

Mathematical Models for Determination of The Critical Period of Weed Competition In Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L)

Tagour, R. M. H.

Weed Research Central Laboratory, Agricultural Research Center, Giza, Egypt.

Received on: 12/11/2015

Accepted: 17/12/2015

ABSTRACT

Two field experiments on sunflower were conducted during 2013 and 2014 summer seasons at EL-Serw Damietta Governorate, Egypt. Each experiment included ten weed competition and weed removal treatments (early or late times after sowing) which were: - weed competition for the whole season, weed competition for 2, 4, 6 and 8 weeks from sowing, weed free for 2, 4, 6 and 8 weeks from sowing and weed free for the whole season, to determine when a natural infestation of weeds start to reduce sunflower yield and when to control without yield losses in sunflower. Dominant major weeds in experimental fields were *Portulaca oleraceae*, L.; *Corchorus olitorius*, L.; *Amaranthus caudatus*, L.; *Echinochloa colonum*, L. and *Chenopodium album*, L.

The obtained results revealed that weed infestation rate under sunflower field was 5.885 and 6.527 t weight / fad., which reduced drastically seed yield of sunflower per faddan by 55.3 to 55.2% under weed control treatment of sunflower for the whole season in 2013 and 2014 summer season, respectively, as compared with weed free for whole season treatment. The use of response curves with weed free or weed competition period showed that seed yield and oil yield of sunflower were the highest with the field free from weeds until 6 weeks after sowing, and the period of weed / sunflower competition was between 2– 6 weeks after sowing. In regression approach for seed yield, oil yield and weed free or weed competition period the polynomials (linear and quadratic) and functions were tested and quadratic function was fitted to estimate the expected yields which had the highest significance. The data recorded and have the highest values of R^2 than the other models (linear or logistic model.) for this reason used to estimate critical periods of weed competition with sunflower. Also, results showed that the quadratic equations were significant and had the highest R^2 (0.989, 0.982) and (0.989, 0.984) for weed free period, and (0.899, 0.992) and (0.91) for weed competition durations in 2013 and 2014 summer seasons, respectively.

According to these results, the critical period of weed competition to sunflower is the first six weeks period after sowing was required to be weed free showed that to maintain 95% of maximum seed and oil yield of sunflower in the presence of weeds infestation can be allowed after sunflower sowing without seed and oil yield sunflower reduction. This information should be taken in consideration for sunflower growers to plan their strategies of integrated weed management for this important crop.

Key words: Critical period – Weed - Competition – Sunflower.

INTRODUCTION

Many attempts have been carried out to increase and to improve the production of sunflower to face the increasing demand on vegetative oils. The most important factor in this concern is weed control. The infestation of sunflower fields with weeds is known to be a major constraint for obtaining high yields. Reduction in sunflower seed yield due to weed competition accounted for about 29-75% Singh *et. al.*, 1993 and Giri *et. al.*, 1998. Therefore, weed control during the first (50-60 days) after sowing sunflower is essential for successful yield (Wanjari *et al.* 2000). Associated weeds with sunflower fields severe reduction in sunflower productivity in quantitative and qualitative aspects. Sunflower is sensitive to weed competition and yield losses due to weed competition, weed - removal has a significant effect on yield of sunflower crop. The outcome of crop-weed competition should be practiced as early as possible in order to allow time of weed control

measures (Knezevic, 2000). Wanjari *et al* mentioned that, green seeded sunflower requires an extended period of effective weed management very necessary because the crop is direct seeded and slow growing with an open canopy.

Thus, research was needed to determine the critical period for weed control in crop. Burnside *et al.*, (1998) mentioned that research needed to determine the critical period for weed control in any field crop is usually done by (1) keep crop free from weeds until certain predetermined times and then allowing weeds to grow; (2) allowing the weeds to emerge and grow in crop for certain predetermined times, after which weeds are removed in a timely manner until the end of growing season, Nieto *et al.*, (1968) and Singh *et al.*, (1996), pointed out that the time interval between (1) and (2) is the critical period for weed control. (Zimdahl, 1988) mentioned that, historical critical periods have been calculated by various methods (hereafter referred to as the critical period approach) in experiments that evaluated the

time of weed emergence and time of removal on crop yields. Using the classical approach, it is possible to identify the period within which no statistically detectable yield losses occur. The use of regression analysis (referred to as the functional approach), (Cousens 1985a; Knezevic *et al.*, 2002 and Mekky *et al.*, 2005).

The objectives of this study, which was conducted on variety medium maturity of the critical period is estimated to compete in the sunflower crop and connect it to remove the chosen periods and let weeds to be determined (1) when the early emerging weeds first began to reduce sunflower crop (2) when the late emerging weeds no longer reduce sunflower crop and (3) by using the above mentioned approaches to determine the critical period for weed control in of sunflower production fields in Egypt.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were carried out during summer seasons of 2013 and 2014 at El-Serw Agricultural Research Station, Agricultural Research Center farm, Damietta Governorate, Egypt to determine the critical period of weed competition in sunflower. The soil texture was clay (Table 1).

The schemes of treatments were followed according to Dawson (1970) where two basic types of treatments were used. In first type of treatments the crop is kept weed free for different periods after planting and then allowed to become weedy. Conversely, in the second type of treatments weeds are allowed to grow with a crop for different periods then crop was maintained weed free for the remainder of the growing season as follow:

Each experiment included ten treatments which were:

- 1- Weed competition for the whole season.
- 2- Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing.
- 3- Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing.
- 4- Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing.
- 5- Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing.
- 6- Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing.
- 7- Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing.
- 8- Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing.
- 9- Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing.
- 10- Weed free for the whole season.

Sunflower c.v. Sakha 53 is a medium maturity variety at (100 days age) was sown on May 10th in both seasons at 5 kg / faddan. Plot area was 16 m² (4m x 4m). Recommended cultural practices were followed except the treatments under study to maintain optimum crop growth. The experiment

Table 1: Chemical and physical analyses of soil of field experiments of 2013 and 2014 seasons

Season	Soil Depth cm.	Particle size distribution				Texture class	Organic mater%	CaCo3 %	PH (1:2.5) Suspension
		Coarse sand%	Fine Sand%	Silt %	Clay %				
2013	0-30	1.73	13.35	21.72	63.20	clayey	1.21	2.35	7.9
2014	0-30	1.69	13.32	21.80	63.19	clayey	1.22	2.31	7.3

design was randomized complete block desi four replicates. Weeds were identified and cl and the total fresh and dry weights of weed were recorded. Sunflower was harvested on 20th in both seasons.

Data recorded

I: Weed survey

Weeds were hand pulled from one meter, taken at random from each plot, id and classified to species and total fresh : weight (g/m²) were recorded.

II: Sunflower yield component at harvest:-

samples of ten sunflower plants were t random from each plot and the following ch were measured: -

- 1- Head diameter (cm).
- 2- No. of seed:
- 3- Seed weight/head (g).
- 4- 100-seedwei:

III: Seed yield

1- Seed yield was calculated from the seed y the whole plot and then conver (ton/faddan).

2- Relative yield %.

Relative yield % = (seed yield for treatment seed yield for control plots) × 100

3- Seed oil content %.

4- Oil yield (kg/faddan):- Seed oil percent: determined according to the methods de in A.O.A.C. (1975), using Soxhlet eq and oil yield (kg/faddan) was determi multiplying seed yield seed oil percentag

All obtained data were statistically a according to (Snedecor and Cochran 1967) 5% level of significance was used to c between means.

IV:- Determination critical period of competition:-

to determine the critical period of competition in sunflower, two approache used: -

1- Classical biological approach: -

The critical period has been defined period during which weeds must be contr prevent yield losses. Since the concept of period was introduced, it has been used to de the period when control operation should be out to minimize yield losses for sunflow (Zimdahl, 1988). The critical period fo control as a "window" in the crop cycle which weeds must be controlled to unacceptable yield losses (Knezevic, 2000).

2- Polynomial Regression approaches (mathematical models)

According to Singh *et al.*, (1996) mathematical models were used to study about the relationship between crop yields (Y) and duration of weed-free or weed-competition period (x) by either be linear function: $\hat{y} = a + b x$ where the parameters \hat{y} = expected yield, a and b represent intercept and slope of regression of yield on the duration, respectively, or by the quadratic function: $\hat{y} = a + b x + c x^2$ where the parameters a,b and c represent intercept and slope of regression of yield on the duration, in a quadratic function.

The relative and actual yield was subjected to analysis of variance using fitting curve, estimation functions to analysis of statistical producers for Social sciences (SPSS 16.0 for windows), to evaluate the effect of the length of the weed – free periods and the duration of weed interference on relative sunflower yields according to (Knezevic *et al.*, 2002). Three fitting curve models namely, polynomial (linear and quadratic) and Logistic curves were fitted to study the relationships between sunflower yield/fad. and duration of weed-free and/or weed-competition periods. First and second

models are linear and quadratic to determine onset of critical period of weed control (Nete 1990). The third model of logistic function p by (Cousen, 1991) mentioned that, earlier depend on Duncan's multiple test or LSD t suggested that regression analysis appropriate useful mean of determining the critical period modified by (Knezevic *et al.*, 2003).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I- Effect of weed competition and r periods on weeds growth:

Data in Table (2) showed that weed infestation level was high in both seasons 2013 & 2014 reaching (1401.3 g/m²) (5.885 ton/fad.) and (1554.1 g/m²) (6.527 ton/fad.) fresh weight, as well as (298.2 g/m²) (1.252 ton/fad.) and (329.4 g/m²) (1.383 ton/fad.) dry weight of weeds, respectively. The major species prevailing in the experimental field were *Portulaca oleraceae*, L.; *Corchorus olitorius*, L. and *Chenopodium album*, L. Thus, the previous level of weed infestation can be considered very suitable for estimating the critical period of weed competition to sunflower.

Table 2: Effect of weed competition and weed removal periods on total fresh and dry weight of weeds during 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Weed competition or weed removal periods	Total fresh weight of weeds (g/m ²)	Total dry weight of weeds (g/m ²)	Reduction %
2013 Season			
Weed competition for the whole season	1401.3	298.2	0
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	21.1	4.5	98.5
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	239.6	50.9	82.9
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	630.6	134.2	54.9
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	892.6	189.9	36.3
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	822.6	175.1	41.3
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	461.1	98.2	67.1
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	215.8	45.9	84.6
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	116.4	24.8	91.7
Weed free for the whole season	2.8	0.6	99.8
L.S.D. at 0.05	137.29	20.24	
2014 Season			
Weed competition for the whole season	1554.1	329.4	0
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	23.4	4.9	98.5
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	265.8	56.4	82.9
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	699.4	148.8	54.8
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	989.9	209.8	36.3
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	912.4	193.4	41.3
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	511.3	108.4	67.1
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	239.4	50.7	84.6
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	128.9	27.3	91.7
Weed free for the whole season	3.2	0.7	99.8
L.S.D. at 0.05	124.19	16.25	

In general, weeds reduction tended to increase with consisted prolonged periods of weed removal periods either early or late competition periods. In general, total weeds tended to reduce consist with increase either weed prolonged late or early weed removal competition periods.

II- Effect of weed competition on sunflower plant:

Data in Table (3) indicated that head diameter (cm), number of seeds/ head, seed weight/head (g) and 100-seed/weight (g) of sunflower plants, at harvest were significantly affected by weed competition and removal duration in both seasons. The treatments of weed free and weed removal periods significantly increased head diameter (cm), number of seeds/ head, seed weight/head (g) and 100-seed/weight (g) than weed competition for the whole season (unweeded check treatment) in both seasons. The highest results of head diameter (cm), number of seeds/ head, seed weight/head (g) and 100-seed/weight (g) were produced by weed free treatments and weed removal at 2 and 4 weeks from sowing, when compared with the other weed

removal treatments as well as, weed competi the whole season (unweeded check) in both : On the contrary, the lowest value in this was obtained from weed removal treatmen weeks and weed competition for the whole (unweeded check).

This may be due to that the competi weeds affected crop growth due to minimiz availability of nutrients, water and sunlig weed growth there will be one less unit , growth. Moreover, it with the establishment plants foliage, they will begin to shade the This shading effect reduced the amount , available for weed development. Meanwhile other side, weed competition during the whc life cycle caused reduction of growth charac recorded with highest density of weeds. results coincided with those obtained by (1988); Durgan *et al.* (1990); Onofri and Tei Carranza *et al.* (1995); Berti *et al.* (199 Lehoczky *et al.* (2006) reported who that th growth was affected by weed competition.

Table 3: Effect of weed competition and weed removal times on yield components of sunflower 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Weed competition or weed removal periods	Head diameter (cm)	N0.of seeds/ head	Seed weight/ head (g)	100 -seed/ weight(g)
2013 Season				
Weed competition for the whole season	8.94	522	31.27	3.09
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	17.52	1024	61.28	6.06
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	15.63	912	54.58	5.39
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	13.27	775	46.42	4.59
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	10.63	621	37.20	3.68
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	13.13	767	45.92	4.54
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	15.65	914	54.72	5.41
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	17.34	1013	60.65	6.00
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	18.50	1080	64.70	6.39
Weed free for the whole season	19.95	1165	69.80	6.90
L.S.D. at 0.0 5	1.55	57.49	2.32	0.25
2014 Season				
Weed competition for the whole season	9.51	527	29.84	3.05
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	18.65	1033	58.47	5.97
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	16.61	920	52.08	5.31
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	14.12	783	44.29	4.52
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	11.32	611	35.50	3.62
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	13.97	774	43.83	4.47
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	17.44	922	52.21	5.33
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	18.46	1022	57.87	5.91
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	19.69	1091	61.74	6.30
Weed free for the whole season	21.24	1176	66.60	6.80
L.S.D. at 0.0 5	1.55	24.85	2.04	0.23

III - Effect of weed competition on yield:

Data presented in Table (4) showed that seed yield per faddan, relative yield, seed oil content and seed oil yield per faddan, at harvest were significantly increased due to weed free and weed removal periods treatments uses in both seasons. The loss in seed and oil yields due to weed competition for whole seasons reached 55.2 and 58.1% and 55.3 and 57.9% in 2013 and 2014 seasons, respectively as compared with weed free treatments. This may be due to the effective competition of weeds with sunflower plants particularly in the early stage of sunflower growth. Removal of weeds for 2 and 4 weeks from sowing then allowing weeds competition for sunflower until the end season caused seed yield reductions by 12.2 and 12.1%, and 20.7 and 21.8% in 2013 and 2014 seasons, respectively as compared with weed free in whole season, which reached 1.133 and 1.112 t/fad. respectively.

These treatments significantly produced the highest seed and seed oil yields per faddan compared with unweeded check in both seasons. The increase in yield induced by weed removal treatments may be due to control of annual weeds at the critical early period, consequently the competition between sunflower plant and associated weeds was decreased and giving good chance for

sunflower growth and improve the filling of resulting heavier grains. These results in agreement with those recorded by Durgar (1990); Onofri and Tei (1994); Berti and (1994); Carranza *et al.* (1995); Sattin *et al.* (1996); Lehoczky *et al.* (2006); Azadbakht *et al.* (2006); Heydarian *et al.* (2012).

On the other hand, further delaying weed removal accentuated the adverse effect of weed competition on seed and oil yields at 8 weeks from sowing. The reduction that ranged from 33.4 to 33.5 and 46.7 % for seed yield, and from 36.8 to 36.9 and 49.6 to 49.7% for oil yield respectively, in both seasons as compared with weed free treatments. Durgan *et al.* (1990); Onofri and Tei (1994); Carranza *et al.* (1995); Berti *et al.* (1996); Sattin *et al.* (1996) and Lehoczky *et al.* (2006) report the reduction in seed and seed oil yields due to increasing of competition with associated weed. The decreased weight of seeds per head simultaneously increased the dry matter proportion of weeds and weed density.

IV – Estimation of the critical period (CP) for weed competition in sunflower.

According to Cousens (1991) there are several approaches to determine the critical period of weed competition to any crop as follows.

Table 4: Effect of weed competition duration on seed and oil yield of sunflower plants at harvest 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Weed competition or weed removal periods	Seed yield (ton/fad.)	Relative yield %	Seed oil content%	Seed oil yield (kg/fad.)
2013 Season				
Weed competition for the whole season	0.507	100	35.20	178.46
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	0.995	196.16	37.05	368.65
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	0.889	175.46	36.07	320.66
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	0.753	148.47	35.68	268.67
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	0.604	119.33	35.41	213.88
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	0.745	147.05	36.59	272.59
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	0.889	175.72	37.20	330.34
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	0.985	194.39	37.22	366.62
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	1.050	207.36	37.45	393.22
Weed free for the whole season	1.133	223.65	37.58	425.78
L.S.D. at 0.05	0.07	15.24	0.32	28.66
2014 Season				
Weed competition for the whole season	0.498	100	35.14	174.99
Weed competition for 2 weeks from sowing	0.977	196.24	37.02	361.68
Weed competition for 4 weeks from sowing	0.869	174.54	36.01	312.93
Weed competition for 6 weeks from sowing	0.739	148.42	35.53	262.57
Weed competition for 8 weeks from sowing	0.593	119.10	35.38	209.80
Weed free for 2 weeks from sowing	0.732	147.07	36.47	266.96
Weed free for 4 weeks from sowing	0.872	175.13	37.15	323.95
Weed free for 6 weeks from sowing	0.966	194.08	37.19	359.25
Weed free for 8 weeks from sowing	1.031	206.98	37.34	384.97
Weed free for the whole season	1.112	223.38	37.46	416.55
L.S.D. at 0.05	0.03	6.73	0.12	12.16

1- Curve fitting approach: -

Figure (1) depending on data of seed and oil yields/fad. by the use of biological response curves results show clearly that to obtain 95% of the sunflower crop need to make the field free from weeds for a period 2 – 6 weeks from sowing and the critical period of weed competition (CPWC) of the seed and oil yield of sunflower started after two weeks and ended at 6 weeks from sowing.

Obviously, the more delay of weed removal will cause more decrease in sunflower yield due to weed/sunflower competition which seriously affect seed and oil yield of sunflower. This may be attributed to the slow growth of sunflower in the first grown stages and poor vegetative growth in one side. Evidently, weed free maintenance for 2 to 6 weeks from sowing is required for good yield.

Wanjari *et al* (2001) mentioned that, green sunflower need an extended period of effective management which is very necessary because the direct seeded and is slow growing with an open c

2- Regression approach (mathematical mo

In this approach polynomial and logistic were tested for modeling the relationship sunflower seed yields and weed free o competition periods Table (5), showed t relationship between seed yield of sunflower period of weed removal or weed competi statistically significant with mathematical mode this study in both season. These equations we $0.513 + 0.123 x - 0.007 x^2$ and $\hat{Y} = 1.127 - 0.00001 x^2$ in season 2013 and $\hat{Y} = 0.505 + (0.007 x^2$ and $\hat{Y} = 1.107 - 0.058 x + 0.00$ season 2014.




Fig 1: The critical period of weed competition and relative seed and oil yield of sunflower in 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Table 5: Estimation of the regression and the standard errors of three models to determine the relationship between seed yield of sunflower (t/ fad.) with weed – free or weed infestation per 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Treatments	Yield	Linear		Quadratic		Logistic	
		R ²	SE	R ²	SE	R ²	SE
2013 season experiment							
Weed-free	Seed yield t/fad	0.930	0.054	0.989	0.022	0.877	0.097
Weed competition	Seed yield t/fad	0.896	0.068	0.899	0.066	0.897	0.077
2014 season experiment							
Weed-free	Seed yield t/fad	0.924	0.055	0.982	0.028	0.875	0.149
Weed competition	Seed yield t/fad	0.991	0.018	0.992	0.018	0.975	0.036

Examining Table 5, it could be noticed that the best model fitted to study the yield of sunflower response to weed free and weed competition durations was quadratic that. It had coefficient of determination (R^2) greater than those of both linear and logistic model. Moreover, values of standard error estimate (SE) of quadratic equation were smaller than those of linear and logistic equations. Therefore, the quadratic model worked well for describing the relationship between seed yield of sunflower and weeds under weed free and weed

competition duration in both first and seasons.

Fig. (2 and 3) and Tables (5 and 6) show the effect of times duration of sunflower crop free from weeds on seed yield. The relationship between yields with the duration of weed free was significant and positive and prediction function with v (SE) 0.989 (0.022) and 0.982 (0.028), the relationship between seed yield with the duration of weed competition was significant and negative




Fig. 2: The relationship between duration of weed free and seed yield (t/fad)




Fig. 3: The relationship between duration of weed competition and seed yield (t/fad).

Table 6: Estimation of expected seed yield and percent of yield losses by quadratic model different weed free period and weed infestation period in 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Period (weeks)	2013 Season Experiment				2014 Season Experiment			
	Weed free Period		Weed infestation Period		Weed free Period		Weed infestation Period	
	Predicted Seed yield (t/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted Seed yield (t/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted Seed yield (t/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted Seed yield (t/fad.)	Yield losses %
	$\hat{Y} = 0.513 + 0.123x - 0.007x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 1.127 - 0.058x + 0.0001x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 0.505 + 0.12x - 0.007x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 1.107 - 0.058x + 0.0001x^2$	
0	0.513	51.3	1.127	0	0.505	50.4	1.107	0
1	0.629	40.3	1.069	5.2	0.618	39.3	1.049	5.2
2	0.731	30.6	1.011	10.3	0.717	29.6	0.991	10.5
3	0.819	22.2	0.954	15.4	0.802	21.2	0.934	15.6
4	0.893	15.2	0.897	20.4	0.873	14.2	0.877	20.8
5	0.953	9.5	0.839	25.6	0.930	8.6	0.819	26.1
6	0.999	5.1	0.783	30.5	0.973	4.4	0.763	31.1
7	1.031	2.1	0.726	35.6	1.002	1.6	0.706	36.2
8	1.049	0.4	0.669	40.6	1.011	0.7	0.649	41.4
9	1.053	0	0.613	45.6	1.018	0	0.593	46.4
10	1.043	0.9	0.557	50.6	1.005	1.3	0.537	51.5

and prediction function with value R^2 (SE) 0.899 (0.066) and 0.992 (0.018), in the first and second season, respectively. Thus, to obtain 95% yield of either seed or oil yields per Fadden weeds should be eliminated between 1 – 6 weeks from sowing.

To determine the critical period of weed competition to sunflower crops, the regression approach was used. Application equation reported that to maintain 95% seed yield of sunflower earlier weed competition should not allowed exceed 1 week from emergence. The same situation the late duration of weed free period should not exceed 6 weeks from emergence.

Examining Table 7 it could be noticed the best model fitted to the oil yield of weed free and weed competition was quadratic. It had coefficient of determination (R^2) greater than those of the linear model and logistic. Moreover, values of standard error estimate (SE) of quadratic equation were

smaller than those of linear and logistic equations. Therefore, the quadratic model worked very well in describing the relation between oil yield of sunflower and weeds under weed free competition in the first and second season. The regression equations were $\hat{Y} = 181.107 + 48.775 x - 2.753 x^2$ and $\hat{Y} = 424.370 - 26.279 x - 0.011 x^2$ in season 2013 and $\hat{Y} = 177.549 + 47.639 x - 2.753 x^2$ and $\hat{Y} = 415.600 - 26.004 x - 0.047 x^2$ in season 2014.

Fig. (4 and 5) and Tables (7 and 8) show the relationship between oil yield with the duration of weed free and weed competition. The results showed that the duration of weed free had similar trend of seed yield and oil yield. The relationship between oil yield with the duration of weed competition was significant and regression equation and prediction function with value R^2 (SE) (0.075) and 0.994 (0.033) in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Table 7: Estimation of the regression and the standard errors of three models to determine the relationship between oil yield of sun flower (kg/ fad.) with weed – free or weed infestation in 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Treatments	Yield	Linear		Quadratic		Logistic	
		R^2	SE	R^2	SE	R^2	SE
2013 season experiment							
Weed-free	Oil yield kg/fad	0.929	21.604	0.989	0.108	0.871	8.583
Weed competition		0.913	24.078	0.919	0.075	0.913	24.776
2014 season experiment							
Weed-free	Oil yield kg/fad	0.924	21.833	0.984	0.108	0.870	10.254
Weed competition		0.990	6.101	0.994	0.033	0.983	5.939




Fig. 4: The relationship between duration of weed free and oil yield (kg/fad).




Fig. 5: The relationship between duration of weed competition and oil yield (kg/fad).

Table 8: Estimation expected oil yield and percent of yield losses by quadratic model under di weed free period and weed infestation period in 2013 and 2014 summer seasons.

Period (weeks)	2013 Season Experiment				2014 Season Experiment			
	Weed free		Weed infestation		Weed free		Weed infestation	
	Period	Period	Period	Period	Period	Period	Period	Period
	Predicted oil yield (kg/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted oil yield (kg/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted oil yield (kg/fad.)	Yield losses %	Predicted oil yield (kg/fad.)	Yield losses %
	$\hat{Y} = 181.107 + 48.775x - 2.825x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 424.370 - 26.279x - 0.011x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 177.549 + 47.639x - 2.753x^2$		$\hat{Y} = 415.600 - 26.004x - 0.047x^2$	
0	181.11	53.7	424.37	0	177.55	53.7	415.60	0
1	227.06	42.0	398.10	6.2	222.43	42.0	389.64	6.3
2	267.36	31.7	371.86	12.4	261.81	31.7	363.78	12.5
3	302.01	22.8	345.63	18.6	295.69	22.9	338.01	18.7
4	331.01	15.4	319.43	24.7	324.06	15.5	312.34	24.9
5	354.36	9.8	293.25	30.9	346.92	9.5	286.75	31.0
6	372.06	4.9	267.09	37.1	364.27	5.0	261.27	37.1
7	384.11	1.8	240.96	43.2	376.12	1.9	235.87	43.3
8	390.51	0.2	214.84	49.4	382.47	0.2	210.58	49.3
9	391.26	0	188.75	55.5	383.30	0	185.37	55.4
10	386.36	1.3	162.68	61.7	378.64	1.1	160.26	61.4

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded depending on the use of either biological and regression approaches that both weed free and weed competition duration show that the relationship with weed – free periods and weed competition periods fit with quadratic functions and the critical period of weed competition in sunflower from the above models was between 1 – 6 weeks from sunflower sowing, thus it is important to remove the weeds at this time to maintain the maximum seed yield potential.

1- Yield/ vine:

Data in Table (1) clearly show that spraying clusters of Early sweet grapevines with GA₃ at 10 to 40 ppm or Sitofex at 2.5 to 10 ppm was significantly effective in improving the yield relative to the check treatment. The promotion on the yield was accompanied with increasing concentrations of each plant growth regulator. Using GA₃ at 10 to 40 was significantly preferable than using Sitofex at 2.5 to 10 ppm in improving the yield. A slight and insignificant promotion on the yield was attributed to increasing concentrations of GA₃ from 20 to 40 ppm and Sitofex from 5 to 10 ppm. The maximum yield was produced on the vines that received one spray of GA₃ at 40 ppm but the best treatment from economical point of view was the application of GA₃ at 20 ppm (since no measurable promotion on the yield was recorded between 20 and 40 ppm of GA₃). Under such promised treatment, yield/ vine reached 13.6 and 14.0 kg during both seasons, respectively. The control vines produced 9.1 and 9.6 kg during 2013 and 2014 seasons, respectively. The percentage of increase on the yield due to application of GA₃ at 20 ppm over the check treatment reached 49.5 and 45.8 % during both

seasons, respectively. The beneficial effects on the yield might be attributed to their action on increasing cluster weight. The pre effects of GA₃ on the yield was supported results of Dimovska *et al.*, (2011) and Abu and Salameh (2012) on different grapevine c — The results regarding the beneficial ef Sitofex on enhancing the yield are in harmo those obtained by Juan *et al.* (2009); Abdel *et al.*, (2010) and Al-Obeed (2011).

2- Harvesting date:

It is clear from the data in Table (1) that and Sitofex treatments had significantly del the harvesting date of Early Sweet grapevine than the control treatment. The degree of de on harvesting date was correlated to the inc the concentrations of both GA₃ and Sitofex GA₃ significantly delayed harvesting comparing with using Sitofex. In concentrations of GA₃ from 20 to 40 p Sitofex from 5 to 10 ppm failed to show sig delay on harvesting date. A cons advancement on harvesting date was obser untreated vines the great delay on harvesti was observed on the vines that received GA ppm during both seasons. GA₃ and Sitofe shown by many authors to retard the rel ethylene and the disappearance of pigments chlorophylls and carotenoids and onest of start. Also they were responsible for prolong maturity stages Nickell (1985). These regarding the delaying effect of GA₃ and Sit harvesting date were in harmony with obtained by Wassel *et al.*, (2007), Kasser (2011), Abu Zahra and Salameh (2012) and *et al.* (2012).

3- Cluster weight and dimensions:

~~It is evident from the data in Table (1) that treating clusters with GA₃ at 10 to 40 ppm or Sitofex at 2.5 to 10 ppm was significantly accompanied with enhancing weight, length and width of cluster relative to the control treatment.~~

The promotion was significantly associated with increasing concentrations of GA₃ and Sitofex. Using GA₃ was significantly favourable than using Sitofex in this respect. The maximum values were recorded on the vines that received one spray of GA₃ at 40 ppm. Meaningless promotion was detected with increasing concentrations of GA₃ from 20 to 40 ppm and Sitofex from 5 to 10 ppm. The untreated vines produced the minimum values during both seasons. The positive action of GA₃ on cluster weight and dimensions might be attributed to its essential role on stimulating cell division and enlargement of cells, the water absorption and the biosynthesis of proteins which will lead to increase berry weight. Dimovska *et al.*, (2011); Abu Zahra and Salameh, (2012) and Dimovska *et al.*, (2014).

The previous essential role of CPPU on cluster weight was attributed to its higher content of cytokinin when applied to plants (Nickell, 1985).

4-Shot berries %:

Data in Table (2) obviously reveal that percentage of shot berries in the clusters of Early Sweet grapevines was significantly controlled with spraying GA₃ at 10 to 40 ppm or Sitofex at 2.5 to 10 ppm relative to the check treatment. Using GA₃ was preferable than using Sitofex in reducing the percentages of shot berries. There was a gradual reduction on the percentage of shot berries with increasing concentrations of GA₃ and Sitofex. There was a slight reduction on such unfavourable phenomenon with increasing concentrations of GA₃ from 20 to 40 ppm and Sitofex from 5 to 10 ppm. The minimum values of shot berries (7.3 and 6.9 % during both seasons, respectively) were recorded on the clusters harvested from vines treated with GA₃ at 40 ppm. The maximum values of shot berries (12.0 & 12.5 %) during both seasons were recorded on the untreated vines during both seasons. The reducing effect of GA₃ on shot berries might be attributed to its important role on enhancing cell division and the biosynthesis of proteins Nickell, (1985). These results were supported by the results of wassel *et al.* (2007) and Abu Zahra and Salameh (2012).

5-Fruit quality:

Data in Tables (2, 3 & 4) clearly show that spraying clusters with GA₃ at 10 to 40 ppm or Sitofex at 2.5 to 10 ppm significantly was accompanied with enhancing weight, longitudinal and equatorial of berry, total acidity%, proteins % and percentages of P, K and Mg and T.S.S. %, reducing sugars %, T.S.S. / acid and total carotenoids relative to the check treatment. The

effect either increase or decrease was as with increasing concentrations of each auxin GA₃ significantly changed these parameters using Sitofex. A slight effect was recorded on quality parameters with increasing concentration GA₃ from 20 to 40 ppm and Sitofex from ppm. From economical point of view, the results with regard to fruit quality were due to treating clusters with GA₃ at 20 ppm. Untreated vines produced unfavourable effect on fruit quality. These results were true during seasons. The effect of GA₃ on increasing weight and dimensions might be attributed to its effect in promoting cell division and enlarge cells, water uptake and the biosynthesis of proteins (Nickell (1985). These results were in agreement with those obtained by Williams and Ayars and Dimovska *et al.*, (2014).

The higher content of Sitofex from early season reflected on enhancing cell division and elongation of berries Nickell (1985). These results were in agreement with those obtained by Zahra (2013) and Retamales *et al.* (2015).

CONCLUSION

Treating Early Sweet grapevines once with GA₃ at average berries reached 6mm with GA₃ at 10 ppm was responsible for promoting yield and quality.

REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C. (1975). Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Chemists, Washington D.C., 2004, 12th ed.
- Azadbakht, A.; R. Amrie ; S. R., Mirzapoor Nasrollahi (2012). Effect of competition on growth characteristics of sunflower at different level of N fertilizer. Annals of Biol. Res., 3(11) 5168.
- Berti, A. and G. Zanin (1994). Density equivalent method for forecasting yield loss in mixed weed populations. Weed Res 327-332.
- Berti A.; C. M. Dunan; M. Sattin; G. Zanin Westra (1996). A new approach to weed control when to control weeds. Weed Sci., 4 503.
- Burnside, O. C.; M. J. Wiens; B. J. Hol Weisberg; E. A. Ristau; M. M. Johnson H. Cameron (1998). Critical periods for weed control in dry beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*). Weed Sci., 46 (3):301-306.
- Carranza, P.; Saavedra, M. and Garica-Toledo (1995). Competition between *Phaseolus vulgaris* and sunflower. Weed Res., 3 375.

- Cousens, R. D. (1985). A simple model relating yield loss to weed density. *Annals Applied Biology*. **107**: 239-252.
- Cousens, R. (1991). Aspects of the design and interpretation of competition (interference) experiments. *Weed Techn.* **5**: 664-673.
- Dawson, J. H. (1970). Time and duration of weed infestation in relation to weed-crop competition. *Proc. South. Weed Sci. Soc.* **23**: 13-25.
- Durgan, B.R.; Dexter, A.G. and Miller, S.D. (1990). Kochia(*Kochia scoparia*) interference in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*). *Weed Techn.* **4**: 52-56.
- Giri, A.N.; R.H. Bhosle and O.G. Lokhand (1998). Performance of cultural, chemical and integrated weed control methods in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*). *Indian J. of Agronomy*. **43(1)**: 143-148.
- Heydarian, H.; M.R.H.S.Hadi; H.S. Mahmoodabadi and M.N. Kalateh (2012). Competitive effects of redroot pigweed (*Amaranthus retroflexus*) on three sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*) cultivars. *Intl. J. Agri. Crop Sci.* **4(9)**: 525-528.
- Knezevic, S. Z. (2000). The concept of critical period of weed control. Pages 30-40 in S. Z. Knezevic, ed, *Integrated Weed Management*. Mead, NE: co operative Extension, University of Nebraska. [the work shop material].
- Knezevic, S. Z.; S. P. Evans; E. E. Blankenship and J. L. Lindquist (2002). Critical period for weed control: the concept and data analysis. *Weed Sci.*, **50**: 773-786.
- Knezevic, S. Z.; S. P. Evans and M. Mainz (2003). Row spacing influences the critical timing for weed removal in soybean (*Glycine max*). *Weed Techn.* **17**: 666-673.
- Lehoczky, E.; Reisinger, P.; Komives, T. and Szalai, T. (2006). Study on the early competition between sunflower and weeds in field experiments. *J. of Plant Diseases and Protection*. **20**: 935-940.
- Mekky, M. S.; A. A. Atia and M. F. I. Daie (2005). Three approaches for estimation critical period in onion crop. *Egypt. J. of Appl. Sci.*, **20 (11 B)**: 474-489.
- Neter, J.; W. Wasserman and M.H. Kunter (1990). *Applied Linear Statistical Models* 3rd ed. IRWIN. Homewood, Boston, U.S.A.
- Nieto, J.H.; M. A. Brondo and J. T. Gonzalez (1968). Critical periods of the crop growth cycle for competition from weeds. *PANS* **14**: 159-166.
- Onofri, A. and Tei, F. (1994). Competitive threshold levels of three broadleaf species in sunflower. *Weed Res.* **34**: 4
- Sattin, M.; A. Berti and G. Zanin (1996). Cr loss in relation to weed time of em and removal: analysis of the variabili mixed infestations. *Proc. of the Secc Weed Control Congress, Copenhag* 67-72.
- Singh, D.I.; J.C. Dagar and S. Gangwar Infestation by weeds and their man in oil seed crops a review. *Agri Reviews (Karnal)*. **13(3)**: 163-175. (c.: Abst. **42(11)**: 4670).
- Singh, M.; M. C. Saxena A. B. E. Abu-Irm A. Al-Thabbi and N. I. Haddad Estimation of critical period of weed *Weed Sci., Society of America Vol (4* 283.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran *Statistical Methods*. Iowa State Univ Press, Ames 593.
- Wanjari, R.H.; N.T. Yaduraju and K.N. (2000). Critical period of crc competition in rainy-season su (*Helianthus annuus*). *Indian of We* **32**: 17-20.
- Wanjari, R.H.; N.T. Yaduraju and K.N. (2001). Critical period of weed com in spring sunflower (*Helianthus a* *Indian J. of Agronomy*. **46**: 309-313.
- Zimdahl, R. L. (1988). The concept and app of the critical weed-free period. In Alt A. and M. Liebmann eds. *Weed Man in Agroecosystems: Ecological App* pp. 145-155. CRC Press, Boca Florida, USA.
- ~~Abdel-Fattah, M.E.; Amen, K.A.; Alaa, A. Eman, A.A. (2010). Effect of berry-tl CPPU spraying and pinching on elu berry quality of two grapevine e Assiut J. of Agric. Sci., 40(4): 92-107.~~
- ~~Abu-Zahra, T.R. (2013). Effect of plant he application methods on fruit qua Superior seedless grape. Biotechnology Research Asia Vol. 527-531.~~

- Abu Zahra, T.R. and Salameh, N. (2012). Influence of Gibberellic acid and cane girdling on berry size of Black Magic grape cultivar. Middle East Journal of Scientific Research **11**(6): 718-722.
- Al-Obeed, R.S. (2011). Enhancing the shelf life and storage ability of Flame seedless grapevine by agrochemicals preharvest foliar applications. Middle East Journal of Scientific Research **8** (2): 319-327.
- Association of Official Agricultural Chemists (A.O.A.C.) (2000). Official Methods of Analysis (A.O.A.C.), 12th Ed., Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington D.C., U.S.A. pp. 490-510.
- Dimovska, V.; Ivanova, V.; Ilieva, F. and Sofijanova, E. (2011). Influence of bioregulator gibberellic acid on some technological characteristics of cluster and berry from some seedless grape varieties. Journal of Agric. Science and technology BI **10**: 1074-1058.
- Dimovska, V.; Petropulos, V.I.; Salamovska, A. and Ilieva, F. (2014). Flame seedless grape variety (*Vitis vinifera* L.) and different concentration of gibberellic acid (GA3). Bulgarian Journal of Agric. Sci., **20** (No.1), 137-142.
- Dokoozlian, N.K. (2001). Gibberellic acid applied at bloom reduces fruit set and improves size of "Crimson seedless" table grapes. Hort. science **36**(4): 706-709.
- Guiseppe, F.; Andream, M.; Guiseppe, N. Carmela, P. Angela, M.; Isabella, C. Piero, M.; Mariangela, V. and Vito, G. (2014). Girdling, Gibberellic acid, and forchlorfenuron effect yield, quality and metabolic profile of table grape cv. Italia. Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 65:3.
- Hiscox, A. and Israelstam B. (1979). Method for the extraction of chlorophylls from leaf tissue without maceration. Can. J. Bot. **57**: 1332-1334.
- Juan, P.Z.; Bernardo, A.L. and Paulina, N. (2009). Preharvest applications of growth regulators and their effect on postharvest quality of table grapes during cold storage. Postharvest Biology and technology **51**: 183-192.
- Kassem, H.A.; Al-Obeed, R.S. and Soliman, S. S. (2011). Improving yield, quality and profitability of Flame seedless grapevine grown under arid environmental by growth regulators preharvest applications. Middle East Journal of Scientific research **8** (1): 165-172.
- Lane, J. H. and Eynon, L. (1965). Determination of reducing sugars by means of a solution with methylene blue as a reagent. A.O.A.C. Washington D.C.U.S.A. p 510.
- Leopold, A. C. (1964). Plant growth development. pp. 133-143. TATA Mc Hill publishing Comp. LTD. Bombe Delhi.
- Marzouk, H.A. and Kassem, H.A (2011). Im yield, quality and shelfe life of Th seedless grapevine by preharvest application. Scientia Horticulturua **13** 430.
- Mead, R.; Currnnow, R. N. and Harted, A. M. Statistical Biology. 2nd Ed. Meth Agriculture and Experimental anc London pp.10-20.
- Nickell, L.G. (1985). New plant growth r increase grape size. Proc. Plant grov Soc. of Am. **12**: 1-7.
- Refaat, S.S.E.; Ghada, Sh.Sh. and Ola, A.A. Effect of foliar spraying with gibberl and/ or sitofex on bud behaviour, ve growth, yield and cluster qual Thompson seedless grapevines. Jou American Science, **8** (5): 99: 21-34.
- Retamales, J.; Bangerth, F. Cooper, T. and C R. (2015). Effect of CPPU and GA3 quality of Sultanina table grape. Isl Hoerticulturuae 394: plant Bioregule Horticulture.
- Wassel, A.H.; Abdel Hameed, M.; Gobara, attia, M. (2007). Effect of micronutrients, gibberellic acid and acid on growth, yield and quality o Banaty seedless grapevines. Africa Science Conference Proceeding Vo 547-553.
- Weaver, R. J. (1976). Grape Growing. A Interscience Publication John Wiley & New York. London. Sydney. Tronto. 175.
- Wilde, S. A.; Corey, R. B.; Lyer, I. G. and V K. (1985). Soil and Plant Analysis f Culture. 3rd Oxford & IBH publishi New Delhi, pp. 1-218.
- Williams, L.E. and Ayars, J.E. (2005). Wate Thompson seedless grapevines as affe the application of Gibberellic acid (G trunk girdling practices to increasin size. Agriculture and Forest Meterolo; **85**: 94

المخلص العربي

النماذج الرياضية لتحديد الفترة الحرجة لمنافسة الحشائش لمحصول عباد الشمس

رش حامض الجبريليك والسيتوفكس في تحسين المحصول وجودة حبات العنب الايرلي سويت في منطقة

المنيا-مصر

رشدي محمد حسن تجور

المعمل المركزي لبحوث الحشائش، مركز البحوث الزراعية، الجيزة

محمد علي مجاور عبادة، ماهر خيرى يواقيم، بسام السيد عبد المقصود بلال

قسم بحوث العنب - معهد بحوث البساتين - مركز البحوث الزراعية - الجيزة - مصر

محمد علي مجاور عبادة، ماهر خيرى يواقيم، بسام السيد عبد المقصود بلال

قسم بحوث العنب - معهد بحوث البساتين - مركز البحوث الزراعية - الجيزة - مصر

اقامة تجربتين حقليتين علي عباد الشمس خلال الموسمين الصيفيين لعامي 2013 و2014م بمحطة البحوث بالسرو محافظة دمياط - مصر. شملت التجربة علي عدد 10 معاملات من الإزالة المبكرة أو المتأخرة من الزراعة وهي:- منافسة الحشائش طول الموسم منذ بداية الزراعة حتي الحصاد ومنافسة الحشائش لمدة 2، 4، 6، 8 أسابيع من الزراعة وإزالة الحشائش طول الموسم وف العدى الطبيعية للحشائش لتحديد حجم النقص في ناتج محصول البذرة في عباد الشمس ومتى يتم التوقف من المحصول. حيث كان مجتمع الحشائش السائدة في حقل التجارب في العامين هي حشائش الرجله وعرف الديك وابو ركة والزربيح بكثافة عالية بما يلائم إجراء مثل هذا النوع من الدراسات. سحت النتائج أن الفقد في محصول البذرة في عباد الشمس هو 55.3 إلي 55.2% تحت ظروف العدى للحشائش بمقدار 6.527 و5.885 طن/فدان من الحشائش الغضة الكلية في الموسمين الأول والثاني علي تم تقدير الفترة الحرجة بالطريقة التقليدية حيث وجد أن الفترة الحرجة لمنافسة الحشائش تبدأ بعد أسبوعين من تم يتوقف النقص في حاصل المحصول بعد 6 أسابيع من الزراعة، أوضح استخدام التحليل الرياضي باستخدام تحدار أن النماذج الرياضية لدراسة العلاقة بين فترات منافسة الحشائش أو أزلتها وحاصل محصول البذرة من عباد الشمس يتبع معادلات من الدرجة الثانية. وكانت معاملات الارتباط قوية ومعنوية علي مستوي 1%

ت 989، 982، و 989، 984. في الفترات الخالية من الحشائش و 899، 992. ، 994. في فترات المنافسة للحشائش خلال الموسم الصيفي 2013 و 2014 علي التوالي. وأوضح تطبيق ادلات أنه للحصول علي 95% من محصول البذرة والزيت من عباد الشمس مقارنة بمحصول البذرة والزيت في مس الخالية من الحشائش طول الموسم فانه علي مزارعي عباد الشمس ألا يتأخروا في بدء عمليات المكافحة بوج الأول من الزراعة وأن تستمر عملية المكافحة حتى الأسبوع السادس من الزراعة من خلال استخدام ت المناسبة باستخدام مبيدات تضاف بعد الإنبات لإبادة المدى الواسع من أنواع الحشائش المذكورة سابقا أو قاة اليدوية في هذه الفترة أو التكامل بينهما.