

Effect of sugar and alcohol industry byproducts on pre-emergence herbicide efficacy

ABSTRACT

The present study evaluate the effects of vinasse and filter cake on the efficacy of indaziflam, saflufenacil, and sulfentrazone for the control of morning glory (*Ipomoea triloba* L.) and crabgrass (*Digitaria horizontalis* Willd), as well as the effects of these byproducts on the emergence of these weeds. The experiments were established in a greenhouse with a completely randomized design and four replications at the Agricultural Science Center, Sao Paulo, Brazil, between May 2017 and May 2018. In the first assay, four herbicide doses: indaziflam (0, 37.5, 75, and 150 g ai ha⁻¹), saflufenacil (0, 42, 84, and 168 g a.i ha⁻¹), and sulfentrazone (0, 300, 600, and 1200 g ai ha⁻¹) were applied for pre-emergent weeds in three soil covers (without byproduct, with vinasse, and with filter cake). In the second assay, seven treatments were evaluated, comparing the effects of the different vinasse and filter cake doses, and absence of byproduct on the weeds emergence. When the doses required for 80% effective control were considered, the results showed that for indaziflam, the filter cake negatively affected crabgrass control. In contrast, vinasse had a positive effect on morning glory control by saflufenacil. For sulfentrazone, the filter cake had a negative effect, requiring twice the dose used on the treatment without byproduct for effective morning glory control. Relative to assay 2, the vinasse addition affected the emergence of morning glory but not of crabgrass; however, the filter cake increased the weed biomass accumulation. Vinasse and filter cake byproducts can negatively or positively affect the performance of pre-emergence herbicides, according to the active ingredient used. However, these effects occur at doses below those recommended for the herbicides. Byproducts can affect the emergence and the weed biomass accumulation.

Keywords: *vinasse, filter cake, chemical control, emergence*

1. INTRODUCTION

Production of sugarcane for alcohol production generates several organic byproducts, such as vinasse and filter cake, which are used in agriculture for soil fertilization [1]. For each liter of alcohol produced, 12 L of vinasse is generated, on average [2]. For filter cake, an average of 30 kg is produced per ton of crushed sugarcane [3]. Vinasse is generated from the distillation process that transforms sugarcane into wine [4]. Vinasse use can improve sugarcane (grass) planting because it reduces soil acidity, thus making liming unnecessary, and vinasse also has a large amount of water, which is fundamental to plant development [5].

Filter cake is the result of sugarcane juice filtration. The use of filter cake can be beneficial for sugarcane cultivation and for the soil since its organic matter contains micronutrients and the minerals contained in it experience little leaching; in addition, filter cake increases the cation exchange capacity, it retains more water, and it improves the soil characteristics, among others factors. In general, these two byproducts reduce the cost of production [1].

Herbicides are also widely used in sugarcane cultivation [6]. Most molecules registered for sugarcane are applied pre-emergence and generally have high mobility and a prolonged residual effect in soils [7].

A production system with or without the presence of straw and the application of vinasse in sugarcane plantations can lead to changes in the soil properties, thereby affecting the availability of herbicides in the soil solution. The addition of vinasse promoted, for example, greater availability of diuron and tebuthiuron in various soil types, whereas for the herbicides clomazone, hexazinone, and sulfentrazone, no effect was observed [8].

Prata and Lavoretti[9] demonstrated a reduction in the persistence of diuron and ametryne molecules with the addition of vinasse to the soil because vinasse increases the microbial activity and biomass, causing the mineralization of these herbicides. Studies have shown that herbicide sorption may change depending on the macromolecular structure and size of the humic substances. A lower amount of aromatic carbon results in greater sorption of the herbicide molecule because of the lower stereochemical rigidity of the humic molecule, facilitating the entry of the herbicide molecule into the reactive sites of the humic molecule.

Because vinasse comprises several organic acids, in addition to being used in soil correction, it can also be used to control some weed species, altering the weed emergence flux and herbicide amount and action[10]. A reduction in the emergence of *Digitariahorizontalis*, *Cyperusrotundus*, *Sidarthombifolia*, and *Emilia sonchifolia* has been observed using vinasse[11].

Indaziflam and saflufenacil herbicides for pre-emergence applications are the most recently registered products for sugarcane cultivation in Brazil, and no information is available on their interaction with vinasse or filter cake.

The objective of this study was to determine the effect of vinasse and filter cake on the efficacy of saflufenacil and indaziflam on *Ipomoea triloba* and *Digitariahorizontalis* control, respectively, as well as the influence of these byproducts on weed germination.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiments were conducted in a greenhouse at the Agricultural Science Center, São Paulo, Brazil (22°18'56"S; 47°23'20"W), from May 2017 to May 2018. According to Köppen System, the climate is classified as mesothermal type (CWA), with hot and rainy summers and dry winters. The experimental units comprised 5-L pots filled with Dark Red Latosol (according to the Brazilian soil classification system), with a texture classified as clayey (66% clay). The vinasse doses were calculated according to the soil chemical analysis. The chemical analysis of the soil, carried out before trial installation at 0- 20 cm depth, showed the following results: pH 5.3; 2.9 g kg⁻¹ of organic matter; 10 mg dm⁻³ P; 2.2 mmol/dm³ K; 29 mmolc/dm³ Ca; 15 mmolc dm⁻³ Mg and 0.4 % Al; 61% V and 75.2 CEC.

The experimental design for each herbicide was completely randomized, with four replications, in a 4 x 3 factorial scheme, with four herbicide doses and three soil cover treatments (without byproduct, with vinasse, and with filter cake).

The herbicides and doses used were indaziflam (0, 37.5, 75, and 150 g ai ha⁻¹), saflufenacil (0, 42, 84, and 168 g ai ha⁻¹), and sulfentrazone (0, 300, 600, and 1200 g ai ha⁻¹), which were applied for pre-emergent weeds.

The indaziflam target weed was *D. horizontalis*, and for saflufenacil and sulfentrazone, it was *I. triloba*. Seeds of the two weed species were sown separately one day before the byproduct application and in sufficient amounts to obtain five plants per pot.

The byproducts were placed superficially on the soil prior to herbicide application. The dose of filter cake was equivalent to 50 t ha⁻¹ and that of vinasse was equivalent to 330 m³ ha⁻¹. To calculate the vinasse dose, the criterion established by the State of São Paulo Environmental Company [12] was used, which recommends the following calculation for sugarcane: vinasse (m³ ha⁻¹) = [(0.05 x CEC - ks) x 3744 + 185] / kvi, where 0.05 = 5% CEC; CEC = the cation exchange capacity of the soil, expressed in cmolc dm⁻³; ks = the soil potassium concentration, expressed in cmolc dm⁻³; 3744 = the constant to convert the results of the fertility analysis, expressed in cmolc dm⁻³ or meq 100 cm⁻³, to kg of potassium in a volume of 1 ha per 0.80 m depth; 185 = weight, in kilograms of K₂O extracted by the crop per hectare, per cut; and kvi = the vinasse potassium concentration, expressed in kilograms of K₂O m⁻³, presented in the analytical results.

The herbicides were applied two days after sowing (DAS) using a CO₂-pressurized backpack sprayer equipped with a spray bar with Teejet 110.02 fan nozzles and an application volume of 200 L ha⁻¹. Weather conditions at the time of application were wind speed of 0.5 m s⁻¹, relative humidity of 60.5%, and air temperature of 25.7 °C.

At 10, 20, and 40 days after application of the herbicide treatments (DAT), visual evaluations were performed based on the criteria of ALAM [13], which use a percentage scoring scale, where 0 (zero) corresponds to the absence of control and 100% to absolute control. At 40 DAT, the plants were cut close to the ground and dried to constant weight in a forced air oven at 60 °C.

The data obtained for each herbicide were subjected to analysis of variance by the F test, and the means were compared using the Tukey test at 5% probability. Regression curves were fitted for the quantitative data.

Effect of sugarcane byproducts on *I. triloba* and *D. horizontalis* germination

The experimental units comprised 5-L pots filled with Dark Red Latosol soil from the previously sieved arable layer.

The experiment compared seven treatments: three doses of vinasse (82.5, 165, and 330 m³ ha⁻¹), three doses of filter cake (20, 40, and 50 t ha⁻¹), and one treatment with no byproducts, in a completely randomized design with 4 replications. In accordance with the germination analysis, the *I. triloba* and *D. horizontalis* seeds were sown in sufficient quantity to obtain 25 plants per pot.

Emergence was evaluated weekly until 42 DAS, and the emerged plants were counted daily. The total seedling emergence data at the last evaluation were transformed into percentage, according to the total number of seeds in the pots. The emergence speed index (ESI) was calculated using the following formula proposed by Maguire [14]: ESI = N₁/D₁ + N₂/D₂ + ... + N_n/D_n, where ESI = the emergence speed index, N = the number of emerged seedlings on the count day, and D = the number of days after sowing when the counting was performed. At 42 DAS, the plants were cut close to the ground, and the shoot dry mass was determined by drying the plants to a constant weight in a forced air oven at 60 °C.

The percent emergence and ESI data were subjected to analysis of variance, and the means were compared using the Tukey test at 5% probability.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In all evaluations, indaziflam application over the filter cake led to lower control of *D. horizontalis* compared to the treatments with vinasse or without byproduct (Figure 1). Although vinasse did not alter the control of the species in the first evaluation relative to the treatment without byproduct, during the evaluations, a negative interaction was observed with the herbicide.





Fig. 1. Percent control of *D. horizontalis* treated with different doses of indaziflam without byproducts or with vinasse or filter cake in the soil at 10 (A), 20 (B), and 40 days after treatment (DAT) (C).

For the doses, starting at 71 g ha⁻¹, *D. horizontalis* control by indaziflam, without byproducts in the soil, was satisfactory at 40 DAT (considering 80% control) (Figure 1). For vinasse, this dose was 98 g ha⁻¹ (38% higher), and for filter cake, it was 119 g ha⁻¹ (67.6% higher). Therefore, byproducts have a high impact on the performance of this herbicide. Amim et al. [15] observed effective control of this weed starting at the 30 g ha⁻¹ dose of indaziflam. However, Kaapro and Hall [16] observed 100% control for *Digitaria horizontalis* using 100 g ha⁻¹.

Alonso et al. [16] found a positive correlation between indaziflam sorption and the organic carbon content of several Brazilian soils. Both vinasse and filter cake, in general, contain high concentrations of nitrate, potassium, and organic matter; their use may alter soil characteristics by promoting changes in its chemical properties.

141 In addition, the use of the filter cake provided greater vigor to the weeds, favoring
 142 their growth, a finding explained by the large amount of organic matter present in the filter
 143 cake [17][3].
 144 Indaziflam water solubility is low (0.0028 kg m^{-3} at 20°C), with $K_{oc} < 1.000 \text{ mL g}^{-1}$ of organic
 145 carbon, $pka = 3.5$, and $\log K_{ow}$ at pH 4, 7 or 9 = 2.8; this herbicide is considered moderately
 146 mobile to mobile or slightly mobile (Jhala et al. 2012; Jhala & Singh 2012) in the soil. The
 147 lower the water solubility of the herbicide is, the greater the affinity of the molecule for
 148 organic matter, which explains the interaction of this herbicide with the byproducts,
 149 especially the filter cake, which is basically an organic compound with variable chemical
 150 composition; high organic matter, phosphorus, nitrogen, and calcium content; and
 151 considerable potassium and magnesium content [17].
 152 Vinasse had a negative effect on *I. triloba* at 10 DAT, regardless of the dose of saflufenacil
 153 (Figure 2), which was evident from the delayed germination of this species. In the
 154 evaluations conducted at 20 and 40 DAT, emergence occurred in the plants in the vinasse
 155 without herbicide treatment. Similarly, but to a lesser extent, filter cake promoted a delay in
 156 the establishment of the species. Ramos et al. [18] observed that the application of 150 m^3
 157 ha^{-1} of vinasse to the soil is harmful to the emergence and early development of peanut
 158 plants and, to a lesser extent, sunflowers. According to the authors, the higher concentration
 159 of salts in the soil solution may lead to a higher osmotic potential around the seeds, thereby
 160 delaying germination and seedling emergence. These data also corroborate the results of
 161 Azania et al. [19], who found a reduction in the emergence speed and percentage of
 162 *Sidarthombifolia* (arrowleavesida) and *Urochloa decumbens* (signalgrass) with the addition of
 163 vinasse at doses up to $150 \text{ m}^3 \text{ha}^{-1}$, but no reduction was observed in the final stand at 40
 164 DAT. Novo et al. [20] also observed a negative effect of vinasse on the percent emergence
 165 of castor bean seedlings.
 166






Fig. 2. Percent control of *I. triloba* treated with different doses of saflufenacil without byproducts or with vinasse or filter cake in the soil at 10 (A), 20 (B), and 40 days after treatment (DAT) (C).

Regarding the doses, 70 g ha⁻¹ and 72 g ha⁻¹ of saflufenacil were necessary for satisfactory weed control (80%) in the treatments without byproduct and with filter cake, respectively, at 40 DAT. However, with the addition of vinasse, this same level of control was reached with a dose of 51 g ha⁻¹. Thus, the results indicate that vinasse may contribute to reducing the saflufenacil dose required for control of the species.

A phytotoxic response to saflufenacil should occur in soils with organic matter content lower than 1.5% [21]. The soil used in the experiment contained 2.9% organic matter, without considering the organic byproducts represented by the filter cake and vinasse. Nevertheless, the product still had phytotoxic action. In the anionic form of the molecule, a lower force of attraction exists between the herbicide and the soil, leading to lower herbicide sorption, with the herbicide remaining available in the soil solution [22].

Vinasse had a suppressive effect on *I. triloba* in the evaluation of sulfentrazone, which corroborates the results presented previously with saflufenacil. However, filter cake interacted negatively with this herbicide. The necessary doses for 80% control of the species at 40 DAT were 301 g ha⁻¹ and 365 g ha⁻¹ for the treatments without byproduct and vinasse, and 600 g ha⁻¹ with the addition of filter cake; thus, a 100% increase in the treatment dose was required over that of the treatment without the byproduct (Figure 3).




Fig. 3. Percent control of *I. triloba* treated with different doses of sulfentrazone without byproducts or with vinasse or filter cake in the soil at 10 (A), 20 (B), and 40 days after treatment (DAT) (C).

This result may be explained by the fact that sulfentrazone was applied to soils with high organic matter (36 g dm³) and clay (560 g kg⁻¹) content, and thus, because of the ionization constant of the herbicide and the soil pH, sorption of the herbicide to the colloids is favored, with the amount of organic matter present in this byproduct explaining the sorption of sulfentrazone to the filter cake [23] and [24]. At the highest dose of this herbicide, the result was similar to the use of the same herbicide dose in the treatment without the byproducts. However, the weed control dose with the filter cake is in agreement with Campos et al. [25] and Ribeiro et al. [26], who found that the recommended dose of sulfentrazone (600 g ha⁻¹) provided excellent control of *Ipomoea quamoclit*, *I. triloba*, and *Merremiacissoides* as early as the first evaluation, which was conducted at 15 DAT, and this control was maintained until 60 DAT.

In addition, vinasse is constituted by several organic acids, and in addition to being used in soil correction, it can be used to control some weeds by altering the weed emergence flux

and herbicide amount and action [10]. According to Novo et al. [27], sulfentrazone (700 g ha⁻¹), when applied alone and on straw, or when combined with vinasse, on which the pesticide was applied before being added, controlled the initial development of *Cyperusrotundus* (nut grass).

Table 2 shows the final dry biomass accumulation values with the interaction between byproducts and herbicides. With regard to sulfentrazone, and in corroboration with the phytotoxicity results, a high biomass accumulation of *I. triloba* was observed when filter cake was used, and double the dose of herbicide was required to reduce the biomass in comparison with the other treatments.

Table 2. Shoot dry biomass of weeds treated with different doses of sulfentrazone, saflufenacil and indaziflam with or without byproducts in the soil.

Dry biomass - <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> (g pot ⁻¹)			
Sulfentrazone g a.i ha ⁻¹	Vinasse	Filter cake	Without byproducts
0	0.15 aB	3.34 bA	0.26 aB
300	0.20 aB	4.66 aA	0.05 abC
600	0.00 bA	0.07 cA	0.02 bA
1200	0.00 bA	0.01 cA	0.02 bA
*CV line	17.28	*CV column	16.10
**MSD 5%	0.16	**MSD 5%	0.10
Dry biomass - <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> (g pot ⁻¹)			
Saflufenacil g a.i ha ⁻¹	Vinasse	Filter cake	Without byproducts
0	0.05 aC	4.25 aA	0.27 aB
42	0.07 aC	1.78 bA	0.32 aB
84	0.00 aA	0.07 cA	0.05 bA
168	0.00 aB	0.15 cA	0.02 bB
*CV line	11.14	*CV column	11.04
**MSD 5%	0.08	**MSD 5%	0.06
Dry biomass - <i>D. horizontalis</i> (g pot ⁻¹)			
Indaziflam g a.i ha ⁻¹	Vinasse	Filtercake	Withoutbyproducts
0	0.13 aB	1.29 aA	0.04 abB
37.5	0.07 aB	0.42 bA	0.10 aB
75	0.00 bA	0.03 cA	0.00 bA
150	0.00 bA	0.07 cA	0.00 bA
*CV line	44.19	*CV column	38.97
**MSD 5%	0.10	**MSD 5%	0.06

The averages followed by the same letter do not differ statistically from each other, lower case letters are compared vertically and upper case horizontal by the Tukey test 5%. *CV (coefficient of variation); **MSD (minimum significant difference).

221 The influence of filter cake on biomass production was observed by Vasconcelos [28] in
 222 sugarcane, where the presence of filter cake in the soil led to a shoot biomass production of
 223 12.9 kg ha⁻¹ and the absence of the byproduct to 10.3 kg ha⁻¹.
 224 Concerning saflufenacil, vinasse had a positive effect on the control of *I. triloba* at the lowest
 225 herbicide doses (0 and 42 g ai ha⁻¹), as this treatment was superior to the treatment without
 226 byproduct and with filter cake, with the filter cake promoting an increase in biomass
 227 accumulation at these doses.
 228 For indaziflam, the filter cake also interacted negatively. Vinasse showed no difference in
 229 biomass accumulation relative to the treatment without byproduct.
 230 Overall, analysis of the biomass revealed that at the two highest doses of all the herbicides,
 231 high weed control was obtained, regardless of the addition of vinasse or filter cake.
 232 Therefore, the byproducts evaluated have an effect on herbicide efficacy at doses below
 233 those recommended.
 234 Because one factor that affects the downward movement of herbicides in the soil is the
 235 content and type of organic matter [29], at herbicide doses below that recommended, the
 236 process tends to be more affected by the byproducts, leading to greater difficulty of the
 237 herbicide to descend to the soil layer housing the weed seeds.

238

239 **Effect of sugarcane byproducts on *I. triloba* and *D. horizontalis* germination**

240 Table 3 shows a significant difference for all variables involving the *I. triloba* at different
 241 doses of vinasse and filter cake, in addition to a control treatment without the addition of
 242 byproducts. Higher doses of vinasse negatively affected both the ESI and the percent weed
 243 emergence. Filter cake stood out positively relative to the vinasse for weed biomass
 244 accumulation, especially at the 50 t.ha⁻¹ dose. According to Santos et al. [3], the positive
 245 effects of the filter cake probably result not only from the nutrient supply but also from the
 246 increased soil moisture accumulation and increased cation exchange capacity, thus causing
 247 an improvement in the utilization of nutrients originally present in the soil.

248

249

250 **Table 3.** Shoot dry mass (g), emergence (%) and ESI of *I. triloba* e *D. horizontalis* treated with
 251 different doses byproducts in the soil.

Treatments	Doses (t or m ³ ha ⁻¹)	Shoot dry mass (g)	ESI	Emergence (%)
<i>I. triloba</i>				
Control	0.0	1.22 b	2.23 a	35.00 a
Vinasse	82.5	1.77 b	2.16 a	30.50 a
Vinasse	165.0	2.27 b	1.09 b	25.00 b
Vinasse	330.0	1.45 b	1.00 b	21.00 b
Filter cake	20.0	3.45 ab	2.02 a	30.00 a
Filter cake	40.0	4.32 ab	2.45 a	41.50 a
Filter cake	50.0	7.50 a	4.79 a	62.00 a
*CV %		58.57	44.79	27.89
**MSD 5%		4.22	3.18	35.25
<i>D. horizontalis</i>				
Treatments	Doses (t or m ³ ha ⁻¹)	Shoot dry mass (g)	ESI	Emergence (%)
Control	0.0	0.46 c	7.91 a	88.57 a
Vinasse	82.5	2.36 c	9.15 a	96.42 a
Vinasse	165.0	1.02 c	7.44 a	84.28 a
Vinasse	330.0	1.25 c	8.03 a	90.71 a
Filter cake	20.0	1.72 c	7.19 a	82.85 a
Filter cake	40.0	6.64 b	6.94 a	77.14 a
Filter cake	50.0	12.06 a	4.63 a	62.85 a
*CV %		38.81		
**MSD 5%		3.25		

Equal lowercase letters between columns do not differ statistically at 5% significance. *CV (coefficient of variation); **MSD (minimum significant difference).

For *D. horizontalis*, the lowest filter cake dose used did not differ from the treatments with vinasse or from the control; however, the biomass accumulation was 3.9 and 7.0 times higher at 40 t ha⁻¹ and 50 t ha⁻¹, respectively, compared to 20 t ha⁻¹ (Table 3).

No significant differences were detected regarding the percent emergence and ESI of *D. horizontalis* with the use of the byproducts as a function of the doses. According to Ramos et al. [18], the effect of vinasse on the plant emergence and initial development can be positive or negative depending on the species involved. For carrots, Cavatte et al. [30] found that the addition of vinasse contributed to a reduction in seed germination; however, the addition of filter cake had no effect compared to the control.

4. CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the vinasse and filter cake byproducts from the sugar and alcohol industry may negatively or positively affect the performance of pre-emergence herbicides, depending on the active ingredient used, especially at herbicide doses below those recommended. Byproducts can affect the emergence and the weed biomass accumulation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Fravet PRF De, Soares RAB, Lana RMQ, Lana AMQ, Korndorfer GH. Efeito de doses de torta de filtro e modo de aplicação sobre a produtividade e qualidade tecnológica da soqueira de cana-de-açúcar. *Ciência e Agrotecnologia*. 2010; 34:618-624. Portuguese.
2. Zolin CA, Paulino J, Bertonha A, Freitas PSL, Folegatti MV. Estudo exploratório do uso da vinhaça ao longo do tempo. I. Características do solo. *Revista Brasileira de Engenharia Agrícola e Ambiental*. 2011; 15:22–28. Portuguese.
3. Santos DH, Tiritan CS, Foloni JSS, Fabris LB. Produtividade de cana-de-açúcar sob adubação com torta de filtro enriquecida com fosfato solúvel. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Tropical*. 2010; 40:454-461. Portuguese.
4. Marques GM. Vinhaça: o futuro da fertilização. *Meio Ambiente*. 2015; 66:1-5. Portuguese.
5. SilvestreAAF, Reis ACS, Gomes AO, Silva DF Da, Débia PJG, Gonçalves, AC. Utilização da Vinhaça na Agricultura. *Journal of Agronomic*. 2014:47-62. Portuguese.
6. Victoria FR, Christoffoleti PJ. Manejo de plantas daninhas e produtividade da cana. *Visão Agrícola*. 2014: 1-3. Portuguese.
7. Blanco FMG, Velini ED, Filho AB. Persistência do herbicida sulfentrazone em solo cultivado com cana-de-açúcar. *Bragantia*. 2010; 69: 71-75. Portuguese.
8. Matos AKA. Influence of vinasse and straw of cane sugar on the sorption of herbicides in different soils (Master thesis). Universidade Estadual Paulista, Faculdade de Ciências Agronômicas de Botucatu, 2014. São Paulo, Brazil. Portuguese.
9. Prata F, Lavoretti A. Comportamento de herbicidas no solo: influência da matéria orgânica. *Revista Biociências*. 2000; 6: 17-22. Portuguese.

- 304 10. Quintela ACR, Andrade LA, Córrea JBD, Rezende PM. Controle de plantas
305 daninhas em cana crua (cultivar RB835089) no sistema integrado palhiço, herbicida
306 e vinhaça. STAB. 2002; 20: 38-42. Portuguese
- 307 11. Christoffoleti PJ, Bacchi OOS. Efeitos da aplicação de vinhaça sobre a população e
308 controle químico de plantas daninhas na cultura da cana-de-açúcar (*Saccharum*
309 *spp.*). Planta Daninha. 1985; 8:60-70. Portuguese.
- 310 12. CETESB Norma P4.231 - Vinhaça – critérios e procedimentos para aplicação no
311 solo agrícola. 2006. Portuguese
- 312 13. Asociación Latinoamericana De Malezas (ALAM). Recomendaciones sobre
313 unificación de los sistemas de evaluación en ensayos de control de malezas.
314 ALAM. 1974;1: 35-38.
- 315 14. Maguire JD. Speed of germination aid in selection and evaluation for seedling
316 emergence and vigor. Crop Science. 1962; 2:176-77.
- 317 15. Amim RT, Freitas SP, Freitas ILJ, Gravina GA, Paes H.M.F. Controle de plantas
318 daninhas pelo indaziflam em solos com diferentes características físico-químicas.
319 Planta Daninha. 2014; 32: 60-64. Portuguese
- 320 16. Kaapro J, Hall J. Indaziflam - A new herbicide for pre-emergent control of weeds in
321 turf, forestry, industrial vegetation and ornamentals. Weed Science Research. 2012;
322 18: 267-270.
- 323 17. Nunes Júnior D. Torta de filtro: De resíduo a produto nobre. Revista Idea News.
324 2008; 92:22-30. Portuguese
- 325 18. Ramos, N.P.; Novo, M.C.S.S.; Ungaro, M.R.G.; Lago, A.A.; Marin, G.C. Efeito da
326 vinhaça no desenvolvimento inicial de girassol, mamona e amendoim em casa de
327 vegetação. Bragantia. 2008; 67:685-692. Portuguese
- 328 19. Azania AAPM, Azania CAM, Marques MO, Pavani MCMD. Emergência e
329 desenvolvimento de guanxuma (*Sida rhombifolia*), capim-braquiária
330 (*Brachiaria decumbens*) e cana-de-açúcar (*Saccharum spp.*) influenciados por
331 subprodutos da destilação do álcool. Planta Daninha. 2004; 22:331-336. Portuguese
- 332 20. Novo MCSS, Ramos N P, Lago, A A, Marin G C. Efeito da adição de palha de cana-
333 de-açúcar e da aplicação de vinhaça ao solo no desenvolvimento inicial de três
334 cultivares de mamona. Revista brasileira de sementes. 2007; 29:125-130.
335 Portuguese
- 336 21. Hixson A.C. Soil Properties Affect Simazine and Saflufenacil Fate, Behavior, and
337 Performance. Faculty of North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.
338 2008.
- 339 22. Inoue MH, Santana DC, Oliveira Jr RS, Clemente RA, Dallacort R, Possamai ACS,
340 Santana CTC, Pereira KM. Calagem e o potencial de lixiviação de imazaquin em
341 colunas de solo. Planta Daninha. 2002; 20:125-132. Portuguese
- 342 23. Grey TL, Walker RH, Hancock HG. Sulfentrazone adsorption and mobility as affected
343 by soil and pH. Weed Science. 1997; 45: 733-738.
- 344 24. Monquero PA, Silva PV, Silva Hirata AC, Tablas DC, Orzari I. Lixiviação e
345 persistência dos herbicidas sulfentrazone e imazapic. Planta Daninha. 2010; 28: 45-
346 54. Portuguese
- 347 25. Campos LH, Francisco MO, Carvalho SJP, Nicolai M, Christoffoleti
348 PJ. Suscetibilidade de *Ipomoea aquamoclit*, *I. triloba* e *Merremiacisoides* aos
349 herbicidas sulfentrazone e amicarbazone. Planta Daninha. 2009; 27: 831-840.
350 Portuguese
- 351 26. Ribeiro NM, Torres BA, Ramos SK, Santos PHV, Simões CT, Monquero P A.
352 Differential susceptibility of morning glory (*Ipomoea* and *Merremia*) species to
353 residual herbicides and the effect of drought periods on efficacy. Australian Journal
354 of Crop Science. 2018; 4:1090-1098.
- 355 27. Novo MCSS, Victoria Filho R, Langbeck FM, Lago AA, Deuber R, Rolim GS.
356 Interação de imazapic no sistema integrado palha de cana-de-açúcar, herbicida e

- 357 vinhaça no crescimento inicial da tiririca.Planta Daninha. 2008; 26: 439-449.
358 Portuguese
- 359 28. Vasconcelos R.L. Fontes de fósforo e torta de filtro sobre o estado nutricional e
360 produtividade da cana-planta (Master thesis). Universidade Estadual Paulista,
361 Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias e Veterinárias de Jaboticabal, Sao Paulo,
362 Brazil.2013
- 363 29. Prata F,Cardinali VC, LavorentiA, Tornisielo VL, Regitano J. Glyphosate sorption
364 and desorption in soils with different phosphorous levels. Scientia Agricola. 2003;
365 60: 175-180.
- 366 30. Cavatte PC, Zonta J B, Lopes JC, Souza LT, Zonta J.H. and Cavatte
367 R.P.Q.Germination and vigor of carrot seeds in limestone mining Soil under different
368 light intensities and fertilizations. Volum. 2009; 2: 25-32.