

## Errata:

Volume No. 12(3), page no. 138-141 (2016)

### Evaluation of bio-efficacy of 2, 4-D Ethyl Ester 38 per cent EC for weed control in wheat

Table 2 should be read as: Table 2: Effect of treatments on weed dry matter accumulation, weed control efficiency, phytotoxicity and grain yield of Wheat during Rabi 2012-13

Treatments	Dose (kg a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Formulation (L ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total weed dry matter accumulation (g m <sup>-2</sup> )				Weed control efficiency (%)				Phytotoxicity observation				Grain yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
			20 DAS		40 DAS		60 DAS		70 DAS		7 DAHA		14 DAHA			21 DAHA	
			0.97	2.38	5.27	59.07	45.54	36.28	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
2,4-D EE 38% EC (Nufarm)	0.225	0.592	0.97	2.38	5.27	59.07	45.54	36.28	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.60		
2,4-D EE 38% EC (Nufarm)	0.450	1.184	0.81	1.98	2.97	65.82	54.69	64.09	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.92		
2,4-D EE 38% EC (Nufarm)	0.675	1.776	0.79	1.87	2.97	66.67	57.21	64.09	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.95		
2,4-D EE 38% EC (Nufarm)	0.900	2.368	0.70	1.39	2.47	70.46	68.19	70.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.98		
2,4-D EE 38% EC (Commercial)	0.450	1.184	0.82	2.00	3.00	65.40	54.23	63.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.89		
Metsulfuron methyl 20% WP	0.004	0.02 (kg)	0.83	2.37	3.00	64.98	45.77	63.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.85		
Hand weeding twice at 25 & 45 DAS	-	-	0.43	1.10	2.32	81.86	74.83	71.95	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.00		
Unweeded control	-	-	2.37	4.37	8.27	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.32		
			<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.27</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0.24</b>		
			<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.57</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0.72</b>		

Note: EE= Ethyl Ester, EC= Emulsified concentration, WP= Wettable powder, a.i.= Active ingredient, L= Litre, DAS= Days after sowing, DAHA=Days after herbicide application

### Vol.13(1):Influence of Biofertilizer and liquid organic manures on growth, fruit, quality and leaf mineral content of mango cv.

Himsagar by S Sau, et al.

Page No	Article sub-head where the mistake	Existing	Should be read as
133	MATERIALS AND METHODS	No of bacteria (CPU/gm of soil)	No of bacteria (CFU per gm of soil)
134	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (Table 1 heading)	Plant height Canopy Fruit weight Fruit yield (Kg TSS (°Brix) Total sugar	Plant height (m) Canopy spread (m) Fruit weight (g) Fruit yield (Kg plant <sup>-1</sup> ) TSS (°Brix) Total sugar (%)
134	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (Table 2 head)	Soil pH Available N Available P Available	Soil pH Available N (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Available P (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Available K (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
134	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (Fig 1a)	Vertical axis title should be read as	Shelf life (days)
134	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (Fig 1b)	Vertical axis title should be read as	Percentage value