# Genetic Behaviour of Some Agronomic Traits in Two Durum Wheat Crosses under Heat Stress

Amin, I.A

Wheat Res. Dep. Field Crops Res. Institute. ARC.

Received on: 31/3/2013

Accepted:30/4/2013

## ABSTRACT

Parents ( $P_1\&P_2$ ),  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and first generation backcrosses (BC<sub>1</sub>&BC<sub>2</sub>) of two durum wheat crosses i.e., Bani Sweif 5 / Bani Sweif 3 (C<sub>1</sub>) and Sohag 3 /KSU 18 (C<sub>2</sub>), were grown in two experiments (normal and heat stress = late sowing). This study was conducted during the three successive growing seasons i.e., 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 at the Experimental Farm of Shandaweel Agric. Res. Station, ARC, to estimate non-allelic interaction, scaling tests (A, B, C and D), coupled with six types of gene action in addition to determining the adequacy of genetic model controlling the genetic system of the inheritance of some economic traits. Days to heading, plant height, number of spikes / plant, number of kernels / spike, 100-kernel weight, biological and grain yields / plant were studied. Results indicated the presence of non-allelic interaction for the significant values in all traits of the two crosses and environments except number of spikes / plant and number of kernels / spike in the two environments for cross I, 100-kernel weight under heat stress for cross II in which the values did not reach the significance level.

Result revealed that additive – dominance model was inadequate for the inheritance of most studied traits of the two crosses and environment conditions. Meanwhile, the scaling tests indicated the presence of non-allelic epistatic gene effect for the remaining characters. Additive, additive x additive and additive x dominance gene effects were higher than the dominance and dominance x dominance gene effect, proving the important role of additive gene effects for most studied traits and selection in the  $F_2$  population would be effective for improving of these characters to produce lines having high grain yield under heat stress.

 $(H/D)^{0.5}$  exhibited different values  $< \pm 1.0$  to  $> \pm 1.0$  according to cross, environment and characters, indicating the presence of partial dominance for all characters under normal and heat stress conditions in the two populations, except over-dominance were observed in the number of spikes /plant and number of kernels/spike under normal condition.

Broad sense heritability values were varied from moderate 41.73% for plant height to high 81.89% for 100-kernel weight in cross I under heat stress. Narrow sense heritability estimates were low for number of spikes/plant, number of kernels/spike and biological yield/plant in the cross I under normal condition. However, it was moderate for all traits for the two crosses and environments except days to heading under the two environments,100 kernel weight under heat stress in cross I as well as plant height and 100 kernel weight under heat stress for cross II. From the previous results it cold be conclude that selection in segregation generated could be effective to produce high yielding ability lines under heat conditions.

Key words: wheat, heat stress, genetic components, six generations.

#### INTRODUCTION

Durum wheat currently represents 8-10% of the wheat grown and produced worldwide (FAO STAT date, 2006). However, it is concentrated in relatively small geographical areas where it often plays a major role in the food security of urban population and in the livelihood and nutrition of urban communities. The productivity of durum wheat is often limited by an array of a biotic stresses that affect a successful growth and a complete grain filling. Heat stress, due to increased temperature, is an agricultural problem in many areas in the world (Wahid *et al.*, 2007).

High temperature during floral initiation and spikelets development (a period of several weeks preceding anthesis) reduced the potential number of grains, thus determining maximum yield potential. Heat stress during the post- anthesis, grain filling stage affects availability and translocation of photosynthates to the developing kernel, starch synthesis and deposition within the kernel, thus resulting in lower grain weight and altered grain quality (Bhullar & Jenner, 1985)

Generation mean analyses provides information on the relative importance of average effects of the genes (additive effects), dominance deviations, and effects due to non allelic genetic interactions, in determining genotypic values of the individuals and, consequently, mean genotypic values of families and generations. Generation mean analysis is a simple but useful technique for estimating gene effects for a polygenic trait, its greatest merit lying in the ability to estimate epistatic gene effects such as additive X additive, dominance X dominance and additive X dominance effects.

Since, genetic information obtained from multi generation are reliable compared with those based on one generation therefore, six populations ( $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ , BC<sub>1</sub>and BC<sub>2</sub>) are considered the one which may be give detailed genetic information for the employed genotypes. High values of heritability and no significant epistatic effects were detected in the inheritance of heading date, plant height and 100 kernel weight (Bhatt, 1972; Edwards et al., 1976 and Singh et al., 1985). Khalifa et al.(1997) and Bayoumi et al. (2008) found that additive dominance model were adequate for revealing the inheritance of grain yield and its components. With A, B, C and D. scaling tests, additive, dominance and epistatic effects were important for yield and its components characters. On the other hand, Pawar et al. (1988), El-Hennawy (1992) and Amawate and Behl (1995) revealed that the dominance gene effects were more important than additive one in most cases which showed presence of both types of gene effects. Result of Srivastava et al. (1992), Awaad (1996), Moshref (1996) and Sharma et al. (2003), indicated that both additive and non additive gene effects were predominant for most studied traits, though the non-additive gene effects were also important. This study aims to evaluate the genetic variations of a recombination inbred line populations for heat tolerance and determine the adequacy genetic model, types of gene action and heritability using six populations under normal and heat environments.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was carried out at the Experimental Farm of Shandaweel Agric. Res. Station, ARC., Egypt during the successive growing seasons of 2009/2010, 2010/2011, and 2011/2012. Four durum wheat cultivars (three local and one introduced) were chosen for this study on basis of their diversity of the studied traits (Table 1). In 2009/2010 season, two crosses were made among the parents to produce  $F_1$  hybrid grains and designated as follows:

In 2010/2011 season, some  $F_1$  plants of each cross were backed cross to both parents to produce the back crosses (Bc<sub>1</sub> and Bc<sub>2</sub>). At the same time, some other  $F_1$  plants were selfed to produce  $F_2$ generation. Also, crosses were made to produce more  $F_1$  grains. In the 2011/2012 season, the six populations, i.e.,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ , Bc<sub>1</sub> and Bc<sub>2</sub> of the two crosses were sown in two experiments in two sowing dates, (Nov. 20 as normal and Dec. 20 as late sowing = heat stress) in a randomized complete blocks design with three replicates. Each replicate consisted of 20 grains in one row for each of the parents and  $F_1$ 's', 40 grains in two rows of each back cross and 80 grains in four rows for the  $F_2$  population. Rows were 2.0 m long and 30 cm apart and 10 cm between plants. Recommended cultural practices for wheat production were adopted in all the growing season. Data were recorded on 5 competitive individual plants for non-segregate basis (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, and F<sub>1</sub>) and 10 plants for BC<sub>1</sub> and BC<sub>2</sub> and 60 plants for F<sub>2</sub> population for each replicate as follows:

1 - Days to heading. 2 - Plant height (cm).

3– Number of spikes / plant. 4– Number of kernels / spike.

5- 100-kernel weight (gm). 6- Biological Yield / plant (gm).

7– Grain yield / plant (gm).

#### **Components the genetic variance:**

In the case of three– six parameters model where the absence of non-allelic interaction as indicated by non– significance of scale test, the genetic components of variance for each trait in the studied crosses were partitioned into additive (D), dominance (H) and environmental (E) genetic variances using formula as follows: E = 1/2 (MD + MD + ME)

$$E = 1/3 (VP_1 + VP_2 + VF_1)$$

$$D = 4VF_2 - 2 (VBc_1 + VBc_2)$$
 and

 $H = 4(VF_2 - 1/2 VD - E)$ 

 $F_2$  plants were used to compute average degree of dominance  $(H/D)^{0.5}$  and heritability in broad and narrow sense.

The A, B, C, and D scaling tests as outlined were applied to test the presence of non-allelic interaction as follows

$$A = 2 \overline{B_1 - P_1 - F_1} \qquad VA = 4 \overline{V(B_1)} + \overline{V(P)} + \overline{V(F1)}$$
  

$$B = 2 \overline{B_2 - P_2 - F_1} \qquad VB = 4 \overline{V(B_2)} + \overline{V(P_2)} + \overline{V(F1)}$$
  

$$C = 4 \overline{F_2} - 2 \overline{F_1} - \overline{P_1} - \overline{P_2} \qquad \overline{VC} = 16 \ V(\overline{F_2}) + 4 V(\overline{F_1}) + V(\overline{F_1})$$
  

$$+ \overline{V(P_2)} \qquad D = 2 \overline{F_2} - \overline{B_1} - \overline{B_2} \qquad VD = 4 \overline{VF_2} + \overline{VB_1} + \overline{VB_2}$$
  
The embrain of the values of  $A - B - C$  and  $D$ 

The analysis of the values of A, B, C and D should be equal zero within the limits of this standard error. The significance of any one of these scales are taken to indicate proceeded to compute the interaction types involved the six parameters genetic model of. Hayman (1958).

The significance of the genetic components were tested using "t" test

Where  $\pm t = effect / (variance effect)^{1/2}$ .

potence ratio (P), was estimated using the following equation.

Table 1: Pedigree and origin of the cultivars used in the two durum wheat crosses.

Cross		Parent	Pedigree	Origin
Cross 1	$P_1$	Bani Sweif 5	DIPPER-2/BUSHEN-3	Egypt
	P <sub>2</sub>	Bani Sweif 3	CORM "S"/ RUFO "S"	Egypt
Cross 2	$P_1$	SOhag 3	MEXI "S" MGHA/51792// DURUM 6	Egypt
C1088 2	P <sub>2</sub>	KSU 18	KSU 18	Italian

 $P = (F_1 - M.P.) / 1/2 (P_2 - P_1)$  where:

- P: potence ratio of gene set. F<sub>1</sub>: First generation mean.
- P<sub>1</sub>: the mean of the lower parent, P<sub>2</sub>: the mean of the higher parent, and M.P: the mid-parent values =  $1/2(P_1+P_2)$ .

Stress tolerance index (STI) for grain yield was computed according to Farshadfar, et al. (2001), as follow:

STI= Yp x Ys /  $(Yp)^2$  x 100 where:

Yp = grain yield under normal conditions.

 $Y_s = grain yield under stress conditions.$ 

Broad-sense heritability (H<sup>2</sup>) as estimated based on the following equations  $H^2 = Vg / (Vg + Ve) x 100$ , where:  $Ve = (Vp_1 + Vp_2 + VF_1)/3$ ,  $Vg = VF_2 - Ve$ .

Narrow–sense heritability( $h^2$ ) for  $F_2$ – generation was estimated as proposed by Warner (1955),  $h^2 = 2VF_2 - (VB_1 + VB_2) / VF_2 \ge 100$ .

Expected genetic advance from selection was calculated as formula proposed using the selection differential (K) equal 2.06 for 5% selection intensity and narrow- sense heritability.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** I-Performance and potence ratio:

Average of the seven characters for P1, P2, F1, F2, BC1 and BC2 populations for two durum wheat crosses under the two environments are given in Tables (2&3). The analysis of variance indicated that there were significant difference between the studied generations in all characters under study and the two environmental conditions, except, number of spikes /plant and number of kernels/spike under the two environments, while plant height and 100 kernel weight under heat stress for cross I (Bani Sweif 5 X Bani Sweif 3), number of spikes/plant, 100-kernel weight and biological yield/plant under heat condition for cross I1 (Sohag 3 x KSU 18) and number of kernel/spikes under two environments for cross II. Significant differences for most characters under study in normal and heat stress conditions indicated the presence of sufficient genetic variability in the experimental materials for grain yield and other traits.

Data for means of six-populations showed that the F1 hybrids were higher than mid-parents and or higher parents in days to heading, plant height, number of spikes/plant, number of kernels/spike, 100-kernel weight, biological yield/plant and grain yield/plant for both crosses under the two environments, except days to heading under the two conditions for cross1I. The results indicated the presence of heterotic effects for these characters.

The potence ratio presented in Tables (2&3), its values ranged from less than one (0.14) for plant height under heat stress to more than one (14.17) for biological yield/plant under normal condition indicating the presence of partial dominance for

plant height (0.14) under heat stress and 100-kernel weight (0.17) under normal condition in the cross 1, days to heading (0.88) and plant height (0.79) under normal condition in the cross I1. Over-dominance were detected for days to heading, number of spikes /plant, number of kernels /spike, biological yield/plant and grain yield/plant under the two environments for cross 1, plant height and 100kernel weight under normal and stress conditions, respectively in the same cross. In the cross II, number of spikes /plant, number of kernels /spike, 100-kernel weight, biological yield/plant and grain yield /plant were over-dominance under the two environments, while days to heading and plant height were over-dominance under heat stress condition. These results are in line with those obtained by ketata et al. (1976), Moshref (1996), khalifa et al. (1997) and Farshadfar et al. (2008).

Stress tolerance index (STI %) for grain yield/plant showed that the first cross had higher values compared to the second cross, Table (3). The  $F_1$  hybrid for cross I gave the highest value (77.14 %) of heat tolerance followed by P  $_2$  and F $_2$  which had (76.52 and 76.49%) than  $BC_2$ ,  $BC_1$  and  $P_1$ populations which had 76.41, 74.96 and 73.91% respectively, in cross I, while in cross II, F<sub>1</sub> hybrid had the highest heat tolerance (74.32%) followed by  $P_1$  (73.79) and  $P_2$  (71.74). These result indicated that selection in the segregation population for development grain yield/plant under heat condition could be effective to produce lines have high grain yield and high tolerance to heat stress. The same results were obtained by Kheiralla, et al. (1993) and Farshadfar et al. (2001).

## **II-Gene effects:**

Choice the most efficient breeding procedures depends, to large extent, on the knowledge of the genetic system controlling the characters to be selected, the estimates of various types of gene effects contributing to the genetic variability are presented in Tables (4&5). The results of A, B, C, and D scaling test for the two durum wheat crosses under both environments, revealed that significant of any of these tests indicates the presence of nonallelic gene interactions or epistasis on the scale of measurement used. Results of scaling test, showed that additive-dominance model are inadequate for explaining the inheritance of all studied traits and this would indicate the presence of non-allelic gene interaction in the two crosses under the two environments, except number of spikes/plant and number of kernels/spike under normal and heat stress, while under heat stress for 100 kernel weight in the first cross. However cross II showed insignificant for plant height and 100 kernels weight under heat stress, indicating the simple genetic variation controlling the inheritance of these traits in the two crosses.

Table 2: Means ± wheat cross	: S.E for the six pol ses under two envi	pulations and poter ironments.	nce ratio for days to	o heading, plant hei	ght, number of spi	ikes/plant and nu	mber of kernels/sl	oike of two durum
Characters	days to	heading	plant hei	ght (cm)	number of s	pikes/plant	number of k	ernels/spike
Population	Normal	Heat	Normal	Heat	Normal	Heat	Normal	Heat
Cross I								
P <sub>1</sub>	81.93±0.57	76.73±0.71	94.93±0.75	90.20±0.61	9.33±0.42	8.93±0.36	40.41±0.72	39.76±0.38
P <sub>2</sub>	95.33± 0.77	82.47±0.50	105.87±0.79	$100.53 \pm 0.69$	10.20±0.45	$10.00 \pm 0.37$	39.00±0.73	37.93±0.55
F1	96.73± 0.75	89.87±0.49	$107.27\pm0.70$	98.67±0.55	11.66±0.51	$10.78 \pm 0.14$	46.80±0.69	42.20±0.52
F <sub>2</sub>	88.97±0.47	$77.14\pm0.40$	91.75±0.42	88.01±0.31	<b>9.41±0.25</b>	8.62±0.21	$41.01 \pm 0.40$	40.35±0.27
BCI	93.50± 0.77	79.43±0.59	$103.53 \pm 0.67$	93.17±0.52	9.97±0.42	9.23±0.33	43.02±0.67	39.01±0.44
BC <sub>2</sub>	91.00± 0.67	77.11±0.59	95.43±0.65	90.00±0.51	10.47±0.43	9.97±0.35	39.35±0.64	40.57±0.44
potence ratio	1.21	3.58	1.72	0.14	4.17	2.03	10.0	3.66
L. S.D.0.05	7.63	2.71	6.65	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Cross II								
P <sub>1</sub>	98.93±0.79	87.00±0.18	104.53±0.74	90.38±0.26	9.00±0.49	9.52±0.21	41.03±0.59	40.08±0.41
P <sub>2</sub>	94.00±0.68	80.93±0.23	$100.67 \pm 0.70$	87.50±0.33	9.93±0.46	8.70±0.21	41.83±0.57	36.06±0.39
F1	97.67±0.73	82.20±0.22	$104.13\pm0.29$	91.40±0.25	$11.60 \pm 0.44$	$10.20 \pm 0.82$	46.23±0.69	42.65±0.38
F <sub>2</sub>	98.65±0.39	77.20±0.12	98.80±0.44	88.44±0.29	9.55±0.27	7.90±0.11	42.08±0.34	43.30±0.20
BCI	92.97±0.64	87.25±0.19	105.27±0.72	90.98±0.40	8.97±0.42	8.86±0.18	40.02±0.56	40.58±0.34
$BC_2$	91.80±0.61	80.23±0.20	103.77±0.70	87.80±0.42	$10.10 \pm 0.54$	8.90±0.18	40.00±0.54	44.03±0.33
potence ratio	0.88	4.62	0.79	1.71	4.53	1.73	11.00	2.72
L. S.D.0.05	4.26	3.80	3.86	3.80	1.99	NS	NS	NS

	100-kerne	el weight	Biological	yield/plant	CD.	rain yield/plant	
Population	Normal	Heat	Normal	Heat	Normal	Heat	STI%
Cross I							
P1	5.28±0.09	5.05±0.06	95.29±0.26	88.73±0.72	20.93±0.72	15.47±0.70	73.91
P <sub>2</sub>	4.56±0.09	<b>4.68±0.12</b>	96.21±0.81	75.61±0.82	23.00±0.76	17.60±0.58	76.52
F1	5.98±0.08	5.13±0.09	102.27±1.18	90.73±0.98	27.13±0.66	20.93±0.49	77.14
$\mathbf{F}_2$	5.24±0.05	5.00±0.08	104.21±0.52	76.12±0.46	21.53±0.39	16.47±0.32	76.49
BCI	5.29±0.08	5.01±0.14	83.25±0.93	80.92±0.73	21.93±0.64	16.44±0.52	74.96
BC <sub>2</sub>	5.27±0.08	4.84±0.09	83.00±0.80	83.93±0.75	23.07±0.61	17.63±0.50	76.41
potence ratio	0.17	1.50	14.17	1.30	3.60	4.13	
L. S. D.0.05	0.48	NS	7.36	6.22	4.32	2.96	
Cross II							
P <sub>1</sub>	5.47±0.08	$4.84 \pm 0.14$	94.27±1.54	80.07±0.62	22.13±0.76	16.33±0.24	73.79
$P_2$	5.33±0.09	4.42±0.12	92.99±1.30	68.32±0.54	19.75±0.64	14.17±1.02	71.74
F1	5.97±0.06	4.91±0.12	98.80±0.97	82.45±0.52	29.13±0.60	21.65±0.26	74.32
F2	5.19±0.05	4.60±0.09	94.21±0.74	70.21±0.32	20.39±0.21	15.64±0.14	69.85
BC1	5.51±0.08	4.46±0.14	90.77±1.22	82.51±0.58	21.90±0.59	14.96±0.23	68.36
BC <sub>2</sub>	5.36±0.08	$4.35\pm0.15$	84.27±1.16	74.35±0.46	21.77±0.63	13.93±0.22	63.99
potence ratio	2.17	1.33	8.08	1.15	6.88	8.82	
1 S D 0 05	J V V	VIC	0.00	110	101		

These results may be taken as an evidence for the failure of simple genetic model to ascertain the genetic variation for these characters in the corresponding crosses. Therefore, the six parameters model was applied for these characters in order to assess the digenic interaction types controlling the genetic variations. These results were in agreement with those of Sirvastava *et al.*(1992), Hassan (1993), Tammam (2005), Abd El-Mageed (2005), El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006) and El-Aref *et al.*(2011).

The mean parameters (m) for all studied attributes of the two crosses and environments which reflect the contribution due to the over all mean plus the locus effects and interaction of the fixed loci were significant. Additive gene effect (d) was positive and significant for days to heading, number of spikes/ plant and grain yield under heat stress, 100 kernel weight under normal condition for cross II and only grain yield/plant under heat for cross I, while positive and negative insignificant for all other characters of the two crosses under both environment conditions. These results indicated that potentiality of improving the performance of these traits using the pedigree selection program may be more effective, El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006).

The estimated of dominance gene action (h) in cross I was positive and significant for plant height, 100 kernel weight and grain yield/plant under normal condition, biological yield/plant under heat stress, while it was negative and significant were obtained by plant height under heat stress and biological yield/plant, under normal environment. Meanwhile in the cross II, positive or negative significant dominance gene effects were found to be involved in the inheritance of plant height and biological yield/plant, under both normal and heat stress, 100 kernel weight and grain yield/plant under normal condition. These results indicated the importance gene effects in inheritance of these traits. On the other hand, significant additive (d) and dominance (h) components indicated that both additive and dominance gene effects were important in the inheritance of these characters. Also, selection desirable characters may be practiced in early generations but it would be effective in the late ones. Similar results were obtained by Hendawy (2003), El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006).

Estimates of epistatic gene effects: additive x additive (I), additive x dominance (J) and dominance x dominance (L) are presented in Table (4&5). Significant estimates of epistatic gene effects for one or more of these three types of epistatic gene effects for some studied traits were detected. Regarding to the additive x additive (i) type of epistatic gene effects were positive and significant in the biological and grain yield/plant under normal environment in cross 1, indicated that two traits had increasing gene and selection for the development of these traits could be effective. Meanwhile, it was negative and significant in case of days to heading under two environments in cross I, days to heading and biological yield/plant under normal environment and number of spikes/plant under both normal and heat stress in the second cross.

On the other hand most traits were insignificant and positive or negative for two crosses and environments, these results indicated that the materials used in this study have increasing alleles for these characters and selection to improve it could be effective.

Data concerning the epistatic gene effects, additive x dominance (j) in Tables (4 & 5) had positive and significant for days to heading and plant height under normal conditions in the cross I and days to heading under heat stress for cross II, while it was significant and negative for biological yield/plant in cross I, number of spikes /plant and number of kernels/spike in cross II under heat stress. These results showed that the inheritance of these traits were effective by the duplication effect of epistatic genes.

The dominance x dominance (l) gene interaction (Tables 4&5) were differed according to crosses and environments, where days to heading under heat stress, biological yield/plant and grain vield/plant under normal conditions in cross I, days to heading under normal, biological and grain yield/plant under heat stress in cross II were positive and significant, while days to heading under heat stress and biological yield/plant under heat and normal environments respectively, were negative and significant. However, other traits under study for the two crosses did. not reach the significance level. Positive and significant results confirm the important role of dominance x dominance gene interaction in the genetic system controlling these results were reported by Srivastava et al. (1992), Tammam (2005) El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006). The absolute relative magnitude of the epistatic effects to the mean effects was somewhat variable depending on the cross and the studied traits. Generally, the absolute magnitude of the epistatic effects were larger than additive or dominance effects. Therefore, it could be concluded that homozygous x homozygous and heterozygous x heterozygous non-allelic interactions were more important than the heterozygous x heterozygous interaction in the inheritance of most studied traits. The study further revealed the epistatic gene effects were important as additive and dominance gene effects for most of the studied traits. The failure in detecting epistatic gene effects based on the generation mean analysis does not necessarily indicate that non-allelic interactions play no role in the determination of phenotypic value.

Chowootowe			Scaling t	est				genetic pa	rameters		
Cliaracters		A	B	C	D	ш	p	Ч	I	ſ	L
	z	8.33±	-10.07±	25.15*±	71.19±	98.97*±	2.50±	-18.78±	-26.88*±	9.20*±	26.61±
Dave to heading		9.26	8.47	19.94	10.91	4.68	5.62	22.10	21.83	5.92	30.07
Days to invaring	п	-7.73±	-18.13*±	9.63±	17.75*±	87.14*±	2.33±	-25.23±	-35.49*±	5.20±	61.36*±
	п	7.26	7.03	4.04	3.02	3.97	4.58	18.50	18.33	4.88	24.76
	N	-6.07±	-11.33±	-48.33*±	-15.47±	91.75*±	8.10±	37.80*±	30.93±	$13.57^{*\pm}$	-13.53±
Dlant hoight	K	2.90	2.86	4.24	0.34	4.15	5.17	19.86	19.57	5.58	27.39
	H	0.47±	-9.27*±	8.97±	8.89±	98.01*±	-0.8±	-21.97*±	-17.77±	<b>4.87</b> ±	26.57±
	5	2.55	2.55	3.70	2.72	3.14	3.97	15.10	14.84	4.35	20.98
	N	-3.87±	$0.00 \pm$	-5.09±	-0.61±	9.41*±	-1.90±	-1.50±	3.06±	1.23±	-1.07±
Nuchau of enilographics	2	2.30	2.12	3.35	2.47	2.56	3.32	12.43	12.21	3.52	17.40
MILLINGE OF SPIRCES/ PRAILIC	u	-2.60±	0.13±	-6.39±	-1.96±	8.62**±	-0.73±	5.22±	3.92±	-0.10±	-1.45±
	H	2.04	2.07	3.03	2.23	2.13	2.62	10.15	10.00	2.81	13.96
	N	0.24±	-8.50±	-8.98±	-0.36±	41.01*±	3.67±	7.81±	0.71±	2.96±	7.55±
Number of Lornals/enits	4	2.88	2.84	4.17	3.08	3.99	5.09	19.24	18.95	5.47	26.75
A number of activity prive	п	-2.12±	-0.83±	-0.71±	1.12±	40.35*±	-1.56±	1.11±	-2.24±	-2.47±	5.19±
		2.32	2.42	1.04	0.73	2.57	3.14	13.16	12.94	3.65	18.17
	N	1.03±	0.29*±	1.17±	-0.08±	5.24*±	$0.01 \pm$	$0.21^{*\pm}$	$0.15 \pm$	-0.35±	-1.47±
100 Lornalization	4	0.96	0.94	3.46	2.52	0.48	0.59	2.29	2.25	0.64	3.14
	n	$1.00 \pm$	-0.10±	$1.41 \pm$	0.25±	5.15*±	$0.36\pm$	<b>-0.64</b> ±	-0.51±	0.18±	-0.39±
	н	1.11	1.01	1.34	1.15	0.79	0.00	3.65	3.63	0.93	4.86
	N	-13.07*±	-32.47*±	20.81±	$42.17^{*\pm}$	$104.21^{*\pm}$	0.25±	-77.83*±	-84.35*±	0.70±	147.89*±
Richarical viald/nlant	4	3.42	3.22	4.84	3.54	2.30	6.75	25.62	25.10	7.13	25.80
Diological yron plant		-4.51±	-11.60±	$-41.33^{*\pm}$	-12.61±	76.12*±	-3.02±	33.78*±	25.22±	-9.58*±	-9.11±
	=	0.41	0.40	0.49	0.27	4.61	5.73	22.14	21.71	6.11	3.69
	Z	-7.27±	-2.13±	-13.28*±	-1.94±	$21.53^{\pm}$	-1.13±	$12.45^{*\pm}$	3.88*土	0.30±	5.52*±
Grain viald/nlant	4	3.04	3.08	4.51	3.29	3.94	4.86	8.82	8.53	5.28	25.89
oram Jivia piant	Н	2.35*±	-1.13±	$1.95 \pm$	$0.36 \pm$	$18.47^{*\pm}$	$1.31^{*\pm}$	1.17±	-0.73±	$0.88 \pm$	-0.49±
		2.60	2.53	3.74	2.76	3.24	4.07	15.53	15.31	4.43	21.44

Chanadauc		Sca	ling test					genetic par	rameters		
Cliai acters		A	B	С	D	ш	p	Н	I	ſ	L
	N	-10.66*±	-8.07±	6.33±	12.53*±	98.65*±	$1.17 \pm$	-23.86*±	$-1.30^{*\pm}$	43.79±	15.23*±
Done to booding	N	2.86	2.76	4.13	3.03	3.90	4.88	18.74	18.41	5.28	25.95
Days to nearing		$10.30^{*\pm}$	2.33±	8.15±	-2.24±	82.62*±	7.02*±	-2.29±	4.48±	3.99*±	-17.11*±
	н	2.38	1.59	2.30	1.70	1.22	1.53	5.86	5.77	1.63	8.10
		5.74±	-1.12±	-18.26*±	-11.44±	98.80*±	1.50±	24.41*土	22.88±	-0.43±	-27.50±
Diant holicht	2	3.00	2.98	4.40	3.23	4.44	5.52	21.29	20.93	5.87	29.41
riant neight	=	3.06±	-6.18±	-6.92±	-1.90±	88.44*±	3.18±	6.26±	3.80±	1.74±	-0.68±
	H	2.16	2.23	3.46	2.57	2.92	3.21	13.38	13.31	3.35	1.75
		-3.59±	-0.40*±	-3.93±	3.03*±	9.55**±	-1.13±	2.08±	-0.06±	-0.66±	4.05±
7	Z	2.29	2.33	3.40	2.52	2.69	3.34	1.22	12.68	3.59	1.70
Number of spikes/plant	:	2.82*±	-1.92±	-3.02*±	-1.96±	7.90*±	-0.04*±	7.01±	3.92±	-2.45*±	-4.82±
	H	1.51	1.45	2.23	1.64	1.14	1.41	5.46	5.36	1.52	7.53
		-7.84*±	-7.66±	-7.28±	4.11±	42.08*±	0.01±	-0.68±	-8.22*±	0.11±	23.72±
Mumbou of Poundalonillo	2	2.65	2.62	3.86	2.83	3.40	4.26	16.43	16.04	4.54	22.65
Number of kernels/spike		2.54±	5.33±	$11.67^{*\pm}$	1.99±	43.30*±	-3.45±	$0.60 \pm$	-3.98*±	-5.46*±	-3.79±
	н	2.07	2.04	2.99	2.20	2.05	2.58	0.96	1.06	0.49	2.02
		0.72*±	0.28±	0.02±	-0.49±	5.19*±	0.15*±	0.55±	$0.98 \pm$	0.08±	-1.98±
1001	Z	1.14	0.92	0.96	1.4	0.49	0.6	2.32	69.6	2.81	1.37
100-kernelweight	-	-0.41±	-1.05±	-0.68±	0.39±	$4.60^{*\pm}$	0.11±	-0.50±	-0.78±	-0.10±	2.24±
	ш	1.24	1.32	1.98	2.45	0.95	1.10	4.42	4.38	1.15	5.91
	N	-11.53±	-23.25*±	31.98*±	33.38*±	104.21*±	6.50±	-61.59*±	<b>-66.76*</b> ±	0.29±	-45.31*±
Dislocial viald/wheet	K	3.88	3.76	5.62	4.18	7.42	9.21	35.36	34.94	4.38	21.44
biological yield/plaint		8.50*±	7.93*±	-12.45*±	-14.44±	70.21*±	6.16±	-27.14*±	28.88±	-3.37±	$13.60*\pm$
	н	2.68	2.41	3.73	2.76	3.24	4.07	15.52	15.31	5.14	2.52
	N	5.06±	-6.32*±	-9.16±	1.11±	22.39*±	0.130±	$6.68^{+\pm}$	-2.22±	-0.37±	13.60±
Croin viald/nlant	N	2.76	2.79	4.06	2.99	3.81	4.76	1.24	17.96	5.14	2.52
OF ALL ALCIUM PLANT		-1.66±	-5.09*±	-1.97±	2.39±	$15.64^{*\pm}$	$1.03^{*\pm}$	-3.82±	-4.79±	-0.35±	11.54*±
		1.69	1.67	2.50	1.84	1.45	1.76	6.89	6.78	1.88	9.44

Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 53-66, 2013

Genetic parameter			genetic varian	ce	71/11/0.5	Herit	abilites	0
Characters		D	Н	E	- (U/H) -	$\mathrm{H}^{2}$	$h^2$	0.0
	N	24.20	9.33	7.44	0.62	66.0	55.34	5.33
Days to neading	H	20.95	1.60	4.87	0.28	69.08	66.54	5.44
	N	15.60	4.36	8.36	0.53	51.54	45.22	3.87
riant neight	H	7.79	0.82	5.73	0.32	41.73	39.64	2.56
1-1-1-1-N	N	4.28	4.83	3.22	1.06	50.69	32.57	1.72
Nmber of spikes/plant	Н	4.34	1.44	2.00	0.58	55.83	47.90	2.10
N	N	12.00	8.71	7.78	2.95	51.23	37.59	0.85
Number of Kernels/spike	Н	7.00	1.75	3.62	0.50	52.07	46.30	2.62
100 1	N	0.22	0.06	0.10	0.54	54.87	47.83	0.47
100-Kernelweignt	Н	0.86	0.31	0.11	0.60	81.89	69.35	1.12
Dislariast widd/start	N	20.99	13.40	14.15	0.80	49.45	37.49	4.09
biological yield/plant	H	19.19	3.40	10.79	0.42	49.19	45.15	4.29
Cusin mindd/mant	N	14.92	1.24	7.78	0.29	49.96	47.97	3.90
Grain yield/plant	Н	9.02	2.87	5.29	0.56	49.70	42.87	2.86

Genetic parameter			Genetic varian	ce	/U/D/0.5	herita	bilites	00
Characters		D	Н	E	- ( <b>n</b> / <b>u</b> )	$\mathrm{H}^{2}$	h <sup>2</sup>	25
Dave to hooding	N	13.29	1.75	8.15	0.36	46.49	43.62	3.51
Days to nearing	Н	1.34	0.64	0.67	0.69	55.13	44.52	1.12
Dlant hoight	Z	17.94	7.19	8.97	0.63	54.55	45.44	4.16
	Н	13.44	0.70	1.61	0.23	81.10	79.04	0.75
Numbou of eniloge and	N	6.66	2.68	3.25	0.63	55.17	45.93	2.55
Minuer of spikes/piant	Н	1.22	0.09	0.67	0.28	48.72	46.92	1.10
Number of lounds (enits	N	9.99	3.48	5.69	0.59	50.75	43.21	3.03
	Н	3.44	0.61	2.33	0.42	44.54	40.93	1.73
100 Ironnalmainht	N	0.23	0.10	0.10	0.66	58.76	48.37	0.49
100-PCI IICIMCIBII	Н	1.20	0.27	0.23	0.47	74.07	66.67	1.30
Piological viold/nlon4	N	50.76	18.60	25.08	0.61	54.49	46.05	7.04
Divingical yiciu/plaint	Н	8.86	5.00	4.82	0.75	54.09	42.17	2.82
Crain viald/nlant	N	0.23	0.10	0.10	0.49	58.76	48.37	2.05
OTAIL JICH PLAIL	Н	2.20	0.28	0.93	0 36	55.71	52 38	156

Nighawan *et al.* (1969) reported the importance of all the three types of gene action. On the other hand Ketata *et al.* (1976) postulated non- additive gene action of sizable amount for grain yield in wheat.

# III-Genetic variance of three- parameters model:

The assessment of genetic variance, additive (D) and dominance (H) gene effects in Tables (6 & 7), revealed that additive genetic variance was higher than dominance one in the days to heading, plant height, number of spikes/plant, number of kernels/spike, 100-kernel weight, biological and grain yield/plant, in the two crosses and environments under study, indicated that the additive gene effects play the main role in the inheritance of these traits and using selection in early segregating generations could be effective to isolate lines characterized by high grain yield under heat stress. Similar results were reported by Singh et al. (1985), El-Hennawy (1992), khieralla et al. (1992), Aboshosha and Hammad (2009) and El-Aref et al. (2011).

The average degree of dominance  $(H/D)^{0.5}$  given in Tables (6&7) revealed that partial dominance gene effects was presented for all characters under study for the two crosses and environments except number of spike/plant and number of kernels/spike under normal condition in cross I. These result indicated that the genetic system of these traits under the two environments are controlling by additive and non-additive gene effects. Similar results were reported by kherilla *et al.* (1992), kherilla *et al.* (1997), El-Hag (2006), Farshadfar *et al.* (2008), Aboshosha and Hammad (2009), Khattab (2009) and El-Aref *et al.* (2011).

# Heritability and Genetic Advance:

Heritability estimate indicates the progress from selection for plant characters is relatively easy or difficult to make in breeding program. Plant breeders, through experience, can perhaps rate a series of their response to selection. Heritability gave a numerical description of this concept. Assessment of heritability of various traits is of considerable important in crop improvement program, for example, to predict response to selection, Nyguist (1991).

Heritability estimates depending on the magnitudes of its genetic variance components of additive (D) and dominance (H) are found in Tables (6&7). In this respect broad sense heritability was higher than that of narrow sense in all studied characters for the two crosses and environments. Broad sense heritability values were varied from moderate 41.73% for plant height to high 81.89% for 100-kernel weight in cross I under heat stress, indicating that superior genotypes for these characters in that cross could be identified from its phenotypic expression, and illustrate the importance of phenotypic selection for improvement these traits (Awaad, 1996).

Narrow sense heritability estimates were low for number of spikes/plant (32.57%), number of kernels/spike (37.59%) and biological yield/plant (37.49%) in the cross I under normal condition. While it was moderate for all traits under two crosses and environment except days to heading 66.54%) (55.34)and under the two environments,100 kernel weight (69.35%) under heat stress in cross I as well as plant height (79.04%) and 100 kernel weight (66.67%) under heat stress for cross II. These revealed also that genetic variance was mostly attributed to the additive effects of gene for the other studied traits. This confirmed the previous results by mean of gene action estimates of additive genetic portion, which was mostly predominant. These results were harmony with those obtained by Hamada (2003), Hendaway (2003), El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006), and El-Aref et al. (2011).

The expected genetic advance (G.S) as percentage of the F<sub>2</sub> mean depends mainly on the values of narrow sense heritability for the studied characters is presented in Table (6&7). Moderate to high genetic for all characters under two crosses and environment except, 100 kernel weight under two crosses and environments, number of spikes/plant and number of kernels/spike under normal in cross I and heat stress in cross II, plant height and grain yield/plant under heat stress in cross I. Moderate to high for most characters under two crosses and environments. These results may suggest that selection in F2 population would be effective to improve these characters in early generations of wheat breeding under normal and heat stress condition. Similar finding were in line with Hassan (1993), El-Sayed and El-Shaarawy (2006), and El-Aref et al. (2011).

## REFERENCES

- Abd El- Mageed, S.A. (2005). Estimation of epistasis, additive and dominance variation in some bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crosses. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 30(6): 299-3011.
- Aboshosha, A.A.M. and S.M. Hammad (2009). Estimation of parameters for yield and yield components and some agronomic characters in two crosses of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 34(5): 4293-4300.
- Amawate, J.S. and P.N. Behl (1995). Genetical analysis of some quantitative components of yield in bread wheat. Indian J.Genet., 55:120-125.
- Awaad, H.A. (1996). Diallel analysis of yield and its contributing characters in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Zagazig Jour. Agric. Res. 23: 999-1012.

- Bayoumi, T. Y.; Manal H. Eid and E. M. Metwali (2008). Application of physiological and biochemical indices as a screening technique for drought tolerance in wheat genotypes. African J. of Biotechnology 7(14): 2341-2352.
- Bhatt, G.M. (1972). Inheritance of heading date, plant height, and Kernel weight in tow spring wheat crosses. Crop Sic., 12: 95-98.
- Bhullar, S.S and C.F Jenner, (**1985**) Differential response to high temperature of starch and nitrogen accumulation in the grain of wheat. Aust. J.Plant Physiol., **12**:263-275.
- Edwards, L.H.; H. Ketata and E.L. Smith (1976). Gene action of heading date, plant height, and other characters in tow winter wheat crosses. Crop Sci., 16: 275-277.
- El-Aref, Kh.A.O; A.M.Tammam; M.M.Ibrahim and Y.S.Koubisy(**2011**). Generation mean analysis in bread wheat under drought conditions. Egypt. J.of Appl. Sci., **26(2)**: 187-208.
- El-Hag, A.A. (2006). Estimation of genetic parameters for earliness and some agronomic characters in three crosses of bread wheat, (*Triticum aestivum* L.). J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., **31(7)**: 4271-4280.
- El-Hennawy, M.A. (1992). Inheritance of grain yield and some other agronomic characters in tow wheat crosses. Al-Azhar Jour. Agric. Res. 15: 57-68.
- El-Sayed, E.A.M and G.A. El-Shaarawy (2006). Genetical studies on yield and some Agronomic characters in some bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crosses J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., **31(8)**: 4901-4914.
- Farshadfar, E.; M. Ghanadha; M. Zahravi and J. Sutka (2001). Generation mean analysis of drought tolerance in wheat (*Triticum aestivum L*.). Acta-Agronomica-Hungarica.; 49(1): 59-66.
- Farshadfar, E.; S. Mahjouri and M. Aghaee (2008). Detection of epistasis and estimation of additive and dominance components of genetic variation for drought tolerance in durum wheat. J. of Bio. Sci., 8(3): 598-603.
- Hamada, A. A (2003). Gene effect for some agronomic traits in three bread wheat crosses. Annals Agric. Sci., Ain shams Univ., Cairo, 48 (1): 131 – 146.
- Hassan, E.E. (**1993**). Gene action for yield and its attributes and their Implications in bread wheat breeding. Zagazig J. Agric. Res. **20**: 995-1005.
- Hayman, B.I (**1958**). The separation of epistatic, additive and dominance variation in generation means .Heredity **12**; 371-390.
- Hendawy, H.I.(**2003**). Genetic architecture of yield and its components and some other agronomic traits in bread wheat. Menufiya J.of Agric. Res. **28(1)**: 71-86.

- Ketata, H.; E.L. Smith; L.H. Edwards and R.W. Me New (**1976**). Detection of epistatic, additive and dominance variation in Winter wheat (*Triticum asetivum L. Em. Thell*). Crop Sci., **16**: 1-4.
- Khalifa, M. A., E. M. Shalaby, A. A. Ali and M. B. Towfelis (**1997**). Inheritance of some physiological traits, yield and its components in durum wheat. 2-grain yield and its components. Assiut J. Agric. Sci, **28** (**4**): 143 – 162.
- Khattab A.B. (2009). Genetic behavior of some traits of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*). J. Agric. Res. Kafr El-Sheikh Univ., 35(2) 446-479.
- Kheiralla, K.A. and Tahany H.I. Sherif (1992). Inheritance of earliness and yield in wheat under heat stress. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., 23: 109-124.
- Kheiralla, K.A.; M.M. El-Defrawy and Tahany H.I. Sherif (1993). Genetic analysis of grain yield, biomass and harvest index in wheat under drought stress and normal moisture conditions. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., **24**: 163-183.
- Moshref, M.K. (1996). Genetical and statistical studies in wheat. Ph.D. Thesis, Al-Azhar Univ., Egypt.
- Nighawan, D. Chand and T.d Yadava (**1969**). Detection of gene effects of some quantative characters in oats (*Avena sateral L*). Indian J. Hered, 1-145.
- Nyguist, W.E. (**1991**). Estimation of heritability and prediction of response in plant populations. CRC Critical Reviews in Plant Science, **10(3)**: 235-322.
- Pawar, I.S.; R.S. Paroda and S. Singh (**1988**). Gene effects for six metric traits in four spring wheat crosses. Indian Jour. Genet., **48**: 195-199.
- Sawant, A.R. and K.B.L. Jain (1985). Gene action for certain quantitative characters in common wheat in optimal and sub-optimal environments. Indian J. Genet., 45: 376-384.
- Sharma, S.N.; R.S. Sain and R.K. Sharma (2003). Genetics of spike length in durum wheat. Euphytica 130: 155–161.
- Singh, G:G.S. Bhullar, and K.S. Gill, (1985). Inheritance of some plant characters in an intervarietal cross of bread wheat. Crop Improve. 12 (2): 179 – 183.
- Srivastava, R.B.; S.C. Sharma and M. Yunus (1992). Additive and non additive gene effects for yield and yield components in tow crosses of wheat (*T. aestivum L.*). Indian Jour. Genet., 52: 297-301
- Tammam, A.M.(2005). Generation mean analysis in bread wheat under different environmental conditions. Minufiy J. Agric. Res. 30(3): 937-956.

.

/

1

/

/

х

Х

:

Wahid A, S.Gelani, M. Ashraf, MR. Floolad (2007). Heat tolerance in plant: An overview. Exp. Bot.,61;199-223.

(

KSU 18/

%

%, %, Warner, J.N (1955). A method for estimating heritability. Agron. J. 44; 427-430.

/

(

/

)

Х

/

)



\_

/

.

.