VARIATION AMONG PLANTS FOR SEED-OIL AND LINT CHARACTERISTICS OF COTTON (GOSSYPIUM HIRSUTUM L.)

N. L. BHALE, R. G. DANI* AND M. G. BHAT

Central Institute for Cotton Research Nagpur 440001

(Received: May 26, 1988; accepted: November 15, 1988)

ABSTRACT

Variation between plants was analysed in 3 cultivars for 7 attributes relating to oil and lint productivity. Variation among plants for fibre length, number of seeds per boll, lint per seed, seed index, and seed-oil index was highly significant. Variation for lint per seed, seed index, and seed-oil index tended to be relatively higher in the oil cultivars.

Key words: Oil content, interplant variation, Gossypium hirsutum.

In the absence of any conscious selection for seed quality components in the past, the levels of oil and protein in seeds of present cultivars of cotton have remained largely unchanged over decades [1]. Differences existing among cotton cultivars for seed-oil and protein content are considered natural consequences of unselected characters, which can be improved through selection [2]. Variation between plants has been shown to exert sizeable influence on oil quality and quantity in some oilseed crops [3]. Adequate information on this aspect is not available in cotton. An attempt was made to assess the patterns of interplant variation in 3 cultivated varieties of *Gossypium hirsutum*, considering 7 attributes related to oil and lint productivity. The results are presented in this paper.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

L-147, B-1007, and SRT-1 are contemporary cultivars of Central Zone of cotton, with comparable levels of yield and maturity duration (200-210 days). They were grown at Nagpur (21° 26' N and 79° 49' E) in Central India. Boll samples were drawn from twenty plants within each cultivar. A sample of 3 mature bolls was picked from upper, middle, and lower fruiting branches in each plant. Data were recorded from each boll individually and average values of 3 bolls from each position were used for analysis. Three seeds from each selected boll were used for estimation of halo length. Each seed was combed gently into a halo with the help of a seed comb and measured by a halo disc by the method suggested by Iyyengar [4]. Bolls were ginned with a hand-operated gin. Seeds were counted after delinting

^{*} Addressee for correspondence.

N. L. Bhale et al.

[Vol. 49, No. 2

with commercial grade sulfuric acid. Seed weight was recorded and seed index expressed as weight in mg per seed. Difference between fuzzy and delinted seed weight was expressed as fuzz (linters) percentage. Oil was determined on a wide-line Newport Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Analyser, using delinted seeds, with a 2-ml sample assembly. Seed oil index giving weight of oil per seed was derived by the formula:

Seed index × Oil %

100

Following Mosjidis and Yermanos [3], the measurements were analysed as randomised complete blocks using plants as blocks and positions within plant as treatments. Blocks were used to indicate among plant variation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Maximum estimates of halo length, weight of lint per seed, seed index, and seed-oil index were characteristic of the bolls on the lower branches (Table 1). Maximum estimates of number of seeds per boll, fuzz percentage, and oil percentage, in contrast, were confined mostly to bolls from the upper plant positions. Between plants differences were highly significant for most attributes. In L-147 and in B-1007, which are relatively older cultivars, variation between plants for lint per seed, seed index, and seed-oil index tended to be higher, suggesting greater heterogeneity due to unselected propagation of the cultivars over years.

Cultivar & parameter	Halo length (mm)	Seeds per boll	Fuzz (%)	Lint (mg/seed)	Seed index (mg/seed)	Oil (%)	Oil index (mg/seed)								
								L-147:					-		
								Range	18.8-30.3	20.3-36.7	4.7-15.9	29.3-76.5	46.3-123.5	17.0-25.1	9.1-30.2
Average (upper)	22.84	29.73	8.58	52.03	85.94	22.49	19.36								
Average (central)	23.76	29.33	9.44	50.21	88.26	22.53	20.00								
Average (lower)	25.01	26.35	9.30	49.43	86.18	20.82	18.04								
Between plants MS	20.95**	26.38**	·8.36**	496.24**	721.34**	8.25**	49.19**								
SE	0.44	0.56	0.38	0.98	2.03	0.31	0.58								
B-1007:															
Range	19.7-28.3	16.3-35.3	6.3-13.5	38.1-76.9	48.6-128.1	12.6-26.0	7.8-29.8								
Average (upper)	26.78	28.08	10.43	54.59	85.20	21.94	18.75								
Average (central)	26.25	28.28	10.41	50.89	90.05	21.81	19.89								
Average (lower)	26.78	25.43	9.79	53.08	92.50	21.61	21.22								
Between plants MS	10.07**	22.72**	5.80	171.30**	671.54**	8.64	39.41**								
SE.	0.35	0.68	0.44	1.80	3.70	0.58	0.90								
SRT-1:															
Range	19.0-26.7	17.0-29.0	6.0-13.5	38.1-76.9	49.4-110.4	13.4-24.3	9.6-22.2								
Average (upper)	21.28	24.32	10.04	52.45	70.77	21.19	15.04								
Average (central)	23.52	24.20	9.05	54.46	75.34	20.60	15.58								
Average (lower)	25.15	24.47	9.15	56.22	80.09	20.02	16.43								
Between plants MS	10.68**	14.61*	4.81*	105.68*	274.50**	12.58**	25.20**								
SE	0.48	0.56	0.33	1.57	1.47	0.36	0.50								

Table 1. Range, plant position, means and mean squares in cotton

*, **Significant at 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

266

July, 1989]

Variation in Cottonseed Oil

Bolls from different nodes on the same sympodial branch differ in time of flowering. Since sampling of bolls was based on plant positions rather than age, the patterns of variation observed between positions would mainly be due to differences in flowering time. Lower averages of lint per seed and seed index were similar to those reported in cotton by Turner et al. [5]. Verhalen et al. [6] observed a decrease in fibre length as the season advanced. Meredith and Bridge [7] noticed that while lint percentage was lowest in early harvests, seed index values decreased in later harvests. Turner et al. [8] obtained higher number of seeds/boll towards the end of season. Seeds from bolls set in the earlier part of the season generally show decline in quality [2]. Higher oil content in the seed can, therefore, be associated with initial harvests [9, 10]. Despite relatively lower percentages of oil, higher values of oil index in 2 out of 3 cultivars seemed consistent with bolls formed on lower and central plant positions. Kohel and Cherry [9] concluded that the use of oil content alone to characterise cottonseed composition could lead to erroneous conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Technical Assistance by Mr. G. Gunasekharan is duly acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- 1. J. P. Cherry, R. J. Kohel, L. A. Jones and W. H. Powell. 1981. Cottonseed quality-factors affecting feed and food uses. Proc. 1981 Beltwide Cotton Prod. Res. Conf.: 266-283.
- J. P. Cherry and H. R. Leffler. 1984. Seeds. In: Cotton. Agronomy Monograph No. 24 (eds. R. J. Kohel and C. F. Lewis). American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil Science Society of America. Madison, Wisconsin, USA: 512-558.
- 3. J. A. Mosjidis and D. M. Yermanos. 1985. Plant position effect on seed weight, oil content and oil composition in sesame. Euphytica, 34: 193-199.
- 4. R. L. N. lyyengar. 1939. Variation in the measurable characters of cotton fibres. I. Variation with respect to the length of fibre. Indian J. agric. Sci., 9: 305-327.
- 5. J. H. Turner, J. M. Stewart, P. E. Hoskinson and H. H. Ramey. 1977. Seed setting efficiency in 8 cultivars of upland cotton. Crop Sci., 17: 769-771.
- 6. L. M. Verhalen, R. Mamaghani, W. C. Morrison and R. W. McNew. 1975. Effect of blooming date on boll retention and fibre properties in cotton. Crop Sci., 15: 47-52.
- 7. W.R. Meredith, Jr. and R. R. Bridge. 1973. Yield, yield component and fibre property variation in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). Crop Sci., 13: 307-312.
- 8. J. H. Turner, S. Worley, P. E. Hoskinson and J. M. Stewart. 1979. Relationship of week of flowering and parameters of boll yield in cotton. Agronomy J., 71: 248-251.
- 9. R. J. Kohel and J. P. Cherry. 1983. Variation in cottonseed quality with stratified harvests. Crop Sci., 23: 1119-1124.
- 10. R. G. Dani and R. J. Kohel. 1987. Effects of time of boll set on seed-oil content in upland cotton. Indian J. agric. Sci., 57: 391-394.