

Biological Control of Weeds using Different Means

DHRUV SINGH, HARSHITA SINGH¹, MC SINGH², CHANDRAKANT,
BHUPENDRA SINGH AND REETESH P SINGH

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut-250 110, UP

¹*GB Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar-263 145, UK*

²*ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi-110 012*

Abstract: Biological control of weeds involves the use of living organisms to attack a weed population to keep at or below desirable level without significantly affecting desirable plants. It includes use of insects, pathogens, nematodes, parasitic plants and competitive plants. Historically, biological control method has proved best on large infestation of a single weed species. These situations usually occurred in range lands or in water bodies. Biological control has also been successful into newly introduced weed area free from its natural enemies. Unfortunately, biological weed control has not developed to the point that it has any appreciable impact on the production of agronomic crops. The more recent and much more successful importation of several pathogens into several countries have served to increase interest in the classical approach to biological control of weeds to such a point that several countries are now actively pursuing this approach. A large number of biocontrol agents are used in biological weed control measure. Some outstanding examples of biological control of weeds are the use of insect to control *Hypericum perforatum* L., *Opuntia* sp. and *Lantana camera* L.

Keywords: Biological control, Insect, Mycoherbicide, Pathogen, Weed

INTRODUCTION

The global need for weed control has been imposed mainly by the chemical industry. If herbicides are often effective and necessary to agriculture, yet pose some serious problems particularly if they are misused. For example, toxic and otherwise harmful compounds threaten animal and public health when they accumulated in food plants, ground waters and drinking water. They can also directly harm the workers who apply them. Even though chemical herbicides are found to be most cost effective and efficacious in the management of weeds in crop field, growing political and environmental concerns have necessitated the search for alternatives. A key approach in all sustainable weed management system is to make the best possible use of the natural enemies of each weed a tactic known as biological control. When properly implemented, biological control had

been to many spectacular successes against both insect pests and weeds generally by the introduction of natural enemies for the country of origin of a pest or weeds and also by avoiding unnecessary use of the chemicals (pesticide and herbicides) particularly those that possess a broad spectrum of activity (Julien, 1992).

I. BIOLOGICAL WEED CONTROL WITH PLANT PATHOGEN

Biological control of weeds by using plant pathogens has gained acceptance as a practical, safe, environmentally beneficial, weed management method applicable to agroecosystems. The interest in this weed control approach from public and private groups and support for research and development effort are the upswing (Charudattan, 2001).

The science of using plant pathogen to control weeds is almost as old as the science of

plant pathology (Templeton et al., 1979; Wilson, 1969). Wilson (1969) described previous efforts to use pathogens for control of cactus, mistletoe, aquatic and agronomic weeds, and weedy trees that represent a continuous effort in biological control of weeds from 1890 through 1969. Cockayne (1910) reported that fungi had been investigated as “weed controllers” in many parts of the world but without success. Cunningham (1927) reported that “natural control” of weeds with plant pathogens had received “much attention in recent years” for eliminating weed without direct labour or monetary expense and described modest efforts to control weeds with pathogen in New Zealand. This type of control of weeds/plants by one species in agroecosystem nowadays known as allelopathy for harmful as well as beneficial effects.

A. Strategies for the Control of Weeds with Plant Pathogens

(i) The Classical Strategy

In this, a pathogen is simply released into weed populations and is expected to increase and disperse naturally throughout the entire weed population without significant subsequent annual release or augmentation of established population (Charudattan, 1984). The natural increase of disease on susceptible plants is relied upon to control weeds, either directly from plant death or indirectly through reduction of plant vigour and seed production, over broad geographical setting and within many ecological niches. The maximum degree of success (55.51%) by classical strategy in India has been achieved in aquatic weed followed by terrestrial weeds (23.8%) (Singh, 1995).

(ii) The Bioherbicide Strategy

As bio-herbicides (microbial pesticides), pathogen can be applied to control weeds within a specific geographical site (i. e., a single field) by inundative application of inoculum (Charudattan; 1984). This approach also referred to as the mycoherbicide approach (Templeton et al., 1979). Inundative application of inoculum of pathogens, often to early stages of weed growth, results in the control of weed infestation without

the disease developing beyond the initial lesion into epidemics. The initial lesion caused by the applied inoculum directly causes the death of infected weed seedlings.

(iii) The Augmentation Strategy

The augmentation strategy is similar to the bioherbicide strategy in that while there is direct human manipulation and distribution of inoculum, the inoculum is neither mass-produced nor applied as an inundative dose over large areas (Charudattan, 1984). Control of the weed results from and requires the increase of disease through many disease cycles to reach threshold levels that cause the death of infected plants within treated areas. These strategies permit the utilization of many different types of pathogens causing different types of diseases.

B. Control of Weeds with Plant Pathogens

(i) Biological control of weeds with microbial pesticides

Three endemic fungal plant pathogen have been registered as microbial pesticides. One is soil born fungus, *Phytophthora*, while two are foliar pathogens in the genus *Colletotrichum*. The endemic fungal pathogen *Phytophthora palmivora* was first used commercially as DeVine in 1981 to control strangler vine, *Morrenia odorata* in citrus groves (Kenney, 1986).

Colletotrichum gloeosporioides was developed in United States and marketed as a microbial herbicide in 1982 as collego for the control of northern jointvetch, *A. virginica*, in rice and soybean in several states in the lower Mississippi River delta (Bowers, 1986). *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* causes an anthracnose on jointvetch seedlings, infesting stems, petioles and leaflets (Daniel et al., 1973; Te Beest, 1988). Enlargement and coalescence of stem lesion result in the girdling and death of plant above the lesions. The fungus sporulates profusely on the lesion surface, and rainfall contributes to dispersal of the fungus spores on the plant, increasing the severity of infection. In the hands of growers, the commercial formulation of the fungus provides greater than 90% control of jointvetch when used according to label direction (Bowers, 1986).

Collego has not been marketed by the registrant since 1992.

A third mycoherbicide, BIOMEL, is composed of spores of *C. Gloeosporioides* (Penz.) Sacco f. sp. *malvae* and was registered in 1992 in Canada for the control of round leaved mallow (*Malva pusilla*, Sm.) in wheat (Mortenson, 1991). The fungus infects leaves, petioles, stems and crowns of this weed and kills the plant within a few weeks after application. The fungus infects several *Malva* species, velvet leaf (*Abutilon theophrasti* Medic.), and hollyhock (*Althea rosea* (L) Cav.), but the disease is severe only on *M. pusilla*.

Work on mycoherbicides resulted in the identification of many new pathogens on *Parthenium* in India. *Cryptosporiopsis* sp., *Alternaria zinniae* M.B. Ellis, *Phoma sorghina* (Sacc.) Boerema, Dorenb. and Kesteren and *Lasiodiplodia theobromae* (Pat.) were some of the hitherto unrecorded pathogens on the weeds (Kumar and Singh, 2000). The most pathogenic isolate IWF (Ph)3; IMI 378270J of *Cryptosporiopsis* sp., was evaluated further and found to be an ideal for mycoherbicide development (Evans et al., 2000).

Ascochyta caulina is a plant pathogenic fungus which is specific to *Chenopodium album*. It has been suggested as a potential mycoherbicide to this weed, which is important and wide spread in arable crop throughout Europe (Netland et al., 2001). Fungus *Stagonospora convolvuli* strain LA39, able to infect both field and hedge bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis* and *Calystegia sepium*, respectively), was found in the UK and its biocontrol efficiency improved by optimizing mass production, formulation and storage techniques. This fungus controlled bindweeds in both a cemetery and in maize crops (Defago et al., 2001). *Colletotrichum orbiculare* has been reevaluated as a biological control agent for Bathurst bur (*Xanthium spinosom* L.) in Australia, when applied as a mycoherbicide, the fungus controlled 50 to 100% of the seedlings in field tests conducted in 1987 and 1988. The highest levels of control, 98 to 100%, were achieved in a dry land grazing site (Auld et al., 1990).

In Japan, two fungi, *Drechslera monoceras* and *Epicochosorus nematosporus* are being investigated

for control of two of the major weeds in rice fields in Japan which is to be very problematic. *Drechslera monoceras* has been reported to give excellent control of barnyard grass, *Echinochloa* species, in greenhouse and field test (Gohbara and Yamaguchi, 1993). Combined use of this fungus and the herbicide pyrazos~lfuron-ethyl controlled most of the weeds growing in paddy fields. Similarly, *E. nematosporus* has been repeatedly effective in controlling water chestnut (*Elocharis kuroguwai*) in green house and field tests (Gohbara and Yamaguchi, 1993). In China, *Exserohilum monoceras* and *Drechslera monoceras* were evaluated for their potential as biological control agents of barnyard grass (*Echinichloa crusgalli*). The soil-borne fungus *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* (Lib.) de Bary has been investigated for control of Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense* (L.) Scop.), spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa* Lam.), and dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale* Weber) (Riddle et al., 1991). Population of dandelions in turf grass were reduced 80 to 85% following repeated applications of heat killed perennial ryegrass seed infested with *S. sclerotiorum* (Riddle et al., 1991).

In the United States an endemic rust has also been evaluated for control of a weed utilizing the augmentative approach rather than a truly classical approach. *Puccinia canalicuiata* (Schw). Lagerh has been evaluated for control of nut sedges; *Cyperus rotundus* L. and *C. esculentus* L, in the United States. When released early in the spring, the rust inhibits flowering and tuber formation (Callaway et al. 1985).

(ii) Control of weeds with classical strategy

Pathogens used in the classical approach are expected to reduce weed populations to economically insignificant levels as a result of the natural epidemics they would cause. (Tempeton et al., 1979). The introduction of the rust fungus *Puccinia chondrilla* into Australia in 1971 from Mediterranean region for the control of rust skeleton weed (*Chondrilla juncea*) appears to constitute the first deliberate introduction of a pathogen for weed control in any country in what has become known as the classical approach to biological control of weeds with plant pathogens (Cullen et al., 1972). Two

strains of *P. chondrillina* from Eboli, Italy, were introduced into the United States in 1975. Within 2 years, the fungus caused severe infections of plants throughout populations of skeleton weed in California, Oregon, Idaho and Washington (Lee, 1986). In 1975, *Entyloma ageratinae* was introduced into Hawaii from Jamaica to control mistflower [*Ageratina riparia* (Regel) K. & R.]. Weed population reduced from 80 to < 5% of the original population within 1 year.

(iii) Biological control of aquatic weeds with plant pathogen

Several plant pathogens have been or are currently under investigation for biological control of aquatic weeds such as water hyacinth, water milfoil, duckweeds, alligator weed and water lettuce, in a variety of aquatic environments (Joye, 1990). Pathogens of aquatic weeds that have been tested as microbial pesticides include species of *Fusarium* and *Macrophomina*, on hydrilla and species of *Acremonium*, *Colletotrichum*, *Fusarium*, *Pythium* and *Phytophthora* for control of eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum* L.), but no promising control agents have been found among these isolates (Joye, 1990). Experiments were conducted with potential commercial formulation of *Cercospora rodmanii* Conway for control of water hyacinth [*Eichhornia crassipes* (Mart) Solmes]. This fungus has been released in South Africa for control of water hyacinth in the Crocodile river using a classical approach (Morris and Cilliers, 1992). Recently, *Microleptodiscus terrestris* (Gerdemann) was reported to have considerable impact on the population of milfoili in Aorida tests (Joye, 1990). In recent work, Verma and Charudattan (1993) reported that this fungus was pathogenic to 3 (*Hydrilla verticillata*, *Myriophyllum aquaticum* and *Ceratophyllum demersum* L.) of 16 aquatic plant tested.

(iv) Biological control of weeds with bacterial plant pathogens

Caesar (1994) suggested that strains of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* (E.F. Smith and Town) isolated from important rangeland weeds may be effective as biological control agents for their respective hosts. Zhou and Neal (1995) compared strains of *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *poannua*

as biocontrol agents for annual and perennial subspecies of annual bluegrass (*Poa annua* L.). Results of controlled growth chamber and field tests showed that two strains of this bacterium were similarly virulent in both tests. Johnson (1994) reported that three application of two strains of *X. campestris* pv. *poannua* controlled between 52 and 82% of the annual blue grass in dormant bermudagrass (*Cynodon transvaalensis* Burt-Davy X *C. dactylon* (L) Pers.) field plots. Begonia et al. (1990) have demonstrated in culture to be assemblies that isolates of *Pseudomonas* and *Erwinia herbicola* caused velvetleaf (*Abutilon theophrasti*) seedling to become chlorotic and develop abnormal root systems compared to non inoculated controls.

(I) BIOLOGICAL WEED CONTROL WITH BIOAGENT OTHER THAN PLANT PATHOGEN

A large number of biocontrol agents such as insects, mites, animals, fish, birds, and their toxic products have been identified for weed control. Among them, insects are one of the important groups. Certain species of insects have been introduced in the region where some weeds such as cactus, klamath weed, lantana, water hycinth and parthenium have become a serious nuisance.

Outstanding case of biological control of weeds

(i) **Lantana (*Lantana camara* L.):** The first attempt of using insects to control weeds was done in the early 1920's to control *Lantana* sp. *Lantana camara* L. is the perennial shrub which is used as an ornamental plant throughout the world. This species became a menace in coconut plantation, rangelands and hindered reforestation. A seedfly (*Ophimoyia lantanae*), a lacebug (*Teleonania scrupulosa*) and butterfly (*Theola* spp.) have been used to control this weeds. Test conducted in 1920 and later showed that some of the insect were very effective in controlling Lantana. These insects include (a) larvae of *Crocidosema lantanae*, (b) larvae of *Agromyza lantanace* and (D) larvae of *Thecla echion* and *Thecla bazochi* (Thakur, 1992).

(ii) **Pricklypear (*Opuntia* sp.):** In Australia, the biological control of *Opuntia* by *Cactoblastic cactorum* transformed pricklypear territory of 24 million ha from a wilderness to a scene of

prosperous endeavor. In India, 40,000 ha of land infested with *Opuntia dillenii* was recovered from the weed by releasing *Dactylopius tomentosus* cochineal scale insect as bioagent other species of *Opuntia* were not attacked by this insect (Narayanan, 1954). The primary damage to *Opuntia* with insects can be combined with secondary attack by bacterial and fungal parasites for eroding the weeds. These secondary bioagents are *Cleosporium anatum* E & E, *Phyllosticta concava* Seav and *Montegnella opuntiorum* Spera.

(iii) Klamath weed (*Hypericum perloratum* L.): This is considered as a noxious weed in the rangelands of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and USA. Two species of the leaf feeding beetle, *Chrysolina hyperici*, *C. gamellata* and a root borer, *Agrilus hyperici* have been used against this weed.

(iv) Aquatic weeds: Waterhyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), a world wide aquatic weeds, infest transplanted paddy fields in many countries, including India. Most success in respect of biological control of this weed has been met in Florida (USA) with a hyacinth moth, *Sameodes albiguttalis* B. Benner, which is a native of South America (Center, 1982). The bioagent exhibits its rapid reproduction ability in field condition its larvae feed upon young leaves and apical buds of water hyacinth, rather severely. Success has been achieved also in the field of aquatic weed control by using the weevil *Neochetina bruchii*, *N. eichorniae* to control water hyacinth and similarly grass carp fish *Ptenopharyngodon idealla* Vahl could control submerged aquatic weeds quite effectively (Gupta, 1987). In Kerala, fresh courses and paddy fields have been cleared from *Salvinia* (*Salvinia molesta*), using curculionid beetle (*Cyrtobagous salviniae*) as a very effective bioagent. The young larvae of the beetle damage the terminal buds, rhizomes, and petioles of *salvinia*.

(v) *Parthenium hysterophorus* (L.): This is an exotic noxious weed accidentally introduced in India in 1956. The Mexican beetle (*Zygogramma bicolorata*) is found to have great potential to bring about permanent reduction in the density of *P. hysterophorus* in the parts of India experiencing moderate weather conditions. (Muniappa, 1980). This beetle was found most active on *P. hysterophorus* during May to September

in Uttaranchal, India (Pandey et al., 2001). Dhileepan et al. (2001), Use light microscope, histochemical assay, gas exchange measurement and mineral estimation to determine response to galling in *P. hysterophorus* by *Epiblema strenuana* and *Cantrachelas albocinereus*. The ability of galls insect to alter the concentration of minerals such as magnesium, chloride and zinc in various part of the plant suggest that these galls act as "mobilizing sink". For the control of *Parthenium*, *Cacia cinacia* another weed (legume) and *Cenchrus ciliaris* (fodder grass) have been found suitable (Mahadevapa, 1997).

(vi) *Orobanche* spp.: Almost 50 insect are reported to feed on *Orobanche* sp. The only insect which selectively and effectively damage *Orobanche* is the fly *Phytomyza orobanchia* Kalt (Diptera: Agromyzidae) (Link et al., 1992).

(IV) BIOLOGICAL WEED CONTROL THROUGH ALLELOPATHY

Green plant produces numerous secondary metabolites many of which are capable of inhibiting plant growing in a community. These chemicals have been designed as allelochemicals and the process as allelopathy. Several instances when such allelopathic phenomena is observed amongst the weeds themselves giving scientists opportunity to use it in allelopathic control of certain weeds using specific botanicals. For instance, dry dodder (*Cuscuta* spp.) powder has been found to inhibit severely the growth of waterhyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) and eventually kill it. Like wise, dry carrot grass (*Parthenium hysterophorus*) powder was found detrimental to certain aquatic weeds. The presence of marigold (*Tagetes* spp.) plants exerted adverse allelopathic effect on *P. hysterophorus* growth. So was found true of, the weed coffee-sena (*Cassia* spp.) which exerted suppressive allelopathic effects on *Parthenium* (Jaykumar et al., 2001). The eucalyptus tree leaf leachates have been shown to suppress the growth of nutsedge (*Cyperus rotundus*) and bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) (Pandey et al., 2001). Several plant species like *Cassia sericeae*, *Cassia tora*, *Cassia antricularia*, *Ipomoea muricata*, *Amaranthus spinosus* and *Croton spiciflorus* have the potential to suppress the carrot grass. *C. sericea* have proved a promising alternate to

control carrot weed at Dharwar and Bangalore in waste land and non cropped area (Mahadevappa et al., 1997).

Future research considerations for biological control of weeds

- Prioritization of taxonomic survey, identification of species and biotypes and preparation of distribution maps of weeds.
- A high degree specificity for the target weed. No effect on non target and beneficial plant or man.
- Potential impact to biotechnological research and development.
- Natural enemies for most plants studied have been identified but whether these can provide the levels of controls, specificity and environmental safety required by today's standards, remain open to question.
- The role of bio-control in integrated weed management and the extent, to which it can help in controlling the numerous weed species, remain to be seen.
- Study of the biology of natural enemy and the weed-natural enemy relationships to determine how best they could be used to solve the problem.
- Increasing the effectiveness of the indigenous host specific natural enemies through different types of manipulations.
- Development of expertise through training.

CONCLUSION

There has been growing awareness and concern about environmental issues and the need to protect it for future generation, The indiscriminate use of broad-spectrum chemicals has resulted in reduction in biodiversity of natural enemies, out break of numerous weeds, development of resistance to herbicides, herbicides induce resurgence and contamination of food and ecosystem. For this, biological weed control measures have been systematically encouraged to bring down the use of toxic chemicals. Future research may discover specific biological control of organisms and combinations of organisms that an effective and safe and can be integrated

with other methods of weed management in crops. There are not many now.

References

- Auld, B.A., McRae, C.F. and Say, M.M. 1988. Possible control of *Xanthium spinosum* by a fungus. *Agric. Ecosystems Environ.*, 21: 219-223.
- Begonia, M.F.T., Kremer, R.J., Stanley, L. and Jamshedi, A. 1990. Association of bacteria with velvet leaf roots. *Acad. Sci.*, 24: 17-26.
- Bowers, R.C. 1986. Commercialization of Collego: an industrialist's view. *Weed Science* 34: 24-25.
- Caesar, A. J. 1994. Pathogenicity of *Agrobacterium* species from the noxious rangeland weeds. *Euphorbia esula* and *Centaurea repens*. *Plant Disease*, 78:796-800.
- Callaway, M. B., Phatak, S. C and Wells, H. D. 1985. Studies on alternate hosts of the rust *Puccinia canaliculata*, a potential biological control agent for nutsedges. *Plant Disease*, 69: 924-926.
- Center, T. D. 1982. The water hyacinth weevils *Neochetina eichhorniae* and *N. bruchi*. *Aquatics*, 4(2):8, 16, 18-19.
- Charudattan, R. 1984. Microbial control pathogens and weeds. *J. Georgia Entomol. Soc.*, 19(3): 40-62.
- Charudattan, R. 2001. Biological control of weeds by means of plant pathogens: Significance for integrated weed management in modern agroecology. *Biocontrol*, 46: 229-260.
- Cockayne, A.H. 1910. Fungi as weed-controllers. *New Zealand J. Agric.*, 1: 214-215.
- Cullen, J.M., Kable, P.F. and Catt, M. 1973. Epidemic spread of a rust imported for biological control. *Nature*. 244: 462-464.
- Cunningham, G. H. 1927. —Natural control of weeds and insects by fungi. *New Zealand J. Agric.*, 34: 244-254.
- Daniel, J. T., Templeton, G. E. and Smith, R. J. 1973. Biological control of Northern jointvetch in rice with an endemic fungal disease. *Weed Science*, 21: 303-307.
- Defago, G. et al. 2001. Towards the biocontrol of bindweeds with a mycoherbicide. *Biocontrol*, 46 (2): 157-173.
- Dhileepan, K., Raman, A. and Florentine, S. K. 2001. Efficiency of gall-inducing insects in the biological. *Antenna*, 25: 47-52.
- Evans. H.C. et al. 2000. Final Technical Report (1996-2000): "Developing strategies for the control of *Parthenium* weed in India using fungal pathogens", submitted to the Department for International Development, United Kingdom, pp 191.
- Gohbara, M. and Yamaguchi, K 1993. Extension Bulletin No. 369. Food and Fertilizer Technology Center, Taipai City, Republic of China on Taiwan. Pp 56.

- Gupta, O.P. 1987. Aquatic Weed Management. Today and Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers, N. Delhi (India) pp. 244.
- Jaykumar, R. et al. 2001. *Madras Agric. J.*, 76: 645-647.
- Johnson B.J. 1994. Biological control of annual bluegrass with *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *poannua* in bermudagrass. *Hort. Science*, 29: 659-662.
- Joye, G.F. 1990. In: Microbes and Microbial Products as Herbicides (Hoagland, R.E. ed.), American Chemical Society, Washington, DC. pp. 155-175.
- Julien, M.E. 1992. Biological Control of Weeds: A World Catalogue of Agents and Their Target Weeds CAB. International, Wallingford, Ox on, UK pp. 208.
- Kenney, D. S. 1986. Devine - the way it was developed - an industrialist's view. *Weed Science*, 34:15-16.
- Kumar, P. S. and Singh, S. P. 2000. First report of *Lasiodiplodia theobromae* as a foliar pathogen of *Parthenium hysterophorus*. *Plant Disease*, 84: 1343.
- Lee, G.A. 1986. Integrated control of rush skeleton weed (*Chondrilla juncea*) in the Western United States. *Weed Science*, 34: 2-6.
- Link, KH. et al. 1992. Proc. 8th Int. Symp on Cont. Weeds, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand. Pp 45.
- Mahadevappa, M. et al. 1997. Proc. 5th Int. conference on Aerobiology held at Bangalore from 10-15 August. Pp 117-126.
- Morris, M. J. and Cilliers, C.J. 1992. New fungus against waterhyacinth. *Plant Protection News* No. 30. Bull. Plant Protection Research Institute, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Mortensen, K. 1991. *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* causing anthracnose of *Lavatera* sp. *Can. Plant Dis. Surv.*, 71:155-159.
- Muniappa, T. V. 1980. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Agric. Sci., Bangalore. pp.118.
- Narayanan, E. S. 1954. In: Report. Commonwealth Entomology Conference Sixth Meet (Williams, J.R. ed.), London, 26 Feb. pp.95-98.
- Netland, J., Dutton, L. and Greaves, M. 2001. Biological control of *Chenopodium album* L. in Europe. *Biocontrol*, 46: 175-196.
- Pandey, S. et al. 2001. *J. Ento. Res.*, 25: 145-149.
- Riddle G.E., Burpee L.E. and Boland G.J. 1991. Virulence of *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* and *S. minor* on dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*). *Weed Science*, 39:109-118.
- Singh, S. P. 1995. Experience in Classical Biological Control in India. In: Biological control as a cornerstone of integrated Pest Management for Sustainable Agriculture in South East Asia, Proceedings of a workshop in Biological Control. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 11-15. September, 1995. MARDI. Malaysia/ACIAR, Australia. pp. 121-154.
- TeBeest, D. O. 1988. Additions to the host range of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* f.sp. *aeschynomene*. *Plant Disease*, 72: 16-18.
- Templeton, G. E., TeBeest, D. O. and Smith, R. J. 1979. Biological weed control with mycoherbicides. *Ann. Rev. Phytopathol.*, 17: 301-310.
- Thakur, M. L. 1992. Lantana weed (*Lantana camara* L.) and its possible management through natural insect pests in India. *Indian Forester*, 118:466-488.
- Verma, U. and Charudattan, R. 1993. Host range of *Mycroplectodiscus terrestris*, a microbial herbicide candidate for Eurasian water milfoil, *Myriophyllum spicatum*. *Biol Control*, 3: 271-280
- Wilson, C. L., 1969. Use of plant pathogens in weed control. *Ann. Rev. Phytopathol.*, 7: 411-434.
- Zhou, T. and Neal, J. C. 1995. Annual bluegrass (*Poa annua*) control with *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *poannua* in New York State. *Weed Technology* 9:173-177.