# THE ASSESSMENT OF DISTANCE BETWEEN *SUGARY-1* INBRED LINES DEVELOPED AT THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT STATION TURDA

Voichița Haș<sup>1</sup>, Alexandru Rotari<sup>2</sup>, Ioan Haș<sup>1</sup>, Dan Nagy<sup>1</sup>

#### ABSTRACT

The sweet corn has not benefited from yield gains due to genetic improvement as field corn has. Possible reasons include the narrowness of the genetic base of sweet corn, the lack of defined heterotic groups and the greater effort devoted to improving field corn. Most of the publicly available inbreds were derived from three cultivars: Golden Bantam, Stowell's Evergreen, Country Gentleman. Ten new sugary-1 inbred lines developed at the Agricultural Research and Development Station Turda were examined by pedigree information, morphological traits, additive genetic effects (ĝ), phenotypic heterosis (H%), electrophoresis of the seed storage proteins (zein). Based on cluster analysis of these data sets the ten sugary-1 inbred lines can be divided into two major groups, very early inbreds that contain Golden Bantam or Northern Flint germplasm (TA 28, SW 87) and late inbreds with Southern Dent (TD 282, TD 103, TD 102). Several inbreds were not closely aligned with either group (TA 22, TD 101). The amount of genetic diversity present in these inbreds can be considered sufficient to obtain high yield and good taste sweet corn hybrids.

Key words: cluster analysis, genetic diversity, *sugary-1* inbred relationships

#### INTRODUCTION

In the last 50 years, yield gains due to the genetic improvement of sweet corn were modest as compared to those of field corn (Duvick, 1984). Several reasons can account for this situation, such as:

- the narrow genetic base of sweet corn; according to some authors (Galinat, 1971; Doebley et al., 1988) it is derived mainly from Northern Flint and its evolution tend to seriously narrow variability (Doebley et al., 1986);
- non-Northern Flint germplasm, represented by the "Evergreen" and "Country Gentleman" cultivars, has emerged from the introgression of the *sugary-1* gene in the dent germplasm (Galinat, 1971; Tracy, 1990);
- excessive use of "Golden Bantam" type in developing *su-1* inbred lines (as a source of yellow endosperm and for its good eating quality) (Huelsen, 1954; Galinat, 1971). Most of present sweet corn germplasm contains, in various proportions, "Golden Bantam" genes in its pedigree (Gerdes and Tracy, 1994).

However, RFLP analyses emphasize a significant diversity in sweet corn germplasm, in spite of the intense use of "Golden Bantam", "Stowell's Evergreen" and "Country Gentlemen" germplasms (Tracy, 1994; Gerdes and Tracy, 1994; Revilla and Tracy, 1995). On the other hand, in contrast with field corn, sweet corn lacks defined heterotic groups (Goodman, 1985).

Several methods were used in order to establish the relations of several germplasm sources and the genetic diversity of sweet corn: the pedigree method (Smith, 1988; Smith et al., 1990), morphological distinctions (Rhodes and Carmer, 1966; Smith, 1988; Goodman and Brown, 1988; Revilla and Tracy, 1995a; Haş et al., 2002), electrophoretic analysis of izoenzyms (Doebley et al., 1988; Revilla and Tracy, 1995b; Rotari et al., 1996; Haş et al., 2002), genetic traits such as heterosis (Smith, 1988), RFLP analysis (Gerdes and Tracy, 1994), molecular markers (Drinić et al., 2000). Morphological traits are capable of showing both identity and distinctness, but these data are affected by environmental interaction. Heterosis data provide estimates of genetic relatedness between lines.

According to Smith and Smith (1989a, 1989b), using morphological traits, chromatographic data and electrophoretic analysis of izoenzyms represents a starting point in establishing genetic diversity of inbred lines, whereas heterotic or RFLP analyses offer clearer data on the relations between lines. The purpose of this study has been to evaluate the genetic diversity and the relationship of ten *sugary-1* inbred lines newly developed at the Agricultural Research and Development Station Turda. To this end, specific methods were used:

- phenotypic methods based on biometric analysis and phenotypic distance values;

- genetic methods based on additive genetic distance values, as well as the analysis of the genetic parameters correlations and the degree of the phenotypic heterosis;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Agricultural Research and Development Station Turda, 27 Agriculturii Street, 401100 Turda, Cluj County, Romania

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Maize and Sorghum Scientific Research Institute Porumbeni, Moldova Republic

- biochemical methods based on the electrophoresis of seed storage proteins (zein) and the visual evaluation of densitometer scans.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Ten sugary-1 inbred lines developed at the Agricultural Research and Development Station Turda and 30  $F_1$  hybrids obtained by crossing these lines in an incomplete diallel system with reciprocals were used in this study. They were planted on Corn Breeding Laboratory Turda, in two years. The experimental design was a randomized complete block with three replicates. Ten plants were selected at random from each plot at harvest (at 21 days after silking date) and they were measured (22 traits/plant). Environment (year), block and hybrids or parental lines were the factors involved in the combined analysis of variance. A factorial  $(m \cdot n + n \cdot m)$  matting design [Design 2 of Comstock and Robinson (1952) and adapted by Căbulea et al. (1994)] was employed for analyzing the 2-yr data. The backgrounds of all lines are given in table 1 (Haş, 2000).

*Table 1*. Background and genealogy information for the ten new *sugary-1* inbred lines developed at the Agricultural Research and Development Station Turda

| No  | Inbred line | Background               | Genealogy   |
|-----|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 1.  | SW 87       | Supersweet- S.U.A.       | 2500-2-1-1  |
| 2.  | TA 22 su    | Syn. Q 206 Canada        | 3603-1-1-7  |
| 3.  | TA 27 su    | Reward – S.U.A.          | 5103-6-3-5  |
| 4.  | TA 28 su    | Golden Beauty - S.U.A.   | 7188-1-1-3  |
| 5.  | TD 103 su   | How Sweet It Is – S.U.A. | 7208-1-1-1  |
| 6.  | TA 25 su    | Reward – S.U.A.          | 3610-2-4-1  |
| 7.  | TA 26 su    | Reward – S.U.A.          | 5093-1-1-1  |
| 8.  | TD 101 su   | Aux 5651 – S.U.A.        | 3607-2-1-3  |
| 9.  | TD 282 su   | Silver Queen – S.U.A.    | 3870-10-2-1 |
| 10. | TD 102 su   | Aromatnaja – R. Moldova  | 7208-3-1-1  |

For the preliminary analyses, traits were assigned to one of three groups (Smith et al., 1991), according to the complexity of their genetic control (Table 2). Trait Group 1 contained characters that seem to be controlled by many independent loci. Trait Group 2 contained vegetative and reproductive characters that seem to be controlled by one to few independent loci of moderate genetic complexity. Trait Group 3 was comprised of characters that are under simple, generally major locus, genetic control. Assigning morphological traits into different groups allowed the option of weighting distances between lines on the basis of the complexity of genetic control for each trait. This provided the opportunity to more effecttively measure morphological distance in terms of the extent of genetic diversity between pairs of inbred lines (Table 3).

Weighted and unweighted morphological distances between lines were calculated by using all distance values, even when the distance for an individual trait between a pair of lines fell below the 5% level of significance.

Distance values were calculated as follows (Smith et al., 1991):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{(T1(i) - T2(i))^2}{\operatorname{var}(T(i))} \right]^{1/2}$$

where T1 is the value of the  $i^{th}$  trait for line 1. T2 is the value of the  $i^{th}$  trait for line 2, and var (T(*i*)) is the variance of the difference for the trait.

The evaluations of yield heterosis was calculated according to Hallauer and Miranda (1981):

$$H \% = \frac{F1 - \frac{(P1 + P2)}{2}}{\frac{(P1 + P2)}{2}}$$

Biochemical measures of distance were calculated using isoenzymic data from zein endosperm seed storage proteins chromatography, and also from electrophoretic profile of zein proteins (Rotari et al., 1996).

Since pedigrees of all lines were known, it was possible to determine differences between lines derived from morphological or biochemical data.

Polygenic diversity was evaluated by calculating additive genetic effects  $(\hat{g})$  within the factorial system:

$$\hat{g}_i$$
 or  $\hat{g}_j = \frac{\sum x_i}{i} - \frac{\sum x_i}{i \times j}$ , (Căbulea, 1975)

- x<sub>i</sub> = sum of values where parent "i" is constant;
- $\Sigma x_{\bullet} =$ sum of all values in the factorial system.

Correlation coefficients (r) of the additive genetic effects  $(\hat{g})$  for the analyzed traits were also calculated in order to emphasize the degree of coancestry.

## VOICHITA HAŞ ET AL.: THE ASSESSMENT OF DISTANCE BETWEEN *SUGARY-1* INBRED LINES DEVELOPED AT THE ARDS TURDA

| Trait                 | Units           | Description   |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---|
| Trait Group 1         |                 | *   |
| Ear weight            | g               | Weight of ear without husk (mean of 30 ears/year/line)                |
| Husk weight           | g               | Weight of husk/ear  |
| Ear length            | cm              | Length of ear   |
| Husk length           | cm              | Length of husk  |
| Ear diameter          | mm              | Diameter of ear without husk  |
| Number of kernel rows | no.             | Number of kernel rows per ear   |
| Cob diameter          | mm              | Diameter of cob   |
| Kernel content:       |                 |   |
| - dry matter(DM)      | %               | Kernel content in dry matter at harvest                               |
| - sucrose             | % / %DM         | Kernel content in sucrose at harvest                                  |
| - total sugar         | % / %DM         | Kernel content in total sugar at harvest                              |
| - WSP*                | % / %DM         | Kernel content in phytoglycogen at harvest                            |
| - fats                | % / %DM         | Kernel content in fats at harvest                                     |
| - proteins            | % / %DM         | Kernel content in proteins at harvest                                 |
| - starch              | % / %DM         | Kernel content in starch at harvest                                   |
| Eating quality        | note            | The taste of kernels at harvest                                       |
| GDU** to silking      | $\Sigma^0_{0}C$ | Heat units accumulated from sowing to 50% silk emergence              |
| GDU** to harvest      | $\Sigma^0 C$    | Heat units accumulated from sowing to harvest (21 days after silking) |
| Plant height          | cm              | Distance from soil level to base of tassel                            |
| Ear height            | cm              | Distance from soil level to base of main ear                          |
| Tiller number         | no.             | Mean number of tillers per plant                                      |
| Trait Group 2         |                 |   |
| Ear topfill           | note            | 1. uncovered; 5.top ear covered by kernel;                            |
| Kernel depth          | cm              | Length of kernel (mean of 5 per ear)                                  |
| Pericarp thickness    | μ               | Thickness of pericarp   |
| Leaf number           | no.             | Number of leaves per plant  |
| Leaf area             | cm <sup>2</sup> | (length x width leaf of main ear)/0.75                                |
| Tassel branch number  | no.             | Number of branches per tassel   |
| Ear shape             | note            | 1. Conical shape; 5. cylindrical shape;                               |
| Trait Group 3         |                 |   |
| Silk color            | note            | 1. red; 5. white;   |
| Kernel color          | note            | 2. white; 5. yellow;  |
| Cob color             | note            | 1. red; 5. white;   |

| Table 2. | Morpholog    | gical traits | measured in | the present | t studv    |
|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
|          | 111010101010 |              |             |             | · Deerer ; |

#### Table 3. The 45 possible pairs of the 10 su 1 inbred lines

| No. | The pairs of inbred lines | No. | The pairs of inbred lines | No. | The pairs of inbred lines |
|-----|---------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| 1.  | SW 87 x TA 22             | 16. | TA 22 x TD 282            | 31. | TD 103 x TA 25            |
| 2.  | SW 87 x TA 27             | 17. | TA 22 x TD 102            | 32. | TD 103 x TA 26            |
| 3.  | SW 87 x TA 28             | 18. | TA 27 x TA 28             | 33. | TD 103 x TD 101           |
| 4.  | SW 87 x TD 103            | 19. | TA 27 x TD 103            | 34. | TD 103 x TD 282           |
| 5.  | SW 87 x TA 25             | 20. | TA 27 x TA 25             | 35. | TD 103 x TD 102           |
| 6.  | SW 87 x TA 26             | 21. | TA 27 x TA 26             | 36. | TA 25 x TA 26             |
| 7.  | SW 87 x TD 101            | 22. | TA 27 x TD 101            | 37. | TA 25 x TD 101            |
| 8.  | SW 87 x TD 282            | 23. | TA 27 x TD 282            | 38. | TA 25 x TD 282            |
| 9.  | SW 87 x TD 102            | 24. | TA 27 x TD 102            | 39. | TA 25 x TD 102            |
| 10. | TA 22 x TA 27             | 25. | TA 28 x TD 103            | 40. | TA 26 x TD 101            |
| 11. | TA 22 x TA 28             | 26. | TA 28 x TA 25             | 41. | TA 26 x TD 282            |
| 12. | TA 22 x TD 103            | 27. | TA 28 x TA 26             | 42. | TA 26 x TD 102            |
| 13. | TA 22 x TA 25             | 28. | TA 28 x TD 101            | 43. | TD 101 x TD 282           |
| 14. | TA 22 x TA 26             | 29. | TA 28 x TD 282            | 44. | TD 101 x TD 102           |
| 15. | TA 22 x TD 101            | 30. | TA 28 x TD 102            | 45. | TD 282 x TD 102           |

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### 1) Morphological data

We tested the ability of morphological data to identify genetically related and unrelated inbred lines from a diverse germplasm.

Correlations of distance measures based on morphological data set and those derived from heterosis and inbreds origin, show that associations among lines on the basis of morphology were essentially at random to any association that might be expected on the basis of heterosis or of inbred line origin. Even when morphological data were additionally constrained by known origin, using canonical variate analysis (Smith and Smith, 1989) correlations between those modified morphological distances with heterosis measures were very low (Figure 1).



*Figure 1* - Phenotypic trait distance values among the possible pairs of the 10 *sugary-1* inbred lines (Group I)

The morphological data showed that the inbred line pairs had range distances from:

- 9.2 to 11.9 (Group I) (Figure 1) inbred lines more similar for morphological traits:

| Inbred line pairs              | Morphological distances | Phenotypic<br>heterosis (%) |  |  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| TA 25 $\leftrightarrow$ TA 26  | 9.2                     | 35                          |  |  |
| TD 103 ↔ TA 25                 | 9.5                     | 65                          |  |  |
| TD 101 ↔ TD 102                | 11.7                    | 22                          |  |  |
| TA 26 $\leftrightarrow$ TD 101 | 11.9                    | 47                          |  |  |

- 21.2 to 28.7 (Group I) (Figure 2) inbred lines less similar for morphological traits:

| Inbred line pairs             | Genetic<br>distances | Phenotypic<br>heterosis (%) |  |  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| TA 22 ↔ TD 102                | 28.7                 | 36                          |  |  |
| SW 87 ↔ TD 102                | 27.0                 | 15                          |  |  |
| SW 87 $\leftrightarrow$ TA 25 | 25.8                 | 44                          |  |  |
| TA 27 ↔ TD 102                | 23.0                 | 52                          |  |  |

Although morphological data have traditionally provided the sole set of descriptors for the purposes of cultivar identification and registration, they cannot reliably be used to estimate distances between maize cultivars that are reflective of their origin or genetic associations.

## 2) Genetic data

The genetic data (for ear weight) showed that the related pairs had a range of interline additive genetic effect distances from:

| - 8.9 to 13.4 (Group | I) (Figure 2) for more |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| similar genetically  | inbred lines:          |

| Inbred line pairs             | Genetic distances | Phenotypic<br>heterosis (%) |  |  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| SW 87 $\leftrightarrow$ TA 26 | 8.9               | 27                          |  |  |
| SW 87 $\leftrightarrow$ TA 25 | 11.5              | 35                          |  |  |
| SW 87 ↔ TA 22                 | 12.4              | 53                          |  |  |

- 25.7 to 32.9 (Group I) (Figure 2) for less similar genetically inbred lines:

| Inbred line pairs              | Genetic<br>distances | Phenotypic<br>heterosis (%) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| TA 27 ↔ TD 101                 | 30.8                 | 43                          |
| TA 27 $\leftrightarrow$ TD 102 | 30.3                 | 52                          |
| TA 22 $\leftrightarrow$ TA 27  | 30.3                 | 47                          |

The inbred lines: TA 25, TA 26 and TA 27 have a common origin, but only TA 25 and TA 26 are more similar for their morphological and genetic distances:

| Inbred<br>line pairs          | Morpho-<br>logical<br>distances | Genetic<br>distances | Phenotypic<br>heterosis<br>(%) |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| $TA 27 \leftrightarrow TA 25$ | 22.5                            | 29.0                 | 45                             |
| $TA 27 \leftrightarrow TA 26$ | 19.7                            | 20.9                 | 30                             |
| $TA 25 \leftrightarrow TA 26$ | 9.2                             | 12.8                 | 35                             |

The morphological distances between inbred lines were highly correlated with additive genetic effects (Group I);  $r = 0.59^{***}$  (Figure 3).



Figure 2. Additive genetic effect distance values among the possible pairs of the 10 sugary-1 inbred lines (Group I)



*Figure 3.* Scatter plot of inbred pairs for phenotypic distance values vs. additive genetic effects (Group I)

Genetic diversity was also analyzed based on the action of additive genes and the genetic effects ( $\hat{g}$ ) specific to the 10 inbred lines (for ear weight at harvest).

The differences at the genetic level are emphasized graphically (Figure 4) and through the correlation coefficients (rĝ), where we can observe that the 10 inbred lines are classified according to the degree of relationship between them. It clearly shows that the highest level of additive likeness is observed between: TD 103 – TA 25 (rĝ = 0.93), TA 25 – TD 102 (rĝ = 0.87), TD 101 – TD 102 (rĝ = 0.79), TD 101 – TD 282 (rĝ = 0.79),TD 102 – TD103 (rĝ = 0.74),TA 26 – TA 27 (rĝ = 0.79), TA 27 – TA 28 (rĝ = 0.75).

Figure 4 also represents the differences, on the additive level between the 10 su-1 inbred lines. Significant differences are shown by the genetic correlation coefficients between the following inbred lines:

- SW 87 as compared to TD 103 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.85$ ), TA 25 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.64$ );
- TA 27 as compared to TD  $102(r\hat{g} = -0.96)$ , TD  $101(r\hat{g} = -0.92)$ , TA  $25(r\hat{g} = -0.89)$ TD  $103 (r\hat{g} = -0.74)$ , TA  $22 (r\hat{g} = -0.60)$ ;
- TA 28 as compared to TD 101 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.84$ ), TA 25 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.84$ ), TD103 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.80$ )
  - TD 282 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.72$ ), TD 102 ( $r\hat{g} = -0.64$ ).

The differences between the compared inbred lines reflect differences in homozygous loci level with cumulative effects.



*Figure 4*. Genetic diversity based on genotypic correlation levels (rĝ) between ten *sugary-1* inbred lines

As far as the action of additive genes is concerned, the evaluation of data on the relations between the 10 *sugary-1* inbred lines (both through phenotypic differences and through correlation coefficients) shows no total correspondence between the two methods.

At an additive level, as well as on a heterotic intensity one, the highest likeness is observed between the two groups of lines:

- the SW 87 group, consisting of the following inbred lines: TA 28, TA 27, TA 22,
- TA 26, which appear to belong to the Northern Flint race;
- the TD 102 group, consisting of the following inbred lines: TA 25, TD 101, TD 103, which appear to belong to the Southern Dent; The *su* TA 22 and TD 101 inbred lines seem to have an average reaction.

The inbred lines that showed the most striking resemblance on the additive level were: TA 22 - SW 87 and TD 102 - TD 103.

For the lines tested in this study, phenotypic heterosis can give a reliable estimate of relatedness among lines that would be expected on the basis of accurate knowledge of origin.

The diversity measured by yield heterotic intensity was found to be quite different from morphological differences.

The crosses TD 102 x SW 87 (H = 17%), TD 102 x TD 101(H = 19%), TD 102 x TA 28 (H = 35%), SW 87 x TA 27 (H = 35%) had the lowest yield heterosis level. Low-intensity heterosis level calls attention upon a possible genetic relation of the TD 102 inbred line with SW 87 and TD 101, as well as SW 87 with TA 27; all these are also confirmed by genealogy and the phenotypic differences (Figure 1).

Heterosis data were used as an indicator of genetic relationships between lines that closely mirror those to be expected on the bases of known origin.

For the ten *su* parental inbreds, which were studied here, we made a classification of the first three inbred lines by their *per se* value and by favorable value of additive effects (GCA) (Table 4). By the most favorable traits, which we considered in both ranks, the leaders were the *su* parental inbreds: TA 28, TA 22, SW 87.

The higher positive values, statistically significant of the correlation coefficients among *per se* values of parental inbred lines and their additive effects are an argument in the favor of practicing the phenotypic selection of some

traits such as: number of tillers per plant, ear length, kernel row number per ear.

| Table 4. Classification of parental inbreds by their per se value and favorable additive effects |
|--|
| in Design 2 experiment   |

| Trait                 | Unit      | Significance<br>of additive<br>variance | Correlation<br>coefficients between<br><i>per se</i> value and<br>additive effects | Classific<br>inbreds | ation of the   | best three <i>se</i> value | Classif<br>three<br>favorab | ication of<br>inbreds by<br>ble additive | the best<br>their<br>e effects |
|-----------------------|-----------|---|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Plant traits          |           |   |  |                      |                |                            |                             |  |                                |
| Plant height          | cm        | **                                      | 0.65*  | 1. <b>TA22</b>       | 2.TD103        | 3.TA25                     | 1.TD103                     | 2. <b>TA22</b>                           | 3.TD101                        |
| No. branches/tassel   | no.       | **                                      | 0.86**   | 1. <b>TA22</b>       | 2.TD102        | 3. <b>TA28</b>             | 1. <b>TA28</b>              | 2.TA27                                   | 3. <b>TA22</b>                 |
| No. ears/plant        | no.       | **                                      | 0.50   | 1.TA27               | 2. <b>TA22</b> | 3.SW87,                    | 1.TA27                      | 2. <b>TA28</b>                           | 3.SW87                         |
|                       |           |   |  |                      |                | TA28                       |                             |  |                                |
| No. tillers/plant     | no.       | **                                      | 0.84**   | 1.TA22               | 2. <b>TA28</b> | 3.TD282                    | 1. <b>TA22</b>              | 2. <b>TA28</b>                           | 3.TD101                        |
| GDUs (sowing - silk   | ing)      | **                                      | 0.60   | 1.SW87               | 2. <b>TA22</b> | 3.TD28                     | 1. <b>TA22</b>              | 2. <b>TA28</b>                           | 3.TA27                         |
| Ear and kernel traits |           |   |  |                      |                |                            |                             |  |                                |
| Ear weight            | g         | **                                      | 0.67*  | 1.TD102              | 2.TA26         | 3. <b>TA28</b>             | 1.TD103                     | 2. <b>TA28</b>                           | 3.TA25                         |
| Husk weight           | g         | **                                      | 0.39   | 1.SW87               | 2.TA27         | 3. <b>TA22</b>             | 1. <b>TA28</b>              | 2.SW87                                   | 3. <b>TA22</b>                 |
| Ear length            | cm        | **                                      | 0.91**   | 1.TD102              | 2.TD101        | 3.TD103                    | 1.TD102                     | 2.TD101                                  | 3.TA26                         |
| Row number            | no.       | **                                      | 0.89**   | 1.TA27               | 2.TA26         | 3.TD282                    | 1.TA27                      | 2.TA26                                   | 3.TD282                        |
| Kernel depth          | cm        | **                                      | 0.26   | 1.TD103              | 2.TA26         | 3.TA27                     | 1.SW87                      | 2.TA28                                   | 3.TD282                        |
| Kernel chemical co    | mposition |   |  |                      |                |                            |                             |  |                                |
| Dry matter            | %         | NS                                      | 0.63*  | 1. <b>TA22</b>       | 2.TD103        | 3.TA26                     | 1.TD282                     | 2. <b>TA22</b>                           | 3.TA25                         |
| Sucrose               | % / % d.m | NS                                      | 0.36   | 1. <b>TA22</b>       | 2.SW87         | 3.TA27                     | 1. <b>TA22</b>              | 2.TD101                                  | 3.TA25                         |
| Total sugar           | % / % d.m | NS                                      | 0.52   | 1.TD282              | 2. <b>TA28</b> | 3.TD103                    | 1.TD282                     | 2.TA25                                   | 3. <b>TA22</b>                 |
| Phytoglycogen         | % / % d.m | NS                                      | 0.73*  | 1.TA25               | 2. <b>TA28</b> | 3.TA27                     | 1.TA25                      | 2.TD103                                  | 3. <b>TA28</b>                 |
| Starch                | % / % d.m | NS                                      | 0.07   | 1. <b>TA28</b>       | 2.TA27         | 3.TD282                    | 1.TD282                     | 2.TA25                                   | 3.TD101                        |
| Protein               | % / % d.m | *                                       | 0.29   | 1.TA27               | 2.SW87         | 3. <b>TA22</b>             | 1.TD282                     | 2.TA27                                   | 3.TA25                         |
| Fats                  | % / % d.m | NS                                      | -0.34  | 1.SW87               | 2.TD282        | 3.TA28                     | 1.TD102                     | 2. <b>TA28</b>                           | 3. <b>TA22</b>                 |

### 3) Biochemical data

The evaluation of diversity of the 10 *su*inbred lines at molecular level took into account the genetic polymorphism of the seed storage proteins (zein) specific to each of the studied lines.

Comparison of the electrophoretic spectrum was based on the relative mobility of the electrophoretic bands (Figure 5) and on the visual evaluation of densitometer scans of electrophoretic spectrum of zein (Figure 6).

Thus:

 the SW 87 inbred line has some common elements in the proteic spectrum with TA 28 and TA 25, but it also has some differences;

- the SW 87 does not differ in electrophoretic spectrum from TD 101 and TD 282;
- the SW 87 line has slight quantitative differences as compared to TD 102.

The similarities between the 10 *sugary-1* inbred lines established, by the methods previously presented, are confirmed by the evaluation of the elements of the electrophoretic spectrum of zein.

Biochemical data were able to uniquely describe all the ten lines studied herein.

Our results were similar with those obtained by Smith and Smith (1989a, 1989b) in their study about field corn lines.

VOICHITA HAŞ ET AL.: THE ASSESSMENT OF DISTANCE BETWEEN SUGARY-1 INBRED LINES DEVELOPED AT THE ARDS TURDA



*Figure* 5 – Zein electrophoretic spectrum of nine *sugary-1* inbred lines: A (SW 87), B (TA 22), C (TA 27), D (TA 28), E (TD 103), F (TA 25), G (TA 26), H (TD 101), I (TD 282



Figure 6 - Densitometer scans of zein electrophoretic spectrum of ten sugary-1 inbred lines

# CONCLUSIONS

Research for the evaluation of genetic diversity in *sugary-1* inbred lines can have a positive influence on the efficiency of sweet corn breeding and on the strategy of developing performance hybrids.

The analysis of these data showed that:

- the 10 *sugary-1* inbred lines, newly developed at the A.R.D.S. Turda are phenotypically and genetically differentiated and can be classified into three germplasm groups;

- morphological, genetic and biochemical data allow the identification of the following groups of the studied *su* lines: early inbreds, belonging to Northern Flint race (SW 87, TA 22, TA 28); late inbreds, apparently resulting from Southern Dent germoplasm (TD 103, TD 101, TD 102, TD 282); TA 22 and TD 101 *su* lines seem to have an average behavior;

- there was a relative correspondence between the results obtained in establishing the relations of the 10 su lines, through the following methods: relation coefficients (rĝ), the intensity of phenotypic heterosis (H%), visual evaluation of densitograms and the description of the electrophoretic spectrum of zein;

- morphological and biochemical data might be able to provide initial screens of identity and distinctiveness, but heterosis data appear to provide the most reliable estimates of overall genotypic relatedness;

- correlations between morphological distances with heterosis measures were very low; thus, although morphological data have traditionally provided the sole set of descriptors for the purposes of cultivar identification and registration, they cannot reliably be used to estimate distances between sweet corn cultivars that are reflective of their pedigree or genetic associations.

- the studied *sugary-1* inbred lines present the possibility of developing performance hybrid formulae, for commercially valuable hybrids with superior productivity, earliness and quality of the ear and of the kernels (particularly eating quality).

#### REFERENCES

- Căbulea, I., 1975. Metode statistice pentru analiza componentelor genetice ale variabilității continue. Probleme de genetică teoretică și aplicată VII: 391-421.
- Doebley, J.F., Goodman, M. M., Stuber, C.W., 1986. Exceptional divergence of Northern Flint corn. Am.J. Bot.73: 64-69.

- Doebley, J.F., Wendel, J.D., Smith, J.S.C., Stuber, C.W., Goodman, M.M., 1988. The origin of Corn Belt maize: the isozyme evidence. Econ.Bot.42: 120-131.
- Drinc, G., Barisic, N., Mladenovic Drinc, S., 2000. Genetic relationship among maize inbred lines revealed by protein markers. Maize and sorghum EUCARPIA, XVIII International Conference, Belgrade.
- Duvick, D.N., 1984. Genetic contribution to yield gains of U.S. hybrid maize, 1930 to 1980. In: Genetic contribution to yield gains of five major crop plants: 15-47.
- Galinat, W.C., 1971. The evolution of sweet corn. Res. Bull-Mass. Agric. Exp. Stn. 591.
- Gerdes, J.T., Tracy, W.F., 1988. Phylogeny of sweet corn inbreds: 81. In: Agronomy abstracts. ASA, Madison, WI.
- Gerdes, J.T., Tracy, W.F., 1994. Diversity of historically important sweet corn inbreds as determined by RFLPs, morphology, isozimes, and pedigree. Crop Sci. 34:26-33.
- Goodman, M.M., 1985. Exotic maize germoplasm: Status, prospects, and remedies. Iowa State J.Res. 59: 497-527.
- Goodman, M.M., Brown, W.L., 1988. Races of corn. In: G.F. Sprague and J.W. Dudley (eds).Corn and corn improvement. 3rd ed. Amer. Soc.Agrin. Madison Wi.
- Hallauer, A.R., Miranda, J.B., 1981. Quantitative genetics, Maize Breeding. Iowa State Univ. Press, Amer.
- Haş, Voichiţa, 2000. Research regarding to the inheritance of some qualitative and quantitative characters in sweet corn. Ph.D.
- Haş, Voichiţa, Rotari, A., Has, I., 2002. Genetic relations of certain *sugary-1* inbred lines developed at the Agricultural Research Station Turda. Buletinul USAMV Cluj-Napoca, 57:
- Huelsen, W.A., 1954. Sweet corn. Interscience Publisher, New York.
- Revilla, P., Tracy, W.F., 1995a. Morphological characterization and classification of open pollinated sweet corn cultivars. J. Americ. Soc. Hort. Sci. 120-118.
- Revilla. P., Tracy, W.F., 1995b. Isozyme variation and phylogenetic relationships among open-pollinated sweet corn cultivars. Crop Sci. 35: 219-227.
- Rhodes, A.M., Carmer, S.G., 1966. Classification of sweet corn inbreds by methods of numerical taxonomy. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 88: 507-515.
- Rotari, A., Comarova, Galina, Frunze, I., Olivera Pari, M., 1996. Identificarea liniilor homozigote de porumb după polimorfismul genetic al zeinei. Cercetări de genetică vegetală și animală. IV: 71-79.
- Smith, J.S.C., 1988. Diversity of United States hybrid maize germoplasm; isozymic and chromatographic evidence. Crop Sci. 28: 63-69.
- Smith, J.S.C., Smith, O.S., 1989a. The description and assessment of distances between inbred lines of maize: I. The use of morphological traits as descriptors. Maydica 34: 141-150.
- Smith, J.S.C., Smith, O.S., 1989b. The description and assessment of distances between inbred lines of maize: II. The utility of morphological, biochemical, and genetic descriptors and a scheme for the testing of distinctiveness between inbred lines. Maydica 34: 151-161.
- Smith, O.S., Smith, J.S.C., Bowen, S.L., Tenborg, R.A, Wall, S.J., 1990. Similarities among a group of elite maize inbreds as measured by pedigree. F1 grain yield, heterosis, and RFLPs, Theor Appl. Genet. 80: 833-840.
- Smith, O.S., Smith, J.S.C., Bowen, S.L., Tenborg, R.A., Wall, S.J., 1991. The description and assessment of distances between inbred lines of maize. III. A revised scheme for the testing of distinctiveness between inbred lines utilizing DNA RFLPs. Maydica 36: 213-226.
- Tracy, W.F., 1990. Potential of field corn germoplasm for the improvement of sweet corn. Crop Sci. 30: 1041-1045.
- Tracy, W.F., 1994. Sweet corn: 147-187. Specialty types of maize, CRC, Boca Raton, FL.