EVALUATING FUNGICIDE APPLICATIONS ON SOYBEANS

Howard Book, Cooperator, Victoria County (2008)
Joe D. Janak, Jr., Stephen Biles and A. J. Jaks
County Extension Agent - Ag/NR, Calhoun, Refugio &
Victoria Extension IPM Agent and Texas AgriLife
Research, Senior Research Associate, respectively
Victoria County

SUMMARY:

In a demonstration evaluating various fungicides for their efficacy in controlling soybean diseases particularly Asian Soybean Rust, there was no disease pressure seen in this soybean demonstration and there was no significant difference in yields realized by the fungicide applications.

OBJECTIVE:

To determine which fungicide can effectively control soybean diseases particularly Asian rust if the disease does develop in Victoria, Texas.

MATERIALS and METHODS:

Hornbeck 5123 soybeans were planted on March 28, 2008 with a Monosem vacuum planter on 38 inch rows at the seeding rate of 10 seeds per foot. Seeds were inoculated with Nitragin inoculant. No fertilizer or insecticide was applied to this demonstration. Boundary 6.5 herbicide was applied banded at the rate of 1 pt/ac broadcast.

Ten different fungicide treatments were applied to two rows of twenty foot plots in a randomized plot design. Fungicides were applied at two soybean growth stages as noted in Table 1, namely R3 stage – 52 days after planting (DAP) and R6 (74DAP). Treatments were replicated three times and compared to an untreated check. The plots were harvested with a research combine. See Table 1 for treatments and results.

RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS:

No Asian soybean rust was detected in this demonstration so it can not be used for evaluating it efficacy on Asian rust. Additionally, no other disease pressure was found and although some yields were above the untreated control, none were statistically significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

Appreciation is expressed to Howard Book, cooperator and to A. J. Jaks, Texas AgriLife Research Senior Research Associate, James Grichar, Texas AgriLife Research Scientist and to Texas AgriLife Research personnel who assisted including: Kevin Brewer, Bill Klesel, and Dwayne Drozd.

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. Howard Book, Cooperator, Victoria County, Victoria, TX 2008.

Trt #	Treatment Name	Conc	Unit	Type	Rate/ Acre	Rate Unit	Appl [1/] Code	Appl [1/] Description	Yield [2/] Bu/acre
1	Untreated Control								17.0 a
2	Stratego	250	G/L	EC	10.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	13.5 a
	Induce	100	%	SL	0.125	% V/V			
3	Stratego	250	G/L	EC	10.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	18.5 a
	Proline	480	G/L	SC	1.0	Fl oz/a			
4	Stratego	250	G/L	EC	10.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	19.4 a
	Folicur	3.6	Lb/Gal	F	2.0	Fl oz/a			
5	Quilt	1.67	Lb/Gal	SC	14.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	18.8 a
6	Domark	230	G/L	ME	4.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	19.1 a
	Headline	2.09	Lb/Gal	EC	6.0	Fl oz/a			
7	Domark	230	G/L	ME	5.0	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	21.3 a
	Quadris	2.08	Lb/Gal	SC	6.2	Fl oz/a			
8	Quadris	2.08	Lb/Gal	SC	6.2	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	16.4 a
	Laredo			EC	7.0	Fl oz/a			
9	Folicur	3.6	Lb/Gal	F	3.1	Fl oz/a	A B	R3; R6	23.3 a
	Headline	2.09	Lb/Gal	EC	4.7	Fl oz/a			
10	Headline	2.09	Lb/Gal	EC	6.0	Fl oz/a	A	R3; R6	21.5 a
	Folicur	3.6	Lb/Gal	F	3.1	Fl oz/a	B		
	Headline	2.09	Lb/Gal	EC	4.7	Fl oz/a			
LSD (P=.05)									6.57
Standard Deviation									3.83
CV									20.28

[1/] Application Code/Description: Applied at soybean growth stage noted, days after planting (DAP) A = R3 (52DAP) stage and B = R6 (74DAP) stage.

[2/] Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.05, Duncan's New MRT)