

SOUTH AFRICAN SUGAR INDUSTRY  
AGRONOMISTS' ASSOCIATION

CODE: SMUT 1/85/Sw UBO  
CAT. NO.: 1646

TERMINAL REPORT

TITLE: LEVELS OF SMUT ROGUING IN NCo376

1. PARTICULARS OF PROJECT

This crop : 7th Ratoon  
Site : Ubombo Ranches, Ngongoni 6  
Region : Northern Irrigated (Swaziland)  
Design : 6 x 6 Latin Square  
Soil Set : 'S'  
Variety : NCo376  
Fertilizer : N      P      K  
(kg/ha)      161    30      -  
Dates : 12/11/87 - 6/12/88  
Age : 12.8 months

2. OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 To determine the effects of different levels of roguing on the expression of smut in NCo376.
- 2.2 To assess the effects of roguing on yield.

3. TREATMENTS

Six levels of roguing were applied to the plots.

Treatment 1 : No roguing  
Treatment 2 : One roguing at 6 weeks  
Treatment 3 : Two roguings at 6 and 12 weeks  
Treatment 4 : Four roguings at 6, 9, 12, and 15 weeks  
Treatment 5 : Four roguings at 6, 12, 18, and 24 weeks

Treatment 6 : Eight roguing at 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24 and 27 weeks

Notes on treatments

- \* The gross plot area was a 54 metre square area comprising 9 sprinkler plots each 18 metres square.
- \* The nett plot for measurement of smut incidence was the center 18 metre square plot.
- \* Measurement of smut incidence was carried out 2 days before the roguing treatments. No post-roguing measurement was carried out as the trial theme was to assess the effectiveness of commercial roguing practice.
- \* Measurement of smut incidence was assessed as whips (exposed and incipient) infected and stools infected.
- \* Total shoot counts were carried out at 6 week intervals.
- \* The first roguing was carried out at about knee height (six weeks) and was done by 'chipping out' infected plant material. Subsequent roguing were done by 'pulling' infected material away from the stool.

4. RESULTS (ROGUING)

4.1 Table 1. Levels of infected stools (%) between 6 and 27 weeks.

| TREATMENT    | JAN 8<br>6 wks | JAN 26<br>9 wks | FEB 16<br>12 wks | MAR 8<br>15 wks | MAR 29<br>18 wks | APR 19<br>21 wks | MAY 10<br>24 wks | MAY 31<br>27 wks |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1            | 19.1           | 43.8            | 38.4             | 27.9            | 26.7             | 17.4             | 6.2              | 2.8              |
| 2            | 18.6           | 36.1            | 32.2             | 28.8            | 22.7             | 14.2             | 5.0              | 3.7              |
| 3            | 15.0           | 34.0            | 21.2             | 12.8            | 12.1             | 9.0              | 3.0              | 1.9              |
| 4            | 14.6           | 36.6            | 18.7             | 10.3            | 9.1              | 6.5              | 4.0              | 1.8              |
| 5            | 15.7           | 33.6            | 22.8             | 12.4            | 13.0             | 2.4              | 2.6              | 0.8              |
| 6            | 13.2           | 24.3            | 17.0             | 18.2            | 7.7              | 2.0              | 3.3              | 1.2              |
| LSD(P=0.05)* | 4.0            | 13.3            | 10.8             | 7.6             | 3.7              | 5.3              | 4.5              | 1.6              |
| (P=0.01)**   | 5.5            | 18.2            | 14.8             | 10.3            | 5.0              | 7.2              | 6.1              | 2.2              |
| SIGNIFICANCE | *              | **              | **               | **              | **               | **               | N.S              | **               |
| TRIAL MEAN   | 16.0           | 34.8            | 25.0             | 18.4            | 15.2             | 8.6              | 4.0              | 2.0              |
| S E MEAN     | 1.4            | 4.5             | 3.7              | 2.6             | 2.4              | 1.8              | 1.5              | 0.5              |
| CV %         | 20.9           | 31.8            | 35.9             | 34.2            | 39.0             | 51.2             | 93.6             | 64.7             |

4.2 Table 2 Levels of infected whips (%) between 6 and 27 weeks (based on 155 000 millable stalks/ha)

| TREATMENT     | JAN 8<br>6 wks | JAN 26<br>9 wks | FEB 16<br>12 wks | MAR 8<br>15wks | MAR 29<br>18 wks | APR 19<br>21 wks | MAY 10<br>24 wks | MAY 31<br>27 wks |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1             | 4.5            | 8.5             | 14.0             | 8.9            | 8.2              | 3.6              | 1.0              | 0.3              |
| 2             | 4.3            | 6.5             | 8.3              | 6.7            | 5.7              | 2.9              | 0.7              | 0.5              |
| 3             | 4.1            | 5.6             | 4.9              | 2.3            | 1.6              | 1.3              | 0.3              | 0.2              |
| 4             | 3.6            | 6.1             | 3.5              | 1.7            | 1.1              | 0.8              | 0.4              | 0.2              |
| 5             | 3.9            | 6.3             | 4.7              | 2.3            | 1.7              | 0.2              | 0.3              | 0.1              |
| 6             | 2.6            | 4.7             | 3.9              | 3.4            | 0.9              | 0.2              | 0.4              | 0.1              |
| LSD(P=0.05)*  | 1.5            | 2.1             | 5.2              | 2.9            | 3.7              | 1.2              | 0.8              | 0.2              |
| LSD(P=0.01)** | 2.1            | 2.8             | 7.1              | 3.9            | 5.0              | 1.6              | 1.1              | 0.3              |
| SIGNIFICANCE  | *              | **              | **               | **             | **               | **               | N.S              | **               |
| TRIAL MEAN    | 3.8            | 6.3             | 6.6              | 4.2            | 3.2              | 1.5              | 0.5              | 0.2              |
| S E MEAN      | 0.5            | 0.7             | 1.8              | 1.0            | 1.2              | 0.4              | 0.3              | 0.1              |
| CV %          | 33.0           | 27.5            | 66.3             | 56.2           | 95.1             | 62.7             | 132.33           | 86.4             |

4.3 TABLE 3 Shoot (stalk) counts (x 1000/ha) at 6, 12, 18 and 24 weeks.

| TREATMENT | JAN 8<br>6 wks | FEB 16<br>12 wks | MAR 29<br>18 wks | MAY 10<br>24 wks | DEC 6<br>Harvest |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1         | 477            | 351              | 279              | 220              | 160              |
| 2         | 453            | 366              | 320              | 241              | 163              |
| 3         | 443            | 354              | 296              | 217              | 160              |
| 4         | 426            | 362              | 277              | 215              | 174              |
| 5         | 469            | 335              | 277              | 232              | 165              |
| 6         | 484            | 348              | 267              | 223              | 176              |
| MEAN      | 459            | 352              | 286              | 224              | 166              |

5. RESULTS (HARVEST)

## 5.1 Table 4. Cane yield, sucrose % cane and sucrose yield.

| TREATMENT     | TONNES CANE/HA | SUCROSE % CANE | TONNES SUCROSE/HA |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 1             | 93.6           | 15.6           | 14.6              |
| 2             | 96.9           | 15.2           | 14.8              |
| 3             | 102.2          | 15.2           | 15.5              |
| 4             | 97.1           | 15.3           | 14.9              |
| 5             | 99.5           | 15.4           | 15.4              |
| 6             | 100.5          | 15.3           | 15.4              |
| LSD (P=0.05)* | 11.8           | 0.6            | 2.0               |
| (P=0.01)**    | 16.0           | 0.8            | 2.7               |
| SIGNIFICANCE  | N.S            | N.S            | N.S               |
| TRIAL MEAN    | 98.3           | 15.3           | 15.1              |
| S E MEAN      | 4.0            | 0.2            | 0.7               |
| CV %          | 10.0           | 3.2            | 11.0              |

6. COMMENT6.1 Roguing Period

- \* Roguing was carried out by estate personnel to determine treatment differences resulting from standard, commercial cane, disease control practices.
  - \* The CVs continued to be high. A marked increase was noticeable with the onset of lodging in early May.
  - \* The variability in shoot (stalk) counts conducted at 6, 12 and 24 weeks were variable due to the procedure of random selection of 2 x 5 metre sampling sites at each sampling date.
  - \* The first inspection before roguing commenced at 6 weeks showed a slight non-significant trend indicating a residual influence occurring from the previous season.
  - \* There are indications that the first roguing was not as affective as in the previous 2 seasons and could be attributed to the difficulty of recognition of incipient whips when the crop is still below knee height.
  - \* See Tables 1 and 2 for the effects of roguing treatment on the expression of smut.
- Treatment 1 (Control) indicated that the natural infection level exceeded 40% stool infection this season.

- Treatment 2, differed little from the control and reflected the ineffective 1st roguing.
- Treatment 3, improved considerably after the 2nd roguing at 12 weeks.
- Treatment 4, differed little from the previous treatment except in sustaining a somewhat lower level of smut inspection.
- Treatment 5, achieved better long term control than treatment 3 and 4 but was somewhat less effective in reducing levels during the early period of growth.
- Treatment 6, less effective in lowering smut levels compared to the previous 2 crops and this may be due to the overall increase in the latent smut levels in the field as a whole.

\* In a comparison of sample data between % stool and % whip infection there is close correlation which is as follows:

$$\text{Linear } Y = 0.32X - 1.68 \quad (r = 0.87)$$

$$\text{Power } Y = 0.072X^{1.32} \quad (r = 0.97)$$

Where  $X$  = % stools infected  
 $Y$  = % whips infected

## 6.2 Harvest Results

- \* The CVs were improved and acceptable for a trial spread over 11 hectares.
- \* There were no significant cane yield differences although there was an apparent trend towards increasing cane yield with higher frequency of roguing.
- \* There were no cane quality differences.
- \* Sucrose yield reflected the trend in cane yield and was not significant.
- \* Stalk counts at harvest indicated an improving trend with more frequent roguing.

## 7. SUMMARY

### 7.1 Roguing

- \* The expected drop in smut infection levels after the first roguing at 6 weeks was not strongly evident and this could be attributed to poor identification of incipient smut by the roguing personnel. This is important as early sustained roguing is necessary to reduce smut expression in fields with high latent levels of infection.

### 7.2 Harvest

- \* The trend towards an increasing yield of cane from consistent roguing was evident and appeared to be reflected in stalk counts at harvest.

## 8. 3 SEASON SUMMARY

### 8.1 Roguing Period

- \* The results in Table 5 clearly show that varying roguing treatments have no effect on the initial expression of smut on the subsequent crop.
- \* The results in Table 6 show the smut levels at 18 weeks (after 12 weeks of roguing treatment). There is a positive improvement in smut levels particularly with the more intensive treatments 4 and 6.
- \* The correlation between % stool and % whip infection is very good and will allow for comparisons to be made against other industries level of smut in NCo376.

### 8.2 Harvest results

- \* Although in this trial stalk counts were not taken at each harvest the final harvest result showed no difference in millable stalks between treatments.
- \* There appeared to be a slight indication of a trend towards improved cane yields in the intensively rogued plots but this was not significant in any of the 3 harvests.

Table 5 Initial levels of smut expression prior to the commencement of roguing treatments at 6 weeks.

| TREATMENT | % STOOL INFECTION |       |       |      | % WHIP INFECTION |       |       |      |
|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
|           | 85/86             | 86/87 | 87/88 | MEAN | 85/86            | 86/87 | 87/88 | MEAN |
| 1         | 17.4              | 16.4  | 19.1  | 17.6 | 2.7              | 4.4   | 4.5   | 3.9  |
| 2         | 18.2              | 19.1  | 18.6  | 18.6 | 2.8              | 5.2   | 4.3   | 4.1  |
| 3         | 14.7              | 13.9  | 15.0  | 14.5 | 2.6              | 3.4   | 4.1   | 3.4  |
| 4         | 17.5              | 14.7  | 14.6  | 15.6 | 3.1              | 4.2   | 3.6   | 3.6  |
| 5         | 17.9              | 15.2  | 15.7  | 16.3 | 2.9              | 4.3   | 3.9   | 3.7  |
| 6         | 18.6              | 11.3  | 13.2  | 14.4 | 2.9              | 2.7   | 2.6   | 2.7  |

Table 6 Levels of smut expression at 18 weeks (following 12 weeks of roguing treatments)

| TREATMENT | % STOOL INFECTION |       |       |      | % WHIP INFECTION |       |       |      |
|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
|           | 85/86             | 86/87 | 87/88 | MEAN | 85/86            | 86/87 | 87/88 | MEAN |
| 1         | 32.6              | 20.1  | 26.7  | 26.5 | 10.3             | 5.9   | 8.2   | 8.1  |
| 2         | 26.0              | 13.7  | 22.7  | 20.8 | 6.3              | 2.7   | 5.7   | 4.9  |
| 3         | 10.7              | 9.6   | 12.1  | 10.8 | 1.5              | 1.2   | 1.6   | 1.4  |
| 4         | 9.1               | 6.0   | 9.1   | 8.1  | 1.1              | 0.7   | 1.1   | 1.0  |
| 5         | 7.8               | 8.6   | 13.0  | 9.8  | 1.0              | 1.2   | 1.7   | 1.3  |
| 6         | 8.1               | 7.5   | 7.7   | 7.8  | 1.0              | 1.0   | 0.9   | 1.0  |

Table 7 Correlation and regression between % stool and % whip infection (Linear -  $Y = a + bX$  and Power -  $Y = aX^b$ )

| TREATMENT | LINEAR RELATIONSHIP |       |       |       | POWER RELATIONSHIP |       |       |       |
|-----------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|           | 1986                | 1987  | 1988  | MEAN  | 1987               | 1987  | 1988  | MEAN  |
| a         | -2.22               | -1.56 | -1.68 | -1.82 | 0.043              | 0.072 | 0.062 | 0.059 |
| b         | 0.36                | 0.34  | 0.32  | 0.34  | 1.53               | 1.32  | 1.43  | 1.43  |
| r         | 0.94                | 0.91  | 0.87  | 0.91  | 0.97               | 0.97  | 0.96  | 0.93  |

Table 8 Stalk populations (1000/ha) at harvest

| TREATMENT | 85/86 | 86/87 | 87/88 | MEAN |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 1         | -     | -     | 160   | 160  |
| 2         | -     | -     | 163   | 163  |
| 3         | -     | -     | 160   | 160  |
| 4         | -     | -     | 174   | 174  |
| 5         | -     | -     | 165   | 165  |
| 6         | -     | -     | 176   | 176  |
| MEAN      | -     | -     | 166   | 166  |

Table 9 Yield at harvest (Tons cane per hectare)

| TREATMENT | 1986  | 1987  | 1988  | MEAN  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1         | 112.0 | 94.3  | 93.6  | 100.0 |
| 2         | 115.5 | 97.1  | 96.9  | 103.2 |
| 3         | 125.4 | 102.0 | 102.2 | 109.9 |
| 4         | 112.9 | 98.9  | 97.1  | 103.0 |
| 5         | 122.8 | 103.0 | 99.5  | 108.4 |
| 6         | 120.4 | 101.3 | 100.5 | 107.4 |
| MEAN      | 118.2 | 99.4  | 98.3  | 105.3 |

TLP/cg  
January 1989