

Original Research Article

Differentiation of Resistance to *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* in Tomato Genotypes via Analysis of GGE Biplot and REML/BLUP

ABSTRACT

The bacterial wilt caused by *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* is among the pathogenic bacteria responsible for reduced productivity of tomato breeding in Brazil. The aim of this work was to select tomato breeding progenies resistant to *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* via GGE biplot and REML/BLUP. Forty-three progenies resulting from the cross between Yoshimatsu and IPA-7 were assessed in the city of Recife, state of Pernambuco, Brazil, in 2016. We used a randomized block design with four replications applying the CCRMRS 74 and CCRMRS 185 isolates. The evaluations were performed by employing the data of the days 10 and 20 after inoculation. The disease incidence and severity were evaluated with the help of a descriptive grade scale. The analysis of variance showed the existence of differentiated performances among the genotypes and among the bacteria, besides the presence of interaction genotypes x bacteria. There was agreement between the GGE biplot and REML/BLUP methods in the identification of genotypes resistant to *Ralstonia solanacearum* and *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*. There was agreement between the GGE biplot and the REML/BLUP methods in identification of genotypes resistant to *Ralstonia solanacearum* and *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*. Genotypes 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 27 and 31 showed resistance to *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*, and progenies 1, 2, 15, 16 and 35 showed more resistance to *Ralstonia solanacearum*.

Keywords: *Solanum lycopersicum*; multivariate analysis; mixed models; interaction genotype x environment.

1. INTRODUCTION

Considered the causal agents of bacterial wilt in Brazil, *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* are the main pathogenic bacteria of tomato breeding. Bacterial wilt is considered as of worldwide importance due to economic risks and difficult control, causing up to 100% in damage [1].

The ninth largest producer of this cultivation, Brazil reported the first bacterial wilt upon tobacco and potato cultures in the state of Rio Grande do Sul [2; 3]. Currently, this disease has spread throughout the country, especially in the North and Northeast of Brazil [4].

Those bacteria enter the plant through injuries occurring in the root system; because of their colonization, there is accumulation of polysaccharides, which induces darkening and obstruction of the xylem. Consequently, water and nutrient translocation is limited, causing bacterial wilt without changing the green coloration [5]. The most recommended control measure is the use of cultivars resistant to those bacteria.

When considering the evaluation dates of the bacteria as different environments, the most resistant genotypes can be selected by means of different analyses, which distinguish them in terms of concept and procedures used to estimate the adaptability. Among the different methodologies, the GGE biplot multivariate analysis and the REML/BLUP (Restriction Maximum Likelihood/Best Linear Unbiased Prediction) prove to be efficient, robust and of easy understanding and interpretation of data, which provides an efficient indication of the best genotypes [6; 7; 8; 9]

The GGE biplot analysis combines the additive effect of genotype with the multiplicative effect of the GE interaction, building the biplot graphics from the principal components (PC), so that the first

component represents the proportion of performance obtained only from the genotype traits, and the second component shows the ratio of the performance that occurs due to the GxE interaction [10; 11]. Several works show the efficiency and superiority of the GGE biplot analysis for the indication of the genotypes [12; 13; 14; 15].

The genetic parameters make it possible to increase the efficiency in the estimate of population potential for the breeding, based on the mean and variance components. Those parameters are very useful for the breeder, since they make it possible to classify the genotypes chosen to be launched as commercial cultivars, besides allowing the prediction of gains, providing a foundation to establish effective selection strategies, such as genetic variability and expression degree of a character from one generation to another [16].

Therefore, the aim of this work was to differentiate the resistance of tomato genotypes to *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* and *Ralstonia solanacearum* via GGE biplot analysis and REML/BLUP.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

At first, manual crosses were performed between the Yoshimatsu and IPA-7 genitors. From them on, populations F_1 and F_2 were obtained, in which 34 genotypes from them were used to assess the resistance to *R. Pseudosolanacearum* and *R. solanacearum* species, using the CCRMRS 74 and CCRMRS 185 isolates, respectively.

The experiments were conducted in 2016, in a greenhouse located at the agronomy department of the *Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco*, lying between 8°01'02" south latitude and 34°56'41" west longitude. The first experiment was carried out from 9/28 to 11/26, with average temperature of 26.77°C and relative average humidity of 70.12%. The second one was performed from 10/26 to 12/12, with average temperature of 27.38°C and relative average humidity of 69.78%.

A randomized block design with four replications was applied, in which each experimental unit was composed of four plants. The seeding was done in expanded polystyrene trays of 128 cells, with Basaplant® commercial substrate. Three seeds per cell were used; after the emergence of the seedlings, the thinning was performed, and only one plant per cell was left. Plants were irrigated and fertirrigated when needed.

After 21 days of seeding, the seedlings were transplanted into 500-ml plastic pots filled with substrate from a mixture of soil and humus in the proportion of 3:1 in that order. Thirty days after seeding, the plants were inoculated by the root cutting method. With the help of a scalpel, a semicircular cut was made in the substrate near to the plant stem, and 15 ml of the bacterial suspension (5×10^8 UFC ml⁻¹) were placed in it [17].

After inoculation, the irrigations were done into plastic containers placed under the 500 ml pots, in order to not drain the inoculum and keep the substrate moist.

2.1 Suspension Preparation

To prepare the inoculum suspension, firstly, the bacterial isolates applied were extracted from a water conserving means. Subsequently, they were cultivated in modified means of TZC (triphenyl tetrazolium tetrachloride) [18] for 48 h, at 30°C ± 2°C temperature. The suspension was transferred to agar nutritive-dextrose-yeast extract medium NYDA (10g dextrose, 3g meat extract, 5g yeast extract, 3g peptone and 18g agar l⁻¹), suspended in sterile distilled water (SDW). It was adjusted for the concentration of 5×10^8 UFC ml⁻¹ applying a photocolormeter (Analyser 500 M, Brazil).

2.2 Genetics and Statistical Analyses

The assessments were performed using data from the days 10 and 20 after inoculation. The incidence and severity of the disease were measured by means of descriptive grade scale from 1 to 5, in which: 1 = dead plants; 2 = completely wilted plants; 3 = plants with up to two-thirds of wilted leaves; 4 = plants with up to one-third of wilted leaves; and 5 = lack of symptoms.

The GGE biplot multivariate analysis was based on the information of phenotypic means. The principal component analysis (PC) was employed to study the data collected, considering the data collection days, of each bacterium, as different environments. The first two PCs were used to join the genotypes; based on their values, the biplots were built by means of the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), according to the equation: $Y_{ij} - \mu - \beta_j = \lambda_1 \xi_{i1} \eta_{1j} + \lambda_2 \xi_{i2} \eta_{2j} + \epsilon_{ij}$, in which λ_1 and λ_2 are the greatest eigenvalues of the first and second principal components ACP1 and ACP2, respectively; ξ_{i1} and ξ_{i2} are the eigenvectors of the i -th genotype for ACP1 and ACP2, respectively; and η_{1j} and η_{2j} are the eigenvectors of the j -th environment for ACP1 and ACP2, respectively. The GGE biplot analysis was carried out with the help of the R software aided by the GGEbiplotGUI package of the R software [19].

To evaluate the effect of the GE interaction via REML/BLUP, it was applied the statistical model 54 of the Selegen-REML/BLUP software [20], corresponding to $y = Xb + Zg + Wc + e$, in which y , b , g , c and e correspond, respectively, to the data vectors of fixed effects (block means through the environments), genotype effects (random), effects of the interaction genotype x environment (random) and of random errors: X , Z and W represent incidence matrices for b , g and c , respectively. That analysis was performed using the Selegen software [21].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The coefficients of variation (CV%) show values ranging from medium (14.92) to high (30.00), according to [22]. Those values indicate good experimental accuracy and reliability of the assessed data.

The significant effect ($p \leq 0.01$) for genotypes and bacteria shows that there was genetic variability among the genotypes and different behavior among the bacteria, respectively (Table 1). Regarding the significance of the interaction genotypes x bacteria, it evidences different performance of the genotypes according to the species evaluated; thus, the classifications of the tomato genotypes can be altered in accordance to the bacterium taken into consideration.

Table 1. Estimates of the mean squares of 34 progenies of tomatoes, evaluated in Recife

SV	DF	MS	
		10 Days	20 Days
Repetition	3	0.45	2.49
Genotypes	33	1.04**	3.07**
Bacterium	1	9.75**	0.83**
Genotypes x Bacterium	33	1.12**	4.44**
Error	1017	0.46	1.03
CV(%)		14.92	30.00

Given the uncertainty in the genotype classification, it is required a detailed study to select the genotypes that show resistance to either *R. Pseudosolanacearum* or *R. solanacearum* to continue in the breeding program for tomato breeding.

The biplot analysis of genotypes x environment described 84.8% of the total variation according to the first two principal components (PCs) (Figure 1). That result suggests that the graphic representations of the biplots proved to be extremely effective, since it explains almost all the proportion of the square sum of genotypes and of the GE interaction. That allows a clear interpretation of the results and a safe selection of the resistant genotypes by means of that methodology [23].




Figure 1. GGE biplot representing the “which-won-where” graph indicating the *Ralstonia pseudosolanaceum* e *Ralstonia solanacearum* resistance rankings of 43 genotypes. Environment 10S (10^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 20S (20^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 10P (10^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanaceum*) e 20P (20^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanaceum*).

The “which-won-where” biplot establishes a set of perpendicular lines, which divide it into several groups, and characterize the progenies in a way that the ones allocated in the vertex of the biplot are classified as of better performance and the ones that are in the polygons are the less responsive ones [24; 25].

The dates of the evaluations of the bacteria resulted in three different groups so that the genotypes resistant to *R. solanacearum*, evaluated at the days 10 and 20, formed group 1. The genotypes that showed resistance to *R. pseudosolanacearum*, at the days 10 and 20, formed groups 2 and 3, respectively.

The progenies 3, 17, 15 and 16 appeared at the vertices of the biplot and were considered more resistant to the bacteria. The genotypes 1, 2, 30 and 35, at the days 10 and 20 of evaluation of *R. solanacearum*; 5, 8, 9, 11, 25, 29, 36, 37, 39 and 43, at the day 10, *R. pseudosolanacearum*; 6, 7, 14, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 18 and 31, for the day 10, *R. pseudosolanacearum* also presented resistance; however, the grades of incidence were greater.

The genotypes that give rise to the vertices, but did not group any of the days of evaluation, are considered susceptible to both bacteria. Therefore, they must be discarded from the breeding program, since they did not show resistance to *R. pseudosolanacearum* and *R. solanacearum*.

The severity and stability of the genotypes were assessed in the ‘means x stabilities’ biplot, in which the circle corresponds to the average environment coordination (AEV); the ideal environment is represented by the line that cuts the origin; and the arrow indicates the higher incidence of the bacterium. This graphic shows which genotypes demonstrate low stability, besides separating which ones had incidence above and below the average (Figure 2).




Figure 2. GGE biplot representing the means x stabilities indicating the yield rankings of 43 genotypes, and their respective incidence stabilities. Environment 10S (10⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacerum*), 20S (20⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacerum*), 10P (10⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacerum*) e 20P (20⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacerum*).

Having said that, the genotypes 3, 5, 11, 25, 15, 37, 36, 8, 16, 35, 19, 1, 39, 43, 9, 27, 29, 23 and 2 showed severity below the overall mean, respectively, and gave good resistance. The progeny 6 displayed severity close to the overall mean, and the genotypes 4, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41 and 42 showed high incidence, and can be discarded.

Taking into consideration the stability, the greater the projection formed by the genotype in relation to the axis, the more stable will be the genotype. Thus, the genotypes 37, 36, 19, 9, 29 and 5, besides having good resistance, were considered as the most stable, respectively.

The genotype considered 'ideal', and applied as a reference to evaluate the other genotypes, is the one that presents longer vector length and zero GxA interaction, that is, the one that is nearer to the center (Figure 3). In this way, the genotypes 5 and 11 are the most wanted for the breeding program, as they show good phenotypic resistance and stability, considered the closest ones to the ideal. In the same way, the genotypes 17, 20 and 33 were the ones that had the worst classification; this confirms they must be discarded.




Figure 3. GGE biplot comparing 43 genotypes evaluated according to the estimate of an ideal genotype. Environment 10S (10⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 20S (20⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 10P (10⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*) e 20P (20⁰ day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*).

The environments that produced smaller angles with the coordination of the average environment are considered the most representative ones, and the ones that show longer vectors are those that best describe the genotypes [26; 27] (Figure 4). Therefore, the 20S (day 20 of evaluation of the *R. solanacearum* bacterium) displayed good representativeness and discriminatory ability, thus, it provides reliable information and favors the selection of the evaluated genotypes. The 20P (day 20 of evaluation of the *R. pseudosolanacearum* bacterium) proved to be less representative and distinguishing, and can be discarded [28; 29].




Figure 4. GGE biplot comparing 43 genotypes evaluated according to the discrimination and representativeness of environments for incidence. Environment 10S (10^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 20S (20^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia solanacearum*), 10P (10^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*) e 20P (20^o day of evaluation of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*).

For a better result analysis, the REML/BLUP method was performed (Table 2). The genotypes 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 17, 18, 34, 35 and 43 are among those ten that showed better values for the different environments and for the average environment. Besides, they are among the genotypes that obtained good resistance, adaptability and stability, according to the harmonic mean method of relative performance of genetic value. From those, four (1, 15, 35 and 43) agreed with the results obtained by the GGE biplot method.

Table 2. Genotypic values, adaptability and stability of genotypic values (MHPRVG) predicted by the REML / BLUP analysis for resistance to *R. pseudosolanacearum* e *R. solanacearum*, in 43 families F2: 3 of tomato Recife

Genotypes	<i>R. pseudosolanacearum</i>		<i>R. solanacearum</i>		Medium environment	MHPRVG
	10 ^o Day	20 ^o Day	10 ^o Day	20 ^o Day		
1	2.704	1.686	2.806	1.612	2.087	1.048
2	2.927	1.421	2.765	1.578	2.078	1.004
3	2.592	1.399	2.651	1.520	2.024	0.883
4	2.994	1.417	2.890	1.716	2.110	1.063
5	2.753	1.523	2.784	1.588	2.068	1.012
6	2.814	1.487	2.909	1.713	2.105	1.068
7	3.062	1.477	2.875	1.640	2.116	1.072
8	2.679	1.618	2.735	1.574	2.061	1.000
9	2.633	1.395	2.900	1.652	2.070	0.997
10	2.644	1.452	2.859	1.585	2.066	0.998
11	2.841	1.506	2.759	1.592	2.072	1.014
12	2.656	1.432	2.630	1.503	2.032	0.906
13	2.697	1.542	2.747	1.603	2.064	1.008
14	2.965	1.532	2.826	1.672	2.101	1.064

15	3.088	1.554	2.753	1.607	2.103	1.058
16	2.639	1.646	2.729	1.581	2.059	1.004
17	2.718	1.456	2.884	1.688	2.092	1.034
18	2.710	1.498	2.868	1.680	2.089	1.039
19	2.622	1.472	2.692	1.562	2.047	0.960
20	2.684	1.460	2.833	1.722	2.080	1.037
21	2.609	1.379	2.665	1.535	2.027	0.892
22	2.775	1.388	2.778	1.622	2.055	0.980
23	2.801	1.444	2.741	1.566	2.054	0.986
24	2.826	1.569	2.841	1.634	2.085	1.038
25	2.726	1.464	2.791	1.657	2.073	1.017
26	2.877	1.492	2.814	1.647	2.083	1.038
27	2.743	1.440	2.850	1.723	2.082	1.037
28	2.602	1.413	2.658	1.540	2.030	0.912
29	2.858	1.406	2.717	1.599	2.052	0.984
30	2.616	1.514	2.638	1.530	2.040	0.935
31	2.628	1.424	2.879	1.570	2.058	0.982
32	2.661	1.384	2.645	1.514	2.035	0.904
33	2.763	1.468	2.820	1.617	2.076	1.017
34	3.112	1.590	2.705	1.698	2.108	1.070
35	2.734	1.707	2.798	1.664	2.096	1.064
36	2.667	1.403	2.772	1.595	2.051	0.977
37	2.900	1.410	2.711	1.628	2.056	0.988
38	2.691	1.482	2.698	1.558	2.049	0.973
39	2.787	1.392	2.685	1.509	2.042	0.923
40	2.650	1.428	2.678	1.550	2.045	0.944
41	2.673	1.436	2.622	1.525	2.037	0.916
42	3.029	1.448	2.671	1.546	2.063	0.986
43	2.944	1.743	2.723	1.554	2.098	1.058
Média geral	1.503	2.622	1.379	2.592	8.096	--

The REML/BLUP method combined with the GGE biplot, when classifying the genotypes resistant to *R. pseudosolanacearum* at the days 10 (25) and 20 (6, 7, 17, 18, 27 and 31) after inoculation. Regarding the *R. solanacearum*, the genotypes 1, 15, 16 and 35 are among the resistant ones when assessed at the day 10 after inoculation, and the genotypes 2 and 15, at the day 20.

The correspondence between the results obtained by the GGE biplot and REML/BLUP methods was also found by [30] and [31]. This equivalence between the results reveals that the application of different methodologies allows greater effectiveness and robustness to select the genotypes to be used in breeding programs.

4. CONCLUSION

There was agreement between the GGE biplot and REML/BLUP methods for the identification of genotypes resistant to *Ralstonia solanacearum* and *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*.

The genotypes 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 27 and 31 displayed resistance to *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum*.

The progenies 1, 2, 15, 16 and 35 showed resistance to *Ralstonia solanacearum*.

REFERENCES

1. Wicker E, Grassrt L, Coranson-Beaudu R, Mian D, Guilbaud C, Fegan M, Prior P. *Ralstonia solanacearum* strains from Martinique (French West Indies) exhibiting a new pathogenic potential. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2007;73(21):6790-6801.
2. IBGE. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Levantamento sistemático da produção agrícola (LSPA). Pesquisa mensal de previsão e acompanhamento das safras agrícolas no ano civil. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE; 2016. Portuguese.

3. Takatsu A, Lopes CA.; Murcha bacteriana em hortaliças: avanços científicos e perspectivas de controle. Horti Bras. 1997;15(3):170-177. Portuguese.
4. Costa SB, Ferreira MASV, Lopes CA. Diversidade patogênica e molecular de *Ralstonia solanacearum* da Região Amazônica brasileira. Fitopatol Bras. 2007;32(4):285-294. Doi: 10.1590/S0100-41582007000400002. Portuguese.
5. Hikichi Y, Yoshimochi T, Tsujimoto S, Shinohara R, Nakaho K, Kanda A, et al. Global regulation of pathogenicity mechanism of *Ralstonia solanacearum*. Plant Biotechnol J, 2007; 24(1):149-154. Doi: 10.5511/plantbiotechnology.24.149.
6. Badu-Apraku B, Oyekunle M, Obeng-Antwi K, Osuman A, Ado S, Coulibay N, et al. Performance of extra-early maize cultivars based on GGE biplot and AMMI analysis. J of Agric Sci. 2012;150(4):473-483. Doi: 10.1017/S0021859611000761.
7. PARAMESH, M.; REDDY, D.; PRIYA, M.; SUMATHI, P.; SUDHAKAR, P.; REDDY, K. GT biplot analysis for yield and drought related traits in mung bean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding, v. 7, n. 3, p. 538-543, 2016.
8. Santos, A.; Ceccon, G.; Teodoro, P.E.; Correa, A.M.; Alvarez, R.C.F.; Silva, J.F.; Alves, V.B. (2016). Adaptabilidade e estabilidade de genótipos de feijão caupi ereto via REML/BLUP e GGE Biplot. Bragantia, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1678-4499.280>. Portuguese.
9. Yokomizo GKI, Farias Neto JT, Hongyu K, Oliveira MDSP. GGE Biplot na avaliação de características de cachos em açaizeiros da região amazônica. Mundo Amazônico. 2017;8(1). Doi:10.15446/ma.v8n1.63456. Portuguese.
10. Yan W, Hunt LA, Sheng Q, Szlavnic Z. Cultivar evaluation and mega-environment investigation based on the GGE Biplot. Crop Sci. 2000;40(3):597-605. Doi: 10.2135/cropsci2000.403597x. Portuguese.
11. Yan W, Holland JB. A heritability-adjusted GGE biplot for test environment evaluation. Euphytica. 2010;171(3):355-369. Doi: 10.1007/s10681-009-0030-5.
12. Silva RR, Benin G. Análises Biplot: conceitos, interpretações e aplicações. Cienc Rural. 2008;42(8):1404-1412. Doi: 10.1590/S0103-84782012000800012. Portuguese.
13. Hongyu K, Silva FL, Oliveira ACS, Sarti DA, Araújo LB, Dias CTS. Comparação entre os modelos ammi e gge biplot para os dados de ensaios multi-ambientais. Rev Bras Biom. 2015;33(2):139-155. Portuguese.
14. Batista PSC, Menezes CB, Carvalho AJ, Portugal AF, Bastos EA, Cardoso MJ, et al. Performance of grain sorghum hybrids under drought stress using GGE biplot analyses. Genet Mol Res. 2017;16(3):1-12, 2017. Doi: 10.4238/gmr16039761.
15. Phuke RM, Anuradha K, Radhika K, Jabeen F, Anuradha G, Ramesh T, Hariprasanna K, et al. Genetic Variability, Genotype × Environment Interaction, Correlation, and GGE Biplot Analysis for Grain Iron and Zinc Concentration and Other Agronomic Traits in RIL Population of Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L. Moench). Front Plant Sci. 2017;5(8):712. Doi: 10.3389/fpls.2017.00712.
16. Carvalho ADF, Silva GO, Resende FV. Adaptabilidade e estabilidade de populações de cenoura pelo método REML/BLUP. Hort Bras. 2017;35(1):69-74. Doi: 10.1590/S0102-053620170111. Portuguese.
17. Felix KCS, Souza EB, Michereff SJE, Mariano RLR. Survival of *Ralstonia solanacearum* in infected tissues of *Capsicum annuum* and in soils of the state of Pernambuco, Brazil. Phytoparasitica. 2012;40(1):53-62. Doi:10.1007/s12600-011-0200-6

- 321 18. Kelman A. The relationship of pathogenicity of *Pseudomonas solanacearum* to colony
322 appearance in a tetrazolium medium. *Phytopathology*. 1954;44(12):693-695.
323
- 324 19. Wickham, H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis* Springer-Verlag. New York: Springer;
325 2009.
326
- 327 20. Rezende MDV. *Selegen-REML/BLUP*. 1th ed. Brasília: Embrapa, 2007. Portuguese.
328
- 329 21. Rezende MDV. *Selegen-REML/BLUP*. 1th ed. Brasília: Embrapa, 2007. Portuguese.
330
- 331 22. Pimentel-Gomes F. *Curso de estatística experimental*. 15th ed. Piracicaba: Fealq, 2009.
332 Portuguese.
333
- 334 23. Yan W. GGEbiplot—A Windows Application for Graphical Analysis of Multienvironment Trial Data
335 and Other Types of Two-Way Data. *Agron. J.* 2001;93:1111-1118. Doi:
336 10.2134/agronj2001.9351111x.
337
- 338 24. Santos AD, Amaral Júnior ATD, Kurosawa RDNF, Gerhardt IFS, Fritsche-Neto R. GGE Biplot
339 projection in discriminating the efficiency of popcorn lines to use nitrogen. *Ciência e*
340 *Agrotecnologia*, 2017;41(1):22-31. Doi: 10.1590/1413-70542017411030816.
341
- 342 25. Yan W. GGEbiplot—A Windows Application for Graphical Analysis of Multienvironment Trial Data
343 and Other Types of Two-Way Data. *Agron. J.* 2001;93:1111-1118. Doi:
344 10.2134/agronj2001.9351111x.
345
- 346 26. Yan W, Tinker NA. Biplot analysis of multi-environment trial data: Principles and applications.
347 *Canadian journal of plant science*, 86: 623-645.
348
- 349 27. Yan, W., Kang, M.S., Ma, B., Woods, S., and Cornelius, P.L. 2007. GGE biplot vs. AMMI
350 analysis of genotype-by-environment data. *Crop Sci.* 2006;47(2):643-653.
351 Doi:10.2135/cropsci2006.06.0374.
352
- 353 28. Yan W, Tinker NA. Biplot analysis of multi-environment trial data: Principles and applications.
354 *Can J Plant Sci.* 2006;86(3):623-645. Doi: 10.4141/P05-169.
355
356
- 357 29. Yan W, Kang MS, Ma B, Woods S, Cornelius PL. GGE biplot vs. AMMI analysis of genotype-by-
358 environment data. *Crop Sci.* 2007;47(2):643-653. Doi:10.2135/cropsci2006.06.0374.
359
- 360 30. Silva GO, Carvalho ADF, Veira JV, Benin G. Verificação da adaptabilidade e estabilidade de
361 populações de cenoura pelos métodos AMMI, GGE Biplot e REML/BLUP. *Bragantia*.
362 2011;70(3):494-501. Doi: 10.1590/S0006-87052011005000003. Portuguese.
363
- 364 31. Santos A, Ceccon G, Teodoro PE, Correa AM, Alvarez RCF, Silva JF, et al. Adaptabilidade e
365 estabilidade de genótipos de feijão caupi ereto via REML/BLUP e GGE Biplot. *Bragantia*.
366 2016;75(3):299-306. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1678-4499.280>. Portuguese.