



Weed Smothering in Mustard (*Brassica spp*) by its High-Density Uniform Broadcast Sowing

Asesh Kumar Ghorai ^{a+++} and Ankit Kumar Ghorai ^b

^a ICAR-CRIJAF, Barrackpore, Kolkata, India.

^b Assistant Director of Agriculture (Bagmundi, Purulia, WB), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2023/v13i21656

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/96398>

Original Research Article

Received: 08/12/2022

Accepted: 16/02/2023

Published: 22/02/2023

ABSTRACT

Manual weed control in mustard is very expensive because of its high labour requirement i.e., 150-250 labourers/ha. Chemical weed control again imposes environmental hazards. Mechanical weed control in mustard is not still that popular till date. Due to severe weed competition, the yield reduction in Indian mustard may go as high as 70 per cent. Thus weed control in zero till mustard using its high-density sowing (HDS) was studied in different farmers' field, at ICAR-CRIJAF, in North 24 PGS and Purulia, from 2018-2022. Fast growing and high-density uniform mustard canopy (100-200 m²) developed at early stages hinders sunlight penetration (up to 99.98 per cent) below its canopy (at 35- 40 days), leading to scanty and under developed growth of different composite weed species at harvest, those germinate or grow below mustard canopy. Weed population below mustard canopy was reduced by 92 to 97 per cent at mustard harvest. It was only 10-80/m² at harvest over 350-1000/m² in weedy situation at initial germination. The reduction of dicot weed biomass below matured mustard at harvest was 81-99 percent (5-150g/ m²) percent over weedy plots (500-800/ m²). Reduction of effective flowers/pods of different weeds under

⁺⁺ Retired Principal Scientist;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: aseshghorai@gmail.com;

matured mustard canopy were up to 99.5 percent. Proper agronomic management practices of HDS mustard e.g., seed rate, date of sowing, uniformity of sowing, irrigation and fertiliser application will eliminate the herbicide application or manual weeding in mustard. Nearly 80 percent mustard plants remain active at harvest. It saves 150-250 labours /ha depending on weed species and its density of germination. Mustard grain yield ranged from 15-30 q/ha depending on management and varieties used. This weed smothering merit of mustard can be used for eco friendly weed control in other wide spaced field/horticultural crops using its dwarf variety (Toria).

Keywords: Weed smothering; light transmission; weed biomass; weed population; mustard yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

Manual weed control in mustard is almost impossible because it's of high labour requirement (150-250 numbers/ha). Chemical weed control imposes environmental hazards. Mechanical weed control is not still that popular till date. Unlike other oilseed crops, mustard suffers more from weed competition in early growth stages especially between 20-40 day after sowing [1]. Due to severe weed competition, the yield reduction in Indian mustard may go as high as 70 per cent [2]. Proper agronomic management practices of high density broadcast sowing mustard with particular reference to seed rate, date of sowing, uniform sowing, irrigation and fertiliser application will eliminate the weeding problem in it and eliminate herbicide or manual weeding requirement in mustard. Mustard cover crops can suppress weeds through a variety of mechanisms both during growth. During cover crop growth, weed germination may be inhibited through shade-induced reduction in the ratio of red to far-red light, while subsequent growth and reproduction may be suppressed through competition for light, water, or nutrients [3]. Kumar et al., [4] found that yellow mustard reduced biomass and seed production of hairy galinsoga [*Galinsoga ciliata* (Raf.) S.F. Blake] by more than 95%. Plant densities also have an effect on weeds. Increasing crop canopy per unit area by manipulating plant density has significant impact on suppressing weed growth [5]. Singh [6] reported that the lowest seed rate of 4 kg/ha recorded significantly higher weed density and dry matter accumulation than higher seed rates of 5 and 6 kg/ha, respectively. In hemp increase of plant density from 100 to 200 plants m^{-2} markedly reduced weed weight from 23.2 to 6.5 g m^{-2} . Further reductions in weed weights in hemp field were observed at 300 plants m^{-2} (2.6 g m^{-2}) and 400 plants m^{-2} (1.5 g m^{-2}), Hall et.al., [7]. Fast growing dense jute canopy (200-348/ m^2) at 25 days after sowing with mean height of 29 cm, reduces the light penetration at

its canopy base by 90-95 per cent and dominated all C4 weeds and eliminated weeding in jute. It reduced the grass, broadleaf, sedges weed population and weed bio mass by 70, 98.5, 64.5 and 91.65 per cent respectively over manual weeding twice [8], produced jute fibre yield upto 38q/ha. In plots with the highest seeding rate (8 million/ha) of spring wheat, weed biomass was significantly lower, however lodging problem, especially in early seeded plots occurred [9] in Lithuania. Marin and Weiner [10] reported on average, weed biomass was reduced by 72% in the first year and 58% in the second year, and maize grain yield was increased by 48% and 44% at the highest density in the grid pattern compared with standard sowing practices (medium density, row pattern). Increased density and uniformity can contribute to weed management in maize in many cases, potentially reducing the need for herbicides or mechanical weed control. Thus weed control in zero till/tilled mustard fields using its high density broadcast sowing was postulated and studied from farmers' field and at ICAR-CRIJAF from 2018-2022.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The observations were taken from large farmers' field in different blocks of North 24 PGS, Purulia, WB and experiments from ICAR-CRIJAF, Barrackpore, West Bengal, 2018-22. Zero till paira mustard (mixed with sand 1:3 ratio) were sown (1st week of November) in double criss-cross pattern (for uniform stand) within matured rice (cv. Kshitish, Gotra etc) field 10 days before its harvest, in well drained muddy soil. Seed (viability > 90 per cent) rate used were 7.5 (3 g/1000 seeds) to 10 kg/ha (bold seed 5g/1000seeds). Mustard varieties used were Bullet, B-9, Agrani, hybrid mustard, Pusa bold, and Varuna etc in different locations. Basal fertiliser (N:P:K:: 25:65:65, through N:P:K:: 10:26:26 @ 250 kg/ha) were applied before or after mustard seeding on muddy soil along with 15 kg nitrogen in urea form/ha. For conventional

cultivated mustard, N:P:K:: 40:60:60 is applied as basal dose. Forty kg N/ha is top dressed at 30 days after sowing (DAS) at branching stage. In zero till paira crop of mustard, 1st irrigation is applied at hair crack of soil/30 DAS at branching stage. For tilled soil, 1st irrigation is applied during sowing and 2nd irrigation at 30 DAS. The 3rd irrigation is applied at pod development stage. Observation of weed population (per m²) and its biomass (per m²) were taken after weed emergence and mustard harvest. Only 45 cm width around the mustard field has to be manually weeded to prevent weed seed formation. Plant protection measures were taken as per recommendations. Light interception was measured at 35-40 days of crop growth by LX-102 Light Meter (Lutron) during 11 am.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Prevalent Weed Population: i) Grass: *Cynodon dactylon* ii) Dicot: *Chenopodium album*, *Solanum nigrum*, *Physalis minima*, *Ageratum conyzoides*, *Amaranthus viridis*, *Euphorbia microphyla*, *Euphorbia prostrata*, *Medicago lupulina*, *Alternanthera spp*, *Cleom viscosa*, *Melilotus spp*, *Digera spp*, *Celosia spp*, *Vicia spp*, *Anagalis arvensis*, *Sonchus spp*, *Rumex spp*, *Taraxacum spp*, *Gnaphalium spp* etc (Table 1). and iii) Sedges: *Cyperus rotundus*.

Depending on species the weed population reaches up to 1000/m², *Chenopodium album* in particular. Fast growing high-density mustard canopy (100-200/m² depending on seed size and seed rates) developed at early stages (Photo 1) blocks sunlight penetration (up to 99.98 per cent, Photo 2, Table 2) below its canopy (of average plant height 30 cm at 35- 40 days), leading to smothering or under growth of composite weed species, those germinate or grow below it. Similar result was reported in jute by Ghorai et al., [8]. It hinders the poor and lanky weeds to produce seeds. Kumar et al., 2009 found that yellow mustard reduced biomass and seed production of hairy galinsoga [*Galinsoga ciliata* (Raf.) S.F. Blake] by more than 95%.

During cover crop growth, weed germination may be inhibited through shade-induced reduction in the ratio of red to far-red light, while subsequent growth and reproduction may be suppressed through competition for light, water, or nutrients [3]. Un-uniform sowing or gapped stand allows composite weeds to germinate, grow and

produce seeds for next generation (Photo 3). Weed population below mustard canopy was reduced by 92 to 97 per cent at mustard harvest. It was only 10-80/m² at harvest over 350-1000/m² in weedy situation at initial germination (Photo, 4). The reduction of dicot weed biomass below matured mustard at harvest was 81-99 per cent (5-150g/ m²) percent over weedy plots (500-800/ m²), Table 3. Reduction of effective flowers/pods of different weeds under matured mustard canopy were up to 99.5 per cent (Table 4). However, many of the weeds perishes away before maturity or can not even produce fruits or seeds at all. Many of the initial mustard plants remain weak due to competition for light, space, moisture and nutrition arising out of population pressure. Near 80 per cent of initial mustard plants remains effective at harvest, others become week seedlings and some of them perish eventually.

Application of Pretilachlor 50% EC at 0.9l/ha as post-emergence herbicide in mustard as paira crop and immediately after rice harvest controlled *Chenopodium album* only. However, many other weed species were suppressed, remain stunted, unproductive under dense and well developed tall growing mustard at 45 days after sowing and eventually produced 11 q mustard seed/ha at ICAR-CRIJAF [8].

Most of the remaining weeds remain stunted (Photo 4) and similar results have been reported by Hall et al., [7], Auskalniene et al., [9], Marin and Weiner [10], Ghorai et al., [8] in other field crops like hemp, corn, wheat and jute. Proper agronomic management practices of high density broadcast mustard sowing with particular reference to seed rate, date of sowing, uniform sowing, irrigation, and fertiliser application in mustard will eliminate the weeding problem in it and eliminate herbicide or manual weeding in mustard and produce good crop with smothered and scanty weeds at harvest (Photo 4).

High-density broadcast sowing of mustard saves 150-250 labours/ha depending on weed species and its density of germination. The mustard crop is harvested at maturity of pods and threshed in threshing floor. Nowadays the mustard is being threshed by multi-crop thresher to minimise cost. Mustard grain yield obtained varied from 15 to 30 q/ha depending on varieties grown in different places (Table 3) [1].

Table 1. Predominant dicotyledonous weeds of mustard fields at different locations across studies

			
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	<i>Solanum nigrum</i>	<i>Ageratum conyzoides</i>	<i>Amaranthus viridis</i>
			
<i>Euphorbia microphylla</i>	<i>Euphorbia prostrata</i>	<i>Medicago lupulina</i>	<i>Alternanthera sessilis</i>
			
<i>Cleom viscosa</i>	<i>Melilotus alba</i>	<i>Digera spp</i>	<i>Celosia argentea</i>
			
<i>Vicia sativa</i>	<i>Anagalis arvensis</i>	<i>Rumex spp.</i>	<i>Spilanthus oleracea</i>



Photo 1. Weed free mustard field under zero till high-density broadcast sowing (35-40 DAS), at ICAR-CRIJAF, Barrackpore and Jagannathpur, 24 PGS (N), WB



Photo 2. Light flux above (254, left) and below (004, right) mustard canopy (in range 20000-50000 X100) in farmers field in Jagannathpur, North 24 PGS (2022)

Table 2. Light flux above and below mustard canopy under high-density zero till broadcast sowing at 35-40 days after sowing

Observation number	Flux above mustard canopy at 11 am. Range : 20000-50000 X100 (Lux)	Flux below mustard canopy at 11 am Range : 20000-50000 X100 (Lux)	Reduction of light transmission below mustard canopy (%)
1	250	8	99.97
2	240	10	99.95
3	220	12	99.94
4	250	10	99.96
5	254	4	99.98
6	260	6	99.98
7	270	12	99.95
SD ±	15.86	3.032	0.84



Photo 3. Weedy mustard field under low-density and scant plant population [24 PGS (N)]



Photo 4. Well grown mustard under high-density broadcast sowing [Swarupnagar & ICAR-CRIJAF (zero till), Purulia & Jagannathpur, 24 PGS (N), tilled] with smothered and scanty weeds at harvest

Table 3. Zero till mustard yield and its weed dynamics for some weed species

Sl. No	Locations	Mustard yield (q/ha)	Initial weed population (Nos./m ²) in weedy plots	Weed population after mustard harvest (Nos./m ²)	Initial weed biomass (g/m ²) in weedy plots	Weed biomass after mustard harvest (g/m ²)	Per cent reuction of weed biomass at mustard maturity (%)
1	ICAR-CRIJAF	15.9	400	45	500	50	90
2	Jagannathpur	30	400	20	700	5-20	97-99
3	Najat	15	350	10	500	10	98
4	Goaldah	22.5	500	60	500	66	87
5	Mochpol	15	1000	80	800	150	81
SD±		6.57	268.32	28.6	141.42	25.99	7.58

Table 4. Reduction of flowers/ pods of weeds under mustard canopy after mustard harvest

Sl. No.	Weed type	Flowers/pods of weeds under normal condition (Nos./plant)	Flowers/pods of weeds under mustard canopy after its harvest (Nos./plant)	Percent reduction of flowers/pods of weeds under canopy over normal growth (%)
1	<i>Physalis minima</i>	50	5	90
2	<i>Chenopodium album</i>	375	25	93
3	<i>Ageratum conyzoides</i>	150	10	93
4	<i>Medicago lupulina</i>	120	15	88
5	<i>Alternanthera spp.</i>	100	8	92
6	<i>Anagalis arvensis</i>	150	10	93
7	<i>Rumex spp</i>	4000	80	98
8	<i>Solanum nigrum</i>	88	4	99.95
SD±	--	1365.6	25.28	3.91

4. CONCLUSIONS

Fast growing and thick mustard canopy (100-200 m²) under high-density sowing, developed at early stages hinder sunlight penetration (up to 99.98 per cent) below its canopy (at 35- 40 days), leading to under growth/suppression of different weed species those germinate or grow below it. Appropriate agronomic management practices e.g., seed rate, date of sowing, irrigation and fertiliser application in high-density broadcast sowing will eliminate weeding in mustard. For uniform distribution the seed should be broadcasted in double criss-cross pattern. Mustard plant population varies from 150-250/m² depending on variety. It saves 150-250 labours /ha depending on weed species and its density of germination. Zero till mustard grain yield ranged from 15-30 q/ha. Only 45 cm width around the mustard field has to be manually weeded to prevent weed seed formation. The same method works well in conventional tilled broadcast mustard for its weed control. This weed smothering merit of mustard can be used for eco friendly weed control in other wide spaced field/horticultural crops using its dwarf variety (e.g., Toria).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Singh RK, Singh RP, Singh MK. weed management in rapeseed-mustard - A review. Agric Rev. 2013;341:36-49.
- Tiwari JP, Kurchania SP. Chemical control of weeds in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L). Indian J Agric Sci. Weed Management in Rapeseed-Mustard- A Review. 1993;63(5):272-5.
- Holt JS. Plant responses to light: A potential tool for weed management. Weed Sci. 1995;43(3):474-82. DOI: 10.1017/S0043174500081509
- Kumar V, Brainard DC, Bellinder RR. Effects of spring sown cover crops on establishment and growth of hairy Galinsoga (*Galinsoga ciliata*) and four vegetable crops. Horticulture. 2009;44(3): 730-6. DOI: 10.21273/HORTSCI.44.3.730
- Bhan VM. Pest management and their control. In: David BV, editor. Narmutha. Indian SCENARIO. Madras, India. 1992;82-94.
- Singh R. Effect of cropping sequence, seed rate and weed management on weed growth and yield of Indian mustard in western Rajasthan. Indian J Weed Sci. 2006;38(1&2):69-72.
- Hall J, Surya PB, David JM. Effect of industrial hemp (*Cannabis sativa* L) planting density on weed suppression, crop growth, physiological responses, and fibre yield in the subtropics. Renewable Bio. Resources. 2014. DOI: 10.7243/2052-6237-2-1
- Ghorai AK, Roy S. Weed Smothering in Jute (*Corchorus olitorius* L.) by its High Density Broadcast Sowing. J Krishi Vigyan. 2022;10(2):329-35. DOI: 10.5958/2349-4433.2022.00059.9
- Auskalniene O, Kadziene G, Jomantaite B. The influence of crop density and sowing

- delay on weed germination in winter wheat. *Julius Kühn-Archiv*. 2018;458:307-9.
10. Marín C, Weiner J. Effects of density and sowing pattern on weed suppression and grain yield in three varieties of maize under high weed pressure. *Weed Res*. 2014; 54(5):467-74.
DOI: 10.1111/wre.12101

© 2023 Ghorai and Ghorai; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/96398>