Evaluating Fungicides for Soybean Rust Control

Raymond Brandl, Cooperator, Victoria County (2005)
Joe D. Janak, County Extension Agent - Ag/NR
Sam Womble, County Extension Agent - NR
Stephen Biles, Calhoun, Refugio & Victoria Extension IPM Agent
A. J. Jaks, Texas Ag. Experiment Station, Senior Research Associate
Victoria County

SUMMARY:

In an demonstration to evaluate various fungicides for their efficacy in controlling soybean diseases especially the anticipated arrival of Asian Soybean Rust, there was no disease pressure seen in this soybean demonstration, thus after the first application of fungicides, further planned applications were not applied. No difference in yields were realized by the initial fungicide applications.

OBJECTIVE:

To determine which fungicide can effectively control soybean Asian rust if the disease does show up in Texas.

MATERIALS and METHODS:

Northrup King RA 452 soybeans were planted on April 2, 2005 at the seeding rate of 138,000 seeds per acre. Seeds were bulk inoculated by Helena Chemical Company with Lipha-Tech Optimizer. No fertilizer or insecticide was applied to this demonstration. Boundary 6.5 herbicide was applied banded at the rate of 1 pt/ac broadcast.

Fourteen different fungicide treatments were applied to two row thirty foot plots in a randomized plot design. Treatments were replicated four times and compared to an untreated check. See Table 1 for treatments.

RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS:

No Asian soybean rust was detected in the state of Texas up until harvest so this demonstration can not be used for evaluating it efficacy on Asian rust. No further disease pressures were found thus a second planned fungicide application warranted not applying. Yields were taken with no differences noted.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

Appreciation is expressed to Raymond Brandl, cooperator and to A. J. Jaks, Texas Ag. Experiment Station, Senior Research Associate.

DISCLAIMER CLAUSE:

Trade names of commercial products used in this report are included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Texas A&M University System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.

Table 1. Evaluation of fungicides for control of diseases on soybeans. Raymond Brandl, Cooperator, Victoria County, Victoria, TX 2005.

Treatment	Rate/Ac	Yield Bu/Ac [a/]
1 Untreated Control	–	16.7 a
2 Bravo Weatherstick	1.5 pt/ac	17.3 a
3 Folicur 3.6 F + Induce	4.0 fl oz/ac 0.125% v:v	15.1 a
4 Stratego 250 EC + Induce	7.0 fl oz/ac 0.125% v:v	15.9 a
5 USF 2010 500 SC + Induce	5.0 fl oz/ac 0.125% v:v	17.2 a
6 A12910	4.0 fl oz/ac	16.6 a
7 Quilt 1.67 SC	14.0 fl oz/ac	17.0 a
8 A9901	1.0 fl oz/ac	16.1 a
9 Tilt 3.6 EC	4.0 fl oz/ac	18.0 a
10 Quadris 2.08 SC	6.2 fl oz/ac	16.9 a
11 Domark 230 ME	4.0 fl oz/ac	17.7 a
12 Domark 230 ME	5.0 fl oz/ac	18.3 a
13 Headline 2.09 EC	8.0 fl oz/ac	17.7 a
14 Laredo EC	7.0 fl oz/ac	18.2 a
15 Folicur 3.6 F (AUP Advisory) + Induce	4.0 fl oz/ac 0.125% v:v	16.1 a

[a/] Yields followed by the same letter are not statistically different from each other.