Indian J. Genet., 61(2): 165-166 (2001)

Short Communication



Generation means analysis for grain yield and its components in maize (Zea mays L.)

R. N. Mahto and D. K. Ganguli

Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Birsa Agricultural University, Ranchi 834 006

(Received: January 2000; Revised: September 2000; Accepted: March 2001)

Generation means analysis of three crosses, CML56 \times CML49, CML85 × CML42 and CML39 × CML14 involving six inbred lines of maize was carried out in respect of grain yield and its component characters. Six generation viz; P1, P2, F1, F2, BC1, and BC2 of each of three crosses were separately grown in compact family block design with three replications during kharif 1997 in the farm of Birsa Agricultural University, Ranchi. The net plot size was of 5m. length of two rows each for P1, P2, F1, BC1, and BC2 and of four rows for F2 generation. The recommended inter row spacing of 70 cm. and intra row spacing of 25 cm. was maintained. Observation on grain yield (g/plant), days to tasseling, days to maturity, plant height, ear length, ear girth, kernel rows/ear, kernels/row, kernels/ear and 100-grain weight were recorded randomly on ten plants from both the parental generation (P1 and P2) and F1's, 20 plants from back cross generations (BC1 and BC2) and on 50 plants from F₂ generation from each plot. The scaling tests A, B and C [1] and joint scaling test [2] were computed for all the ten characters in three crosses to test the adequacy of the additive dominance model. The gene effects and interactions for each characters were estimated after Hayman [3].

Out of three scaling test at least one or two scale and joint scaling test were found significant in all the three crosses for most of the characters. This indicated the presence of epistatic/digenic interactions [4, 5].

The estimate of mean (m) was highly significant for all the characters in all the crosses (Table 1). Both additive (d) and dominance (h) gene effects were significant in respect of grain yield, days to tasseling, days to maturity, plant height, ear length, ear girth and kernels/ear in the cross CML85 \times CML42 and in respect of three characters viz; plant height, days to maturity and ear girth in the cross CML56 \times CML49 and only two characters i.e. plant height and days to maturity in the cross CML39 \times CML14. The additive and dominance gene effects were significant only for plant height and days to maturity in all the three crosses. The dominance component (h) was significant and greater in magnitude than the additive effect (d) for most of the traits in all the three crosses. This indicated predominant role of dominance gene action in controlling the above traits. Importance of the dominance gene effects in maize has been reported in the inheritance of plant height, ear length, ear girth and grain yield [4], ear diameter and kernel rows/ear [5], for 100-grain weight [6] and for maturity [7].

Among the digenic interaction effects, additive \times additive (i) and dominance \times dominance (l) interaction were significant for most of the characters. The interactions (I) was negative and greater in magnitude than (i) for most of the characters in all the three crosses. Importance of epistatic effect in the inheritance of ear length, kernel rows/ear, kernels/row and 100-grain weight has also been reported [6]. Epistatic gene action was relatively more important than additive gene effect but less important than the dominance gene effect for plant height, ear length, ear girth, kernel rows/ear and seed yield [4]. All the three epistatic interactions were observed to be significant for plant height and ear length in the cross CML56 × CML49, for grain yield and 100-grain weight in the cross CML85 × CML42 and for days to tasseling and ear girth in the cross CML39 × CML14. The magnitude of the additive \times additive (i) and dominant \times dominant (I) interactions was more than the magnitude of additive × dominance (j) for most of the characters. Duplicate gene action was observed for most of the characters which indicated hinderance in selection improvement. In this situation reciprocal recurrent selection is likely to be useful for the effective utilization of both type additive and non- additive gene actions simultaneously [8].

Table 1.	Genetic	components of	generation	means	in th	nree	maize	crosses	for	yield	and	its	components
----------	---------	---------------	------------	-------	-------	------	-------	---------	-----	-------	-----	-----	------------

Cross	Genetic components								
	(m)	(d)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(I)	interaction		
Grain yield									
$CML56 \times CML49$	$96.9 \pm 2.4^{**}$	3.5 ± 3.2	$135.2 \pm 12.5^{**}$	70.2 ± 11.9 ^{**}	3.1 ± 3.6	-112.9 ± 18.1	D		
CML85 × CML42	61.1 ± 1.5 ^{**}	$11.7 \pm 2.9^{**}$	98.3 ± 8.8 ^{**}	32.2 ± 8.4	13.3 ± 3.3 ^{**}	63.2 ± 14.2 ^{**}	С		
CML39 × CML14	$69.0 \pm 1.7^{**}$	-0.9 ± 4.8	179.4 ± 12.2**	$122.2 \pm 11.9^{**}$	5.4 ± 5.1	$-160.3 \pm 21.2^{**}$	D		
Plant height									
CML56 × CML49	121.2 ± 1.7	$-10.8 \pm 2.8^{**}$	60.0 ± 8.9**	$39.8 \pm 8.7^{**}$	~9.0 ± 2.9 ^{**}	-58.7 ± 13.3 ^{**}	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	$118.3 \pm 1.4^{**}$	$-12.0 \pm 2.8^{**}$	79.9 ± 8.2 ^{**}	$60.8 \pm 7.9^{**}$	1.9 ± 3.2	-61.4 ± 13.1 ^{**}	D		
CML39 × CML14	113.9 ± 1.7 ^{**}	$-13.4 \pm 2.2^{**}$	64.3 ± 8.4 ^{**}	42.2 ± 8.2 ^{**}	$3.4 \pm 2.6^{**}$	-37.3 ± 11.8 ^{**}	D		
Days to tasseling									
$CML56 \times CML49$	64.4 ± 0.5	0.2 ± 0.7	-14.7 ± 2.5	-10.5 ± 2.4	-0.3 ± 0.8	12.9 ± 3.6	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	$64.0 \pm 0.5^{**}$	$-3.2 \pm 0.6^{**}$	-12.4 ± 2.4 ^{**}	-8.1 ± 2.4 ^{**}	-0.1 ± 0.6	1.2 ± 3.2	-		
CML39 × CML14	$63.5 \pm 0.5^{**}$	-0.1 ± 0.5	-18.0 ± 2.1 ^{**}	-12.7 ± 2.1 ^{**}	-1.5 ± 0.6**	12.9 ± 2.9	D		
Days to maturity									
CML 56 \times CML 49	108.3 ± 0.5**	2.0 ± 0.6**	–11.7 ± 2.3**	-7.9 ± 2.2**	0.0±0.0	8.3 ± 3.1**	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	106.4 ± 0.6	10.8 ± 2.8	-1.7 ± 2.8	-3.4 ± 0.7	-11.3 ± 3.7		С		
$CML39 \times CML14$	$106.7 \pm 0.6^{**}$	$1.6 \pm 0.5^{**}$	14.8 ± 2.5	-7.9 ± 2.5 ^{**}	-0.8 ± 0.6	6.3 ± 3.3	D		
Ear length									
$CML56 \times CML49$	13.5 ± 0.3	-0.7 ± 0.4	6.5 ± 1.4	4.5 ± 1.4	-1.3 ± 0.5	-7.6 ± 2.1	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	13.0 ± 0.3	0.9 ± 0.4	5.9 ± 1.3	3.2 ± 1.3	0.8 ± 0.4	-1.6 ± 1.9	-		
CML39 × CML14	$13.2 \pm 0.2^{**}$	-0.2 ± 0.4	8.2 ± 1.3	$4.3 \pm 1.2^{**}$	0.4 ± 0.5	-4.2 ± 2.1	D		
Ear girth	**		••	**					
$CML56 \times CML49$	4.2 ± 0.1	-0.2 ± 0.1	1.8 ± 0.3	1.2 ± 0.3	–0.1 ± 0.1	-1.9 ± 0.4	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	3.7 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.1	1.4 ± 0.3	0.9 ± 0.3	0.1 ± 0.1	-0.1 ± 0.4	-		
CML39 × CML14	3.8 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.1	2.7 ± 0.2	1.9 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.1	-2.5 ± 0.4	D 1		
Kernel rows/ear	**		**	**	*				
$CML56 \times CML49$	13.3 ± 0.2	-0.6 ± 0.3	4.62 ± 1.1	2.7 ± 1.0	–0.7 ± 0.4	–3.1 ± 1.7	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	12.3 ± 0.2	0.5 ± 0.4	5.2 ± 1.0	2.4 ± 1.0	-0.2 ± 0.4	–0.1 ± 1.7	-		
CML39 × CML14	12.3 ± 0.2^{-1}	0.3 ± 0.4	7.5 ± 1.1	5.4 ± 1.1	0.6 ± 0.4	-7.5 ± 1.8	D		
Kernels/row	**		**	**		**			
$CML56 \times CML49$	26.8 ± 0.5	1.3 ± 1.0	$22.6 \pm 2.9_{**}$	$15.1 \pm 2.8_{**}$	0.4 ± 1.1	$-26.4 \pm 4.8_{**}$	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	23.7 ± 0.4	–1.2 ± 1.1	$25.9 \pm 2.8_{**}$	19.1 ± 2.7	–0.0 ± 1.1	-19.9 ± 4.8	D		
$CML39 \times CML14$	24.8 ± 0.4	–0.1 ± 1.0	20.0 ± 7.4	12.5 ± 2.6	0.4 ± 1.1	-16.4 ± 4.6	D		
Kernels/ear	**		**	**		**	_		
$CML56 \times CML49$	$362.2 \pm 8.9_{**}$	2.1 ± 13.7	$384.8 \pm 46.3_{**}$	$242.3 \pm 45.0_{**}$	–11.9 ± 15.0	-406.6 ± 70.0	D		
$CML85 \times CML42$	$291.0 \pm 5.4_{**}$	-36.6 ± 16.8	471.7 ± 42.1	298.7 ± 39.9	–14.2 ± 17.9	213.6 ± 75.4	D		
$CML39 \times CML14$	305.1 ± 7.1	4.1 ± 16.4	444.6 ± 45.3	291.1 ± 43.3	15.0 ± 18.1	-373.9 ± 76.4	D		
100-grain weight	**		**		*				
CML56 × CML49	27.2 ± 0.4	0.5 ± 0.7	7.7 ± 2.2	0.4 ± 2.1	1.5 ± 0.7	-2.4 ± 3.3			
CML85 ± CML42	21.9 ± 0.4	4.6 ± 0.8	–0.9 ± 2.3	–7.1 ± 2.2	3.6 ± 0.8	23.9 ± 3.7	D		
CML39 × CML14	23.0 ± 0.4	-0.4 ± 0.8	20.6 ± 2.3**	14.9± 2.2**	0.9 ± 0.8	-20.2 ± 3.6**	D		

C = Complementary, D = Duplicate

References

- 1. **Mather K.** 1949. Biometrical Genetics. Dover Publication Inc. New York, USA.
- Cavalli L. L. 1952. Analysis of linkage in quantitative inheritance. In: Quantitative inheritance (eds. E.C.R. Rieve and C.H. Waddington) HMSO, London: pp 135-144.
- 3. **Hayman B. I.** 1958. The separation of epistasis from additive and dominance variation in generation mean. Heredity, **12**: 371-391.
- Gamble E. E. 1962. Gene effects in corn (*Zea mays* L.) II Relative importance of gene effects for plant height and certain component attributes of yield. Canad. J. Plant Sci., 42: 349-358.
- 5. Mukherjee B. K., Agrawal S. B., Singh M. P., Gupta N.

P. and Singh N. N. 1974. Studies on diverse germplasm complexes of maize. 1. Gene effects and nature of heterosis in diverse germplasm and their crosses. Genetika, **6**: 33-41.

- Melchinger A. F., Geiger H. H. and Schnell F. W. 1986. Epistasis in maize. Genetic effect in crosses among early flint and dent inbred lines determined by three methods. TAG., 72: 231-239.
- Hallauer A. R. and Russel W. A. 1962. Estimates of maturity and its inheritance in maize. Crop Sci., 2: 289-294.
- Comstock R. E., Robinson H. F. and Harvey H. H. 1949. A breeding procedure designed to make maximum use of both general and specific combining ability. Agron. J., 41: 360-367.