December, 2004

Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004

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

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

Elaine Grassbaugh, Research Associate
Ohio State University, Dept. of Horticulture and Crop Science

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 of this project

- ***Sean Mueller, Stan Gahn and the summer crew at the North Central Agricultural Experiment Station*** for their assistance with seeding, plot maintenance, and harvesting

- To the following seed companies for their gracious donations of seed:

    - ***Seminis***
    - ***Stokes***
    - ***Rupp***
    - ***Harris Moran***
    - ***Rispen***
    - ***Siegers***

- To ***Dr. Pat Lipps, OSU/OARDC Dept of Plant Pathology*** for assistance in disease observations

- ***To the many volunteer taste testers and their family members*** for sampling varieties and recording ratings and observations

Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation - 2004

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. The objectives of the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation were (1) to test and evaluate *sh_2* and *se* sweet corn varieties under northern Ohio growing conditions for plant and ear characteristics and yield, and (2) to provide taste test results from the general public for several varieties. Each variety was judged using only plot numbers and only at the end of the evaluation were variety names substituted for plot numbers.

Plant evaluations were performed at regular intervals during the growing seasons and at harvest. Eighteen *se* varieties and twenty-three varieties of *sh2* 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, midseason and pre-tassel stages
-Suckering
-Silk and harvest dates
-Snap rating (ease of ear removal from stalk)
-Ear height
-Final stand per 10 ft/row
-Total number of ears per 10ft/row
-Percent marketable ears
-Flag appearance
-Husk cover
-Tip fill
-Rows of kernels/ear
-Ear color, length and diameter
All values reported are based on the average of all 4 replications per entry, unless otherwise noted.

Plots were established on May 11, 2004, in rows spaced 30" apart and at a seeding rate of 3 seeds per foot of row. On May 24 and 25, all varieties were hand thinned to establish a spacing of 8 to 10 inches between plants. All cultural practices and field operations are listed in Table 3. There was a noticeable difference between the *se* and *sh_2* from emergence to mid-season evaluation. *Se* plants seemed healthier and better looking. Due to heavy rainfall, a second cultivation was attempted but was discontinued due to excessive damage to plants. The *sh_2* varieties were completely cultivated, *se* were not. *Sh_2* varieties were set back about one week due to this cultivation. Additional nitrogen was applied to both the *se* and *sh_2* due to heavy rainfall. Seedling vigor (emergence), mid-season vigor and pre-tassel vigor ratings were taken along with silk date and harvest date (Tables 4, 9).

On July 15, 2004 under the direction of Dr. Pat Lipps, Dept. of Plant Pathology, OARDC/OSU, plots were scouted for presence of gray leaf spot, anthracnose and rust (Tables 5, 10). At harvest, ease of harvesting ear (snap rating), ear height, stand per 10 ft./row, total dozens per acre, marketable dozens per acre and percent marketable dozens per acre were recorded (Tables

6, 11). At harvest, 10 ears per rep were evaluated for flags, husk cover, tip fill, number of kernel rows/ear, ear color, length and diameter (Tables 7, 12).

As part of this years 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.

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. Most participants thought the test was interesting and very enjoyable for them and their family members. Most participants kept a record of the sample numbers and requested a list of the varieties at the end of the test. Sweet corn varieties selected 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 8, 13). Volunteer participants were asked to taste cooked sweet corn for evaluation. Due to heavy harvest pressure of the *sh2* varieties, fewer varieties were sampled by the public, compared to the *se* varieties. Some general observations of the taste test panel were that everyone has a different idea of how sweet corn should taste, some participants prefer immature corn while others prefer fully mature or over-mature ears, and people prefer longer ears. All participants volunteered for future taste test panels.

Table 1. Varieties and seed suppliers for *se* entries for the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004, Fremont, OH.

se Trial Varieties

Bi-Color	**Seed Company**
Seneca Spring (68 day)	Seminis
Temptation (72 day)	Stokes / Seminis
Precious Gem (78 day)	Stokes
Mystique (75 day)	Stokes
Chippawa (70 day)	Stokes
Brocade (81 day)	Stokes
Nantasket (70 day)	Rupp
Montauk (80 day)	Rupp
Envoy (68 day)	Rupp
Buccaneer (76 day)	Rupp
Nauset (80 day)	Rupp
Accord (78 day)	Rispen
Providence (82 day)	Rispen
Renaissance (70 day)	Rispen / Harris Moran
Absolute (80 day)	Seminis
EX 8487249 (79 day)	Seminis
Yellow	
PX 9330109 (77 day)	Seminis

Table 2. Varieties and seed suppliers for *sh*$_2$ entries for the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004, Fremont, OH.

sh$_2$ Trial entries:

Bi-Color		**Seed Company**
Extra Tender 275A	(75 day)	Stokes
Extra Tender 276A	(76 day)	Stokes
Extra Tender 277A	(77 day)	Stokes /Rupp
Extra Tender 278A	(78 day)	Siegers
Extra Tender 282A	(82 day	Stokes
Obsession (79 day)		Seminis
EX 08705788 (81 day)		Seminis
AAX 816 (79day)		Rupp
Polaris (81 day)		Rispen
Candy Corner (76 day)		Harris Moran /Rispen
Mirai 301 BC (76 day)		Siegers
Mirai 308		Siegers
Mirai 327		Siegers
A&C 6802		Rispen
White		
Extra Tender 372A		Stokes
Extra Tender 377A (77 day)		Stokes
Extra Tender 378A		Sieger
Extra Tender 382A		Rispen
EX 08705770 (83 day)		Seminis
Yellow		
Mirai 002		Sieger
XTH 1178		Sieger
Extra Tender 171A	(71 day)	Stokes
A&C 6800		Rispen

Table 3. Log of field operations for Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation, 2004, Fremont, OH.

Harvest Protocol: Harvested center 2 rows of 4 row planted per variety / Rep,
Harvested 10 feet per each of 2 rows harvest rows in center of plot

Date	Description of Operation
4/22/2004	Applied 150 lbs / @ 46-0-0, 150lbs /@ 18-46-0, and 350 lbs /@ of 0-0-60
4/22/2004	Worked field with JD 7210 and Landoll Finish-all and packer
5/11/2004	Worked field with JD 7210 and Landoll Finish-all and packer
5/11/2004	Laid out planted and stakes plot area
5/11/2004	Planted SH2 and SE trials, planted 4 rows per variety / Rep in 30" rows, varieties were replicated 4 times, seeding rate was 3 seeds / ft of row seeded with a 4 row Kinkade Cone Seeder, Applied in furrow at a rate of 2.5 oz / 1000 feet of row
5/11/2004	Applied 2pts/@ Dual 8E
5/13/2004	Staked plots
5/24/2004	Evaluated both the SE & SH2 trials on emergence
5/24/2004	Thinned and weeded SH2 trial, established stand of 8-10" between plants trimmed Reps to 25 feet
5/25/2004	Thinned and weeded Se trial, established stand of 8-10" between plants trimmed Reps to 25 feet
6/2/2004	Side dressed both SE & SH2 trials with 250 lbs/@ of 28-0-0
6/2/2004	Cultivated SE & SH2 trials with Allis Chalmers G
6/18/2004	Gibbs Aero-Sprays applied 2 qts/@ Manex, and 7 oz/@ Asana XL
6/22/2004	Side dressed both SE & SH2 trials with an additional 200 lbs/@ of 28-0-0 due to excessive rainfall and loss of Nitrogen
6/24/2004	Worked alleys in both SE & SH2 trials
6/25/2004	Gibbs Aero-Sprays applied 7 oz/@ Asana XL
6/30/2004	Applied 2qt /@ Thiodan 3EC
7/6/2004	Applied 3 oz/@ of Warrior
7/9/2004	Applied 3 oz/@ of Warrior
7/14/2004	Hoed and weeded front and back of Reps 1 & 2 of SE trial
7/14/2004	Hoed and weeded front and back of Reps 1 & 2 of SH2 trial
7/15/2004	Hoed and weeded front and back of Reps 3 & 4 of SE trial
7/15/2004	Hoed and weeded front and back of Reps 3 & 4 of SH2 trial
7/16/2004	Applied 7 oz/@ Asana XL and 1 pt /@ Dimethoate
7/19/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 31 & 45 from SE Plots
7/22/2004	Applied 3 oz/@ of Warrior and 1 pt /@ Dimethoate
7/26/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 32, 35, 40 & 43 from SE Plots
7/27/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22 from SH2 trial
7/28/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 1, 2, 10, 12, 17 from SH2 trials
7/28/2004	Hand Harvested and evaluated varieties 34, 36, 37, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48 from SE trial
7/30/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varietie's 33 & 38 from SE trial
7/30/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 3, 11, 13 from SH2 trial
8/2/2004	Hand Harvested and evaluated variety 23 from SH2 trial
8/2/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated variety 39 from SE trial
8/5/2004	Hand harvested and evaluated varieties 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 8, 9, 18, 19 from SH2 trial
8/10/2004	Mowed off and disked plot area under

Table 4. Plant evaluation, silking dates and harvest dates for ***se*** varieties in the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004, Fremont, OH.

Bi-color Varieties	**Seeding Vigor 5/23**	**Mid- Season 6/21**	**Pre-tassel 6/30**	**Suckers (1-3)**	**Silk Date (July)**	**Harvest Date**
Seneca Springs	2.75	3.25	4	1	6,6,6,6	7/19
Temptation	3.25	3.75	3.75	1.5	6,6,6,6	7/26
Precious Gem	2.75	4	4	1.5	12,12,12,12	7/30
Mystique	2	3.25	3.5	1	6,6,6,6	7/28
Chippawa	2	3.25	3.5	1	8,8,8,6	7/26
Brocade	3.5	3.75	3.75	1	8,8,8,8	7/28
Accord	2.25	3.75	4	1	12,12,12,12	7/28
Providence	3	3.25	3.25	1	12,12,12,12	7/30
BT 0805	3	3.5	3	1	12,12,12,12	8/2
Renaissance	3	4.25	4	2	6,6,6,6	7/26
Absolute	2	2.5	2.5	3	12,12,12,12	7/28
EX 8487249	2.75	3.25	3.25	1	12,12,12,12	7/28
Nantasket	3	4	4	1.5	8,8,8,6	7/26
Montauk	3.25	3.25	3.25	1.5	12,12,12,12	7/28
Envoy	3.25	4	4.25	2.5	6,6,6, (30)	7/19
Buccaneer	2.75	4	3.5	1.5	12,8,8,8	7/28
Nauset	3.25	4.25	4.5	3	12,12,8,8	7/28
Yellow Variety						
PX 9330109	3	3	3	3	12,12,8,8	7/28

Rating Scales

Seedling Vigor (Emergence) : 1= Poor (spindly) 3= Good (average) 5= Outstanding (Strong ,dark green)

Mid Season and Pre-Tassel: 1= poor (weak plant, poor color) 3= Good (color & shape) 5= Strong, healthy plant

Suckers: 0= No suckers 1=some 2=moderate 3=severe

Silk Date: when over 50% of plants were silking

Table 5. Observations of disease incidence in 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation plots of ***se*** sweet corn varieties.

Bi-color *(se)*	**Gray Leaf Spot**	**Anthracnose**	**Rust**
Seneca Springs		X	
Temptation	X		X
Precious Gem			X
Mystique		X	
Chippawa		X	
Brocade	X		
Accord		X	
Providence	X	X	
BT 0805	X	X	
Renaissance		X	
Absolute		X	
EX 8487249		X	
Nantasket	X		X
Montauk	X		
Envoy	X	X	X
Buccaneer		X	X
Nauset	X	X	
Yellow *(se)*			
PX 9330109		X	X

The field was scouted for disease on July 15. Although some disease was found it was minor and did not require any treatment.

Table 6. 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial harvest data (*se* varieties).

Bi-color (*se*)	**Snap Ease**	**Ear Height (inches)**	**Stand Per 10/ft**	**Total Dozens Per Acre**	**Marketable Dozens (%)**
Seneca Springs	3	13.5	36.0	2759	2096 76%
Temptation	3	19.5	31.5	2087	1857 89%
Precious Gem	4	20.75	30.75	2106	1958 93%
Mystique	3.25	22.75	31.0	2160	2160 100%
Chippawa	2	19.87	28.25	2069	1944 94%
Brocade	3	22.75	31.5	2069	2069 100%
Accord	3.5	23.0	32.25	2160	1944 94%
Providence	3	21.25	29.25	2069	1986 96%
BT 0805	3	23.5	30.5	2069	2048 99%
Renaissance	2.5	19.12	33.0	2305	2143 93%
Absolute	5	21.25	33.5	2160	2116 98%
EX 8487249	3.75	26.75	33.25	2287	2287 100%
Nantasket	4	20.25	30	2033	1931 95%
Montauk	4	22.5	30.6	2156	2156 100%
Envoy	5	16.5	32	2741	2412 80%
Buccaneer	2	22.25	32	2214	2214 100%
Nauset	3	25.25	35.75	2323	2276 98%
Yellow (*se*)					
PX 9330109	3.75	19.25	30.75	2214	2214 00%

Snap Rating: (ease of harvesting ear from stalk)
1=Difficult 3=Easy 5=Extremely ease

Table 7. Ear characteristics of *se* varieties in the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation –2004.

Bi-color (se)	**Flags**	**Husk Cover**	**Tip Fill**	**Rows (avg)**	**Color**	**Length (inches)**	**Diameter (inches)**
Seneca Springs	4	5	4	14	4	7.2	1.6
Temptation	3	4	5	16	4	7.45	1.9
Precious Gem	4	4	3	17	3	8.5	1.9
Mystique	2	5	4	18	4	7.8	2.0
Chippawa	2	3	5	12	2	8.0	1.9
Brocade	3	5	3	16	3	8.0	1.9
Accord	3	4	5	18	5	7.6	1.8
Providence	2	5	4	15	1	8.9	1.7
BT 0805	2	5	4	15	3	8.6	1.9
Renaissance	4	4	4	16	3	8.3	1.8
Absolute	3	3	3	18	3	8.2	1.8
EX 8487249	2	4	5	18	4	8.0	1.8
Nantasket	5	3	5	16	3	7.7	2.0
Montauk	5	3	5	18	5	8.5	2.0
Envoy	1	4	5	14.5	3	7.1	1.65
Buccaneer	4	3	4	16	2	7.8	1.75
Nauset	3	4	4	14	3	8.2	1.6
Yellow (se)							
PX 9330109	3	3	4	20	5	8.2	2.0

Flags: 1=No flags 3=Somewhat attractive 5=Long & attractive
Husk Cover: 1=No cover 3=Adequate tip cover 5=No cover
Tip Fill: 1=More than 2 inch gap 3=1 inch gap to tip 5=Complete to the end
Color: 1=Dull 3=Average & uniform 5=Bright excellent contrast

Table 8. 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (taste & appeal) for *se* entries taken at harvest. Tenderness and sweetness based on raw taste testing by researchers at harvest.

Bi-color (se)	**Row straightness on ear**	**Tenderness**	**Sweetness**	***Taste Test (Public)**
Seneca Springs	4	5	4	
Temptation	5	4	5	X
Precious Gem	3	4	4	X
Mystique	5	5	3	
Chippawa	4	4	4	X
Brocade	3	3	3	
Accord	3	5	3	
Providence	4	5	4	X
BT 0805	3	5	4	X
Renaissance	3	5	5	X
Absolute	3	3	3	
EX 8487249	5	4	2	
Nantasket	3	4	3	X
Montauk	5	5	4	X
Envoy	5	3	4	
Buccaneer	2	4	3	
Nauset	4	3	3	
Yellow (se)				
PX 9330109	3	4	4	X

Grading scales:

Row straightness: 1=no uniformity 3=mostly straight, some irregularities 5=straight and uniform
Tenderness: 1-tough 3=somewhat tender 5=very tender
Sweetness: 1=bland 3=somewhat sweet 5=very sweet
*** Indicates which varieties were panel taste tested.**

Table 9. Plant evaluation, silking dates and harvest dates for ***sh₂*** varieties in the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004, Fremont, OH.

Bi-Color (*sh2*)	**Seeding Vigor 5/23**	**Mid-Season 6/21**	**Pre-Tassel 6/30**	**Suckers (0-3)**	**Silk Date (July)**	**Harvest Date**
Extra Tender 275A	2.25	3	2.75	1	12,12,12,12	7/28
Extra Tender 276A	3.5	4	4	2.6	8,12,12,12	7/28
Extra Tender 277A	2.5	3.5	3	.66	12,12,12,12	7/30
Extra Tender 278A	3	3	3.25	.66	14,12,12,14	8/5
Extra Tender 282A	3	3.25	3.5	1	17,17,15,15	8/5
Obsession	3	3.75	3.75	1	14,12,15,15	8/5
EX 08705788	2.75	3	3.25	1	14,15,14,15	8/5
AAX 816	1	1.25	1.75	2	14,15,15,15	8/5
Polaris	3	4	3.5	2.3	14,14,15,15	8/5
Candy Corner	3.25	4	3.75	2	12,12,12,12	7/28
Mirai 301 BC	2.5	3.75	3.75	1.66	12,12,12,12	7/30
Mirai 308	2	3.5	3.75	2	8,12,8,12	7/28
Mirai 327	2.5	2.25	2.5	1	12,12,12,12	7/30
A&C 6802	3	3.25	3.25	1.66	12,8,8,8	7/27
White *(sh2)*						
Extra Tender 372A	3.25	4.5	4.25	2.33	8,8,8,8	7/27
Extra Tender 377A	3	3.75	4	1.66	12,12,12,12	7/27
Extra Tender 378A	3.5	3.25	3.5	1	12,12,12,15	7/28
Extra Tender 382A	2	3	2.75	.66	17,17,15,15	8/5
EX 08705770	2.5	4	4	1.66	14,14,15,15	8/5
Yellow (*sh2*)						
XTH 1178	3	3.5	3.25	1.66	12,15,12,12	7/27
Extra Tender 171A	3.5	3.75	3	1	8,8,8,8	7/27
A&C 6800	3	3.5	3.25	1	6,12,8,8	7/27
Mirai 002	1.75	2.75	3	1.33	14,14,15,12	8/2

Seedling Vigor (Emergence) : 1= Poor (spindly) 3= Good (average) 5= Outstanding (Strong ,dark green)
Mid Season and Pre-Tassel: 1= poor (weak plant, poor color) 3= Good (color & shape) 5= Strong, healthy plant
Suckers: 0= No suckers 1=some 2=moderate 3=severe
Silk Date: when over 50% of plants were silking

Table 10. Observations of disease incidence in 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation plots of ***sh2*** sweet corn varieties.

Bi-Color (sh2)	**Gray Leaf Spot**	**Anthracnose**	**Rust**
Extra Tender 275A	X		
Extra Tender 276A	X	X	
Extra Tender 277A	X		
Extra Tender 278A			X
Extra Tender 282A	X	X	
Obsession		X	
EX 08705788			X
AAX 816	X		X
Polaris		X	
Candy Corner	X	X	X
Mirai 301 BC		X	X
Mirai 308	X	X	
Mirai 327	X		
A&C 6802		X	
White (sh2)			
Extra Tender 372A	X	X	
Extra Tender 377A			X
Extra Tender 378A	X	X	X
Extra Tender 382A		X	X
EX 08705770	X	X	
Yellow (sh2)			
XTH 1178	X	X	
Extra Tender 171A	X	X	
A&C 6800	X		
Mirai 002	X		

Disease was scouted on July 15 and although some disease was found no treatment was required

Table 11. 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial harvest data (*sh2* varieties).

Bi-Color (sh2)	**Snap (1-5)**	**Ear Height (inches)**	**Stand Per/10ft**	**Total Dozens Per Acre**	**Market Dozens (%)**
Extra Tender 275A	4.5	19	38.5	2614	1986 / 76%
Extra Tender 276A	4.75	19.25	37.5	2687	2552 / 95%
Extra Tender 277A	2.75	19	36.75	2687	2176 / 81%
Extra Tender 278A	4.5	20.75	34.75	2396	2156 / 90%
Extra Tender 282A	4	26.5	34.25	2360	2265 / 96%
Obsession	5	23.75	35.75	2832	2803 / 99%
EX 08705788***	3	28.75	36.5	2567	2311 / 90%
AAX 816	2.75	18	33.5	2378	2069 / 87%
Polaris	2.75	24.25	37.5	2668	2668 / 100%
Candy Corner	4.25	20	36.0	2632	2448 / 93%
Mirai 301 BC ***	2.3	27.25	40.0	2543	2314 / 91%
Mirai 308	3.25	20.75	35.0	2541	2338 / 92%
Mirai 327	4	19.75	33.75	2414	2124/ 88%
A&C 6802	4	17	33.25	2396	2252 / 94%
White (sh2)					
Extra Tender 372A	3.75	18.75	32.0	2160	2030 / 94%
Extra Tender 377A	3	19.5	37.25	2541	2338 / 92%
Extra Tender 378A	4.25	20	35.75	2596	2518 / 97%
Extra Tender 382A	3.75	22.25	37.75	2977	2798 / 94%
EX 08705770	2.75	30	31.0	2323	2114 / 91%
Yellow (sh2)					
XTH 1178**	4	21.5	38	2729	2456 / 90%
Extra Tender 171A	3	16	34.75	2450	2107 / 86%
A&C 6800	4.5	17.25	39.0	2687	2310 / 86%
Mirai 002	3.5	24.25	38.0	2233	1965 / 88%

Snap Rating (ease of harvesting ear from stalk):
1= Difficult 3=Easy 5=Extremely easy

*** Data based on three reps only
** Data based on two reps only

Table 12. Ear characteristics of sh2 varieties in the Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2004.

Bi-Color (sh2)	**Flags**	**Husk Cover**	**Tip Fill**	**Rows (avg)**	**Color**	**Length (inches)**	**Diameter (inches)**
Extra Tender 275A	2	4	5	18	3	8.3	1.7
Extra Tender 276A	3	3	5	18	3	8.4	2.0
Extra Tender 277A	3	2	3	18	4	7.4	1.9
Extra Tender 278A	3	3	2	17	3	8.2	1.9
Extra Tender 282A	4	4	4	18	3	7.9	1.8
Obsession	2	3	3	17	3	8.0	1.8
EX 08705788	3	4	2	18	5	9.2	2
AAX 816	4	3	3	16	2	8.8	2
Polaris	4	4	5	18	5	7.6	1.9
Candy Corner	3	3	3	14	3	8.1	1.8
Mirai 301 BC	4	5	3	17	4	7.8	19
Mirai 308	3	3	4	17	4	7.8	1.9
Mirai 327	3	3	3	16	4	8.0	1.8
A&C 6802	2	3	3	15	4	7.9	1.8
White (sh2)							
Extra Tender 372A	4	2	5	17	3	8.1	2.0
Extra Tender 377A	3	3	5	17	4	7.7	1.8
Extra Tender 378A	4	4	5	18	3	8.3	1.7
Extra Tender 382A	3	4	5	18	3	7.8	1.9
EX 08705770	5	3	3	18	4	8.0	1.9
Yellow (Sh2)							
XTH 1178	3	3	5	17	3	8.25	1.8
Extra Tender 171A	2	1	3	16	4	7.45	1.75
A&C 6800	3	2	4	14	4	8.75	1.9
Mirai 002	3	5	5	14	3	7.3	1.8

Flags: 1=No flags 3=Somewhat attractive 5=Long & attractive
Husk Cover: 1=No cover 3=Adequate tip cover 5=No cover
Tip Fill: 1=More than 2 inch gap 3=1 inch gap to tip 5=Complete to the end
Color: 1=Dull 3=Average & uniform 5=Bright excellent contrast

Table 13. 2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (taste & appeal) for *sh2* entries taken at harvest. Tenderness and sweetness based on raw taste testing by researchers at harvest.

Bi-Color (sh2)	**Row straightness on ear**	**Tenderness**	**Sweetness**	**Taste Test* (Public)**
Extra Tender 275A	3	5	4	
Extra Tender 276A	3	5	5	
Extra Tender 277A	3	4	5	X
Extra Tender 278A	4	4	4	
Extra Tender 282A	4	3	3	
Obsession	4	4	4	X
EX 08705788	5	3	5	
AAX 816	4	5	5	X
Polaris	4	3	3	
Candy Corner	3	3	3	
Mirai 301 BC	3	5	5	
Mirai 308	3	5	5	
Mirai 327	3	3	4	
A&C 6802	4	3	3	
White (sh2)				
Extra Tender 372A	3	4	5	
Extra Tender 377A	4	4	5	X
Extra Tender 378A	5	4	3	
Extra Tender 382A	4	3	4	
EX 08705770	4	3	4	
Yellow (sh2)				
XTH 1178	4	4	3	X
Extra Tender 171A	3	3	4	
A&C 6800	4	4	4	X
Mirai 002	3	3	4	X

Row straightness: 1=no uniformity 3=mostly straight, some irregularities 5=straight and uniform

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

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

*** Indicates which varieties were panel taste tested.**

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'Nantasket' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		1	2	2
Size of Ear			2	3
Kernel Color			2	3
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness			5	
Sweetness		1	4	
Flavor		2	3	

Participant's Comments:

- somewhat gummy
- good ear size, easy to husk, good sized kernels but not very sweet
- had good taste
- not much flavor

Variety: 'Providence' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		2	3	
Size of Ear	1	4	1	1
Kernel Color	1	2	4	
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		2	5	2
Sweetness	1	1	4	2
Flavor	1	1	4	2

Participant's Comments:

- not as tender or sweet as some other varieties
- cob was very flexible, may not be a corn variety for freezing

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'Temptation' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color			9	
Size of Ear		9		
Kernel Color		5	3	1
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		2	1	6
Sweetness		1	4	4
Flavor		2	1	6

Participant's Comments:

- reminds me of the corn my grandmother used to make
- nice ear size, a little shorter length, medium to large kernel
- fully & uniformly matured to tip end
- a little hard to husk, more silk left on ear

Variety: 'Renaissance' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		2	9	
Size of Ear		2	8	1
Kernel Color		1	8	2
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		1	7	3
Sweetness		3	3	4
Flavor		2	4	5

Participant's Comments:

- silk embedded between rows, difficult to clean
- flavor was excellent (lots of flavor)
- nice sized ears, large kernels, fully & uniformly mature
- husked easily, minimal silk left on ear
- very enjoyable

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'Precious Gem' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		7	9	
Size of Ear	2	3	10	1
Kernel Color	1	8	7	
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	4	6	5	1
Sweetness	5	7	3	1
Flavor	7	6	2	1

Participant's Comments:

- rather tasteless
- size of ears varied greatly
- some ears not filled out well on the ends

Variety: 'Chippawa' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		6	9	
Size of Ear		10	4	1
Kernel Color		8	5	1
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		7	4	4
Sweetness	6	2	3	4
Flavor	6	2	3	4

Participant's Comments:

- didn't have to use butter
- taste is ok, but wouldn't recommend it to others
- ears were small and not filled out to the end
- not much flavor
- silk was difficult to remove

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'BT 0805' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color	1	5	8	7
Size of Ear	3	3	5	10
Kernel Color	1	6	5	9
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	3	3	6	9
Sweetness	3	4	3	11
Flavor	3	3	4	11

Participant's Comments:

- good taste
- this is the best one yet
- I would not hesitate to purchase this variety
- great ear of corn

Variety: 'Montauk' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		5	14	6
Size of Ear		9	9	7
Kernel Color	1	4	14	6
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	1	3	13	8
Sweetness	1	5	10	13
Flavor	1	5	10	13

Participant's Comments:

- very good
- big ears, had a good smell even before it was cooked
- kernels had a nice bright color
- best one so far
- kernels had good texture and full of flavor
- great corn, would go out of my way to purchase this variety
- loved the corn

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'PX 9330109' (se)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		15	6	
Size of Ear	4	8	5	4
Kernel Color		9	8	4
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	7	5	6	3
Sweetness	8	6	4	3
Flavor	8	5	5	3

Participant's Comments:

- small ears but large kernels
- had wonderful taste
- delightful
- ear size varied greatly

Variety: 'Extra Tender 277A' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		7	19	1
Size of Ear	2	12	12	3
Kernel Color		4	20	5
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		4	11	14
Sweetness		6	9	14
Flavor	1	5	10	13

Participant's Comments:

- small ears, light green husk
- excellent; would buy this variety
- nice corn, one of the best
- best we've had
- good flavor-maybe too sweet
- close to perfect
- wow
- very sweet/tender; great taste
- good corn

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'Obsession' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		10	8	2
Size of Ear	1	14	4	1
Kernel Color		9	9	2
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	3	6	7	4
Sweetness	2	5	6	7
Flavor	2	6	7	5

Participant's Comments:

- sweetness may improve with extra ripening time
- average ears
- this was the best corn so far
- excellent
- sugar-like, almost too sweet

Variety: 'AAX 816' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		5	12	1
Size of Ear		6	10	2
Kernel Color		6	11	1
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		5	6	7
Sweetness		5	6	7
Flavor		2	10	6

Participant's Comments:

- long skinny ears
- crisp kernels
- not gummy
- wouldn't mind seed of this variety
- comes off cob easily, great taste, nice full kernels
- good color
- excellent

-

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'Extra Tender 377A' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		9	9	3
Size of Ear	5	10	5	1
Kernel Color		7	9	5
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	1	4	8	7
Sweetness	6	4	5	6
Flavor	5	4	5	7

Participant's Comments:

- would highly recommend
- husked easily
- not much flavor
- good flavor
- good
- would not purchase

Variety: 'XTH 1178' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		2	1	1
Size of Ear		2	1	1
Kernel Color	1		2	1
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness		2		2
Sweetness	1	1	1	1
Flavor	1	1	1	1

Participant's Comments:

- good
- would not purchase

2004 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – Taste Panel Results

Numbers indicate the number of participants and or families who rated the varieties in each category.

Variety: 'A&C 6800' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		4	12	1
Size of Ear	5	11	2	
Kernel Color	1	8	7	2
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	4	5	5	4
Sweetness	5	5	3	5
Flavor	5	5	3	5

Participant's Comments:

- top 1/3 of ear underdeveloped while bottom 2/3 was overmature; weather related?
- ok, but would not recommend
- would purchase this variety
- enjoyed it
- tough kernels

Variety: 'Mirai 002' (sh_2)

Appearance:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Husk color		3	6	7
Size of Ear	1	9	3	6
Kernel Color		5	8	6
Taste:	**Poor**	**Acceptable**	**Very Good**	**Excellent**
Tenderness	1	5	5	8
Sweetness	2	5	2	10
Flavor	2	5	2	10

Participant's Comments:

- very good, couldn't stop eating this variety
- family fought over the last ear
- pretty good corn
- very good corn
- great flavor