

1-1-2015

Evaluation of Foliar Fungicides and Insecticides on Soybeans in Northern Iowa

Daren Mueller

Iowa State University, dsmuelle@iastate.edu

Stith Wiggs

Iowa State University, stithw@iastate.edu

Warren Pierson

Iowa State University, wpierson@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports



Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agriculture Commons](#), [Agronomy and Crop Sciences Commons](#), and the [Natural Resources and Conservation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mueller, Daren; Wiggs, Stith; and Pierson, Warren, "Evaluation of Foliar Fungicides and Insecticides on Soybeans in Northern Iowa" (2015). *Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports*. 2217.

http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports/2217

This report is brought to you for free and open access by Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Evaluation of Foliar Fungicides and Insecticides on Soybeans in Northern Iowa

Abstract

Researchers at Iowa State University assessed fungicide and insecticide applications to soybeans at seven locations across Iowa including the Northwest Farm (Sutherland), Northern Farm (Kanawha), Northeast Farm (Nashua), Agronomy Farm (Boone), Armstrong Farm (Lewis), McNay Farm (Chariton), and Southeast Farm (Crawfordsville) (Figure 1).

Keywords

Plant Pathology and Microbiology

Disciplines

Agricultural Science | Agriculture | Agronomy and Crop Sciences | Natural Resources and Conservation

Evaluation of Foliar Fungicides and Insecticides on Soybeans in Northern Iowa

RFR-A1487

Daren Mueller, assistant professor
Stith Wiggs, research associate
Warren Pierson, extension program specialist
Department of Plant Pathology and
Microbiology

Introduction

Researchers at Iowa State University assessed fungicide and insecticide applications to soybeans at seven locations across Iowa including the Northwest Farm (Sutherland), Northern Farm (Kanawha), Northeast Farm (Nashua), Agronomy Farm (Boone), Armstrong Farm (Lewis), McNay Farm (Chariton), and Southeast Farm (Crawfordsville) (Figure 1).

Materials and Methods

The experimental design at each location was a randomized complete block with four replications. Details on cultivar, planting date, population, pesticide applications, and harvest dates are listed in Table 1. Fungicides and insecticides were applied with a self-propelled research sprayer (Figure 2) at growth stage R3 (beginning pod) at all seven locations, unless otherwise noted. Disease was assessed when soybeans were at the R6 (full seed) growth stage. Diseases found included Septoria brown spot in the lower canopy and small amounts of Cercospora leaf blight and frogeye leaf spot in the upper canopy. Only diseases that had more than one percent severity were analyzed and included in this report. Soybean aphid populations were observed between R3 and R6 and the integrated pest management (IPM) spray was timed according to soybean aphid count. One of the seven locations (Sutherland) reached soybean aphid threshold, but then the aphid population crashed before the IPM treatment could be applied. Green stem

disorder notes were taken once soybeans were at growth stage R8. The number of green stems were counted in 10 feet of row and then converted to a percentage based on plant population of the field. Total seed weight/plot and moisture were measured with a 2009 Almaco SPC20 research plot combine. Seed weight was adjusted to 13 percent moisture and yield was calculated.

Results and Discussion

The 2014 growing season had timely rains throughout the summer, including August, a crucial time for disease development on soybeans.

There were two fungal diseases observed in the plots with at least one percent severity. These were Septoria brown spot and Cercospora leaf blight. Soybean vein necrosis virus and frogeye leaf spot were identified at low levels at several locations. Soybean green stem notes also were taken at all the locations. Green stem notes did not show any patterns between product applications. Levels were very low and inconsistent.

Yields averaged between 42.2–79.2 bushels/acre, depending on location. Yield responses to fungicide, insecticides, and fungicides + insecticides were minimal at all locations. There were both negative and positive responses to various treatments at some locations, but nothing consistent was observed over the seven locations (Figure 3). The average yield response for all fungicides across all locations was -0.4 bushels/acre. No insecticide alone averaged statistically greater than the untreated control across all locations. Additional insecticides were paired with fungicides (Table 2). There was no additive effect for fungicide + insecticide treatments as they averaged only 0.3 bushels/acre more than

the untreated control across all seven locations. See Table 3 for details on yield responses.

For the most part, fungicides and insecticides had minimal or no effect on seed moisture or green stem disorder. This information is from a single year (2014) and is not meant to be representative of pesticide performance every

year. Additional research is required on the effect of these pesticides on soybean in Iowa.

Acknowledgements

This research was partially funded by Iowa Soybean Association checkoff dollars. The authors would like to thank all the research farm staff for their help during the growing season to successfully conduct these trials.

Table 1. Research location, planting date, cultivar, planted population, pesticide application date, disease assessment date, and harvest date for seven fungicide and insecticide trials in Iowa in 2014.

Research location	Planting date	Cultivar	Planted population	Spray date	Disease assessment date	Harvest date
Ames (C)	Jun 6	Pioneer 92Y75	164,000	Aug 8	Sep 15	Oct 20
Lewis (SW)	May 16	Asgrow 2933 RR	150,000	Jul 16	Sep 5	Oct 25
Crawfordsville (SE)	May 28	Asgrow AG2931	165,680	Jul 29	Sep 9	Oct 22
Kanawha (NC)	May 20	Stine 20RD20	158,000	Jul 24	Sep 8	Oct 9, 10*
Chariton (SC)	May 6	Pioneer 93Y60	160,000	Jul 23	Sep 4	Oct 25
Nashua (NE)	May 25	Kruger K2-2402	175,000	Jul 28	Sep 8	Oct 10
Sutherland (NW)	May 21	Kruger 1901	160,000	Jul 22	Sep 4	Oct 15

*Kanawha-harvested half the plot each day due to wet soil conditions.

Table 2. Products and the rates evaluated in the statewide trials in Iowa in 2014.

Product ^a	Active ingredient	Pesticide type	Rate (fl oz/A)
Priaxor	pyraclostrobin + Xemium	Fungicide (Fc)	4
Priaxor + Domark ^b	pyraclostrobin + Xemium + tetraconazole	Fungicide	4 + 4
Stratego YLD	trifloxystrobin + prothioconazole	Fungicide	4
Topguard	flutriafol	Fungicide	5
Equation	azoxystrobin	Fungicide	6
Aproach	picoxystrobin	Fungicide	6
Aproach Prima	picoxystrobin + cyproconazole	Fungicide	6.8
Custodia	azoxystrobin + tebuconazole	Fungicide	8.6
Fortix	fluoxastrobin + flutriafol	Fungicide	5
Quilt Xcel	azoxystrobin + propiconazole	Fungicide	10.5
Quadris Top	azoxystrobin + difenoconazole	Fungicide	14
Regalia + Quadris	extract of <i>Reynoutria sachalinensis</i> + azoxystrobin	Fungicide	16 + 6
Regalia + Fortix	extract of <i>Reynoutria sachalinensis</i> + fluoxastrobin + flutriafol	Fungicide	16 + 5
Fastac	alpha-cypermethrin	Insecticide (Ic)	3.8
Leverage 360 ^c	imidacloprid + β -cyfluthrin	Insecticide	2.8
Asana XL	esfenvalerate	Insecticide	9.6
SkyRaider	bifenthrin	Insecticide	6.4
Priaxor + Fastac	pyraclostrobin + xemium + alpha-cypermethrin	Fc + Ic	4 + 3.8
Stratego YLD + Leverage 360 ^c	trifloxystrobin + prothioconazole + imidacloprid + β -cyfluthrin	Fc + Ic	4 + 2.8
Aproach + Asana XL	picoxystrobin + esfenvalerate	Fc + Ic	6 + 9.6
Custodia + SkyRaider	azoxystrobin + tebuconazole + bifenthrin	Fc + Ic	8.6 + 6.4

^aAll products applied with nonionic surfactant (Induce at 0.3% v/v) unless otherwise noted.

^bRegistered as Priaxor® D.

^cApplied with COC at 0.5 percent v/v. Shaded rows include an insecticide.

Table 3. Treatments and rates for management of foliar disease and yield response at the ISU Northern Research Farm, Kanawha, IA in 2014.

Product	Septoria brown spot (%)	Cercospora leaf blight (%)	Green stem disorder (%)	Moisture (%)	Yield (bu/A)
Untreated Control	6.7	3.5	0	14.0	47.2
Priaxor	2.0*	5.7	0	15.7	47.2
Priaxor + Domark	2.9*	3.8	0	15.4	42.9
Stratego YLD	3.4*	2.6	0	17.1*	52.7
Topguard	4.8	3.3	0	14.6	44.7
Equation	6.8	2.8	0.3	14.7	47.4
Aproach	7.8	4.7	0	14.0	49.2
Aproach Prima	4.6	5.1	0.3	14.6	45.8
Custodia	5.9	3.8	0	15.3	42.1
Fortix	4.9	4.3	0	16.1	47.5
Quilt Xcel	3.1*	3.3	0	14.3	46.4
Quadris Top	4.9	3.8	0	14.5	49.0
Regalia + Quadris	6.2	4.5	0	15.5	47.7
Regalia + Fortix	3.7*	3.4	0	14.2	46.8
Fastac	7.1	3.8	0	14.9	45.3
Leverage 360	2.4*	4.4	0	15.6	45.8
Asana XL	4.3	3.3	0	15.9	50.1
SkyRaider	3.8*	3.5	0	14.5	47.5
Priaxor + Fastac	3.0*	5.4	0.3	16.0	49.2
Stratego YLD + Leverage 360	6.4	5.7*	0	15.0	46.4
Aproach + Asana XL	6.3	4.3	0	15.0	47.7
Custodia + SkyRaider	4.5	3.7	0	14.2	50.9*
P value	0.00	0.58	0.65	0.42	0.14
LSD	2.6	2.6	NS	2.1	6.6
CV%	38.7	47.2	503.5	9.9	9.7

Shaded rows include an insecticide.

*Significantly different than the untreated control.





Figure 1. Map of field locations for the 2014 fungicide and insecticide study.



Figure 2. Self-propelled research sprayer applying treatments in Ames, IA.



Treatments at all locations

Figure 3. Yield response (bu/A) to treatments compared with untreated control on soybean at seven locations in Iowa during the 2014 growing season. Treatments consisted of 16 fungicides, 4 insecticide, and 4 fungicide and insecticide combinations. The average response to each treatment was plotted as management response (bu/A).