



## **Result Demonstration/Applied Research Report**

---

### **Tom Green County Dryland Cotton Variety Test**

John and Doug Wilde Farm, 2005

Rick Minzenmayer, Steve Sturtz and Dr. Billy Warrick  
Extension Agent-IPM, County Extension Agent Agriculture  
and Extension Agronomist, respectively  
Tom Green County

#### **Summary:**

Six cotton varieties were compared under similar growing conditions to determine which cotton varieties consistently have higher yields and favorable fiber qualities. FiberMax 960 RR, FiberMax 989 RR and FiberMax 989 B2R topped this test in gross returns of \$574.11 per acre, \$448.78 per acre and \$447.18 per acre, respectively. Producers should keep in mind that these results can change under different field conditions, soil fertility and irrigation practices, so it is suggested that you look at the better cultivars on your farm for several seasons.

#### **Objective:**

Commercial cotton varieties require testing each year for determinations of consistency of yield and fiber quality. Through the use of a field test, a comparison is made of new varieties of cotton with varieties that have proven to be successful, long term yielders. Testing of said varieties within a geographic area of production is important to provide local producers with the latest information on old and new varieties.

### Materials and Methods:

Six cotton varieties were planted using an eight row John Deere Maxi-Merge planter in a strip test fashion using 12 planted row plots in the Wall farming community. The following is a list of materials and methods used in this test.

Planting Date: May 21, 2005  
Seeding Rate: 39,204 seeds/ row acre  
Planting Pattern: 2 planted 1 out  
Soil Type: Angelo Clay Loam  
Previous Crop: Cotton  
Herbicides: 1 over the top application of Round Up®  
Fertilizer: Approx. 60lbs. Nitrogen per acre  
Insecticides: All planting seed were treated with Cruiser®  
Harvest Date: November 1, 2005

Variety	Plant Stand Avg. # per foot
FM 989 RR	2.4
PHY 410 R	2.5
PHY 310 R	2.5
FM 960 RR	3.1
DP 494	2.4

### Results and Discussion:

Table 1 contains the yield and fiber quality information for each of the eight cotton varieties evaluated in this test. FiberMax 960 R, FiberMax 989 R and FiberMax 989 B2R topped this test in gross returns of \$574.11 per acre, \$448.78 per acre and \$447.18 per acre, respectively.

All cotton varieties were planted in a two planted one out row pattern across the field and stripper-harvested using a John Deere four row cotton stripper. Each cotton variety consisted of 12 planted rows. Weights were determined using a boll buggy. Fiber quality analysis was determined by the Texas Tech Textile Center in Lubbock.

**Table 1. Agronomic Data from John and Doug Wilde's Dryland Cotton Variety Test (Tom Green County, 2005)**

Variety	Yield Per Acre				Fiber Quality						CCC Loan Value	Lint Gross Return (\$/acre)	Seed Gross Return (\$/acre)	Total Gross Return (\$/acre)
	In Pounds		% Turnout		Color- Leaf	Fiber		Strength (gram/tex)	Uniformity					
	Lint	Seed	Lint	Seed		Length (staple)	Mic							
FiberMax 960 R	955	1506	30.8	48.5	412	35	3.3	30.2	80.3	52.25	498.83	75.28	574.11	
FiberMax 989 R	717	1207	26.5	44.6	412	35	3.5	29.8	80.8	54.15	388.43	60.35	448.78	
FiberMax 989 B2R	731	1217	26.1	43.4	412	34	3.9	28.7	80.0	52.85	386.34	60.85	447.18	
Deltapine 494	703	1173	27.1	45.1	412	34	3.7	28.5	81.7	52.85	371.66	58.63	430.29	
Phytogen 310 R	609	1025	25.9	43.6	412	34	3.5	25.9	80.4	52.60	320.31	51.24	371.55	
Phytogen 410 R	588	1020	25.0	43.4	411	33	3.7	25.9	79.3	50.40	296.28	50.99	347.27	

Seed income calculated using a price of \$100 per ton.

**Acknowledgments:**

Sincere appreciation is expressed to John and Doug Wilde for establishing and managing this test. Also a word of thanks to the seed companies that provided cottonseed, they include:

Delta and Pine Land Company who provided Deltapine 494.

Bayer CropScience who provided the FiberMax 960 R, FiberMax 989 R and FiberMax 989 B2R.

Dow Agrosiences who provided Phytogen 310 R and Phytogen 410 R.

Trade names of commercial products used in this report are included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Texas A&M University System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.