



Inheritance of stem solidness and its relationship to yield and other agronomic traits in spring wheat
by Mohammad Aslam Hayat

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Crop and Soil Science

Montana State University

© Copyright by Mohammad Aslam Hayat (1993)

Abstract:

The wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), a devastating pest of wheat, has caused considerable economic damage in the Pacific Northwest. Solid-stemmed wheat varieties have provided a genetic source of resistance against the insect. However, solid-stemmed wheats tend to yield less than hollow-stemmed wheats. Some, but not all, studies have shown yield to be negatively related to stem solidness. To date, it is not clear whether solid-stemmed wheats have low yield due to a negative genetic correlation or to the poor genetic background of the original solid-stemmed selections. The cause of the negative association between solid stems and other traits was studied in spring wheat using solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. The progeny derived from different crosses between solid and hollow parents was evaluated to determine the genetic basis for improved yield in modern solid-stemmed spring wheats. Space-planted nurseries of different crosses grown in 1990 and 1991 showed that the genetic basis of stem solidness is different between an early release (Rescue) and a later release (Lew). Additionally, larger experiments of F₆ progeny derived from crosses between solid and hollow parents were grown in two different environments and agronomic data were gathered. The genetic correlation coefficients between stem solidness and grain yield were small and did not tend to be negative. Therefore, no negative genetic relationship appears to exist between stem solidness and grain yield. However, stem solidness was found negatively correlated to protein and plant height in early solid-stemmed releases. Thus, it appears that a linkage existed between the genes for solid stems and genes conferring poor percent protein and tall plants in the early releases. This linkage appears to have been broken in later releases. Stem solidness was independent of all other traits studied. Heritabilities of all traits, except yield, were high.

INHERITANCE OF STEM SOLIDNESS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO YIELD
AND OTHER AGRONOMIC TRAITS IN SPRING WHEAT

by

Mohammad Aslam Hayat

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Crop and Soil Science

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

November 1993


D378
H 3238

ii

APPROVAL
of a thesis submitted by
Mohammad Aslam Hayat


This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

10/4/93
Date


Chairperson, Graduate Committee


Approved for the Major Department

10/4/93
Date


Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

11/11/93
Date


Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation for sale in and from microform or electronic format, along with the right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Signature



Date

October 1, 1993

Dedicated to HOLY PROPHET MOHAMMAD
: (Peace be Upon Him)
the great social reformer
and
to my beloved late parents who passed away
during my stay at Montana State University, Bozeman
and
were greatly missed

VITA

Mohammad Aslam Hayat was born to Mr. and Mrs. Malik Mian Mohammad Awan on October 1, 1957 in Sahiwal, Pakistan. He got his secondary education at Multan district. He received his Master of Science in Agronomy from University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan in December 1983. He is married to Tanveer Hayat. They have two daughters, Jawairia (seven year) and Hafsa (five year); and a sweet baby boy Talal Mohammad Hayat.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude and special appreciation to my major advisor Dr. Luther E. Talbert for being patient, encouraging and for his support and guidance throughout the pursuit of this degree.

Sincere thanks are extended to Drs. John M. Martin, Wendell L. Morrill, Thomas K. Blake, Charles F. McGuire, Raymond L. Ditterline, John E. Sherwood and Philip L. Bruckner for sharing their time and advice.

My sincere thanks to Susan P. Lanning for her excellent assistance in the field work and computer, and being a very special friend of the family.

I would like to acknowledge the help of Dr. John Martin with the analysis of the data used in this thesis.

Special thanks to Nancy K. Blake for help in reading and suggestions during my writing of the thesis.

I am thankful to my brothers and sisters in Pakistan and all my friends whose prayers were with me all the time.

I would like to acknowledge the help, patience and love of my wife Mrs. Tanveer Hayat. I express my love to Jawairia, Hafsa and Talal who missed me during my field work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
History of Wheat Stem Sawfly.....	4
Insect Morphology.....	5
The Adult.....	5
The Egg.....	7
The Larva.....	7
Host Plants.....	8
Crop Damage.....	9
Control Strategies.....	11
Stem Solidness.....	16
Environmental Effect.....	16
Inheritance of stem solidness.....	17
Relationship of solid-stems to Other Traits..	20
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	22
Statistical Analysis.....	26
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	29
Genetic Effects.....	29
Comparison of Means.....	32
Comparison between Reciprocal Crosses.....	41
Heritability Estimates.....	43
Phenotypic and Genotypic Correlations.....	47
Stem Solidness versus Various	
Agronomic Traits.....	47
Correlations Among Traits.....	54
5. SUMMARY.....	57
LITERATURE CITED.....	61
APPENDIX.....	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Different solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras with their pedigrees.....	25
2. Number of plants studied per generation.....	25
3. Estimates of genetic effects for stem solidness for different crosses in 1990.....	30
4. Estimates of genetic effects for stem solidness for different crosses in 1991.....	31
5. Comparison of means of different wheats released in different eras.....	33
6. Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different wheats released in different eras.....	36
7. Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different wheats released in different eras.....	39
8. Mean stem solidness score of different internodes of F6 progeny derived from various crosses.....	42
9. Comparison of means between reciprocal crosses....	44
10. Heritability estimates for stem solidness and other agronomic traits of F6 progeny of different solid-stemmed wheats.....	45
11. Experiment 1. Phenotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras.....	49
12. Experiment 2. Phenotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras.....	49
13. Experiment 1. Genotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras.....	50

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
14. Experiment 2. Genotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras.....	50
15. Analysis of variance of generation means for stem solidness in 1990.....	72
16. Analysis of variance of generation means for stem solidness in 1991.....	72
17. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Rescue/Newana cross.....	73
18. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Newana cross.....	74
19. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Newana cross.....	75
20. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Rescue/Thatcher cross.....	76
21. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Thatcher cross.....	77
22. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Thatcher cross.....	78
23. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Pondera cross.....	79
24. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Pondera/Fortuna cross.....	80
25. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Pondera cross.....	81

LIST OF TABLES--continued

Table	Page
26. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Pondera/Lew cross.....	82

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Diagram showing categories for stem solidness rating.....	23

ABSTRACT

The wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), a devastating pest of wheat, has caused considerable economic damage in the Pacific Northwest. Solid-stemmed wheat varieties have provided a genetic source of resistance against the insect. However, solid-stemmed wheats tend to yield less than hollow-stemmed wheats. Some, but not all, studies have shown yield to be negatively related to stem solidness. To date, it is not clear whether solid-stemmed wheats have low yield due to a negative genetic correlation or to the poor genetic background of the original solid-stemmed selections. The cause of the negative association between solid stems and other traits was studied in spring wheat using solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. The progeny derived from different crosses between solid and hollow parents was evaluated to determine the genetic basis for improved yield in modern solid-stemmed spring wheats. Space-planted nurseries of different crosses grown in 1990 and 1991 showed that the genetic basis of stem solidness is different between an early release (Rescue) and a later release (Lew). Additionally, larger experiments of F6 progeny derived from crosses between solid and hollow parents were grown in two different environments and agronomic data were gathered. The genetic correlation coefficients between stem solidness and grain yield were small and did not tend to be negative. Therefore, no negative genetic relationship appears to exist between stem solidness and grain yield. However, stem solidness was found negatively correlated to protein and plant height in early solid-stemmed releases. Thus, it appears that a linkage existed between the genes for solid stems and genes conferring poor percent protein and tall plants in the early releases. This linkage appears to have been broken in later releases. Stem solidness was independent of all other traits studied. Heritabilities of all traits, except yield, were high.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), is a destructive pest of wheat in the northwestern areas of the United States and the southern wheat growing areas of Canada (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Wheat productivity in these areas is severely limited due to the attack of wheat stem sawfly. Developing larvae tunnel to the base of plant where they girdle the stem internally. This tunneling reduces the yield and test weight of the grain (Seamans et al., 1938). Girdling causes severe lodging of the crop resulting in serious economic losses to the farmers (Holmes, 1977).

Weiss et al. (1987) reported severe sawfly infestations in Montana. The annual monetary losses in Montana were estimated to be \$ 5,265,000 in 1945 and \$ 7,045,500 in 1946 due to sawfly cutting (Montana Agricultural Experiment Station and Montana Extension Service Staffs, 1946). A loss of \$ 17,000,000 to the combined wheat crop of Montana and North Dakota was observed in 1952 (Davis, 1955). In 1989, extensive damage was observed in winter wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) in central Montana (Morrill et al., 1992). The sawfly remains a devastating wheat pest.

Solid-stemmed wheat varieties have provided a genetic source of resistance against wheat stem sawfly. 'Rescue' was

the first solid-stemmed variety with resistance to wheat stem sawfly. It was reported to have yield potential almost equal to hollow-stemmed susceptible cultivars at the time of release (Montana Agricultural Experiment Station and Montana Extension Service Staff, 1946). However, the protein quality and baking strength of Rescue were lower than hollow-stemmed, susceptible cultivars (Stoa, 1947). Later it was concluded that solid-stemmed wheats tend to yield less than susceptible hollow-stemmed varieties (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Some, but not all genetic studies, have shown yield to be negatively correlated with stem solidness (McNeal et al., 1965).

To date, it is not clear whether solid-stemmed wheats have low yield due to a negative genetic correlation, or to the poor genetic background of the original solid-stemmed selections. A negative genetic correlation could be attributed to pleiotropy or to linkage between genes for solid stems and genes conferring low yield. In later case, one would expect the negative correlation to have lessened during breeding for improved varieties as a result of cross-overs and recombination of genes.

Hanson (1959) suggested that random intermating of one or more cycles in self-pollinated species should break up linkage groups and result in increased genetic recombination within the linkage group. Many other authors also suggested using random intermating to break up linkage blocks through

increased genetic recombination (Miller and Rawlings, 1967; Meredith and Bridge, 1971; Redden and Jensen, 1974; Altman and Busch, 1984).

This research tested the cause of the negative relationship between solid stems and other traits in spring wheat using solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. Rescue is the original solid-stemmed variety, released in 1945, and is a parent of Fortuna, released in 1966. Fortuna was the solid stem parent of Lew, released in 1976. Yield improvements occurred with each new release. We evaluated progeny derived from each solid-stemmed parent to determine the genetic basis for improved yield in modern solid-stemmed spring wheat varieties and to determine whether continued progress may be expected.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Wheat Stem Sawfly

Wheat stem sawfly (Cephus cinctus Norton) is an insect native to North America (Ainslie, 1920; Criddle, 1922; Farstad, 1940; Callenbach and Hansmeier, 1945; Mills, 1945). The insect was present in native grasses in California and Nevada in 1890 (Ainslie, 1920). In 1895, adults were found feeding in the Canadian Northwest Territories (Ainslie, 1929). In 1906 larvae were found feeding in wheat near Kulm, North Dakota and in various grasses, chiefly Agropyron species, in Wyoming (Ainslie, 1920 and 1929). The first reported collection of adult sawfly in Montana was in 1900, near Bozeman. Infested wheat stems were identified in 1910, in northeastern Montana near Bainville (Montana Agriculture Experiment Station and Extension Service Staffs, 1946). In 1908 larvae were found in grasses in Oregon, and from 1911 to 1915 the species was found in native grasses of Utah and other states (Ainslie, 1929).

This pest was originally a grass feeder, but larval feeding habits changed to small grains in the early 1900's (Criddle, 1922; Ainslie, 1929). Development of large scale farming resulted in movement of the insect from prairie grasses to wheat (Munro, 1945 and Davis, 1955). In 1941, the sawfly began causing economic loss in northeastern Montana

counties and the western part of the Golden Triangle of Montana. By 1943, it was a major pest of wheat in Montana (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). At present, the insect remains an economic pest in Montana, North Dakota and the southern prairie provinces of Canada.

Insect Morphology

The Adult

Adult sawflies are black wasps, six to twenty millimeters long, with bright yellow markings. The wings are clear but appear to be golden in the sunlight (Wallace and McNeal, 1966):

The adults emerge from infested stubble in early summer and fly to nearby fields (Seamans et al., 1938 and Davis, 1955). Wasp emergence in June or July coincides with stem elongation of wild grasses. The date of emergence depends on temperature, soil type, and the depth that the infested wheat stubble is buried (Luginbill and McNeal, 1955). Timing of emergence is critical because stems of host plants must have developed to receive eggs. Additionally, plants must be young to provide green material during the development period of larvae. The adults fly on warm calm days, but flights may cease during cloudy weather. Wasps cling to the plants during windy conditions (Seamans, 1945 and Butcher, 1946). Wasps live for about a week, are weak fliers and generally migrate only to the nearest available host plants (Seamans, 1945 and Wallace and McNeal, 1966).

In most localities both sexes occur, but parthenogenesis is apparently common. Farstad (1938) described an area in Alberta from which no males had been found for several years and concluded that females are only produced through parthenogenesis and males can probably be produced only from fertilized eggs. However, Mackay (1955) indicated that males can be developed from unfertilized, haploid eggs and females from fertilized, diploid ones. The emerging adults are sexually mature so mating and oviposition can begin almost immediately.

Farstad and Platt (1946) noted that wheat is preferred over other small grains and Holmes and Peterson (1960) indicated that spring wheat is preferred to winter wheat. Wasps lay eggs in stems of wheat or large hollow-stemmed grasses. Large stems and plants with elongating internodes are preferred (Ainslie, 1920; Holmes and Peterson, 1958; Holmes and Peterson, 1960). Females select stems with the proper diameter and come to rest with the head oriented downward. Stems are grasped firmly with the legs, the body is arched, and the saw-like ovipositor is forced through the wall tissue of the plant. The egg passes through the ovipositor into the lumen of the stem. When the ovipositor is withdrawn the incision in the stem closes (Ainslie, 1929).

Females usually deposit a single egg in each stem and then fly to another stem (Ainslie, 1920), though other

females also may deposit an egg in the same stem (Weiss et al., 1987). Ainslie (1920) and Mills (1945) found that adult females may lay 30 to 50 eggs. The number of eggs deposited in the host stems may be affected by longevity of the female, host availability, and size of the female (Wall, 1952). If more than one egg hatches in the same stem, a struggle occurs between the larvae until only one survives (Seamans et al., 1938; Munro, 1945; Davis, 1955).

The Egg

The freshly laid egg is crescent-shaped, thin, delicate and glassy in appearance (Ainslie, 1920 and Criddle, 1917). The egg can be seen under a microscope by splitting the infested stem. Ainslie (1929) stated that egg size ranges from 1.0 to 1.25 millimeters in length, varying with the size of the female. The egg always lies free within the stem of the host plant and its incubation period varies, depending on temperature and moisture (Ainslie, 1920), but is usually from four to seven days (Mills, 1945 and Roemhild, 1954).

The Larva

The newly hatched larva is nearly transparent and colorless. Later on when it starts feeding inside the stem, a greenish-yellow color develops (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). It has a very large head with chewing mouth parts (Holmes, 1954). The larva feeds on the parenchyma and vascular tissues in the interior of the stem. Seamans et al., (1938)

stated that the larva feeds inside the stem by successfully tunnelling the nodes, until the stems begin to ripen. At this stage the stem is a continuous hollow tube filled with "sawdust". All nutrients required for growth, development, and reproduction of Cephus cinctus are obtained from feeding inside the stem during the larval stage (Holmes, 1954). There have been no reports of adult sawflies feeding (Wallace and McNeal, 1966).

As the crop ripens, the larva moves downward. Holmes (1975) suggested that the light penetrating the stem walls of maturing host plants may initiate the downward movement. The larva cut a groove with its mandibles around the inside of the stem near the ground level. Cutting begins when the stems contain approximately 50% moisture (Holmes, 1975) and the kernel is 40 to 50% moisture (Holmes and Peterson, 1965). At this point, the larva plugs the top of the stub with frass and moves down in the stub of the stem that remains below ground. Here it forms a cocoon in which it overwinters and pupates the next spring. When wind blows, the stem breaks off at the groove, and the adult is able to emerge in summer by pushing through the plug of frass.

Host Plants

Wallace and McNeal (1966) stated that Cephus cinctus Norton is able to attack several plant species. C. cinctus may infest nearly all cultivated grains but wheat is a preferred host (Farstad and Platt, 1946). Larvae may feed on

Hordeum vulgare L. (barley), Secale cereale L. (rye), Triticum aestivum , Triticum durum L., Triticum monococcum L., Triticum polonicum L., Triticum timopheevii Zhuk., and Triticum turanicum Jakubz, but most of larvae may not survive in H. vulgare and S. cereale (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Triticum durum, T. polonicum and T. timopheevii appear to be resistant to larval development (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Although barley is more resistant to cutting than wheat, the amount of cutting in barley appears to vary between cultivars (Farstad and Platt, 1946). Farstad (1940) reported that oat (Avena sativa L.) is entirely resistant to the wheat stem sawfly and speculated that this is due to lack of essential nutrients required for the growth and development of the insect. Farstad (1944) found that sawflies may lay eggs in the stems of Linum usitatissimum L. (flax), however, larval development was stunted, and almost all of the larvae died before harvest. In addition to cultivated hosts, wheat stem sawfly may also infest many wild grasses, especially Agropyron species, which according to Criddle (1917), were the preferred host prior to wheat.

Crop Damage

The wheat stem sawfly affects yield both physiologically and physically. Yield of the infested stems is decreased by cutting vascular bundles and thus reducing nutrients and water flow to the developing kernels (Austin et al., 1977 and Weiss and Morrill, 1992). Infested stems

may produce fewer kernels that are lower in dry weight than those produced by non-infested plants (Seamans et al., 1938; Holmes, 1977).

McNeal et al. (1955) conducted replicated trials with four wheats, seeded on three dates, and found a mean loss of 5.7% in the weight of the kernel due to sawfly tunnelling. They concluded that losses could range from 5% to over 20%. Holmes (1977) found a range in yield reduction of 10.8 to 22.3% attributable to reduction in the number and size of the kernel. He further found a mean loss of 11.5% in kernel weight caused by sawfly cutting and a 6.2% loss in kernel weight due to larval tunnelling. The loss in protein content ranged from 0.6 to 1.2%. Three factors appear to affect the magnitude of crop losses: rainfall in July and August, date of infestation, and larval cutting dates (Holmes, 1977).

The greatest economic loss is attributed to the physical damage. The larva girdles the stem at the base and cuts a V-shaped notch, resulting in severe lodging and yield loss. The amount of loss due to fallen heads is mediated by infestation rate, plant density, wind, and pre-harvest rainfall (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Farstad and Jacobson (1945) estimated losses, due to lodging caused by larvae, at 800-1600 Kg/ha. The overall losses caused by wheat stem sawfly were estimated at 133,805 Megagram for Montana and North Dakota in 1951 and 61,252 Megagram for Montana alone in 1952 (Montana Agriculture Experiment Station and Montana

Extension Service, 1946; Davis, 1952). In Canada, 544,200 Megagrams of wheat were lost annually (Platt and Farstad, 1946).

Control Strategies

Methods used to control wheat stem sawfly include altering tillage practices (Criddle, 1922; Farstad et al., 1945; Munro et al., 1949; Weiss et al., 1987), using trap crops (Seamans, 1926), swathing (Holmes and Peterson, 1965), changing planting date (Jacobson and Farstad, 1952; McNeal et al., 1955; Holmes and Peterson, 1963; Weiss et al., 1987), and using resistant crops such as flax, oat, and barley in rotation (Butcher, 1946). Other factors may influence sawfly number, such as parasitism from parasitoids, field size (Holmes, 1982), fertilizer application (Luginbill and McNeal, 1954a), and resistant wheat cultivars (Callenbach and Hansmeier, 1945; Butcher, 1946; Agricultural Research Service Staff, 1955; Kasting and McGinnis, 1963). Disease and predators have little effect on C. cinctus although birds may destroy a small part of the population (Davis et al., 1955).

Chemicals generally have not been effective for sawfly control because the adults feed very little and the eggs and larvae are inside the host stem. Munro et al. (1949) studied five insecticides for control of wheat stem sawfly and concluded that none of the chemicals produced satisfactory control. Gall and Dogger (1967) concluded that application

of 2,4-D directly to the insect or the wheat plant was ineffective. Contact insecticides such as parathion and malathion kill wasps which are active in the field, but do not provide protection throughout the oviposition period (Holmes and Hurtig, 1952; Wallace, 1962). To date, no foliage spray is recommended for the control of wheat stem sawfly (W. L. Morrill, Personal Communication, 1993).

Attempts at biological control have been unsuccessful. One study suggested that use of parasitoids to control C. cinctus was not successful because sawflies mature too early in wheat (Holmes et al., 1963). Wheat stem sawfly originally occurred in wild grasses (Ainslie 1920; Agricultural Research Service Staff, 1955) at comparatively low population densities, where populations were suppressed by parasitoids. Although sawflies quickly adapted to wheat (Ainslie, 1920), parasitoids were slower to follow. Davis et al. (1955) stated that the rate of parasitism was nearly 100% in wild grasses but seldom was above 2% in wheat. Parasitism rates vary from year to year (Holmes, 1982). Rates may be lower due to unfavorable environmental conditions such as shorter growing seasons (Beirne, 1972). Seven hymenopterous species of native parasitoids, all of them wasp like, attack wheat stem sawfly (Davis et al., 1955). The species are Bracon lissogaster Muesebeck, B. cephi Gahan, Eupelmella vesicularis Retzius, Eupelmus allynii French, Eurytoma atripes Gahan, Pleurotropis

utahensis Crawford, and Scambus detritus Holmgren (Holmes, 1953; Agricultural Research Service Staff, 1955; Davis et al., 1955). Attempts to establish foreign parasitoids such as Collyria calcitrator Gravenhorst and Bracon terebella Wesmeal (Agricultural Research Service Staff, 1955; Luginbill and McNeal, 1955) were unsuccessful.

Wheat stem sawfly populations can be reduced by tillage systems. Reduced tillage and no-till management systems may increase wheat stem sawfly survival rate (Farstad et al., 1945; Weiss et al., 1987). Sawfly larvae overwinter in wheat stubble (Agricultural Research Service Staff, 1955), therefore tillage practices which push infested stubble to the soil surface increase sawfly larval mortality by reducing overwinter survival (Holmes and Farstad, 1956; Holmes, 1982; Weiss et al., 1987). Infestations generally are more severe on field borders, therefore entire fields need not be tilled.

Luginbill and McNeal (1954a) studied the effect of fertilizers on sawfly damage in 'Rescue' (solid stem) and 'Thatcher' (hollow stem) spring wheat, and 'Yogo' winter wheat. They concluded that application of phosphorus alone or in combination with nitrogen increased sawfly cutting in both spring and winter wheats. They indicated that phosphorus caused better growth and development of the plant making it more susceptible to sawfly infestation. Amount of sawfly cutting in winter wheat was reduced when potassium

was applied together with nitrogen and phosphorus, whereas nitrogen alone had little effect on the amount of sawfly cutting. It was suggested that this was a result of the interaction of the three fertilizers (Luginbill and McNeal, 1954a).

Use of narrow strips instead of wide fields increase the severity of wheat stem sawfly damage. Holmes (1982) found that in larger fields, damage was confined mostly to edges of the fields, and resulting damage was not as severe.

Delayed spring planting were found to reduce sawfly damage. Since adults require stems for egg laying, plants which are still tillering avoid attack. Weiss et al. (1987) found that the earliest planting of hollow-stemmed wheat resulted in the highest crop damage. As planting was delayed, sawfly infestations decreased and yield increased. However, they suggested that solid-stemmed spring wheats planted earlier in the severely infested areas will reduce the sawfly damage and increase profits. McNeal et al. (1955), studying four spring wheat varieties, reported that later seeding reduced sawfly cutting significantly. Later, Morrill (unpublished data 1989-1992) concluded that delayed planting reduces efficient use of spring soil moisture, and should not be recommended for wheat stem sawfly control.

Girdled stems do not break immediately, therefore, lodging losses increase as harvest is delayed (Luginbill and McNeal, 1954b). Swathing reduces lodging losses but

increases harvest costs (Holmes and Peterson, 1965).

Swathing does not reduce sawfly populations because larvae have retreated to stem bases (Holmes and Peterson, 1965) and does not prevent the losses in yield and quality caused by the tunnelling of the larvae (Holmes, 1977).

The most effective control is to grow wheat varieties resistant to sawfly attack (Luginbill, 1969; Luginbill and Knipling, 1969). If a plant is resistant, it is capable of suppressing or retarding the development of a pest.

Resistance in wheat to the wheat stem sawfly is positively correlated with stem solidness (Kemp, 1934; Farstad, 1940; Platt and Farstad, 1946; Platt et al., 1948; Luginbill and Knipling, 1969). The resistance results from the hinderance of egg development, first-instar larval development, or older larval development (Roberts, 1954). Population levels of the wheat stem sawfly are greatly reduced by the use of solid-stemmed spring wheat cultivars (Holmes and Peterson, 1957). Eckroth and McNeal (1953) studied morphological characteristics of 180 varieties of spring wheat in relation to sawfly resistance. Only stem solidness appeared to contribute resistance. Solid stems offer protection from damage by the larvae, but not protection from oviposition by the female (Holmes and Peterson, 1960). McNeal et al. (1955) reported that after sawfly larva tunnelling, solid-stemmed wheats were more resistant to being cut than hollow-stemmed wheats. Eckroth and McNeal (1953) studied maturity, height,

and stem diameter and determined that these characters had little relation to infestation and cutting by the wheat stem sawfly.

Stem Solidness

Stem solidness is caused by the development of pith (undifferentiated parenchymous cells) inside the stem. Although it has never been demonstrated that pith is the only factor causing a variety to be resistant, many observations show that when a variety is less solid it is also less resistant (Wallace and McNeal, 1966). Roemhild (1954) reported a direct relationship between thickness of parenchyma cell walls and larval mortality in solid-stemmed spring wheat. Adults lay eggs in solid stems but many eggs and larvae die. The pith appears to cause stems to dry out earlier, and larvae have difficulty in migrating to the stub prior to maturity.

Kemp (1934) attempted to locate the source of wheats resistant to the wheat stem sawfly infestations and found that solid-stemmed wheats had less sawfly cutting than hollow-stemmed wheats. He found the wall of the stem at the nodes was thicker in solid-stemmed wheats than those of hollow-stemmed wheats.

Environmental Effect

Environmental conditions affect the degree of stem solidness in wheat. Platt (1941) found that stem solidness of T. aestivum cultivars was affected by variation in

height, temperature, moisture supply, and spacing of plants. Under greenhouse conditions the solidness of S-615, a solid-stemmed wheat from Portugal, was almost completely inhibited. Artificial shading in the field inhibited the expression of stem solidness. Holmes et al. (1960) also showed that shading the plants reduced stem solidness. Similar results were obtained by Holmes (1984). Luginbill and McNeal (1958) found that the stem solidness of Rescue decreased as seeding rate was increased and as row spacing was narrowed.

Inheritance of Stem Solidness

Stem solidness is a highly heritable character. Lebsack and Koch (1968) reported that heritability estimates for stem solidness ranged from 60 to 95%.

Biffen (1905), in one of the first recorded reports on the inheritance of stem solidness, studied crosses of 'Rivet' (Triticum aestivum), which is solid in the top internode, with hollow-stemmed cultivars of T. aestivum. He reported a ratio of three hollow segregates to one solid in the F₂ generation and concluded that hollow stem was dominant. He also suggested that stem solidness is not morphologically a simple character.

Engledow and Hutchinson (1925) studied crosses of 'Rivet' with 'Chinese Spring' and concluded stem solidness was dominant and did not appear to be associated with any other character of the wheat plant. The difference between

solid and hollow stems was hypothesized to be controlled by one gene.

Yamashita (cited by Platt et al., 1941) used an extensive series of crosses involving several species of Triticum to study the genetics of the solid stem character. He indicated the presence of several genes that varied in number and effect with each species.

Putnam (1942) studied the inheritance of stem solidness in tetraploid wheats. He split the stems length-wise and recorded them as solid, intermediate, or hollow. His results in crosses of T. durum and T. turgidum varieties to 'Golden Ball' (solid-stemmed wheat) indicated that the inheritance of stem solidness was unifactorial. The solid stem character was partially dominant.

Holmes (1984) reported that the Portuguese spring wheat 'S-615' is a parent of all currently grown solid-stemmed bread wheats. Wallace et al. (1969) listed a group of spring wheat selections from Portugal that were both solid-stemmed and resistant to C. cinctus. They stated that these selections may possess different or additional genes from those found in 'S-615'.

Platt et al. (1941), in a study of inheritance of solid stem, crossed the hollow varieties 'Renown' and 'Thatcher' with solid-stemmed selections of 'S-615-9' and 'S-633-3'. They reported that three genes were involved in the expression of solidness and that the solid condition

resulted when all three genes were recessive. The authors suggested that the genes act cumulatively, and that four or more dominant genes would produce phenotypically hollow plants.

McNeal (1956) studied inheritance of stem solidness in a cross of 'Rescue' by 'Thatcher'. He found that the hollow-stemmed 'Thatcher' and solid-stemmed 'Rescue' were differentiated by one major gene and several modifying genes for stem solidness. The major gene was found to have an effect equal to two and one-half times that of all minor modifying genes.

McNeal et al. (1957) examined F_2 plants from crosses between 'Rescue' and four solid-stemmed wheat introductions from Portugal. They concluded that each of the Portuguese wheats possessed the same major gene, or genes, for stem solidness that occur in Rescue. However three of the Portuguese wheats differed slightly from Rescue. This was ascribed to the action of minor genes affecting stem solidness.

McKenzie's findings (1965) agreed with the study by McNeal (1956) in 'Rescue' x 'Thatcher' material concerning the presence of a single major gene. McKenzie (1965) studied inheritance of stem solidness in two hollow-stemmed ('Red Bobs' and 'Redman') by two solid-stemmed ('C.T.715' and 'S-615') spring wheats and hypothesized that the varieties in each cross differed by four genes for stem solidness. One

major gene was indicated in both crosses and the other three genes within each cross were similar in their influence on solidness.

Several cytogenetic studies of stem solidness have been reported by Larson. Larson and MacDonald (1959) found in monosomic lines of S-615 that top and bottom internode solidness was controlled by genes at different loci. After examining aneuploids of Rescue it was found that chromosome 3D had genes on the long arm for a solid top internode and genes for solid lower internode on the short arm (Larson and MacDonald, 1962). Larson (1959) also found that chromosome 3D of Rescue had a gene, or genes, inhibiting the production of pith, especially in the top internode, but in S-615, a parent of Rescue, the 3D chromosome promoted pith production in the top internode (Larson, 1959). Larson and MacDonald (1959) showed that an aneuploid of Rescue has fewer chromosomes influencing solid stem than has its solid-stemmed parent, 'S-615'.

Relationship of Solid-Stems to Other Traits

Resistant varieties of wheat offer the best means of controlling wheat stem sawfly. Most solid-stemmed spring wheats have lower yield potential (McNeal et al., 1965; Wallace and McNeal, 1966) and poorer milling and baking values than hollow-stemmed cultivars (Stoa, 1947). The reduced yield potential of solid-stemmed cultivars relative to hollow-stemmed cultivars have caused a decrease in the

acceptance of solid-stemmed cultivars by the growers of Montana (Weiss and Morrill, 1992).

Recent reports and cultivar releases suggest that the production of solid-stemmed cultivars with high yield should be possible (Lebsock et al., 1967; Lebsock and Koch, 1968; McNeal and Berg, 1977a; McNeal and Berg, 1979).

CHAPTER 3

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material used to study the inheritance of stem solidness and its correlation with other agronomic traits was derived by crossing solid-stemmed parents, released in different eras (Table 1), with hollow-stemmed parents. Crosses were made to obtain F1, F2 and backcross progeny in 1990 and 1991 in the greenhouse, using Rescue (CI 12435) and Lew (CI 17429) as solid stem parents, and Thatcher (CI 10003) and Newana (CI 17430) as hollow stem parents. F1 progeny of the crosses were selfed and backcrossed. Spikes were bagged to avoid contamination. Space-planted parents, F1, F2 and backcross progeny were grown in a randomized complete block design with four replications at Bozeman, Montana in 1990 and 1991. A replication contained two rows of each F2, one row of each parent, each F1 and each backcross in the experiment grown in 1990. In 1991, the same experiment was repeated except that there were four rows of each F2 and the F1's were crossed to both of the parents (Table 2).

Tillers per plant (no), plant height (cm), stem solidness, grain yield (gm) and kernel weight (gm) were recorded on a single plant basis. Individual plant ratings for stem solidness were made, near plant maturity, using a 1-5 scale where 1 designates complete hollowness and 5

designates complete solidness (McNeal, 1956) as shown in Figure 1. At maturity plants were threshed individually to measure the grain yield.




Figure 1. Diagram showing categories for stem solidness rating. 1 = hollow, 5 = solid (McNeal, 1956).

Larger experiments of F6 lines derived from solid by hollow crosses were planted in 1992 at Bozeman, Montana U.S.A. Two experiments with lattice designs, one a 12-by-12 and the other a 13-by-13, were planted in three replications on both dryland and irrigated environments. Each plot was a 3.04 meter row. Seeding rate was 10 grams per row at a planting depth of 3.80 cm with rows spaced 30.5 cm apart.

Experiment 1, contained the five parents and 139 F6 lines, derived from six different crosses; Rescue/Newana, Fortuna/Newana, Lew/Newana, Rescue/Thatcher, Fortuna/Thatcher, Lew/Thatcher. Each replication contained one line of each parent and 21-24 lines of each cross. A total of 144 entries were planted in each of two environments.

Experiment 2 was comprised of crosses derived from Fortuna/Pondera and Lew/Pondera including reciprocal crosses, and was also planted in single rows with the same planting specifications. Each replication contained one row of each parent and 37-43 lines of each cross. A total of 169 entries per replication were planted in each of two environments.

Days to heading (number of days from January 1 to 50% of the heads emerging from the boots), plant height (cm), grain yield (Mg ha^{-1}), test weight (kg m^{-3}) and stem solidness data (McNeal, 1956) were gathered. For stem solidness rating, two stems per row were cut at random, near crop maturity. A cross section was cut through the center of each internode, beginning with the bottom internode (internode 1). A total of five internode ratings were recorded. Most of the plants examined had five internodes, but in a few plants that had only four internodes the rating for the fourth was doubled to provide comparable ratings. Internode scores were summed to give the stem a single score. Finally, score for both stems was averaged and noted as one final stem solidness score. Average plant heights were collected by measuring two plants (height in centimeters from soil surface to the estimated average height of 2 or 3 main tillers, excluding awns) per plot at random. Finally each row was harvested separately with a plot combine to obtain grain yield and test weight. Test weight was measured on a

Seedburo test weight scale using kg m³ scale. Percent protein was recorded for six crosses of experiment one, using Near-infrared Reflectance (NIR) in the cereal quality laboratory, Montana State University, Bozeman.

Table 1. Different solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras with their pedigrees.		
cultivars	year of release	pedigree
Rescue	1945	Apex/S-615*
Fortuna	1966	Rescue/3/Chinook/4/ Frontana//Kenya58/ Newthatch
Lew	1976	Fortuna/S6258

* = original solid-stemmed wheat from Portugal.

Table 2. Number of plants studied per generation.			
cross and generations		1990	1991
Rescue/Newana	**P1	39	6
	P2	43	14
	F1	46	19
	F2	93	59
	B1	@	11
	B2	42	15
Lew/Newana	P1	37	12
	P2	41	9
	F1	44	22
	F2	84	29
	B1	@	@
	B2	47	12
Rescue/Thatcher	P1	35	4
	P2	32	16
	F1	40	20
	F2	88	53
	B1	@	13
	B2	44	23
Lew/Thatcher	P1	38	9
	P2	40	7
	F1	44	44
	F2	89	96
	B1	@	14
	B2	46	17

@ = Seed was not available for these generations.

** = Parent 1, parent 2, their F1 and F2 progeny and progeny of the backcrosses of F1 to P1 and P2, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

For the 1990 and 1991 experiments, analysis of variance was computed to test the significance of differences between the generations and a generation means analysis was used to quantify the genetic effects (Rowe and Alexander, 1980). Generation means analysis, as outlined by Mather and Jinks (1977), was used to estimate the types of gene action and the conformity of the genetic system governing the expression of stem solidness to a simple additive-dominance genetic model. Lack of fit of the genetic model to the data, as indicated by the χ^2 test, implied the existence of epistatic effects. These were accommodated by increasing the complexity of the model to include the additive by additive, nonallelic interaction component. Simple correlations were determined to study the relationship of stem solidness with other agronomic traits in the 1990 and 1991 experiments.

For 1992 experiments analysis of variance was computed, combined over dryland and irrigated environments because the interaction over environments were non-significant. Heritability estimates, and genetic and phenotypic correlations were also computed.

Expected mean squares for a given cross were computed as follows:

source	df	Expected (mean square)
Experiment	e-1	
Rep(Expt)	(r-1)e	
Genotype	(g-1)	$\sigma^2 + r\sigma^2_{GE} + re\sigma^2_G$
Genotype(Expt)	(g-1)(e-1)	$\sigma^2 + r\sigma^2_{GE}$
Error	r(g-1)(e-1)	σ^2

e, g, r = Number of experiments, genotypes and replicates, respectively.
 $\sigma^2_G, \sigma^2_{GE}, \sigma^2$ = Genotypic, genotypic by expt. and error variances,
 respectively.

Observed mean squares were equated to expected mean square and mean product (MP) was obtained from SSCP matrices for each source of variation.

The following variance components were estimated:

σ^2_G = genotypic component due to genetic differences among lines.

σ^2_{GE} = component arising from the interaction of lines with experiment.

σ^2_e = component arising due to plot-to-plot environmental variation.

Equivalent components of covariance were estimated by equating mean cross product to their expectations.

Heritability estimates for each trait were calculated as:

$$h^2 = \sigma^2_G / \{ \sigma^2_G + (\sigma^2_{GE}/e) + (\sigma^2/re) \}$$

The phenotypic correlation between two traits, i and j, was estimated as:

$$\text{Phenotypic } r = \text{MCPG}_{ij} / (\text{MSG}_i \cdot \text{MSG}_j)^{1/2}$$

where MCPG_{ij} is the line mean cross product, and MSG_i and MSG_j are the line mean squares for trait i and trait j.

The genotypic correlation between two traits, i and j, was estimated by:

$$\text{Genotypic } r = \sigma^2_{g_{ij}} / (\sigma^2_{g_i} \times \sigma^2_{g_j})^{1/2}$$

where $\sigma^2_{g_{ij}}$ is the line component of covariance (mean product) between traits i and j, and $\sigma^2_{g_i}$ and $\sigma^2_{g_j}$ are the line components of variance of the two traits.

Means of the parents and crosses were identified to study the mean comparisons as follow:

$$t = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2 / \{(\text{MSE}/\text{reg1}) + (\text{MSE}/\text{reg2})\}^{1/2}$$

where $\bar{x}_1$ and $\bar{x}_2$ are the means of the variable one and two, respectively; MSE is the mean square error; r, e, g are number of replications, experiments and genotypes, respectively. TPROB program of MSUSTAT was used to find the probabilities for given t-value. All the means were assigned letters according to Student t-test (Steel and Torrie, 1960).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Genetic Effects

The analysis of variance of generation means for different crosses in 1990 and 1991 is given in Appendix 15 and 16, respectively. Parents and their progenies differed significantly ($P \leq 0.01$) for stem solidness for all crosses in both years. Therefore genetic effects for all the crosses were calculated (Mather and Jinks, 1977; Rowe and Alexander, 1980). Significant additive effects in the year 1990 were detected in the crosses where Rescue was used as a solid-stemmed parent, while significant additive, dominant and additive by additive effects were found in the crosses involving Lew as a solid stem parent (Table 3).

In 1991, significant additive effects were present in crosses of Rescue/Thatcher and Lew/Thatcher. The cross of Rescue/Newana showed additive effects, and both additive and additive by additive effects were found in the Lew/Newana cross (Table 4).

In all cases in which Rescue (an older solid-stemmed wheat) was the solid-stemmed parent, only additive effects were observed. However, in the crosses where Lew (a newer solid-stemmed wheat) was the solid-stemmed parent, additive, dominant and epistatic effects were observed. This may indicate that the genetic basis of stem solidness is

Table 3. Estimates of genetic effects for stem solidness for different crosses in 1990.				
Effect	Rescue/Newana	Lew/Newana	Rescue/Thatcher	Lew/Thatcher
a	7.71*	5.90**	9.65*	6.23**
d	NS	2.46*	NS	9.10*
aa	NS	3.47*	NS	7.18*

a,d,aa = Additive, dominant and additive by additive, respectively.

*,** = Significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively.

NS = Non-significant.

Table 4. Estimates of genetic effects for stem solidness for different crosses in 1991.				
Effect	Rescue/Newana	Lew/Newana	Rescue/Thatcher	Lew/Thatcher
a	5.70**	4.89*	6.05**	5.41*
d	NS	NS	NS	NS
aa	NS	5.20*	NS	NS

a,d,aa = Additive, dominant and additive by additive, respectively.

*,** = Significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively.

NS = Non-significant.

different between the early release (Rescue) and the later release (Lew), although the source of stem solidness in Lew traces back to Rescue. These results are compatible with results of other workers. Yamashita (cited by Platt et al., 1941), in crosses of several species of Triticum, indicated the presence of several genes for stem solidness that varied in number and effect with each species. Wallace et al. (1969) stated that a group of solid-stemmed spring wheat selections from Portugal may possess different or additional genes from those found in S-615. Larson and MacDonald (1959) showed that Rescue has fewer chromosomes influencing solid stem than has its solid-stemmed parent, 'S-615'.

Comparison of Means

Comparison of means of different wheats used in Experiment 1 are given in Table 5. A comparison between the solid-stemmed parents released in different eras showed that all three of them differed significantly from each other for mean days to heading. Fortuna was the earliest followed by Lew. Rescue was the latest among all the parents. Newana and Thatcher, both hollow-stemmed parents, did not differ for mean days to heading, but were later than the solid stem parents with the exception of Rescue.

All the parents differed significantly for mean plant height except Rescue versus Thatcher and Fortuna versus Lew. Solid-stemmed wheats Fortuna and Lew did not differ for mean test weight and were of significantly higher mean test

Table 5. Comparison of means of different wheats released in different eras*.						
parents	days to heading	plant height (cm)	test weight (kg/m ³)	grain yield (Mg/ha)	stem solidness	protein (%)
Rescue	188d	108c	729a	4.46ab	20c	14.56d
Fortuna	180a	98b	778c	5.15b	20c	14.04bc
Lew	184b	97b	775c	4.98ab	15b	13.96b
Newana	185c	80a	728a	6.12c	8a	13.18a
Thatcher	184bc	110c	744b	4.20a	8a	14.46cd

* = Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level.

weight than all other parents studied. Fortuna (Lebsock et al., 1967) and Lew (McNeal and Berg, 1977a) are improved solid-stemmed cultivars, therefore, it is supposed that these are better grade wheats. Rescue and Newana did not differ for mean test weight and their average test weight was the smallest among all the parents studied. Although test weight of Rescue was comparable to other cultivars from 1945 to 1947. (Stoa, 1947), this cultivar is no longer competitive with current cultivars and therefore is not accepted by Montana farmers.

The solid-stemmed parents did not differ for mean yield in this study. However, data from state wide yield trials has shown that, in general, Rescue has low yields, Fortuna is intermediate and Lew is the highest yielding solid-stemmed wheat (e.g. Bowman et al., 1992). Hollow-stemmed wheats differ significantly from each other. Newana, a hollow-stemmed wheat, was the highest yielding parent among all the cultivars studied.

The solid-stemmed parents, Rescue and Fortuna, did not differ significantly from each other for mean stem solidness score, while Lew differed significantly from Rescue and Fortuna. On the average Rescue was the most solid, Fortuna being less and Lew was the least solid-stemmed wheat. It seems that in improved varieties certain genes conferring stem solidness were lost while breeding for improved yield potentials. Hollow-stemmed cultivars did not differ from

each other for mean solid stem score. Older solid-stemmed parents differ significantly for mean protein percentage from the newer ones. Mean protein percentage of older solid-stemmed wheats was greater than the newer releases. A previous study has shown that Rescue has certain deficiencies in milling and baking value (Stoa, 1947).

Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different solid-stemmed wheats with Newana as hollow-stemmed wheat are given in Table 6. All the crosses differ significantly for mean days to heading. Lew/Newana was the latest, while Rescue/Newana being intermediate and Fortuna/Newana was the earliest. Rescue and Lew are mid season maturity (Stoa, 1947; McNeal and Berg, 1977a). Fortuna is early maturing (Lebsock et al., 1967) and Newana is of mid-late maturity (McNeal and Berg, 1977b). These investigations agree with this study in which the cross involving Fortuna as a solid stem parent headed earlier than the crosses involving Rescue or Lew as a solid stem parent. Crosses with Newana behaved different than expectations, in that, Lew/Newana was the latest and Rescue/Newana was intermediate. This may be surprising in that Rescue is of later maturity than Lew.

All the crosses with Newana differed significantly for mean plant height. The progeny of the Rescue/Newana cross were tallest. The progeny derived from the cross of Fortuna/Newana was intermediate and Lew/Newana was the

Table 6. Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different wheats released in different eras*.

cross	days to heading	plant height (cm)	test weight (kg/m ³)	grain yield (Mg/ha)	stem solidness	protein (%)
Rescue/Newana	184b	97c	735a	4.66a	15c	14.18ab
Fortuna/Newana	183a	93b	748c	5.05b	10b	14.22b
Lew/Newana	185c	89a	745b	5.25c	9a	14.11a

* = Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level.

shortest. Reduction in plant height which might increase resistance to lodging and facilitate harvesting should not be difficult given heritability of 0.96 to 0.99 found in this study.

For mean test weight all the crosses with Newana differed significantly from each other (Table 6). Crosses where Fortuna was used as a solid-stemmed parent were of higher test weight (748.11), followed by cross involving Lew (745.32) as a solid-stemmed parent. Progeny of crosses with Rescue had the lowest test weight (735.05). This trait, a criterion for establishing market grade, is of such economic impact that low test weight cultivars are unacceptable to the trade. Since the heritability of test weight found in this study was high, selection for this trait is possible.

In all the Newana crosses, means for grain yield differed significantly from each other. Smallest grain yield was observed in the cross with Rescue (released 1945); Fortuna (released 1966) crosses yielded more than those with Rescue, while the cross with Lew (released 1976) was the highest yielding of all the three solid-stemmed parents. These results were expected, since Lew is a high yielding solid-stemmed variety, and Rescue is a lower yielding solid-stemmed variety.

In the crosses where Rescue was used as a solid-stemmed parent, progeny were more solid, while progeny of Fortuna crosses were less solid. Progeny derived from Lew were least

solid. Solid stems are desired for the ability to control wheat stem sawfly cutting, and it seems that in improved varieties certain genes conferring stem solidness may have been lost while breeding for improved yield potential. However, stem solidness scores of improved solid-stemmed varieties investigated in this study are consistent with those Wallace et al. (1973) suggested as necessary for the effective control of wheat stem sawfly. The Fortuna/Newana cross differed significantly from Lew/Newana for mean percent protein, while other comparisons were non-significant.

Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different solid-stemmed wheats crossed with a hollow-stemmed wheat, Thatcher, are presented in Table 7. All crosses differed significantly for mean days to heading. Fortuna/Thatcher cross was the earliest. Lew/Thatcher was intermediate, while Rescue/Thatcher was the latest.

All crosses differed significantly for mean plant height. The Rescue/Thatcher cross was the tallest, because of the fact that the parents were the tallest among all studied. This cross indicates a poor combining ability for lodging resistant and higher yields. The difference between Fortuna/Thatcher versus Lew/Thatcher cross means for plant height was not large. Both are improved solid-stemmed wheats and seem suited for plant height and days to heading.

Mean test weight for the Rescue/Thatcher cross differed

Table 7. Comparison of means of F6 progeny derived from various crosses of different wheats released in different eras*.

cross	days to heading	plant height (cm)	test weight (kg/m ³)	grain yield (Mg/ha)	stem solidness	protein (%)
Rescue/Thatcher	186c	108c	737a	4.26a	10b	14.53a
Fortuna/Thatcher	181a	101a	761b	4.69b	11c	14.57a
Lew/Thatcher	184b	102b	762b	4.78b	9a	14.56a

* = Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level.

significantly from other crosses. The Fortuna/Thatcher versus Lew/Thatcher did not differ from each other. The smallest average test weight was observed in the crosses where Rescue was used as a parent. Crosses involving Fortuna as a solid-stemmed parent were of higher test weight, while the crosses with Lew were of the highest test weight among all the solid-stemmed parents used. This indicates that Rescue is of poor grade, Fortuna being better and Lew is of the best grade. Since heritability of this trait was found high in this study, selection for this trait is possible.

The Rescue/Thatcher cross had significantly lower mean grain yield when compared with the other two crosses. The crosses involving Fortuna or Lew as a solid-stemmed parent did not differ significantly from each other. The cross with Lew (released 1976) gave the highest yielding progeny. It seems that genetic yield potential was improved with each new release. In previous crosses where Newana was used as a hollow-stemmed parent (Table 6), the grain yield was higher as compared to crosses where Thatcher was used as a hollow-stemmed parent. Newana was shorter in stature and higher yielding than Thatcher in this study. The crosses involving Newana as a hollow-stemmed parent yielded more than those with Thatcher as a hollow-stemmed parent. Therefore, it may be concluded that Newana will work better than Thatcher while breeding for sawfly resistance, but further studies may be needed on combining abilities.

Mean stem solidness scores of all the crosses differed significantly from each other. Progeny derived from Rescue and Fortuna crosses were more solid than the progeny derived from the Lew crosses. This may indicate that in improved cultivars certain genes conferring stem solidness were lost while breeding for improved yield potentials. Over all it seems that Newana is a better hollow-stemmed parent than Thatcher, since crosses with Newana were more solid than the Thatcher.

Means for internodes involving various crosses from Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 are presented in Table 8. In almost all the crosses the first internode was the most solid, followed by the second internode. The fifth internode was least solid. The first two internodes are desired to be solid because larvae must pass through these to girdle the stem at the base, near ground level.

Comparison between Reciprocal Crosses

The difference between reciprocal crosses is usually attributed to the cytoplasmic difference between the parents. Mean comparison of reciprocal crosses in Experiment 2 derived from F6 progeny of different solid-stemmed wheats with Pondera, a hollow-stemmed wheat, are given in Table 9.

Significant differences were observed between reciprocals of Fortuna/Pondera for heading date, test weight and grain yield, while differences were non-significant for plant height and stem solidness. Significant reciprocal

Table 8. Mean stem solidness score of different internodes of F6 progeny derived from various crosses.

cross	Internode 1	Internode 2	Internode 3	Internode 4	Internode 5
Rescue/Newana*	3.17	3.06	2.85	2.80	2.81
Fortuna/Newana*	2.39	2.03	1.77	1.89	1.91
Lew/Newana*	2.41	2.08	1.78	1.78	1.72
Rescue/Thatcher*	2.50	2.20	2.02	1.73	1.60
Fortuna/Thatcher*	2.55	2.36	2.11	1.91	1.92
Lew/Thatcher*	2.22	1.94	1.57	1.40	1.43
Fortuna/Pondera**	2.61	2.49	2.32	2.40	2.20
Pondera/Fortuna**	2.63	2.50	2.34	2.39	2.20
Lew/Pondera**	2.58	2.34	2.08	2.03	1.89
Pondera/Lew**	2.63	2.57	2.29	2.22	2.09

*,** = Crosses designed for experiment 1 and experiment 2, respectively.

effects were observed in all the traits in the Lew/Pondera cross, except for grain yield. There were enough reciprocal differences that these cannot be dismissed. Cytoplasmic differences or unintentional selection may be causes of these differences.

Heritability Estimates

Heritability estimates for stem solidness, yield and other agronomic traits from F6 progeny derived from ten different crosses in experiments 1 and 2 between solid and hollow-stemmed wheats are presented in Table 10.

Heritability estimates for heading date ranged from 0.92 to 0.98. These estimates were in agreement with those reported by Oettler et al. (1991) indicating a range of 0.95 to 0.98. Since estimates found in this study were also high, therefore, selection for the trait is possible.

Plant height was found to be highly heritable in this study. The estimates ranged from 0.84 to 0.99. Heritabilities of plant height of similar magnitude have been found by others: 0.80 (Britts and Cassalett, 1975 cited by Teich, 1984), 0.55 to 0.97 (Wegrzyn and Pochaba, 1977 cited by Teich, 1984), 0.77 (Teich, 1984), 0.96 (Oettler et al., 1991). Since this trait was found to be highly heritable, selection for reduced height, which might increase resistance to lodging and facilitate harvesting, should not be difficult.

Heritability estimates for test weight ranged from 0.81

Table 9. Comparisons of means between reciprocal crosses.					
cross	days to heading	plant height (cm)	test weight (kg/m ³)	grain yield (Mg/ha)	Stem solidness
Fortuna/Pondera	181*	90	763*	5.57*	12
Pondera/Fortuna	180*	90	769*	5.19*	12
Lew/Pondera	181*	91*	776*	5.99	11*
Pondera/Lew	182*	93*	772*	5.89	12*

* = Reciprocal crosses differed significantly at the 0.05 probability level.

Table 10. Heritability estimates (%) for stem solidness and other agronomic traits of F6 progeny of different solid-stemmed wheats.

cross	days to heading	plant height	test weight	grain yield	stem solidness	percent protein
Rescue/Newana*	98	96	90	76	92	96
Fortuna/Newana*	96	97	86	10	94	92
Lew/Newana*	93	99	88	62	85	76
Rescue/Thatcher*	96	69	81	\$	86	93
Fortuna/Thatcher*	95	84	81	67	96	93
Lew/Thatcher*	95	84	92	29	88	92
Fortuna/Pondera**	98	97	97	78	95	@
Pondera/Fortuna**	97	98	92	83	97	@
Lew/Pondera**	93	98	92	68	95	@
Pondera/Lew**	92	97	91	59	96	@

*,** = Crosses designed for experiment 1 and experiment 2, respectively.

\$ = Variance component for yield was negative, therefore was deleted from the matrix.

@ = Protein percentage was not calculated for these crosses.

to 0.97. This high heritability suggests that selection for better grade solid-stemmed wheat is also possible. A previous study also indicated high heritability values of 0.98 for test weight (Teich, 1984).

Grain yield has been found to be heritable and under polygenic control (Ausemus et al., 1946) with major and minor genes (Kuspira and Unrau, 1957). Heritability estimates for grain yield found in this study ranged from 0.10 to 0.83. Singh et al. (1986) reported heritability estimates in bread wheat ranging from 0.07 to 0.62 for grain yield. Similar results were found by Teich (1984) and McKendry et al. (1988). Where heritability is low, such as for yield, it is difficult to effectively evaluate a potential cultivar by its performance in a single plot. Precision in evaluation increases with replication, test sites and test years. Given the low to high heritability of grain yield found in this study, this appears to be a most prudent means of facilitating selection for grain yield.

Heritability estimates for stem solidness ranged from 0.85 to 0.97. Stem solidness was found to be highly heritable in all ten crosses. Similar results were obtained on a single plant basis for experiments grown in 1990 and 1991 (data not shown). These results were in agreement with those reported by Lebsock and Koch (1968), indicating that stem solidness is highly heritable. Literature reviewed by Wallace and McNeal (1966) indicated that expression of

solidness is strongly influenced by environment. The data presented in this study show that selection for stem solidness could be done and progress could be made at the location where solidness is expressed.

Grain protein in wheat also has been shown to be a heritable trait under polygenic control (Ausemus et al., 1946). However, studies of crosses between certain varieties have suggested that grain protein is controlled by one to a few major genes with many modifiers (Haunold et al., 1962; Lofgren et al., 1968; Cowley and Wells, 1980; Halloran, 1981). Heritability estimates for grain protein percentage ranged from 0.76 to 0.96 in this study. In almost all crosses estimates were greater than 0.91 except one cross with 0.76. McKendry et al. (1988) reported moderately high heritability estimates of 0.50 to 0.76 in crosses between different spring wheats. High heritability estimates found in this study indicate improvement and selection for this trait should be effective.

Phenotypic and Genotypic Correlations

Stem Solidness versus Various Agronomic Traits

Phenotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits studied in two different experiments (Expt. 1 and Expt. 2) with different sets of crosses are given in Tables 11 and 12, respectively. The genotypic correlations between stem solidness and other agronomic traits studied in two different experiments (Expt.

1 and Expt. 2) with different sets of crosses, are listed in Tables 13 and 14, respectively.

Genotypic and phenotypic correlations agreed in sign, but genotypic values were, in general, somewhat greater in magnitude for almost all the characters for the ten crosses. This suggested that the association between stem solidness and various agronomic traits, in general, was genetically inherited. Several workers (Pandey and Gritton, 1975; Dyke and Baker, 1975; Kibite and Evans, 1984) have also reported genetic correlation coefficients that were larger than their respective phenotypic correlations.

Genotypic correlations between stem solidness and heading date were less than .29 in all the six crosses of experiment one. Half of the correlations were negative and half were positive. In the second experiment the genotypic correlation coefficients ranged from $-.001$ to $-.19$. The phenotypic correlations among these traits were non-significant and the magnitude of the genotypic correlation coefficients were very small in all of the ten crosses studied in two different experiments. It may indicate that there is no genetic association between stem solidness and heading date, and that both act independently. McKenzie (1965) also reported that stem solidness is not correlated with heading date. Given high heritability for both the traits, selection for early or late maturing solid-stemmed wheats could be effective.

Table 11. Experiment 1. Phenotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. Number of lines evaluated per cross are shown in parenthesis.

cross	days to heading	plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
Rescue/Newana (21)	.28	-.61**	-.29	.11	-.58**
Fortuna/ Newana (24)	.12	-.30	-.08	.21	-.22
Lew/Newana (24)	.16	-.17	-.21	.13	.14
Rescue/Thatcher (22)	-.16	-.17	.23	.36	-.19
Fortuna/Thatcher (24)	-.02	-.16	-.20	.14	-.16
Lew/Thatcher (24)	-.04	.10	-.08	-.18	-.15

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

Table 12. Experiment 2. Phenotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. Number of lines evaluated per cross are shown in parenthesis.

cross	days to heading	plant height	test weight	grain yield
Fortuna/Pondera (43)	-.10	-.04	.09	.21
Pondera/Fortuna (43)	.14	-.06	.02	.27
Lew/Pondera (43)	-.001	-.14	-.19	.18
Pondera/Lew (37)	-.17	-.08	-.11	-.09

Table 13. Experiment 1. Genotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. Number of lines evaluated per cross are shown in parenthesis.

cross	days to heading	plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
Rescue/Newana (21)	.28	-.65	-.34	.15	-.60
Fortuna/Newana (24)	.13	-.33	-.09	.52	-.24
Lew/Newana (24)	.21	-.17	-.24	.23	.13
Rescue/Thatcher (22)	-.20	-.34	.23	@	-.22
Fortuna/Thatcher (24)	-.02	-.19	-.22	.18	-.16
Lew/Thatcher (24)	-.04	.05	-.08	-.36	-.23

@ = Variance component for yield was negative, therefore was deleted from the matrix.

Table 14. Experiment 2. Genotypic correlations between stem solidness and various agronomic traits in F6 progeny from solid-stemmed wheats released in different eras. Number of lines evaluated per cross are shown in parenthesis.

cross	days to heading	plant height	test weight	grain yield
Fortuna/Pondera (43)	-.11	-.05	.09	.22
Pondera/Fortuna (43)	.14	-.06	.04	.31
Lew/Pondera (43)	.001	-.14	-.20	.27
Pondera/Lew (37)	-.19	-.08	-.11	-.08

The genotypic correlation coefficients between stem solidness and plant height ranged from .05 to $-.65$ in experiment one. In all the crosses except Lew/Thatcher the correlation coefficients were negative. Rescue/Newana had the highest negative correlation ($-.65$) followed by Fortuna/Newana ($-.33$). The cross with Lew was the smallest of all ($-.17$). Highly significant negative phenotypic correlation was observed in the cross where Rescue, an older solid-stemmed wheat, was used as a solid-stemmed parent. Conversely, this correlation was non-significant in the crosses with newer releases, Fortuna or Lew. Since the correlation was lower for newer versus older solid-stemmed wheats, it may be concluded that a linkage existed between the genes conferring solid stems and genes controlling plant height. This linkage was broken due to recombination of genes during the breeding efforts for shorter stature over the years. Lebsack and Koch (1968) reported significant negative association between stem solidness and plant height in certain generations, while it was non-significant in others. McKenzie (1965) also reported negative correlations between stem solidness and plant height in two different crosses. In the second experiment where newer releases were used, genotypic correlation coefficients were all low. The phenotypic correlations in experiment two were all non-significant. This also indicates that in newer releases no significant negative association exists between the traits.

Heritabilities of these traits were high enough to ensure a solid-stemmed wheat with reduced height.

The genotypic correlation coefficients between stem solidness and test weight were all less than $-.35$ in the crosses studied in experiment one. All of the crosses showed negative values except one. The phenotypic correlations were all non-significant in all of ten crosses studied in two different experiments. Most genotypic correlations were negative, and were of small magnitude. This indicates that the traits may be independent from each other. However, heritability of both the traits found in this and various other studies is high, therefore, it would be possible to select for solid-stemmed wheat with a good market grade.

The correlations between stem solidness and grain yield were of most importance in this study. The genotypic correlation coefficients between the traits ranged from $-.09$ to $.52$ in the ten crosses studied in two different experiments. Most of the correlations were positive, except Lew/Thatcher and Pondera/Lew were negative. Variance components for grain yield in Rescue/Thatcher cross were negative, therefore, the genotypic correlation coefficients were not calculated for this trait. In all ten crosses studied in two different experiments, the phenotypic correlation coefficients were all non-significant. The genotypic correlation coefficients were small and did not tend to be negative. This shows that the traits are

independent and that there is no negative genetic correlation between stem solidness and grain yield. Lebsock and Koch (1968) also indicated no relationship between stem solidness and yield. They also reported that black chaff and stem rust caused bias in the estimation of the relationship between stem solidness and yield. Some reports have shown yield to be negatively correlated with stem solidness (McNeal et al., 1965).

The second most important correlations in this study were stem solidness versus percent protein. These were studied only for experiment one. The genotypic correlations ranged from .14 to -.60. The genotypic correlation coefficient in Rescue/Newana cross was the highest (-.60) followed by Fortuna/Newana (-.24). The Lew/Newana cross was the smallest of all (.14), and positive. In the second set of crosses involving Thatcher as a hollow stem parent, a similar trend was observed. The cross involving Rescue (released 1945) as a solid-stemmed parent had a more negative genotypic correlation and the phenotypic correlation between stem solidness and protein for this cross was also highly negative. Conversely, the crosses with newer releases, Fortuna or Lew, had smaller genotypic correlation values and the phenotypic correlations for these crosses were non-significant. A possible explanation is that there was a linkage between the genes for solid stems and genes conferring low percent protein. Breeding efforts over

the years may have served to break up this deleterious linkage.

Correlations Among Traits

Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various traits in ten crosses were also studied (Appendices 17 through 26).

Days to heading was correlated positively with plant height to the extent of .75 in Rescue/Thatcher and .38 in Fortuna/Pondera crosses; whereas, this correlation was non-significant in all other crosses studied. In the above two crosses, it seems that later types were taller, while no association existed between the traits in other crosses studied. Hayes et al. (1927) also reported positive correlation between heading date and plant height in various trials of spring and winter wheats, whereas, Bridgford and Hayes (1931) found date of heading to be negatively associated with plant height to the extent of $-.61$ in hard red spring wheat.

The correlation coefficients between days to heading and grain yield were non-significant in almost all crosses except a highly significant negative correlation was observed in the Fortuna/Pondera cross. This indicates that mostly these traits are independent, except that in one cross earlier types yielded more than those in the latter ones. Bridgford and Hayes (1931) studied correlation of factors affecting grain yield in hard red spring wheat and

reported a positive correlation between grain yield and heading date. Similar results were reported by Yunus and Paroda (1982).

Test weight was strongly negatively correlated with days to heading in most of the crosses studied. This indicates that earlier types were of better grade. Altman and Busch (1984) also reported highly significant negative correlation between these traits in most of the populations studied in spring wheat.

A strong positive association between plant height and test weight was observed in the Lew/Newana, Lew/Thatcher, Lew/Pondera and Pondera/Fortuna crosses. However, this correlation was negative (-0.73), in the Rescue/Thatcher cross. Similar results were reported by Altman and Busch (1984). It seems that most of the time taller types were of better grade. This reduces the probabilities of obtaining short, good grade lines from crosses such as those observed in this study. Significant positive association of plant height with percent protein in Rescue/Newana and Fortuna/Newana have also reduced the probabilities of obtaining short lines with high percent protein from these crosses.

Grain yield was strongly negatively correlated with percent protein in the Rescue/Newana cross, whereas, this correlation was non-significant in the remaining crosses studied. This may indicate that selection for high yielding

and good protein wheat would be difficult in this particular cross. Yield and protein are documented as negatively associated traits (Terman et al. 1969; McNeal et al. 1972; Loffler and Busch, 1982; Cox et al. 1985).

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

Parents and their progenies differed significantly ($P < 0.01$) for stem solidness for all the crosses in 1990 and 1991. Significant additive effects were detected in crosses where Rescue (released 1945) was used as a solid-stemmed parent, while significant additive, dominant and epistatic effects were found in the crosses involving Lew (released 1976) as a solid-stemmed parent. This may indicate that the genetic basis of stem solidness is different between the early releases (Rescue) and the later release (Lew).

All the parents differed significantly from each other for mean days to heading. Fortuna was the earliest followed by Lew. Rescue was the latest among all. Crosses with Fortuna were earliest followed by crosses with Lew, while crosses with Rescue were the latest. Rescue was significantly taller than other solid-stemmed parents. Progeny derived from crosses with Rescue were also taller, while progeny of crosses with Fortuna or Lew were shorter. Fortuna and Lew had significantly higher test weight than Rescue. In the crosses where Fortuna or Lew were used as solid-stemmed parents, progeny had higher test weight, while progeny from Rescue crosses had lower test weight.

Solid-stemmed parents did not differ from each other for mean grain yield. However, on average newer solid-

stemmed wheats (Fortuna and Lew) had higher yields than older solid-stemmed wheat (Rescue). Smallest grain yield was observed in the crosses with Rescue (released 1945); Fortuna (released 1966) crosses yielded more than those with Rescue, while crosses with Lew (released 1976) were the highest yielding of all. On average Rescue had higher percent protein than Fortuna or Lew. However, average percent protein was higher in the progeny derived from crosses with Fortuna or Lew than the progeny of Rescue crosses.

Rescue was the most solid parent followed by Fortuna and Lew. The hollow-stemmed parents had the lowest score for stem solidness. In the crosses where Rescue was used as a solid-stemmed parent, progeny was more solid. Progeny derived from Fortuna crosses was less solid, while progeny of Lew crosses was least solid. Solid stems are desired for the ability to control wheat stem sawfly cutting and it seems that in improved varieties certain genes conferring stem solidness have been lost while breeding for improved yield potential. However, stem solidness scores of improved solid-stemmed wheats investigated in this study are consistent with those Wallace et al. (1973) suggested as necessary for effective control of wheat stem sawfly. In almost all crosses the first internode was the most solid, followed by the second internode. The fifth internode was the least solid. The first two internodes are desired to be solid because larvae must pass through these to girdle the

stem at the base, near ground level.

Significant reciprocal differences were observed for most of the traits studied. Cytoplasmic differences or unintentional selection may be causes of these differences.

All traits studied were found to be highly heritable, except grain yield. This indicates that selection for all the traits should be effective, except that in selecting for grain yield one should be extra careful.

A highly significant negative correlation between stem solidness and protein and plant height was observed in the crosses where Rescue, an older solid-stemmed wheat, was used as a solid-stemmed parent. Conversely this correlation was non-significant in the crosses with newer releases, Fortuna or Lew. Therefore, it may be concluded that a linkage existed between the genes conferring stem solidness and genes controlling plant height and low percent protein.

The correlation between stem solidness and yield was of most importance in this study. In all the ten crosses studied in two different experiments, the phenotypic correlations were all non-significant. The genotypic correlation coefficients were small and did not tend to be negative. This shows that the traits are independent and that there is no negative genetic correlation between stem solidness and grain yield. The fact that progeny from crosses with Rescue were lower yielding suggests that the poor yield of solid-stemmed wheats may be due to poor

genetic background, rather than pleiotropy or deleterious linkages.

In Rescue/Thatcher and Fortuna/Pondera, days to heading were positively related with plant height, whereas, days to heading were negatively related with grain yield in Fortuna/Pondera cross. This indicates that most of the time these traits were independent, except in these few crosses later types were tallest and earlier types yielded more. Days to heading was mostly negatively related to test weight indicating that earlier types were better grade. In certain crosses plant height was found positively related with test weight, while it was negatively associated with percent protein. It reduces the possibilities of obtaining short lines with good grade and high percent protein. Grain yield was mostly independent from percent protein, except in Rescue/Newana a negative relationship was observed. This indicates that selection for high yield and higher percent protein in this particular cross will be difficult.

LITERATURE CITED

Agricultural Research Services Staff. 1955. The wheat stem sawfly. USDA-ARS Situation Report 22-13. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.

Ainslie, C.N. 1920. The western grass-stem sawfly. USDA Bull. 841. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.

_____. 1929. The western grass-stem sawfly: a pest of small grains. USDA Tech. Bull. 157. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.

Altman, D.W., and R.H. Busch. 1984. Random intermating before selection in spring wheat. Crop Sci. 24:1085-1089.

Ausemus, E.R., J.B. Harrington, L.P. Reitz, and W.W. Worzella. 1946. A summary of genetic studies in hexaploid and tetraploid wheats. J. Am. Soc. Agron. 38:1082-1099.

Austin, R.B., J.A. Edrich, M.A. Ford, and R.D. Blackwell. 1977. The fate of the dry matter, carbohydrates and ^{14}C lost from the leaves and stems of wheat during grain filling. Ann. Bot. 41:1309-1321.

Beirne, B.P. 1972. The biological control attempt against the European wheat stem sawfly, Cephus pygmaeus (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in Ontario. Can. Entomol. 104:987-990.

Biffen, R.H. 1905. Mendel's laws of inheritance and wheat breeding. J. Agr. Sci. (England) 1:4-48.

Bowman, H.E., S.D. Cash, C.F. McGuire, L.E. Talbert, D.W. Wichman, J.W. Bergman, G.R. Carlson, L.E. Welts, G.D. Kushnak, and G.F. Stallknecht. 1992. Spring wheat varieties: Performance evaluation and recommendations. Montana State Ext. Ser., Bozeman, Montana.

Bridgford, R.O., and H.K. Hayes. 1931. Correlation of factors affecting yield in hard red spring wheat. Agron. J. 23:106-117.

Butcher, F.G. 1946. The wheat stem sawfly. North Dakota Agric. Coll. Ext. Service Circ. A-94. Fargo, ND.

Callenbach, J.A. and M.P. Hansmeier. 1945. Wheat stem sawfly control. MT Ext. Service in Agric. and Home Econ. Circ. 164.

Cowley, C.R., and D.G. Wells. 1980. Inheritance of seed protein in crosses involving 'Hard': A hard red winter wheat. Crop Sci. 20:55-58.

Cox, M.C., C.O. Qualset, and D.W. Rains. 1985. Genetic variation for nitrogen assimilation and translocation in wheat. I. Dry matter and nitrogen accumulation. Crop Sci. 25:430-435.

Criddle, N. 1917. Further observations upon the habits of the western wheat stem sawfly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Agric. Gazette of Can. 4:176-177.

_____. 1922. The western wheat stem sawfly and its control. Dominion of Canada Department of Agriculture pamphlet 6. F.A. Ackland. Ottawa, Canada.

Davis, E.G. 1952. Status of the wheat stem sawfly in the northern Great Plains in 1951. USDA Spec. Rept. No. 1. 4p.

_____. 1955. Status of the wheat stem sawfly in the United States in 1954. North Dakota Agric. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull. 17(5):171-175.

Davis, E.G., C. Benton, and H.W. Somsen. 1955. Natural enemies of the wheat stem sawfly in North Dakota and Montana. North Dakota Agric. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull. 18(2):63-65.

Dyke, P.L., and R.J. Baker. 1975. Variation and covariation of agronomic and quality traits in two spring wheat populations. Crop Sci. 15:161-165.

Eckroth, E.G. and F.H. McNeal. 1953. Association of plant characters in spring wheat with resistance to the wheat stem sawfly. Agron. J. 45(9):400-404.

Engledow, F.L. and J.B. Hutchinson. 1925. Inheritance in wheat. II. T. turgidum x T. durum crosses, with notes on the inheritance of solidness of straw. J. of Genet. 16:19-32.

Farstad, C.W. 1938. Thelytokous parthenogenesis in Cephus cinctus Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 70:206-207.

_____. 1940. The development of western wheat stem sawfly (Cephus cinctus Norton) in various host plants as an index of resistance. Ph.D. diss. Iowa State Coll., Ames.

_____. 1944. Wheat stem sawfly in flax. Sci. Agric. 24(8):383-386.

Farstad, C.W. and L.A. Jacobson. 1945. Manual for sawfly control workers in Alberta. Mimeo Contribution 16, Lethbridge.

Farstad, C.W., K.M. King, R. Glen, and L.A. Jacobson. 1945. Control of wheat stem sawfly in the prairie provinces. War-Time Production Series Spec. Pamph. 59 Agric. Supplies Board, Ottawa, Canada.

Farstad, C.W., and A.W. Platt. 1946. The reaction of barley varieties to wheat stem sawfly attack. Sci. Agric. 26(5):216-224.

Gall, A., and J.R. Dogger. 1967. Effect of 2,4-D on the wheat stem sawfly. J. Econ. Entomol. 60:75-77.

Halloran, G.M. 1981. Grain yield and protein relationships in a wheat cross. Crop Sci. 21:699-701.

Hanson, W.D. 1959. The breakup of initial linkage blocks under selected mating systems. Genetics 44:857-868.

Haunold, A., V.A. Johnson, and J.W. Schmidt. 1962. Genetic measurements of protein in the grain of Triticum aestivum L. Agron. J. 54:203-306.

Hayes, H.K., O.S. Aamodt, and F.J. Stevenson. 1927. Correlation between yielding ability, reaction to certain diseases, and other characters of spring and winter wheats in rod-row trials. Jour. Amer. Soc. Agron. 19:896-910.

Holmes, N.D. 1953. Notes on Scambus detritus (Holmg.) (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae), a new parasite of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. Can. Entomol. 85(9):1p.

_____. 1954. Food relations of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 86:159-167.

_____. 1975. Effects of moisture, gravity, and light on the behavior of larvae of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 107:391-401.

_____. 1977. The effect of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), on the yield and quality of wheat. Can. Entomol. 109:1591-1598.

_____. 1982. Population dynamics of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in wheat. Can. Entomol. 114:775-778.

_____. 1984. The effect of light on the resistance of hard red spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 116:677-684.

Holmes, N.D., and C.W. Farstad. 1956. Effects of field exposure on immature stages of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Agr. Sci. 36:196-202.

Holmes, N.D., and H. Hurtig. 1952. Screening tests of ten contact insecticides on wheat stem sawfly. Can. Dept. Agr. Sci. Serv., Div. Ent. Res. Notes Ser., 4pp.

Holmes, N.D., R.I. Larson, L.K. Peterson, and M.D. MacDonald. 1960. Influence of periodic shading on the length and solidness of the internodes of Rescue wheat. Can. J. Plant Sci. 40:183-187.

Holmes, N.D., W.A. Nelson, L.K. Peterson, and C.W. Farstad. 1963. Causes of variation in effectiveness of Bracon cephi (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) as a parasite of the wheat stem sawfly. Can. Entomol. 95(2):113-126.

Holmes, N.D., and L.K. Peterson. 1957. Effect of continuous rearing in Rescue wheat on the survival of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 89:363-364.

Holmes, N.D., and L.K. Peterson. 1958. Oviposition and survival of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in various hosts. Internatl. Cong. Ent., Montreal, Proc. 4:459.

Holmes, N.D., and L.K. Peterson. 1960. The influence of the host on oviposition by the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Plant Sci. 40:29-46.

Holmes, N.D., and L.K. Peterson. 1963. Effect of variety and date of seeding spring wheats and location in the field on sex ratio of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Zoo. 41:1217-1222.

Holmes, N.D., and L.K. Peterson. 1965. Swathing wheat and survival of wheat stem sawfly. Can. J. Plant Sci. 45:579-581.

Jacobson, L.A., and C.W. Farstad. 1952. Effect of time of seeding Apex wheat on infestation and sex ratio of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 84:90-92.

Kasting, R., and A.J. McGinnis. 1963. Resistance of plants to insects: The role of insect nutrition. Agri. Institute Rev. Sept-Oct.

- Kemp, H.J. 1934. Studies of solid stem wheat varieties in relation to wheat stem sawfly control. *Sci. Agric.* 15:30-38.
- Kibite, S., and L.E. Evans. 1984. Causes of negative correlations between grain yield and grain protein concentration in common wheat. *Euphytica* 33:801-810.
- Kuspira, J., and J. Unrau. 1957. Genetic analysis of certain characters in common wheat using whole chromosome substitution lines. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 37:300-326.
- Larson, R.I. 1959. Cytogenetics of solid stem in common wheat. I. monosomic F2 analysis of the variety S-615. *Can. J. Bot.* 37:135-156.
- Larson, R.I., and M.D. MacDonald. 1959. Cytogenetics of solid stem in common wheat. II. Stem solidness of monosomic lines of the variety S-615. *Can. J. Bot.* 37:365-378.
- Larson, R.I., and M.D. MacDonald. 1962. Cytogenetics of solid stem in common wheat. IV. Aneuploid lines of the variety Rescue. *Can. J. Genet. Cytol.* 4:97-104.
- Lebsock, K.L., and E.J. Koch. 1968. Variation of stem solidness in wheat. *Crop Sci.* 8:225-229.
- Lebsock, K.L., W.B. Noble, and L.D. Sibbitt. 1967. Registration of Fortuna wheat (Reg. No. 461). *Crop Sci.* 7:170.
- Loffler, C.M., and R.H. Busch. 1982. Selection for grain protein, grain yield, and nitrogen partitioning efficiency in hard red spring wheat. *Crop Sci.* 22:591-595.
- Lofgren, J.R., K.F. Finney, E.G. Heyne, L.C. Bolte, R.C. Hosney, and M.D. Shogren. 1968. Heritability estimates of protein content and certain quality and agronomic properties in bread wheats (*Triticum aestivum*, L.). *Crop Sci.* 8:563-567.
- Luginbill, P., Jr. 1969. Developing resistant plants-the ideal method of controlling insects. USDA-ARS Prod. Research Rep. III. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.
- Luginbill, P., Jr. and E.F. Knipling 1969. Suppression of wheat stem sawfly with resistant wheat. USDA production Research Rep. 107. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.
- Luginbill, P., Jr., and F.H. McNeal. 1954a. Effect of fertilizers on the resistance of certain winter and spring wheat varieties to the wheat stem sawfly. *Agron. J.* 46(12):570-573.

Luginbill, P., Jr., and F.H. McNeal. 1954b. Progress in wheat stem sawfly control. Montana State Coll. Farmer. 7(2). Feb. 1954.

Luginbill, P., Jr., and F.H. McNeal. 1955. What's being done about the wheat stem sawfly. Mont. Farmer Stockman, April 1. p. 1.

Luginbill, P., Jr., and F.H. McNeal. 1958. Influence of seeding density and row spacing on the resistance of spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly. J. Econ. Entomol. 51:804-808.

Mackay, M.R. 1955. Cytology and parthenogenesis of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Zoo. 33:161-174.

Mather, K., and J.L. Jinks. 1977. Introduction to biometrical genetics. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

McKendry, A.L., P.B.E. McVetty, and L.E. Evans. 1988. Inheritance of grain protein concentration, grain yield, and related traits in spring wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Genome 30:857-864.

McKenzie, H. 1965. Inheritance of sawfly reaction and stem solidness in spring wheat crosses: stem solidness. Can. J. Plant Sci. 45:591-600.

McNeal, F.H. 1956. Inheritance of stem solidness and spikelet number in a Thatcher x Rescue wheat cross. USDA Tech. Bull. 1125. U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.

McNeal, F.H., and M.A. Berg. 1977a. Registration of Lew wheat (Reg. No. 582). Crop Sci. 17:674.

McNeal, F.H., and M.A. Berg. 1977b. Registration of Newana wheat (Reg. No. 583). Crop Sci. 17:674.

McNeal, F.H., and M.A. Berg. 1979. Stem solidness and its relationship to grain yield in 17 spring wheat crosses. Euphytica 28:89-91.

McNeal, F.H., M.A. Berg, and P. Luginbill. 1955. Wheat stem sawfly damage in four spring wheat varieties as influenced by date of seeding. Agron. J. 47(11):522-525.

McNeal, F.H., M.A. Berg, C.F. McGuire, V.R. Stewart, and D.E. Baldrige. 1972. Grain and plant nitrogen relationships in eight spring wheat crosses, Triticum aestivum L. Crop Sci. 12:599-602.

McNeal, F.H., K.L. Lebsock, P. Luginbill, and W.B. Noble. 1957. Segregation for stem solidness in crosses of Rescue and four Portuguese wheats. *Agron. J.* 49:246-248.

McNeal, F.H., L.E. Wallace, M.A. Berg, and C.F. McGuire. 1971. Wheat stem sawfly resistance with agronomic and quality information in hybrid wheats. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 64:939-941.

McNeal, F.H., C.A. Watson, M.A. Berg, and L.E. Wallace. 1965. Relationship of stem solidness to yield and lignin content in wheat selections. *Agron. J.* 57:20-21.

Meredith, W.R., Jr., and R.R. Bridge. 1971. Breakup of linkage blocks in Gossypium hirsutum L. *Crop Sci.* 11:695-698.

Miller, P.A., and J.O. Rawlings. 1967. Breakup of initial linkage blocks through intermating in a cotton population. *Crop Sci.* 7:199-204.

Mills, H.B. 1945. The wheat stem sawfly in Montana. *Montana Agric. Exp. Stn. War Circ.* 6.

Montana Agricultural Experiment Station and Montana Extension Service Staffs. 1946. The wheat stem sawfly in Montana. *Montana Agric. Exp. Stn. and Montana Ext. Service.*

Morrill, W.L., J.W. Gabor, and G.D. Kushnak. 1992. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae): damage and detection. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 85:2413-2417.

Munro, J.A. 1945. Wheat stem sawfly and harvest loss. *North Dakota Agric. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull.* 7(4):12-16.

Munro, J.A., W. Nostdahl, and R.L. Post. 1949. Wheat stem sawfly. *North Dakota Agric. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull.* 11:85-91.

Oettler, G., F. Wehmann, and H.F. Utz. 1991. Influence of wheat and rye parents on agronomic characters in primary hexaploid and octaploid triticale. *Theor. Appl. Genet.* 81:401-405.

Pandey, S., and E.T. Gritton. 1975. Genotypic and phenotypic variances and correlations in peas. *Crop Sci.* 15:353-356.

Platt, A.W. 1941. The influence of some environmental factors on the expression of the solid stem character in certain wheat varieties. *Sci. Agric.* 22:139-151.

Platt, A.W., J.G. Darroch, and H.J. Kemp. 1941. The inheritance of solid stem and certain other characters in crosses between varieties of Triticum vulgare. Sci. Agric. 22(4):216-223.

Platt, A.W., and C.W. Farstad. 1946. The reaction of wheat varieties to wheat stem sawfly attack. Sci. Agric. 26(6):231-247.

Platt, A.W., C.W. Farstad, and J.A. Callenbach. 1948. The reaction of Rescue wheat to sawfly damage. Sci. Agric. 28(4):154-161.

Putnam, L.G. 1942. A study of the inheritance of solid stem in some tetraploid wheats. Sci. Agric. 22:594-607.

Redden, R.J., and N.F. Jensen. 1974. Mass selection and mating systems in cereals. Crop Sci. 14:345-350.

Roberts, D.W.A. 1954. Sawfly resistance in wheat. I. Types of resistance. Can. J. Agric. Sci. 34:582-597.

Roemhild, G.R. 1954. Morphological resistance of some of the Gramineae to the wheat stem sawfly (Cephus cinctus Norton). Ph.D. diss. Montana State Coll., Bozeman.

Rowe, K.E., and W.L. Alexander. 1980. Computations for estimating the genetic parameters in joint-scaling tests. Crop Sci. 20:109-110.

Seamans, H.L. 1926. The value of trap crops in the control of the wheat stem sawfly in Alberta. Ontario Entomol. Soc. Ann. Rpt. 59:59-64.

_____. 1945. A preliminary report on the climatology of the wheat stem sawfly (Cephus cinctus Nort.) on the Canadian prairies. Sci. Agric. 25:432-457.

Seamans, H.L., G.F. Manson, and C.W. Farstad. 1938. The effect of the wheat stem sawfly (Cephus cinctus Norton) on the heads and grain of infested stems. 75th Ann. Rep. Ent. Soc. Ontario, Contribution 2355 Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.

Singh, G., G.S. Bhullar, and K.S. Gill. 1986. Genetic control of grain yield and its related traits in bread wheat. Theor. Appl. Genet. 72:536-540.

Steel, R.G.D., and J.H. Torrie. 1960. Principles and procedures of statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

Stoa, T.E. 1947. Rescue wheat. North Dakota Agric. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull. 10(2):43-45.

Teich, A.H. 1984. Heritability of grain yield, plant height and test weight of a population of winter wheat adapted to southwestern Ontario. Theor. Appl. Genet. 68:21-23.

Terman, G.L., R.E. Ramig, A.F. Dreier, and R.A. Olson. 1969. Yield-protein relationships in wheat grain, as affected by nitrogen and water. Agron. J. 61:755-759.

Wall, A. 1952. The diameter of the wheat stem in relation to the length and sex of emerging sawfly (Cephus cinctus Nort.). Sci. Agric. 32:272-277.

Wallace, L.E. 1962. Field-plot tests of chemicals for wheat stem sawfly control. J. Econ. Entomol. 55:908-912.

Wallace, L.E., and F.H. McNeal. 1966. Stem sawflies of economic importance in grain crops in the United States. USDA Tech. Bull. 1350, U.S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington, DC.

Wallace, L.E., F.H. McNeal, and M.A. Berg. 1973. Minimum stem solidness required in wheat for resistance to the wheat stem sawfly. J. Econ. Entomol. 66(5):1121-1123.

Wallace, L.E., F.H. McNeal, M.A. Berg, and P. Luginbill Jr. 1969. Resistance of varieties of Portuguese wheat, Triticum aestivum L. em. Thell., to the wheat stem sawfly. USDA-ARS 33-132.

Weiss, M.J., and W.L. Morrill. 1992. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) revisited. American Entomol. 38(4):241-245.

Weiss, M.J., W.L. Morrill, and L.L. Reitz. 1987. Influence of planting date and spring tillage on the wheat stem sawfly. Montana AgResearch 4(1):2-5.

Yunus, M., and R.S. Paroda. 1982. Impact of biparental mating on correlation coefficients in bread wheat. Theor. Appl. Genet. 62:337-343.

APPENDIX

Table 15. Analysis of variance of generation means for stem solidness in 1990.

Source	Rescue/Newana		Lew/Newana		Rescue/Thatcher		Lew/Thatcher	
	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.
generations	4	156.37**	4	83.36**	4	136.58**	4	101.99**
error	19	2.24	19	1.62	19	2.21	19	1.85

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

Table 16. Analysis of variance of generation means for stem solidness in 1991.

Source	Rescue/Newana		Lew/Newana		Rescue/Thatcher		Lew/Thatcher	
	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.	d.f.	m.s.
generations	5	76.30**	4	68.03**	6	62.07**	5	61.24**
error	31	3.09	27	5.20	36	4.93	43	4.87

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

Table 17. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Rescue/Newana cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	-.09	-.73**	-.15	-.23
	rg	-.09	-.78	-.15	-.22
plant height	rp		.42	-.12	.55*
	rg		.46	-.11	.57
test weight	rp			.02	.26
	rg			-.04	.32
grain yield	rp				-.53*
	rg				-.63

*,** = Significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability level, respectively.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 18. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Newana cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	.02	-.73**	.22	-.22
	rg	.02	-.80	.96	-.24
plant height	rp		.30	-.15	.64**
	rg		.31	-.52	.70
test weight	rp			.09	.32
	rg			-.26	.39
grain yield	rp				-.21
	rg				-.33

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 19. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Newana cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	-.20	-.61**	.36	-.002
	rg	-.21	-.66	.40	.05
plant height	rp		.56**	.12	.25
	rg		.59	.12	.31
test weight	rp			.21	-.15
	rg			.20	-.10
grain yield	rp				-.19
	rg				-.09

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 20. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Rescue/Thatcher cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	.75**	-.76**	-.13	.07
	rg	.86	-.90	@	.09
plant height	rp		-.73**	-.24	-.15
	rg		-1.05	@	-.12
test weight	rp			.41	.10
	rg			@	.15
grain yield	rp				.02
	rg				@

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

@ = Variance component for yield was negative, therefore was deleted from the matrix.

Table 21. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Thatcher cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	.29	-.10	.10	-.38
	rg	.32	-.11	.12	-.40
plant height	rp		-.12	-.23	-.18
	rg		-.24	-.33	-.16
test weight	rp			.34	-.33
	rg			.42	-.37
grain yield	rp				-.29
	rg				-.40

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 22. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Thatcher cross.

Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield	percent protein
days to heading	rp	-.32	-.72**	.07	-.13
	rg	-.36	-.75	.18	-.14
plant height	rp		.54**	-.06	.21
	rg		.61	-.29	.19
test weight	rp			-.14	.14
	rg			-.18	.19
grain yield	rp				.21
	rg				.39

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 23. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Fortuna/Pondera cross.				
Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield
days to heading	rp	.38*	-.74**	-.39**
	rg	.39	-.76	-.45
plant height	rp		-.03	-.13
	rg		-.03	-.16
test weight	rp			.51**
	rg			.58

*,** = Significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 24. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Pondera/Fortuna cross.				
Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield
days to heading	rp	.01	-.46**	-.01
	rg	.01	-.46	-.002
plant height	rp		.60**	.25
	rg		.63	.25
test weight	rp			.46**
	rg			.48

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 25. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Lew/Pondera cross.				
Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield
days to heading	rp	.18	-.19	.19
	rg	.19	-.18	.26
plant height	rp		.59**	.02
	rg		.61	-.01
test weight	rp			.15
	rg			.10

** = Significant at the 0.01 probability level.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

Table 26. Phenotypic and genotypic correlations between various agronomic traits of F6 progeny derived from Pondera/Lew cross.				
Traits		plant height	test weight	grain yield
days to heading	rp	.10	-.55**	-.13
	rg	.10	-.56	-.18
plant height	rp		.27	-.05
	rg		.30	-.03
test weight	rp			.41*
	rg			.44

*,** = Significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively.

rp,rg = Phenotypic and genotypic correlations, respectively.

