A SURVEY OF WEEDS FOUND IN COTTON FIELDS OF THE KHAIRPUR DISTRICT, SINDH, PAKISTAN

RABIA ASMA MEMON, G. RAZA BHATTI^{*}, SHAHIDA KHALID^{**}, RASHIDA SOOMRO^{*} AND SHAKEEL AHMED^{*}

Institute of Botany, University Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan *Department of Botany, Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur, Pakistan **Department of Weed Science, NARC, Islamabad, Pakistan

Abstract

A survey of weeds of cotton fields from 8 Talukas of the district Khairpur has been carried out during 1999-2001. Thirty-six weed species belonging to 16 families are reported. The weed communities were recorded from various Talukas on the basis of density analysis. The most frequently occurring weeds of cotton crop placed in the "Assertive" category are *Trianthema portulacastrum* (76.88%), *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (73.75%), *Brachiaria eruciformis* (70.63%), *Corchorus aestuans* (68.75%), *Euphorbia serpens* (67.50%) and *Setaria pumila* (61.25%). A similarity index (SI) of species has been determined. Most common family representing cotton weeds is Poaceae having 45.74 FIV.

Introduction

Cotton is the major cash crop of Pakistan. More than 20 million people depend on the crop for their livelihood. It supplies cash return to farmers, supplies raw material to the textile industry and provides employment in both the rural and the urban areas. It accounts for almost 60% of the country's \$10 billion annual foreign exchange earnings through the export of raw cotton, garments and threads etc (Rizvi, 2000). Beside other reasons its yield is also reduced by heavy weed infestation. The ability of weeds to compete successfully with crops for light, water and nutrients depends on several interrelated factors. These include the timing of weed emergence in relation to crop emergence, the growth form of the weed, and the density of the weed present in the crop. The different environmental conditions determine the specific weed spectrum, composition and population of each region. Hussain (1987) reported diversity of weed spectrum for the 12 cotton growing districts of the Punjab where he found Cyperus rotundus, Convolvulus arvensis, Cynodon dactylon, Trianthema monogyna, Portulaca oleracea and Sorghum halepense as dominant weed species. Ullah et al., (1995) reported Trianthema monogyna, Digeria arvensis, Echinocoloa colonum, Cyperus rotundus, Cynodon dactylon and Digitaria timorensis as the most common weeds in the fields of cotton crop at Agronomic Research Station in Bahawalpur. A list of important weed species of cotton crop occurring in Tandojam area was provided by Brohi & Makhdoom (1987) which includes Echinochloa colonum, Cyperus rotundus, Cynodon dactylon, Desmostachya bipinnata, Trianthema monogyna, Convolvulus arvensis, Brachiaria reptans, Tribulus terrestris, Euphorbia pilulifera, Chorchorus depressus, Digeria arvensis, Rhynchosia minima, Phyllanthis niruri, Portulaca oleraceae and Amranthus polygamus. Similarly, Bhatti et al., (1993) and Memon et al., (2001) have compiled a list of weed species from cotton fields of Khairpur District.

The present study was carried out to determine the diversity of the weed species in the Khairpur district and their spectrum which includes density, frequency, similarity index and family importance values.



Fig. 1. Sites surveyed during the study for weed distribution in district Khairpur.

Materials and Methods

The survey was carried out during 1999-2001 in cotton fields from 8 Talukas viz., Kingri, Gambat, Khairpur, Sobhodero, Kotdiji, Thari Mirwah, Faiz Ganj and Nara of district Khairpur. Four sampling sites were randomly selected from each Taluka making a total of 32 sites for field observations (Fig. 1). Observations on weed density were recorded with the help of the quadrate method described by Pound & Clements (1898). Specifically five quadrates of $1m^2$ were randomly selected from each site. All the species

in a quadrate were recorded and counted. Frequency and density of each weed species were calculated according to Odum (1971). Statistical analysis of data was performed by applying Factorial Completely Randomized Design using ANOVA and DMRT program following Steel & Torrie (1980). Similarity index (SI) between two Talukas was calculated following Odum (1971).

To determine the similarity index (SI) the value of weed species of cotton occurring in each individual Taluka were compared with those of the species occurring in Taluka Nara as it consists more number of weed species in cotton.

All the species were identified with the help of Flora of Pakistan (Nasir & Ali, 1970-1994 and Ali & Qaiser, 1995-2003), Flora of Karachi (Jafri, 1966), Flora of Bombay (Cooke, 1903-1906), Crop Weeds of Nepal (Rajbhandari & Joshi, 1998), Flora of Egypt (Boulos, 1999) and Flora of Tamilnadu (Matthew, 1982-83).

Number of genera and species were also determined. Family importance values (following Mori *et al.*, 1983) were used to compare the relative distribution of each family to weed community composition

Results and Discussion

Thirty-six weed species of 16 families were recorded from cotton. Different weed communities were recorded from each Talukas of district Khairpur. According to the density analysis (Table 1) the most dominant weeds were *Euphorbia serpens*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Brachiaria eruciformis* and *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* in Khairpur; *Euphorbia serpens*, *Brachiaria eruciformis*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* and *Corchorus aestuans* in Kotdiji; *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Ipomoea aquatica*, *Euphorbia serpens*, *Celosia argentea* and *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* in Thari Mirwah; *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* and *Euphorbia serpens* in Faiz Ganj; *Brachiaria eruciformis*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Euphorbia serpens* in Sobhodero; *Euphorbia serpens*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Brachiaria eruciformis* aestuans in Gambat; *Corchorus aestuans*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Brachiaria eruciformis* and *Euphorbia serpens* in Kingri and *Cenchrus ciliaris*, *Bergia aestivosa*, *Cressa cretica* and *Euphorbia serpens* in Nara.

More broad leaved weeds (BLW) were observed than grass weeds (GW) as shown in Table 2.

Density/square meter: The district average data shown in Table 1 depict that in cotton *Euphorbia serpens* and *Trianthema portulacastrum* were the most dense weeds having an average density of 13.86 and 13.06 respectively, followed by *Brachiaria eruciformis* (11.65), *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (11.26) and *Corchorus aestuans* (10.16). There was variation among the densities of weeds in different sampling fields within the Talukas. *Oxystelma esculentum* was found only from two sites of Faiz Gang having 4.50 density. *Bergia aestivosa, Cenchrus ciliaris, Crotalaria medicaginea, Mukia maderaspatana* and *Tephrosia villosa* were recorded only from the Nara having density values 11.75, 12.00, 11.00, 10.25 and 9.75 respectively. Probably the reason could be the close proximity of agriculture area to sandy flat or dunes. Bhatti *et al.*, (2001) and Bhatti (2003) reported these species from the Nara desert. The occurrence of such species as a weed in crop is certainly due to their seeds dispersals by wind or any other human activities. The flora of Nara Taluka has different weed flora as compared to the rest of the Talukas in our study.

| | | Table 1. Dens | sity of weeds | of cotton crop in | different Tal | ukas of district | Khairpur. | | | | |
|--------|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|--------------|--------|----------|
| S. No. | Weed species | V'halunua | $V_{c,b}(0)$ | Than Minneb | Take Cani | Site | Combat | Vinced | Naua | Tate | Avauates |
| - | | 1 20 PE | Imov | LITAL MULWAIL | 1 40 TE | 500000ED | Californ | 1 00 OD | A A A DOD DD | 10.01 | AVELAGE |
| _; , | Alhagi maurorum Medic. | 1.30 DE | 0.90 DE | 1.00.0 | 1.40 EF | 1.60 CDE | 1.75 F | 1.90 CD | 5.50 ABCDEF | 15.25 | 1.91 |
| 2. | Amaranthus virdis Linn. | 5.10 CDE | 5.00 CDE | 4.20 DEFGHI | 4.10 DEF | 4.75 BCDE | 4.25 DEF | 6.00 BCD | 5.85 ABCDEF | 39.25 | 4.91 |
| с, | Atylosia platycarpa Benth. | 2.90 DE | 2.65 DE | 1.60 GHI | 1.00 EF | 0.00 E | 1.40 F | 0.00 D | 10.00 ABCDE | 19.55 | 2.44 |
| 4. | Bergia aestivosa Wight & Arn. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 I | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | 0.00 F | 0.00 D | 11.75 AB | 11.75 | 1.47 |
| 5. | Brachiaria eruciformis (J.E. Sm.) Griseb. | 13.40 AB | 19.85 A | 8.35 BCDEFG | 7.00 CDE | 11.60 A | 9.50 BCD | 13.00 A | 10.50 ABCDE | 93.20 | 11.65 |
| 9. | Celosia argentea Linn. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 11.00 ABCD | 0.00 F | 3.50 BCDE | 6.00 CDEF | 4.00 BCD | 3.75 ABCDEF | 28.25 | 3.53 |
| 7. | Cenchrus ciliaris Linn. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 I | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | $0.00 \mathrm{F}$ | 0.00 D | 12.00 A | 12.00 | 1.50 |
| ø | Cleome viscosa Linn. | 7.45 BCD | 5.75 CDE | 5.00 DEFGHI | 6.25 CDEF | 4.60 BCDE | 5.25 DEF | 4.10 BCD | 3.40 ABCDEF | 41.80 | 5.23 |
| .6 | Convolvulus arvensis Linn. | 4.90 CDE | 3.00 DE | 7.25 CDEFGHI | 3.70 DEF | 3.95 BCDE | 2.75 DEF | 4.90 BCD | 2.25 DEF | 32.70 | 4.09 |
| 10. | Conyza bonariensis (Linn.) Cronquist. | 2.35 DE | 2.85 DE | 1.00 HI | 3.20 EF | 2.30 CDE | 1.75 F | 1.60 CD | 2.90 ABCDEF | 17.95 | 2.24 |
| 11. | Corchorus aestuans Linn. | 7.80 BCD | 10.25 BC | 9.50 BCDEF | 9.60 BCD | 7.85 ABC | 11.90 ABC | 14.80 A | 9.55 ABCDE | 81.25 | 10.16 |
| 12. | Corchorus tridens Linn. | 5.25 CDE | 4.75 DE | 4.65 DEFGHI | 2.90 EF | 3.10 DEF | 3.25 DEF | 3.20 CD | 4.70 ABCDEF | 31.80 | 3.98 |
| 13. | Cressa cretica Linn. | 4.40 DE | 3.65 DE | 4.35 DEFGHI | 5.05 DEF | 6.20 ABCDE | 4.25 DEF | 2.85 CD | 11.50 ABC | 42.25 | 5.28 |
| 14. | Crotalaria medicaginea var. medicaginea Lamk. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 I | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | 0.00 F | 0.00 D | 11.00 ABCDE | 11.00 | 1.38 |
| 15. | Cucumis melo var. agrestis Naudin. | 4.40 DE | 3.10 DE | 5.05 DEFGHI | 4.05 DEF | 4.30 BCDE | 2.85 DEF | 4.05 BCD | 3.20 ABCDEF | 31.00 | 3.88 |
| 16. | Cynodon dactylon (Linn.) Pers. | 6.50 CDE | 3.00 DE | 3.85 DEFGHI | 5.75 CDEF | 7.50 ABC | 6.50 CDEF | 6.75 BC | 4.20 ABCDEF | 44.05 | 5.51 |
| 17. | Cyperus rotundus Linn. | 4.85 CDE | 6.25 CD | 3.75 EFGHI | 5.10 DEF | 4.75 BCDE | 3.25 DEF | 4.50 BCD | 4.50 ABCDEF | 36.95 | 4.62 |
| 18. | Dactyloctenium aegyptium (Linn.) Willd. | 11.50 ABC | 11.55 B | 10.60 ABCDE | 13.50 AB | 11.50 A | 14.10 AB | 9.40 AB | 7.90 ABCDEF | 90.05 | 11.26 |
| 19. | Desmostachya bipinnata (Linn.) Stap. | 2.10 DE | 1.60 DE | 2.15 DEFGHI | 2.10 EF | 2.85 BCDE | $0.90 \mathrm{F}$ | 2.30 CD | 3.10 ABCDEF | 17.10 | 2.14 |
| 20 | Digeria muricata (Linn.) Mart. | 3.25 DE | 6.00 CD | 4.00 DEFGHI | 4.85 DEF | 4.40 BCDE | 4.50 DEF | 5.65 BCD | 3.75 ABCDEF | 33.55 | 4.55 |
| 21. | Eclipta prostrata L. Mant. | 4.35 DE | 4.60 DE | 5.70 DEFGHI | 3.30 DEF | 2.45 BCDE | 4.50 DEF | 3.55 BCD | 2.35 CDEF | 30.80 | 3.85 |
| 22. | Euphorbia serpens Kunth. | 14.25 A | 21.15 A | 13.20 ABC | 11.50 ABC | 8.60 AB | 17.90 A | 12.95 A | 11.30 ABCD | 110.85 | 13.86 |
| 23. | Ipomoea aquatica Forssk. | 1.60 DE | 1.90 DE | 14.90 AB | 1.00 EF | 4.10 BCDE | 2.10 F | 2.40 CD | 1.90 EF | 29.90 | 3.74 |
| 24. | Launaea procumbens (Roxb.) | 5.50 CDE | 3.80 DE | 2.95 FGHI | 2.40 EF | 2.60 BCDE | 2.50 DEF | 3.00 CD | 2.55 BCDEF | 25.30 | 3.16 |
| 25. | Mukia maderaspatana (Linn) M. J. Roem. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 I | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | $0.00 \mathrm{F}$ | 0.00 D | 10.25 ABCDE | 10.25 | 1.28 |
| 26. | Oxystelma esculentum (L.f.) R.Br. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 DEFGHI | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | $0.00 \mathrm{F}$ | 0.00 D | 0.00 F | 4.50 | 0.56 |
| 27. | Phragmites australis (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud. | 1.75 DE | 2.3 0 DE | 4.50 DEFGHI | 3.85 DEF | 3.50 BCDE | 3.90 DEF | 2.60 CD | 3.50 ABCDEF | 25.90 | 3.24 |
| 28. | Phyla nodiflora (Linn.) Greene | 2.85 DE | 4.50 DE | 2.60 FGHI | 2.40 EF | 2.60 BCDE | 2.65 DEF | 4.00 BCD | 2.50 CDEF | 24.10 | 3.01 |
| 29. | Physalis peruviana Linn. | 2.10 DE | 1.75 DE | 0.60 I | 2.25 EF | 0.00 E | 1.60 F | 0.00 D | 9.00 ABCDEF | 17.30 | 2.16 |
| 30. | Pluchea lanceolata (DC.) Oliv. & Hiern. | 3.00 DE | 3.10 DE | 1.80 GHI | 1.80 EF | 1.10 DE | 0.00 F | 1.90 CD | 8.50 ABCDEF | 21.20 | 2.65 |
| 31. | Sesbania bispinosa (Jacq.) W.F. Wight | 1.60 DE | 3.30 DE | 3.00 FGHI | 2.65 EF | 2.85 BCDE | 2.45 DEF | 3.00 CD | 7.60 ABCDEF | 26.45 | 3.31 |
| 32. | Setaria pumila (Poir.) Roem. & Schult. | 5.75 CDE | 5.75 CDE | 8.25 BCDEFGH | 6.70 CDE | 7.10 ABCD | 9.35 BCDE | 6.25 BCD | 8.75 ABCDEF | 57.90 | 7.24 |
| 33. | Tephrosia villosa (Linn). Pers. | 0.00 E | 0.00 E | 0.00 I | 0.00 F | 0.00 E | 0.00 F | 0.00 D | 9.75 ABCDE | 9.75 | 1.22 |
| 34. | Trianthema portulacastrum Linn. | 13.55 AB | 13.50 B | 16.90 A | 15.45 A | 10.55 A | 13.05 AB | 13.50 A | 8.00 ABCDEF | 104.50 | 13.06 |
| 35. | Tribulus terrestris Linn. | 4.60 CDE | 3.40 DE | 4.85 DEFGHI | 4.60 DEF | 4.25 BCDE | 4.65 DEF | 2.85 CD | 2.65 BCDEF | 27.60 | 3.980 |
| 36. | Xanthium stromarium Linn. | 4.65 CDE | 2.70 DE | 3.55 EFGHI | 1.80 EF | 3.10 BCDES | 2.25 EF | 3.80 BCD | 5.40 ABCDEF | 27.25 | 3.41 |
| LSD | | 28.79 | 23.78 | 29.28 | 26.00 | 25.15 | 29.32 | 25.16 | 36.56 | | |
| Value | s having different letters in a column differ sign | nificantly at 0.0 | 150 probabilit | y levels. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

RABIA ASMA MEMON ET AL.,

| | Table 2. Frequen | icy% of weed | ls of cotte | on crop in differe | ent Talukas | of district K | hairpur. | | | | |
|--------|---|--------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|--------|-------|--------|---------|
| S. No. | Name of weed species | Khairmir | Katdiji | Thari Mirwah | Fair Cani | Sife Sobbodaro | Combat | Kinari | Nore | Total | Average |
| - | Albacei manuounun Madio | 20.00 | 25.00 | 75 00 | Fair Gau | 20.00 | 20.00 | 25 00 | 55 00 | 200.00 | 26.35 |
| | Amagamathus virdis Linn | 50.00 | 65 00 | 55.00 | 20.00 | 00.02 | 35.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 455.00 | 56.88 |
| im | Atvlosia platycarpa Benth. | 45.00 | 45.00 | 30.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 75.00 | 245.00 | 30.63 |
| 4 | Bergia aestivosa Wight & Am. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 7.50 |
| 5. | Brachiaria eruciformis (J.E. Sm.) Griseb. | 85.00 | 85.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 70.00 | 65.00 | 70.00 | 65.00 | 565.00 | 70.63 |
| 9 | Celosia argentea Linn. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.00 | 0.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | 235.00 | 29.38 |
| 7. | Cenchrus ciliaris Linn. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 8.13 |
| °. | Cleome viscosa Linn. | 60.00 | 65.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 470.00 | 58.75 |
| 9. | Convolvulus arvensis Linn. | 60.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 | 45.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 435.00 | 54.38 |
| 10. | Conyza bonariensis (Linn.) Cronquist. | 35.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 | 55.00 | 40.00 | 25.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 | 305.00 | 38.13 |
| 11. | Corchorus aestuans Linn. | 70.00 | 80.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 75.00 | 55.00 | 550.00 | 68.75 |
| 12. | Corchorus tridens Linn. | 45.00 | 55.00 | 50.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 50.00 | 355.00 | 44.38 |
| 13. | Cressa cretica Linn. | 65.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 55.00 | 45.00 | 65.00 | 470.00 | 58.75 |
| 14. | Crotalaria medicaginea var. medicaginea Lamk. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 | 8.75 |
| 15. | Cucumis melo var. agrestis Naudin. | 50.00 | 60.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 60.00 | 45.00 | 420.00 | 52.50 |
| 16. | Cynodon dactylon (Linn.) Pers. | 45.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 70.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 470.00 | 58.75 |
| 17. | Cyperus rotundus Linn. | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 55.00 | 470.00 | 58.75 |
| 18. | Dactyloctenium aegyptium (Linn.) Willd. | 70.00 | 70.00 | 75.00 | 80.00 | 80.00 | 90.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 590.00 | 73.75 |
| 19. | Desmostachya bipinnata (Linn.) Stap. | 25.00 | 25.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 20.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 | 285.00 | 35.63 |
| 20. | Digeria muricata (Linn.) Mart. | 45.00 | 55.00 | 40.00 | 55.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 415.00 | 51.88 |
| 21. | Eclipta prostrata L. Mant. | 60.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 55.00 | 45.00 | 460.00 | 57.50 |
| 22. | Euphorbia serpens Kunth. | 60.00 | 90.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 80.00 | 70.00 | 60.00 | 540.00 | 67.50 |
| 23. | Ipomoea aquatica Forssk. | 25.00 | 45.00 | 95.00 | 35.00 | 45.00 | 30.00 | 40.00 | 25.00 | 340.00 | 42.50 |
| 24. | Launaea procumbens (Roxb.) | 55.00 | 70.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 | 55.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 | 410.00 | 51.25 |
| 25. | Mukia maderaspatana (Linn) M. J. Roem. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 8.13 |
| 26. | Oxystelma esculentum (L.f.) R.Br. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 45.00 | 0.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 45.00 | 5.63 |
| 27. | Phragmites australis (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud. | 30.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | 50.00 | 60.00 | 40.00 | 30.00 | 35.00 | 345.00 | 43.13 |
| 28. | Phyla nodiflora (Linn.) Greene | 40.00 | 70.00 | 55.00 | 40.00 | 30.00 | 45.00 | 65.00 | 50.00 | 395.00 | 49.38 |
| 29. | Physalis peruviana Linn. | 25.00 | 30.00 | 15.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 75.00 | 210.00 | 26.25 |
| 30. | Pluchea lanceolata (DC.) Oliv. & Hiern. | 35.00 | 50.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 50.00 | 245.00 | 30.63 |
| 31. | Sesbania bispinosa (Jacq.) W. F. Wight | 25.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 40.00 | 30.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 300.00 | 37.50 |
| 32. | Setaria pumila (Poir.) Roem. & Schult. | 60.00 | 60.00 | 65.00 | 50.00 | 65.00 | 75.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 | 490.00 | 61.25 |
| 33. | Tephrosia villosa (Linn). Pers. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 8.13 |
| 34. | Trianthema portulacastrum Linn. | 85.00 | 85.00 | 75.00 | 80.00 | 60.00 | 70.00 | 90.00 | 70.00 | 615.00 | 76.88 |
| 35. | Tribulus terrestris Linn. | 50.00 | 50.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 60.00 | 55.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 430.00 | 53.75 |
| 36. | Xanthium stromarium Linn. | 70.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 55.00 | 45.00 | 40.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 | 410.00 | 51.25 |
| BLW | (78%), GW (20%), SW (3%). | | | | | | | | | | |

Frequency: Memon *et al.*, (2003) proposed status of wheat weeds based on their frequency as assertive, ascendant, average and below average. The recorded cotton weed species were grouped into aforesaid status given in Table 3.

Average frequency of weed species in the Khairpur district (Table 2 and 3) showed that the most frequently occurring weeds of cotton placed in the "Assertive" category were *Trianthema portulacastrum* (76.88%), *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (73.75%), *Brachiaria eruciformis* (70.63%), *Corchorus aestuans* (68.75%), *Euphorbia serpens* (67.50%) and *Setaria pumila* (61.25%). Ullah *et al.*, (1995) also reported *Trianthema portulacastrum* as dominant weed from cotton fields of the Agronomic Research Station in Bahawalpur.

The weed species placed in the "Ascendant" category were *Cynodon dactylon*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Cleome viscose* and *Cressa cretica*, each with 58.75% of frequency followed by *Eclipta prostrata* (57.50%), *Amaranthus virdis* (56.88%), *Convolvulus arvensis* (54.38%), *Tribulus teresterris* (53.75%), *Cucumis melo* (52.50%), *Digeria muricata* (51.88%), *Launea nudicaulis* and *Xanthium stromarium* (each with 51.25%). The weeds having high percentage of frequency are shown in Fig. 1.

Analysis of density and frequency on Taluka basis as shown in Table 1 and 2 revealed that *Brachiaria eruciformis, Corchorus aestuans, Euphorbia serpens* and *Trianthema portulacastrum* were thickly occupied in Kingri as it is obvious from their density values of 13.00, 14.80, 12.95 and 13.50 respectively. They also occurred frequently having 70%, 75%, 70% and 90% respectively. The density of *Cynodon dactylon* and *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* was 8.75 and 9.40 respectively, each with 60% frequency.

In Taluka Gambat *Corchorus aestuans, Dactyloctenium aegyptium, Euphorbia serpens* and *Trianthema portulacastrum* with 11.90, 14.10, 17.90 and 13.05 densities was found thickly populated, having higher frequency of 65%, 90%, 80% and 70% respectively. *Cynodon dactylon* showed less value of density (6.50) as compared to its frequency (60%).

In Takuka Khairpur *Brachiaria eruciformis, Dactyloctenium aegyptium, Euphorbia serpens* and *Trianthema portulacastrum* with density of 13.40, 11.50, 14.25 and 13.55 respectively were encountered abundant. These weeds were also common having highest frequency of 85%, 70%, 60% and 85% respectively. *Corchorus aestuans* and *Setaria pumila* were found less abundant having density of 7.00 and 5.75 respectively. On the other hand their frequency was high with 70% and 60% respectively.

In Taluka Sobhodero *Brachiaria eruciformis, Dactyloctenium aegyptium, Trianthema portulacastrum* and *Euphorbia serpens* were densely populated having density 11.60, 11.50, 10.55 and 8.60 respectively. Besides, they all were found frequent having 70%, 80%, 60% and 60% frequency respectively.

In Taluka Kotdiji *Euphorbia serpens* with 21.15, *Brachiaria eruciformis* with 19.85, *Trianthema portulacastrum* having 13.50, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* with 11.55 and *Corchorus aestuans* with 10.25 density values were found more abundant. Their frequency was recorded 90%, 85%, 85%, 70% and 80% respectively. Likewise Khairpur *Setaria pumila* accounted for similar values of density (5.75) and frequency (60%).

In Taluka Thari Mirwah heavily populated weeds were *Trianthema portulacastrum* with 16.90 density, followed by *Euphorbia serpens* (13.20), *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (10.60) and *Corchorus aestuans* (9.50). All these weeds showed 75%, 60%, 75% and 70% frequency respectively. *Brachiaria eruciformis* and *Setaria pumila* acquired 60% and 65% frequency as compared to their middling density values of 8.35 and 8.25, respectively. *Cynodon dactylon* having 60% frequency was frequent as compared to its less density value (3.85).

| S. No. | Status | Name of weed species | Frequency |
|------------|---------------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Acceptions | Triand and a set of a set of the | 70 |
| 1. | Assertive | Distribute a portula castrum Linn. | 70.88 |
| 2. | Assertive | Dactyloctenium aegyptium (Linn.) Willd. | /3./5 |
| <i>3</i> . | Assertive | Brachiaria eruciformis (J.E. Sm.) Stap | /0.63 |
| 4. | Assertive | Corchorus aestuans Linn. | 68.75 |
| 5. | Assertive | Euphorbia serpens Kunth. | 67.50 |
| 6. | Assertive | Setaria pumila (Poir.) Roem. & Schult. | 61.25 |
| 7. | Ascendant | Cynodon dactylon (Linn.) Pers. | 58.75 |
| 8. | Ascendant | <i>Cyperus rotundus</i> Linn. | 58.75 |
| 9. | Ascendant | Cleome viscosa Linn. | 58.75 |
| 10. | Ascendant | Cressa cretica Linn. | 58.75 |
| 11. | Ascendant | Eclpta alba (Linn.) Hassk. | 57.50 |
| 12. | Ascendant | Amaranthus virdis Linn. | 56.88 |
| 13. | Ascendant | Convolvulus arvensis Linn. | 54.38 |
| 14. | Ascendant | Tribulus terrestris Linn. | 53.75 |
| 15. | Ascendant | Cucumis melo var. agrestis Naudin. | 52.50 |
| 16. | Ascendant | Digeria muricata (Linn.) Mart. | 51.88 |
| 17. | Ascendant | Launaea procumbens (Roxb.) | 51.25 |
| 18. | Ascendant | Xanthium stromarium Linn. | 51.25 |
| 19. | Average | Phyla nodiflora (Linn.) Greene | 49.38 |
| 20. | Average | Corchorus tridens Linn. | 44.38 |
| 21. | Average | Phragmites australis (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud. | 43.13 |
| 22. | Average | Ipomoea aquatica Forssk. | 42.50 |
| 23. | Average | Conyza bonariensis (Linn.) Cronquist. | 38.13 |
| 24. | Average | Sesbania bispinosa (Jacq.) W. F. Wight. | 37.50 |
| 25. | Average | Alhagi maurorum Medic. | 36.25 |
| 26. | Average | Desmostachya bipinnata (Linn.) Stap. | 35.63 |
| 27. | Average | Atylosia platycarpaBenth. | 30.63 |
| 28. | Average | Pulchea lanceolata (DC.) Oliv. & Hiern. | 30.63 |
| 29. | Average | Celosia argentea Linn. | 29.38 |
| 30. | Below average | Physalis peruviana Linn. | 26.25 |
| 31. | Below average | Crotalaria medicaginea var. medicaginea Lamk. | 8.75 |
| 32. | Below average | Cenchrus ciliaris Linn. | 8.13 |
| 33. | Below average | Mukia maderaspatana (Linn) M. J. Roem. | 8.13 |
| 34. | Below average | Tephrosia villosa (Linn). Pers. | 8.13 |
| 35. | Below average | Bergia aestivosa Wight & Arn. | 7.50 |
| 36. | Below average | Oxvstelma esculentum (L.F.)R.Br. | 5.63 |

Table 3. Status of weeds of cotton crop.

In Taluka Faiz Ganj *Trianthema portulacastrum* and *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* were thickly populated having 15.45 and 13.50 densities respectively. In addition to that they occurred frequently each with 80% of frequency. Similarly *Corchorus aestuans* (9.60) and *Euphorbia serpens* (11.50) were densely populated and common having 70% and 60% frequency respectively. *Cynodon dactylon* showed less value of density (5.75) as compared to its value of frequency (70%).

Table 4. Similarity Index (SI) of weed species of cotton in different Talukas of district Khairpur

| in different Talukas of district Knairpur. | | |
|--|------|--|
| Talukas | SI | |
| Nara-Khairpur | 0.91 | |
| Nara-Kotdiji | 0.91 | |
| Nara-Thari | 0.91 | |
| Nara-FaizGanj | 0.91 | |
| Nara-Sobhodero | 0.87 | |
| Nara-Gambat | 0.91 | |
| Nara-Kingri | 0.89 | |

Table 5. Family importance values (FIV) of cotton weeds.

| | rable 5. ranning | importance values (11) |) of cotton wecus. | |
|-------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| S.No. | Families | Relative diversity | Relative density | FIV |
| 1. | Asteraceae | 13.89 | 9.47 | 23.36 |
| 2. | Aizoaceae | 2.78 | 9.65 | 12.43 |
| 3. | Amaranthaceae | 8.33 | 6.94 | 15.27 |
| 4. | Poaceae | 19.44 | 26.30 | 45.74 |
| 5. | Asclepiadaceae | 2.78 | 0.35 | 3.13 |
| 6. | Convolvulaceae | 8.33 | 8.11 | 16.44 |
| 7. | Cypraceae | 2.78 | 2.86 | 5.64 |
| 8. | Fabaceae | 13.89 | 6.34 | 20.23 |
| 9. | Cucurbitaceae | 5.56 | 3.19 | 8.75 |
| 10. | Caparidaceae | 2.78 | 3.23 | 6.01 |
| 11. | Euphorbiaceae | 2.78 | 8.57 | 11.35 |
| 12. | Tiliaceae | 5.56 | 8.74 | 14.30 |
| 13. | Verbenaceae | 2.78 | 1.86 | 4.64 |
| 14. | Solanaceae | 2.78 | 1.34 | 4.12 |
| 15. | Elatinaceae | 2.78 | 0.91 | 3.69 |
| 16. | Zygophyllaceae | 2.78 | 2.13 | 4.91 |

Table 6. Number of genera and species of weeds representing families of cotton crop.

| S. No. | Family | Genera | Species |
|--------|----------------|--------|---------|
| 1. | Asteraceae | 5 | 5 |
| 2. | Aizoaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 3. | Amaranthaceae | 3 | 3 |
| 4. | Poaceae | 7 | 7 |
| 5. | Asclepiadaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 6. | Convolvulaceae | 3 | 3 |
| 7. | Cypraceae | 1 | 1 |
| 8. | Fabaceae | 5 | 5 |
| 9. | Cucurbitaceae | 2 | 2 |
| 10. | Caparidaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 11. | Euphorbiaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 12. | Tiliaceae | 1 | 2 |
| 13. | Verbenaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 14. | Solanaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 15. | Elatinaceae | 1 | 1 |
| 16. | Zygophyllaceae | 1 | 1 |

-

WEEDS IN COTTON FIELDS OF KHAIRPUR DISTRICT, SINDH, PAKISTAN

In Taluka Nara *Brachiaria eruciformis*, *Euphorbia serpens*, *Setaria pumila*, *Trianthema portulacastrum* and *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* were thickly populated having density values 10.50, 11.30, 8.75, 8.00 and 7.90 respectively and also occurred frequent with frequency of 65%, 60%, 60%, 70% and 65% respectively. *Cynodon dactylon* showed less value of density (4.20) as compared to its frequency (60%).

The above study reveals that *Dactyloctenium aegyptium, Euphorbia serpens* and *Trianthema portulacastrum* having greater values of both density and frequency in all the Talukas. This can be regarded as most devastating weeds of cotton. In Taulka-wise, the other weeds with highest values of both density and frequency include *Brachiaria eruciformis* in Khairpur, Kotdiji, Sobhodero, Kingri and Nara; *Corchorus aestuans* in Kotdiji, Thari Mirwah, Faiz Ganj, Gambat and Kingri and *Setaria pumila* in Nara. Whereas, the weed species with low rating of density but higher frequency were *Corchorus aestuans* in Nara; *Setaria pumila* in Khairpur and Kotdiji and *Cynodon dactylon* in Thari Mirwah, Faiz Ganj, Gambat and Nara.

Among the recorded weed species *Alhagi maurorum, Convolvulus arvensis, Cressa cretica, Cynodon dactylon, Cyperus rotundus, Phragmites australis, Phyla nodiflora* were found common in both the crops because of their perennial life span.

Similarity index (SI): To determine the SI value all Talukas were compared with Nara as it contained more number of species. Like wheat, in cotton Sobhodero also showed dissimilar species having 0.87 SI (Table 4). Which clearly depicted that the rest of the Talukas possessed less dissimilarity among the weed species.

Family importance value (FIV): Poaceae (grasses) represented by seven species and 26.30% of individuals stood first having highest 45.74 FIV. It was followed by Asteraceae and Fabaceae having 23.36 and 20.23 FIVs respectively (Table 5). Family Fabaceae was represented by 5 species with 6.34% of individuals. All 36 weed species were representing 16 families (Table 6). Poaceae having 7 genera each with single species, Fabaceae and Asteraceae with 5 genera each representing single species, Convolvulaceae and Amaranthaceae having 3 genera each with single species, Cucurbitaceae represented by 2 genera each with single species, while Tiliaceae having only 1 genus with 2 species. Whereas, the remaining 9 families were accounted for one genus with single species each. The above study depicts the weed spectrum, density, frequency percentage which shows that different weeds are increasing at an alarming rate in the cotton crop.

While planning weed management one should include not only those species causing the present economic damage but also those present in small numbers with a potential of becoming economically important later on. In this regard list of weeds present in each field and their relative abundance can be used to select the most effective management options. Early recognition of serious weeds invading a new area is also important to prevent them from becoming established. Weed control management can thus be programmed according to the presence of types of weeds for increasing the yield of crops.

There are number of species which are accounted for their high density and frequency in specific fields. The high frequency percentage of some of the species suggests the wider presence of such species in terms of areas. Hence, strategies may be planned to control such species first. More threat to crops can be anticipated from these species.

References

Ali, S.I. and M. Qaiser. 1995-2003. Flora of Pak. Fasciles, Karachi.

- Bhatti, G.R. 2003. Post rain-fall Plant Biodiversity of the Nara desert. Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur and World Wild Fund (WWF) for Nature, Pakistan.
- Bhatti, G.R., M. Shah and R. Qureshi. 2001. *Final Technical Report on Floristic study of Arid zone* (Desert Nara Region), Sindh Pakistan.
- Bhatti, N.M., A.Q. Mahar, A.R. Malik, G.S. Markhand and N. Ismaili. 1993. Weed Flora of Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) fields in District Khairpur. *Scientific Sindh, Ann. Jour. of Res.*, 1: 127-129.
 Boulos, L. 1999. *Flora of Egypt.* Vol. I. (Azollaceae-Oxalidaceae). Al Hadra Publishing, Cairo, Egypt.
- Brohi, R. and M.U. Makhdoom. 1987. Weed Control in Cotton in Sind. Advances in Weed Science, a case of Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. *Proceedings of the Pak-Indo-US Weed Control* Workshop, NARC., Islamabad, Pakistan. 419-428.

Cooke, T. 1903-1906. (Eds.). Flora of Bombay. Bot. Survey of India, Calcutta. Vol. I-III.

- Hussain, M., S.A. Saeed, A. Rao, A. R. Bajwa and M. Yaqub. 1987. Weed Spectrum and Competition in Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). Advances in Weed Science, a case of Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. *Proceedings of the Pak-Indo-US Weed Control Workshop, NARC. Islamabad, Pakistan*, 437-443.
- Jafri, S.M.H. 1966. The Flora of Karachi. The Book Corporation, Karachi, Pakistan.
- Matthew, K.M. 1982-83. *The Flora of the Tamilnadu*. Carnatic Rapinat herbarium; St. Josephs College. Vol. I-III.
- Memon, R.A., G.R. Bhatti and S. Khalid. 2001. Weeds of Cotton Crop in District Khairpur. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 33: 753-759.
- Memon, R.A., G.R. Bhatti and S. Khalid. 2003. Weed diversity of wheat crop in Khairpur District, Sindh. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res., 9(1-2): 99-103.
- Mori, S.A., B.M. Boom, A.M. de Carvalino and T.S. dos Santo. 1983. Ecological importance of Myrtaceae in an Eastern Brazilian Wet forest. *Biotropica*, 15: 68-70.
- Nasir, E. and S.I. Ali. 1970-1994. Flora of Pak. Fasciles, Karachi.
- Odum, E.P. 1971. Fundamentals of Ecology. W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, 574 p.
- Pound, R. and P.E. Clements. 1898. A method of determining the abundance of secondary Weeds species. *Minn. Bot. studies*, 2:19.

Rajbhandari, K.R. and R. Joshi. 1998. *Crop weeds of Nepal*. Kanchan Printing Press, Kathmandu, Nepal. Rizvi, M. 2000. GE-ed cotton alarms farmers, NGOs.

- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1980. *Principles and Procedures of Stastistics*. A Biometrical Approach. McGraw Hill, New York, 2nd Ed.
- Ullah, E., L. Ali and M.S. Cheema. 1995. Screening of Herbicides for weed control in Cotton. In Saeed Ahmed & Muhammad Saeed (Eds.): Weed management for sustainable agriculture. Proceedings of Fourth all Pakistan Weed Science Conference. University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, 191-201.

(Received for publication 14 February 2006)