RIL88 _(qph1)	×	RIL279	Evaluation
Backcro with RIL 4 genera	ssec 88 fe ation	d I or I Is V	Ρ
RIL88 _(qph1)	×	BC₄F₁ (05YH175-2)	
		V⊗ BC E	G
DU 00		$\bigvee_{i=1}^{i=1} \otimes i_{i=1}^{i_{i}} \otimes i_{i=1}^{i_{$	G, P
RIL88 _(qph1)	×	$\mathbb{BC}_{4}F_{3}(06YH054-6)$	G, P
		BC₅F ₁	•
		₩ [⊗] BC ₅ F ₂	G
		$\mathbf{v}\otimes$	G, P
		BC₅F₃	C P
RIL88 _(aph1)	×	Ψ ⊗ BC₅F₄(08YB036-7)	G, P
			G, P
		BC ₆ F₁ √⊗	G P
		BC ₆ F ₂	0, .
		\mathbf{h}_{\otimes}	G, P
		BC ₆ F ₃ RIL88 _(QPH1)	

Figure S1. Construction of *qph1* fine mapping population BC_6F_2 and near-isogenic line RIL88_(QPH1). G=evaluated by genotyping; P=evaluated by phenotyping.



Figure S2. Fine mapping of qph1 in BC₄F₂ and BC₄F_{2:3}.

qph1 was mapped to an interval between marker umc1035 and umc2236 and co-segregated with umc2396. PH=plant height, EH=ear height, DTPS=days to pollen shedding, DTS=days to silking, ED=ear diameter, EL=ear length, EW=ear weight. HN=data collected from Hainan, China. BJ=data collected from Beijing, China.











Figure S3. Phenotypic variation and distribution of yield-related traits in BC₄F_{2:3.}

qph1/qph1, QPH1/qph1 and *QPH1/QPH1* plants are indicated in blue, green and red respectively, Horizontal axis stands for variation scales of different agronomic traits and vertical axis stands for numbers of plants within certain ranges.



Figure S4. Stalk internode length variation between RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1).

Variation rate = $[(RIL88_{(QPH1)}-RIL88_{(qph1)})/RIL88_{(QPH1)}] \times 100\%$. Internodes were counted from ground up. The uppermost internodes exhibited no significant difference in length and the variation rates gradually increase from the top of the plants towards the bottom, with the lowest internode having the greatest reduction in internode length.



Figure S5. Scanning electron microscopy examination of the sixth internode from RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1).

The sixth internode of RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1) in mid-elongation stage were subjected histological analysis. A and B, longitudinal sections of the parenchyma cells in RIL88_(qph1) (left) and RIL88_(QPH1) (right); C and D, transverse view of the parenchyma cells in RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1); E and F, transverse view of the epidermal region of RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1).



Figure S6. Scanning electron microscopy examination of the uppermost internode from RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1).

The uppermost internode of RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1) in adult stage were subjected to histological analysis. A and B, longitudinal sections of the parenchyma cells in RIL88_(qph1) (left) and RIL88_(QPH1) (right); C and D, transverse view of the parenchyma cells in RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1); E and F, transverse view of the epidermal region of RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1).



Figure S7. Allelism test of *qph1*.

A. Plant height comparison between hybrids derived by RIL88_(qph1)×*br*2 mutants and RIL88_(QPH1)×*br*2 mutants. B. Ear height comparison between hybrids derived by RIL88_(qph1)×*br*2 mutants and RIL88_(QPH1)×*br*2 mutants. C. Significance test of Plant height and ear height between *br*2-117a/*br*2-117a, *br*2-117a/*qph1* and *qph1/qph1* individuals in the RIL88_(qph1)×117A F₂ population. D. RIL88_(qph1), RIL88_(qph1)×117A, 117A, RIL88_(QPH1)×117A and RIL88_(QPH1). E. Plant height and ear height performance of RIL88_(qph1), RIL88_(QPH1) and the four *br*2 mutants (from left to right: RIL88_(qph1), 114F, 114G, 117A, 121B and RIL88_(QPH1)). Error bars indicate S.D.



Figure S8. Sub-cellular localization of *QPH1*.

(A-C) Transient expression of GFP in onion epidermal cells in bright (A), merge (B) and dark (C) field. (D-F) Transient expression of *QPH1-GFP* in onion epidermal cells in bright (D), merge (E) and dark (F) field.



Figure S9. *qph1* expression in RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1) internodes from three developmental stages during elongation.

s1, s2 and s3 represent three different developmental stages of RIL88_(qph1) and RIL88_(QPH1) during elongation. In stage 1 (s1), which is at the beginning of elongation stage, plants have 8 expanded leaves and 13 visible leaves; in stage 2 (s2), which is in the middle of elongation, plants have 9 expanded leaves and 14 visible leaves; in stage 3 (s3), which is near the end of elongation, plants have 11 expanded leaves and 16 visible leaves. Relative expression level of *QPH1* (*qph1*) to the endogenous control $zm\beta$ -actin is shown.



Figure S10. Plant height (A) and yield performance (B) comparison between individuals of different genotypes in B73×Ye107 F_2 population.



Figure S11. Plant height and ear height segregation in 9 F₂ populations of N546 conversion lines and normal inbred lines.

*Significant difference between *br2-bj/Br2* and *BR2/Br2* individuals (0.05 level) **Highly significant different between *br2-bj/Br2* and *BR2/Br2* individuals (0.01 level) Data is expressed as mean ± s.d.



Figure S12. Yield component analysis of the four F_2 populations.

- 1, 2, 3, 4, represent 4F1×81162 , Ye107×Zheng32, Ye107×B73 and Zong3×Chuan48-2 F₂ populations
- * Phentotype between individuals of different genotypes reached significant level (0.05)
- ** Phentotype between individuals of different genotypes reached significant level (0.01)