Does the Corn Rootworm Resistance Trait Affect N Use Efficiency?

Fluid Fertilizer Forum

February 22, 2011

Carrie Laboski, Todd Andraski, Joe Lauer





Carrie Laboski, Ph.D. CPSS, Assoc. Professor, Extension Soil Fertility Specialist









Carrie Laboski, Ph.D. CPSS, Assoc. Professor, Extension Soil Fertility Specialist

Background

- CRW hybrids have larger root system if not stressed by CRW larval feeding
 - Is more N needed to feed a larger plant, or is less N needed because the root system is more efficient?







v of Wisconsin-Madison

Objective:

 To determine if corn hybrids with a transgenic CRW resistant gene vary in their NUE and N need compared to non-resistant hybrids





Methods & Materials





5

Site background info.

- Previous crop = corn grain
- Spring chisel & soil finisher
- Plano silt loam (Typic Argiudoll)



Soil Test	2008	2009	2010
P, ppm	107 (EH)	33 (EH)	91 (EH)
K, ppm	347 (EH)	163 (VH)	146 (H)
рН	7.1	6.9	7.1
OM, %	4.1	3.2	3.5
PPNT, lb N/a	69 (19 credit)	12 (0 credit)	37 (0 credit)





Experimental design

- N x hybrid in a full factorial CRD
 - 4 replications
- 6 N rates
 - -0-200 lb/a in 40 lb/a increments
 - Applied 11, 23, or 27 day after planting
- 8 Hybrids



Hybrids

Hybrid	Hybrid i.d.	Brand	Hybrid	CRM	Traits
1	Bt-CR 1	Pioneer	P35F44	105	(CB & CRW) Herculex Xtra, Roundup Ready 2, Liberty Link
2	Isoline 1	Pioneer	P35F37	105	Roundup Ready 2
3	Bt-CR 2	DeKalb	DKC52-59	102	(CB & CRW) Yield Guard VT3, Roundup Ready
4	Isoline 2	DeKalb	DKC52-62	102	Roundup Ready 2





Hybrid	Hybrid i.d.	Brand	Hybrid	CRM	Traits
5	Standard Bt- CB	Northrup King (08/09)	N58-D1	107	(CB) Yield Guard
		Renk (10)	RK670	103	(CB) Yield Guard
6	Standard nontransgenic	Pioneer (08)	35A30	106	None
		Pioneer(09/1 0)	35F38	105	None
7	Bt-CR (Mon863) 1	Renk (08)	R698RRYGR₩	104	(CRW) Yield Guard Roundup Ready
		DeKalb (09/10)	DKC55-4 (VT3)	105	(CB & CRW) Yield Guard VT3, Roundup Ready
8	Bt-CR (Mon863) 2	Dairyland	ST400	106	Roundup Ready, CRW





Plot details

Planting

- May 5, 2008; May 12, 2009; May 5, 2010
- 33,600 seeds/a or 36,670 seeds/a
 - Thinned to 30,500 or 34,294 at V4-V5

 3 gal/a 10-34-0 in furrow in 200 4.4 lb/a insecticide in T-band (For all plots) 	Date	Root injury rating in border; 0-3 node-injury scale
 Border area - no insecticide 	7/24/08	1.12
	7/27/09	0.19
Weather	7/26/10	1.50

- 2008: Wet June; cool all-season
- 2009: somewhat dry; cold
- 2010: June & July wet; somewhat warmer July & Aug.



Results







N use efficiency definitions

• Relative yield (RY)

- (Yield at 0 lb/a \div Yield at 200 lb/a) x 100

• Partial factor productivity (PFP)

 $- bu/a \div lb/a N$ fertilizer

• Agronomic N fertilizer efficiency (ANFE) $-\Delta bu/a \div lb/a N$ fertilizer





N use efficiency definitions

- Internal N Use Efficiency (INUE)
 - $bu/a \div lb/a N uptake$
- Physiological Efficiency (PE) – $\Delta bu/a \div \Delta Ib/a N uptake$
- Fertilizer N Recovery Efficiency (FNRE) $-\Delta Ib/a N uptake \div Ib/a N fertilizer$





Effect of isoline on RY, PFP, and ANFE

Hybrid	Relative Yield ₂₀₀							
	2008	2009	2010					
	%							
1	68a	54b	49b					
2	72a	56b	44c					
р	ns	ns	ns					
3	70	60	66					
4	74a	53b	60b					
р	ns	ns	ns					

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.



p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p < 0.10.



Effect of isoline on RY, PFP, and ANFE

Hybrid	Rela	ative Yie	ld ₂₀₀	Pa Pro	rtial Fact ductivity	' or '160	
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	
		%		bu/lb N fert			
1	68a	54b	49b	1.40a	1.18b	1.49a	
2	72a	56b	44c	1.47a	1.25b	1.44a	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	*	
3	70	60	66	1.54a	1.35b	1.42a	
4	74a	53b	60b	1.47a	1.32c	1.43b	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.



RTMENT O

tv of Wisconsin-Madison

Effect of isoline on RY, PFP, and ANFE

Hybrid	Relative Yield ₂₀₀			Partial Factor Productivity ₁₆₀			Agronomic N Fertilizer Efficiency ₁₆₀			
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	
	%			bu/lb N fert			Δb	Δ bu/ Ib N fert		
1	68a	54b	49b	1.40a	1.18b	1.49a	0.43b	0.52ab	0.72a	
2	72a	56b	44c	1.47a	1.25b	1.44a	0.41b	0.53b	0.78a	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	*	ns	ns	ns	
3	70	60	66	1.54a	1.35b	1.42a	0.45	0.55	0.46	
4	74a	53b	60b	1.47a	1.32c	1.43b	0.42b	0.61a	0.57a	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.



v of Wisconsin-Madison

Effect of isoline on INUE, PE, and FNRE

Hybrid	Internal N Use Efficiency ₁₆₀								
	2008	2010							
	bu/	bu/lb N uptake							
1	0.97	1.03	0.94						
2	1.00b	1.10a	0.94c						
р	ns	ns	ns						
3	1.02a	1.05a	0.91b						
4	1.01b	1.09a	0.91c						
р	ns	ns	ns						

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

DEPARTMENT OF SOIL SCIENCE University of Wisconsin-Madison

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.



Effect of isoline on INUE, PE, and FNRE

Hybrid	Int Ef	ernal N ficiency	Use 160	Physiological Efficiency ₁₆₀			
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	
	bu _/	∕lb N upt	ake	Δ bu $/\Delta$ Ib N uptake			
1	0.97	1.03	0.94	0.86	0.85	1.09	
2	1.00b	1.10a	0.94c	0.91	0.95	0.89	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	
3	1.02a	1.05a	0.91b	0.76	0.91	0.68	
4	1.01b	1.09a	0.91c	0.66c	1.01a	0.85b	
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.



RTMENT O

v of Wisconsin-Madison

Effect of isoline on INUE, PE, and FNRE

Hybrid	Internal N Use Efficiency ₁₆₀			Physiological Efficiency ₁₆₀			Fertilizer N Recovery Efficiency ₁₆₀		
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
	bu/lb N uptake			Δ bu/ Δ Ib N uptake			Δ lb N uptake/ lb N fert.		
1	0.97	1.03	0.94	0.86	0.85	1.09	0.57	0.60	0.67
2	1.00b	1.10a	0.94c	0.91	0.95	0.89	0.47b	0.54b	0.87a
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	*	*
3	1.02a	1.05a	0.91b	0.76	0.91	0.68	0.57	0.64	0.66
4	1.01b	1.09a	0.91c	0.66c	1.01a	0.85b	0.66	0.60	0.70
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.

of Wisconsin-Madison

Effect of CRW trait on RY, PFP, and ANFE

Hybrid	Relative Yield ₂₀₀			Partial Factor Productivity ₁₆₀			Agronomic N Fertilizer Efficiency ₁₆₀		
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
	%			bu/lb N fert			∆bu/ lb N fert		
CRW	68a	57b	60b	1.45a	1.26b	1.47a	0.44b	0.53a	0.57a
Non- CRW	67a	53b	54b	1.44a	1.27b	1.43a	0.47b	0.58a	0.62a
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.





of Wisconsin-Madison

Effect of CRW trait on INUE, PE, and FNRE

Hybrid	Internal N Use Efficiency ₁₆₀		Physiological Efficiency ₁₆₀			Fertilizer N Recovery Efficiency ₁₆₀			
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
	bu/lb N uptake		Δ bu/ Δ lb N uptake			Δ Ib N uptake/ Ib N fert.			
1	1.01b	1.06a	0.94c	0.81	0.92	0.87	0.58	0.59	0.66
2	1.03b	1.07a	0.92c	0.95	0.95	0.87	0.52b	0.61b	0.74a
р	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

For a given measure of NUE, values in each row followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.10 probability level.

p values compare an isoline pair in each year. ns = not significant; * = p<0.10.





of Wisconsin-Madison

N response CRW vs non-CRW hybrids

Year	Yield CRW	at 0 N non-CRW	Yield at CRW	plateau N rate non-CRW	Platec CRW	ıu N rate non-CRW
	bu/a		bu/a		lb N/a	
2008	161	154	235	228	152	139
2009	115	110	206	206	160	164
2010	145*	130*	240	234	165	154

* CRW and non-CRW hybrids are significantly different for Yield at 0 N in 2010.

When averaged overall years, Yield at 0 N for non-CRW hybrids is significantly less than CRW hybrids.





Summary

 CRW traited hybrids are more efficient in using mineralized soil N in 0 N plots

 However, this does not translate to significantly greater yield levels when fertilized or different N needs





Questions?

Thanks to:

- Fluid Fertilizer Foundation
- Wisconsin Fertilizer Research Program
- Brookside Lab
- Waters Ag Lab

Wisconsin-Madison

Contact Info:

- Carrie Laboski
- laboski@wisc.edu
- 608-263-2795
- www.soils.wisc.edu/extension



