

Summary of 2023 Irrigated Winter Wheat Variety Performance Results



				2023 Multi-Location Average					2023 Individual Trial Yield ^b		
	Market				Test						
Brand/Source	Class	Variety ^a	Yield ^b	Yield	Weight	Protein ^c	Lodging	Heading ^d	Burlington	Fort Collins	Wiggins
			bu/ac	percent of average	lb/bu	percent	score (1-9) ^e	days from average		— bu/ac —	
Colorado State University exp.	HRW	CO18D297R	107.4	111%	59	12.2	3	1	84.5	127.5	109.0
PlainsGold	HWW	Monarch	106.0	110%	58	11.3	1	1	84.5	128.5	105.5
PlainsGold	HRW	Amplify SF	103.5	107%	58	12.4	4	2	80.0	128.0	103.0
PlainsGold	HRW	Guardian	102.3	106%	58	12.6	3	2	82.5	122.0	101.5
Frenchman Valley Coop	HWW	Valley	102.2	106%	59	11.8	3	1	80.5	127.0	98.5
PlainsGold	HRW	Byrd CL Plus	101.1	104%	57	11.6	5	2	82.5	118.5	103.0
CROPLAN	HRW	CP7017AX	100.6	104%	58	11.7	3	0	79.0	116.0	108.0
Colorado State University exp.	HWW	CO18D007W	99.8	103%	57	11.9	2	-1	74.0	127.5	96.5
Colorado State University exp.	HRW	CO19D304R	99.4	103%	57	11.9	7	2	81.5	124.5	93.0
PlainsGold	HRW	Crescent AX	99.0	102%	59	12.1	6	-2	84.0	113.5	100.5
Colorado State University exp.	HRW	CO18035RA	98.3	102%	57	11.7	6	-2	82.5	116.5	97.0
Limagrain	HRW	LCS Steel AX	98.2	101%	58	12.5	3	-3	83.5	110.5	98.5
PlainsGold	HWW	Snowmass 2.0	97.6	101%	56	12.1	4	-1	77.0	122.0	92.0
PlainsGold	HRW	Canvas	97.6	101%	57	12.2	2	0	69.0	122.5	102.0
AgriPro	HRW	SY Wolverine	96.1	99%	56	12.5	1	0	75.5	121.5	91.0
CROPLAN	HRW	CP7266AX	93.3	96%	58	12.1	7	0	90.0	95.0	96.5
Limagrain	HRW	LCS Atomic AX	93.1	96%	58	12.0	5	0	85.0	97.5	96.5
PlainsGold	HWW	Windom SF	92.0	95%	56	12.2	3	-1	73.0	111.0	93.5
PlainsGold	HWW	Breck	92.0	95%	57	12.1	I	0	62.0	122.5	91.0
Colorado State University exp.	HRW	CO18042RA	91.2	94%	58	12.0	6	0	68.0	114.5	90.5
PlainsGold	HRW	Kivari AX	88.5	91%	56	11.0	8	0	70.0	110.5	82.5
PlainsGold	HRW	Brawl CL Plus	87.7	91%	58	13.3	2	-1	70.5	103.0	89.0
PlainsGold	HRW	Ray	79.3	82%	50	12.4	3	9	46.5	111.0	81.0
		Average	96.8	100%	57	12.0	4	0	77.0	117.0	96.5
		fLSD (0.30)	6.1						7.0	4.0	5.0
		^f LSD (0.05)	11.7						13.0	7.5	9.5

^aVarieties ranked from highest to lowest yield across three irrigated trials in 2023.

 $The \ data \ included \ in \ this \ table \ may \ not \ be \ republished \ without \ permission. \ Contact \ Sally \ Jones-Diamond \ (sally.jones@colostate.edu)$

^bYield adjusted to 12% moisture content. Variety yield values in the top least significant difference (LSD) yield group across the locations and within each location are in bold. Multi-location yield values for each variety are least squares means and not arithmetic averages.

^cProtein adjusted to 12% moisture content and averaged across two trials in 2023.

^dVarieties with positive values headed later than the trial averages and varieties with negative values headed earlier than average. Based on one trial.

^eLodging score: 1 equals no lodging and 9 is severe lodging. Scores from three trials in 2023.

Farmers selecting a variety based on yield should use the LSD (.30) to protect themselves from false negative conclusions (concluding varieties are the same when they are actually different). Companies or researchers may use the LSD (.05) to avoid false positive conclusions (concluding varieties are different when they are actually the same).