

# GOA Trial Site Report

## Clethodim Damage in Canola- the Impact of Tank Mixing Other Herbicides or Additives- Gilgandra 2016

<b>Trial Code:</b>	GOCD00316-1
<b>Season/Year:</b>	Winter 2016
<b>Location:</b>	“Inglewood”, Gilgandra
<b>Trial Co-operators:</b>	Kevin and John Kilby

### Keywords

GOCD00316, clethodim, damage, canola, ryegrass, herbicide, tank mixes, Gilgandra

### Take home message

Tank mixing other common herbicides or sulfate of ammonia (SOA) with clethodim when applied to canola did not appear to exacerbate flower or yield damage in canola

### Background

Increasing levels of Group A – ‘fop’ resistance and the drop in retail pricing of clethodim herbicides<sup>1</sup> has driven an increase in both frequency of use and rates applied of these products in canola. At the same time there has been a marked increase in reports of clethodim damage, possibly related to higher rates and frequency. It is well known that clethodim can at times cause some level of crop damage but conditions that result in this expression or its actual impact on yield have not been adequately documented.

Trial research by GOA from 2013 investigated what might trigger damage to canola by studying application rates and timings of clethodim. In summary the research found that damage was generally only evident when clethodim was applied at timings and rates outside of label recommendations. However, even when obvious clethodim crop damage was observed, yield impacts, if any were often mild.

In contrast, research conducted by the Hart Group in South Australia, found significant yield impacts from clethodim damage when applied outside label recommendations. They also observed some varietal differences in crop tolerance to clethodim. Subsequent investigation of a number of varieties by GOA in 2015 did not find major differences in susceptibility to clethodim.

As GOA has been unable to replicate observed field level clethodim damage in commercial crops, investigation has moved on to assess the potential influence of tank mix partners may have on the occurrence and severity of canola crop damage. Clethodim is often applied with a number of other products; water conditioners such as sulfate of ammonia (SOA), other herbicides and insecticides, oils, wetters or fertilisers. GOA is investigating if some common tank mix options are contributing to observed commercial crop damage.

---

<sup>1</sup> Example trade names- Select®, Platinum®, Status®, Clethodim 240

## DISCLAIMER

Following is a report on a scientific experiment. It may contain some herbicide treatments that are not registered for the situation, manner or rate at which they are used in this trial. This document or anything else resulting from, construed or taken from this or by GOA or its representatives should not be taken as a suggestion, recommendation or endorsement of any unregistered herbicide uses.

## Aim

Investigate if the addition of additional herbicides or spray additives to clethodim and Uptake contributed to an increase in “clethodim damage” in canola.

## Methods

Small plots, using a randomised complete block design with three replicates was used for the research.

A number of tank mix options were identified and applied to either a Clearfield (CL) or triazine tolerant (TT) variety, see **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table 1. Trial site details

Trial Establishment Date	Autumn, 2016		
Crop and Variety	TT: ATR Gem CL: 44Y89	Targeted plant populations	35 plants/m <sup>2</sup>
Sowing date	21/4/2016	Harvest Date	15/11/2016
Seedling equipment	Double Boot Tyne	Row Spacing	27.5 cm
Crop Nutrition (kg/ha)	150 Trifos + 200 Urea	Soil type	Sandy Clay Loam
Previous Crop	Oats (grazed out)	Pre-Sowing Stubble Management	Cultivated

Treatments consisted of 14 clethodim tank mixes (8 CL and 6 TT) as detailed in the table below. Trial treatment were applied by hand boom calibrated to apply 100L/ha of spray mixture through AIXR015 nozzles at 3 Bar pressure. Rainwater was used as the spray carrier.

Treatments were applied when canola was 8-9 leaves with buds formed but not clearly visible, crop was not yet elongating. This timing was towards the end of the ideal application windows in an effort to enhance any differences between treatments

The trial area had a low population of weeds after establishment and received an early post emergent application of Verdict™ and Lontrel™ Advance to remove any weed burden prior to treatment with clethodim.

Assessment was made at peak flowering for any level of flower abnormality and yields assessed by plot header.

Results were analysed by ANOVA and results compared by using LSD method with a 95% confidence interval. Any references to differences between treatments should be assumed to be statistically different unless otherwise stated.

**Table 2.** Treatment list

Product/timing	Rate (mL/ha), (g/ha) or % of spray volume	Variety
Nil (Y89)	nil	44Y89
Clethodim + Uptake™	500 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + SOA + Uptake™	500 + 800 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Lontrel Advance™ + Uptake™	500 + 150 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Lontrel Advance™ + SOA + Uptake™	500 + 150 + 800 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Intervix® + Uptake™	500 + 500 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Intervix® + SOA + Uptake™	500 + 500 + 800 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Intervix® + Lontrel Advance™ + Uptake™	500 + 500 + 150 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + Intervix® + Lontrel Advance™ + SOA + Uptake™	500 + 500 + 150 + 800 + 0.5%	44Y89
Clethodim + atrazine + Uptake™	500 + 1100 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Clethodim + atrazine + SOA Uptake™	500 + 1100 + 800 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Clethodim + atrazine Lontrel Advance™ + Uptake™	500 + 1100 + 150 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Clethodim + atrazine Lontrel Advance™ + SOA Uptake™	500 + 1100 + 150 + 800 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Clethodim + Lontrel Advance™ + Uptake™	500 + 1500 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Clethodim + Lontrel Advance™ + SOA Uptake™	500 + 150 + 800 + 0.5%	ATR Gem
Nil (ATR Gem)	Nil (ATR Gem)	ATR Gem

## Results

Full results and statistical analysis are listed in Annex 1.

Only a small number of plots were observed with minor flower damage when assessed at peak flowering.

**Yields:** There was no statistically significant impact of any of the applied treatments on yields when compared to untreated control.

**Oil:** For the 44Y89 there was no impact of the treatments on oil% when compared to the UTC or clethodim and Uptake alone. In the ATR Gem oil% was higher than the UTC in all treatments containing Lontrel Advance™.

## Discussion

Application of a number of common clethodim tank mixes on canola did not result in any significant flower damage or yield reductions when compared to either the untreated control in both varieties or a simple application of clethodim and Uptake alone in the 44Y89 (Clearfield variety).

In the case of oil % there also was no significant impact measurable in the 44Y89 however there was some in the ATR Gem in all treatments where Lontrel Advance™ was added. The impact was a lift in oil% of around 1%. However, as mentioned, there was no impact on yields or other observations that might help explain this situation.

It is noted that 2016 was quite mild growing conditions with good moisture. There were also fewer reported incidences of clethodim damage than normal on commercial farms which could indicate seasonal conditions were no conducive to damage.

## Conclusion

There was no indication from this trial that the addition of additional tank mix herbicides or SOA to clethodim when applying to canola, results in anymore flower damage or increases in yield damage in canola.

There was some small impact upon oil% when adding Lontrel Advance™ but seemed specific to only one of the varieties.

## Acknowledgements

Research undertaken as part of this project is made possible by the significant contributions of growers through both trial cooperation and support of GRDC. The authors would like to thank them for their continued support. Special thanks to the Kilby family of Gilgandra for hosting this trial.

## Annex 1. Treatment list and results

Note all treatments with the exception of the untreated control were tank mixed with Clethodim and Uptake, rates are listed below

	Variety	Product and rate	Oil (%)	Groups	Yield (t/ha)	Groups
1	44Y89	Untreated Control	45.2	bcde	2.6	n.s.
2	44Y89	Clethodim and Uptake only	45.0	de	2.4	n.s.
3	44Y89	SOA	45.5	bcde	2.5	n.s.
4	44Y89	Lontrel Advance™	45.7	abcde	2.8	n.s.
5	44Y89	Lontrel Advance™ + SOA	44.9	e	2.7	n.s.
6	44Y89	Intervix	45.4	bcde	2.7	n.s.
7	44Y89	Intervix + SOA	45.8	abcd	2.8	n.s.
8	44Y89	Intervix + Lontrel Advance™	45.2	bcde	2.6	n.s.
9	44Y89	Intervix + Lontrel Advance™ + SOA	45.1	cde	2.6	n.s.
10	ATR Gem	Atrazine	45.9	abc	2.8	n.s.
11	ATR Gem	Atrazine + SOA	45.9	abc	2.6	n.s.
12	ATR Gem	Atrazine + Lontrel Advance™	46.0	ab	2.3	n.s.
13	ATR Gem	Atrazine + Lontrel Advance™ + SOA	46.5	a	2.6	n.s.
14	ATR Gem	Lontrel Advance™	46.1	ab	2.7	n.s.
15	ATR Gem	Lontrel Advance™ + SOA	46.0	ab	2.6	n.s.
16	ATR Gem	Untreated Control	45.1	cde	2.5	
		LSD	0.87			

Product	Rate (g or ml/ha)
Atrazine	1100g/ha
Intervix	500mL/ha
Clethodim	500mL/ha
Lontrel Advance™	150mL/ha
Uptake Oil	0.5% v:v
SOA	800g/ha