



Screening of Effective Leaf Extracts for Weed Management in Little Millet (*Panicum sumatrense* Roth ex Roem. & Schult)

P. Amrutha Varshini ^{a*}, P. Murali Arthanari ^a, G. Senthil Kumar ^a
and C. Bharathi ^b

^a Department of Agronomy, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Tamil Nadu (641 003), India.

^b Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Tamil Nadu, (641 003), India.

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i2131299

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/89524>

Original Research Article

Received 07 May 2022
Accepted 16 July 2022
Published 19 July 2022

ABSTRACT

Field experiment was conducted at Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore in January 2022 by seven different leaf extracts as an allelopathical compound in order to choose the best alternative to chemical herbicides by non-chemical weed management approach in little millet owing to the great surge of organic farming in millet production nowadays. Screening trail has been conducted to observe the effect of leaf extracts (Tamarind, Casuarina, Castor, Papaya, Teak, Pine, Nerium) with 20 & 30% concentration on weed control. This experiment laid out in a randomized block design and was replicated twice with 15 different treatments. The findings of this investigation demonstrated that the pre emergence (3 DAS) application of Tamarind leaf extract (30%), Casuarina leaf extract (30%), Castor leaf extract (30%), Papaya leaf extract (30%), Teak leaf extract (30%), Pine leaf extract (30%) and Nerium leaf extract (30%) pronounced the lowest weed density and highest weed control efficiency among fifteen treatments. Based on the results of the experiment, it was concluded that pre emergence application of any different leaf extract among the fifteen treatments, Tamarind, Casuarina, Castor, Papaya, Teak, Pine, and Nerium leaf extracts with 30% concentration had found the allelopathic potential to reduce the weed density and recorded high weed control efficiency with no phytotoxicity on the little millet.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: amruthapidimi28@gmail.com;

Keywords: Little millet; leaf extracts; pre emergence; weed control efficiency.

1. INTRODUCTION

Little millet (*Panicum sumatrense* Roth ex Roem.& Schult) is employed as a nutrient-rich food crop in India. In India, the Eastern Ghats ranked top in little millet production and diet among native tribes and it extends to Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Myanmar. Because this millet helps people of all ages, it is regarded as wonderful millet. Per 100 grams of little millet has 8.7 grams of protein, 75.7 grams of carbohydrates, 5.3 grams of fat, 1.7 grams of minerals, and 9.3 milligrams of Iron. Although minor millets are a good supply of nutrients, minerals, and they are resistant to drought and stress in rainfed agriculture [1]. Farmers are shifting away from minor millets and toward other cereal and cash crops in order to increase their revenue [2].

Weeds compete with crops during the early stages of crop growth; hence a management approach that assures early season weed suppression in crops is critical for crop growth, development, and production. Weeds are often handled manually in conventional management approaches, manual weeding is regarded the most effective control, but its usage has declined due to a manpower scarcity for large-scale agricultural production and rising labour costs [3]. Millets can grow under drought situations and can adapt to climate change. To increase demand for new and contemporary items, it is critical to concentrate on boosting production because of the decline in soil health and fertility caused by toxic chemicals released by herbicides and pesticides. As a result, there is a greater need for sustainable agriculture and eco-friendly alternatives to toxic substances in millet production. Plant allelopathy is an excellent alternative to the use of hazardous chemical herbicides in weed control [4]. Plant-based herbicides are becoming increasingly popular. Weed management with plant extracts is an environmentally beneficial solution. As a result, an attempt will be made to produce plant-based herbicides based on distinct leaf extracts in Little Millet.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during winter (February 2022). The trial site is located at 11.015256 ° N latitude and 76.934964° E longitude at an altitude of 1593 ft (Google Earth).

Screening trial was started (Date of sowing) on 04.02.2022 with ATL-1 variety of little millet, spacing taken up was 30×10 cm and raised crop up to critical weed competition, 30-40 DAS. Weed observations (weed density and weed dry weight) have been taken on 10 and 20 DAS respectively. Soil from the site contains a pH-9.4, EC-0.4 dS/m, Organic carbon-0.45%, low nitrogen-174 kg/ha, medium phosphorus-19kg/ha, high potassium- 520kg/ha and this experiment was laid out with randomized block design and replicated twice with plot size 1×1 m dimension. The treatments composed with different leaf extracts, Tamarind leaf extract, Casuarina leaf extract, Castor leaf extract, Papaya leaf extract, Teak leaf extract, Pine leaf extract, Nerium flower extract @ 20 & 30% concentration each respectively and Unweeded check.

2.1 Preparation of Leaf Extracts

Leaf species free from diseases and pests were collected from surroundings of TNAU and washed gently. After cleaning, washed leaves were chopped into small pieces and undergone to soaking for 12 hrs/whole night in 1:1 ratio(leaves : water) and ground into paste with grinder. The paste of each leaf species has to be filtered through whatt man no 1 paper and it represents stock solution (100% concentration) [Fig. 1] [5,6]. From stock solution required amount of concentration has to be prepared i.e., 20% and 30% concentration.

2.2 Preparation of Nerium Flower Extract

Disease and pest free flowers were collected and dried in shade dry for 3 days and kept dried flowers in hot air oven at 70°C for 2 days and made it fine powder. The flower powder weigh for required amount i.e., 20 and 30 g for [Fig. 2] (20 & 30% concentration) in 1 litre of distilled water [7].

2.3 Weed Control Efficiency

The predominant weed species in experimental field was identified and grouped into grasses, sedges and broad leaved weeds. Weed observations have been taken by using quadrant 0.25× 0.25m from each plot and separated into grasses, sedges, broad leaved weeds and density was documented and expressed in number/m². Later collected weed species get dried in shade

and kept in hot air oven for 70°C and observations of weed dry weight is taken. Weed Control Efficiency was worked out as per the protocol proposed by Mani et al., [8] and indicated in percentage.

$$WCE = \frac{W_{pc} - W_{pt}}{W_{pc}} \times 100$$

W_{pc} - Weed population in control plot,
W_{pt} - Weed population in treatment plot

The experimental data obtained throughout were statistically analysed by adopting Fisher's method of ANOVA suggested by Gomez and Gomez [9]. The data on weed density and weed dry weight were subjected to square root transformation ($\sqrt{x + 0.5}$).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The predominant weed species observed in the trail was *Chloris barbata*, *Cyanodon dactylon*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*., *Echinochloa colonum* in grasses, *Cyperus rotandus* in sedges and *Amaranthus viridis*, *Trianthema protulacastrum*, *Digeria arvensis*, *Phyllanthus niruri* , *Euphorbia hirta*, *Parthenium hysterophorus* in broad leaved weeds similar weed species were observed in millet crops at Tamil Nadu region was reported by Mishra [10].

Grasses showed dominance than broad leaved weeds at 10 and 20 DAS. In grasses *Chloris barbata* (61 & 56%) projected high relative

density among grasses at both 10 and 20DAS respectively. In broad leaved weeds *Trianthema portulacastrum* (37.17 & 31%) recorded high relative density (Figs. 3 & 4) .Sedges were not affected significantly to any treatments.

Different treatments have a significant impact on grass density. Among all the treatments lowest weed density of grass resulted in Papaya leaf extract @ 30% concentration (20 no/m²) at 10 DAS, Casuarina leaf extract @ 30% concentration (29 no/m²) recorded least grass density at 20 DAS. Broad leaved weeds are less dominated compared to grasses in micro plot field (Fig. 5); same result trend was reported by Mc hung et al., [11]. The lowest broad leaved weed density is observed in Castor leaf extract @ 20 & 30% concentration (2.11,2.11 no/m²) respectively at 10 DAS and Casuarina leaf extract @ 30% concentration par with Castor leaf extract @20% concentration at 20 DAS (4,4 no/m²)(Table 1.).Similar result revealed] by Anwar et al.,[12] applying 10-20% methanol extracts pronounced weed inhibition.

The overall dry weight of the weed was significantly reduced in the treatment of Tamarind leaf extract 30% conc (3.33g/m²) [13] followed by Teak leaf extract 30% conc (5.33 g/m²) (Table 2).The highest weed density can be seen in control so similarly highest dry weight reported in control (Unweeded check)(Fig. 6) plot.



Fig. 1. Stock solution




Fig. 2. Flower powder solution




Fig. 3. Effect of different leaf extracts on relative density of grasses at 20 DAS in little millet




Fig. 4. Effect of different leaf extracts on relative density of broad leaved weeds at 20 DAS in little millet

Table 1. Effect of different leaf extracts on weed density (no/m²)

T.No.	Treatments	Grasses		Sedges		BLW	
		10 DAS	20 DAS	10 DAS	20 DAS	10 DAS	20 DAS
T ₁	PE application of Tamarind @ 20%	7.60 (57.5)	8.72 (75.5)	2.25 (5)	2.48 (6)	2.82 (7.5)	3.16 (9.5)
T ₂	PE application of Tamarind @ 30%	5.75 (34)	6.89 (51)	1.42 (2)	1.42 (2)	2.91 (8)	3.00 (8.5)
T ₃	PE application of Casuarina @	7.08	7.25	0.71	0.71	2.55	2.40

T.No.	Treatments	Grasses		Sedges		BLW	
		10 DAS	20 DAS	10 DAS	20 DAS	10 DAS	20 DAS
	20%	(49.5)	(53.5)	(0)	(0)	(6)	(5.5)
T ₄	PE application of Casuarina @ 30%	5.24 (27)	5.47 (29.5)	1.29 (1.5)	1.29 (1.5)	2.52 (6)	1.82 (4)
T ₅	PE application of Castor @ 20%	6.85 (46.5)	8.40 (70)	1.98 (5)	2.05 (5.5)	2.11 (4)	1.79 (3)
T ₆	PE application of Castor @ 30%	5.99 (35.5)	5.79 (33)	1.73 (3.5)	0.97 (0.5)	2.11 (4)	2.11 (4)
T ₇	PE application of Papaya @ 20%	6.36 (40)	6.37 (40.5)	1.5 (2.5)	1.15 (1)	2.74 (7)	2.31 (5)
T ₈	PE application of Papaya @ 30%	4.48 (20)	6.60 (43)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	1.73 (3.5)	2.72 (7)
T ₉	PE application of Teak @ 20%	6.24 (39)	7.25 (52)	0.97 (0.5)	2.21 (4.5)	2.80 (7.5)	2.25 (5)
T ₁₀	PE application of Teak @ 30%	5.47 (30.5)	6.40 (40.5)	1.27 (1.5)	1.67 (2.5)	2.55 (6)	2.55 (6)
T ₁₁	PE application of Pine @ 20%	7.17 (51)	8.37 (71.5)	1.97 (3.5)	0.71 (0)	2.63 (7)	2.12 (4)
T ₁₂	PE application of Pine @ 30%	5.96 (35)	7.05 (49.5)	1.1 (1)	1.15 (1)	2.74 (7)	2.43 (5.5)
T ₁₃	PE application of Nerium flower extract @ 20%	8.06 (64.5)	8.77 (77)	1.29 (1.5)	1.29 (1.5)	2.80 (7.5)	2.55 (6)
T ₁₄	PE application of Nerium flower extract @ 30%	5.86 (34)	6.83 (46.5)	1.29 (1.5)	1.42 (2)	2.74 (7)	2.52 (6)
T ₁₅	CONTROL	9.04 (81.5)	10.25 (105.5)	3.58 (5)	2.90 (8.5)	4.85 (23)	5.09 (25.5)
SEd		0.78	0.88	0.96	0.86	0.51	0.55
CD (P=.05)		1.68	1.90	NS	NS	1.10	1.18

PE-Pre emergence at 3 days after sowing.

Data in parentheses are original value.

Data statistically analysed by $\sqrt{x + 0.5}$ transformation

Table 2. Effect of different leaf extracts on total weed density (no/m²) & total weed dry weight (g/m²)

T.No.	Treatments	Total weed density		Total weed dry weight
		10 DAS	20 DAS	20 DAS
T ₁	PE application of Tamarind @ 20%	8.69 (70)	9.33 (86.50)	2.52 (6.33)
T ₂	PE application of Tamarind @ 30%	6.62 (44)	7.13 (55.5)	1.83 (3.33)
T ₃	PE application of Casuarina @ 20%	7.49 (55.5)	7.60 (59)	3.34 (11.17)
T ₄	PE application of Casuarina @ 30%	5.89 (34.5)	6.52 (42)	2.70 (7.33)
T ₅	PE application of Castor @ 20%	7.45 (55.5)	8.88 (78.5)	3.27 (10.67)
T ₆	PE application of Castor @ 30%	6.60 (43)	6.44 (41)	2.49 (6.17)
T ₇	PE application of Papaya @ 20%	7.05 (49.5)	6.82 (46.5)	3.16 (10.00)
T ₈	PE application of Papaya @ 30%	4.80 (23.5)	7.11 (50)	2.55 (6.67)
T ₉	PE application of Teak @ 20%	6.86	7.61	3.13

T.No.	Treatments	Total weed density		Total weed dry weight
		10 DAS	20 DAS	20 DAS
		(47)	(57.5)	(9.83)
T ₁₀	PE application of Teak @ 30%	6.13	6.96	2.31
		(38)	(48)	(5.33)
T ₁₁	PE application of Pine @ 20%	7.88	8.84	2.73
		(61.5)	(79)	(7.67)
T ₁₂	PE application of Pine @ 30%	6.56	7.49	2.35
		(43)	56)	(5.67)
T ₁₃	PE application of Nerium flower extract @ 20%	8.61	9.41	2.65
		(73.5)	(88.5)	(7.0)
T ₁₄	PE application of Nerium flower extract @ 30%	6.55	7.28	2.58
		(42.5)	(53)	(6.67)
T ₁₅	CONTROL	10.86	11.37	3.78
		(117.5)	(129)	(14.33)
SEd		0.79	0.82	0.32
CD (P=.05)		1.69	1.76	0.68

PE-Pre emergence at 3 days after sowing.

Data in parentheses are original value.

Data statistically analysed by $\sqrt{x + 0.5}$ transformation

Table 3. Effect of different leaf extracts on plant growth parameters in little millet

T.No.	Treatments	Plant height (cm)		DMP (Kg/ha)	
		15 DAS	30 DAS	15 DAS	30 DAS
T ₁	PE of Tamarind @ 20%	5.45	26.42	85.00	600.00
T ₂	PE of Tamarind @ 30%	5.14	27.68	91.67	666.67
T ₃	PE of Casuarina @ 20%	5.62	27.72	76.67	433.33
T ₄	PE of Casuarina @ 30%	6.22	26.02	115.00	550.00
T ₅	PE of Castor @ 20%	6.45	28.02	131.67	716.67
T ₆	PE of Castor @ 30%	6.23	29.77	138.33	726.67
T ₇	PE of Papaya @ 20%	4.77	29.58	93.34	666.67
T ₈	PE of Papaya @ 30%	5.99	29.39	120.00	685.00
T ₉	PE of Teak @ 20%	6.47	30.57	68.33	683.33
T ₁₀	PE of Teak @ 30%	7.02	28.85	116.67	795.00
T ₁₁	PE of Pine @ 20%	5.62	27.57	88.33	483.33
T ₁₂	PE of Pine @ 30%	6.49	30.12	101.67	583.33
T ₁₃	PE of Nerium @ 20%	6.32	28.52	113.33	466.67
T ₁₄	PE of Nerium @ 30%	5.85	31.47	125.00	483.33
T ₁₅	CONTROL	5.19	25.47	85.00	383.33
SEd		0.51	1.72	13.9	40.27
CD (P=.05)		1.10	3.69	29.9	86.38

PE-Pre emergence at 3 days after sowing

Weed control efficiency calculated at 10 and 20 DAS. Among all the treatments Papaya leaf extract @ 30% concentration and Castor leaf extract 30% concentration declared 80 and 68.22% WCE at 10 and 20 DAS respectively (Fig. 5) and no sedge density was recorded in Casuarina leaf extract @ 20% concentration and Papaya leaf extract @ 30% concentration on both 10 and 20DAS respectively. Anwar et al.,[14] Suggested that using papaya aqueous leaf extract has great weed growth inhibition than leaf powder.

The average plant height of little millet increased gradually increasing with the development of crop age at 15 and 30 DAS. The highest plant height (6.49 and 31.47 cm) (Table 3) was registered in Pine leaf extract @30% concentration and Nerium flower extract @ 30 % concentration at 15 and 30DAS respectively. The lowest plant height (5.19 & 25.47 cm) was performed in Absolute control As weed competes with crop for all resources, there might be a reason for decrease in plant height due to huge density of weeds in control plot.




Fig. 5. Treatment (R₁T₁₀)



Fig. 6. Treatment (R₂T₇)



Fig. 7. Treatment (R₁T₁₅)




Fig. 8. Effect of different leaf extracts on weed control efficiency (%) in little millet

Same results have been appeared in Cober and Morrison [15]. The higher dry matter (138.33 & 131.67 kg/ha) (Table 3) produced in Castor leaf extract 30 & 20% conc at 15 DAS. At 30DAS, highest dry matter production (795 kg/ha) registered in Teak leaf extract @ 30% conc followed by (726 kg/ha) in Castor leaf extract.

4. CONCLUSION

From the experiment conducted, it could be concluded that application of 30% concentration of Tamarind, Casuarina, Castor, Papaya, Teak, Pine, Nerium leaf extracts before emergence of weeds and crop on 3 days after sowing recorded

higher weed control efficiency and no phytotoxicity. Hence these leaf extracts @ 30% concentration might be used for weed control in little millet crop of organic production systems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Author(s) acknowledge the supports from Tamil Nadu Agricultural University and Department of Agronomy involved.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Durgad AG, Amrutha TJ, Suresh SP, Hiremath GM, Goudappa SB, Ananda N. Economics of foxtail and little millets production in Ballari and Koppal districts of Karnataka, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2019;9:214-22.
2. Upadhyaya HD, Vetriventhan M. Underutilized climate-smart nutrient rich small millets for food and nutritional security; 2018.
3. Abbas T, Zahir ZA, Naveed M, Kremer RJ. Limitations of existing weed control practices necessitate development of alternative techniques based on biological approaches. *Advances in Agronomy*. 2018; 147:239-80.
4. Khawar J, Muhammad F, Mubshir H, Hafeez ur R, Muhammad A. A. Wild oat (*Avena fatua* L.) and canary grass (*Phalaris minor* Ritz.) management through allelopathy. *Journal of Plant Protection Research*. 2010;50(1):41-44
5. Sripunitha A. Herbal hydration-dehydration treatments for improving vigor, viability and productivity in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*. Mill) cv. PKM 1. Unpublished M. Sc., Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu; 2009.
6. Ramachandran A. Efficacy of different botanical extracts on the management of *Parthenium hysterophorus* (L.). *Journal of Research in Weed Science*. 2019;2(1):16-32.
7. Uslu, Ömer S, Osman G, Ali RK, Adem E, Muhammad AK, Mustafa NT, Ete MT. Allelopathic effects of flower extract of oleander (*Nerium oleander*) on the germination of seed and seedling growth of *Lolium multiflorum*. *Iğdır Univ. J. Inst. Sci. & Tech* 8, no. 1. 2018; 309-317.
8. Mani VS, Malla ML, Ci Gautam. K. Weed-killing chemicals in potato cultivation. *Indian Farming*. 1973;23:17-18.
9. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*: John Wiley and Sons; 1984.
10. Mishra, JS. Weed management in millets: Retrospect and prospects. 2015; 246-253.
11. McHugh NM, Bown B, McVeigh A, Powell R, Swan E, Szczur J, Wilson P, Holland J. The value of two agri-environment scheme habitats for pollinators: Annually cultivated margins for arable plants and floristically enhanced grass margins. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*. 2022; 326:107773.
12. Anwar S, Naseem S, Karimi S, Asi MR, Akrem A, Ali Z. Bioherbicidal activity and metabolic profiling of potent allelopathic plant fractions against major weeds of wheat—Way forward to lower the risk of synthetic herbicides. *Frontiers in plant science*. 2021;333.
13. Parvez SS, Parvez MM, Nishihara E, Gemma H, Fujii Y. *Tamarindus indica* L. leaf is a source of allelopathic substance. *Plant Growth Regulation*. 2003;40(2):107-15.
14. Anwar T, Qureshi H, Parveen N, Bashir R, Qaisar U, Munazir M, Yasmin S, Basit Z, Mahmood RT, Nayyar BG, Khan S. Evaluation of bioherbicidal potential of *Carica papaya* leaves. *Brazilian Journal of Biology*. 2019 ;80:565-73.
15. Cober ER, Morrison MJ. Short-season soybean genetic improvement evaluated in weed-free and weedy conditions. *Crop science*. 2011;51(6):2582-2588.

© 2022 Varshini et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/89524>