



# Effect of Weed Management Practices on Weed Control Efficiency and Productivity of Rapeseed-mustard: A Review

Diksha, Amit Dhankar <sup>a\*</sup>, Sonali Sharma <sup>a</sup>, Pooja Karki <sup>a</sup>,  
Pritika Thakur <sup>a</sup> and Kanika Shukla <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Agriculture, Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be) University, Mullana-133 207, Ambala (Haryana), India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jeai/2024/v46i92806>

## 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/120903>

Review Article

Received: 12/06/2024

Accepted: 14/08/2024

Published: 24/08/2024

## ABSTRACT

This study was designed for investigate the weed flora in rapeseed-mustard fields and evaluate the effectiveness of various weed management strategies to enhance crop yield and productivity. Mustard fields are infested by a diverse range of weed species, including annual, biennial and perennial, which compete with crops for essential resources, leading to significant yield loss. The key grassy weeds identified include *Avena ludoviciana*, *Cynodon dactylon* and *Phalaris minor*, while the notable broad-leaved weeds include *Chenopodium album*, *Anagallis arvensis* and *Melilotus alba*. The critical period for weed competition in mustard lies between 20 and 40 days

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [amitdhankarhau@gmail.com](mailto:amitdhankarhau@gmail.com);

after sowing. Literature about the different weed management practices including; cultural, mechanical and chemical methods was studied. It was found that chemical herbicides such as pendimethalin, oxadiargyl, isoproturon, clodinafop and oxyfluorfen showed significant efficacy in controlling weed population and also improving the crop yield. Mechanical methods, though labor-intensive, were also effective particularly when combined with chemical treatments. Integrated weed management (IWM) approaches which combine multiple strategies were found to be the most effective in maintaining weed population, crop health and productivity.

**Keywords:** Rapeseed-mustard; weeds; weed flora; weed control; integrated weed management.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

“India ranked third in production of rapeseed-mustard after Canada and China and accounts for one-third of the total oil production in India” [1]. “Rapeseed-mustard represents significant oilseed crop as its seeds contain 40-46% oil” [2]. “Moreover, its meal contains 38-40% protein which has a comprehensive quantity of amino acids together with lysine, methionine and cysteine” [3]. Among the oilseed crops grown in the country, it occupies about 24.70% of the total area with 48.28% of the total oilseed production in India (Dayanand, 2016) where rapeseed-mustard is primarily cultivated in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat, covering an area of 7.99 million hectares with a production of 11.96 million tonnes and productivity of 1497 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> during 2021-22 [4]. “In addition, its oil is utilized for human consumption throughout the northern India for cooking purpose” [5,6,7]. “Rapeseed-mustard has many industrial uses, and its oilcake serves as animal feed and manure” [8].

“Weeds are one of the major factors, which inflict yield losses in Indian mustard crop to the extent of more than 35%” [9]. “They cause loss of seed yield up to 35-60% or even more depending upon the weed density, type of weed flora and duration of infestation” [10]. While, Kumar et al. [11] “noted 41.7% reduction in yield due to uncontrolled weeds in mustard”. In the same trend, Gharde et al. [12] “reported 21.4% yield reduction in mustard crop in India”. However, Mishra et al. [13] “estimated approximately 15-30% yield reduction due to weeds in mustard crop”. “In India, the more losses caused by weeds up to 33% come after by the insects 20%, pathogens 26%, storage pests 7%, rodents 6% and others 8%” [14]. “The presence of weeds like *Physalis minima*, *Medicago sativa*, *Sonchus arvensis*, *Chichorium intybus* in mustard field caused reduction in the productivity” [15]. “However, *Chenopodium album*, *Asphodelus tenuifolius*, *Melilotus indica*, *Cornopus didymus*,

*Spergula arvensis* and *Phalaris minor*, etc. showed serious yield loss in mustard” [16]. “The crop is infested with both wide leaved and grassy weeds, and if not managed at appropriate time, they may seriously reduced the productivity of mustard” [17]. “Higher seed rates, altered row orientation, narrower row spacing and selection of competitive species have been estimated as encouraging integrated weed management methods to improve competitiveness of the crop” [18].

For the management of weeds, the pre-emergence application of pendimethalin was found effective [19,20], and hence, it is the most common herbicide to control weeds in Indian mustard. Mechanical control is the method to remove weeds from the field physically or with the help of small tools or implements. While, in the biological methods, the weeds are controlled with recommended living organisms. On the other hand, in chemical methods, weeds are managed by the use of herbicides [16]. Manual weeding at 3-4 weeks after sowing is the most common practice to control weeds in Indian mustard but increasing wages and scarcity of labour compel the farmers to search for other alternatives [21].

## 2. WEED FLORA IN MUSTARD FIELD

“Based on their summed dominance ratio, the most dominant weed species followed the following order, i.e., *Medicago sativa*, *Anagallis arvensis*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Trachyspermum* spp. and *Cynodon dactylon*, however, *Medicago sativa* was the top ranking dominant weed followed by *Anagallis arvensis*” [22]. According to Kumar et al. [11], the dominant broadleaf weeds were *Amaranthus spinosus* L., *Gallinsoga parviflora* Cav., *Coronopus didymus* L., while the monocot weeds were *Digitaria sanguinalis* L., *Poa annua* L., *Avena fatua* L., other weeds were *Polygonum alatum* L., *Malva parviflora* L., *Chenopodium botrys* L., *Setaria galuca* L., *Panicum dicotomiflorum* L. and *Medicago*

*denticulate* Wild. Bijarnia et al. [23] “observed the weed species like *Melilotus indica*, *Rumex denticulatus*, *Asphodelus tenuifolius*, *Chenopodium album* and *Chenopodium murale* in mustard crop”. Kalita et al. [24] “reported *Anagallis arvensis*, *Convolvulus arvensis*, *Chenopodium album*, *Fumaria parviflora*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Chenopodium murale*, *Asphodelus tenuifolius*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Melilotus indica* and *Phalaris minor* weeds in mustard field”. “The dominant weed species found in mustard field were *Chenopodium album* (37%), *Chenopodium murale* (22%), *Portulaca oleracea* (14.5%), *Melilotus indica* (6.5%), *Asphodelus tenuifolius* (5.6%) and *Rumex dentatus* (5.6%), however, some other species like *Amaranthus blitum*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Heliotropium subulatum*, *Glinus lotoides* and *Cynodon dactylon* were also observed in minor abundance”, i.e., 8.8% [25]. Gupta et al. [26] found *Chenopodium album* (Bathua), *Thithoria diversifolia* L. (wild sunflower), *Anagallis arvensis* (Krishan neel), *Melilotus alba* (Senji), *Cyperus rotundus* (motha) and *Cynodon dactylon* (Doob) the predominant weeds in mustard field during crop season. Suryavanshi et al. [15] found the dominant dicot weeds like *Medicago sativa*, *Sonchus arvensis*, *Cichorium intybus* and *Physalis minima* associated with gobhi mustard. Bhawana et al. [27] observed eleven weeds in mustard field, i.e., *Cyperus rotundus*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Anagallis arvensis*, *Melilotus alba*, *Rumex* sp., *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Convolvulus arvensis*, *Chenopodium album*, *Vicia hirsute*, *Phalaris minor* and *Polypogonmon speliensis*. In mustard crop, Choudhary and Bhagawati [28] have shown the broadleaved weeds, such as *Ageratum conyzoides*, *Galinsoga parviflora*, *Commelina benghalensis*, *Chromolaena odorata*, and *Borreria hispida*, as well as the grassy weeds including *Digitaria sanguinalis*, *Eleusine indica*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Echinochloa colona* and *Cynodon dactylon* in mustard field. Sidar [29] found the mustard crop infested with grassy weeds, i.e., *Phalaris minor* (21.35%) and *Cynodon dactylon* (7.78%), and broad-leaved weeds, i.e., *Chenopodium album* accounted for 17.58% loss, *Anagallis arvensis* 27.43%, *Cyperus rotundus* 10.61% and *Melilotus alba*, *Vicia hirsuta*, *Lathyrus asphaca* and *Rumex* sp. 19.22%. The most common weeds in rapeseed mustard field are *Avena ludoviciana*, *Phalaris minor*, *Chenopodium album*, *Rumex dentatus*, *Anagallis arvensis*, *Convolvulus arvensis* and *Cirsium arvensis* [6,30,31,16]. Weeds found in mustard crop include *Chenopodium album*, *Lathyrus* spp.

*Anagallis arvensis*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Argemone mexicana* and others [32].

### 3. CROP-WEED COMPETITION

“The loss in seed yield of rapeseed-mustard due to the weed competition with crop was recored 32.27% with net return minimum” [33]. “Weed competition in mustard is more serious during early stages since crop growth remains slow during the first 4-6 weeks after sowing” [34,35,26,36,37]. Moreover, Asif et al. [38] “considered the duration of weed crop competition is a major factor influencing quality of crop production”. “Hand weeding twice at 30 and 60 days after sowing recorded maximum weed control efficiency and minimum weed index” [21]. “Many weeds are crop and/or region-specific. *Orobanche aegyptiaca* for example has become a severe danger in rainfed areas of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Haryana. While, *Chenopodium*, *Asphodelus*, *Melilotus* and *Trianthema* spp. cause considerable yield loss in other location” [39].

### 4. WEED MANAGEMENT BY AGRONOMIC PRACTICES

Shrivastava et al. [40] demonstrated that one-hand weeding at 20 days after sowing followed by the application of oxyfluorfen at 100 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence at 2 days after sowing resulted in lowest weed density. The application of herbicidal treatments in conjunction with one hand weeding at 35 days after sowing led to a significant increase in the seed yield of mustard compared to the weedy check. Specifically, this combined approach resulted in a boost of seed yield ranging from 32 to 68% over the weedy check condition [19]. The maximum plant height was noticed in two-hand weeding, while the lowest in weedy check throughout the growing season and the number of branches per plant was noted higher in two-hand weeding but lowest in weeded plots. Furthermore, a greater seed yield of 898.50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and test seed weight of 3.14 g was recorded in two hand weeding and lowest in weedy check [41]. Bamboriya et al. [42] found the lowest weed density and dry weight as well as the maximum weed control effectiveness and also noted that the interaction of herbicides with one hoeing was equally effective in reducing the weed population at 60 days after sowing. One-hand weeding at 25 days after sowing significantly increased both seed and oil yield of Indian mustard, with oxadiargyl also showing promising results in this regard [24]. “The

superior weed management treatment with respect to oil yield of Indian mustard was one hand weeding 25 DAS (908 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) closely followed by oxadiargyl 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (899 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Whereas, the performance of pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and quizalofop-ethyl 0.05 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was statistically at par in respect of oil yield as 722 and 661 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively” (Sontara et al. 2017). Gupta et al. [26] “suggested that both two hand weeding and the pre-emergence application of pendimethalin can contribute to optimizing mustard yield, highlighting the efficacy of these practices in mustard cultivation. The number of siliquae per plant, number of seeds per siliqua and length of siliqua were recorded maximum in two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing being statistically at par with pendimethalin @ 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + hand weeding 30 days after sowing and found superior over rest of the weed management practices” [43]. “Hand weeding twice at 30 and 60 days after sowing was most effective in achieving significantly higher mustard seed and straw yield and it was at par with pendimethalin 750 g ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence followed by one-hand weeding” [21]. “The application of pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> followed by clodinafop-propargyl 0.06 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 days after sowing was found most efficient in lowering the dry matter of weeds, followed by the application of fluazifop-p-butyl 0.08 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 days after sowing, clodinafop-propargyl 0.06 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 days after sowing, propaquizafop + oxyfluorfen 0.08 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 days after sowing and propaquizafop 0.10 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 days after sowing over weedy check” [44]. Conducting hand weeding twice at 20 and 40 days after sowing resulted in reduced dry weight of weeds to 27.05 g m<sup>-2</sup> at 60 days after sowing and gave weed control efficiency of 80.87% [45].

## 5. WEED MANAGEMENT BY CHEMICALS

“Soltani et al. [46] reported that pendimethalin achieved 97% control of *Amaranthus retroflexus*, 90% control of *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*, 90% control of *Chenopodium album*, 12% control of *Sinapsis arvensis* and 96% control of *Setaria viridis* as compared to the weedy check plot. The use of application of oxyfluorfen at 100 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence at 2 days after sowing led to increased pod and biological yield due to reduced weed dry matter accumulation, more branches per plant, more pods per plant and higher 100 kernels weight” [40].

“The pre-emergence application of pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> increased the seed yield of Indian mustard by 48.1% as compared to control” [9]. Gohelet et al. [47] “stated that pre-emergence application of oxadiargyl 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> to Indian mustard increased seed yield by 18.2% as compared to weedy check”. While, Yadav et al. [25] “observed that oxadiargyl, pendimethalin, trifluralin and oxyfluorfen were more effective in reducing the population of *Chenopodium album* and *Anagallis arvensis* however, oxadiargyl 90 g ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence herbicide gave maximum weed control efficiency (81.82%) in comparison with the control”. “In addition, integration of quizalofop and clodinafop proved to be beneficial in managing *Phalaris minor*. Using of pre-emergence herbicides assumes greater importance given their effectiveness from the initial stages of crop growth, and later emergence can be tackled by applying selective post-emergence herbicides” [48].

## 6. EFFECT OF WEED MANAGEMENT ON NUTRIENTS UPTAKE

“All the weed management practices had significant influence on N, P and K removal by mustard over weedy check. Significantly higher uptake of N, P and K was recorded under two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing by mustard plant followed by fluazifop-pbutyl @ 0.055 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> 10 days after sowing + hoeing 40 days after sowing and fenoxa-prop-p-ethyl @ 0.075 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> 10 days after sowing + hoeing 40 days after sowing as compared to rest of the treatments. Although, the N, P and K removal under these treatments were statistically at par [42]. The maximum uptake of nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium by crop was achieved in plots treated with pendimethalin 1.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> followed by one hand weeding” [49]. “The two hand weeding and pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence were found significantly better in enhancing nitrogen, phosphorus and sulphur concentration in seed and straw as well as their uptake and protein content in seed” [50]. In the same pattern, Kumar et al. (2020) recorded highest nutrient uptake by mustard sown on november 17 and supplied with nitrogen 103.31 kg, phosphorus 33.73 kg, potassium 87.38 kg and sulphur 16.83 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. “The application of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium content (%) did not significantly influence due to various integrated weed management practices, however, the highest content of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium was determined with two hand weeding at 20

and 40 days after sowing as compared to rest of the integrated weed management practices” [51].

## 7. EFFECT OF WEED MANAGEMENT ON GROWTH PARAMETERS

“Two hand weedings, applying trifluralin 0.60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> before planting and pendimethalin 0.70 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> before planting and before the emergence of plants led to a significant reduction in dry weight of the associated weeds as compared to the unweeded control” [52]. Patel et al. [53] “showed higher plant growth and yield attributing characters under weed-free conditions and found that the use of pendimethalin 0.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence with one hand weeding at 25 days after sowing, oxadiargyl 75 g ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence with one hand weeding at 25 days after sowing and pendimethalin 0.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence alone resulted in significantly higher values for dry matter production per plant (51.00 g) and number of siliquae per plant (280.37), number of seeds per siliqua (14.70) and test weight (4.25 g) as compared to other treatments”. “One-hand weeding at 30 days after sowing was found as effective as oxyfluorfen 0.125 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, fluchloralin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and metribuzin 0.125 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in terms of improving the number of siliquae per plant, seeds per siliqua, test weight and seed yield of mustard as compared to the weedy check” [54]. Mukherjee [19] observed the minimum weed density and weed dry matter production with the application of pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and one hand weeding at 35 days after sowing, and this method was as effective as hand weeding twice during both the years. In contrast, Kumar et al. [11] recorded the lowest weed density under manual weeding (H7m<sup>2</sup>) and quizalofop-ethyl 60 g ha<sup>-1</sup> (288 m<sup>2</sup>) at initial crop growth stage (25 DAS) and also recorded the lowest weed biomass in the weed-free treatment and pendimethalin application. Jangir et al. [55] demonstrated that the combination of pendimethalin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, quizalofop-P-ethyl 0.04 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> applied at 20 days after sowing and hand-weeding and IC treatments applied at 40 days after sowing led to maximum plant height, number of branches per plant, dry matter accumulation, number of siliquae per plant and seed and stover yield. The total dry matter accumulation decreased significantly with the delay in sowing during both the years at all the growth stages, *i.e.*, 30, 90, 120 and at harvest, however, the difference in dry matter accumulation at 60 days after sowing between october 25 and november 5 was statistically at

par with each other [56]. Tomar [57] observed that hand weeding and the application of pendimethalin showed the maximum seed yield as compared to the weedy control plot. Yadav et al. [25] observed that oxadiargyl, pendimethalin and trifluralin resulted in lower nitrogen uptake and higher yield attributes, such as the number of siliquae per plant, siliqua length and seed yield per siliqua, as well as increased overall seed yield in mustard plants. Performing two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing led to maximum grain yield of 14.79 q ha<sup>-1</sup> and stover yield of 47.05 q ha<sup>-1</sup> [45]. Two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing being at par with pendimethalin applied @ 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and straw mulch 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (3 DAS), however, the crop had significantly maximum plant height and dry matter accumulation over weedy check plot at all stages of crop growth [51].

## 8. EFFECT ON YIELD PARAMETERS

The maximum seed yield of mustard was achieved with the application of pendimethalin @ 1.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, which resulted in seed yield levels comparable with all other treatments except for the weedy check, as well as the treatments involving fluchloralin at 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and pendimethalin at 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [19]. Akhter et al. [58] reported that delayed planting of brown sarson resulted in a significant decline in yield contributing components, *i. e.*, number of siliquae per plant, number of seeds per siliqua and 1000 seeds weight. Among sowing dates, the crop sown on 20th October showed its supremacy in obtaining yield (1.35 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) with the delay in sowing, resulting in considerable yield loss (4-11%) during both the years of experiment [59]. Singh et al. [33] explained that the loss in seed yield due to weeds was 32.27% and the net return being minimum. Gupta et al. [25] found that hand weeding performed at 25-30 and 40-45 days after sowing resulted in maximum mean plant height (165.4 cm), number of siliquae per plant (153.7), seeds per siliqua (13), test weight (4.33 g), as well as mustard seed and stover yield were statistically comparable to the outcomes obtained from one round of hand weeding (16.08 and 50.39 q ha<sup>-1</sup> for seed and stover yield, respectively) and the pre-emergence application of pendimethalin 38.7CS (15.86 and 48.49 q ha<sup>-1</sup> for seed and stover yield, respectively). Pandey et al. [60] showed that combining pendimethalin 1000 g per hectare with hand weeding performed at 40 days after sowing resulted in maximum grain (51.83 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) and

and stover (53.80 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) yield of mustard crop, suggesting that integrating pendimethalin application with timely hand weeding could be an effective weed management strategy for optimizing both grain and stover yield in mustard cultivation. Raj et al. [61] reported that performing two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing resulted in lowest total weed population, dry weight of weeds and weed index throughout their study. Furthermore, the growth parameters, yield attributes, overall yield and quality of the mustard crop significantly increased when two hand-weeding were performed at 20 and 40 days after sowing. The maximum seed yield of mustard was recorded with two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing, which was statistically at par with pendimethalin @ 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + hand weeding 30 days after sowing (Singh et al., 2020).

The mustard crop produced significantly higher seed yield (13.44 q ha<sup>-1</sup>), plant height (156.7 cm), number of branches per plant (5.18), number of siliquae per plant (182.85), and number of seeds per siliqua (13.16) with the application of oxadiargyl @ 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence followed by one-hand weeding at 40 days after sowing [45]. Higher seed (1483 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and stover (3280 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) yield was recorded under the treatment where intercultivation and hand weeding was done at 15 and 30 days after sowing, which was at par with oxadiargyl 6% EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence followed by intercultivation at 30 days after sowing [62].

## 9. EFFECT OF WEED MANAGEMENT ON ECONOMIC

Indian mustard crop gave higher gross and net returns due to weed control over other treatments by the application of trifluralin 0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + hand-weeding, pendimethalin 1.50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and isoproturon 1.50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Kumar et al., 2012). In this trend, Kour et al. [22] recorded the maximum yield, weed control efficiency (85.16%), net returns (Rs. 20,373 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and benefit to cost ratio (1.71) from Indian mustard intercropped with chickpea when pendimethalin was applied @ 1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence. While, Mukherjee [19] obtained the maximum net returns (Rs. 19,950 ha) from mustard crop with hand-weeding twice (Rs. 19,950 ha) followed by the application of pendimethalin (0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + hand-weeding at 35 days after sowing (19,850 ha<sup>-1</sup>). However, the maximum benefit to cost ratio (2.06) was recorded with the application of pendimethalin (1.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), closely followed by pendimethalin (0.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + one hand-weeding

at 35 days after sowing (1.91). Dinda et al. [59] achieved a maximum net monetary return of ₹ 39405.58 ha<sup>-1</sup> with a benefit cost ratio of 3.00 when the crop was sown 20<sup>th</sup> October. Singh et al. [63] reported the maximum net return (₹ 55287.26 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and benefit to cost ratio (2.38) from mustard crop when sown on 25<sup>th</sup> October. Gupta et al. [25] reported that the maximum net returns Rs. 47178 ha<sup>-1</sup> and benefit to cost ratio (3.75) from mustard crop under pre-emergence application of pendimethalin 38.7 CS. From Indian mustard crop, Jangir et al. [55] obtained the maximum economical gain of 60,458 ha<sup>-1</sup> and benefit to cost ratio of 3.41 with lowest values for total weed population, dry weight of total weeds, weed index and better weed control efficiency with the application of pendimethalin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as post-emergence + quizalofop-P-ethyl 0.04 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at 20 days after sowing + hand-weeding and IC at 40 days after sowing but it was at par with pendimethalin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence + hand weeding and IC at 49 days after sowing. Dwivedi and Puhup [64] obtained the maximum gross return and benefit to cost ratio (3.91) with hand weeding twice at 21 and 45 days after sowing, while net return was maximum with the application of isoproturon + metsulfuron-methyl (1 kg + 4 g ha<sup>-1</sup>) as post-emergence. Osari et al. [65] recorded the maximum net returns of Rs. 42490 ha<sup>-1</sup> and benefit to cost ratio of 3.18 with the pre-emergence application of pre-mix imazethapyr + imezamox at 80 g ha<sup>-1</sup> + two hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing followed by pre-emergence application of pendimethalin + imazethapyr 750 g ha<sup>-1</sup>. Raj et al. [61] reported that the application of pendimethalin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> resulted in maximum net returns (Rs. 69277.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and benefit to cost ratio (2.07) for the mustard crop. Singh et al. [43] obtained the maximum gross return of Rs. 102326 ha<sup>-1</sup> and net return of Rs. 72862 ha<sup>-1</sup> with hand weeding at 20 and 40 days after sowing and pre-emergence application of pendimethalin 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [66].

## 10. CONCLUSION

The present study highlights the importance of understanding local weed flora and utilizing a combination of pre- and post-emergence herbicides, along with mechanical weeding to achieve optimal weed control. The current review article underscores the need for disseminating knowledge about effective herbicide use and integrated weed management among small and marginal farmers for sustainable agriculture.

## DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Shekhawat K, Rathore SS, Premi OP, Kandpal BK, Chauhan JS. Advances in agronomic management of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Czern & Coss): An overview. International Journal of Agronomy. 2012;12(5):24-48.
2. Hussain M, Adnan M, Khan BA, Bilal HM, Javaid H, Rehman F, Jagtap DN. Impact of row spacing and weed competition period on growth and yield of rapeseed; A review. Ind. J. Pure App. Biosci. 2020;8(6):1-11.
3. Amjad M. Oil seed crops of Pakistan. Pakistan Agricultural Research Council Islamabad, (PARC). 2014;1-59.
4. Anonymous. Agriculture Statistics at a glance, Directorate of Economics & Statistics. Department of Agriculture and Cooperation & Family Welfare, Gol, 4<sup>th</sup> Advance estimates, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi. 2020;72-109.
5. Kumar S, Kumar A, Rana SS, Chander N, Angiras NN. Integrated weed management in mustard. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2012;44(3):139-143.
6. Singh L, Kumar S. Effect of integrated weed management on weed and growth attributing characters of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). Journal of Oilseed Brassica. 2020;11(1):62-68.
7. Singh A, Mahajan G, Chauhan BS. Germination ecology of wild mustard (*Sinapis arvensis*) and its implications for weed management. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2022;70(1):103-111.
8. Bora P, Ojha NJ, Phukan J. Mustard and rapeseed response to integrated nutrient management: A review. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2021;10(1):1801-1805.
9. Bharat R, Sharma R, Bazaya BR, Rai S, Gupta R. Effect of different herbicides on diverse weed flora and productivity of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea*) in irrigated sub tropics of Jammu, In Proceeding of 25<sup>th</sup> Asia Pacific Weed Science Society Conference. w. e. f. October, 13-16, PJT State Agricultural University, Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad, A. P. 500060. 2015;190.
10. Kumar N, Pathak RK, Kumar D, Shekhar C, Diwakar SK. Effect of weed management strategy on weed flora and yield of Indian mustard. IJCS. 2020;8(5): 757-760.
11. Kumar R, Narendra Hazra KK, Yadav SL, Singh SS. Weed management using post-emergence herbicides in chickpea + mustard intercropping system. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 2015;85(8):1074-1079.
12. Gharde Y, Singh PK, Dubey RP, Gupta PK. Assessment of yield and economic losses in agriculture due to weeds in India. Crop Protection. 2018;10(7):12-18.
13. Mishra JS, Rao AN, Singh VP, Rakesh K. Weed management in major field crops. In: Advances in Weed Management, Indian Society of Agronomy, New Delhi, India Chapter. 2016;9:(1-21).
14. Kalita S, Mundra SL, Sharma NK. Effect of weed management and nitrogen nutrition on biochemical and phenological parameters of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L. Czern and Coss). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(5):727-729.
15. Suryavanshi T, Sharma AR, Nandeha KL, Lal S. Effects of weed management strategy on weed dynamics, gobhi mustard productivity and profitability under conservation agriculture in Central India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018; 7(4):776-788.
16. Brar AS, Gill HK. Role of planting pattern and weed control methods on growth and yield of mustard: A review. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(4): 880.
17. Gill HK, Singh G. Weed Flora in Mustard-A review. IJCS. 2020;8(6):1023-1026.
18. Khaliq A, Matloob A, Ihsan MZ, Abbas RN, Aslam Z, Rasool F. Supplementing herbicides with manual weeding improves weed control efficiency, growth and yield of dry seeded rice. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2013; 15:191-199.
19. Mukherjee D. Influence of weed and fertilizer management on yield and nutrient

- uptake in mustard. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2014;46(3):251-255.
20. Rao AN, Chauhan BS. Weeds and weed management in India - A Review. In: Proceedings of Weed Science in the Asian Pacific Region. Indian Society of Weed Science, Hyderabad, India. 2015;87-118.
  21. Chishi HM, Zhimo K, Khiamn M, Zhimomi A. Integrated weed management in mustard. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2021;53(3):310-312.
  22. Kour R, Sharma BC, Kumar A, Nandan B, Kour P. Effect of weed management on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) and Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) intercropping system under irrigated conditions of Jammu. Indian J. Agron. 2014;59(2):242-246.
  23. Bijarnia AL, Yadav RS, Singh SP, Rathore PS, Jat RS. Study of integrated nutrient management and weed control measures on mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) and residual effect on fodder pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.) in North Western Rajasthan. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2017;5(3):314-318.
  24. Kalita S, Mundra SL, Sharma NK, Solanki NS. Weed management and nitrogen application for improved yield of mustard. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2017;49(1):85-87.
  25. Yadav AK, Kureel RS, Pratap T, Singh PK, Mehta S, Dubey SK. Effect of various herbicide molecules on weed management in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Czern & Coss). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(6):2479-2482.
  26. Gupta KC, Kumar S, Saxena R. Effect of different weed control practices on yield and returns of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). Journal of Crop and Weed. 2018;14(1):230-233.
  27. Bhawana Singh, Sristi, Sarita, Mehla, Unique, Kumari S. Studies on weed dynamics in mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) crop under Doon valley conditions of Uttarakhand. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2019;7(5):3169-3171.
  28. Choudhary VK, Bhagawati R. Planting method, row arrangement and crop residue mulch influence on weed dynamics and productivity of toria mustard. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2019;51(3):298-301.
  29. Sidar RS. The identification of weeds and effect of herbicides in rapeseed-mustard: A review. Journal of Medicinal Plants. 2019;7(6):73-77.
  30. Kumar S, Meena RS, Jatav SS. Effect of sowing dates and nutrient sources on nutrient uptake of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2020;90(10):1902-7.
  31. Singh S, Mahajan G, Singh R, Chauhan BS. Germination ecology of four African mustard populations in the eastern region of Australia. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2021;69(4):461-467.
  32. Hadke RS, Ghatak RD, Gawali K, Nagmote A. Effect of integrated weed control practices on growth parameters and yield attributes of Indian mustard in clay loam soils of Nagpur in Maharashtra. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(9):982-985.
  33. Singh RK, Meena N, Mishra J. Effect of weed management on indian mustard (*Brassica Juncea* L.) cultivars. Journal of Plant Development Sciences. 2016;8(3): 179-181.
  34. Adhikary P, Ghosh RK. Integrated weed management strategies in black-gram-brinjal-mustard cropping sequence. Environment and Ecology. 2014;32(2A): 725-727.
  35. Sheoran P, Punia SS, Singh S, Singh D. Orobanche weed management in mustard: Opportunities, possibilities and limitations. Journal of Oilseed Brassica. 2016;1(2):96-101.
  36. Das TK, Ghosh S, Gupta K, Sen S, Behera B, Raj R. The weed Orobanche: Species distribution, diversity, biology and management. Journal of Research in Weed Science. 2020;3(2):162-180.
  37. Sharma Y, Kaushik MK. Effect of varying date of sowing and weed management practices on yield of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021; 10(9):229-231.
  38. Asif M, Aziz A, Nadeem MA, Safdar ME, Ali A, Akhtar N, Raza A, Adnan M, Hanif MS. Assessing the Agronomic Consequences of Delayed Removal of Parthenium from Forage Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.). Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2020;24(4):737-742.
  39. Kumar PV, Barkha. Integrated weed management in mustard. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(6):2483-2486.
  40. Shrivastava A, Kaleem M, Singh S, Chandrawanshi SK. Bio-efficacy of



- imazethapyr at various doses in kharif groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) on sandy loam soil. *Legume Research-An International Journal*. 2013;36(4):368-370.
41. Akhter MT, Mannan MA, Kundu PB, Paul NK. Effect of sowing time and weed management on the yield and yield components of three varieties of rapeseed (*Brassica campestris* L.). *Bangladesh J. Bot.* 2016;45(5):963-969.
  42. Bamboriya SD, Kaushik MK, Bamboriya SD, Tiwari RC. Weed dynamics and weed control efficiency management practices for increased productivity of mustard. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*. 2016;48(4):458-459.
  43. Singh A, Yadav RS, Anshuman K, Kumar A, Patel VK, Singh AP, Pratap R. Effect of weed management practices on yield and economics in Indian mustard. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*. 2020;8(2):1364-1367.
  44. Meena BS, Nagar G, Kumawat R. New generation post emergence herbicides for controlling weeds in Indian mustard and its efficacy on weeds in south eastern Rajasthan. *Annals of Agricultural Research*. 2023;44(4):459-467.
  45. Kumar ST. Effect of weed management practice on weed growth, yield attributes, yield and economics of toria (*Brassica campestris* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine*. 2020;8(1).
  46. Soltani N, Nurse RE, Shropshire C, Sikkema PH. Weed control in white bean with pendimethalin applied preplant followed by postemergence broad leaved herbicides. *The Open Plant Science Journal*. 2013;7:24-30.
  47. Gohel SP, Mathukia RK, Dadhania NM. Herbicides for enhancing weed control efficiency in Indian mustard. In: 25th Asian-Pacific Weed Science Society Conference, Hyderabad. 2015;573.
  48. Choudhary VK, Dixit A. Bio-efficacy of sequential herbicide application for weed management in dry direct seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2021;91(1):79-83.
  49. Verma H, Singh SP, Singh VP, Mahapatra BS, Sirazuddin Joshi N, Chilwal A. Nutrient uptake and soil health under chemical and non-chemical weed management practices in irrigated rice ecosystem. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2017;6(12):3152-3155.
  50. Kumar R, Yadav SS, Singh P, Verma HP, Yadav N. Effect of weed management and sulphur fertilization on nutrient content and nutrient uptake by Mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern & Coss) under semi arid condition of Rajasthan. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2019;8(3):571-575
  51. Raj P, Singh G, Raj R, Kumar A, Pandey D, Pal RK. Influence of integrated weed management on growth attributes and quality of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2021; 10(4):131-135.
  52. Kour R, Sharma BC, Kumar A, Kour P. Nutrient uptake by chickpea+ mustard intercropping system as influenced by weed management. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*. 2013;45(3):183-188.
  53. Patel HB, Patel GN, Ali S, Patel DM, Patel NH. Effect of integrated weed management on growth, yield and weed parameters in mustard. *Crop Research*. 2013;46(1-3):109-114.
  54. Sah D, Sewak R, Singh AK, Swami S. Growth, yield, and profitability of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) with different weed control measures and sulphur levels. *Agriculture Science Digest*. 2013;33(1):15-20.
  55. Jangir R, Arvadia LK, Kumar S. Growth and yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea*L.), dry weight of weeds, and weed control efficiency influenced by different planting methods and weed management. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science*. 2017; 6(7):2586-2593.
  56. Keerthi P, Pannu RK, Dhaka AK, Sharma KD. Effect of date of sowing and nitrogen levels on growth and yield of mustard. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2017; 6(9):1029-1036.
  57. Tomar J. Irrigation, fertilizers and weed management for improving productivity and nutrient uptake of mustard. In: proc 25<sup>th</sup> Asian-Pacific Weed Science Society Conference on "Weed Science for Sustainable; 2015.
  58. Akhter S, Singh L, Rasool R, Shazia R. Effect of date of sowing and varieties on yield of brown sarson (*Brassica rapa* L.) under temperate Kashmir. *International*

- Journal of Engineering Science Invention. 2015;4(3):65-69.
59. Dinda NK, Ray M, Sarkar P. Effect of sowing date vis-a-vis variety of rapeseed and mustard on growth, yield and aphid infestation in Gangetic plains of West Bengal. *The Ecoscan*. 2015;9(1&2):21-24.
60. Pandey D, Singh G, Kumar R, Rao A, Kumar M, Kumar A. Effect of weed management practices on growth and yield of Indian mustard. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2019;8(4):3379-3383.
61. Raj P, Singh RP, Pal RK, Rajput P, Rana SS. Integrated weed management in indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2020; 10:271-276.
62. Yernaaidu Y, Parameswari YS, Madhavi M, Ramprakash T. Effect of weed management practices on nutrient uptake and economics of mustard (*Brassica juncea*). *International Journal of Economic Plants*. 2023;10(1):16-19.
63. Singh AK, Singh H, Rai OP, Singh G, Singh VP, Singh NP, Singh R. Effect of sowing dates and varieties for higher productivity of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Journal of Applied and Natural Science*. 2017;9(2):883-887.
64. Dwivedi SK, Puhup CS. Weed dynamics, growth pattern, yield and economics of linseed under different weed management practices. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*. 2019;51(1):36-39.
65. Osari S, Marskole J, Jatav SK, Bhadauria SS. Efficacy of herbicides controlling on weed flora and productivity of greengram. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*. 2019;6:396-400.
66. Shekhawat K, Rathore SS, Premi OP, Kandpal BK, Chauhan JS. Advance in agronomic management of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czernj. Cosson), An Overview. *Inter. J Agron*. 2012;14.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. 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/120903>