

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Maize grain yield enhancement through high plant density cultivation with different inter-row and intra-row spacings**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1532578> since 2016-06-29T18:35:15Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1016/j.eja.2015.09.006

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



## UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

This Accepted Author Manuscript (AAM) is copyrighted and published by Elsevier. It is posted here by agreement between Elsevier and the University of Turin. Changes resulting from the publishing process - such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms - may not be reflected in this version of the text. The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in “Maize grain yield enhancement through high plant density cultivation with different inter-row and intra-row spacings.”, *European Journal of Agronomy*, 72: 28-37, DOI: [doi:10.1016/j.eja.2015.09.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2015.09.006).  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1161030115300277>

You may download, copy and otherwise use the AAM for non-commercial purposes provided that your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this AAM for non-commercial purposes only under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this AAM in the following format: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>), [+DOI: doi:10.1016/j.jcs.2015.06.004.]

# **Maize grain yield enhancement through high plant density cultivation with different inter-row and intra-row spacings.**

Authors: Giulio Testa, Amedeo Reyneri, Massimo Blandino\*

Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, Forestali e Alimentari, Largo Paolo Braccini 2, 10095 Grugliasco (TO), Italy.

\* Corresponding author. Tel: +39-011-6708895; fax +39-011-6708798.

E-mail address: massimo.blandino@unito.it

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Increasing the maize plant population has undergone a constant evolution over the years,  
3 with the purpose of enhancing the crop yield. Field trials, in which 2 different experiments  
4 were considered, have been conducted in NW Italy in order to analyze the yield benefit of  
5 high plant density on recent hybrids, considering both intra-row and inter-row plant  
6 spacings. The first experiment, which was carried out during the 2013 and 2014 season,  
7 evaluated the effects of 4 growing plant densities (from 7.5-to 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) combined with  
8 2 row widths (the traditional 0.75 m and a narrow inter-row spacing of 0.50 m) on plant  
9 architecture-and grain yield. Two hybrids, with different ear developments (fixed and flex),  
10 were taken into account. The higher plant density led to a decrease in the stalk area  
11 (-20%), leaf greenness (-5.2%) and cob length (-10.8%). It also negatively affected the  
12 kernel weight (-7.1%) and the number of kernels per row (-10%). The grain yield only  
13 increased significantly, for both hybrids (+7.4%), if a density of 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> was  
14 reached when the inter-row spacing was reduced (0.50 m). In the second study, an  
15 innovative system (narrow inter-row spacing combined with a plant population of about  
16 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) was compared with a standard planting system (7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> sown on  
17 0.75 m wide rows), considering 32 different production situations (PS) over 4 growing  
18 seasons (2011-2014). This study has confirmed that even though the single plant yield  
19 potential was reduced in terms of ear weight and thousand kernels weight by 18% and 6%  
20 respectively for a high planting density, the final grain yield increased on 90% of the PS  
21 with an average gain of 11.7%. This work has proved that, in the conditions in which the  
22 experiments were conducted, a high planting density of up to 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> can lead to a  
23 significant yield increase, but only when it is combined with narrow inter-row spacing.  
24 These conditions increase plant stresses, and modify plant morphology and development  
25 to the detriment of the single plant yield. However, the lower yield per plant is fully

26 compensated by the higher plant population.

27

28 **Keywords:** seeding rate, uniform planting pattern, plant traits, kernel traits.

29

30 **Abbreviations:** ECB, European Corn Borer; ESQ, ears per square meter; HI, harvest  
31 index; HiD, innovative high planting density system; HNT, hydro N-tester; KD, kernel  
32 depth; KL, kernel length; KPR, kernels per row; KR, kernel row; KSQ, kernels per square  
33 meter; KV, kernel volume; N, nitrogen; NIS, narrow inter-row spacing; PS, production  
34 situation; RR, relative ratio; SIS, standard inter-row spacing; StD, standard density planting  
35 system; TKW, thousand kernels weight; TW, test weight.

## 36 **1. Introduction**

37 Increasing the population density of plants is an agronomical practice that has  
38 continuously been studied for maize crops. This crop technique has evolved and will  
39 continue to evolve over the years and it is the agronomic management factor that has  
40 changed the most over the past six decades (Tollenaar, 1992). After the introduction of the  
41 first hybrids, farmers started to steadily increase the plant density, at an average rate of  
42 0.3 plants m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. In the US Corn Belt of the 1930s, the mean population density was 3  
43 plants m<sup>-2</sup>, while it was 4 plants m<sup>-2</sup> in the 1960s and 6 plants m<sup>-2</sup> in the 1980s (Duvick,  
44 2005). Nowadays, the average density in the USA, where maize cultivation is intense, is  
45 around 8 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (Li et al., 2015), whereas in the EU, where the pedo-climatic  
46 conditions are more heterogeneous across countries, it can vary from 6 to 8 plants m<sup>-2</sup> for  
47 medium-late maturing hybrids in fertile growing areas. On both continents, in which this  
48 crop is cultivated intensively, the most common inter-row spacing for the current planting  
49 density is approximately 0.70 - 0.75 m in order to facilitate inter-row tillage (Sharratt and  
50 McWilliams, 2005). The main purpose of increasing the plant density is to enhance maize  
51 yield in terms of grain or biomass, thus making the crop system more efficient and  
52 competitive per area unit. In the absence of biotic or abiotic stresses, grain yield is related  
53 to the amount of solar radiation intercepted by the crop, and the use of a high density  
54 population, with an earlier canopy closure, maximizes the leaf area index (Cox and  
55 Cherney, 2001)

56 The crop yield potential could be divided into three genotype components. The first one is  
57 the yield potential per plant, which, over the last 70 years, has remained stable for  
58 non-stressed plants under very low planting densities (1 plant m<sup>-2</sup>) (Duvick et al., 2004a;  
59 Sangoi et al., 2002). The second component is the tolerance to various abiotic and biotic  
60 stresses, and the third one is responsiveness to inputs (Tokatlidis and Koutroubas, 2004).

61 In the late 1930s, the average grain yield in the United States was around  $2 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  (Duvick  
62 et al., 2004a). After this, the mean yield gain was increased each year by  $115 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  until  
63 the 1990s, when the yield expectation was around  $8.8 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$ . This occurred thanks to the  
64 positive interaction between enhancements in cultural practices and plant breeding, which  
65 improved components 2 and 3 of the crop yield potential (Duvick, 2005). Continuous  
66 changes in plant architecture have led to an increase in the efficiency of grain production  
67 under stresses for high planting densities, because of higher intra-specific competition,  
68 unfavorable weather, or low soil fertility (Duvick et al., 2004a).

69 The shoot and seed density per area unit of modern maize hybrids is theoretically the  
70 same, since these plants have lost their tillering ability (Duvick et al., 2004b), to the  
71 advantage of a higher harvest index (HI) on the single plant. Thus, the only way that maize  
72 plants can moderately compensate for planting density changes on the final yield is  
73 through an adaptation of ear development. A flex ear hybrid adjusts its ear growth  
74 according to the conditions that are encountered in the field, by modifying the number of  
75 kernels per ear that reach full maturity. This feature allows, for example, to better  
76 compensate for plant vacancies and hence preserve the yield if harsh field conditions  
77 occur (Mascagni and Bell, 2004). On the other hand, a fixed ear development keeps the  
78 total number of kernels per ear relatively steady, regardless of the environmental  
79 conditions. Maize is one of the herbaceous species that offers the highest grain yield  
80 potential, yet it is one of the most sensitive crops to variations in plant density (Vega et al.,  
81 2001). Modern hybrids can generally withstand higher population densities, because they  
82 can support stressful environmental conditions caused by a higher intra-specific  
83 competition more easily, and this results in a lower incidence of barren plants and reduced  
84 stem lodging (Tollenaar, 1989; Widdicombe and Thelen, 2002). In order to overcome the  
85 problems of high density planting, these hybrids are characterized by more upright and

86 shorter leaves, and the synchrony between the differentiation of the female and male  
87 florets is higher (Sangoi, 2000), thus limiting barrenness. However, in order to place the  
88 crop in the best growing conditions possible, even for high plant populations, the planting  
89 pattern has to be re-thought with a reduction in the inter-row spacing and a more balanced  
90 equidistance. Plants spaced more uniformly in fact compete minimally for the main  
91 growing factors. Among these factors, the one that is affected most is light, and this is  
92 followed by nutrients and water ( Li et al., 2015; Sharratt and McWilliams, 2005).  
93 According to this line of reasoning, an increase in planting density, obtained by reducing  
94 the within row plant spacing, could be a limiting factor. In fact, if plants are sown too close  
95 to each other in the same row, their full yield potential could be restrained.

96 The objective of this work was to evaluate the effects of plant density on maize yield and  
97 on the ear and plant morphology of hybrids with different ear development for full-season  
98 varieties under irrigation conditions. The interaction between the plant density, considering  
99 the reference plant population generally applied in temperate areas and different  
100 increments of up to 40%, and inter-row spacing, has been considered. Since the plant  
101 arrangement is one of the most important practices employed to increase maize yield  
102 (Okumura et al., 2014), this information could help to identify the best actual planting  
103 pattern for intensive high-yield maize cultivation in temperate areas, which could contribute  
104 significantly to an improvement in the competitiveness of this cereal.



## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Experimental sites and agronomical management

The study on the effects of different planting densities on the morphological development of plants and ears and grain yield was performed over four growing seasons, from 2011 to 2014, and it involved two different experiments conducted in the same agricultural area in the Piedmont region in North West of Italy, characterized by a humid subtropical climate according to the Köppen climate classification (Peel, 2011).

#### 2.1.1 Experiment 1

Field trials were conducted in the 2013 and 2014 growing seasons at Buriasco, in the North West of Italy (44°51'53" N, 7°26'21" E), an area that is characterized by a deep and fertile loamy soil (40% sand, 46% silt, 15% clay, Typic Hapludalfs, USDA classification) and a medium-high content of organic matter (3.2%) with a balanced C/N ratio (11.0). The N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (available) and K<sub>2</sub>O (exchangeable) soil content were respectively high (1.7 g kg<sup>-1</sup>), medium (23 ppm) and low (18 ppm). The soil pH was sub-acid (6.3) and the Cation Exchange Capacity was medium (16.3 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>).

The compared treatments were a factorial combination of:

- 2 inter-row spacings:
  - o 0.75 m wide, standard inter-row spacing (SIS), representing the reference spacing for the maize crop system;
  - o 0.5 m wide, narrow inter-row spacing (NIS)
- 4 planting densities:
  - o D1: 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (reference planting density)
  - o D2: 9 plants m<sup>-2</sup>
  - o D3: 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>

- 129                   ○ D4: 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>
- 130           - 2 hybrids characterized by a different ear development according to the
- 131           environmental conditions that occur during the growing season:
- 132                   ○ Syngenta NX7234, FAO maturity class 500; 127 relative days to maturity,
- 133                   characterized by a fixed ear development.
- 134                   ○ KWS Korimbos, FAO maturity class 500; 125 relative days to maturity,
- 135                   with a flex ear development.

136   The experiment was carried out according to a split plot design: the inter-row space and

137   hybrid were considered as the main factors, whereas the planting density was considered

138   as a sub-plot factor, with 3 randomized replicates. The whole field was planted at a

139   maximum planting density of 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>, and then each plot was thinned at the four leaf

140   stage (growth stage GS 14) (Lancashire et al., 1991) to adjust the plant population to the

141   desired levels. The plant density was then checked again by counting the plants from GS

142   65 to GS 75. The sub-plots for the 0.5 m inter-row spacing were 10 m. long and 12 rows

143   wide, and were 8 rows wide for the 0.75 m inter-spacing. The plot alleys, which were

144   orthogonal to the maize rows, were 1 m wide.

145   The previous crop was maize each year. Mechanical Pplanting was carried out on April

146   17<sup>th</sup> and March 17<sup>th</sup>, respectively, for 2013 and 2014, after an autumn 0.3 m deep

147   ploughing, followed by disk harrowing. All seeds were treated with fludioxonil and

148   metalaxil-m (Celest XL<sup>®</sup>, Syngenta Crop Protection S.p.A., Milan, Italy). All the plots

149   received the same amount of nutrients: before sowing 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of K<sub>2</sub>O (as potassium

150   chloride) were applied, whereas during sowing 39 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of N and 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (as

151   diammonium phosphate). At GS 16, 261 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of N (as urea) were applied as side-

152   dressing fertilization, during the 25<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> of May respectively in 2013 and 2014.

153   Irrigation was conducted using the pivot method, providing each time 50 mm of water, in

154 order to avoid any drought stress until the end of the dough stage (GS 87). Irrigation was  
155 performed twice in 2013, whereas it was only applied once in 2014, due to abundant  
156 rainfall in the summer. Weed control was conducted at pre-emergence with mesotrione  
157 (0.15 kg AI ha<sup>-1</sup>) S-metolachlor (1.25 kg AI ha<sup>-1</sup>) and terbuthylazine (0.75 kg AI ha<sup>-1</sup>)  
158 (Lumax<sup>®</sup>, Syngenta Crop Protection S.p.A., Milan, Italy). All the plots were sprayed at GS  
159 75 in both trials with pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin insecticide (Karate<sup>®</sup> Zeon, Syngenta  
160 Crop Protection S.p.A., Milan, Italy) at 0.019 kg AI ha<sup>-1</sup>. The spraying application was  
161 performed on July 19<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, respectively, for the 2013 and 2014 growing seasons.  
162 This allowed any possible damage to the stalks and ears, due to the larva activity of the  
163 European Corn Borer (ECB) (*Ostrinia nubilalis* Hübner), to be restrained.

#### 164 **2.1.2 Experiment 2**

165 The standard planting density (StD) was compared against the innovative high planting  
166 density (HiD) for several production situations (PS) (Aubertot and Robin, 2013) from the  
167 year 2011 to 2014. The StD involved the ordinary planting pattern and density that are  
168 commonly adopted in the maize temperate growing areas of Europe and North America.  
169 This consists of an average seeding rate of 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>, planted in rows 0.75 m apart,  
170 with an average intra-row spacing of 0.18 m. The HiD system had the purpose of  
171 maximizing grain yield by increasing the seeding rate to 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>. In order to  
172 achieve this density, and at the same time to keep plants as equidistant as possible, the  
173 distance between rows was reduced to 0.5 m. The average gap between one plant and  
174 another was set to 0.19 m within each row. On both systems, planting was conducted by a  
175 mechanical sowing machine with adjustable row width. All seed were treated with  
176 fludioxonil and metalaxil-m (Celest XL<sup>®</sup>, Syngenta Crop Protection S.p.A., Milan, Italy).  
177 Overall, the comparisons between the StD and HiD systems were made considering 34  
178 PS, according to a completely randomized block design with 4 replicates. All the plots

179 were 10 m long and 8 or 12 rows wide, for the StD and HiD systems, respectively. All the  
180 measurements were conducted on the two middle rows. The list of the compared PS and  
181 their main geographical and agronomical information is reported on Table 1.

182 A 0.3 m deep ploughing and an insecticide treatment were applied at GS 75 in all the trial  
183 fields in order to restrain the ECB activity. All the hybrids in the comparison belonged to a  
184 full maturity class (FAO 500 or 600) and they are representative of the varieties more  
185 cultivated in the considered growing area. As described in Table 1, different irrigation  
186 systems were adopted, according to the typical farm management system in force in the  
187 area, each providing enough water to maintain the water-holding capacity between 33 and  
188 200 kPa. Other agronomical practices that have not been reported, such as fertilization  
189 and weed control, were conducted according to the ordinary agronomic techniques of the  
190 cultivation area and were the same for both density theses.

## 191 **2.2 Field and harvest assessments**

### 192 **2.2.1 Experiment 1**

193 The following assessments have been made on the two middle rows from each plot during  
194 the milk stage (GS 75), which occurred on August 12<sup>th</sup> and July 20<sup>th</sup> respectively for 2013  
195 and 2014 growing seasons. The ear leaf greenness was measured by means of a  
196 chlorophyll meter, Hydro N-Tester® data logger (HNT) (Hydro-Agri, now Yara, Yara Italia  
197 S.p.a., Milan, Italy). Thirty randomly selected ear leaves were measured for each plot in  
198 order to record the average HNT value.

199 In order to measure the stalk area, the maximum (D) and minimum diameter (d) were  
200 measured on the first internode at the milk stage (GS 75) by means of a digital gauge. This  
201 assessment was conducted on 15 randomly selected plants per plot. The stalk area was  
202 then calculated using the following formula:

203 
$$(1) \text{ Stalk area (cm}^2\text{)} = \left( \frac{D \text{ (mm)}}{2} * \frac{d \text{ (mm)}}{2} * \pi \right) / 100$$

204 The ear insertion height from the ground was measured at the milk stage (GS 75) on 15  
205 plants randomly selected per plot.

206 Incidence of lodged plants was recorded for each plot before harvesting.

207 At the end of maturity, the grain yields were obtained by harvesting the entire length of the  
208 2 middle rows in the 0.75 m SIS plots and the 3 middle rows in the NIS plots using a  
209 Walter Wintersteiger cereal plot combine-harvester. The grain yield results were adjusted  
210 to a 14% moisture content. This operation was carried out on October 15<sup>th</sup> and October 6<sup>th</sup>  
211 for the 2013 and 2014 growing seasons, respectively.

212 Before the mechanical harvest, ears were collected by hand and counted from each plot,  
213 considering a surface of 4.5 m<sup>2</sup>, in order to record the number of lodged plants, to  
214 calculate the density per square meter of the fully developed ears (ESQ) and to conduct  
215 further assessments regarding the morphology of the ears and kernels.

216 The cob and tip back length was measured on 15 randomly selected ears. Moreover, the  
217 number of kernel rows (KR) and the number of kernels per row (KPR) were also counted  
218 on 7 of these randomly selected ears. The theoretical amount of kernels per square meter  
219 (KSQ) was then calculated by multiplying the average number of kernels per ear (KR \*  
220 KPR) by the ESQ.

221 The collected ears were shelled using an electric sheller. The kernels from each plot were  
222 mixed thoroughly to obtain a random distribution; a 1 kg sub-sample was then taken and  
223 dried at 60°C for 72 hours, in order to reduce the kernel moisture content to 10%.

224 The grain moisture and the test weight (TW) were determined on wet and dry kernels,  
225 respectively, by means of a Dickey-John GAC2000 grain analysis meter (Dickey-John  
226 Corp. Auburn, IL, USA) according to the supplied programme. Two hundred dry kernels  
227 were randomly collected and weighed to assess the thousand kernel weight (TKW). The

228 kernel volume (KV) was measured by recording the rise in the known alcohol volume after  
229 inserting 100 kernels into a graduate cylinder. Two analytical replicates were carried out  
230 for all these assessments. The average kernel length (KL) and kernel depth (KD) was  
231 measured on 30 kernels randomly selected from each sample using a digital gauge.

### 232 **2.2.2 Experiment 2**

233 At the end of maturity, ears were collected manually from an area of 4.5 m<sup>2</sup> in each plot,  
234 weighed, counted and then shelled. The following assessments were conducted on the  
235 kernels, according to the same procedure as experiment 1: grain moisture, TW, TKW, KR,  
236 KPR and KSQ. The ear weight (including the cob and grains) was calculated as the total  
237 weight of the ears divided by the number of harvested ears.

### 238 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

239 An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to compare the effect of the planting density  
240 of experiment 1 on the recorded parameters, using a split-plot design, in which the inter-  
241 row space and hybrid were considered as the main factors, whereas the four planting  
242 densities were considered as a sub-plot factor.

243 The normal distribution and homogeneity of variances were verified by performing the  
244 Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality test and the Levene test, respectively.

245 As far as grain yield and ESQ are concerned, ANOVA was conducted considering the  
246 combination of planting density, the inter-row spacing (8 theses) and the hybrid as  
247 independent variables. As far as KPR is concerned, the ANOVA test was conducted for  
248 each hybrid, considering the combination of planting density and the inter-row spacing as  
249 independent variables. The year was considered as a random variable in all the tests.

250 Multiple comparison tests were performed, according to the Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F  
251 (REGW-F) test, on the planting density treatment means. SPSS Version 21.0 for Windows

252 statistical package was used for the ANOVA statistical analysis.

253 The relative ratio (RR= HiD/StD) between the HiD agronomic system and StD was

254 calculated for each measured parameter for all the PS considered in experiment n° 2. The

255 average RR and the confidence interval were calculated at significance levels of 99.9%

256 (P<0.001), 99% (P<0.01) and 95% (P<0.05).

## 257 **3. Results**

### 258 **3.1 Experiment 1**

259 The two years in which the experiment was carried out showed different meteorological  
260 trends throughout each growing season (Table 2). 2013 was characterized by abundant  
261 rainfall in April and May, which delayed planting operations. The first stage vegetative  
262 growth of the crop was also slowed down. On the other hand, the following year had a  
263 drier and warmer spring, which allowed precocious planting, although the summer was  
264 rainy and mild, which prevented heat and drought stress conditions.

265 Table 3 shows the effects of the hybrid, inter-row spacing and planting density on the  
266 morphological assessments performed on the plants, ears and kernels, ESQ and grain  
267 yield and moisture. The two compared hybrids differed significantly from each other for all  
268 the parameters measured, except for the ESQ and TW.

269 The average cob and tipback length of the fixed hybrid resulted to be longer than the flex  
270 one, that is, +6.7 and +9.9%, respectively. The KPR was also higher, while the KSQ was  
271 significantly lower (-13.4%), and this was mainly due to a reduced KR (15.7 rows versus  
272 19.4). The KV was also higher (+5.4%) as was the TKW (+4.7%) and KL (+3.5%), whereas  
273 the KD was lower (-6.6%).

274 Of all the parameters related to plant architecture, the ones that were influenced the most  
275 by inter-row spacing were the stalk area and ear height. The plants in the narrow row  
276 system (NIS) had a thicker stalk (4.1 versus 3.7 cm<sup>2</sup>, +8.9%) but also a slightly higher (+5  
277 cm) ear height. The planting density significantly influenced the stalk development and ear  
278 height, but also the leaf greenness during the ripening stage, the latter being an indicator  
279 of the nutritional status of the crop. The reduction in the stalk area from the lowest  
280 population density (D1: 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) to the highest (D4: 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) was of 20%,



281 whereas it was -5.2% for leaf greenness, which was expressed as an NHT value. Even  
282 though the increased planting population led to thinner plants, which were also  
283 characterized by a taller ear height, none of the compared treatments displayed a lodging  
284 propensity, and plant lodging was lower than 2% for both of the considered growing  
285 seasons. The interactions between inter-row space and planting density for these plant  
286 morphological parameters were never significant.

287 As far as the ears are concerned, the cobs belonging to the NIS plots resulted to be on  
288 average shorter than those from the 0.75 m wide rows. The KR value remained stable for  
289 the two inter-row spacings and the planting densities, while the KPR decreased  
290 consistently as the density was increased from 9 (D2) to 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (D3). A significant  
291 interaction between hybrid and inter-row spacing was reported. A diminishing trend of KPR  
292 was recorded for both types of hybrid as a consequence of the increasing plant density.  
293 However, the effect was more consistent and significant on the flex hybrid (figure 1). The  
294 lowest KPR (34 kernels row<sup>-1</sup>) was in fact observed on this hybrid on ears belonging to the  
295 plots planted at D4 with 0.5 m wide inter-rows (NIS). Nevertheless, this value did not differ  
296 from the D3 and D4 theses for the plants with the standard inter-row spacing (SIS). The  
297 highest KPR was observed for the lowest planting densities for both inter-row spacings.  
298 The difference in KPR in the flex hybrid for the NIS, between the two opposite planting  
299 densities (D1 vs D4) was higher than that measured for the standard planting density (6  
300 kernels vs 4).

301 As expected, the average number of ears harvested per unit area (ESQ) significantly  
302 increased as the growing density increased. This parameter resulted to be 8.9% higher in  
303 the NIS than in the SIS, which also explains the 9.9% KSQ difference between the  
304 compared inter-row spacing systems. Figure 2 reports the ESQ values for the different  
305 planting densities for the NIS and the SIS. Only in the D1 thesis were the ESQ values from

306 both inter-row planting patterns close to the target planting density of 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (7.7  
307 ears m<sup>-2</sup> for the NIS and 7.2 ears m<sup>-2</sup> for the SIS). For the higher plant densities, the  
308 number of ears harvested per unit area was on average lower than the number of plants  
309 per unit area, foreseen in the experimental protocol. The gap between the harvested ears  
310 (ESQ) and the number of plants per unit area resulted to gradually rise as the planting  
311 density was increased. Furthermore, this trend was clearly more consistent for the SIS  
312 than for the NIS: the average ESQ in the D4 thesis (12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) for the NIS was 11.3  
313 ears m<sup>-2</sup> and it was significantly different from the D4 thesis for the SIS, which resulted in  
314 an average of 10 ears m<sup>-2</sup>. The same trend was observed for the D3 thesis: an average of  
315 10.2 ears m<sup>-2</sup> were harvested for the NIS, whereas only 9.1 ears m<sup>-2</sup> were harvested for  
316 the SIS.

317 A significant interaction was observed between the inter-row and planting density on grain  
318 yield (figure 3). In the SIS, the grain yield did not increase because of the higher planting  
319 density. On the other hand, the NIS showed a significant yield benefit when the plant  
320 population was increased from 7.5 to 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (+7.4%). The highest yield peak was  
321 obtained for 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (D4) in the NIS. However, for this inter-row space systems this  
322 plant density did not differ significantly in grain yield from 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (D3 thesis).

323 No significant differences were observed for grain yield between NIS and SIS at the lower  
324 plant density (D1 and D2). However, the NIS resulted in a significantly greater grain yield  
325 (+10.9%) than the SIS for the higher plant densities (D3 and D4).

326 The different inter-row spacing did not influence any of the kernel parameters, that is,  
327 moisture, TW, TKW, KL, KD or KV. On the other hand, the more intense plant population  
328 negatively influenced the length, volume and weight of the kernels. The TKW in fact  
329 diminished by 7.1% for between 7.5 and 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>, whereas the KV diminished by  
330 5.7%. The interactions between the inter-row spacing and planting density were never

331 significant for the kernel parameters.

## 332 **3.2 Experiment 2**

333 The results of the application of the innovative high plant density system (HiD), compared  
334 to the standard one (StD), in the 34 production situations (PS), are reported in Table 4.

335 The average yield increase obtained by switching from StD to the HiD was of 1.8 t ha<sup>-1</sup>  
336 (+11%, P<0.001). The grain moisture, TW and KR were not affected by the two different  
337 seeding rates. Conversely, the TKW decreased by 5.7% from the StD to the HiD. The  
338 average ear weight dropped by 18% after the adoption of the innovative system. The same  
339 trend, but less pronounced (-9%) was seen for the KPR value. However, because of the  
340 higher number of ears per square meter, the total amount of kernels per square meter  
341 (KSQ) increased (+23%).

342 Figure 4 represents the percentage of grain yield variation obtained after adopting the HiD  
343 system, sorted from the lowest to the highest in all 32 PS taken into account. Only 6.2% of  
344 the cases (2 PS out of 32) showed a negative effect, with an average yield decrease of  
345 6.8%, while one PS showed no variations. The remaining cases (90%) instead showed a  
346 yield increase of between 1.3% and 22%.

347

#### 348 **4. Discussion**

349 The study has proved that the morphological adaptation of plants, ears and particularly of  
350 grain yield response is clearly influenced by the equidistance space between plants, and  
351 therefore by plant density and inter-row spacing.

352 Data collected during an extensive comparison of production situations (Table 1) have  
353 confirmed that when the seeding rate increases up to 10.5 plant m<sup>-2</sup>, the ear and kernel  
354 development is modified, with a lower single plant yield potential. However, because of the  
355 higher number of kernels harvested per unit area when higher density systems were  
356 adopted, the final grain yield was clearly enhanced.

357 The KPR, unlike the KR, has been shown (Table 3) to be negatively affected by an  
358 increase in planting population, especially for the flex ear hybrid. The young kernel  
359 abortion immediately after fertilization, is due to a lower supply of carbon and nitrogen to  
360 the ear (Liu et al., 2015). In high density conditions, in fact, the crop has to face a more  
361 challenging and constraining situation, which is mainly caused by intra-specific  
362 competition. This starts to occur above all at the end of the stem elongation and grain  
363 development stage (GS 38-70), which is a key period in determining the number of KPR.  
364 KR is instead defined at an earlier stage, usually from the fifth to the eight leaf unfolded  
365 stage (GS 15-18) (Dardy and Lauer, 2006). During this period, the crop is not yet in an  
366 intra-specific competitive environment caused by the higher planting density. Plants in fact  
367 are still too small to cause a stressful condition to each other. In the present experiment,  
368 since the KPR decreased while the KR remained the same, the total number of kernels  
369 produced by a single plant was reduced because of the higher plant population, as already  
370 reported by Echarte et al. (2000) and Zhang et al. (2014) for an increasing planting  
371 population with a steady inter-row spacing of 0.70 m.

372 As far as the kernel dimension is concerned, the increase in plant density caused a

373 reduction in kernels, which was related to the lower kernel length and volume (Table 3),  
374 whereas no effects were observed for the variations in row width. This also explains why  
375 the smaller kernels caused a lower TKW, which, among others, was also seen by Sangoi  
376 et al. (2002). On the other hand, the TW remained stable for the different compared plant  
377 densities in both experiments 1 and 2 (Table 3 and 4). A possible explanation could be  
378 that, although the single grain was not so heavy, smaller kernels were able to better fill the  
379 fixed volume thus reducing the empty spaces more and compensating for the lower single  
380 kernels weight.

381 All the previously discussed aspects confirm that compared to the standard plant density  
382 for full maturity hybrids a higher planting population, which implies fewer, smaller and  
383 lighter kernels per ear, lowers the yield potential of the single maize plant (Li et al., 2015).  
384 As can clearly be seen from the multiple comparison of experiment 2 (Table 4), the  
385 average ear weight decreased by 18% for the high plant density system. However, the key  
386 to the yield enhancement obtained from the application of a high plant population in  
387 modern hybrids, is the higher number of kernels harvested per unit area (KSQ), which was  
388 +26% and +23% for experiment n° 1 and 2, respectively, comparing 7.5 and 10.5 plants  
389 ha<sup>-1</sup>. For highly competitive conditions, which are typical of high plant populations, the final  
390 grain yield is linked more to the number of harvested kernels than to the kernel weight  
391 itself (Sangoi et al., 2002). In the environmental conditions in which experiment 1 was  
392 conducted, a significant yield increase for a higher plant population (10.5 plant m<sup>-2</sup>) was  
393 only observed in NIS (0.5 m inter-row distance), and not in the SIS (0.75 m inter-row  
394 distance) (Figure 3). The main advantage of the NIS was that a higher number of ears per  
395 area unit (ESQ) was harvested than for SIS (Figure 2). In fact, the plants grown with a high  
396 plant density in the SIS had a higher incidence of barrenness than those grown in the NIS.  
397 This is the consequence of the lower equidistance space that was adopted in the SIS: by

398 maintaining the 0.75 m inter-row width and moving from 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> to 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>, the  
399 average distance of two contiguous plants on the same row was reduced from 0.18 m to  
400 0.11 m. With a high increase in the plant population for a large inter-row spacing, the risk  
401 of having higher irregularities of the plant distance in the row is greater and consequently  
402 the percentage of dominated plants, which are often infertile is also higher (Lauer and  
403 Rankin, 2004). However, the NIS system allows a more even distance between intra-row  
404 plants and thus alleviates intercrop competition, therefore only in this condition, a reduced  
405 plant spacing, yet more equidistant, allowed a significant yield increase. The better  
406 response of NIS has confirmed what was observed in previous studies on silage maize  
407 (Cox and Cherney, 2001). Farnham (2001) also reported a better yield increase when  
408 adopting higher planting populations for an even narrower (0.38 m) inter-row space,  
409 although the average grain yield was higher for a 0.76 m wide one. In other studies in  
410 which the highest plant density tested was 10 plants m<sup>-2</sup> (Nielsen, 1988; Porter et al.,  
411 1997; Widdicombe and Thelen, 2002), it was reported that row width was inversely  
412 correlated to the grain yield and that an interaction between plant density and row width  
413 was observed. The use of light, with a better interception of the solar radiation, is more  
414 efficient on narrow rows, and contributes by maximizing the final yield (Onyango, 2009).  
415 This type of planting leads to a better shading of the soil surface during the early part of  
416 the season, and limits water evaporation from the bare soil, as reported by Bullock et al.  
417 (1998) for soybean. Moreover, a more shaded inter-row space does not offer a suitable  
418 environment for weeds. The NIS in fact could reduce competition with weeds through early  
419 canopy closure (Fanadzo et al., 2010). This planting pattern, although resulting in a more  
420 enhanced yield when a high planting density is adopted, needs to be supported with  
421 appropriate field equipment. The tractor wheels and track base width have to be  
422 dimensioned correctly as well as the combine harvester header and harrow squadrons, in

423 order to prevent any driving over plants. Furthermore, it is expected that the inter-row  
424 tillage in a NIS would be shallower, thus limiting soil ventilation, water penetration and  
425 mechanic weed control. However, no further difficulties appeared for the irrigation process,  
426 in either the furrow inter-row method, or in the over canopy ones (sprinkling/pivot  
427 systems).

428 The hybrids evaluated in experiment 1, after the application of the higher planting  
429 population, showed different behavior, in terms of ear development, but also in terms of  
430 plant architecture. However, their response to the higher plant population was similar in  
431 terms of yield increase, since no interaction was seen between these factors.

432 The highest planting density sown at 12 plants  $m^{-2}$  was not sufficient to determine a yield  
433 breakdown of either the inter-row spacing or the hybrids. However, this planting density  
434 treatment did not significantly differ from when the plants were sown at a rate of 10.5  
435 plants  $m^{-2}$  (Figure 3), thus confirming that, for the agronomical conditions that were tested,  
436 the best crop yield potential was obtained for 10.5 plants  $m^{-2}$ . This work has shown that, in  
437 growing areas which are suitable for maize cultivation, under irrigated and fertile  
438 conditions, an increase in planting density from 7.5 to 10.5 plants  $m^{-2}$  with the present full  
439 season hybrids represents a real opportunity for farmers to boost the crop yield potential.  
440 This agronomical strategy, albeit very promising, needs to be considered carefully in the  
441 different production situations, since the risk of losses related to greater stress can  
442 increase. As far as plant stand ability is concerned, the stalk section was shown to be  
443 negatively affected by the higher planting population (Table 3), whereas the ear height had  
444 an opposite trend. Plants sown more densely, receive a different quality of light,  
445 characterized by enriched far red and impoverished red radiation (Rajcan and Swanton,  
446 2001). This can in fact stimulate apical dominance, and induce plants to grow taller, with a  
447 thinner stalk that is more disposed to lodging or breaking (Sangoi et al., 2002; Stanger and

448 Lauer, 2007; Widdicombe and Thelen, 2002). Even though ear insertion tended to be  
449 higher for the NIS, the stalk area was also larger, and hence more tolerant to plant lodging.  
450 Moreover, it has also been reported for maize, that some chemical compounds, known as  
451 plant growth regulators (PGRs), can modify plant growth by reducing height and thus  
452 lodging risks when a high planting density is applied or in other conditions (Shekoofa and  
453 Emam, 2008; Zhang et al., 2014). In the fields where the trials were carried out, lodging  
454 was not observed to be connected to any treatment. Similar results have also been  
455 recorded in experiments conducted on lodging tolerant hybrids in Brazil (Sangoi et al.,  
456 2002) on densities of 10 plants m<sup>-2</sup>.

457 The decrease in leaf greenness, due to the increase in plant population (Table 3), could be  
458 interpreted as a response of the crop to the lower nutrient supply available for each single  
459 plant, especially in terms of N uptake (Wood et al., 1992). This aspect has also been  
460 confirmed by the fact that no differences were observed between the two inter-row  
461 spacings. In fact, in the considered greater planting population conditions, the same  
462 amount of nutrients was diluted over a higher number of plants. This underlines that a high  
463 planting density is less suitable for fields characterized by lower soil fertility, or when the  
464 supply of nutrients through the fertilization, and N in particular, is not adequate for the  
465 higher yield level. The nutrient balance in a high density crop system is certainly different  
466 from a standard one, since a higher nutrient uptake is expected (Rao et al., 2014).  
467 Moreover, a high density crop could be more sensitive to drought stress: water  
468 consumption is greater in high stands, since more water evapotranspires through the  
469 plants, although less water evaporates from the bare ground. This enhances the crop  
470 water use efficiency, but conversely increases crop requirements. Thus, in no irrigated or  
471 in less water availability conditions, lower plant populations are preferred (Karlen and  
472 Camp, 1985).



473 In addition to the data reported in this work, it is also necessary to consider the impact on  
474 kernel quality in order to carefully evaluate the applicability of high population planting of  
475 maize for grain. The lower nutrient and water availability for each plant in the high density  
476 system could affect not only the single plant yield potential, but also other kernel quality  
477 parameters (Oikeh et al., 1998), such as grain composition and kernel hardness.  
478 Moreover, the higher stress condition could negatively affect the sanity of the grain yield.  
479 In a previous work (Blandino et al., 2008) a higher planting population in StD (8.2  
480 compared to 6.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>) led to an increased fungal ear rot severity and mycotoxin  
481 contamination. However, at the moment, no qualitative data are available for the HiD  
482 condition, pertaining to a more balanced distance between the plants; therefore further  
483 evaluations focused more on kernel quality are needed. This will lead to a better  
484 understanding of whether the adoption of a high planting system on a narrow inter-row  
485 space could enhance farmer competitiveness on the market by increasing grain yield, and  
486 at the same time provide the high quality standards required for the supply chain.

487

## 488 **5. Conclusion**

489 This work has proved that, for the cultivation of medium-late maturing hybrids in temperate  
490 areas and irrigated conditions, a high planting density of up to 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup> can lead to a  
491 significant yield increase, only when it is combined with narrow inter-row spacing, since it  
492 guarantees a more plant equidistance. The high density condition increases plant  
493 stresses, and modify plant morphology and development to the detriment of the single  
494 plant yield. However, the lower yield per plant is fully compensated by the higher plant  
495 population.

496

497 **6. Acknowledgements**

498 The authors would like to thank Francesco Amato, Giovanni Berrino, Matteo Calcagno,  
499 Alessandra Gazzola, Federico Marinaccio, Andrea Pilati, Giacomo Sala, Valentina  
500 Scarpino and Stefania Stura for their expert technical assistance. The funds for this  
501 research were provided by KWS Italia S.P.A.

502

503 **1. References**

- 504 Aubertot, J.N., Robin, M.H., 2013. Injury Profile SIMulator, a Qualitative Aggregative  
505 Modelling Framework to Predict Crop Injury Profile as a Function of Cropping  
506 Practices, and the Abiotic and Biotic Environment. I. Conceptual Bases. PLoS One 8.  
507 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073202.
- 508 Blandino, M., Reyneri, A., Vanara, F., 2008. Effect of plant density on toxigenic fungal  
509 infection and mycotoxin contamination of maize kernels. Field Crop. Res. 106, 234–  
510 241. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2007.12.004.
- 511 Bullock, D., Khn, S., Rayburn, A., 1998. Soybean Yield Response to Narrow Rows Is  
512 Largely due to Enhanced Early Growth. Crop Sci. 38, 1011–1016.  
513 doi:10.2135/cropsci1998.0011183X003800040021x.
- 514 Cox, W.J., Cherney, J.R., 2001. Row Spacing , Plant Density , and Nitrogen Effects on  
515 Corn Silage. Agron. J. 93, 597–602. doi:10.2134/agronj2001.933597x.
- 516 Dardy, H., Lauer, J., 2006. Plant Physiology: Critical Stages in the Life of a Corn Plant, in:  
517 Corn Diagnostic Guide. University of Wisconsin Extension, pp. 17–22.
- 518 Duvick, D.N., 2005. Genetic progress in yield of United States maize (*Zea mays* L.).  
519 Maydica 50, 193–202.
- 520 Duvick, D.N., Smith, J.S.C., Cooper, M., 2004a. Changes in Performance, Parentage, and  
521 Genetic Diversity of Successful Corn Hybrids, 1930-2000, in: Corn: Origin, History,  
522 Technology and Production. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ (USA), pp. 65–97.
- 523 Duvick, D.N., Smith, J.S.C., Cooper, M., 2004b. Long-term Selection in a Commercial

524 Hybrid Corn Breeding Program: Past, Present, and Future, in: Plant Breeding  
525 Reviews. Long Term Selection: Crops, Animals, and Bacteria. John Wiley & Sons,  
526 New York, NJ (USA), pp. 109–151.

527 Echarte, L., Luque, S., Andrade, F.H., Sadras, V.O., Cirilo, a., Otegui, M.E., Vega, C.R.C.,  
528 2000. Response of maize kernel number to plant density in Argentinean hybrids  
529 released between 1965 and 1993. Field Crop. Res. 68, 1–8. doi:10.1016/S0378-  
530 4290(00)00101-5.

531 Fanadzo, M., Chiduza, C., Mnkeni, P.N.S., 2010. Effect of inter-row spacing and plant  
532 population on weed dynamics and maize (*Zea mays* L.) yield at Zanyokwe irrigation  
533 scheme, Eastern Cape, South Africa. African J. Agric. Res. 5, 518–523.  
534 doi:10.5897/AJAR09.246.

535 Farnham, D.E., 2001. Row Spacing, Plant Density, and Hybrid Effects on Corn Grain Yield  
536 and Moisture. Agron. J. 93, 1049–1053. doi:10.2134/agronj2001.9351049x.

537 Karlen, D.L., Camp, C.R., 1985. Row Spacing, Plant Population, and Water Management  
538 Effects on Corn in the Atlantic Coastal Plain. Agron. J. 77, 393–398.  
539 doi:10.2134/agronj1985.00021962007700030010x.

540 Lancashire, P.D., Bleiholder, H., Van Den Boom, T., Langeluddeke, P., Stauss, R., Weber,  
541 E., Witzemberger, A., 1991. A uniform decimal code for growth stages of crops and  
542 weeds. Ann. Appl. Biol. 119, 561–601.

543 Lauer, J.G., Rankin, M., 2004. Corn response to within row plant spacing variation. Agron.  
544 J. 96, 1464–1468. doi:10.2134/agronj2004.1464.

- 545 Li, J., Xie, R.Z., Wang, K.R., Ming, B., Guo, Y.Q., Zhang, G.Q., Li, S.K., 2015. Variations in  
546 Maize Dry Matter, Harvest Index, and Grain Yield with Plant Density. *Agron. J.* 107,  
547 829. doi:10.2134/agronj14.0522.
- 548 Liu, T., Gu, L., Dong, S., Zhang, J., Liu, P., Zhao, B., 2015. Optimum leaf removal  
549 increases canopy apparent photosynthesis, <sup>13</sup>C-photosynthate distribution and grain  
550 yield of maize crops grown at high density. *Field Crop. Res.* 170, 32–39.  
551 doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2014.09.015.
- 552 Mascagni, R., Bell, R., 2004. Flex-ear, fixed-ear corn and optimum plant population, in:  
553 Benedict, L.F. (Ed.), *Louisiana Agriculture*. Baton Rouge, LA (USA).
- 554 Nielsen, R.L., 1988. Influence of Hybrids and Plant Density on Grain Yield and Stalk  
555 Breakage in Corn Grown in 15-Inch Row Spacing. *J. Prod. Agric.* 1, 190–195.  
556 doi:10.2134/jpa1988.0190.
- 557 Oikeh, S.O., Kling, J.G., Okoruwa, a. E., 1998. Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Effects on  
558 Maize Grain Quality in the West African Moist Savanna. *Crop Sci.* 38, 1056–1061.  
559 doi:10.2135/cropsci1998.0011183X003800040029x.
- 560 Okumura, R.S., Stragliotto, C., Mariano, D. de C., Lobato, A.K. da S., Guedes, E.M.S.,  
561 Neto, C.F. de O., Saldanha, E.C.M., da Conceição, H.E.O., Alves, G.A.R., da Silva,  
562 R.T.L., 2014. Production components in transgenic Bt maize hybrids under different  
563 spacing. *J. Food, Agric. Environ.* 12, 255–258.
- 564 Onyango, O.C., 2009. Decreased row spacing as an option for increasing maize (*Zea*  
565 *mays* L.) yield in Trans Nzoia district, Kenya. *J. Plant Breed. Crop Sci.* 1, 281–283.

- 566 Peel, M.C., 2011. Updated Köppen-Geiger Climate Map of the World [WWW Document].  
567 URL <http://people.eng.unimelb.edu.au/mpeel/koppen.html> (accessed 7.29.15).
- 568 Porter, P.M., Hicks, D.R., Lueschen, W.E., Ford, J.H., Warnes, D.D., Hoverstad, T.R.,  
569 1997. Corn response to row width and plant population in the northern Corn Belt. *J.*  
570 *Prod. Agric.* 10, 293–300. doi:10.2134/jpa1997.0293.
- 571 Rajcan, I., Swanton, C.J., 2001. Understanding maize-weed competition: resource  
572 competition, light quality and the whole plant. *Field Crop. Res.* 71, 139–150.  
573 doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(01)00159-9.
- 574 Rao, P.V., Subbaiah, G., Veeraraghavaiah, R., 2014. Agronomic Responses of Maize to  
575 Plant Population and Nitrogen Availability. *Int. J. Plant, Anim. Environ. Sci.* 4, 107–  
576 116.
- 577 Sangoi, L., 2000. Understanding plant density effect on maize growth and development:  
578 an important issue to maximize grain yield. *Ciência Rural* 31, 159–168.  
579 doi:10.1590/S0103-84782001000100027.
- 580 Sangoi, L., Gracietti, M., Rampazzo, C., Bianchetti, P., 2002. Response of Brazilian maize  
581 hybrids from different eras to changes in plant density. *Field Crop. Res.* 79, 39–51.  
582 doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(02)00124-7.
- 583 Sharratt, B.S., McWilliams, D. a., 2005. Microclimatic and Rooting Characteristics of  
584 Narrow-Row versus Conventional-Row Corn. *Agron. J.* 97, 1129–1135.  
585 doi:10.2134/agronj2004.0292.
- 586 Shekoofa, A., Emam, Y., 2008. Plant growth regulator (Ethephon) alters maize (*Zea mays*

- 587 L.) growth, water use and grain yield under water stress. *J. Agron.* 7, 41–48.  
588 doi:10.3923/ja.2008.41.48.
- 589 Stanger, T.F., Lauer, J.G., 2007. Corn Stalk Response to Plant Population and the Bt–  
590 European Corn Borer Trait. *Agron. J.* 99, 657. doi:10.2134/agronj2006.0079.
- 591 Tokatlidis, I., Koutroubas, S., 2004. A review of maize hybrids' dependence on high plant  
592 populations and its implications for crop yield stability. *Field Crop. Res.* 88, 103–114.  
593 doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2003.11.013.
- 594 Tollenaar, M., 1989. Genetic Improvement in Grain Yield of Commercial Maize Hybrids  
595 Grown in Ontario from 1959 to 1988. *Crop Sci.* 29, 1365–1371.  
596 doi:10.2135/cropsci1989.0011183X002900060007x.
- 597 Tollenaar, M., 1992. Is low plant population a stress in maize? *Maydica* 37, 305–311.
- 598 Turgut, I., Duman, A., Bilgili, U., Acikgoz, E., 2005. Alternate row spacing and plant density  
599 effects on forage and dry matter yield of corn hybrids (*Zea mays* L.). *J. Agron. Crop*  
600 *Sci.* 191, 146–151. doi:10.1111/j.1439-037X.2004.00146.x.
- 601 Vega, C.R.C., Andrade, F.H., Sadras, V.O., 2001. Reproductive partitioning and seed set  
602 efficiency in soybean, sunflower and maize. *Field Crop. Res.* 72, 163–175.  
603 doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(01)00172-1.
- 604 Widdicombe, W.D., Thelen, K.D., 2002. Row Width and Plant Density Effects on Corn  
605 Grain Production in the Northern Corn Belt. *Agron. J.* 94, 1020–1023.  
606 doi:10.2134/agronj2002.1020.
- 607 Wood, C., Reeves, D., Duffield, R., Edmisten, K., 1992. Field chlorophyll measurements

608 for evaluation of corn nitrogen status. *J. Plant Nutr.* 15, 487–500.  
609 doi:10.1080/01904169209364335.

610 Zhang, Q., Zhang, L., Evers, J., Werf, W. Van Der, Zhang, W., Duan, L., 2014. Maize yield  
611 and quality in response to plant density and application of a novel plant growth  
612 regulator. *Field Crop Res.* 164, 82–89. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2014.06.006.

613



614 **TABLES**

615

616 **Table 1.** List of production situations (PS) in which experiment 2 was carried out. Year, location,  
 617 growing degree days (GDD) from April to October, soil texture, hybrid, and planting and harvest  
 618 dates are reported.

# PS	Year	Location <sup>a</sup>	GDD April- October (°C d <sup>-1</sup> )	Soil texture	Hybrid	Planting Date	Harvest Date	Irrigation method
1	2011	Carignano	2089	Loam	SY NX7234	26-Mar	14-Sep	Furrow
2	2011	Carignano	2089	Loam	SY NX7234	14-Apr	21-Sep	Furrow
3	2011	Carmagnola	2072	Silt loam	P1543	8-Apr	19-Sep	Sprinkling
4	2011	Verolengo	2053	Sandy loam	SY NX7234	4-Apr	8-Sep	Furrow
5	2012	Buriasco	2014	Silt loam	DKC 6815	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
6	2012	Buriasco	2014	Silt loam	SY NX7234	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
7	2012	Macello	2023	Silt loam	SY NX7234	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
8	2012	Buriasco	2014	Silt loam	KWS Korimbos	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
9	2012	Macello	2023	Silt loam	KWS Korimbos	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
10	2012	Buriasco	2014	Silt loam	P1758	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
11	2012	Buriasco	2014	Silt loam	SY Radioso	26-Mar	3-Oct	Pivot
12	2012	Carignano	1995	Loam	SY NX7234	27-Mar	8-Oct	Furrow
13	2012	Carignano	1995	Loam	P1547	27-Mar	8-Oct	Furrow
14	2012	Carignano	1995	Loam	SY Radioso	27-Mar	8-Oct	Furrow
15	2012	Carmagnola	2002	Silt loam	P1547	30-Mar	26-Sep	Sprinkling
16	2012	Verolengo	1928	Sandy loam	SY NX7234	23-Mar	24-Sep	Furrow
17	2012	Verolengo	1928	Sandy loam	SY Radioso	23-Mar	24-Sep	Furrow
18	2013	Buriasco	1911	Silt loam	SY NX7234	17-Apr	15-Oct	Pivot
19	2013	Macello	1918	Silt loam	SY NX7234	17-Apr	15-Oct	Pivot
20	2013	Buriasco	1911	Silt loam	KWS Korimbos	17-Apr	15-Oct	Pivot
21	2013	Macello	1918	Silt loam	KWS Korimbos	17-Apr	15-Oct	Pivot
22	2013	Carignano	1875	Loam	SY Radioso	13-May	28-Oct	Furrow
23	2013	Carmagnola	1879	Silt loam	P1547	9-May	4-Nov	Sprinkling
24	2013	Vigone	1911	Silt loam	P1547	13-May	22-Oct	Furrow
25	2013	Vigone	1911	Silt loam	PR34G44	13-May	22-Oct	Furrow
26	2014	Buriasco	1842	Silt loam	DKC6815	17-Mar	2-Oct	Furrow
27	2014	Buriasco	1842	Silt loam	SY NX7234	17-Mar	6-Oct	Furrow
28	2014	Buriasco	1842	Silt loam	KWS Korimbos	17-Mar	6-Oct	Furrow
29	2014	Buriasco	1842	Silt loam	P1547	17-Mar	2-Oct	Furrow
30	2014	Carmagnola	1979	Silt loam	P1547	21-Mar	6-Oct	Sprinkling
31	2014	Chivasso	1844	Sandy loam	SY NX7234	4-Apr	29-Sep	Furrow
32	2014	Chivasso	1844	Sandy loam	KWS Korimbos	4-Apr	29-Sep	Furrow

619

620 <sup>a</sup> GPS coordinates for each location: Carignano N44°52'48" E7°37'42"; Carmagnola N44°53'11" E7°41'15";

621 Verolengo N45°13'47" E7°56'41"; Buriasco N44°51'48" E7°26'20"; Macello N44°51'21" E7°25'44"; Vigone

622 N44°50'19" E7°28'55"; Chivasso N45°12'42" E7°55'41".

623

624 **Table 2.** Monthly total rainfall, rainy days, average temperature and growing degree days (GDD)  
 625 from April to October in Buriasco in the 2013 and 2014 growing seasons.

Year	2013				2014			
	Month	Rainfall (mm)	Rainy days (d)	Average T (°C)	GDD (°C d <sup>-1</sup> )	Rainfall (mm)	Rainy days (d)	Average T (°C)
<b>April</b>	206	17	12.6	124	71	12	14.3	163
<b>May</b>	231	21	14.8	182	91	13	16.4	210
<b>June</b>	42	9	21.0	326	102	12	20.7	324
<b>July</b>	93	8	24.2	428	153	18	20.6	337
<b>August</b>	25	9	23.1	405	50	9	20.6	345
<b>September</b>	11	7	19.3	297	132	11	18.4	277
<b>October</b>	85	15	13.5	148	24	9	14.6	187
<b>April-October</b>	694	86	18.4	1911	623	84	17.9	1842

626

627

628 **Table 3.** Effect of hybrid, inter-row spacing and planting density on the stalk area, ear height, leaf greenness (N-tester), cob length, tip back length,  
 629 kernel rows (KR), kernels per row (KPR), kernels per square meter (KSQ), ears per square meter (ESQ), grain yield, grain moisture, test weight  
 630 (TW), thousand kernel weight (TKW), kernel length (KL), kernel depth (KD) and kernel volume (KV).

Factor	Source of Variation	Stalk area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Ear height (cm)	Leaf greenness (NHT value)	Cob length (cm)	Tip back (cm)	KR (n)	KPR (n)	KSQ (n m <sup>-2</sup> )	ESQ (n m <sup>-2</sup> )	Grain Yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Grain Moisture (%)	TW (kg hL <sup>-1</sup> )	TKW (g)	KL (mm)	KD (mm)	KV (mm <sup>3</sup> )
<b>Hybrid<sup>a</sup> (A)</b>	Fix	3.6 b	133 b	879 a	20.1 a	2.02 a	15.7 b	40.7 a	5692 b	9.0	17.0 a	27.7 a	77.1	364 a	13.34 a	4.27 b	297 a
	Flex	4.2 a	159 a	806 b	18.7 b	1.82 b	19.4 a	36.7 b	6453 a	9.2	15.8 b	27.2 b	76.9	346 b	12.87 b	4.55 a	281 b
	P	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	NS <sup>b</sup>	***	**	NS	***	***	***	***
	SEM <sup>c</sup>	0.54	7.95	29.7	0.90	0.33	1.28	3.04	924	1.10	1.39	1.22	1.16	18.0	18.0	0.12	16.8
<b>Inter-row spacing<sup>d</sup> (B)</b>	Narrow (NIS)	4.1	148	844	19.2	1.95	17.6	38.8	6385 a	9.5 a	17.0 a	27.4	77.1	353	13.17	4.39	289
	Standard (SIS)	3.7	143	840	19.7	1.89	17.4	38.7	5755 b	8.7 b	15.8 b	27.5	77.0	357	13.06	4.42	290
	P	***	***	NS	**	NS	NS	NS	***	***	***	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	SEM	0.54	7.95	29.7	0.90	0.33	1.28	3.04	924	1.10	1.39	1.22	1.16	18.0	18.0	0.12	16.8
<b>Planting Density<sup>e</sup> (C)</b>	D1	4.4 a	143 b	867 a	20.7 a	1.73 c	17.7	41.0 a	5380 c	7.5 d	15.8 b	27.1	77.0	369 a	13.35 a	4.44	298 a
	D2	4.0 b	145 ab	850 b	19.9 b	1.89 bc	17.5	39.7 a	5770 c	8.4 c	16.2 ab	27.5	76.9	360 a	13.21 a	4.42	293 ab
	D3	3.6 c	147 ab	831 c	18.8 c	1.95 ab	17.5	37.6 b	6279 b	9.6 b	16.7 a	27.7	77.1	350 b	12.94 b	4.38	286 bc
	D4	3.5 c	148 a	821 c	18.4 c	2.09 a	17.4	36.8 b	6758 a	10.7 a	16.9 a	27.5	77.1	343 b	12.97 b	4.39	281 c
	P	***	*	***	***	***	NS	***	***	***	**	NS	NS	***	***	NS	**
	SEM	0.76	11.24	42.0	1.27	0.47	1.81	4.29	1307	1.56	1.96	1.72	1.64	25.4	25.4	0.17	23.7
<b>A x B</b>	P	NS	***	*	**	NS	NS	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	*	***	*	**
<b>A x C</b>	P	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<b>B x C</b>	P	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

631 Means followed by different letters are significantly different. The level of significance (P) is shown in table.

632 <sup>a</sup> The hybrid factor values are based on 48 replicates (2 years X 2 inter-row spacings X 4 planting densities X 3 repetitions). Fix hybrid: Syngenta NX7234, FAO  
 633 maturity class 500; Flex hybrid: KWS Korimbos, FAO maturity class 500.

634 <sup>b</sup> NS, not significant (P(F)<0.05).

635 <sup>c</sup>SEM, standard error of means.

636 <sup>d</sup> The inter-row spacing values are based on 48 replicates (2 years X 2 hybrids X 4 planting densities X 3 repetitions). The narrow inter-row (NIS) is 0.5 m wide,  
637 while the standard inter-row (SIS) is 0.75 m wide.

638 <sup>e</sup> The planting density values are based on 24 replicates (2 years X 2 hybrids X 2 inter-row spacings X 3 repetitions). D1: 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D2: 9 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D3: 10.5  
639 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D4: 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>.

640

641 **Table 4.** Comparison of the innovative planting density (HiD) and the standard density (StD)  
 642 in different production situations<sup>a</sup> on grain yield, grain moisture, test weight (TW), thousand  
 643 kernel weight (TKW), kernel rows (KR), kernels per row (KPR) and kernels per square meter  
 644 (KSQ).

Parameter	Unit	Mean HiD	Mean StD	Mean RR	Significance <sup>b</sup>
<b>Grain yield</b>	t ha <sup>-1</sup>	18.1	16.2	1.117	***
<b>Grain moisture</b>	%	25.4	25.0	1.013	NS <sup>c</sup>
<b>TW</b>	kg hL <sup>-1</sup>	78.3	78.2	1.001	NS
<b>TKW</b>	g	372	394	0.942	***
<b>Ear weight</b>	g	260	317	0.824	***
<b>KR</b>	n	16.5	16.3	1.013	NS
<b>KPR</b>	n	36.4	40.2	0.904	***
<b>KSQ</b>	n m <sup>-2</sup>	5775	4690	1.233	***

645

646 <sup>a</sup> The production situations refer to those reported in table 1.


647 <sup>b</sup> The reported values are mean for each treatment, relative ratio (RR = HiD/StD) and significance in  
 648 term of interval of confidence.

649 <sup>c</sup> NS = not significant at P<0.05.

650

651

652 **Figure 1.** Effect of inter-row spacing and planting density on the number of kernels per row  
 653 (KPR) developed on the fixed and flex ear hybrids.



654


655 Means of the flex ear hybrid followed by different letters are significantly different for  $P < 0.001$  and a  
 656 standard error of means (SEM) of 1.46. No significant differences were observed for the fixed ear  
 657 hybrid (SEM=3.4).

658 The planting density X inter-row spacing values for each hybrid are based on 6 repetitions (2 years X  
 659 3 replicates). The NIS was 0.5 m wide, while the SIS was 0.75 m wide. Plant density: D1 7.5 plants  $m^{-2}$ ;  
 660 D2 9 plants  $m^{-2}$ ; D3 10.5 plants  $m^{-2}$ ; D4 12 plants  $m^{-2}$ .

661 Fix hybrid: Syngenta NX7234, FAO maturity class 500; Flex hybrid: KWS Korimbos, FAO maturity class  
 662 500.

663

664 **Figure 2.** Effects of inter-row spacing and planting density on the number of ears per square  
 665 meter (ESQ).



666

667 Mean values followed by different letters are significantly different (P<0.01).

668 Inter-row spacing X planting density values are based on 12 repetitions (2 years X 2 hybrids X 3  
 669 replicates). The narrow inter-row was 0.5 m wide, while the standard inter-row was 0.75 m wide.


670 Plant density: D1 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D2 9 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D3 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D4 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>.

671

672



673 **Figure 3.** Effects of inter-row spacing and planting density on grain yield.



674

675 Mean values followed by different letters are significantly different (P<0.01).


676 Inter-row spacing X planting density values are based on 12 repetitions (2 years X 2 hybrids X 3  
677 replicates). The narrow inter-row was 0.5 m wide, while the standard inter-row was 0.75 m wide.

678 Plant density: D1 7.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D2 9 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D3 10.5 plants m<sup>-2</sup>; D4 12 plants m<sup>-2</sup>.

679

680

681 **Figure 4.** Percentage yield increase of the innovative planting density (HiD) compared to the  
 682 standard density (StD) on the 32 compared production situations.



683

684 <sup>a</sup> The production situations refer to those reported in table 1.