



Energy Balance Studies of Weed Management Practices in Mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czerj and Cosson)

Y. Yernaïdu ^{a*}, Y. S. Parameswari ^a, M. Madhavi ^a
and T. Ram Prakash ^a

^a Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad-500030, India.

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2023/v13i61802

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/95155>

Original Research Article

Received: 05/11/2022

Accepted: 01/01/2023

Published: 11/04/2023

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad during *rabi* 2020-21 on loamy sand soils to study energy balance of weed management practices in mustard. The energy balance studies were determined by using direct and indirect energy. Among the different weed management practices, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ recorded higher energy input. This treatment was followed by Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ and Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹. Maximum energy output, net energy, energy use efficiency and energy productivity were noticed under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: yernaïduyalla@gmail.com;

Keywords: Energy input; energy output; energy efficiency; energy productivity; intercultivation.

1. INTRODUCTION

“In terms of international trade, mustard is one of the most significant oilseed crops. Among the seven edible oilseeds, it is India's second-largest oilseed crop after groundnut. Oil content in mustard seeds ranges from 37 to 49%” [1]. “Rapeseed and mustard grow on 6.23 million hectares of land in India, producing 9.34 million tonnes and 1499 kg ha⁻¹, respectively, in terms of output and productivity” [2]. The primary biotic stressor in mustard production is weeds. The usage of non-farm inputs including fertilisers, insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other chemicals has grown over time as a result of agriculture's intensification. Energy is needed in large quantities for these inputs. daily rise in the price of crude oil, which in turn drives up the cost of external inputs. As a result, the benefits of cultivation are limited while the expense increases. Therefore, it is necessary to calculate energy inputs and outputs. To determine the direction of a system's energy consumption pattern, energy balance is defined as the measurement of proportion and analysis of the energy input absorbed and output created by various activities [3]. Keeping this in view, the current experiment was conducted with the aim of analysing the energy balance of weed control techniques in mustard. Studies on the energy balance were conducted for the procedures used from the beginning of crop cultivation to the end of harvest.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field study was carried out at the College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, during the rabi season 2020–21. The soil in the experimental field had a loamy sand texture, a pH of 7.9, was moderately fertile, and had accessible nitrogen (223 kg ha⁻¹), phosphorus (30.87 kg ha⁻¹), potassium (375.72 kg ha⁻¹), and organic carbon (0.69%). The NRCHB-101 mustard variety was sown at a seed rate of 4 kg ha⁻¹. Manually, the seeds were spaced 40 cm apart by 10 cm. The recommended fertiliser dosage of 80:40:40 Kg ha⁻¹ of N, P₂O₅, and K₂O was used. The experiment was laid in a randomised block design and replicated three times with twelve treatments: T₁: Stomp 30 % EC as PE fb Turga Super 5% EC as PoE, T₂: Raft 6% EC as PE fb Turga Super 5% EC as PoE, T₃: Goal 23.5 % EC as PE fb Turga Super 5% EC as PoE, T₄: Stomp

30 % EC as PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹, T₅: Raft 6% EC as PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹, T₆: Goal 23.5 % EC as PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹, T₇: Stomp 30 % EC as PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS, T₈: Raft 6% EC 0.09 kg ha⁻¹ PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS, T₉: Goal 23.5 % EC as PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS, T₁₀: Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS (weed free), T₁₁: Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS, T₁₂: Unweeded control. Herbicides for pre-emergence were used 24 hours after sowing. All post-emergence herbicides were applied to weeds when they had 2–3 leaves. At 15 DAS, straw mulch was applied. Intercultivation was carried out with push hoe at 15 and 30 DAS. At 15 and 30 DAS, manual weeding was done. Energy input, energy output, net energy, energy efficiency, and energy productivity were all noted.

Direct and indirect energy were used to evaluate the energy input of various treatments. Indirect energy inputs are the energy necessary to convey machinery, synthetic fertilisers, pesticides, and seed. Direct energy inputs include the whole amount of fossil fuel used in land preparation, harvesting, human labour, and electricity.

2.1 Output Energy

When determining output energy, the seed and stover yields were taken into account. By dividing the seed and stover yields by the associated energy coefficient, energy output was estimated. The energy intensities or efficiencies of the various weed management techniques were calculated as i) net energy and (ii) the output to energy input ratio (Energy use efficiency, EUE).

2.2 Total Net Energy

$$NEt = \text{Energy Output} - \text{Energy input}$$

2.3 Total Energy Use Efficiency

$$EUEt = \frac{\text{Total energy output (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Energy input (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

2.4 Total Energy Productivity

$$EPt = \frac{\text{Total yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Energy input (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

Table 1. Energy conversion factors used in the present study

Input		Energy coefficient	References
Machinery	MB Plough	22.4 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Rotavator	23.2 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Cultivator	20.72 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Sprayer	3.76 MJ kg ⁻¹	[5]
Irrigation	Diesel	56.31 MJ l ⁻¹	[4]
	Water	1.02 m ³	[4]
	Electricity	11.93 kW h	[4]
	Pump	0.382 kW h ha ⁻¹	[4]
Manual labour	Men	1.96 MJ man-h ⁻¹	[6]
	Women	1.57 MJ man-h ⁻¹	[6]
Fertilizers	Nitrogen	60.0 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Phosphorus	11.30 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Potassium	6.70 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
Pesticides	Emamectin	228.8 MJ kg ⁻¹	[7]
	Propiconazole	175 MJ kg ⁻¹	[8]
	Oxyfluorfen	551 MJ kg ⁻¹	[9]
	Oxadiargyl	121.5 MJ kg ⁻¹	[10]
	Quizalofop ethyl	518 MJ kg ⁻¹	[9]
	Pendimethalin	421 MJ kg ⁻¹	[9]
Seed	Seed	14.70 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
Output	Grain	14.70 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]
	Stover	12.50 MJ kg ⁻¹	[4]

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect on Weed Flora

“The experimental field was infested with grasses like *Digitaria sanguinalis*, *Echinochloa crusgalli*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Dinebra retroflexa*, *Eleusine indica* and sedges like *Cyperus rotundus* and broad-leaved weeds like *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Alternanthera sessilis*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Cleome viscosa*, *Euphorbia hirta*, *Commelina benghalensis* and *Digera arvensis*” [11].

3.2 Effect on Weed Density and Weed Dry Weight

Data pertaining to yield presented in Table 2. “Among weed management practices, Lower

grasses, sedges and broad -leaved weed density were observed under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS recorded lower grass weed density and it was found to be on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. In turn Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS on par with Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Similarly, Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS registered lower weed dry matter compared to other and it was statistically on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS were on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. These treatments followed by Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹,

Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ and intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS). Lower weed dry matter was observed in different treatments due to suppression of weeds resulted lesser weed dry matter" [12].

3.3 Effect on Weed Control Efficiency

The effectiveness of weed control was impacted by several weed management techniques (Table 3). "Higher weed control efficiency was observed with intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and this treatment was followed by Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t ha⁻¹, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t ha⁻¹, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t

ha⁻¹, intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS, It might be due to effective control of weeds led to reduced weed dry matter resulted in higher weed control efficiency" [13,14].

3.4 Effect on Yield

Data pertaining to yield presented in Table 3. Among weed management practices, higher seed and stover yield were observed under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. In turn Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS on par with Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Effective control of weeds provided congenial environment for crop which resulted in higher yield attributes led to higher yield [15].

Table 2. Effect of different weed management practices on weed density and weed dry weight in mustard

Treatments	Weed density (No. m ⁻²)			Weed dry weight
	Grasses	Sedges	Broad leaved	
T ₁ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	2.61 (5.80)	2.94 (7.65)	4.53 (19.52)	3.51 (11.29)
T ₂ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	2.57 (5.59)	2.77 (6.66)	4.48 (19.06)	3.38 (10.43)
T ₃ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	2.59 (5.71)	2.88 (7.32)	4.51 (19.36)	3.45 (10.88)
T ₄ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	3.23 (9.46)	2.41 (4.85)	3.66 (12.39)	3.08 (8.48)
T ₅ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	3.19 (9.18)	2.26 (4.13)	3.59 (11.89)	2.98 (7.89)
T ₆ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	3.21 (9.28)	2.37 (4.66)	3.63 (12.21)	3.03 (8.18)
T ₇ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	2.56 (5.58)	2.00 (3.01)	3.17 (9.06)	2.58 (5.66)
T ₈ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	2.17 (3.70)	1.79 (2.26)	2.97 (7.85)	2.29 (4.24)
T ₉ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	2.52 (5.44)	1.97 (2.90)	3.08 (8.49)	2.53 (5.38)
T ₁₀ : Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 DAS and 30 DAS (weed free)	1.98 (2.92)	1.61 (1.71)	2.55 (5.53)	2.01 (3.05)
T ₁₁ : Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS	3.25 (9.56)	2.49 (5.21)	3.70 (12.71)	3.17 (9.03)
T ₁₂ : Unweeded control	5.86 (33.56)	4.63 (20.43)	9.08 (81.53)	7.70 (58.30)
SE (m) ±	0.16	0.11	0.15	0.11
CD (P=0.05)	0.48	0.33	0.44	0.35

Note: Values in the parenthesis are original and ($\sqrt{x+1}$) transformed. PE-Pre Emergence, PoE-Post Emergence

Table 3. Effect of different weed management practices on weed control efficiency and yield in mustard

Treatments	Weed control efficiency (%)	Seed yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Stover yield (kg ha ⁻¹)
T ₁ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	80.63	895	2596
T ₂ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	82.12	917	2668
T ₃ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	81.33	908	2634
T ₄ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	85.46	1084	2878
T ₅ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	86.46	1104	2938
T ₆ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	85.97	1092	2897
T ₇ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	90.29	1267	3098
T ₈ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	92.72	1349	3149
T ₉ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	90.77	1320	3115
T ₁₀ : Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 DAS and 30 DAS (weed free)	94.77	1483	3280
T ₁₁ : Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS	84.52	1070	2799
T ₁₂ : Unweeded control	-	641	2413
SE (m) ±		47.7	48.7
CD (P=0.05)		140.0	142.8

Table 4. Effect of different weed management practices on energetics in mustard

Treatments	EI	Eot (MJ ha ⁻¹)	Net	EUET	Ept (kg MJ ⁻¹)
T ₁ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	19423	45748	26325	2.36	0.180
T ₂ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	19013	46970	27958	2.47	0.189
T ₃ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> Turga Super 5 % EC as PoE	19157	46422	27265	2.42	0.185
T ₄ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	41944	52058	10114	1.24	0.094
T ₅ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	41534	53100	11566	1.28	0.097
T ₆ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha ⁻¹	41578	52413	10835	1.26	0.096
T ₇ : Stomp 30 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19588	57483	37895	2.93	0.223
T ₈ : Raft 6 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19178	60338	41160	3.15	0.235
T ₉ : Goal 23.5 % EC as PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19223	58488	39266	3.04	0.231
T ₁₀ : Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 DAS and 30 DAS (weed free)	19315	62945	43630	3.26	0.247
T ₁₁ : Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS	19202	50862	31660	2.65	0.202
T ₁₂ : Unweeded control	18988	22736	3748	1.20	0.161
SE (m) ±		1198.5	1200.	0.13	0.01
CD (P=0.05)		3595.1	3602.	0.40	0.03
			0		

EI: Energy Input, Eot: Total energy output, Net: Total net energy, EUET: Total energy use efficiency, Ept: Total energy productivity

3.5 Energy Balance Studies

Data pertaining to energy balance studies were presented in Table 4. Among the different weed management practices, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ recorded

highest energy input. This treatment was followed by Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ and Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹ it might be due to more energy necessary to produce straw mulch.

Higher total energy output was observed with intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with Raft 6 % EC 0.09 as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS in turn on par with Goal 23.5 % as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and Turga Super 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS was recorded significantly higher net energy and it was found to be on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS in turn on par with Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

“Significantly superior energy use efficiency (EUE) of total output was recorded under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS” [16-17].

Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS was recorded highest energy productivity (EP) of total output and it was statistically on par with Raft 6 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, Goal 23.5 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Similar results were noticed by Jha et al. [10].

4. CONCLUSIONS

In case of energy balance studies, maximum energy input was required for Stomp 30 % EC as PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha⁻¹. Higher energy output, net energy, energy use efficiency and energy productivity were recorded under Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is my great pleasure to give my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Y. S. Parameswari (Chairperson), Assistant Professor(Agronomy), College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad and committee members, Dr. M. Madhavi, Senior Professor (Agronomy), Associate Dean, Agricultural College, Aswaraopet, PJTSAU, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad & Dr. T. Ramprakash, Principal

Scientist (SSAC) & Head, AICRP on Weed Management, Diamond Jubilee Block, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad for their continuous help and motivation during the course of experiment.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Bhowmik B, Mitra B, Bhadra K. Diversity of insect pollinators and their effect on the crop yield of *Brassica juncea* L., NPJ-93, from Southern West Bengal. International Journal of Recent Scientist Research. 2014;5(6):1207-1213.
2. India statistics 2019-20 (indiastat.com).
3. Acharya SK, Bera S, Ahmad G. Estimation of farm energy balances of small farm management: A social-ecological and techno managerial analysis. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2013;9(2):91-95.
4. Devasenapathy P, Senthil Kumar G, Shanmugam PM. Energy management in crop production. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2009;54(1):80-90.
5. Pimentel D. Economics and energetics of organic and conventional farming. Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics. 1993;6:53-60.
6. Mittal JP, Dhawan KC. Energy-use patterns under various farming systems in Punjab. Applied Energy. 1988;30(4):261-268.
7. Green MB. Energy in pesticide manufacture, distribution and use. In Energy in Plant Nutrition and Pest Control, ed. Helsel ZR. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier. 1987:165-177.
8. Guzman GJ, Alonso AM. A comparison of energy use in conventional and organic olive oil production in Spain. Agricultural Systems. 2008;49:1-10.
9. Chaudary KK, Singh SS, Pratibha G, Ranjan B, Shamim M, Srinivas L. Patel A. Energy conservation and greenhouse gas mitigation under different production systems in rice cultivation. Energy. 2017;130:307-314.
10. Jha SK, Dewangan YK, Jha D. Effect of weed management practices and seed rates on economics and energetics on direct seeded rice production system. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2020;9(5):677-681.

11. Yernaïdu Y, Parameswari YS, Madhavi M, Ramprakash T. Effect of weed management practices on weed parameters and nutrient removal by weeds in mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czernj and Cosson). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(8): 184-187.
12. 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. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2020;8(2):1364-1367.
13. Sharma OL, Jain NK. Effect of herbicide on weed dynamics and seed yield of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). Indian Journal of Agriculture Science. 2002;72(6): 322-324.
14. 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.
15. Das SK. Chemical weed management in *Brassica rapa* variety yellow sarson. Journal of Applied and Natural Science. 2016;8(2):663-667.
16. Rani PL, Yakadri M, Mahesh N, Bhatt PS. Energy usage and economic analysis of cotton under various weed management practices. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2016;48(1):99-101.
17. Rathke GW, Wienhold BJ, Wilhelm WW, Diepenbrock W. Tillage and rotation effect on corn-soybean energy balances in eastern Nebraska. Soil and Tillage Research. 2007;97:60-70.

© 2023 Yernaïdu et al.; 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/95155>