## Fungicide efficacy trial on winter wheat, 2017

Martin Nagelkirk, Michigan State University Extension

A fungicide efficacy trial was conducted on soft winter wheat in collaboration with industry to observe the performance of various fungicide products. Ambassador soft white winter wheat was used in a randomized, complete block design with four replications. The variety is susceptible to Septoria and Stagonospora leaf spots, Stripe and leaf rust, and Fusarium head scab. It is moderately resistant to powdery mildew.

The fungicide products, rates and application timings employed in this trial are provided in the table below. All fungicide treatments included a nonionic surfactant (Induce) at the rate of 0.125 %, except Adepidyn, which had a use rate of 0.025 %, and Badge SC, which had none. The fungicides were applied using a tractor mounted boom sprayer. The T1 (first joint; Feekes growth stage 6) treatments were applied on May 4 and the T2 (full flag leaf; growth stage 9) treatments on May 22. Both timings utilized 16 gallons of water per acre, 42 psi and Turbo TeeJet 11002 nozzles. The T3 (early flower; growth stage 10.51) treatments were applied on June 7 using Turbo TeeJet Duo bodies with double 11001 nozzles, 40 psi, and 15 gallons of water per acre.

Only a trace of powdery mildew and Septoria leaf spot developed during the tillering and early jointing stages. As the crop began to

head, Septoria and Stripe rust became the predominant diseases. On June 9 (late flowering), Septoria was rated on a scale of 0 to 10 (0 denoting no disease) on the second and third leaves and Stripe rust was rated on the flag leaf expressed as a percent of leaf area showing evidence of disease. By June 29 (milk stage), both diseases were evident on the flag leaves and the rating was repeated using the percent of leaf area. Additionally, despite very low incidence, heads within ten 55-foot rows exhibiting symptoms of Fusarium head scab were counted.

The plots exhibited a variation of coloration as the plants neared maturity (figure 1). In general, the higher performing treatments were brighter in appearance. Yields were adjusted where significant lodging occurred (replication ll, treatment 9; replication lV, treatments 12 and 7).

The trial was harvested on July 17 using an International 2144 combine equipped with a Juniper HarvestMaster system that provided grain weight, test weight, and moisture. Grain samples were sent to University of Minnesota for analysis of DON. Statistical analysis was performed using SAS 9.3 PROC MIXED method by Adam Byrne, Research Associate, MSU.

All results are provided in table 1. Badge SC (copper oxychloride plus &copper hydroxide) appeared to inhibit the development of Septoria but its use did not lead to a significant improvement in yield. All other products applied at T1 as the sole application suppressed Septoria development and resulted in an average yield improvement of 4.1 bu/ac. Where a fungicide was used exclusively at T3, the yields were increased by an average of 10.4 bu/ac. Fusarium head scab pressure was very low and therefore differences are suspect. Nevertheless, some statistically significant differences were found.



Location:	JGDM McConnachie Fms Sandusky, MI
Collaborators:	Bayer, Syngenta & BASF, MI Wheat
Soil Type	Capac silt loam
Previous crop:	dry beans
Variety:	Ambassador
Nitrogen rate:	120 lbs/ac
Plot design:	RCB
Replications:	four
Plot area:	15 x 60 ft
Treatment area:	15 x 60 ft
Harvest area:	15 x 55 ft
Planting date:	Sept 25, 2016
Seeding rate:	1.8 m/ac
Harvest date:	July 17, 2017
Herbicide:	none
Insecticide:	none



Table 1: Effect of fungicides	5 01	n tl	ne j	perfo	mai	nce of	sof	ft wint	ter w	heat a	and d	isease	e leve	els,			Deck	erville	MI, 2	2017	
	tir	nin	a 2		ha	rveste	d g	rain			sept	oria³		s	tripe	rust <sup>4</sup>			F۲	IB⁵	
fungicide treatments <sup>1</sup>			Б	moi	st.	test v	мt	yie	ld	9-Ji	ine	26-Ji	ine	9-Ju	ne	26-Jı	ine	hea	ds	DC	N
	T1	Т2	Т3	%		lbs/b	u	bu/a	ac	1 to	10	%		%		%		#		%	o o
non treated control				14.8	b	60.1	b	110.9	j	5.3	а	16.8	а	2.3	а	7.0	bc	5.5	а	0.12	а
Adepidyn 8.6 oz.+Tilt 3.3 oz			x	16.7	а	58.9	с	124.8	abc	2.8	cde	0.6	f	1.8	ab	1.9	de	2.3	cd	0.01	de
Nexicor 5 oz	X			14.6	bc	60.8	а	115.4	ghi	1.1	efg	11.5	ab	0.3	de	6.3	bcd	3.0	bcd	0.06	abcd
Nexicor 5 oz; Caramba 13.5 oz	x		x	14.7	bc	60.7	а	125.1	abc	1.0	fg	4.0	cdef	0.4	de	1.5	de	2.5	cd	0.08	abc
Nexicor 5 oz; Nexicor 5 oz; Caramba 13.5	x	x	x	14.8	b	60.6	ab	126.4	abc	0.8	g	1.5	ef	0.1	е	1.0	е	1.8	d	0.01	de
USF0728 4 oz	X			14.6	bc	60.7	а	116.8	fgh	1.3	defg	10.7	abc	0.6	bcd	6.5	bcd	2.8	cd	0.06	abcd
USF0728 8 oz		x		14.6	bc	60.8	а	120.1	def	0.9	g	3.3	cdef	0.1	е	4.3	bcd	2.0	cd	0.13	ab
USF0728 4 oz; Prosaro 8 oz		x	x	14.7	bc	60.7	а	120.8	cdef	2.6	cdef	3.0	def	0.6	cde	4.5	bcd	3.8	abcd	0.03	bcde
USF0728 4 oz; Prosaro 8 oz	x		x	14.6	bc	60.8	а	122.0	bcde	1.8	defg	2.0	ef	0.9	bcd	1.8	de	2.0	cd	0.00	е
Prosaro 6.5 oz			x	14.5	bc	60.8	а	118.0	efg	4.3	abc	5.0	bcde	2.3	а	3.5	cde	4.3	abcd	0.02	cde
Prosaro 8 oz			x	14.9	b	60.5	ab	118.4	fgh	5.0	abc	3.0	def	2.0	а	5.5	bcd	2.8	cd	0.03	bcde
Caramba 13.5 oz			x	14.7	bc	60.7	а	124.0	abcd	3.5	bc	4.0	cdef	1.6	ab	2.8	cde	3.8	abcd	0.02	cde
Propicon 3.6 EC 4 oz	x			14.5	bc	60.9	а	112.8	hij	1.5	defg	12.0	ab	1.0	abc	11.8	ab	5.5	а	0.11	а
Badge SC	X			14.4	С	60.9	а	111.3	ij	2.9	cd	9.0	abcd	2.4	а	18.0	а	5.3	ab	0.11	а
P value				<0.00	001	<0.00	01	<0.0	001	<0.0	001	<0.00	001	<0.00	001	<0.00	003	0.01	.75	0.00	)22
	Table 1: Effect of fungicides   fungicide treatments <sup>1</sup> non treated control   Adepidyn 8.6 oz.+Tilt 3.3 oz   Nexicor 5 oz   Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5 oz   Nexicor 5 oz, Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5   USF0728 4 oz   USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz   USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz   Prosaro 6.5 oz   Prosaro 8 oz   Caramba 13.5 oz   Propicon 3.6 EC 4 oz   Badge SC   P value	Table 1: Effect of fungicidesItfungicide treatments1finnon treated control71Adepidyn 8.6 oz+Tilt 3.3 oz7Nexicor 5 oz7Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5 oz7Nexicor 5 oz, Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5 oz7USF0728 4 oz7USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz7USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz7USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz7Prosaro 6.5 oz7Prosaro 8 oz7Caramba 13.5 oz7Propicon 3.6 EC 4 oz7Badge SC7Proalue7	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the set of fungicides on the set of fungicides on the set of fungicide treatments time   fungicide treatments T1 T2   non treated control I I   Adepidyn 8.6 oz+Tilt 3.3 oz I I   Nexicor 5 oz X I   Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5 oz X X   Nexicor 5 oz, Nexicor 5 oz, Caramba 13.5 X X   USF0728 4 oz X X   USF0728 4 oz, Prosaro 8 oz X X   Prosaro 6.5 oz I I   Prosaro 6.5 oz I I   Propicon 3.6 EC 4 oz X X   Badge SC X I	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the product of function of f	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the vertice of fungicides on the vertice of fungicides on the vertice of fungicide treatments <sup>1</sup> Image: Imag	Table 1: Effect of fungicides or vertex ve	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the vertor verto	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of function of funct	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the vertex	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of sector secto	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of solution of the performance of the peri	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of solution of the performance of	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of series of	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter wheat and disease level   Image:	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of soft winter whet substant disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance disease levels.     Table tere termance disease disease disease disease di	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of sort with each of the performance of the periference of th	Table 1: Effect of fungicides on the performance of solution of the performance of	Table 1: Effect of fungicides or tree performance of tree performance o	Table 1: Effect of fungicides or use of sectors of sect	Able 1: Effect of fungicides on the vertices of vertices o	Table 1: Effect of fungicides or tree of source of

<sup>1</sup> all fungicides applied with Induce nonionic surfactant at 0.125% except Adepidyn had 0.25% and Badge SC had none.

<sup>2</sup> T1 = first joint (Feekes g.s. 6); T2 = full flag (g.s.9); T3 = early flower (g.s.10.51).

<sup>3</sup> Septoria leaf spot rated on a relative scale of 0 to 10 (0= no disease).on June 9 and as a percent of flag leaf area on June 26.

<sup>4</sup> stripe rust rating expressed as amount of visible disease on surface of flag leaf as percent.

<sup>5</sup> incidence of scabby heads in ten 55 foot rows; DON levels below 0.05 are undetectible and are assign a value of 0.

T	5	9	13		8	1	9	5
1	6	10	14	30	10	6	4	
A State of the	7	11	15	P 3	Contraction of the local division of the loc	15	17	14
4	8	12	16	11	12	13	16	11
	13	1 m	5		13	15	10	4
1	4	15	8	Re	-	15	8	
11	16	14	10	4	11	16	14	1
17	7	6	9.183	1 and	6	9	12	7-1-1

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Michigan State University Extension programs and materials are open to all without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, age, height, weight, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, or veteran status.