



# Effect of Integrated Weed Management Practices on Growth and Yield of Green Chilli (*Capsicum annum* L.)

Nitesh Kharwal<sup>a</sup> and Deependra Yadav<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Abhilashi University, Chail-Chowk, India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i183456

## 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/104392>

Original Research Article

Received: 29/05/2023

Accepted: 02/08/2023

Published: 07/08/2023

## ABSTRACT

Weed infestation in chilli production, especially during early growth stages, is a major constraint leading to significant yield loss. Effective weed management during this critical phase is crucial for maximizing chilli crop productivity. Keeping this in view a field experiment was conducted at the research farm of Abhilashi University, Mandi (H.P) during the *Kharif* season of 2022-23. The main objective was to assess the impact of various integrated weed management strategies on the growth and yield of green chilli crops. The experiment consisted of seven treatments with control, laid out in Randomized Block Design with three replications. The treatment details viz., T<sub>1</sub>[Weedy check (Control)], T<sub>2</sub>(Weed free), T<sub>3</sub>[Hand weeding at 30 and 60 days after transplanting (DAT)], T<sub>4</sub>[organic mulch (paddy straw)], T<sub>5</sub> (Oxyfluorfen 1.0 kg/ha, T<sub>6</sub> Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha) and T<sub>7</sub> (Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The results of the study revealed that the "Weed-free" treatment (T<sub>4</sub>) exhibited the highest plant height (80.35 cm), number of leaves per plant (120), number of fruits per plant (85) with an average weight of fruits per plant (276.74 g), dry weight of fruits per plant (33.21 g) and yield (7.56 kg/plot and 189.05 q/ha). The treatment "Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha + Hand weeding after 60 DAT" (T<sub>7</sub>) followed closely, recording the plant height (75.78 cm), number of leaves per plant (114.66), number of fruits per plant (82.33) with an average weight of

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [deependra1328@gmail.com](mailto:deependra1328@gmail.com);

fruits per plant (251.56 g), dry weight of fruits per plant (32.7 g) and yield (7.12 kg/plot and 178.08 q/ha). The "Weedy check" treatment (T<sub>1</sub>) required the longest duration for 50% flowering and the first and final harvest, with 76, 108 and 124 days, respectively. On the other hand, the "Weed-free" treatment (T<sub>2</sub>) required the shortest period, with 66, 93, and 106 days, respectively. Regarding weed-related parameters, the "Weedy check" treatment (T<sub>1</sub>) demonstrated the highest weed count (110), fresh weight of weeds (2160.03 g) and dry weight of weeds (388.81 g), while the "Weed-free" treatment (T<sub>2</sub>) exhibited the minimum weed count (0.00), fresh weight of weeds (0.00 g) and dry weight of weeds (0.00 g). The highest weed control efficiency (WCE) of 100% and the lowest weed index (0.00%) were observed in the "Weed-free" treatment (T<sub>2</sub>), whereas the lowest WCE (0.00%) and the highest weed index (69.69%) were recorded in the "Weedy check" treatment (T<sub>1</sub>). Economically, the combined treatment of "Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha with hand weeding after 60 DAT" (T<sub>7</sub>) resulted in the highest net return of 4,39,192.78 ₹/ha, followed by the "Weed-free" treatment (T<sub>2</sub>) with 4,35,207 ₹/ha. The lowest net return was observed in the "Weedy check" treatment (T<sub>1</sub>) with 62,117.28 ₹/ha.

**Keywords:** Chilli (*Capsicum annum L.*); integrated weed management; growth; yield; weed control.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Chilli pepper (*Capsicum annum L.*) holds significant importance as a spice and cash crop in India and various other countries worldwide. With its roots in Mexico and Peru, it is primarily cultivated in tropical and subtropical regions. The fruits of chilli pepper are renowned for their rich nutrient content, containing approximately 292 IU of vitamin A and 111mg of ascorbic acid per 100g of edible matter [1]. In India, green chilli is cultivated across an extensive area of 427 thousand hectares, yielding an annual production of 4700 thousand metric tons. Major chilli-producing states include Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, and Bihar, with Madhya Pradesh leading the production with an area of 57.93 thousand hectares and an output of 906.08 thousand metric tonnes [2].

Despite its economic significance, the chilli crop faces severe challenges due to weed infestations. Weeds, such as *Cynodon dactylon* (Bermuda grass), *Cyperus rotundus* (coco-grass), *Convolvulus arvensis* (bindweed), *Bidens pilosa* (Blackjack) and *Nicandra physalodes* (apple of Peru) etc., compete with chilli plants for vital resources, resulting in considerable yield losses. Traditional methods of manual weeding are labour-intensive and time-consuming, making them less practical, particularly during the monsoon season when field conditions become damp and unsuitable for hoeing.

To address this challenge, herbicides have been increasingly utilized to control weeds efficiently. However, some weeds may still escape herbicidal treatment, necessitating the integration of multiple weed management techniques for

effective control. Integrated weed management has emerged as a viable solution, combining the use of herbicides with mechanical weed control strategies. Integrated weed management (IWM) is a holistic approach that integrates various strategies to efficiently control and manage weeds in agricultural settings. The central objective of integrated weed management is to reduce weed infestations and their adverse effects on crop development and productivity, all while promoting sustainable resource utilization and minimizing harm to the environment. This research focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of integrated weed management techniques to reduce crop-weed competition during the critical growth stages of chilli plants. By assessing the impact of timely and efficient weed management practices, the aim is to provide insights into achieving sustained agricultural output and enhanced chilli yield.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted to evaluate the effect of Integrated Weed Management (IWM) practices on the growth and yield of green chilli (*Capsicum annum L.*). The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. Seven treatments, including a control, were evaluated to assess their impact on the chilli crop. The chilli variety *Bio Seed 6157* was used in the experiment. Seeds were sown in well-prepared nursery beds measuring 3 m in length, 2 m in width, and 0.15 m in height. The soil was enriched with a mixture of well-rotted farmyard manure (FYM), urea, single super phosphate (SSP) and muriate of potash (MOP). Thiram @ 3g/kg of seeds was applied to treat the seeds before sowing. Regular watering was

provided during the germination and growth period. At the time of transplanting the experimental field was harrowed twice and ploughed once with a tractor to attain a fine tilth. Soil pulverization was done using a power tiller, followed by planking. Raised beds of dimensions 2 m × 2 m × 0.1 m were prepared. Nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>), and potassium (K<sub>2</sub>O) were added to the soil using urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash, respectively. After calculating fertilizer doses for one hectare, it was converted to per plot (4 m<sup>2</sup>) basis nitrogen @ 65.2 gm, phosphorus @ 150 gm and potash @ 40 gm. Herbicides, Pendimethalin, and Oxyfluorfen were used as pre-emergence and sprayed three days after transplanting. Hand weeding was performed 30 and 60 days after transplantation. Mulching with paddy straw (5 t/ha) was done to suppress weed growth. Intercultivation as per treatments was carried out at 30 and 60 days of transplantation. Irrigation was also provided at regular intervals depending on weather conditions. Various growth and yield metrics were recorded from five randomly chosen plants in each plot. The observations included plant height, number of fruits per plant, number of leaves per plant, fresh and dry fruit weight, yield per plot and yield per hectare. For the dry weight parameter, the fruit and the weeds were kept in the hot air oven for 3 days at 75<sup>o</sup>C for maintaining a consistent weight. Weed control efficiency (WCE) was estimated by the formula given by Mani et al. [3], and the result was reported in percentage form. Whereas the weed index (WI) was determined using the formula specified by Gill and Vijayakumar [4], and the result was also reported in percentage form. The data obtained for various parameters were subjected to statistical analysis using online statistical package software (OPSTAT).

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Soil Studies

In this study, the soil characteristics of the experimental field were determined to establish the initial status of the soil. To achieve this, Auger sampling was employed, randomly collecting samples from different sections of the field at a depth of 0-15 cm. An active soil sample was then made from the composite and subjected to chemical analysis. The results from the soil testing laboratory indicated several key findings. Firstly, the soil displayed a slightly acidic reaction. Secondly, the available nitrogen content was found to be low. Lastly, the soil exhibited a medium level of available phosphorus and

potassium content. Table 1 contains the results of the soil testing laboratory analysis.

#### 3.2 Crop Studies

Different parameters at the time of harvest per plant were counted and a difference among different treatments has been recorded. The data recorded for the growth parameter is displayed in Table 2. and data for the yield parameter is displayed in Table 3.

##### 3.2.1 Plant height

The experiment conducted on different treatments revealed varying effects on plant height. The highest plant height (80.35 cm) was observed under treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum plant height (51.00 cm) was found under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). The presence of weeds in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check) likely had a negative impact on plant growth for several reasons. Weeds compete with crops for essential resources such as nutrients, water and sunlight. As a result, they deprived the cultivated plants of these vital elements, led to stunted growth and reduced overall height. Due to high competition with weeds, the shortest plant height was obtained in the weedy check. Similar results were also reported by Gasti and Chakravorty [5] and Sathiyamurthy et al. [6].

##### 3.2.2 Number of leaves per plant

The highest number of leaves per plant (120.00) were recorded under treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) which was followed by treatment T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1 kg a.i./ha. + one hand weeding at 60 DAT). The lowest number of leaves per plant (73.67) was noted in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). The increased number of leaves per plant in both weed-free and herbicide-treated plots can be attributed to the plant's ability to efficiently utilize the available space, moisture and light, promoted vigorous growth. Whereas the weedy check plots faced intense competition with weeds for essential resources like moisture, nutrients, space and light. As a result, the crop's growth was severely impacted, and the number of leaves per plant was limited in comparison to the weed-free treatment. Similar results were obtained by Gasti and Chakravorty [5].

##### 3.2.3 Days required for 50 per cent flowering

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported minimum days (66.66) for 50 per cent

flowering followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). Maximum days (76.00) were noticed for 50 per cent flowering in T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). The early flowering in chilli plants under weed-free conditions can be attributed due to the lack of competition for essential resources. In weed-free conditions, chilli plants have unrestricted access to these vital resources, enabling them to grow and develop more efficiently. As a result, they reach the flowering stage earlier than when competing with weeds. On the other hand, in weedy check conditions, the presence of weeds creates intense competition for resources. Weeds have rapid and aggressive growth, due to which they uptake significantly more amount of available resources. This competition adversely affected the growth and development of the chilli plants, led to delays in their flowering stage. Similar results were also recorded by Kumari et al. [7].

### 3.2.4 Days required for the first and final harvest

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported minimum days (93.66 and 106.66) for the first and final harvest respectively, followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). Maximum days (108.00 and 124.00) were noticed under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). In weed-free conditions, chilli plants experienced earlier first and final harvests due to better access to essential resources which led to efficient growth and development. Conversely, weedy check conditions with competing weeds delay chilli plant maturity and subsequent harvests, as weeds deprive the plants of crucial resources and hinder their growth. The absence of weeds allows chilli plants to thrive and mature faster, resulted in earlier harvests, while the presence of weeds delays maturity and leads to delayed first and final harvests. Similar results were also recorded by Kumari et al. [7].

### 3.2.5 Average weight of fruits per plant (g)

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported a maximum average weight of fruits per plant (276.74 g), followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum average weight of fruits per plant (105.32 g) was noticed under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). In the weed-free treatment, chilli fruit achieves maximum weight due to no competition from weeds for essential resources like nutrients, water and sunlight. On the contrary, in the weedy check condition, where weeds grow unchecked

alongside chilli plants, the fruit's weight is at its lowest due to intense resource competition and hindered growth. Similar findings were reported by Ningappa [8], Khokhar et al. [9] and Singh et al. [10]. When weeds grow around fruit-bearing plants, they create shade and reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the crop. This reduced sunlight can lead to smaller fruit development as the plant struggles to produce enough energy through photosynthesis. Additionally, weeds often have an extensive root system that competes with the plant for water and nutrients in the soil. This competition can hinder the plant's ability to access the necessary resources, resulting in smaller and less nutritious fruits.

### 3.2.6 Dry weight of fruits per plant (g)

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported a maximum dry weight of fruits per plant (33.21 g), followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum average weight of fruits per plant (9.84 g) was noticed under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). The increased dry weight of chilli in weed-free conditions is attributed to the absence of weed competition. In such conditions, chilli plants have improved access to essential resources like nutrients, water and sunlight, promoting their growth and biomass accumulation. On the other hand, weedy check conditions experience intense competition for resources, resulted in reduced growth and lower dry weight of chilli plants. Similar findings were observed by Hajebi et al. [11], Ningappa [8], Khokhar et al. [9] and Singh et al. [10].

### 3.2.7 Yield per plot (kg)

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported a maximum (7.56 kg) yield per plot, followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum yield per plot (1.93 kg) was found under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). In weed-free conditions, chilli plants achieve maximum yield as they face no competition from weeds, enabling them to access essential resources like nutrients, water and sunlight, led to thriving growth and abundant fruit production. On the other hand, weedy check conditions with coexisting weeds create intense resource competition for chilli plants, causing hindered growth and reduced fruit production, resulting in the lowest yield. Similar results were also obtained by Singh et al. [10], Gare et al. [12], Cheena et al. [13], Adigun et al. [14], Krishnamurthy et al. [15] and Faruq et al. [16].

### 3.2.8 Yield per hectare (q)

Results showed that treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) reported a maximum (189.05 q) yield per hectare, followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum yield per plot (48.44 q) was found under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). Weed-free conditions lead to maximum chilli yield, as the absence of weed competition allows chilli plants to access vital resources (nutrients, water and sunlight) for thriving growth and abundant fruit production. Conversely, in weedy check conditions, intense resource competition from weeds hinders chilli plant growth, resulted in the lowest yield per hectare. Similar findings were also obtained by Singh et al. [10], Gare et al. [12], Cheena et al. [13], Adigun et al. [14], Krishnamurthy et al. [15] and Faruq et al. [16].

### 3.3 Weed Studies

The data recorded for the weed studies is displayed in Table 4.

#### 3.3.1 Weed flora

*Amaranthus viridis* L., *Trianthema portulacastrum* L., *Phyllanthus niruri* L., *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* L., *Cyperus rotundus* L., *Digitaria sanguinalis* L., *Parthenium hysterophorus* L., *Convolvulus arvensis* L., *Portulaca oleracea* L., *Dactyloctenium ilegyptium* L., *Lactuca rancinata* Dc., *Celosia argentea* L., *Dinebra retroflexa*, *Physalis minima* L. and *Amaranthus retroflexus* L. were the most common weed species that were found in the experimental field. Similar weeds have also been reported by Robinson et al. [17], Khokhar et al. [9] and Shaikh [18].

#### 3.3.2 Weed count per square meter

The results showed that the maximum weeds (110.00) were found in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check), followed by T<sub>4</sub> [organic mulch (paddy straw)]. The lowest weed density was found under treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free). In the weedy check condition, the weed count was high because there were no weeds grown alongside the chilli plants, leading to increased weed density. On the other hand, in the weed-free condition, the weed count was lowest because weeds were eliminated from the field completely. Similar results were also reported by Khokhar et al. [9], Singh et al. [10] and Shil and Adhikary [19].

#### 3.3.3 Fresh weight and dry weight of weeds (g)

The results showed that the highest fresh and dry weight of weeds (2160.03 g and 388.81 g) were found in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check), followed by T<sub>4</sub> [organic mulch (paddy straw)]. The lowest fresh and dry weed weight was found under treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free). The fresh weight and dry weight of weeds was highest in the weedy check condition because the weeds were allowed to grow unchecked alongside the chilli plants, resulted in vigorous weed growth. In the absence of weed control measures, the weeds had access to ample resources like nutrients, water, and sunlight, enabling them to thrive and accumulate more biomass. On the other hand, in weed-free conditions, the fresh and dry weight of weeds was lowest because efforts were made to control or eliminate weeds. The absence of weed competition and management practices limited the growth and development of weeds, leading to reduced fresh weight and dry weight compared to the weedy check condition. Similar observations were also reported by Khokhar et al. [9], Rajkumar [20], Singh et al. [10], Ningappa [8] and Kalasare et al. [21].

#### 3.3.4 Weed control efficiency (%)

The results showed that the maximum weed control efficiency (100%) was found in treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed-free) followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT). The minimum weed control efficiency was found under treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check). In the weed-free condition, there were no weeds which led to maximum weed control efficiency as weed growth is completely prevented. This allows chilli plants to access resources and thrive without competition and results in optimal growth and yield. In contrast, in the weedy check condition, weed control efficiency is the lowest as weeds were allowed to grow freely alongside chilli plants. Lack of weed management led to reduced efficiency and negative effects on chilli plant productivity. Similar results were also reported by Faruq et al. [16], Aviles-Baeza et al. (2022) and Krishnamurthy et al. [15].

#### 3.3.5 Weed Index (%)

The results showed that the maximum weed index (69.69) was found in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check), followed by T<sub>4</sub> [organic mulch (paddy straw)]. The lowest weed index (0.00) was observed under treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free). The

presence of weeds and their density was highest in the weedy check condition, where weed control measures were lacking, while the weed-free condition exhibits the lowest weed index due to successful weed management efforts. Similar results were also reported by Faruq et al. [16] and Tursun et al. [22] and Khokhar et al. [9].

### 3.4 Economics

The data recorded for economics is presented in Table 5.

#### 3.4.1 Cost of cultivation (₹/ha)

The treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) had the highest total cost of cultivation (₹ 1,31,962.22) followed by T<sub>3</sub> [hand weeding after 30 and 60 DAT] (₹ 99,462.22). The overall cost of cultivation was

lowest (₹ 83,212.22) in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (weedy check).

#### 3.4.2 Gross return (₹/ha)

The treatment T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) had the highest gross return (₹ 5,67,169.5) followed by T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT) (₹ 5,34,236.00). The overall gross return was lowest in treatment T<sub>1</sub>(weedy check) (₹ 83,212.22).

#### 3.4.3 Net return (₹/ha)

The treatment T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT) had the highest net return (₹ 4,39,192.78) followed by T<sub>2</sub> (weed free) (₹ 4,35,207.28). The overall net return was lowest in treatment T<sub>1</sub>(weedy check) (₹ 62,117.28).

**Table 1. Soil properties of the experimental field**

S. No.	Characters	Values obtained before transplanting
1	pH	5.84
2	Available Nitrogen (kg/ha)	165.42
3	Available Phosphorus (kg/ha)	12.57
4	Available Potash (kg/ha)	130.85

**Table 2. Growth parameters influenced by different treatments**

Treatments	Plant height (cm)	NO. of leaves per plant	Days for 50% flowering	Days req. for harvesting	
				1 <sup>st</sup> harvest	Final harvest
T <sub>1</sub>	51.00	73.66	76.00	108.00	124.00
T <sub>2</sub>	80.35	120.00	66.66	93.66	106.66
T <sub>3</sub>	68.13	107.00	68.66	98.00	112.00
T <sub>4</sub>	51.32	97.33	71.33	102.33	118.00
T <sub>5</sub>	66.22	105.33	69.33	99.33	114.00
T <sub>6</sub>	63.46	101.33	70.66	101.00	116.00
T <sub>7</sub>	75.78	114.66	67.66	95.00	108.33
SE(m) ±	2.88	3.97	1.13	1.11	1.04
CD at 5%	8.99	12.39	3.52	3.48	3.25

**Table 3. Yield parameters influenced by different treatments**

Treatments	Average weight of fruits per plant (g)	Dry weight of fruits per plant (g)	Number of fruits per plant	Yield per plot (kg)	Yield per hectare (q)
T <sub>1</sub>	105.32	9.84	61.00	1.93	48.44
T <sub>2</sub>	276.74	33.21	85.00	7.56	189.05
T <sub>3</sub>	219.97	26.39	80.00	5.71	142.83
T <sub>4</sub>	151.11	18.13	70.33	3.29	82.30
T <sub>5</sub>	196.34	23.56	78.00	5.00	125.17
T <sub>6</sub>	182.76	21.93	77.00	4.41	110.30
T <sub>7</sub>	251.56	32.70	82.33	7.12	178.08
SE(m) ±	9.43	1.09	1.86	0.25	6.23
CD at 5%	29.40	3.40	5.79	0.77	19.43

**Table 4. Weed parameters influenced by different treatments**

Treatments	Weed count	Fresh weight of	Dry weight of	Weed control	Weed
	(No./m <sup>2</sup> )	weeds (g/ m <sup>2</sup> )	weeds (g/m <sup>2</sup> )		
	At harvest	At harvest	At harvest	efficiency (%)	index (%)
T <sub>1</sub>	10.53 (110.00) *	46.47 (2160.03) *	19.73 (388.81) *	0.00	69.69
T <sub>2</sub>	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	100.00	0.00
T <sub>3</sub>	5.65 (31.33)	25.05 (635.53)	10.66 (114.40)	70.79	20.73
T <sub>4</sub>	7.96 (62.66)	35.30 (1249.80)	15.00 (224.96)	42.29	53.52
T <sub>5</sub>	6.20 (37.66)	27.39 (753.33)	11.65 (135.60)	64.88	24.83
T <sub>6</sub>	6.47 (41.00)	28.55 (817.27)	12.14 (147.11)	62.29	39.87
T <sub>7</sub>	5.36 (28.00)	23.56 (557.80)	10.03 (100.40)	74.23	4.15
SE(m) ±	0.26	1.20	0.50	-	-
CD at 5%	0.82	3.75	1.58	-	-

\* NOTE: Figures in parenthesis are original values

**Table 5. Economics influenced by different treatments**

Treatments	Total cost (₹/ha)	Gross income (₹/ha)	Net income (₹/ha)
T <sub>1</sub>	83,212.22	1,45,329.5	62,117.28
T <sub>2</sub>	1,31,962.22	5,67,169.5	4,35,207.28
T <sub>3</sub>	99,462.22	4,28,498	3,29,035.78
T <sub>4</sub>	98,087.22	2,46,920.8	1,48,833.53
T <sub>5</sub>	99,887.22	3,75,514	2,75,626.78
T <sub>6</sub>	86,918.47	3,30,910	2,43,991.53
T <sub>7</sub>	95,043.22	5,34,236	4,39,192.78
SE(m) ±	-	-	-
CD at 5%	-	-	-

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that weed-free treatment was the best treatment for enhancing the crop and yield parameters. It was also helpful in controlling the weed count which ultimately resulted in increasing the weed control efficiency. Treatment T<sub>7</sub> (pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. + HW after 60 DAT) was efficient in achieving the maximum net return due to less labour cost as compared to T<sub>2</sub> (weed free).

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

- Narayan S, Makhdoomi MI, Malik A, Nabi A, Hussain K, Khan FA. Influence of
- Plastic and organic mulching on productivity, growth and weed density in chilli (*Capsicum annum* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6:1733-1735.
- Anonymous. Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, horticulture Statistics; 2022. Available: <https://agricoop.nic.in/en/StatHortEst>
- Mani VS, Malla ML, Gautam KC, Bhagwandas. Weed killing chemicals in potato cultivation. Indian Farm. 1973; VXXII:17-18.
- Gill GS, Vijayakumar. Weed index A new method for reporting weed control trials. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 1969;16:96-98.
- Gasti DV, Chakravorty S. Integrated Weed Management in Chilli + Garlic

- Intercropping System. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8:3100-3110.
6. Sathiyamurthy VA, Rajashree V, Shanmugasundaram T, Arumugam T. Effect of different mulching on weed intensity, yield and economics in chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;6:609-617.
  7. Kumari V, Singh J, Sharma D, Mishra S. Evaluation of chilli genotypes for growth and fruit yield attributing traits under Chhattisgarh plain conditions. International Journal of Current Microbiology Applied Sciences. 2017;11:3478-3483.
  8. Ningappa RB, Tuppad GB, Madhu G. Sequential application of pre and post emergence herbicides for weed management in chilli+ onion+ cotton intercropping systems. Trends Bioscience. 2014;7:2818-23.
  9. Khokhar KM, Mehmood T, Shakeel M. Evaluation of integrated weed management practices for chillies in Pakistan. Crop Protection. 2007;26:1135-1139.
  10. Singh U, Hiremath SM, Halikatti SI, Shashidhara GB, Patil PL. Evaluation of herbicides for weed control in rainfed transplanted chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.). Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2011;24:125-128.
  11. Hajebi A, Das TK, Singh SB, Saha S, Sefidkon F, Lebaschi MH, Hajebi F. Effect of Tillage and Weed Management Practices on Growth and Oleoresin Yield in Chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.). Pesticide Research Journal. 2015;27:122-127.
  12. Gare BN, Raundal PU, Burli AV. Integrated weed management in chilli under rainfed condition. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2015;47:390-392.
  13. Cheena J, Saidaiah P, Geetha A. Long Term Effect of Integrated Weed Management on Growth and Yield Attributes in Chilli. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;6:1504-1508.
  14. Adenubi OO, Sanni KO. Weed interference and fruit yield of chilli pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) as influenced by plant density. Open Journal of Plant Science. 2020;5:30-32.
  15. Krishnamurthy D, Desai BK, Maruthi. Integrated Weed Management in Chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9:2319-7706.
  16. Faruq MO, Uddin MR, Alam MR. Effect of weed management practices on chilli yield in Chattogram hill districts of Bangladesh. Journal of Innovative Agriculture. 2022; 9:32-43.
  17. Robinson DE, McNaughton K, Soltani N. Weed management in transplanted bell pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) with pretransplant tank mixes of sulfentrazone, S-metolachlor, and dimethenamid-p. Horticultural Science. 2008;43:1492-1494.
  18. Shaikh AR. Integrated weed management in Rabi chilli. (*Capsicum annuum*) Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2005;37:285-286.
  19. Shil S, Adhikary P. Weed management in transplanted chilli. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2014;46:261-263.
  20. Rajkumar S, Palled YB. Weed management in Drilled Onion (*Allium cepa* L.) + chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.) + cotton (*Gossypium herbaceum* L.) Relay intercropping in rainfedvertisols. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2009;41:189-194.
  21. Kalasare, Rajesh, Ramesh, Babu, Baburai Nagesh, Aravinda Kumar, Panpatte, Deepak, Shitap Mayur. Effect herbicides on weeds in chilli + onion + cotton intercropping system. BIOINFOLET - A Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences. 2016;13:6-9.
  22. Tursun N, Akinci IE, Uludag A, Pamukoglu Z, Gozcu D. Critical period for weed control in direct seeded red pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.). Weed Biology and Management. 2012;12:109-115.

© 2023 Kharwal and Yadav; 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/104392>