1

2

3

4

 $\bigcirc$ 

## **Original Research Article**

## Efficacy of Different Tillage and Weed Management Practices on Yield and Yield Attributing Characters of Winter Maize (Zea Mays L.) In Chitwan, Nepal

#### 5 ABSTRACT

6 A field research trial at experimental station of National Maize Research Program (NMRP), Rampur, 7 Chitwan, Nepal during winter 2015/16 was conducted to study the effects of different tillage and weed 8 management practices on yield and yield attributing characters of winter maize (Zea mays L.). The experiment 9 was laid out in split plot design, with two tillage methods (no tillage and conventional tillage) as main plot 10 factor and seven weed management practices as sub plot factor (sequential application of atrazine at the rate 11 0.75 kg a.i. kg/ha fb 2,4-D at the rate 1.5 kg/ha; pre-emergence tank mix application of atrazine at the rate 0.75 12 kg/ha and glyphosate at the rate 2.5ml/liter of water; pre-emergence tank mix application of atrazine at the rate 13 0.75 kg/ha and pendimethalin at the rate 2 ml/lit of water; cowpea co-culture; black polythene mulch, weed free and weedy check). From the study the highest grain yield (707 gg/ha) was obtained from black polythene 14 mulch which was statistically similar to weed free check (5916-29 pa). The other weed management practices 15 16 produced intermediate yield between black polythene mulch and weedy check which produced the lowest grain yield (3168 kg Also, tillage methods significantly influence the harvest index, significantly higher harvest 17 index was found in no tillage (46.49%) as compared to conventional tillage practices (42.12%). 18

19 20

0 Keywords: Tillage; Weed management; Efficacy; Maize; Nepal; Yield.

21

#### 22 1. INTRODUCTION

Maize traditionally grown as a staple food crop for many years, and is the second most important crop after rice in terms of area and production in Nepal. Better yield potential, short duration, superior nutritional content (about 72-% starch, 10-% protein, 4.8-% oil, 9.5-% fiber, 3-% sugar, and 1.7-% ash) [1] and equally important for fodder as well as for grain implies the maize as "Queen of cereals". During 2014 to 2016, on average maize is grown in area of 900,913 hectares with total production of 2,220,010 tons and average yield of 3.09 t/ha [2]. It is being grown in diverse climatic and geographic regime ranging from tropical to temperate zone.

30 Weed, a plant grown where it is not desirable, declines yield and quality of crop plants and leads to 31 higher cost in food production [3] and also regarded as greatest limiting factor in efficient crop production. 32 Thus, weed is the major problem for losing the yield potential of crop (37%) as compared to other loss potential 33 i.e. animal pest 18%, fungal and bacterial pathogen 16%, and virus 2% [4]. Maize yield losses due to weeds 34 depend on the cultivars, species and number of weeds per unit area, crop-weed competition period and duration. 35 Besides reducing yield, weeds can reduce grain quality, cause irregular maturation and harvesting difficulties, as 36 well as act as alternate hosts for pests and pathogens. Thus, the need for increasing maize yield has called for 37 better crop management practices including efficient weed control strategies to enhance the productivity. Since, 38 different weed control practices like cultural, physical, biological and chemical are used for weed control. No 39 doubt cultural methods are still useful tools but are laborious, time consuming and getting expensive. Also, soil 40 moisture and temperature are affected by tillage system, potentially affecting weed and crop germination 41 conditions, growth and yield of crop. Among the crop production factors, tillage contributes up to 20% [5]. With 42 the development and widespread adoption of minimum and zero-tillage systems these days, weed management 43 approaches have evolved. But their economic and geographical based validation is lacking.

The scenario needs an effective intervention through genuine research findings on the best weed management practice for increasing productivity of maize crop while maintaining the ecological and economical 46 sustainability at the same time. The best results of weed control can only be seen in case of integrated weed 47 management practices. Integrated weed management is the need of the day, because of its sustainability and 48 higher productivity [6]. Therefore, an attempt was made in order to evaluate the efficacy of tillage and weed 49 management on yield attributes and yield of winter maize.

50

#### 51 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

52 Research was conducted in the research block of NMRP (National Maize Research Program under 53 Nepal Agriculture Research Council) Rampur, Chitwan during winter season from September 2015 to March 2016. The area is situated in Central terai of Nepal which lies at  $27^{0}37$  North latitude and  $84^{0}25$  East longitude 54 55 with the elevation of 256m above mean sea level. Split plot design was adopted for the experiment where main-56 plot factor represent tillage practices and sub-plot factor contained different weed management practices (Table 57 1).

58	Details of factor	and their	levels used	in experimen	t are given below:
----	-------------------	-----------	-------------	--------------	--------------------

- 59 Main plot: Tillage
- 60 i) No tillage (NT)
- 61 ii) Conventional tillage (CT)
- 62 Sub plot: Weed management practices

#### 63 Table 1. Sub-Plot Factors used for research trials (Weed management Practices)

Treatment No	Treatment practice	Frequency and doses
1	Weedy Check	
2	Weedy Free	Hand weeding at the rate 10days interval
3	Polythene Mulching	Black Polythene
4	Cowpea intercropping	Maize cowpea 1:2
5	Atrazine+Glyphosate (pre-emergence	Atrazine: 0.75 kg a. kg/ha or 1.5 kg/ha
	tank mixture)	(Pre-emergence application)
		Glyphosate: 0.80 <sup>tt</sup> /ha, 1-2 kg a.i <del>kg</del> /ha
6	Atrazine + Pendimethalin (pre-emergence	Pendimethalin: 2 ml/lt water
	tank mixture)	(1-1.5) kg a.i <del>kg</del> /ha
7	Atrazine fb 2,4-D(sequential application)	2,4-D: 1.5 kg/ha

64

Experiment was laid out in split plot design with three replication and fourteen treatments constituting 65 42 plots. The size of individual plot was  $6m \times 4m$  (24m<sup>2</sup>). Bund of 1m width separate two main plots and 0.5m 66 width separate two individual plots and each replication was separated by 1 m bund. Maize was sown 67 continuously in line with spacing of 60 cm  $\times$  25 cm. Altogether 10 rows and 16 hill per row of maize were 68 maintained in each plots. The varieties used in the experiment were "RML-32/RML-17". The hybrid 69 "RML32/RML17" was used as a parentage and presently developed Rampur hybrid 4, which can be grown in 70 terai and inner terai, having yield potential of 6.95 t/ha with grain color orange. Field was prepared using 2 71 tillage methods. In no tillage plot field was left as it is ,weed was killed by treating with glyphosate at the rate 72 0.80 lit/ha whereas in conventional tillage field was ploughed by using tractor 10 days prior to sowing to make 73 field fine.

74 Field was fertilized using common of inorganic fertilizer for hybrid maize i.e. nitrogen, phosphorus, 75 and potash at the rate 180:60:40 kg NPK/ha were applied through Urea (46%N), DAP (18%N and 46%  $P_2O_5$ ) 76 and MOP (60% K<sub>2</sub>O). As recommended, seed rate of 20 kg/ha was used. Harvesting of maize was done from 77 net plot area of  $12\text{m}^2$  of 5 rows from each plot manually with help of sickles.

78 Data regarding Number of harvested cob, Diameter and Length of the cob, Number of rows per ear, 79 grain per rows, grain per ear, weight of cob with grain and weight of grain per ear, Thousand kernel weight, 80 Grain yield and straw yield, stover yield and Harvest Index (HI) were taken and analyzed using MSTAT and 81 Microsoft excel and interpretations were made based on results and findings. The purpose of analysis of 82 variance was to determine the significant effect of treatments on weeds and maize.

83 The crop from the net plot was harvested to record the grain yield. Grain was further dried, shelled, cleaned and 84 weight was taken using electronic balance and at the same time moisture content was also recorded using digital

85 moisture meter. The grain yield per hectare was computed for each treatment from the net plot yields. Grain

86 yield was adjusted to 14% moisture by using following formula given by Paudel [7].

87 Grain yield (kg/ha) at 14% moisture=
$$\frac{(100-MC)\times plot yield(kg)\times 1000(m^2)}{m^2}$$

 $(100-14)\times$ netplot area $(m^2)$ 88 Where, MC is the moisture content percentage of the grain

Similarly, harvest index was calculated by dividing economic yield with the biological yield by using followingformula;

91 92 HI=Economic Yield (Grain yield) / Biological Yield (Biomass Yield) x 100

### 93 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### 94 Number of ear harvested (per hectare)

Average number of ears harvested was 69563.49 per heetare ranged from 60277.78 to 85972.22per
 heetare (Table 2). Number of ear harvested was not significantly influenced by tillage methods. Comparatively
 higher was recorded under no till as compared to the conventional tillage.

The tested weed management practice significantly influenced number of ear harvested. Black polythene mulch treated plots resulted in higher number of ear (85972.22/-ha.) which was found statistically similar with weed free (76944.44/ha.) treatment and sequential application of atrazine *fb* 2,4-D treatment. Lowest number was obtained in weedy check plot (60277.78/ha) which was statistically at par with tank mixture herbicidal combinations of atrazine and pendimethalin, and atrazine and glyphosate, and maize cowpea coculture treatments. Among herbicidal application, atrazine *fb* 2,4-D recorded highest number of ear than other treatment.

#### 105 Number of kernel row per ear

Average number of kernel rows per ear was (11.19) ranging from 10.33 to 12.00 (Table 2). Kernel
 row per ear also was not significantly affected by tillage methods. However, number of kernel row per ear found
 greater in no till than conventional tillage.

Similarly, different weed management practices significantly influenced number of kernel row per ear. Due to reduction in crop weed competition, highest number of kernel rows per ear was recorded in black polythene mulch treated plots (12.00) and which was significantly at par with all treatment including weedy check except tank mixture treatments i.e. atrazine and pendimethalin, and atrazine and glyphosate. The least number of kernels per ear was recorded in tank mixture application of atrazine and pendimethalin treated plot and it was statistically similar with the tank mixture application of atrazine and glyphosate.

#### 115 Number of kernels per row

Average number of kernel per row was 27.81 ranged from 26.33 to 31.17 (**Table 2**). Number of kernel per row was significantly influenced by both tillage methods and weed management practices. Numbers of kernels per row were significantly higher under no tillage than under conventional tillage.

Among different weed management practices, significantly higher number of kernels per row was
 observed in black polythene mulch (31.17). Further, the numbers of kernels per row recorded in rest of the
 treatments were statistically similar.

#### 122 Number of kernels per ear

Average number of kernels per ear was 312.24 ranging from 281 to 374 (**Table 2**). Number of kernel per ear was significantly influenced by both tillage methods and weed management practices. The number of kernels per ear was significantly higher under no tillage than that of conventional tillage. This was also reflected on grain yield. Among weed management practices, significantly higher number of kernels per ear was observed in
 black polythene mulch (374.00). Further, the numbers of kernels per row were statistically similar.

129 The number of kernels per ear recorded in weed free treatment was comparable to all other herbicidal 130 treatments but the difference was remarkable. This might be the reason for obtaining significantly higher grain 131 yield in weed free condition as compared to all other herbicidal treatments.

# 132Table 2. Yield attributes as influenced by tillage methods and weed management practices in winter133maize at NMRP, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal, 2015/16

	maize at 10011	, Rampur,	, emenany	1 (epai, 2015)	10	
Treatments	Total number	Number	Number	Number	Thousand	Sterility
	of	of kernel	of	Ofkernel	grain	(%)
	earsharvested	rows ear-+	kernels	s ear <sup>-1</sup>	weight (g)	
	per ha		row <sup>-+</sup>			
Tillage methods						
No Tillage	73571 <del>.43</del>	11.33	28.76 <sup>a</sup>	326.57 <sup>a</sup>	201.22	16.76
Conventional Tillage	65555.56	11.05	26.86 <sup>b</sup>	297.90 <sup>b</sup>	208.70	15.24
LSD (p=0.05)	Ns	ns	1.434	17.42	ns	ns
Weed management Practices				 -		
Cowpea co-culture	63750.00 <sup>c</sup>	11.67 <sup>ab</sup>	27.50 <sup>b</sup>	321.00 <sup>b</sup>	196.14	15.06 <sup>bc</sup>
Black polythene mulch	85972.20 <sup>a</sup>	12.00 <sup>a</sup>	31.17 <sup>a</sup>	374.00 <sup>a</sup>	209.71	10.21 <sup>c</sup>
Atrazine 0.75 kg a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> +	62777.70 <sup>c</sup>	10.33 <sup>c</sup>	27.33 <sup>b</sup>	282.67 <sup>b</sup>	196.22	14.27 <sup>bc</sup>
Pendimethalin						
Atrazine 1.5 kg a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> fb	74027.70 <sup>b</sup>	11.33 <sup>abc</sup>	27.17 <sup>b</sup>	308.67 <sup>b</sup>	204.73	17.59 <sup>b</sup>
2,4-D						
Atrazine 0.75 kg a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> +	63194.40 <sup>c</sup>	10.67 <sup>bc</sup>	26.33 <sup>b</sup>	281.33 <sup>b</sup>	212.75	18.58 <sup>b</sup>
Glyphosate						
Weed free	76944.40 <sup>ab</sup>	11.33 <sup>abc</sup>	$28.00^{b}$	318.00 <sup>b</sup>	223.17	10.61 <sup>c</sup>
Weedy check	60277.70 <sup>c</sup>	11.00 <sup>abc</sup>	27.17 <sup>b</sup>	300.00 <sup>b</sup>	191.99	25.67 <sup>a</sup>
LSD (p=0.05)	9065.60	0.71	2.23	44.16	ns	5.19
CV,%	19.95	8.88	9.70	15.42	11.60	43.71
Grand Mean	69563.49	11.19	27.81	312.24	204.96	16.00

<sup>134</sup> 

Note: Mean separated by DMRT and columns represented with same letter (s) are non-significant at 5% level of
 significance, DAS, days after sowing ; ns, non-significant.

137

#### 138 Thousand grain weight

Mean thousand grain weight was recorded 204.96g (Table 2). Thousand grain weight was found to be
 non-significant among the tillage methods and weed management practices. However, it was found highest in
 weed free condition (223.17g) which may be due to higher weed control efficiency and least was observed in
 weedy check plot (191.99g).

#### 143 Sterility percentage

Mean sterility percentage was found 16.00% ranging from 10.21 to 25.67% (**Table 2**). Sterility percentage was not influenced by establishment tillage methods; however it was significantly influenced by different weed management practices. Least sterility percentage was recorded in black polythene mulch treated plot (10.21-%) and weedy free (10.61%). Weedy check had high influence on sterility percentage recording (25.67%).

149



152Figure 1. Interaction effect of tillage and weed management practices on number of cob per ha of winter153maize at NMRP, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal, 2015/16

154

150 151

Figure 1 above showed the significant interaction of tillage methods and weed management practices for number of cob per ha. For treatments black polythene mulch, weed free, weedy check and in tank mixture application of atrazine and pendimethalin, both tillage methods resulted in statistically similar number of cob per ha. Whereas, under cowpea co-culture, herbicidal tank application of atrazine and glyphosate and sequential application of atrazine and 2,4-D treatments, number of cob per hectare under no tillage was significantly higher than under conventional tillage.

Figure 2 below showed the significant interaction of tillage methods and weed management practices
 for number of grains rows per cob. Under all treatment except weedy check, both tillage methods resulted in
 statistically similar number of grain rows per cob.

164



Figure 2. Interaction effect of tillage and weed management practices on grain rows per cob of winter
 maize at NMRP, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal, 2015/16

#### 169 Grain yield

165 166

Tillage methods also significantly influence the grain yield. Mean grain yield of the experiment was
4.78 t/ha and ranged from 3.16 to 7.07 t/ha among the treatments (Table 3). Grain yield were significantly
influenced by tillage methods as well as weed management practices.

Grain yield of no tillage (5.58 t/ha) was significantly higher than conventional tillage (3.98 t/ha) as
because of highest weed density and dry weight in conventional tillage practice. Weed compete with crop which
in turn decreased all growth parameters and yield attributes like number of kernels per ear and thousand grain
weight remarkably. Finding was supported by Karki, Gadal and Shrestha [8] who found no tillage produced the
highest grain yield of 5.21 t/ha as against CT with 4.75 t/ha.

178 Similarly, among weed management practice black polythene mulch produced the highest grain yield 179 (7.07 kg/ha) which was statistically similar with grain yield of weedy free plot (5.91 kg/ha) and significantly 180 superior than grain yields obtained from all other weed management practices. finding was supported by Ram, 181 Sreenwar and Rani [9] who found Higher grain yield (7.65 t/ha) in black polythene mulch higher grain yield 182 may be due to higher weed control efficiency also due to greater value of all yield attributing characters and 183 lower weed infestation in mulch plot. The lowest grain yield found in weedy check plot (3.16 t/ha) which might 184 be due to competition from weed which effect yield attribute character and which found statistically similar with 185 treatments cowpea co-culture (4.06 t/ha), tank mixture of atrazine and pendimethalin (4.11 t/ha) and tank 186 mixture of atrazine and glyphosate applied plot (3.95 t/ha) application of atrazine fb 2,4-D gave satisfactory 187 result among other chemical treated plot and the result is in close conformity with finding of Yadav et al. [10]. 188

189

190

1.00

191

193

#### 194

195

# Table 3. Grain yield(t/ha), straw yield (t/ha), harvest index (%) and weed index (%) as influenced by tillage methods and weed management practices in winter maize at NMRP, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal, 2015/16

Treatment	Yield	Straw dry weight	Harvest	WI
	(t/ha)	(t/ha)	Index (%)	
Tillage methods		· ·		
No Tillage	5.58 <sup>a</sup>	6.28 <del>0.33</del> ª	46.49 <sup>a</sup>	11.48
Conventional Tillage	3.98 <del>1</del> .00 <sup>b</sup>	5.23 <del>1.94</del> <sup>b</sup>	42.12 <sup>b</sup>	25.11
LSD (=0.05)	<mark>584.20</mark>	120.10	0.679	ns
Weed management Practices				
Cowpea co-culture	4.06 <sup>cd</sup>	5.90 <sup>c</sup>	39.18 <sup>c</sup>	30.79 <sup>ab</sup>
Black polythene mulch	7.07 <sup>a</sup>	8.30 <sup>a</sup>	45.93 <sup>abc</sup>	-20.68 <sup>d</sup>
Atrazine 0.75 kg a.i. ha-1 + Pendimethalin	4.11 <sup>cd</sup>	4.56 <sup>e</sup>	46.01 <sup>abc</sup>	30.84 <sup>ab</sup>
Atrazine 1.5 kg a.i. ha-1 $fb$ 2,4-D	5.18 <sup>bc</sup>	4.91 <sup>de</sup>	50.18 <sup>a</sup>	12.25 <sup>bc</sup>
Atrazine 0.75 kg a.i. ha-1 + Glyphosate	3.95 <sup>cd</sup>	4.86 <sup>de</sup>	43.86 <sup>abc</sup>	34.61 <sup>ab</sup>
Weed free	5.91 <sup>ab</sup>	6.69 <sup>b</sup>	46.80 <sup>ab</sup>	$0.00^{cd}$
Weedy check	3.16 <sup>d</sup>	5.03 <sup>d</sup>	38.20 <sup>bc</sup>	40.27 <sup>a</sup>
LSD (p=0.05)	<mark>1165.50</mark>	<mark>346.60</mark>	5.779	21.48
CV,%	38.42	25.58	14.85	167.69
Grand Mean	4.78	5.75	44.31	18.30

196

Note: Mean separated by DMRT and columns represented with same letter (s) are non-significant at 5% level of
 significance, DAS, days after sowing; ns, non-significant

#### 199 Straw yield

Mean straw yield of experiments was 5.75 t/ha ranging from 8.30 t/ha in black polythene mulch to 4.56 t/ha in tank mix herbicidal application of atrazine and pendimethalin (**Table 3**). Straw yield was significantly influenced by both tillage methods as well as weed management practices. Gosavi [11] also reported the highest green cob and stover yield (24.67 and 30.36 t/ha respectively) under polythene mulch than control (19.44 and 23.51 t/ha respectively).

Higher straw yield was obtained under no tillage (6.28 t/ha) as compared to conventional tillage (5.23 t/ha). However, finding was in contrast with Gul et al. [12] who resulted that conventional tillage recorded higher biological yield (7.98 t/ha) compared to no-tillage (7.70 t/ha).

#### 208 Harvest index

Average harvesting index in the experiment was 44.13% (**Table 3**). Tillage methods significantly influence the harvest index, significantly higher harvest index was found in no tillage (46.49-%) as compared to conventional tillage practices (42.12-%).

Similarly, weed management practice influence the harvest index. Highest harvest index was recorded in sequential application of atrazine *fb* 2,4-D treated plot (50.18–%) and was significantly at par with all treatment except cowpea co-culture and weedy check. Increase in percentage of harvest index as compared to weedy check may be attributed to adequate suppression of weed growth due to some residual effect as well and more availability of plant nutrients to maize crop, which favored better utilization of photo-assimilates for grain yield formation [13]. Lowest Harvest Index was found in cowpea co-culture treated plot and was statistically similar with weedy check.

#### 219 Weed index

Weed index was not significantly influenced by tillage methods. But it was more than double under conventional tillage as compared to no till (**Table 3**). Conventional tillage recorded significantly higher weed index (25.11%) than that of zero tillage (11.48%) which may be due to higher total weed density and dry weight recorded in conventional tillage in comparison to zero tillage. This indicates 25.11% of grain yield was reduced by higher weed growth in conventional tillage.

225 Similarly, weed index was significantly influenced with respect to weed management practices. 226 Highest weed index (WI) was observed in weedy check plot (40.27%) which was statistically similar with tank 227 mix of atrazine and glyphosate, atrazine and pendimethalin and cowpea co-culture plot. Yadav, Choudhary, 228 Choudhary, and Kishor, [14] also reported application of either atrazine or butachlor followed by 2,-4-D 229 recorded lower weed density, weed dry weight and higher WCE in crop. Lowest WI was recorded in black 230 polythene mulch which showed the yield increment was 20.68% above the weed free. Gul et al. [12] also and 231 weed index recorded lower fresh weed biomass in black plastic mulch and was significantly at par with hand 232 weed treatment.



Weed management practices

#### 233 234

#### Figure 3. Interaction effect of tillage and weed management practices on Stover dry weight (t/ha) of winter maize at NMRP, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal, 2015/16

Figure 3 showed the significant interaction of tillage methods and weed management practices for stover dry weight (t/ha). Under black polythene mulch and weed free plots, both tillage methods resulted in statistically similar stover dry weight. Whereas, for cowpea co-culture, weedy check and all herbicide applied treatment, stover dry weight under no tillage was significantly higher than under conventional tillage.

241

#### 242 4. CONCLUSION

The influence of tillage and weed management methods on yield and yield components of maize was determined. On the aspect of tillage, winter maize can be successfully grown under no till system provided the insure irrigation facilities in the humid sub tropics. Yield attribute character and yield was significantly influenced by different herbicidal application. Sequential application of atrazine and 2,4-D gave superior result 247 on yield attributing traits, whereas herbicidal tank application gave comparatively lower values. Comparatively 248 greater yield (5.18 t/ha) was also found in sequential application of atrazine and 2,4-D. Regarding yield of 249 maize, treatment with black polythene mulching resulted in best grain yield. Besides the environmental 250 protection, cowpea co-culture treatments yielded almost similar grain yield as compared with common 251 herbicidal weed management practices. Grain yield found in cowpea co-culture treatments which are statistically 252 similar with herbicidal application. The research is mostly focused on effectiveness of different weed control 253 methods under conventional and no tillage system. In this aspect, future research can be conducted based on 254 physical, chemical and biological properties of soil Environment friendly black plastic mulching and cowpea 255 intercropping methods along with herbicides were studied in this research and result showed positive on yield. 256 Inspite of effectiveness in this study, recommendation of black plastic mulching as a best method to farmers in-257 depth study on cost benefit analysis of these weed control measures is required.

258

259

REFERENCES



260	1.	Chaudhary AR, Agronomy in "Maize in Pakistan" Pakistan Agriculture Coordination board
261		Univ. Agri. Faisalabad, Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences 1983. 6(2):118-120.
262	2.	MoAD ABPSD, Statistical information on Nepalese agriculture 2015, 2014/15 (2071/072).
263		Government of Nepal, Ministry of Agricultural Development, agribusiness promotion and Statistics
264		Division, Singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal.
265		
266	3.	Pandey AK, Prakash V, Singh RD, Mani VP, Integrated weed management in maize (Zea mays).
267		Indian Journal of Agronomy 2000, <b>46</b> (2):260-65.
268	4.	Dahal S, Karki TB, Conservation Agriculture Based Practices Affect the Weed Dynamics in Spring
269		Maize. World Journal of Agricultural Research, 2014, 2(6A), 25-33.
270		
271	5.	Khurshid K, Iqbal M, Arif MS, Nawaz A, Effect of tillage and mulch on soil physical properties and
272		growth of maize. International Journal of Agriculture and Biology 2006, 5(1): 593-596.
273	6.	Riaz M, Jamil M, Mahmood TZ,. Yield and yield components of maize as affected by various weed
274		control methods under rain-fed conditions of Pakistan. International Journal of Agriculture and
275		Biology, 2007, <b>9</b> (1): 152-155.
276	7.	Paudel MN, Mixed variety cultivation as productivity-enhancing and cost-reducing strategies for maize
277		(Zea mays L.) production. retrieved from http://www.uplb.edu.ph. 2005.
278 279 280	8.	Karki TB, Gadal N, Shrestha J, Studies on the conservation agriculture based practices under maize (Zea mays L.) based system in the hills of Nepal. International Journal of Applied Sciences and Biotechnology, 2014, <b>2</b> (2): 185-192.
281	9.	Ram P, Sreenivas G, Rani PL, Impact of Sustainable Weed Management Practices on Growth,
282		Phenology and Yield of Rabi Grain Maize (Zea mays L.). Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci, 2017, 6(7),
283		701-710.
284	10.	Yadav TK, Chaoudhary RS, Choudhary R, Kishor K, Studies of Weed management practices on weed
285		dynamics and yield of maize. International Journal of Chemical Studies 2017, 5(4): 1957-1960.
286	11.	Gosavi K, Effect of mulches, fertilizer and levels of organic manure on the performance of Rabi sweet
287		corn (Zea mays saccharata) 2006.

## UNDER PEER REVIEW

288	12.	Gul B, Khan MB, Hassan G, Khan A, Hasim S, Khan IA, Impact of tillage, plant population and
289		mulches on biological yield of maize. Pakistan Journal of Botany 2009, 41(5): 2243-2249.

290 13. Abdullahi S, Gautam G, Joy D, Effect of Different Weed Control Methods on Growth and Yield of
 291 Maize (Zea Mays L.) Under Rainfed Condition in Allahabad. Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary
 292 Science 2016 9(4): 44-47.