

Growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.) as influenced by integrated weed management under temperate conditions of North Western Himalayas

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted at Experimental Station of CSIR-IIIM, Srinagar, J&K, India during *kharif* 2013 and 2014. The experiment was laid in a randomized block design with 4 weed management practices viz., W_0 = No weeding, W_1 = Hand weeding 20 and 50 days after sowing, W_2 = atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre-emergence + hand weeding 20 days after sowing and W_3 = atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre-emergence + Isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ post-emergence. The results revealed that weed management practices W_2 at par with W_3 significantly improved plant height, number of functional leaves, leaf area index and dry matter production at different growth stages as compared to W_0 , whereas W_2 took significantly more number of days for the crop to reach different phenological stages over rest of the treatments including control during both years of study. Similarly, W_2 being at par with W_3 recorded significant improvement in all yield contributing characters over W_1 and W_0 . Both grain and stover yields were also significantly higher with W_2 over W_1 and W_0 . Significantly higher biological yield and harvest index was recorded with W_3 as compared to the rest of treatments during both the years of experimentation.

Key words: Weed management, growth, yield, yield attributes, maize

Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.), belonging to the grass family *Gramineae*, is believed to have originated from Mexico or Central America and spread to West Africa with early European traders in the 16th century. It is the third most important cereal in the world after rice and wheat [1]. It is produced throughout the country in India under diverse environments. In

27 industrialized countries maize is largely used as livestock feed and as a raw material for
28 industrial products, while in developing countries, it is mainly used for human consumption.
29 Maize is consumed mainly as second-cycle produce in the form of meat, eggs and dairy
30 products. It is an important source of proteins (10.4%), fat (4.5%), starch (71.8%), fiber (3%),
31 vitamins and minerals like Ca, P, S and small amounts of Na. Its flour is considered to be a
32 good diet for heart patients due to its low gluten (protein) content [2].

33 Crop yield loss could be caused in high extent by increase in the weed biomass, weed
34 density and weed species [3]. Weeds are one of the greatest limiting factors to efficient crop
35 production. *Cynodon dactylon*, *Marsilea quadrifoliata*, *Poa annua*, *Echinochloa crus-galli*,
36 *Ammania auriculata*, *A. baccifera* and *Anagallis arvensis* are common weed which are found
37 in the study area and most of them are associated with the maize [4]. As a consequence of
38 structural and financing problems the cultural condition of the soil deteriorates and weeds
39 proliferate and many species are hard to kill [5].

40 Weed infestation, results in severe reduction in crop yield as in the condition of pure
41 corn culture, corn losses of 40– 60% have been reported [6]. Crop yield loss could be caused
42 in high extent by increase in the weed biomass, weed density and weed species [3]. Weeds are
43 one of the greatest limiting factors to efficient crop production. As a consequence of
44 structural and financing problems the cultural condition of the soil deteriorates and weeds
45 proliferate; many species are hard to kill [5]. Weed infestation, results in severe reduction in
46 crop yield as in the condition of pure corn culture, corn losses of 40– 60% have been reported
47 [6]. During the recent years maize yields have become stagnant and this situation cannot coup
48 to solve the food problems of ever increasing population. It is a necessity to continuously
49 increase the production to meet the demands of people. The low productivity of the crop is
50 due to several constraints viz., weed management practices, planting methods, nutrition etc.
51 Weed management practices plays a great role in increasing maize yields. Farmers usually

give more importance to cultural practices and neglect other factors like weed control. As the maize is usually grown during the hot summer months of May and June when manual labour is difficult to employ; therefore, other methods of weed control are more feasible, less laborious, cost effective and economical.

Several weed species that are strong competitors, compete with the maize crop and thus the yield is decreased. Weed management strategies attempt to limit the deleterious effects of weeds growing with crop plants. These effects could be quite variable, but the most common is competition for available resources. The quantities of growth factors used by weeds are thus unavailable to the crop. As there are limitations of every weed control method; therefore, integrated weed management is a good option for sustainable agriculture. It involves the combination of all the possible methods to suppress the weeds below economic threshold levels. Although some methods are effective against weeds, they prove uneconomical for the farmers or pose environmental hazards. Keeping in view the above points, the present study was undertaken to determine the effect of weed management practices on growth, yield and yield attributes of maize.

Materials and Methods

Experimental site

A field experiment was conducted at Experimental Station (33° 53' 0" N and 74° 55' 0" E) of CSIR of Indian Institute of Integrative Medicine, Srinagar (J&K) during *kharif* 2013 and 2014. The climate of the experimental site was mid to high altitude temperate type characterized by hot summers and severe winters. The average annual precipitation was 812 mm (average over past twenty years) and more than 80 % of precipitation was received from western disturbances in the form of snow and rains. The mean maximum temperature was 16.73 °C and minimum 2.71 °C during first year (2013) and 16.73 and 2.08 °C during second year (2014), respectively. The mean maximum and minimum relative humidity was 85.74 and

77 86.75 and 53.75 and 58.17 per cent during 2013 and 2014, respectively. The total rainfall
78 received during the entire growing season of 2013 and 2014 amounted to 383.70 mm and
79 426.10 mm, respectively.

80 **Experimental design and treatment details**

81 The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with 4 weed management
82 practices viz. W_0 = no weeding, W_1 = hand weeding 20 and 50 days after sowing, W_2 =
83 atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} (pre-emergence) + hand weeding 20 days after sowing and W_3 =
84 atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} (pre-emergence) + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} (post-emergence)
85 with 3 replications.

86 **Land preparation, fertilizer management and inter-culture operations**

87 The land was irrigated after harvesting the previous crop and then disc ploughed
88 followed by two turns with tiller and one turn with rotavator to bring the soil to fine tilth. The
89 block borders, plot bunds and drainage channels were made manually. The experimental plots
90 were leveled before sowing of seed. The maize variety “C6” was sown at a spacing of 75 cm
91 x 20 cm between rows and plants, respectively. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were
92 applied through urea, diammonium phosphate and muriate of potash, respectively. Full dose
93 of phosphorus and potassium and $1/3^{rd}$ of nitrogen were banded as per the treatment just
94 before sowing of seed. Remaining nitrogen was top dressed in two equal splits at knee high
95 and tasselling stages. Two herbicides viz., atrazine and isoproturon were used in this
96 experiment. Atrazine was sprayed pre-emergence @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} immediately after
97 sowing and isoproturon was sprayed as post-emergence @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} after the
98 emergence of weeds.

99 **Observations recorded**

100 Five randomly selected maize plants in each plot were tagged for various periodic

observations. Growth parameters viz., plant height (cm), leaf area index, days to reach different phenological stages (knee high, tasseling, silking, and maturity), and dry matter production (q ha^{-1}), were recorded from penultimate rows of each plot. The leaf area of each leaf was calculated by multiplying the length and maximum width. The value thus obtained was multiplied by a constant 0.73309 to get actual leaf area and then leaf area index (LAI) was calculated by dividing the leaf area per plant by ground surface provided to each plant (1200 sq. cm). Yield attributes viz., cob length, cobs plant^{-1} , grains cob^{-1} , cob diameter, no. of rows cob^{-1} , and 100-grain weight and number of cobs plant^{-1} were recorded from five randomly selected plants from each plot. After harvesting the crop, cobs and stalks were properly sun dried and bundled. The bundle weight of each net plot was recorded and expressed as biological yield. The grain yield of each net plot was thoroughly cleaned and sun dried. The yield from each plot was recorded separately as kg plot^{-1} and then converted in q ha^{-1} . After removal of the cobs from stalks in each net plot, the stalks were weighed to determine the stover yield in q ha^{-1} . Harvest index (%) was determined by dividing the weight of grains per plot at 15 % moisture content by total produce per plot and multiplying by 100.

$$\text{Harvest index} = \frac{\text{Grain yield}}{\text{Biological yield}} \times 100$$

Statistical analysis

The data obtained in respect of various observations were statistically analyzed by the method described by [7]. The significance of “F” and “t” was tested at 5% level of significance.

Results and Discussion

Growth characters

A perusal of the data (Table 1a, b) indicates that weed management practices W_2

(atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre-emergence + hand weeding 20 DAS) while remaining at par with W₃ (atrazine 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ POST) recorded the taller plants as compared to W₁ (hand weeding 20 and 50 days after sowing) and W₀ (no weeding). This is true at all the stages of growth i.e. knee height, tasseling, silking and maturity during both the years of experimentation. The height of plant is an important growth character directly linked with the productive potential of plant in terms of fodder grains and yield. Plant height has been reported to be positively correlated with productivity of plants [8]. This may be attributed to higher weed densities under the treatment that had compete with maize for nutrients, soil moisture, height and carbon dioxide [7]. Among herbicide treatments W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) at par with W₃ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST) produced significantly taller plants than other treatments. This was probably due to better weed control with the treatments that enabled lower densities of weeds to compete with crop for resources. Similar results were also reported by [9,10]. Results from the study showed that W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) and W₃ (atrazine 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ POST) registered significantly higher number of functional leaves at all stages of growth during both the years of experimentation compared to W₁ (hand weeding 20 and 50 days after sowing) and W₀ (no weeding). This might be attributed to severe competition of high weed densities for resources viz; sunlight, moisture and nutrients thereby making maize plants weaker enough to produce more functional leaves which was closely followed by W₃ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoprutron @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST). The reasons for this might be that atrazine functions by binding to the plasto quinone-binding protein in photosynthesis II. Weed death results from starvation and oxidative damage caused by breakdown in the electron transport process. The oxidative damage is accelerated at high light intensity [11].

151 Significantly higher leaf area was recorded with treatment W₃ (atrazine @1.0 kg a.i.
152 ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST), however, it remained at par with W₂
153 (atrazine @1.0 kg ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS), while significantly lower leaf area
154 index was observed in no weeding treatment at all crop growth stages. This might be due to
155 severe competition of weeds for growth resources which made the crop plant inefficient to
156 utilize the higher leaf area index at various growth stages was noticed under W₂ (atrazine @
157 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) and W₃ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE +
158 isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST) treatments (Table 1a, b). This could be attributed to better
159 control of weeds in early growth stages of crop which provided the crop plants optimum
160 environment to utilize growth resources efficiently resulting in better growth of crop. The
161 herbicide treatment W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) took more
162 number of days for crop to reach various phenological stages. This could be attributed to the
163 fact that reduced competition with weeds for nutrients especially higher supply of nitrogen
164 might have enhanced the vegetative phase of crop and delaying its maturity.

165 The study revealed that dry matter production at different crop growth stages
166 increased significantly upto W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS)
167 treatment (Table 1a, b). In fact, plant dry matter accumulation depends on the quantity of total
168 carbon fixed by photosynthesis and the fraction of that carbon converted to dry matter [12].
169 In addition to the presence of biotic and abiotic stresses, plant dry matter accumulation
170 depends on the quantity of radiation absorbed by the canopy [13]. The higher dry matter
171 recorded under W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) treatment could
172 be possibly due to better weed control and weed control efficiency resulting in lower weed
173 density and higher dry matter. In addition, lower weed competition with maize, taller maize
174 plants, higher LAI, higher efficiency in intercepting and absorbing solar radiation and
175 partitioning of assimilate and inorganic nutrients may have promoted higher dry matter

accumulation under W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) treatment. The results are in line with those reported by [8,10,14].

Yield and yield attributing characters

Various yield contributing characters viz., cob length and diameter cobs per plant grain rows and number of grains per plant and 100-seed weight recorded under W₂ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) and W₃ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST) treatment as well as unweeded treatments were significantly higher than other weed control treatment as well as unweeded treatment (Table 2). In fact reduced weed competition due to atrazine applied PRE allowed the crop stand growth better and utilize the available nutrients especially nitrogen which is because of its cell division and cell elongation role improved cob length and diameter as well as number of cobs per plant. Higher number of grains per cob could be attributed to better translocation of metabolites for seed development and decrease in number of grains in W₁ (hand weeding 20 and 50 days after sowing) and W₀ (no weeding) treatments was due to increase in weed competition [15,16,17] reported that maximum 100-seed weight was recorded with pre-emergence application of atrazine at 0.50 kg a.i ha⁻¹ in combination with pendimethalin at 0.25 kg a.i ha⁻¹.

The results of the investigation reveal that the lowest grain yield was found under unweeded treatments (Table 3). This could be attributed to greater renewal of nutrients and moisture by weeds and a severe crop weed competition resulted in poor source and sink development with poor yield components. These results are similar to other reported research [10,18,19]. Among weed control treatments W₂ (atrazine @1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) followed by W₃ (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST) recorded maximum grain yield which could be attributed to improved yield component viz.; higher number of cobs/plant, grains per cob and 100-grain weight. This

improvement in turn was due to higher dry matter production and distribution in different parts, higher LA1 [20]. This implies that with effective and efficient weed control, more plant nutrients are made available to the crop for enhanced leaf area formation that increases solar radiation interception thereby favouring better utilization of photosynthesis for higher grain yield. Both stover and biological yield were also significantly higher under W_2 (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) and W_3 (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST) treatments (Table 3). Higher biological yield and stover yield is the effect of higher plant height, more number of functional leaves and higher dry matter production. Harvest index is defined as a ratio of yield biomass to the total biomass at harvest [16,21,22]. During the study it was found that lowest harvest index was observed under no weeding W_0 (no weeding) treatment which could be attributed to higher partitioning of assimilates to vegetative biomass at the expense of sink (grains). Significantly higher harvest index was observed under W_2 (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 DAS) treatment though at par with W_3 (atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ PRE + isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ POST). This could be attributed to adequate suppression of weed growth as well as more availability of plant nutrients to maize crop which favoured better utilization of photo-assimilates for grain yield formation. Similar results have been discussed by [8,23].

Conclusion

Various aspects of the present investigation and observation generated showed that all growth, yield and yield attributing traits were discernible influenced various weed management practices. Results clearly suggested that for temperate environment of Kashmir Valley, from stand point of higher growth and yield of maize, the application of atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ PRE + hand weeding 20 days after sowing or atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ PRE + Isoproturon @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ POST were found to be appropriate weed management practices.

References

1. Gull S, Khanday, BA. Influence of fertility levels and weed management practices on

- 229 yield and yield attributes of rain-fed maize. Scientific Research and Essays. 2015; 10(24):
230 659-663.
- 231 2. Hamayun M. Effect of spacing and weed free periods on the productivity of maize (*Zea*
232 *mays* L.). Pakistan Journal of Weed Science & Research. 2003; 9(3&4): 179-184.
- 233 3. Blackshaw RE, Lemerle D, Mailer R, Young KR. Influence of wild radish on yield and
234 quality of canola. Weed Sci. 2002; 50: 334–349.
- 235 4. Farkas A. Soil management and tillage possibilities in weed control. Herbologia 2006; 7:
236 9–23.
- 237 5. Siddiq MAA, Reshi Z, Sapru BL, Kachroo, P. Weeds of kharif crops in Kashmir Valley.
238 Indian Journal of Weed Science 1986; 17(3):22-34.
- 239 6. Thobatsi T. Growth and yield responses of maize (*Zea mays* L.) and cowpea (*Vigna*
240 *unguiculata*) in a intercropping system. MSc Thesis, University of Pretoria. 2009. p.
241 149.
- 242 7. Cochran WG, Cox GM. Planning and analysis of non-experimental studies. In:
243 *Proceedings of the Twelfth Conference on the Design of Experiments in Army Research*
244 *and Testing*, ARO-D Report. 1967; 67(2): 319-36.
- 245 8. Saeed IM, Abbasi K, Kazim M. Response of maize to nitrogen and phosphorus
246 fertilization under agronomic condition of Rawalakot Azad Jammu and Kashmir.
247 Pakistan Journal of Biology. 2001; 4: 949-952.
- 248 9. Riaz M, Jamil M, Mahmood TZ. Yield of maize as affected by various weed control
249 methods. Int. J. Agri Biol. 2007; 9(1): 152–155.
- 250 10. Makinde JO, Ogunbodede BA. Evaluation of atrazine plus isoxaflutole (Atoll) mixture
251 for weed control in maize. Ghana J. Agric Sci. 2007; 40: 193-198.
- 252 11. Naveed M, Ahmad R, Nadeem MA, Nadeem SM, Shahzad K, Anjum MA. Effect of a
253 new post emergence herbicide application in combination with urea on growth yield and

254 weed control in maize. J Agric Res. 2008; 46(2): 157-110.

255 12. Appleby AP, Miller F, Carpy S. "Weed control" in Ulmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial
256 Chemistry. 2002. Wiley-VCH, www.weinheim. doi:10.1002/14356007.928-165.

257 13. Norman JM, Arkebaver TJ. Predicting canopy photosynthesis and light use efficiency
258 from leaf characteristics. In: *Model Crop Photosynthesis from Bio-chemistry to Canopy*.
259 1991. [Eds. K.J. Boote and R.S. Loomis]. CSSA Spec. Publ. 19 CSSA, Madison, WI., pp.
260 75-94.

261 14. Sinclair TR, Muchow RC. Radiation use efficiency. Advances in Agronomy. 1999; 65:
262 216-265.

263 15. Singh Y. On farm weed control in rice (*Oryza sativa*) for higher production. in mid
264 western U.P. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2002; 34(1&2): 126.

265 16. Thakur DR, Sharma Y. Integrated weed management in rainfed maize (*Zea mays* L.).
266 Indian Weed Science. 1996; 28(3&4): 207-208.

267 17. Haji ID, Hunshal CS, Malligwad LH, Basavaraj B, Chimmad VP. Effect of pre and
268 post emergence herbicides on weed control in maize (*Zea mays* L.). Karnataka J Agric
269 Sci. 2012; 25(3): 392-394.

270 18. Patel VJ, Upadhyay PN, Patel JB, Patel BD. Evaluation of herbicide mixtures for weed
271 control in maize (*Zea mays* L.) under Middle Gujarat conditions. The Journal of
272 Agricultural Sciences. 2006; 2(1): 15-20.

273 19. Sinha SP, Prasad SM, Singh SJ, Sinha KK. Integrated weed management in winter
274 maize (*Zea mays*) in North Bihar. Indian J. Weed Sci. 2003; 35(3/4): 273-274.

275 20. Kolage AK, Shinde SH, Bhilare RL. Weed management in *kharif* maize. J.
276 Maharashtra Agric Univ. 2004; 29(1): 110-111.

277 21. Kamble TC, Kakade SU, Nemade SU, Pawar RV, Apotikar VA. A integrated weed
278 management in hybrid maize. Crop Res. Hisar. 2005 29(3): 396-400.

279 22. Worku M, Zelleke H. Advances in improving harvest index and grain yield of maize in
280 Ethiopia. East African Journal of Science. 2007; 1(2): 112-119.

281 23. Salisbury FB, Ross CW. Allelochemicals and Allelopathy. In: *Plant Physiology* (2nd
282 Ed.), Wadsworth Publication Co. Inc. Belmont, California. 1978; p. 357.

283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292

Table 1a: Growth characters of maize as affected by integrated weed management.

Treatments	Growth stages							
	2013				2014			
	Knee high	Tasseling	Silking	Maturity	Knee high	Tasseling	Silking	Maturity
Plant height (cm)								
W ₀	50.22	155.15	160.97	163.87	51.21	153.09	160.38	164.38
W ₁	54.19	161.13	168.56	172.72	55.43	163.01	169.46	174.43
W ₂	59.31	167.52	175.64	181.42	59.84	169.07	177.51	182.14
W ₃	58.28	166.63	173.99	179.63	58.49	167.18	175.81	180.37
SE(m) ±	0.791	0.953	1.183	1.187	0.796	1.054	1.193	1.230
CD (p=0.05)	2.435	2.934	3.645	3.657	2.451	3.247	3.675	3.789
Number of functional leaves								
W ₀	3.58	8.78	8.29	3.53	4.88	9.98	8.99	3.74
W ₁	5.44	10.24	9.89	4.09	5.97	10.58	9.82	4.05
W ₂	7.18	11.28	11.40	4.31	8.11	11.03	12.03	4.57
W ₃	6.95	11.13	11.06	4.29	7.31	10.90	10.26	4.38
SE(m) ±	0.108	0.192	0.125	0.090	0.312	0.271	0.334	0.177
CD (p=0.05)	0.334	0.590	0.384	0.277	0.960	0.836	1.030	0.545
Leaf area index								
W ₀	1.24	2.08	1.63	1.35	1.23	1.92	1.49	1.20
W ₁	1.73	2.64	2.44	1.83	1.79	2.74	2.49	1.85
W ₂	1.85	2.80	2.68	1.93	1.88	2.93	2.79	2.02
W ₃	1.87	2.82	2.70	2.06	1.89	2.95	2.84	2.06
SE(m) ±	0.032	0.017	0.029	0.034	0.020	0.028	0.033	0.033
CD (p=0.05)	0.098	0.051	0.089	0.105	0.062	0.085	0.102	0.101

Where, W₀ = No weeding, W₁ = Hand weeding 20 and 50 DAS, W₂ = Atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre emergence + Hand weeding 20 DAS and W₃ = Atrazine @1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ pre emergence + Isoproturon @ 1.0 Kg a.i. post emergence)

299 **Table 1b: Growth characters of maize as affected by integrated weed management.**

300

Treatments	Growth stages							
	2013				2014			
	Knee high	Tasseling	Silking	Maturity	Knee high	Tasseling	Silking	Maturity
Dry matter production (q ha^{-1})								
W ₀	6.28	38.27	61.32	92.83	6.31	39.59	63.28	95.50
W ₁	6.91	43.27	68.74	102.95	6.99	43.47	69.03	105.35
W ₂	7.38	47.03	74.31	110.55	7.93	50.18	78.96	114.91
W ₃	7.30	46.40	73.37	109.27	7.67	48.11	75.90	112.73
SE(m) $\pm$	0.061	0.934	1.180	1.549	0.211	0.920	1.231	1.583
CD (p=0.05)	0.189	2.876	3.635	4.772	0.651	2.833	3.792	4.875
Days taken to phenological stages								
W ₀	37.73	70.90	96.78	122.08	37.72	71.83	97.35	121.53
W ₁	39.13	72.52	98.03	123.18	38.95	71.90	99.03	122.17
W ₂	41.78	75.30	100.82	126.75	41.30	74.30	101.12	125.25
W ₃	39.95	73.37	98.87	124.82	39.73	72.27	99.80	124.48
SE(m) $\pm$								
CD (p=0.05)	1.435	1.356	1.554	1.456	1.434	1.473	2.363	2.756

301 Where, W₀ = No weeding, W₁ = Hand weeding 20 and 50 DAS, W₂ = Atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre emergence + Hand weeding 20 DAS and W₃ = Atrazine @1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹

302 pre emergence + Isoproturon @ 1.0 Kg a.i. post emergence)

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311 **Table 2: Yield contributing characters of maize as affected by integrated weed management.**

312

Treatments	Cob length (cm)	Cobs plant ⁻¹	Grains cob ⁻¹	Cob diameter (cm)	Number of rows cob ⁻¹	100-grain weight (g)
2013						
W ₀	11.83	1.065	390.00	1.58	12.83	18.70
W ₁	12.91	1.100	409.22	1.93	15.94	20.02
W ₂	14.11	1.123	425.67	2.23	18.63	22.27
W ₃	14.06	1.11	421.83	2.21	16.19	21.26
SE(m) ±	0.065	0.017	2.331	0.091	0.26	0.299
CD (p=0.05)	0.20	NS	7.18	0.28	0.78	0.92
2014						
	13.96	1.12	416.18	2.09	16.31	20.66
W ₀	14.05	1.09	399.06	1.78	13.92	18.59
W ₁	15.09	1.11	419.95	2.06	16.11	20.29
W ₂	16.45	1.13	433.11	2.31	17.92	22.38
W ₃	16.21	1.13	429.50	2.20	16.80	22.07
SE(m) ±	0.305	0.009	2.575	0.049	0.24	0.328
CD (p=0.05)	0.94	0.03	7.93	0.15	0.69	1.01

313 Where, W₀ = No weeding, W₁= Hand weeding 20 and 50 DAS, W₂ = Atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre emergence + Hand weeding 20 DAS and W₃= Atrazine @1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹

314 pre emergence + Isoproturon @ 1.0 Kg a.i. post emergence)

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324 **Table 3: Yield and harvest index of maize as affected by integrated weed management.**

Treatments	2013				2014			
	Biological yield	Harvest index	Seed yield	Stover yield	Biological yield	Harvest index	Seed yield	Stover yield
W ₀	101.88	39.31	40.83	63.05	103.58	40.03	42.27	63.31
W ₁	110.40	39.59	44.89	68.51	112.12	40.24	46.32	68.80
W ₂	122.69	40.71	49.54	72.14	124.25	41.13	50.69	72.56
W ₃	119.40	40.66	48.96	71.45	120.82	41.03	49.99	71.83
SE(m) ±	2.064	0.045	0.240	0.759	2.337	0.052	0.266	0.652
CD (p=0.05)	6.36	0.14	0.74	1.94	7.20	0.16	0.82	1.21

325 Where, W₀ = No weeding, W₁ = Hand weeding 20 and 50 DAS, W₂ = Atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i ha⁻¹ pre emergence + Hand weeding 20 DAS and W₃ = Atrazine @1.0 kg a.i. ha⁻¹
 326 pre emergence + Isoproturon @ 1.0 Kg a.i. post emergence)