# EFFECT OF TIME OF APPLICATION OF NEMATOCIDES ON THE HALIDE CONTENT OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO LEAF

By R. C. Colbran, M.Agr.Sc., Ph.D.,\* and H. T. Green, B.Sc.†

#### SUMMARY

In field trials at Beerwah in south-eastern Queensland the increase in leaf halides following the use of DD and EDB for root-knot nematode control was reduced by earlier fumigation. The reduction was more marked with DD than with EDB.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Colbran and Green (1961) showed that in the Beerwah district preplant fumigation with EDB resulted in an increase in the bromine content of flue-cured leaf of the variety Hicks and the chloride content was increased following use of both EDB and DD. This effect had been noted elsewhere by other workers, including McCants, Skogley, and Woltz (1959), who considered it was due in part to the interruption of nitrification resulting in a temporary accumulation of ammonium nitrogen.

During the 1961-62 season two field trials were established in the same district to determine the effect of time of application of DD and EDB on soil nitrogen and halide content of the leaf.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The chemicals used were:

- EDB.—Ethylene dibromide in power kerosine. EDB (sp. gr. 25/25  $2 \cdot 17$ ) content 15 per cent. v/v.
- DD.—A mixture of 1,3-dichloropropene and 1,2-dichloropropane containing 50-59 per cent. of total chlorine; inert compounds not exceeding 1 per cent. by weight.

<sup>\*</sup> Research Entomologist, Queensland Department of Agriculture and Stock

<sup>†</sup> Chemist, Queensland Department of Agriculture and Stock

The treatments were:

#### Trial 1

1.	EDB	20	gal/ac	applied	15	davs	before	planting

# Trial 2

6.

1. EDB 20 gal/ac applied 35 days before planting

99

The six treatments in each trial were replicated four times in randomized block designs. In Trial 1 each plot measured 11 ft x 142 ft and contained 2 datum rows 4·5 ft apart; in Trial 2, 11 ft x 198 ft with 2 similarly spaced datum rows. A blue-mould resistant variety was used with plants 20 in. apart in the row.

The fumigants were applied by a tractor-mounted gravity injector and the areas were rolled after treatment.

Nitrogen supplied in the basal fertilizer was in the form of nitrate of soda.

Soil samples for nitrate nitrogen and ammonium nitrogen determinations were taken with a 1-in. soil sampling tube from the 0-6-in. horizon and consisted of 20 subsamples from each plot. Each sample was placed in a plastic bag and chloroform added prior to sealing to halt nitrification.

Nitrate nitrogen and ammonium nitrogen were determined by the Conway micro-diffusion technique (after Bremner and Shaw 1955).

One ripe leaf from each of 12 plants per plot was picked and flue-cured prior to halide analysis. Chloride and bromine were determined by the methods used by Colbran and Green (1961).

Trial 1 was planted on September 21; Trial 2 on October 4. Leaf samples for halide analyses were taken from Trial 1 on December 8 and from Trial 2 on January 4.

## III. RESULTS

## (a) Trial 1

The results of Trial 1 are presented in Tables 1-4.

There was a 28 per cent. reduction in the chloride content of the flue-cured leaf following fumigation with DD when the interval between fumigation and planting was increased from 15 days to 99 days. This interaction did not occur with EDB.

TABLE 1
TRIAL 1: CHLORIDE CONTENT OF CURED LEAF

	Fumig	ation–Pla	anting		Chloride Content (% Cl)			
		(days)			EDB	DD	Mean	
15					0.71	0.90	0.80	
63					0.68	0.81	0.74	
99		• •			0.72	0.65	0.69	
Mean			••		0.70	0.79	0.74	
Magaza		· Canana	fan	C50/	DD, EDB	Time	Individual	
	ary o gnifica	fferencence	es for <	1%	0·08 0·12	0·10 0·14	0·15 0·20	

TABLE 2
TRIAL 1: BROMINE CONTENT OF CURED LEAF

	Fumie	ation–Pl	anting		Bromine Content (p.p.m.)			
	(days)				EDB	DD		
15					2,785	277.5		
63					1,889	322.5		
99	• •	• •	• •		1,700	345.0		
Ne		ry diffe signifi	rences cance	5% 1%	725 1,137	No significant differences		

TABLE 3

Trial 1: Soil Nitrate

G. o. Han Data			Days after	N	itrate N (p.p.r	<i>p</i> :«		
Sampling I	Jate		Fumigation	EDB	ĎD	Mean	Differences	
July 5	••		21 Control	1.08	0.98	1·03 1·28	Control>DD	
August 11		••	22 58 Control	4·50 5·88 (5·19)*	3·52 2·35 (2·94)	4·01 4·11 (4·06) 5·70	Control>>DD EDB>>DD	
September 27		••	21 69 105	6·58 6·35 8·68 (7·20)	7·02 3·25 3·70 (4·66)	6·80 4·80 6·19 (5·93)	EDB>>DD	
October 25			49 97 133	7·85 6·78 5·00 (6·54)	5·55 5·00 6·60 (5·72)	6·70 5·89 5·80 (6·13)	Not significant	

<sup>\*</sup> Figures in parentheses represent means of treated plots at the respective sampling dates.

TABLE 4

TRIAL 1: SOIL AMMONIUM

g 11	D-4		Days after	Am	monium N (p.	p.m.)	D:0	
Sampling ?	Date		Fumigation	EDB	DD	Mean	— Differences	
July 5		•••	21 Control	7.58	9.82	8·70 7·28	Not significant	
August 11	• •		22 58 Control	1·68 1·12 (1·40)*	1·60 1·55 (1·58)	1·64 1·34 (1·49) 1·19	Not significant	
September 27	••		21 69 105	17·28 18·65 16·10 (17·34)	23·72 29·65 26·32 (26·57)	20·50 24·15 21·21 (21·95)	DD>>EDB	
October 25	•••	• •	49 97 133	25·90 23·95 20·25 (23·37)	27·88 27·85 25·42 (27·05)	26·89 25·90 22·84 (25·21)	Not significant	

<sup>\*</sup> Figures in parentheses represent means of treated plots at the respective sampling dates.

There was a reduction of 41 per cent. in the bromine content of leaf following fumigation with EDB when the interval between fumigation and planting was similarly increased. The level of soil nitrate nitrogen was reduced by EDB and DD, the reduction being more pronounced with DD.

## (b) Trial 2

The results of Trial 2 are given in Tables 5-8.

The chloride content of leaf in plots treated with EDB was reduced when the interval between fumigation and planting was increased from 35 days to 112 days. The bromine content of leaf from plots treated with EDB at the 30 gal/ac rate was greater than from plots treated at the 20 gal/ac rate and decreased as the interval between fumigation and planting was increased from 35 days to 112 days. Changes in soil nitrate nitrogen and ammonium nitrogen were not significant.

TABLE 5
TRIAL 2: CHLORIDE CONTENT OF CURED LEAF

					Chloride Content (%Cl)				
	Fumig	gation–Plan (days)	iting		EDB (20 gal/ac.)	EDB (30 gal/ac.)	Mean		
35					1.12	1.03	1.07		
76					0.80	0.98	0.89		
112	• •	• •	• •	• •	0.83	0.65	0.74		
Mean				• •	0.91	0.89	0.90		
NT .	1	·m	C	2.507	Rate	Time	Individual		
		ifference	ior		0.18	0.22	0.32		
10	r sign	ificance		<u></u>	0.25	0.31	0.44		

TABLE 6
TRIAL 2: BROMINE CONTENT OF CURED LEAF

					Bromine Content (p.p.m. Br)			
	Fumig	gation–Pl (days)	anting		EDB (20 gal/ac.)	EDB (30 gal/ac.)	Mean	
35					2,945	3,620	3,282	
76					1,820	2,945	2,382	
112	• •	• •	• •	• •	1,820	1,610	1,715	
Mean		• •		••	2,195	2,725	2,460	
		ifferenc	es for		Rate 475	Time 582	Individual 823	
sig	gnifica	ance	_	<u> </u>	657	805	1,139	

TABLE 7
TRIAL 2: SOIL NITRATE

		Nitrate N (p.p.m.)				
Sampling Date		Days after Fumigation	EDB (20 gal/ac)	EDB (30 gal/ac)	Mean	Differences
July 5	•••	21 Control	0.55	0.62	0·58 0·59	Not significant
August 11		22 58 Control	2·48 2·18 (2·32)*	2·18 1·98 (2·08)	2·32 2·08 (2·20) 2·22	Not significant
September 27		21 69 105	3·90 4·12 3·55 (3·86)	4·65 3·85 4·20 (4·23)	4·28 3·99 3·88 (4·05)	Not significant
October 25		49 97 133	3·18 3·05 3·12 (3·12)	3·28 3·15 3·42 (3·28)	3·22 3·10 3·28 (3·20)	Not significant

<sup>\*</sup> Figures in parentheses represent means of treated plots at the respective sampling dates.

TABLE 8
Trial 2: Soil Ammonium

Sampling Date			Days after	Ammonium	N (p.p.m.)			
			Fumigation	EDB (20 gal/ac)	EDB (30 gal/ac)	Mean	Differences	
July 5		••	21 Control	10.05	8.25	9·17 9·66	Not significant	
Aug. 11		••	22 58 Control	0·80 0·50 (0·65)*	0·30 0·70 (0·50)	0·55 0·60 (0·58) 0·29	EDB 20, EDB 30> Control	
September 27			21 69 105	5·72 6·98 8·55 (7·08)	10·92 3·70 8·80 (7·81)	8·32 5·34 8·68 (7·45)	Not significant	
October 25		• •	49 97 133	3·20 6·82 4·28 (4·77)	4·88 8·18 4·30 (5·78)	4·04 7·50 4·29 (5·28)	Not significant	

<sup>\*</sup> Figures in parentheses represent means of treated plots at the respective sampling dates.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

In the Beerwah district most of the growers have limited acreages available for tobacco production and the crop is commonly grown on the same area every year. Under these conditions preplant fumigation is necessary to ensure root-knot nematode control. The data presented in this paper indicate that the increase in the halide content of flue-cured leaf following use of nematocides can be reduced considerably by earlier fumigation. Accordingly, in fields where the halide content of leaf is an important consideration, EDB is preferable to DD and it should be applied during autumn or early winter instead of 2–3 weeks prior to planting.

## V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mr. C. E. Rose (Chemist) carried out the nitrogen analyses. Mr. D. Ironside (Field Assistant) was associated with both trials. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

## **REFERENCES**

- Bremner, J. M., and Shaw, K. (1955).—Determination of ammonia and nitrate in soil. J. Agric. Sci. 46:320-8.
- Colbran, R. C., and Green, H. T. (1961).—Effect of nematocides on the halide content and burning time of flue-cured tobacco leaf in South Queensland. *Qd J. Agric. Sci.* 18:287-92.
- McCants, C. B., Skogley, E. O., and Woltz, W. G. (1959).—Influence of certain soil fumigation treatments on the response of tobacco to ammonium and nitrate forms of nitrogen. *Proc. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer.* 23:466-9.

(Received for publication October 31, 1962)