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Abstract

Maize is considered as one of the important grain crops in the world. Maize is in high demand within the district because it is one of the staple food and also used for animal feed. Current yield attained by small scale farmers is lower than the potential of our existing varieties. In field experiment at Njizweni situated in Gqeleni sub-district was conducted in November 2018 to evaluate the agronomic and yield performance maize cultivars in a semi-arid environment. Plant population, plant height, leaf area, number of cobs/plant, cob length, number of grains per cob, 100 grain weight and number of cobs were significantly different (p<0.05) between cultivars. There was no significant difference (p>0.05) on maize grain yield although maximum number of cobs per plant (1.76) was recorded on PAN 6R-710BR, PAN5R-591R, BG 5285 and WE 6208B.

Introduction

Maize or corn (Zea mays L.) is the mostly produced food worldwide and is the third most important cereal crop of the world after wheat and rice [1]. It is a staple food in South Africa for 70% of its population [2] and most smallholder farmers depend on the production of maize for their food security and livelihood [3]. It is projected that by 2050, maize production will double to meet the growing demands of human and animal consumption, and biofuel production, particularly in developing countries [4]. The adaptation properties of maize make it a viable crop in a variety of climate zones [5]. It is grown throughout South Africa under a variety of conditions including dry and rain-fed environments [6]. Small-scale farmers primarily cultivate maize in the Eastern Cape Province for subsistence purposes and surpluses are typically sold to surrounding communities (Mandikiana, 2011). It is an important component of food security in the province [7]. It is also a source of nutrients as well as phytochemical compounds such as carotenoids, phenolic compounds and phytosterols which play an important role in preventing chronic diseases [8]. Furthermore, maize products contribute significantly to South African nutrition – 35% of the carbohydrates, 15% of the fat, and 31% of the protein requirements of the South African diet are met by maize products directly. Among the South African population, white maize is the staple food, whereas yellow maize is used primarily in animal feed.

Baloyi, et al. [9] report that yields are between 1.8 and 3.5 tonnes per hectare in small-scale farm. In the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, small-scale farmers report average yields of 1.25 tonnes per hectare against a potential of 7 tonnes per hectare [10,11] noted that weed problems, insect pest attacks, poor plant population, insufficient fertilizer and selection of cultivars that are unsuitable for a given set of environmental conditions are the main constraints to increasing maize productivity. In addition to enhancing grain yield, the adoption of suitable high yielding cultivars will increase income per hectare, compared to conventional varieties of maize [12]. Due to the falling yield potential of some locally grown open pollinated varieties, selecting good varieties with high prospects and wide range of acceptability...
is of utmost importance. Beyond tolerance to abiotic and biotic stresses, more ear-bearing plants per unit land area without a reduction in kernels per ear are likely the reason for high yields in modern hybrids.

Adoption of improved maize varieties in the study region vary widely among small scale farmers due to socioeconomic factors, including inaccessibility of farm inputs and credit, poor agronomic management (especially low fertilizer application, suboptimal or untimely weeding, late planting, and low plant population) and poor market access for smallholder farmers [3]. Most cultivar evaluation trials in South Africa is conducted under irrigation in controlled experimental stations and there is no report of on farm performance of different maize hybrids under small holder farmers’ conditions. It is crucial to study genetic gains under farmers’ conditions to monitor the efficiency of varietal turnover. The superior performance of these new maize hybrids evaluated under researcher-managed on-station conditions needs to be verified under on-farm smallholder farmers’ conditions, as farmers are the ultimate users of the new maize hybrids. Farmer participatory research programs encourage resource poor farmers to use higher yielding varieties as farmers are able to identify ideal plant varieties”[13]. An on-farm yield trial underscores the importance of partnership between farmers and researchers, with the strong support of development workers for wider technology promotion [14]. In consideration of this, the present study is aimed at comparing the production potential of different maize hybrids in Ngqeleni sub-district so as to choose a hybrid which is best suited for high yield.

Materials and methods

In the Ngqeleni sub-district, an experiment was conducted to determine the performance of different maize varieties under local conditions. Experimental site lies at 31°46'43"S and 29°54'52"E. An experiment was conducted using three replications of Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The net plot size of the study was 5m x 5m. Crop was sown on replications of Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). Signiﬁcant relationships between maize yield and plant population.
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Table 1: Growth parameters.

| Treatments      | Plant population | Plant height (cm) | Leaf area (cm²) | Cob length (cm) |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Phb33H54BR      | 96.33            | 202.84            | 722.88          | 17.17           |
| BG 5285         | 92.33            | 214.65            | 718.50          | 18.50           |
| PAN 4A111       | 89.00            | 208.42            | 675.79          | 18.67           |
| P2137           | 88.00            | 210.46            | 694.63          | 18.17           |
| PHB33442        | 87.00            | 206.48            | 768.38          | 20.00           |
| WE 6210B        | 87.00            | 209.48            | 685.02          | 19.17           |
| PAN6R80CBT      | 86.33            | 184.44            | 675.79          | 17.83           |
| WE 6207B        | 86.33            | 188.46            | 707.75          | 17.83           |
| PAN 6R-710BR    | 85.00            | 173.53            | 790.28          | 17.33           |
| P2432R          | 84.67            | 190.53            | 612.03          | 19.33           |
| PAN 60-245      | 84.67            | 181.44            | 812.73          | 18.17           |
| SC 701          | 84.67            | 195.45            | 813.13          | 17.50           |
| PAN5R-591R      | 84.00            | 224.52            | 596.21          | 17.50           |
| WE 6208B        | 83.67            | 190.53            | 880.38          | 15.33           |
| PAN 6R-680R     | 83.33            | 190.53            | 684.55          | 19.67           |
| PAN 1745R       | 80.00            | 187.53            | 725.48          | 18.83           |
| P2823WB         | 79.33            | 217.94            | 741.75          | 17.83           |
| CV %            | 8.31             | 8.53              | 25.91           | 8.48            |

Results and discussion

Maize hybrid differed significantly (p<0.05) for plant height. Different cultivars of plants have different heights that are genetically and environmentally determined. Significantly the maximum plant height (224 cm) was recorded in PAN5R-591R followed by P2823WB. The minimum plant height (173 cm) was observed in PAN 6R-710BR. These findings are in agreement with those of Tahir [10] and Ali [15] who also found differences in plant heights among hybrids. This was due to the fact that plant height is a genetically controlled factor so the height of different varieties does not remain equal. Cultivars had no significant effect on leaf area. The maximum leaf area (880.38 cm²) was observed in WE 6208B and minimum (596.21 cm²) recorded in PAN5R-591R. Cultivar PHB33442 had the maximum (20.0 cm) significant effect on cob length and WE 6208B recorded the lowest (15.33 cm) cob length. Besides genetics, environmental and nutritional factors are also factors that can influence the number of cobs per plant. The greater the number of cobs per plant, the greater the grain yield. A significant difference in the number of cobs per plant is evident from the Tables 1,2. Maximum number of cobs per plant (1.76) was recorded in PAN 6R-710BR, PAN5R-591R, BG 5285 and WE 6208B. Minimum number of cobs per plant (1.0) was found in Phb33H54BR, P2137, PHB33442, PAN6R80CBT and WE 6207B. Efendi, et al. [16] found that the percentage of plants that have more than one ear or prolific were significantly influenced by varieties and spacing. There is a direct relationship between grain yield and number of kernels per cob. The analysis of the data revealed that all cultivars affected the number of grains per cob in a significant way. Maximum number of grains per cob (684.0) was found in PAN6R80CBT which differed significantly from all other cultivars. Minimum number of
grains per cob (403.67) was found in SC 701. In all grain crop research, the ultimate goal is to maximize the grain yield. A number of other factors such as plant density, cob size per plant, and grains per row are important in determining grain size. So an increase or decrease in any of the above factors may influence the crop yield. Although no significant effect of cultivars was observed on grain yield, data in the table indicated that PAN6R880CBT recorded maximum (6.17) grain yield whilst PAN 6R–680R had the minimum (5.05) grain yield. Maize grain cultivars was observed on grain yield, data in the table indicated that PAN6R880CBT recorded maximum (6.17) grain yield whilst PAN5R–591R, BG 5285 and WE 6208B recorded the highest percentage of prolificacy. Further studies focusing on the influence of management practices on agronomic performance of different maize varieties is required. The results are applicable to the semi-arid areas of the Eastern Cape region.

### Conclusion and recommendations

Although, significant difference was not observed both in yellow and white cultivars in terms of grain yield parameter. Maize cultivar PAN 6R–710BR, PAN5R–591R, BG 5285 and WE 6208B recorded the highest percentage of prolificacy. Further studies focusing on the influence of management practices on agronomic performance of different maize varieties is required. The results are applicable to the semi-arid areas of the Eastern Cape region.
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### Table 2: Yield parameters.

| Treatments      | No. of cobs/plant | No. of grains/cob | Grain yield (tons/ha) |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Phb33H54BR      | 1.00              | 541.00            | 5.81                  |
| BG 5285         | 1.67              | 567.67            | 6.01                  |
| PAN 4A111       | 1.50              | 602.33            | 5.76                  |
| P2137           | 1.00              | 595.00            | 5.99                  |
| PHB33442       | 1.00              | 490.33            | 5.78                  |
| WE 6210B        | 1.17              | 533.33            | 5.50                  |
| PAN6R880CBT     | 1.00              | 684.00            | 6.17                  |
| WE 6207B        | 1.00              | 540.33            | 5.52                  |
| PAN 6R–710BR    | 1.76              | 653.33            | 5.70                  |
| P2432R          | 1.33              | 673.67            | 5.81                  |
| PAN 6Q–245      | 1.67              | 556.67            | 5.38                  |
| SC 701          | 1.17              | 403.67            | 5.43                  |
| PAN5R–591R      | 1.83              | 498.00            | 5.23                  |
| WE 6208B        | 1.67              | 546.33            | 5.91                  |
| PAN 6R–680R     | 1.33              | 571.63            | 5.05                  |
| PAN 1745R       | 1.33              | 610.00            | 5.28                  |
| P2823WB         | 1.17              | 597.33            | 5.55                  |
| CV %            | 25.76             | 8.64              | 31.70                 |

**Figure 1:** Grain yield and plant population.
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