ESTIMATE OF CONTROL MEASURES FOR AQUATIC MACROPHYTES IN BEČEJ-BOGOJEVO CHANNEL (SERBIA)

Maja Meseldžija¹, Milica Dudić¹, Radovan Begović², Marko Džigurski¹

¹University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Agriculture, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 8, Novi Sad, Serbia ²Chemical Agrosava, Palmira Toljatija 5/IV, Novi Beograd, Serbia e-mail: maja@polj.uns.ac.rs

Abstract

From June to August 2016, a field survey of the distribution of aquatic macrophytes was performed along Bečej-Bogojevo channel, survey mark 0+250-1+600km. In this research taxonomy and vegetation of macrophytes are given. Dominant aquatic macrophytes were identified as well as their morphological and biological characteristics. Based on results at 10 locations of the Bečej-Bogojevo channel 16 weed species were determined. The main aquatic macrophytes occurring in study area are *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., *Trapa natans* L., and *Salvinia natans* L.All. Mechanical control measures were effective on all identified species except *Salvinia natans* (L). All. which is restores from fragments, while from biological measures in our country only the introduction of the grass carp species is applied (*Ctenopharyngodon idella* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1844).

Introduction

Aquatic macrophyte species are important parts of natural aquatic systems because they produce oxygen and perform a water-purification function by binding heavy metals and removing nutrient loads [1]. Macrophytes serve as habitats for a wide diversity of organisms, they promote sediment deposition, increase water clarity and quality and have an influence on fish productivity [2]. Problems with aquatic plants have increased in the last two centuries, so they disturb the flow of water in irrigation canals and drainage channels. Deep-rooted submerged weeds cause a reduction in oxygen levels and present gas exchange with water resulting in unfavorable fish production, and provide ideal habitat for the mosquito development, and serve as vectors for disease [3]. The most widespread macrophytes in the Danube-Tisa-Danube channel are Ceratophyllum demersum L., Trapa natans L., Typha latifolia L., Salvinia natans L. All., Hydrocharis morsus ranae L., Potamogeton lucens L., Lemna minor L., Nymphea alba L. [4]. The Danube-Tisa-Danube (DTD) hydro-system is a multivalent water system connecting waters of Bačka and Banat regions in Serbia. The Bečej-Bogojevo canal is 90km long and it starts from the Tisa river at Bečej lock. The canal weed control is a complex task demanding knowledge of aquatic plants. Mechanical control is expensive and requires access to waterways, while chemical control is easier, quick and usually cheaper when compared to mechanical methods [5], but herbicides are often toxic that the water cannot be used often for fish culture or human consumption. The species which has been most widely used in biological control is the grass carp, Ctenopharyngodon idella. The aim of this paper was to review the most frequent aquatic weeds of the canal DTD and to provide recommendations for their mechanical, chemical and biological control.

Experimental

In this paper, during the vegetation period in 2016, the presence of aquatic weed species was examined on the Bečej-Bogojevo channel (survey mark 0+250-1+600km) in Serbia. Collected plant material was identified by "Flora of SR Serbia I-IX, [6], "Flora of Serbia X,, [7], "Flora of Serbia I, [8], "Flora Europeae I-V, [9] i Iconographie der Flora des Sudostlichen Mitteleuropa, [10]. The standard phytocenological methods of the Swiss-French school were

used to record vegetation [11]. Biological and morphological properties of aquatic macrophytes are also shown. The assessment of measures has been compared with the literature data, where both the advantages and disadvantages for all measures individually by species suppressed are given.

Results and discussion

Phytocenological analysis was performed on the Bečej-Bogojevo channel at 10 localities by Braun-Blanquet method. The results and available weeds in the selected area are given in Table 1-3 with their scientific names. During the floristic research different types of species were found in the study area on the Bečej-Bogojevo channel. In that area, 16 weed species were identified.

Analyzing higher taxonomic categories, of the 16 constant species, 4 species belong to the class Magnoliopsida (*Ceratophyllum demersum* L., *Trapa natans* L. (agg.), *Rumex lapatifolium* L., *Rumex hydrolaphatum* (Huds), 11 species to the class Liliopsida (*Typha latifolia* L., *Hydrocharis morsus-ranae* L., *Typha angustifolia* L., *Phragmites communis* L. Trin., *Lemna minor* L., *Potamogeton pectinatus* L., *Glyceria maxima* (Hartm) Holm, *Potamogeton crispus* L., *Butomus umbellatus* L., *Vallisneria spiralis* L., *Najas marina* L.) and 1 species belong to the classes Polypodiopsida (*Salvinia natans* L. All.). The flora is divided into 11 families, of which the representatives of the families *Poaceae*, *Polygonaceae*, *Hydrochariaceae*, *Typhaceae*, *Potamogetonaceae* are presented with 2 representatives for each family, while the families *Lemnaceae*, *Najadaceae*, *Ceratophylaceae*, *Salviniaceae*, *Trapaceae*, *Butomaceae* are presented with only one.

| Surface size (m ²) | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | The | Cover |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------|
| General | 70 | 80 | 95 | 70 | 100 | 95 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | level of | value |
| coverage | | | | | | | | | | | presence | |
| Number of plant | 3 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | | |
| species | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Plant species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | |
| Ceratophyllum | 1.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.1 | V | 2625 |
| demersum L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trapa natans | - | 1.1 | - | 2.2 | 3.3 | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | 3.3 | IV | 985 |
| L.(agg.) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Typha latifolia | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | 4.4 | II | 1175 |
| L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salvinia natans | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| L. Alli. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hydrocharis | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| morsus-ranae L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Typha | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | Ι | 750 |
| angustifolia L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phragmites | - | 4.4 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 4.4 | - | - | II | 1425 |
| communis Trin. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lemna minor L. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rumex | - | - | 1.1 | 1.1 | - | - | 1.1 | - | - | - | II | 150 |
| lapatifolium L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potamogeton | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | +.1 | - | +.1 | II | 20 |
| pectinatus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Glyceria maxime | 1.1 | - | 2.2 | - | 1.1 | - | 1.1 | - | - | 1.1 | III | 375 |
| (Hartm) Holm | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1. Phytocoenological recordings, June 2016

25th International Symposium on Analytical and Environmental Problems

| Potamogeton crispus L. | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | - | - | Ι | 15 |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|-----|
| Butomus umbellatus L. | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 20 |
| Vallisneria spiralis L. | 2.2 | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 190 |
| Rumex hydrolaphatum (Huds) | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 20 |
| Najas marina L. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

During June 2016, at the tested localities, dominant species were *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., *Phragmites communis* Trin., and *Typha latifolia* L., of which *C. demersum* had the highest cover value, with the level of presence V. *Ceratophyllum demersum* is a submerged, perennial plant with no roots, attached to the lake bottom by modified leaves. Mechanical measures had good effects in some more temperate areas. Engel (1990) [12] states that the best results were obtained if suppression was carried out during July. In Serbia, herbicides diquat and 2,4-D have been registered for this species. It is successfully suppressed using the fish *Ctenopharyngodon idella*, as a biological control measure.

Table 2. Phytocoenological recordings, July 2016

| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Table 2. Phytocoen | <u> </u> | | | , , | - | | - | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-------|
| Number of plant 5 8 12 9 5 3 8 4 4 6 of presen Plant species 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ce Ceratophyllum 1.1 2.2 3.3 4.4 3.3 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 demersum L. - 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 L.(agg.) - - 2.2 2.2 - 1.1 - 2.2 2.2 IV 1025 L.(agg.) - - 2.2 - - - 3.3 - 4.4 I 1175 Salvinia natans - - - - - - 3.3 - I 750 angustifolia L. - - - 3.3 - - II 1425 | Surface size (m ²) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NumberImage in the speciesImage in the speciesCeratophyllum demersum L.1.11.12.22.22.22.21.13.31.1V2425Typha latifolia L2.22.23.3-4.4I1175Salvinia natans morsus-ranae L2.22.2+.13.3Typha angustifolia L2.22.21.11.12.2III585Morsus-ranae L3.33.3-Image in the speciesImage in the speciesPhragmites communis L4.41.11.12.22.21.11.1< | General coverage | 70 | 80 | 95 | 70 | 100 | 95 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | value |
| Plant species 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ce Ceratophyllum 1.1 2.2 3.3 4.4 3.3 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 demersum L. 1.1 1.1 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 L(agg.) Trapa natans 1.1 1.1 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 L(agg.) Typha latifolia L. - 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.1 - 2.2 2.2 1V 1025 Salvinia natans - - - - 3.3 - 4.4 1 1175 Salvinia natans - - - +.1 - 1.1 2.2 III 585 Morsus-raae L. - - - | Number of plant | 5 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 6 | of | |
| Ceratophyllum 1.1 2.2 3.3 4.4 3.3 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 <i>demersum</i> L. 1.1 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.1 3.3 1.1 V 2425 <i>Trapa</i> natans 1.1 1.1 2.2 2.2 2.2 - 1.1 - 2.2 2.2 IV 1025 L.(agg.) Typha latifolia L. - - 2.2 - - - 3.3 - 4.4 I 1175 Salvinia natans - - 2.2 - | species | | | | | | | | | | | presen | |
| demersum L.Image: Constraint of the second systemImage: Constraint of the second systemImage: Constraint of the second systemImage: Constraint of the second systemTrapa natans1.11.12.22.22.2-1.1-2.22.2IV1025L.(agg.)1.11.12.22.23.3-4.4I1175Salvinia natansL. AlliHydrocharis morsus-ranae L2.22.2+.1+.1-1.12.2III585Morsus-ranae L3.33.3-I750Angustifolia L2.24.4III1425Phragmites communis L4.42.21.1III1425Rumex lapatifolium L.1.11.12.22.21.1III110Potamogeton Clapatifolium L1.11.11.111010Potamogeton crispus L1.11.1II15Butomus <td>Plant species</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>ce</td> <td></td> | Plant species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | ce | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Ceratophyllum | 1.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.1 | V | 2425 |
| L.(agg.) Image: constraint of the stress of the stres | demersum L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Trapa natans | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | - | 1.1 | - | 2.2 | 2.2 | IV | 1025 |
| Salvinia natans - | L.(agg.) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L. Alli. Image: Constraint of the stress of the stres | <i>Typha latifolia</i> L. | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | 4.4 | Ι | 1175 |
| Hydrocharis morsus-ranae L2.22.22.2+.1+.1-1.12.2III585Typha angustifolia L3.33.31.12.2III585Phragmites communis L. Trin3.33.3I750Lemna minor L.1.11.12.22.24.4III1425Rumex lapatifolium L1.11.12.22.21.1III1425Potamogeton crispus L1.11.12.22.21.1III110Potamogeton crispus L1.11.1III110Butomus-+.1+.1II10 | Salvinia natans | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | L. Alli. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Hydrocharis | - | 2.2 | 2.2 | +.1 | - | - | +.1 | - | 1.1 | 2.2 | III | 585 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | <i>morsus-ranae</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c cccc} Phragmites & - & 4.4 & - & - & 2.2 & - & - & 4.4 & - & - & II & 1425 \\ \hline communis & L. & & & & & & & \\ Trin. & & & & & & & \\ \hline Lemna minor L. & 1.1 & 1.1 & 2.2 & 2.2 & - & - & 1.1 & - & - & 1.1 & III & 550 \\ \hline Rumex & - & - & 1.1 & 1.1 & - & - & 1.1 & - & - & II & 150 \\ \hline lapatifolium L. & & & & & \\ Potamogeton & - & - & 1.1 & 1.1 & - & - & - & +.1 & - & - & II & 110 \\ \hline pectinatus L. & & & & & \\ Glyceria maxime & +.1 & - & +.1 & - & +.1 & - & - & - & II & 20 \\ \hline (Hartm) Holm & & & & & \\ Potamogeton & - & +.1 & +.1 & +.1 & - & - & - & II & 15 \\ \hline Butomus & - & +.1 & +.1 & +.1 & - & - & - & I & 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Typha | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | Ι | 750 |
| communis L. <thl.< th=""> L. L. L.</thl.<> | angustifolia L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trin.Image: constraint of the structure of the s | Phragmites | - | 4.4 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 4.4 | - | - | II | 1425 |
| Lemna minor L.1.11.12.22.21.11.1III550Rumex lapatifolium L1.11.11.11.1III150Potamogeton pectinatus L1.11.1+.1-+.1III110Glyceria maxime (Hartm) Holm+.1-+.1-+.1-+.1III20Potamogeton crispus L+.1+.1II15Butomus-+.1+.1I10 | <i>communis</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Trin. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Lemna minor L. | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | - | - | 1.1 | - | - | 1.1 | III | 550 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Rumex | - | - | 1.1 | 1.1 | - | - | 1.1 | - | - | - | II | 150 |
| pectinatus L. Image: Constraint of the sector of the | lapatifolium L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Glyceria maxime (Hartm) Holm +.1 - +.1 - +.1 - +.1 - - II 20 Potamogeton crispus L. - +.1 +.1 - - - - I 15 Butomus - +.1 +.1 - - - - I 15 | Potamogeton | - | - | 1.1 | 1.1 | - | - | - | +.1 | - | +.1 | II | 110 |
| (Hartm) Holm - - - - - - - I 15 Potamogeton crispus L. - +.1 +.1 +.1 - - - - - I 15 Butomus - +.1 +.1 - - - - - I 15 | pectinatus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potamogeton - +.1 +.1 +.1 - - - - I 15 crispus L. - +.1 +.1 - - - - I 15 Butomus - +.1 +.1 - - - - I 15 | Glyceria maxime | +.1 | - | +.1 | - | +.1 | - | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 20 |
| crispus L. - +.1 +.1 - - - - - I 10 | (Hartm) Holm | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| crispus L. | Potamogeton | - | +.1 | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | Ι | 15 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| umbellatus L. | Butomus | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Ι | 10 |
| | umbellatus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

25th International Symposium on Analytical and Environmental Problems

| Vallisneria spiralis L. | +.1 | +.1 | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | III | 25 |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|---|---|---|-----|----|
| Rumex hydrolaphatum (Huds) | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 20 |
| Najas marina L. | - | - | - | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | - | Ι | 5 |

In submerged vegetation during the July, the dominant role had the species *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., whose level of presence was V. When it comes to flotant plants, *Trapa natans* L. was most dominant, with a cover value of 1025 and the level of presence IV. In addition to these two species, *Phragmites communis* L. Trin and *Typha latifolia* were also dominant. *Trapa natans* L. is a floating herb, that colonizes areas of freshwater lakes and ponds where it forms floating vegetation, causing problems for boaters and swimmers. Early detection of introductions and rapid control response are key to preventing high impact infestations. Herbicides that are effective on *T. natans* are glyphosate, triclopyr, and 2,4-D. The most promising biocontrol species appears to be the leaf beetle *Galerucella birmanica*.

Table 3. Phytocoenological recordings, August 2016

| Table 3. Phytocoen | 0 | | | | 0 | | 05 | 25 | 25 | 25 | T | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-------|
| Surface size (m ²) | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | The | Cover |
| General coverage | 70 | 95 | 95 | 80 | 100 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | level | value |
| Number of plant | 5 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 6 | of | |
| species | | | | | | | | | | | prese | |
| Plant species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | nce | |
| Ceratophyllum | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 1.1 | V | 1700 |
| demersum L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trapa natans | +.1 | +.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.2 | - | 1.1 | - | 1.1 | +.1 | IV | 390 |
| L.(agg.) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Typha latifolia</i> L. | - | - | 4.4 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | 4.4 | II | 1625 |
| Salvinia natans | 1.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | IV | 1950 |
| L. Alli. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hydrocharis | - | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | +.1 | 1.1 | +.1 | - | 1.1 | - | IV | 835 |
| morsus-ranae L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Typha | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3.3 | - | Ι | 375 |
| angustifolia L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phragmites | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.3 | - | - | II | 1125 |
| <i>communis</i> L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trin. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lemna minor L. | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | 1.1 | - | - | +.1 | II | 60 |
| Rumex | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.1 | - | - | - | Ι | 50 |
| lapatifolium L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potamogeton | - | - | +.1 | 1.1 | +.1 | - | - | +.1 | - | +.1 | III | 70 |
| pectinatus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Glyceria maxime | +.1 | - | +.1 | - | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | II | 15 |
| (Hartm) Holm | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potamogeton | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Ι | 10 |
| crispus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Butomus | - | +.1 | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | Ι | 5 |
| umbellatus L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vallisneria | 3.3 | - | - | - | - | +.1 | +.1 | - | - | - | Ι | 375 |
| spiralis L. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rumex | - | - | - | - | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | Ι | 5 |
| hydrolaphatum | | | | | | | | | | | _ | - |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | I | 1 | I | I | I | I | 1 | I | | | 1 | 1 |

25th International Symposium on Analytical and Environmental Problems

| (Huds) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Najas marina L. | - | - | - | - | - | +.1 | - | - | - | - | Ι | 5 |

The dominant aquatic macrophytes in August 2016, were *Salvinia natens*, with the level of presence IV, then *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., and *Typha latifolia* L. Many endangered plant species are found in aquatic ecosystems. Some of these species are *Najans marina* L., *Hidrocharis morsus-ranae* L., *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., *Trapa natans* L., *Butomus umbellatus* L., *Vallisneria spiralis* L., which deserves special attention because their protection contributes to the conservation of ecosystem diversity.

Conclusion

Based on the number and coverage, 16 aquatic weeds species were identified at 10 localities of the Bečej-Bogojevo canal in the period June-August 2016. The most common are the representatives of the family *Poaceae*, *Polygonaceae*, *Hydrochariaceae*, *Typhaceae*, *Potamogetonaceae*. The predominant aquatic macrophytes at the investigated localities in June was *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., in July *Trapa natans* L. and in August month *Salvinia natans* L.All. During the vegetation period, in June and July 2016, it is recommended that mechanical suppression need to be repeated based on the dominant aquatic flora. In the case of the introduction of grass carp into the Bečej-Bogojevo canal, as a form of biological control, the application of mechanical suppression would be reduced.

References

[1] L. Moeller, A. Bauer, H. Wedwitschka, W. Stinner, A. Zehnsdorf, Crop Characteristics of Aquatic Macrophytes for Use as a Substrate in Anaerobic Digestion Plants—A Study from Germany. *Energies*, (2018), 11, p. 3016.

[2] H. Yu, W. Qi, C. Liu, L. Yang, L. Wang, T. Lv, J. Peng, Different Stages of Aquatic Vegetation Succession Driven by Environmental Disturbance in the Last 38 Years. Water, 11(7), (2019), p.1412.

[3] M. Salwa Abou El Ellaand, A. Tarek El Samman. Review: Egyptian Experience in Controlling Aquatic Weeds. J Am Sci, (2016), pp. 104-115.

[4] B. Konstantinović, M. Meseldžija, S. Maletin, Mogućnost primene herbicida i biljojedih riba u uklanjanju korovske vegetacije iz kanalske mreže. U: Održive melioracije, Belić, S. (ed.), Univerzitet u Novom Sadu Poljoprivredni, Novi Sad, (2007).

[5] S. Datta, Aquatic Weeds and Their Management for Fisheries, Aquatic Weeds and Their Management for Fisheries, (2009), pp. 1-22.

[6] M. Josifović, (ed.). Flora SR Serbia, I-IX, SANU, Belgrade, (1970-1977).

[7] Sarić, M. (ed.). Flora of Serbia X, SANU, Belgrade, (1986).

[8] Sarić, M. (ed.). Flora of Serbia 1. SANU, Belgrade, (1992).

[9] G. Tutin, V.H. Heywood, N.A. Burges, D.H. Valentine, S.M. Walters, D.A. Webb, (ed.) Flora Europaea I, Cambridge University press, Cambridge, England, (1964).

[10] S. Jávorka, V. Csapody, Icanographie der Flora des Südostlichen Mitteleuropa. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, (1975).

[11] J. Braun-Blanquet, Pflanzesociologie, Grundzuge der Vegetations Kunde. 3rd ed. Springer Verlag, Wien-New York, (1964).

[12] S. Engel, Ecological impacts of harvesting macrophytes in Halverson lake, Wisconsin. Journal of Aquatic Plant Management, (1990), pp. 41-45.