments in maize. Rout and Satapathy (1996) observed that highest grain yield of maize was from the herbicides treated plot. In view of the importance of the national problem, the present research was conducted to study the impact of herbicides on different weeds and also know the response of crop to such herbicides in terms of tolerance, yield and yield components of maize.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at BARI, Gazipur in 2006-2007. Maize was used in the experiment. The layout of experiment was in randomized complete block (RCB) design with three replications. There were five treatments namely, T₁: No weeding (check); T₂: Hand weeding; T₃: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha; T₄: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5L/ha; T₅: Ronstar @ 2.0L/ha, in each replication with at plot size 5 X 4m². Herbicidal treatments were done after seed sowing with hand sprayer. The crop was fertilized with N₂₅₀P₅₅ K₁₁₀S₅₅ kg ha⁻¹ in the form of urea, triple super phosphate (TSP), muriate of potash (MoP) and gypsum. One third of nitrogen and full dose of other fertilizers were incorporated into the soil during final land preparation. Remaining nitrogen were top-dressed in two equal splits at 35 and 60 days after sowing (DAS) in maize rows. Weed samples were collected using 50cm X 50cm quadrat from randomly selected two places from each plot at 25 and 45 days of planting. Number and dry weight of weeds were recorded. Weed control efficiency (WCE) was calculated using following formula: $WCE (\%) = (A-B/A) \times 100$ where A = Dry weight of weeds in no weeding plots and B = Dry weight of weeds in treated plots. Yield and yield contributing characters were recorded and analyzed statistically and mean separations were done by LSD tests were used (Cochran and Cox, 1957) to determine differences among sowing dates using Mstat-CTM statistical software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data indicated that the number of weeds m⁻² was significantly affected by different herbicide in maize (Table 1). It could be inferred from the data that maximum number of weeds were found from no weeding check plot at 25 and 45 DAA respectively and the minimum number of weeds were found in Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha treated plot which is statistically similar to Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5L/ha treated plot. Dual Gold 960EC treated plots shows satisfactory control both in 25DAA and 45DAA. Dual Gold 960EC treated plots effectively control (>80%) *Digitaria sanguinalis*, *Echinochloa colonum*, *Amaranthus* sp., *Commelina benghalensis*, *Rumex maritimus* but 50-55% control was observed in case of *Cynodon dactylon*. Statistical analysis of the data presented in table 2 indicated

that the weed biomass was affected by various herbicides in maize. Maximum weed biomass was found in no weeding check both at 25 and 45DAA respectively and the minimum was observed in Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5L/ha treated plot although there was no significant difference with Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha treated plot. The results were in agreement with Hafeezullah(2000) and Shakoor *et al.* (1986).

Table 1. Number of weeds as affected by different treatments in Maize

Treatments	Number of weeds m ⁻²												Total weed density m ⁻²	
	<i>Digitaria sanguinalis</i>		<i>Echinochloa colonum</i>		<i>Amaranthus sp</i>		<i>Commelina benghalensis</i>		<i>Rumex maritimus (Bon palong)</i>		<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>			
DAA*	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45
T1: No weeding control	20	31	9	16	18	25	11	19	40	51	18	24	116	166
T2: Hand weeding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
T3: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0 L/ha	2	4	1	3	1	2	1	3	3	5	9	11	17	28
	(90)	(89)	(89)	(81)	(94)	(92)	(88)	(84)	(93)	(90)	(50)	(54)	(85)	(83)
T4: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5 L/ha	3	4	1	3	1	3	1	2	4	6	8	12	18	30
	(88)	(87)	(89)	(81)	(94)	(88)	(91)	(89)	(90)	(88)	(56)	(50)	(85)	(82)
T5: Ronstar	4	6	2	3	3	5	2	3	10	14	7	8	28	39
	(80)	(81)	(83)	(81)	(83)	(80)	(82)	(84)	(75)	(73)	(61)	(67)	(76)	(77)

(Figure in parenthesis is the percent reduction value), * DAA: Days after application

Table 2. Weed biomass (g m⁻²) as affected by different treatments in maize

Treatments	Weed biomass (Dry wt) (g m ⁻²)												Weed biomass (g m ⁻²)	
	<i>Digitaria sanguinalis</i>		<i>Echinochloa colonum</i>		<i>Amaranthus sp</i>		<i>Commelina benghalensis</i>		<i>Rumex maritimus (Bon palong)</i>		<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>			
DAA*	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45	25	45
T1: No weeding control	23.40	34.56	5.94	11.19	9.73	12.09	9.16	16.76	24.61	27.64	10.62	15.27	83.5	117.5
T2: Hand weeding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
T3: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha	2.46	3.86	0.67	1.97	0.49	0.84	0.89	2.11	2.13	2.83	5.46	6.84	12.1	18.5
	(89)	(89)	(89)	(82)	(95)	(93)	(90)	(87)	(91)	(90)	(49)	(55)	(86)	(84)
T4: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5L/ha	2.51	3.49	0.69	1.19	0.41	0.59	0.69	1.01	2.56	2.91	3.74	8.49	10.6	17.7
	(89)	(90)	(88)	(89)	(96)	(95)	(92)	(94)	(90)	(89)	(65)	(44)	(87)	(85)
T5: Ronstar	4.84	7.05	0.84	1.51	1.67	2.41	1.74	3.02	5.76	7.07	4.12	6.94	19.0	28.0
	(79)	(80)	(86)	(87)	(83)	(80)	(81)	(82)	(77)	(74)	(61)	(55)	(77)	(76)

(Figure in parenthesis is the percent reduction value), * DAA: Days after application

Table 3. Data regarding yield and yield components as affected by different treatments in maize

Table 3. Data regarding yield and yield components as affected by different treatments

Treatment	Plant height (cm)	Cobs/plant	Kernels/cob	100 kernels wt (g)	Seed yield (kg/ha)
T1: No weeding check	188.60	1.06	423.33 c	30.57	6400 c
T2: Hand weeding	196.07	1.20	507.33 a	31.30	8400 a
T3: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1L/ha	192.27	1.20	504.20 a	31.17	8375 a
T4: Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.5L/ha	192.53	1.06	483.20 b	30.37	7850 b
T5: Ronstar	189.47	1.06	479.60 b	29.40	7550 b
LSD _(0.05)	NS	NS	4.25	NS	12.31
Level of significance	-	-	**	-	**

Statistical analysis of the data (Table 3) revealed that different treatments had no significant effect on plant height. Mean value of the data indicated that highest plant height was observed in hand weeding plot and the lowest plant height was in no weeding check plot. The difference in plant height is attributed to the various intensities of weed competition with maize plant. Non significant differences were obtained for number of cobs per plant due to different treatments (Table 3). Number of kernels per cob was significantly affected by different treatments (Table 3). It could be inferred from the data presented that maximum kernels per cob were recorded in hand weeding plots. These were however, statistically at par with Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha. The minimum kernels per cob were recorded in no weeding check plot. Statistical analysis of the data revealed that 100 kernels weight was non significant among the treatments. It could be inferred from the data (Table 3) that maximum (8400kg) grain yield was recorded in hand weeding plot which is statistically at par with Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha treated plot. The minimum yield was recorded in no weeding check plots (Table 3). Janjic et al. (1983) and Knezevic et. al. (1996) reported that best grain yield of maize was achieved with the application of Dual Gold 960EC at the rate of 4 kg ha⁻¹.

CONCLUSION

From the outcome of this study, it can be concluded that hand weeding is the best method to control weeds and getting higher yield but shortage of labor and higher cost are great hurdles for adoption this method. In Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha treated plot gave the second highest yield which is statistically similar to hand weeding plot. So, using of Dual Gold 960EC @ 1.0L/ha could be suitable for adoption of weed control in maize.

REFERENCE

- Cochran, W. and G. Cox. 1957. Experimental Design John Willey & Sons Inc., New York.
- Hafeezullah, 2000. Effect of deferent sowing and weed control methods on the performance of sunflower. M.Sc.(Hons), thesis, Agric. Univ., Peswar, Pakistan.
- Janjic, V., M. Trifunovic, V. Bogdanovic, 1983. A study on the effect of herbicide on yield and quality of maize grain. Fragments Herbologica Jugoslavica, 12: 51-58.
- Knezevic, M. and M. Dukic, 1996. Effect of some agrotechnical measures upon predominant weeds spices and maize grain yield. Macedorian Agric. Review, 43: 29-32.
- Miller, T.W. and C.R. Libbey, 1999. response of three corn cultivars to several herbicides. Res. Prog. Report. Western Soc. Weed Sci. Colorado Springs, USA, 9-11 March, pp: 57-58.
- Rout, D. and M.R. satapathy, 1996. Chemical weed control in rainfed maize (*Zea mays*). Indian J. Agron., 41: 51-53.
- Shakoor, A., M. Naeem and C.O. Ahmed, 1986. Efficacy of different herbicides for control of weeds in maize. Pak. J. Agric., 7: 44-50.