Genetic control of coppice regrowth in *Eucalyptus* spp.

Marcos Rafael Amâncio¹, Fernanda Bortolanza Pereira², João Gabriel Zanon Paludeto¹, Amanda Roberta Vergani³, Odair Bison³, Fabiana Schmidt Bandeira Peres¹, Evandro Vagner Tambarussi^{1,2,4,*}

¹Midwestern State University (UNICENTRO), Forest Engineer Department, PR 153, Km 7, CEP 84500-000, Irati, PR, Brazil

²São Paulo State University (Unesp), Forest Science Graduate Program, Universitária Avenue, 3780, CEP 18610-034, Botucatu, SP, Brazil

³Duratex Florestal Ltda., Marechal Rondon Highway, Km 323, CEP 17139-899, Agudos, SP, Brazil

⁴Escola Superior de Agricultura "Luiz de Queiroz" ESALQ/USP, Pádua Dias Av., 11, CEP: 13418-900, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil;

*Corresponding Author: Evandro Vagner Tambarussi; e-mail: tambarussi@gmail.com

Abstract

Forest companies prefer a coppice system as a silvicultural strategy owing to its economic and sustainability advantages compared to developing new plantations for second rotations. However, studies aiming to determine the selection of superior genetic material for this management strategy are scarce. In this study, we evaluated five clonal tests of *Eucalyptus* spp. located in Itatinga and Angatuba, São Paulo State, Brazil, to determine the genetic correlations and control of productivity for regrowth management in two rotations. The volume (m³) and survival of the *Eucalyptus* spp. clonal tests were determined for the two rotations at 5.5 years of age. The experiments were carried out in a randomized block design with six replicates, five plants per plot, and unbalanced treatments. The heritability in the normal scale ($\hat{h}_n^2$) for the survival ranged from 0.056 to 0.11, the heritability in the broad sense ($\hat{h}_b^2$) ranged from 0.205 to 0.334, and the genotypic correlation was positive and high (0.71-0.86), and statistically significant to the genetic means for the two rotations. The ranking of the best clones in the second rotation was similar (76 %) to their ranking in the first selection. Thus, for the evaluated material, there was no need for the second measurement to obtain accurate selection when managing a coppice system.

Keywords: : coppice, quantitative genetics, tree breeding, urog-randis

Introduction

Trees of the *Eucalyptus* genus have a high commercial value because of characteristics like trunk straightness, elevated growth rates, the possibility of vegetative propagation, good mechanical wood quality, and adaptation to diverse climatic conditions (Eldridge et al., 1993). The *Eucalyptus* species in Brazil present the highest productivity and the lowest rotation time in the world (IBÁ, 2017).

Some Brazilian forest companies have begun to use a coppice system as a silvicultural practice, which consists of retaining sprout growth for the second rotation, in *Eucalyptus* plantations. This system is more economical (Guedes et al., 2011; Crous and Burger, 2015) and sustainable (Takahashi et al., 2009; Gabrielle et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2017) than establishing new plantations. In forest plantations, the coppice system can only be used with species that re-sprout from the epicormic buds present on the trunk after a clear-cut. This silvicultural system presents a high rate of initial growth compared to the first rotation because of a range of factors, including organic and inorganic sources available to stumps and an already formed root system that facilitates initial plant growth (Reis and Kimmins, 1986; Reis and Reis, 1991; Whittcock et al., 2003).

However, in some cases, the volume of production in the second rotation is lower than that observed in the first rotation (Ribeiro et al., 1987; Fontenele et al., 2018). This is associated with many factors, such as the season and height of cutting, the number of sprouts retained, the health of the stump,

location of the plantation, and genetic material (Ribeiro et al., 1987; Higa and Sturion, 1997; Perrando and Corder, 2006).

Estimating genetic parameters can be understood as the search for methods to determine the genetic mechanisms underlying quantitative traits and the kind of selection that must be used in breeding programs (Vencovsky, 1969). The genetic control of traits can be assessed by using the estimates of the genetic parameters obtained from the mean or variance components (Falconer and Mackay, 1996).

Owing to the scarcity of the genetic information on the regrowth capacity of *Eucalypts*, this study aimed to estimate the genetic control of productivity for coppice systems in the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones and answer the following questions: (i) are there any genetic correlations between the observed productivities of the first and the second rotation coppice systems? (ii) is clonal selection necessary for the second rotation?

Materials and Methods

Experimental material

The data used for this experiment include the measurements taken before the forest plantation clear-cut for the first and second rotations of five clonal tests (Table 1) that were parts of independent experiments belonging to the Duratex S/A forest company. Therefore, the clones and species evaluated were not necessarily the same in all different locations, making it impossible to perform analysis across the sites. The species used in the experiments were *Eucalyptus grandis* W. Hill ex Maiden (from Coffs Harbour), *Eucalyptus saligna* Sm. (undefined provenance), *Eucalyptus urophylla* S.T. Blake (from the Island Flores), and the hybrid *E. urophylla* × *E. grandis* (*E. urograndis*). The clonal test was established using a randomized block design, with linear plots of five trees, six blocks, and different number of treatments (Table 1). The experiments were established in the municipalities of Itatinga and Angatuba, São Paulo State. According to the Köppen and Geiger (1936) classification, the climate of the study area was classified as Cfa: humid, temperate with hot summers, annual average temperatures of 19.1 °C and 19.9 °C, and annual average rainfalls of 1,308 mm and 1,215 mm for Itatinga and Angatuba, respectively. Four of the study areas presented the soil classified as typic dystrophic Red-Yellow Latosols with a sandy, medium texture, and the fifth area presented dystrophic Red Latosol with a clayey texture.

Planting for the first rotation was realized in 2001 for all tests and measurements before forest clear-cut were conducted in 2007 for the first rotation and in 2012 for the second rotation. Two sprouts per individual were retained for all plants, except for the plants located next to the individuals that failed to re-sprout, for which three sprouts were retained.

The individual volume was estimated using volumetric equations provided by the company. The measurement of diameter at breast height (DBH) and total height was performed using a diameter calliper and hypsometer, respectively. Survival was evaluated for both rotations in each site.

Table 1

Clonal tests of *Eucalyptus* spp. evaluated at 5.5 years of age in each rotation, with their respective number of treatments (clones) and spacing. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Experiment	Species/number of treatments				Spacing (m)
	<i>E. grandis</i>	<i>E. urograndis</i>	<i>E. saligna</i>	<i>E. urophylla</i>	
1	20	1	2	1	4.5 × 1.33
2	20	15	0	0	4 × 1.2
3	23	8	0	11	4.5 × 1.33
4	11	1	0	11	4.5 × 1.33
5	33	3	1	19	4 × 1.5

Statistical analysis

We estimated the components of variance for volume and survival for both measurements in each site, using the variance analysis and the following additive model:

$$y = X\beta + Zg + Wb + e,$$

where y is a vector of measurements at two different rotations for each tree, β is the vector of block effects (fixed), g is the vector of clone effects, b is the effects of clone × rotation interaction, and e is the vector of residual effects with normal and homoscedastic distribution; g , b , and e are random effects; X , Z , and W represent the incidence matrices for the respective effects.

The analysis was performed using the software R (R Core Team 2018) and the mixed-model statistical package *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015). In this package, we used the *lmer* function to estimate the variance components by restricted maximum likelihood (REML).

Genetic parameter estimates

The following components of variance were estimated: genetic variance among clones ($\hat{\sigma}_g^2$), residual variance ($\hat{\sigma}_e^2$), clone × rotation variance ($\hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$), and phenotypic variance ($\hat{\sigma}_f^2 = \hat{\sigma}_g^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$). From the variance components, we obtained:

a) Heritability in the broad sense: $\hat{h}_g^2 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_g^2}{\hat{\sigma}_f^2}$

b) For survival, the heritability in the normal range and broad sense: $h_n^2 = h_{0/1}^2[p(1-p)]/z^2$ (Dempster and Lerner, 1950); where $h_{0/1}^2$ is the binomial heritability in the broad sense, p is the frequency of phenotype; and z is the order of the standard normal curve corresponding to the probability p .

c) Experimental variation coefficient: $\widehat{CV}_{exp} = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_e^2}}{\bar{m}}$; where $\bar{m}$ is the mean.

d) Genetic variation coefficient: $\widehat{CV}_g(\%) = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_g^2}}{\bar{m}} * 100$; where $\bar{m}$ is the mean volume.

For survival, the heritabilities were estimated at the binomial scale and later transformed to the standard scale. This transformation is only applicable when the heritabilities are less than or equal to 0.3, which was the case in our study (Van Vleck, 1971; Lopes et al., 2000).

BLUPs and correlation estimates

We obtained the best linear unbiased predictions (BLUPs) using the genetic values generated by the `ranef` function of the mixed-model `lme4` package (Bates et al., 2015) in the R software (R Core Team, 2018). The correlations were estimated using the `chart.correlation` function of the *Performance Analytics* package (Peterson and Carl, 2018), which uses the Pearson coefficient of correlation by default. For this analysis, we considered the mean prediction of each clone in each rotation.

Results

The average survival was lower in experiments 4 and 5 (< 70 %) than the other experiments (84.6-90.3 %, Table 2). The heritabilities in the normal range and narrow sense were low in all experiments, ranging from 0.057 (experiment 4) to 0.112 (experiment 1).

Significant (1 % for LRT) differences among clones and clone $\times$ rotation interactions were detected for the volume in all five experiments (Table 3). However, no differences were detected in experiment 5 among clones and clone $\times$ rotation interactions for survival, but it was the only experiment with

significant interaction between clones and rotation. This suggests that the clones presented different survival between rotations. The clone $\times$ block interactions were significant in all experiments for both traits (Table 4).

The residual variance ($\hat{\sigma}_e^2$: 0.018-0.029) was predominantly higher than the other variance components (Table 5). The heritability in the broad sense ($\hat{h}_g^2$) ranged from 0.190 (experiment 3) to 0.281 (experiment 1).

For selecting the best genetic material, the best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) associated with the random effect of $\hat{\sigma}_g^2$ (g) was added to the BLUP associated with the random interaction between clones and rotation $\hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$ (ge) plus the mean of their respective trait at each rotation (u). On average, 76 % of the clones selected in the first evaluation were also the best in the second rotation. This result was particularly evident in experiment 3, wherein nine of the top ten clones were also observed among the top ten in the second rotation, while in experiment 1, only five of the top ten were observed in the next rotation (Table 6).

Positive and high correlations were observed among the rotations in the coppice system for all experiments (Figure 1) when performed for the mean genetic values predicted for the clones in each rotation, corroborating the results presented in Table 6. The Pearson correlation coefficient was high (0.71-0.86), suggesting that such variation might help select clones in the first rotation for production after regrowth.

Table 2

Estimates of genetic parameters for the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones obtained from the combined analysis of survival for two rotations, each evaluated at 5.5 years of age. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Parameter	Experiments				
	1	2	3	4	5
$\hat{\sigma}_f^2$	0.122	0.085	0.129	0.224	0.168
$\hat{\sigma}_g^2$ (SE)	0.006 (0.0025)	0.002 (0.0012)	0.006 (0.002)	0.008 (0.004)	0.009 (0.003)
$\hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$	0	0	0	0	0.026 (0.001)
$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$ (SE)	0.116 (0.004)	0.083 (0.002)	0.123 (0.0035)	0.216 (0.008)	0.158 (0.010)
$\hat{h}_{0/1}^2$ (SE)	0.048 (0.02)	0.029 (0.02)	0.048 (0.01)	0.035 (0.02)	0.048 (0.02)
$\hat{h}_n^2$	0.112	0.084	0.111	0.057	0.081
$\bar{C}V_g(\%)$	8.9	5.5	9.3	13.6	14.2
$\bar{C}V_e(\%)$	39.8	31.8	41.5	72.1	58.7
$\bar{x}(\sigma) \%$	85.5 (35.2)	90.3 (29.6)	84.6 (36.1)	64.5 (47.9)	67.8 (46.7)

$\hat{h}_{0/1}^2$: inomial heritability in the narrow sense; $\hat{h}_n^2$: heritability in the normal range in the narrow sense; $\bar{C}V_g(\%)$: coefficient of genetic variation; $\bar{C}V_e(\%)$: coefficient of experimental variation; $\bar{x}$: mean survival (standard deviation), SE: standard error.

Table 3

Analysis of deviance and likelihood ratio test (LRT) for the volume (m^3) and survival of the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones and clone $\times$ rotation interactions in two rotations at 5.5 years of age. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4, were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Trait	Deviance	Experiment				
		1	2	3	4	5
Volume (m^3)	$\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone}}$	12.164*	35.091*	29.925*	12.028*	12.058*
	$\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone} \times \text{Rotation}}$	98.245*	12.794*	24.731*	26.134*	96.613*
Survival	$\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone}}$	10.332*	7.494*	17.798*	10.296*	2.361
	$\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone} \times \text{Rotation}}$	0	0.2178	0.017	0	124.975*

*: significant at 1% probability by LRT; $\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone}}$: likelihood ratio test of clone; $\text{LRT}_{\text{Clone} \times \text{Rotation}}$: likelihood ratio test of clone $\times$ rotation interaction.

Table 4

F test with Satterthwaite approximation for fixed effects ($F_{\text{Clone} \times \text{Block}}$) for the traits, volume (m^3) and survival, of the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones in two rotations at 5.5 years of age. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Experiments	Volume (m^3)	Survival
	P-value	P-value
1	0.0007	<0.0001
2	0.0052	<0.0001
3	<0.0001	<0.0001
4	<0.0001	<0.0001
5	<0.0001	<0.0001

Table 5

Estimates of genetic parameters for the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones obtained from the combined analysis of volume (m^3) for two rotations, each evaluated at 5.5 years of age. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Parameter	Experiments				
	1	2	3	4	5
$\hat{\sigma}_f^2$	0.032	0.030	0.027	0.044	0.042
$\hat{\sigma}_g^2$	0.009 (0.0035)	0.007 (0.0019)	0.005 (0.0016)	0.011 (0.0049)	0.01 (0.0022)
$\hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$	0.005 (0.0015)	0.001 (0.0005)	0.001 (0.001)	0.004 (0.004)	0.009 (0.004)
$\hat{\sigma}_e^2$	0.018 (0.0007)	0.022 (0.0007)	0.021 (0.0007)	0.029 (0.0014)	0.023 (0.0009)
$\hat{h}_n^2$	0.281 (0.08)	0.233 (0.05)	0.190 (0.05)	0.25 (0.10)	0.24 (0.08)
$\bar{C}V_g(\%)$	32.49	26.26	22.67	26.45	30.26
$\bar{C}V_e(\%)$	45.88	46.50	44.66	42.66	45.25
$\bar{x}(\sigma)$	0.295 (0.181)	0.322 (0.175)	0.327 (0.173)	0.403 (0.221)	0.332 (0.203)

$\hat{\sigma}_f^2$: phenotypic variance; $\hat{\sigma}_g^2$: quadratic component associated with genotypic variance; $\hat{\sigma}_{gr}^2$: variance of the clone $\times$ rotation interaction; $\hat{\sigma}_e^2$: residual variance; $\hat{h}_n^2$: heritability in the broad sense for mean clones; $\bar{C}V_g(\%)$: coefficient of genetic variation; $\bar{C}V_e(\%)$: coefficient of experimental variation; $\bar{x}$: mean volume (m^3) (standard deviation).

Table 6

Best Linear Unbiased Prediction (BLUP) for volume based on the means of the clones from two rotations and ranking of the best *Eucalyptus* spp. clones at 5.5 years. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Ranking	Experiment 1		Experiment 2		Experiment 3		Experiment 4		Experiment 5	
	Rotation 1		Rotation 2		Rotation 1		Rotation 2		Rotation 1	
	Clone	<i>g+ge+u</i>	Clone	<i>g+ge+u</i>	Clone	<i>g+ge+u</i>	Clone	<i>g+ge+u</i>	Clone	<i>g+ge+u</i>
1	159	0.512	159	0.845	119	0.498	119	0.605	144	0.431
2	119	0.408	119	0.653	115	0.435	118	0.502	152	0.427
3	70	0.322	50	0.337	96	0.424	115	0.501	108	0.541
4	61	0.316	79	0.335	118	0.414	120	0.461	152	0.539
5	49	0.303	70	0.324	120	0.407	96	0.452	151	0.497
6	34	0.298	68	0.313	97	0.395	99	0.427	158	0.502
7	41	0.284	9	0.312	101	0.380	107	0.422	151	0.497
8	76	0.284	76	0.312	107	0.377	106	0.417	158	0.502
9	63	0.283	49	0.303	99	0.371	98	0.409	158	0.502
10	30	0.279	62	0.301	103	0.362	103	0.406	158	0.502

Figure 1

Estimates of genotypic correlations with volume in five experiments for the *Eucalyptus* spp. clones in two different rotations based on the Pearson correlation coefficient. Letters A, B, C, D, and E represent experiments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. ***P < 0.001. Experiments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were established in Itatinga, SP, and experiment 5 in Angatuba, SP.

Discussion

The significant effects found for the survival trait in the four experiments (1, 2, 3, and 4) indicated that this trait varied according to the genetic material, whereas the opposite was seen for the interaction between clones and rotation, wherein the result was not significant for the same four experiments, indicating that rotation did not influence survival (Table 3).

The high average percentage of survival obtained in experiments 1, 2, and 3 (Table 2) is similar to that reported previously in the literature for *Eucalyptus* spp. clones at ages up to 7 years (Souza et al., 2012; Fontenele et al., 2018). The high average of survival allowed us to conclude that the materials are well adapted to the experimental environments 1, 2, and 3, and survival is not an essential trait for selection in this specific breeding program.

The heritability (in the normal scale) for survival was low in all experiments, according Stansfield (1974) heritability classification (low < 0.2, intermediary: 0.2-0.5; high > 0.5). Studying the clones of *E. grandis*, Osorio et al. (2001) observed similar values for survival heritability (0.11) in an experiment with similar averages of survival (close to 90 %).

The heritability ($\hat{h}_g^2$) value for volume was intermediate in all experiments, except for experiment 3, in which the heritability value was low.

For both traits (volume and survival), the residual coefficient of variation ($\widehat{CV}_e(\%)$) was very high (31.8-72.1 %). According to the classification of Mora and Arriagada (2016), values of $\widehat{CV}_e(\%) > 30\%$ are usually indicative of poorly controlled experiments or problems in the data (Brown, 1998; Taylor et al., 1999). However, for field experiments, especially those with forest species, it is very common to find the values of $\widehat{CV}_e(\%)$ above 30 % (Moraes et al., 2015). It is important to emphasize that volume is an indirectly obtained trait, and therefore, it gathers both the measurement errors of the variables used in its estimation (diameter at breast height and height) as well as the errors of the estimate itself (residual error). This fact also helps in increasing the $\widehat{CV}_e(\%)$ estimates.

The coefficient of genetic variation ($\widehat{CV}_g(\%)$) for volume indicated high levels of genetic variability in all five experiments. These results can be explained by the fact that the trials present more than one *Eucalyptus* species, increasing the $\widehat{CV}_g(\%)$ value in each experiment. In most cases, the $\widehat{CV}_g(\%)$ values reported in the studies based on the pure populations of *Eucalyptus* spp. (Kageyama and Vencovsky, 1983; Santos et al., 2015; Henriques et al., 2017) were lower than those obtained in the studies on the hybrid populations (Moraes et al., 2014; Paludeto et al., 2017; Tambarussi et al., 2017a, b). Thus, the $\widehat{CV}_g(\%)$ value was increased probably because of the presence of two or more genomes in each population, resulting in high genetic variability.

In experiments 1 and 2, the top-ranked clones across both rotations were the same (clone 159 and 119, respectively). For all clones evaluated, the genetic values predicted in the second rotation were superior to those predicted in the first; this can be explained by the larger individual volume observed in the

second clear-cut, given the retention of more than one sprout per tree, thereby increasing its volume considerably.

Gonçalves et al. (1997) studied clonal response in the second rotation based on the selection made in the first rotation for *E. grandis* half-sib families. They observed that compared to the first rotation, the gains were greater than 67 % of the expected gains if the selection was performed directly in the second rotation, indicating this strategy has a high level of accuracy. Nevertheless, the Pearson correlation results allowed us to infer that the clones selected in the first rotation would be the best in the coppice system. Thus, considering the lack of other studies that corroborate with one or another conclusion, a possible strategy is to perform a preliminary evaluation, considering the plant genetic material in both rotations, to understand the response to clonal selection in each breeding program.

Conclusions

A high and positive genotypic correlation exists between the productivities obtained for the coppice silvicultural system in the first and second rotations.

In the present breeding program, there was no need to perform a selection in the second rotation for the coppice system; this increased the efficiency and genetic gains in the breeding programs for this production system. Future studies are necessary to conclude the overall behaviour of clonal selection in coppice systems.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

To Duratex for the experiment deployment and the data. Fernanda Bortolanza Pereira and João Gabriel Zanon Paludeto were supported by CAPES Master's Degree scholarship and Professor Evandro Vagner Tambarussi, Ph.D. are supported by a National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq) research fellowship."

References

- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1-48. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Brown CE (1998) Coefficient of Variation. In: *Applied Multivariate Statistics in Geohydrology and Related Sciences*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-80328-4_13

- Crous JW, Burger L (2015) A comparison of planting and coppice regeneration of *Eucalyptus grandis* x *Eucalyptus urophylla* clones in South Africa. *Southern Forests: a Journal of Forest Science*, 77(4): 277–285. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2989/20702620.2015.1063031>
- Dempster ER, Lerner IM (1950) Heritability of threshold characters. *Genetics*, Bethesda, 35(2): 212–236.
- Eldridge SR, Thornburn PJ, Mcewan KL, Hatton TJ (1993) Health and structure of *Eucalyptus* communities on Chowilla and Monoman Islands of the River Murray floodplain, South Australia. CSIRO Division of Water Resources, Adelaide.
- Falconer DS, Mackay TFC (1989) *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*. Pearson Prentice Hall, Harlow.
- Falconer DS, Mackay TFC (1996) "Introduction to quantitative genetics. 1996." Harlow, Essex, UK: Longmans Green 3.
- Fontenele NM, Silva JAA, Ferreira RLC, Berger R, Gadeha FHL, Guerra MOG (2018) Volumetric and economic evaluation of *Eucalyptus* spp. clones in high forest, coppice and native vegetation systems at the Gypsum Pole of Araripe – PE. *Scientia Forestalis* 46(117): 77–86. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18671/scifor.v46n117.07>
- Gabrielle B, The NN, Maupu P, Vial E (2013) Life cycle assessment of *Eucalyptus* short rotation coppices for bioenergy production in southern France. *GCB Bioenergy* 5:30–42. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12008>
- Gonçalves GA, Ramalho MAP, Andrade HB, Marques OGM (1997) Resposta na segunda rotação pela seleção efetuada na primeira, em famílias de meios-irmãos de *Eucalyptus grandis* Hill ex Maiden. *Revista Árvore* 21(3): 377–383.
- Guedes ICL, Coelho LM Jr, Oliveira AD, Mello JM, Rezende JLP, Silva CPC (2011) Economic analysis of replacement regeneration and coppice regeneration in *Eucalyptus* stands under risk conditions. *Cerne* 17(3): 393–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-77602011000300014>
- Henriques EP, Moraes CB, Sebbenn AM, Tomazello Filho M, Moraes MLT, Mori ES (2017) Estimativa de parâmetros genéticos para caracteres silviculturais e densidade do lenho em teste de progênie de *Eucalyptus urophylla*. *Scientia Forestalis* 45(113): 119–128. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18671/scifor.v45n113.11>
- Higa RCV, Sturion JA (1997) Capacidade de brotação em subgêneros e espécies de *Eucalyptus*. *Série Técnica – IPEF*, 11(30): 23–30.
- Indústria Brasileira De Árvores [IBÁ] (2017) Relatório IBÁ 2017. Brasília. https://iba.org/images/shared/Biblioteca/IBA_RelatorioAnual2017.pdf. Accessed on 25 March 2018.
- Kageyama PY, Vencovsky R (1983) Variação genética em progênie de uma população de *Eucalyptus grandis* (Hill) Maiden. *IPEF* 24: 9–26.
- Lopes UV, Huber DA, White TL (2000) Comparison of methods for prediction of genetic gain from mass selection on binary threshold traits. *Silvae Genetica* (49): 50–56.
- Mora F, Arriagada O (2016) A classification proposal for coefficients of variation in *Eucalyptus* experiments involving survival, growth and wood quality variables. *Bragantia* 75(3): 263–267. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-4499.458>
- Moraes CB, Freitas TCM, Pieroni GB, Resende MDV, Zimback L, Mori ES (2014) Genetic parameters of *Eucalyptus* clones for early selection in frost occurrence region. *Scientia Forestalis* 42(102): 219–227.
- Osorio LF, White TL, Huber DA (2001). Age trends of heritabilities and genotype-by-environment interactions for growth traits and wood density from clonal trials of *Eucalyptus grandis* Hill ex Maiden. *Silvae Genetica*, 50(3–4), 108–116.
- Paludeto JGZ, Estopa RA, Tambarussi EV (2017) Efficiency of early selection in *Eucalyptus grandis* W. Hill ex Maiden x *Eucalyptus urophylla* S. T. Blake clones. *Revista do Instituto Florestal* 29(2): 169–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24278/2178-5031.201729203>
- Perrando ER, Corder MPM (2006) Rebrotas de cepas de *Acacia mearnsii* em diferentes idades, épocas do ano e alturas de corte. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira* 41(4): 555–562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-204X2006000400002>
- Peterson BG, Carl P (2018) *PerformanceAnalytics: Econometric Tools for Performance and Risk Analysis*. R package version 1.5.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=PerformanceAnalytics>. Accessed on 20 January 2018
- R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>. Accessed on 20 January 2018
- Ramalho MAP, Santos JB, Pinto CABP (2008) *Genética na agropecuária*. UFLA Publisher, Lavras.
- Reis GG, Reis MGF (1991) Respostas estomáticas e mudanças nos níveis de reservas de plantas intactas e de brotações de *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* Dehn. Submetidas à deficiência hídrica no solo. *Revista Árvore* 15(2): 112–25.
- Reis MGF, Kimmins JP (1986) Importância do sistema radicular no crescimento inicial de brotos de *Eucalyptus* spp. *Revista Árvore* 10(2): 196–201.
- Ribeiro FA, Macedo PRO, Mendes CJ, Suiter Filho W (1987) Segunda rotação de eucalipto. *Série Técnica – IPEF* 4(11): 23–29.
- Santos PET, Pludzyszyn Filho E, Silva LTM, Vadsresen PB (2015) Genetic variation for growth and selection in adult plants of *Eucalyptus badjensis*. *Genetics and Molecular Biology* 38(4): 457–464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1415-475738420150041>
- Santos CEM, Bruckner CH, Cruz DC, Siqueira DL, Pimentel LD, Rosado LDS (2010) Repetibilidade em características do fruto do maracujazeiro. *Revista Ceres* 57(3): 343–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-737X2010000300009>
- Satterthwaite FE (1946) An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components. *Biometrics Bulletin* 2(6): 110–114. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3002019>
- Souza FC, Reis GG, Reis MDGF, Leite HG, Alves FF, Faria RS, Pereira MM (2012) Sobrevivência e diâmetro de plantas intactas e brotações de clones de eucalipto. *Floresta e Ambiente* 19(1): 44–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4322/floram.2012.006>
- Stansfield WD (1974). *Genética*. McGraw-Hill do Brasil, São Paulo.
- Takahashi N, Egashira Y, Aikawa S, Kojima T (2009) Woody biomass production by utilizing coppice of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* in an arid area in western Australia. *Journal of Arid Land Studies* 19(1): 53–56.
- Tambarussi EV, Lima BM, Queiroz RC, Peres FSB, Dias DC, Pagliarini MK, Pereira FB, Rosa JRB, Rezende GDSP (2017a) Estimativas de parâmetros genéticos para a seleção precoce em clones de *Eucalyptus* spp. *Scientia Forestalis* 45(115): 507–517. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18671/scifor.v45n115.08>
- Tambarussi EV, Pereira FB, Azevedo VA, Peres FSB, Dias AN, Furlan RA (2017b) Variabilidade genética em clones de *Eucalyptus* spp. para Grajaú, estado do Maranhão. *Revista do Instituto Florestal* 29(2): 253–261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24278/2178-5031.201729209>
- Taylor SL, Payton ME, Raun WR (1999) Relationship between mean yield, coefficient of variation, mean square error, and plot size in wheat field experiments. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 30:9–10, 1439–1447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00103629909370298>
- Van Vleck LD (1972) Estimation of heritability of threshold characters. *Journal of Dairy Science*, Champaign 55(2): 218–255. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(72\)85463-8](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(72)85463-8)
- Vencovsky R (1969) Genética quantitativa. In: Kerr WE (Ed) *Melhoramento e genética*. Melhoramentos, São Paulo, pp. 17–37.
- Whitlock SP, Apolaza LA, Kelly CM, Potts BM (2003) Genetic control of coppice and lignotuber development in *Eucalyptus globulus*. *Australian Journal of Botany* 51: 57–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/BT02049>
- Zhou XG, Ye D, Zhu HG, Li XQ, Su Y, Lan J, Wen YG (2017) Effects of second rotation seedlings and coppice on understorey vegetation and timber production of *Eucalyptus* plantations. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science* 29(1): 54–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44028275>.