

Virginia Soybean Variety Evaluation Tests 2005



Virginia Cooperative Extension

Virginia Soybean Variety Evaluation Tests 2005

David L. Holshouser, Extension Soybean Specialist, Virginia Tech

Michael Ellis, Agricultural Technician, Virginia Tech

Patsy Lewis, Agricultural Technician, Virginia Tech

Tidewater Agricultural Research and Extension Center

6321 Holland Road

Suffolk, VA 23437

(757) 657-6450

dholshou@vt.edu

erellis@vt.edu

<http://www.vaes.vt.edu/tidewater/soybean/>

Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station

Tidewater Agricultural Research and Extension Center

Disclaimer: Commercial products are named in this publication for informational purposes only. Virginia Cooperative Extension does not endorse these products and does not intend discrimination against other products which also may be suitable.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Introduction to Variety Tests	1
Methods and Definitions.....	2
Production Information.....	3
Monthly Precipitation	4
Suppliers of Soybean Varieties	5

Tables Of Data:

Table 1a-h. Yield Summaries and Average Relative Yield	7-13
Table 2a-e. Performance of Full Season Maturity Group III Entries	14-16
Table 3a-d. Performance of Double crop Maturity Group III Entries	16-17
Table 4a-f. Performance of Full Season Early Maturity Group IV Entries	17-22
Table 5a-e. Performance of Double Crop Early Maturity Group IV Entries.....	23-25
Table 6a-f. Performance of Full Season Late Maturity Group IV Entries.....	25-28
Table 7a-d. Performance of Double Crop Late Maturity Group IV Entries	28-30
Table 8a-e. Performance of Full Season Early Maturity Group V Entries.....	31-35
Table 9a-d. Performance of Double crop Early Maturity Group V Entries.....	36-39

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to the many cooperators and contributors who have made the Soybean Variety Evaluation Tests possible.

The cooperation and support offered by commercial seed companies, state crop improvement associations, and several experiment stations in supplying seed and information on varieties is gratefully acknowledged.

Special thanks are given to the following cooperators for supplying land and technical assistance while conducting these tests:

Bobby Ashburn, Tidewater Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Suffolk

Lin Barrack, Eastern Virginia Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Warsaw

Tommy Custis, Eastern Shore Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Painter,

Ted Haberland, Producer, Madison County

Brian Jones, County Agent, Augusta County

Ned Jones, Southern Piedmont Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Blackstone

Kevin Phillips, Producer, Augusta County

Katy Rainey, Department of Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences, VPI & SU, Blacksburg

Dave Starner, Northern Piedmont Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Orange

A special note of appreciation is also extended to County Agents who does an excellent job of disseminating the information.

Financial assistance from the Virginia Soybean Board to help fund a portion of these tests is gratefully acknowledged.

Introduction to Variety Tests

The purpose of this publication is to provide performance data of the many soybean varieties offered for sale in Virginia. These data should be of benefit to producers and agribusinesses in making selections of varieties for their use. It is realized that not all varieties that are offered for sale in Virginia are included in these tests. There is no implication that varieties not included are inferior in any way, but only that they have not been tested. The private varieties that have been evaluated in these tests were submitted for testing by commercial seed companies.

Variety evaluations were conducted under full-season and double crop conditions at Blackstone, Orange, Painter, the Shenandoah Valley, Suffolk, and Warsaw. All double-crop tests were no-till planted following small grain. Due to the number of entries, it was necessary to separate the varieties by maturity in all locations.

The year began as a good one, with adequate rainfall to allow the full-season crop to emerge and develop adequate leaf area. However, droughty conditions persisted through much of June, resulting in poor growth for the double-crop plantings. Rain resumed in August, but little rain fell from mid-August through mid-October in most regions. Small seed size was a result of the droughty conditions during seed fill in the full-season tests. Rainy and warm weather conditions in mid-October during the maturity stages caused phomopsis seed decay to develop rapidly. Therefore, seed quality suffered. Yield for the double-crop plantings was lower due to poor leaf area development, but the October rains filled out the seed; seed size was closer to average than one might expect.

Interpreting the Results

Table 1 contains yield summaries over all locations. Past analysis of test data indicated that variety selection should be made from multiple years and sites. More locations result in more reliable information. However, average yields over locations should not be used to select the highest yielding variety unless all varieties are tested in all locations because data will be skewed to those varieties that are tested in the highest yielding locations. Therefore, relative yield is a better method of comparing varieties over locations. Relative yield is calculated by dividing the yield of a variety by the average yield of all varieties within the same maturity group at that location. A variety with a relative yield of 105 was 5% above the

average of all varieties at that location. Relative yield is not an actual yield, but a value that is relative to all other yield values at that location. Varieties are ranked by relative yield in descending order.

Tables 2 through 9 contain detailed yield and other information from each location. The highest average yielding varieties are listed first in each table. It is not statistically correct to compare varieties from different maturity groups. However, it is recommended that producers select two to three of the highest yielding varieties from each maturity group adapted to his region in order to spread out harvesting time and yield risks associated with timing of summer rainfall patterns. Because of year-to-year variability in variety performance it is suggested that data for varieties with less than three locations or years testing be considered preliminary. The average performance of a variety over multiple environments is more reliable than its performance in one test. Multiple-year data can be obtained from the authors. Many of the new varieties, which do not have two-year averages, are excellent and will probably, earn a share of the Virginia soybean acreage. Other traits are also shown in the tables (maturity, lodging, height, seed quality, purple stain, and seed size) because each producer emphasizes certain of these traits or a combination of them when selecting varieties for his farm. After examining these results, the producer may want to plant limited quantities of several new better performing varieties to observe how they perform on his farm and under his management conditions.

An LSD (least significant difference) was calculated within maturity groups at each location. The LSD is a statistical test calculated at the 10% probability level to aid the reader in comparing the yield differences among varieties within a particular maturity group. When two entries are compared and the difference between them is greater than the calculated LSD value, the varieties are considered to be significantly different. The "NS" designation indicates that there were no significant differences for yield among the varieties within that maturity group. The coefficient of variation (CV) is a relative measure of variation and is an indicator of the degree of precision associated with the test. For soybean variety evaluation tests, CV values less than 15% indicates that the precision of the test was good in distinguishing differences between varieties.

R2 is also a measure of variability. It gives information regarding significant differences. The higher the R2, the more likely there are significant differences be-

tween varieties. When yields are low, R2 can be a better indicator of degree of precision associated with the test than CV values.

Methods and Definitions

The variety test was evaluated in a randomized complete block design and replicated three times. All tests were maintained weed free with herbicides and hand weeding. Row widths, number of rows planted and harvested, and length of row harvested are shown on the production information page. Harvest was conducted as near to the date of first harvest maturity as work schedules and weather would permit. Fertilizer was applied according to Virginia Tech soil test recommendations.

Maturity Group	Seeding Rates (seeds/acre):	
	Full Season	Double-Crop
III	165,000	220,000
IV	165,000	220,000
V	165,000	220,000

Maturity was taken at the date when 95% of the pods turned brown (R8). Detailed maturity date information was not taken at each location due to greater travel distances from the Tidewater AREC.

Lodging notes are recorded on a scale of 1 to 5 according to the following criteria:

- 1.0 - almost all plants erect
- 2.0 - either all plants leaning slightly, or a few plants down
- 3.0 - either all plants leaning moderately (45o angle), or 25 to 50% down
- 4.0 - either all plants leaning considerably or 50 to 80% down
- 5.0 - all plants down

Plant Height is determined as the average length of plants in a plot from the ground to the uppermost node of the plant at maturity.

Purple Seed Stain (PSS) is the percentage of seed from a 100-seed sample that are affected with that disease.

Seed Quality (SQ) is rated from 1 to 5 according to the following scale:

- 1.0 = very good; 2.0 = good; 3.0 = fair; 4.0 = poor; 5.0 = very poor.

Seed quality ratings are a good representation of *Phomopsis* seed decay.

Seed Size (SS) is obtained from the weight of a 100-seed sample and is transformed to number of seed per pound.

Yields were collected with a small-plot combine equipped with scales and moisture tester. Yields were adjusted to 13% moisture. A bushel weight of 60 pounds (at 13% moisture) was used to determine bushel-per-acre (BU/AC) yield.

Production Information

Location*	Planting Date	Tillage System	Herbicides	Date Applied	Insecticides/ Fungicides	Soil Type	Row Width	Number of Rows		Length of Row
								Planted	Harvested	
Blackstone-FS	5/17	No-Till	Dual II Mag Authority Sencor	5/17	None	Appling Cecil sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Orange-FS	6/1	Conv.	Dual II Mag Canopy XL	5/23	None	Davidson Clay Loam	15"	5	3	17'
Painter-FS	5/12	Conv.	Dual II Mag, Sencor	5/12	Stratego 8/30/05	Bojac/sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Suffolk-FS	5/18	Conv	Dual II Mag,	5/23	Quadris 8/16/05	Dragston / Eunola fine sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Warsaw-FS	5/30	Conv.	Python, Dual Mag Reflex Select	5/10 7/11 7/7	Warrior T 9/1	Kempsville loam	30"	4	2	12'
Shenandoah-FS	6/1	Conv.	Roundup WeatherMax, Classic	7/12	None	Tempsville silt loam	15"	5	3	17'
Blackstone-DC	6/29	No-Till	Dual II Mag, Sencor, Authority	6/21	None	Appling/ Cecil sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Orange-DC	7/11	No-Till	Roundup	7/31	None	Davidson Clay loam	15"	5	3	17'
Painter-DC	7/7	No-Till	Touchdown, Sencor, Dual II Mag Select, Classic	7/7 8/26	Mustang Max 8/18 Stratego 9/19	Bojac/sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Suffolk-DC	6/30	No-Till	Dual II Mag, Canopy XL Roundup WeatherMax	7/1	Quadris 9/12	Dragston sandy loam	15"	5	3	17'
Warsaw-DC	7/14	No-Till	Roundup Weather Max Dual Mag Select, Basagran, Reflex	6/17 8/3	Warrior T 9/1	Kempsville loam	7.5"	5	5	12'
			Select, Basagran	9/1						

*FS = Full-Season, DC = Double-crop

Monthly Precipitation (inches) and Average Rainfall May through October at Variety Test Locations.

Location		May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Total
Blackstone	2005	2.53	2.11	4.65	2.96	1.34	3.50	17.09
	54-yr Avg.	3.96	4.02	4.72	3.96	3.60	3.30	23.56
Orange	2005	3.19	0.85	3.64	2.95	2.29	9.71	22.63
	62-yr. Avg.	3.85	3.81	4.52	3.92	3.76	3.41	23.27
Painter	2005	4.56	6.75	5.82	5.76	1.32	7.05	31.26
	63-yr Avg.	3.38	3.37	4.51	4.13	3.53	3.36	22.28
Suffolk	2005	4.78	2.64	5.19	4.5	3.08	5.68	25.87
	71-yr. Avg.	3.97	4.21	5.79	5.74	4.17	3.41	27.29
Warsaw	2005	4.10	2.51	5.16	3.09	1.44	6.57	22.87
	39-yr Avg.	4.41	3.81	4.24	4.22	4.28	3.20	24.16

Suppliers Of Soybean Varieties Tested In 2005

Supplier	Brand	Variety
Delta and Pine Land Company 103 Seaboard Ave. Piedmont, AL 36272	D&PL	DP3861RR, DPX1908RR, DP4331RR, DP4546RR, DP4724RR, DP4960RR, DP5414RR, DP5634RR, DP5808RR, DP5915RR
Delta King Seed Co P.O. Box 970 McCrary, AR 72101	Delta King	DK4366, DK4866, DK5066, DK5567, DKXTJ652, DKXTJ6P51
Featherstone Farm 13941 Genito Rd. Amelia, VA 23002	Clark Delta King	CL54RR DK4461RR, DK4868RR
Garst Seed Co. 4850 W 350 N Danville, IN 46122	Garst	3824RR, 3960RR, 4512RR, 4612RR
Meherrin Ag& Chemical P.O. Box 7040 Suffolk, VA 23437	Asgrow	AG5605
Monsanto Company 4312 Carol Ave Cortland, IL 60112	Asgrow	AG4404, AG 4503, AG4703, AG4801, AG4903, AG5301, AG5605
NK Brand Seeds 25 Red Oak DR Lititz, PA 17543	NK	S40-R9, S43-B1, S49-Q9, S52-U3
Pioneer Hi-Bred International Inc. 7501 Memorial Parkway Huntsville, AL 35802	Pioneer	93M92, 94M30, 94M50, 94B73, 94M80, 95M50, 95M81
Progeny Ag Products 1529 Hwy 193 Wynne, AR 72396	Progeny	3900, 4401, 4949, 5660, 5822
R.W. White Farms, Inc Virginia Beach, VA	Public	Hutcheson, Teejay
Royster-Clark, Inc. 717 Robinson Road Washington C.H., OH 43160	Vigoro	V39N4RR, EX340078, V442NRR, V44N6RR, V48N5RR, V49N6RR, EX340079, V51N6RR, V53N5RS, V55N5RR
Southern States Coop P.O. Box 26234 Richmond, VA 23260	Southern States	RT3851, RT3951, RT4151, RT4230, RT4440, RT4451, RT4502, RT4551, RT4651, RT4808, RT4981, RT5130, RT5302, RT5540, RT5401, RT5450, RT3802.
T.A. Seeds P.O. Box 300 Avis, PA 17721	T.A. Seeds	TS3999R, TS4399R, TS4599R, TS4659R
UniSouth Genetics, Inc. 2640-C Nolensville Rd. Nashville, TN 37211	USG	7393nRR, 7415nRR, 7423nRS, 7434nRR, 7440nRR, 7455nRR, 7484nRR, 7494nRR, 7499nRR, 7504nRR, 7505nRR, 7515nRR, 7553nRR, 7582nRR, 7443nRR, 7489RR, 7482nRR, 7495nRR, 540nRR, 444nSTS, 550nSTS, 5002T, 5601T

Suppliers Of Soybean Varieties Tested In 2005 (cont.)

Supplier	Brand	Variety
University of Maryland Room 1112 HJ Patterson Hall College Park, MD 20742-5821	Maryland Public	Md96-57222 Manokin
University of Tennessee 2431 Joe Johnson Dr. Knoxville, TN 37996-4561	Tennessee	TN05-547RR, TN05-548RR
United Agri Products 544 Pridgen Pond Rd Kenston, AL 36453	Dyna Gro	3392, 3443
UAP Northeast P.O. Box 6 Eastville, VA 23347	Dyna Gro	3390, 3437, 38T47

PUBLICATION 424-107-05

www.ext.vt.edu

Produced by Communications and Marketing, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2009

Virginia Cooperative Extension programs and employment are open to all, regardless of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. An equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia State University, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating. Rick D. Rudd, Interim Director, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg; Alma C. Hobbs, Administrator, 1890 Extension Program, Virginia State, Petersburg.