## Extent of heterosis for green fodder yield and its components traits in sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]

K.V. PATEL AND A.D. PATEL

Received : May, 2011; Accepted : July, 2011

## SUMMARY

Sorghum having ability to grow in poor soil, faster growth habit, high yielding, palatable, nutritious quality and uniform green forage yield through out the year. The experimental material comprised of three male sterile lines used as female parents, 16 genotypes used as male parents, one standard check variety and 48  $F_1$  hybrids in a line x tester fashion. All sixty eight entries were studied in randomized complete block design with three replications. The results revealed that the degree of heterosis varied from cross to cross for all the traits under study. The expression of heterosis in the positive direction was in maximum number of hybrids for green fodder yield, leaf length, number of nodes per plant, dry matter yield and crude protein yield. While, the magnitude of heterosis in the negative direction was observed for days to flowering, leaf width, leaf : stem ratio, stem thickness, dry matter content, HCN content and NDF content. The hybrid AKMS 14A x S 1049 revealed the highest and significant heterosis and heterobeltiosis for green fodder yield, dry matter content and dry matter yield. The hybrids 3660 A x PB 22, Indore 9 A x PB 22 and AKMS 14A x HC 171 and AKMS 14A x PB 78 were recorded to be the most significant heterotic hybrids over standard check GFSH 1. Hybrid AKMS 14 A x IS 2472 gave higher green fodder yield with low HCN content and NDF content as compared to check variety GFSH 1. On the basis of gca : sca ratio, preponderance of non-additive gene action for green fodder yield per plant suggesting heterosis breeding programme could be useful for developing superior genotype for green fodder yield.

Patel, K.V. and Patel, A.D. (2011). Extent of heterosis for green fodder yield and its components traits in sorghum *licolor* (L.) Moench]. *Internat. J. Plant. Sci.*, **6** (2): 348-351.

Key words : Heterosis, Green fodder yield, Genotypes, HCN content, Protein content

**C**orghum is a often cross-pollinated crop. In order to Dmake forage sorghum an enterprising and remunerative crop, there is a need to develop varieties / hybrids having early maturity, faster growth, and high forage yield compiled with high protein and low HCN content at flowering stage. For development of such forge hybrid, knowledge and information on genetic architecture is essential for formulation of efficient breeding strategies for genetic improvement of sorghum as a forage crop. The availability of cytoplasmic male sterile line (CMS) in this crop had made commercial exploitation of heterosis. The phenomenon of heterosis had provided the most important genetic tool for improving yield. Identification of specific parental combination, which is capable of producing the highest level of heterotic effects in F<sub>1</sub>, is of greater value in hybrid seed production programme.

Correspondence to:

**K.V. PATEL**, College of AIT, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

Authors' affiliations: A.D. PATEL, Bidi Tobacco Research Station (AAU), ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

In present experiments, material comprised of three male sterile line as a female, sixteen genotype as a tester and it's 48 hybrids and one standard check evaluate in three different environment (different date of sowing) condition in RBD design with three replications. The experiment was conducted at Department of Plant Breeding and Genetic, Ananad Agricultural University, Anand. Each entry was accommodated in a 4.5 m long single row plot with spacing of 30 x 10 cm. Recommended package of practices were followed. Five plants were randomly selected and tagged to record data on green fodder yield and its related traits. For measuring qualitative traits random sample drawn from the total yield of a particular entry.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Per cent heterosis over better parent (heterobeltosis) for green fodder yield revealed varying magnitude of expression in different environment (Table 1). The reletive heterobeltosis ranged from -72.93% (P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>15</sub>) to 6.04% (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>4</sub>) in E<sub>1</sub>. In E<sub>2</sub>, -45.81% ( P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>15</sub>) to 196.42% (

 $\bullet$  HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE  $\bullet$ 

Table 1: Estimates of heterosis (H1), heterobeltiosis (H2) and standard heterosis (H3) for green fodder yield per plant											
Sr.	Crosses	Green fodder yield per plant									
No.		Heterosis (H <sub>1</sub> )				erobeltiosis (l	2,	Standard heterosis (H <sub>3</sub> )			
1		E1	E2	E3	E1	E2	E3	E1	E2	E3	
1.	$P_1 \times P_4$	63.52 **	58.12 **	102.22**	38.72	12.21	45.21**	-49.66	45.81**	-20.18*	
2.	$P_1 \times P_5$	61.62 **	121.88 **	52.76 **	47.97*	65.90**	3.19	-46.31**	115.58**	-43.27**	
3.	$P_1 \times P_6$	16.01	12.85	35.37 *	6.26	-22.12	18.09	-53.65**	1.20	-35.09**	
4.	$P_1 \times P_7$	37.89 **	161.00 **	93.80 **	23.18	98.16*	32.98**	-43.18**	157.49**	-26.90**	
5.	$P_1 \times P_8$	65.88 **	-12.60	8.16	55.27**	-21.66	3.92	-35.39**	1.80	-38.01**	
6.	$P_1 \times P_9$	-27.27 **	-14.47	-10.42	-51.84*	-19.51	-39.08**	-46.13**	18.57	-7.02	
7.	$P_1 \times P_{10}$	1.34	13.70	28.71**	-23.24	-10.14	20.37*	-45.91**	16.77	-23.98**	
8.	$P_1 \times P_{11}$	58.36 **	-32.45 **	64.88**	36.77*	-35.17**	52.25**	-31.77**	-8.38	-1.17	
9.	$P_1 \times P_{12}$	25.36	22.78	-26.78*	13.69	-6.22	-28.72	-58.75**	21.86	-60.82**	
10.	$P_1 \times P_{13}$	124.01 **	-25.57 *	-5.94	117.27**	-26.24*	-17.60	-16.11**	-2.39	-39.77**	
11.	$P_1 \times P_{14}$	67.76 **	16.43	64.77**	57.21*	-6.91	54.26**	-42.95	20.96	-15.20	
12.	$P_1 \times P_{15}$	-60.73 **	-58.15**	45.18**	-73.35**	-58.29**	38.83**	-72.93**	-45.81*	-16.37*	
13.	$P_1 \times P_{16}$	30.38 *	60.62 **	40.31**	3.64	42.86**	38.14*	-36.24**	85.63**	-21.64**	
14.	$P_1 \times P_{17}$	36.20	173.45 **	53.26**	11.34	98.16**	50.00**	-59.60**	157.49**	-17.54	
15.	$P_1 \times P_{18}$	17.60	-24.60 *	45.15**	-9.09	-32.97**	20.28*	-39.60**	11.98	0.58	
16.	$P_1 \times P_{19}$	194.56 **	166.13 **	86.75**	143.53**	128.11**	64.89**	-11.63**	196.42**	-9.36	
17.	$P_2 \times P_4$	227.74 **	74.58 **	1.37	198.83**	42.07**	-29.52**	-8.28	23.36	-56.73**	
18.	$P_2 \times P_5$	105.88 **	63.96 **	27.54	104.08**	42.76**	-16.19	-37.36	23.96	-48.54**	
19.	$P_2 \times P_6$	-5.72	75.82 **	70.29**	-19.69	37.93	41.90**	-64.97**	19.76	-12.87	
20.	$P_2 \times P_7$	12.29	49.51 *	16.43	-6.50	32.76	-22.38	-56.87**	15.27	-52.34**	
21.	$P_2 \times P_8$	-2.85	-2.52	6.28	-15.59	-10.17	4.76	-64.88**	-7.48	-35.67**	
22.	$P_2 \times P_9$	-46.77 **	-42.46 **	-34.97**	-66.08**	-54.27**	-54.41**	-62.06**	-32.63	-30.41**	
23.	$P_2 \times P_{10}$	19.42	43.91 *	71.83**	-14.29	34.48	69.44**	-39.60**	16.77	7.02	
24.	$P_2 \times P_{11}$	80.46 **	56.43**	13.89	45.74**	26.27*	10.81	-27.29**	78.45**	-28.07**	
25.	$P_2 \times P_{12}$	70.88 **	-17.15	38.14**	67.64*	-25.86	27.62*	-48.55**	-35.63	-21.64**	
26.	$P_2 \times P_{13}$	90.45 **	72.13 **	-16.52	70.92**	42.53**	-23.20*	-34.00**	88.63**	-43.86**	
27.	$P_2 \times P_{14}$	61.29 **	165.45 **	92.51**	58.67*	151.72**	71.43**	-49.66**	118.57**	5.26	
28.	$P_2 \times P_{15}$	7.24	-11.23	-19.23	-30.18**	-25.75	-20.00	-29.08**	-4.19	-50.88**	
29.	$P_2 \times P_{16}$	31.49 *	129.30 **	77.23**	-1.45	113.02**	70.48**	-39.37**	115.58**	4.68	
30.	$P_2 \times P_{17}$	95.67 **	112.37 **	87.69**	71.28**	77.59**	74.29**	-47.43**	54.20**	7.02	
31.	$P_2 \times P_{18}$	46.02 **	-23.58 *	33.06**	6.73**	-41.94**	15.38	-29.08**	-2.99	-3.51	
32.	$P_2 \times P_{19}$	122.04 **	17.33	49.15**	96.79**	13.55	25.71	-39.60**	5.39	-22.81**	
33.	$P_3 \times P_4$	25.00	136.84 **	54.84** 67.25**	-2.01	80.00**	5.26	-56.38**	88.63**	-29.82**	
34.		31.82	125.13 **	67.35**	10.55	81.71**	7.89	-50.78**	90.42**	-28.07**	
35. 36	$P_3 \times P_6$	13.71	28.93	51.09** 59.73**	12.56	-5.14 28 86*	21.93	-49.89** 41.82**	-0.60 45 51*	-18.71* 20.41**	
36. 27	$P_3 \times P_7$	28.33	69.04 ** 46.07 **		26.09	38.86* 45.71**	4.39	-41.83**	45.51* 52.70**	-30.41** -23.39**	
37.	$P_3 \times P_8$	14.39	46.97 ** 24 70 *	21.30	10.65	45.71**	14.91	-50.74** 26.17**	52.70** 57.10**		
38.	$P_3 \times P_9$	-5.58	24.70 * 185 71 **	-17.87** 18.02	-34.00** 17.46	6.71 145 71**	-41.00** 15.70	-26.17**	57.19** 157.49**	-9.94 22.81**	
39. 40	$P_3 \times P_{10}$	1.17 65 88 **	185.71 **	18.92	-17.46 56.05**	145.71**	15.79	-41.83** 21.70**		-22.81** 20.82**	
40.	$P_3 \times P_{11}$	65.88 ** 71 72 **	-19.22	6.67 4.43	56.95** 42.81*	-29.66*	5.26	-21.70** 26.42*	-0.60 -13.47	-29.82** 28.01**	
41.	$P_3 \times P_{12}$	71.72 **	-0.17 83 84 **	4.43 33.05**	42.81* 116.08**	-17.43 64.71**	-7.02 27.20*	-36.42*		-38.01**	
42.	$P_3 \times P_{13}$	131.43 **	83.84 ** 16.30	33.05**		64.71** 27.14	27.20*	-3.80** 48 55	117.97** 22.65	-7.02 41.52**	
43.	$P_3 \times P_{14}$	34.98	-16.39	2.04	15.58 -41.63**	-27.14	-12.28	-48.55 40.72**	-23.65	-41.52**	
44.	$P_3 \times P_{15}$	-18.84	-38.03 **	15.21		-43.85**	9.65	-40.72** 25.12**	-27.54	-26.90**	
45.	$P_3 \times P_{16}$	22.36	-32.56 *	23.22* 56.86**	5.45* 68 3.4**	-33.71*	14.04	-35.12**	-30.54	-23.98**	
46.	$P_3 \times P_{17}$	121.85 **	-6.79 16.52	56.86** 18 20	68.34** 14.48**	-27.43 32.08**	40.35**	-25.06** 23.04**	-23.95	-6.43	
47.	$P_3 \times P_{18}$	37.10 **	-16.52	18.29	14.48**	-32.08**	6.29	-23.94**	13.48	-11.11	
48.	$P_3 \times P_{19}$	210.82 **	-21.21	-1.08	138.19**	-25.71	-19.30	6.04	-22.15	-46.20**	
*	<u>SE +</u>	10.89 s significance	16.54	$\frac{8.20}{0.05 \text{ and } 0.01}$	12.57	19.10	9.47	12.57	19.10	9.47	

\* and \*\* indicates significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

•HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE•

[Internat. J. Plant Sci., 6 (2); (July, 2011)]

Table	e 2 : Hybrids with significant he different traits in sorghum	terosis (H	), heterot	oeltiosis (H	I <sub>2</sub> ) and sta	andard he	eterosis (H	I <sub>3</sub> ) in the	desired di	rection fo	
Sr.	Characters	Н	Heterosis $(H_1)$			Heterobeltiosis (H <sub>2</sub> )			Standard heterosis $(H_3)$		
No.		$E_1$	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	$E_1$	$E_2$	E <sub>3</sub>	
1.	Days to 50% flowering	18	16	29	10	7	9	34	2	11	
2.	Plant height	46	48	44	25	18	24	1	5	18	
3.	Number of tillers per plant	2	3	8	2	2	2	1	2	1	
4.	Number of leaves per plant	5	28	26	2	11	5	1	9	0	
5.	Leaf length	33	21	11	19	13	4	10	4	17	
6.	Leaf width	7	17	12	3	4	3	0	4	13	
7.	Leaf stem ratio	14	4	4	8	0	3	24	0	9	
8.	Number of nodes per plant	20	48	46	14	30	31	0	0	1	
9.	Green fodder yield per plant	25	23	27	21	18	18	0	18	0	
10.	Stem thickness	35	27	47	5	7	5	19	10	36	
11.	Dry matter content	1	2	5	1	1	2	4	14	1	
12.	Dry matter yield per plant	23	20	25	14	12	10	0	19	1	
13.	Crude protein content	8	25	17	2	10	10	8	39	32	
14.	Crude protein yield per plant	21	26	29	17	18	18	0	27	1	
15.	HCN content	19	6	11	11	1	1	18	4	0	
16.	NDF content	2	16	16	0	11	7	0	0	0	

E<sub>1</sub>: 15<sup>th</sup>, June,2005, E<sub>2</sub>: 1<sup>st</sup>,August,2005, E<sub>3</sub>: 15<sup>th</sup>, September'2005

 $P_1 \ge P_{10}$  and -60.82 ( $P_2 \ge P_{10}$ ) to 7.02% ( $P_2 \ge P_{17}$ ). Data Showed wide range of variability in heterosis among the hybrids.

In E<sub>1</sub> *i.e.* 15<sup>th</sup> June 2005, P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>19</sub> showed positive heterosis over best check which indicates hybrid suitable for this seasons. In E<sub>2</sub> *i.e.* 1<sup>st</sup> August 2005, the crosses  $P_1 x P_5$ ,  $P_1 x P_7$ ,  $P_1 x P_{19}$ ,  $P_2 x P_{14}$ ,  $P_2 x P_{16}$  and  $P_3 x P_{13}$ were shows significant positive heterosis over best check (GFSH-1) and in E<sub>3</sub> *i.e.* 15<sup>th</sup> September 2005, the crosses  $P_2 \times P_{10}$ ,  $P_2 \times P_{17}$  and  $P_2 \times P_{14}$  showed positive heterosis over check varieties which indicate concern hybrid fit for concern environment.

The expression of heterosis in the positive direction was maximum in number of hybrids for green fodder yield, plant height, number of tillers per plant, number of leaves per plant, leaf length, number of nodes per plant, dry matter yield per plant and crude protein yield per plant. The finding is in close agreement with the Parmar (1991), Mistry and Patil (1994), Patel et al. (1995) and Rajguru et al. (2005). The magnitude of heterosis in negative direction was maximum for days to 50% flowering, leaf width, leaf: stem ratio, stem thickness, dry matter content, crude protein content, HCN and NDF content. This kind of environmental influence was earlier reported by Patel(1990), Parmar (1991), Patel(1991) and Parmar (1997) (Table 2).

Overall plant height, number of nodes per plant, green fodder yield per plant, crude protein yield per plant showed superiority in all three environments. It is interesting to note that very few number of crosses showed hereobeltiosis for days to 50% flowering, leaf: stem ratio, stem thickness and crude protein content but it was high for standard heterosis. For green fodder yield per plant, total 21, 18, and 18 hybrids displayed significant heterosis over better parents in  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  and  $E_3$  environments, respectively. While for standard heterosis 0, 18 and 0 hybrids registered significant heterosis in  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  and E<sub>3</sub> environments, respectively. Among this Indore 9A x PB 22, AKMS 14A x IS 2472, AKMS 14A x PB 78, 3660A x PB-45 were recorded to be the most significant heterotic hybrids both over better parents in  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ and E<sub>2</sub> environments, respectively and over a check hybrid(GFSH-1) in E<sub>2</sub> environments.

Among all three environments,  $E_2$  (1<sup>st</sup> Aug) was found suitable for cultivation of sorghum. Among all the hybrids,  $P_3 \ge P_{19}$ ,  $P_1 \ge P_{19}$  and  $(P_2 \ge P_{10} \ge P_2 \ge P_{17})$ were recorded to be the most significant heterotic hybrids over standard check (GFSH-1) in  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$ ,  $E_3$ , respectively.  $P_2 \ge P_{14}$  gave higher green fodder yield with low HCN and NDF content as compared to standard check GFSH-1.

[Internat. J. Plant Sci., 6 (2); (July, 2011)]

- Mistry, P.K. and Patil, F.B. (1994). Heterosis for Forage yield and its components in forage sorghum. *Forage Res.*, **20** (2-3): 132-136.
- Parmar, H. D. (1991).Estimation of genetic parameters in forage sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Anand Campus, Anand, Gujarat (India).
- Parmar, H.P. (1997). Line x Tester analysis in forage srghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Anand Campus, Anand, Gujarat (India).
- Patel, J.C., Jaimini, S.N., Patil, K.G and Macchar, R.G (1995). Diallel analysis for dry matter in forage sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. Forage Res., **21** (1): 15-19

- Patel, J.K. (1990). Heterosis and combining ability studies in forage sorghum. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Anand Campus, Anand, Gujarat (India).
- Patel, M. P. (1991). Heterosis and Stability analysis in fodder sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Anand Campus, Anand, Gujarat (India).
- Rajguru, A. B., Kashid, N. V., Kamble, M. S., Rasal, P. N. and Goswami, A. B. (2005). Heterosis response for yield and yield components of *Rabi* sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench]. *J.Maharastra Agric. Univ.*, **30**(3): 292-295.

\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*