

Update



Cercospora leaf blight

318-235-9805 pprice@agcenter.lsu.edu

DISEASE ID IS IMPORTANT!

Cercospora Species Associated with Cercospora leaf blight in the southern US.



C. cf. flagellaris

C. kikuchii



#### Doyle's Lab - Developing a protocol to study the biology of the species associated with CLB

C. cf. flagellaris – DMCC1435 and DMCC4400 C. cf. iranica – BW251 C. kikuchii - DMCC2070 C. cf. sigesbeckiae – BW232



4 days after plating



5 x 10<sup>4</sup> conidia/mL 0.5% Tween 20 0.5% gelatin





Plants inoculated with mock solution



Plants inoculated with conidia solution

Ernesto da Silva

#### Vinson Doyle's Program

### Virulence varies among isolates – *C. kikuchii* most virulent in this study



#### Vinson Doyle's Program

CLB symptoms caused by multiple species of *Cercospora* 



#### "NEWLY" IDENTIFIED SYMPTOM LIL' PURPLE SPOTS \*possible management trigger?



Ernesto da Silva

Vinson Doyle's Program



# **Official Variety Trials**

Cercospora leaf blight ratings at MRRS, NERS, DLRS, RRS, BHRS www.lsuagcenter.com



# **Official Variety Trials - Observations**

Later maturity groups typically will have more CLB Later planted trials typically will have more CLB CLB ratings can be confounded with chloride toxicity at MRRS Years ago, LL varieties seemed to have more resistance to purple seed stain

# Plant Introductions Resistant to CLB

JOURNAL OF CROP IMPROVEMENT https://doi.org/10.1080/15427528.2020.1865226



\*57 PIs identified resistant

Check for update

#### Evaluating Cercospora leaf blight resistance in soybean accessions using an improved categorical disease-evaluation scale

Brian M. Ward<sup>a,b</sup>, Bishnu K. Shrestha<sup>c</sup>, Tom W. Allen <sup>Od</sup>, Blair Buckley<sup>e</sup>, Pengyin Chen<sup>f</sup>, Michael Clubb<sup>f</sup>, Leandro A. Mozzoni<sup>g</sup>, Moldir Orazaly<sup>g</sup>, Liliana Florez<sup>g</sup>, David Moseley<sup>g,h</sup>, John C. Rupe<sup>i</sup>, Thanos Gentimis<sup>i</sup>, and Paul P. Price, III <sup>Oc</sup>

- 568 Accessions
- 2016-2018
- 17 location-years
- MG III-VII

Numerical description	Symptom expression and characteristic differences between plant parts
0	No disease symptoms
1	Light purple/bronzing, few petiole lesions, no leaf blight
2	Moderate purple/bronzing and/or petiole lesions, no or minimal leaf blight
3	Heavy purple/bronzing and/or petiole lesions, light blight
4	Heavy purple/bronzing and/or petiole lesions, moderate blight
5	Severe blight, < 50% defoliation
6	Severe blight, > 50% defoliation

2 3



### **Commercial Lines Identified Resistant to CLB**

		CM			AL			AR		 	LA			MO		_		MS		_		TN	
Cultivar	MG e	AVG f	N <sup>g</sup>	# h	AVG	N	#	AVG	Ν	 #	AVG	Ν	 #	AVG	Ν		#	AVG	Ν		#	AVG	Ν
AG46X6	4.6	0.035	50	1	0.005	2	2	0.003	12	4	0.026	24		N/A	0		5	0.136	8		1	0.000	4
AG53X6	5.3	0.043	50	4	0.017	3	19	0.019	12	5	0.028	24		N/A	0		17	0.173	7		3	0.003	4
R11-2354	6.0	0.057	92	9	0.026	6	8	0.009	24	б	0.033	24	21	0.022	6		1	0.092	16		5	0.015	8
LA560512	5.0	0.062	86	18	0.056	5	18	0.017	20	1	0.020	24	б	0.006	б		2	0.115	16		10	0.027	7
S12-2418	4.0	0.067	90	17	0.055	5	14	0.014	24	11	0.052	24	1	0.000	6		12	0.165	16		14	0.036	7
R10-197RY	5.6	0.070	92	14	0.052	б	11	0.011	24	2	0.024	24	16	0.016	6		9	0.154	16		22	0.053	8
AG47X6	4.7	0.073	51	б	0.020	3	13	0.013	12	19	0.088	24		N/A	0		15	0.171	8		2	0.003	4
UA5814HP	5.8	0.074	90	8	0.023	5	15	0.015	24	3	0.026	24	1	0.000	6		10	0.154	16		20	0.048	7
S11-20124	5.0	0.074	92	21	0.069	7	5	0.005	24	8	0.041	24	20	0.021	6		19	0.174	16		11	0.027	7
DG5580	5.5	0.075	49	2	0.010	3	16	0.015	12	23	0.105	22		N/A	0		б	0.137	8		4	0.014	4
Osage	5.6	0.075	93	26	0.085	7	12	0.011	24	9	0.047	24	31	0.039	6		4	0.133	16		28	0.071	8
REV56R63	5.6	0.080	50	7	0.020	3	28	0.038	12	21	0.088	24		N/A	0		11	0.163	8		9	0.025	3
DG4967LL	4.9	0.080	136	11	0.043	8	22	0.024	36	 24	0.105	39	2	0.001	9		13	0.166	24		23	0.054	8
S12-3782	4.0	0.081	88	12	0.047	б	7	0.008	23	14	0.074	24	1	0.000	6	1	24	0.193	16		19	0.043	5
R11-1192	5.7	0.082	41	13	0.050	3	36	0.063	20		N/A	0	8	0.009	3		7	0.146	12		24	0.063	3
4670RR2Y	4.6	0.083	40	20	0.067	4	3	0.005	12		N/A	0	3	0.001	6		28	0.205	8		30	0.078	2

#### USB/MSSB Variety Development Project (2016-2021); David Moseley continues a similar project (USB)

Cercospora Leaf Blight – Fungicide Resistance

> ~90% resistant to strobilurins ~33% resistant to thiophanate-methyl







cf. flagellaris isolates only; and C, Cercospora spp. other than C. cf. flagellaris associated with soybean in the southern United States from 2018 to 2021.

А

в

of isolates (%)

Frequency

## Fungicide efficacy on CLB





### Fungicide efficacy on Cercospora leaf blight at MRRS



### Fungicide efficacy on aerial blight and CLB - DLRS







## Fungicide efficacy on CLB, ASR, and AB - DLRS









Products that have worked somewhat consistently on CLB in the recent past

# • In no particular order...

- Miravis Top
- Priaxor
- Quadris Top SBX
- TrivaPro
- Lucento
- Revytek
- Veltyma

#### • Possible reasons...

- Genetic diversity in pathogens
- Ratio of pathogens in a given area
- Varying degrees of fungicide resistance across areas
- Differences in varietal responses to disease and/or fungicide application
- Combinations of all the above

#### **NO GUARANTEES!**

# **Fungicide Timing Considerations**



	of	-	ot	e 2	_	e (Pod ight)	as	ä	, Pi		
			2023) Rate/A (fl oz)	Aerial we blight	Brownsp	Cercospor leaf bligh	Frogeye leaf spot*	Diaporthe and stem bl	Soybean	Targetsp	White mo
			6.0 – 15.5	VG	P-G	P	Р	U	G-VG	P-F	Р
CROP PROTECTION SOYB	EAN DISEASE MA	ANAGEMENI	2.0 - 5.7	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	U	U	NL
A Product of Land Grant Universities		CPN-1019-W	6.0 - 12.0	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	G	U	G <sup>8</sup>
	and and another statement		6.0 - 12.0	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	VG	P-F	NL
Fungicide Efficacy for Control of S	2.75 - 5.5	U	VG	F	F	U	VG	U	NL		
	7.0 - 14.0	0	VG	P-0	G-VG	U NI	VG-E	. Р 	F		
	3	multiple generics	4.0 - 6.0	P	6	NL	ł	NL	VG	U	NL
	Prothioconazole	41.0% Proline 480 SC° Domark 230 ME	2.5 - 5.0	NL	NL	NL	G-VG	NL	VG	U	+
<b>– –</b>	Tetraconazole 20	5% multiple generics	4.0 - 5.0	NL	VG	P-G	F-G	U	VG-E	Р	F
Annual	1 Thiophanate-me	hyl 70% Topsin-M, multiple generics	10.0 - 20.0	U	U	F	G-VG	U	G	U	F
	29 Fluazinam 40.0%	Omega 500 DF	12.0- 16.0	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	U	G
	7 Boscalid 70%	Endura 0.7 DF	3.5 - 11.0	U	VG	U	P	NL	NL	U	VG
Fungicide	11 Azoxystrobin 25.	5% EXCAINA 2.84 SC 10% Topguard EQ 4.29 SC	5.0 - 8.0	VG	VG	U	G-VG	U	E	P	U
	11 Azoxystrobin 18. 3 Difenoconazole 1	2% Quadris Top 2.72 SC	8.0 - 14.0	U	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	F-G	VG	Р	NL
Efficacy	11 Azoxystrobin 19. 3 Difenoconazole 1	9.8% Quadris Top SBX 3.76 SC	7.0 – 7.5	VG	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	F-G	VG	F-G	U
	11 Azoxystrobin 7.0 3 Propiconazole 11	6 Quilt 1.66 SC, 7% multiple generics	14.0 - 20.5	U	G	F	F	U	VG	Р	NL
Publication	11 Azoxystrobin 13. 3 Propiconazole 11	% Quilt Xcel 2.2 SE, 7% multiple generics	10.5 - 21.0	E	G	F	F	U	VG	Р	NL
	7 Benzovindiflupyr 11 Azoxystrobin 10. 3 Propiconazole 11	2.9% 5% Trivapro 9%	13.7 – 20.7	E	G-VG	P-G	F-G	G	VG-E	U	NL
	3 Cyproconazole 7.	Aproach Prima 2.34 SC	5.0 - 6.8	VG	G	P-G	F-G	U	VG-E	F-G	NL
			<b>0 14</b>		U	NL	U	U	U	NL	G
www.cropprotec	tionne	twork	<u>.or</u>		VG	F-G	G-VG	U	VG-E	F-G	U
	3 Flutriafol 19.3%	Fortix SC, Preemptor SC	4.0 - 6.0	U	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	U	U	Р	U

## CLB Management Recommendations

- Early planted, Early maturing varieties usually avoid CLB
- Plant a resistant variety, if that information is available
- Chose varieties tested in your neck of the woods
- The pathogens are known to overwinter on soybean debris
- Alternative hosts: pokeweed, cotton, giant ragweed, others?
- Infested seed does not appear to be a significant inoculum source
- Use effective fungicides within the R3-R5 window (R5 IMHO)
- Don't bother putting out Strobilurins or Topsin for CLB control
- Apply by ground using as much water as you can afford!
- Please let me know if/when you see the LIL' PURPLE SPOTS and we'll come put in a test!

### THANK YOU FOR THE SUPPORT

- Farmers
- Crews
- Collaborators
- Grad Students
- Consultants
- Agents
- Industry Partners





#### THE LOUISIANA Soybean & Grain RESEARCH & PROMOTION BOARD



ID-SOUTI

