

2016

The Efficacy of Spraying Organic Fungicides to Control Fusarium Head Blight Infection in Spring Wheat

Heather Darby

University of Vermont, heather.darby@uvm.edu

Erica Cummings

University of Vermont

Julian Post

University of Vermont

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uvm.edu/nwcsp>



Part of the [Agricultural Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Darby, Heather; Cummings, Erica; and Post, Julian, "The Efficacy of Spraying Organic Fungicides to Control Fusarium Head Blight Infection in Spring Wheat" (2016). *Northwest Crops & Soils Program*. 111.

<https://scholarworks.uvm.edu/nwcsp/111>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the UVM Extension at ScholarWorks @ UVM. It has been accepted for inclusion in Northwest Crops & Soils Program by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UVM. For more information, please contact donna.omalley@uvm.edu.



The Efficacy of Spraying Organic Fungicides to Control Fusarium Head Blight Infection in Spring Wheat



Dr. Heather Darby, UVM Extension Agronomist
Erica Cummings and Julian Post
UVM Extension Crops and Soils Technicians
(802) 524-6501

Visit us on the web: <http://www.uvm.edu/extension/cropsoil>

THE EFFICACY OF SPRAYING ORGANIC FUNGICIDES TO CONTROL FUSARIUM HEAD BLIGHT INFECTION IN SPRING WHEAT

Dr. Heather Darby, University of Vermont Extension

Heather.Darby@uvm.edu

There is a high demand for locally grown wheat for baking purposes throughout the Northeast. One major obstacle for growers is *Fusarium* head blight (FHB) infection of grain. This disease is currently the most important disease facing organic and conventional grain growers in the Northeast, resulting in loss of yield, shriveled grain, and most importantly, mycotoxin contamination. A vomitoxin called Deoxynivalenol (DON) is considered the primary mycotoxin associated with FHB. Eating contaminated grain with DON concentrations greater than 1ppm poses a health risk to both humans and livestock. The FHB spores are usually transported by air currents and can infect plants at flowering through grain fill. Fungicide applications have proven to be relatively effective at controlling FHB in other spring wheat growing regions. Limited work has been done in this region on the optimum timing for a fungicide application to spring wheat specifically to minimize DON. In addition, there are limited studies evaluating organic approved biofungicides, biochemicals, or biostimulants for management of this disease. In April of 2016, the UVM Extension Northwest Crops and Soils Program initiated a spring wheat fungicide trial to determine the efficacy and timing of fungicide application to reduce FHB infection on cultivars with varying degrees of disease susceptibility. This project is funded through an USDA NIFA Organic Research and Education Grant (2014-05379).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was established at the Borderview Research Farm located in Alburgh, VT on 21-Apr to investigate the effects of cultivar resistance, fungicide efficacy, and application timing on FHB and DON infection in spring malting barley. The experimental design was a randomized complete block, with a split-plot arrangement of cultivar as the whole-plot and fungicide+timing treatments as the sub-plots. The main plot of cultivar included Prosper, a hard red spring wheat with moderately FHB resistant, and Glenn, a hard red spring wheat a FHB resistant variety. The fungicide+timing treatments are listed in Table 2.

The seedbed at the Alburgh location was prepared by conventional tillage methods. All plots were managed with practices similar to those used by producers in the surrounding areas (Table 1). The previous crop planted at the site was sunflowers. Prior to planting the trial area was disked and spike tooth harrowed to prepare for planting. The plots were seeded with a Great Plains Cone Seeder on 21-Apr at a seeding rate of 350 live seeds per m². Plot size was 5'x 20'.

When the wheat reached 75-100% flowering (23-Jun), plots were sprayed with the fungicide treatments (Table 2). The application was made using a Bellspray Inc. Model T4 backpack sprayer. This model had a carbon dioxide pressurized tank and a four-nozzle boom attachment. It sprayed at a rate of 10 gallons per acre. All but one plot (Control) of each cultivar was inoculated 24 hours (24-Jun), after the flowering treatment was applied, with a spore suspension (40,000 spores/ml) consisting of a mixture of isolates of *Fusarium graminearum* endemic to the area. The *Fusarium graminearum* spores were multiplied and harvested using the 'Gz conidial suspension inoculum protocol'. Five days after the flowering application

(28-Jun), plots not previously treated with a fungicide were sprayed with the fungicides treatments except for the control and *Fusarium graminearum* only plots (Table 2). Water was applied at the same rate as the fungicides to the control plots and to those that were only inoculated with *Fusarium graminearum*. Below is a list of the treatment materials evaluated in this trial. Descriptions have been provided from manufacturer information.

Table 1. General plot management of the trial.

Location	Borderview Research Farm Alburgh, VT
Soil type	Benson rocky silt loam
Previous crop	Sunflowers
Row spacing (inch)	7
Seeding rate (live seed m²)	350
Replicates	3
Varieties	Prosper and Glenn
Planting date	21-Apr
Harvest date	9-Aug
Harvest area (ft)	5 x 20
Tillage operations	Spring plow, disk & spike tooth harrow

Actinovate® (EPA# 73314-1) is a biological fungicide (0.0371% *Streptomyces lydicus* WYEC 108) that suppresses and controls root rot, damping-off fungi and foliar fungal pathogens. Its active ingredient is a patented bacterium that grows around the root system (when soil drenched) and foliage of the plant (when sprayed on) while using several novel modes of antifungal action to protect plants.

ChampION++® (EPA# 55146-115) a fungicide/bactericide that controls key fungal and other diseases in a wide range of high-value crops. It is a new dry formulation (water dispersible granule) of copper that features consistently smaller particles and other unique formulation attributes to provide more thorough coverage – and thus better disease control –with less environmental loading.

Champ WG (EPA# 55146-1) is a 77% copper hydroxide-based, broad-spectrum fungicide for disease control. When copper hydroxide is mixed with water, it releases copper ions, which disrupt the cellular proteins of the fungus. This product is approved for use in organic production systems.

Regalia (EPA # 85059-3) bio fungicides have a unique and complex mode of action, referred to as Induced Systemic Resistance (ISR), and carry a FRAC code of P5. ISR creates a defense response in the treated plants and stimulates additional biochemical pathways that strengthen the plant structure and act against the pathogen. When applied to crops, Regalia products activate ISR and induce the plants to produce specialized proteins and other compounds—phytoalexins, cell strengtheners, antioxidants, phenolics, and PR proteins—which are known to inhibit fungal and bacterial diseases and also improve plant health and vigor. This product is approved for use in organic production systems.

SONATA® (EPA# 69592-13) fungicide provides excellent control of powdery mildews and rusts. Based on a patented strain of *Bacillus pumilus* (QST 2808), SONATA is an excellent fit for integrated disease management programs. SONATA contains a unique, patented strain of *Bacillus pumilus* (QST 2808) that produces an antifungal amino sugar compound that inhibits cell metabolism. SONATA also creates a zone of inhibition on plant surfaces, preventing pathogens from establishing on the plant.

Table 2. Treatments-fungicide application dates and rates.

Treatments	Flowering application	5 days after flowering application	Application rate
	date	date	
Control	23-Jun	28-Jun	Water
<i>Fusarium graminearum</i>		24-Jun	40,000 spores/ml
Actinovate	23-Jun	28-Jun	6 fl oz ac ⁻¹
ChampION	23-Jun	28-Jun	1.5 lbs ac ⁻¹
Champ WG	23-Jun	28-Jun	1 lbs ac ⁻¹
Regalia	23-Jun	28-Jun	1 qt ac ⁻¹
SONATA	23-Jun	28-Jun	2 qt ac ⁻¹

When the wheat reached the soft dough growth stage (15-Jul), FHB intensity was assessed by randomly clipping 60-100 heads throughout each plot, spikes were counted and a visual assessment of each head was rated for FHB infection. To assess the infection rate we use the North Dakota State University Extension Service's "A Visual Scale to Estimate Severity of Fusarium Head Blight in Wheat" online publication.

Grain plots were harvested in Alburgh with an Almaco SPC50 plot combine on 9-Aug, the harvest area was 5' x 20'. At the time of harvest grain moisture, test weight, and yield were calculated.

Following harvest, seed was cleaned with a small Clipper cleaner (A.T. Ferrell, Bluffton, IN). An approximate one pound subsample was collected to determine quality. Quality measurements included standard testing parameters used by commercial mills. Test weight was measured by the weighing of a known volume of grain. Generally the heavier the wheat is per bushel, the higher baking quality. The acceptable test weight for bread wheat is 56-60 lbs per bushel. Once test weight was determined, the samples were then ground into flour using the Perten LM3100 Laboratory Mill. At this time, flour was evaluated for mycotoxin levels. Deoxynivalenol (DON) analysis was analyzed using Veratox DON 5/5 Quantitative test from the NEOGEN Corp. This test has a detection range of 0.5 to 5 ppm. Samples with DON values greater than 1 ppm are considered unsuitable for human consumption.

All data was analyzed using a mixed model analysis where replicates were considered random effects. The LSD procedure was used to separate treatment means when the F-test was significant (P< 0.10).

Variations in yield and quality can occur because of variations in genetics, soil, weather, and other growing conditions. Statistical analysis makes it possible to determine whether a difference among

varieties is real or whether it might have occurred due to other variations in the field. At the bottom of each table a LSD value is presented for each variable (e.g. yield). Least Significant Differences at the 10% level of probability are shown. Where the difference between two varieties within a column is equal to or greater than the LSD value at the bottom of the column, you can be sure in 9 out of 10 chances that there is a real difference between the two varieties. In the following example, variety A is significantly different from variety C, but not from variety B. The difference between A and B is equal to 725, which is less than the LSD value of 889. This means that these varieties did not differ in yield. The difference between A and C is equal to 1454, which is greater than the LSD value of 889. This means that the yields of these varieties were significantly different from one another. The asterisk indicates that variety B was not significantly lower than the top yielding variety.

Variety	Yield
A	3161
B	3886*
C	4615*
LSD	889

RESULTS

Seasonal precipitation and temperature recorded at weather stations in close proximity to the 2016 site are shown in Table 3. The growing season this year was marked by lower than normal temperatures in April, and higher than average temperatures in May and August. Rainfall amounts were below average throughout the growing season resulting in 5.52 inches of precipitation less than normal. From April to August, there was an accumulation of 4536 Growing Degree Days (GDDs) which was 43.7 GDDs above the 30 year average.

Table 3. Temperature and precipitation summary for Alburgh, VT, 2016.

Alburgh, VT	April	May	June	July	August
Average temperature (°F)	39.8	58.1	65.8	70.7	71.6
Departure from normal	-4.92	1.84	0.01	0.13	2.85
Precipitation (inches)	2.56	1.53	2.81	1.79	2.98
Departure from normal	-0.26	-1.92	-0.88	-2.37	-0.93
Growing Degree Days (32-95°F)	291	803	1017	1201	1224
Departure from normal	-97.9	49.5	3.20	4.45	84.4

Historical averages are for 30 years of data provided by the NOAA (1981-2010) for Burlington, VT. Alburgh precipitation data from 8/17/16-10/31/16 was missing and was replaced by data provided by the NOAA for Highgate, VT.

Wheat Variety x Fungicide+Timing Interactions:

There were no significant interactions between spring wheat variety and fungicide type and timing of application. This indicates that the varieties responded similarly to the fungicide treatments.

Impact of Fungicide and Timing

There was a significant difference in average FHB infected head severity between fungicide+timing treatments (Table 4). No significant differences were found in the average FHB plot severity and the incidence of infected heads between fungicide+timing treatments. Regalia applied at flowering had an average 14.5% FHB infected head severity and this was significantly higher than all other treatments.

Table 4. The FHB incidence and severity following fungicide treatments at flowering and five days after flowering, Alburgh, VT 2016.

Treatment	Average FHB severity	Average FHB infected head severity	Incidence FHB of infected heads
	%	%	%
Non-sprayed, non-inoculated control	0.52	7.21*	7.05
Inoculated Fusarium spores 24-Jun	0.32	7.00*	4.61
Actinovate – flowering	0.57	6.40*	7.43
Actinovate – 5 days after flowering	0.45	6.42*	5.48
ChampION - flowering	0.43	8.17*	5.75
ChampION – 5 days after flowering	0.39	7.17*	5.43
Champ WG - flowering	0.86	7.56*	10.9
Champ WG – 5 days after flowering	1.00	9.81*	9.30
Regalia - flowering	0.67	14.5	4.72
Regalia – 5 days after flowering	0.51	7.58*	6.14
SONOTA - flowering	0.75	9.40*	8.43
SONOTA – 5 days after flowering	0.77	7.38*	7.95
<i>LSD (0.10)</i>	NS	4.06	NS
<i>Trial Mean</i>	0.60	8.21	6.93

Values shown in **bold** are of the highest value or top performing.

* Treatments that are not significantly different than the top performing variety in a column are indicated with an asterisk
NS - None of the treatments were significantly different from one another.

There was no significant difference in harvest moisture, test weight, yield, and DON concentration between fungicide+timing treatments (Table 5). All fungicide+timing treatments had moistures above 14%, the optimum moisture for grain storage, and therefore had to be dried down.

Table 5. The impact application timing and fungicide on spring wheat yield and quality.

Treatment	Harvest moisture	Test weight	Yield @13.5% moisture	DON
	%	lbs bu ⁻¹	lbs ac ⁻¹	ppm
Non-sprayed, non-inoculated control	14.2	58.5	2907	0.30

Inoculated Fusarium spores 24-Jun	14.4	58.6	2400	0.28
Actinovate – flowering	14.7	58.3	2622	0.48
Actinovate – 5 days after flowering	14.8	58.8	2570	0.15
ChampION - flowering	14.6	58.8	2575	0.23
ChampION – 5 days after flowering	14.5	57.7	2611	0.32
Champ WG - flowering	14.7	57.6	2746	0.28
Champ WG – 5 days after flowering	14.2	58.0	2167	0.31
Regalia - flowering	14.4	58.1	2503	0.27
Regalia – 5 days after flowering	14.2	58.3	2626	0.35
SONOTA - flowering	14.9	57.5	2231	0.33
SONOTA – 5 days after flowering	14.5	58.6	2363	0.28
<i>LSD (0.10)</i>	NS	NS	NS	NS
<i>Trial Mean</i>	14.5	58.2	2527	0.30

Values shown in **bold** are of the highest value or top performing.

NS - None of the treatments were significantly different from one another.

None of the fungicide+timing treatments met industry standards of 60 lbs bu⁻¹ for wheat. The average yield for the trial was 2527 lbs ac⁻¹ (Figure 1). All fungicide+timing treatments had DON concentrations below the FDA 1 ppm recommendation.




Figure 1. The impact of application timing and fungicide on spring wheat yield.

Impact of Variety

There were no significant differences in the average FHB plot severity, FHB infected head severity, and incidence of FHB infection between spring wheat varieties (Table 6). Interestingly Glenn, the more resistant variety, had the lowest average FHB plot severity, FHB infected head severity, and incidence of FHB infection between the two varieties.

Table 6. The impact of spring wheat variety of FHB incidence and severity.

Variety	Average FHB severity	Average FHB infected head severity	Incidence FHB of infected heads
	%	%	%
Glenn	0.56	7.73	6.62
Prosper	0.65	8.69	7.25
<i>LSD (0.10)</i>	NS	NS	NS
<i>Trial Mean</i>	0.60	8.21	6.93

NS - None of the varieties were significantly different from one another.

The spring wheat varieties were significantly different in harvest moisture and yield (Table 7, Figure 2). Prosper had the lowest harvest moisture (14.3%). Both varieties had moistures above 14% and therefore had to be dried down for storage. Glenn was the highest yielding (2657 lbs ac⁻¹) and had the highest test weight of 58.4 lbs bu⁻¹. Neither of the varieties achieved industry standards for test weight of 60 lbs bu⁻¹. Varieties did not differ in yield or DON concentrations and both were below the FDA recommendation of 1 ppm.

Table 7. The impact of spring wheat variety of quality and yield.

Variety	Harvest moisture	Test weight	Yield @13.5% moisture	DON
	%	%		%
Glenn	14.7	58.4	2657*	0.30
Prosper	14.3*	58.0	2397	0.30
<i>LSD (0.10)</i>	0.35	NS	212	NS
<i>Trial Mean</i>	14.5	58.2	2527	0.30

Values shown in **bold** are of the highest value or top performing.

* Varieties that are not significantly different than the top performing variety in a column are indicated with an asterisk.

NS - None of the varieties were significantly different from one another.




Figure 2. Impact of variety on spring wheat yields.

DISCUSSION

Overall, the 2016 growing season was ideal for growing spring wheat. The warmer than average temperatures, along with below normal rainfall throughout much of the growing season, resulted in minimal fungal growth. This is evident in the low DON concentrations in both varieties. All of the treatments, including the untreated control and the Fusarium only plots, had DON concentrations below the 1 ppm threshold. It is interesting, given the ideal growing conditions, that none of the treatments attained the industry standard for test weight. The lack of moisture during the growing season may have had an impact on grain fill.

It is important to remember that the results only represent one year of data. The Northwest Crops and Soils Program will be repeating this trial again in 2017.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The UVM Extension Northwest Crops and Soils Team would like to thank the Borderview Research Farm for their generous help with the trials, as well as acknowledge the USDA NIFA Organic Research and Education grant program for their financial support. We would like to acknowledge Nate Brigham, Julija Cubins, Kelly Drollette, Hillary Emick, Abha Gupta, Lindsey Ruhl, Xiaohe “Danny” Yang, and Sara Ziegler for their assistance with data collection and entry. This information is presented with the understanding that no product discrimination is intended and neither endorsement of any product mentioned, nor criticism of unnamed products, is implied.

UVM Extension helps individuals and communities put research-based knowledge to work.



Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. University of Vermont Extension, Burlington, Vermont, University of Vermont Extension, and U.S. Department of Agriculture, cooperating, offer education and employment to everyone without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or familial status.