Effect of Sprayer Nozzle Selection on Improving Weed Control by Maister Power Herbicide and Maize Crop Productivity Mobarak, O. M. M. and S. D. M. Eid Weed Research Central Laboratory, Agriculture Research Center, Giza, Egypt



ABSTRACT

During the last three decades pre-emergence soil acting herbicides were used widely for weed control in maize, but for the role of some of them in environmental pollution, world tended to use new chemical group as post emergence herbicides at reduced rates to limit herbicide inputs in environment as alternatives to such mentioned herbicides. For this reason two field experiments were conducted at Mallawy agriculture research station - El-Minia Governorate, Egypt, during 2014 and 2015 summer seasons, to evaluate three spray volumes using two nozzle types and four Maister power as a new post emergence herbicide rates to control weeds in maize field and their effects on maize productivity. Each experiment included twenty four combination treatments arranged in split-split plot design where spray three volumes i.e. 200, 150, 100 litre/faddan were located in the main plots, two nozzle type i.e. TK1 and flat fan nozzles were located in sub-plots and three Maister power herbicide rates i.e. 500 as recommended rate and reduced rates of 400 and 300 cc/faddan as reduced rates as well as untreated check were located in sub sub-plots. The main findings showed that spray Maister power herbicide by 150 L/faddan water carrier is good from view point of total annual weed control which were reduced by 11.2 and 12 % in 2014 and 2015 seasons, respectively, as compared with 200L/faddan. Spray volume can be increased to 200 L water/faddan in case of grassy weeds dominance in flora composition which existed in experimental fields without any harmful effect on maize plants. TK1 nozzle is preferable than flat fan nozzle type which characterized by its good distribution of herbicide spray solution droplets which reflected in improving weed control by 21.6 and 6.6% and increasing maize grain yield per faddan by 3.5 and 7.87% in 2014 and 2015 seasons, respectively, than the case of flat fan nozzle. Using Maister power at reduced rate of 400 cc/faddan was equal with 500cc/faddan without any significant difference in their control of annual weeds or maize productivity in case of the dominance of Xanthium strumarium L., Euphorbia geniculata L., Corchorus olitorius L. and Portulaca oleracea L. as annual broad-leaved weeds. Echinochola colonum L and Brachiaria reptans as annual grassy weed species. The correlation between weeds and maize yield (ardab/faddan) as well as its components was negative. Thus, the final conclusion indicated that the best alternative for weed control in maize by spraying Maister power herbicide at rate of 400 cc/faddan with 150 L/faddan spray volume. Using TK1 nozzle can improve the efficacy of herbicide application to reduce its rate as compared with recommended rate of this herbicide and, cost and decreasing environmental pollution.

Keywords: Maize, Zea mays L., weed control, TK1, Flat fan, Maister power herbicide and spray volumes.

INTRODUCTION

Maize is the third major cereal crop grown in Egypt after wheat and rice. Weeds are considered to be the most important factor which is responsible for decreasing maize productivity. Weed compete strongly with maize plants for space, light, moisture, nutrients and carbon dioxide, especially in early growth stages which reduced the yield, grain quality and hinder harvest operations and increase the cost of production Rutta et al., (1991). Del Pino and Covarelli (1999) reported that a weed-free duration of 2 - 3 weeks after crop emergence is enough to provide acceptable grain yield. The presence of weeds in maize field cause significant yield losses, up to 30% in the case of renunciation of any kind of protection and herbicide application either pre or post emergence Dogan et al., (2004). Nowadays, post-emergence herbicides can be used as alternative to pre-emergence and soil acting herbicides which causing environmental pollution in China the performance of pre-emergence herbicides is not good due to the adoption of non-tillage techniques in maize production. Maister power (formasulfuron sodium + iodosulfuron methyl-sodium+ thiencarbazonemethyl 4.53 % OD) herbicide as a new post-emergence herbicide used at rate of 500 cm³/faddan for weed control on maize. For minimizing herbicide rate and spray volume nozzle types which give a good distribution of spray droplets can play a role in this situation. Post emergence herbicide at reduced doses is one of the most important tools to limit herbicide input into the environment according to the integrated weed management system Swanton and Weise (1991). High input of herbicides results in environmental pollution

and the development of weed resistance, in addition to the high cost for weed control too. An effective way to reduce the side effect of the herbicide was to apply the lowest dose needed for biologically effective weed control Kudsk and Streibig (2003). Pannacci (2016) found that dose of foramsulfuron can be reduced below recommended dose depending on weed species and growth stage. Foramsulfuron showed a good crop selectivity and without negative effect on maize yield. It is well known that droplet size significantly affects herbicide efficacy Jensen (2006) mentioned that the combinations of herbicides, nozzle type and application parameters (spray volume, droplet size, etc.) can lead to increase of herbicides efficacy against some weed species Sikkema et al., (2008). Lešnik et al., (2005) also demonstrated that certain combinations of herbicides, nozzles and application parameters (spray volume, droplet size, etc.) can lead to reduction of herbicide efficacy against some weed species. Lešnik et al., (2012) showed that the response of different weed species to herbicide application parameters (spray volume, droplet size, etc.) was not uniform, spray volume did not have any significant effect on the efficacy, droplets and higher spray volume decreased the efficacy of the tested herbicide mixtures against grass weeds and increased the efficacy against broad-leaved weeds. In order to maximize herbicidal efficacy, a certain coverage of droplets per unit area of leaf surface must be attained Bode (1987). In general large spray droplets have been shown to provide less area coverage per unit volume compared to smaller spray droplets Spillman (1984). Piggot and Matthews (1999) mentioned that nozzle manufacturers have been designing new types of fan

Mobarak, O. M. M. and S. D. M. Eid

nozzles in order to achieve a coarser spray while maintaining good droplet distribution in order to maximize herbicidal efficacy. Moshtohry and Ammar (2007) found that TK1, flat fan, deflector yellow nozzles can reduce spray volume without any reduction in the weed control efficacy of herbicides compared with hollow cone nozzle. Zaremohazabieh and Ghadiri, (2011) found that maximum weed biomass reduction and the highest maize grain yield were obtained with foramsulfuron herbicide. The use of this herbicide offers the opportunity for a new mode of action for weed management in maize Baghestani et al. (2007). Among post-emergence herbicides in maize, foramsulfuron is a sulfonylurea that exerts its herbicidal activity by inhibiting acetolactate synthase also known as acetohydroxy acid synthase and provides control of grass, perennial and some broadleaved weeds with a good selectivity to the maize Bunting et al., (2005). Pannacci (2016) used MDRE (minimum dose requirement for a satisfactory efficacy of weed control) by optimizing foramsulfuron dose for post-emergence weed control in maize, he found that the herbicide can be reduced depending on floristic composition.

For these reasons, the aim of this investigation was to compare and optimize the efficacy of Maister power rates by the use of two nozzle types (flat-fan and TK1) with the use of various water carrier volumes against weeds associated with maize crop and maize yield and its components.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted at Mallawy Research Station at El-Minia Governorate, Egypt, during 2014 and 2015 summer seasons. Each experiment included combinations of twenty four treatments. The preceding winter crop was sugar beet in both seasons. The soils of this study were silt clay loam texture with 7.99 and 8.14 sand, 53.32 and 54.35 silt and 36.69 and 37.51 clay, pH were 8.01 and 8.14 and organic matter (%) were 1.14 and 1.18 during 2014 and 2015 seasons, respectively. The experimental design was split-split-plot with four replicates was. The main plots included three spray volumes of water, the subplots were assigned by two nozzle types, while, four Maister power herbicide rates were assigned in sub-subplots as follows:

A- Water carrier volume(spray volumes):

1-200 litre/faddan.

2-150 litre/ faddan.

- 3-100 litre/ faddan.
- B- Nozzle type: (The two nozzle obtained from *Teejet*TM)

1. Flat fan (TP 8515).

2. TK1

C- Three Maister power rates: (formasulfuron sodium + iodosulfuron methyl-sodium+ thiencarbazonemethyl 4.53 % OD) known commercially as Maister power applied at 2-6 maize leaves stage as compared with unweeded control check as follows:

 $1-500 \text{ cm}^3/\text{ faddan}.$

 $2-400 \text{ cm}^3/\text{ faddan}.$

 $3-300 \text{ cm}^3/\text{ faddan}.$

4-Unweeded check.

4-Onweeded cheek.

Plot area was 10.5 m^2 (3.5 m length 3.0 m width). Maize hybrid (single cross 128) was planted in both seasons with seed rate of 10 kg/ faddan in hills at 25 cm distance and ridges of 70 cm apart in the first week of June in both seasons. Herbicides treatments were sprayed post-emergence after 15 days from maize planting. A knapsack sprayer (battery sprayer with constant pressure of 5 bar) equipped with one nozzle boom was used. The normal cultural practices for growing maize were applied as recommended for the region (i.e. fertilization, irrigation, pest and diseases control. During growing seasons, the following data were recorded:

A- Weed assesment:

Weeds were hand pulled from one square meter chosen randomly from each plot at 45 days after sowing and weed species identified according to Tackholm (1974), the dry weight of annual broad-leaved, grassy and total annual weeds (g/m^2) was estimated.

B- Yield and yield components:

At harvest, samples of ten maize plants were randomly taken from central area of each plot to study: plant height (cm), ear length (cm), ear diameter (cm), no. of rows ear⁻¹, number of grain ear⁻¹, ear weight (g), grains weight ear⁻¹ (g) and 100- grain weight (g). In addition, grain yield (ardab feddan⁻¹) was estimated from each whole plot.

Data were subjected to analysis of variance as described by Gomez and Gomez (1984). Least significant difference (LSD) test at 0.05 level was used to compare between means of treatments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Weed assessment show that, existed weed species in the experimental site in both seasons were *Xanthium strumarium* L., *Euphorbia geniculata* L., *Corchorus olitorius* L. and *Portulaca oleracea* L. as annual broad– leaved weeds. *Echinochola colonum* L.and *Brachiaria reptans* L. as annual grassy weeds.

I- Effect of spray volume of Maister power on:

1. Fresh weight of annual weeds g/m²

Data in Table 1 show that the effect of spray volume i.e. 200, 150 and 100 l/ fed. of Maister power herbicide solution were not statistically significant in concern of their effects on weight of total annual weeds (g/m^2) , but arrived to level of significance on grassy weeds in 2014 and 2015 seasons and for broad-leaved weeds in 2015 season only. Both 200 and 150 l spray volumes of Maister power herbicide decreased grassy weeds weight (g/m²) significantly by 22.7 and 20.8 % respectively, in 2014 season and 13.5 and 17.7 % respectively, in 2015 season as compared to 100 l/fed. This mean that spray volume increase the efficacy of weed control depending on flora composition in experimental fields either monocot or dicot weed species which may be attributed to spray solution volume interception by grassy weed leaves are lower than broad-leaved weeds because its leaves are erect and leaf blade is narrow that need more solution to be retained in leaf surface. These results are in agreement with those obtained by (Lešnik et al., 2012) they suggested that the optimum water carrier volume depended on weed species specific.

	0113.						
Spray volume (1/fed)	Grassy we	Grassy weeds (g/m ²)		weeds (g/m ²)	Total annual weeds (g/m ²)		
Spray volume (i/reu)	2014	2015	2014	2015	Total annual weeds (2014 20 560.6 53 497.9 46 507.3 47	2015	
200	79.19	107.7	481.4	426.4	560.6	534.1	
150	81.19	102.4	416.1	365.6	497. 9	468.0	
100	102.5	124.5	404.8	355.2	507.3	479.7	
LSD at 0.05	17.95	19.23	NS	70.43	NS	NS	

 Table 1. Effect of spray volume on fresh weight of grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds g/m² in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

In contrary grassy weeds with low spray volume (100 L/fed.) tended to decrease broad leaved-weeds weight (g/m^2) than the other two spray volumes in both seasons and arrived to the level of significance by 16.7% in 2015 season only.

2-yield and yield components:

Concerning yield and its components data in Table 2 cleared that spray volume of herbicide solution didn't affect significantly maize yield/faddan and its components, except with ear weight and grain weight (g)/ear in 2014 season and grain weight (g)/ear and 100grain weight (g) in 2015 season.

Table 2. Effect of spray volume of Maister power herbicide on maize yield and its components in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

Spray volume (l/fed.)	Plant height (cm)	Ear length (cm)	Ear diameter (cm)	No. of rows/ ear	No. of grains/ ear	Ear weight (g)	Grain weight /ear (g)	100-grain weight (g)	Grain yield (ardab/ fed.)
			X	2014	season				
200	282.2	20.45	4.59	13.93	592.9	259.9	229.6	271.5	20.33
150	278.1	20.43	4.59	13.83	592.2	269.5	230.7	270.1	20.31
100	278.4	20.55	4.58	13.80	590.9	258.2	221.5	268.1	20.03
LSD at 0.05	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	10.70	8.45	NS	NS
0.00				2015	season				
200	270.1	19.84	4.33	13.93	576.3	271.5	259.9	229.6	17.82
150	270.8	19.75	4.40	13.91	576.5	270.1	269.5	230.7	18.08
100	269.3	20.01	4.36	13.83	571.1	268.1	258.2	221.5	17.59
LSD at 0.05	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	10.70	8.45	NS
II Dee (e 1 (1	11 02	4 1 01 /	70/	.1 1

II- Effect of nozzle type on:

1. Fresh weight of annual weeds g/m²:

It seemed from Table 3 that the average effects of nozzle types on weed control by Maister power herbicide can be varied from one type to another on different weed categories. TK1 was superior on its effect on weed control by Maister power as compared with flat fan nozzle and reached to the level of significance on their effect on broad-leaved weeds and total annual weeds (g/m^2) in 2014 season which

decreased by 23.4 and 21.7%, respectively, whereas in 2015 season fresh weight of grassy weeds reached to the level of significance and was decreased by 15.5% the in the case of flat fan nozzle. This may be due to TK1 nozzle gave small droplet with good distribution of herbicide solution droplets on treated leaf surface. Figure1 show the droplet size and distribution on water-oil sensitive paper. The figure show that TK1 distribution of spray solution was better than flat-fan nozzle.

Table 3. Effect of nozzle type for herbicide spray solution on fresh weight of grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds g/m² in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

Nozzla typo	Grassy w	eeds (g/m ²)	Broad-leaved	l weeds (g/m ²)	Total annual	Total annual weeds (g/m ²)		
Nozzie type	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015		
Flat Fan	93.7	120.9	491.7	388.7	585.4	509.7		
TK 1	82.0	102.1	376.5	376.1	458.1	478.2		
LSD at 0.05	NS	15.70	69.10	NS	73.53	NS		

	100 L	150 L	200 L
Flat fan			
TK1			

Figure 1. show the distribution and size of spray droplets and herbicide spray solution distribution on water oil sensitive papers.

2- Yield and its components:

Table 4 revealed that the average effect of nozzle types arrived to the level of significance on maize grain yield ardab/faddan and increased grain yield by 3.5 and 7.87 % in the first and second season, respectively. These increments in grain yield are attributed to

significant increments in yield attributes (plant height and ear weight in the first season and ear length, no. of rows/ear, no. of grains/ear, ear weight, grain weight/ear and 100-grain weight in the second season), which may be due to the role of nozzle type in increasing herbicide efficacy of weed control.

тарие п шп	cet of hotel	e cypes of	i maize jien	a unu no e	simponentes	111 20114	ind 2010 5	cusons	
Nozzle type	Plant height (cm)	Ear length (cm)	Ear diameter (cm)	No. of rows /ear	No. of grains/ ear	Ear weight (g)	Grain weight /ear (g)	100-grain weight (g)	Grain yield (ardab/fed.)
				2014	season				
Flat Fan	274.5	20.5	4.6	13.8	588.7	254.8	225.6	39.9	19.9
TK 1	284.9	20.4	4.6	13.9	595.2	270.3	229.0	39.7	20.6
LSD at 0.05	4.43	NS	NS	NS	NS	8.73	NS	NS	0.58
				2015	season				
Flat Fan	268.8	19.69	4.36	13.79	561.3	262.9	194.0	37.24	17.15
TK 1	271.3	20.1	4.38	13.99	588.0	276.9	202.3	38.9	18.5
LSD at 0.05	NS	0.28	NS	0.17	17.43	6.79	5.80	0.86	0.55

Table 4. Effect of nozzle types on maize yield and its components in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

III- Effect of Maister power rates on: 1-Fresh weight of weeds g/m²:

Table 5 and figure 2 show the average effect of Maister power herbicide rates on fresh weight of both grassy and broad-leaved weeds and their total (g/m^2) in both 2014 and 2015 seasons. Increasing herbicide rates caused significant and consistent decrease gradually in weight of various weed categories. The rate of 500 cm³/faddan rates reduced grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds by 89.8, 92.1 and 91.7% in the 2014

season and 86.0, 90.2 and 89.3% in 2015 season. While 400 cm³/faddan reduced grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds by 87.2, 89.6 and 89.2% in the 2014 season and 83.0, 87.1 and 86.3%, respectively, in 2015 season. This may be due to the susceptibility of these three main predominant weeds (*Xanthium strumarium*, *Euphorbia geniculate* and *Echinochola colonum*) to Maister power herbicide which shows that the minimum effective dose was 400 cm³/faddan and gave the similar weed control efficacy to the recommended rate.

 Table 5. Effect of Mayster power rates on fresh weight of grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds g/m² in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

Herbicide rate cm ³ /fed	Grassy we	eeds (g/m ²)	Broad leaved	weeds (g/m ²)	Total annual	weeds (g/m ²)
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
500	24.0	39.1	97.1	99.3	121.1	138.4
400	30.3	47.1	127.4	131.1	157.7	178.2
300	60.73	81.6	285.1	281.0	345.9	362.6
Untreated check	236.3	278.3	1226.7	1018.2	1463.0	1296.4
LSD at 0.05	20.72	22.02	97.7	81.3	104.0	82.9



Figure 2. response of the most dominant weed species in the experiment to different Maister power rates (Xanthium strumarium L., Euphorbia geniculata Echinochola colonum)

2- Maize yield and its components:

Results in Table 6 showed that the average grain yield of maize (ardab/faddan) and its components were affected significantly by Maister power herbicide rates in both growing seasons where it is tended to increase than untreated check. Plant height (cm) increased significantly with treating plots by Maister power rates at 500, 400 and 300 cm³/faddan by 9.37, 7.82 and 3.43% in 2014 and 18.23, 12.52 and 5.26% in 2015 season, respectively, compared to unweeded check.

Herbicide rate	Plant beight	Ear length	Ear diameter	No. of rows/	No. of grains/	Ear weight	Grain weight	100-grain weight	Grain yield
cm ³ /fed	(cm)	(cm)	(cm)	ear	ear	(g)	/ear (g)	(g)	fed.)
				201	4				
500	290.8	21.76	4.75	14.49	652.9	301.8	259.0	42.74	25.32
400	286.6	21.53	4.66	14.31	644.7	293.1	254.6	41.86	24.63
300	275.0	20.24	4.58	13.75	567.8	255.3	220.9	39.59	21.03
Untreated	265.8	18.38	4.34	12.88	502.6	199.9	174.7	35.17	9.09
LSD at 0.05	6.26	0.49	0.07	0.22	15.49	12.35	9.76	1.17	0.81
				201	5				
500	297.9	21.4	4.73	14.45	668.4	306.9	229.3	41.43	21.58
400	283.5	21.12	4.62	14.3	650.3	300.6	225.0	40.58	20.99
300	265.2	19.58	4.3	13.78	549.7	266.9	195.9	38.53	17.82
Untreated	251.9	17.38	3.81	13.04	430.1	206.3	142.5	31.74	10.94
LSD at 0.05	4.27	0.38	0.14	0.24	24.65	9.60	8.20	1.22	0.78

Table 6. Effect of Maister power rate on maize yield and its components in 2014 and 2015 seasons.

Ear length (cm), ear diameter (cm), number of rows/ear number of grains/ear and grain weight/ear had been affected by Maister power herbicides rates, whereas the highest values obtained from Maister power herbicides at rate of 500 and 400 cm³/faddan in both seasons without significant effect.

Grain weight (g)/ear increased significantly by increasing Maister power herbicide rates. The rate of 500 and 400 cm³/faddan increased grain weight (g)/ear by 48.27 and 45.75%, respectively, in 2014 season and 60.93 and 57.9 %, respectively, in 2015 compared with unweeded check.

Data in Table 6 indicated that 100-grain weight (g) affected significantly by Maister power herbicide rates. The highest values obtained from 500 and 400 cm³/faddan which were 42.74 and 41.86 (g), respectively, in 2014 season and 41.43 and 40.58 (g), respectively, in 2015 season without any significant difference between these two rates.

Maize grain yield (ardab/faddan) exceeded significantly under all Maister power herbicide rates compared to untreated check by 178.55, 170.96 and 131.35% at rates 500, 400 and 300 cm3/faddan, respectively, in 2014 season, whereas these respective rates increased grain yield by 137.4, 130.9 and 96.04% in 2015 season. The difference between 500 and 400 cm³/faddan didn't reach the level of significance in both seasons. These increases are owing to the role of this herbicide in minimizing weed competition under the severe level of infestation in untreated check (1463.0 and 1296.4 g/m²) in both seasons respectively, or equal 6.144 and 5.44 ton/faddan which owing to increases in ear weight (g), grain weight/ear (g) and 100-grain weight (g). such results indicated that the mixture of mentioned weed species dominant in experimental field can be controlled easily with reduced rates of Maister power herbicide (400 cm³ /feddan). Silmilar results were obtained by Pannacci (2016).

IV- Effect of interaction between spray volumes and nozzle types on weeds, maize grain yield and its components.

Results indicated that the effect of mentioned interaction didn't arrive to the level of significance at 5% on weeds, maize grain yield and its components, which meaning that the two studied factors act independent.

V- Effect of interaction between nozzle type and Maister power herbicide rates on

1- Weeds fresh weight (g/m^2) :

Table 7 show that the effect of aforementioned interaction on weeds were not statistically significant on grassy, broad-leaved and total annual weeds in 2014 season and grassy weeds in 2015 season, except with broad-leaved and total annual weeds in 2015 season. Spraying Maister power herbicide at rate of 500 or 400 cm³/faddan using TK1 nozzle exhibited the highest reduction on broad-leaved and total annual weeds weight(g/m²) for this reason TK1 nozzle can be recommended to spray post-emergence Maister power herbicide with 400 cm³/faddan to control weeds in maize field wiyh out any significant differences from the recommended rate (500 cm³/faddan).

Table	7. I	Effect	of	interact	ion	between	nozzle	type
	an	id Ma	iste	er powei	· he	rbicide r	ate on	fresh
	W	eight	of	grassy.	bro	oad-leave	d and	total

w	eight of grassy,	broad-leaved	and total
an	nual weeds g/m ² i	n 2014 and 20	015 seasons.
Nozzle	Herbicide rate	Broad	Total annual
type	cm ³ /fed	leaved weeds	weeds
		2015	2015
	500	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	180. 9
Elet Een	400	157.3	219.1
riat raii	300	326.4	414.8
	Untreated Check	941.7	1223.8
	500	69.0	95.9
TV 1	400	104.9	137.3
IKI	300	235.6	310.4
	Untreated Check	1094.7	1369.1
LSD at one		67.8	69.1

2-Maize grain yield and its components:

Results showed that the effect of previous interactions on maize grain yield and its components didn't arrive to the level of significance at 5% level-except plant height in 2015 season, meaning that the two studied factors act independent.

VI- Effect of interaction between spray volume and herbicide rate on weeds and maize grain

Data indicated that the effect of previous interactions on weeds, maize grain yield and its components were statistically significant at 5% level.

VII- Effect of interaction among spray volumes, nozzle type and Maister power herbicide rates:

Results indicated that the effect of interaction between spray volumes, nozzle type and Maister power herbicide rates on weeds or maize crop yield didn't differ significantly in both seasons, but in general spray Maister power herbicide at 400 cm3/faddan using TK1 nozzle with 150 litre/faddan extended highest reduction in total weeds.

VIII- correlation analysis:

Data in Table 8 showed that the correlation analysis between studied weed characteristics and maize yield components characteristics. Results indicated that grain yield ardab/fed. were positively and highly significantly at 0.05 level correlated with maize yield and its components namely plant height (cm), ear length (cm), ear diameter (cm), No. of rows/ear, No. of grains/ ear, ear weight (g), grain weight /ear (g) and 100-grain weight (g) while it was negatively and significantly correlated with broad leaved weeds, narrow leaved weeds and total annual weeds. These cleared that weed population in experimental field exhibited severe effects of competition to maize crop.

Table 0, Correlation analysis between weeks maile view and its components in 2017 and 2013 seaso	Table 8. Correlation	on analysis between	weeds, maize vie	ld and its compon	ents in 2014 and	1 2015 seasons
--	----------------------	---------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------	----------------

$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Characters	Broad leaved weeds (g/m ²)	Total annual weeds (g/m ²)	Plant height (cm)	Ear length (cm)	Ear diameter (cm)	No. of rows/ ear	No. of grains/ ear	Ear weight (g)	Grain weight /ear (g)	100- grain weight (g)	Grain yield (ardab/ fed.)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						2014						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Grassy weeds (g/m ²)	0.882**	0.916 **	- 0.576 **	- 0.751 **	- 0.662 **	- 0. 804**	- 0.811 **	- 0.774 **	- 0.771 **	- 0.714 **	- 0.897 **
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Broad leaved weeds (g/m^2)		0.997 **	- 0.529 **	- 0.789 **	- 0.685 **	- 0.774 **	- 0.777**	- 0.814 **	- 0.820 **	- 0.780 **	-0.901 **
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total annual weeds (g/m ²)			- 0.545 **	- 0.795 **	- 0.693 **	- 0.791 **	-0. 795 **	- 0.821 **	- 0.825 **	- 0.781 **	-0.915 **
Ear length (cm) $0.731 **$ $0.741 **$ $0.850 **$ $0.781 **$ $0.829 **$ $0.754 **$ $0.818 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $0.751 **$ $0.746 **$ $0.695 **$ $0.780 **$ $0.704 **$ $0.741 **$ No. of rows/ear $0.751 **$ $0.764 **$ $0.753 **$ $0.801 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.851 **$ Grain weight (g) $0.764 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.881 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.881 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.881 **$ Io0-grain weight (g) $0.764 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.881 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.841 **$ $0.831 **$ Total annual weeds (g/m ²) $0.994 **$ $-0.717 **$ $-0.828 **$ $-0.759 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.837 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Plant height (cm) $0.744 **$ $-0.855 **$ $-0.773 **$ $-0.766 **$ $-0.837 **$ $-0.837 **$ $-0.987 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $0.744 **$ $-0.764 **$ $-0.733 **$ $0.803 **$ $0.788 **$ $0.773 **$ $-0.766 **$ $-0.837 **$ $-0.837 **$ $-0.987 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $0.789 **$ $0.719 **$ $0.732 **$ $0.807 **$ $0.807 **$ $0.807 **$ $0.808 **$ $0.818 **$ $0.868 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $0.764 **$ $0.798 **$ $0.798 **$ $0.798 **$ $0.799 **$ $0.847 **$ $0.818 **$ $0.868 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $0.764 **$ $0.798 *$	Plant height (cm)				0.617 **	0.573 **	0.598 **	0.639 **	0.599 **	0.639 **	0.586 **	0.591 **
Ear diameter (cm) $0.751 **$ $0.746 **$ $0.695 **$ $0.780 **$ $0.704 **$ $0.741 **$ No. of rows/car $0.881 **$ $0.753 **$ $0.801 **$ $0.708 **$ $0.801 **$ $0.786 **$ $0.851 **$ Ear weight (g) $0.764 **$ $0.764 **$ $0.764 **$ $0.764 **$ $0.786 **$ $0.880 **$ $0.850 **$ Grain weight /ear (g) $0.744 **$ $-0.744 **$ $-0.759 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Grassy weeds (g/m ²) $0.860 **$ $0.910 **$ $-0.744 **$ $-0.813 **$ $-0.759 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.839 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Broad leaved weeds (g/m ²) $0.994 **$ $-0.717 **$ $-0.828 **$ $-0.760 **$ $-0.810 **$ $-0.829 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Total annual weeds (g/m ²) $0.744 **$ $-0.828 **$ $-0.759 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.839 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Plant height (cm) $0.744 **$ $-0.798 **$ $-0.760 **$ $-0.830 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.908 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $-0.740 **$ $-0.744 **$ $-0.760 **$ $-0.830 **$ $0.783 **$ $0.695 **$ $0.697 **$ No. of rows/car $-0.740 **$ $-0.799 **$ $0.733 **$ $0.803 **$ $0.758 **$ $0.783 **$ $0.695 **$ $0.807 **$ Ear diameter (cm) $-0.764 **$ $0.732 **$ <t< td=""><td>Ear length (cm)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.731 **</td><td>0.741 **</td><td>0.850 **</td><td>0.781 **</td><td>0.829 **</td><td>0.754 **</td><td>0.818 **</td></t<>	Ear length (cm)					0.731 **	0.741 **	0.850 **	0.781 **	0.829 **	0.754 **	0.818 **
No. of rows/ear No. of grains/ ear Ear weight (g) Grassy weeds (g/m^2) 0.860** 0.910** -0.744 ** -0.813** -0.759 ** -0.697 ** -0.827 ** -0.839 ** -0.827 ** -0.841 ** -0.905 ** Broad leaved weeds (g/m^2) 0.994 ** -0.717 ** -0.828 ** -0.759 ** -0.697 ** -0.827 ** -0.839 ** -0.841 ** -0.905 ** Broad leaved weeds (g/m^2) 0.994 ** -0.717 ** -0.828 ** -0.754 ** -0.766 ** -0.810 ** -0.839 ** -0.842 ** -0.841 ** -0.905 ** Total annual weeds (g/m^2) 0.994 ** -0.717 ** -0.828 ** -0.754 ** -0.766 ** -0.810 ** -0.839 ** -0.842 ** -0.841 ** -0.905 ** Plant height (cm) 0.740 ** -0.845 ** -0.773 ** -0.765 ** -0.833 ** -0.860 ** -0.859 ** -0.837 ** -0.908 ** Ear length (cm) 0.789 ** 0.719 ** 0.719 ** 0.733 ** 0.803 ** 0.758 ** 0.783 ** 0.6695 ** 0.807 ** Ear length (cm) 0.764 ** 0.732 ** 0.827 ** 0.847 ** 0.850 ** 0.818 ** 0.808 ** Ear diameter (cm) 0.764 ** 0.732 ** 0.827 ** 0.847 ** 0.818 ** 0.868 ** Ear diameter (cm) 0.764 ** 0.732 ** 0.827 ** 0.847 ** 0.818 ** 0.808 ** Ear weight (g) 0.764 ** 0.732 ** 0.827 ** 0.847 ** 0.818 ** 0.818 ** 0.868 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.761 ** 0.777 ** 0.756 ** 0.783 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) 0.836 ** 0.889 ** Ear weigh	Ear diameter (cm)						0.751 **	0.746 **	0.695 **	0.780 **	0.704 **	0.741 **
No. of grains/ ear- $0.788 * * 0.847 * * 0.786 * * 0.850 * 0.850 * 0.850 * 0.871 * 0.731 * 0.731 * 0.851 * 0.731 * 0.851 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.756 * 0.851 * 0.756 * 0.851 * 0.756 * 0.851 * 0.851 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.751 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.821 * 0.821 * 0.905 * 0.905 * 0.994 * 0.717 * 0.717 * 0.755 * 0.755 * 0.755 * 0.755 * 0.755 * 0.839 * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.821 * 0.799 * 0.799 * 0.794 * 0.828 * 0.761 * 0.777 * 0.756 * 0.783 * 0.821 * 0$	No. of rows/ear							0.881 **	0.753 **	0.801 **	0.708 **	0.851 **
Ear weight (g) Grain weight /ear (g) $0.764 **$ $0.703 **$ $0.871 **$ 100-grain weight (g) $0.864 **$ $0.843 **$ 2015 $0.860 **$ $0.910 **$ $-0.744 **$ $-0.813 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.829 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Broad leaved weeds (g/m ²) $0.994 **$ $-0.717 **$ $-0.828 **$ $-0.759 **$ $-0.697 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Total annual weeds (g/m ²) $0.994 **$ $-0.717 **$ $-0.828 **$ $-0.754 **$ $-0.765 **$ $-0.839 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.842 **$ $-0.818 **$ $-0.828 **$ Total annual weeds (g/m ²) $0.740 **$ $-0.818 **$ $-0.773 **$ $-0.765 **$ $-0.839 **$ $-0.827 **$ $-0.841 **$ $-0.905 **$ Plant height (cm) $-0.740 **$ $-0.845 **$ $-0.773 **$ $-0.765 **$ $-0.830 **$ $0.850 **$ $0.897 **$ $-0.908 **$ Ear length (cm) $-0.764 **$ $0.732 **$ $0.827 **$ $0.860 **$ $0.850 **$ $0.818 **$ $0.868 **$ No. of rows/ear $-0.744 **$ $0.798 **$ $0.709 **$ $0.777 **$ $0.756 **$ $0.783 **$ No. of grains/ ear $-0.830 **$ $0.837 **$ $0.837 **$ $0.837 **$ $0.838 **$ Ear weight (g) $-0.836 **$ $0.889 **$ $0.906 **$ I00-grain weight (g) </td <td>No. of grains/ ear</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.788 **</td> <td>0.847 **</td> <td>0.786 **</td> <td>0.850 **</td>	No. of grains/ ear								0.788 **	0.847 **	0.786 **	0.850 **
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ear weight (g)									0.764 **	0.703 **	0.871 **
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Grain weight /ear (g)										0.864 **	0.843 **
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	100-grain weight (g)											0.781 **
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						2015						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Grassy weeds (g/m ²)	0.860**	0.910 **	- 0.744 **	- 0.813 **	- 0.759 **	- 0.697 **	- 0.827 **	- 0.839 **	- 0.827 **	- 0.841 **	- 0.905 **
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Broad leaved weeds (g/m^2)		0.994 **	- 0.717 **	- 0.828 **	- 0.754 **	- 0.760 **	- 0.810 **	- 0.839 **	- 0.842 **	- 0.811 **	- 0.882 **
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total annual weeds (g/m ²)			- 0.740 **	- 0.845 **	- 0.773 **	- 0.765 **	- 0.833 **	- 0.860 **	- 0.859 **	- 0.837 **	- 0.908 **
Ear length (cm)- $0.764 * * 0.732 * * 0.827 * 0.827 * 0.847 * 0.850 * 0.818 * 0.868 * 0.868 * 0.818 * 0.868 * 0.818 * 0.868 * 0.818 * 0.868 * 0.818 * 0.818 * 0.868 * 0.818 * 0.819 * 0.799 * 0.798 * 0.790 * 0.784 * 0.819 * 0.799 * 0.799 * 0.761 * 0.777 * 0.756 * 0.783 * 0.827 * 0.828 * 0.761 * 0.777 * 0.756 * 0.783 * 0.827 * 0.830 * 0.837 * 0.837 * 0.832 * 0.880 * 0.837 * 0.837 * 0.832 * 0.808 * 0.898 * 0.906 * 0.898 * 0.898 * 0.906 * 0.898 * 0.898 * 0.899 * 0.906 * 0.898 * 0.898 * 0.897 * 0.837 $	Plant height (cm)				0.789 **	0.719 **	0.733 **	0.803 **	0.758 **	0.783 **	0.695 **	0.807 **
Ear diameter (cm) - 0.744 ** 0.798 ** 0.790 ** 0.819 ** 0.819 ** 0.799 ** No. of rows/ear - 0.828 ** 0.761 ** 0.777 ** 0.756 ** 0.783 ** No. of grains/ ear - 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) - 0.898 ** 0.849 ** 0.906 ** Grain weight /ear (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 ** 100-grain weight (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 **	Ear length (cm)					0.764 **	0.732 **	0.827 **	0.847 **	0.850 **	0.818 **	0.868 **
No. of rows/ear - 0.828 ** 0.761 ** 0.777 ** 0.756 ** 0.783 ** No. of grains/ ear - 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.880 ** Ear weight (g) - 0.898 ** 0.849 ** 0.906 ** Grain weight /ear (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 ** 100-grain weight (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 **	Ear diameter (cm)						0.744 **	0.798 **	0.790 **	0.784 **	0.819 **	0.799 **
No. of grains/ ear - 0.830 ** 0.837 ** 0.832 ** 0.800 ** Ear weight (g) - 0.898 ** 0.849 ** 0.906 ** Grain weight /ear (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 ** 100-grain weight (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 **	No. of rows/ear							0.828 **	0.761 **	0.777 **	0.756 **	0.783 **
Ear weight (g) - 0.898 ** 0.849 ** 0.906 ** Grain weight /ear (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 ** 100-grain weight (g) - 0.871 **	No. of grains/ ear								0.830 **	0.837 **	0.832 **	0.880 **
Grain weight /ear (g) - 0.836 ** 0.889 ** 100-grain weight (g) - 0.871 **	Ear weight (g)									0.898 **	0.849 **	0.906 **
100-grain weight (g) - 0.871 **	Grain weight /ear (g)										0.836 **	0.889 **
	100-grain weight (g)											0.871 **

CONCLUSION

To maximize the efficiency of post-emergence Maister power herbicide against annual weeds in maize field and reduce its rate by 20% of the recommended rate it could be concluded that using TK1 nozzle for spray the herbicide with good distribution of small droplets and using 150 litre water/faddan as herbicide carrier.

REFERENCES

- Baghestani, M; Zand E.; Soufizadeh S.; Eskandari A.; Pourazar R.; Veysi M.; and Nassirzadeh N. (2007). Efficacy evaluation of some dual-purpose herbicides to control weeds in maize (*Zea mays*). Sci. Direct 6:936-942.
- Bode, L.E. (1987). Spray application technology. In: Methods of applying herbicides, WSSA Monograph 4 (ed. by McWhorter C.G. and Gebhardt M.R.). Weed Science Society of America, Champain, IL, 85–110.

- Bunting, J.A.; Sprague C.L. and Riechers D.E. (2005). Incorporating foramsulfuron into annual weed control systems for corn. Weed Techn 19: 160-167.
- Del Pino, A. and Covarelli G. (1999). Critical period of weed competition in maize. In: proce. of the 11th EWRS (European Weed Research Society) Symp., Basel, Switzerland, 68.
- Dogan M.N.; Unay A.; Boz O. and Albay F. (2004). Determination of optimum weeds control timing in maize (*Zea mays* L.). Turk. J. Agric. 28: 349-354.
- Gomez, K.A. and Gomez A.A. (1984): Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research. John Wiely and Sons. Toronto
- Jensen, P. K. (2006). Influence of volume rate on herbicide efficacy of flat fan, low-drift and air induction nozzles under field conditions - Aspects of Applied Biology -International Advances in Pesticide Application. – 2006, 77: 439–444.

- Kudsk, P. and Streibig J.C., (2003). Herbicides-a-twoedged sword. Weed Res. 43: 90-102.
- Lešnik, M.; Vajs S.; Leskošek G. and Simončič A. (2005). The impact of nozzle types (standard vs. drift-reducing) on biotical efficacy of herbicides applied for control of weeds in maize. Proc. of 7th Slovenian Plant Protec. Conf. – Zreče, Slovenia, p. 80–90.
- Lešnik, M., Kramberger B. and Vajs S. (2012). The effects of drift-reducing nozzles on herbicide efficacy and maize (*Zea mays* L.) yield. Žemdirbystė Agric., 99 (4): 371–378.
- Moshtohry, M. R. and Ammar A. E. (2007). Effect of nozzle types, spray volumes and rate of glyphosate on droplet sizes and its efficiency on weed control in citrus orchards. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 32 (7): 5623-5634.
- Pannacci, E. (2016). Optimization of foramsulfuron doses for post-emergence weed control in maize (*Zea mays* L.). Spanish J. of Agric. Res., 14(3), 1-9.
- Piggott, S. and Matthews G.A. (1999). Air induction nozzles: a solution to spray drift? Int. Pest Control 41: 24–28.

- Rutta, A.; Vanderlip R. L.; Higgins R. A.; Moshier I. J. and Feyerherym A. M. (1991). Suitability of corn growth models for incorporation of weed and in set stress.Agron. J., 83: 757-763.
- Sikkema, P. H.; Brown L.; Shropshire C.; Spieser H. and Soltani N. (2008). Flat fan and air-induction nozzles affect soybean herbicide efficacy. Weed Biology and Management. 8 (1): 31–38.
- Spillman, J.J. (1984). Spray impaction, retention, and adhesion: an introduction to basic characteristics. Pestic. Sci. 15: 97–106.
- Swanton, C.J. and Weise, S.F., (1991). Integrated weed management: the rationale and approach. Weed Technol. 5: 657-663
- Täckholm, V. (1974). Students' Flora of Egypt. Second edition Published by Cairo University, Printed by Cooperative Printing Company Beirut. 887p.
- Zaremohazabieh, S. and Ghadiri H. (2011). Effects of rimsulfuron, foramsulfuron and conventional herbicides on weed control and maize yield at three planting dates. J. Biol. Environ. Sci., 5 (14): 47-56.

تأثير إختيار بشبوري الرشاشة علي تحسين مكافحة الحشائش باستخدام مبيد مايستر باور وانتاجية محصول الذرة الشامية أحليه المستحدين التسمين في المستحدين من عد

أسامه ماهر محمود مبارك وسعيد ضاحي محمد عيد المعمل المركزي لبحوث الحشائش- مركز البحوث الزراعية- الجيز ة- مصر

تم إقامة تجربتان حقليتان بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بملوي- محافظة المنيا خلا الموسمين الصيفيين 2014-2015 بهدف تقييم فاعلية مبيد مايستر باور باستخدام حجوم محلول رش مختلفة وبشابير معينة علي مكافحة الحشائش وانتاجية محصول الذرة الشامية ومكوناته. اشتملت كل تجربة علي عدد 24 معاملة في تصميم قطع منشقة مرتين عبارة عن التوافيق بين ثلاث معدلات من حجم محلول الرش للمبيد وهي 200، 100 و 100 لتر ماء/فدان في القطع الرئيسية ونو عين من البشابير وهما TK1 و Flat fan في القطع الشقية الرش للمبيد وهي 200، 100 و 100 لتر ماء/فدان في القطع الرئيسية ونو عين من البشابير وهما TK1 و Flat fan في القطع الشقية الأولي وأربع معدلات مبيد مايستر باور 500، 400 و 300 سم²/فدان ومعاملة الكنترول في القطع الشقية اثانية لدراسة تأثير ذلك علي مكافحة الحشائش وإنتاجية محصول الذرة الشامية. وكانت أهم النتائج كما يلي:- أن أنسب حجم لمحلول الرش لمبيد مايستر باور كان بمعدل 100 لترماء/فدان لمكافحة الحشائش الحولية العريضة الأوراق (الشبيط – الشربة- الرجلة- الملوخية) السائدة في حقول الذرة الشامية ويمكن زيادتها الي 200 لتر ماء/فدان في حالة سيادة الحريضة الأوراق (المبيط – الشربة- الرجلة- الملوخية) السائدة في حقول الذرة معدل 110 عن بشبوري معدار المكافحة الحشائش الحولية العريضة الأوراق (المبيد – الشربة- الرجلة- الملوخية) السائدة في حقول الذرة الشامية ويمكن زيادتها الي 200 لتر ماء/فدان في حالة سيادة الحشائش النجيلية (أبو ركبة- حشيشة الار انب).- يفضل إستخدام بشبوري محصول الذرة الشامية بمقدار 2,10 و 6,6 % وزيادة محصول الذرة بنسبة 3,3 7,87 % في موسمي 2014 و 2015 على الترتيب.-محصول الذرة الشامية بمقدار 2,10 و 6,6 % وزيادة محصول الذرة بنسبة 3,3 7,87 % في موسمي والى و 2015 على الترتيب.-يمكن استخدام ميد مايستر باور في الذرة الشامية بمعدل منخفض (400 سم³، لمودان) باستخدام بشبوري المكنورة مكافحة المناتية معادل معدوي في نسبة 1,80 7,87 % في موسمي والى و رالتي تقترب من نسبة مرورة مكافحة الناتية ما 200 س³، في هذا السامية معدوي في نسبة المكافحة أومحصول حبوب الذرة الشامية مما يشير إلى مرورة مكافحة الماستر باور في الذرة الشامية معدوي في نسبة المكافحة أومحصول حبوب الذرة الشامية مما يشير إلى مرورة مكافحة الحشائش في هذا المحصول.- اتضح من تحليل الإرتباط أن هناك ارتبط معنوي سال بين مالمية ال