



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**INFLUENCE OF PHYSICAL SPRAY CHARACTERISTICS AND  
PRESENCE OF GLYPHOSATE IN ENHANCING THE  
PERFORMANCE OF METSULFURON-METHYL AGAINST  
WOODY BORRERIA (DIODIA OCIMIFOLIA)**

**OOI KOK ENG**

**FP 1999 21**

**INFLUENCE OF PHYSICAL SPRAY CHARACTERISTICS AND  
PRESENCE OF GLYPHOSATE IN ENHANCING THE PERFORMANCE  
OF METSULFURON-METHYL AGAINST  
WOODY *BORRERIA* (*Diodia ocimifolia*)**

**OOI KOK ENG**

**MASTER OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE  
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA  
1999**



**INFLUENCE OF PHYSICAL SPRAY CHARACTERISTICS AND  
PRESENCE OF GLYPHOSATE IN ENHANCING THE PERFORMANCE  
OF METSULFURON-METHYL AGAINST  
WOODY *BORRERIA* (*Diodia ocimifolia*)**

**By**

**OOI KOK ENG**

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Agricultural Science in the Faculty of Agriculture,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**January 1999**



Dedicated to :

**My father and mother,  
wife and daughter,  
brother and sisters  
and friends**

Thank you and I love you all



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The undertaking and completion of this programme would not have been possible without the support of my employers, DuPont Far East Inc., Malaysia Branch. To them I am most grateful for permission, financial support, facilities and most important, time to see me through the programme in a relatively compressed period.

I would like to thank the Chairman of the Supervisory Committee, Associate Prof. Dr. Rajan Amartalingam for his advice, guidance and unwavering encouragement throughout the course of this study.

Sincere thanks and appreciation are also extended to the other member of my Supervisory Committee Associate Prof. Dr Dzolkhifli Omar for advice regarding the application technique; and Associate Prof. Dr. Mohd Ridzuan Abd Halim for guidance on the statistical analysis in this study.

And finally, my gratitude to all staff at the Toxicology Laboratory for kindly providing their services and assistance throughout the course of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	iii
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	vi
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	x
	<b>LIST OF PLATES</b> .....	xii
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	xiv
	<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	xv
	<b>ABSTRAK</b> .....	xviii
 <b>CHAPTER</b>		
I	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II	LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
	<i>Diodia ocimifolia</i> .....	6
	Metsulfuron-methyl .....	10
	Effects of Droplet Size and Carrier Volume on Foliage Applied Herbicide Performance.....	12
	Droplet Size and Carrier Volume Effects on Canopy Penetration and Impaction.....	16
	Droplet Size and Carrier Volume Effects on Spray Retention .....	21
	Droplet Size and Carrier Volume Effects on Foliar Uptake.....	24
	Surfactants.....	26
	Organosilicone Surfactants.....	28
	Herbicide Interaction Response.....	31
	Present Status.....	31
	Importance of Herbicide Mixtures.....	32
	Development of Terminology.....	33
	The History of Herbicide Mixtures.....	36
	Analysis of Mixture Interactions.....	43
III	EXPERIMENT 1: INFLUENCE OF DOSAGE, CARRIER VOLUME AND SURFACTANT ON <i>D.</i> <i>OCIMIFOLIA</i> CONTROL.....	50
	Materials and Methods.....	50
	Study Location.....	50
	Measurement of Droplet Size.....	50
	Measurement of Spray Coverage.....	52
	Selection of Test Species.....	53
	Establishment of <i>Diodia</i> Seedlings.....	53
	Spray Retention Study.....	54



	Preparation of Fluoresceine Standard Curve.....	55
	Application of Treatments.....	56
	Measurements and Observations.....	56
	Data Analysis.....	58
	Results and Discussion.....	58
<b>IV</b>	<b>EXPERIMENT 2: EFFECT OF METSULFURON-METHYL ON <i>D. OCIMIFOLIA</i> SEEDLING MORTALITY AND SEED PRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>72</b>
	Materials and Methods.....	72
	Study Location .....	72
	Establishment of <i>Diodia</i> Seedlings.....	72
	Application of Treatments.....	73
	Measurements and Observations.....	75
	Data Analysis.....	76
	Results and Discussion.....	76
<b>V</b>	<b>EXPERIMENT 3: INTERACTION EFFECTS OF METSULFURON-METHYL AND GLYPHOSATE MIXTURES ON <i>D. OCIMIFOLIA</i>.....</b>	<b>86</b>
	Materials and Methods.....	86
	Study Location.....	86
	Establishment of <i>Diodia</i> Seedlings.....	86
	Application of Treatments.....	
	Measurements and Observations.....	90
	Data Analysis.....	91
	Results and Discussion.....	92
<b>VI</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>106</b>
	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>109</b>
	<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>124</b>
	<b>VITA .....</b>	<b>147</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Herbicides used to control <i>D. ocimifolia</i> .....	9
2	Methods to evaluate the response of herbicide mixtures.....	48
3	Spray parameter set used in this experiment .....	51
4	Characteristics of spray droplets obtained using different nozzles, carrier volume and spray pressures..	59
5	The effect of carrier volume and surfactant on percent spray retention.....	61
6	The effect of metsulfuron-methyl and carrier volume on fresh weight and percent inhibition of <i>D. ocimifolia</i> ..	67
7	The effect of carrier volume and surfactant on fresh weight and percent inhibition of <i>D. ocimifolia</i> .....	69
8	The effect of metsulfuron-methyl and surfactant on fresh weight and percent inhibition of <i>D. ocimifolia</i> .....	70
9	Herbicide treatments - metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate applied alone.....	88
10	Herbicide treatments - metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate mixtures.....	89
11	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl in the presence and absence of surfactant on <i>Diodia</i> growth expressed as percent of control .....	93
12	Effect of glyphosate in the presence and absence of surfactant on <i>Diodia</i> growth expressed as percent of control .....	97
13	Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:36 mixture, in the presence of surfactant).....	99





<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
14 Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:72 mixture, in the presence of surfactant).....	100
15 Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:18 mixture, in the presence of surfactant).....	101
16 Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:36 mixture, without surfactant).....	102
17 Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:72 mixture, without surfactant).....	102
18 Interaction effects between metsulfuron-methyl (M) and glyphosate (G) (1:18 mixture, without surfactant).....	103
19 Spray retention study.....	125
20 Interaction of rate, carrier volume and surfactant of fresh weight.....	125
21 Interaction of rate, carrier volume and surfactant on percent inhibition.....	126
22 Height of plants treated at flowering stage 2 WAA.....	127
23 Height of plants treated at flowering stage 4 WAA.....	127
24 Height of plants treated at vegetative stage 2 WAA.....	128
25 Height of plants treated at vegetative stage 4 WAA.....	129
26 Percent inhibition of plants treated at flowering stage 2 WAA .....	130



<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
27	Percent inhibition of plants treated at flowering stage 4 WAA..... 130
28	Percent inhibition of plants treated at vegetative stage 2 WAA..... 131
29	Percent inhibition of plants treated at vegetative stage 4 WAA..... 131
30	Seed production of plants treated at flowering stage ... 132
31	Seed production of plants treated at vegetative stage.. 133
32	Percent germination of plants treated at flowering stage..... 133
33	Percent germination of plants treated at vegetative stage..... 134
34	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 1.87 g/ha..... 135
35	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 3.75 g/ha..... 135
36	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 7.5 g/ha..... 135
37	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 15 g/ha..... 136
38	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 30 g/ha..... 136
39	Growth as % control of plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 60 g/ha..... 136
40	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 33.75 g/ha..... 137
41	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 67.5 g/ha..... 137



<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
42	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 135 g/ha.....	137
43	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 270 g/ha.....	138
44	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 540 g/ha.....	138
45	Growth as % control of plants treated with glyphosate at 1080 g/ha.....	138



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Structural formula of metsulfuron-methyl.....	10
2	Simplified scheme of the biosynthetic pathway of branched chain amino acid synthesis, showing the site of action of metsulfuron-methyl.....	12
3	Structure of organosilicone surfactants.....	28
4	Graphical expression of plant responses to herbicide mixtures.....	35
5	The interaction of metsulfuron-methyl dosage and carrier volume on <i>D. ocimifolia</i> fresh weight with 0.25 % surfactant. (Best fit model, $Y = 32.1 - 2491.6X_1 - 54306.4X_1^2 + 2.9X_2 - 77.8 X_1^2 X_2$ , $r^2 = 0.95$ ) .....	62
6	The interaction of metsulfuron-methyl dosage and carrier volume on <i>D. ocimifolia</i> fresh weight without surfactant. (Best fit model, $Y = 31.7 - 2547.4X_1 - 55205.4X_1^2 + 3.5X_2 - 95.2 X_1^2 X_2$ , $r^2 = 0.98$ ).....	63
7	The interaction of metsulfuron-methyl dosage and carrier volume on <i>D. ocimifolia</i> percent inhibition with 0.25 % surfactant. (Best fit model, $Y = 2.5 + 4365.6X_1 - 47170.4X_1^2 - 0.006X_1X_2 - 0.1 X_1^2 X_2^2$ , $r^2 = 0.98$ ) .....	64
8	The interaction of metsulfuron-methyl dosage and carrier volume on <i>D. ocimifolia</i> percent inhibition without surfactant. (Best fit model, $Y = 2.5 + 4621.8X_1 - 56175.2X_1^2 - 5.7X_1X_2 - 195.3 X_1^2 X_2^2$ , $r^2 = 0.98$ ) .....	65
9	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl on plant height of <i>Diodia</i> treated at two growth stages.....	77
10	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl on percent inhibition of <i>Diodia</i> treated at two growth stages.....	78



<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page</b>
11	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl on seed production in <i>Diodia</i> treated at two growth stages.....	83
12	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl on percent germination of <i>Diodia</i> seeds from plants treated at two growth stages.....	84
13	Dose response relationship with metsulfuron-methyl on <i>Diodia</i> in the presence and absence of surfactant.....	94
14	Dose response relationship with glyphosate on <i>Diodia</i> in the presence and absence of surfactant.....	96
15	Derived regression models illustrating dose-response isoboles for metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate in the presence of surfactant.....	104
16	Derived regression models illustrating dose-response isoboles for metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate in the absence of surfactant.....	104



## LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Page
1	Nozzles used in Experiment 1.....	52
2	<i>Diodia</i> seedlings at 2 weeks after sowing.....	54
3	Knapsack sprayer used in the experiments treatments.....	57
4	<i>Diodia</i> seedlings ready for treatment.....	57
5	Distribution of spray deposits on water-sensitive paper for nozzle (A) XR11001, (B) XR11002, (C) XR1106 and (D) XR11008.....	60
6	The effect of carrier volume in the presence of surfactant on percent inhibition of <i>Diodia</i> plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 30 g/ha 28 days after spraying.....	68
7	The effect of carrier volume in the absence of surfactant on percent inhibition of <i>Diodia</i> plants treated with metsulfuron-methyl at 30 g/ha 28 days after spraying.....	68
8	<i>Diodia</i> seedling at vegetative stage.....	74
9	<i>Diodia</i> seedling at flowering stage.....	74
10	The effect of metsulfuron-methyl dosage on <i>Diodia</i> plants at vegetative stage 28 days after spraying.....	80
11	The effect of metsulfuron-methyl dosage on <i>Diodia</i> plants at flowering stage 28 days after spraying.....	80
12	Untreated <i>Diodia</i> at flowering stage.....	81
13	Flower abscission caused by metsulfuron-methyl.....	81
14	The growth of side shoots on the main stem.....	83



<b>Plate</b>		<b>Page</b>
15	Effect of metsulfuron-methyl dosage on <i>Diodia</i> 14 days after spraying.....	95
16	Effect of glyphosate dosage on <i>Diodia</i> 14 days after spraying.....	98



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

m <sup>2</sup>	= Square metre
%	= Percentage
cm	= Centimetre
kg	= Kilogram
a.i	=Active ingredient
L	= Litre
ha	= Hectare
μm	= Micrometre
m	= Metre
h	= Hour
μl	= Microlitre
°C	= Degree centigrade
w/v	= Weight per volume
v/v	= Volume per volume
DAS	= Days after spraying
WAA	= Weeks after application
w/w	= Weight over weight
ID	= Inhibitory dosage



Abstract of thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Agricultural Science

**INFLUENCE OF PHYSICAL SPRAY CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESENCE OF GLYPHOSATE IN ENHANCING THE PERFORMANCE OF METSULFURON-METHYL AGAINST WOODY BORRERIA (*Diodia ocimifolia*)**

by

**Ooi Kok Eng**

**January 1999**

**Chairman : Associate Prof. Dr Rajan Amartalingam**

**Faculty : Agriculture**

Influence of physical spray characteristics (carrier volume, herbicide dosage and surfactant) and presence of glyphosate on the performance of metsulfuron-methyl against woody borreria (*Diodia ocimifolia*) was studied in the glass house. The activity of metsulfuron-methyl on *Diodia ocimifolia* was influenced by herbicide dosage, carrier volume, surfactant and the interaction of these factors. The performance of metsulfuron-methyl increased as herbicide dosage increased irrespective of carrier volume. The results indicated that 30 g/ha metsulfuron-methyl was required for effective control of *Diodia*. A significant decrease in performance of metsulfuron-methyl was observed as the carrier volume increased from 200 to 600 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. The presence of surfactant increased the activity of



metsulfuron-methyl against *Diodia* at carrier volumes of 400 and 600 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. However, the results did not indicate loss in herbicide performance for carrier volume less than 200 L ha<sup>-1</sup> in the absence and presence of surfactant. These observed responses were further illustrated using models obtained by linear regression analysis. Metsulfuron-methyl applied to *D. ocimifolia* at both growth stages caused seedling mortality and reduced seed production. *Diodia ocimifolia* was more susceptible at the vegetative stage compared to the flowering stage. Shoot tip growth was arrested at low dosage of 3.75 g/ha. However, metsulfuron-methyl dosage required for complete kill of *Diodia* seedlings was 15 g/ha at the vegetative stage and 30 g/ha at the flowering stage. Metsulfuron-methyl applied at the flowering stage caused flower abscission but did not inhibit germination of seeds collected from treated plants. Metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate mixtures at all ratios were more effective than the herbicides used alone. At low rates of metsulfuron-methyl (3.75 and 15 g/ha), the response in the presence of glyphosate (135 and 540 g/ha) with and without surfactant (1:36 mixtures) was synergistic or additive. However, in the 1:72 mixture the interaction response became additive. The same response was obtained with the 1:18 mixture. The results indicate that the appropriate combination for optimum performance is the 1:36 mixture both in the presence and absence of surfactant. The percent inhibition data expressed graphically using isobole method showed synergistic interaction

between metsulfuron-methyl and glyphosate in the presence and absence of surfactant.

Abstrak tesis ini diserahkan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi syarat untuk mendapatkan Ijazah Master Sains Pertanian

**PENGARUH CIRI FIZIKAL SEMBURAN DAN PENAMBAHAN  
GLIFOSAT TERHADAP PENINGKATAN KEBERKESANAN  
METSUFURON-METIL KE ATAS  
'WOODY BORRERIA' (*Diodia ocimifolia*)**

Oleh

Ooi Kok Eng

Januari 1999

**Pengurus** : Prof. Madya Dr Rajan Amartalingam

**Fakulti** : Pertanian

Kesan ciri-ciri fizikal penyemburan (isipadu semburan, kadar racun herba and surfaktan) dan penambahan glifosat dalam meningkatkan keberkesanan metsufuron-metil ke atas 'woody borreria' (*Diodia ocimifolia*) telah dikaji di rumah kaca. Keberkesanan metsufuron-metil ke atas *D. ocimifolia* dipengaruhi oleh kadar racun herba, isipadu semburan, surfaktan dan interaksi antara tiga faktor tersebut. Keberkesanan metsulfuron-metil meningkat dengan meningkatnya kadar racun herba. Keputusan diperolehi menunjukkan 30 g/ha metsulfuron-metil diperlukan untuk memberi kawalan yang berkesan ke atas *Diodia*. Keberkesanan metsulfuron-metil menurun dengan meningkatnya isipadu semburan dari 200 ke 600 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. Kehadiran surfaktan meningkatkan keberkesanan



metsulfuron-metil ke atas *Diodia* pada isipadu semburan 400 dan 600 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. Namun, kehadiran surfaktan pada isipadu semburan 200 L ha<sup>-1</sup> tidak menunjukkan sebarang perubahan ke atas keberkesanan metsulfuron-metil. Pemerhatian terhadap respon tersebut kemudian telah diilustrasikan secara model dengan menggunakan analisis regresi linear. Rawatan metsulfuron-metil ke atas *D. ocimifolia* pada kedua-dua peringkat pertumbuhan menyebabkan kematian dan mengurangkan penghasilan biji benih. *Diodia ocimifolia* pada peringkat vegetatif adalah lebih peka berbanding dengan peringkat pembungaan. Kadar serendah 3.75 g/ha adalah memadai untuk menghalang pertumbuhan pucuk terhenti. Namun demikian, kadar metsulfuron-metil yang diperlukan untuk menyebabkan kematian sepenuhnya adalah 15 g/ha pada peringkat vegetatif dan 30 g/ha pada peringkat pembungaan. Keguguran bunga berlaku apabila metsulfuron-metil dirawat pada peringkat pembungaan. Walau bagaimanapun, metsulfuron-metil tidak menghalang percambahan biji benih yang dikutip daripada pokok yang telah dirawat. Campuran metsulfuron-metil and glifosat pada semua nisbah yang diuji adalah lebih berkesan berbanding dengan rawatan racun herba secara berasingan. Pada kadar rendah metsulfuron-metil (3.75 dan 15 g/ha), campuran glifosat (135 and 540 g/ha) dengan dan tanpa kehadiran surfaktan (campuran 1:36) menunjukkan respons sinergistik dan aditif. Namun, pada campuran 1:72, respons interaksi tersebut bertukar kepada aditif. Campuran 1:18 juga menunjukkan respons yang sama. Keputusan ini

menunjukkan campuran yang paling sesuai untuk mendapatkan kesan optima adalah 1:36 dengan dan tanpa kehadiran surfaktan. Data peratus perencatan pertumbuhan yang di gambarkan secara graf dengan kaedah isobole menunjukan respons sinergistik bagi interaksi metsulfuron-metil dan glifosat dengan dan tanpa kehadiran surfaktan.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Pesticide application technology is an important component of pest management in today's agriculture. Choice of suitable physical and chemical spray characteristics determine effectiveness and efficiency of spray applications. Correct choice will determine the success of achieving desired weed control and the best balance of effectiveness and crop safety; it minimizes any possibility of adverse environmental effects.

Tremendous progress has been made in the development of synthetic crop protection agents over the last 30 years. However, the development of equipment for pesticide delivery has received comparatively little attention. In Malaysia, the conventional knapsack sprayer (CKS) has been used extensively since the introduction of chemical weed control in the 1950s (Teoh, 1992). Although a recent survey showed that the knapsack sprayer remains the most commonly use

spraying equipment in estates, there has been a major shift towards very low volume (VLV) and ultra low volume (ULV) application using controlled droplet applicators (CDA) and mistblowers (Teoh and Chung, 1991). Among various factors that could have influenced the recent changes, the labor situation in Malaysia and developments in the agrochemical industry had the most significant impact. Environmental and economic concerns have also created renewed research interest in methods of improving efficiency of herbicide application. The goal of any spray operation should be to apply herbicides effectively on the target species without compromising environmental and user safety.

Besides the spray equipment, the spray nozzle also plays an important role in application accuracy. The oldest principle of atomization, the hydraulic spray nozzle, is still the most widely used today and the basic design of hydraulic sprayers has changed only little over the last 100 years. Most of these nozzles produce a broad droplet-size distribution and hence, the need for medium to high carrier volumes. In theory, application of a narrow droplet-size distribution, which allows carrier volumes to be reduced should be more efficient. This is due to reduction in small droplets which are prone to drift and large wasteful droplets which are poorly retained. A number of reports show significant improvement in herbicide efficacy as a result of a change in carrier volume (Buhler and



Burnside, 1987; Smeda and Putnam, 1989) or droplet size (McKinlay *et al*, 1974; Merritt, 1982)

Surfactants are commonly used with post-emergence herbicides to enhance performance and improve spray coverage (Nalewaja and Adamezewski, 1977; Varshney and Singh, 1990). Foy *et al* (1965) found that the use of surfactants is mainly to reduce surface tension or alter the viscosity and density of the spray solution. Many surfactants also alter the cuticular waxes on the leaf surface which may enable herbicides to penetrate the cuticle. Increased absorption may allow for reduced herbicide rates (Wanamarta and Penner, 1989). Surfactants also affect the behaviour of both spray deposition on difficult-to-wet leaf surfaces and spray retention. This could be particularly important at higher carrier volume application when the spray solution retained on the leaf is near saturation capacity and spray solution run-off could be exacerbated by the presence of surfactant.

Few studies have examined both the independent and combined influence of droplet size, carrier volume and surfactant concentration on herbicidal activity. In general, a complex interaction occurs among plant species, surfactant, herbicide, and environment. Thus, it is very important