

**August 20, 2013**

# **Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2013**

**Mark Koenig, Extension Educator  
Ohio State University Extension, Sandusky Co.**

**Matt Hofelich, Station Manager  
OARDC/OSU North Central Agricultural Research  
Station**

## Acknowledgements:

Special thanks and appreciation to the following for their support and assistance with this project:

- **Ohio Vegetable and Small Fruit Research and Development Program** for their financial support
- **Frank Thayer and Robert Shaw, at the OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station** for their assistance with this project.
- **Sara Miller and Lindsay Overmyer, Summer Assistants at OARDC** for all their help analyzing the sweet corn varieties for this project.
- To the following seed companies for their gracious donations of seed and support:

**Seminis**  
**Syngenta**  
**Stokes**  
**Harris Moran**  
**Crookham**  
**IFSI**  
**Monsanto**  
**Abbott-Cobb**

- **To the many volunteer taste testers and their families** for sampling the varieties and rating their observations.

## Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation - 2013

Sweet corn is one of the most commonly grown fresh market crops in Northwest Ohio. Having two general genotypes and a wide array of different varieties within each genotype, it becomes difficult to choose what varieties to plant. To add to this confusion there is also the combination of the two genotypes referred to by triple sweets *syn*. The objectives of the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation were (1) to test and evaluate *sh<sub>2</sub>*, *se* and *syn* sweet corn varieties under northern Ohio growing conditions for plant, ear characteristics and yield, and (2) to provide taste test results from the general public for several varieties. Each variety was judged using plot numbers and only at the end of the evaluation was variety names substituted for plot numbers.

Plant evaluations were performed at regular intervals during the growing season and at harvest. An extremely wet and windy season did affect several varieties and forced us to abandon one full rep in the *se* trial due to water damage. Weather also limited our spray program and insects and worms were present in most varieties.

Twenty *se* and or *syn* varieties and twenty-seven varieties of *sh<sub>2</sub>* were evaluated (Tables 1, 2). Plots were established in a randomized complete block design with 4 replications per entry. Each rep was planted in 4 rows, harvesting only the middle two rows. Data collected on each entry included the following:

- Seedling vigor early & stand ability
- Suckering
- Tassel, silk and harvest dates
- Snap rating (ease of ear removal from stalk)
- Ear height
- Final stand per 20 ft/row (2 ten ft/row harvest data rows)
- Marketable dozen per acre
- Flag appearance
- Husk cover
- Tip fill
- Rows of kernels/ear
- kernel depth
- Ear color, length and diameter
- Brix value at harvest, 5 days storage (Table 7, 12)

All values reported are based on the average of all useable replications.

Plots were established on May 14 for *sh<sub>2</sub>* varieties and *se* varieties in rows spaced 30" apart and at a seeding rate of 3 seeds per foot of row. Seedling vigor (emergence), stand ability, and tassel, silk and harvest date (Tables 3, 8).

At harvest, ease of harvesting ear (snap rating), ear height, stand per 10 ft./row for 2

row, marketable dozens per acre (Tables 4, 9). At harvest, 5 ears per rep were evaluated for flags, husk cover, tip fill, number of kernel rows/ear, ear color, length and diameter (Tables 5, 10).

As part of this continuing project, several different varieties were distributed to a group of volunteer individuals for the purpose of rating varieties on appearance and taste. Individuals were given two different varieties and asked to judge each variety in two general areas. The first area was Appearance, defined as (1) husk color (2) size of ear and (3) kernel color. The second area was Taste, which included (1) tenderness (2) sweetness and (3) flavor. The evaluation form also asked about overall comments about each variety. Participants were encouraged to let each family member judge the corn individually. Varieties were only identified to participants as numbers. This year we also added a traceability code to each variety.

The goal of the consumer taste results was to get the public's opinion on some of the sweet corn varieties tested in our trial this year. Sweet corn varieties chosen for public opinion were selected by harvest ratings done at the OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station. These ratings included appearance of rowing how straight the rows of kernels were on the ears, tenderness and sweetness (raw taste test) (Tables 6, 11). Volunteer participants were asked to taste cooked sweet corn for evaluation. Some general observations of the taste test panel were that everyone has a different idea of how sweet corn should taste and people prefer longer ears. All participants volunteered for future taste test panels.

I would also like to make a few comments on this year's evaluation. First was the weather which was very wet early to mid-season. On July 10<sup>th</sup> we had an extreme wind event that pretty well flattens most of the corn varieties just before tasseling. All varieties recovered but were very goose necked at harvest. This made harvest difficult and stocks were pretty brittle. Second was that the maturity of the sweet corn. All most all of the varieties this year were quite uneven in their maturity. Seeing we do a single pick in this evaluation, we had a much larger non marketable number than in the past years. Please take this into account, but we wanted to give fresh market producers an idea of what might be available with multiple harvest. Last we did notice a little more smut than in past years, not overwhelming but was more noticeable in the sh2 varieties.

Again as always I want to thank Matt Hofelich, Frank Thayer, Bob Shaw and the summer crew at OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station for all their help with this project and all past projects. Without their help this would not be possible.

Thanks

Table 1. Varieties and seed suppliers for *se* & *su* entries

**2013 North Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation  
OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station**

Varieties & Seed Companies

***SE/ SYN* Trial Varieties**

<b>Bi-Color <i>SE</i> Varieties</b>		<b>Supplier</b>
Temptation TS	(72 day)	Seminis
Profit	(72 day)	Crookham
Ka-ching	(78 day)	Crookham
CSYBF10 –394-82235	(68 day)	Crookham
CSYBF7-257-82237	(70 day)	Crookham
CSYBF10-398-82236	(68 day)	Crookham
Paydirt	(68 day)	Crookham
Easy Money	(75 day)	Crookham
BC 1002	(72 day)	Syngenta

*sh*<sub>2</sub>Trial Varieties Continued on next page

Table 2. Varieties and seed suppliers for  $sh_2$  entries

**SH2 Trial Varieties**

<b>Bi-Color SH2 Varieties</b>		<b>Supplier</b>
Awesome XR	(75 day)	Stokes
Stellar XR	(75 day)	Stokes
Fantastic XR	(75 day)	Stokes
XTH 20173	(73 day)	IFSI
Anthem XR	(72 day)	IFSI
XTH 2071	(71 day)	IFSI
7112 R	(76 day)	Abbott-Cobb
8902 MR	(81 day)	Abbott-Cobb
2760 MR	(83 day)	Abbott-Cobb
7602 MR	(78 day)	Abbott-Cobb
2060 MR	(77 day)	Abbott-Cobb
2750 R	(74 day)	Abbott-Cobb
Marquette	(76 day)	Harris Moran
Rainier	(73 day)	Harris Moran
Battalion	(77 day)	Syngenta
BSS 1860	(80 day)	Syngenta
CSABF9-357	(78 day)	Crookham
CSABF10-423	(75 day)	Crookham
EX08767143	(80 day)	Monsanto

**White SH2 Varieties**

XTH 3674	(74 day)	IFSI
XTH 3274	(73 day)	IFSI
XTH 3174	(76 day)	IFSI
XTH 3380	(80 day)	IFSI
ACX SS 1441	(73 day)	Abbott-Cobb
7401 IMP	(74 day)	Abbott-Cobb
1760 MR	(82 day)	Abbott-Cobb
Biscayne	(78 day)	Harris Moran
AP 358-82225	(78 day)	Crookham
CAPBF10-411	(75 day)	Crookham
CAPBF10-427	(75 day)	Crookham
CAPBF10-413	(78 day)	Crookham
CAPBF10-426	(78 day)	Crookham
11-6R-QHW-1580	(80 day)	Monsanto
QHW6RH 1229	(82 day)	Monsanto

**Supplier****Yellow SH2 varieties**

XTH 1572	(72 day)	IFSI
Protector	(81 day)	Syngenta
QHY6SH 1321	(78 day)	Monsanto
QHY6RH 1077	(78 day)	Monsanto
QHY6RH 1336	(80 day)	Monsanto

**Suppliers**

Table 3. Plant Evaluation se & syn

### 2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Se)

Varieties	Seeding 5/22	Comments	Tassel Date	Suckers (1-3)	Silk Date	Harvest Date
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>						
Profit	3		7/9	2	7/12	7/29
Easy Money	4		7/5	2.75	7/9	7/26
Pay-Dirt	4		7/5	2	7/8	7/24
Ka-ching	4		7/8	2.25	7/12	8/2
CSYBF 10-394	3		7/8	2.5	7/12	7/26
CSYBF 7-257	2		7/8	2	7/12	7/26
CSYBF 10-398	2		7/8	2.5	7/12	7/24
Temptation II TS	3		7/5	2.25	7/9	7/26
BC 1002	2		7/5	2.5	7/8	7/24
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>2.3</b>		

**Rating Scale:**

Seeding Emergence; 1 = poor (weak) 3 = average 5 = outstanding

Experienced extremely tough planting conditions, heavy rain two day later

Stand ability: 1 = up right 3 = some leaning 5 = heavy leaning

Sucker: 0 = no suckers 1 = few 2 = moderate 3 = severe

Silking date = 50% or more of plants silking in all 4 reps

Tasseling date = 50% or more of the plants tasseling in all 4 reps



Table 4. Harvest data se & syn

### 2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Harvest Data Se)

Varieties	Snap (1 – 5)	Ear Height (Inches)	Ear Shank	Stand Per/acre	Harvested Dozen/ acre	Marketable Dozen/acre
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>						
Profit	3	14	3	20,905	1423	1161
Easy Money	4	10	2.5	20,905	1670	1089
Pay-Dirt	3	15	3	21,777	2032	1143
Ka-ching	3	15	3	20,905	1765	1260
CSYBF 10-394	2	15	4	20,905	1815	1488
CSYBF 7-257	2.25	15	3	20,034	1597	1350
CSYBF 10-398	3	12	3	21,777	2032	1379
Temptation II TS	3.25	15	3.5	18,292	1670	1306
BC 1002	2.75	11	3	22,648	1887	1161
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>20,905</b>	<b>1760</b>	<b>1260</b>

Rating for snap 1 = difficult to pull    3 = average    5 = very easy to pull  
 Ear shank    1 = short    3 = average    5 = long

Table 5. Ear Evaluation se & syn

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Ear Evaluation Se)**

Varieties	Husk Cover	Flags	Overall Husk	Tip Fill	Rows (AVG)	Length (Inches)	Diameter (Inches)
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>							
Profit	3	5	4	5	16	8	1.85
Easy Money	2	4	4	5	16	7.8	1.8
Pay-Dirt	2.5	3	3	5	18	7.4	1.6
Ka-ching	3	4	4	5	16	8	1.8
CSYBF 10-394	3	4	4	4	16	7.7	1.7
CSYBF 7-257	3	5	4	5	18	8	1.8
CSYBF 10-398	3	4	4	5	16	7.8	1.7
Temptation II TS	2	4	4	5	18	8	1.85
BC 1002	2	4	4	4	16	7.8	1.65
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>1.75</b>

Flags: 1 = no flags    3 = somewhat attractive    5 = long & attractive  
 Husk cover: 1 = no cover    3 = adequate tip cover    5 = abundant tip cover  
 Tip Fill: 1 = more than 2 inch gag    3 = 1 inch gap    5 = complete to the end  
 Overall husk: 1 = dull unattractive    3 = average appearance    5 = very attractive

Table 6. Taste and Appeal se & syn

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste & Appeal Se)**

Varieties	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Kernel Depth	Taste Test (Public)
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>						
Profit	3	5	4	4	2	X
Easy Money	3	4	5	5	2	
Pay-Dirt	4	3	4	5	2	X
Ka-ching	4	4	4	4	2	
CSYBF 10-394	4	4	5	5	2	
CSYBF 7-257	4	4	5	5	2	X
CSYBF 10-398	3	5	4	4	2	
Temptation II TS	4	4	5	5	2	X
BC 1002	2	4	5	5	2	X
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>2</b>	

Grading scales:

Rowing (straightness): 1 = no uniformity 3 = mostly straight 5 = straight & uniform

Color rating: 1 = dull 3 = good contrast 5 = Bright, very good contrast

**Tenderness, Sweetness were evaluated with raw sweet corn**

Tenderness: 1 = tough 3 = somewhat tender 5 = very tender

Sweetness: 1 = bland 3 = somewhat sweet 5 = very sweet

Kernel depth: 1 = shallow 2 = normal 3 = deep

Table 7. Table Brix value se & syn

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Se  
Brix Ratings Cold Storage**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Harvest Brix</b>	<b>5 Day Brix</b>
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>		
Profit	22	20
Easy Money	22	21
Pay-Dirt	17	21
Ka-ching	22	20
CSYBF 10-394	22	23
CSYBF 7-257	25	23
CSYBF 10-398	19	17
Temptation II TS	25	22
BC 1002	19	19
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>18.4</b>

Table 8. Plant Evaluation *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Sh2)**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Seeding 5/22</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>	<b>Tassel Date</b>	<b>Suckers (1-3)</b>	<b>Silk Date</b>	<b>Harvest Date</b>
<b>Bi-color Varieties</b>						
Awesome XR	3		7/8	2	7/12	7/30
Stellar XR	3		7/8	1.5	7/15	7/31
Fantastic XR	3		7/8	2.5	7/16	7/31
XTH 20173	3		7/8	2.5	7/15	7/30
Anthem XR	3		7/8	2.5	7/15	7/29
XTH 2071	3		7/8	1.5	7/12	7/29
7112 R	3		7/8	2	7/15	7/31
8902 MR	3		7/12	1.5	7/17	8/6
2760 MR	2		7/15	2	7/19	8/8
7602 MR	2		7/12	2.5	7/15	8/2
2060 MR	2		7/12	2.5	7/16	8/8
2750 R	3		7/12	2.5	7/17	8/6
Marquette	3		7/12	3	7/16	8/2
Rainier	3		7/9	3	7/15	7/30
Battalion	3		7/12	2	7/17	8/6
BSS 1860	3		7/12	3	7/15	8/5
CSABF9-357	3		7/9	2	7/15	8/5
CSABF10-423	4		7/12	1	7/15	8/2
EX 08767143	2		7/12	2.5	7/16	8/8

**Rating Scale:**

Seeding Emergence; 1 = poor (weak)      3 = average      5 = outstanding  
 Standability: 1 = some leaning      3 = considerable leaning      5 = heavy leaning or down  
 Sucker:      0 = no suckers      1 = few      2 = moderate      3 = severe

Table 8. Plant Evaluation  $sh_2$ **2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Sh2)**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Seeding 5/22</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>	<b>Tassel Date</b>	<b>Suckers (1-3)</b>	<b>Silk Date</b>	<b>Harvest Date</b>
<b><u>White</u></b>						
XTH 3674	4		7/9	1.5	7/15	7/30
XTH 3274	4		7/9	2	7/16	7/31
XTH 3174	4		7/9	1.5	7/16	8/2
XTH 3380	3		7/12	1.5	7/19	8/6
ACX SS 1441	3		7/12	2.5	7/16	8/2
7401 IMP	3		7/12	1.5	7/15	8/2
1760 MR	3		7/12	1	7/19	8/8
Biscayne	3		7/15	2	7/17	8/6
AP 358-82225	3		7/8	2	7/12	8/5
CAPBF10-411	4	raccoons	7/8	1.5	7/12	7/30
CAPBF10-427	3		7/8	2	7/12	7/31
CAPBF10-413	2		7/15	1.5	7/17	8/5
CAPBF10-426	3		7/9	2.5	7/15	8/6
11-6R-QHW1580	2		7/12	2.5	7/17	8/6
QHW6RH1229	3		7/12	3	7/17	8/8
<b><u>Yellow Varieties</u></b>						
XTH 1572	3		7/8	1.5	7/15	7/30
Protector	3		7/12	2.5	7/16	8/8
QHY6SH 1321	3		7/12	2	7/16	8/5
QHY6RH 1077	4		7/12	2	7/15	8/5
QHY6RH 1336	4		7/12	2.5	7/15	8/5
<b>Average</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>2</b>		

Table 9. Harvest data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Harvest Data Sh2)**

<b>Varieties Bi-Color Varieties</b>	Snap (1 – 5)	Ear Height	Ear Shank	Stand Per/acre	Harvested Dozen/ acre	Marketable Dozen/acre
Awesome XR	3	19.5	3	20,688	1814	1651
Stellar XR	2.5	20	4	20,034	1706	1597
Fantastic XR	3.5	19	4	18,728	1651	1524
XTH 20173	3	18.5	3	18,815	1815	1641
Anthem XR	3.75	19.25	2	17857	1633	852
XTH 2071	3.75	18.5	4.5	21,559	1524	961
7112 R	3.5	20	3	20,557	1691	1474
8902 MR	4	19	4	17,421	1561	1161
2760 MR	3.25	22	3	17,639	1778	1488
7602 MR	3.25	22	3	19,164	1778	1379
2060 MR	2.75	19.75	2	17,203	1670	1397
2750 R	3.5	23	4	17,857	1633	1633
Marquette	3.25	22	2	19,817	1959	1778
Rainier	3.5	17.25	3	21,341	2033	1724
Battalion	3	26	4	20,906	1851	1633
BSS 1860	3.5	20.25	3	18,510	1905	1814
CSABF9-357	3.5	18.75	3	20,034	1833	1651
CSABF10-423	3.75	23	3	21,560	1851	1615
EX 08767143	4	23	2	21,995	2359	2232

**Scale next page**

Table 9. Harvest data *sh*<sub>2</sub>**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Harvest Data Sh2)**

<b>Varieties</b>	Snap (1 – 5)	Ear Height (inches)	Ear Shank	Stand Per/acre	Harvested Dozen/ acre	Marketable Dozen/acre
<b><u>White</u></b>						
XTH 3674	3.25	20.25	5	16,986	1416	1270
XTH 3274	3.75	19	3	18,946	1615	1470
XTH 3174	3.25	24	3	18,293	1706	1524
XTH 3380	4	25	4	21,777	1924	1560
ACX SS 1441	4	23	3	20,253	1833	1579
7401 IMP	3.75	19.25	3	17,204	1579	1343
1760 MR	3.25	19.75	4	17,203	1670	1434
Biscayne	4	23.5	4	18,728	1887	1706
AP 358-82225	3.75	16	4	17,639	1543	1252
CAPBF10-411	3.5	17	2	18,554	1786	1423
CAPBF10-427	3.75	19	3	21,559	1858	1691
CAPBF10-413	3.25	20.75	3	20,688	1978	1651
CAPBF10-426	3	26	4	22,648	1996	1742
11-6R-QHW1580	3	18	3	20,470	2105	2033
QHW6RH1229	3.75	25	3	24,390	2685	2377
<b><u>Yellow Varieties</u></b>						
XTH 1572	3.5	19	4	18,728	1561	907
Protector	3.25	25	3	20,906	2758	2432
QHY6SH 1321	3.75	15	2	20,034	1670	1651
QHY6RH 1077	4	21.5	3	20,034	1960	1633
QHY6RH 1336	3.25	22	4	21,341	1905	1633
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>20.75</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>19,163</b>	<b>1832</b>	<b>1576</b>

Rating for snap 1 = difficult to pull    3 = average    5 = very easy to pull  
 Ear shank    1 = short    3 = average    5 = long



Table 10. Ear Evaluation data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Ear Evaluation Sh2**

<b>Varieties Bi-color Varieties</b>	Husk Cover	Flags	Overall Husk	Tip Fill	Rows (AVG)	Length (Inches)	Diameter (Inches)
Awesome XR	2	5	4	5	18	8	1.8
Stellar XR	2	5	4	4	18	8	1.75
Fantastic XR	1	5	4	5	18	8.2	1.9
XTH 20173	2	4	5	5	18	7.7	1.85
Anthem XR	2	5	4	5	18	8.2	1.8
XTH 2071	2	5	4	5	18	7.8	1.8
7112 R	2	4	5	5	16	7.95	1.65
8902 MR	1	5	5	5	18	9.4	1.8
2760 MR	3	4	4	5	16	9	1.7
7602 MR	2	4	4	5	18	7.9	1.7
2060 MR	1	5	5	5	18	8.9	1.85
2750 R	1	4	4	5	18	8.2	1.8
Marquette	2	4	4	5	16	7.8	1.8
Rainier	1	4	5	5	18	7.9	1.85
Battalion	2	5	5	5	20	7.8	1.9
BSS 1860	1	4	3	5	18	8.2	2
CSABF9-357	1	4	4	4	20	8	2
CSABF10-423	0	2	2	4	16	8.6	1.75
EX 08767143	1	3	3	4.5	18	7.8	1.9

**Scale next page**

Table 10. Ear Evaluation data *sh*<sub>2</sub>**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Ear Evaluation Sh2**

<b>Varieties</b> <b>White</b>	Husk Cover	Flags	Overall Husk	Tip Fill	Rows (AVG)	Length (Inches)	Diameter (Inches)
XTH 3674	2	5	4	5	18	8.1	1.8
XTH 3274	1	4	4	5	20	8.1	1.95
XTH 3174	1	4	5	4	16	8	1.9
XTH 3380	2	5	4	5	18	7.5	1.75
ACX SS 1441	1	3	3	5	18	8.2	1.85
7401 IMP	1	3	3	4	18	8.2	1.8
1760 MR	1	4	4	5	18	8.7	1.8
Biscayne	2	2	3	5	18	7.2	1.85
AP 358-82225	1	5	5	5	16	8.6	2
CAPBF10-411	1	3	4	4	18	8.1	1.8
CAPBF10-427	2	4	4	5	16	7.7	1.75
CAPBF10-413	1	4	4	4	16	7.7	1.75
CAPBF10-426	3	5	5	5	18	8	1.95
11-6R-QHW1580	1	4	5	5	16	8	1.65
QHW6RH1229	2	3	3	5	18	7.8	1.8
<b><u>Yellow Varieties</u></b>							
XTH 1572	2	5	5	5	18	8	1.8
Protector	1	3	4	4	16	7.45	1.8
QHY6SH 1321	0	3	3	4	20	7.9	1.9
QHY6RH 1077	1	3	4	5	18	8.2	1.9
QHY6RH 1336	1	4	5	4	22	7.6	1.9
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>

Flags: 1= no flags    3= somewhat attractive    5= long &amp; attractive

Husk cover: 1 = no cover    3 = adequate tip cover    5 = abundant tip cover

Tip Fill: 1 = more than 2 inch gag    3 = 1 inch gap    5 = complete to the end

Overall husk: 1 = dull unattractive    3 = average appearance    5 = very attractive

Table 11. Taste and Appeal *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste &Appeal Sh2)**

<b>Varieties Bi-Color Varieties</b>	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Kernel Depth	Taste Test (Public)
Awesome XR	3	5	3	3	3	X
Stellar XR	3	4	4	4	2.5	
Fantastic XR	3	4	5	4	2	
XTH 20173	4	5	5	5	2	X
Anthem XR	4	3	5	5	2.5	X
XTH 2071	5	5	5	4	2	X
7112 R	3	5	5	3	1	X
8902 MR	4	4	4	4	2.5	
2760 MR	4	4	4	3	2	
7602 MR	4	5	5	5	2	X
2060 MR	5	5	5	5	3	X
2750 R	4	4	5	5	2	X
Marquette	4	5	5	3	2.5	
Rainier	4	5	5	3	2	
Battalion	5	5	3	3	2	
BSS 1860	4	4	5	4	3	X
CSABF9-357	4	4	4	4	2.5	
CSABF10-423	3	4	4	4	2	
EX 08767143	4	5	5	5	2	

**Scale next page**

Table 11. Taste & Appeal data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste & Appeal Sh2)**

<b>Varieties</b>	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Kernel Depth	Taste Test (Public)
<b><u>White</u></b>						
XTH 3674	4	4	5	4	2	X
XTH 3274	4	5	5	5	2.5	X
XTH 3174	5	4	4	5	2	X
XTH 3380	3	4	5	4	2	
ACX SS 1441	4	4	4	4	2	
7401 IMP	5	4	5	4	2	
1760 MR	4	3	4	4	2.5	X
Biscayne	4	5	5	5	2	
AP 358-82225	5	5	4	4	3	
CAPBF10-411	5	5	5	4	2.5	X
CAPBF10-427	4	5	5	5	2.5	X
CAPBF10-413	3	5	5	2	2	
CAPBF10-426	4	5	5	5	2	
11-6R-QHW1580	4	4	5	5	2	X
QHW6RH1229	4	4	5	5	2	X
<b><u>Yellow Varieties</u></b>						
XTH 1572	3	5	5	3	2.5	X
Protector	4	5	4	4	2.5	
QHY6SH 1321	4	5	4	4	2	
QHY6RH 1077	5	5	4	5	2	
QHY6RH 1336	3	5	4	4	2	
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>2.25</b>	

Grading scales:

Rowing (straightness): 1 = no uniformity    3 = mostly straight    5 = straight & uniform

Color rating: 1 = dull    3 = good contrast    5 = Bright, very good contrast

**Tenderness, Sweetness were evaluated with raw sweet corn**

Tenderness: 1 = tough    3 = somewhat tender    5 = very tender

Sweetness: 1 = bland    3 = somewhat sweet    5 = very sweet

Kernel depth 1 = shallow    2 = normal    3 = deep

Table 12. Brix values  $sh_2$

**2013 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation  
Brix Ratings Cold Storage**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Harvest Brix</b>	<b>5 Day Brix</b>
Awesome XR	16	11
Stellar XR	17	14
Fantastic XR	17	18
XTH 20173	16	13
Anthem XR	17	18
XTH 2071	15	16
7112 R	14	15
8902 MR	13	14
2760 MR	13	12
7602 MR	11	11
2060 MR	14	19
2750 R	16	13
Marquette	16	15
Rainier	16	13
Battalion	15	15
BSS 1860	14	17
CSABF9-357	17	12
CSABF10-423	17	15
EX 08767143	18	14

Table 12. Brix values  $sh_2$

**2012 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation  
Brix Ratings Cold Storage**

<b>Varieties</b>	Harvest	5 Day
<b><u>White</u></b>	Brix	Brix
XTH 3674	17	13
XTH 3274	16	16
XTH 3174	13	15
XTH 3380	14	12
ACX SS 1441	17	15
7401 IMP	13	11
1760 MR	15	15
Biscayne	11	14
AP 358-82225	17	19
CAPBF10-411	19	18
CAPBF10-427	17	17
CAPBF10-413	18	15
CAPBF10-426	13	15
11-6R-QHW1580	13	13
QHW6RH1229	14	12
<b><u>Yellow Varieties</u></b>		
XTH 1572	16	13
Protector	14	15
QHY6SH 1321	18	15
QHY6RH 1077	18	13
QHY6RH 1336	16	14
<b>Average</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>14.5</b>

Table 13. Public evaluation of sweet corn varieties in the 2013 North Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation, OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station\***Following page Scale**  
**P=**Poor; **A=**Acceptable; **V=**Very good; **E=**Excellent

Variety	Husk Color				Size of Ear				Kernel Color				Tenderness				Sweetness				Flavor			
	P	A	V	E	P	A	V	E	P	A	V	E	P	A	V	E	P	A	V	E	P	A	V	E
	Number of ratings in each category																							
<b>Bi-color se/syn</b>																								
Profit			2	2			2	2			3	1		1	2	1		1	1	2		1	1	2
Pay Dirt	1	6	2	1	1	5	5		1	5	3	1	1	3	5	2	2	4	2	3	1	3	4	3
CSYBF7-257		1	6	2		2	5	2	1	1	6	1		3	5	1	2	4	2		3	3	3	
BC 1002		3	5	1		7		1		2	6	1	1	1	7		1	3	4	2	1	1	6	1
Temptation TS		3	5	3		3	7	1	1		8	2	1		6	4	1	1	6	3	1	1	7	2
<b>Bi-color sh2</b>																								
Awesome XR			1	3			1	3			2	2			2	2			1	3			1	3
XTH 20173		1		2		1	1	1			1	2			1	2				3				3
Anthem XR		1	1	4		1	1	4		2		4		1	3	2		2	1	3		3		3
<b>XTH 2071</b>				3				3				3		1	2		1			2	1		1	1
<b>7112 R</b>				2			2				2					2			2				2	
7602		2	3	2	1	2	2	2		1	2	3	1	1	2	3		2	2	3	1	1	2	3
2060		1	5	1	1	1	5		1		6		1	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
2750		1	4	5		1	5	4		1	3	6	1	1	2	6	1		3	6	1		3	6
BSS 1860			2	2			1	3			1	3				4				4				4
<b>White sh2</b>																								
XTH 3674			2	1			1	2	1			2			3				3				2	1
XTH 3274		4	5	2	2	6	2	1	1	4	4	2		4	5	2	1	3	4	2	1	4	4	2
XTH 3174		1	3	4		3	2	3		3	3	2		2	5	1		5	2	1		5	2	1
1760 MR		2		2	1		1	2		1	1	2		1	1	2		2	1	1		1	2	1
CAPBF10-411			1	1			2				1	1			1	1			2				2	
CAPBF10-427		2	7	3	1	5	1	5		3	5	4		3	6	3		2	5	5		3	5	4
11-6R-QHW-1580		2	1	2	1	2	1	1		2	1	2		3		2		3		2		3		2
QHW6RH1229		3	2	1		5	1		1	2		1		3	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	1
<b>Yellow sh2</b>																								
XTH 1572			1	4			3	2			3	2				5			2	3			2	3