

Rothamsted Repository Download

A - Papers appearing in refereed journals

Cooke, D. A., Thomason, I. J., MCKinney, H. E., Bendixen, W. E. and Hagemann, R. W. 1979. Chemical control of *Heterodera schachtii* on sugarbeet in California. *Journal of Nematology*. 11 (2), pp. 205-206.

The output can be accessed at:

<https://repository.rothamsted.ac.uk/item/96y40/chemical-control-of-heterodera-schachtii-on-sugarbeet-in-california>.

© Please contact library@rothamsted.ac.uk for copyright queries.

Chemical Control of *Heterodera schachtii* on Sugarbeet in California

D. A. COOKE,¹ I. J. THOMASON,² H. E. MCKINNEY,²
W. E. BENDIXEN,³ and R. W. HAGEMANN⁴

Soon after the discovery of 1,2-dichloropropane 1,3-dichloropropene as a nematocide, in the late 1940's, several thousand hectares of land infested with *Heterodera schachtii* Schmidt were treated. Control of *H. schachtii* was easier to obtain on sandy soils (5) than on clay or peat-type soils. Yields of sugarbeet roots of 51.7 or 53.5

tonnes/ha were obtained in 1974-75 following fumigation with Telone (1,3-dichloropropene) or D-D in combination with an "at-planting" treatment with Temik 15 G (2-methyl-2-(methylthio)propionaldehyde *O*-(methylcarbamoyl)oxime) in a silty clay soil (Brinkman, Imperial Valley, southern California) (4). Yield increases were greater with fumigant nematicides (D-D or Telone), alone or in combination with the granular Temik 15 G or Furadan 10 G (2-dihydro-2,2-dimethyl-7-benzofuranyl methyl carbamate), than with the granular compounds used alone (3). The five tests reported here were conducted to test effects of chemical control in fields infested with low populations of *H. schachtii*. Four of the five experiments (Chew, Lerno, Doel I, Doel II) were on clay

Received for publication 21 February 1978.

¹ Broom's Barn Experimental Station, Higham, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England.

² Department of Nematology, University of California, Riverside, California 92521.

³ Farm Advisor, Cooperative Extension, Santa Maria, California 93456.

⁴ Farm Advisor, Cooperative Extension, El Centro, California 92243.

Much of this work was done while the senior author was on a one-year secondment to the Nematology Department, University of California, Riverside. We thank J. Fukuto for assistance.

TABLE 1. Yield of sugarbeets and pre- and postplant population densities of *Heterodera schachtii* with several chemical treatments at five locations in southern California.

Location and Treatment ^a	Date	Yield (tonnes/ha)	Eggs per 100 g soil					
			Preplant	Sample date	After harvest	Sample date		
Suey								
Untreated	3/27/76	91.3	1.5	5/14/76	455	10/27/76		
Telone II 112 l/ha		94.4			263			
Telone II 225 l/ha		97.7			107			
Lerno								
Untreated	9/23/75	80.4	4.7	9/23/75	608	6/3/76		
Telone II 90 l/ha		78.9			13			
Chew								
Untreated	10/6/75	86.6	23	8/27/75	138	6/20/76		
Telone II 101 l/ha		88.5			46			
Doel I								
Untreated	9/18/75	44.8	65	7/3/75	1612	5/27/76		
D-D 168 l/ha		50.0	208	8/27/75	1322			
D-D 168 l/ha + Furadan 45 kg/ha		50.1			1333			
D-D 168 l/ha + Temik 30 kg/ha		53.0			1450			
Doel II								
Untreated	9/19/75	38.7	65	7/3/75	847	5/27/76		
Furadan 45 kg/ha		46.2			1385			
Temik 30 kg/ha		47.2			208		8/27/75	1040
D-D 138 l/ha		48.6						1067
D-D 186 l/ha + Furadan 45 kg/ha		47.6						940
D-D 186 l/ha + Temik 30 kg/ha		49.1						1187

^aDesign: All tests were paired comparisons replicated four times except that Doel I was in randomized blocks with three replications.

soils in Imperial Valley, southern California. The fifth experiment (Suey) was on a clay loam soil near Santa Maria, Santa Barbara County, California. Details are given in Table 1.

Testing chemicals against *H. schachtii* in heavily infested fields is suitable for determining the most effective material. Extrapolation of results is hazardous, however, since results may differ in areas where infestation is lighter, making the sugarbeet nematode a less important factor limiting sugarbeet production.

Sugarbeet yields in three experiments in fields with less than 65 eggs/100 g of soil (Table 1) were not influenced appreciably by any nematicide treatment. In the Doel field, where preplanting samples taken on separate occasions contained 65 and 208 eggs/100 g of soil, yields were increased by 5.2 to 8.2 tonnes/ha in one experiment and by 7.5 to 10.4 tonnes/ha in another. Yield increases following nematicide treatments were much larger in experiments where there were 3,960 eggs/100 g of soil in 1974 and 383 eggs/100 g of soil in 1975 (3).

From those results, the economic thresh-

old for *H. schachtii* on sugarbeets is about 150 eggs/100 g of soil (1).

Some fields infested with *H. schachtii* are being treated unnecessarily with nematicides. A rapid and effective soil sampling method, e.g., by an automatic surface sampler (2), would reduce costs of sampling, allowing more samples in fields or parts of fields.

LITERATURE CITED

1. COOKE, D. A., and I. J. THOMASON. 1979. The relationship between population density of *Heterodera schachtii*, soil temperature, and sugarbeet yields. *J. Nematol.* 11:124-128.
2. COOKE, D. A., H. MCKINNEY, and I. J. THOMASON. 1978. A rapid method for sampling surface soil. *J. Nematol.* (in press).
3. KONTAXIS, D. G., I. J. THOMASON, W. CRITES, H. LEMBRIGHT, and R. W. HAGEMANN. 1977. Nematicides improve sugarbeet yields. *Calif. Agr.* 31(4):10-11.
4. KONTAXIS, D. G., I. J. THOMASON, P. YU, and B. SMITH. 1975. Chemical control of the sugarbeet cyst nematode in Imperial Valley. *Calif. Agr.* 29(12):6-7.
5. THORNE, G. 1952. Control of the sugarbeet nematode. USDA Farmers Bull. No. 2054. 18 p.