

INTERACTION BETWEEN CERTAIN HERBICIDES
AND SOIL INSECTICIDES

By

Mohamed Refaat Abd Elmohaimen

B.Sc. (Agriculture)

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfilment of
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Ain Shams University
Faculty of Agriculture
Department Plant Protection

1972



Interaction Between Certain Herbicides

And Soil Insecticides

This Thesis for M.Sc. Degree.

Has been Approved by:

M. H. Zaky
M. R. Al-Badghady
M. S. El-Rif

Committee incharge

Date: / /1972.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his deep appreciation and thanks to Prof. Dr. M.R. Abo El-Ghar, Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture Shebin El-Kom and Head of the plant protection Department, Ain Shams University, for his interest, suggesting the problem guidance, supervising the work and criticism.

Thanks are due to Dr. A.M. Shaaban and Dr. Z.H. Zidan Lecturers, Plant Protection Department, Ain Shams University for supervising their valuable assistance.

Thanks are also extended to Dr. A.A. Selim Lecturer, Plant Protection Department, Ain Shams University for reading the manuscript.

List of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION 	1
 Part I	
Review of Literature 	2
(1) Effect on weeds 	2
(2) Effect on growth and development of plants 	6
(3) Effect on early season pests ...	12
(4) Persistence of pesticides in soil ...	16
 Part II	
Material and Methods 	22
Pesticides Used 	22
(A) Herbicides 	22
(B) Insecticides 	23
The effect of Cotoran, Temik and Di-Syston and their combination on cotton plants...	23
(1) Determination of fresh and dry weights of plants 	25
(2) The effect of Cotoran on weeds...	26
(3) Effect on the growth and develop- ment of cotton plants 	26
(4) Persistence of pesticides in soil	27
(5) Persistence of the after effect of pesticides on wheat as a suc- cessive crop to cotton 	29
(6) Residual effect of Cotoran, Temik, Di-Syston and their combination in cultivated soil 	30
(7) Analytical procedures of pesti- cides 	32
A- Di-Syston 	32
B- Temik (U.C. 21149) 	33
C- Cotoran 	35
 Part III	
Results and Discussion 	42
(I) Effect of Cotoran, Di-Syston, Temik and their combinations on the winter and Summer weeds in cotton fields 	42

(a) Effect on the total fresh weights of winter weeds	42
(i) Effect of Cotoran alone	44
(ii) Effect of Temik/Cotoran combinations	45
(iii) Effect of Di-Syston, Cotoran combinations	48
(b) Effect on the percentage dry weights of winter weeds	50
(c) Effect on the total fresh weights of summer weeds	55
(i) Cotoran herbicidal treatment	55
(ii) Temik-Cotoran and their combinations	59
(iii) Di-Syston, Cotoran and their combinations	60
(d) Effect on the percentage dry weights of summer weeds	62
(II) Effect of Cotoran, Temik, Di-Syston and their combinations on the growth and development of cotton plants	66
(1) Effect on the germination of cotton seeds	66
(2) Effect on the root length of cotton plants	69
(3) Effect on the average stem length of cotton plants	71
(4) Effect on the number of vegetative branches of cotton plants	74
(5) Effect on the number of fruiting branches of cotton plants	76
(6) Effect on the average number of bolls of cotton plants	78
(7) Effect on the fresh weight of stems of cotton plants	81
(8) Effect on the dry weight of stems of cotton plants	83
(9) Effect on the opening of bolls	85

	Page
(10) Effect on yield and lint	87
(11) The effect on wheat sown after cotton treated with Cotoran, Di-Syston, Temik and their combinations ...	88
(III) Effect of Cotoran, Temik, Di-Syston, and their combinations on the early season insects infested cotton plants ...	92
(1) Effect on Thrips	92
(2) Effect on Aphids	94
(IV) Residual interaction between Cotoran, Di-Syston and Temik in cultivated soil under field conditions	98
(1) Persistence of Di-Syston and Temik in soil treated with Cotoran ...	98
i) Effect of concentrations and time after application on the rate of Di-Syston and Temik	98
ii) Effect of Cotoran rates on the persistence of Di-Syston and Temik	101
(2) Persistence of Cotoran in cultivated soil treated with different rates of Di-Syston and Temik	103
i) Effect of concentrations and time after application on the persist- ence of Cotoran	103
ii) Effect of different rates of Di-Syston and Temik on the per- sistence of Cotoran	105
(3) Persistence of Cotoran in wheat fields previously treated in cotton season	108
(V) Residual interaction between Cotoran, with Di-Syston on Temik in soil under laboratory conditions	112
(1) Persistence of Di-Syston and Temik in soil treated with Cotoran ...	112
i) Effect of time after application on the persistence of Di-Syston and Temik	112
ii) Effect of Cotoran rates on per- sistence of Di-Syston and Temik..	114

	Page
(2) Persistence of Cotoran in soil treated with Di-Syston and Temik	117
i) Effect of concentrations and time after application on the persistence of Cotoran	117
ii) Effect of Di-Syston and Temik rates on the persistence of Cotoran ...	119
SUMMARY	122
LITERATURE CITED	133

Part (I)

Review of Literature

(1) Effect on weeds

Counselman et al. (1964) studied the herbicidal activity of chloroxuron (N-4(chlorophenoxy)-phenyl-N,N-dimethyl urea and C-2059 (N'-3-trifluoromethyl-phenyl) N,N-dimethyl urea) in seven areas of the United States. The herbicides were incorporated to a depth of 2 in just before sowing cotton, maize, groundnuts, soybeans, sugar beet, peas, beans, oats and wheat. Pre-emergence and post-emergence treatments were respectively applied 2 and 21 days after sowing. Chloroxuron achieved good control of broad leaved weeds, but not grasses. Better control of grasses than that obtained with either herbicide applied alone was given by chloroxuron 4 ~~g~~ t either CDEC 4.5 ~~g~~ or linuron 1 ~~g~~, applied pre-emergence, and chloroxuron 4 ~~g~~ t either trifluralin 4 ~~g~~ or norea 2 ~~g~~ incorporated, without injury to the crop. C.2059 applied post-emergence showed particular promise for use in cotton and was tolerated by cotton, sorghum, maize and soybeans at rates higher than those required for weed control. C.2059 at 2 ~~g~~ applied pre-emergence gave adequate weed control, whereas cotton and maize tolerated rates up to 15 ~~g~~.

The persistence in soil of monuron, diuron and fenuron applied at 0.8 to 2 ~~#~~ furrow-irrigated cotton annually from 1954 to 61 was studied at several locations in Arizona and California by Aric et al. (1965). The average yield of seed cotton was not affected by repeated application of diuron and monuron whereas annual applications of fenuron at 1.6 ~~#~~ caused a significant reduction in yield for the 8-year period. Mild chlorosis of the foliage occurred in cotton seedlings sown on plots treated the previous four seasons with monuron at 1.6 ~~#~~. Fenuron at 0.8 ~~#~~ caused similar symptoms for 4 to 5 weeks after treatment. Diuron caused no injury to cotton seedlings, but reduced the stand of oats.

It was concluded that diuron and monuron at 1 to 2 ~~#~~ may persist in small amounts from one annual application to the next, but that accumulation of these herbicides is unlikely in the silt loam and sandy loam soils tested. Harris et al. (1965) found that pre-emergence applications of chloropropham at 4 ~~#~~ and diuron at 2-8 ~~#~~ on soils varying between sandy loam and clay loam, and monuron at 2-8 ~~#~~ on heavy clay soils are recommended for the control of small seeded annual weeds. Directed sprays of diuron at 0.2-0.4 ~~#~~ + 0.5% W.P.

in 25 gal. water are recommended for the control of activity growing annual weeds not more than 2 in. high in cotton at least 6 in. high. Diuron may also be applied at lay by to control mid and late germinating weeds, though the full effects of this practice have not been evaluated.

Forester and Stripecke (1966), found that cotoran used as pre-emergence herbicide at a rate of 2.4 kg/ha. gave satisfactory control to Bidens pilosa, Richardia brasiliensis, Ipomea sp., Portulaca oleracea, Acanthospermum hispidum and reasonable control of Cenchrus echinatus, whereas Euphorbia geniculata was resistant.

Rizk et al. (1966) showed that cotoran at the rate of 2 lb/a. was less effective when sprayed on dry soil, while it was very effective when sprayed on moist soil or incorporated into soil under moist or dry conditions. Many investigators found that when the soil remained dry for 6 days after cotoran application, weed control was very poor.

Bradley (1968) stated that cotoran at a rate of 1.5 to 3.0 lb/a. showed that E. colonum and C. distans

were fairly resistant, whereas P. oleracea was well controlled.

Mikhailichenko and Faiziev (1968), concluded that cotoran at 4.5 kg/ha. was effective against annual weeds but not perennial.

In Egypt, Zahran et al. (1968) noticed that application of cotoran either pre-emergence or post-sowing at 3 lb/feddan resulted in a satisfactory weed control. Cotoran activity differs greatly depending upon the method of application.

(2) Effect on growth and development of plants.

In experiments with peas and eggplant Ashdown and Cordner (1952) observed enhanced growth and yields following applications of the diethyloxythio phosphoric acid ester of ethyl mercaptoethanol.

Casida et al. (1952) reported that available phosphorus in soils appeared to decrease the insecticidal effectiveness of Schradan on pea plants grown in soils or nutrient solutions. They also confirmed that plants grown on silica sand to which Schradan was added were more toxic than those grown on soils with smaller particle size than sand and with a higher content of organic matter.

Hasckaylo and Ergle (1955) reported that cotton plants grown in solution cultures containing Schradan, accumulated the insecticide in successively lower concentrations in leaves, roots, bolls, petioles and stems. Relatively low concentrations of Schradan stimulated vegetative development but higher concentrations were phytotoxic to both vegetative and fruiting activity. Increased concentrations of chlorophyll and carotenoid pigments were directly correlated with Schradan treatment.

Anderson et al. (1959) reported that soil treatments with Aldrin, Dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Chlordane, Trithion and Lindane, did not affect yields of butternuts, squash, cabbage, carrots, onions, radishes, sweet corn, tomatoes and turnips. DDT stunted butternut plants but yield reductions were not statistically significant.

Metcalf et al. (1959) conducted experiments using Thimet and Di-syston as dusts, granules, and emulsifiable concentrates applied at planting time or after emergence of pea nuts. They found that plants growing on treated plots yielded more peanuts, but the grains in the yield were most significant.

Everly and Pickett (1960) treated seeds of Sorghum, variety RS 610, with phorate at the rate of 0.5, 1.0, 2.0 and 4.0 pounds of active ingredient per 100 pounds of seed, with and without Arasan 75. They reported that plants produced from seed treated with 0.5 and 1.0 pound rates shed pollen earlier than the untreated plants. Highly significant differences in seed yield were associated with differences in stand. The plots receiving the Phorate treatments had significantly less yield than the untreated plants in the

green-house tests. Germination was reduced by the higher dosages and prolongation of storage for 3 days. Treated seeds, 10 months after storage, showed great reduction in germination. Per cent germination under green-house conditions was highly significantly correlated with the field stand.

Studies were conducted in the green-house by Kirk and Wilson (1960) to determine the relative effects of Phorate, Di-Syston and SD 3562 on the germination of wheat when applied as seed treatment. They reported that both Phorate and SD 3562 were seriously toxic to wheat seed. The latter being most toxic under the test conditions. Di-Syston did not significantly reduce seed viability with rates as high as 1.5 pounds per 100 pounds of seeds.

Allen et al. (1961) found that Heptachlor-fertilizer mixtures applied to the seed furrow for control of the Sugar-beet root maggot, Tetanopus myopaeformis, did not reduce sugar-beet stands significantly. Phytotoxic effects were not serious even under dry soil conditions. When insecticide-fertilizer mixtures were applied to the seed furrow at the rate of 80 pounds per acre.