

**November 14, 2011**

# **Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation – 2011**

**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, Kristen Hetrick and the summer crew at the OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station** for their assistance with this project.
- To the following seed companies for their gracious donations of seed and support:

**Seminis**  
**Syngenta**  
**Rogers / Syngenta**  
**Harris Moran**  
**Crookham**  
**IFSI**

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

## Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation - 2011

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 insect 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
  - Ear color, length and diameter
  - Brix value at harvest, 5 days storage, 10 days storage (Table 8, 13)
- All values reported are based on the average of all useable replications.

Plots were established on June 3 for *sh<sub>2</sub>* varieties and June 8, for the *se* varieties in rows spaced 30" apart and at a seeding rate of 3 seeds per foot of row. All cultural practices and field operations are listed in Table 3. Seedling vigor (emergence), stand ability, and tassel, silk and harvest date (Tables 4, 9).

At harvest, ease of harvesting ear (snap rating), ear height, stand per 10 ft./row for 2 row, marketable dozens per acre (Tables 5, 10). 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 6, 11).

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 7, 12). 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.

This year we also incorporated an additional observation to look at different post emergence herbicides on sweet corn. This part of the evaluation was purely an observation to see if any damage or difference in harvest could be observed. The herbicides that were applied were Callisto, Laudis, Impact, and Option.

The protocol we used in this observation was to spray one of the four reps used in the trial. The sprayer was set up to spray five foot section and all four herbicides were sprayed on the first rep. Application was done to both genotype on the same day and all were within the labels directions as far as size and rate applied. Rates per acre were Callisto 3 oz, Laudis 3 oz, Impact .75 oz, and Option 1.5 oz.

General observations:

1. There was no long term tissue damage with any of the applications
2. There was some leaning with Callisto and Laudis for short period of time
3. Impact appeared to be harder on the corn than other herbicides, but no long term affect
4. Callisto and Impact caused some short term stripping of some varieties.
5. All herbicides improved the weed control.

We also planted radishes and winter peas after harvesting the sweet corn. Radishes were planted September 1 with a hand seeder and peas were mixed with radishes. As of November radishes were still growing however maybe a little short of nitrogen as they were starting to yellow; peas were doing fine. A side note that radishes were seeded way to heavy, either poor setting on seeder or I was not walking fast enough.

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

**2011 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>
Fastlane (67 day)	Harris Moran
Bon Jour (70 day)	Harris Moran
Rendevous (72 day)	Harris Moran
Jackie (74 day)	Harris Moran
Powwow (75 day)	Harris Moran
Synergy (75 day)	Seminis
SEB6RH1080 (74 day)	Seminis
SEB6RH1102 (72 day)	Seminis
QEB6RH1276 (79day)	Seminis
Profit (74 day)	Crookham
Ka-ching (78 day)	Crookham
CSYBF7 – 263 (74 day)	Crookham
Paydirt (70 day)	Crookham
BC 0822 (77 day)	Syngenta
Primus (81 day)	Syngenta
<b>White Varieties</b>	
Edelweiss TSW (76 day)	Harris Moran
Kokopelli (74 day)	Harris Moran
Misquamicut (78 day)	Harris Moran
Silver Duchess (83day)	Crookham
SEW6RH1230 (74 day)	Seminis

Table 2. Varieties and seed suppliers for *sh*<sub>2</sub> entries

## ***SH*2 Trial Varieties**

### **Bi-Color *SH*2 Varieties**

	<b>Supplier</b>
EX087455857 R (76 day)	Seminis
EX08767143 (81 day)	Seminis
QHW6RH1229 (82 day)	Seminis
2170 (70 day)	IFSI
XTH 2674 (74 day)	IFSI
XTH 2773 (73 day)	IFSI
XTH 2576 (76 day)	IFSI
XTH 2171 (71 day)	IFSI
XTH 2379 (79 day)	IFSI
4002 BC (76 day)	Abbott & Cobb
7002 R (72 day)	Abbott & Cobb
7112 R (74 day)	Abbott & Cobb
7602 MR (76 day)	Abbott & Cobb
HMX 8343 (75 day)	Harris Moran
HMX 9352 (75 day)	Harris Moran
BSS 8040 (81 day)	Syngenta
Bueno (76 day)	Crookham
CSABF8-323 (84 day)	Crookham
CSABF9-357 (85 day)	Crookham
Pick me (79 day)	Crookham

### **White *SH*2 Varieties**

	<b>Supplier</b>
Munition (79 day)	Syngenta
HMX 0361 (70 day)	Harris Moran
XTH 3773 (day)	IFSI
XTH 3174 (74 day)	<b>IFSI</b>
XTH 3876 (76 day)	IFSI
3379 (79 day)	IFSI
7401 (75 day)	Abbott & Cobb

Table 3. Log of operation for *se & su*

**2011 Log of Operations for Koenig SE sweet corn Trial**

**Date**

5/31/2011	flagged and staked alleys
6/8/2011	worked plot area to with danishtine and packer
6/8/2011	planted trial with JD 7000 4 row with Almaco Cone seeding units
6/8/2011	Applied Dual@1.25pt/A, Gramoxone Inteon @1qt/A, 28%UAN @28gal/A
6/10 - 22	trial received 3.85 inches of rain
7/5/2011	applied herbicide treatments: in order from South to North, Callisto, Laudis, Impact, and Option
7/8/2011	trial received .4 inches of rain
7/11/2011	trial received .8 inches of rain
7/13/2011	cultivated with 2 row
7/15/2011	set out plot stakes
7/18 - 8/9	trial received 6.65 inches of rain
8/11/2011	harvested varieties 40, 41, 56
8/11/2011	evaluated varieties 40, 41, 56
8/14/2011	trial received .4 inches of rain
8/16/2011	Harvested 42, 46, 50, 53,
8/16/2011	evaluated varieties 42, 46, 50, 53
8/16/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 40, 41, 56
8/17/2011	Harvested 43 & 55
8/17/2011	Evaluated 43 & 55
8/19/2011	Harvested 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54
8/19/2011	Evaluated 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54
8/21/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 42, 46, 50, 53
8/21/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 40, 41, 56
8/22/2011	Harvested 57
8/22/2011	Evaluated 57
8/22/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 43 & 55
8/24/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54
8/26/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 42, 46, 50, 53
8/27/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 43 & 55
8/27/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 57
8/29/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54
9/1/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 57
9/1/2011	mowed off trial
9/1/2011	disked under trial
8/27/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 57
8/29/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54
9/1/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 57
9/1/2011	mowed off trial
9/1/2011	disked under trial

Table 3 log of operation for *sh<sub>2</sub>*

**2011 Log of Operations for Mark Koenig SH2 variety plots in Field HE**

Date	Description of Operation
5/31/2011	flagged and staked alleys
6/2/2011	worked plot area with Finish-all
6/2/2011	Staked and drove plot area
6/3/2011	planted trial with JD cone seeder
6/3/2011	flagged and staked plots
6/4/2011	applied Dual@1.25 pt/A
6/10, 6/22	received 3.85 inches of rain
6/27/2011	cultivated trial
7/5/2011	applied herbicide treatments: in order from South to North, Callisto, Laudis, Impact, and Option
7/8/2011	trial received .4 inches of rainfall
7/11/2011	trial received .8 inches of rainfall
7/18/2011	applied Mustang Max @4 oz/a
7/18/2011	trial received .6 inches of rainfall
7/22/2011	trial received 2.75 inches of rainfall
7/23/2011	trial received .25 inches of rainfall
7/28/2011	trial received .6 inches of rainfall
7/29/2011	trial received .2" rain
8/1/2011	trial received .5 inches of rainfall
8/3/2011	trial received .3 inches of rainfall
8/5/2011	applied Sevin @ 32oz/A
8/5/2011	harvested & evaluated varieties 9 & 25
8/6/2011	trial received 1 inch of rainfall
8/9/2011	harvest & evaluated 5,6,7,10,11,13,24,15
8/9/2011	trial received .45 inches of rainfall
8/10/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 9 & 25
8/10/2011	Harvested & evaluated 29,4,28,16,1
8/11/2011	Harvested & evaluated 14 & 18
8/12/2011	Harvested & evaluated 2,3,12,17,23,27
8/14/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 24, 15
8/14/2011	trial received .4 inches of rainfall
8/15/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 1, 4, 16, 28, 29
8/15/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 9 & 25
8/15/2011	Harvested & evaluated 8,19,20,21,22,26
8/16/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 14 & 18
8/17/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 2, 3, 12, 17, 23, 27
8/19/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 24, 15
8/19/2011	mowed off trial, completed
8/19/2011	disked trial under as completed
8/20/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 1, 4, 16, 28, 29
8/20/2011	5 day brix test on varieties 8, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26
8/21/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 14 & 18
8/22/2011	10 day brix test on varieties 2, 3, 12, 17, 23, 27

8/25/2011

10 day brix test on varieties 8, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26

Table 4. Plant Evaluation se &amp; syn

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Se)**

Varieties	Seeding 6/14	Stand ability & comments	Tassel Date	Suckers (1-3)	Silk Date	Harvest Date
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>						
Fastlane	1	Very short	7/22	1	7/26	8/11
Bon Jour	2	Very short	7/22	1	7/26	8/11
Rendevous	3	2	7/26	1.5	7/29	8/16
Jackie	2	2	7/26	2	7/29	8/17
Powwow	3	DOWN BEFORE CORN WAS MATURE				
Synergy	1	2	7/26	2	8/1	8/19
SEB6RH1080	1	1	7/26	2	8/1	8/19
SEB6RH1102	2	1	7/29	1	7/29	8/16
QEB6RH1276	2	2	7/29	2	8/1	8/19
Profit	1	Very short	7/22	1.5	7/26	8/16
Ka-ching	2	1	7/29	1	8/1	8/19
CSYBF7-263	1	3	7/26	1	7/29	8/17
Paydirt	1	2	7/26	1	7/29	8/11
BC 0822	2	3	7/22	2	7/26	8/15
Primus	3	1	7/22	1	7/26	8/15
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>						
Edelweiss TSW	2	2	7/26	2	8/1	8/16
Kokopelli	3	4		2	7/29	8/19
Misquamicut	2	DOWN BEFORE CORN WAS MATURE				
Silver Duchess	3	2	7/26	2	8/1	8/24
SEW6RH1230	2	1		2	8/1	8/19
<b>AVERAGE</b>						
	1.95			1.5		

**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 5. Harvest data se & syn

## 2011 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>						
Fastlane	3.25	9	3	15,943	1350	842*
Bon Jour	3.5	13	3	19,428	1568	1133*
Rendevous	3.5	16	4	17,686	1546	1277
Jackie	3.5	18.5	5	17,947	1452	1277
Powwow	NOT HARVESTED					
Synergy	3.25	13	3	20,909	1786	1713
SEB6RH1080	3	14.5	4	20,299	1742	1524
SEB6RH1102	3	18	4	20,299	1546	1205
QEB6RH1276	3.25	14.5	3	20,030	2003	1815
Profit	3.25	14	5	20,909	1764	1495
Ka-ching	3.5	14	5	21,432	1786	1669
CSYBF7-263	3	15.5	4	21,780	1815	1713
Paydirt	3.25	5	3	15,943	1350	893*
BC 0822	3	21	4	21,780	1815	1560
Primus	3.5	20	3	20,473	1760	1706
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>						
Edelweiss TSW	3.25	16	5	22,303	1909	1764
Kokopelli	3	15	4	17,424	1452	1277
Misquamicut	NOT HARVESTED					
Silver Duchess	2.5	15.5	4	21,780	1815	1764
SEW6RH1230	3	16	3	17,424	1669	1379
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>19,654</b>	<b>1674</b>	<b>1445</b>

Rating for snap 1 = difficult to pull 3 = average 5 = very easy to pull

Ear shank 1 = short 3 = average 5 = long

\*these early sweet corn varieties were extremely stressed all season long

Table 6. Ear Evaluation se & syn

## 2011 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>							
Fastlane	3	4	4	5	14	7.3	1.7
Bon Jour	2	4	5	5	12	7.9	1.55
Rendevous	3	4	4	5	14	7.5	1.7
Jackie	2	5	5	5	14	7.5	1.8
Powwow	Variety down, not harvestable						
Synergy	3	4	4	5	16	7.6	1.7
SEB6RH1080	3	4	4	5	14	7.4	1.7
SEB6RH1102	2	5	5	3	14	7.8	1.65
QEB6RH1276	3	2	3	5	16	7.67	1.75
Profit	3	4	4	5	14	8.1	1.8
Ka-ching	3	4	4	5	16	9.1	1.7
CSYBF7-263	3	3	3	3	14	7.4	1.7
Paydirt	2	2	4	5	12	7.3	1.5
BC 0822	3	3	4	4	14	8.5	1.8
Primus	2	2	4	5	14	8.65	1.75
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>							
Edelweiss TSW	3	5	4	4	16	7.8	1.8
Kokopelli	3	5	3	5	16	7.3	1.7
Misquamicut	Variety down, not harvestable						
Silver Duchess	4	4	4	5	14	8.55	1.8
SEW6RH1230	4	2	3	5	16	7.8	1.6
<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.8	3.6	3.9	4.7	14.4	7.8	1.7

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 7. Taste and Appeal se & syn

## 2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste & Appeal Se)

Varieties	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Taste Test (Public)
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>					
Fastlane	3	4	4	4	
Bon Jour	3	3	4	4	
Rendevous	3	4	3	4	
Jackie	3	4	4	5	
Powwow	Variety down early no harvest				
Synergy	4	3	4	5	X
SEB6RH1080	4	4	4	3	X
SEB6RH1102	4	2	4	4	X
QEB6RH1276	4	4	5	4	X
Profit	4	4	4	5	X
Ka-ching	4	4	4	5	X
CSYBF7-263	4	4	4	4	X
Paydirt	3	3	3	3	
BC 0822	4	4	5	5	
Primus	4	4	5	5	X
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>					
Edelweiss TSW	5	4	4	4	
Kokopelli	4	4	4	4	
Misquamicut	Variety down early no harvest				
Silver Duchess	5	4	4	5	X
SEW6RH1230	4	4	4	3	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</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

Table 8. Table Brix value se & syn

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Se  
Brix Ratings Cold Storage**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Harvest Brix</b>	<b>5 Day Brix</b>	<b>10 Day Brix</b>
<b><u>Bi-Color Varieties</u></b>			
Fastlane	18	11	12
Bon Jour	18.5	11	15
Rendevous	13	16.5	13
Jackie	16	11.5	12.5
Powwow			
Synergy	18.5	20	11.5
SEB6RH1080	18	20	12.5
SEB6RH1102	10	15	7.5
QEB6RH1276	13	19	11
Profit	14	14.5	13.5
Ka-ching	14	20	10.5
CSYBF7-263	9	10.5	12.5
Paydirt	19.5	14	14
BC 0822	21	13.5	16
Primus	19	15	17.5
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>			
Edelweiss TSW	14	11.5	9.5
Kokopelli	11.5	21.5	10.5
Misquamicut			
Silver Duchess	21.5	10.5	10
SEW6RH1230	12	14	10
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>12.2</b>

Table 9. Plant Evaluation  $sh_2$ **2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Sh2)**

Varieties	Seeding	Stand ability 7/26	Tassel Date	Suckers (1-3)	Silk Date	Harvest Date
<b>Bi-color Varieties</b>	6/8					
EX087455857R	1	2	7/19	2	7/26	8/10
EX 08767143	4	3	7/22	2	7/29	8/12
QHW6RH1229	4	3	7/22	2.5	7/29	8/12
4002 BC	3	3	7/22	2.5	7/26	8/10
7002 R	4	3	7/22	2	7/26	8/9
7112 R	2	1	7/19	2	7/22	8/9
7602 MR	1	2	7/22	2	7/29	8/15
2170	5	1	7/19	1.5	7/22	8/5
XTH 2674	3	2	7/19	1	7/26	8/9
XTH 2773	2	4	7/19	2	7/22	8/9
XTH 2576	5	4	7/19	1.5	7/26	8/12
XTH 2171	4	1	7/19	2	7/26	8/9
XTH 2379	4	3	7/22		7/26	8/11
BSS 8040	4	2	7/26	2	7/29	8/15
HMX 8343	2	4	7/22	1.5	7/26	8/12
HMX 9352	2	2	7/22	2	7/26	8/9
Bueno	2	3	7/22	2	7/26	8/15
CSABF8-323	2	4	7/22	2	7/26	8/12
CSABF9-357	2	2	7/19	1.5	7/26	8/10
Pick-me	3	2	7/19	2	7/22	8/10

Scale next page

Table 9. Plant Evaluation  $sh_2$

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Plant Evaluation Sh2)**

<b>Varieties</b>	Seeding 6/8	7/16	Tassel Date	Suckers (1-3)	Silk Date	Harvest Date
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>						
7401	2	3	7/22	1	7/26	8/9
HMX 0361	4	2	7/19	1.5	7/22	8/5
Munition	5	2	7/26	2	7/29	8/15
XTH 3773	1	1	7/19	2	7/26	8/9
XTH 3174	<b>3</b>	1	7/22	2	7/26	8/10
XTH 3876	4	3	7/22	2	7/26	8/12
3379	3	3	7/22	1	7/26	8/11
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.04</b>			<b>1.7</b>		

**Rating Scale:**

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

Standability:    1 = some leaning    3 = considerable leaning & some snap  
5 = heavy leaning or down

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 10. Harvest data  $sh_2$

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Harvest Data Sh2)**

<b>Varieties Bi-Color Varieties</b>	<b>Snap (1 – 5)</b>	<b>Ear Height</b>	<b>Ear Shank</b>	<b>Stand Per/acre</b>	<b>Harvested Dozen/ acre</b>	<b>Marketable Dozen/acre</b>
EX087455857R	3.5	15	5	18078	1524	1306
EX 08767143	4	21	3	18,513	1815	1669
QHW6RH1229	3.25	24	3	22,216	2032	2014
4002 BC	3.5	15.5	3	18,078	1579	1125
7002 R	3.25	17.5	3	20,909	2032	1579
7112 R	3.25	17	5	19820	1833	1742
7602 MR	3.5	18	5	15,682	1361	1125
2170	3.5	17	4	19,602	1706	1524
XTH 2674	3.5	20	5	17,424	1433	925
XTH 2773	3.5	15	3	20,256	1869	1560
XTH 2576	3.5	21	5	20,030	1887	1651
XTH 2171	3.5	17.5	4	20,691	1887	1524
XTH 2379	4	18	4	21,345	1833	1579
BSS 8040	3.5	22	5	19,602	1651	1560
HMX 8343	3.5	18	5	16989	1524	1343
HMX 9352	3.5	16.5	3	18,078	1706	1524
Bueno	3.5	18.5	4	20,030	1887	1597
CSABF8-323	3.5	19.75	4	18,513	1669	1306
CSABF9-357	3.5	14	4	20,909	2051	1960
Pick-me	3.5	15	3	18295	1524	1234

**Scale next page**

Table 10. Harvest data  $sh_2$

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Trial (Harvest Data Sh2)**

Varieties	Snap (1 – 5)	Ear Height (inches)	Ear Shank	Stand Per/acre	Harvested Dozen/ acre	Marketable Dozen/acre
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>						
7401	4	15.5	3	20,909	1778	1597
HMX 0361	4	17	3	18,078	1633	1343
Munition	3	21	5	20,691	1796	1452
XTH 3773	3.5	17.5	5	20,030	1778	1688
XTH 3174	3.75	18	4	22,216	1869	1343
XTH 3876	3.5	21.75	5	19,167	1724	1597
3379	4	18	5	18,731	1669	1470
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>19,440</b>	<b>1742</b>	<b>1494</b>

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

Table 11. Ear Evaluation data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Ear Evaluation Sh2**

<b>Varieties</b> <b>Bi-color Varieties</b>	Husk Cover	Flags	Overall Husk	Tip Fill	Rows (AVG)	Length (Inches)	Diameter (Inches)
EX087455857R	5	5	5	5	18	8.2	1.95
EX 08767143	2	3	4	5	18	8.6	1.8
QHW6RH1229	2	2	3	4	16	7.8	1.7
4002 BC	2	4	5	5	18	7.5	1.75
7002 R	1	5	4	5	18	7.8	1.8
7112 R	3	5	4	5	18	8.3	1.7
7602 MR	3	5	5	5	16	8	1.8
2170	3	5	4	5	16	8.65	1.75
XTH 2674	2	5	4	4	18	7.8	1.85
XTH 2773	2	4	4	5	18	8	1.85
XTH 2576	2	5	4	5	16	8.6	2
XTH 2171	2	4	4	5	16	7.8	1.9
XTH 2379	3	4	5	5	16	8.4	1.75
BSS 8040	2	5	4	5	18	8.6	1.8
HMX 8343	1	4	4	5	16	8.1	1.85
HMX 9352	2	4	4	4	16	8.2	1.7
Bueno	3	5	4	5	16	7.9	1.9
CSABF8-323	2	4	4	5	16	8.5	1.7
CSABF9-357	2	5	5	4	18	8	1.8
Pick-me	2	5	4	5	14	7.9	1.7

**Scale next page**

Table 11. Ear Evaluation data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

## 2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Ear Evaluation Sh2

Varieties	Husk Cover	Flags	Overall Husk	Tip Fill	Rows (AVG)	Length (Inches)	Diameter (Inches)
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>							
7401	2	5	4	4	18	8.9	1.75
HMX 0361	2	3	3	4	16	8.3	1.6
Munition	1	4	4	5	16	7.8	1.75
XTH 3773	2	5	5	4	16	7.8	1.8
XTH 3174	3	4	4	5	18	8.25	1.8
XTH 3876	3	5	4	5	18	8.6	1.9
3379	3	5	4	4	18	8.05	1.85
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>1.8</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 12. Taste and Appeal *sh*<sub>2</sub>

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste & Appeal Sh2)**

<b>Varieties Bi-Color Varieties</b>	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Taste Test (Public)
EX087455857R	3	5	3	3	
EX 08767143	5	4	3	5	X
QHW6RH1229	5	4	4	5	X
4002 BC	4	4	4	5	X
7002 R	3	5	4	5	X
7112 R	4	5	5	5	X
7602 MR	5	4	4	5	X
2170	4	3	4	4	X
XTH 2674	4	4	4	5	
XTH 2773	4	5	5	5	X
XTH 2576	4	4	5	5	X
XTH 2171	4	4	3	3	
XTH 2379	4	5	3	5	X
BSS 8040	4	4	4	5	X
HMX 8343	5	4	4	5	
HMX 9352	4	4	5	5	X
Bueno	4	4	3	4	X
CSABF8-323	3	4	4	4	X
CSABF9-357	4	3	4	4	X
Pick-me	4	4	3	4	X

**Scale next page**

Table 12. Taste & Appeal data *sh*<sub>2</sub>

## 2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation (Taste & Appeal Sh2)

Varieties	Rowing	Color	Tenderness	Sweetness	Taste Test (Public)
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>					
7401	4	4	4	3	
HMX 0361	3	4	3	3	X
Munition	3	4	2	4	
XTH 3773	3	4	5	4	
XTH 3174	4	4	4	5	X
XTH 3876	4	3	5	5	X
3379	4	4	3	5	X
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.4</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

Table 13. Brix values  $sh_2$

**2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation  
Brix Ratings Cold Storage**

<b>Varieties</b>	<b>Harvest Brix</b>	<b>5 Day Brix</b>	<b>10 Day Brix</b>
EX087455857R	15.5	13.5	14.5
EX 08767143	12.5	7.5	7
QHW6RH1229	11	8.5	6.5
4002 BC	12.5	14.5	12
7002 R	10	11	13.5
7112 R	13.5	10	11.5
7602 MR	14.5	12.5	10
2170	12	13.5	12
XTH 2674	9	15	12.5
XTH 2773	14.5	13	12.5
XTH 2576	12.5	9	7.5
XTH 2171	11	10	12.5
XTH 2379	10	8.5	15
BSS 8040	12	13	12.5
HMX 8343	11.5	9	9
HMX 9352	11	10	11.5
Bueno	13.5	13	12.5
CSABF8-323	8	9.5	8.5
CSABF9-357	15	15.5	9
Pick-me	15.5	17.5	13

Table 13. Brix values *sh*<sub>2</sub>

### 2011 Northern Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation Brix Ratings Cold Storage

Varieties	Harvest Brix	5 Day Brix	10 Day Brix
<b><u>White Varieties</u></b>			
7401	11	10	9.5
HMX 0361	12	12	12
Munition	12	8.5	8.5
XTH 3773	12	9	10.5
XTH 3174	14	13.5	11
XTH 3876	11.5	12.5	10.5
3379	5	12	13
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>11.0</b>

Table 14. Public evaluation of sweet corn varieties in the 2011 North Ohio Sweet Corn Evaluation, OARDC North Central Agricultural Research Station\*

Following page

Scale P=Poor; A=Acceptable; V=Very good; E=Excellent



