Sugarbeet Tolerance and Weed Control from Postemergence Ethofumesate 4SC

Alexa Lystad and Tom Peters Research Specialist and Extension Sugarbeet Agronomist



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EXTENSION

Ethofumesate – Historical Summary

- Ethofumesate was first registered as NORTRON (Edwards 2005)
 - Registered for annual grass and broadleaf control in sugarbeet
- Ethofumesate mode of action includes inhibition of mitosis along with reduced respiration and photosynthesis.

- Soil applied with some post-emergence activity (Eshel, 1978)
 Up to 10 weeks residual control (Eshel et al., 1976, Elkins, 1972)
- Previous rates, ethofumesate has excellent control (90-99%) on redroot pigweed soil applied (ND Weed Control Guide, Zollinger et al. 2017)
 Good to fair control (80-65%) on kochia, common lambsquarters, and waterhemp

$Ethofumesate \ 4SC-New \ Label$

- <u>Regulatory Approval for Ethofumesate 4SC POST:</u>
- \bullet Increase postemergence ethofumes ate rate from 12 to 128 fl oz/A
- \bullet Decrease the Pre Harvest Interval (PHI) from 90 to 45 days
- Benefits Unknown
 - Potential for greater control on later germinating weeds (Waterhemp)



http://www.willowoodusa.com/products/herbicides/willowood-usa-ethofumesate/

Technical challenges

- How does ethofumesate at rates up to 128 fl oz/A fit a weed management system in sugarbeet?
- Can sugarbeet tolerate ethofumesate postemergence?
- Is ethofumesate tank mixed more efficacious than applied alone postemergence?
- Can crops planted in sequence with sugarbeet tolerate these increased rates POST?



Weed Control

- Troublesome weed species in our growing area
 - Waterhemp (Amaranthus tuberculatus)
 - ALS inhibitor, Growth Regulator, EPSPS, PSII Inhibitor, PPO inhibitor, HPPD inhibitor
 - Common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*)
 - PSII Inhibitor, ALS inhibitor, EPSPS (suspected)
 - Redroot Pigweed (Amaranthus retroflexus)
 - ALS inhibitor, Atrazine (PSII)



Common Lambsquarters





Redroot Pigweed

Waterhemp

Objectives

• Do sugarbeet tolerate Ethofumesate 4SC at rates to 128 fl oz/A?

- Does Ethofumesate 4SC POST control weeds?
 - Common Lambsquarters
 - Redroot Pigweed
 - Waterhemp



Materials and Methods

- Sugarbeet Tolerance
 - Experimental Design: Randomized Complete Block
 - Number of Locations: 6
 - Number of Replications: 6
 - Number of Treatments: 6
- Common lambsquarters, redroot pigweed, and waterhemp control
 - Experimental Design: Randomized Complete Block
 - Number of Locations: 2 per target weed
 - Number of Replications: 4
 - Number of Treatments: 13



Field Evaluations

- Sugarbeet Injury
 - Visual (0-100%)
- Sugarbeet Stand
 - 10' of middle 2/4 treated rows counted

• Yield

- Tons per acre
- % Sucrose
- Recoverable sucrose per acre
- Weed Control • Visual (0-100%)
- Weed Density
 - 1/4 meter quadrats



Do Sugarbeet Tolerate Ethofumesate 4SC? – Density and Stature Reduction^a

Ethofumesate ^b	Density	7 DAT ^c	14 DAT	28 DAT
fl oz/A	100 ft		%%	
0	150	0 a	0 a	0 a
8	149	2 a	1 a	0 a
16	151	2 a	2 a	1 a
32	150	7 b	6 b	2 a
64	153	16 c	14 c	8 b
128	147	28 d	29 d	18 c
LSD (0.05)	NS	5	5	4
		<i>p</i> -val	ue	
	0.4305	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001

^aMeans within a main effect not sharing any letter are significantly different by the t-test at the 5% level of significance.

^bHigh surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.8 L ha⁻¹ added to each post treatment.

^cStature reduction 7 and 14 days after treatment (DAT).

Does Sugarbeet Tolerate Ethofumesate 4SC? – Yield Components^a

Ethofumesate ^b	Root Yield ^c	Sucrose Content	Rec. Suc ^d
fl oz/A	Tons/A	%	lbs/A
0	30	15.7	8,484 ab
8	30	15.6	8,343 abc
16	30	15.7	8,440 ab
32	31	15.7	8,511 a
64	29	15.7	8,143 bc
128	29	15.4	8,024 c
LSD (0.05)	NS	NS	349
		<i>p</i> -value	
	0.1418	0.2844	0.0410

^aMeans within a main effect not sharing any letter are significantly different by the t-test at the 5% level of significance.

^bHigh surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A added to each post treatment.

^cRoot yield reported in tons per acre.

^dRecoverable sucrose reported in pounds per acre.

Does Sugarbeet Tolerate Ethofumesate 4SC? – Yield Components^a

Ethofumesate ^b	Root Yield ^c	Sucrose Content	Rec. Suc ^d
fl oz/A	Tons/A	%	lbs/A
0	30	15.7	8,484 ab
8	30	15.6	8,343 abc
16	30	15.7	8,440 ab
32	31	15.7	8,511 a
64	29	15.7	8,143 bc
128	29	15.4	8,024 c
LSD (0.05)	NS	NS	349
		<i>p</i> -value	
	0.1418	0.2844	0.0410

^aMeans within a main effect not sharing any letter are significantly different by the t-test at the 5% level of significance.

^bHigh surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A added to each post treatment.

^cRoot yield reported in tons per acre.

^dRecoverable sucrose reported in pounds per acre.



 $128 \mathrm{~fl} \mathrm{~oz/A}$

64 fl oz/A

32 fl oz/A



Hickson, ND 2019

Untreated check



 $128 \mathrm{~fl} \mathrm{~oz/A}$

64 fl oz/A

32 fl oz/A



Prosper, ND 2018

Untreated Check

Sugarbeet visible stature reduction in response to herbicide application across environments^a

		Stature Reduction	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	C	%
Glyphosate ^b	32	2 a	1 a
Ethofumesate ^c	16	3 a	3 ab
Ethofumesate ^c	32	8 ab	5 abc
Ethofumesate ^c	64	17 cd	18 d
Ethofumesate ^c	128	25 def	28 e
Ethofumesate + glyphosate ^d	32 + 32	14 bc	8 bc
Ethofumesate + glyphosate ^d	64 + 32	22 cdef	19 d
LSD (0.05)		8	5
		<i>P</i> -value	
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

^aMeans within a main effect not sharing any letter are significantly different by the LSD at the 5% level of significance.

^bAmmonium sulfate at 2.5% v/v and non-ionic surfactant at 0.25% v/v.

^cHigh surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A.

^dAmmonium sulfate at 2.5% v/v and high surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A.

Sugarbeet visible stature reduction in response to herbicide application across environments^a

		Stature Reduction	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	C	%
Glyphosate ^b	32	2 a	1 a
Ethofumesate ^c	16	3 a	3 ab
Ethofumesate ^c	32	8 ab	5 abc
Ethofumesate ^c	64	17 cd	18 d
Ethofumesate ^c	128	25 def	28 e
Ethofumesate + glyphosate ^d	32 + 32	14 bc	8 bc
Ethofumesate + glyphosate ^d	64 + 32	22 cdef	19 d
LSD (0.05)		8	5
		<i>P</i> -value	
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

^aMeans within a main effect not sharing any letter are significantly different by the LSD at the 5% level of significance.

^bAmmonium sulfate at 2.5% v/v and non-ionic surfactant at 0.25% v/v.

^cHigh surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A.

^dAmmonium sulfate at 2.5% v/v and high surfactant methylated oil concentrate at 1.5 pt/A.

Ethofumesate at 128 fl oz/A









Common lambsquarters control, 7 and 14 DAT, across environments^a

		Common La	ambsquarters
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	0	%
Glyphosate	32	98 a	95 a
Ethofumesate	16	48 e	45 e
Ethofumesate	32	70 cd	66 d
Ethofumesate	64	64 d	77 bcd
Ethofumesate	128	79 bc	84 abc
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	100 a	96 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	100 a	95 a
LSD (0.05)		13	16
		<i>P</i> -value	
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

Common lambsquarters control, 7 and 14 DAT, across environments^a

		Common Lambsquarters	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	Ç	%
Glyphosate	32	98 a	95 a
Ethofumesate	16	48 e	45 e
Ethofumesate	32	70 cd	66 d
Ethofumesate	64	64 d	77 bcd
Ethofumesate	128	79 bc	84 abc
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	100 a	96 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	100 a	95 a
LSD (0.05)		13	16
		<i>P</i> -v	alue
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

Redroot pigweed visible control 7 and 14 DAT across environments^a

		Redroot Pigweed	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A		%
Glyphosate	32	99 a	93 ab
Ethofumesate	16	44 fg	47 e
Ethofumesate	32	50 ef	62 d
Ethofumesate	64	54 def	71 cd
Ethofumesate	128	64 cd	76 cd
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	99 a	98 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	100 a	99 a
LSD (0.05)		10	14
		P-v	value
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

Redroot pigweed visible control 7 and 14 DAT across environments^a

		Redroot	Pigweed
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A		%
Glyphosate	32	99 a	93 ab
Ethofumesate	16	44 fg	47 e
Ethofumesate	32	50 ef	62 d
Ethofumesate	64	54 def	71 cd
Ethofumesate	128	64 cd	76 cd
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	99 a	98 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	100 a	99 a
LSD (0.05)		10	14
		<i>P</i> -v	value
		< 0.0001	< 0.0001

Waterhemp visible control 7 and 14 DAT across environments^a

		Waterhemp	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	0	<i>%</i>
Glyphosate	32	62 bcd	53 cd
Ethofumesate	16	58 cd	65 bcd
Ethofumesate	32	63 bcd	66 bc
Ethofumesate	64	74 abc	78 ab
Ethofumesate	128	80 ab	84 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	86 a	86 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	91 a	91 a
LSD (0.05)		18	16
ANOVA			value
		0.0001	< 0.0001

Waterhemp visible control 7 and 14 DAT across environments^a

		Waterhemp	
Treatment	Rate	7 DAT	14 DAT
	fl oz/A	9	//
Glyphosate	32	62 bcd	53 cd
Ethofumesate	16	58 cd	65 bcd
Ethofumesate	32	63 bcd	66 bc
Ethofumesate	64	74 abc	78 ab
Ethofumesate	128	80 ab	84 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	32 + 32	86 a	86 a
Ethofumesate + glyphosate	64 + 32	91 a	91 a
LSD (0.05)		18	16
ANOVA		<i>P_v</i>	value
		0.0001	< 0.0001

Waterhemp control 14 DAT in response to herbicide treatment and application timing, greenhouse, 2019^a



Sugarbeet Tolerance Summary

- Ethofumesate 4SC postemergence at rates to 128 fl oz/A did not reduce sugarbeet stand, root yield, or sucrose content.
- Ethofumesate 4SC at 128 fl oz/A reduced recoverable sucrose content
- \bullet Ethofumes ate 4SC reduced sugarbeet stature at 64 and 128 fl oz/A
 - Sugarbeet recovered from stature reduction



Efficacy Summary

- Ethofumesate is not a stand-alone POST herbicide for common lambsquarters, redroot pigweed, or waterhemp control
- Glyphosate alone or ethofumesate plus glyphosate at 32 + 32 fl oz/A, provided the greatest overall control of common lambsquarters and redroot pigweed
- Ethofumesate plus glyphosate at 32 fl oz/A or ethofumesate at 128 fl oz/A provided the greatest waterhemp control
 - Ethofumesate 4SC at 128 fl oz/A significantly increases sugarbeet stature reduction and input costs compared to glyphosate + ethofumesate at 32 fl oz/A



Acknowledgements

- Thank you to the Sugarbeet Research and Education Board (SBREB) for funding this work
- Thank you to site personnel; University of Minnesota-Crookston; KayJay Ag Services; Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative; and Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative who aided in planting, managing, and harvesting.
- Thank you to my advisor, Dr. Tom Peters, along with Jeff Stith, Nathan Haugrud, Charles Tvedt, Jewel Faul, and Peter Hakk and other NDSU colleagues for their hard work throughout 2018 and 2019 to aid in conducting and collecting quality experimental data

Thank you

Alexa Lystad

Extension Research Specialist – Sugarbeet Weed Control

701-231-5353 (office)

701-871-1378 (mobile)

alexa.l.lystad@ndsu.edu

NDSU EXTENSION

University of Minnesota **EXTENSION**