

Manitoba survey of herbicide-resistant weeds in 2022



Charles M. Geddes^{1*}, Mattea M. Pittman¹, Kim Brown-Livingston², and Julia Y. Leeson³

*Charles.Geddes@agr.gc.ca
X @charlesmgeddes

¹Lethbridge Research and Development Centre (RDC), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC), Lethbridge, AB; ²Manitoba Agriculture, Carman, MB; ³Saskatoon RDC, AAFC, Saskatoon, SK

Introduction and Objectives

Herbicide-resistant (HR) weeds are a growing concern for farmers worldwide¹, and Manitoba is no exception. The percentage of annual-cropped fields occupied by HR weeds in Manitoba increased from 32% in 2002² to 48% in 2008³ to 68% in 2016⁴. The most-recent Manitoba survey (2016) estimated that HR weeds cost Manitoba farmers about \$73 million annually in reduced crop yields and quality and increased weed control expenses⁴. Continued monitoring of the occurrence, distribution and impact of HR weeds is essential to understand how best to mitigate and manage this increasing threat to cropping systems. **The objective of this study was to determine the occurrence, distribution, and impact of HR weeds in Manitoba in 2022**, with particular focus on tier 1 acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACCCase) and acetolactate synthase (ALS)-inhibiting herbicides.

Materials and Methods

- Randomized-stratified pre-harvest survey conducted in mid- to late-August of 2022.
- 155 randomly-selected ¼ sections (65 ha) (Fig. 1) stratified based on cultivated area within each ecoregion and seeded area of each crop (Table 1).
- Mature weed seeds collected from uncontrolled visible weed patches, and the patch area estimated.
- Seeded in 24×24×5 cm flats with soilless medium and watered daily in the greenhouse.
- 16 hr photoperiod with 20/18°C temperature and 230 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ supplemental light.
- Tested with tier 1 ACCCase- and ALS-inhibiting (Groups 1 & 2) herbicides (Table 2)^{2,4}.
- Herbicides applied at the 2–4 leaf stage using a moving-nozzle cabinet sprayer (TeeJet® 8002VS nozzle; 275 kPa; 200 L ha⁻¹ solution; 2.4 km hr⁻¹).
- Plants characterized as resistant (no injury; injury with new growth) or susceptible (dead; nearly dead) 3 wk after treatment relative to resistant and susceptible controls⁵.
- Maps of resistance occurrence developed using QGIS v. 3.22.2⁶.




Figure 1. Locations of the 155 fields included in the 2022 survey of herbicide-resistant weeds in Manitoba.

Table 1. Field allocation by crop and ecoregion.

Crop	Ecoregion					All areas	% of all areas
	Aspen Parkland ^a	Boreal Transition ^b	Lake Manitoba Plain	Interlake Plain ^c	Lake of the Woods		
	no. of fields						
Canola	22	7	18	4	51	33	
Wheat	25	1	18	5	49	31	
Soybean	7	0	13	0	20	13	
Oat	10	0	4	0	14	9	
Barley	5	0	1	1	7	5	
Corn	1	0	4	2	7	5	
Field pea	3	0	1	0	4	3	
Pinto bean	0	0	2	0	2	1	
Sunflower	0	0	1	0	1	<1	
Sub-total	73	8	62	12	155	100	
% of total	47	5	40	8	100	100	

^aIncludes SW MB Uplands; ^bIncludes Mid-Boreal Uplands; ^cIncludes Lake of the Woods

Table 2. Herbicides used for resistance diagnostics.

Herbicide common name	Herbicide trade name	Rate (g ai/ha ha ⁻¹)
Fenoxaprop	Puma® Advance ¹	60 & 150
Quizalofop	Assure® II ^{2,a}	48 & 70
Tralkoxydim	Liquid Achieve™ SC ^{3,b}	200 & 400
Clethodim	Centurion® ^{6,c}	90
Imazamox	Solo® ADV ⁴	35
Imazethapyr	Pursuit® 240 ^{4,d}	75
Imazapyr	Arsenal® PowerLine ^{4,d}	72
Thifensulfuron + Tribenuron	Refine® SG ^{5,d}	15(10+5)
Chlorosulfuron	Telar® XP ^{1,d}	22 & 89
Glyphosate	Roundup WeatherMAX® ¹	900

Company name: ¹Bayer CropScience Inc.; ²AMVAC Chemical Corp.; ³Corteva Agriscience; ⁴BASF Canada Inc.; ⁵FMC of Canada Ltd. Adjuvants: ⁶Merge® @ 0.5% v/v; ⁷Turbocharge® @ 0.5% v/v; ⁸Amigo® @ 0.5% v/v; ⁹Agral® 90 @ 0.25% v/v

Results




Figure 2. The percentage of surveyed fields occupied by herbicide-resistant weeds in the current (2022) and historical (2002, 2008 & 2016)²⁻⁴ surveys of Manitoba.




Table 3. Frequency of confirmation of each weed biotype resistant to acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACCCase) or acetolactate synthase (ALS)-inhibiting herbicides among fields tested and among all fields sampled, and the land area and field area occupied.

Common name	Scientific name	Resistance	Tested fields		Area occupied		Field area	
			%	ha	%	ha	%	ha
Grass:								
Wild oat	<i>Avena fatua</i>	ACCCase	100	37	430,178	1,469,609		
Green foxtail	<i>Setaria viridis</i>	ACCCase	88	27	848,363	1,170,531		
Yellow foxtail	<i>Setaria pumila</i>	ACCCase	43	12	211,687	561,454		
Barnyardgrass*	<i>Echinochloa</i> spp. ^a	ACCCase	33	11	146,349	455,787		
Stinkgrass*	<i>Eragrostis cilianensis</i>	ACCCase	33	3	157,530	157,530		
Quackgrass*	<i>Elymus repens</i>	ACCCase	100	1	11	31,130		
Wild oat	<i>Avena fatua</i>	ALS	82	30	396,199	1,213,825		
Barnyardgrass	<i>Echinochloa</i> spp. ^a	ALS	86	29	393,857	1,084,472		
Yellow foxtail	<i>Setaria pumila</i>	ALS	9	3	45,064	113,632		
Green foxtail	<i>Setaria viridis</i>	ALS	2	<1	40,103	40,103		
Quackgrass*	<i>Elymus repens</i>	ALS	100	1	11	31,130		
Wild oat	<i>Avena fatua</i>	ACCCase + ALS	82	30	396,197	1,183,768		
Barnyardgrass*	<i>Echinochloa</i> spp. ^a	ACCCase + ALS	37	12	182,667	479,032		
Quackgrass*	<i>Elymus repens</i>	ACCCase + ALS	100	1	11	31,130		
Broadleaf:								
Kochia	<i>Bassia scoparia</i>	ALS	100	19	115,793	752,060		
Pigweeds	<i>Amaranthus</i> spp. ^b	ALS	31	13	351,347	613,484		
Pale smartweed	<i>Persicaria lapathifolia</i>	ALS	76	10	11,676	395,278		
Spiny sowthistle*	<i>Sonchus asper</i>	ALS	59	7	68,664	300,762		
Lambsquarters*	<i>Chenopodium album</i>	ALS	12	4	99,216	151,153		
Horseweed*	<i>Erigeron canadensis</i>	ALS	33	1	645	65,116		
False cleavers	<i>Galium spurium</i>	ALS	40	1	54,940	54,940		
Shepherd's purse	<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>	ALS	50	1	21	44,098		
Chickweed	<i>Stellaria media</i>	ALS	100	<1	<1	34,351		
All HR Weeds			80	75	1,404,228	2,998,079		

^aMay include *E. muricata* va. *Microstachya* or *E. crus-galli*; ^bMay include *A. retroflexus*, *A. hybridus* or *A. powellii*
*Indicates putative resistance in need of further testing for official confirmation.

Results and Discussion

- 1,037 tests were conducted on 576 samples, representing 35 weed species.
- 75% of the fields were occupied by HR weeds in 2022 (Table 3; Fig. 2).
- The estimated area occupied by HR weed patches decreased from 2.2 million ha in 2016⁴ to 1.4 million ha in 2022, while the equivalent field area increased from 2.7 million ha in 2016 to 3.0 million ha in 2022 (Table 3).
- Based on previous grower estimates⁴ combined with the area where HR weeds were present before crop harvest in Manitoba in 2022 (Table 3), HR weeds cost Manitoba farmers about \$81 million annually.
- New issues of concern that warrant further investigation include (Table 3; Fig. 3):
 - Putative ACCCase inhibitor-resistant barnyardgrass, quackgrass and stinkgrass.
 - Putative ALS inhibitor-resistant quackgrass, spiny sowthistle, lambsquarters and horseweed.
- This survey did not test for glyphosate or auxinic herbicide resistance in kochia due to limited mature seed present pre-harvest. However, the 2018 post-harvest survey of Manitoba documented glyphosate and dicamba resistance in 50% and 1% of the kochia populations sampled, respectively⁷.
- Extreme precipitation caused flooding during the spring of 2022 and late seeding of crops. Late weed recruitment likely altered the weed communities present.




Figure 3. Maps showing the locations of populations exhibiting resistance to acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACCCase)-, acetolactate synthase (ALS)-, and ACCCase + ALS-inhibiting herbicides for each weed species with resistant biotypes in a 2022 survey of 155 fields in Manitoba.

*HR weeds with an asterisk were new for Manitoba and are therefore considered "putative-resistant" until confirmed using dose-response experiments.

Conclusions

Overall, **75% of the sampled fields in Manitoba had at least one HR weed biotype present before crop harvest. HR weeds occupied 1.4 million ha of cropland in 2022, equivalent to a field area of 3.0 million ha. HR weeds cost Manitoba farmers an estimated \$81 million annually** in increased weed control expenses and reduced crop yields and quality. The growing impact of HR weeds warrants greater investment in integrated weed management programs.

References

- Heap. 2022. www.weedscience.org
- Beckie et al. 2008. *Weed Technol* 22:530-543
- Beckie et al. 2013. *Weed Technol* 27:171-183
- Beckie et al. 2020. *Weed Technol* 34:461-474
- Beckie et al. 2000. *Weed Technol* 14:428-445
- QGIS Development Team. 2023. www.qgis.org
- Geddes et al. 2022. *Can J Plant Sci* 102:459-464

Acknowledgments

We sincerely acknowledge the technical assistance of Shane Hladun. We also thank Hugh Beckie for sharing his vast experience in herbicide resistance diagnostics.



Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Agriculture et Agroalimentaire Canada

