ISSN 0258-7122 (Print), 2408-8293 (Online) Bangladesh J. Agril. Res. 42(3): 457-466, September 2017

GENETIC ANALYSIS OF YIELD AND YIELD CONTRIBUTING TRAITS IN BORO RICE (*Oryza sativa* L.) OVER ENVIRONMENTS

K. PRIYANKA¹ AND H. K. JAISWAL²

Abstract

Hayman's component analysis was employed to estimate genetic components of variation for yield and yield related traits in *boro* rice. Nine diverse lines of *boro* rice were crossed in diallel mating design excluding reciprocals and all the parental lines along with their 36 crosses were evaluated in randomized block design over 3 seasons in 3 replication. Significant differences among genotypes were observed for all the traits over seasons. Component analysis indicated importance of both additive and dominance components. However, greater magnitude of dominance component than its corresponding additive component of variance exhibited greater role of dominance in the inheritance of these traits. The average degree of dominance was more than unity indicating overdominance for all the traits. Most of the traits exhibited low to moderate narrow sense heritability.

Keywords: Boro rice, component analysis, diallel, gene action, heritability

Introduction

Rice is a major food crop for more than half of the world population. About 90 percent of all the rice grown in the world is produced and consumed in Asia. The largest rice producing countries include China, India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand and Bangladesh. In Bangladesh, rice is cultivated in all the three seasons i.e. aus, aman and *boro*, accounting for around 34.5 million metric tons of rice. *Boro* rice is famous for high productivity. India is the world's second largest producer of rice after China, accounting for about 20% of the world rice production. To meet the food demand of the growing population and to achieve food security in the country, the present level of production need to be increased by 2 million tones every year. Amelioration of grain yield is primary objective in plant breeding experiments. It is a complex trait governed by polygenes and highly influenced by environment. Grain yield depends on a number of growth and yield component traits directly or indirectly. Therefore, selection of yield components would be more beneficial than yield per se.

Formulation of an effective breeding strategy requires the sound knowledge of nature and magnitude of gene action. Biometrically, Hayman's component analysis is an important tool which clearly provides information about various components of variance (Hayman, 1954) and in this way, helps to find the nature of various gene effects. Thus, the present study was conducted over three

^{1&2}Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi – 221 005, Uttar Pradesh (India).

seasons to have a reliable information of the various components of genetic variation for yield and yield related traits in *boro* rice.

Materials and Method

Seeds of nine diverse genotypes of boro rice (IR 8, IR 36, IR 64, HUR 36, HUR 105, MTU 1010, Java, Krishna Hamsa and Gautam) were sown in nursery at three different dates with 15 days interval between successive sowings to ensure synchronization in flowering for the purpose of hybridization. In kharif, raised nursery beds were made. Twenty one days old seedlings were transplanted in the crossing block. Raising a good nursery in *kharif* season was not a big deal in case of rice but in boro season special care was needed due to low temperature at vegetative stage. Firstly, seeds were soaked in water overnight and kept in moistened gunny bags for two days for sprouting. Then these sprouted seeds were spread uniformily in prepared seed beds (wet bed nursery) in last week of November. Nursery beds were covered with polythene sheets during night hours to avoid cold injury. Sixty days old seedlings were transplanted in the crossing block. A standard spacing of 20 x 15 cm was adopted for the planting. Row length was maintained at 2 m. Single seedling per hill was transplanted. Recommended agronomic package of practices for each season was followed to raise a good crop. At the time of flowering, crosses were made in 9 x 9 diallel mating design without reciprocals during kharif-2014, boro-2014 and kharif-2015 to generate 36 crosses. All the 36 crosses along with 9 parents were evaluated in randomized block design in three replications for three seasons i.e. boro-2014, kharif-2015 and boro-2015 at Agricultural Research Farm of Banaras Hindu University. All the genotypes were evaluated for days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, plant height, effective tillers per plant, main panicle length, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, grains per panicle, 100 seed weight and yield/plant. Data was recorded from ten randomly selected plants from each entry in each replication. Mean data over replications were used for statistical analysis.

The analysis of variance was performed as per method suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1967) for randomized block design. Diallel component analysis was performed with the help of statistical software Windostat v.9.2 (Windostat Services, Hyderabad, A.P., India).

Results and Discussion

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed significant variations for all the traits among seasons, genotypes and season x genotype interaction (Table 1). Significant season x genotype interaction indicated the differential response of genotypes over the seasons, so a separate analysis for each environment was carried out in order to assess the reliable estimates of various genetic components. Separate analysis for individual environment could also help in selection of traits which exhibited consistency in gene action, thus those traits could be reliably utilized in breeding programme irrespective of the environments. Analysis of variance indicated significant differences among the

I	1	*	*	*		1	jt:			I			*	*	*				*	*	*		*	÷				n t
Υ/Ρ	3.241	351.631***	234.775***	53.569***	5.319		Plant heigh eld/plant		γ/P	2.62	5.86	0.54	121.92^{***}	172.01^{***}	47.99***	18.06^{**}	13.96^{*}	6.67	147.33^{***}	211.06^{***}	56.56***	63.17**	69.55***	78.66***	6.01	5.92	4.13	y; PH- Pla
100SW	0.001	2.430***	0.830^{***}	0.178^{***}	0.001	10000	tturity; PH- ht; Y/P- Yi		100SW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36^{***}	0.51^{***}	0.31^{***}	0.49***	0.52^{***}	0.49***	0.31^{***}	0.46^{***}	0.23^{***}	1.21^{***}	2.19^{***}	1.75^{***}	0.00	0.00	0.00	to maturit
G/P	57.314	775.143***	4443.339***	710.850***	42.189		1 – Days to ma 100 seed weig	oro rice	G/P	160.02^{*}	10.56	37.39	2765.23***	1635.81^{***}	1463.99^{***}	2723.67***	2419.68^{***}	4243.45***	2643.79***	1224.94^{***}	466.59***	7348.27***	9745.25***	14137.35***	47.56	38.28	39.22	- Days to 50% flowering; DTM - Days to maturity; PH- Plant
FW	0.007	0.021	0.078^{***}	0.081^{***}	0.013		ering; DTM le; 100SW-	raits in B	FW	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.07^{***}	0.07^{***}	0.09^{***}	0.08^{***}	0.03*	0.09^{***}	0.07^{***}	0.08^{***}	0.09^{***}	0.02	0.08*	0.34^{***}	0.02	0.01	0.01	flowering;
Ъ	2.634	31.639^{***}	485.546***	56.780^{***}	2.182		s to 50% flow -Grains/panic	and yield contributing traits in <i>Boro</i> rice	FL	3.53	1.45	1.49	240.03***	194.09^{***}	164.99^{***}	198.63^{***}	115.11^{***}	283.31^{***}	219.87^{***}	215.95^{***}	140.69^{***}	1276.66^{***}	61.00^{***}	68.77***	2.75	1.49	2.32	Days to 50%
ΡL	0.869	2.359	43.341***	6.714^{***}	1.652		DTF – Day f width; G/F	I yield co	PL	0.28	0.41	2.93	18.00^{***}	17.17^{***}	21.60^{***}	10.44^{***}	5.13^{**}	15.24***	20.18^{***}	20.40***	21.28^{***}	2.44	0.08	83.70	1.80	1.67	1.50	om; DTF –
ET/P	0.100	95.213***	12.856***	9.201^{***}	1.397		of freedom; W- Flag lea	· yield and	ET/P	0.05	1.27	0.34	11.63^{***}	6.98^{***}	12.65***	6.79***	4.98***	4.55**	13.02***	7.53***	13.10^{***}	1.86	3.68	61.68^{***}	1.61	1.32	1.29	- Degrees of freedom; DTF
Hd	1.010	858.412***	725.681***	28.747***	0.931	-	JF − Degrees g leaf length; F	crosses) for	Hd	0.01	0.70	3.00*	243.00***	304.15^{***}	236.02***	344.82***	518.69^{***}	223.37***	226.08***	238.89***	233.46***	20.93^{***}	871.73***	426.84***	0.78	1.33	0.67	n; DF – Degre
SV DF DTF DTM PH ET/P PL FL	5.114^{*}	138478.703***	730.764***	43.254***	1.497		*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001; SV-Source of variation; DF – Degrees of freedom; DTF – Days to 50% flowering; DTM – Days to maturity; PH- Plant height; ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL – Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 seed weight; Y/P- Yield/plant	llel (9 parents + 36 crosses) for yield	DTM	2.23	1.61	2.69	256.39***	331.49***	229.38***	190.58^{***}	199.50^{***}	281.73^{***}	265.11^{***}	342.01^{***}	219.91^{***}	477.90***	1019.56^{***}	142.09^{***}	1.38	1.61	1.53	*p <u>c</u> 0.05; **p <u>c</u> 0.01; ***p <u>c</u> 0.001; SV-Source of variation; DF – Degrees of freedom; DTF – Days to 50% flowering; DTM – Days to maturity; PH- Plant beicher ETM – Effective tilber/Jent, DT – Desicle Janach, ET – Elec Jace Lace Lace Later Days Loff, C.B. Canico Andria 1008W – 100 002W
DTF	4.751*	139328.563*** 1	718.510***	54.947***	1.512		001; SV-Sourc ; PL- Panicle l		DTF	4.82	1.79	0.96	263.83^{***}	314.84^{***}	249.73***	206.83^{***}	193.93^{***}	285.23***	274.10^{***}	334.10^{***}	246.47***	360.15^{***}	608.02***	80.12^{***}	1.56	1.41	1.56	001; SV-Sot
DF	2	2 139	44 71	88 52	268		;***p⊴0.(lers/plant	A of 9×	Season	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	B-2014	B-2015	K-2015	1;***p<0
,	u						≤0.01 ive til	VOV	DF	2			4			×			35						88			
SV	Replication	Season	Genotype	Season*	Genotype Error		*p≤0.05; **p≤0.01;***p≤0.001; S ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL-]	Table 2. ANOVA of 9×9 dia	SV	Replication			Treatments			Parents			Hybrids			Parent Vs.	Hybrids	•	Error			*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001; hoisht: ET/D Effortion tilloco(4)

GENETIC ANALYSIS OF YIELD AND YIELD CONTRIBUTING

459

treatments i.e. 9 parents and 36 crosses over the three seasons (Table 2). Significant variation for the yield traits in rice were reported by Hosseini *et al.* (2005), Sharma (2006), Dey *et al.* (2013) and Allahgholipour *et al.* (2015).

The estimates of components of genetic variation $(\hat{D}, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \hat{h}^2, \hat{F} \text{ and } \hat{E})$ are presented in Table (3). The estimates of additive component of genetic variation were significant for most of the traits in all the growing seasons except days to 50% flowering (*boro*-2015), days to maturity (*boro*-2015), effective tillers/plant (in all the seasons), panicle length (in all the seasons), flag leaf length (*boro*-2015), flag leaf width (*boro*-2015), grains/panicle (*boro*-2014) and yield/plant (in all the seasons). The estimates of dominance components, \hat{H}_1 and \hat{H}_2 were highly significant for all the traits over all the three seasons (*boro*-2014, *boro*-2015 and *kharif*-2015). In general, for yield traits estimates of additive component (\hat{D}) were smaller than those of dominance components (\hat{H}_1 and \hat{H}_2) for all the three seasons.

The estimates of net dominance effect, i.e. \hat{h}^2 , were positive and significant for days to 50% flowering (*boro*-2014), days to maturity (*boro*-2014 and *boro*-2015), plant height (*boro*-2015 and *kharif*-2015), effective tillers/plant (*kharif*-2015), panicle length (*kharif*-2015), flag leaf length (*boro*-2014), flag leaf width (*kharif*-2015), grains/panicle (*boro*-2015 and *kharif*-2015) and 100 seed weight (in all the seasons). Positive and significant \hat{h}^2 for most of the traits was reported by Verma and Srivastava (2004).

The estimates of component \hat{F} were significant and positive for plant height (boro-2015), flag leaf length (*kharif*-2015), flag leaf width (*boro*-2014), grains/panicle (*boro*-2015 and *kharif*-2015) and 100 seed weight (*kharif*-2015) suggesting an excess of positive genes controlling these traits. Raju *et al.* (2011) also reported an overall excess of dominant genes for most of the yield and quality traits except plant height, panicle length and kernel breadth.

Component \hat{E} was non-significant for most of the traits except flag leaf width (*boro*-2014). Verma and Srivastava (2004) and Kumar (2011) also reported non significant estimates of \hat{E} for all the yield traits under study which support the findings of the present investigation.

Most of the earlier studies reported significance of both additive and dominance genetic variance for most of the yield traits. Li and Chang (1970), Murai and Kinoshita (1986), Xu and Shen (1991), Mahmood *et al.* (2004), Verma and Srivastava (2004) and Kumar (2011) reported importance of both additive and dominant genes for all the traits under study. Raju *et al.* (2011) reported significant additive and non additive component of variance for the traits, plant height, panicle length, 1000-grain weight and kernel length/breadth ratio. The dominant component of variance was significant for days to 50% flowering, ear

460

GENETIC ANALYSIS OF YIELD AND YIELD CONTRIBUTING

bearing tillers, panicle weight and grain yield/plant and additive component was significant for kernel length and breadth. The non-additive component of variance dominated the additive one for most of the yield traits except 1000-grain weight. Verma and Srivastava (2004), Kumar *et al.* (2008) and Habib *et al.* (2014) reported involvement of both additive and dominance component of variance in the inheritance of the yield traits under study but the magnitude of dominance component was greater than the additive component of variance which indicated greater role of dominance in genetic control of these traits, which supports the present findings.

The proportions of components of genetic variation are presented in Table 4. The estimates of degree of dominance $(\hat{H}_1/\hat{D})^{1/2}$ were higher than the unity for most of the traits in all the three seasons, suggesting the presence of over-dominance type of intra-allelic interactions. The estimates were close to unity for days to 50% flowering (1.400 in *kharif*-2015), days to maturity (1.335 in *kharif*-2015), plant height (1.384 in boro-2014 and 1.337 in boro-2015) and grains/panicle (1.237 in *kharif*-2015) suggesting complete to over-dominance for the trait. Raju et al. (2011) reported over-dominance for days to flowering, ear bearing tillers per plant, panicle weight, grain yield/plant and kernel length and kernel length/breadth ratio and partial dominance for plant height, 1000 grain weight and kernel breadth. The average degree of dominance more than unity for most of the traits was also reported by Verma and Srivastava (2004), Kumar (2011) and Habib et al. (2014) which is in agreement with present findings. Mahmood et al. (2004) reported less than unity average degree of dominance for the trait plant height, number of productive tillers per plant and number of primary branches per panicle, suggesting partial dominance for these traits. Akram et al. (2007) reported over-dominance for panicle length, grain yield/plant and 100 seed weight, whereas partial to complete dominance for tillers per plant.

The ratio $\hat{H}_2/4$ \hat{H}_1 was found close to the expected value of 0.25 for most of the traits, suggesting nearly symmetrical distribution of positive and negative alleles at loci showing dominance for the traits. An asymmetrical distribution of positive and negative alleles was observed in case of panicle length (0.178 in *boro*-2014), flag leaf length (0.155 in *kharif*-2015), flag leaf width (0.181 in *boro*-2015), grains/panicle (0.179 in *boro*-2014, 0.148 in *boro*-2015 and 0.140 in *kharif*-2015) and yield/plant (0.198 in *boro*-2014 and 0.181 in *boro*-2015). Various researchers have reported closeness as well as deviations from the value 0.25 for most of the yield and quality traits in their materials (Murai and Kinoshita, 1986; Xu and Shen, 1991; Verma and Srivastava, 2004; Akram *et al.*, 2007; Kumar, 2011 and Raju *et al.*, 2011) which is in agreement with the present findings. However, Habib *et al.* (2014) reported less than 0.25 for all the traits suggesting asymmetrical distribution of genes in the parents which may be due to differences among the materials under study.

$ \begin{array}{ component season brite brite$	Table 3. Co	Table 3. Components of genetic variation for yield and yield contributing traits for 9x9 diallel in <i>Boro</i> rice in three seasons	genetic var	iation for y	ield and yie	ld contrib	uting trai	ts for 9x9 d	liallel in B	<i>loro</i> rice in t	hree seasoi	JS
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Component	Season	DTF	DTM	Hd	ET/P	Τd	FL	ΡW	G/P	100SW	Υ/Ρ
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Û	Boro-2014	68.399*	36.061*	114.686^{*}	1.738	2.891	65.288*	0.021*	891.203	0.164^{*}	4.041
$ \begin{split} \dot{H}_1 & Boro-2015 & 94.561^* & 93.392^* & 74.215^* & 1.095 & 4.568 & 93.667^* & 0.027^* & 1401.425^* & 0.162^* \\ \dot{H}_1 & Boro-2014 & 273.891^* & 270.448^* & 219.824^* & 14.759^* & 26.470^* & 288.402^* & 0.092^* & 4974.33^* & 0.507^* \\ \dot{H}_2 & Boro-2015 & 355.004^* & 383.304^* & 383.304^* & 8.368^* & 24.934^* & 263.696^* & 0.087^* & 3081.517^* & 0.693^* \\ \dot{K}harf/^2015 & 185.261^* & 166.534^* & 232.242^* & 14.858^* & 30.738^* & 246.164^* & 0.124^* & 2143.826^* & 0.301^* \\ \dot{H}_2 & Boro-2014 & 230.276^* & 236.944^* & 185.018^* & 14.213^* & 18.807^* & 233.170^* & 0.076^* & 3568.331^* & 0.420^* \\ \dot{K}harf/^2015 & 162.649^* & 149.516^* & 191.881^* & 14.551^* & 2.0781^* & 221.792^* & 0.063^* & 1827.368^* & 0.305^* \\ \dot{h}_2 & Boro-2014 & 52.481^* & 69.741^* & 2.962 & 0.065 & 0.125 & 186.436^* & 0.001 & 1068.599 & 0.177^* \\ \dot{h}_2 & Boro-2014 & 52.481^* & 69.741^* & 2.962 & 0.065 & 0.125 & 186.436^* & 0.203^* & 1827.368^* & 0.235^* \\ \dot{h}_2 & Boro-2014 & 52.481^* & 69.741^* & 2.962 & 0.065 & 0.125 & 186.436^* & 0.201 & 1068.599 & 0.177^* \\ \dot{H} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.038^* & 2110.841 & 0.212 \\ \dot{H} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.038^* & 2109.999^* & 0.180^* \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.038^* & 2109.499 & 0.180^* \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.558 & 0.958 & 0.922 & 0.005^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.558 & 0.922 & 0.005^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.558 & 0.944 & 0.548 & 0.922 & 0.005^* & 19.03741^* & 0.213 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.558 & 0.9209 & 0.1001 & 19.037.741^* & 0.215 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.558 & 0.920 & 0.001 & 1000.1470.9019^* 0.905^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.558 & 0.922 & 0.005^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.538 & 0.922 & 0.005^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.538 $		Boro-2015	64.168	65.962	172.458*	1.219	1.161	37.875	0.006	794.003*	0.174^{*}	2.680
$ \hat{H}_1 = Boro-2014 = 273.891^* = 270.448^* = 219.824^* = 14.759^* = 26.470^* = 288.402^* = 0.092^* = 4974.33^* = 0.507^* = Boro-2015 = 356.004^* = 383.304^* = 308.144^* = 8.368^* = 24.934^* = 263.696^* = 0.087^* = 3081.517^* = 0.693^* = Kharif-2015 = 185.261^* = 166.534^* = 235.944^* = 185.018^* = 14.213^* = 18.807^* = 233.170^* = 0.124^* = 2143.826^* = 0.307^* = 305.81^* = 0.420^* = 10^* = 10^* = 120^* = 120^* = 120^* = 14.551^* = 14.551^* = 14.551^* = 24.360^* = 153.370^* = 0.107^* = 11.99.832^* = 0.305^* = 10^* = 10^* = 11.51^* = 0.420^* = 10^* = 10^* = 11.51^* = 0.420^* = 10^* = 10^* = 11.51^* = 0.420^* = 10^* = 10^* = 11.51^* = 0.420^* = 10^* =$		Kharif-2015	94.561*	93.392*	74.215*	1.095	4.568	93.667*	0.027*	1401.425*	0.162^{*}	0.874
Boro-2015 356.004* 383.304* 308.144* 8.368* 24.934* 263.696* 0.087* 3081.517* 0.693* \dot{H}_2 Boro-2015 185.261* 166.534* 232.242* 14.858* 30.738* 246.164* 0.124* 2143.826* 0.373* \dot{H}_2 Boro-2014 230.276* 236.944* 185.018* 14.213* 18.807* 233.170* 0.076* 358.331* 0.420* \dot{H}_2 Boro-2015 314.359* 356.402* 236.988* 7.936* 0.301* 1199.832* 0.501* \dot{h}_2 Boro-2015 314.359* 356.402* 236.898* 7.936* 0.305* 0.501* 1199.832* 0.305* \dot{h}_2 Boro-2014 51.481* 19.51* 2.962 0.355 0.316* 358.32* 0.301* 1199.832* 0.305* \dot{h}_2 Boro-2014 51.1519 2.0.56 0.105 8.730 0.010 1420.85* 0.32* \dot{h}_2 Boro-2014 31.133 2.4.745	\hat{H}_{I}	Boro-2014	273.891*	270.448*	219.824^{*}	14.759*	26.470*	288.402*	0.092*	4974.33*	0.507*	134.155*
$ \begin{split} \dot{H}_2 & Boro-2014 & 230.276^* & 236.944^* & 185.018^* & 14.213^* & 18.807^* & 233.170^* & 0.124^* & 2143.826^* & 0.331^* \\ Boro-2014 & 230.276^* & 236.944^* & 185.018^* & 14.213^* & 18.807^* & 233.170^* & 0.076^* & 3568.331^* & 0.40^* \\ Boro-2015 & 314.359^* & 336.402^* & 236.944^* & 185.018^* & 14.513^* & 243.60^* & 153.070^* & 0.107^* & 1199.832^* & 0.305^* \\ Kharif-2015 & 162.649^* & 149.516^* & 191.881^* & 14.551^* & 24.360^* & 153.070^* & 0.107^* & 1199.832^* & 0.305^* \\ Boro-2014 & 52.481^* & 69.741^* & 2.036^* & 12.045^* & 9.758 & 0.010 & 1420.957^* & 0.32^* \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.048^* & 2063.406^* & 0.217^* \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.028^* & 2110.841 & 0.212 \\ Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.746 & 149.561^* & 0.868 & 2.769 & 42.161 & 0.01 & 1903.741^* & 0.213 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.253^* & 0.353^* & 0.355 & 0.038^* & 210.84^* & 0.218^* \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.253 & 0.525 & 0.588 & 0.922 & 0.007 & 1903.741^* & 0.210 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.253 & 0.438 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.049 & 0.180^* \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.538 & 0.432 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.049 & 10.364^* & 0.318^* \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.001 & 1903.741^* & 0.210 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.000 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.004 & 12.566 & 0.000 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 10.495 & 0.004 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 10.668 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0002 \\ \dot{K} harf-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0002 \\ \dot{K} harf-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 0.004 & 10.3099 & 0.0000 \\ \dot{F} & 0.506 & iritre chartion: PI - Paricle length; PI - Paricle length; PI - Flatelender, \dot{H}_1 - variance due to proportion of positive and continue cefects. $,	Boro-2015	356.004*	383.304*	308.144^{*}	8.368*	24.934*	263.696*	0.087*	3081.517*	0.693^{*}	211.363*
$ \hat{H}_2 = Boro-2014 230.276^* 236.944^* 185.018^* 14.213^* 18.807^* 233.170^* 0.076^* 3568.331^* 0.420^* \\ Boro-2015 314.359^* 336.402^* 25.689^* 7.936^* 20.781^* 221.792^* 0.063^* 1827.368^* 0.591^* \\ Kharif-2015 162.649^* 149.516^* 191.881^* 14.551^* 24.360^* 153.070^* 0.107^* 1199.832^* 0.305^* \\ Boro-2014 52.481^* 69.741^* 2.962 0.065 0.125 186.436^* 0.001 1068.599 0.177^* \\ Boro-2015 88.777 148.969^* 127.377^* 0.365 -0.206 8.730 0.010 1420.957^* 0.325^* \\ \hat{F} Boro-2014 31.133 24.745 70.022 1.073 6.800 67.875 0.048^* 2063.406^* 0.227^* \\ \hat{F} Boro-2014 31.133 24.745 70.022 1.073 6.800 67.875 0.048^* 2063.406^* 0.201 \\ Kharif-2015 17.430 20.934 38.553 -0.266 7.831 151.353^* 0.037 2199.099^* 0.180^* \\ \hat{E} Boro-2014 0.144 0.546 0.467 0.253 0.588 0.922 0.007^* 16.686 0.001 \\ \hat{E} Boro-2014 0.144 0.548 0.447 0.536 0.366 7.831 151.353^* 0.037 2199.099^* 0.180^* \\ Kharif-2015 0.474 0.538 0.438 0.440 0.548 0.925 0.004 12.556 0.0001 \\ \hat{E} Boro-2015 0.516 0.519 0.241 0.422 0.510 0.768 0.004 12.556 0.0001 \\ height: ETP - Effective tillers/plant; PL - Place of freedom; DTF - Days to 50\% flowering; DTM - Days to matu height; ETP - Effective tillers/plant; PL - Place effects; \hat{H}_1, variance effect; \hat{H}_1, variance effects; \hat{H}_2, estimate genetic variance deviations; \hat{H}_2 estimate genetic variance deviations; \hat{H}_2 estimate deviations; \hat{H}_2 method positive and negative and negative genes; \hat{h}^2 and thin and the to dominance effects; \hat{H}_1.$		Kharif-2015	185.261*	166.534^{*}	232.242*	14.858*	30.738*	246.164*	0.124^{*}	2143.826*	0.373*	55.574*
$\begin{split} Boro-2015 & 314.359* & 336.402* & 258.698* & 7.936* & 20.781* & 221.792* & 0.063* & 1827.368* & 0.591* \\ Kharif-2015 & 162.649* & 149.516* & 191.881* & 14.551* & 24.360* & 153.070* & 0.107* & 1199.832* & 0.305* \\ Boro-2015 & 88.777 & 148.969* & 127.377* & 0.365 & -0.206 & 8.730 & 0.010 & 1420.957* & 0.32* \\ Kharif-2015 & 11.519 & 20.586 & 62.36* & 8858* & 12.045* & 9.758 & 0.048* & 2063.406* & 0.327* \\ F & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.028* & 2110.841 & 0.212 \\ Boro-2015 & 26.402 & 34.786 & 149.561* & 0.868 & 2.769 & 42.161 & 0.01 & 1903.741* & 0.211 \\ Kharif-2015 & 17.430 & 20.934 & 38.553 & -0.266 & 7.831 & 151.353* & 0.037 & 2199.099* & 0.180* \\ F & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.546 & 7.831 & 151.353* & 0.037 & 2199.099* & 0.180* \\ F & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.538 & 0.438 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.495 & 0.004 & 120.556 & 0.0001 \\ F & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.525 & 0.588 & 0.922 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0001 \\ F & Boro-2015 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.495 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0001 \\ F & Boro-2015 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.519 & 0.740 & 120.848 & 0.902 & 0.004 & 12.058 & 0.1000 \\ F & Boro-2015 & 0.519 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.519 & 0.748 & 10.095 & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ F & Dero-2015 & 0.519 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.518 & 0.495 & 0.004 & 12.058 & 0.1000 \\ F & P_{2}0.05; **P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.01; ***P_{2}0.001; ***P_{2}0.000; ***P_{2}0.000; ***P_{2}0.000; ***P_{2}0.001; ***P$	\hat{H}_{2}	Boro-2014	230.276*	236.944*	185.018*	14.213*	18.807*	233.170*	0.076^{*}	3568.331*	0.420^{*}	106.026^{*}
$ \begin{split} & Kharif-2015 162.649^* 149.516^* 191.881^* 14.551^* 24.360^* 153.070^* 0.107^* 1199.832^* 0.305^* \\ & Boro-2014 52.481^* 69.741^* 2.962 0.065 0.125 186.436^* 0.001 1068.599 0.177^* \\ & Boro-2015 88.777 148.969^* 127.377^* 0.365 -0.206 8.730 0.010 1420.957^* 0.325^* \\ & Kharif-2015 11.519 20.586 62.36^* 8.858^* 12.045^* 9.758 0.048^* 2063.406^* 0.225^* \\ & Boro-2014 31.133 24.745 70.022 1.073 6.800 67.875 0.028^* 2110.841 0.212 \\ & Boro-2015 17.430 20.934 38.553 -0.266 7.831 151.353^* 0.037 2199.099^* 0.180^* \\ & \hat{E} Boro-2015 0.744 0.538 0.467 0.253 0.525 0.588 0.922 0.007^* 16.686 0.001 \\ & \hat{E} Boro-2015 0.474 0.538 0.440 0.548 0.440 0.548 0.945 0.04 12.556 0.0002 \\ & \hat{E} Boro-2015 0.516 0.519 0.241 0.422 0.510 0.768 16.686 0.0001 \\ & height: ETP - Effective tillers/plant; PL - Paincle length; FU - Flag leaf undth; G/P-Grains/panicle; 1005W- 100 set Vield/plant; D^- variance due to proportion of positive genes; \hat{H}^- - mean of covariance of additive and dori$	4	Boro-2015	314.359*	336.402*	258.698*	7.936*	20.781^{*}	221.792*	0.063*	1827.368*	0.591^{*}	153.380*
$ \begin{split} \dot{h}_2 & Boro-2014 & 52.481^* & 69.741^* & 2.962 & 0.065 & 0.125 & 186.436^* & 0.001 & 1068.599 & 0.177^* \\ Boro-2015 & 88.777 & 148.969^* & 127.377^* & 0.365 & -0.206 & 8.730 & 0.010 & 1420.957^* & 0.357 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.028^* & 2110.841 & 0.212 \\ Boro-2015 & 26.402 & 34.786 & 149.561^* & 0.868 & 2.769 & 42.161 & 0.01 & 1903.741^* & 0.211 \\ \dot{F} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.266 & 7.831 & 151.353^* & 0.037 & 2199.099^* & 0.180^* \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.526 & 7.831 & 151.353^* & 0.037 & 2199.099^* & 0.180^* \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.525 & 0.588 & 0.922 & 0.006^* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.538 & 0.430 & 0.548 & 0.940 & 0.548 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0000 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.548 & 0.940 & 0.548 & 0.922 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0000 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.548 & 0.940 & 0.548 & 0.902 & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.414 & 0.538 & 0.438 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.904 & 12.556 & 0.0000 \\ \dot{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.516 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 10.686 & 0.0001 \\ \dot{E} & P_{2}0.01; ***p_{\leq}0.01; SV-Source of variation: DF - Degrees of freedom; DTF - Days to 50% flowering; DTM - Days to matu height; ETP - Effective tillers/plant; PL - Flag leaf length; FW - Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW - 100 set Yield/plant; D - variance component due to additive gene effects; \dot{H}_{I} - variance component due to additive genes; \dot{\dot{H}}_{I} - variance component due to forminance deviations; \dot{H}_{2} - estimate genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \dot{h}_{I}^{2} - net dominance effect; \dot{F}_{I} - mean of covariance of additive and dot dominance defecti. \dot{F}_{I} - mean of covariance of additive and dot dominance offecti. \dot{F}_{I} - mean of covariance of additive and dot dominance offecti. \dot{F}_{I}^{2} - net dominance offecti. \dot{F}_{I}^{2} - setimate$		Kharif-2015	162.649*	149.516^{*}	191.881^{*}	14.551*	24.360*	153.070*	0.107*	1199.832*	0.305*	48.465*
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	\hat{h}_{2}	Boro-2014	52.481*	69.741^{*}	2.962	0.065	0.125	186.436^{*}	0.0001	1068.599	0.177*	8.462
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4	Boro-2015	88.777	148.969*	127.377*	0.365	-0.206	8.730	0.010	1420.957*	0.32^{*}	9.397
$ \begin{split} \hat{F} & Boro-2014 & 31.133 & 24.745 & 70.022 & 1.073 & 6.800 & 67.875 & 0.028* & 2110.841 & 0.211 \\ Boro-2015 & 26.402 & 34.786 & 149.561* & 0.868 & 2.769 & 42.161 & 0.01 & 1903.741* & 0.211 \\ Kharif-2015 & 17.430 & 20.934 & 38.553 & -0.266 & 7.831 & 151.353* & 0.037 & 2199.099* & 0.180* \\ \hat{E} & Boro-2014 & 0.546 & 0.467 & 0.253 & 0.525 & 0.588 & 0.922 & 0.005* & 16.686 & 0.0001 \\ \hat{E} & Boro-2015 & 0.474 & 0.538 & 0.438 & 0.440 & 0.548 & 0.495 & 0.004 & 12.556 & 0.0002 \\ Kharif-2015 & 0.519 & 0.241 & 0.422 & 0.510 & 0.768 & 10.04 & 13.059 & 0.0001 \\ \text{height; ETP - Effective tillers/plant; PL - Panicle length; FL - Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 see Yield/plant; \hat{D} - variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}_1- variance component due to additive genes; \hat{h}_1- variance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dore the covariance of additive and dore to additive and negative genes; \hat{h}_2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dore to additive and not active to the propertion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}_2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dore dominance of additive and dore to additive and dore to additive and not additive and not and not available to additive and negative genes; \hat{h}_2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dore dominance detects; \hat{H}_2 - net dominance detects; \hat{H}_2$		Kharif-2015	11.519	20.586	62.36*	8.858*	12.045*	9.758	0.048^{*}	2063.406*	0.257*	10.976
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ê	Boro-2014	31.133	24.745	70.022	1.073	6.800	67.875	0.028^{*}	2110.841	0.212	-9.881
$\begin{split} \hat{E} & Kharif-2015 17.430 20.934 38.553 -0.266 7.831 151.353* 0.037 2199.099* 0.180^{*} \\ \hat{E} & Boro-2014 0.546 0.467 0.253 0.525 0.588 0.922 0.005* 16.686 0.0001^{*} \\ Boro-2015 0.474 0.538 0.438 0.440 0.548 0.495 0.004 12.556 0.0002^{*} \\ \hat{E} & Kharif-2015 0.516 0.519 0.241 0.422 0.510 0.768 0.004 13.059 0.0009^{*} \\ \hat{E} & $		Boro-2015	26.402	34.786	149.561*	0.868	2.769	42.161	0.01	1903.741^{*}	0.211	1.220
$ \hat{E} Boro-2014 0.546 0.467 0.253 0.525 0.588 0.922 0.005^* 16.686 0.0001^* \\ Boro-2015 0.474 0.538 0.438 0.440 0.548 0.495 0.004 12.556 0.0002^* \\ Kharif-2015 0.516 0.519 0.241 0.422 0.510 0.768 0.004 13.059 0.0000^* \\ \text{height; ET/P - Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL - Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 see Yield/plant; \hat{D} - variance component due to additive gene effects; \hat{H}_I - variance component due to dominance deviations; \hat{H}_2 - estimate genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}^2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dor$		Kharif-2015	17.430	20.934	38.553	-0.266	7.831	151.353*	0.037	2199.099*	0.180^{*}	-4.095
Boro-2015 0.474 0.538 0.438 0.440 0.548 0.495 0.004 12.556 0.0002 $Kharif-2015$ 0.519 0.241 0.422 0.510 0.768 0.004 13.059 0.0009 $*p \ge 0.051$; $*r p \le 0.01$; SV-Source of variation; DF - Degrees of freedom; DTF - Days to 50% flowering; DTM - Days to matu height; ET/P - Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL - Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100 sec Yield/plant; D - variance component due to additive gene effects; \hat{H}_1 - variance component due to dominance deviations; \hat{H}_2 - estimate genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}_2 - net dominance effect; \hat{H}_2 - net dominance of additive and dor	Ê	Boro-2014	0.546	0.467	0.253	0.525	0.588	0.922	0.005*	16.686	0.00014	1.979
Kharif-20150.5160.5190.2410.4220.5100.7680.00413.0590.00006* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; SV-Source of variation; DF – Degrees of freedom; DTF – Days to 50% flowering; DTM – Days to maturheight; ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL – Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 seeYield/plant; \hat{D} - variance component due to additive gene effects; \hat{H}_I - variance component due to dominance deviations; \hat{H}_2 - estimategenetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}_2^2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dominance		Boro-2015	0.474	0.538	0.438	0.440	0.548	0.495	0.004	12.556	0.00027	1.974
*p ≤ 0.05 ; ** $p\leq 0.01$; SV-Source of variation; DF – Degrees of freedom; DTF – Days to 50% flowering; DTM – Days to matun height; ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL – Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 see Yield/plant; \hat{D} - variance component due to additive gene effects; \hat{H}_1 - variance component due to dominance deviations; \hat{H}_2 - estimate genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}^2_{-1} - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dor		Kharif-2015	0.516	0.519	0.241	0.422	0.510	0.768	0.004	13.059	0.0000	1.350
negnt, E1/F – Enective uners/plant; FL- Fancie lengui; FL – Flag lear lengui; FW - Flag lear widui; U/F-Grains/pancie; 1005W - 100 see Yield/plant; \hat{D} - variance component due to additive gene effects; \hat{H}_I - variance component due to dominance deviations; \hat{H}_2 - estimate genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}^2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dor	*p<0.05; **p	≤0.01;***p≤0.0		ce of variatio	n; DF – Degr	tees of freed	lom; DTF –	Days to 50%	6 flowering	;; DTM – Days	to maturity;	PH- Plant
genetic variance due to proportion of positive and negative genes; \hat{h}^2 - net dominance effect; \hat{F} - mean of covariance of additive and dor	Vield/nlant: <i>V</i>	– Ellecuve ullel Ô - variance coi	is/piaili; r.L- mponent due	ramere tengu	II; FL – Flág . rana affacte	leat tengun; Ĥ varian	r w - riag li ce compone	cat wrater, G/	r-uranns/p	allicie; 1005 W aviations: $\hat{H}_{2,-}$	- 100 SEEU M . Actimata of	/elgiit; 1/F- dominance
•	genetic varian	ice due to propo	ortion of posi	tive and nega	tive genes; \dot{h}	$\frac{1}{i^2}$ - net dom	ninance effe	ct; \hat{F} - mear	n of covaria	ince of additive	e and domina	ance effects

462

PRIYANKA AND JAISWAL

over all arrays; \hat{E} - environmental component of variation.

Table 4. Propo	Table 4. Proportion of genetic components of variation for yield and yield contributing traits in boro rice over seasons	component	s of variati	ion for yit	eld and yiel	ld contrib	uting trait	s in boro	rice over s	easons	
Component	Season	DTF	DTM	Hd	ET/P	PL	FL	FW	G/P	100SW	Y/P
$(\hat{H}_{1}/\hat{D})^{1/2}$	Boro-2014	2.001	2.071	1.384	2.914	3.026	2.102	2.117	2.363	1.759	5.762
	Boro-2015	2.355	2.411	1.337	2.620	4.634	2.639	3.697	1.970	1.996	8.880
	Kharif-2015	1.400	1.335	1.769	3.684	2.594	1.621	2.128	1.237	1.517	7.974
\hat{H}_{2} /4 \hat{H}_{1}	Boro-2014	0.210	0.219	0.210	0.241	0.178	0.202	0.206	0.179	0.207	0.198
7	Boro-2015	0.221	0.219	0.210	0.237	0.208	0.210	0.181	0.148	0.213	0.181
	Kharif-2015	0.219	0.224	0.207	0.245	0.200	0.155	0.215	0.140	0.204	0.218
() ()	Boro-2014	1.257	1.209	1.566	1.237	2.271	1.657	1.960	3.010	2.165	0.650
KD/KR	Boro-2015	1.191	1.246	1.960	1.314	1.693	1.535	1.506	4.109	1.872	1.053
	Kharif-2015	1.141	1.183	1.344	0.936	1.987	2.987	1.910	4.470	2.155	0.546
\hat{h}_{2}/\hat{H}_{2}	Boro-2014	0.228	0.294	0.016	0.005	0.007	0.800	0.001	0.299	0.423	0.080
1	Boro-2015	0.282	0.443	0.492	0.046	0.010	0.039	0.166	0.778	0.542	0.061
	Kharif-2015	0.071	0.138	0.325	0.609	0.489	0.064	0.447	1.720	0.843	0.226
\hat{h}_{2} (ns)%	Boro-2014	41.0	37.6	46.1	12.9	26.2	30.8	14.8	9.30	15.7	42.5
` ~ 4	Boro-2015	33.4	31.6	35.7	13.9	18.1	25.2	34.2	13.3	18.0	42.4
	Kharif-2015	54.8	54.1	44.1	17.0	17.6	31.2	11.7	18.9	24.8	31.0
DTF – Days to 5(Flag leaf width; C dominant genes w	DTF – Days to 50% flowering; DTM – Days to maturity; PH- Plant height; ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL – Flag leaf length; FW- Flag leaf width; G/P-Grains/panicle; 100SW- 100 seed weight; Y/P- Yield/plant; $(\hat{H}_I / \hat{D})^{1/2}$ – average degree of dominace; $\hat{H}_2 / 4 \hat{H}_1$ – proportion of dominant genes with positive and negative effects; \vec{KD} / \vec{KR} – proportion of dominant and recessive genes; \hat{h}_2 / \hat{H}_2 – proportion of gene(s)	M – Days to n ; 100SW- 100 ; gative effects	naturity; PH-) seed weight s; <i>KD/KR</i> -	- Plant heig t; Y/P- Yie proportion	y; PH- Plant height; ET/P – Effective tillers/plant; PL- Panicle length; FL – Flag leaf length; weight; Y/P- Yield/plant; $(\hat{H}_1 / \hat{D})^{1/2}$ – average degree of dominace; $\hat{H}_2 / 4 \hat{H}_1$ – proporti $/\hat{K}R$ – proportion of dominant and recessive genes; \hat{h}_2 / \hat{H}_2 – proportion of gene(s)/gene(s)	ffective tille \tilde{t}_I/\hat{D}) ^{1/2} – t and recess	ers/plant; PI average deg ive genes; \hat{h}	- Panicle le ree of dom $\frac{1}{2}/\hat{H}_2 - p$	ength; FL – inace; \hat{H}_2 / roportion of	Flag leaf leng 4 \hat{H}_I – prop gene(s)/gene	;th; FW- ortion of (s)

GENETIC ANALYSIS OF YIELD AND YIELD CONTRIBUTING

463

blocks exhibiting dominance; \hat{h}_2 (ns)% - narrow sense heritability estimate

The ratio of dominance to recessive genes, i.e. $\overline{KD}/\overline{KR}$, was greater than unity for all the yield traits except effective tillers per plant (0.936 in *kharif*-2015) and yield/plant (0.650 in boro-2014 and 0.546 in Kharif-2015) in all the three seasons suggesting presence of an excess of dominant genes in parental lines. For effective tillers/plant (kharif-2015) it was close to unity indicating an equal proportion of dominant and recessive gene among parents. However, an excess of recessive genes were observed for yield/plant (boro-2014 and kharif-2015). Akram et al. (2007) also reported presence of dominant alleles in parental alleles for most of the traits as the ratio was more than unity. Verma and Srivastava (2004) reported occurrence of more recessive genes for the trait 50% flowering, panicle length, flag-leaf area and grain yield and occurrence of dominant genes in other yied traits. Raju et al. (2011) reported excess of dominant alleles for days to flowering, ear bearing tillers per plant, panicle weight, 1000 grain weight, grain vield/plant, kernel length and kernel length/breadth (L/B). Kumar (2011) reported distribution of more dominant alleles for the traits day to first flowering, plant height, grain yield/plant, 1000 grain weight, grain length and grain breadth and distribution of more recessive alleles for number of productive tillers, panicle length, number of grains per panicle and grain length/breadth (L/B). Habib et al. (2014) found less than unity value for plant height, number of tillers/plant, panicle length, total spikelets/plant, number of seeds/panicle, days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, panicle number/plant, grain weight/panicle, grain vield/plot and 1000 seed weight indicating excess of recessive alleles.

The ratio of \hat{h}^2/\hat{H}_2 denotes an approximate number of genes/group of genes controlling the trait exhibiting dominance. The estimate ranged from 0.001 (flag leaf width in boro-2014) to 1.720 (grains/panicle in kharif-2015) in various seasons, which indicated that at least one to two genes or group of genes showing dominance were present for different traits. In boro-2014, all the traits were controlled by single gene or gene group. In boro-2015, all the traits were controlled by single gene or gene group exhibiting dominance. In kharif-2015, all the traits were controlled by single gene or gene group except grains/panicle which was controlled by two gene or gene groups exhibiting dominance. Li and Chang (1970) reported one to five gene or gene groups exhibiting dominance for seeding to heading period, plant height, number of panicles per plant, panicle length, panicle weight and number of spikelets per panicle in rice. Murai and Kinoshita (1986) reported one to twelve gene or gene groups exhibiting dominance for different yield traits. Verma and Srivastava (2004) reported one major gene group involved in expression of panicle length and plant height in F1 while the remaining traits showed the presence of at least one major group of genes controlling their inheritance. Kumar (2011) found the ratio less than one for all the traits under study and reported that all the traits were under the control of at least single group of genes. Xu and Shen (1991) and Akram et al. (2007) reported one to three gene or gene groups and Habib et al. (2014) reported three to five genes or gene groups showing dominance for traits under study.

The estimates of narrow sense heritability were low to moderate for most of the yield traits in all the three seasons. Days to 50% flowering showed highest heritability (33.4 to 54.8%) over the seasons followed by plant height (35.7% to 46.1%) and yield/plant (31.0% to 42.5%). Raju *et al.* (2011) also reported low to moderate narrow sense heritability for yield components such as days to 50% flowering, ear bearing tillers, panicle weight besides grain yield/plant indicating prevalence of non additive gene action i.e. dominant and epistasis in these traits. However, high heritability was observed by Raju *et al.* (2011) for 1000-grain weight indicating prevalence of additive gene action and direct selection for this trait can be done for genetic improvement. Direct selection is effective for the traits showing high heritability and desirable mean performance.

Conclusion

The present investigation indicated the importance of dominance type of genetic effects in inheritance of yield and yield related traits in rice over three seasons. Certainly, heterosis breeding would be more beneficial to harvest the dominance gene effects of these traits. The low to moderate narrow sense heritability for most of traits suggested that direct selection for these traits may not be effective and reliable.

Acknowledgement

The first author is grateful to the Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi, India for financial assistance as INSPIRE Fellowship and Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, BHU for providing facilities for conducting of experiments during the course of present study.

References

- Akram, M., M. Munir, S. Ajmal, S. Mahmud and Y. Ashraf . 2007. Combining ability analysis for yield and yield components in rice (*Oryza sativa L.*). *Pak. J. Agric. Res.* 20: 1-2.
- Allahgholipour, M., E. Farshdfar and B. Rabiei. 2015. Combining ability and heritability of selected rice varieties for grain yield, its components and grain quality characters. *Genetika*. 47 (2): 559-570.
- Dey, S.R., M.S.R. Bhuyan, M. Maniruzzaman, M.A. Islam and S. Begum. 2013. Heterosis in inter-ecotypic classes of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), J. Agrofor. Environ. 7(1): 111-114.
- Habib, M., G.A. Parray and Z.A. Dar. 2014. Component analysis of different traits in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under temperate conditions. *Agric. Sci. Digest.* 34 (4): 307-309.
- Hayman, B.I. 1954. The theory and analysis of diallel crosses. Genetics. 39: 789-809.
- Hosseini, M., R.H. Nejad and A.R. Tarang. 2005. Gene effects, combining ability of quantitative characteristics and grain quality in rice. Iranian J. Agric. Sci. **36** (1): 21-32.

- Kumar, N.S. 2011. Genetics of grain yield and its component characters in rice. *Crop Improv.* **38** (1): 45-47.
- Li, C.C. and T.T. Chang. 1970. Diallel analysis of agronomic traits in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Bot. Bull. Acad. Sinica.* **11**: 61-81.
- Mahmood, T. M., F. L. Turner, Stoddard and M.A. Javed. 2004. Genetic analysis of quantitative traits in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) exposed to salinity. *Australian J. Agricl. Res.* 55 (11): 1173-1181.
- Murai, M. and T. Kinoshita. 1986. Diallel analysis of traits concerning yield in rice. *Japan. J. Breed.* **36**: 7-15.
- Panse, V.G. and P.V. Sukhatme. 1967. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers, ICAR, New Delhi, India.
- Raju, C.H.S., L. Krishna, C.H.D. Raju, S. Vanishree, P.N. Reddy and B.B. Reddy. 2011. Genetic studies of quantitative traits through Hayman's approach in rice. *Oryza*. 48 (4): 314-318.
- Sharma, R.K. 2006. Studies on gene action and combining ability for yield and its component traits in rice. *Indian J. Genet.* 66: 227-228.
- Verma, O.P., and Srivastava, H.K. 2004. Genetic component and combining ability analysis in relation to heterosis for yield and associated traits using three diverse rice growing ecosystems. *Field Crop Res.* **88**: 91-102.
- Xu, Y.B. and Z.T. Shen. 1991. Diallel analysis for tiller number at different growth stages in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* 83: 243-249.