## Effect of sowing date and herbicides on Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) growth, yield, yield components and companion weeds under rainfed conditions at Duhok governorate.

Guhdar Salih Hussein

Department of Field Crops, College of Agriculture, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region, Republic of Iraq.

#### Abstract

This experiment was carried out at the research farm of Field Crops Department, Agricultural College, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq during spring season 2015-2016. The experiment comprised of three sowing date (15 February, 1 March and 15 March) and four herbicide treatments (Propyzamide, Haloxyfop, Trifluraline and weedy Check). The experiment laid out in a split plot design based on the randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications assigning sowing dates in the main plots and herbicide treatments in the sub-plots. Results revealed that the Haloxyfop had good effect on reducing the number of narrow leaved weeds per m<sup>2</sup> followed by Trifluraline which recorded 0.44 and 8.00 respectively. The application of Trifluraline herbicide at 15-February sowing date gave lowest dry weight of broad leaved weeds 86.80 g/m<sup>2</sup>, maximum plant height (48.33 cm) , 100-seed weight (30.50 g) , harvest index (34.17%) and the highest seed yield 2499.52 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> which cause to increasing yield 120.37% compare to weedy check at the same date of sowing.

Keywords: *Cicer arietinum* L., Sowing date, Haloxyfop, Trifluraline, Propyzamide.

#### Introduction

Chickpea(Cicer arietinum L.) is considered as one of the most important grain legumes all over the world. It is used widely in public foods. and in various commodities and recipes. Chickpea great nutritive value has as it percentage contains a high of protein. In Iraq, it ranks as a grain legume after faba second bean. Its cultivation is concentrated in the northern governorates including Sulaymania, Duhok, Erbil and Ninevah, covering an area of 14,000 ha with average yield of 0.74 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (1). Chickpea is the third major legume crop in the world after dry bean at 19 million tons (MT) and field pea at 10.3 MT (6). Chickpea, however, is a poor competitor to weeds because of slow growth rate and limited leaf area development at early stages of crop growth and establishment (2). Nevertheless. almost all values reflect the seriousness of the weed problem. Yield losses were observed to vary between 40 to

94% in the Indian subcontinent. Post emergent applications need great care with respect to stage of growth and air temperature to avoid phytotoxicity (3). Weeds infestations also deteriorate the quality of seed which create and also effect storage problem market rate of the product. Saxena(32) 30-50% reported annual loss due to weeds.

problem of weeds in The chickpea is so severe due to lack of suitable weed control measures. weed chickpea Current control strategies include crop rotations, mechanical practices, hand weeding and mostly application of pre emergence herbicides usually farmers go for manual weeding under such situation. However, availability of labour and cost involved make them to seek for other cheaper alternatives for weed control. The use of post emergence herbicides for season long weed control is thus, preferred over early use of herbicides (14). Since work post emergence herbicides on especially in chickpea is meager,

an attempt has been made to evaluate the efficacy of post emergence herbicides for effective control of weeds in chickpea (11).

Among the various agronomic practices, sowing time is single most important factor influencing the yield of chickpea. Optimum sowing time of chickpea may vary from one variety to another and also from one region to another due to variation of agro-ecological conditions (37). Ozdemir and Karadavut(23) reported а 102% vield increase in autumn sowing over spring sowing. Date of sowing plays an important role in vield and vield attributes of chickpea (35 and 30). Delayed sowing reduces growing period, hastens maturity and ultimately reduces yield. The purpose of this experiment was to identify the problem of weed species in the Kurdistan chickpea crop in region- Duhok to evaluate several herbicides for selective weed control and to find out the suitable sowing date of chickpea.

#### **Material and Methods**

Site description and experimental design:

This experiment was conducted at the research farm of Field Crops Department, Agricultural College, University of Duhok, Sumail County, Kurdistan Region- Iraq during spring season 2015-2016. The site is located at

latitude 36° 51 38 N, longitude 42° 52 E, altitude 473 m above sea

level. The soil was clay with (pH 7.8, O.M. 2.56%, E.c. 1.02 ds<sup>-1</sup>, N 28.89% and P 0.0294%). The agrometeorological station on the experimental site recorded monthly minimum, maximum and average temperature, relative humidity and rainfall that presented in (Table 1). Total Rainfall total in experimental site was 468.1 mm and rainfall distribution were 44.26 % in fall, 46.46 % in winter and 9.27 % in spring. The experiment comprised of three sowing date (15 February, 1 March and 15 March) and four herbicides Propyzamide,

Haloxyfop, Trifluraline and weedy Check (Table 2). The experiment laid out in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) as a split plot arrangement with three replications assigning sowing dates in the main plots and herbicide treatments in the sub-plots. Each sub-plot consisted of 4 rows 3m long, 0.25 m row spacing, 0.15 m plant distance and 0.5 m space which was intended between any 2 Replications neighboring plots. were spaced apart 2 m from each other. The seeds of local variety were sown by hand and placed at 5 cm deep.

Measurement of traits and Statistical analysis:

Weed The sampling: weed biomass was identified by experts of plant taxonomy in the College of Agriculture and then classified narrow and broad leaved. to Quadrate samples for each group were counted in an area of  $1.0 \text{ m}^2$ . Dry weight was obtained after 48 hours of oven-drying weed plants at 70°c for the two groups of weeds. Also the number and dry weight of narrow and broad leaved were recorded (Table 3).

- Crop: Ten plants from each plot were used to measure yield and components morphological characters of plant. Measurement characters included plant height (cm), height of the lowest pod from soil surface (cm). number of primary branches / plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per plant, weight of 100 seed (g), biological yield (g plant<sup>-1</sup>), harvest index (%) and seed yield  $(kg ha^{-1})$ . The recorded data was statistically analyzed with analysis of variance according to RCBD design using statistical analysis system (SAS, 2001), and the significant differences among the means were tested by DMRT at probability 0.05 (5).

#### **Results and Discussion**

Tables 4 and 5, represented nonsignificant differences among sowing dates on number of narrow leaved weeds, but regarding the

Table 1: Average values of Maximum and Minimum Temperature (°C),Relative Humidity of Air(%)rainfall (mm) during the season of study in2016 at Sumail Location\*

| Month             | Monthly<br>absolute<br>minimum<br>temperature<br>C | Monthly<br>absolute<br>maximum<br>temperature<br>C | Average<br>temp. C | Relative<br>humidity<br>% | Precipitati<br>on mm |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| September<br>2015 | 19.50  | 39.01  | 29.25              | 28.00                     | 20.0                 |
| October           | 16.20  | 29.34  | 22.77              | 50.60                     | 41.8                 |
| November          | 06.88  | 18.72  | 12.80              | 73.20                     | 58.4                 |
| December          | 01.27  | 13.52  | 07.39              | 74.00                     | 87.0                 |
| January 2016      | 01.40  | 10.60  | 06.00              | 78.40                     | 90.5                 |
| February          | 04.50  | 16.83  | 10.66              | 74.80                     | 39.0                 |
| March             | 06.57  | 18.81  | 12.69              | 70.40                     | 88.0                 |
| April             | 11.01  | 25.69  | 18.35              | 56.70                     | 40.6                 |
| May               | 14.90  | 31.56  | 23.23              | 41.40                     | 02.8                 |
|                   |  |  |                    |                           | 468.1                |

\* Source: Agro-Meteorological Station of Agricultural College, 2016.

| Common<br>Name        | Trade<br>Name    | Formulatio<br>n | Applicatio<br>n rate<br>(kg a.i. ha <sup>-</sup><br><sup>1</sup> ) | Time of application  |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| propyzamide           | Kerb             | 50% W.P.        | 1.5  | Post emergence (3-4 leaf stage of crop)                    |
| Haloxyfop -<br>methyl | Gallant<br>Super | 10.8% E.C.      | 0.108  | Post emergence (3<br>leaf stage of narrow<br>leaved weeds) |
| Trifluraline          | Treflan          | 48% E.C.        | 1.152  | Pre-plant soil<br>incorporated                             |

#### Table 2: Some information of herbicide used in the experiment

W.P.: Wettable powder, E.C.: Emulsifiable Concentrate.

number of broad leaved weeds was significant. However the highest number was recorded for delay sowing date (15-March). Among herbicide treatments the , effect Haloxyfop had good on reducing the number of narrow leaved weeds followed by Trifluraline which recorded 0.44 8.00 respectively, while and

Trifluraline followed by Propyzamide recorded lowest number of broad leaved weeds 14.66 and 16.88 respectively. Also the same trend was shown about dry weight of narrow and broad leaved weeds which Haloxyfop dry recorded lowest weight of narrow leaved weeds  $2.40 \text{ g/m}^2$  but

## 2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences Table 3: Common weeds accompanied with chickpea field during the spring season 2016.

|                | Scientific name             | Family name     |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Narrow leaved  | l weeds                     |                 |
| 1              | Phalaris minor Retz.        | Poaceae         |
| 2              | Hordeum glaucum Steud.      | Poaceae         |
| 3              | Cyperus rotundus L.         | Cyperaceae      |
| 4              | Cynodon dactylon (L.)Pers.  | Poaceae         |
| 5              | Avena fatua L.              | Poaceae         |
| 6              | Sorghum halepense (L.)Pers. | Poaceae         |
| Broad leaved v | veeds                       |                 |
| 7              | Malva sylvestris L.         | Malvaceae       |
| 8              | Convolvulus arvensis L.     | Convolvulaceae  |
| 9              | Polygonum aviculare L.      | Polygonaceae    |
| 10             | Euphorbia helioscopia L.    | Euphorbiaceae   |
| 11             | Hypericum perforatum L.     | Hypericaceae    |
| 12             | Vaccaria pyramidata Medik.  | Caryophyllaceae |

| 13 | Sinapis arvensis L.               | Brassicaceae |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 14 | Trifolium campestre Scherb.       | Fabaceae     |
| 15 | Lactuca serriola L.               | Asteraceae   |
| 16 | Cichorium intybus L.              | Asteraceae   |
| 17 | Centaurea iberica Trevir. Spreng. | Asteraceae   |
| 18 | Sonchus oleraceus L.              | Asteraceae   |
| 19 | Xanthium strumarium L.            | Asteraceae   |
| 20 | Silybum marianum (L.) Gaertn      | Asteraceae   |
| 21 | Carthamus oxycantha Bieb.         | Asteraceae   |

2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences

highest weight was 237.70 and 227.55 g/m<sup>2</sup> for weedy check

treatments of narrow and broad leaved weeds respectively.

This result supported by Yasin et.al.(38) and Gollojeh al.(9) et. who reported the efficient control of grass weeds by selective herbicides. Also the results were agreement with findings by Yousefi et. al.(39) who observed the Trifluraline application cause to increase the control of weeds in chickpea field due to inhibition action of that herbicide in seed germination of weeds.

Concerning the interaction of with herbicide sowing dates treatments, the lowest number and dry weight of narrow leaved weeds was shown at Haloxyfop herbicide application at first and third sowing dates which was zero and the highest value related to check. The lowest number of broad leaved

## Table 4: Analysis of variance on different traits of chickpea and companion weeds.

| Source                 | Degre<br>e of<br>freedo<br>m<br>d.f. | Number of<br>narrow<br>leaved<br>weeds m <sup>-2</sup> | Numb<br>er of<br>broad<br>leaved<br>weeds<br>m <sup>-2</sup> | Dry<br>weigh<br>t of<br>narro<br>w<br>leaved<br>weeds<br>g m <sup>-2</sup> | Dry<br>weigh<br>t of<br>broad<br>leaved<br>weeds<br>g m <sup>-2</sup> | Plant<br>height<br>(cm) | Lowe<br>st pod<br>heigh<br>t (cm) | Numb<br>er of<br>primar<br>y<br>branch<br>s<br>plant <sup>-1</sup> | Numb<br>er of<br>pods<br>plant <sup>-1</sup> | Numb<br>er of<br>seeds<br>plant <sup>-1</sup> | 100-<br>seed<br>weigh<br>t<br>(g) | Biologic<br>al yield<br>(g plant <sup>-</sup><br>) | Harve<br>st<br>index<br>(%) | Seed<br>yield (<br>kg ha <sup>-</sup><br><sup>1</sup> ) |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| Block                  | 2                                    | 17.33  | 12.44  | 94.4   | 370   | 0.861                   | 6.583                             | 0.111<br>11  | 0.67   | 0.443   | 0.110<br>8                        | 0.03   | 0.139                       | 204   |
| SD<br>(Sowing<br>date) | 2                                    | 57.33<br>n.s.  | 283.1<br>1   | 11628<br>.6  | 8108.<br>1  | 51.19<br>4              | 35.58<br>3                        | 0.361<br>11<br>n.s.  | 86.16<br>3                                   | 62.10<br>3                                    | 18.07<br>58                       | 48.094   | 29.95<br>6                  | 19196<br>0  |
| Error a                | 4                                    | 36.67  | 13.78  | 507  | 127.4   | 0.444                   | 1.542                             | 0.069<br>44  | 1.173  | 1.487   | 0.794<br>2                        | 2.828  | 5.976                       | 1356  |
| H<br>(Herbicide        | 3                                    | 996.74   | 150.9<br>6   | 89144  | 27412<br>.5   | 125.3<br>61             | 48.76<br>9                        | 0.222<br>2 n.s.  | 288.3<br>39                                  | 358.2   | 43.16<br>2                        | 165.515  | 177.1<br>01                 | 61707<br>2  |

| s)      |    |            |             |             |             |                 |            |                 |             |               |            |               |            |             |
|---------|----|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| D*H     | 6  | 54.96 n.s. | 60.3<br>*   | 13760       | 1711.<br>3  | 10.86<br>1<br>* | 6.435<br>* | 0.138<br>9 n.s. | 7.43        | 3.342<br>n.s. | 1.444<br>* | 1.325<br>n.s. | 8.691<br>* | 11952<br>*  |
| Error b | 18 | 24.8888    | 21.62<br>94 | 674.8<br>88 | 267.1<br>72 | 3.694<br>4      | 1.851<br>8 | 0.194<br>4      | 1.564<br>11 | 1.738<br>8    | 0.487<br>1 | 0.6422        | 2.791<br>8 | 3002.<br>88 |
| Error   | 22 | 27.03      | 20.2        | 644         | 241.8       | 3.104           | 1.795      | 0.171<br>7      | 1.493       | 1.693         | 0.543      | 1.04          |            | 2704        |
| Total   | 35 |            |             |             |             |                 |            |                 |             |               |            |               |            |             |

2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences

n.s.,\* represented non-significant, significant at 0.05 level respectively.

## Table 5: Effect of sowing dates, herbicides and their interaction on number and dry weight of narrow and broad leaved weeds.

|                 | Num                                      | ber of n<br>weed                        | arrow le<br>ls m <sup>-2</sup>           | eaved                        | Number                                   | Number of broad leaved weeds<br>m <sup>-2</sup> |  |                              |  | eight of<br>we<br>(g 1                  | narrow<br>eds<br>n <sup>-2</sup> )       | leaved                       | Dry weight of broad leaved<br>weeds<br>(g m <sup>-2</sup> ) |   |  |                              |  |
|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| Herbicid<br>es  | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>Febru<br>ary) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(1-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(15-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Mean<br>of<br>herbic<br>ides | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>Febru<br>ary) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(1-<br>Mar<br>ch)         | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(15-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Mean<br>of<br>herbic<br>ides | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>Febru<br>ary) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(1-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(15-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Mean<br>of<br>herbic<br>ides | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>Febru<br>ary)                    | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(1-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Sowi<br>ng<br>date<br>(15-<br>Mar<br>ch) | Mean<br>of<br>herbic<br>ides |  |
| Propyza<br>mide | 12.00<br>cd                              | 9.33<br>De                              | 21.3<br>3<br>B                           | 14.22<br>b                   | 13.33<br>B                               | 16.0<br>0<br>b                                  | 21.3<br>3<br>b                           | 16.88<br>B                   | 78.93<br>de                              | 103.<br>07<br>D                         | 100.<br>27<br>d                          | 94.10<br>b                   | 104.67<br>de  | 95.2<br>0<br>e                          | 140.<br>67<br>c                          | 113.51<br>b                  |  |
| Haloxyf         | 0.00                                     | 1.33                                    | 0.00                                     | 0.44                         | 16.00                                    | 20.0  | 30.6                                     | 22.22                        | 0.00                                     | 7.20                                    | 0.00                                     | 2.40                         | 105.20  | 141.                                    | 131.                                     | 126.13                       |  |

| ор                         | e           | E               | E              | d          | В          | 0              | 6              | А          | F           | F                | f               | d           | de          | 3                | 87               | b           |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
|                            |             |                 |                |            |            | b              | а              |            |             |                  |                 |             |             | с                | cd               |             |
| Triflura<br>line           | 9.33<br>de  | 9.33<br>De      | 5.33<br>De     | 8.00<br>c  | 14.66<br>B | 16.0<br>0<br>b | 13.3<br>3<br>b | 14.66<br>B | 28.40<br>F  | 121.<br>20<br>Cd | 46.6<br>7<br>ef | 65.40<br>с  | 86.80<br>e  | 124.<br>80<br>cd | 129.<br>73<br>cd | 113.77<br>b |
| Check                      | 25.33<br>ab | 20.0<br>0<br>Bc | 30.6<br>6<br>A | 25.33<br>a | 17.33<br>B | 18.6<br>6<br>b | 33.3<br>3<br>a | 23.11<br>A | 169.87<br>B | 164.<br>00<br>Bc | 379.<br>20<br>a | 237.70<br>a | 188.80<br>b | 204.<br>40<br>b  | 289.<br>47<br>a  | 227.55<br>a |
| Mean of<br>sowing<br>dates | 11.66       | 10.0<br>0       | 14.3<br>3      |            | 15.33<br>В | 17.6<br>6<br>b | 24.6<br>6<br>a |            | 69.30<br>C  | 98.8<br>6<br>B   | 131.<br>53<br>a |             | 121.36<br>c | 141.<br>43<br>b  | 172.<br>93<br>a  |             |

2017 291 – 263 : ( 2 ) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences

Values within each set of means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at p=0.05 according to Duncan's M.R.T., 1

# Table 6: Effect of sowing dates, herbicides and their interaction on plant height, lowest pod and number of primary branches of chickpea.

|              |                | Plant He       | ight (cm)      |            | L              | owest pod      | height (cr     | n)         | Number         | r of primar    | y branches     | s plant <sup>-1</sup> |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Herbicides   | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Mean of    | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Mean of    | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Sowing<br>date | Mean of               |
|              | (15-           | (1-            | (15-           | herbicides | (15-           | (1-            | (15-           | herbicides | (15-           | (1-            | (15-           | herbicides            |
|              | February)      | March)         | March)         |            | February)      | March)         | March)         |            | February)      | March)         | March)         |                       |
| Propyzamide  | 44.00          | 43.66          | 42.00          | 43.22      | 23.66          | 22.00          | 21.00          | 22.22      | 3.33           | 3.33           | 3.00           | 3.22                  |
|              | b              | b              | bc             | а          | bc             | cd             | D              | а          |                |                |                |                       |
| Halovyfon    | 47.00          | 42.33          | 41.33          | 43.55      | 26.33          | 23.66          | 20.00          | 23.33      | 3.66           | 3 33           | 3.00           | 3 33                  |
| Паюхутор     | а              | bc             | bc             | а          | а              | bc             | De             | a          |                | 5.55           | 5.00           | 5.55                  |
| Trifluraline | 48.33          | 43.33          | 40.00          | 43.88      | 26.00          | 22.00          | 21.33          | 23.11      | 3.66           | 3.00           | 3.33           | 3.33                  |
|              | a              | b              | c              | а          | ab             | cd             | Cd             | a          |                | • •            |                |                       |

| Check                   | 36.33<br>d | 36.00<br>d | 36.00<br>d | 36.11<br>b | 18.33<br>e | 18.33<br>e | 18.33<br>E | 18.33<br>b | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|
| Mean of<br>sowing dates | 43.91<br>a | 41.33<br>b | 39.83<br>b |            | 23.58<br>a | 21.50<br>b | 20.16<br>B |            | 3.41 | 3.16 | 3.08 |      |

<u>2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences</u>

Values within each set of means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at p=0.05 according to Duncan's M.R.T., 1955.

weeds was shown in Propyzamide application at February15 sowing date (13.33) and the same value was recorded for Trifluraline application at March15 sowing date. But the lowest dry weight of broad leaved weeds was for Trifluraline application first at sowing date  $86.80 \text{ g/m}^2$ . These results in accordance were with those

achieved by Ala and Mazid (24) and Sarparast and Sheikh (31) that reported the application of Propyzamide admixture with Terbutyn compare to weedy check gave good result in controlling of weeds. Also Majnon Hosseini. 1994 (17)indicated that the Trifluraline application for controlling of chickpea weeds was effective in more reducing of competition effects.

Data from Tables 4 and 6 indicated significant differences among sowing dates in plant height and lowest pod height. The greater height was recorded at early date of sowing 43.91 cm and 23.58 cm for plant and lowest pod height respectively. traits Ozdemir and Karadavut(23) and Valimohammadi al.(37) et. represented height that plant influenced by sowing time. Also,

according to Rahemi and Soltani (28) and Shamsi(33), the height of the first pod from soil surface with increases earlier planting dates. Regarding to herbicide treatments the maximum plant height was recorded at Trifluraline treatment (43.88cm) which was nosignificant with other studied herbicides. This result is in agreement with Marwat et al.(18) and Larik *et al*(15).

The interaction of sowing dates with herbicide treatments represented that maximum plant height recorded for was February15 sowing with date Trifluraline followed by Haloxyfop application at the same date of 48..33 47 sowing and cm respectively, also the same trend shown for the lowest was pod

height trait. However, the minimum height for plant and lowest pod height was recorded for weedy check treatments at different sowing dates.

Concerning the number of primary branches per plant, non-significant differences were recorded for sowing times, herbicide treatments and their interaction. This trait

not affected with request period for its formation and also was the genetic trait that less affected with environment. The reason for superiority of first sowing date to others may be attributed to greater opportunity for plant using stored moisture in soil that cause more branching per plant (Table 1). The same results was reported bv Shamsi(33) who confirmed present results.

The results from Tables 4 and 7 indicated that early sowing date gave greater ability for plant in pod formation which surpassed the February15 date on other sowing dates and recorded 27.96 pod and seeds  $plant^{-1}$ . So that delay in sowing was reduced 15.95% the number of seeds per plant. It seems that delayed planting due to encounter the reproductive growth with the higher temperature inoculation is less than the number of flowers and will lead to а reduction in the number of seeds (21).These per plant results supported by findings of Mishra et. al.(19) and Turk et. al.(36) who reported that the delay in sowing time reduced number of seeds per plant. Also the present results were with those agree reported by Johnson and Major(13) and also Singh et al (34) who found that number of pods per plant was decreased with delay in sowing time.

Significant effects found was among herbicide treatments, the Trifluraline scored highest number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (29.06) followed by Haloxyfop application 28.68 pods and the same trend reflected on plant <sup>-1</sup>. The number of seeds interaction of sowing dates with herbicide treatments represented

that the highest number of pods plant <sup>-1</sup> was recorded for first Haloxyfop sowing date with (33.73)application and the plant<sup>-1</sup> minimum 14.86 pods related to weedy check at the third sowing date. Similar trend was observed by Pooniya et.al (27),Ratnam et. al.(29) and Gore et. al. (10).

From the same Table, different sowing significant dates gave effect in 100-seed weight trait. Delay in sowing date cause to in 100-seed reduce weight. Increasing weight of 100-seed in the first date of sowing may be due to availability of longer growth duration that cause increased more population production and resulting increase in pod formation and seed filling (34). Also lower 100-seed weight in chickpea and soya bean was reported due to using shorter period for of resources by plant (8) and (12). The effect of herbicides on 100seed weight was significant and greater weight of 100-seed was recorded in Trifluraline (28.45 g)

followed by Haloxyfop (26.42 g). The current study revealed that the interaction of different sowing and herbicides dates had effect 100-seed significant on weight. The maximum weight (30.50)**g**) was recorded in with February15 sowing date Trifluraline

application followed by Haloxyfop at the same sowing date (28.30 g), while the lowest weight of 100seed was shown among weedy check treatments at March sowing dates. Some researchers reported that the chickpea seed weight was sensitive to sowing dates and delay in sowing dates cause to formation of smaller seeds (40).

Tables 4 and 8 represented the effects significant among sowing dates, herbicides their and interactions on biological vield, harvest index and seed yield per The hectare. highest biological yield was recorded in date 15-February (26.87 g/plant) but lowest value (22.90 g/plant) was found in third sowing date. Some

# Table 7: Effect of sowing dates, herbicides and their interaction on number of pods, seeds per plant and 100-seedweight of chickpea.

|              | N                                       | Number of pods plant <sup>-1</sup>   |                                       |                           |   | umber of s                           | seeds plan                            | t <sup>-1</sup>           | 100-seed weight (g)                     |                                      |                                       |                           |  |
|--------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Herbicides   | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s |  |
| Propyzamid   | 28.66                                   | 24.60                                | 23.00                                 | 25.42                     | 30.73                                   | 25.40                                | 24.73                                 | 26.95                     | 26.76                                   | 25.23                                | 25.00                                 | 25.66                     |  |
| e            | C                                       | d                                    | d                                     | b                         | ab                                      | c                                    | c                                     | B                         | c                                       | d                                    | D                                     | C                         |  |
| Haloxyfop    | 33.73                                   | 27.73                                | 24.60                                 | 28.68                     | 31.53                                   | 28.93                                | 26.13                                 | 28.86                     | 28.30                                   | 25.66                                | 25.30                                 | 26.42                     |  |
|              | A                                       | с                                    | d                                     | a                         | a                                       | b                                    | c                                     | A                         | b                                       | cd                                   | D                                     | B                         |  |
| Trifluraline | 30.86                                   | 27.86                                | 28.46                                 | 29.06                     | 31.60                                   | 29.13                                | 29.00                                 | 29.91                     | 30.50                                   | 28.17                                | 26.7                                  | 28.45                     |  |
|              | B                                       | с                                    | c                                     | a                         | a                                       | b                                    | b                                     | A                         | a                                       | b                                    | C                                     | A                         |  |
| Check        | 18.60                                   | 17.20                                | 14.86                                 | 16.88                     | 18.00                                   | 16.46                                | 14.13                                 | 16.20                     | 23.66                                   | 22.93                                | 22.86                                 | 23.15                     |  |

|         | E     | e     | f     | С | d     | d     | e     | С | e     | e     | E     | D |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Mean of | 27.96 | 24.35 | 22.73 |   | 27.96 | 24.98 | 23.50 |   | 27.30 | 25.50 | 24.96 |   |
| dates   | А     | b     | с     |   | a     | b     | с     |   | а     | b     | В     |   |

2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences

Values within each set of means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at p=0.05 according to Duncan's M.R.T., 1955.

# Table 8: Effect of sowing dates, herbicides and their interaction on biological yield, harvest index and seed yield of chickpea.

|                 | Biological yield (g plant <sup>-1</sup> ) |                                      |                                       |                           | Harvest index (%)                       |                                      |                                       |                           | Seed yield (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )       |                                      |                                       |                           |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Herbicides      | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y)   | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s | Sowing<br>date<br>(15-<br>Februar<br>y) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(1-<br>March<br>) | Sowin<br>g date<br>(15-<br>March<br>) | Mean of<br>herbicide<br>s |
| Propyzamid<br>e | 28.30<br>b                                | 27.08<br>b                           | 25.05<br>cd                           | 26.81<br>b                | 29.88<br>b                              | 27.16<br>bc                          | 28.91<br>b                            | 28.65<br>b                | 2254.2<br>b                             | 1959.0<br>8<br>C                     | 1930.6<br>4<br>cd                     | 2074.96<br>a              |
| Haloxyfop       | 30.59<br>a                                | 27.71<br>b                           | 26.62<br>bc                           | 28.31<br>a                | 29.20<br>b                              | 26.79<br>bc                          | 24.77<br>c                            | 26.92<br>c                | 2378.64<br>ab                           | 1978.6<br>4<br>C                     | 1758.2<br>d                           | 2038.48<br>a              |
| Trifluraline    | 27.42                                     | 24.32                                | 24.00                                 | 25.24                     | 34.17                                   | 29.39                                | 27.50                                 | 30.35                     | 2499.52                                 | 1905.7<br>6                          | 1758.1<br>6                           | 2054.48                   |

|         | b     | d     | d     | с     | а     | b     | bc    | а     | а      | Cd          | d           | а      |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Check   | 21.16 | 18.67 | 15.92 | 18.58 | 20.10 | 20.17 | 20.39 | 20.22 | 1134.2 | 1004.4      | 860.4       | 999.68 |
|         | e     | f     | g     | d     | d     | d     | d     | d     | e      | Ef          | f           | b      |
| Mean of | 26.87 | 24.44 | 22.90 |       | 28.34 | 25.88 | 25.39 |       | 2066.6 | 1711.9<br>6 | 1576.8<br>4 |        |
| dates   | а     | b     | b     |       | а     | ab    | b     |       | а      | В           | С           |        |

2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences

Values within each set of means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at p=0.05 according to Duncan's M.R.T., 1955.

researchers Naseri et.al. (25).Imam and Niknejad(12), Lopez-Billido et.al.(16) and Naseri et.al. (22) regarded the similar results about soya bean and other crops and reported that the longer growing period was the main reason for greater biomass.

The Haloxyfop application recorded vield 28.31 maximum g/plant which was increased 52.36 % compared to weedy check. Among interaction of sowing dates with herbicides, the application of Haloxyfop at first sowing date maximum biological gave vield (30.59 g/plant) followed by Propyzamide (28.30 g/plant) at the same sowing date which cause to increase 44.56 % and 33.74 % compared to check at the same sowing date.

The highest harvest index 28.34% was recorded at the first sowing date while about the herbicide effects. the Trifluraline recorded 30.4% which cause increase to 10.13% compare to check. The interaction of sowing dates with herbicides indicated that the highest harvest index was recorded for early date sowing when treated with Trifluraline (34.17%). These results confirm the findings by

Pooniya *et.al.* (27), Rahemi *et.al.*(29) and Gore *et.al.* (10).

Finally, the seed vield was determined on the basis of single plant yield (g) conversion to kg ha <sup>1</sup>. The same Table clearly showed that the sowing at February15 gave maximum yield  $(2066.6 \text{Kg. ha}^{-1})$ that increased 489.76 kg from the third sowing date. Many researchers that. agree early planting dates have higher yields (26), (7) and (20). The lower yield in delay time of sowing attributed low height, less to plant plant branches and shorter growing period (21).

The all studied herbicides had good effects on controlling of weeds that ultimately reflected on increasing seed yield. There were no significant differences among herbicide treatments. However, the

highest yield was recorded at Trifluraline application treatment (2054.48 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) which causes to increase in yield 105.5 % compare to weedy check. This result

researchers supported by Chaib and Forster, (4) who reported that Trifluraline application cause the to increase yield by 80% compare weedv check. Among to the interaction of sowing dates with herbicides , the maximum vield  $(2499.52 \text{ kg ha}^{-1})$  was shown in February15 sowing date with application followed Trifluraline by Haloxyfop at the same sowing date (2378.64 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and cause to 120.37% increase vield and 109.71% respectively compare to weedy check at the same date of The sowing. results were in accordance with those achieved by Yasin, et al (38) and Gollojeh et  $al_{,}(9)$  who reported the efficient control of grass weeds cause to yield improving in both chickpea and lentil.

#### References

- 1- Abbas, A.I. 1990. Status of chickpea production in Iraq. In: Chickpea in the nineties: of proceedings the Second International Workshop on Chickpea Improvement, 4 - 81989, Dec, **ICRISAT** Center. India. pp. 293-294.
- 2- Bhalla, C.S.; S. P. Kurchania and Parsdkar, N. R. 1998. Herbicidal and weed control in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). World Weed, 5:121 – 124.
- 3- Bhan, V. M. and S. Kukula. 1987. Weeds and their control in chickpea. In: The Chickpea, (Eds.): M.C. Saxena and K.B. Singh. C.A.B. Inter., Wallingford. Oxen, U.K. pp. 319-328.
- 4- Chaib, S. L. and R. Forster. 1982. Efficiency of herbicide m ixtures on beans when incorporated with a hoe and a disc harrow. The 5th Congress of the Latin American Weed Association (ALAM), Campinas. 103- 104.

- 5- Duncan, D.B. 1995. Multiple ranges and multiple F-tests. Biometrics, 11:1-42.
- 6- FAO, 2004. Production year book 2003. Vol. 58. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- 7- Gholipur M. and A. Soltani. 2005. Optimization of chickpea waiting planting management by simulation using chickpea model. In Proceeding of the First National Conference on Pulse in Iran .20 – 21 November 2005. Research Center for Plant Sciences. Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. Mashhad. Iran. p.7.
- 8- Ghorban-Zadeh, M., and M. Nasiri. 2005. Response of grain yield of soybean varieties and yield components to delay in sowing. J. Agric. Sci., 15: 149-161.
- 9- Gollojeh, K.S.; A. Ebadi, M. Mohebodini and Sabaghnia N. 2013. Herbicide effects on weed control and yield of Lentil (*Lens culinaris* Medik.) in dryland

- condition. Natura Montenerina, Podgorica, 12(1): 151-163.
- 10-Gore, A. K.; S. M. Gobade and Patil P.V. 2015. Effect of pre and post emergence herbicides yield on and economics of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). Int. J. of Tropical Agri., 33(2): 909-912.
- 11- Goud, V.V.; N.B. Muradei,
  M.S. Khakre and Patil A.N.
  2013. Efficacy of Imazethapyr and Quizalofop-ethyl herbicides on growth and yield of chickpea. The international quarterly J. of Life Sciences, 8(3): 1015-1018.
- Imam, Y., and M. Niknejad.
   2004. An introduction to physiology of agronomic plants yield. Shiraz University Pub. Second. Ed., Iran, pp. 571.
- Johnson, D. R. and D. J. Major. 1979. Harvest index of soybean as affected by planting date and maturity rating. Agron. J., 71:538-541.

- 14- Kantar, F., E. Elkoca, and Zengin H. 1999. Chemical and agronomical weed control in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L. cv. Azizye-94). Turkish J. Agri. and Forestry, 23: 631-635.
- 15-Larik, A.S.;M. Rajput, A. A. Kakar. S.S. Bukhari and Shaikh M.A. 1999. Effect of weedicide afaon character on association in Brassica juncea and Eruca sativa. Sarh J. Agric., 15:198-202.
- 16-Lopez-Billido, F.J.; R.J. Lopez Billido, S.K. Khalil and Lopez-Billido L. 2008. Effect of planting date on winter Kabuli chickpea growth and under vield rain fed Mediterranean condition. Agro. J., 100: 957-967.
- 17- Majnon-Hosseini, N. 1994.
  Effect of selective herbicides on chickpea weeds. 3th Congress of Agronomy and Plant Breeding. Tabriz, Iran.
- Marwat, K.B.; Z. Hussain,
   N.I. Khan and Gul B. 2003.

- Impact of weed management on rapeseed. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res., 9:207-214.
- 19- Mishra, J. S.; V. P. Sing and Bhman V. M. 1996. Response of lentil to date of sowing and weed control in jabalpur, India, Lens Newsletter 23 (1,2): 18-23.
- 20-Mohammadnejad, Y. and A. Soltani 2005. Shares of main branches in stem and determining grain vield of chickpea with different planting dates and densities. In proceeding of the First National Conference on Pulse in Iran. 20-2005. November Research 21 Center for Plant Sciences. Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. Mashhad. Iran.
- 21- Mousavi, S.K., and P.
  Pezeshkpour. 2006. Evaluation of Kabouli chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cultivars response to sowing date. Iranian J. Agron. Res., 4: 141-154.
- 22- Naseri, R.; S.A. Siyadat, A. Soleymani Fard, R. Soleymani

- Khosh-khabar H. 2011. and Effects of planting date and density on yield, yield components and protein content of three chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) cultivars under rainfed conditions in Ilam Journal province. Iranian of Pulses Research, 2(2): 7-18.
- 23- Ozdemir, S. and U. Karadavut. 2003. Comparison of the performance of autumn and spring sowing of chickpeas in a temperate region. Turkish J. of Agriculture and Forestry, 27:345-352.
- 24-Pala. M. and A. Mazid. 1992. On- farm assessment of improved production crop Northwest practices in Syria. Resource Farm Management Program. ICARDA. Aleppo. Syria.
- 25- Pepper, G.E., and J.T.Walker. 1988. Yield components for stand deficiencies by determinate and

- indeterminate growth-habit soybean. Agron. J., 80:1-4.
- 26-Pezeshkpur, P.: M. Daneshvar and Ahmadi A. 2005. The effect of plant density on agronomical properties, leaf chlorophyl, and light penetration of shading floor white to chickpea variety. In proceeding of the first National conference on pulse in Iran 20 to 21 2005. November Research for Center Plant Sciences. university Ferdowsi of Mashhad, Mashhad. Iran.
- 27- Pooniya, V.; B. Rai and Jat R.K. 2009. Yield and yield attributes of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) as influenced by various row spacing and weed control. Indian. J. weed sci. 41 (3 & 4): 222–223.
- 28- Rahemi, K.A. and A.
  Soltani. 2005. Allometric relationships between leaf area and vegetative qualities in plant chickpea. In proceeding of the First National Conference on

- Pulse in Iran. 20-21 November 2005. Research Center for plant Sciences. Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad. Iran.
- 29- Ratnam, M., A. S. Rao and Reddy T. Y. 2011. Integrated weed management in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Indian J. Weed Sci., 43 (1 & 2): 70-72.
- 30- Saini, S.S. and A.S. Faroda. 1997. Effect of sowing time, its pattern and seed rate on growth and yield of 'H 86-143' chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Indian J. Agron., 42: 645-49.
- 31- Sarparast, R., and F. Sheikh. 2010. Effect of different herbicides on weed control in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Iran J. Pulses Res. 1: 33-42.
- 32- Saxena, M.C. 1979. Recent advances in chickpea agronomy.
  In: Proc. Int. Workshop on chickpea improvement, pp: 95-96.
- 33- Shamsi, K. 2010. The effect of sowing date and row spacing

- on yield and yield components on Hashem chickpea variety under rain fed condition. African Journal of Biotechnology Vol. 9 (1), pp. 007-011.
- 34-Singh, K.B.; R.S. Malhotra, M.C. Saxena and Bejiga G. 1997. Superiority of winter traditional sowing over spring of sowing chickpea in the Mediterranean Region. Agron. J. 89: 112-118.
- 35- Thakur, H. S.; N.K. Sinha, Raghuwanshi and Sharma R.A. 1998. Response of gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.) varieties to plant population and date of sowing. Indian J.Agron., 43: 315-17.
- 36-Turk, M.A.; A.M. Tawaha EL-Shatnawi M. 2003. and Lentil (Lens culinaris Medik) Response to plant density, sowing date. phosphorus fertilization and Ethephon application absence in the of Journal moisture stress. of

Agronomy and Crop Science. 189 (1): 1-6.

by sowing date and cultivar. Can. J. Plant Sci., 75: 321-327.

- 37-Valimohammadi, F.: M. Tajbakhsh and Saeid A. 2007. Comparison winter and spring sowing dates and effect of plant density yield, on yield components and some quality, morphological traits of chickpea arietinum L.) (Cicer under environmental condition of Urmia. J. Agron., 6(4): 571-575.
- 38- Yasin, J.Z.; S. Al-Thahabi,
  B.E. Abu-Irmaileh, M.C.
  Saxena, and Haddad N.I. 1995.
  Chemical weed control in chickpea and lentil. Intern. J.
  Pest Manage. 41(1): 60-65.
- 39- Yousefi, A.R.; M. Alizadeh,
  H. Rahimian and Jahansouz M.
  2006. Broad leaved weeds
  control by herbicide and hand
  hoeing in chickpea. Iranian
  Journal of Agricultural Sciences,
  1(2):337-346.
- 40- Zaiter, H.Z., and S.G.Barakat. 1995. Flower and pod abortion in chickpea as affected

## 2017 291 – 263 : (2) 9 Kufa Journal For Agricultural Sciences تأثير مواعيد زراعية و بعض مبيدات الأدغال في صفات نمو و حاصل الحمص ومكوناته و الأدغال المرافقة له تحت الظروف المطرية في محافظة دهوك.

كو هدار صالح حسين

قسم المحاصيل الحقلية، كلية الزراعة، جامعة دهوك، اقليم كردستان، عراق.

المستخلص

أجريت التجربة في حقل البحوث العائد لقسم المحاصيل الحقاية ،كلية الزراعة، جامعة دهوك، إقليم كردستان-العراق خلال الموسم الربيعي 2015-2016، باستعمال تصميم القطاعات الكاملة المعشاة و بترتيب الألواح المنشقة ، اشتملت على ثلاث مواعيد للزراعة ( 15 شباط و 1 آذار و 15 آذار ) في الألواح الرئيسية و ثلاث مبيدات للأدغال (بروبيز اميد، هالوكسى فوب، ترفلان) فضلا عن معاملة بدون مكافحة (مقارنة) في الألواح الثانوية. دلت النتائج بأن مبيد هالوكسى فوب كان له تأثير جيد في تقليل عدد الأدغال الرفيعة الأوراق تلاه مبيد ترفلان افضلا عدد الى 40.0 و 8 دغال المبيدين بالتتابع مقارنة بعدم إضافة المبيدات. أعطت المعاملة بمبيد الترفلان و التي زرعت في 21-شباط اقل وزن جاف للأدغال عريضة الأوراق 86.80 غم. م<sup>2</sup> ، أعلى ارتفاع نبات 30.40 سم ، وزن 100- بذرة (30.5 غم) ، دليال الحصاد (10.5%) و أعلى حاصال البدور (

كلمات مفتاحية: الحمص، موعد الزراعة، بروبيزاميد ،هالوكسي فوب، ترفلان.