

2010

# Bean Leaf Beetle-Phomopsis Management Trials on Soybean

Jose Pablo Soto-arias  
*Iowa State University*

Gary P. Munkvold  
*Iowa State University, [munkvold@iastate.edu](mailto:munkvold@iastate.edu)*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms\\_reports](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports)



Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agriculture Commons](#), and the [Plant Pathology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Soto-arias, Jose Pablo and Munkvold, Gary P., "Bean Leaf Beetle-Phomopsis Management Trials on Soybean" (2010). *Iowa State Research Farm Progress Reports*. 430.  
[http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms\\_reports/430](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/farms_reports/430)

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](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

---

# Bean Leaf Beetle-Phomopsis Management Trials on Soybean

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of insecticide and fungicide applications on bean leaf beetle populations and *Phomopsis* (pod and stem blight) infection. There is some evidence that bean leaf beetle activity may directly affect *Phomopsis* colonization of soybean pods and stems.

## **Keywords**

RFR A9083, Plant Pathology

## **Disciplines**

Agricultural Science | Agriculture | Plant Pathology

# Bean Leaf Beetle-*Phomopsis* Management Trials on Soybean

## RFR-A9083

Jose Pablo Soto-Arias, graduate assistant  
Gary Munkvold, associate professor  
Department of Plant Pathology

### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of insecticide and fungicide applications on bean leaf beetle populations and *Phomopsis* (pod and stem blight) infection. There is some evidence that bean leaf beetle activity may directly affect *Phomopsis* colonization of soybean pods and stems.

### Materials and Methods

Plots were planted on May 21, 2009, using Pioneer brand soybean variety 92M76. The experimental design for this study was a randomized complete block in a split-plot arrangement with four replications. The main plots were insecticide treatments and consisted of applications targeting different bean leaf beetle life stages. These treatments were: 1) no insecticide, 2) insecticide seed treatment + foliar application to control first generation, 3) insecticide seed treatment + foliar application to control first and second generations, and 4) foliar application to control first and second generations. Insecticide seed treatment consisted of the neonicotinoid insecticide thiamethoxam (Cruiser 5FS), and foliar applications were pyrethroid insecticide lambda-cyhalothrin (Warrior). All seeds were treated with fungicides Apron Maxx (Apron XL and Maxim). The sub-plots were foliar fungicide applications of the triazole fungicide tebuconazole (Folicur 3.6F), and strobilurin fungicide pyraclostrobin (Headline) at R5

growth stage and an untreated control. The foliar insecticide applications were on July 7 and August 13, and R5 fungicide spray was on August 18.

### Results and Discussion

Even though bean leaf beetle populations were very low in 2009, it was observed that foliar insecticide applications had an effect of reducing insect feeding damage. Treatments that included a foliar application targeting the second beetle generation showed less pod damage compared with other treatments (Table 1).

A plate test was performed to evaluate *Phomopsis* incidence in stems. Treatments that included insecticide seed and foliar applications reduced *Phomopsis* infection of stems (Table 1). The strobilurin fungicide also was effective in reducing *Phomopsis* infection of stems.

Seeds harvested were tested by blotter test to determine *Phomopsis* infection. Treatments that included insecticide seed and foliar applications plus an application of any fungicide reduced *Phomopsis* infection of seeds (Table 1). The strobilurin fungicide also was effective in reducing *Phomopsis* infection of seeds.

Soybean yields did not differ due to treatments (Table 1).

### Acknowledgements

Thanks to Kevin Van Dee, Southeast Farm superintendent, and his staff for their assistance and cooperation in this study. This work was funded, in part, by soybean checkoff funds from the Iowa Soybean Association.

**Table 1. Average percent of *Phomopsis* incidence of stem and seed, percent of insect feeding damage, and yield response.**

<u>Treatment</u>		Phomopsis incidents (%)		Insect feeding damage	Yield
Insecticide	Fungicide	Stems <sup>1</sup>	Seeds <sup>1</sup>	% pod damage/plant <sup>1</sup>	(bu/A) <sup>1</sup>
None	None	60 a	11.81 a	11.67 a	68 a
None	Triazole	33 ab	7.37 ab	7.87 ab	71 a
None	Strobilurin	35 ab	5.12 b	9.75 a	75 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	None	36 ab	8.6 ab	8.01 ab	66 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	Triazole	34 ab	5.56 b	9.14 a	66 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	Strobilurin	21 b	4.25 b	2.62 bc	68 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	None	43 ab	8.81 ab	1.82 c	57 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	Triazole	45 ab	7.19 ab	2.25 c	69 a
Seed trt+foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	Strobilurin	48 ab	7.69 ab	0.65 c	66 a
Foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> + 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	None	50 ab	7.31 ab	1.71 c	64 a
Foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> + 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	Triazole	35 ab	7.69 ab	1.64 c	67 a
Foliar 1 <sup>st</sup> + 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	Strobilurin	38 ab	6.06 ab	1.10 c	71 a

<sup>1</sup>Means within a column with the same letter are not significantly different ( $P \leq 0.05$ ).