

Potential Yield Loss from Weeds in Corn, Soybean and Dry bean in North America

Nader Soltani^{1*}, J. Anita Dille², Ian C. Burke³, Wesley J. Everman⁴, Mark J. VanGessel⁵, Vince M. Davis⁶ and Peter H. Sikkema¹

¹University of Guelph Ridgetown Campus, Ridgetown, ON; ²Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS; ³Washington State University, Pullman, WA; ⁴North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC; ⁵University of Delaware, Georgetown, DE; and ⁶BASF, Madison, WI.

INTRODUCTION

Weeds are one of the most significant threats to crop production in North America. Previous Weed Science Society of America (WSSA) Weed Loss Committee reports by Chandler (1984), Bridges (1992), and Swanton et al. (1993) provided a summary of crop yield losses due to weeds in different regions of the United States and Canada. These data have been useful to highlight the continued need for weed science research.

The objective of this WSSA Weed Loss Committee study was to update the potential yield loss in corn, soybean and dry bean due to weed interference based on quantitative data (from replicated, small plot studies) from the primary growing regions of North America.

METHODS

Research/extension weed specialists in the corn, soybean and dry bean growing areas of the United States and Canada were requested to provide data on yield loss due to weed interference in their states and provinces (Table 1, 2 and 3). Data included results from weed control studies from up to 10 individual studies conducted within each calendar year during 2007 to 2013 for corn and soybean and during 2007 to 2016 for dry bean.

Each researcher/specialist was asked to provide the "weedy yield" and "weed-free yield" which was defined as the yield from plots with >95% weed control (based on normal agronomic practices for optimal crop yield with excellent weed control management programs). To determine potential crop yield loss for each state or province, percent yield loss (YL%) was determined for each individual study, then averaged within a year, and averaged across years as follows:

$$\text{Potential YL\%} = (\text{weed-free yield} - \text{weedy yield}) / \text{weed-free yield} * 100 \quad [1]$$

Information on total crop harvested, average yield and yearly average commodity prices for each state or province were obtained from USDA-AMS (2017) and AAFC (2017) reports. The potential loss for each state or province was based on the product of the estimated amount of yield loss due to weed interference multiplied by the mean price for 2007 to 2013 for corn and soybean and 2007 to 2016 for dry bean.

Corn

Averaged across 2007 to 2013, weed interference caused a 50.3% yield loss in corn (Table 1). Based on 2012 census data in the US and Canada corn was grown on 35,374,804 and 1,434,099 hectares with production of 262.5 and 10.7 million tonnes, respectively. Using an average corn price across 2007 to 2013 of US\$194.48 T⁻¹ (\$4.94 bu⁻¹), the farm gate value would be reduced by \$25.7 billion in the US and \$1.05 billion in Canada if no weed management tactics were employed. With the use of a two-pass weed control program, and assuming a herbicide plus application cost of US\$100 ha⁻¹ for optimum weed control in corn, there would be a \$7.25 return for every \$1 invested in weed management.

Table 1. Potential annual average corn production and value losses due to weeds for each state or province that provided data for the period of 2007 to 2013.

Region State or province	Harvested Area Hectares x 1000	Average yield T ha ⁻¹	Yield loss %	Potential loss in	Loss in value
				production T x 1000	(\$194.48 t ⁻¹ or \$4.94 bu ⁻¹) US\$ x 1000
Northeast					
Delaware	70	8.2	42.1	241	46,841
Pennsylvania	390	8.1	55.5	1,676	312,669
Appalachian					
Kentucky	526	8.3	83.0	3,866	728,540
Tennessee	298	7.7	29.1	669	134,761
North Carolina	346	6.5	43.6	994	189,276
Lake States					
Michigan	896	9.0	55.8	4,481	871,766
Minnesota	3,104	10.2	52.6	16,716	3,251,777
Wisconsin	1,264	9.1	47.3	5,414	1,053,147
Eastern Canada					
Ontario	820	9.5	51.4	4,018	781,450
Corn Belt					
Illinois	4,949	10.1	50.7	25,303	4,922,303
Indiana	2,407	9.5	58.6	13,469	2,620,136
Iowa	5,408	10.4	39.9	22,520	4,380,904
Missouri	1,238	7.9	73.7	7,238	1,407,990
Ohio	1,373	9.7	60.2	8,001	1,556,446
Northern Plains					
North Dakota	1,005	7.4	51.3	3,811	741,311
South Dakota	1,959	8.2	48.0	7,680	1,494,027
Nebraska	3,683	9.8	52.4	20,825	4,051,151
Kansas	996	4.6	46.3	2,580	501,886
Mountain					
Montana	17	8.2	43.2	62	12,158
Southeast					
Mississippi	308	9.2	18.0	535	121,071
Georgia	140	9.6	41.0	526	98,671
Arkansas	225	10.1	10.0	260	58,141

Soybean

Table 2. Potential annual average soybean production and value losses due to weeds for each state or province that provided data for the period of 2007 to 2013.

Region State or province	Harvested Area Hectares x 1000	Average yield T ha ⁻¹	Yield loss %	Potential loss in	Loss in value
				production T x 1000	(\$89.81 t ⁻¹ or \$10.61 bu ⁻¹) US\$ x 1000
Northeast					
Delaware	70	2.40	28.7	48	18,698
Pennsylvania	195	2.97	35.2	204	79,581
Appalachian					
Kentucky	572	2.62	82.1	1,232	480,366
North Carolina	621	2.09	47.4	618	240,699
Tennessee	546	2.36	36.0	464	180,992
Lake States					
Michigan	784	2.81	62.6	1,380	537,769
Minnesota	2795	2.78	65.3	5,083	1,981,155
Wisconsin	641	2.82	53.7	972	378,809
Eastern Canada					
Ontario	979	2.92	38.1	1,091	425,193
Corn Belt					
Illinois	3,649	3.15	60.5	6,964	2,714,599
Indiana	2,115	3.30	54.8	3,672	1,431,427
Iowa	3,778	3.28	46.8	5,816	2,266,893
Missouri	2,091	2.52	51.5	2,723	1,061,365
Ohio	1,819	3.09	42.3	2,385	929,800
Northern Plains					
North Dakota	1,623	2.12	61.7	2,111	823,013
South Dakota	1,677	2.53	51.9	2,207	860,080
Nebraska	1,046	2.89	36.3	1,098	428,106
Kansas	1,438	2.26	52.6	1,710	666,435
Delta States					
Arkansas	1,281	2.61	34.1	1,143	445,585
Mississippi	760	2.75	48.6	1,019	397,249

Averaged across 2007 to 2013, weed interference caused a 52.1% yield loss in soybean (Table 2). Based on 2012 census data in the US and Canada, soybean was grown on 30,798,512 and 1,679,203 hectares with production of 80 million and 5 million tonnes, respectively. Using an average soybean price across 2007 to 2013 of \$389.81 T⁻¹ (\$10.61 bu⁻¹), the farm gate value would be reduced by \$16.2 billion in the US and \$1.0 billion in Canada annually if no weed management tactics were employed. With the use of a two-pass weed control program, and assuming a herbicide plus application cost of US\$100 ha⁻¹ for optimum weed control in soybean, there would be a \$5.67 return for every \$1 invested in weed management.

Dry Bean

Table 3. Potential annual average dry bean production and value losses due to weeds for each state or province that provided data for the period of 2007 to 2016.

State or province	Harvested area Hectares	Average yield kg ha ⁻¹	Total Value US\$ * 1000	Yield loss %	Potential loss in production kg ha ⁻¹	Loss in value
						(\$0.73 kg ⁻¹ or \$33.04 cwt ⁻¹) US\$ * 1000
United States						
Idaho	46,258	2,129	71,906	50.2	1,069	36,097
Michigan	83,491	2,083	126,988	31.2	650	39,620
Montana	12,469	1,966	17,896	35.6	700	6,371
Nebraska	51,195	2,532	94,669	58.7	1,487	55,571
North Dakota	362,819	1,701	450,536	93.5	1,590	421,251
South Dakota	4,456	2,169	7,058	30.8	668	2,174
Wyoming	14,051	2,550	26,167	70.5	1,798	18,448
Canada						
Ontario	48,455	2,204	77,971	55.9	1,232	43,586
Manitoba	44,608	1,871	60,928	71.9	1,345	43,807

Averaged across 2007 to 2016, weed interference caused a 71.4% yield loss in dry bean (Table 3). Based on 2016 census, dry bean production in the United States and Canada would be reduced by 941,000 and 184,000 tonnes out of their total production of 1,318,000 and 258,000 tonnes valued at approximately \$622 and \$100 million, respectively, to uncontrolled weeds. With the use of a two-pass weed control program, and assuming a herbicide plus application cost of US\$125 ha⁻¹ for optimum weed control in dry bean, there would be a \$10.39 return for every \$1 invested in weed management.

CONCLUSIONS

Corn, soybean and dry bean growers in the United States and Canada would potentially lose 50, 52 and 71% of their crop, with a monetary loss valued at \$26.8 billion, \$17.2 billion and \$722 million respectively, if they did not employ any weed management tactics.

The economic cost of weed interference in corn, soybean and dry bean emphasizes the need for continued weed science research to find new weed management options for growers in North America.

REFERENCES

- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada [AAFC] (2017) Grain Statistics Weekly. www.grainscanada.gc.ca/statistics
 Bridges DC (1992) Crop losses due to weeds in the United States-1992. WSSA special publication, Champaign, IL.
 Chandler JM, Hamill AS, Thomas AG (1984) Crop losses due to weeds in Canada and the United States. WSSA special publication, Champaign, IL.
 Swanton CJ, Harker KN, Anderson RL (1993) Crop losses due to weeds in Canada. Weed Technol. 7:537-542.
 USDA-AMS (2017) Livestock and grain market news. www.ams.usda.gov/market-news/livestock-poultry-grain.