Weed control in direct seeded rice using new herbicide combination Under Indian Tropical Condition

ABSTRACT

Direct seeded rice (DSR) is gaining momentum in India due to acute labour shortage during the peak period of transplanting and shortage of water. ~~high demand of labour during peak season of transplanting and short period availability of water.~~ Weeds are the major biological constrain in DSR ~~management is a major factor contributing a considerable share to the cost of production and deciding the final yield~~ and its management contribute a major share in cost of production, as crop and weed emerge simultaneously and exerts competition right from the beginning of the crop. ~~as the crop and weeds emerge simultaneously due to which the crop suffers competition even from early stage of growth which in turn reduces the grain yield. Weeds are the main biological constraints to its success.~~ Field experiments were conducted ~~in the~~ in *rabi* ~~season of~~ 2013 and 2014 to study the effect of new herbicide combination, bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop ~~10~~ 14 % SE ~~against weeds~~ on weed control in DSR and their residual effect on succeeding crop, green gram. Results revealed that the post-emergence (POE) application of herbicide combination, bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop ~~10~~ 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} ~~along~~ with wetter ~~gave significantly~~ recorded significantly lower total weed density (25.78 and 24.19 plants m^{-2} respectively, during 2013 and 2014), total weed biomass (24.89 g m^{-2} and 34.56 g m^{-2} respectively, during 2013 2014) and higher weed control efficiency (80.07 and 81.68% respectively, during 2013 and 2014) ~~at 40 days after herbicide spray (DAHS).~~ Application of bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop ~~10%~~ 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} along with wetter (100 ml ha^{-1}) ~~as POE herbicide can keep the weed density and dry weight below the economic threshold level and increase the~~ recorded higher grain yield of 5676 and 6388 kg ha^{-1} respectively, during both the years. ~~in DSR. Non treated control accounted for~~ Weedy check recorded the lower grain yield ~~which inturn reflected through~~ and recorded the higher weed index of 51.83 and 52.85% respectively, during both the years ~~due to heavy competition of weeds for nutrient, space and light~~. Succeeding crop of green gram ~~was sown immediately after the harvest of DSR~~ was not affected by the residue of ~~new formulation of herbicide combination~~ bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop ~~10~~ 14 % SE at all the tested ~~different~~ doses. ~~The results of this study are important for farmers growing DSR in making decisions regarding the application of POE herbicide combination, according to existing weed flora in the field~~.

Keywords: DSR, Grain yield, Green Gram, Herbicide combination, Weed biomass, Weed control efficiency, Weed density.

I. Introduction

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is the leading cereal crop of the world and more than half of the human race depend rice for their daily sustenance (Chauhan and Johnson, 2011). Globally, ~~actua~~l rice yield losses due to pests have been estimated ~~a~~t to be 40%, of which weeds caused highest yield loss ~~has the highest loss potential~~ of 32%. The worldwide estimated loss in rice yield from weeds is around 10% ~~of the total production~~ (Oerke and Dehne, 2004). Though India has the largest rice growing area with 44.8 million hectares it stands second after China with respect to production, 106.0 mt in 2013-14. Currently, India produced rice ~~that is sufficient~~ not only to meet the domestic demand but also export to other countries. ~~was largest exporter during 2012~~. However, to meet the rapidly increasing ~~he rapidly increasing~~ population, projected to be 1.6 billion by 2050 calls for stepping up the current production of 106 mt of milled rice to 140 mt a~~t enhanced productivity of 3.5 t ha~~$^{-1}$(put reference). Transplanting is the traditional system of rice cultivation and it is in vogue in many rice growing areas. Such a rice production system, ~~however,~~ requires ~~a~~ large amount of water during puddling and transplanting (Chauhan 2012a, Chauhan *et al*., 2012b). In order to ~~check the declining water table,~~ reduce the use of water, a new technique of crop establishment, direct seeding is now fast replacing traditional transplanting ~~rice area~~ method ~~with~~ in areas with good drainage and irrigation facilities (Balasubramanian and Hill, 2000). ~~Weeds are main biological constraints to the production of direct seeded rice (Chauhan, 2012b; Chauhan and Johnson, 2010).~~

Direct seeded rice cultivation is subjected to greater weed competition than transplanted rice because both weeds and crop seeds emerge at the same time and compete with each other for its existence. ~~germination resulting in less grain yield~~. Crop competitiveness is the ability of the crop to produce desirable yields in the presence of weeds (Zhao, 2006). In tropics, average rice yield losses from weeds is 35% (Oerke and Dehne, 2004). Sunil *et al*. (2010) ~~as~~ stated that season-long weed competition in DSR may cause yield reduction up to 80%. ~~In DSR, weeds emerge simultaneously rice seedlings at the early growth stages when rice is highly susceptible~~

to the weed competition (Khaliq and Matloob, 2011; Chauhan, 2012). Thus, an efficient and timely weed control is crucial for the success of DSR. Direct seeding can curtail water and labor inputs involved in rice production; nevertheless, its large scale adoption is impeded by heavy weed infestation. However, for cultivation of DSR, weeds are a major hurdle as nearly all *rabi* season weeds depending upon seed bank in the field infest this crop. DSR is successful only when possible provided there is good crop establishment as well as adequate weed control methods is available to keep the crop free from weeds (Rao and Nagamani, 2007). Efficient, cost-effective and timely weed management options remain pivotal to making DSR profitable and commercially acceptable. Such a strategy should help to improve the yield and reduce the production costs as well as minimize the negative effects of weeds on the quality of the produce. Timely and effective weed control has a positive correlation with good crop stand and high grain yield in DSR of DSR. Manual weeding though effective although is effective and the most common practice of weed control in direct seeded rice; these have have several limitations particularly during peak period which makes it further problematic. In hand weeding, it is difficult to differentiate and remove the grassy weeds especially *Echinochloa crusgalli* and *Echinochloa colonum* due to the phenotypical similarities between weeds and rice seedlings in the early stages. Herbicides are considered to be an alternative supplement to hand weeding. The use of herbicides offers selective control of weeds right from the beginning, giving the crop an advantage of good start and competitive superiority over weeds. Hence, chemical weed control in direct seeded rice has gained importance. because of the intensity of weed problem, coupled with the lack of labour for weeding and high cost. Chemical weed control has expanded manifold in DSR (Chauhan and Opena, 2013a, b) and is likely to increase further with the increased adoption of direct seeding.

In India, the high cost and scarcity of labour and cost effective as well as timely control of weeds have increased the use of herbicides for weed control in almost all crops (Rao *et al*., 2014). In order to control weeds, farmers use both pre and post emergence herbicides (Mahajan and Timsina, 2011). Both pre and post emergence herbicides, if properly used, are quite effective in suppressing weeds in DSR (Chauhan, 2012). To the best of our understanding, a very few studies in this line have been conducted in DSR grown in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu, India. Moreover, the rice herbicides presently used in Tamil Nadu are mainly pre-emergence therefore; weeds coming at later stages of crop growth are not controlled as effectively as the weeds at emergence stage. This situation warranted for initiating research efforts to evaluate and identify suitable post-emergence herbicides. But sometimes Continuous use of a single herbicide (pretilachlor) and indiscriminate use of herbicides may lead the buildup of herbicide resistance in

weeds. ~~Nevertheless, indiscriminate use of herbicides is driving agro ecosystem toward declining species diversity and in many situations, is leading to herbicide resistance (Powles and Yu, 2010). Singh (2008) found that the continuous changes in weed community composition in just five years.~~ Without any doubt, the development and availability of effective POE herbicides have encouraged farmers to try this new method of crop establishment (DSR) in Tamil Nadu. Currently available rice herbicide have a narrow spectrum of activity and their efficacy is further limited when they are used alone (Singh, 2008; Chauhan, 2012). This rarely provides season long weed control (Khaliq *et al*., 2011a, b). Control of complex weed flora with a single POE application is really a diffcult task for the DSR farmers (Mahajan *et al*., 2013). Therefore, the combined application of different herbicides with different mode of action is required for broad spectrum weed control in DSR and for delaying the development of herbicide resistance.

~~Hence,~~ There is a need to focus attention on new herbicide combination to enhance the weed control efficiency, broadening the spectrum of weed control and reduce the cost of cultivation ~~and labour requirements~~. ~~Literatures suggest that the repeated use of the same herbicides encourages the problem of herbicide resistance in weeds (Kim, 1996). For a broad spectrum of weed control in DSR, applications of herbicides with different mode of action (chemistry) are needed.~~ With changing scenario of weed management, farmers need new herbicides or new herbicide combination ~~having~~ with high efficacy, low phytotoxicity, ~~there was~~ no residual effect ~~on succeeding crops~~ and cost effective. ~~Thus, it is essential to identify economic and effective herbicide combinations for managing complex weed flora in DSR. This study was conducted for general detailed information for managing a mixed population of grasses, sedges and broad leaved weeds in DSR effectively and economically with herbicide combination of newly available POE herbicides.~~ Hence the present work is intended to look out the broad spectrum weed control through new POE herbicide combination bispyribac sodium + metamifop 14 % SE for weed control in DSR in ~~in *rabi* season DSR of~~ Tamil Nadu.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Experimental Site and Initial Soil Characteristics

A field study was conducted for two years (*rabi* season~~s of~~ 2013 and 2014) at the research farm of ~~Wetland Farm, (Field No: N_4),~~ Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India. The

experimental farm was located ~~in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu is~~ at 11°29" N latitude and 77° 08" E longitude with an altitude of 256 m above MSL. The climate ~~is~~ was semi arid, with an average 674.2 mm rainfall distributed over 47 rainy days ~~(mean of past 50 years~~). The maximum rainfall received during the cropping period was 70 mm. The maximum and minimum temperature received during the cropping period ranged from 35.7 to 27.0°C and 26.0 to 19.8°C, respectively during 2013 and 2014. Relative humidity ranged from 61 to 95 per cent and 29 to 75 per cent during forenoon and afternoon, respectively. The solar radiation received during the cropping period ranged from 224 to 462.6 cal cm $^{-2}$ day^{-1} and the sunshine hours ranged from 1.4 to 9.0 h day^{-1}. The evaporation prevailing during the cropping period ranged from 2.4 to 9.2 mm. The soil was clay loam in texture with a pH of 7.4 and an organic matter content of 0.5 % with low in available nitrogen (238 kg ha^{-1}), medium in available phosphorus (16.8 kg ha^{-1}) and high in available potassium (518 kg ha^{-1}). ~~with 0.5% organic matter with a pH of 7.4.~~ *2.2. Experimental design and treatments*

~~The treatments in each year were arranged in a~~ The experiment was conducted in randomized complete block design with three replication with 12 treatments (Table.1). ~~Twelve weed control treatments were included with different herbicide combination options for weed control in DSR.~~ Herbicides included in the study were bispyribac-sodium, metamifop, almix, clincher and a combination of bispyribac sodium and metamifop . These herbicides were applied ~~applied~~ alone and with wetter as in Table 1. ~~and a wetter (isoxadifen, a safener).~~

2.3. Experimental details, selection of cultivar and sowing

In each year, rice (cv. ADT 43, a cultivar with the duration of 120 days) was seeded in the first week of September and ~~the~~ harvested in last week of December. Manually operated rice drum seeder developed by Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore was used for sowing the seeds. The seeder has two wheels at both the ends. It drops the seeds at 30 cm apart in continuous row. At a time, eight rows of rice seeds were sown. A seed rate of 40 kg ha^{-1} was adopted. Before sowing the field was drained ~~to keep it under~~ to saturated condition, to facilitate easy sowing and uniform establishment of seedlings. A thin film of water was maintained at the time of sowing. For the next 8-15 days, irrigation and drainage of water were alternated to facilitate aeration, adequate moisture for germination of seed and establishments of seedlings. Thereafter, the plots were irrigated to 2 cm depth uniformly in all the treatments after the appearance of hair line cracks, up to panicle initiation stage. After panicle initiation, the plots were irrigated to 5 cm depth on disappearance of ponded water. Irrigation was stopped 15 days prior to harvest.

2.4. Treatment details

All tested herbicides were applied as POE on 10 to 15 DAS. ~~New formlation of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10 14 % SE was applied as POE herbicide on 10 to 15 DAS. Bispyribac-sodium (Nominee gold) has been widely used for DSR with its excellent foliar efficacy against grasses, sedges and broad leaved weeds. Metamifop which was discovered by Dongbu Honnong Co., Ltd. is a novel grass herbicide with excellent foliar efficacy against grasses and crop safety~~. Hand operated knapsack sprayer fitted with a flat fan type nozzle (WFN 40) was used for spraying the herbicides adopting a spray volume of 500 ~~litres~~ L ha^{-1} ~~in DSR~~. The herbicides were sprayed by keeping a thin film of water in the field. The field was neither drained nor irrigated for 2 days after application of herbicides. The non-treated control plot was kept undisturbed for the entire cropping period. In the hand treated plot, two hand weedings were given on 25 and 45 DAS.

Table 1. Herbicide treatments used in the study

Tr. No	Treatment details	Dose g ~~.a.i~~ ha^{-1}	Dose mL g^{-1} ha^{-1} of Formulation	Time of Application
T_1	Bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE + Wetter	42 ~~g a.i.~~ + 100 mL wetter	300 mL +100 mL wetter	10-15 DAS
T_2	Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + Metamifop 14 % SE + Wetter	56 ~~g a.i.~~ + 100 mL wetter	400 mL+100 mL wetter	10-15 DAS
T_3	Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + Metamifop 14 % SE + Wetter	70 ~~g a.i.~~ + 100 ml wetter	500 mL +100 mL wetter	10-15 DAS
T_4	Almix (Chlorimuron + Metsufuron 20% WP)	4 ~~g a.i.~~	20 g	10-15 DAS
T_5	Clincher (Cyhalofop Buthyl 10% EC)	80 ~~g a.i.~~	800 mL	10-15 DAS
T_6	Bispyribac sodium 10% SC + Wetter	20 ~~g a.i.~~ + 100 mL wetter	200 mL + 100 mL wetter	10-15 DAS
T_7	Metamifop 10% SE + Wetter	50 ~~g a.i.~~ + 100 mL wetter	500 mL +100 mL wetter	10-15 DAS
T_8	Bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + Metamifop 14 % SE	70 ~~g a.i.~~	500 mL	10-15 DAS
T_9	Bispyribac sodium 10% SC	20 ~~g a.i.~~	200 mL	10-15 DAS
T_{10}	Metamifop 10% SE	50 ~~g a.i.~~	500 mL	10-15 DAS
T_{11}	Hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS	---	---	---
T_{12}	Non-treated control	---	---	---

Abbreviation: DAS - Days after sowing.

2.5. Observation on weeds

2.5.1. Weed flora of the experimental field

To account ~~for~~ the general weed flora of the experimental field, species wise observations were carried out at ~~weeds observed in the treatment plots were recorded during the period of maximum appearance of~~ 20 and 40 days after herbicide spray (DAHS). ~~The weed flora of the experimental site was recorded species wise.~~

2.5.2. Weed density

The weed count was recorded species wise using 0.5 m x 0.5 m quadrant from four randomly fixed places in each plot and the weeds falling within the frames of the quadrant were counted and the mean values were expressed in number m^{-2}. The density of grasses, sedges and broad leaved weeds and also the total weeds were recorded at 20 and 40 days after herbicide application (DAHS) and expressed in number m^{-2}.

2.5.3. Weed dry weight

The weeds falling within the frames of the quadrant were collected, categorized into grasses, sedges and broadleaved weeds, first shade dried and later dried in hot-air oven at 80^{o}C for 72 hrs. The dry weight of grasses, sedges and broadleaved weeds were recorded separately at 20 and 40 DAHS and expressed in g m^{-2}.

2.5.4. Weed control efficiency

Weed control efficiency (WCE) was calculated as per the procedure ~~given~~ suggested by Mani *et al*. (1973).

$$WCE\ \% = \frac{WD_c - WD_t}{WD_c} \cdot 100$$

Where,

WCE - weed control efficiency (%)

WD_c - weed biomass (g m^{-2}) in control plot

WD_t - weed biomass (g m^{-2}) in treated plot

2.5.5. Weed index

Weed index (WI) was calculated as per the method suggested by Gill and Vijaya Kumar (1969).

$$WI = \frac{X - Y}{X} \cdot 100$$

Where, X = yield (kg ha^{-1}) from minimum weed competition plot

Y = yield (kg ha^{-1}) from the treatment plot for which WI is to be worked out.

2.6. Observation on

crop 2.6.1. Grain yield

Grains from each net plot were cleaned, sun dried, weighed and adjusted to 14% moisture content and the grain yield was expressed in kg ha^{-1}.

2.7. Residual crop cultivation

To study the residual effect of herbicides ~~applied to direct seeded rice~~, the succeeding crop of green gram (cv. Co 6) was raised without disturbing the layout of the previous experiment. After the harvest of rice crop, ~~the follow up crop~~ green gram was dibbled in rice stubbles. A seed rate of 20 kg ha^{-1} was adopted for the green gram crop with a spacing of 30 cm

x 10 cm.

2.8. Statistical analysis

The data collected ~~for direct seeded rice~~ was statistically analyzed following the procedure given by Gomez and Gomez (2010) for randomized block design. The data pertaining to weeds and germination were transformed to square root scale of $\sqrt{(X + 2)}$ and analyzed as suggested by Snedecor and Cochran (1967). Whenever significant difference existed, critical difference was constructed at five per cent probability level. ~~Such of those treatments where The differences are not significant were denoted as NS.~~

3. Results and discussion

3.1. General weed flora of the experimental field

A critical analysis of relative proportion of grasses, sedges and broad leaved ~~weeds to total weed population in non-treated contro~~l revealed that during the crop growth period, the population of sedges was higher than that of grasses and broad leaved weeds. Among the grasses, *Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) Beauv., *Echinochloa colona* (L.) Link., *Dinebra retroflexa* (Vahl.) Panzer. and *Panicum repens* (L.) were the dominant species and major sedges were *Cyperus difformis* (L.), *Cyperus irria* (L.) and *Fimbristylis miliacea* (L.) Vahl. Among the broad leaved weeds M*arsilea quadrifoliata* (Linn.), *Ammania baccifera* (L.) and *Eclipta alba* (L.) Hassk. were the dominant species. However, a species-wise result was given for the first five weeds only, as they were the predominant weeds in the experimental trial

3.2. Effect on weeds

3.2.1. Weed density and weed biomass

3.2.1.1. Echinochloa crus-galli

Weedy check plot recorded the higher population of *E. crus-galli* at 20 and 40 DAHS during both the years (20.36 and 29.45 plants m^{-1}). ~~*E. crus-galli* density in the non-treated control (20.36 and 29.45 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 34.54 and 56.89 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) recorded higher population of *E. crus-galli* at 20 and 40 DAHS (Table 2).~~ During *rabi*, 2013 the lower density of *E. crus-galli* was observed in ~~by POE application of herbicide combination~~ bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + metamifop ~~14 % SE at~~ treated plot at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} with wetter ~~at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ (2.30 and 6.54 plants m^{-2}) and was statistically similar to ~~the density of~~ bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} without wetter (2.86 and 7.86 plants m^{-2}) and bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} with

wetter + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (3.86 and 7.55 plants m^{-2}). In this study, POE application of herbicides, alone like almix at 4 g a.i. ha^{-1} (5.63 and 11.19 plants m^{-2}) and clincher at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (7.21 and 12.77 plants m^{-2}) were recorded poor control weed found to be less effective in controlling of *E. crus-galli* than that of herbicide combination of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE with wetter at + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} with three different doses. During *rabi* 2014, at 20 and 40 DAHS, POE application bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (7.52 and 10.24 plants m^{-2}) registered significantly lesser weed lower density of *E. crusgalli* which was comparable to bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (7.82 and 13.26 plants m^{-2}) and bispyribac sodium 14% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (10.76 and 16.78 plants m^{-2}). Our results confirmed that the POE application of new herbicide combination. It has also been observed that application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} obtained higher weed control during both the years due to vigorous growth of crop that did not allow later flush of *E. crus-galli*. While, this treatment was quite effective against *E. crus- galli* and *E. colona*. Thus facilitate the DSR in rice crop to attain vigorous growth at the initial stage than that and in turn provided smothering effect at later stage of the crop. Mahajan and Chauhan (2013) in an earlier study revealed that the single application of azimsulfuron and bispyribac sodium did not control *D. aegyptium.* (Not relevant to the present work, give reference related to the results of the present study)

3.2.1.2. Dinebra retroflexa

The non-treated control plot recorded higher density of The density of *D. retroflexa* in the (in at 20 and 40 DAHS (9.56 and 14.23 plants m^{-2} and 8.24 and 9.45 plants m^{-2} during 2013 and 2014, respectively). All the tested herbicide treatments reduced the density of *D. retroflexa* as compared to the non-treated control. During both the years of study, the lower density of *D. retroflexa* was observed in POE application of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (0.00 and 0.00 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 0.00 and 0.84 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) and was statistically similar to the density that of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (0.00 and 0.82 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 0.00 and 1.22 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) and bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (0.00 and 1.56 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 0.00 and 0.84 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) (Table 2).

POE application of bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (2.36 and 3.82 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 1.86 and 2.42 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) showed was more effective in reducing the it's the density of *D. retroflexa* as compared with the individual application of to clincher at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (3.22 and 4.64 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 3.02 and 5.73 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively). It was revealed from the result that Our findings proved that almost all the tested doses of bispyribac sodium + metamifop 14 % SE herbicide combination with different doses were more effective for the in controlling *D. retroflexa* than the other tested herbicides. ; however, the combined application of 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE was better when herbicides were applied as alone like almix, clincher, bispyribac sodium and metamifop. The study also indicated that This study was revealed that relatively POE application of clincher and almix against lesser effective of *D. retroflexa* control as compared to POE application of bispyribac sodium and metamifop alone.

3.2.1.3. Panicum repens

The density of *P. repens* in the non-treated control (7.42 and 11.46 plants m^{-2} in 2013 and 6.42 and 8.42 plants m^{-2} in 2014, respectively) registered. The highest population of *D. retroflexa* was recorded at 20 and 40 DAHS in the control plot (Table 2). POE application of metamifop 10% EC at 50 g a.i. ha^{-1} registered higher weed density of *P. repens* (3.22 and 5.02 plants m^{-2} and 2.44 and 4.21 plants m^{-2} during 2013 and 2014, respectively) as compared to individual application of bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} alone. During both the years, POE application of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 42, 56 and 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses recorded lower density of *P. repens* and also was significantly superior to other herbicidal treatments. The rice crop followed the herbicide combination The bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE treated plot was almost weed free and did not allow the later flush of weed seedlings to grow due to vigorous growth of the crop. In general, POE application of Post emergence application of clincher at 80 g a.i.ha^{-1} showed recorded lesser density of *P. repens* as compared to almix at 4 g a.i.ha^{-1} during both the years at both the stages of observation.

3.2.1.4. Cyperus difformis

C. difformis was one of the dominant sedge present in the experimental field. Different weed control treatments imposed to direct seeded rice significantly influenced the density of *C. difformis* at all the stages. During *rabi* 2013, application of POE herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (5.32 and 9.56 plants m^{-2}) proved to be effective in controlling the density of sedge and recorded significantly lower density of *C. difformi* at 20 and 40 DAHS (Table 3). However, POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (5.38 and 11.01 plants m^{-2}) was comparable with application of bispyribac sodium 4 % SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g a.i. ha^{-1}

with + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (7.56 and 13.19 plants m^{-2}) at both the stages of observation. obtained lesser density of *C. difformis* at 20 and 40 DAHS. Individual application of bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} (12.50 and 19.54 plants m^{-2}) and metamifop 10% EC at 50 g a.i. ha^{-1} (18.16 and 24.98 plants m^{-2}) were ineffective against sedge weed control when compared to herbicide combination. However, the combined application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE with wetter at all doses with all different doses were effectively controlled the sedges present in the experimental plots. The results also indicated the suggested a poor control of *C. difformis* by individual application of almix at 4 g a.i. ha^{-1} and clincher at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} as compared to other herbicidal combination. POE of almix at 4 g a.i. ha^{-1} (11.68 and 22.89 plants m^{-2}) registered lower density of *C. difformis* when compared to at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (14.56 and 20.19 plants m^{-2}) at 20 and 40 DAHS. Higher density of *C. difformis* was invariably observed in non-treated control (39.40 and 52.46 plants m^{-2}) at 20 and 40 DAHS. POE application of bispyribac sodium is effective mainly against *C. rotundus* was given by (Mahajan and Chauhan, 2013). During *rabi,* 2014, at 20 and 40 DAHS, bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} recorded the lowest population of *C. difformis* (2.56 and 4.16 plants m^{-2}) among all the treatments used at both the stages of observation. This was followed by the treatment with application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (2.58 and 4.57 plants m^{-2}). Based on the two year experimentation, density of *C. difformis* was lower in second season trial when compared to first season at all the stages of observation. Kumaran *et a*l. (2015) revealed that early POE application of bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 40 g a.i. ha^{-1} was more effective against C. *rotundus* as compared to pretilachlor S at 0.45 kg a.i. ha^{-1} followed by one hand weeding on 40 days after sowing (DAS).

3.2.1.5. Marsilea quadrifoliata

The density of *M. quadrifoliata* in the non-treated control plot was 17.52 and 32.45 plants m^{-2} during 2013 and 13.67 and 18.23 in 2014, respectively. All herbicide treatments reduced the density of *M. quadrifoliata* significantly as compared to the non-treated control (Table 3). The lower density of *M. quadrifoliata* was observed in POE application of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (1.15 and 2.98 plants m^{-2} during 2013 and 2.37 and 5.24 in 2014, respectively). Individual application of almix recorded lower density of *M. quadrifoliata* and was closely followed by bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} and metamifop 10% EC at 50 g a.i. ha^{-1} + wetter during both the years at 100 ml ha^{-1} during both the years. The combined application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 42, 56 and 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses as POE application were registered better control of weeds when herbicides was applied as individual like compared to almix, clincher, bispyribac sodium and metamifop.

From the study it was revealed that all the different tested doses of bispyribac sodium + metamifop new herbicide combination were more effective for the control of against grasses and

sedges when compared to broad leaved weeds. ~~This information is very helpful for DSR farmers in Tamil Nadu to achieve broad spectrum weed control.~~

3.2.2. *Total weed density*

Significant variation in total weed density was observed among the herbicidal weed control treatments. During both the years, lesser total weed density was observed with POE application of bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} with wetter ~~at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ and bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} without wetter and it was closely followed by application of bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} with wetter ~~at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ (16.80, 17.09, 22.50 and 13.90, 15.43, 18.44 during 2013 and 2014, respectively). At 40 DAHS also similar results were recorded (Table 3). Bispyribac sodium is pyrimidinyl carboxate group which inhibits the biosynthesis of amino acids. Metamifop is aryloxyphenoxy propionate group which inhibits the activity of acetyl coenzyme-A carboxylase (ACCase) leading to growth retardation of weeds. However, the combined application of both herbicides induces chlorosis selectively in weeds and insufficient chlorophyll production makes it difficult to thrive ~~for thrive of weeds~~. The combined application of these herbicides was better than their individual application in reducing the weed density, weed biomass and enhancing the productivity of rice yield. Total weed density was higher in individual application as POE application of clincher at 80 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} when compared to almix at 4 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} and it was comparable ~~similar in the~~ during both the years of study. ~~Clincher is a systemic POE herbicide and it is aryloxyphenoxy propionate group~~. ~~In the present study,~~ POE applications of clincher (alone) effectively control grassy weeds than compared to sedges and broad leaved weeds in the present study~~in direct seeded rice~~. Total weed density in weedy check ~~the non-treated control~~ were 105.20 and 156.13 plants m^{-2} during 2013; 85.93 and 1132.78 plants m^{-2} during 2014, respectively at 20 and 40 DAHS. All the herbicide treatments recorded significantly lower total weed density s~~ignificantl~~y as compared to non-treated control. ~~Earlier,~~ Mahajan and Chauhan (2013) revealed that sequential applications of pre and post-emergence herbicides provided better weed control than the sole application of pre or post-emergence herbicides in DSR.

3.2.3. *Total weed biomass*

With regard to the total weed biomass, significant variation was observed among the herbicidal weed management practices in DSR. During both the years, lower total weed biomass was observed in POE application of bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} with wetter ~~at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ (8.92 and 24.89 g m^{-2} and 11.38 and 34.56 g m^{-2} during 2013 and

2014, respectively), bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (9.54 and 31.42 g m^{-2} and 13.45 and 37.58 g m^{-2}, respectively during 2013 and 2014). These treatments were closely followed by application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (16.77 and 36.76 g m^{-2} and 18.56 and 52.62 g m^{-2} during 2013 and 2014, respectively), bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (21.56 and 40.97 g m^{-2} and 24.63 and 64.82 g m^{-2} during 2013 and 2014, respectively) and individual application of almix at 4 g a.i./ha^{-1} (24.41 and 44.91 g m^{-2} and 28.44 and 65.89 g m^{-2} during 2014, respectively) as POE herbicides at 20 and 40 DAHS (Table 4). In the present study, Herbicides differed in respect of their efficacy and bispyribac sodium emerged as promising one in averting both density and dry matter accumulation by weeds. The performance of this herbicide could be attributed to reasonable suppression of weeds and selectivity to rice crop as well. It is a member of pyrimidinyloxy benzoic chemical family, inhibits acetolactate synthase enzyme in susceptible plants and thus retarding the synthesis of branch chain amino acids (Darren and Stephen, 2006). The effectiveness of bispyribac sodium as a post-emergence herbicide for weed control in DSR is was also reported elsewhere (Mahajan *et al.*, 2009; Khaliq *et a*l., 2011b). At 20 and 40 DAHS, POE application of bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} obtained recorded lower weed biomass as compared with application of almix at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (24.41 and 44.91 g m^{-2} and 28.44 and 65.89 g m^{-2} respectively, during 2013 and 2014, respectively) and clincher at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (26.79 and 49.81 g m^{-2} and 30.44 and 63.24 g m^{-2} respectively, during 2013 and 2014). Total weed biomass in the non-treated control plot were 70.97 and 116.83 g m^{-2} and 110.56 and 188.67 g m^{-2} respectively during 2013 and 2014, respectively at 20 and 40 DAHS. All the herbicide treatments recorded lower total weed biomass significantly as compared to the non-treated control.

3.2.4. Weed control efficiency

Adoption of herbicide combination of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} treatment exhibited lowest weed infestation with higher weed control efficiency than sole herbicide application in the present study. During both the years, it was observed that POE application of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} resulted the higher weed control efficiency of 87.43 and 80.07% in 2013 and 88.45 and 81.68%, in 2014, respectively and

it was followed by application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (86.55 and 73.10 % and 86.35 and 80.08%respectively, during 2013 and 2014, respectively). In the present study at At 40 DAHS, weed control efficiency with ranged from 47.89 to 66.06% in the case individual herbicide application whereas the range was from 60.22 to 80.07% in the case of new herbicide combination during 2013. respectively and WCE ranged from 55.67 to 66.48% in the case of single individual herbicide application and 63.14 to 81.68 % in the case of new herbicide combination in during 2014, respectively (Table 4).

3.3. Effect on crop

3.3.1. Response of grain yield

Rice grain yield following all herbicide treatments ranged from 4276 to 5676 kg ha^{-1} and 4658 to 6388 kg ha^{-1}, respectively during 2013 and 2014 in herbicide treated plots, while the non-treated control plots recorded the yield of 2734 and 3012 kg ha^{-1}, respectively during in 2013 and 2014, respectively (Table 4). Higher grain yield was recorded in the plots treated with new combination herbicide, bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (5676 and 6388 kg ha^{-1}, respectively during 2013 and 2014) and it was statistically comparable with similar to the grain yield observed in the plots treated with the application of herbicide combination of of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter (5488 and 6232 kg ha^{-1}, respectively during 2013 and 2014), bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} (5442 and 6076 kg ha^{-1}, respectively during 2013 and 2014) and hand weeding twice (5256 and 5908 kg ha^{-1},respectively during 2013 and 2014). Bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14% SE showed on par with hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS for most of the yield parameters and grain yield. These treatments recorded lesser crop weed competition during the critical period of rice that was marked as more panicles per unit area, increased kernel number and kernel weight over non-treated control. Higher grain yield in response to efficient weed control are reported elsewhere (Mahajan *et al*., 2009; Khaliq *et al*., 2011a, b; Akbar *et al*., 2011). Our data showed effectiveness of manual weeding in limiting weed density and dry biomass merely owing to POE application of new herbicide combination as an effective tool for their weed management in direct seeded rice. Nonetheless, during later part of the growing season weeds were also suppressed by shading effect of rice in manually weeded plots due to quick and dense canopy closure (Baloch et al., 2005). In both the years, grain yield recorded in the plots treated with already existing molecule of almix at 4 g a.i. ha^{-1} (4948 and 5792 kg ha^{-1} respectively, during 2013 and 2014) and clincher at 80 g a.i. ha^{-1} (4404 and 5248 kg ha^{-1} respectively, during 2013 and in 2014) were statistically similar, but lower than grain yield recorded in the bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter. Though, The combined application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE

+ metamifop 14 % SE with wetter ~~with all different doses were very effective,~~ provide broad spectrum weed control and subsequently increasing the productivity of direct seeded rice in this study.

3.3.2. Weed index

The best treatment with the maximum yield was taken as the base to work out the weed index,that gives the magnitude of yield reduction due to weed competition in other treatments. New herbicide combination, ~~of POE application of~~ bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i. ha^{-1} at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ registered maximum grain yield and it was taken as the weed free plot for calculating the weed index. ~~and therefore lower yield reduction of only recorded the weed index of 3.31% and 2.44% were recorded in~~ Bispyribac sodium + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} without wetter ~~during both the years~~ recorded the weed index of 3.31 and 2.44 % respectively during 2013 and 2014 (Table 4). The yield reduction in the treatment ~~of~~ bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} with wetter ~~at 100 ml ha^{-1}~~ and bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ ha^{-1} were found to be 4.12 and 8.97% in 2013 and 4.88 and 7.47% in 2014, respectively. ~~The higher yield reduction of 24.67% was recorded occurred under~~ Metamifop 10% EC at 50 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} ~~in~~ recorded a higher weed index of 24.67 % during 2013 and bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 42 g ~~a.i~~. ha^{-1} with ~~+~~ wetter recorded a weed index of 27.08 during 2014. ~~In~~ Non-treated control plots recorded a weed index of 51.83 and 52.85%, respectively during 2013 and 2014. The higher weed index registered in non treated plot might be due to ~~reduced vegetative~~ increased weed growth and reduced nutrient availability to the crop ~~could b~~e ~~might be the reason for the lower grain yield in~~ This emphasize the importance of proper weed management for increasing dry matter production of rice with reduced weed indices, thereby increasing the crop growth and grain yield.

~~*3.3.3. Phytotoxicity rating in* direct seeded rice~~ (No table regarding the phytotoxicity ratings)

~~Application of new molecule herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at all different doses did not have any phytotoxicity effect on direct seeded rice. The phytotoxicity effect has been rated as "none".~~

3.4. Carryover effect on succeeding green gram

~~During both the years of study, the residual effect of herbicides applied to rice crop; on the succeeding crop of green gram (cv. CO 6) was raised without disturbing the previous layout of the experiment. After the harvest of rice crop, the follow up crop (green gram) was dibbled in rice stubbles. A seed rate of 20 kg ha^{-1} was adopted with a spacing of 30 cm x 10 cm.~~

3.4.1. Effect on weeds

During both years of study, at 40 days after sowing (DAS), POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} with + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} was found significantly superior in reducing the registering lower total weed density in comparison to the other treatments. POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i. ha^{-1} without wetter, bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g a.i./ha and metamifop 10% EC at 50 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} were found on par with each other (Table 5). Non-treated control registered higher total weed density even in succeeding green gram crop taken after harvest of rice.

3.4.2. Effect on crop

3.4.2.1. Germination

Germination percentage of green gram indicated that there was no significant difference among the treatments (Table 5). It was also clear that there was no residual toxicity due to the POE application of herbicide combination bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses on the germination of the succeeding crop during both the years of study.

3.4.2.2. Number of pods per plant

Number of pods per plant of green gram showed no significant difference among the weed control treatments. The number of pods per plant in all the treatments was comparable to the observations in that of non-treated control during both the years of study. So, there was no residual toxicity due to new formulation of herbicide combination of POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} on the performance of the succeeding crop (Table 5).

3.4.2.3. Seed yield of green gram

Yield of green gram raised as succeeding crop showed no distinct variation due to different doses of POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} in DSR during both the years (Table 5).

Carryover effect study results showed that new formulation of POE herbicide combination, bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} with + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses applied in DSR was found to be safe on the succeeding green gram. This might be due to detoxification of herbicides in soil and the resulting degraded products may not and do not adversely affect the growth and yield of the succeeding crop. in terms of germination percentage, number of pods per plant and seed yield of the green

gram. Hence, it was concluded that The POE application bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses of combination can be safely applied for weed control in DSR without any residual toxicity. However, the impact of continuous and inappropriate application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE combination in clay loam soil needs to be investigated to assess its risk potential to non-target organisms. As a final point, Hence it can be concluded that POE application of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g a.i.ha^{-1} + with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} can keep the total weed density and weed biomass reasonably at lower level and enhance the productivity of DSR. Thus a synergistic composition of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE, when applied to DSR, allow a reduction in the amount of herbicide needed, greater flexibility in timing of the application besides offering broad spectrum weed control.

4. . Conclusions

The individual application of POE herbicides like bispyribac sodium, metamifop, almix and clincher did not control the complex weed flora in DSR. The plots treated with herbicide combination of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70, 56 and 42 g a.i. ha^{-1} + wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} at all different doses obtained higher grain yield because of lower total weed density and weed biomass in these herbicide combination treated plots when compared to individual herbicide application. Herbicide combination, bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ha^{-1} with wetter at 100 ml ha^{-1} effectively control of *Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) Beauv., *Dinebra retroflexa* (Vahl.) Panzer and *Panicum repens* L., among the grasses;

Cyperus difformis L. *and Cyperus irria* L. among the sedges; *Marsilea quadrifolia* Linn and *Ammania baccifera* L. among broad leaved weeds with higher weed control efficiency. and higher grain yield. of 80% at critical period of crop growth stage in DSR. Our study thus demonstrated that Hence it can be concluded from the study that POE application of herbicide combination of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 14 % SE with wetter effectively control all the three major group of weed and are needed for maintained a weed free period during the critical stages of crop growth and resulted in higher grain yield in DSR. Sometimes, if farmers missed the application of pre-emergence herbicide due to erratic rains or any other reasons, effective weed control and high yield can still be obtained with this new herbicide combination of bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE + wetter.

Table 2. Effect of treatments on weed density (No.m^{-2}) at 20 and 40 DAHS in direct seeded rice

Herbicide treatments	Weed density (No.m^{-2})											
	rabi, 2013						*rabi*, 2014					
	Echinochloa crus-galli		*Dinebra retroflexa*		*Panicum repens*		*Echinochloa crus-galli*		*Dinebra Retroflexa*		*Panicum repens*	
	20 DAHS	**40 DAHS**	**20 DAHS**	**40 DAHS**	**20 DAHS**	**40 DAHS**	**20 DAHS**	**40 DAHS**	**20 DAHS**	**40 DAHS**	1.41 (0.00)	**40 DAHS**
T_1 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 42 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	2.73 (5.43)	3.40 (9.56)	1.79 (1.21)	2.28 (3.22)	1.41 (0.00)	2.04 (2.16)	3.84 (12.74)	5.91 (32.89)	1.41 (0.00)	1.79 (1.22)	1.41 (0.00)	1.96 (1.86)
T_2 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	2.42 (3.86)	3.09 (7.55)	1.41 (0.00)	1.89 (1.56)	1.41 (0.00)	1.79 (1.22)	3.57 (10.76)	4.33 (16.78)	1.41 (0.00)	1.69 (0.84)	1.29 (0.00)	1.79 (1.22)
T_3 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	2.07 (2.30)	2.92 (6.54)	1.41 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	3.09 (7.52)	3.50 (10.24)	1.30 (0.00)	1.41 (0.00)	1.69 (0.84)	1.40 (0.00)
T_4 - Almix (Chlorimuron + Metsufuron 20% WP) at 4 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	2.76 (5.63)	3.63 (11.19)	2.45 (4.01)	2.83 (6.02)	1.85 (1.43)	2.56 (4.56)	4.11 (14.88)	5.31 (26.23)	2.40 (3.74)	2.33 (3.42)	1.74 (1.02)	2.29 (3.24)
T_5 - Clincher (Cyhalofop Buthyl 10% EC) at 80 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	3.03 (7.21)	3.84 (12.77)	2.28 (3.22)	2.58 (4.64)	1.79 (2.44)	2.42 (3.86)	4.45 (17.76)	5.50 (30.42)	2.24 (3.02)	2.78 (5.73)	1.41 (0.00)	1.89 (1.56)
T_6 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	2.56 (4.56)	4.07 (14.56)	1.69 (0.85)	1.81 (1.26)	1.41 (0.00)	1.57 (0.45)	4.74 (20.45)	5.18 (24.85)	1.66 (0.77)	1.70 (0.89)	1.70 (0.88)	1.41 (0.00)
T_7 - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	2.71 (5.32)	3.54 (10.54)	2.28 (3.22)	2.77 (5.68)	1.77 (1.12)	2.04 (2.18)	3.40 (9.56)	4.06 (14.52)	2.10 (2.41)	2.36 (3.58)	1.41 (0.00)	1.79 (1.21)
T_8 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	2.20 (2.86)	3.14 (7.86)	1.41 (0.00)	1.68 (0.82)	1.41 (0)	1.69 (0.86)	3.10 (7.82)	3.91 (13.26)	1.41 (0.00)	1.79 (1.22)	1.66 (0.74)	1.65 (0.72)
T_9 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	2.88 (6.32)	3.68 (11.56)	2.09 (2.36)	2.41 (3.82)	1.79 (1.22)	2.21 (2.89)	4.46 (17.85)	5.88 (32.56)	1.96 (1.86)	2.10 (2.42)	2.11 (2.44)	1.88 (1.54)
T_{10} - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	3.38 (9.42)	4.12 (14.98)	2.50 (4.24)	2.77 (5.66)	2.28 (3.22)	2.65 (5.02)	3.70 (11.72)	4.42 (17.56)	2.29 (3.24)	2.49 (4.22)	1.41 (0.00)	2.49 (4.21)
T_{11} - Hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS	4.53 (18.52)	3.09 (7.54)	3.14 (7.86)	2.33 (3.42)	2.96 (6.78)	1.89 (1.56)	5.71 (30.56)	4.53 (18.56)	3.39 (9.52)	1.89 (1.56)	2.80 (5.86)	1.80 (1.24)
T_{12} - Unsprayed control	4.73 (20.36)	5.61 (29.45)	3.40 (9.56)	4.03 (14.23)	2.49 (7.42)	3.67 (11.46)	6.04 (34.54)	7.67 (56.89)	3.20 (8.24)	3.38 (9.45)	2.90 (6.42)	3.23 (8.42)
SEd	**0.34**	**0.45**	**0.13**	**0.24**	**0.09**	**0.19**	**0.31**	**0.40**	**0.11**	**0.20**	**0.07**	**0.15**
CD (P=0.05)	**0.71**	**0.92**	**0.25**	**0.48**	**0.18**	**0.40**	**0.63**	**0.82**	**0.21**	**0.42**	**0.15**	**0.31**

Figures in parenthesis are original values; Data subjected to square root transformation; DAHS: Days after herbicide spray

Table 3. Effect of treatments on weed density and total weed density (No.m^{-2}) at 20 and 40 DAHS in direct seeded rice

Herbicide treatments	Weed density and total weed density (No./m^{2})											
	rabi, 2013						*rabi*, 2014					
	Cyperus Difformis		*Marsilea quadrifoliata*		Total weed Density		*Cyperus Difformis*		*Marsilea quadrifoliata*		Total weed Density	
	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS
T_1 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 42 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1} + wetter	3.40 (9.54)	4.08 (14.65)	2.32 (5.36)	2.75 (7.54)	5.83 (32.03)	6.87 (45.17)	1.95 (1.80)	3.41 (9.66)	2.89 (6.33)	3.59 (10.89)	5.07 (23.68)	7.86 (59.80)
T_2 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1} + wetter	3.09 (7.56)	3.27 (13.19)	1.20 (1.45)	2.05 (4.21)	4.95 (22.50)	5.98 (33.81)	1.94 (1.77)	3.19 (8.20)	2.16 (2.67)	3.40 (9.56)	4.52 (18.44)	6.73 (43.35)
T_3 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 10% SE at 70 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1} + wetter	2.71 (5.32)	3.40 (9.56)	1.07 (1.15)	1.73 (2.98)	4.43 (16.80)	5.27 (25.78)	2.14 (2.56)	2.48 (4.16)	2.09 (2.37)	2.69 (5.24)	3.99 (13.90)	5.12 (24.19)
T_4 - Almix (Chlorimuron + Metsufuron 20% WP) at 4 g a.i.ha^{-1}	3.70 (11.68)	4.99 (22.89)	3.25 (10.57)	2.76 (7.63)	6.75 (43.61)	7.79 (58.76)	3.67 (11.47)	4.46 (17.90)	2.58 (4.65)	3.35 (9.21)	6.01 (34.13)	8.07 (63.14)
T_5 - Clincher (Cyhalofop Buthyl 10% EC) at 80 g ~~a.~~i.ha^{-1}	4.07 (14.56)	3.42 (20.19)	3.52 (12.36)	3.03 (9.21)	7.51 (54.47)	6.99 (46.88)	3.28 (8.77)	4.15 (15.20)	2.87 (6.23)	3.99 (13.89)	6.04 (34.54)	8.43 (69.06)
T_6 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1} + wetter	3.24 (8.47)	4.30 (16.45)	2.89 (8.34)	3.40 (11.56)	5.84 (32.12)	7.50 (54.26)	2.65 (5.03)	3.67 (11.46)	2.80 (5.86)	3.23 (8.42)	5.81 (31.70)	6.86 (45.05)
T_7 - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1} + wetter	4.75 (20.56)	3.52 (26.19)	1.86 (3.45)	2.64 (6.98)	6.81 (44.41)	6.79 (44.08)	4.10 (14.77)	4.82 (21.20)	2.58 (4.67)	4.18 (15.46)	6.09 (35.13)	7.44 (53.29)
T_8 - Bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70 g a.i.ha^{-1}	2.72 (5.38)	3.22 (11.01)	1.11 (1.24)	2.07 (4.30)	4.37 (17.09)	5.39 (27.02)	2.19 (2.58)	2.56 (4.57)	2.11 (2.46)	3.00 (7.02)	4.17 (15.43)	5.76 (31.23)
T_9 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 ~~g a.i~~.ha^{-1}	3.81 (12.5)	4.64 (19.54)	3.57 (12.78)	2.83 (8.00)	6.70 (42.91)	7.29 (51.15)	3.18 (8.12)	4.07 (14.55)	2.71 (5.34)	3.45 (9.90)	5.95 (33.40)	8.17 (64.69)
T_{10} - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i~~.ha^{-1}	4.49 (18.16)	5.19 (24.98)	2.75 (7.56)	3.40 (11.57)	7.43 (53.20)	8.55 (71.14)	3.94 (13.56)	4.96 (22.56)	3.28 (8.78)	4.10 (14.85)	6.49 (40.09)	8.03 (62.44)
T_{11} - Hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS	5.71 (30.56)	4.07 (14.56)	4.07 (14.56)	2.96 (6.78)	9.22 (82.93)	6.37 (38.54)	4.63 (19.48)	3.54 (10.56)	4.08 (14.62)	3.06 (7.34)	9.21 (82.90)	6.84 (44.75)
T_{12} - Unsprayed control	6.43 (39.4)	7.38 (52.46)	4.42 (17.52)	5.24 (32.45)	10.35 (105.02)	12.57 (156.13)	4.49 (18.14)	5.62 (29.54)	3.96 (13.67)	4.50 (18.23)	8.77 (85.93)	11.61 (132.78)
SEd	**0.52**	**0.62**	**0.23**	**0.38**	**0.65**	**0.62**	**0.29**	**0.40**	**0.26**	**0.31**	**0.50**	**0.60**
CD (P=0.05)	**1.07**	**1.27**	**0.48**	**0.79**	**1.38**	**1.28**	**0.61**	**0.81**	**0.52**	**0.64**	**1.02**	**1.23**

Figures in parenthesis are original values; Data subjected to square root transformation; DAHS: Days after herbicide spray

Table 4. Total weed dry weight, weed control efficiency, grain yield and weed index as influenced by different weed management practices in direct seeded rice

Herbicide treatments	Total weed dry weight (g/m^2), WCE (%), grain yield (kg/ha) & Weed Index (WI)											
	rabi, 2013						*rabi*, 2014					
	Total weed dry weight (g/m^2)		WCE (%)		Grain yield	Weed Index	Total weed dry weight (g/m^2)		WCE (%)		Grain yield	Weed Index
	20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS			20 DAHS	40 DAHS	20 DAHS	40 DAHS		
T_1 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4%~~ SE + metamifop 14 % SE at 42 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	5.49 (23.18)	6.76 (47.68)	67.33	60.22	4286	24.49	5.40 (27.11)	8.34 (69.54)	72.49	63.14	4658	27.08
T_2 - Bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	4.10 (16.77)	5.90 (36.76)	76.37	69.73	4978	12.30	4.53 (18.56)	7.39 (52.62)	81.17	72.11	5722	10.43
T_3 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~. ha^{-1} + wetter	2.69 (8.92)	4.78 (24.89)	87.43	80.07	5676	0.00	3.66 (11.38)	6.05 (34.56)	88.45	81.68	6388	0.00
T_4 - Almix (Chlorimuron + Metsufuron 20% WP) at 4 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.24 (24.41)	6.55 (44.91)	65.60	62.63	4948	12.83	5.52 (28.44)	8.12 (65.89)	71.14	65.08	5792	9.33
T_5 - Clincher (Cyhalofop Buthyl 10% EC) at 80 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.27 (26.79)	6.91 (49.81)	62.25	58.36	4404	22.41	5.70 (30.44)	7.95 (63.24)	69.12	66.48	5248	17.85
T_6 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	4.64 (21.56)	6.24 (40.97)	69.62	66.06	5442	4.12	5.16 (24.63)	8.05 (64.82)	75.01	65.64	6076	4.88
T_7 - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	5.39 (26.03)	7.56 (59.16)	63.32	50.22	5004	11.84	5.49 (28.19)	8.52 (72.61)	71.40	61.51	5748	10.02
T_8 - Bispyribac sodium 4% SE + metamifop 10% SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	2.92 (9.54)	5.68 (31.42)	86.55	73.10	5488	3.31	3.93 (13.45)	6.29 (37.58)	86.35	80.08	6232	2.44
T_9 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.28 (27.86)	7.08 (52.10)	60.74	59.00	5167	8.97	5.87 (32.51)	8.49 (72.15)	67.02	61.76	5911	7.47
T_{10} - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.45 (29.70)	7.74 (61.84)	58.15	47.89	4276	24.67	6.18 (36.19)	9.15 (83.64)	63.28	55.67	4968	22.23

T_{11} - Hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS	7.39 (52.55)	6.15 (35.84)	25.95	69.32	5256	7.40	10.33 (104.63)	7.20 (49.87)	5.36	73.56	5908	7.51
T_{12} - Unsprayed control	8.42 (70.97)	10.72 (116.83)	-	-	2734	51.83	10.03 (110.56)	13.81 (188.67)	-	-	3012	52.85
SEd	**0.58**	**0.88**	-	-	**352**	-	**0.61**	**0.87**	-	-	**309**	-
CD (P=0.05)	**1.21**	**1.79**	-	-	**688**	-	**1.23**	**1.76**	-	-	**623**	-

Figures in parenthesis are original values; Data subjected to square root transformation; DAHS: Days after herbicide spray

Table 5. Effect of treatments on weed density, germination percentage, number of pods plant^{-1} and seed yield of succeeding green gram

Herbicide treatments	Succeeding green gram crop							
	rabi, 2013				*rabi*, 2014			
	Weed density (No./m^2) at 40 DAS	Germination (%)	Number of pods plant^{-1}	Seed yield (kg ha^{-1})	Weed density (No./m^2) at 40 DAS	Germination (%)	Number of pods plant^{-1}	Seed yield (kg/ha)
T_1 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 42 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	6.51 (40.32)	82.99	21.67	622	7.77 (58.44)	87.56	24.89	660
T_2 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 56 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	6.14 (35.65)	85.55	24.33	655	7.32 (51.62)	89.31	27.62	694
T_3 - Bispyribac sodium 4~~% SE~~ + metamifop 14 % SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	4.75 (20.58)	82.32	21.00	667	6.29 (37.54)	90.56	30.24	672
T_4 - Almix (Chlorimuron + Metsufuron 20% WP) at 4 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	6.17 (36.05)	82.55	24.00	602	7.44 (53.33)	87.41	27.14	652
T_5 - Clincher (Cyhalofop Buthyl 10% EC) at 80 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	6.06 (34.78)	84.99	23.67	615	8.08 (63.24)	89.85	28.32	643
T_6 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	6.32 (37.88)	85.52	23.33	620	7.36 (52.13)	90.38	27.98	647
T_7 - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1} + wetter	5.50 (28.30)	81.99	24.00	567	8.01 (61.98)	89.85	28.65	623
T_8 - Bispyribac sodium ~~4% SE~~ + metamifop 10% SE at 70 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.14 (24.42)	84.45	23.67	630	6.71 (43.08)	89.31	29.87	668
T_9 - Bispyribac sodium 10% SC at 20 g ~~a.i.~~ha^{-1}	5.21 (25.18)	87.94	24.26	653	7.24 (50.37)	89.46	27.56	667

T_{10} - Metamifop 10% SE at 50 g~~-a.i~~.ha^{-1}	6.02 (34.24)	84.45	24.38	649	8.32 (67.21)	90.41	29.76	684
T_{11} - Hand weeding twice on 25 and 45 DAS	7.70 (57.26)	84.33	24.27	644	9.42 (86.81)	88.56	26.54	672
T_{12} - Unsprayed control	8.02 (62.3)	84.99	24.00	586	9.67 (91.47)	89.85	28.65	528
SEd	**0.45**	**-**	**0.85**	**62**	**0.51**	**-**	**2.17**	**71**
CD (P=0.05)	**0.92**	**-**	**NS**	**NS**	**1.03**	**-**	**NS**	**NS**

Figures in parenthesis are original values; Data subjected to square root transformation; DAS: Days after sowing

References

Akbar, N., Ehsanullah, K., Jabran., Ali, M.A., 2011. Weed management improves yield and qualit of direct seeded rice. Aus. J. Crop Sci. 5 (6), 688-694.

Balasubramanian, V., Hill, J., 2000. Direct wet seeding of rice in Asia: Emerging issues and st strategic research needs for the 21 century. Annual Workshop of the Directorate of Rice Res., Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh.

Baloch, M.S., Hassan, G., Morimoto, T., 2005. Weeding techniques in transplanted and wet seeded rice in Pakistan. Weed Biolog. Mang. 5, 190-196.

Chauhan, B.S., 2012. Weed ecology and weed management strategies for dryseeded rice in Asia. Weed Technol. 26, 1-13.

Chauhan, B.S., 2012a. Weed Management in Direct-Seeded Rice Systems. International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines. p. 20.

Chauhan, B.S., 2012b. Weed ecology and weed management strategies for dry-seeded rice in Asia Weed Technol. 26, 1-13.

Chauhan, B.S., Johnson, D.E., 2011. Row spacing and weed control timing affect yield of aerobic rice. Field Crops Res. 121, 226-231.

Chauhan, B.S., Opena, J., 2013a. Implications of plant geometry and weed control options in designing a low-seeding seed-drill for dry-seeded rice systems. Field Crops Res. 144, 225-231.

Chauhan, B.S., Opena, J., 2013b. Weed management and grain yield of rice sown at low seeding rates in mechanized dry-seeded systems. Field Crops Res. 141: 9-15.

Darren, W.L., Stephen, E.H., 2006. Foliar and root absorption and translocation of bispyribacsodium in cool-season turf grass. Weed Technol. 20 (4), 1015-1022.

Gill, G.S., Vijaya Kumar, K., 1969. Weed Index - A new method of reporting weed control trials. Indian J. Agron., 14, 96-98.

Gomez, K.A., Gomez, A.A., 2010. Statistical procedures for Agricultural Research. Wiley India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India.

Khaliq, A., Matloob, A., 2011. Weed-crop competition period in three fine rice cultivars under direct-seeded rice culture. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res. 17, 229-243.

Khaliq, A., Matloob, A., Shafique, H.M., Farooq, M., Wahid, A., 2011b. Evaluating sequential application of pre and post emergence herbicides in dry seeded finer rice. Pakistan J. Weed Sci. Res. 17, 111-123.

Khaliq, A., Riaz, Y., Matloob, A., 2011a. Bioeconomic assessment of chemical and nonchemical weed management strategies in dry seeded fine rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). J. Plant Breeding Crop Sci. 3 (12), 302-310.

Kim, K.U., 1996. Ecological forces influencing weed competition and herbicide resistance. In: Naylor, R. (Ed.), Herbicides in Asian Rice: Transitions in Weed Management. Stamford University, California and IRRI, Philippines, pp. 129-142.

Kumaran, S.T., Kathiresan, G., Murali Arthanari, P., Chinnusamy, C., Sanjivkumar, V., 2015. Efficacy of new herbicide (bispyribac sodium 10% SC) against different weed flora, nutrient uptake in rice and their residual effects on succeeding crop of green gram under zero tillage. J. Appl. and Natural Sci. 7 (1), 279-285.

Mahajan, G., Chauhan, B.S., 2013. Herbicide options for weed control in dry-seeded aromatic rice in India. Weed Technol. 27, 682-689.

Mahajan, G., Chauhan, B.S., 2013. The role of cultivars in managing weeds in dryseeded rice production systems. Crop Prot. 49, 52-57.

Mahajan, G., Chauhan, B.S., Johnson, D.E., 2009. Weed management in aerobic rice in Northwestern Indo-Gangetic Plains. J. Crop Improv. 23 (4), 366-382.

Mahajan, G., Timsina, J., 2011. Effect of nitrogen rates and weed control methods on weeds abundance and yield of direct seeded rice. Arch. Agron. Soil Sci. 57, 239-250.

Mani, V.S., Mala, M.L., Gautam, K.C., Bhagavandas., 1973. Weed killing chemicals in potato cultivation. Indian Fmg., 23 (1), 17-18.

Oerke, E.C., Dehne, H.W., 2004. Safeguarding production losses in major crops and the role of crop protection. Crop Prot. 23, 275-285.

Powles, S.B., Yu, Q., 2010. Evolution in action: plants resistant to herbicides. Ann. Rev. Plant Biol. 61, 317-347.

Rao, A.N., Nagamani. A., 2007. Available technologies and future research challenges for managing weeds in dryseeded rice in India. In: Proc. 21st Asian Pacific Weed Sci. Soc. Colombo, Sri Lanka on 2-6 October.

Rao, A.N., Wani, S.P., Ladha, J.K., 2014. Weed management research in India ananalysis of the past and outlook for future. In: Souvenir (1989-2014). Directorate of Weed Research, Jabalpur, India, DWR Publication No.18, pp. 1-26.

Singh, G., 2008. Integrated weed management in direct-seeded rice. In Y. Singh, V.P. Singh, B. Chauhan, A. Orr, A.M. Mortimer, D.E. Johnson and B. Hardy eds., Direct Seeding of Rice and Weed Management in the Irrigated Rice-Wheat Cropping System of the Indo-Gangetic Plains. International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines: Directorate of Experiment Station, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. 161-175.

Snedecor, G.W., Cochran, W.G., 1967. Statistical Methods. Oxford and IBH Publ. Co., New Delhi. p. 593.

Sunil, C.M., Shekara, B.G., Kalyanmurthy, K.N., Shankaralingapa, B.C., 2010. Growth and yield of aerobic rice as influenced by integrated weed management practices. Ind J Weed Sci. 42 (3&4), 180-183.

Zhao, D., 2006. Weed competitiveness and yielding of aerobic rice genotypes. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, The Netherlands.

.