



Fungicide Efficacy for Control of Soybean Foliar Diseases

The North Central Regional Committee on Soybean Diseases (NCERA-137) has developed the following information on foliar fungicide efficacy for control of major foliar soybean diseases in the United States. Efficacy ratings for each fungicide listed in the table were determined by field-testing the materials over multiple years and locations by the members of the committee. Efficacy ratings are based upon level of disease control achieved by product and are not necessarily reflective of yield increases obtained from product application. Efficacy depends upon proper application timing, rate, and application method to achieve optimum effectiveness of the fungicide as determined by labeled instructions and overall level of disease in the field at the time of application. Differences in efficacy among fungicide products were determined by direct comparisons among products in field tests and are based on a single application of the labeled rate as listed in the table, unless otherwise noted. For application timing and use considerations, please contact your local cooperative extension service. Table includes systemic fungicides available that have been tested over multiple years and locations. The table is not intended to be a list of all labeled products¹.





Find Out More

The Crop Protection Network (CPN) is a multistate and international collaboration of university and provincial extension specialists, and public and private professionals who provide unbiased, research-based information to farmers and agricultural personnel. Our goal is to communicate relevant information that will help professionals identify and manage field crop diseases.

Find more crop disease resources at

CropProtectionNetwork.org

This publication was developed by members of NCERA-137. It was compiled by Kiersten Wise, University of Kentucky.

The information in this publication is only a guide, and the authors assume no liability for practices

implemented based on this information. Reference to products in this publication is not intended to be an endorsement to the exclusion of others that may be similar. Individuals using such products assume responsibility for their use in accordance with current directions of the manufacturer.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer. ©**2023** by the Crop Protection Network. All rights reserved.



We Are Extension



Fungicide mode of action groups:

- Group 11 Qol Strobilurins
- Group 3 DMI Triazoles
- Group 1 MBC Thiophanates
- Group 7 SDHI Carboxamides
- Group 29 2,6-Dinitro-anilines
- Group BM-01 Plant Extracts

Efficacy categories:

P=Poor; F=Fair; G=Good; VG=Very Good; E=Excellent; NL=Not Labeled for use against this disease; NR=Not Recommended; U=Unknown efficacy or insufficient data to rank product

Fungicide Efficacy for Control of				eb	pot	ora ht ³	t -	he (Pc blight	sn i	pot	•bloi
Soybean Foliar Diseases Table (05/2023)			Aerial web blight	Brown spot ²	Cercospora leaf blight ³	Frogeye leaf spot ⁴	Diaporthe (Pod and stem blight)	Soybean rust	Target spot	White mold ⁵	
	Active ingredient (%)	Product/Trade name	Rate/A (fl oz)	Aer blig	Bro	Cer lea	Fro	Dig and	Soy	Tar	Mh
11	Azoxystrobin 22.9%	Quadris 2.08 SC, multiple generics	6.0 - 15.5	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	G-VG	P-F	Р
	Fluoxastrobin 40.3%	Aftershock 480 SC, Evito 480 SC	2.0 – 5.7	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	U	U	NL
	Picoxystrobin 22.5%	Aproach 2.08 SC	6.0 - 12.0	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	G	U	G ⁸
	Pyraclostrobin 23.6%	Headline 2.09 EC/SC	6.0 - 12.0	VG	P-G	Р	Р	U	VG	P-F	NL
	Cyproconazole 8.9%	Alto 100SL	2.75 – 5.5	U	VG	F	F	U	VG	U	NL
	Flutriafol 11.8%	Topguard 1.04 SC	7.0 - 14.0	U	VG	P-G	G-VG	U	VG-E	Р	F
3	Propiconazole 41.8%	Tilt 3.6 EC, multiple generics	4.0 - 6.0	Р	G	NL	F	NL	VG	U	NL
	Prothioconazole 41.0%	Proline 480 SC ⁶	2.5 - 5.0	NL	NL	NL	G-VG	NL	VG	U	F
	Tetraconazole 20.5%	Domark 230 ME multiple generics	4.0 - 5.0	NL	VG	P-G	F-G	U	VG-E	Р	F
1	Thiophanate-methyl 70%	Topsin-M, multiple generics	10.0 - 20.0	U	U	F	G-VG	U	G	U	F
29	Fluazinam 40.0%	Omega 500 DF	12.0- 16.0	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	U	G
7	Boscalid 70%	Endura 0.7 DF	3.5 – 11.0	U	VG	U	Р	NL	NL	U	VG
1	Inpyrfluxam 31.25%	Excalia 2.84 SC	2.0	E	NL	NL	NL	NL	U	NL	NL
[<mark>11]3</mark>	Azoxystrobin 25.30% Flutriafol 18.63%	Topguard EQ 4.29 SC	5.0 - 8.0	VG	VG	U	G-VG	U	E	Р	U
<u>11</u> 3	Azoxystrobin 18.2% Difenoconazole 11.4%	Quadris Top 2.72 SC	8.0 - 14.0	U	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	F-G	VG	Р	NL
11 3	Azoxystrobin 19.8% Difenoconazole 19.8%	Quadris Top SBX 3.76 SC	7.0 – 7.5	VG	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	F-G	VG	F-G	U
<mark>11</mark> 3	Azoxystrobin 7.0% Propiconazole 11.7%	Quilt 1.66 SC, multiple generics	14.0 - 20.5	U	G	F	F	U	VG	Р	NL
11 3	Azoxystrobin 13.5% Propiconazole 11.7%	Quilt Xcel 2.2 SE, multiple generics	10.5 – 21.0	E	G	F	F	U	VG	Р	NL
7	Benzovindiflupyr 2.9%										
11	Azoxystrobin 10.5%	Trivapro	13.7 – 20.7	Е	G-VG	P-G	F-G	G	VG-E	U	NL
3	Propiconazole 11.9%	intupio	15.7 20.7	-				G		Ū	
3	Cyproconazole 7.17%										
11	Picoxystrobin 17.94%	Aproach Prima 2.34 SC	5.0 - 6.8	VG	G	P-G	F-G	U	VG-E	F-G	NL
7 3	Fluopyram 17.4% Prothioconazole 17.4%	Propulse 3.34 SC	6.0 - 10.2	NL	U	NL	U	U	U	NL	G
7	Bixafen 15.55% Flutriafol 26.47%	Lucento 4.17 SC	3.0 - 5.5	VG	VG	F-G	G-VG	U	VG-E	F-G	U
11 3	Fluoxastrobin 14.84% Flutriafol 19.3%	Fortix SC, Preemptor SC	4.0 - 6.0	U	G-VG	P-G	G-VG	U	U	Р	U

¹Multiple fungicides are labeled for soybean rust only, powdery mildew, and Alternaria leaf spot, including tebuconazole (multiple products) and myclobutanil (Laredo). Contact fungicides such as chlorothalonil may also be labeled for use. ²In areas where QoI-fungicide resistant isolates of the brown spot pathogen are present, QoI fungicides may result in poor disease control. ³ Cercospora leaf blight efficacy relies on accurate application timing, and standard R3 application timings may not provide adequate disease control. Fungicide efficacy may improve with earlier or later applications; however, efficacy has been inconsistent with some products. Fungicides with a solo or mixed QoI or MBC mode of action may not be effective in areas where QoI or MBC resistance has been detected in the fungal population that causes Cercospora leaf blight. ⁴ In areas where QoI-fungicide resistant isolates of the frogeye leaf spot pathogen are not present, QoI fungicides may be more effective than indicated in this table. ⁵ White mold efficacy is based on R1-R2 application timing, and lower efficacy is obtained at R3 or later application timings, or if disease symptoms are already present at the time of application. ⁶Proline has a supplemental label (2ee) for white mold in NY. ⁷ Stratego YLD has a supplemental label (2ee) for white mold on soybean only in IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI. ⁸ Rating is based on two applications of a 9 fl oz/A rate of Aproach at R1 and R3.



Fungicide mode of action groups: Group 11 Qol Strobilurins Group 3 DMI Triazoles Group 1 MBC Thiophanates Group 7 SDHI Carboxamides Group 29 2,6-Dinitro-anilines Group BM-01 Plant Extracts

Efficacy categories:

P=Poor; F=Fair; G=Good; VG=Very Good; E=Excellent; NL=Not Labeled for use against this disease; NR=Not Recommended; U=Unknown efficacy or insufficient data to rank product

Table continued from previous page

Fungicide Efficacy for Control of

Soybean Foliar Diseases Table (05/2023)				Aerial web blight	Brown spo	Cercospora leaf blight	Frogeye leaf spot ⁴	Diaporthe and stem bli	Soybean r	larget spo	White mol
	Active ingredient (%)	Product/Trade name	Rate/A (fl oz)	Aeria bligł	Brow	Cerco leaf	Frog leaf	Diap and st	Soyb	Targ	Whit
11 3	Trifloxystrobin 13.7% Prothioconazole 16.0%	Delaro 325 SC	8.0 – 11.0	VG	VG	U	G-VG	U	U	NL	F
7 11 3	Fluopyram 10.9% Trifloxystrobin 13.1% Prothioconazole 14.9%	Delaro Complete 3.83 SC	8.0 - 11.0	U	VG	U	U	U	U	NL	U
7 3	Pydiflumetofen 6.9% Difenoconazole 11.5%	Miravis Top 1.67 SC	13.7	VG	VG	F-G	G-VG	G	NL	F-G	U
7 11 3	Pydiflumetofen 7.0% Azoxystrobin 9.3% Propiconazole 11.6%	Miravis Neo 2.5 SC	13.7 – 20.8	U	U	U	G-VG	U	U	U	Р
11 7	Pyraclostrobin 28.58% Fluxapyroxad 14.33%	Priaxor 4.17 SC	4.0 - 8.0	E	G-VG	P-G	P-F	U	VG-E	F-G	Р
7 11 3	Fluxapyroxad 14.33% Pyraclostrobin 28.58% Tetraconazole 20.50%	Priaxor D 4.17 SC, 1.9 SC	4.0 each component	VG	VG	P-G	F-G	G	VG-E	F-G	Р
11 3	Trifloxystrobin 32.3% Prothioconazole 10.8%	Stratego YLD 4.18 SC ⁷	4.0 - 4.65	VG	G	F	F-G	U	VG	Р	NL
11 3	Azoxystrobin 9.35% Tetraconazole 7.48%	Affiance 1.5 SC	10.0 – 14.0	U	VG	F	F-G	U	U	U	U
11 3	Fluoxastrobin 17.76% Tetraconazole 17.76%	Zolera FX 3.34 SC	4.4 - 6.8	U	U	U	F-G	U	U	U	U
1 3	Thiophanate-methyl 21.27% Tetraconazole 4.20%	Acropolis	20.0 - 23.0	NL	U	U	G-VG	U	VG-E	U	U
7 11 3	Fluxapyroxad 7.74% Pyraclostrobin 15.49% Mefentrifluconazole 11.61%	Revytek	8.0 – 15.0	VG	VG	F-VG	G-VG	U	VG-E	F-VG	Р
11 3	Pyraclostrobin 17.56% Mefentrifluconazole 17.56%	Veltyma	7.0 – 10.0	U	U	U	G-VG	U	U	U	NL
BM-01 3	Tea Tree Oil 20.4% Difenconazole 20.4%	Regev HBX	4.0 - 8.5	U	U	U	G-VG	U	U	U	U

¹Multiple fungicides are labeled for soybean rust only, powdery mildew, and Alternaria leaf spot, including tebuconazole (multiple products) and myclobutanil (Laredo). Contact fungicides such as chlorothalonil may also be labeled for use. ²In areas where QoI-fungicide resistant isolates of the brown spot pathogen are present, QoI fungicides may result in poor disease control. ³ Cercospora leaf blight efficacy relies on accurate application timing, and standard R3 application timings may not provide adequate disease control. Fungicide efficacy may improve with earlier or later applications; however, efficacy has been inconsistent with some products. Fungicides with a solo or mixed QoI or MBC mode of action may not be effective in areas where QoI or MBC resistance has been detected in the fungal population that causes Cercospora leaf blight. ⁴ In areas where Qol-fungicide resistant isolates of the frogeye leaf spot pathogen are not present, Qol fungicides may be more effective than indicated in this table. ⁵ White mold efficacy is based on R1-R2 application timing, and lower efficacy is obtained at R3 or later application timings, or if disease symptoms are already present at the time of application. ⁶Proline has a supplemental label (2ee) for white mold in NY. ⁷ Stratego YLD has a supplemental label (2ee) for white mold on soybean only in IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI. ⁸ Rating is based on two applications of a 9 fl oz/A rate of Aproach at R1 and R3.

Many products have specific use restrictions about the amount of active ingredient that can be applied within a period of time or the amount of sequential applications that can occur. Please read and follow all specific use restrictions prior to fungicide use and follow all harvest restrictions provided on the label. This information is provided only as a guide. It is the responsibility of the pesticide applicator by law to read and follow all current label directions. Reference to products in this publication is not intended to be an endorsement to the exclusion of others that may be similar. Persons using such products assume responsibility for their use in accordance with current directions of the manufacturer. Members or participants in the NCERA-137 group assume no liability resulting from the use of these products.



This article is published by the Crop Protection Network with funding provided by U.S. soybean farmers through the United Soybean Board, the United States Department of Agriculture – National Institute of Food and Agriculture, and the Grain Farmers of Ontario through the Canadian Agricultural Partnership (CAP), a federal-provincial territorial initiative."