
Analogy potential effects of planting methods and tank mixed herbicides on wheat yield and weed populations

Ashrafi, Z.Y. *, Rahnavard, A. and Sedigheh, S.

Payame Noor University (PNU), Tehran State, Iran.

²Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Mazandaran State, Iran.

Ashrafi, Z.Y., Rahnavard, A. and Sedigheh, S. (2009). Analogy potential Effects of Planting Methods and Tank Mixed Herbicides on Wheat yield and weed populations. *Journal of Agricultural Technology* 5(2): 391-403.

The aim of integrated weed management (IWM) was to use the combination of different practices to maintain weed densities at manageable levels. A field experiment was conducted at Agricultural College, Tehran of University, in Karaj city 2005-2006 by planting wheat, to investigate the response of planting methods and tank mixed herbicides. The experiment was laid out using a split plot arrangement, in randomized complete block design with three replications. Methods of planting were assigned to the main plots; while tank mixed herbicides were kept in the sub-plots. The sub-plot size measured 4.5 X 4.5 m². Row to row distance was kept at 30 cm. Data were recorded on weed density m⁻², plant height (cm), spike length (cm), Number of spikes m⁻², Number of grains spike⁻¹, 1000 grain weight (g), biological yield (kg ha⁻¹), and grain yield (kg ha⁻¹). The weeds infesting the experiment were *Avena fatua*, *Anagallis arvensis*, *Euphorbia helioscopia*, *Phalaris minor*, *Poa annua*, *Convolvulus arvensis*, *Coronopus didymus*, *Fumaria polymorpha*, *Melilotus parviflora*, *Chenopodium album* and *Rumex crispus*. The data for individual traits were subjected to ANOVA technique and significant means were separated by the LSD test. The analysis of the data showed that methods of sowing were statistically significant for plant height, No. of grains spike⁻¹, 1000-grain weight and biological yield. The herbicides were statistically significant for all the parameters investigated except No. of grains spike⁻¹, while the interaction of methods of planting with herbicides could not reach the level of significance in any of the traits examined. Among the methods of planting, line sowing was the best followed by line + broadcast sowing. The herbicide mixtures controlled mixed stands of broadleaf and grassy weeds to the tune of 65 to 74% with a consequent increase in grain yield from 58-107%. Buctril-M + Topik 15 WP, 2,4-D + Puma Super 75 EW and Topik 15 WP were segregated as the top scoring applications by increasing yield to the extent of 107, 104 and 101 %, respectively over the weedy check.

Key words: Integrated weed management, wheat, weed control, mix- herbicides, planting, grain yield

*Corresponding author: Ashrafi, Z.Y.; e-mail address: z.y.ashrafi@gmail.com

Introduction

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) belongs to the family Poaceae and is an annual self-pollinated, photoperiodically long day grass. Like other grasses wheat produces tillers depending upon soil fertility and micro- and macro-environment. Wheat is the most important staple food crop for the whole world. Its cultivation is simple and adaptable to a varied soil and climatic conditions. It is also known as the king of cereals. Besides of food, wheat is used for livestock and poultry feeds. A large population of the world consumes wheat in a number of ways. Wheat culture both in Iran, as well as in the whole country is the backbone of the whole agricultural system. In Iran, wheat was grown on an area of 4.76 million hectares with a grain production of 14.07 million tons, during 2004-2005. The mean country and provincial productions are limited to 3150 kg and 1564 kg ha⁻¹, respectively (Anonymous, 2007; Montazeri *et al.*, 2005; Zand *et al.*, 2001). During the recent years wheat production has exceeded the requirement of the nation and subsequently the nation has entered into the international wheat export trade. The factors responsible for luxuriant growth and production probably have been the timely availability of fertilizers, higher support prices of wheat and accelerated use of herbicides like Puma super and Topic by the growers. The tempo however, needs to be sustained rather further accelerated, there still existing gap between the actual and potential yield of the crop at the farmers' fields. There are several reasons for this gap but the worst one is weed competition with the wheat crop in the field. The weeds use the soil fertility, available moisture, solar radiation and space with crop plants and result in yield reduction. Moreover, the wheat grains contaminated with weed seeds fetch lower prices. As, the nation has entered the international export market, the production of cleaner wheat grains is essential for competition in the international trade. Ashrafi *et al.* (2009) have reported nearly 21.44 % losses caused to the wheat crop by weeds. The losses on annual basis amount to more than Rs. 28 billion at the national level and Rs. 2.00 billion in Iran (Ashrafi *et al.*, 2009; Hassan and Marwat, 2001; Montazeri *et al.*, 2005; Rahnavard *et al.*, 2009). The weeds competitive with wheat crop in Iran include *Avena fatua*, *Phalaris minor*, *Anagallis avensis*, *Poa annua*, *Cirsium arvense*, *Convolvulus arvensis*, *Ammi visnaga*, *Chenopodium album*, *Fumaria polymorpha*, *Carthamus oxycantha*, *Euphorbia helioscopia*, *Medicago denticulata*, *Melilotus indica*, *Silybum marianum*, *Galium aparine* and *Rumex crispus*. Wheat can be sown by different methods viz., drilling in lines, cross sowing or broadcasting. Each method of planting has a varying impact on weed competition. For wheat cultivation the best method is line and line + broadcast sowing (Ashrafi *et al.*, 2009; Gogoi and Kalita, 1995; Code and Donaldson, 1996; Montazeri *et al.*, 2005) because of equidistant spacing of wheat, the

wheat is better competitive with weeds. Weed control has been practiced since the time immemorial by manual labour (weeding) or animal drawn implements, but these practices were laborious, tiresome and expensive due to increasing cost of labour. The growing mechanization of farm operations and ever increasing labour wages have stimulated interest in the use of chemical weed control. Chemical weed control is the easiest and most successful alternative method. Although different reports are available on the efficacy of different herbicides in wheat (Ashrafi, 2006; Ashrafi *et al.*, 2009; Mohibullah and Ali, 1974; Gill and Walia, 1979; Praczyk, *et al.*, 1995; Balyan *et al.*, 1983; Porwal and Gupta (1987); Azad *et al.*, 1997; Khan *et al.*, 1999; Khan *et al.*, 2001; Khan *et al.*, 2002; Hashim *et al.*, 2002; Qureshi *et al.*, 2002; Zand *et al.*, 2001), the herbicide use in Iran is not widely practiced as in the agriculturally advanced nations. The interest around the testing of graminicides (Walia *et al.*, 1998; Ormeno and Diaz, 1998; Brar *et al.*, 1999a; Brar *et al.*, 1999b; Montazeri *et al.*, 2005) indicates the problems posed by grasses. Tank mixing of herbicides is practiced for attaining synergism but, antagonism is also not uncommon in such a mixing (Ashrafi, 2006, Williams, 1984; Deschamps, *et al.*, 1990; Augero-Alverdo and Appleby, 1991; Augero-Alverdo, *et al.*, 1991; Pandey and Singh, 1994; Brar *et al.*, 1999b). Whereas, the studies of Panwar *et al.* (1996); Khan *et al.* (2002) and Montazeri *et al.* (2005) showed synergistic response on combined use of herbicides.

The instant studies were undertaken to evaluate the efficacy of different herbicides alone and in mixture on dynamics of weeds in wheat planted with different methods with these objectives a) to find out the most economical tank mixture of herbicides for the control of weeds in wheat crop b) to figure out the most suitable planting method for wheat cultivation and c) to evaluate the response of wheat to different planting methods and tank mixture of herbicides.

Materials and methods

A field experiment was conducted at College of Agronomy, Agricultural Paradise, Tehran of University, in Karaj City (35° 34' N, 55° 57' E) 2005-2006 to investigate the efficacy of some herbicide mixtures on grassy and broadleaf weeds and their consequent effect on wheat crop. The experiment was laid out in a split plot design with three replications. In a well-prepared soil, the basal dose of NPK was applied. All the phosphorous and potash were applied at the time of planting while, nitrogen was applied in two split doses. First half with the first irrigation and the remaining half at the early boot leaf stage. Methods of sowing (broadcast, line sowing and line + Broadcast) were assigned to the main plots, while ten herbicides detailed below (Table 1) were kept in the subplots. Each sub-plot size measured $4.5 \times 1.5 \text{ m}^2$. Row to row distance was

kept at 30 cm. Wheat variety Zarrin was sown on the 11th November, 2005 at the rate of 100 kg ha⁻¹ with broad cast and seed drill and broadcast + drill. The herbicides were applied with a knapsack sprayer during mid-January 2006, after first irrigation, when the soil was in an adequate moisture status. Spray the herbicides successfully all the precautionary measures were adopted so as to avoid any danger of physical exposure to the herbicides. In this experiment the data were recorded on Weed Density (m⁻²), Plant height (cm), Spike Length (cm), No. of Spikes m⁻², No. of Grains spike⁻¹, 1000 grain weight (g), Biological yield (kg ha⁻¹) and Grain yield (kg ha⁻¹). Standard procedures were adopted for recording the data on all above traits.

The data recorded for each trait were individually subjected to the ANOVA technique by using MSTATC Computer software and means were separated by using Fisher's protected LSD test (Steel and Torrie, 1980).

Table 1. Detail of the tank mixed herbicides assigned to the sub-plots.

S. No.	Herbicides Mixtures (Trade name)	Common Name	Dose(kg a.i.ha ⁻¹)
1	2,4-D+ Puma Super 75 EW	2,4-D fecnoxaprop-p-ethyl	0.90 + 0.94
2	2,4-D + Topik 15 WP	2,4 -D+ clodinafop	0.90 + 0.04
3	2,4-D + Isoproturan 50 WP	2,4-D + isoproturon	0.90 + 0.63
4	Buctril-M40 EC+Puma Super 75 EW	(bromoxynil + MCPA) + fenoxaprop-p-ethyl	0.70 + 0.94
5	Buctril-M 40 EC + Topik 15 WP	(bromoxynil + MCPA) + isoproturon	0.70 + 0.04
6	Buctril-M 40 EC +Isoproturon 50 WP	(bromoxynil+MCPA)+ isoproturon	0.70 + 0.63
7	Logran Extra 64 WG + Puma Super 75 EW	(triasulfuron+ terbutryn)+ fenoxaprop-p-ethyl	0.16 + 0.94
8	Logran Extra 64 WG + Topik 15 WP	(triasulfuron+ terbutryn)+ clodinafop	0.16 + 0.04
9	Logran Extra 64 WG + Isoproturon 50 WP	(triasulfuron + terbutryn)+ isoproturon	0.16 + 0.63
10	Weedy check (no weeding)	-	-

Results and dicussion

An experiment comprised the method of sowing and herbicides on wheat was carried out at Agricultural Research, University of Tehran, Karaj city. Data were recorded on weed dynamics and some morphological and agronomic traits of wheat. The data are presented below:

Weed density m⁻²

The analysis of variance showed that method of planting and interactions of planting method with herbicides were no statistically significant while, the herbicidal applications were evaluated as statistically significant. The evident shown from the data in Table 2 that almost similar weed density m⁻² was recorded in all methods of planting. However, the highest weed density was recorded in the broadcast sowing (37.2) as compared to line (31.5) or line + broadcast sowing (31.7). All herbicidal combinations although were no

significant among themselves, had a lower density of weeds m^{-2} as compared to the weedy check (88.889). Among the herbicides, numerically lowest weeds (23.4) were recorded in Buctri-M + Isoproturon. The interactions in the method of planting with herbicides were no statistically difference. However, the lowest weed density (20.1) was observed in line sowing treated with Buctril-M + Topik. The treatments involved line sowing in general, had the lowest infestation as compared to the interactions in line + broadcast or broadcast sowing. The highest weed density (102.69) was recorded in the weedy check under broadcast sowing (Table 2). These results were confirmed by Panwar *et al.* (1996); Pandey and Singh (1994); Khan *et al.* (1999); Khan *et al.* (2002); Khan *et al.* (2003) who reported that application of the tank mixed herbicides reduced broad and narrow leaf weeds to a varying degree sometimes approaching 100%. Base on the results conflict to the work reported by Ashrafi, (2006); Williams (1984); Deschamps *et al.* (1990); Augero-Alverdo and Appleby (1991); Augero-Alverdo *et al.* (1991). The variability in findings could be attributed to the different herbicidal combinations tested by those researchers.

Table 2. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on weed density (m^{-2}) in Wheat.

Herbicidal combination	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast
2,4-D + Puma Super	22.4	25.7	31.6
2,4-D + Topic	26.2	24.6	32.3
2,4-D + Isoproturon	27.0	28.3	34.6
Buctril-M + Puma Super	28.7	32.3	34.3
Buctril-M + Topik	20.1	24.8	29.0
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	25.6	22.3	24.0
Logran Extra+ Puma Super	23.2	27.7	33.6
Logran Extra + Topik	24.6	25.667	23.0
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	23.0	28.1	24.7
Weedy check	80.9	76.4	104.6
Mean	30.4	33.2	35.1

LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 11.26,* The means sharing a letter in common do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Plant height (cm)

The analysis of variance showed that method of planting and herbicidal applications were statistically significant, while the interaction between method of planting and herbicides was evaluated as no statistically significant. The perusal of data in Table 3 exhibits that the Line + Broadcast and Broadcast Sowing were statistically at par with each other, but surpassed the Line Sowing. More plant height (102 cm each) was recorded in Line + Broadcast and Broadcast Sowings. All herbicides although no significant among themselves

had a more plant height as compared to the weedy check (78 cm). Almost all the herbicides gave the equal plant height (103 cm) numerically except Logran Extra + Topik and Logran Extra + Isoproturon (102 cm), which had slightly lower plant height. Earlier workers like Ashrafi *et al.* (2009); Rahnavard *et al.* (2009) have also found that herbicides has no effect in plant height and concluded that trait under reference is strictly under genetic control. The difference in findings can be attributed to the different genetic material used and a variance in environmental conditions. The interaction method of planting with herbicides although it was none statistically exhibits that the plant height of the treatments involving Broadcast Sowing was generally taller (105 cm) than the other planting methods. The minimum plant height (75 cm) was observed in the weedy check under the Line sowing (Table 3). These results are collaborated with the conclusions of Gogoi and Kalita (1995).

Table 3. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on plant height (cm) in wheat.

Herbicidal Combination	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast
2,4-D + Puma Super	100	103	105
2,4-D + Topic	101	103	105
2,4-D + Isoproturon	100	104	104
Buctril-M + Puma Super	100	104	105
Buctril-M + Topic	100	104	104
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	101	104	104
Logran Extra + Puma Super	100	104	104
Logran Extra + Topic	99	103	103
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	98	104	104
Weedy check	75	81	79
Mean	98 B	102 A	102 A

LSD_{0.05} for sowing methods = 3.348, LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 2.671

* The means sharing a letter in common in their respective category do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Spike length (cm)

The analysis of variance showed that methods of sowing and interaction of method of planting with herbicides were statistically no significant, while the herbicidal applications were detected as significant. It is evident from the data in Table 4 that almost similar spike length was recorded in all methods of planting. However, the longest spikes (10 cm) were recorded in Line and Line + Broadcast sowing. All tank mixed herbicides although non significant among themselves had a more spike length (10 cm) as compared to the weedy check (9 cm). The interaction of method of planting with herbicides was no statistically significant the highest spike length (11 cm) was observed in Line + Broadcast Sowing treated with 2, 4-D + Puma Super, 2, 4-D + Topik, Logran Extra + Puma Super,

Logran Extra + Topik and in Broadcast 2, 4-D + Puma Super (Table 4). These results are in agreement with the work of Ashrafi (2006); Ashrafi *et al.* (2009); Rahnavard *et al.* (2009) who reported that spike length is significantly affected by herbicidal applications.

Table 4. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on spike length (cm) in wheat.

Herbicidal Combination	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	Mean
2,4-D + Puma Super	10	11	11	10 A*
2,4-D + Topic	10	11	9	10 A
2,4-D + Isoproturon	10	10	10	10 A
Buctril-M + Puma Super	10	10	9	10 A
Buctril-M + Topic	10	10	10	10 A
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	10	10	10	10 A
Logran Extra + Puma Super	10	11	9	10 A
Logran Extra + Topic	9	11	9	10 A
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	9	10	9	10 A
Weedy Check	9	9	9	9 B
Mean	10	10	9	

LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 0.9822 *The means sharing a letter in common do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Number of spikes m⁻²

The No. of spikes per unit area is the most important trait contributing to the grain yield in wheat. The data on No. of spikes per m² are presented in (Table 5). The statistical analysis of the data indicated that methods of sowing and interaction of method of sowing with herbicides was statistically non significant while, the differences among the herbicides were detected as significant. The data in Table 5 show that almost similar spikes m⁻² were recorded in all methods of sowing. However, the highest spikes m⁻² (276.47) were observed in line sowing as compared to Line + Broadcast (269.53) or Broadcast (246.73) sowing. Among the herbicides the highest No. of spikes m⁻² were recorded in 2, 4-D + Topik (276.67) which however were statistically at par with all other herbicidal applications but statistically higher than the weedy check (199.78) (Table 5). The interaction of the method of planting with the herbicides although no statistically significant exhibited that the spikes m⁻² of the treatments involving Line sowing were generally higher than the other planting methods. Line sowing treated with Buctril–M+Topik (293.00) gave the maximum No. of spikes m⁻² (Table 5).

Number of grains spike

Number of grains spike⁻¹ is another important component of yield. Change in number of grains spike⁻¹ drastically influences the final yield. The

analysis of data showed that the variable method of sowing was evaluated as significant, while the herbicides and interaction of methods of planting with herbicides were statistically non significant. The data in Table 6 exhibits those higher grains spike⁻¹ (53.213) was recorded in line sowing. However, it was statistically at par with line + broadcast sowing (50.197) but higher than broadcast sowing (44.2). The herbicidal treatments were statistically non significant, but numerically the highest No. of grains (52.41) were observed in 2,4-D + Topik. Minimum grains (45.00) were recorded in weedy check (Table 6). The interaction of method of planting with herbicides although no statistically significant, exhibited higher grains spike⁻¹ (59.569) in the line sowing treated with 2, 4-D+Topik. The lowest grains spike⁻¹ (42.333) were recorded in the 2,4-D+Isoproturon under the broadcast planted treatment. These results are corroborated with the results of Balyan *et al.* (1983); Khan *et al.* (2001); Khan *et al.* (2002); Khan *et al.* (2003) who concluded that herbicidal applications produce more grains spike⁻¹ than the untreated control.

Table 5. Effect of methods of planting and herbicides on No. of Spikes m⁻² in wheat.

Herbicidal Combination	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	Mean
2,4-D + Puma Super	275.00	277.00	233.33	261.78 A*
2,4-D + Topic	288.67	281.67	259.67	276.67 A
2,4-D + Isoproturon	278.33	279.33	266.67	274.78 A
Buctril-M+ Puma Super	286.00	263.00	263.00	270.67 A
Buctril-M + Topic	293.00	270.67	262.67	275.44 A
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	280.00	276.33	272.67	276.33 A
Logran Extra + Puma Super	289.67	283.33	237.33	270.11 A
Logran Extra + Topic	288.00	280.67	230.33	266.33 A
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	280.33	275.67	255.67	270.56 A
Weedy Check	205.67	207.67	186.00	199.78 B
Mean	276.47	269.53	246.73	

LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 39.46,* The means sharing a letter in common do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

1000-grain weight (g)

The analysis of data indicated that the methods of planting and herbicides were statistically significant, while the interaction of method of planting with herbicides was statistically non significant. The maximum 1000 grain weight (39 g) was recorded in line + broadcast sowing, but it was statistically higher than the line and broadcast sowing (37 g) (Table 7). Among the herbicides, the maximum 1000 grain weight was recorded in Buctril-M+Topik and Logran Extra+ Puma Super (39 g) each. However, were statistically at par with all other herbicidal applications, but statistically higher than the weedy check (30 g). The interaction

of method of planting with herbicides, although no statistically significant showed that the treatments involving line and line + broadcast sowing generally had bolder grain than broadcast sowing. Line sowing treated with Buctril-M+Puma Super (40 g each) had the highest 1000 grains weight (Table 7), while broadcast and line sowings under the weedy check (28 g each) possessed the smallest kernel size. Similar results were also reported by Tanveer *et al.* (1999); Balyan and Malik (1996); Samunder *et al.* (1994) concluded that the herbicides were very effective for weed control and also gave best crop yield.

Table 6. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on No. of grains Spike⁻¹ in wheat.

Herbicidal Combinations	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	Mean
2,4-D + Puma Super	52.100	52.00	42.667	48.92
2,4-D + Topic	59.569	50.667	47.000	52.41
2,4-D + Isoproturon	50.767	50.633	42.333	47.81
Buctril-M + Puma Super	54.800	49.667	48.333	50.93
Buctril-M + Topic	51.433	54.133	44.333	49.97
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	54.867	50.000	43.333	49.29
Logran Extra + Puma super	56.467	48.033	45.333	49.94
Logran Extra + Topic	57.133	51.800	43.000	50.64
Logran Extra+ Isoproturon	48.667	49.333	43.333	47.11
Weedy Check	46.333	46.000	42.667	45.00
Mean	53.213 A*	50.197 A	44.200 B	

LSD_{0.05} for sowing methods = 4.618, *The means sharing a letter in common do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Table 7. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on 1000 grain weight (g) in wheat.

Herbicidal Combinations	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	Mean
2,4-D + Puma Super	38	39	38	38 A*
2,4-D + Topic 15 WP	39	39	37	38 A
2,4-D + Isoproturon	38	39	36	38 A
Buctril-M + Puma Super	40	39	37	38 A
Buctril-M + Topic	38	40	38	39 A
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	39	39	37	38 A
Logran Extra+ Puma Super	38	39	39	39 A
Logran Extra+Topik 15 WP	38	40	37	38 A
Logran Extra+ Isoproturon	37	40	37	38 A
Weedy Check	28	33	28	30 B
Mean	37 B	39 A	37 B	

LSD_{0.05} for sowing method = 1.62, LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 2.628

*The means sharing a letter in common in their respective category do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Biological yield (kg ha⁻¹)

The analysis of variance showed that method of planting and herbicidal applications were statistically significant, while the interaction of method of planting with herbicides was recorded as statistically non significant. The highest biological yield (17763 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in Line sowing, while Line +Broadcast (16739) and Broadcast sowing (15970) were statistically at par with each other (Table 8). Among the herbicides, the highest biological yield (18793 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in 2, 4-D + Puma Super. However, it was statistically at par with all other herbicidal applications except Logran Extra + Topik (15638 kg ha⁻¹). The lowest biological yield (10908 kg ha⁻¹) was observed in the weedy check. The interaction of method of planting with herbicides although no statistically significant exhibits that the biological yield of the treatments involving Line sowing was generally higher than the other planting methods. Line sowing treated with 2, 4-D + Puma super gave maximum biological yield (23241 kg ha⁻¹) than rest of the interactions. The minimum biological yield (10601 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in weedy check under the Line + broadcast sowing. The herbicide 2, 4-D + Puma super gave the excellent control of weeds hence consequently it increased the biological yield (Table 8). These results are in a greater agreements with the work of Porwal and Gupta (1987) and Brar *et al.* (1999b). They also reported that different herbicides reduced weed and increased grain and straw yield of wheat over the control plots.

Table 8. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on biological yield kg ha⁻¹ in wheat.

Herbicidal Combinations	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	Mean
2,4-D + Puma Super	22222	16872	17284	18793 A*
2,4-D + Topic 15 WP	18922	18930	16173	18008 AB
2,4-D + Isoproturon	19341	17284	18930	18518 AB
Buctril-M + Puma Super	18383	17697	15638	17239 AB
Buctril-M + Topic 15 WP	18107	16872	15226	16735 AB
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	18930	15638	18107	17558 AB
Logran Extra+ Puma Super	16461	16872	17284	16872 AB
Logran Extra + Topic 15 WP	15638	17284	13992	15638 B
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	18107	19342	16461	17970 AB
Weedy Check	11523	10601	10601	10908 C
Mean	17763 A	16739 B	15970 B	

LSD_{0.05} for sowing methods = 851, LSD_{0.05} for herbicides = 2893,* The means sharing a letter in common in their respective category do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Grain yield (kg ha⁻¹)

The data showed that method of sowing and the interaction of method of sowing with herbicides were statistically non-significant while, the differences among the herbicides were detected as significant. The perusal of data (Table 9) exhibited that almost similar grain yield was recorded in all methods of planting. However, the line + broadcast had a slightly higher yield (4142.78 kg ha⁻¹) as compared to line (4078.39) or broadcast sowing (4088.53). All the herbicides out yielded the weedy check. Among the herbicides the highest yield was recorded in Buctril-M + Topik (4771.06 kg ha⁻¹). However, it was statistically at par with all other herbicidal applications except Buctril-M + Isoproturon (3631.82 kg ha⁻¹), 2, 4-D + Isoproturon (3775.64 kg ha⁻¹), and Buctril-M + Puma Super (4138.53 kg ha⁻¹). The herbicide Buctril-M + Isoprotran was in turn statistically comparable with Buctril-M + Puma Super (4138.53 kg ha⁻¹), Logran Extra + Topik (4378.86 kg ha⁻¹), Logran Extra + Isoproturon (4389.79 kg ha⁻¹) and Logran+Puma Super (4314.13 kg ha⁻¹) (Table 9). The herbicides Buctril-M+Topik gave an excellent control of weeds hence consequently increased the grain yield. The interaction of the method of planting with the herbicides although no statistically significant exhibited that the yield of treatments involving line+broadcast sowing was generally higher than the planting with the other methods. Line+Broadcast treated with 2, 4-D+Puma Super out yielded (5115.23 kg ha⁻¹) the rest of the interactions. The lowest grain yield (2239.68 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in the weedy check, under line sowing. These findings are in a close conformity with Pandey and Singh (1994); Azad *et al.* (1997); Samunder *et al.* (1994) who reported a differential response of various herbicides on the grain yield of wheat.

Table 9. Effect of method of planting and herbicides on grain yield (kg ha⁻¹) in wheat.

Herbicide Combination	Method of Sowing			Mean
	Line sowing	Line + Broadcast	Broadcast	
2,4-D + Puma Super	4395.06	5115.23	4568.07	4692.78A*
2,4-D + Topic 15 WP	4802.47	4691.36	4407.59	4633.81A
2,4-D + Isoproturon	3744.86	4084.13	3497.94	3775.64CD
Buctril-M + Puma Super	3781.89	3884.74	4748.97	4138.53BC
Buctril-M + Topic	4494.24	4979.42	4839.51	4771.06A
Buctril-M+ Isoproturon	3827.16	3223.46	3844.86	3631.82D
Logran Extra + Puma Super	4979.42	3859.67	4103.29	4314.13AB
Logran Extra + Topic 15 WP	4320.98	4456.57	4359.02	4378.86AB
Logran Extra + Isoproturon	4198.19	4855.97	4115.22	4389.79AB
Weedy Check	2239.68	2277.36	2400.82	2305.96 E
Mean	4078.39	4142.78	4088.53	

LSD_{0.05} for treatment = 494.7

* The means sharing a letter in common do not differ significantly by LSD test at 5% probability level.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their appreciation to University of Tehran and Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, for full support of the project.

References

- Anonymous. (2007). Agricultural Statistics of Iranian. Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock, Government of Iranian. Tehran.
- Ashrafi, Z.Y. (2006). Effect of tankmix herbicide and fertilizer on wheat yield and weed control, M.S.c thesis, Agriculture College, University Of Tehran, Iran.
- Ashrafi, Zoheir Y,S. Sadeghi, H.R Mashhadi and R.E. Blackshaw. (2009). Study Effects of Planting Methods and Tank Mixed Herbicides on Weeds Controlling and Wheat Yield. *Journal of Agricultural Science* 1:101-111.
- Augero-Alverdo, R. and Appleby, A.P. (1991). Uptake, translocation, and phytotoxicity of root-absorbed haloxyfop in soybeans, *Festuca rubra* L., *Festuca arundinacea* Schreb. *Weed Res.* 31:257-263.
- Augero-Alverdo, R., Appleby, A.P. and Armstrong, D.J. (1991). Antagonism of haloxyfop activity in tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) by dicamba and bentazon. *Weed Sci.* 39:1-5.
- Azad, B.S., Harbans, S. and Singh, H. (1997). Effect of time, methods of application of herbicide and nitrogen on weed control in wheat. *Annals Agric. Res.* 18 (2):174-177.
- Balyan, R.S., Bhan, V.M. and Singh, S.P. (1983). Evaluation of herbicides in wheat. *Indian J. Weed Sci.* 15(1): 43-46.
- Balyan, R.S. and Malik, R.K. (1996). Effect of spray volume on herbicide efficacy in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Haryana Agric. Univ. J. Res.* 26 (4): 249-257.
- Brar, L.S., Walia, U.S. and Dhaliwal, B.K. (1999a). Bioefficacy of new herbicide for the control of resistant *Phalaris minor* in wheat. *Pesti. Res. J.* 11(2): 177-180.
- Brar, L.S., Walia, U.S. and Dhaliwal, B.K. (1999b). Performance of clodinafop for the control of wild oat (*Avena ludoviciana*) in wheat. *J. Res. Punjab Agric. Univ.*, 36(3-4):187-190.
- Code, G. R. and Donaldson, T.W. (1996). Effect of cultivation, sowing methods and herbicides on wild radish populations in wheat crops. *Aust. J. Exper. Agric.* 36 (4): 437-442.
- Deschamps, R.J.A., Hsio, A.I. and Quick, W.A. (1990). Antagonistic effect of MCPA on Fenoxaprop activity. *Weed Sci.* 38:62-66.
- Gill, H.S. and Walia, U.S. (1979). Herbicidal control of *Phalaris minor* Retz. in wheat. *Proc. 7 th Conf. of the Asian-Pacific Weed Sci. Soc.*, pp. 9-62. *Weed Absts.* 30(7):2251 ;1981.
- Gogoi, A.K. and Kalita, H. (1995). Effect of seeding method and herbicides on weeds and growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). *Indian J. Agron.* 40 (2): 209-211.
- Hashim, S., Marwat, K.B. and Hassan, G. (2002). Response of wheat varieties to substituted herbicides. *Pak. J. Weed_Sci. Res.* 8 (1-2):49-56.
- Hassan, G. and Marwat, K.B. (2001). Integrated Weed Management in agricultural crops. *Proc. National Workshop on technologies for Sustainable Agriculture*, Sep. 24-26, 2001, NIAB, Faisalabad, Pakistan, pp. 27-34.
- Khan, I., Muhammad, Z., Hassan, G. and Marwat, K.B. (2001). Efficacy of different herbicides for controlling weeds in wheat crop-I. Response of agronomic and morphological traits in wheat variety Ghaznavi-98. *Scientific Khyber* 14(1):51-57.
- Khan, I., Hassan, G. and Marwat, K.B. (2002). Efficacy of different herbicides for controlling weeds in wheat crop-II. *Weed dynamics and herbicides. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res.* 8(1-2): 41-47.

- Khan, M.A., Zahoor, M., Ahmad, I., Hassan, G. and Baloch, M.S. (1999). Efficacy of different herbicides for controlling broad leaf weeds in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Pak. J. Biol. Sci. 2(3):732-734.
- Khan, N., Hassan, G., Marwat, K.B. and Khan, M.A. (2003). Efficacy of different herbicides for controlling weeds in wheat crop at different times of application – II. Asian J. Plant Sci. 2(3): 310-313.
- Mohibullah and Ali, A. (1974). Efficacy of different herbicides in controlling weeds and their effect on wheat yield. Front. J. Agric. Res. 1(1): 41-45.
- Montazeri, M.E.Z. and Baghestani, M.A. (2005). Weeds and their Control in Wheat Fields of Iran. Agricultural Research and Education Organization Press, pp. 85.
- Ormeno, N.J. and Diaz, S.J. (1998). I Clodinafop, a new herbicide for the selective control of grassy weeds in wheat. II Selectivity on spring and alternative cultivars. Agricultura, Tecnica, Santiago 58(2): 103-115.
- Pandey, J. and Singh, R.P. (1994). Effect of sulfonyl urea herbicides on weed control in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). Indian J. Agron. 39 (4):565-568.
- Panwar, R.S., Malik, R.K. and Rathi, S.S. (1996). Effect of tralkoxydim and its combination with other new herbicides on the control of weeds in wheat. Indian J. Agron. 41 (3): 401-405.
- Porwal, M.K. and Gupta, O.P. (1987). Studies on chemical control in wheat. Indian J. Agron. 32(3): 282-283.
- Praczyk, T., Adamczewski, K., Miklaszewska, K. and Gorniak, J. (1995). Estimation of Logran Extra 62 WG for weed control in wheat. Materialy, Sesji, Instytutu, Ochrony, Roslin 35(2): 311-313.
- Qureshi, M.A., Jarwar, A.D., Tunio, S.D. and Majeedano, H.I. (2002). Efficacy of various weed management practices in wheat. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res. 8(1-2): 63-69.
- Rahnavard, A., Ashrafi, Z.Y., Alizade, H.M. and Sadeghi, S. (2009). Studies on the effect of fertilizer application and crop rotation on the weed infested fields in Iran. Journal of Agricultural Technology 5(1): 41-50.
- Samunder, S., Malik, R.K. and Singh, S. (1994). Effect of 2,4-D and tribenuron on the control of broad-leaf weeds in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). Indian J. Agron. 39(3): 410-414.
- Steel, R.G.D. and Torrie, J.H. (1980). Principles and procedures of statistics a biological yield approach, 2nd ed. McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc. New York.
- Walia, U.S., Brar, L.S. and Dhaliwal, B.K. (1998). Performance of Clodinafop and Fenaxaprop-ethyl for the control of *Phalaris minor* in wheat. Indian J. Weed Sci. 30: (1-2): 48-50.
- Williams, C.S. (1984). Interaction of bentazon with haloxyfop-methyl or sethoxydim. Ph.D Dissert. Agron. Deptt. University of Illinois, Urbana, IL., USA.
- Zand, E., Kooceki, A., Mashhadi, H.R. and Mahallati, M.N. (2001). Variation in yield and intra-specific competition ability of Iranian wheat cultivars (*Triticum aestivum*) during the last 50 years. Agric. Sci. Technol. 15(1): 21-31.

(Received 28 December 2008; accepted 27 August 2009)