

Short Research Article

Trinexapac-ethyl Winter Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Cultivar Evaluations with Variable Rates of Nitrogen

ABSTRACT

In the southeastern region of the United States, soft red winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is grown in double-crop production systems. The plant growth regulator (PGR) trinexapac-ethyl is applied to improve wheat morphology by reducing height and increasing stem wall diameter, which can promote maximum yields. An experiment was conducted from 2014 to 2015 to evaluate the effects of trinexapac-ethyl with varying N rates on growth, lodging, and yield of five soft red winter wheat cultivars. Soft red winter wheat was treated with trinexapac-ethyl at 233 or 256 g ai ha⁻¹ at 60 d after planting, or as a split application of 128 g ai ha⁻¹ 60 and 108 d after planting. You should write this sentence more clearly. You have applied three different doses, you are confusion with "or" using. Nitrogen fertilizer at 112 or 168 kg ha⁻¹ was applied at Feekes' stage 3-4. Crop heights, spike counts per m², and node length from the flag leaf to the base of the floral spike were collected 144 d after planting, with final yields, grain moisture, and test weight determined after harvest. There were no interactions for the main effects of PGR by nitrogen rate, PGR by cultivar, or cultivar by nitrogen rate. Trinexapac-ethyl at 256 at Feekes 4, or split applied at 128 g ha⁻¹ at Feekes 4 and 7, significantly reduced soft red winter wheat height, and distance from the flag-leaf node to base of the floral spike as compared to the non-treated control. While there were no yield differences for trinexapac-ethyl treatments, height reductions and improved stem strength would reduce lodging that can often lead to crop failure.

Keywords: soft red winter wheat cultivars, trinexapac-ethyl, N fertilizer

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red, Highlight

Formatted: Font color: Red

23 INTRODUCTION

24 Soft red winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is an autumn-seeded crop in the southeastern United States
 25 utilized for grain and forage. Soft red winter wheat is a secondary crop in multiple-cropping systems that
 26 can provide an economical way for farmers to produce two crops in one year [1,2]. From 2013 to 2016, 17
 27 million ha year⁻¹ of soft red winter wheat were harvested across the United States [3]. Due to the
 28 significance of wheat in many double-crop production systems, there has been a greater interest in wheat
 29 production practices, especially those that encourage high crop yield [4,5]. Primary requirements for high
 30 yields are uniform stand establishment followed by even tiller production which can be influenced by crop
 31 additives such as plant growth regulators and N fertilization [5].

32 Plant growth regulators (PGRs) are phytohormones that mimic or modify one or more specific
 33 physiological processes within a plant [6]. Organ development or photosynthetic properties are not
 34 negatively affected by PGRs but allow the crop to continue developmental sequence with retarded growth
 35 ([7,8,9]. In small grain and forage production, PGRs reduce stem internodes and length (13-28%) and
 36 improve grain set, grain quality, development, and harvest ability [10,11,12,13]. PGRs have been reported
 37 to increase seed yields in tall fescue, creeping red fescue, perennial ryegrass, and annual ryegrass seed
 38 crops as much as 50% or greater [14,15,16,13,17]. Previous studies on Kentucky bluegrass displayed that
 39 trinexapac-ethyl reduced heat tolerance, total height, average clipping yield 30-45%, and growth rate but
 40 increased chlorophyll concentration [18,19,20,21].

41 Trinexapac-ethyl is a plant growth regulator for turf grass seed production and small grains in the
 42 southeast [22,15,10]. Trinexapac-ethyl is a unique Type II PGR in that it interferes with the production of
 43 gibberellins (GAs) later in gibberellin biosynthetic pathway with respect to other Type II
 44 PGRs [23,24,25]. Trinexapac-ethyl is an acyl cyclohexanedione derived from cyclohexanecarboxylate. It
 45 inhibits the hydroxylation of GA₂₀ to the physiologically active GA₁ by inhibiting 3-β-hydroxylase, a
 46 regulatory enzyme [26,27,28]. The inhibition of this key enzyme prevents cell elongation (i.e. expansion)
 47 which causes a shortening of internodes, a strengthening of the stem, an increase in stem diameter, and
 48 reduction in lodging [11,29,13].

49 Trinexapac-ethyl applications interact with other management practices including canopy closure
 50 date, crop residue destruction, and nitrogen application [13,30,15,31]. There has always been interest

Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red
 Formatted: Font color: Red

in using timing and rate of N fertilizer application for intense soft red winter wheat management that maximize yield [5,32,33,34,35,36]. One study evaluated N uptake and use efficiency prior to and during the grain filling period in soft red winter wheat [37]. Van Sanford and MacKown (1986) noted that there was a strong correlation between grain protein/yield and N uptake under non-limiting N conditions. Multiple research has shown that grain yield has been directly linked with the uptake of N [38,39,40,41].

University of Georgia recommendations for a N application are 90 to 112 kg ha⁻¹ in a season for small grains production. In the autumn season, the cropping rotation strategy and previous crop can affect the amount of N fertilizer applied [42,43]. During the winter season, several applications of N can be made prior to stem elongation in wheat. Once tillers are being promoted, excessive N fertilization can lead to lodging and reductions in flour quality and milling properties, so applications are not recommended after Feekes' growth stage 4-5 [44,42]. Soft red winter wheat cultivars are continuously changing due to breeding programs that seek to improve disease tolerance, quality, and grain yield [45,46,47,48,49].

There is limited information available on trinexapac-ethyl effects on wheat cropping systems in the southeastern US. Given variability in wheat cultivar response to plant growth regulators and N fertilization [50,51,38,52,37,36], a field study was designed to evaluate the effects of trinexapac-ethyl and varying N rates on winter wheat lodging and yield when applied to five different wheat cultivars.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field trial was conducted from 2014 to 2015 at the Southwest Georgia Branch Experiment Station (SWGREC) located in Plains Georgia (Latitude 32.036638; Longitude -84.397595). Soil type was a Faceville sandy loam (clayey, kaolinitic, thermic, Typic Kandiudults) with < 1% organic matter and pH of 6.1. The soil was conventionally prepared by disk harrowing, moldboard plowing 25 to 30 cm deep, then rotary tilling. Single plots were 1.8 m wide and 9.1 m long.

Soft red winter wheat cultivars AGS 2026, AGS 2060, Coker 9553, Coker 9700, and Cypress were sown at 323-377/m² into seedbeds on 5 Dec 2014 at 101 kg ha⁻¹ [53,54,55]. Higher seeding rates are not recommended for standard cultural practices because of the increased potential for disease and lodging [33]. Main effect of cultivar was blocked by replication. Within each cultivar block, N fertilizer rate and PGR applications were randomized.

79 Nitrogen fertilizer at 112 or 168 kg ha⁻¹ was applied with a Gandy TM Spreader (The Gandy Co.,
80 Mankato, MN) on 22 Jan 2015 when wheat was in Feekes' growth stage 3-4. Trinexapac-ethyl was POST
81 applied to wheat at 233 or 256 g ai ha⁻¹ 60 d after planting, or as a split application of 128 g ai ha⁻¹ each
82 time at 60 and 108 d after planting. The PGR treatments were applied with a CO₂-pressurized broadcast
83 sprayer with FF11002 nozzles calibrated to deliver 187 L ha⁻¹ volume of water. Standard culture practices
84 for wheat production were followed using University of Georgia recommendations for pest control [56].

85 At Feekes' stage 10.5 data for crop heights from soil to apex of the spike (cm), along with apical
86 stem length from the flag-leaf node to the base of the floral spike (cm), was measured on 5 random plants
87 for each variable. Data for spike counts per m² were also recorded. These data were collected 144 d after
88 planting. Grain was harvested at Feekes' growth stage 11 after natural desiccation using a small plot
89 combine, grain was mechanically cleaned, and then for each plot grain moisture, yield, and test weight
90 determined. Final grain yield was based on 13% moisture.

91 The experimental design was a three-way factorial arranged in a randomized complete block with
92 four replications. Data was subjected to mixed-model ANOVA analysis in SAS 9.4®, and all two-way
93 interactions were subjected to GLM procedures. Means were separated using an LSD at the $P = 0.05$
94 level.

95 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

96 The two-way interactions for crop height, head count, yield, and test weight for cultivar (C) x
97 fertilizer (F), C x trinexapac-ethyl treatment (TE), and F x TE were not significant for any variable (Table
98 1). For flag-leaf to apex, C x F was significant ($P = 0.0099$), but not for C x TE or F x TE. As cultivars will
99 vary for height due to genotype differences, the C x F difference is an indication of this variability (Benetoli
100 da Silva et al. 2011). Therefore, data for all variables for the main effects for TE were combined across N
101 fertilizer treatment and cultivars, main effects of F were combined across TE and cultivars, and main
102 effects of cultivars were combined across TE and F for analysis.

103 Trinexapac-ethyl

104 Wheat height varied amongst the four different PGR treatments. There were significant height
105 reductions when TE was applied at 256 g ai ha⁻¹, and for the split application of 128 g ai ha⁻¹ at Feekes'
106 stage 4 and 7 (Table 2). Data indicated that the single TE application of 256g ai ha⁻¹, or split application

107 128 g ai ha⁻¹, reduced plant heights to 80 and 76 cm, respectively as compared NTC [what is it?](#) of 83 cm.
 Similarly,
 108 there was significant reduction length of the stem for flag-leaf to the base of the floral apex, ranging from
 109 9 to 11 cm, for any TE application treatment as compared to the NTC with 12 cm (Table 2). These
 110 finding_scorrespond_with previous research results that applications of trinexapac-ethyl at later wheat
 111 growth development stages reduce plant height[12]. There were no differences for any treatment for
 112 wheat head count per m² or grain test weight (Table 2). These results confer with previous research that
 113 reported PGR interactions were nonsignificant for test weight measurements [50].

114 Trinexapac-ethyl treatments had similar yields [as istatistical](#) as compared to the non-treated
 115 control: 3,470 kg ha⁻¹ and 3,660 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 3). None of the TE treatments impacted these soft red
 winter wheat yields
 116 indicating the crop safety for this PGR. It can be used to effectively reduce plant height, which could
 117 reduce potential for lodging. Benetoli de Silva et al. (2011) noted no differences in yield for TE applied to
 118 wheat in an experiment in South America, however they did not indicate the type of wheat. Similar results
 119 have been reported with ethephon [50, 57].

120 **N fertilizer**

121 Significant differences for wheat head count per m² were observed between the two N fertilizer
 122 applications. The 168 kg N ha⁻¹ fertilizer treatment produced more wheat heads than the 112 kg N ha⁻¹
 123 application (Table 2). Tamang et al.'s (2017) research noted reduced spike number plant⁻¹ and grain
 124 number spike⁻¹ when lower nitrogen levels were present. Crop height measurements displayed a similar
 125 response to the 112 and 168 kg N ha⁻¹ applications in which the larger application rate produced a larger
 126 plant (Table 2). Previous research on dryland winter wheat indicated higher nitrogen rates result in larger
 127 plants with greater above-ground biomass than with lower application rates [58]. However, a taller height
 128 could potentially lead to lodging issues later in the growing season. With respect to crop height, the
 129 results differ from Benetoli da Silva et al.'s (2011) study in which they reported no influence over wheat
 130 height due to nitrogen application rates. For flag-leaf to the base of the floral apex measurements and
 131 grain test weights, no differences were detected between the 112 or 168 kg ha⁻¹ treatments (Table 2).

132 For N application rates, there were significant differences in yield. The 168 kg N ha⁻¹ application
 133 yielded 3,670 kg ha⁻¹, while the 112 kg N ha⁻¹ rate yielded 3,440 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 3). Previous research on
 134 soft red winter wheat by Boquet and Johnson (1987) indicated similar results and concluded that a

positive linear correlation exists between the increase in yield and increase in amount of N fertilizer applied. More recent research noted that increases in nitrogen fertilizer applications had a positive influence on wheat grain protein and yield [36,58]. Furthermore, Vieira (2017) reported that a split fall and spring application of high nitrogen rates may be important for maximizing grain yield in soft red winter wheat.

140 Cultivar

Between all five cultivars, there were differences for each of the measurements recorded. With respect to wheat height, there were no differences between the Cypress and AGS 2026 cultivars but all other cultivars were significantly different (Table 2). AGS 2060 was the shortest of the cultivars at 75 cm while Coker 9553 was the tallest at 87 cm. However, previous research conducted by Wiersma et al. (1986) reported no difference in crop height across all seven winter wheat cultivars tested. AGS2060, which had the smallest average with 382 heads, was [different than other cultivar as significant](#) the only significant cultivar for head count per m².

All five cultivars were significantly different from one another for flag-leaf to the base of the floral apex measurements, with Cypress as the tallest and Coker 9700 as the shortest (Table 2). Wheat cultivar was the only significant ($P < 0.0001$) main effect observed for test weight. Amongst the cultivars, Coker 9700 and Cypress were statistically similar at 68 and 69 kg hL⁻¹. These cultivars differed from Coker 9553, AGS 2026, and AGS 2060 in which wheat cultivars AGS 2026 and Coker 9700 had the lowest and highest average test weights, respectively (Table 2).

With respect to yield, PGRs are designed to allow the full yield potential of wheat to be realized due to interfering with plant development [60]. It is the reduction in lodging of the cultivar that allows for the yield potential to be increased over other scenarios [61]. There were significant differences in yield among the cultivars, with Coker 9553 (3,290 kg ha⁻¹) having the greatest yield and AGS 2060 having the least (2,960 kg ha⁻¹). Coker 9700 was similar to both AGS 2026 and Cypress, even though AGS 2026 yielded greater at 3,720 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 3). Variable cultivar yield response corresponds with previous research using ethephon on seven winter wheat cultivars [50].

160 **CONCLUSION**

161 In conclusion, the split application of trinexapac-ethyl at Feekes' stage 4 and 7 significantly reduced
 162 overall stem length. While it did not improve wheat yield, trinexapac-ethyl could assist growers by
 163 preventing lodging from occurring which would improve harvest efficiency promoting greater yield. Each
 164 of the five cultivars had a varying degree of response to fertilizer and trinexapac-ethyl treatments. AGS
 165 2060 had the least amount of response to all treatments and produced the lowest yield as compared to all
 166 other cultivars. Higher N fertilizer rates resulted in larger and higher yielding wheat as was expected.
 167 Future research will focus on repeating this study.

168

169 **REFERENCES**

- 170 1. Grey, T.L. Utility of residual herbicides in no-till double-crop glyphosate resistant soybean
 171 production. *Crop Manag.* 2007. Accessed: February 6, 2017. Available:
 172 <https://dl.sciencesocieties.org> doi: 10.1094/CM-2007-0122-01-RS.
- 173 2. Moss JW, Tubbs RS, Grey TL, Smith NB, Johnson JW. Assessment of double-crop and
 174 relay-intercropping systems of peanut with soft red winter wheat and residual herbicides.
 175 *Crop Forage Turfgrass Manage.* 2017;(*In press*).
- 176 3. [USDA] U.S. Department of Agriculture Wheat Data: Yearbook Tables. U.S. Department of
 177 Agriculture: Environmental Research Service. 2017. Accessed 9 February 2017. Available:
 178 <https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/wheat-data/>
- 179 4. Culpepper AS, York AC. Weed management in no-till bromoxynil-tolerant cotton (*Gossypium*
 180 *hirsutum*). *Weed Tech.* 1997;11(2):335-345.
- 181 5. Roth, GW, Marshall HG, Hatley OE, Hill Jr RR. Effect of management practices on grain
 182 yield, test weight, and lodging of soft red winter wheat. *Agron. J.* 1984;76:379-383
- 183 6. Mitchell JW, Rice RR. Plant-growth regulators. Pages 256-266 *in* Yearbook of Agriculture.
 184 USDA: United States Government Printing Office. 1942.

- 185 7. Qian YL, Engelke MC, Foster MJV, Reynolds S. Trinexapac-ethyl restricts shoot growth and
186 improves quality of Diamond zoysiagrass under shade. HortSci. 1998;33(6):1019-1022.
- 187 8. Stier JC, Rogers JN III, Flore JA. Nitrogen and trinexapac-ethyl effects on photosynthesis of
188 Supina bluegrass in reduced light conditions. Agron. Abstr. Madison: ASA Publ.;1997.
- 189 9. Kaufmann JE. Understanding turfgrass growth regulation. In: Leslie AR, editor. Handbook of
190 integrated pest management for turf and ornamentals. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 1994.
- 191 10. Rolston MP, Trethewey JAK, Chynoweth R, McCloy B. Trinexapac-ethyl delays lodging and
192 increases seed yield in perennial ryegrass seed crops. N.Z. J. Agr. Res. 2010;53(4):403-
193 406.
- 194 11. Marchese JA, Suchoronczek A, Civeiro JC, Ascari CL, Fedrigo K. Efecto del trinexapac-etilo
195 asociado con la fertilización nitrogenada elevada y parcelada en la productividad del trigo
196 BRS-220. Brazilian J. of Applied Tech. for Agr. Sci. 2016;9:105-111. Brazilian.
- 197 12. Borm GEL, van den Berg W. Effects of the application rate and time of the growth regulator
198 trinexapac-ethyl in seed crops of *Lolium perenne* L. in relation to spring nitrogen rate. Field
199 Crop Res. 2008;105(3):182-192.
- 200 13. Chastain TG, Young WC III, Silberstein TB, Garbacik CJ. Performance of trinexapac-ethyl
201 on *Lolium perenne* seed crops in diverse lodging environments. Field Crop Res.
202 2014;157:65-70.
- 203 14. Chastain TG, Young WC III, Garbacik CJ, Silberstein TB. Trinexapac-ethyl rate and
204 application timing effects on seed yield and yield components in tall fescue. Field Crop Res.
205 2015;173:8-13.
- 206 15. Zapiola ML, Chastain TG, Garbacik CJ, Silberstein TB, Young WC III. Trinexapac-ethyl and
207 open field burning maximize seed yield in creeping red fescue. Agron. J. 2006;98(6):1427-
208 1434.
- 209 16. Chynoweth RJ, Trethewey JAK, Rolston MP, McCloy BL. Reduced stem length increases
210 perennial ryegrass seed yield. Agron. N.Z. 2014;44:61-70.

- 211 17. Trethewey JAK, Rolston MP, McCloy BL, Chynoweth RJ. The plant growth regulator,
212 trinexapac-ethyl, increases seed yield in annual ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum* Lam.). N.Z. J.
213 Agric. Res. 2016;59(2):113-121.
- 214 18. Heckman NL, Horst GL, Gaussoin RE, Young LJ. Heat tolerance of Kentucky bluegrass as
215 affected by trinexapac-ethyl. HortSci. 2001;36(2):365-367.
- 216 19. Heckman NL, Horst GL, Gaussoin RE, Tavenner BT. Trinexapac-ethyl influence on cell
217 membrane thermostability of Kentucky bluegrass leaf tissue. Scientia Horticulturae.
218 2002;92(2):183-186.
- 219 20. Beasley JS, Branham BE, Ortiz-Ribbing LM. Trinexapac-ethyl affects Kentucky bluegrass
220 root architecture. HortSci. 2005;40(5):1539-1542.
- 221 21. Xiao-ying W, Tian-ming HU, Quan-zhen W, Li-min T, Xiao-ling Z, Kai T. Growth of Kentucky
222 bluegrass as influenced by nitrogen and trinexapac-ethyl. Agr. Sci. 2009;8(12):1498-1502.
- 223 22. Anonymous. Palisade EC specimen label. Greensboro, NC: Syngenta Crop. 2017a.
224 Available <http://www.cdms.net/ldat/ld2P2008.pdf>. Accessed February 2, 2017.
- 225 23. Watschke TL, DiPaola JM. Plant growth regulators. Golf Course Mgt. 1995;63:59-62.
- 226 24. Ervin EH, Koski AJ. Growth responses of *Lolium perenne* L. to trinexapac-ethyl. HortSci.
227 1998;33(7) :1200-1202.
- 228 25. Rademacher W. Gibberellins: metabolic pathways and inhibitors of biosynthesis. In: Boger
229 P, Sandmann G, editors. Target sites of herbicide action. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 1989.
- 230 26. Rademacher W, Temple-Smith KE, Griggs DL, Hedden P. The mode of action of acylcyclo-
231 hexanediones-a new type of growth retardant. Current Plant Sci. Biotech. in Agric.
232 1992;13:571-577.
- 233 27. Adams R, Kerber E, Pfister K, Weiler EW. Studies on the action of the new growth retardant
234 CGA 163'935 (cimectacarb). In: Karssen CM, van Loon LC, Vreugdenhil D, editors.
235 Progress in plant growth regulations. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academics; 1992.

- 236 28. Hedden P. Gibberellin biosynthesis enzymes and the regulation of gibberellin concentration.
237 In: Takahashi N, Phinney BO, MacMillian J, editors. Gibberellins. New York: Springer-
238 Verlag; 1991.
- 239 29. Stefen DLV, Souza CA, Coelho CMM, Gutkoski LC, Sangoi L. A adubação nitrogenada
240 durante o espigamento melhora a qualidade industrial do trigo (*Triticum aestivum* cv.
241 Mirante) cultivado com regulador de crescimento etil-trinexapac. Revista de la Facultad de
242 Agronomía, La Plata. 2015;114(2):161-169. Brazilian.
- 243 30. Rolston MP, Trethewey JAK, Chynoweth RJ, McCloy BL. Italian ryegrass seed yield;
244 trinexapac-ethyl and closing date interaction. Agron. N.Z. 2012;42:119-127.
- 245 31. Rolston MP, McLoy BL, Trethewey JAK. Nitrogen-modulus interaction in perennial ryegrass
246 seed production. Agron. N.Z. 2007;37:37-44.
- 247 32. Boquet DJ, Johnson CC. Fertilizer effects on yield, grain composition, and foliar disease of
248 doublecrop soft red winter wheat. Agron J. 1987;79(1):135-141.
- 249 33. Beuerlein JE, Oplinger ES, Reicosky D. Yield and agronomic characteristics of soft red
250 winter wheat as influenced by management. J. Prod. Agric. 1991;4(1):124-131.
- 251 34. No Thesis Comparison. Vieira LV. Determination of optimum fall and spring nitrogen
252 fertilizer rates for maximizing grain yield of soft red winter wheat sown at variable planting
253 dates. University of Arkansas 2016.
- 254 35. Hitz K, Clark AJ, Van Sanford DA. Identifying nitrogen-use efficient soft red winter wheat
255 lines in high and low nitrogen environments. Field Crop Res. 2017;200:1-9.
- 256 36. Tamang BG, Brasier KG, Thomason WE, Griffey CA. Differential responses of grain yield,
257 grain protein, and their associated traits to nitrogen supply in soft red winter wheat. J. Plant
258 Nutr. Soil Sci. 2017. Accessed 3 March 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201600312>
- 259 37. Van Sanford DA, MacKown CT. Variation in nitrogen use efficiency among soft red winter
260 wheat genotypes. Theor Appl Genet. 1986;72(2):58-163.

- 261 38. Austin RB, Ford MA, Edrich JA, Blackwell RD. The nitrogen economy of winter wheat. J Agri
262 Sci. 1977;88(1):59-167.
- 263 39. Desai M, Bhatia CR. Nitrogen uptake and nitrogen harvest index in durum wheat cultivars
264 varying in their grain protein concentration. Euphytica. 1978;27(2):561-566.
- 265 40. Cox MC, Qualset CO, Rains DW. Genetic variation for nitrogen assimilation and
266 translocation in wheat. II. Nitrogen assimilation in relation to grain yield and protein. Crop
267 Sci. 1985;25(3):435-440.
- 268 41. Loffer CM, Rauch TL, Busch RH. Grain and plant protein relationships in hard red spring
269 wheat. Crop Sci. 1985;25(3):521-524.
- 270 42. Harris, G. Wheat fertilization and liming. Pages 19-20 *in* Southern Small Grains: Resource
271 Management Handbook. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 2013.
- 272 43. Hargrove WL, Touchton JT, Johnson JW. Previous crop influence on fertilizer nitrogen
273 requirements for doublecropped wheat. Agron J. 1983;75(6):855-859.
- 274 44. Wise K, Johnson B, Mansfield C, Krupke C. Managing wheat by growth stage. Purdue
275 Extension: Purdue University. 2011. Accessed 2 February 2017.
276 <https://www.extension.purdue.edu/extmedia/ID/ID-422.pdf>
- 277 45. Liu S, Abate ZA, Lu H, Musket T, Davis GL, McKendry AL. QTL associated with Fusarium
278 head blight resistance in the soft red winter wheat Ernie. Theor. and Applied Gen.
279 2007;115(3):417-427.
- 280 46. Hao Y, Chen Z, Wang Y, Bland D, Buck J, Brown-Guedira G, Johnson J. Characterization of
281 a major QTL for adult plant resistance to stripe rust in US soft red winter wheat. Theor. and
282 Applied Gen. 2011;123(8):1401-1411.
- 283 47. Benetoli da Silva TR, Schmidt R, Tavares da Silva CA, Nolla A, Favero F, Poletine JP.
284 Effect of trinexapac-ethyl and nitrogen fertilization on wheat growth and yield. J. Food Agr.
285 Env. 2011;9(3&4):596-598.

- 286 48. Campbell LG, Lafever HN. Cultivar x environment interactions in soft red winter wheat yield
287 tests. Crop Sci. 1977;17(4):604-608.
- 288 49. McKendry AL, Tague DN, Miskin KE. Effect of 1BL.1RS on agronomic performance of soft
289 red winter wheat. Crop Sci. 1996;36(4):844-847.
- 290 50. Wiersma DW, Oplinger ES, Guy SO. Environment and cultivar effects on winter wheat
291 response to ethephon plant growth regulator. Agron. J. 1986;78(5):761-764.
- 292 51. Crook MJ, Ennos AR. The effect of nitrogen and growth regulators on stem and root
293 characteristics associated with lodging in two cultivars of winter wheat. J. Exp. Bot.
294 1995;46(8):931-938.
- 295 52. Dubois JB, Fossati A. Influence of nitrogen uptake and nitrogen partitioning efficiency on
296 grain yield and grain protein concentration of twelve winter wheat genotypes (*Triticum*
297 *aestivum* L.) Z Pflanzenzucht. 1981;86:41-49.
- 298 53. Anonymous. AGS 2026. Georgia's Integrated Cultivar Release System. 2017b. Accessed
299 13 March 2017. Available: <http://georgiacultivars.com/cultivars/wheat>.
- 300 54. Anonymous. AGS 2060. Georgia Seed Development. 2017c. Accessed 13 March 2017.
301 Available: <http://gsdc.com/crops/>.
- 302 55. Costa JM, Bockelman HE, Brown-Guedira G, Cambron SE, Chen X, Cooper A, Cowger C,
303 Dong Y, Grybauskas A, Jin Y, Kolmer J, Murphy JP, Sneller C, Souza E. Registration of the
304 soft red winter wheat germplasm MD01W233-06-1 resistant to fusarium head blight. J. Plant
305 Reg. 2010;4(3):255-260.
- 306 56. Horton D, editor. Georgia Pest Management Handbook: 2017 Commercial Edition. 28th ed.
307 Athens (GA): University of Georgia Cooperative Extension; 2017.
- 308 57. Cox WJ, Otis DJ. Growth and yield of winter wheat as influenced by chlormequat chloride
309 and ethephon. Agron. J. 1989;81(2):264-270.
- 310 58. Nielsen DC, Halvorson AD. Nitrogen fertility influence on water stress and yield of winter
311 wheat. Agron. J. 1991;83(6):1065-1070.

- 312 59. Pal M, Rao LS, Jain V, Srivastava AC, Pandey R, Raj A, Singh KP. Effect of elevated CO₂
313 and nitrogen on wheat growth and photosynthesis. *Biol. Plant.* 2005;49(3):467-470.
- 314 60. Berti M, Zagonel J, Fernandes EC. Wheat varieties yield under trinexapac-ethyl and
315 nitrogen rates. *Scientia Agraria* 2007;8:127-134.
- 316 61. Dahnous K, Vigue GT, Law AG, Konzak CF, Miller DG. Height and yield response of
317 selected wheat, barley, and triticale cultivars of ethephon. *Agron. J.* 1982;74(3):580-582.

318 **ABBREVIATIONS**

319 **Term:** TE-Trinexapac-ethyl

320 Table 1: Analysis of variance for TE and N effects on wheat cultivars in Georgia^a

Variable	Effect	F-value	Pr > R
Crop height (cm)	Cultivar x Fertilizer	2.09	.11 NS ^b
	Cultivar x TE	1.46	.30 NS
	Fertilizer x TE	0.43	.79 NS
Flag-leaf to base of floral spike (cm)	Cultivar x Fertilizer	3.47	.01 **
	Cultivar x TE	0.83	.62 NS
	Fertilizer x TE	1.31	.27 NS
Head count/m ²	Cultivar x Fertilizer	1.90	.09 NS
	Cultivar x TE	1.19	.15 NS
	Fertilizer x TE	0.35	.73 NS
Test weight (kg hL ⁻¹)	Cultivar x Fertilizer	1.45	.22 NS
	Cultivar x TE	0.91	.54 NS
	Fertilizer x TE	0.44	.72 NS
Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Cultivar x Fertilizer	0.61	.65 NS
	Cultivar x TE	0.85	.63 NS
	Fertilizer x TE	0.25	.86 NS

[cultivar, fertilizer application, and growth regulator application conducted for 2014-2015.^a](#)

321

Table 2:

Crop
height,
head
count,
and
flag-leaf
to apex
as
influenc
ed by

ion was Plains, GA conducted in 2014-2015. Cultivars were AGS 2026, AGS 2060, Coker 9553, Coker 9700, and Cypress. MIXED model analysis was performed. ^bAbbreviation: NS, not significant; ** = level of probability at $P = 0.01$ to 0.001 , respectively.

Variable	Rate	Timing	Crop height	Flag-leaf to base of floral spike	Head count	Test Weight ^b
	g ha ⁻¹	Feekes' stage	cm	cm	# m ²	kg hL ⁻¹
Main effect of growth regulator						
Nontreated			83 a	12 a	412 a	67 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	233	4	81 ab	11 b	423 a	67 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	256	4	80 b	11 b	425 a	66 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	128 + 128	4 + 7	76 c	9 c	415 a	67 a
Main effect of fertilizer	kg ha ⁻¹					
Nitrogen fertilizer	112	3-4	79 b	11 a	408 b	67 a
Nitrogen fertilizer	168	3-4	81 a	11 a	430 a	67 a
Main effect of cultivar						
Coker 9553			87 a	12 b	420 a	67 b
Coker 9700			82 b	9 e	442 a	69 a
Cypress			78 c	13 a	427 a	68 a
AGS 2026			78 c	11 c	427 a	64 d

AGS 2060

75 d

10 d

382 b

65 c

^aThe two-way interactions of cultivar x fertilizer and fertilizer x trinexapac-ethyl were not significant; therefore, data were combined across variables. However, the two-way interaction of cultivar x fertilizer was significant for flag-leaf to base of floral spike measurements.

^bMeans with a variable followed by the same letter are not significant according to Fisher's protected LSD test at $P \leq 0.05$.

[Table 2: Crop height, head count, and flag-leaf to apex as influenced by cultivar, fertilizer application, and growth regulator application](#)

[conducted for 2014-2015.^a](#)

[Table 3: Yield as influenced by cultivar, fertilizer treatments, and growth regulator applications conducted for 2014-2015.^a](#)

Variable	Rate	Yield ^b
Main effect of growth regulator	g ha ⁻¹	kg ha ⁻¹
Nontreated		3660 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	233	3570 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	256	3470 a
Trinexapac-ethyl	128 + 128	3520 a
Main effect of fertilizer	kg ha ⁻¹	
Nitrogen fertilizer	112	3440 b
Nitrogen fertilizer	168	3670 a
Main effect of cultivar		
Coker 9553		3920 a
Coker 9700		3660 bc
Cypress		3590 c
AGS 2026		3720 b
AGS 2060		2960 d

^aThe two-way interactions of cultivar x fertilizer, fertilizer x trinexapac-ethyl, and cultivar x fertilizer were not significant for yield; therefore, data were combined across variables.

^bMeans with a variable followed by the same letter are not significant according to Fisher's protected LSD test at $P \leq 0.05$.

[Table 3: Yield as influenced by cultivar, fertilizer treatments, and growth regulator applications conducted for 2014-2015.^a](#)