A perspective on the practical use of PCR testing to aid farm management
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Velcourt and its approach to crop production

- Velcourt activities
- Evidence based approach
- Velcourt trials
Opportunities with PCR testing

Optimisation of fungicide inputs, within an IPM context
Political / environmental / social backdrop

Velcourt interest focussed on Septoria in winter wheat in the first instance:

‘Can we measure the level of latent Septoria in wheat and use this to optimise fungicide inputs?’
Services

Microgenetics Swift Detect test
   - Log genome scale
   - Results categorised as undetected, low, medium or high

Bayer Crop Check
   - 1-100 scale
   - 1 represents the threshold for reliable detection
   - Results categorised as ‘protectant’, ‘early stage infection’ and ‘curative scenario’
Known unknowns

Accuracy and repeatability - sampling process as well as testing process
Spatial differences in disease pressure
False negative risk

Which leaf layer to test and when?
How to interpret results?
How do you factor this into decision making alongside other factors- variety, drilling date, weather etc
Initial questions

1. Does qPCR testing appear to accurately reflect what is expected, and then relate to observed Septoria?
2. How does spatial variation in Septoria pressure impact upon testing?
3. Do different tests give the same results?
1. Does PCR testing reflect observed Septoria

- Variety – fungicide interaction trial at Kings Lynn
- Matrix of disease pressure:
  - 3 varieties; Firefly, Extase and Skyscraper
  - 2 levels of fungicide; tebuconazole only and fully treated
- Testing on 3 leaf levels with Swift Detect only
- Comparison with observed Septoria levels 3-6 weeks later
Swift detect log genome score compared with observed Septoria 15-41 days later

Leaf 1 (35 days)
Leaf 2 (15 days)
Leaf 3 (41 days)
## Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11th May</th>
<th>3rd June</th>
<th>18th June</th>
<th>8th July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>Pre T1 Leaf 3</td>
<td>Pre T2 Leaf 2</td>
<td>Post T2 leaf 1</td>
<td>Post T3 Leaf 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefly</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extase</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyscraper</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teb programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11th May</th>
<th>3rd June</th>
<th>18th June</th>
<th>8th July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firefly</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extase</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyscraper</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11th May</th>
<th>3rd June</th>
<th>18th June</th>
<th>8th July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firefly</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extase</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyscraper</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSIBLE FARMING FOR THE FUTURE**
2. Does spatial variation in Septoria pressure render testing ineffective?

- Is this a risk?
- Need to consider the human factor!
- Two simple trials with the managers to look at this.
‘Trial’ 1

Manager trial undertaken on farm. It was not replicated and there were no Septoria assessments.

Three points were marked in a field. A sample was taken from around this point, allowing comparison.

No composite sample.
Comparison of qPCR results from samples taken from different points in fields across the country.

Location and timing

RESPONSIBLE FARMING FOR THE FUTURE
Trial 2

- One field was sampled at nine different points at two timings.
- Nine leaves were collected and sent for qPCR analysis from each point in the field.
- Leaf 3 and leaf 2 were sampled @ GS 37
- Leaf 1 was sampled at GS 69

- Field of Gleam in Hertfordshire, very low rainfall.
- Very low levels of observed Septoria
qPCR results from 9 different sampling points in one field

Sampling point, leaf layer and date

Leaf 3 11/05/22
Leaf 2 11/05/22
leaf 1 06/06/22

RESPONSIBLE FARMING FOR THE FUTURE
3. Are there differences between commercially available tests?

- Two tests commercially available.
- If technically comparable, then it becomes a commercial decision.
- Composite samples were split and sent for testing under the two different systems available.
Comparison of qPCR results from split samples using two different tests in 2022
Service

In both cases the quality of the service was high, with results back within 48 hours and often 24.

Reliability issues seem to be associated with the postal service, rather than the test providers, with some samples delayed, and some never delivered.
Comments from Velcourt managers and agronomists

“Both tests were simple to use”  Tom Taylor, AFM, Mawthorpe Farms

“It will add the most value when there is not obvious disease pressure, but the level of latent disease is unknown” Mike Dewar, Stowell Park

“It is something I could imagine building into my crop walking routine”  Mike Dewar

“As yet, I do not have the confidence in the approach to build it into my decision making”  Kieran Walsh, Agronomist
What is required?

• Clarity around how to best use the tests and how to interpret them.
• Common scale?
• Ring testing?

• Confidence - the false negative risk is significant.
• Independent appraisal and guidance?

• An exciting technology, but much work yet to be done.