

**University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
ScholarWorks@UARK**

Research Series

Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station

4-1-2004

Arkansas Cotton Variety Test 2003

Fred M. Bourland

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

S. B. Jackson

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

J. M. Hornbeck

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

F. E. Groves

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/aaesser>

 Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agronomy and Crop Sciences Commons](#), [Botany Commons](#), and the [Horticulture Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bourland, Fred M.; Jackson, S. B.; Hornbeck, J. M.; and Groves, F. E., "Arkansas Cotton Variety Test 2003" (2004). *Research Series*. 114.
<https://scholarworks.uark.edu/aaesser/114>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

ARKANSAS COTTON VARIETY TEST 2003



*F.M. Bourland, S.B. Jackson,
J.M. Hornbeck, and F.E. Groves*

ARKANSAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

Division of Agriculture

April 2004

University of Arkansas

Research Series 513

This publication is available on the Internet at www.uark.edu/depts/agripub/publications

Additional printed copies of this publication can be obtained free of charge from Communication Services, 110 Agriculture Building, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701.

Technical editing and cover design by Camilla Romund

Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Fayetteville. Milo J. Shult, Vice President for Agriculture; Gregory J. Weidemann, Dean, Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences and Associate Vice President for Agriculture—Research, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture. SG520QX6. The University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture follows a nondiscriminatory policy in programs and employment.

ISSN:1051-3140 CODEN:AKAMA6



**ARKANSAS
COTTON
VARIETY TEST
2003**

F.M. Bourland
S.B. Jackson
J.M. Hornbeck
F.E. Groves



Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station
Fayetteville, AR 72701

SUMMARY

The primary aim of the Arkansas Cotton Variety Test is to provide unbiased data regarding the agronomic performance of cotton varieties and advanced breeding lines in the major cotton-growing areas of Arkansas. This information helps seed dealers establish marketing strategies and assists producers in choosing varieties to plant. In this way, the annual test facilitates the inclusion of new, improved genetic material in Arkansas cotton production. Varietal adaptation is determined by evaluating the varieties and lines at four University of Arkansas research stations located near Keiser, Clarkedale, Marianna, and Rohwer and one off-station site (near Manila). Tests are duplicated in irrigated and non-irrigated culture at the Keiser and Marianna locations. In 2003, 33 entries were evaluated in the main test and 23 were evaluated in the first-year test. Replications of the two tests were randomized in the fields so that data can be compared.

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Materials and Methods	5
Data Collected	6
Yield Comparisons	6
Results	7
Literature Cited	7
Acknowledgments	8
Cultural Inputs and Production Information	
Participants in 2003 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test	9
Production information for all locations (Table 1)	10
Environmental conditions (Table 2)	10
Results	
Yield and fiber quality results (Tables 3-10)	11
(Varieties tested in previous year)	
Yield and fiber quality results (Tables 11-18)	19
(Varieties tested for the first time in 2003)	
Leaf pubescence ratings (Table 19)	27
2-year and 3-year yield averages (Tables 20-21)	28

Arkansas Cotton Variety Test 2003

*F.M. Bourland, S.B. Jackson,
J.M. Hornbeck, and F.E. Groves¹*

Introduction

The purpose of the University of Arkansas Cotton Variety Testing Program is to provide unbiased comparisons of cotton varieties and advanced breeding lines produced over a range of environments. Data from these tests help to identify the potential adaptability of varieties to particular cotton-growing regions of the state. Bourland et al. (2000) documented several unintentional biases that are inherent to the Arkansas cotton variety testing program. These include management associated with varieties expressing herbicide- and insect-resistance. The biases tend to cancel each other so that no great advantage is given to any particular variety. Recognizing the genetic differences among entries is the ultimate goal of the test, therefore all varieties are treated the same. Within the official varietal test, no specialized production inputs were contributed with respect to genetically enhanced varieties. Roundup Ready® varieties, Buctril®-resistant varieties, Bt varieties, and conventional varieties were all treated equally with respect to weed and insect control.

Lines that had not been previously tested in the Arkansas Variety Testing Program were evaluated in the 2003 1st-year varietal test. Lines that had been evaluated in 2002 and were re-submitted in 2003 were evaluated in the 2003 main varietal test.

Materials and Methods

The 2003 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test was conducted at the Northeast Research and Extension Center at Keiser; the Delta Branch Station at Clarkedale; the Cotton Branch Experiment Station at Marianna; and the Southeast Branch Experiment Station at Rohwer. An irrigated test was conducted at each site, and a non-irrigated test was conducted at Keiser and Marianna. An on-farm varietal test was conducted near Manila in Mississippi County (located in northeast Arkansas) on a soil naturally infested with root-knot nematode. Cultural practices associated with the test are listed in Table 1.

Entries were separated into those tested for the first time in 2003 (1st-year entries) and entries that were evaluated in the 2002 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test (returning entries). All test sites included the same entries. Double-treated (two fungicides) seed for all entries were obtained from originators. Prior to planting, all seeds were treated with imidacloprid (Gaucho®) at a rate of 6oz/100 lb seed. Plots were planted with a constant number of seeds (ca. 4.5 seed/row ft) except when increased due to low seed quality. All varieties were planted in two-row plots ranging in length from 40 to 50 feet. All tests were arranged in a randomized complete block and replicated four times. Although exact inputs varied across locations, cultural inputs at each

¹F.M. Bourland is center director and professor and S.B. Jackson is a research specialist at the Northeast Research and Extension Center; J.M. Hornbeck is a research specialist at the Cotton Branch Experiment Station; F.E. Groves is a research specialist at the Southeast Branch Experiment Station.

location were generally based on University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service recommendations for cotton production, including COTMAN rules for insecticide termination. All plots were machine-harvested, yield per acre was calculated, and data were statistically analyzed.

Data Collected

Stand: After final emergence, number of plants per row foot was determined after counting the number of surviving plants in a random 5-foot section of each of the two rows. Since seed was obtained from different sources, stand counts simply demonstrate the adequacy of final stands rather than the genetic ability of entries to produce stand.

Leaf Pubescence: Leaf pubescence was visually rated on a scale of 1 (smooth leaf) to 7 (very hairy) in the irrigated tests at Keiser using a system described by Bourland et al. (2003). A full-sized leaf, ca. 5-6 nodes from plant apex, was rated for 6 plants per plot for all 4 replications.

Plant Height: Plant height measurements were collected from each variety prior to harvest. Average plant heights for varieties were determined by measuring from the soil surface to the terminal of one average-sized plant per plot.

Lint Percentage and Fiber Data: Prior to mechanical harvest, hand-harvested samples of 50 open bolls were obtained from two replications at each location. In each test, the samples were obtained by picking all open bolls from consecutive plants. Within each row of two-row plots, a site having average or above-average plant density was chosen and 25 bolls were harvested and bulked to form a 50-boll sample. The 50-boll samples were ginned (lab ginned without the use of lint cleaners) to determine lint fraction (the percentage lint to seedcotton). Fiber properties were determined using HVI classification.

Seed index: Two sets of 50 fuzzy seed were counted and weighed from the ginned seed of each 50-boll sample. If the two weights varied greatly, a third sample was taken. Two consistent weights of 50 seed were added to obtain fuzzy seed index (weight of 100 seed).

Seed per acre: For each plot, an estimate of number of seeds per acre was obtained by multiplying seed-

cotton yield (lb/a converted to g/a) times average seed percentage (the percentage seed to seedcotton in ginned sample, averaged by entry over reps), then divided by average weight of a seed (average seed index by entry over reps divided by 100).

Lint index: Lint index (weight of lint on 100 seeds) was determined from 50-boll sample data by dividing lint weight from gin by the number of seeds per sample (determined using seed index) then multiplying by 100.

Lint Yield: Seedcotton yield per plot was converted to seedcotton yield per acre then multiplied by average lint percentage (determined by variety and location) to estimate lint per acre.

Yield Comparisons

Uncontrolled variation is inherent to collection of varietal performance data (particularly yield data). In addition to their genetic ability, variation among varieties may be due to slight differences in soil, pest, or climatic conditions within a field; various interactions with specific management; or experimental error. Statistics allow users to define the degree of uncontrolled variation and to interpret data. The statistical tool used to compare means in these tests was Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (LSD). An LSD was calculated when the F value from ANOVA was significant. Varietal yields are considered significantly different if the difference between the mean yields of two varieties is greater than the LSD value. Differences smaller than the LSD may have occurred by chance or due to uncontrolled variation and are therefore considered not significant.

Additional estimates of variation are provided by measures of R-squared and coefficient of variation (CV). R-squared (times 100) indicates the percentage of variation that is explained by defined sources of variation (e.g. replication and varietal effects within a location). Confidence in data increases as R-squared increases. Generally, the meaningfulness of difference among means is questionable when data have R-squared values of less than 50%. Also, confidence in data becomes greater as CV declines. Since CV is a function of the mean of a parameter, R-squared is a better tool for comparing the precision of different experiments.

Results

Several problems were associated with the tests in 2003. Excessive rainfall in May caused problems in attaining and maintaining test stands. Following are observations regarding each location:

Manila. This was the first year that trial leaders have conducted small-plot varietal testing in this area. The site chosen has high infestation of root-knot nematode and is representative of a large cotton-growing area in northeast Arkansas and southeast Missouri. The test was conducted in cooperation with Mr. Ray Benson and was located (north) adjacent to the public golf course in Manila. Extended saturated conditions are unusual on this sandy soil yet excessive rainfall caused flooding and forced researchers to replant the test twice. Yields of late-maturity varieties may have been lessened by the late planting. Symptoms of root-knot nematode occurred relatively late but were extensive.

Keiser. Adequate stands were achieved in the irrigated and non-irrigated tests at Keiser, but wet and cloudy conditions caused emerged seedlings to grow very slowly throughout the month of May. Although stands were relatively uniform, the slow and differential growth lessened uniformity over the field.

Clarkedale. A 10-inch rain accompanied by strong wind destroyed stands from the first planting. Subsequently, the tests were replanted relatively late.

Marianna. Stands in the non-irrigated test at Marianna were relatively low and lacked uniformity. Both tests at Marianna followed corn in a field that has drainage problems. The wet conditions, high nitrogen carryover, late planting, and relatively cool June-August (Table 2) resulted in excessive growth and poor fruiting. Excessive growth was a greater problem in the irrigated test (planted later) than in the non-irrigated test. Consequently, yields at Marianna were low, particularly in the irrigated test.

Rohwer. Excessive rainfall and flooding (primarily on one side of the study field) caused a loss of 10 plots per replication of the main test. Stands in the rest of the main test and the 1st-year test were sufficient.

Environmental conditions varied across the state (Table 2). Temperatures in the 2003 production season tended to be below the historical average (1960 - 1998).

Unusually wet conditions immediately after planting adversely affected stands and early growth at each location. Daily high temperatures were generally mild throughout the summer. Consequently, plant stress was minimal and high yields were generally achieved.

Table 1. Table 1 includes cultural inputs and production information for varietal trials at Manila; Keiser (irrigated and non-irrigated); Clarkedale; Marianna (irrigated and non-irrigated); and Rohwer.

Table 2. Table 2 reports weather information for north, central, and south Arkansas locations during the 2003 production season.

Tables 3–10. Tables 3–10 represent the results of the main test of the 2003 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test. Varieties listed in these tables were tested the previous year in Arkansas. Table 3 provides results over all locations, and Tables 4–10 provide results for each of seven locations.

Tables 11–18. Tables 11–18 are the results of the 1st-year Arkansas Cotton Variety Test. Varieties tested in the 1st-year test were not entered in the 2002 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test. Table 11 provides results over all locations, and Tables 12–18 provide results for each of seven locations.

Table 19. Leaf pubescence ratings (main and 1st-year test) at Keiser are in Table 19.

Tables 20–21. Tables 20 – 21 are two- and three-year means for entries in the main test, respectively.

Literature Cited

- Bourland, F.M., N.R. Benson, and W.C. Robertson. 2000. Inherent biases in the Arkansas cotton variety testing program. pp. 547–549. In Proc. Beltwide Cotton Prod. Res. Conf., San Antonio, Tex. 4–8 Jan. 2000. National Cotton Council, Memphis, Tenn.
- Bourland, F. M., J. M. Hornbeck, A. B. McFall, and S. D. Calhoun. 2003. A rating system for leaf pubescence of cotton. *J. Cotton Sci.* 7:8–15.

Acknowledgments

The authors express appreciation to the directors, program technicians, and staffs at the Northeast Research and Extension Center, Delta Branch Experiment Station, Cotton Branch Experiment Station, and the Southeast Branch Experiment Station. Additionally, the authors would like to express appreciation to Ray Benson for his efforts and support of the on-farm test in Mississippi County. Annual evaluation of cotton varieties is made possible by the work of the research assistants and technicians at these locations and by the contributions of seed companies participating in the Arkansas Cotton Variety Test.

Cultural Inputs and Production Information

Participants in the 2003 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test

Institution/contact person	Main test entries		1st-year test entries	
Bayer Crop Science / Jane Dever jane.dever@bayercropscience.com	FM 958 FM 960BR FM 960R	FM 966 FM 989BR	FM 958LL FM 966LL	
Beltwide Cotton Genetics / Tom Kilgore buytexas@aol.com	BCG 24R	BCG 28R	BCG 295	
Calif. Planting Cotton Seed Dist. / Hal Moser hmoser@cpcsd.com			CS31 CS32 CS33	CS34 CS35 CS36
Delta & Pine Land Company / David Albers david.w.albers@deltaandpine.com	DP 436RR DP 451B/RR DP 491 DP 555BG/RR DP 493 DP 444BG/RR	DP 449BG/RR PM 1199RR PM 1218BG/RR SG 215BG/RR SG 105 SG 521R	DP 434RR DP 432RR DP 494RR DPLX 00W12	DP 424BG2/RR DP 468BG2/RR SG 105, check
Mississippi State Univ.-Delta / John Creech jcreech@drec.msstate.edu	DES 810	DES 816		
PhytoGen Seed Co., LLC. / Frank Bordelon FCBordelon@dow.com			PHY 410RR	
Stoneville Pedigreed Seed Co. / Andy White awhite@stoneville.com	BXN 49B ST 5303R ST 4793R	ST 4892BR ST 5599BR	ST 4563B2 ST 5222B2 ST 4646B2R	ST 4892BR, check ST 5242BR ST 3990BR
Syngenta Seeds, Inc. / Charles Cook Charlie.cook@syngenta.com	DX 2429			
Texas A&M University / Wayne Smith& Peggy Thaxton cwsmith@tamu.edu p-thaxton@tamu.edu	96WD22			
University of Arkansas / Fred Bourland bourland@uark.edu	Ark 8712 Ark 9101-97-09	Ark 9108-04-17 Ark 9111-57-20		

Table 1. Cultural practices for locations in the 2003 Arkansas Cotton Variety Test

Location	Fertilizer N, P, K lb/a	Planting date(s)	Irrigation dates ¹	Defoliation date	Harvest date
Manila, Irrigated	90,30,60	May 1,13,23	5 turns of pivot	Sep 25	Oct 6
Keiser, Irrigated	100,20,0	May 2	Jul 2,12,25, Aug 6	Sep 15, 20	Sep 25
Keiser, Non-irrigated	100,20,0	May 2	None	Sep 15, 20	Sep 12
Clarkedale, Irrigated	80, 46, 60	May 6,27	Jun 24, Jul 2, 9	Sep 22	Oct 20
Marianna, Irrigated	82, 46, 30	May 9	Jul 10, Aug 2, 9, 29	Sep 23	Oct 15
Marianna, Non-irrigated	82, 46, 30	May 2	None	Sep 16	Oct 1
Rohwer, Irrigated	120, 40, 60	May 13	Jun 14, Jul 10	Sep 21, 20	Sep 25

¹ Manila location was irrigated with center pivot, other irrigated locations were furrow-irrigated.

Table 2. Weather summary for the 2003 production season in north, central, and south Arkansas

Month by location	DD60s in 2003	DD60s historical avg. ¹	Rainfall (in.) in 2003
Keiser (northeast Ark.):			
May	341	326	11.39
June	441	549	3.30
July	660.5	659	5.80
August	642	579	0.68
September	305	366	3.48
Total	2389.5	2479	24.65
Marianna (central Ark.):			
May	354.5	326	7.40
June	434.5	549	4.16
July	638.5	659	4.02
August	598.5	579	2.07
September	321.5	366	3.43
Total	2347.5	2479	21.08
Rohwer (southeast Ark.):			
May	395.5	635	9.69
June	490.0	564	5.35
July	637.5	672	2.37
August	678.5	621	1.34
September	404.0	532	4.74
Total	2605.5	3024	23.49

¹ DD60 (growing degree days based on 60°F) from historical weather data, 1960-1998

Table 19. Leaf pubescence ratings¹ for entries in the 2003 main and 1st-year Arkansas Cotton Variety Test.

Main test - Cultivar	Leaf pubes. rating	r	1st year test - Cultivar	Leaf pubes. rating	r
96WD22	3.7	5	BCG295	1.1	18
Ark8712	1.7	15	CS31	3.6	8
Ark9101-97-09	4.6	2	CS32	2.4	11
Ark9108-04-17	1.2	26	CS33	4.9	5
Ark9111-57-20	1.3	21	CS34	1.2	17
BCG24R	1.0	30	CS35	1.0	21
BCG28R	2.9	9	CS36	2.9	10
BXN49B	3.2	7	DP424BGII/RR	1.7	13
DES810	2.2	13	DP432RR	6.0	1
DES816	3.5	6	DP468BGII/RR	1.0	19
DP436RR	1.0	30	DP494RR	3.9	7
DP444BG/RR	1.3	23	DPLX00W12	1.4	15
DP449BG/RR	1.4	20	DPLX01W99R_074	1.6	14
DP451B/RR	1.4	18	FM958LL	1.0	21
DP491	1.3	22	FM966LL	1.0	21
DP493	1.0	30	PHY410RR	5.5	3
DP555BG/RR	1.3	23	SG105, check	1.0	19
FM958	1.5	17	ST3990BR	3.0	9
FM958B	2.7	12	ST4563B2	4.0	6
FM960BR	1.8	14	ST4646B2R	5.0	4
FM966	1.4	18	ST4892BR, check	5.5	2
FM989BR	1.1	29	ST5222B2	1.3	16
PM1199RR	2.7	11	ST5242BR	1.8	12
PM1218BG/RR	1.5	16	.	.	
PSC355	3.1	8	.	.	
SG105	1.3	23	.	.	
SG215BG/RR	1.2	26	.	.	
SG521R	1.2	28	.	.	
ST4793R	4.0	4	.	.	
ST4892BR	5.9	1	.	.	
ST5303R	1.0	30	.	.	
ST5599BR	2.8	10	.	.	
SynNX2429	4.1	3	.	.	
Mean	2.1		Mean	2.7	
LSD 0.10	1.5		LSD 0.10	1.6	
C.V.%	58.7		C.V.%	51.2	
R-sq x 100	58.9		R-sq x 100	69.1	

¹/ Leaf pubescence rated at Keiser irrigated test using method of Bourland et al. (2003).

