

COMPARATIVE TEST OF HERBICIDES IN SOYBEAN AFTER EMERGENCE
HALOXYFOP-P-METHYL 25% ME

Agricultural Engineer MSc. Ramón Gigón

"2014 - Year of Tribute to Admiral Guillermo Brown, in the Bicentennial of the Naval Combat of Montevideo "

COMPARATIVE TEST OF HERBICIDES IN SOYBEAN AFTER EMERGENCE 2014/ 15
CAMPAIGN 2014/15

Recipient: Red Surcos S.A

Executor: EEAI INTA Barrow

Professional responsible for the trial: Agricultural Engineer MSc. Ramón Gigón

Products to assess: Haloxyfop-P-methyl 25% ME

Trial design: Randomized complete blocks with plots of 3 m wide and 8 m long.

PROPOSED TREATMENTS

No	Treatments and dose
1	Control plot: not controlled
2	Dose 1: 150 cc/ha (Haloxyfop-P-methyl 25% ME)
3	Dose 2: 200 cc/ha (Haloxyfop-P-methyl 25% ME)
4	Dose 3: 250 cc/ha (Haloxyfop-P-methyl 25% ME)
5	Control chemical: 500 cc/ha (Haloxyfop-P-methyl 12.5% EC)+ 1 L/ha Power Oil

WORK REPORT.

- a. Crop: Soy.
- b. Location: EEAI Barrow, Tres Arroyos, Buenos Aires province.
- c. Soil moisture: Good soil moisture at the moment of application.
- d. Characteristics of the application: Application was conducted on December 29, 2014. A manually operated backpack sprayer was used with constant CO2 pressure of 35 lb, with tip 11002 and a volume of application of 140 L/ha. Wind speed was 15 km/h, relative humidity was 48% and ambient temperature of 30 °C.
- e. Weed present: The weed present was *Digitaria sanguinalis* (DIGSA), hairy crabgrass, hairy finger-grass or crab finger grass with a size of 2-3 tillers and *Cynodon dactylon* (CYNDA) or couch grass in advanced regrowth.
- f. Measured variables: 17 and 38 days after application, visual control assessments were conducted for each weed. Data was submitted to analysis of variance and average values were compared with Fisher test (DMS) with $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the DIGSA control. Controls were excellent in treatments 4 and 5. Control in treatment 3 was good, but some plants were observed, especially, the ones that were bigger because they regrew after 38 days. The lower dose was not able to control the weed.

Table 1 Evaluation in % of DIGSA control 17 and 38 days after application.

Treat.	17 DAA	38 DAA
1	0.00 A	0.00 A
2	63.33 B	60.00 B
3	86.00	80.67
4	97.67 D	97.67 D
5	93.33	96.33 D
CV%	4.52	6.80
DMS	5.79	8.57

The different letters in the columns show significant differences between treatments.

Table 2 shows the CYNDA control. It is well known that, in order to control perennial grass, the dose of graminicides in general must be considerable increased. Also, treatments 4 and 5 showed an acceptable control. It is worthwhile highlighting that, when treatments to control this weed were applied, it has not developed a good leaf volume, and this could prevent the correct absorption and translocation of herbicides towards physiological points of action.

Table 2 Evaluation in % of CYNDA control 17 and 38 days after application.

Treat.	17 DAA	38 DAA
1	0.00 A	0.00 A
2	33.33 B	33.33 B
3	63.33 C	63.33 C
4	78.33 D	78.33 D
5	76.67 D	80.00 D
CV%	11.40	8.77
DMS	10.80	8.42

The different letters in the columns show significant differences between treatments.

FINAL COMMENTS

- Treatments 4 and 5 showed a very good control of annual grass such as *Digitaria sanguinalis*.
- As regards the control of annual grass such as *Cynodon dactylon*, controls were not total in none of the treatments assessed. It is suggested to evaluate it under different conditions and with a higher dose.

Agricultural Engineer MSc. Ramón Gigón