Field evaluation of the fungicides Vertisan, Aproach, and Proline for management of Ascochyta blight of chickpeas

Carrington and Williston, ND (2011)

Michael Wunsch, Michael Schaefer, & Blaine Schatz, NDSU Carrington Research Extension Center Gordon Bradbury, NDSU Williston Research Extension Center

KEY FINDINGS:

- Vertisan (20 fl oz/ac) performed equivalently to a rotational strategy with Proline (5 fl oz/ac) and Endura (6 oz/ac).
- Vertisan (20 fl oz/ac) performed equivalently to Proline (5 fl oz/ac), but this treatment could not be rigorously assessed due to problems with flooding at the Carrington location where it was tested.
- Vertisan appeared to exhibit a rate response, with increased disease control as the application rate increased from 14 to 20 fl
 oz/ac, but this response could not be rigorously assessed due to problems with flooding at the Carrington site where both rates were tested.

Ascochyta Severity² CARRINGTON, ND: July 13 **TREATMENT** (Application timing^y) percent Non-treated check (water) 77 e* 1 Vertisan 1.67EC 14 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 24 abc Vertisan 1.67EC 20 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 3 18 a Aproach 2.08SC 8 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 4 41 bcd Aproach 2.08SC 12 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 5 49 cde Confidential A + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 22 ab 6 Proline 480SC 5 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A) / Endura 70WG 6 oz/ac (B) 7 19 a Proline 480SC 5.0 fl oz/ac + NIS 0.25% v/v (A,B) 8 14 a Non-treated check (water) 9 68 de Treatment differences, F:^x 18.89 Treatment differences, P > F:^w < 0.0001 C.V.: 15.43

² Ascochyta severity: Percent of the canopy exhibiting necrosis caused by Ascochyta blight.

^y Fungicide application timing:

A = Thursday, June 23, 6:30-8:00 am; chickpeas 5-6 in tall, canopy open; ascochyta blight already widespread with incidence approx. 1-3% and severity approx. 1%

B = Wednesday, July 6 at 12:00-1:30 pm; ascochyta blight widespread; treatment differences apparent

* **Treatment differences**, *F* : *F*-values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences among treatments.

^w **Treatment differences**, P > F: Probability of observing an *F*-statistic greater than that observed; an assessment of the significance of treatment differences.

* Within-column means followed by different letters are significantly different (alpha = 0.05; Tukey multiple comparison procedure)

YIELD WAS NOT ASSESSED IN THIS TRIAL.

Due to recurrent, torrential rains, this trial flooded in late July.

The fungicide APROACH is currently not registered for use on chickpeas and should not be used. Future registration of this fungicide is anticipated, and results for Aproach are provided for reference only.

ereight by		A	Ascochyta blight							
EAT/NEI/T (Application timing*)percentperce		Severity ^z (foliar tissues)	Incidence ^y (diseased plants)	Incidence [×] (diseased pods)	YIELD		SEED DIA	METER "		TES WEIG
EATMENT (Application timing*) percent formation status statu		Aug. 6	Aug. 6	Aug. 6			9.5-10.3 mm	8.7-9.5 mm	< 8.7 mm	
Increased check40 b*100 b*90 b*381 b*10 a*21 b*23 *46 b*Mine 460SC 51 lozize (A,B,C)3 a87 ab30 a913 a25 a41 a22 a12 a*Mine 460SC 51 lozize (A,B,C)3 a66 a33 a945 a18 a43 a24 a12 a*Treatment differences, F :53.917.427.9615.215.4027.330.240.021Treatment differences, F :23.6915.0224.8621.7431.400.0220.022chya incidence (diseased pods):The percent of pods exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyla bilght.evaluated (10 plants in each of 3 locationchya incidence (diseased pods):The percent of pods exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyla bilght, in each plot, 30 plants were evaluated (10 plants in each of 3 locations percent differences, F : F : values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences amplems.noetid application timing: A = June 28, prior to bloom (7-8 nodes), at first appearance of disease symptoms (incidence approx. 0.5 to 1%); B = July 7, early bloom; C = June 20, marks are significantly different (apha = 0.05; Tukey multiple comparison procedure)001. ND:002. ND:003. ND:	TREATMENT (Application timing ^v)	percent	percent	percent	lbs/ac	percent	percent	percent	percent	lbs/t
Inter 480SC 5 fl oziac (A,C) / Endura3 a87 ab30 a913 a25 a41 a22 a12 a*Testment differences, F_2 3.366 a3.3945 a18 a43 a24 a15 a*Treatment differences, F_2 5.3917.427.3916.210.640.07.330.3424 a16 a*Treatment differences, F_2 5.3917.427.3916.210.0640.07.330.3426 a21.74thyta incidence (diseased pods): The percent of plants exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta bilght: icide application timing: A = June 28, prior to bloom (7-8 nodes), at first appearance of seases symptoms of Ascochyta bilght; in each plot, 50 pods were evaluated (10 pods in each of 5 locations pecidiameter: Seed size was determined by assessing the percent (by weight) of a 200-gram seed sample that passed through seives with round 2664, 2464, and 2264-in noul 2664, 2464, and 2264-inrecluse associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences among treatment.reclument differences, $F : F$ values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences among treatment.reclument differences are significantly different (apha = 0.05; Tukey multiple comparison procedure)ON ND:	1 Non-treated check	40 b *	100 b *	* d 06	381 b *	10 a *	21 b *	23 a *	46 b *	58.1
risan 1.67 EC 20 fl oz/ac (A,B,C)3 a66 a33 a945 aTreatment differences, $F: ^{\mu}$ 53.917.427.9615.21Treatment differences, $P > F: ^{\mu} < 0.001$ 0.7290.02050.0045C.V.:23.6915.0224.8621.74chyta incidence (diseased plants): The percent of plants exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta blight, in eachchyta incidence (diseased pods): The percent of pods exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta blight, in eachchyta incidence (diseased pods): The percent of pods exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta blight, in eacher holes.icide application timing: A = June 28, prior to bloom (7-8 nodes), at first appearance of disease symptomment differences, $F : F$. values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differenceson and Williston, NDON, ND:		ა ე	87 ab		913 a	25 a	41 a	22 a	12 a *	58.6
Treatment differences, $F:^u$ 53.91 7.42 7.96 15.21 Treatment differences, $P > F:^u$ < 0.0001			66 a	33 a	945 a	18 a	43 a	24 a	15 a *	58.0
Treatment differences , $P > F$. ⁺ < 0.0001 0.0239 0.0205 0.0045 C.V. 23.69 15.02 24.86 21.74 chyta incidence (diseased plants) : The percent of plants exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta blight. chyta incidence (diseased pods) : The percent of pods exhibiting symptoms of Ascochyta blight; in each diameter: Seed size was determined by assessing the percent (by weight) of a 200-gram seed sample the re holes. icide application timing: A = June 28, prior to bloom (7-8 nodes), at first appearance of disease symptom nent differences , $F : F$ -values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences nent different letters are significantly different (alpha = 0.05; Tukey multiple c N , ND:	Treatment differences, F:"		7.42	7.96	15.21	5.40	27.33	0.34	26.75	0.5
ngicides an, Aproach, roline for gement of chyta blight ckpeas an and Williston, ND N, ND:	Treatment differences, <i>P</i> > <i>F</i> : ^t C.V.:		0.0239 15.02	0.0205 24.86	0.0045 21.74	0.0564 31.40	0.0020 11.90	0.7294 13.28	0.0021 30.13	0.59 1.4
ngicides an, Aproach, roline for gement of chyta blight ckpeas ton and Williston, ND:	² Ascochyta severity: The percent of the canor ^y Ascochyta incidence (diseased plants): The plot).	py exhibiting nec e percent of plan	rosis caused by ts exhibiting syn	 Ascochyta blig notoms of Ascouting 	ht.					ons per
ngicides an, Aproach, roline for gement of chyta blight ckpeas ton and Williston, ND:	*Ascochyta incidence (diseased pods): The * Seed diameter: Seed size was determined b diameter holes.	percent of pods y assessing the p			ichyta blight; in	each plot, 30 pla	ints were evalua	ted (10 plants in	each of 3 locati	
 th Treatment differences, F: F- values associated with the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences among treatments. th Treatment differences, P > F: Probability of observing an F-statistic greater than that observed; an assessment of the significance of treatment differences. the test of the null hypothesis that there are no differences among treatments. * Within-column means followed by different letters are significantly different (alpha = 0.05; Tukey multiple comparison procedure) ON, ND: 	^v Fungicide application timing: A = June 28, p blocm	prior to bloom (7-	exhibiting symp percent (by weiç	toms of Ascoch jht) of a 200-gra	ichyta blight; in iyta blight; in ea am seed sample	each plot, 30 pla ch plot, 50 pods that passed th	ints were evalua were evaluated ough seives wit	ted (10 plants in (10 pods in eacł 1 round 26/64, 2⁄	each of 3 locati 1 of 5 locations 1/64, and 22/64-	per plot). -inch
evaluation of ngicides an, Aproach, roline for gement of chyta blight ckpeas ton and Williston, ND:	bloom. "Treatment differences, F: F- values associated to the second	ted with the test of t	exhibiting symp percent (by weig 8 nodes), at firs	toms of Ascoch jht) of a 200-gra t appearance of	ichyta blight; in ea iyta blight; in ea am seed sample f disease sympt		nts were evalua were evaluated ough seives wit	ted (10 plants in (10 pods in each 1 round 26/64, 24 %); B = July 7, e;	each of 3 locati 1 of 5 locations 1/64, and 22/64- arly bloom; C =	per plot) -inch July 21,
he fu /ertis nd P hanag scoo f chi earring 2011)	gicides n, Aproach, oline for ement of nyta blight kpeas n and Williston, ND	letters are sign	exhibiting symp percent (by weig nodes), at firs 8 nodes), at firs 6 the null hypot of the null hypot statistic greater ificantly differ	toms of Ascoch jht) of a 200-gra t appearance of hesis that there than that obser ent (alpha = 0.0	ichyta blight; in ea am seed sample am seed sample f disease sympt f are no differen ved; an assess 5; Tukey multip	each plot, 30 pla ch plot, 50 pods that passed the oms (incidence oms among treat nent of the sign le comparison p	ints were evaluated were evaluated ough seives wit ough soives wit approx. 0.5 to 1 approx. 0.5 to 1 rocedure)	ted (10 plants in (10 pods in each ı round 26/64, 24 %); B = July 7, ea nent differences.	each of 3 locati of 5 locations p //64, and 22/64- arly bloom; C =	inch July 21,

Field evaluation of the fungicides Vertisan, Aproach, and Proline for management of Ascochyta blight of chickpeas - Carrington and Williston, ND (2011)

Michael Wunsch, Michael Schaefer, and Blaine Schatz, NDSU Carrington Research Extension Center Gordon Bradbury, NDSU Williston Research Extension Center

701-652-2951 / michael.wunsch@ndsu.edu

METHODS – WILLISTON, ND:

- Location of trial: NDSU Williston Research Extension Center, Williston, ND.
- Experimental design, seeding, planting, and harvest: Chickpeas were planted May 26 at 5 seeds per square foot. The experiment was a randomized complete block design with four replicates. Plots consisted of six rows, each 8 in apart; plot size was 64 square feet. To minimize spray drift between treatments, treatment plots were separated by buffer plots. <u>The large-kabuli chickpea</u> 'Dylan', highly susceptible to Ascochyta blight, was seeded in treatment plots; the kabuli-type chickpea 'CDC Frontier', moderately resistant to ascochyta blight, was seeded in buffer and guard plots.
- Inoculation: The trial was not inoculated. All disease was due to ambient inoculum.
- Fungicide applications: Fungicides were applied June 28 prior to bloom (7 to 8 nodes) at first appearance of disease symptoms (incidence approx. 0.5 to 1%), July 7 at early bloom, and July 21 at full bloom. Applications were made with a hand boom with four 8002 nozzles at 19 inch spacing. Applications were made with 20 gal/ac water and 40 psi pressure.
- Disease assessment: Ascochyta incidence and severity were assessed Aug. 6. The percent of the canopy exhibiting necrosis due to Ascochyta blight
 was evaluated at three locations per plot, incidence of Ascochyta blight was assessed by evaluating 30 plants per plot (10 plants from each of 3 locations),
 and the percent of pods exhibiting Ascochyta infection was evaluated by assessing 50 pods per plot (10 pods at each of 5 locations).
- Statistical analysis: All data were evaluated with analysis of variance. The assumption of constant variance was assessed by plotting residuals against predicted values, and the assumption of normality was assessed with a normal probability plot. To meet model assumptions, the square-root transformation was applied to the Aug. 6 Ascochyta severity data and the Aug. 6 incidence of Ascochyta pod infection data. The Aug. 6 Alternaria severity data had an outlier that violated the assumptions of normality and of homoskedasticity of variances but that could not be corrected with systematic transformations, and the untransformed data were analyzed. All other data met model assumptions. Single-degree-of-freedom contrasts were performed for all pairwise comparisons of treatments; to control the Type I error rate at the level of the experiment, the Tukey multiple comparison procedure was employed. Analyses were conducted with replicate and treatment as main factor effects and with interactions included in the model, and they were implemented in PROC GLM of SAS (version 9.2; SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

METHODS - CARRINGTON, ND:

- Location of trial: NDSU Carrington Research Extension Center; Carrington, ND
- Experimental design, seeding, planting, and harvest: Soil type was Heimdal-Emrick loam, and cconventional tillage was used. Chickpeas were planted May 25 at 4.5 pure live seeds per square foot (targeted plant population was 4 plants per square foot). Seeds were treated with Cruiser 5FS (1.28 fl oz/cwt), ApronMaxxRTA (5.0 fl oz/cwt), and Mertect 340F (2.04 fl oz/cwt). The experiment was a randomized complete block design with four replicates. Plots consisted of seven rows, each 25 ft long and 7 in apart; an 18-in alley separated plots (plot size, center-to-center = 5 ft by 25 ft). To minimize spray drift between treatments, treatment plots were separated by buffer plots. The large-kabuli chickpea 'Xena', highly susceptible to Ascochyta blight, was seeded in treatment plots; the Desi-type chickpea 'Amit', moderately resistant to ascochyta blight, was seeded in buffer and guard plots. Due to recurrent torrential rains from mid-July to mid-August, the trial was lost to flooding. Disease severity was assessed prior to flooding, but the trial was not harvested.
- Inoculation: Chickpea residues from the 2010 field season that were naturally infected with Ascochyta rabiei were spread evenly across the trial on June 10 at the V1 crop stage (first multifoliate leaf unfolded from stem).
- Fungicide applications: Fungicides were applied Thursday, June 23 at 6:30-8:00 am (chickpeas 5-6 in. tall, ascochyta blight incidence approx. 1-3%, ascochyta severity approx. 1%) and Wednesday, July 6 at 12:00-1:30 pm. A 60-in hand boom with four equally spaced XR TeeJet 8001VS nozzles was used for applications. Applications were made with 17.5 gal/ac water and 35 psi pressure.
- Disease assessment: Disease severity (the percent of plant canopy necrotic) was evaluated July 13. Disease incidence was 100% in all plots.
- Statistical analysis: Disease severity ratings were evaluated with analysis of variance. The assumption of constant variance was assessed by plotting residuals against predicted values, and the assumption of normality was assessed with a normal probability plot. The assumptions were not met for the disease severity data; to meet model assumptions, a systematic natural-log transformation was applied to these data. Single-degree-of-freedom contrasts were performed for all pairwise comparisons of isolates; to control the Type I error rate at the level of the experiment, the Tukey multiple comparison procedure was employed. Analyses were conducted with replicate and treatment as main factor effects and with interactions included in the model, and they were implemented in PROC GLM of SAS (version 9.2; SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

FUNDING:

This project was funded by the DuPont Crop Protection.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

- Fungicide performance can differ in response to which diseases are present, levels of disease when products are applied, environmental conditions, plant architecture and the susceptibility to disease of the chickpea variety planted, crop growth stage at the time of fungicide application, and other factors.
- This report summarizes fungicide performance as tested at the NDSU Carrington and Williston Research Extension Centers in 2011 under the conditions partially summarized in the methods section (above).
- Fungicide efficacy may differ under other conditions; when choosing fungicides, always evaluate results from multiple trials.
- This report is shared for educational purposes and is not an endorsement of any specific products.