SOUTH AFRICAN SUGAR INDUSTRY

AGRONOMISTS' ASSOCIATION

7310/18(a) CHEMICAL RIPENER TRIAL

1680 Cat. No. To compare the effects of spraying two rates of Roundup and Object: Fusilade applied each at two times of application. First ratoon. This crop: ZSA Experiment Station, Field G1-5. Location: PE.1 sandy clay loam derived from gneiss. Soil type: Randomised blocks, 4 replications. Design: Variety/ NCo376, 1,5m between rows. Spacing: 26th March, 1987. Planted: Harvested: Harvest <u>Age</u> 10.5.38 13.4 months P 1R8.5.89 12,0 months Ν Ferti iser: P205 K20 60 (kg/ha)P 100 100 60 160 60 1RRainfall Irrigation/ Irrigation 695.6 Rainfall (mm): P 1 253,0 1 211.0 402,1 1RTreatments: 1. Control - no chemical ripener. Control - no chemical ripener. 2. Treatments applied at 75-80% purity Roundup @ 0,6 1/ha product. 3. Roundup @ 0,45 1/ha product. 4. Fusilade @ 0,33 1/ha product. 5. 6. Fusilade @ 0,25 1/ha product. Treatments applied at 89-85% purity 7. Roundup @ 0,6 1/ha product. Roundup @ 0,45 1/ha product. 8. Fusilade @ 0.33 1/ha product. 9. Fusilade @ 0.25 1/ha product. 10. Conduct: Samples of 24 stalks per plot were taken from guard rows 1. before spraying and from net plots after the first application to assess purity% juice and change in quality. Dates, times of spraying, weeks before harvest, purities 2. at spraying, as well as the prevailing weather conditions at spraying are shown below: Treatments applied at 75-80% purity a.) Roundup Fusilade Date applied 4.1.99 4.1.89 Weeks before harvest 17,9 17,9

Time of spraying (p.m.)

Purity% juice

Weather conditions

4.00-5.30

77,1

Calm

1.00-5.00

75,4

Calm

b) Treatments applied 80-85% purity

Date applied	9.2.89	9.2.89
Meeks before harvest	12,4	12,4
Time of spraying (p.m.)	4.45-6.00	4.45-6.00
Purity% juice	81,0	81,0
Weather conditions	Calm with	Calm with
	gusts of	gusts of
	wind	wind

<u>Spreýžna</u> dotails:

Roundup and Fusilade were sprayed over the top of the canopy using a carbon dioxide pressurised kanpsack sprayer with a T-boom. The T-boom had three TK 1,5 nozzles spaced 1,0m apart spraying down from a height of approximately 50cm above the canopy. The solution was delivered at 102 l/ha by maintaining a pressure of 220 kPa and a walking speed of 1,25 m/s.

FILLE

Relevant yield and quality data for the first rateon crop are presented in Table 1. The plant crop results of this trial are not presented because no treatments were applied due to severe lodging at the time of spraying.

a) <u>Guality data</u>: (see Table 1) Ripener treatments significantly increased IRC and ERF% cane. Figure 1 shows changes in ERC% cane with time of-NC0376 sprayed with Roundup at two rates. Both rates (0,6 1/ha and 0,45 1/he products) increased ERC% cane more than the control with the high rate giving higher values. There was a rapid ERC% cane increase within the first 6 weeks after application. The rise was steady thereafter up until 3 weeks before harvest when ERC% cane declined. The decrease occurred at all rates of application. Similarly, the two rates of Fusilade increased ERC% cane values, with the increases being more marked than in the case of Roundup (see Figure 2). Fusilade rates also caused a decline in ERC% cane in the last 3 weeks.

The high and low rates of Roundup are compared with those of Fusilade in Figures 3 and 4. Both rates of Fusilade did better than their Roundup counterparts. The decrease in ERC% cane in the last three weeks before harvest was less marked in the Roundup treatments.

Changes in ERC% cane after spraying with Roundup and Fusilade at two stages of maturity are shown in Figures 5 to 8. In all cases, high rates gave higher ERC% cane and spraying early caused an early rapid rise in ERC% cane. The high ERC% cane values were maintained above those of the control up to harvest. The later application also caused a sharp rise in ERC% cane and the difference between the early and late application was small at harvest. Further comparisons of Roundup and Fusilade rates are shown in Figures 9 to 12.

Yield data: Ripener treatments caused significant cane yield declines, with the effect being more marked in the case of Fusilade. Spraying desiccants at 75.4 and 77.1 % purity proved too early in this trial where sugar cane was sprayed when it was 7.9 months old. Desiccants sprayed late (81.7% purity) also reduced cane yield but the reduction at this stage of maturity was less marked than at the earlier stage. There was a significant yield difference between the two stages of maturity. Cane and ERC yield difference between the rates of application were small and non-significant (see Table 1). Yield and quality responses are shown in Table 2. c) <u>Stalk data</u>: Ripener treatments had no effect on stalk populations but they significantly reduced stalk lengths. Fusilade contributed more in reducing stalk lengths than Roundup. There were no significant differences in stalk diameters and at harvest, stalks were erect and had not flowered.

CONCLUEIONS

All ripemer treatments significantly improved quality over the controls. ERC% cane responses were greater with Fusilade then with Roundup but Fusilade caused a greater loss in cane yield with the result that Roundup gave more favourable FRC and FRF yield responses.

The case yield decline after spraying ripeners was greater than expected and could have been reduced by harvesting earlier than scheduled. It has been noted in previous trials that delays in harvesting desiccant-sprayed sugarcane resulted in reduced quality benefits. Thus, applying desiccants at an early stage of maturity (75-77% purity) proved too early for the scheduled time of harvesting. The later application proved better mainly because the loss in cane yield was smaller.

Cane yield differences between rates of application of desiccants were small and non-significant, but the standard rates gave significantly better quality responses than reduced rates.

The trial continues into the second ratoon crop.

1

CN/Aug'89 lg

Table 1 - Yield and Quality Data

TREATMENTS	Cane Yield t/hz	ERC 労 cane	ERC Yield t/ha	ERF % cane	ERP Yield t/ha
Controls Ripeners Significance	118,83 101,07 ***	12,70 14,32 ***	15.09 14.47 N.S.	13,83 15,06 ****	16,30 15,21 **
<u>Desicconts</u> Foundup Fusilade Significence	105,52 96,62 ***	14,01 14,63 ***	14,78 14,14 N.S.	14,81 15,31 *#*	15,62 14,80 **
<u>Times of application</u> Early Late Significance	93,77 103,38	14,28 14,36 N.S.	13,36 15,55 ****	15,00 15,12 N.S.	14,04 16,38 ***
Rates of application Standard 3/4 x standard Significance	98,88 103,26 N.S.	14,52 14,11 ***	14,36 14,54 N.S.	15,22 14,89 **	15.07 15.35 N.S.
Interactions LED main effects 5% 1%	5,67 7,66	0,28 0,33	0,77 1,04	0,26 0,35	0,82 1,11
Treatment mean S.E. main effects * S.E. single plot * C.V.*	104,46 1,95 7,32 7,48	13,99 0,10 0,19 2,76	14,55 0,27 0,53 7,32	14,81 0,09 0,18 2,46	15,43 0,28 0,57 7,33

7310/1º(a) CHATTICAL SIPENER TELLAL

Table 2 - Treatvent Mesponses

a) MaC's care responses expressed as b of controls

Desiconta	Carly	Late	Nean
	81 32	<u><u><u>81</u></u>.32</u>	
Roundup Fustlade	111 109 115 115	.114 101 11. 114	110 115
Nean	114 111	115 111	
	112	113	113

c) Cane yield responses expressed as 5 of controls

	Sarly		Tist	Eean	
Desiccants	R1)	R?	- 54	Ji 2	
Roundup Fusilede	79 71	90 78	ରୁ ଅଜ	97 85	90 22
Kean	75	37	97	91	
	80			86	

e) INT yield responses expressed as % of control

Designate	்க	darly		Late		
Deologen 05	21	R.C		K2		
Toundup Fusilade	15 70	95 86	101 104	103 94	95 91	
Nean	82	91	. 10 ³	00	 ا ۲۰	
	27		1			

b) ERF% cane responses expressed as % of controls

Desiccents	Early		La	Mean	
	<u>R1</u>	R 2	R1	R2	
loundup Fusilade	107 111	105 110	110 112	105 110	107
Fean	109	103	111	100	
	109		1	109	

d) MRC yield responses expressed as [6 of controls

Deciserate	Early		La	hean	
Desiccants	R1	R2	R1	R2	
Rounduy Fusilade	20 82	97 90	105 109	105 97	99 25
Bean	<u></u> 5	94	107	101	
·	90		1	97	

Table 3 - Stalk Data

TREATMENTS	STALK POPULATION x10 ⁻³	STALK LENGTH (m)	STALK DIALETER (cm)
Controls Ripeners Significance	141,44 142,97 N.S.	2,51 1,95 ****	2,29 2,33 N.S.
<u>Dericcants</u> Noundup Fusilade Significance	144,12 141,81 N.S.	2,13 1,77 ***	2,26 2,39 N.S.
<u>Time of application</u> Early Late Significance	142,29 143,64 N.S.	1,84 2,06 ****	2,33 2,32 N.S.
Rates of application Standard 3/4 standard Significance	142,31 143,63 N.S.	1,36 2,04 ****	2.35 2,30 N.S,
Interactions LSD main effects 5% 1%	3,27 4,41	0,13 0,17	0,82 1,63
Treatment mean S.Z. main effects ± S.Z. single plot ± C.V.5	142,66 1,13 2,25 3,16	2,06 0,04 0,09 8,42	2,32 0,58 1,15 4,15

- 6 -









Fig 4: POUNDUP AND FUSILADE LON PATES (meaned for times of application)



7



-4

-8

Ą



F19 7: REWER SEPAYED AT 389 % FURITY (meaned for rates of application)

MEEKS BEFORE HARVEST

16

14

11

19

8

\$

4

-19

-16

-12



Fig 8: FUSILABE SFRAYED AT >80 % PURITY (meaned for rates of application)



8 -





Ø

9 -

-12 MEEN'S REFORE HARMEST

-8

- 0

-16

. . .

-4

Ø

SOUTH AFRICAN SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRONOMISTS' ASSOCIATION

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7310/18(a) CHEMICAL R	IPENER TRIAL	
Cat No.:	1680		
Object:	To compare the effects (/Fusilade Super applied (of spraying two rate each at two times of	es of Roundup and Fapplication.
This crop:	Second Ratoon		
Location:	ZSA Experiment Station,	Field G1-5.	
Soil type:	PE1. sandy clay loamede	rived from gneiss.	
Design:	Randomiaed blocks, 4 rep	plications.	
Variety/			
Spacing:	NCo376, 1,5m between rol	ws.	
Planted:	26th March, 1987.		
Harvested	Harvested	Age	
	P 10.5.88	13,4 months	
	1R 8.5.89	12,0 months	
	28 9.5.90.	IZ,U months	
Fertilizer	N	P205 K20) . •
(kg/ha)	P 100	100 60	
	1R 160	60 60 60 60	
	- 211 100	00 00	
Irrigation/	Irrigation	Rainfall	
<u>Rainfall (mm)</u> :	P 1 253,0	695,6	
	1R 1 211,0 2R 1 163,0	402,1	ν.
Trantmonto	N.B.: From this point of be referred to as Fusila	onward the term Fusi	lade Super will
ileauments:	2. Control - no chemica	al.	
١	Treatments applied at 75	5-80% purity	
	3. Roundup at 0,6 1/ha	product	
	4. Roundup at 0,45 1/ha	a product	
	6. Fusilade at 0.25 1/r	na product	
	Treatments applied at 80	D-85% purity	
	7. Roundup at 0,60 1/ha	product	
. • . · ·	8. Roundup at 0,45 1/ha	a product	
	10. Fusilade at 0,25 1/t	na product	
Conduct:	1. Samples of 24 stalks	s per plot were take	n from quard rows
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	before spraying and	from net-plots afte	r the first
•	application to asses	s purity % juice an	d changes in quality.
	spraying as well as	the prevailling wea	ther conditions
· · · ·	at spraying are show	n below:	
м. А.	(a) <u>Ireatments applied a</u>	at 75-80% purity:	
	Data include	Roundup	Fusilade
	Weeks before harvest	15	15
,	Time of spraying (pm) 5:05-6:00	5:05~6:00
	Purity juice Weather conditions	76,4 Calm	76,4

.

÷. '

(b) Treatments applied at 80-85% purity

	Roundup	Fusilade
Date applied	21.2.90.	21.2.90.
Weeks before harvest	11	11
Time of spraying (pm)	5:05-6:35	5:05-6:35
Purity% juice	85,2	85,2
Weather conditions	gust of wind at	first and
	calm later.	

Spraying details:

Roundup and Fusilade were sprayed over the top of the canopy using a carbon dioxide pressurised knapsack sprayer with a I-boom. The I-boom had three I.K. 1,5 nozzles spaced 1,0m apart spraying down from a height approximately 50cm above the canopy. The solution was delivered at 1021/ha by maintaining a pressure of 220 kPa and a walking speed of 1,25 m/s.

RESULTS

Relevant quality data are presented in Table 1 and yield data in Table 2.

a) <u>Quality effects</u>: Changes in ERC% cane after spraying Roundup and Fusilade at standard and 3/4 standard rates are shown in Figure 1 and 2 respectively. Both rates of application increased ERC% cane and in the Roundup treatment, the standard rate of 0,6 1/ha product gave higher responses than the 3/4 standard of 0,4 1/ha product. In the Fusilade treatment differences between rates (0,33 and 0,25 1/ha product) were small (see Figure 2).

Figure 3 shows that the high rate of Roundup gave an early rapid rise in ERC% cane over the Fusilade rate until about 8 weeks before harvest. Then after Fusilade increased ERC% cane values were more than Roundup until harvest. The low rate of Fusilade gave marked ERC% cane increases over that of Roundup (see Figure 4).

Applying desiccants early at 75,4% purity increased ERC% cane by 16% compared with 11% increase when applied at 85,2% purity (see Table 3). Changes in ERC% cane after applying Roundup and Fusilade at two stages of maturity are shown in Figures 5 to 8. Both early and late Fusilade applications did better than Roundup applied at the same times of application.

The ripening effects at harvest as shown by purity% juice (Table 1) indicate that ripeners improved maturity. Differences between ripener treatments were however small and non-significant. Ripeners reduced Fibre% cane and moisture but it is not clear why early desiccant application gave higher moisture than the late application.

b) Yield effects: Ripener treatments caused significant cane yield decline with the effect being more marked in the case of Fusilade. Cane yield differences between Roundup and Fusilade in the second ratoon crop were small and nonsignificant. Results are shown in Table 2.

Spraying desiccants at 76,4% purity reduced cane yield by 10% for a gain of 5,1% in ERC yield over the control. Spraying at 85,2% purity also reduced cane yield by 7% for a gain of 3,4% in ERC yield over the control. ERF yield gains were smaller than those of ERC yield (0,63% and 0,10% for early and late applications respectively).

Yield differences between rates of application were small and non-significant. Spraying at 3/4 standard rate was more favourable in that only 7,4% was lost in cane yield compared with 9,3% lost in the standard rate. Both rates however increased ERC and ERF yields over the control. Results on yield responses are presented in Table 3.

c) <u>Stalk data</u>: Table 4 shows that there was an increase in the number of stalks in the ripened treatments but stalk lengths were significantly reduced. Ripener treatment also increased stalk diameters.

d) <u>Visual symptoms</u>: Characteristic symptoms of Roundup and Fusilade effects were observed. Symptoms were however less marked in the 3/4 standard rates particularly in the fusilade treatments.

CONCLUSIONS

All ripener treatments significantly improved quality over the control. ERC% cane responses were greater with Fusilade than with Roundup but Fusilade caused a greater loss in cane yield. High ERC% cane responses to Fusilade accounted for high ERC and ERF yield responses in the second rateon crop.

Differences in can, ERC and ERF yields between rates of desiccant application were small and non-significant. Desiccants applied at an early stage of maturity caused greater cane yield losses but this was compensated by high quality with the result that ERC and ERF yields were higher than those of the control.

The most favourable overall ripener responses were obtained when desiccants were applied early at 3/4 standard rates.

The trial continues into the third ration crop.

<u>CN/Aug'90</u> vdr

Table 1. Quality data at harvest

TREATMENTS	ERC% CANE	ERF% CANE	PURITY % JUICE	FIBRE% CANE	MOISTURE %CANE
Control Ripeners Significance	12,88 ['] 14,65 ***	14,52 15,89 ***	89,00 91,57 ***	14,19 13,63 *	69,62 68,83 ***
Desiccants Roundup Fusilade Significance	14,37 14,93 ***	15,66 16,12 **	91,42 91,73 N.S.	13,91 13,35 **	68,83 68,83 N.S.
<u>Times of application</u> Early Late Significance	14,97 14,33 ***	16,16 15,62 ***	91,84 91,30 N.S.	13,11 14,14 ***	69,06 68,59 *
Rates of application Standard 3/4 x standard Significance	14,78 14,52 N.S.	16,02 15,76 N.S.	91,59 91,55 N.S.	13,34 13,92 **	68,98 68,67 N.S.
Interactions	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S
L.S.D. 5% 1%	0,81 1,10	0,71 0,96	1,76 2,38	1,02 1,38	0,95 1,28
Trial mean S.E. main effects ± S.E. single plot ± C.V:%	14,30 0,28 0,56 3,91	15,61 0,24 0,49 3,13	91,06 0,61 1,22 1,34	13,74 0,35 0,70 5,12	68,99 0,33 0,66 0,95

Jable 2. Yield data

TREATMENTS	(CANE YIEL t/ha	D	ERC YIELD			ERF YIELD t/ha		
	1R	2R	Mean	1R	2R	Mean	1R	2R	Mean
Cantrol Ripeners Significance	118,83 101,07 ***	131,98 120,96 ***	125,41 111,02 -	15,09 14,47 N.S.	16,97 17,69 N.S.	16,03 16,08 -	16,30 15,21 **	19,13 19,20 N.S.	17,72 17,21 -
<u>Desiccants</u> Roundup Fusilade Significance	105,52 96,62 ***	122,47 119,44 N.S.	114,00 108,03 -	14,78 14,14 N.S.	17,55 17,83 N.S.	16 ,17 15,99 -	15,62 14,00	19,15 19,25 N.S.	17,39 17,03 -
<u>Times of application</u> Early Late Significance	93,77 108,38 ***	119,07 122,84 N.S.	106,42 115,61 -	13,36 15,55 ***	17,83 17,55 N.S.	15,60 16,55 -	14,04 16,38 ****	19,25 19,14 N.S.	16,65 17,76 -
Rates of application Standard 3/4 standard Significance	98,88 103,26 N.S.	119,69 122,22 N.S.	109,29 112,74 -	14,36 14,54 N.S.	17,67 17,71 N.S.	16,ū2 16,13 -	15,07 15,35 N.S.	19,16 19,24 N.S.	17,12 17,30 -
Interaction	N.S.	N.S.	-	N.S.	N.S.	1	N.S.	N.S.	-
L.S.D. main effects 5% 1%	5,67 7,66	13,47 18,19		0,77 1,04	-		0,82 1,11	5 cd 2	-
Trial mean S.E. main effects ± S.E. single plot ± C.V.%	104,46 1,95 7,82 7,48	123,16 4,64 9,28 7,54	113,81	14,55 0,27 0,53 7,32	17,54 0,69 1,38 7,85	16,65 - - -	15,43 0,28 0,57 7,33	19,18 0,72 1,45 7,55	17,31 - - -

Table 3. Treatment responses expressed as % of control

a) ERC% cane

b) ERF% cane

Desiccants	Early		Late		Mean
	R1	R2	R1	R2	
Roundup Fusilade	117 119	111 118	110 113	108 114	112 116
Меал	118	114	110	111	114

 Desiccants
 Early
 Late
 Mean

 R1
 R2
 R1
 R2
 R1
 R2

 Roundup
 112
 107
 107
 106
 108

 Fusilade
 114
 112
 108
 109
 111

 Mean
 113
 110
 108
 108
 110

c) Cane yield

Early Late Desiccants Mean R1 R2 R1 R2 Roundup 95 93 93 87 96 Fusilade 90 89 93 90 91 Mean 89 92 93 93 92 ۱

d) ERC yield

Desiccents	Early		Late		Mean
	Rî	R2	R1	R2	nean
Roundup Fusilade	102 107	106 105	103 105	103 103	104 105
Mean	105	106	104	103	105

e) ERF yield

Desiccants	Early		Late		Mean
	R1	R2	R1	R2	, ie air
Roundup Fusilade	97 103	102 100	99 100	101 99	100 101
Mean	100	101	100	100	101

<u>N.B.</u>:

R1 = standard \dot{r} ate R2 = 3/4 x standard rate

Table 4. Stalk data at harvest

المستعد منصب بالرجي المترجي المراجع			
TREATMENTS	Stalk population x 1 000	Stalk length (m)	Stalk diameters (cm)
Controls Ripeners Significance	159,73 171,67 ***	2,58 2,13 ***	2,15 2,24 *
Desiccants Roundup Fusilade Significance	169,52 173,81 N.S.	2,32 1,93 ***	2,22 2,27 N.S.
<u>Times of application</u> Early Late Significance	175,94 167,38 ***	2,00 2,25 ***	2,26 2,23 N.S.
<u>Rates of application</u> Standard 3/4 stendard Significance	173,53 169,80 N.S.	2,05 2,19 **	2,26 2,23 N.S.
Interactions	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
L.S.D. 5% 1%	11,79 15,92	0,26 0,35	0,18 0,24
Triel mean S.E. main effects ± S.E. single plot ± C.V. %	169,28 4,06 8,12 4,80	2,21 0,09 0,18 8,10	2,23 0,06 0,12 5,56

.

FIG.1: ROUNDUP AT HIGH AND LOW RATES.



FIG.2: FUSILADE AT HIGH AND LOW RATES

ε٥

1 80 -



FIG.3: HIGH ROUNDUP AND FUSILADE RATES.



FIG.4: LOW ROUNDUP AND FUSILADE RATES.



- 9 -

FIG.5: ROUNDUP APPLIED EARLY AND LATE.



FIG.6: FUSILADE APPLIED EARLY AND LATE.



FIG.7: ROUNDUP AND FUSILADE APPLIED EARLY



---- CONTROL --- Roup EARLY ---- Fide EARLY

FIG.8: ROUNDUP AND FUSILADE APPLIED LATE

