

Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre

Variation in growth and stem quality among and within provenances of sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) in Denmark

Dinant Lodewijk Meulman

Master thesis • 30 credits
EUROFORESTER
Master Thesis no. 316
Alnarp 2019

Variation in growth and stem quality among and within provenances of sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) in Denmark

Dinant Lodewijk Meulman

Supervisor: Jens Peter Skovsgaard, SLU, Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre

Assistant supervisor: Jon Kehlet Hansen , University of Copenhagen, Department of

Geosciences and Natural Resource Management

Examiner: Urban Nilsson, SLU, Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre

Credits: 30 credits

Level: Advanced level A2E

Course title: Master thesis in Forest Science

Course code: EX0928

Course coordinating department: Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre

Place of publication: Alnarp Year of publication: 2019

Online publication: https://stud.epsilon.slu.se

Keywords: Sycamore, *Acer pseudoplatanus*, provenance, growth, stem

quality

Faculty of Forest Sciences

Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre

ABSTRACT

Sycamore currently covers around 2% of the Danish forest cover and is an economic attractive species that is also interesting for ecological reasons. This thesis analyses a provenance and progeny trial series in Denmark in order to get an overview of suitable provenances for Denmark, the importance of provenance selection and possible breeding gains. The trial is of planted 2 year old sycamore measured after 9 years and consist out of 16 provenances. Experimental blocks on three sites were measured for the height, dbh straightness and forking behaviour. This data was analysed for significant differences between provenances and for heritability. The results found are that there are significant differences between provenances regarding height growth, diameter growth, stem straightness and forking frequency below 130 centimetres. Three provenances seem promising for the growth conditions in Denmark. Furthermore the analysis shows that there is heritability for height, diameter and stem straightness and that genetic gains for these traits are possible.

Keywords: Sycamore, Acer pseudoplatanus, provenance, growth, stem quality

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Poul Elgaard and Timothy R. Dowse for all the help with the field measures. Further I would like to thank my supervisors, Jens Peter Skovsgaard and Jon K. Hansen for all the support and help throughout this thesis.

ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	6
2.1 THE FIELD TRIALS	6
2.2 SITE DESCRIPTION	7
2.3 FIELD MEASUREMENTS	8
2.4 Statistical analysis	9
3 RESULTS	11
3.1 PROVENANCE	11
3.2 FAMILY	16
3.3 SITE	17
4 DISCUSSION	19
4.1 Provenance	19
4.2 FAMILIES	22
4.3 SITE	22
5 CONCLUSIONS	23
REFERENCE LIST	25
APPENDIXES	26
APPENDIX 1: PROVENANCE TESTS	26
Appendix 2: Correlations	26
APPENDIX 3: SOIL SAMPLES	27

1 INTRODUCTION

Sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) is a broadleaved tree originating from the central European highlands and is currently naturalized in large parts of Europe. Sycamore can grow on a wide range of soils but performs best on deep moist soils of moderate to high fertility (Ammer, 2008; Long, 1992). Long (1992) further specifies that soils of reasonable high pH would benefit sycamore but soil tests in Denmark show no relation between pH and growth (Jensen et al., 2008). Sycamore is moderately light demanding besides the very early stages, young plants can survive for a long time in low light conditions (Hein et al., 2009). Natural regeneration is abundant, this combined with the shade tolerance of seedlings leads to the establishment of a dense seedling bank under the canopy. Small seedlings are able to adapt quickly to increased light conditions, larger seedlings that have lived under a closed canopy can however struggle with stability issues (Hein et al., 2009). Sycamore seedlings are very sensitive to competition from herbaceous plants (Hein et al., 2009).

Sycamore is a species that produces very valuable wood (Vacek et al., 2018), the wood is hard, even grained and brightly coloured making it widely used. Further the sycamore is economically attractive because it also a fast growing species on suitable sites (Hein et al., 2009). From an ecological aspect sycamore provides particular value for birds, fungi, epiphytes and invertebrates (Cundall et al., 1998). According to Hein et al. (2009) the litter from sycamore also has a positive effect on the nutrient cycling and humus formation. The ability to tolerate salt spray and atmospheric pollution can also make it an interesting species (Cundall et al., 1998). Sycamore can be an invasive species Sycamore can also possess a treat to biodiversity in regards that the species is considered invasive (Hein et al., 2009; Long, 1992; Sjöstedt, 2012). This is caused by its frequent seed production, the strong seed dispersal and the capability for seedlings to establish under relatively closed canopy. Some authors indicate that its invasiveness might be overstated and that sycamore will likely alternate in time with other species such as ash (Cundall et al., 1998; Long, 1992).

In Denmark is naturalised sycamore consist of around 2 % of the forest area in monocultures, this is likely an underestimation since sycamore is mostly seen in mixed stands (Jensen et al., 2008). The market is good with the demand exceeding the supply in Denmark. Little research regarding suitable provenances for Denmark is done. Growth of sycamore is vigorous in Denmark, with a maximum mean annual increment of 15 m³ and a total volume production between 700 and 1050 m³ after 80 years (Kølby, 1956 according to Hein et al., 2009).

Provenance trials provide information regarding seed sources for commercial use, they show if certain provenances perform better for desired traits. Further they are the first step in breeding programs to identify provenances with high potential over a range of environments, or in case of severe provenance-environment interactions, to outline possible seed zones (White et al., 2007). Progeny trials provide information on the additional genetic variation within provenances and possibilities to improve certain traits through selection. If the same genetic material is replicated at several sites, it will also provide information on genotype-environment interactions (White et al., 2007). High genotype-environment interactions will decrease possible genetic gains from the breeding program or could lead to a division of the breeding program aiming at different sites (White et al., 2007).

The objective of this master thesis is to analyse how different provenances of sycamore perform in relation to survival, growth and stem quality and provide information on provenance by environmental interactions and furthermore to test for genetic variation within some of the provenances. There is currently a series of field trials in Denmark planted at four locations throughout the country including samples of different provenances and families from open pollinated trees in different provenances. The series was established 2010 and could be used for the purpose of this thesis. The thesis will focus on the provenance suitability for Denmark and on the genetic variation within and among provenances. Thus, the field trials will be measured and analysed, and the results will be compared to literature available.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 The field trials

This thesis is based on measurements from three field trials in a field series including progeny from sycamore provenances and families from open pollinated trees in stands of different provenances of sycamore. The series was established in spring 2010 by the University of Copenhagen. All field trials are established with two year old plants in randomized unbalanced blocks with 9 blocks and with 4-tree row plots. Figure 1 shows the design for Drastrup, the design of Tophøj, and Sorø is the same except for blocks which are distributed differently. For this thesis three sites from this trial series were measured, the sites were located near Drastrup, Tophøj, and Sorø and are called after this for the rest of this thesis. There is one more site located near Valnæs, unfortunately there were nesting sea eagles at the time of measurements and thus this site was dropped for this thesis. At Drastrup the rows are oriented S-N with a row spacing of 3 meter and a plant spacing of 1 meter. At Tophøj and Sorø the rows are oriented S-N with a row distance of 2.5 meter and a planting distance of 1 meter.




Figure 1: experiment design for Drastrup. On the right the overview of the blocks, on the left block 7 is enlarged. Each square represents a plot containing four plants of the same mother tree indicated by a plant number. On the axis are the x and y coordinates of the site.

The experiment contains several provenances from various location throughout Denmark, one provenance from the Czech Republic and one from Poland. Provenances are divined as the site where the seed were collected. All provenances from Denmark are believed to originate from imported seeds, but have been in Denmark for one or more generations. The number of generations for each Danish provenance in Denmark is unknown. From several of the provenances there is an additional test where offspring from known mother trees was collected and included with a specific plant number. Table 1 shows the provenances included in the trial and which provenances have a family trial. The number of trees planted of each provenance varies greatly and the number of measured trees of each provenance can be seen in figure 2.




Figure 2: Number of living trees measured for each provenance over all sites, tree number on the y axis and provenance on the x axis

Table 1: Provenances included in the field trail

Area or forest district	Forest	nr.	Family trial	Altitude (meter above sea level)	coordinates
Orenæs	Resle skov	1	х	9	N 54°93′ / E 11°72′
Barløse skov	Barløseborg skov	2		18	N 55°34′ / E 9°93′
Wedellsborg	Ørsbjerg	3		65	N 55°38′ / E 10°00′
Randbøl	Boller Nederskov	4	Х	24	N 55°27′ / E 11°68′
Poland	Krezin	5			unknown
Bregentved	Bregnemade	6		59	N 55°31′ / E 12°00′
Gjorslev	Magleby skov	7	Х	10	N 55°39′ / E 12°33′
Bregentved	Boholte	8		39	N 55°37′ / E 12°03′
Ravnholt Gods	Lykkesholm	9		70	N 54°25' / E 10°65'
Copenhagen	Vestkoven	10		20	N 55°69' / E 12°32'
Czech Republic	Harrachov	11	Х	670	N 50°77′ / E 15°37′
Pallisgård	Bøssevænge	12		24	N 55°26′ / E 11°68′
Holsteinborg	Kirkeshoven	13	Х	22	N 55°23′ / E 11°44′
Sorø	Filosofgangen	14			N 55°43′ / E 11°57′
	Sorø	15	х	40	N 55°53′ / E 11°57′
Kalø	Fussingø	16	x	30	N 56°29' / E10°49'

2.2 Site description

Drastrup and Tophøj are located in the north of Jutland and Sorø is located on the island of Sealand (figure 3). The experiment at Drastrup is situated at the bottom of an east facing slope and has a south facing slope starting from the border of the site. There is a dense grass layer present on the site. Next to the sycamore planting there are several other experiments, all of these are in young stages and did not provide shelter. Tophøj is a flat site situated next to a minor road, between the road and the planting there is a patch of grass of around 20 to 40 meter wide. In the north the site is bordered by a young beech and larch mixture and to the east an open birch stand, both these stands appear to predate the sycamore. There was very little undergrowth present within the site at the time of measurement, this is aided by that there has been mechanical cleaning of undergrowth. Sorø is a near flat site located at the edge of a forest. The north of the site is bordered by a stream. On the south west side there are several old oaks that get replaced by tall conifers towards the east where they form the south-east and east borders. Sorø also has had mechanical cleaning of undergrowth in the previous growing season. The site currently shows a very light herb layer and mosses covering most of the forest floor. Table 2 shows some climatic conditions and the soil type for each site.

Table 2: specifications of the included sites

Location	coordinates	soil type	average precipitation	average annual temperature	altitude
Drastrup	N 56°59' / E 9°50'	Sandy glacial till	741	8.1	35
Tophøj	N 56°42' / E 9°28'	Sandy glacial till	740	8.3	50
Sorø	N 55°54′ / E 11°50′	Clayey glacial till	649	8.6	35




Figure 3: Location of sites

2.3 Field measurements

Several parameters have been tested in order to get an overview of how the different provenances perform. Diameter and height to estimate growth. To estimate the quality of the stem, the stem straightness and forking were measured. Branching behaviour is not considered since the stands are still very young (2010) and this will thus unlikely lead to usable results while being a large time investment.

For each site there was an established protocol for the measurements with a tree id and previous measurements, this protocol was used in the field and for the analysis. Tophøj has already had a thinning leaving only the best tree of each plot and had a removal of forking, complicating comparison between the sites. For this reason and to reduce the workload it was decided that on the other sites for each plot one tree would be selected and only for that tree the height, forking and straightness would be measured. The selection was done primarily on the height and secondarily on the straightness, with exceptions if the straightness was of such large difference that some height difference was accepted. At Sorø all trees were scored for defects, this includes their straightness and forking, in spring 2018. These scores were deemed to be still representative and therefore Sorø is not scored again with exceptions when there were obvious changes.

The diameter (dbh) was measured by calipering trees at breast height (130 cm) parallel of the rows, in case of multiple stems up to the three largest stems were measured. Total tree height was measured using a Messfix telescopic height measurer of eight meters at Tophøj and Drastrup, at Sorø a combination of a height measure stick from Hasting of fifteen meter and a vertex height meter were used because of the greater height of the trees. Forking tendency was estimated by noting of trees that have a fork below 130 centimetre and measuring the height of the lowest fork above 130 centimetre if available. Stem straightness is estimated on a one to nine scale with one being the lowest score and nine the highest. The scores seven to nine indicate a straight tree or a tree with only weak bends, four to six are trees that are not straight but still show dominant upward growth and can have only up to two axis breaks of medium severity, and lastly scores one to three for trees that do not show a strong upward growth form and trees with more axis breaks.

On visual impression of the sites there seemed to be a spatial pattern in the height growth of trees. Therefore a soil sample was taken at the centre of each block, in three cases where there was an elongated block with visual differentiation in tree growth two samples were taken. The sample were taken with a soil auger to a depth of one meter. The samples were analysed by Eurofins using their standard package for magnesium (Mg), phosphorus (P), potassium (K) and the reaction count, which is comparable to pH plus 0.5.

2.4 Statistical analysis

2.4.1 Provenance test

Analysis for each individual site was done with all data available for the trait measured. For analysis across sites only the data from selected trees was used to make the data from Drastrup and Sorø comparable with Tophøj. A linear model was applied to test differences among provenances within sites:

$$Y_{jkl} = \mu + P_j + B_k + \rho_{jk} + e_{jkl}$$
 [1]

where Y_{jkl} is value of the trait in question, μ is the grand mean, P_j is the fixed effect of provenance j, B_k is the fixed effect of block k, ρ_{jk} is the random interaction between provenance j and block k and e_{jkl} is the residual (normally and independently distributed (NID)).

Model [1] was expanded to test for differences among provenances across sites using the linear model

$$Y_{ijkl} = \mu + S_i + P_j + B_{ik} + \gamma_{ij} + \rho_{ijk} + e_{ijkl}$$
 [2]

where Y_{ijkl} is value of the trait in question, μ is the grand mean, S_i is the fixed effect of site i, P_j is the fixed effect of provenance j, B_{ik} is the fixed effect of block k within site i, γ_{ij} is the random interaction between site i and provenance j and ρ_{ijk} is the random interaction between provenance j and block k within site i, and e_{ijkl} is the residual.

Normal plot histograms of residuals were made to examine for severe deviations from the assumption of normal distribution and residuals were plotted as function of predicted values to examine for lack of variance homogeneity. Provenance effects were tested using the Satterthwaite approximation (Satterthwaite, 1946) i.e. provenance effects were largely tested by the interaction between blocks and provenances using model [1] and by the site by provenance interaction using model [2]. The random variation from the site by provenance interaction in model [2] was tested using a Loglikelihood ratio tests. The MIXED procedure in the statistical software program SAS (SAS Institute, 2008) was used for the analysis, to estimate least square means and make pairwise tests (using the Tukey-Kramer adjustment).

2.4.2 Family test

The analysis for heritability and for breeding value where done through ASReml software. For each site, a linear model is applied, which includes block effects, provenance effects and genetic effects through families, in case of dbh for Drastrup and Sorø and for straightness in Sorø plot effects were also included. A pedigree file in ASReml was applied having provenances as groups, assigning pedigree of mother trees to provenances and assigning the pedigree of individual trees with to mother trees and provenances (Gilmour et al. 2009). ASReml will provide the additive genetic variance directly through the use of the pedigree file (Gilmour et al. 2009).

Normal plot histograms of residuals were made to examine for severe deviations from the assumption of normal distribution and residuals were plotted as function of predicted values to examine for lack of variance homogeneity. The significance of an effect was tested by comparing the loglikelihood ratio (Kendall and Stuart 1979) with and without the effect analysis. Loglikelihood values were obtained using ASReml (Gilmour et al. 2009).

Within each trial site, the additive variance V_A was estimated assuming the trees are half sib progeny. Subsequently narrow sense heritability of traits was estimated according to Isik et al. (2017) as;

$$h^2 = V_A/V_p$$
 [3]

where V_P is the total phenotypic variance i.e the estimated genetic variance, the plot variance (for dbh at Drastrup and Sorø and for straightness at Sorø). The application of the pedigree file in the software program ASReml makes it possible to estimate breeding values of individual trees in the field trials considering the genetic variation, performance of the individual trees as well as the family mean (Gilmour et al. 2009). Described in a simplistic way the breeding values are estimated as;

$$BV = b^{1*}(y^{1}-m) + b^{2*}(y^{2}-m)$$
 [4]

where m is the mean, y^1 is the estimated value for the individual and y^2 is the estimated family value and where b^1 and b^2 are regression coefficients taking into account the genetic variance and the relationship between the individual and the family.

Breeding values were obtained from output created by ASReml. The mean breeding values for trees measured by this thesis were compared with the mean breeding values of trees selected in scenarios where 400 and 100 of the trees with the highest breeding value were selected. These numbers were chosen as example numbers, the sites are about on hectare in size therefore a final number of trees of 100 seems appropriate. This is however a large deviation from the current situation and therefor 400 was included as an intermediate step.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Provenance

3.1.1 Health performance

Survival has been estimated by the survival from 2010 until 2019 for all of Drastrup and block one to four at Sorø. The data for early survival (2011-2012) was available for all sites but contains discrepancies and thus has not been used for this thesis. Instead the survival until 2019 has been used. This data could however not be established for Tophøj since there has been a thinning reducing the tree number to one tree per plot making it impossible to estimate the overall survival. Further the survival has only be calculated in block 1 to 4 at Sorø since there has been a removal of trees at the north end of most rows to follow legislation and a removal in block 5 because of uncertainty of origin. This causes these blocks to be less representative and thus these have been left out. The difference in survival rates between provenance is significant (p < 0.001 in Drastrup/ p < 0.05 in Sorø) and table 3 shows the grouping of significant different provenances (p < 0.05).

Table 3: Survival rate 2010-2019 and wilting calculated as least square means by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest. The groups show the significant different results, where a shared letter indicates no significant differences (p < 0.05)

Sı	ırvival: Drast	trup	Survi	val: Sorø (bl	ock 1-4)	Wilti	ng: Drastrup)
Provenance	mean	groups	Provenance	mean	groups	Provenance	mean	groups
P8	93.3%	ab	P14	98.4%	ab	P6	3.13	ab
P12	91.9%	ab	P12	92.8%	ab	P4	3.25	а
P13	91.8%	а	P8	92.4%	ab	P10	3.34	abc
P5	89.5%	ab	P10	92.1%	ab	P16	3.56	abc
P4	88.9%	а	P1	91.9%	а	Р3	3.72	abcd
P2	88.6%	ab	P9	91.5%	ab	P9	3.78	abcd
P7	87.4%	а	Р3	87.7%	ab	P11	3.82	abcd
P15	86.8%	а	P7	86.6%	ab	P5	3.84	abcd
P1	85.8%	ab	P4	85.8%	ab	P2	3.88	abcd
P14	84.5%	ab	P15	85.0%	ab	P7	3.91	abcd
P10	84.0%	ab	P11	84.6%	ab	P13	4.22	abcd
P11	83.9%	ab	P13	83.2%	ab	P12	4.27	abcd
P9	83.9%	ab	P6	81.1%	ab	P1	4.54	abcd
P6	79.8%	ab	P2	79.5%	ab	P15	5.05	d
Р3	78.9%	ab	P5	77.4%	ab	P14	5.19	bcd
P16	78.0%	b	P16	74.8%	b	P8	5.67	cd

Drastrup has partly been measured by the University of Copenhagen after the summer drought in 2018 for signs of wilting. The measurements have been done in September and were a classification of the proportion of wilting in classes from zero to ten each representing a class of ten percent, for example class "1" contains percentages one to ten next class "2" contain eleven to twenty. The results from that measurement have been included here to get an estimate of drought tolerance of different provenances, there are significantly (< 0.001) differences between provenances. Table 3 shows the ranking and groups for the wilting between provenances. There seems to be no correlation between growth, dbh or height, and wilting nor is there a correlation with the survival rate.

3.1.2 DBH

There are significant differences (p < 0.001) in diameter growth among provenances on all sites. The correlation between the sites is low, however provenance 10 and 13 are consistently in the five best and provenances 11 and 15 are consistently in the worst five. Table 4 shows the diameter for the different provenances over the sites and the groups where each letter indicates no a group with no significant differences (p < 0.05). Figure 4 shows the range of dbh of each provenance over all sites.




Figure 4: Range of dbh (cm) measurements on the y axis by provenance on the x axis across all sites

Table 4: Dbh (cm) calculated as least square means by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest in overall ranking. The groups show the significant different results, where a shared letter indicates no significant differences (p < 0.05). ranking within site is shown by (x)

	Dra	strup	То	phøj	S	orø	0\	Overall	
Provenance	Mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups	
P10	3.36 (2)	ab	5.81 (3)	abc	6.49 (3)	a	5.92 (1)	ab	
P1	3.27 (3)	ab	6.31 (2)	а	6.15 (9)	abc	5.84 (2)	а	
P8	2.89 (9)	abcd	6.49 (1)	ab	6.58 (1)	ab	5.78 (3)	abc	
P12	3.77 (1)	а	5.18 (9)	abc	6.26 (5)	abc	5.68 (4)	abcd	
P13	3.14 (5)	abc	5.31 (5)	abc	6.41 (4)	abc	5.56 (5)	abc	
P6	3.23 (4)	abcd	5.16 (10)	abc	6.02 (10)	abc	5.38 (6)	abcd	
P9	2.81 (11)	bcd	5.27 (6)	abc	6.52 (2)	ab	5.38 (7)	abcd	
P7	3.04 (7)	abcd	5.22 (8)	abc	6.17 (8)	abc	5.34 (8)	abcd	
P4	2.92 (8)	bcd	5.49 (4)	abc	6.19 (6)	abc	5.31 (9)	abcd	
P2	3.12 (6)	abcd	4.95 (15)	abc	6.18 (7)	abc	5.27 (10)	abcd	
P3	2.67 (14)	bcd	5.07 (12)	abc	5.97 (11)	abc	5.04 (11)	abcd	
P16	2.87 (10)	bcd	5.06 (13)	bc	5.45 (14)	abc	4.96 (12)	cd	
P15	2.80 (12)	bcd	5.00 (14)	bc	5.26 (15)	С	4.91 (13)	cd	
P5	2.41 (16)	d	5.23 (7)	abc	5.95 (12)	abc	4.90 (14)	abcd	
P14	2.68 (13)	bcd	5.11 (11)	abc	5.08 (16)	bc	4.90 (15)	bcd	
P11	2.57 (15)	cd	4.84 (16)	С	5.52 (13)	abc	4.77 (16)	d	

3.1.3 Height

There are significant differences among provenances in height growth for all sites and across the sites, the significance level overall and for Drastrup and Tophøj is < 0.001, at Sorø it is < 0.01. There is some correlation between the sites (0.64-0.76), with the highest correlation between Tophøj and Sorø. Provenance 8 performs the best on all sites and provenance 1 and 10 both also are constant in the five best. On the bottom side, provenances 11 and 16 are consistently in the worst five. Table 5 shows the groups of significant (< 0.05) different provenances for each site, note that Sorø did not have significant groups at this level. Figure 6 shows the variation in each of the provenances.




Figure 5: Range of height (cm) measurements on the y axis by provenance on the x axis across all sites

Table 5: Height calculated as least square means by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest in overall ranking. The groups show the significant different results, where a shared letter indicates no significant differences (p < 0.05). ranking within site is shown by (x)

	Dras	trup	Topl	høj	Sor	ø	Ove	rall
	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups
P8	481.1 (1)	a	616.2 (1)	a	847.2 (1)	a	648.4 (1)	а
P10	438.6 (5)	abc	539.9 (3)	abc	834.6 (2)	a	603.8 (2)	abc
P1	441.7 (4)	a	557.6 (2)	ab	798.1 (5)	a	598.7 (3)	а
P12	475.7 (2)	ab	530.2 (4)	abc	783.3 (8)	a	595.6 (4)	ab
P13	434.6 (6)	ab	522.6 (6)	abc	787.1 (7)	а	581.4 (5)	abc
P7	413.3 (7)	abcd	510.7 (8)	abc	800.6 (4)	a	574.5 (6)	abcd
P 9	380.7 (12)	abcde	529.5 (5)	abc	802.8 (3)	а	571.3 (7)	abcde
P2	448.8 (3)	abc	482.6 (14)	bc	772.2 (11)	a	568.4 (8)	abc
P4	399.0 (8)	abcde	501.7 (9)	bc	797.9 (6)	а	565.6 (9)	abcde
Р3	391.4 (10)	abcde	488.4 (13)	bc	777.9 (10)	a	552.3 (10)	abcde
P5	377.1 (13)	abcde	520.3 (7)	abc	724.9 (14)	a	549.6 (11)	abcde
P14	362.2 (16)	cde	498.0 (10)	bc	778.6 (9)	a	543.9 (12)	cde
P15	392.3 (9)	bcde	490.4 (11)	С	730.9 (13)	a	539.0 (13)	bcde
P11	368.2 (15)	е	488.8 (12)	С	739.4 (12)	a	532.6 (14)	е
P6	383.7 (11)	abcde	466.4 (16)	С	716.1 (15)	a	523.0 (15)	abcde
P16	372.4 (14)	de	475.9 (15)	С	714.0 (16)	а	522.7 (16)	de

3.1.4 Straightness

When looking at straightness there are significant (< 0.001) differences between provenances. There is some correlation between Drastrup/Tophøj (0.74) and Tophøj/Sorø (0.78) but less so between Drastrup/Sorø (0.51). On all sites provenance 11 performs the best, provenances 7 and 16 are also in the top 5 on all sites. Provenances 1 and 5 are in the lowest performing provenances on all sites. Figure 6 shows the variation for each provenance, of note here is that provenances 7, 11 and 16 have very few measured below a 5. Table 6 shows the significant different (< 0.05) groups for the provenances.




Figure 6: Range of Straightness measurements on the y axis by provenance on the x axis across all sites

Table 6: Straightness calculated as least square means by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest in overall ranking. The groups show the significant different results, where a shared letter indicates no significant differences (p < 0.05). ranking within site is shown by (x)

	Dra	strup	То	phøj	S	orø	ov	erall
Provenance	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups
P11	5.82 (1)	a	6.74 (1)	а	6.81 (1)	a	6.56 (1)	a
P16	5.58 (3)	abc	6.63 (3)	ab	6.35 (4)	abcde	6.29 (2)	ab
P7	5.70 (2)	ab	6.50 (5)	abc	6.40 (3)	b	6.26 (3)	abc
P2	5.48 (6)	abcd	6.42 (7)	abc	6.43 (2)	abcd	6.24 (4)	abcd
P4	5.37 (8)	abcd	6.64 (2)	ab	6.12 (6)	bcde	6.13 (5)	bcd
P12	5.58 (4)	abcd	6.08 (14)	abc	5.95 (10)	bcde	6.05 (6)	abcd
P6	5.50 (5)	abcd	6.43 (6)	abc	6.02 (9)	bcde	6.00 (7)	bcd
P9	5.25 (9)	abcd	6.30 (9)	abc	6.22 (5)	bcde	5.99 (8)	abcd
P10	5.41 (7)	abcd	6.27 (10)	abc	6.07 (8)	bcde	5.98 (9)	bcd
P8	5.12 (11)	abcd	6.22 (11)	abc	5.70 (14)	bcde	5.91 (10)	bcd
P13	5.21 (10)	abcd	6.32 (8)	abc	5.73 (13)	de	5.86 (11)	bcd
P3	4.62 (16)	d	6.59 (4)	abc	5.89 (12)	bcde	5.86 (12)	bcd
P1	4.94 (14)	d	6.17 (13)	С	5.68 (15)	е	5.82 (13)	cd
P15	5.11 (12)	cd	6.18 (12)	С	6.08 (7)	bcde	5.80 (14)	d
P14	4.99 (13)	bcd	6.07 (15)	bc	5.90 (11)	bcde	5.70 (15)	bcd
P5	4.73 (15)	bcd	5.86 (16)	С	5.31 (16)	cde	5.45 (16)	d

3.1.5 Forking

The variation in probability for low forks (<130 cm) is significant for Tophøj and Sorø (<0.05), it is not significant for Drastrup. The correlation is low between the sites, however provenances 11 and 14 do score top 5 on all sites and provenances 12 and 13 bottom 5 at all sites. Table 7 shows the significant groups (< 0.05) for low forks. A remark about the values for Sorø is that these values are composed on measures of all trees where Drastrup, Tophøj and the overall values are only taking the selected trees into account.

Table 7: Low forking frequency calculated as probability of a frequency analysis by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest in overall ranking. The groups show the significant different results, where a shared letter indicates no significant differences (p < 0.05). ranking within site is shown by (x)

	Dras	trup	Topl	nøj	So	rø	ove	erall
Provenance	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups	mean	groups
P8	5.7% (1)	n.s.	16.4% (4)	abcd	18.0% (6)	abc	8.6% (1)	а
P11	23.7% (2)	n.s.	12.4% (3)	а	16.6% (3)	ab	14.8% (2)	ab
P14	25.6% (4)	n.s.	10.9% (1)	abc	14.9% (1)	ab	14.8% (3)	ab
P1	26.5% (6)	n.s.	19.1% (10)	abcd	18.0% (7)	ab	16.3% (4)	ab
P16	30.4% (10)	n.s.	12.0% (2)	а	19.0% (8)	ab	17.4% (5)	ab
P2	25.6% (5)	n.s.	18.8% (9)	abcd	17.6% (5)	ab	17.9% (6)	abcd
P7	28.4% (7)	n.s.	17.1% (5)	ab	21.4% (11)	abc	19.7% (7)	abc
P10	28.7% (8)	n.s.	18.8% (8)	abcd	17.0% (4)	ab	20.0% (8)	abcd
P4	29.2% (9)	n.s.	17.3% (6)	ab	22.4% (12)	bc	20.2% (9)	abc
P12	38.9% (13)	n.s.	21.9% (11)	abcd	24.1% (13)	abcd	22.2% (10)	abcd
P6	24.9% (3)	n.s.	31.5% (15)	bcd	31.5% (15)	cd	23.4% (11)	abcd
Р3	35.9% (12)	n.s.	29.4% (13)	abcd	16.4% (2)	ab	23.8% (12)	bcd
P9	42.1% (15)	n.s.	18.3% (7)	abcd	24.8% (14)	abcd	23.9% (13)	bcd
P15	31.4% (11)	n.s.	27.6% (12)	bcd	19.6% (9)	ab	24.6% (14)	cd
P13	39.9% (14)	n.s.	30.9% (14)	cd	32.9% (16)	d	29.9% (15)	d
P5	44.4% (16)	n.s.	39.2% (16)	d	20.6% (10)	abcd	32.7% (16)	cd
Average	30.1%		21.4%		20.9%		20.6%	

There are no significant differences found for high fork (>130 cm) frequency between the provenances at any site, the data however suggest a trend at Drastrup and Tophøj. Table 8 shows the results for high forking frequency. The height of the lowest fork above 130 centimetres is not significant between the provenances on any site.

Table 8: High forking frequency calculated as probability of a frequency analysis and least square mean of forking height by provenance, ranked from highest to lowest in overall ranking in probability. ranking within site is shown by (x)

	Drastr	up	Тор	høj	Sc	orø	ove	rall
	frequency	mean height	frequency	mean height	frequency	mean height	frequency	mean height
P5	15.6% (2)	224.4	21.6% (1)	254.3	2.9% (8)	511.87	13.6% (1)	274.7
P2	13.8% (1)	264.5	45.9% (11)	343.2	1.8% (2)	396.52	20.9% (2)	325.7
P7	18.2% (4)	290.5	39.8% (4)	308.6	2.7% (7)	348.39	21.4% (3)	313.1
P9	21.7% (8)	295.4	40.6% (7)	287.8	1.8% (3)	447.54	21.7% (4)	316.1
P8	16.4% (3)	370.4	44.4% (10)	416.7	2.6% (6)	376.87	22.4% (5)	407.4
P11	23.1% (9)	251.9	42.0% (8)	310.9	2.3% (4)	449.33	23.4% (6)	309.7
P16	18.7% (5)	294.9	49.4% (12)	320.0	3.7% (11)	372.52	24.9% (7)	331.3
P4	21.5% (7)	292.4	50.3% (13)	306.0	3.6% (10)	406.87	27.5% (8)	321.4
P15	32.0% (14)	282.7	40.5% (5)	305.3	3.5% (9)	403.08	27.6% (9)	318.3
P13	24.6% (10)	264.1	35.9% (3)	325.6	6.8% (16)	386.47	27.9% (10)	316.4
P14	40.2% (15)	256.6	29.2% (2)	318.3	4.3% (12)	481.44	27.9% (11)	332.3
P12	20.3% (6)	279.2	67.3% (16)	330.9	1.3% (1)	321.17	28.5% (12)	307.9
P6	30.3% (11)	210.2	40.3% (4)	307.3	5.3% (15)	378.72	29.2% (13)	318.3
P1	30.7% (12)	301.6	57.0% (15)	345.9	2.5% (5)	446.79	31.2% (14)	348.3
P10	41.3% (16)	292.3	42.8% (9)	323.5	4.3% (13)	357.56	32.7% (15)	325.5
Р3	30.9% (13)	246.0	52.0% (14)	316.3	4.4% (14)	455.98	33.0% (16)	328.4
Average	25.0%	276.1	43.7%	320.0	3.4%	408.8	25.9%	324.7

3.2 Family

3.2.1 Heritability

Table 9 shows the variation for dbh, height and straightness on the three sites and what is contributing to this variation. Forking height was also tested but is not shown as it was not significant on any site. From the presented results all are significant, with an exception for dbh on Drastrup as can be seen from the table. h^2 is the heritability of the trait based on the data. For the test that have a plot variance this is the variance between plots and the environmental variance in then the within plot variance. The genetic correlation between the traits has been examined within sites to get an overview of how selection for one trait would affect the other traits. There is a high genetic correlation between height and dbh (> 0.9) and low between height and straightness or dbh and straightness (> -0.5, < 0.5).

Table 9: Variance and heritability for dbh, height and straightness

trait		dbh			Height			Straightness		
Site	Drastrup	Tophøj	Sorø	Drastrup	Tophøj	Sorø	Drastrup	Tophøj	Sorø	
Plot variance	0.46	*	0.80	*	*	*	*	*	0.08	
Genetic variance	0.10	0.66	0.44	1623	2106	1537	0.24	0.13	0.27	
Environmental variance	1.69	2.28	3.07	8462	9026	23629	0.87	0.49	1.00	
Phenotypic standard deviation	1.50	1.71	2.08	100	106	159	1.05	0.79	1.16	
Mean	3.0	5.3	5.9	402	507	764	5.4	6.4	6.2	
Coefficient of variation	0.50	0.32	0.35	0.25	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.12	0.19	
h²	0.04	0.22	0.10	0.16	0.19	0.06	0.22	0.21	0.25	
h² se	0.037	0.092	0.046	0.089	0.087	0.071	0.100	0.097	0.094	
P-Value	n.s.	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	> 0.001	

3.2.2 Breeding gain

Table 10 shows the predicted gain in percentage for the three sites based on mean breeding values of selected trees and for two scenarios where the number per site would be reduced to the 400 or 100 trees with the highest individual breeding value. The selection has been done for each trait and a final selection where the selection was a combination of height and straightness of equal weights. The table shows possible gains for all traits and particularly for diameter growth. Selections based upon a single trait can cause minor losses in other traits but when balancing the selection positive gains for all traits are possible.

Table 10: Breeding gain by site and trait for selections down to 400 and 100 trees for four scenarios aiming to improve dbh, height, straightness or a combination of height and straightness.

	remaining	DBH			Height			Straightness			Height and Straightness (50-50)		
Site	trees	DBH	Height	Straightness	DBH	Height	Straightness	DBH	Height	Straightness	DBH	Height	Straightness
Drastrup	400	7%	6%	0%	6%	7%	-1%	-1%	-1%	7%	3%	4%	4%
	100	13%	10%	-2%	10%	13%	-3%	-4%	-3%	11%	8%	9%	6%
Tophøj	400	14%	7%	-1%	12%	8%	-2%	-4%	-3%	5%	10%	6%	1%
	100	28%	14%	-3%	25%	15%	-3%	-6%	-3%	7%	21%	13%	1%
Sorø	400	13%	7%	-3%	11%	8%	-3%	-5%	-3%	7%	6%	5%	4%
	100	20%	10%	-4%	15%	13%	-3%	-7%	-5%	13%	9%	9%	5%

3.3 Site

When looking at the data collected on the selected trees the sites show large differences in growth as can be seen in figure 7, most notably is height and to a lesser extent dbh. Drastrup shows the lowest growth potential and Sorø the highest. In regards to straightness there are less apparent differences, only Drastrup seems to score a bit lower on average.

Table 11 shows the average results from the soil samples. From this can be seen that Sorø is the richest site of the three and Tophøj the poorest site. There is a large variation in pH and magnesium at Sorø with pH values between 4.6 and 6.9 and magnesium ranging from 4.8 to 17 mg. When being tested against height, diameter and straightness there are significant covariation between pH and all traits. pH seems to have a negative relation to growth but a positive relation to straightness. Figure 8 shows the pH-trait relation for height and straightness, the sites are represented with a number and colour in these graphs; Drastrup,1/blue, Tophøj, 2/red, and Sorø, 3/green.

Table 11: Average pH and content of nutrient from soil samples + standard error (SE).

site	Mg (mg/100 gts.)	SE	P (mg/100 gts.)	SE	K (mg/100 gts.)	SE	рН	SE
Drastrup	3.5	0.8	4.3	0.9	3.5	2.2	5.7	0.2
Tophøj	2.3	0.6	2.2	0.4	4.8	1.5	4.9	0.5
Sorø	8.2	3.3	3.1	1.2	8.0	0.9	5.7	0.9




Figure 7: range of straightness, height (cm) and dbh (cm) for each site. Traits are on the y axis and the sites on the x axis




Figure 8: Analysis of covariance for height and straightness compared to pH + regression lines. The top figure shows straightness on the y axis, the bottom one height on the y axis. pH is on the x axis for both figures

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Provenance

4.1.1 Health performance

The differences in survival between the different provenances gives significant results where measured, but a remark needs to be made that the data set from Sorø is not very large for this trait and that spatial variation can play a substantial role in this case. What can be seen is that on both sites only one provenance performs worse than one in Sorø or 4 others in Drastrup, P16. This is also a provenance that performs below average in both growth traits. It is not possible to distinguish whether the poor health performance has affected its growth or it is the poor growth that causes the lower health performance.

The drought response of the provenances is significantly different and not related to any of the other factors that have been tested in this thesis. This means that there are differences in drought resistance and that until now the effects of this did not play a large role in regards the survival, growth or stem quality. However in case of dry sites there is an indication that P8 and 15 should be avoided in favour of the other provenances tested and that P4 and 6 appear the best suitable.

4.1.2 DBH

There are significant differences in DBH between provenances, the size of the groupings and the variation between sites make it however difficult to draw general conclusions outside the very best and worst performing provenances

When disregarding the significance of the results certain trends can be seen in the rankings of the provenances across sites. P10 and 13 perform well on all sites, indicating that these provenances have an inherent capacity for a higher DBH growth compared to the other tested provenances or are best suited for the climate and soils in Denmark. On the other side, there are P3, 11, 14, 15 and 16, these provenances perform in the lower half for all sites indicating that these are less suitable. This can be because these are originating from stands that are less adapted to the local conditions, for example P11 is from the Czech Republic, the others are from stands across Denmark but might be from stands that are fewer generations in Denmark than the other provenances.

P5 is the provenance from Poland, this provenance seems to perform worse than most Danish provenances similar to the Czech provenance, it does however perform way better on Tophøj comparative to its ranking on the other sites and overall. P9 performs the best on Sorø, slightly above average om Tophøj and then below average on Drastrup. P1 performs good on Drastrup and Tophøj, but is average on Sorø. P8 is also noteworthy in that it performs really good on Tophøj (1) and Sorø (2) but much more average on Drastrup (9), this can indicate a factor that limits its growth on this site for example there could be a higher sensitivity to competition from herbaceous plants. P12 is the other way around in that it performs extremely well on Drastrup (1) with 0.4 cm higher dbh on average, while performing good (5) or average on (9) on Sorø and Tophøj.

4.1.3 Height

For height there are also groupings of significant different provenances that are again only showing differences between the best and worst provenances and not resulting in distinct groups of provenances that can be used, the over site grouping is a bit more diverse however.

One of the more interesting trends that can be seen from the data is the there is one provenance performing the best on all sites: P8. When looking at the distribution of measurements it can be seen that not only the average is high, it is also the only provenance with no height below two metres. One note on this is however that P8 is one of the provenances with a relatively low number of trees measured, only 53 while some have over 300. But since this provenance performs the best on all sites in height growth and 3rd overall in diameter growth this provenance should be considered for seed orchards and commercial plantings. P1 and 10 also perform good on all sites, both of these provenances also performed good on diameter growth, with p10

being more consistent over the sites in dbh. P13 performs only slightly above average in height (6-7), when combining both parameters for growth it can still be one of the better and consistent performing provenances. P1, 8, 10 and 13 seem thus the most promising provenances for growth around the country.

P9 again shows the same pattern where it performs better in Sorø (3) then in Tophøj (5) then in Drastrup (12), this further indicates that there are some requirements for this provenance. P12 is also still better in Drastrup (2) compared to the other sites (4/8) but the pattern is not as strong as before. Another provenance that shows a repeating pattern is P5, on the low end for Drastrup and Sorø but average at Tophøj.

The least performing provenances regarding height growth are P3, 6, 11, 14, 15 and 16. All these provenances score below average on all sites. P11, 14, 15 and 16 are also the provenances that are significantly different from the best provenances in height growth when comparing across sites. Except P6, these are the same provenances that perform poorly in regard to diameter growth.

4.1.4 Straightness

When looking at the straightness of the different provenances the first thing to note is that all provenances except P5 have around 25 percent of the selected trees in the high-quality classes (7-9). Considering that on each site around 1.000 trees were selected and scored for straightness on sites of about one hectare, there is an indication that all these provenances should provide sufficient high-quality trees when managed accordingly. What in turn indicates that for commercial usage in traditional forestry growth could be a more interesting factor to consider for provenance choice than the straightness.

Another note to make on the distribution of measurements is that P7, 11 and 16 have very few measures under a 5. This means that there a very few trees with a truly bad shape. This could be of interest when low number of trees are planted, for example as an admixture or in a wide spacing, and if there is still a wood quality goal. It is however important to keep in mind that these are all the most vigorous trees out of four and that the distribution off all trees would include more trees of the lower qualities as well.

When looking at the ranking of the different provenances it can be seen that the summarized order is not always in line with expectations when looking at the three individual sites. For example P8, which scores ranking 11, 11 and 14 and then a final ranking of 10. This has to do with that the ranking of Sorø contains all trees and not only selected trees while the overall scoring contains only the selected trees, herefor the trees used for calculating at Sorø for the summarized score are different than those presented in the table. The reason for this is that including all measures at Sorø for the overall scoring would taint the outcome because the data collected at Drastrup and Tophøj is not comparable but including the non-selected trees was considered to better show differences in provenance when available.

The grouping of significantly different provenances is only showing a difference between the very best performing and the worst performing provenances. An exception for this is P11 at Sorø and in the overall ranking, this provenance is significantly better than all but 3 in Sorø and 5 overall. Since the mean of this provenance also is the highest on all sites there is an indication that this provenance could be of interest for improving seed material. Other provenances that perform well on all sites are P16 and 7. On the lower end of performance there is P1,5 and 14. P15 also is on the low end in Drastrup and Tophøj and even lower overall indicating that at Sorø the selected trees of P15 are lower than selected trees of other provenances. This means that apparently the best growing trees of this provenance have a poor shape.

When looking at returning trends it can be seen that P12 again performs better at Drastrup than at the other sites. P9 still performs best at Sorø but there is no difference in the ranking between Drastrup or Tophøj for straightness. The patterns that could be seen for P1 and 5 for growth are not visible here, both provenances perform similar on all sites.

Comparing the straightness and the growth of provenances there are no provenances that perform among the best on all parameters. P11 and 16 that show the best shape but are among the worst for growth, P7 is more average in growth. Two of the better performing provenances for growth ,P8 and 10, are slightly below average in case of straightness. P1 that also performs good on growth is one of the worst for straightness. P5, 11, 14 and 15 are performing on the lower half on all parameters indicating that these provenances are less suitable.

4.1.5 Forking

From the three parameters analysed only the forking frequency of low forks showed significant results. Both the frequency and the height of high forks were far from significant. What further is interesting is that there is no correlation between the occurrence of high and low forks.

Since there are no significant differences and there are no clear trends visible for forking frequency above 130 centimetres or the forking height there cannot be differentiated between the provenances. What is apparent is the large differences between sites. This would indicate a large environmental influence on forking, however this cannot be concluded because the differences are more likely explained by differences in measuring. At Tophøj there has been pruned and in order to estimate what the natural forking would be for each pruning wound it would be estimated if the branch was a fork at the time of pruning. This is highly inaccurate and likely is an overestimation when comparing the data. Sorø on the other side was scored by a different person and method than the other sites, here forks above a certain proportion of the tree were not considered and old forks were more likely considered a ramnicorn than on the other sites. This likely led to an underestimation compared to the other sites.

Considering the frequency of low forks, when comparing the individual sites and the overall score it can again be seen that the selection has a large influence on the outcome of the selection. This is logical considering that in case of comparable height forking trees would be avoided as much as possible leading to a different estimation of forking when comparing Sorø to the other sites and overall frequency. Again there are significant different groups but these only differentiate between the best and worst performing provenances. Comparing the provenances for trends it appears P8, 11 and 14 perform the best and P5 and 13 the worst. None of the trends between stands that could be seen for previous parameters are visible in the low forking frequency.

4.1.6 Literature

There is very little literature regarding provenance studies in sycamore to compare these results with. Helliwell and Harrison (1978) did a study where they planted sycamore seeds of 6 different seed sources and measured if these showed different height growth and how this interacted with different soil types. They did find significant difference between the seed sources, showing a different growth potential between provenances. These results are however only for two-year growth from seed in a controlled environment, regular water supply and weed control, and are therefore likely showcasing a different relation. More comparable is a study in Britain from where Cundall et al. (1998) compared height growth four years after planting on a farm forestry site, in this they found no significant differences across their sites. One of the provenances that was included was from Denmark and is also included in this test, called P3 in this thesis. They only had it included in one of the sites and there it performed best, comparing to how this provenance is performing in this thesis then it can be seen that on the tested sites P3 performs average or below average after 9 years. Without any other shared provenances not much more can be said regarding this difference and what is causing it. There is also test in Germany where diameter, height and straightness were measure after 15 years and 31 years (Weiser, 1981; Weiser 1996). At both times no significant differences were found between provenances regarding diameter or height growth. The results from Weiser (1981, 1996) also found significant differences between provenances regarding straightness. The ranking of the different provenance changes a bit over the years but no large shifts in what provenances perform well. What is of interest is that the average score for each provenance is degrading over time, indicating that the final proportion of high-quality trees is lower than estimated at this time. This means that disregarding the straightness in favour of growth might be more of a

risk. Comparing straightness between the studies is not possible since Weiser uses a different grading for straightness. According to Pâques (2013) there are also provenance trails in Belgium, the Czech Republic and the Netherlands, however there are no published result or results have not been found due to language differences. The difference between provenances in drought tolerance is in line with the results of a study that compared the effect of warming and water stress on different provenances of sycamore (Carón et al., 2015). This further indicates that choosing a drought tolerant provenance can be beneficial on dry sites.

4.2 Families

The heritability rates for the tested rates are moderate. What further can be seen is a large standard deviation in the heritability. The results from dbh show a large increase in heritability when the plot variance is not tested, this indicates that all test that are run without this factor could be an overestimation of heritability. However when the plots are included for straightness is Sorø then no decrease in heritability is visible. The coefficient of variation is comparable for the different sites for height and is also not too far off for straightness. This coefficient is larger when comparing the sites for dbh and might help explain why Drastrup to be not significant.

The genetic correlations between the growth indicators indicates that selecting for height should also increase the genetics for diameter and visa versa. The correlation is not there between either of the growth indicators and straightness, but is at least not negative therefore selections can improve one trait without lowering the other. These results can be seen when looking at the table that was constructed for the breeding gains. Height and diameter always increase when there is selected for either of them, while straightness slightly decreases. When selecting for straightness the opposite occurs. However when an effort is made to select both for height and straightness then an increase in both can be realized, even though the gain in straightness is minimal. This does not mean that there is no possibility for improving both traits at the same time, for this thesis only a single combination of weights was tested, a simple one of equal proportions. When establishing seed orchards or improving a breeding program different weights should be tested, that way the most optimal combinations can be found. What is apparent form table 10 is that the possible gain in diameter is the highest and the least for straightness, suggesting that breeding seeds for more diameter growth is likely the most interesting trait improvement in this generation. The exception on this is Drastrup where all traits gain similar improvements when selecting for them. What has to be considered with these results is that beyond the selection of one tree per plot there has not been any spatial considerations. These are purely theoretical gains as spatial distribution plays a large role in selecting trees in a seed orchard. Another note that has to be taken into account when comparing the possible gain between sites is that the current number of trees is varying between sites and thus the selection intensity is varying when reducing to a set number of trees.

4.3 Site

Comparing the 9-year survival across sites it can be seen that survival is higher at Drastrup than Sorø. This is not in line with the growth differences and can probably best be explained by the fact that there are large patches of poor performance on both sites but the larger data set of Drastrup better covers this variation. The patches of poor growth at Sorø might be explained by differences in groundwater level. Jensen et al. (2008) did an extensive test on how soil properties affect sycamore growth in Denmark and found many dying individual trees in wet spots of otherwise healthy stands on soils with stagnant groundwater within the top 40 centimetres of soil. While there has been no test for groundwater level at the sites the soil was rather wet at some places at Sorø and the situation seems similar to that described by Jensen et al.(2008).

For the tested traits there are clear differences between sites, with Drastrup having worse results for height, dbh and straightness. When comparing Drastrup and Tophøj there is a similar precipitation and temperature,

but better soil conditions in Drastrup. This raises the question why there is less growth in Drastrup. Likely the difference in competition is part of the explanation. The occurrence of an extensive grass layer has been connected to reduced growth in sycamore (Jensen et al., 2008). The grass layer at Drastrup is well developed and will have caused increased competition. There has been no establishment of grass at Tophøj and other herbaceous vegetation has been mechanically managed further increasing the difference between sites. The wider spacing of the rows might further improve the competitiveness of the grass layer. Another effect that should be considered is that Tophøj has had more maintenance, including the early removal of forks. This can have had an influence on the remaining stand, focussing the growth potential on a single stem. The shelter effect against wind from surrounding stands is rather low on both sites considering a dominant west to southwest wind direction. The higher growth in Sorø compared to Tophøj is in line with the expectations of the soil type, in case of well drained soils growth of sycamore increases with clay content (Jensen et al., 2008). The results of the soil samples also show a higher nutrient content in Sorø than at Tophøj.

When comparing the soil properties with the growth and straightness the only result found is that there is a negative relation with increasing pH and growth while still affecting the straightness positively. When comparing the groupings, it shows that this relation is strongly dependent on few blocks at Sorø that show a very high pH and reduced growth compared to the rest of Sorø. For lower pH there does not seem to be a negative relation. This could indicate that very high pH has a negative impact on the growth of sycamore. Jensen et al. (2008) did not find any relation between growth and pH but did not have many sites with as high a pH as that was found on these blocks in Sorø. It is also not unlikely that there is no causal relation between pH and growth and both are correlating with another factor. Like mentioned before the soil at Sorø is expected to have a high groundwater level at some parts of the site, this could influence both the pH and the growth. Further testing is needed to make conclusions, especially since the number of soil test is low.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The results of this thesis are not entirely sufficient to make clear distinctions between good provenances and provenances to avoid, in most cases only the very best were significantly different from the very worst. This leaves a large group in the middle that are statistically no different from either the best or the worst. However there are some trends visible. Table 12 shows how each provenance compares to the mean on that site/overall for the traits where significant differences were found. What can be seen here is that P10 is the only provenance that scores high on growth and at least average on quality. However is straightness is deemed less of a priority since it will likely be sufficient, than P1 and 8 are also of interest, both these are in the top of growth and above average in forking frequency. P7 scores more average in growth, but scores very good in straightness making this provenance interesting when considering lower density plantings. When only considering quality aspects than P11 and 16 are the top performers, P11 scores excellent on both and P16 excellent in straightness and good on forking frequency. When looking for provenance to avoid in Denmark it can be seen that of the analysed material there are a few provenances that perform poorly on most variables tested, P3, 5 and 15.

Table 12: Performance of provenances across traits compared to the average performance. Dbh, height and low forking frequency are presented in percentage from the average, straightness in absolute values from the average. Traits are coloured from green to orange for preferred to undesired performance, each site-trait combination is coloured separately. Provenance are also coloured to indicate how they relate to each other: Dark green (good or average on all traits), Light green (good growth, poor straightness), blue (overall average), yellow (good stem quality, poor growth), grey (only good on one site) and red (poor).

	Growth Stem quality															
		DBI	н			Hei	ght			Straig	htness		Lo	w Forking	Frequen	су
Provenance	Drastup	Tophøj	Sorø	overall	Drastup	Tophøj	Sorø	overall	Drastup	Tophøj	Sorø	overall	Drastup	Tophøj	Sorø	overall
1	10%	18%	2%	10%	8%	9%	3%	6%	- 0.3	- 0.2	- 0.4	- 0.2	-4%	-2%	-3%	-4%
2	5%	-7%	3%	-1%	9%	-6%	0%	0%	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.2	-4%	-3%	-3%	-3%
3	-10%	-5%	-1%	-5%	-5%	-5%	0%	-3%	- 0.7	0.3	- 0.2	- 0.1	6%	8%	-4%	3%
4	-2%	3%	3%	0%	-3%	-2%	3%	0%	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	-1%	-4%	1%	0%
5	-19%	-2%	-1%	-8%	-8%	1%	-7%	-3%	- 0.5	- 0.5	- 0.7	- 0.5	14%	18%	0%	12%
6	9%	-3%	0%	1%	-6%	-9%	-8%	-8%	0.2	0.1	- 0.0	0.0	-5%	10%	11%	3%
7	2%	-2%	3%	1%	1%	-1%	3%	1%	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3	-2%	-4%	0%	-1%
8	-3%	22%	9%	9%	17%	20%	9%	14%	- 0.2	- 0.1	- 0.3	- 0.1	-24%	-5%	-3%	-12%
9	-5%	-1%	8%	1%	-7%	3%	4%	1%	- 0.0	- 0.0	0.2	- 0.0	12%	-3%	4%	3%
10	13%	9%	8%	11%	7%	5%	8%	7%	0.1	- 0.1	0.0	- 0.0	-1%	-3%	-4%	-1%
11	-13%	-9%	-8%	-10%	-10%	-5%	-5%	-6%	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6	-6%	-9%	-4%	-6%
12	27%	-3%	4%	7 %	16%	3%	1%	5%	0.3	- 0.3	- 0.1	0.1	9%	1%	3%	2%
13	6%	-1%	7%	5%	6%	2%	2%	3%	- 0.1	- 0.0	- 0.3	- 0.1	10%	10%	12%	9%
14	-10%	-4%	-15%	-8%	-12%	-3%	0%	-4%	- 0.3	- 0.3	- 0.1	- 0.3	-4%	-10%	-6%	-6%
15	-6%	-6%	-12%	-8%	-4%	-5%	-6%	-5%	- 0.2	- 0.2	0.0	- 0.2	1%	6%	-1%	4%
16	-3%	-5%	-9%	- 7 %	-9%	-7%	-8%	-8%	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0%	-9%	-2%	-3%

There is some heritability for height/diameter growth and straightness, the estimates shown by this thesis might be a slight overestimation. When trying to improve the genetics for each site by selecting the best 100 trees for a single trait a gain of 13-28% can be realized for diameter growth, 13-15% for height and 7-13% for straightness. When considering both height growth and straightness the gains reduce to 5-21% for diameter, 5-13% for height and 1-6% for straightness.

REFERENCE LIST

- Ammer, G. W. R. H. M. B. C. (2008). Growth and nutrition of young European ash (Fraxinus excelsior L.) and sycamore maple (Acer pseudoplatanus L.) on sites with different nutrient and water statuses, 465–479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-008-0230-x
- Carón, M. M., Frenne, P. De, Chabrerie, O., Cousins, S. A. O., Backer, L. De, Decocq, G., Diekmann, M., Heinken, T., Kolb, A., Naaf, T., Plue, T., Selvi, F., Strimbeck, G.R., Wulf, M., Verheyen, K. (2015). Impacts of warming and changes in precipitation frequency on the regeneration of two Acer species. *Flora*, 214, 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2015.05.005
- Cundall, E. P., Cahalan, C. M., & Plowman, M. R. (1998). Early results of sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) provenance trials at farm-forestry sites in England and Wales. *Forestry*, *71*(3), 237–245. https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/76.4.385
- Gilmour, A. R., Gogel, B. J., Cullis, B. R., & Thompson, R. (2009). ASReml User Guide 3.0. VSN International Ltd, 275. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Hein, S., Collet, C., Ammer, C., Goff, N. Le, Skovsgaard, J. P., & Savill, P. (2009). A review of growth and stand dynamics of *Acer pseudoplatanus L*. in Europe: Implications for silviculture. *Forestry*, 82(4), 361–385. https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/cpn043
- Helliwell, D. R., & Harrison, A. F. (1978). Variations in the growth of different seeds of acer pseudoplatanus and betula verrucosa grown on different soils. *Forestry*, *51*(1), 37–46.
- Isik, F., Holland, J., & Maltecca, C. (2017). *Genetic Data Analysis for Plant and Animal Breeding*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55177-7
- Jensen, J. K., Rasmussen, L. H., Raulund-Rasmussen, K., & Borggaard, O. K. (2008). Influence of soil properties on the growth of sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus L.*) in Denmark. *European Journal of Forest Research*, 127(4), 263–274. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-008-0202-1
- Long, J. N. (1992). The silviculture of trees used in British forestry. Forest Ecology and Management (Vol. 55). https://doi.org/10.1079/9781780640266.0000
- Pâques, L. E. (2013). Forest Tree Breeding in Europe. Dordrecht: Springer Science +Business Media.
- SAS Institute (2008) https://www.sas.com/en_us/software/stat.html
- Satterthwaite, F. E. (1946). An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components. Biometrics bulletin, 2(6), 110-114
- Sjöstedt, J. (2012). A literature study and survey of sycamore maple (Acer pseudoplatanus L .) in southern Sweden.
- Vacek, S., Vacek, Z., Kalousková, I., Cukor, J., Bílek, L., Moser, W. K., ... Podrázský, V. (2018). Sycamore maple (Acer pseudoplatanus L .) stands on former agricultural land in the Sudetes evaluation of ecological value and production potential. Dendrobiology, 79, 61–76.
- Weiser, F. (1981). Zielstellung und Ergebnisse einer 15jährigen
 Bestandesnachkommenschaftsprüfung bei Bergahorn, Acer pseudoplatanus L. Forstwirschaft, 3 (4), 142-144
- Weiser, F. (1996). Bestandesnachkommenschaftsprüfung von Bergahorn. DerWald, 14, 774 777
- White, T. L., Adams, W. T., & Neale, D. B. (2007). Forest Genetics. Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: provenance tests

A table presented on the right of the page containing all significance test done regarding provenance differences ordered by site and trait. First the test of fixed test is shown, followed by the outcome of the least mean squares or probability test.

Appendix 2: Correlations

tables containing correlation data mentioned in text, the first contains correlation between provenances for significant traits across sites. The second table contains correlations for provenances between wilting and growth/survival. The third table is the genetic correlations between traits for each site for dbh, height and straightness.

TABLE 1	DBH	HEIGH	STRAIGHTNES	L_FORKIN	
		T	S	G	
DRASTRUP/TOPHOJ	0.26	0.67	0.51	0.51	
DRASTRUP/SORO	0.47	0.64	0.78	0.36	
TOPHOJ/SORO	0.55	0.76	0.74	0.49	

TABLE 2	correlation
WILTING-DBH	-0.095
WILTING-HEIGHT	0.3092
WILTING-	0.4781
SURVIVAL	

GENETIC	HEIGHT/DBH	HEIGHT/	DBH/
CORRELATIONS		STRAIGHTNESS	STRAIGHTNESS
1	*	0.2386	*
2	0.9438	-0.0498	-0.0934
3	0.9261	0.402	-0.1561

Duk	٩	David State of Francisco	Tabej	See State of Early	Our all Tracks of Franch Effects
		Type 2 Twite of Fixed Effects Effect Issen DF Den DF # Veille Pr > F provides S 140 4.87 4.000 DG 8 841 38.47 4.000	7ype 3 Teshs of Fixed Bitsols Effect Num DF Own DF F Visite Py F provings 15 140 4.87 4.0001 nos 8 841 35.47 4.0001	Type 3 Texts of Fixed Effects Effect NumDF Dec DF F Value Pt > F growing 15 123 3-44 < 0001	Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects Effect Non EF ConDF F Value Ft > F ate 2 213 425:03 < 0001
	- 1			Model 8 972 49-07-40001	province 19 29.9 6.91 < 0001 000 001 001 002 003 004 005 004 005 005 006 006 006 006 006 006 006 006
		Least Squares Manne Effect procurus Estract Standar Of 1 Value Fr > 15 for 6 Ener	Lead Squares Means Effect provens Estimat Standar DF 1396ue Pr>P(noe s d	Coast Squares Means Effect provens Gatmat Stancer OF 1 1/bile Pr>(t) 100 8 8	th Cent Squares Means Smot province Satroid Standar DF EValue Print on Beller province 1 58420 0.1333 151 4417 < 0001
				The state of the s	Description 1 5 8425 C 1323 15 1 44 17 < 2001
		No.	1	1	March Marc
		nce province 4 2.819 0.00442 64.4 30.30 < 0001 nce province 5 2.600 0.2007 724 (2.01 + 0001	nce province 4 5-807 3215 657 28-64 < 0001 nce province 5 5-2269 0-3779 672 13-82 < 0001	nos grunna 4 0.1577 0.7992 803 31.08 4.0001 nos grunna 5 5.5464 0.4073 801 12.72 4.0001	nos
		Per province 6 3.200 0.1647 300 18.59 < 0001	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	700 5 5300 0400 01 12.2 1300 provide 6 62109 0204 131 21.96 1001	DECEMBER 8 53024 52023 613 266-5001
		provene 7 1,0423 0,1021 39.7 29.79 < 0001 nce provene 6 2,9679 0,1065 746 14.52 < 0001	000 province 8 6-4544 0-100 622 15.51 < 0001	present 7 6.1674 5.2095 87.7 30,01 < 0001 1004 present 8 5.6797 6.301 303 21.65 < 0001	provene 7 5.3365 0.1314 14.7 40.64 <0.001 1600 provene 8 5.7797 0.2412 163 20.36 <0.001
		nce provens 9 2.8074 0.1808 529 15.53 < 0001 7009 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	000 prosent 9 52741 03025 at3 14 67 < 0001 prosent 9 52741 03025 at3 14 67 < 0001 prosent 10 63091 02962 225 18 61 < 0001	nos privens 9 65151 02508 225 23.04 <0001 009 privens 10 6489 02644 128 26.05 <0001	process 9 53779 52077 919 2539 45001 noe process 10 5918 51727 43,7 34,27 45001
٠		ese provene 11 2,5700 0:00341 42.8 27.52 - 3001	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	7000 11 55205 31364 461 29.61 43001	PORT 15 47000 01154 852 4133 -0001
		provine 12 3766 0:1007 067 10:86 < 0001 602 provine 33 3:1409 0:1253 134 25:06 < 0001	provens 12 5.1815 0.420) 099 12.30 <0001 068 provens 13 5.002 0.2990 137 23.47 <0001	provine 12 62996 0.3191 228 18-01 < 0001 nos provine 13 6-4062 0.2299 123 27-59 < 0001	provens 12 5,6794 0,2363 196 23,53 <0.001 noe provens 13 5,596 0,1963 29.2 25,56 <0.001
		provens 14 2,0004 0,1001 490 14.40 < 0001 new provens 15 2,000 0,0001 44.5 20.71 < 0001	provine 14 5.1074 0.3025 403 14.5 < 0001 768 provine 15 6.0015 5.206 56.5 04.27 < 0001	provens 14 52601 0.2085 211 16.46 x.0001 nee	provens 14 4,8900 0,2151 101 22,77 <0001 nee provens 15 4,9102 0,1247 11.8 20,38 <0001
3			000 movemen 16 5:003 3:244 109 23:75 < 0001 Adm	700 TO THE	
		Effect Num DF Des DF F Value Pr > F	Effect Num DF Den DF F Vision Fr » F provens 15 164 3.63 < 0001	Effect Numbf Den Df F Value Pr > F provens 15 154 2.17 2.0005	Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects Effect Num EF Daniel F Value Fr > F site 2 290 1546 23 < 2001
•		nce Moulk 8 1000 08.14 < 5001	nce Baux B SCS 3839 - 0001	506 8 93.7 72.39 < 0001	previous 15 519 8.22 - 0001
	1	Less Squere Menn Effect proving Estreet Standard DF (Value Fr>)	Least Squares Means Effect provons Estimat Standar DF 1 Value Propp	Least Squares Means Brisct prevers Bismail Bassier DF 1Value Pr> X	eterhile 24 254 65.5.4.0001 dk Least Squares Means Effect proves Samuel Standar DF 1Valve Pr-35 nice s d
		Control of the Mark Control of the C	Broc .	ton tone	
		March Marc	1	West	No. No. Sale
		Red	nee province & 50171 12 0236 00.5 41 72 < 0026 nce province 5 1272 5 22 7661 539 22 86 < 0021	non ground 4 797.86 19.9091 81.6 40.08 < 2001 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 00	nee provens 4 505.54 75044 100 71.25 <5001 nos 5 545.56 12.02 2058 20.09 <5001
		PERSONAL BRANCH	Province 6 466 20 21 9090 499 21 29 - 2001	700 8 710.14 32.3737 268 22.13 < 0001	POPULATION B 022 96 13 9624 1208 37 4 < 0001
		provens 7 4/3.29 5/401 1000 42.87 < 0001 608 provens 8 401.10 24.2977 1002 19.8 < 0001	provens F 610.72 (2.606) 73.6 40.61 < 0001 nce provens B 616.22 25.4104 699 24.26 < 0001	provens 7 800.61 20.8542 TO A 38.16 < 0001 non provens 8 847.22 38.7216 882 21.46 < 0001	provens 7 874.81 8.3668 223 88-67 <-0.001 .000 provens 8 040.37 17.2867 2104 37.51 <-0.001
		provene 9 26000 155460 1000 1538 <0001 600 provene 65 438.05 143090 1000 26.26 <0001	ALE provens 9 529.52 21.1290 464 25.00 < 0001 Rde provens 10 539.67 17.4N(7 263 50.85 < 0001	prevene 8 902.63 32.9999 367 24.63 <0001 000 prevene 10 804.56 27.9641 212 28.64 <0001	provens 8 571.33 14.3258 1409 20.88 <0.001 nos provens 10 603.82 11.7344 782 51.46 <0.001
- 1		POW 81 36818 84383 1002 45-68 < 0001 Med Alexandria Ale	nce provens 11 46875 10,0665 29.6 46.54 < 0006 Ace	7000 presents 11 720-36 17.132 30.5 42.15 <0001	000 000 00 000 00 000 000 000 000 000
		province 12 475.00 (23.5191 1002 20.14 < 0001 608 (23.5191 1002 21.51 < 0001 (23.5191 1002 21.51 < 0001	provina 12 500.15 25.4772 673 20.01 4.0001 60# provina 13 522.07 15.0019 145 34.76 < 0001	prevent 12 753.28 06.6577 239 21.37 <.0001 009 prevent 13 787.07 25.2494 153 31.17 <.0001	prevents 12 096.57 16,7476 1764 26.56 4.0001 nee prevents 13 381.41 10.4995 532 56.38 4.0001
		provens 54 362.19 19.2763 1002 18.79 < 0001 nee provens 15 392.29 8.6852 1002 45.17 < 0001	provens 14 #96 21 1365 #84 23 96 < 0001 #866 provens 15 #90 25 11 4052 #9.1 #2.99 × 0001	provens 14 778.56 38.8197 405 35.06 <0001 1000 provens 15 730.31 23.1031 58.8 56.36 <0001	provens 14 543.9 15-0117 1465 36.23 <-0.001 nee provens 15 535.92 7.7968 162 69.13 <-0.001
j	- 1	nce :	008 processe 16 673.56 14.0136 112 33.96 < 0007 008		
		provine 15 1/2:30 8:5902 1002 4:59 4:0001 628 Type 2 Testin of Fisced Sthech Ethics, Name De Des Der F Visike 91 + F provine 15 149 5:30 - 0001 BOOK 5 702 4:80 - 0001	province to 423.56 (2005) 55	Type I from or Fleet Block Ether: Nam DF Dee DF F Value FF F Freena 15 129 11.0 - 0001 nee 1 8 47 8 11.3 - 0001	FOR Type 2 Years of Fland Effects Effect Num SF Den DF F Value FF + F 886 2 27.1 175.85 < 0001
		Block 8 70.5 4.86 < 2001			provens 15 36.6 6.71 < 2001
		Level Squares Means Effect proverse Selfred Sander Of 1Value Fr-31 606 o 6	Least Squares Means Effect prevent Extinat Standar EF LYsius Fire() nos e d	Least Square Means Effect prevent Stated Season OF 1 Value Fr + State note a S	Other second School Stanter DE Cities Stant
			Brut .		non e di Brear provena i 1,000 00057 ML7 00.42 40001 non provena 2 8,2002 01006 116 44,73 4,0001
		province 2 6.4751 0.216 551 25.34 0.0001 000 province 3 4.6252 0.216 561 21.39 0.0001 No. 2 Department 4 0.2160 0.00040 18.3 04.51 0.0001	province 2 6.4216 0.169 061 62.55 0.0001 province 3 6.6016 0.165 0.26 43.05 0.0001 file	proving 2 6425 0.002 019 5821-0001 000 proving 3 58596 0.725 606 3414-0001 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	provents 2 62362 01360 116 6473 (000) novents 3 68023 0136 106 43.09 (000) Add 6 61204 000296 15 73.35 (000)
		provens 4 5.3140 0.00649 28.3 54.57 < 0.001 766 provens 5 4.7287 0.2838 780 17.83 < 0.001 668	provens 4 6.6419 0.07909 46.3 05.05 < 0001 nce provens 5 5.0613 0.1607 500 30.36 < 0001	provena 4 5.1153 G.06411 44.9 72.7 <2001 nee provena 5 0.3141 0.2002 1543 1843 <0001 nee	provena 8 6.1224 0.06296 15 73.53.40001 nee provena 5 6.4696 0.1672 171 32.6 <0001
		000 provene 6 5.5000 0.1675 399 27.67 < 0001 non non non non non non non non non no	006 provena 6 6.0274 0.1657 005 36.6 < 0001 006 provena 7 6.0033 0.0004 42.3 77.57 < 0001	7 5.255 0.0000 543 71.14 <001	1000 1000
		RCB B 51362 0.2558 752 20 < 0001 PCB PCP 9 5.250 0.2558 001 22.81 < 0001	PER	000 00000 00000 00000 00000 00000 00000 0000	NOW
		Aug	No.	March 1	Section Sect
		provens 12 5.575 6.2724 762 20.47 < 0001	provine \$1 6.7408 0.00022 16.1 111.54 < 0.008 nee provine \$2 6.0793 0.1808 741 52.52 < 0.001	prevent 11 6.8063 0.08873 20.3 98.03 4.0001 nos prevent 12 5.9521 0.18 461 33.06 4.0001	province 15 8.554 9.07438 10.7 86.53 <.0001 nee province 12 6.045 0.1376 109 38.35 <.0001
		provena \$3 5.2003 0,1912 191 34.43.43001 600 provena 64 49607 0,2165 513 23.04.40001	provine 13 8.324 0.1042 143 00.71 4.0001 709 provine 14 6.0741 0.163 626 30.69 4.0001	700 prevent 15 5726 0.1500 100 00.03 x.0001 700 700 700 700 700 700 700 700 700	provens 15 2,8544 0,1225 54.8 87.2 4,0001 1004 provens 14 8,8554 0,14 113 40.84 4,0001
1	1	POWER 15 5.1114 CORTO 36.1 02.66 4.0001 MAR 2004 01.000 64.4 04.20 4.0001	provents 15 6.1002 0.07215 35.7 85.64 < 0001 nee provents 15 6.0272 0.0064 100 02.64 < 0001	nee present 15 6,0771 0,08732 45.2 66.6 x,0001 664 664 664 664 664 664 664 664 664 66	nove province 15 1,8044 0.00196 14.2 70.31 4.0001 nove province 16 0.2006 0.00147 21 68.72 4.0001
	Н	Top Type II Teets of Faced Effects Effect Num OF Con DF 7 Value F1>7 provens 15 (20 0.55 0.6775	Effect Num OF Gen Of F Value Fro F	Type II Tests of Fixed Diffects Effect Num OF Den DF F Value PF > F private IS 15 23 0009	
		provene 15 (20 0.66 0.67% sea block 8 (21 2.11 0.099)	province 15 120 2.01 0.3198 Asse block 8 120 1.11 0.3611	provene 15 115 2.3 2.0009 nos block 5 115 10.45 <0001	provens 15 30 264 0.0116 noise site 2 30 36.96 < 0.000 site/dec 24 305 1.67 0.0004
		Citie Effect province Extense StoSirr DF trave Proof p_est to the province 1 1/1023 0.2516 120 442 < 0001 0.26416	Obs Effect provers Extend Station Of Traine Proof p_est eas 0 1 provers 1 14422 0.287 120 5.61<0001 0.1912	Obs Effect provens Estrant Steller OF Tribus Probt p_est fice v 1 provens 1 -15142 0-1081 118 -10-96 <-0.001 0-1800	Chi Street provine Sesmat Sollier DF trates Probt g_est
		2 provins 2 -0.0607 0.4425 125 -0.41 0.0173 0.26564	2 powers 2 11.4004 0.0001 120 -2.52 0.0042 0.10041	1 provens 1 -1.5142 0.1361 115 -10.96 <.0001 0.1803 nee 2 provens 2 -1.5421 0.2908 115 -6.31 <.0001 0.1702	1 provers 1 -1.6396 0.1878 30 -10.39 <0001 0.18290 700
		7 province 3 (0.0013 0.0212 120 (1.30) 0.1701 0.30002 (0.00) 4 (0.00012 0.1027 120 (4.6 < 0.001 0.2919	3 province 3 0.0194 9.424 120 42.08 0.0411 0.29434 0.004 4 province 4 41.563 0.245 120 45.3 < 0.061 0.51324	700 2 118252 0.2984 115 45.45 < 0.001 0.1644 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	1 privers 3 -11923 02714 30 -428 00002 023828 104 4 privers 4 -13756 03304 30 -1638 <0001 020172
		5 provins 5 0,2360 0,475 120 -0,47 0,6367 0,44054 6 provins 6 -1,1003 0,4112 120 -0,56 0,0003 0,24512	5 prowns 5 04361 04301 120 +1.02 03104 03902 6 prowns 0 07771 04317 120 -1.6 02040 020408	5 powers 5 -13522 0.5066 115 -2.65 0.006 0.2056 6 powers 5 -0.7775 0.2276 115 -0.42 0.0000 0.3145	5 private 5 07201 03101 30 -2.32 00272 032797 res 6 -1.1003 0.238 30 -4.6.4000 0.23300
		7 province 7 4/1246 02147 120 4/31/4/0001 0/26599 (inc.) (inc	7 primarie 7 -16773 02662 120 -688 40001 037116 968 8 primarie 8 -16273 08852 120 -2.56 0.0116 036418	7 province 7 -1.3006 0.1363 115 -6.42 < 0001 0.2137 rice 8 -1.5149 0.214 115 -4.42 < 0001 0.1800	7 provine 7 (1,004) 0,1445 30 (6,00 < 0,001) 0,19714 now 8 2,000 0,4757 30 4,50 < 0,001 0,00429
		9 province 5 -0.3150 0.4311 120 -0.6 0.4268 5.43012	8 prouves 0 -1,4104 0,4075 120 -2.01 0,3032 0,18256 9 prouves 0 -1,4104 0,4075 120 -3.01 0,3032 0,18256	# powers 9 -1,1095 0,2608 115 -4,32 <0001 0,2479 006	9 provens 6 -1187 0.3651 30 -4.37 0.3801 0.2300
		10 province 10 439116 0.3917 120 4279 0.0008 0.20663 104 11 province 11 -1.1672 0.1987 120 -6.87 <.0001 0.22736	99 private 15 -1.466 0.3861 120 -5.71 0.0000 6.18796 004 11 private 11 -1.9662 0.311 120 -9.27 -0.001 0.12396	10 proving 10 -1-5064 0,2228 115 -7-09 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 -7-695 0,1027 115 -15-72 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 proving 11 -7-695 0,1027 115 -15-72 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 proving 11 -7-695 0,1027 115 -15-72 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 proving 11 -7-695 0,1027 115 -15-72 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 proving 11 -7-695 0,1027 115 -15-72 -(0001 0,1088 No. 11 proving	10 -13686 02222 30 425 4000 0.1996 004 11 province 11 -12474 0.1215 30 -1429 40001 0.14838
	.	12 province 12 -0.4025 0.4884 120 -0.90 0.2981 0.28878 43 province 13 -0.4115 0.2838 120 -1.45 0.1454 0.28858	12 POWEN 12 -1,2694 0.8701 120 -2,23 0.6278 0.21936 708 13 070498 13 0.8026 0.2784 120 -2,86 0.0047 0.2044	12 prowns 12 /1.165 0.2894 (15 -5.82 0.0002 0.2414 form 13 prowns 13 /2.7133 0.1817 (15 -4.41 0.001 0.2288	12 provens 12 -1,2533 03239 30 -5.87 5:0008 022213 709 13 provens 13 -0,6529 0.1731 30 -4,33 <0001 0,25884
3	1	53 province 13 d-0115 0.2006 120 -1-46 0.1004 0.0005 14 province 14 d-0007 0.4408 120 -2-41 0.0717 0.0006 15 province 15 d-0111 0.1800 120 -4.16 -0001 0.31408 15 province 15 d-0111 0.1800 120 -4.16 -0001 0.31408 16 d-0110 0.1800 0.1800 100 4.27 4.0001 0.3000			
27.75					16 provint 16 -1.1212 0.1214 30 42.5 (000) 0.24816 164 provint 16 -1.8596 0.1698 30 4.77 (000) 0.17271 164 provint
		Fire Type II heats of Fixed Effects Effect, Nam DF Den DF F Virtue Pr > F provides 15 120 1.86 C071e 60e 15 120 5.26 - 5001	nce Type III heats of Found Effects Effect Num DF Den DF FVMAR Fr.> F grovenne 18 120 1.65 0.0070 nce 8 120 2.54 0.005	Pre Type II Texts of Fixed Diffects Difect. Auro DP Dos DP # Value Pr > F	Type III Tests of Fixed Directs Effect Num DF Com DF 9 Value Pr > F provine 15 601 1.68 (0.1007)
		Obs Affect process Astimat Station DF Walve Prote p.est		One Effect occurre Satirual Staffer OF Scalar Probl 4 est	1004 1005 1,05 0 1275 1005
		1 princes 1 (1514) 0,2243 120 -3.63 (1004 3,2003) 2 princes 2 -1.835 (1000) 120 -3.33 (1001 3,1705)	On Effect proven Science Sollier OF final Pools 9, est 1 provins 1 0203 0205 120 1.37 0.1744 0.3731 708 2 provins 1 0.1648 0.3094 120 0.41 0.6759 0.488	1 provine 1 43635 E3075 117 -1131 40001 030 nce 2 provine 2 43198 0715 117 432 4001 06176	
		3 provene 3 0.6068 0.4417 120 -183 0.0701 0.30664	3 private 2 E07925 0:3896 120 02 05412 0:61966	3 pro-era 3 3.0717 0.4858 117 4.68 < 0001 0.0442	1 provens 3 -0.7085 0.2913 401 -0.91 0.0082 0.33638
		4 province 4 1,2509 6,2134 120 4306 4,0001 5,21543 504 5 province 5 1,0907 6,0405 120 4283 6,0007 0,0008	4 private 4 201080 0,1000 120 0.07 E342 0,00047 5 private 0 -1,2811 0,3100 120 -2,53 0,0108 0,21001	4 provine 4 (3,2009 0,2406 117 (3,15 (3,001 0,6086 Ne 5 provine 5 (3,4080 0,6185 117 (3,43 0,0000 0,008)	4 growns 4 -05/06 0.1227 401 -7:31 <0001 0.27477 Nos 5 provens 5 -16401 0.3792 401 -4.87 <0001 0.13440
		# growns 8 4,0000 0.38 120 -2.13 0.088 0.30015 7 provins 7 -1505 0.245 120 -6.04 0.0001 0.18169	Topics S 03031 04126 120 056 03428 041291 04	8 private 8 -2.884 0.4232 117 -6.42 <-0.001 0.0429 608 7 provins 7 -3.5604 0.307 117 -11.66 <-0.001 0.0271	# growns 8 0,887 0,241 401 312 0,000 0,218 744 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
		## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ##	## prowns 8 -02200 0.4002 126 -0.47 0.6004 0.44307 108 prowns 8 -02610 0.2000 120 -0.06 0.2070 0.40070	## powers 8 -28036 57987 117 -601 -0001 0025 008 00 00176 00 00176 00 00176 00 00176	8 proving 0 -12409 03229 401 -173 50903 022427 nce 8 proving 0 -12801 02738 401 -47 -0001 021603
		10 provens 10 43506 63164 120 -113 02611 041327	10 province 10 -0.2914 0.3156 120 -0.92 0.3861 0.42757 Nos 11 province 11 -0.3200 0.1429 120 -2.25 0.0005 0.42045	10 proving 10 3,0000 0,3868 117 -7.67 < 0001 0,6431 11 proving 11 -2,7500 0,2221 117 -0,76 < 0001 0,0222	
		12 private 12 -1380 0380 120 -236 032 02000	12 primes 12 0.7223 0.9054 120 1.43 0.1505 0.67312	12 proving 12 4,334 1,5079 117 43 4,5001 0,0129	12 promis 12 09179 03031 401 433 5003 02809
á		15 provens 15 -6 1213 0.3167 120 -0.51 0.0006 0.24077 1004 14 provens 14 0.3675 0.405 120 -0.59 0.3256 0.40182	13 province 13 -0.5781 0.27 120 -2.14 0.0043 0.20806 NAS 14 province 14 -0.8637 0.4040 120 -2.67 0.0403 0.20241	13 provine 13 -2,5111 0,2006 117 -6,00 +3001 0,0004 No. 14 provinc 14 -3,1076 0,5136 117 -6,05 <3001 0,0427	19 privers 19 -0.9004 0.1767 401 -0.38 -0.001 0.27881 649 14 privers 14 -0.9687 0.2633 401 -0.4 0.0004 0.27914
1		14 province 14 -0.3875 0.400 120 -0.595 0.3255 0.40182 120 -0.595 0.3255 0.40182 120 -0.357 0.0001 0.3017 120 -0.357 0.0001 0.3017 120 -0.464 -0.001 0.3017 120 -0.0017 120	95 provides 15 -0.382 0.1788 120 -2.15 0.0038 0.40617 10 provides 16 -0.0002 0.2388 120 -0.11 0.9163 0.49898	15 provine 15 33113 22498 117 4325 42001 0.0051 fice 16 provine 16 32477 23254 117 439 43001 0.0014	15 province 15 -0.9621 3.5178 401 -6.17 <0.001 0.27646 7046 16 province 16 -1.1016 0.1464 401 -7.08 <0.001 0.24644
	٦	Type 3 Tech of Fixed Effects Effect Nam OF Dec OF # Value #1>#	Type 1 Tests of Plane Effects Effect Num DF Den DF F Value Fr > F	Type 3 Tests of Flood Bittests Effect: Num DF Des DF IF Value IFF > F	Type 3 Tests of Frand Effects Effect Non-OF ConOF F Value Fy F
		15 proving 15 (1772 0296 120 4.64 -0.001 0.0001 1 (1772 0296 120 4.64 -0.001 0.0001 1 (1772 0296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1	Type 3 Testis of Trans Ethiolog Ethiot Naur De Geo D' F Visida P P F F provens 15 65 050 05133 nos 8608 8 446 3.81 0.0017	Type 2 Techs of Final Difficility BTHCC NumED Ches De 7 Value PF1 > F prevent 18 126 5.6 0.8715 DOS 150 2.1 0.0416	March 1
		Lengt Squares Marris	10	35 years 0.2 color 200 years 0.7 years 0.7 color 200 years 0.7 yea	See 1 647 90.79 10001 Clear Spann Shann Effect province Street DF 1Value Fr 9 (1) One 0 Desc. D
		ACM 9 6 Broot provens 1 30157 183940 35.8 15.12 40007 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600	note 8 Stree Stree provens 1 54500 163720 20 23 67 40001 note 2 543.22 52.801 188 13.86 40001	Freeze 1 440.75 03.4224 108 0.35 × 0.001 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	Description 5 342.5 15.7713 68.2 35.29 < 0.001 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0
		provens 2 264.68 64.1422 184 4.88 < 0001 008 provens 5 245.67 37.9215 185 6.49 < 0001	province 2 343.22 32.807 185 13.86 < 0001 fice province 3 316.29 30.2467 174 13.46 < 0001 Max.	7 204 52 120.52 108 3.28 0.0016 nos promins 3 455.56 74.9019 308 6.06 < 2001	noe 2 325.74 25.1685 276 11.17 < 0001 noe 2 325.74 25.1685 276 11.17 < 0001 noe 2 325.4 23.7965 256 12.8 < 0001 noe 2 325.4 23.7965 256 12.8 < 0001
		provene 4 292.39 20.3303 01.5 14.30 < 0001 608 provene 0 224.41 61.6494 230 3.64 0.0003	provina 4 300.59 (6.4875 27.5 18.55 < 0001 nee provina 5 254.26 < 6.8476 291 6.76 < 0001	AGE proving 4 400.07 412194 100 5.07 4.0001 AGE proving 5 511.07 105.54 108 5.02 0.0032	nee provena 4 32139 126907 50 8 23.45 < 0001 nee provena 5 274 88 4C0476 724 6.85 < 0001
		oce provena 6 275 15 34 518 151 5:00 < 0001 nee provena 7 290.51 24 0485 04.9 12:08 < 0001	nce provena 6 30729 355400 213 842 < 0001 file provena 7 306.50 19.0019 52.2 15.21 < 0001	nos granna 8 378.72 71.4336 138 5.3 4.0001	roce process 8 218.32 24.6023 259 12.09 10.001 roce process 7 313.1 15.8227 W3.2 19.79 10.001
		MCV province 8 370.30 61.300 200 6.02 < 0001 MCV	008 province 8 018.71 38.8775 300 13.72 - 0001 008 0090000 8 007.70 33.3445 300 840 - 0001	700 B 270 87 123.50 108 3.00 0.0029 108 108 271 0.0000	NOW
		Personal 9 (25-21 6102) 107 1-56 - 0.001 Personal 90 (292.34 (28.236) 107 11-56 - 0.001 Personal 91 (291.3 19.396) 42.8 12.95 - 0.001	proving \$ 327.5 33.565 252 \$ 60.7 00.17 00.6 proving \$9 323.5 35.6654 165 12.53 < 0001 666 666 11 312.51 14.0001 15.7 22.85 < 0001	700 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	Anne province 16 205.47 18.2115 253 16.54 <0001 760 1970-198 11 200.88 12.3136 27 25.15 <0001
		private 11 2019 193000 42.6 1296 <0001 609 provem 12 210.16 04.0454 154 246 5.0001	provena 11 312.91 14.0991 15.7 22.05 < 0001 Rda provena 12 336.69 32.465 213 10.2 - 0001 Rda	provens 19 69:33 37:2197 138 12:07 <0001 000 prevens 12 321:17 174.64 138 1.84 0.0079	provens 15 30536 123156 31 7 25.15 <0001 non provens 12 30732 25.8263 443 1632 <0001
1	J	2000 200	March Marc	March Marc	1
	Distantion of the last	nos provens 15 292.06 17.2799 29.4 16.36 - 0001 nos provens 16 294.01 22.0724 93.9 13.26 - 0001	nce proving 15 505.21 16.8645 31 16.1 - 0001 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.1 - 0001 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.0 16.0	nos provens 15 400.08 41.3254 108 9.75 <0001 nos provens 16 3/2.52 53.677 108 8.95 <0001	non provens 15 31634 123874 656 (A.31 4000) non non non non non non non non non no
13	7	Type It Trats of Fixed Effects Effect Num OF Den OF F Value Pt > F	New 20 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000		100
		Type 3 Touts of Find Effects 4Test Name Of Own OF # Valles Pr + F province 15 28.2 3.58 0.0000 nos 2 21.2 14.67 0.0004 Learn Squares Misers Learn Squares Misers			
		272 144 C004			
		provens 2 18750 64303 80.1 601 < 0001 nes			
		NOS 2 3.7191 04303 101 054 40001 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000			
		provine 5 3,843 0,484 127 2.94 < 0001 ACR provine 6 3,128 6,4106 67.3 7.62 < 0001			
		provene 8 0.0063 0.0296 10.4 16.5 < 0.001			
		POR DESCRIPTION OF THE PORT OF			
		provend 95 3.3064 0.3669 36-6 5.25 < 0001 606 provend 91 3.9156 0.2642 (11,7 14.43 < 0001 606			
		provene 12 4271 0.4022 162 524 - 0001 ecc provene 13 42007 03276 27.5 1236 - 0001			
		nce provene 14 5:1894 0:4197 23.5 12.36 < 0001 668 provene 15 1:0543 0:2562 12.2 10:05 < 0001			
3	-	NOT		Total III Tests of Flour Fature	
				Type II Tests of Freed Offices Bifect Num DF Den DF F Value Fr > F prevent 15 45 2.23 0.0111 Age	
		Block 9 120 142 4001 Clos Effect province Editinat Statist DF Status Proof p_ent		### 15 45 2.43 0.0111	
		7 province 1 1.7904 0.1644 120 12.44 - 0.001 0.80179 708 2 province 2 2.0522 0.2999 120 6.84 - 0.001 0.88617 709		7 provine 1 2-4364 C2219 10 10-64 - 3001 03-90 006 2 provine 2 1,0964 0364 48 3.73 0.0008 07962 664 2 070408 0 3 1,0008 0 464-5001 0.6775	
		9 growns 3 1.209 0.3407 120 5.35 4.0001 0.76927 718 4 growns 6 2.0612 0.1508 720 15.2 4.0001 0.86900 709		5 proeme 3 13076 0.4275 65 46.4001 0.8775 618 4 provens 4 17963 0.2012 65 8.75.4001 0.8575 008	
		5 province 5 2 145 0.3790 120 5.66 < 0.001 0.8562 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10		A province of 17955 0.2002 as 8.75 -0.001 0.8575 0.2012 as 8.75 -0.001 0.8575 0.2012 as 8.75 -0.001 0.7758	
		7 province 7 1.5373 G.1647 120 13.39 (0001 5.27605 6.66 8 province 8 2.6281 0.6690 120 5.6 (0001 0.83265		7 powers 7 13047 5,2129 45 8,54 4,0001 0,3658 rote 8 province 8 2,5047 5,6293 45 4,04 6,0002 0,8244	
		# Pice 9 1-5823 0.2628 120 6.29 < 0.001 0.83901 10 province 10 1-5827 0.2007 120 0.00 < 0.001 0.83903		9 proving 9 2,300 0,4001 45 4,67 <,0001 0,5153 mm = 10 2,4510 2,3848 49 0,27 <,0001 0,500	
				1	
		12 provine 12 24346 0.4025 120 6.06 4.0069 0.91946 0.00		12 provine 12 25629 85435 65 47<0001 03027 res 13 provine 13 1,6009 0,2612 45 6,13<0001 0,8321 res	
	J	14 primaria 14 10905 02015 120 5.49 <0001 024108 15 primaria 15 12802 0.1267 120 14.86 <0001 0.86768		14 priceire 14 4/362 1,0100 45 4.06 0,0002 0,942 15 priceire 15 1,7316 0,1604 15 8,6 < 0,001 0,8490 16 priceire	
3	ś	16 provens 16 1,2668 0,1068 120 11,86 < 0,001 0,78016		16 provene 16 1,5856 0,2121 45 5.12<0001 0,7476	

Appendix 3: soil samples

The first table shows the specific values for the soil samples by block, the second table shows the x and y coordinate where the sample was taken.

site	blok	Mg (mg/100 gts.)	P (mg/100 gts.)	K (mg/100 gts.)	Reaction count	pН
Drastrup	1	3.3	5.3	8.2	6.1	5.6
	2	3.9	4.4	6.7	6.4	5.9
	3	2.5	5.7	2.5	5.7	5.2
	4	2.5	4.8	2.1	6.3	5.8
	5	2.9	4.5	2.8	6.1	5.6
	6	3.1	4.2	2.6	6	5.5
	7	4.5	4.1	2.7	6.3	5.8
	8	4.2	3.1	1.8	6.3	5.8
	9	4.8	2.7	2.1	6.2	5.1
	mean	3.5	4.3	3.5	6.2	5.
						_
Tophøj	1a	2.4	1.3	4.9	6.9	6.4
	1b	2.5	2.3	4.9	5	4.
	2	1.7	2.2	3.1	5.3	4.5
	3	2.8	2.7	6.1	5.4	4.
	4	2.65	2.25	5.1	5.5	
	5	2.6	2.2	3.8	5.2	4.
	6	1.4	2.3	3.1	5.2	4.
	7	2.3	2.3	5.8	5.1	4.
	8	1.9	1.7	4.7	5.3	4.
	9a	2.8	1.3	5.3	5.6	5.
	9b	3.6	2.6	8.7	5.8	5.
	mean	2.3	2.2	4.8	5.4	4.
Sorø	1	9.1	2.1	9.2	7.4	6.9
	2	6.8	4.8	8.6	5.9	5.
	3	6.3	2.8	10	5.7	5.:
	4	4.8	2.3	6.7	7.4	6.
	5	17	2.4	7.9	6.9	6.
	6	6.8	1.6	7.6	5.3	4.
	7	8.1	5.5	7.8	5.1	4.
	8	6.5	3.7	6.8	5.1	4.
	9	8.2	2.6	7	7.1	6.
	mean	8.2	3.1	8.0	6.2	5.

Tophøj	Х	У
1a	17	10
1b	17	70
2	25	20
3	25	60
4a	4	130
4b	4	170
5	14	100
6	25	100
7	14	140
8	25	140
9a	12	170
9b	27	170
Drastrup		
1	6	20
2	18	20
3	30	20
4	6	60
5	18	60
6	30	60
7	6	100
8	18	100
9	30	100
Sorø		
1	6	20
2	18	20
3	30	20
4	42	20
5	56	20
6	12	52
7	30	52
8	42	52
9	56	52