

**Research Article** 

# Heterobeltiosis and inbreeding depression for grain yield and its components in sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]

■ MUKESH VYAS, LATA CHOUDHARY AND B.R.RANWAH

# **SUMMARY**

Heterosis over better parent was maximum for grain yield per plant and also depends on plant height, length of panicle, number of whorls per panicle, number of primaries per panicle, 1000 grain weight, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Cross SPV 1329 x ICSV 272 had maximum heterobeltiosis in both thez environments (95.38% in  $E_1$  and 94.74% in  $E_2$ ). Crosses SU 248 x ICSV 298, SPV 1329 x ICSV 272 and SU 248 x ICSV 272 had maximum grain yield per plant along with higher biological yield per plant thus indicated suitability for dual purpose hybrids. These crosses had highest the heterobeltiotic effects for grain yield per plant, number of primaries per panicle, 100 grain weight, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Most of the high heterotic crosses showed high inbreeding depression for all most all the traits. Heterosis with inbreeding depression for grain yield may be an out come of the expression of heterosis for yield components studied depending in such a manner that such crossed can be exploited only through hybrid breeding instead of selecting for trangessive segregants.

Key Words : Sorghum, Heterosis, Heterobeltiosis, Inbredding depression, Grain yield, Yield components

How to cite this article : Vyas, Mukesh, Choudhary, Lata and Ranwah, B.R. (2014). Heterobeltiosis and inbreeding depression for grain yield and its components in sorghum *[Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench]. *Internat. J. Plant Sci.*, **9** (2): 424-427.

Article chronicle : Received : 16.01.2014; Revised : 07.06.2014; Accepted : 20.06.2014

In the recent past, plant breeders have extensively explored and utilized heterosis in boosting up yield in a number of crops and exploitation of hybrid vigour is considered an out standing accomplishment of plant breeding. Sorghum is an often cross pollinated crop wherein grain yield is a complex character. It is a product of large number of components and their interactions. Therefore, the scope for exploitation of hybrid vigour will depend on the direction and magnitude of heterosis,

## MEMBERS OF THE RESEARCH FORUM •

#### Author to be contacted :

**MUKESH VYAS,** Department of Plant Breeding and Genitics, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, UDAIPUR (RAJASTHAN) INDIA **Email:**vyas.mukesh66@gmail.com

#### Address of the Co-authors:

LATA CHAUDHARY, Department of Plant Breeding and Genitics, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, UDAIPUR (RAJASTHAN) INDIA

**R.B. RANWAH,** A.I.C.P.R. on Sorghum, Department of Plant Breeding and Genitics, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, UDAIPUR (RAJASTHAN) INDIA biological feasibility and nature of gene action. Study of heterosis and inbreeding depression will have a direct effect. Therefore, there is a requirement to develop and identify high yielding hybrids hence, there is urgent need to evaluate the best hybrids with suitable performance over a wide range of environmental conditions. The present investigation aimed to estimate and to obtained information on the extent of heterosis and inbreeding depression in two succeeding years *i.e. Kharif*, 2000 and 2001 of sorghum for grain yield and components of yield with an over all objective to select superior crosses for exploitating heterosis over a wide range of environmental conditions.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

A set of LxT design crosses were produced by crossing six diverse sorghum lines viz, SPV 1330, SU 248, SPV 1329, SPV 1201, SU 556 and SU 562 with three drought tolerant testers. viz, IRAT-204, ICSV-272 and ICSV 298. The nine parents and their 18 F<sub>1</sub>s and F<sub>2</sub>s were grown in Complete Randomized Block Design with three replications in two different

| Matrix Matrix< |                                | tuəmn                     | 9 g        | Grain yield<br>per plant |            | Days to 50%<br>flowering | 50%<br>ring | Days to<br>maturity | to<br>ty    | Plant<br>height |            | Number of<br>leaves plant | er of<br>plant     | Flag leaf<br>area | leaf<br>a   | Length of panicle |           | Weight of panicle |       | Number of<br>whorls per<br>panicle |     | Number of<br>primaries<br>panicle |     | 1000 Grain<br>weight |                        | Biological<br>yield per<br>plant |    | Harvest<br>indes |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----|------------------|
|   | Crosses                        | oriva∃                    | Bb         |                          | Per se     | BP                       | A           | BP                  | 6           | BP              | A          | BP                        | A                  | Bb                | A           | BP                |           |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   | _   |                      |                        |                                  | BP | E E              |
|   | L <sub>3</sub> xT <sub>2</sub> | E                         | 95.<br>38* | 5.<br>14*                | 127.<br>49 |                          | -7.<br>85*  |                     | -1.<br>88*  | 10.<br>22*      |            | 14.<br>29*                | -15.<br>63*        | 0.                | -1.         | 3.<br>95          |           |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | 1.<br>62*        |
|   |                                | $\mathbf{E_2}$            |            | 9.<br>18*                | 126.<br>40 | -0.<br>55                |             | -6.<br>55 *         | -8.<br>56*  | 11.<br>91*      | 4.<br>18*  |                           | -14.<br>29*        | 0.<br>80*         | 0.<br>92*   |                   |           |                   | 5.    |                                    | 6 8 |                                   |     | -1.<br>18            |                        |                                  |    | -0.<br>94*       |
|   | $L_2 x T_2$                    | Eı                        |            | 29.<br>98*               | 123.<br>12 |                          | 4.<br>42*   |                     | -11.<br>19* |                 | 7.<br>91*  | 11.                       | <b>-</b> 16.<br>67 |                   |             |                   | .31       | ***               |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | 3.<br>85*        |
|   |                                | ${\rm E_2}$               |            | 13.<br>84*               |            | -5.<br>75 *              | -3.<br>66   |                     | -10.<br>15* | 2.<br>97*       | 12.<br>57* | <b>3</b> .<br>03          | <b>5</b> .<br>88   |                   | -0.<br>30*  |                   |           |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | -7.<br>16*       |
|   | $L_2 x T_3$                    | ${\rm E_l}$               |            | 3.<br>86*                | 128.<br>84 | -1.                      | -5.<br>23*  |                     | -3.<br>55*  |                 | 13.00*     | 15.<br>38                 | .0                 |                   | -13.<br>86* |                   | 6.<br>51* | -                 |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | 0.               |
|   |                                | $\mathrm{E}_2$            | 49.<br>16  | 1.                       | 126.<br>45 |                          | -5.<br>26*  |                     | -5.<br>04*  |                 | 15.<br>62* |                           | 9.<br>68           |                   | -13.<br>63* |                   |           |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | 0.               |
|   | $L_1 x T_2$                    | ${\rm E}_1$               |            | 0.<br>78*                | 100.<br>16 |                          | 0.<br>54    |                     | -2.<br>57*  |                 | -0.<br>85* |                           | -16.<br>13*        |                   | -1.<br>16*  | 0.<br>96          |           |                   | 5.    | с, <del>Г</del>                    | 2   | 8 -2                              |     |                      |                        |                                  |    | 1.               |
|   |                                | $\mathrm{E}_2$            | 37.<br>87  | 15.<br>36                | 115.<br>45 |                          |             |                     | 1-<br>43    |                 |            | 12.<br>50*                | 2.<br>78           |                   |             |                   | 7.<br>27* | 4                 | .1 *. | ν<br>α                             |     | ς <u>1</u>                        |     |                      | 38.<br>33 <sup>*</sup> |                                  |    | -1.<br>63        |
|   | $L_4 x T_1$                    | $E_1$                     |            | 10.<br>34*               | 117.<br>41 | -5.<br>71*               | -9.<br>70*  |                     | -6.<br>32*  |                 | 20.<br>68* | 6.<br>67                  | -9.<br>38          |                   | -1.<br>34*  |                   | 8.<br>39* |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   |     | -1.                  |                        | 0.<br>62                         |    |                  |
|   |                                | $\mathrm{E}_2$            | 9.<br>46   | 3.                       | 112.<br>50 | -5.<br>33*               | -9.<br>38*  |                     | -4.<br>89*  |                 | 20.<br>27* |                           | -14.<br>29*        |                   | 3.<br>05*   |                   | 3.        |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   | . * | 1.<br>20°            |                        |                                  |    |                  |
| $ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$   | $L_4 x T_2$                    | $\mathbf{E}_{1}$          |            | 3.<br>83*                | 110.<br>26 | -2.<br>72*               | 2.          |                     | -4.<br>80*  |                 | 7.<br>41*  | 6.<br>67                  | -9.<br>38          |                   | -0.<br>56   |                   | 5.<br>4 * | -                 |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        | 2.<br>35                         |    |                  |
|   |                                | $\mathrm{E}_2$            | 6.<br>36   | 4.<br>70                 | 109.<br>95 | -5.<br>17*               | -16.<br>97  | -0.<br>74           | -6.<br>69*  | 1.<br>45*       | 5.<br>76*  |                           | -19.<br>23*        |                   | 4.<br>64    | 5.<br>77*         | 3.<br>92  | -                 |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        | 0.<br>64                         |    |                  |
| 2. 10. 1082101. 0. 6. 20. 2. 1. 8. 300. 272. 8. 3. 10. 1. 12. 1.<br>08* 66* 08 30 59 84 45* 31* 69* 86 62* 99* 86 61 24 59 70 38* 09* 95* 35 05* 19* 91*  | $_{4}\mathrm{xT}_{3}$          | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{l}}$ |            | 11.<br>10*               | 107.<br>86 | -0.<br>55                | -1.<br>65   |                     | -0.<br>37   |                 | 5.<br>23*  | 10.<br>71                 | -9.<br>68          |                   | -2.<br>04*  | 3.<br>01          | -0.       | . 0               |       |                                    |     |                                   | *   | -3.<br>71            |                        |                                  |    |                  |
|   |                                | $\mathrm{E}_2$            |            | 10.<br>66*               | 108.<br>08 | 30 -2.                   | -10.        |                     | -1.<br>84   |                 |            | 20.<br>69*                | 2.<br>86           | 1.                | 8.<br>99*   |                   |           |                   |       |                                    |     |                                   |     |                      |                        |                                  |    |                  |

MUKESH VYAS, LATA CHOUDHARY AND B.R.RANWAH

Internat. J. Plant Sci., 9 (2) July, 2014 : 424-427 425 Hind Agricultural Research and Training Institute

environments *i.e. Kharif,* 2000 and 2001 at Instructional Research Farm. Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Udaipur (Rajasthan). Each parents and  $F_1$  progency were represented by a single row, while  $F_2$  by 4 rows plots of 3 meter length with recommended distances of 45 cm spacing between rows and 15 cm between plants. All the agronomical package of practices was followed to raise the healthy crop.

Observation were recorded on 10 randomly selected plants in  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  and 20 plants in  $F_2$  generations in both the environment on thirteen quantitative characters *viz.*, days to 50 per cent flowering, days to maturity, plant height, number of leaves per plant, flag leaf area, length of panicle, weight of panicle, number of whorls per panicle, number of primary branches per panicle, grain yield per plant, 1000 grain weight, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Magnitude of heterosis over better parent according Fonesca and Patterson (1968) and Shall (1914) and inbreeding depression (Matzinger *et al.*,1962) form  $F_1$  to  $F_2$  for all the eighteen crosses in both the environment were calculated.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Performance of F, hybrids, as compared with the better parent mean (heterobeltiosis) and inbreeding depression from  $F_1$  to  $F_2$  for thirteen characters in two different environments *i.e. Kharif*, 2000 (E<sub>1</sub>) and *Kharif*, 2001 (E<sub>2</sub>) are presented in Table 1 Heterobeltiosis for grain yield per plant over better parent was in range of 95.38 per cent  $(L_2 \times T_2)$  to 2.48 per cent  $(L_4 \times T_3)$  in E<sub>1</sub> whereas in E<sub>2</sub> it ranged from 99.33 per cent (L<sub>5</sub> x  $T_1$ ) to 2.98 per cent ( $L_4 \times T_3$ ). For grain yield per plant, all crosses had positive significant heterobeltiosis except L<sub>1</sub> x T<sub>1</sub> L<sub>2</sub> x T<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub> x T<sub>2</sub> in E<sub>1</sub>. Inbreeding depression was significant in 15 crosses in  $E_1$ , where as in  $E_2$  it was significant for 14 crosses except  $L_3 \times L_1 L_6 \times T_1$  in  $E_1$  and crosses  $L_1 \times T_3 L_6 \times T_1$  and  $L_6 \times T_3$ in E<sub>2</sub>. Depression effect of inbreeding was lowest in cross L<sub>1</sub> x  $T_2$  (0.78%) in  $E_1$  and in  $E_2$  for  $L_2 \times T_3$  (1.883%). Inbreeding depression in negative direction was observed in  $L_6 \times T_3$  (-3.24%) in E<sub>1</sub> only.

Grain yield according to per se data of cross L<sub>2</sub> xT<sub>3</sub> was maximum in both the environment ( $E_1 = 128.84$  g) and  $E_2 =$ 126.45 g) among all the crosses. It was followed by  $L_3 \times T_2$  $(127.49 \text{ g and } L_2 \text{ x } T_2 (123.12 \text{ g}) \text{ in } E_1 \cdot L_3 \text{ x } T_2 (126.40 \text{ g}) L_1 \text{ x } T_2$ (115.45 g). L<sub>2</sub> x T<sub>2</sub> (115.83 g) in E<sub>2</sub>. Among the F<sub>1</sub>s six crosses *viz.*,  $L_2 \times T_3$ ,  $L_3 \times T_2$ ,  $L_2 \times T_2$ ,  $L_4 \times T_1$ ,  $L_4 \times T_2$  and  $L_4 \times T_3$  had significantly higher grain yield than parent SPV 1201 in both the environments. Grain yield of  $L_1 \times T_2$  was also higher than SPV 1201 in E2. Such best heterobeltiotic crosses selected on the basis of grain yield per plant in both the environments revealed that for grain yield per plant depended upon one or more components like plant height, length of panicle, number of whorls per panicle, number of primaries per panicle, 1000 grain weight, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Similar findings were reported Chan and Chen (1994); Ghorade et al. (1997) and Reddy and Joshi (1993) who also suggested that no separate gene system exist for yield. It is the end product of mulplicative interaction between its contributing characters resulting in the expression of heterosis.

A persual of data (Table 1) indicated that most of the high heterotic crosses had high inbreeding depression for all the characters. Therefore, in general, the mean expression of  $F_2$  was lower than that of  $F_1$  but in some cases, comparable or even higher expression of  $F_2$  were also found. However, there were crosses *viz.*,  $L_1 \times T_3$ ,  $L_2 \times T_2$ ,  $L_3 \times T_2$ ,  $L_4 \times T_1$ ,  $L_5 \times T_1$ ,  $L_6 \times T_1$ ,  $L_4 \times T_3$ ,  $L_5 \times T_3$ ,  $L_6 \times T_2$ ,  $L_6 \times T_3$ ,  $L_1 \times T_1$ ,  $L_3 \times T_1$ ,  $L_5 \times T_2$ ,  $L_3 \times T_3$ ,  $L_6 \times T_2$ , having negative heterosis in  $E_1$  or  $E_2$  for characters *viz.*, biological yield per plant, 1000 grain weight, plant height, number of primaries per panicle, flat leaf area, number of leaves per plant, days to 50 per cent flowering and days to maturity. Among three crosses characters frequency of such crosses was higher for harvest index particularly in  $E_2$  followed by biological yield per plant, 1000 grain weight and plant height.

Maximum heterobeltiosis was obtained in  $E_3 \times T_2$  (SPV 1329 x ICSV 272) in both the environment (98.83% in  $E_1$  and 94.74% in  $F_2$ ). This was followed by  $E_5 \times T_1 L_2 \times T_1$  and  $L_2 \times T_3$  in both the environments *i.e.* 93.04, 88.19 and 54.46 per cent in  $E_1$ . 99.99, 85.32 and 46.16 per cent in  $E_2$ , respectively.

Among different crosses three crosses *viz.*,  $L_2 \times T_3$  (SU248 x ICSV 298),  $L_3 \times T_2$  (SPV 1329 x ICSV 272) and  $L_2 \times T_2$  (SU 248 x ICSV 272) had maximum grain yield per plant and also gave higher biological yield per plant thus, indicated suitability for dual purpose hybrids.

Relationship between heterotic response and inbreeding depression (*i.e.* crossing showing high heterotic response also showed high inbreeding depression) suggest the importance of non-additive genes in sorghum. High express  $F_2$  and  $F_1$  generation revealed the presence of such enhanced vigour for seed yield in  $F_2$  can be attributed to epistatic gene actions. For grain yield per plant all the crosses with high heterotic had high inbreeding depression. These crosses can also had high inbreeding depression for component characters. Therefore, these crosses can be exploited only through hybrid breeding instead of selecting for transgrassive segregants of after incorporating male sterlity system.

## REFERENCES

- Chan, Xue Que and Chen, X.Q. (1994). Studies on genetic effect of yield heterosis in sorghum nucleo cytoplasm hybrids. J. Jilin Agric. Univ., 16 (4):7-11.
- Fonesca, S. and Patterson, P.I. (1968). Hybrid vigour in a seven parental diallel cross in common winter wheat (*Tritium aestivum* L.). Crop Sci., **8**:85-86.
- Ghorade, R.B., Gite, B.D., Sahkare, B.A. and Thorat, Areehane (1997). Analysis of heterosis and heterobeltiosis for commercial exploitation of sorghum. J. Soils Crops, 7(2):185-189.
- Matzinger, D.F., Mann, T.J. and Cockerham, C.C. (1962). Diallel crosses in *Crop Sci.*, 2:383-386.

Reddy, J.N. and Joshi, P. (1993). Heterosis, inbreeding depression and combining bility in sorghum, *Indian J. Genet*, **53** (2): 138-146. Shall, G.H. (1914). Duplicate genes for capsule from Capsella pursapustoris Zeitcher induk tive E. Yererbung lehra., 12:94-149.

