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#### Abstract

A diallel cross set was carried out among six parents of common wheat without reciprocal crosses to study the inheritance of heading date, maturity date, plant height, spike length, number of spikes per plant, number of kernels per spike, 1000 grain weight and grain yield per plant using Hayman approach and Jones method. The parental varieties and their possible 15 crosses were sown under two different nitrogen levels i.e., 70 kg /faddan (normal) and $35 \mathrm{~kg} / f a d d a n$ (stress) using randomized complete block design with three replicates per each nitrogen level. The diallel cross analysis were carried out using the approaches proposed by Hayman (1954) and Jones (1965).


Mean squares for fertilizations were found to be significant for all traits studied except days to maturity and plant height, indicating differences between the two different nitrogen fertilization levels for most characters.

Genotypes, parents and the resultant crosses mean squares were found to be highly significant for most traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels and their combined data.
The additive genetic variance ( D ) was found to be highly significant for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen fertilizations except number of grains per spike and grain yield per plant at the two different nitrogen levels .
The dominance genetic variation $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{1}$ and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{2}$ were found to be highly significant for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen fertilizations. Moreover, the estimated values of dominance components $\widehat{\mathrm{H}}_{1}$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{H}}_{2}$ were found to be greater in their magnitude than the corresponding additive genetic variations ( $\hat{\mathrm{D}}$ ) for most traits under investigation.

Estimates of the ratio of dominant to recessive alleles in the parents ( $K_{D} / K_{R}$ ) were found to be more than unity for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels, except grain yield per plant.

Moderate heritability values were detected for heading date, plant height and spike length . For the other traits, low heritability in narrow sense was detected.

The additive genetic variance (a) was found to be highly significant for all characters studied at both two nitrogen fertilizer levels. The dominance genetic variation (b) was highly significant for all-characters studied at the different two nitrogen fertilizer levels. The (a) values were found to be larger in magnitude than the corresponding (b) values for most traits studied.
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## INTRODUCTION

Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) is the most important cereal crop in Egypt. Increasing wheat production to narrowing the gap between production and consumption is vital in Egypt. Big variation in wheat productivity in different parts of the country should be reduced to achieve high productivity, through using wheat breeding programs and developing new set of wheat varieties with high yielding capacity.

Egypt is the most importing country of wheat worldwide producing about 8.5 million tons per year, while the annual requirements are about 13.5 million tons.

The diallel analysis provides a unique opportunity to test a number of lines in all possible combinations. The present study is aimed to evaluate of the different genetic components according to Hayman (1954) and Jones (1965).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was carried out at Shebin El-kom Agricultural Research Station Fac. of Agric., Menoufia University during the two successive seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.The Egyptian wheat genotypes (Sids12, Gemmieza-11, Line1, Line2, Line3 and Line4) representing a wide range of variability were provided by Agriculture Research Center (ARC), Egypt. These cultivars were selected to study the genetic components according to (Hayman 1954) and (Jones 1965).

A diallel cross without reciprocal set was carried out among the six parents in 2014/2015 growing season. The parental varieties and their possible 15 crosses were sown in 2015/2016 under two nitrogen fertilizer levels 30 kg . Nitrogen per fadden and 70 kg . Nitrogen per
fadden, which would be mentioned in the text as stress condition (S) and normal condition ( N ), respectively.

The two experiments were arranged in a randomized complete block design with three replicates per each fertilizer level. Each plot comprised single rows 3 meters long with 30 cm . between rows, plants within rows were 10 cm . apart allowing a total of 30 plants per plot. Normal agricultural practices were applied as usual for the ordinary wheat fields in the area. Ten guarded plants were randomly selected from each plot for subsequent measurements as follows:

1. Days to heading.
2. Days to maturity.
3. Plant height (cm).
4. Number of spikes /plant.
5. Spike length (cm).
6. Number of grains per spike.
7. 1000- grain weight (gm).
8. Grain yield / plant (gm).

## A. Statistical procedures

Two steps are involved in the analysis of the data. The first step is the ordinary analysis of variance. Only when the significant differences among the parents and $F_{1}$ 's are established, there is need to proceed for second step analysis, i.e. Hayman method (1954) and Jones method (1965). The combined analysis of the two nitrogen levels was done to test the interaction of the different genetic parameters with the two different fertilizer levels and that was done whenever the homogeneity of variances was detected.

The genetic parameters were estimated according to the procedure described by Hayman (1954) and (Jones 1965). Heritability in narrow-sense was
also estimated according to Mather and Jinks (1982).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The gaining of the maximum and quick improvement of varieties is depending up on the estimation of the type and relative magnitude of the genetic variance involved in inheritance of the characters under study. Diallel cross analysis has been used to estimate the different genetic components which make decisition dealing with the traits in view.

For better representation and discussion of the results obtained herein, it would be preferred to outline these results into three parts as follows:

## 1. Variation and interaction with two different nitrogen levels.

Mean performance of the six parent and their fifteen crosses under the two different nitrogen levels with the combined data for all traits studied i.e. Days to heading ,days to maturity, plant height, number of spikes per plant, spike length , 1000-grain weight , number of grains per spike, and grain yield per plant are given in Table (1). Mean values of normal fertilization ( N ) were found to be relatively better than those of stress fertilization (S) in most traits under investigation.

The analysis of variance of each nitrogen levels together with the combined data for all traits studied under normal fertilization (N) and stress fertilization (S) with the combined data are presented in Table (2).

Nitrogen fertilizer levels mean squares were found to be significant for all traits studied except days to maturity, and plant height.

Genotypes and the resultant 15 crosses mean squares were found to be highly significant for most traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels and
their combined data, indicating the wide diversity among these populations used in the present study

Parent mean squares were found to be highly significate for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels and their combined data, except plant height under stress condition, indicating that parental varieties and lor lines differed in their mean performance in all traits except plant height under stress condition.

Parents Vs crosses mean squares as an indication to average heterosis overall crosses, were found to be highly significant for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels and their combined data except 1000 grain weight . This may indicate that the average heterosis could be pronounced for these traits (Table 2).

The interaction of genotypes with the two different nitrogen levels were found to be highly significant for number of spike per plant, spike length and grain yield per plant reflecting that these entries behaved differently from nitrogen level to another.

The interactions of the two different nitrogen levels with parents were found to be significant for all traits studied except days to heading, plant height and 1000 grain weight.

The interactions of the resultant crosses with the two different nitrogen levels were found to be highly significant for no. of spikes per plant, no. of grains per spike and grain yield per plant.

The interactions of parents Vs crosses with the two different nitrogen levels were found to be significant for no. of grains per spike and grain yield per plant, indicating the influence of the two different nitrogen levels with these two traits. Consequently, it could therefore be concluded that the test of potential
Table (1). Genotypes mean performance under the two nitrogen fertilizer levels.

| Genotypes | Days to heading (day) |  |  | Days to maturity (day) |  |  | Plant height (cm) |  |  | No. of spikes/plant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. |
| Sids 12 | 92.333 | 92.667 | 92.5 | 151 | 151.33 | 151.17 | 101.3 | 109.89 | 105.6 | 4.337 | 5.027 | 4.682 |
| Gemmeiza 11 | 96.667 | 97.667 | 97.167 | 149.67 | 150 | 149.83 | 100.67 | 105.72 | 103.19 | 5.107 | 5.987 | 5.547 |
| $\times$ Line1 | 103.333 | 104.667 | 104 | 154.33 | 154.67 | 154.5 | 102.23 | 109.33 | 105.78 | 6.72 | 10.553 | 8.637 |
| $\times$ Line2 | 91 | 91.667 | 91.333 | 149.33 | 149.67 | 149.5 | 110.4 | 118.36 | 114.38 | 9.403 | 14.14 | 11.772 |
| $x$ Line3 | 90.333 | 91.333 | 90.833 | 154.33 | 154.67 | 154.5 | 102.43 | 109.58 | 106.01 | 7.917 | 10.377 | 9.147 |
| $x$ Line4 | 95 | 96.333 | 95.667 | 154.67 | 155.33 | 155 | 95.87 | 98.89 | 97.38 | 9.017 | 11.197 | 10.107 |
| Sids $12 \times$ Gem11 | 95.667 | 96 | 95.833 | 154 | 154.33 | 154.17 | 103.27 | 103.1 | 103.18 | 9.75 | 13.403 | 11.577 |
| $\times$ Line1 | 101 | 101.333 | 101.167 | 156.33 | 157 | 156.67 | 107.13 | 117.42 | 112.28 | 8.367 | 11.187 | 9.777 |
| $\times$ Line2 | 94 | 95 | 94.5 | 152.67 | 153.67 | 153.17 | 101.37 | 106.8 | 104.08 | 9.093 | 11.123 | 10.108 |
| $x$ Line3 | 99 | 99.333 | 99.167 | 155.33 | 156.33 | 155.83 | 101.13 | 109.05 | 105.09 | 8.773 | 10.997 | 9.885 |
| $x$ Line4 | 94.333 | 94.667 | 94.5 | 154.33 | 155 | 154.67 | 96.67 | 105.1 | 100.88 | 8.383 | 9.923 | 9.153 |
| Gem11 x Line1 | 103.333 | 103.667 | 103.5 | 156 | 156.67 | 156.33 | 103.67 | 114.75 | 109.21 | 10.837 | 12.89 | 11.863 |
| x Line2 | 97 | 97.667 | 97.333 | 154.33 | 155 | 154.67 | 109.13 | 112.2 | 110.67 | 8.773 | 10.873 | 9.823 |
| $x$ Line3 | 101 | 101.667 | 101.333 | 153.67 | 155 | 154.33 | 104.57 | 108.12 | 106.35 | 7.663 | 11.3 | 9.482 |
| $x$ Line4 | 103 | 103.333 | 103.167 | 153.33 | 153.67 | 153.5 | 102.47 | 109.13 | 105.8 | 10.84 | 11.547 | 11.193 |
| Line1 xLine2 | 101.333 | 102 | 101.667 | 154.67 | 155.67 | 155.17 | 108.47 | 112.52 | 110.5 | 8.453 | 10.917 | 9.685 |
| $x$ Line3 | 104 | 104.667 | 104.333 | 154.33 | 155.67 | 155 | 110.47 | 114.34 | 112.4 | 7.24 | 9.227 | 8.233 |
| x Line4 | 104 | 105 | 104.5 | 151.33 | 152.67 | 152 | 106.93 | 116.62 | 111.78 | 12.003 | 14.387 | 13.195 |
| Line2 x Line3 | 99.667 | 101 | 100.333 | 154.67 | 155.33 | 155 | 104.53 | 115.59 | 110.06 | 11.347 | 12.39 | 11.868 |
| x Line4 | 99 | 99.667 | 99.333 | 154 | 154.67 | 154.33 | 105.67 | 109.05 | 107.36 | 8.59 | 9.82 | 9.205 |
| Line3 x Line4 | 102.333 | 103.333 | 102.833 | 154.33 | 155.67 | 155 | 96.87 | 108.3 | 102.58 | 8.117 | 9.127 | 8.622 |
| Mean | 98.444 | 99.175 | 98.81 | 153.65 | 154.38 | 154.02 | 103.58 | 110.18 | 106.88 | 8.606 | 10.78 | 9.693 |
| L.S.D. 5 \% | 1.424 | 1.092 | 1.243 | 1.22 | 0.93 | 1.06 | 1.51 | 2.08 | 1.77 | 1.093 | 1.05 | 1.048 |
| L.S.D. 1 \% | 1.905 | 1.44 | 1.642 | 1.63 | 1.23 | 1.4 | 2.02 | 2.75 | 2.35 | 1.463 | 1.384 | 1.385 |

Table (1). Cont.

| Genotypes | No. of grains/spike |  |  | Spike length |  |  | 1000 - Grain weight |  |  | Grain yield/plant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. |
| Sids 12 | 60.147 | 69.467 | 64.807 | 15.027 | 18.103 | 16.565 | 53.583 | 52.487 | 53.035 | 17.547 | 21.947 | 19.747 |
| Gemmeiza 11 | 56.43 | 65.087 | 60.758 | 12.707 | 14.423 | 13.565 | 53.917 | 52.72 | 53.318 | 18.287 | 20.773 | 19.53 |
| Line 1 | 57.813 | 65.303 | 61.558 | 9.903 | 11.667 | 10.785 | 43.38 | 42.443 | 42.912 | 14.383 | 18.017 | 16.2 |
| Line 2 | 55.06 | 69.467 | 62.263 | 11.643 | 12.19 | 11.917 | 51.06 | 49.943 | 50.502 | 19.89 | 25.01 | 22.45 |
| Line 3 | 70.5 | 82.78 | 76.64 | 10.527 | 12.787 | 11.657 | 41.347 | 39.053 | 40.2 | 15.15 | 22.55 | 18.85 |
| Line 4 | 58.92 | 74.49 | 66.705 | 10.47 | 14.2 | 12.335 | 62.653 | 60.687 | 61.67 | 15.317 | 22.09 | 18.703 |
| $12 \times$ Gem11 | 72.98 | 85.537 | 79.258 | 14.69 | 15.433 | 15.062 | 52.003 | 51.01 | 51.507 | 20.967 | 28.773 | 4.87 |
| $\times$ Line1 | 62.813 | 72.293 | 67.553 | 11.587 | 13.017 | 12.302 | 61.327 | 60.147 | 60.737 | 19.123 | 26.577 | 22.85 |
| $\times$ Line2 | 82.617 | 106.99 | 94.803 | 10.893 | 13.213 | 12.053 | 51.603 | 51.103 | 51.353 | 19.547 | 27.78 | 23.663 |
| $x$ Line3 | 87.18 | 110.37 | 98.775 | 11.393 | 13.14 | 12.267 | 53.25 | 51.333 | 52.292 | 21.273 | 35.613 | 28.443 |
| $x$ Line4 | 90.297 | 109.717 | 100.007 | 13.273 | 14.8 | 14.037 | 51.043 | 49.583 | 50.313 | 19.007 | 28.29 | 23.648 |
| Gem11 x Line1 | 73.593 | 80.627 | 77.11 | 12.46 | 13.883 | 13.172 | 57.243 | 54.373 | 55.808 | 22.653 | 40.503 | 31.578 |
| $x$ Line2 | 75.59 | 87.977 | 81.783 | 12.403 | 14.107 | 13.255 | 52.18 | 50.757 | 51.468 | 20.953 | 31.377 | 26.165 |
| $x$ Line3 | 66.243 | 74.257 | 70.25 | 10.303 | 12.517 | 11.41 | 51.12 | 48.323 | 49.722 | 14.883 | 23.293 | 19.088 |
| $x$ Line4 | 72.133 | 84.963 | 78.548 | 13.413 | 14.337 | 13.875 | 51.34 | 47.833 | 49.587 | 15.683 | 28.32 | 22.002 |
| Line1 x Line2 | 60.35 | 73.09 | 66.72 | 8.69 | 11.48 | 10.085 | 50.213 | 58.62 | 54.417 | 16.7 | 27.743 | 22.222 |
| $x$ Line3 | 62.183 | 72.273 | 67.228 | 11.01 | 12.153 | 11.582 | 51.51 | 51.157 | 51.333 | 13.31 | 22.7 | 18.005 |
| $x$ Line4 | 53.05 | 62.87 | 57.96 | 13.497 | 15.7 | 14.598 | 51.71 | 49.913 | 50.812 | 12.29 | 22.407 | 17.348 |
| Line2 $\times$ Line3 | 71.747 | 86.59 | 79.168 | 10.857 | 13.147 | 12.002 | 49.963 | 46.65 | 48.307 | 15.66 | 30.243 | 22.952 |
| $x$ Line4 | 82.18 | 97.953 | 90.067 | 11.13 | 13.733 | 12.432 | 41.74 | 40.157 | 40.948 | 17.733 | 27.447 | 22.59 |
| Line3 x Line4 | 73.43 | 86.753 | 80.092 | 13.263 | 15.337 | 14.3 | 55.173 | 53.16 | 54.167 | 17.923 | 27.87 | 22.897 |
| Mean | 68.822 | 81.85 | 75.336 | 11.864 | 13.779 | 12.822 | 51.779 | 50.545 | 51.162 | 17.537 | 26.634 | 22.086 |
| L.S.D. 5 \% | 1.878 | 2.57 | 2.195 | 0.895 | 1.061 | 0.958 | 1.238 | 6.47 | 4.522 | 1.059 | 1.361 | 1.19 |
| L.S.D. 1 \% | 2.512 | 3.388 | 2.901 | 1.198 | 1.399 | 1.267 | 1.657 | 8.53 | 5.976 | 1.417 | 1.794 | 1.572 |


| S.O.V. | d.f |  | Days to heading (day) |  |  | Days to maturity (day) |  |  | Plant height (cm) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. |
| Fertilization |  | 1 |  |  | 16.794** |  |  | 16.7937** |  |  | 1372.8001** |
| Rep $\times$ F. | 2 | 4 | 1.444 | 0.825 | 1.135 | 0.7778 | 0.1429 | 0.4603 | 0.4154 | 2.3935 | 1.4045 |
| Genotypes (G) | 20 | 20 | 58.344** | 58.821** | 116.971** | 10.4492** | 11.8095** | 22.0484** | 54.0252** | 72.7573** | 111.3134** |
| Parents (P) | 5 | 5 | 70.089** | 77.522** | 147.383** | 18.7556** | 19.7889** | 38.5167** | 66.3317** | 120.5609** | 180.4576** |
| Crosses (F1) | 14 | 14 | 34.117** | 34.889** | 68.852** | 4.5556** | 4.1651** | 8.5349** | 49.7951** | 56.5278** | 86.5359** |
| P vs F1 | 1 | 1 | 338.800** | 300.357** | 638.579** | 51.4286** | 78.9349** | 128.8960** | 51.7147** | 60.9529** | 112.4779** |
| GxF. |  | 20 |  |  | 0.194 |  |  | 0.2103 |  |  | 15.4691** |
| PxF. |  | 5 |  |  | 0.228 |  |  | 0.0278 |  |  | 6.4350** |
| F1xF. |  | 14 |  |  | 0.154 |  |  | 0.1857 |  |  | 19.7870** |
| p vsF1 $\times$ F. |  | 1 |  |  | 0.579 |  |  | 1.4675 |  |  | 0.1897 |
| Error | 40 | 80 | 0.744 | 0.425 | 0.585 | 0.5444 | 0.3095 | 0.427 | 0.8384 | 1.5471 | 1.1927 |

Comb. = combined data.

* and ** significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability , respectively.
Table (2). Cont.

| S.O.V. | d.f |  | No. of spikes/plant |  |  | No. Of grains/spike |  |  | Spike length "cm" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. | Stress | Normal | Comb. |
| Fertilization |  | 1 |  |  | 148.917** |  |  | 5346.795** |  |  | 115.585** |
| Rep $\times$ F. | 2 | 4 | 0.069 | 0.657 | 0.363 | 1.805 | 4.647 | 3.226 | 0.094 | 0.709 | 0.401 |
| Genotypes (G) | 20 | 20 | 10.358** | 15.406** | 23.941** | 351.172** | 627.647** | 945.102** | 7.802** | 7.323** | 14.218** |
| Parents (P) | 5 | 5 | 12.839** | 35.176** | 44.182** | 91.893** | 133.807** | 209.420** | 10.920** | 16.310** | 25.349** |
| Crosses (F1) | 14 | 14 | 6.038** | 6.705** | 11.583** | 322.729** | 640.789** | 923.894** | 7.205** | 4.613** | 11.258** |
| P vs F1 | 1 | 1 | 58.441** | 38.362** | 95.750** | 2045.775** | 2912.863** | 4920.438** | 0.575 | 0.337 | 0.016 |
| GxF. |  | 20 |  |  | 1.823** |  |  | 33.717** |  |  | 0.907** |
| PxF. |  | 5 |  |  | 3.833** |  |  | 16.280** |  |  | 1.881** |
| F1xF. |  | 14 |  |  | 1.160** |  |  | 39.624** |  |  | 0.56 |
| p vsF1 $\times$ F. |  | 1 |  |  | 1.053 |  |  | 38.200** |  |  | 0.896 |
| Error | 40 | 80 | 0.439 | 0.393 | 0.416 | 1.295 | 2.355 | 1.825 | 0.294 | 0.402 | 0.348 |

[^0]Table (2). Cont.

| S.O.V. | d.f |  | 1000 - Grain weight "gm" |  |  | Grain yield/plant "gm" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S | Comb. | Normal | Stress | Comb. | Normal | Stress | Comb. |
| Fertilization |  | 1 |  |  | 47.9397** |  |  | 2606.968** |
| Rep $\times$ F. | 2 | 4 | 2.8392* | 1.2225 | 2.0308** | 0.053 | 0.5 | 0.276 |
| Genotypes (G) | 20 | 20 | 82.3034** | 93.9860** | 167.8665** | 23.887** | 80.768** | 83.667** |
| Parents (P) | 5 | 5 | 181.3410** | 182.1225** | 363.0014** | 13.842** | 15.787** | 24.392** |
| Crosses (F1) | 14 | 14 | 51.6909** | 67.4583** | 107.3179** | 28.100** | 66.468** | 81.795** |
| P vs F1 | 1 | 1 | 15.6894** | 24.6906** | 39.8720** | 15.133** | 605.875** | 406.256** |
| GxF. |  | 20 |  |  | 8.4229** |  |  | 20.987** |
| PxF. |  | 5 |  |  | 0.4621 |  |  | 5.237** |
| F1xF. |  | 14 |  |  | 11.8314** |  |  | 12.772** |
| p vsF1 $\times$ F. |  | 1 |  |  | 0.508 |  |  | 214.752** |
| Error | 40 | 80 | 0.5632 | 0.4875 | 0.5253 | 0.412 | 0.66 | 0.536 |

[^1]a number of environmental conditions. Also, genetic diversity alone would not guarantee the expression of heterosis, but the suitability of the environments would be required in case of the above mentioned two characters. The same results were previously obtained by ELRefaey et al., (2010), Al-Naggar et al., (2015), Kumar et al., (2015) and Ali (2018).

## 2. Hayman's method (1954): <br> Genetic components and heritability

Hayman (1954) suggested certain assumptions which need to be fulfilled for valid diallel analysis. These include homozygous parents, diploid segregation, no reciprocal differences, no genotype environmental interaction, no epistasis, no multiple alleles and uncorrelated gene distribution. Failure of any one or any combinations of the assumptions invalidates to some degree the conclusion obtained by means of analysis.

The data obtained here were subjected to the genetical analysis of half diallel table as described by Hayman (1954). The mean values of each cross were used to estimate the different genetic components of variation $\hat{D}$, $\widehat{\mathrm{F}}, \widehat{\mathrm{H}}_{1}, \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{2}, \quad h^{2}$ and F as defined by Hayman (1954).The different genetic components of variation and their portions for all traits studied at the two different fertilizer level, are given in Table (3).

The additive genetic variance ( D ) was found to be exceeded its standard error for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen fertilizations except number of grains per spike and grain yield per plant at the two different nitrogen levels, confirming the importance of additive effects in the inheritance of these traits . These results are in harmony with those previously obtained by Al-Naggar (2015) and Ali (2018).

The presence of dominance genetic variation $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{1}$ and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{2}$ were found to be exceeded its standard error for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen fertilizations. Moreover, the estimated values of dominance components $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{1}$ and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{2}$ were found to be greater in their magnitude than the corresponding additive genetic variations ( D ) for all traits under investigation. These results indicated that the dominance genetic variations had greater role in the inheritance of all traits under study. Similar results were previously obtained by Okan (2009), EL-Refaey et al., (2010), Ullah et al., (2010) and Ahmad et al., (2016), Al-Naggar (2015) and Ali (2018).

A positive $F$ value indicates an excess of dominant genes while a negative value indicates an excess of recessive genes. In the present investigation, the positive values of ( $F$ ) showed that there were more dominant genes present in the parental varieties than recessive alleles, irrespective of whether these dominant alleles are increasing or decreasing in their effects for all traits studied under the two different levels of fertilizations except grain yield per plant under normal fertilizations. Consequently, the excess of genes either dominant or recessive controlling these three traits were consistent at the two different environments.

The overall dominance effects, as the algebric sum over all loci in heterozygotes in all crosses symbolized as ( $h^{2}$ ) were found to be exceeded its standard errors for heading date maturity date, no. of grains Ispike., plant height, no. of spikes /plant under the two nitrogen levels and grain yield /plant at the stress condition only, indicating the prevalence of dominant effect over all loci in all crosses.

Insignificant estimates of ( $h^{2}$ ) were detected for, spike length and 1000grain weight at both nitrogen fertilizations and
Table (3). Components of variation and other statistics for traits studied under the two nitrogen fertilizer levels. (Hayman 1954)

| Parameters | Heading date |  | Maturity date |  | Plant hight "cm" |  | No. of spikes/plant |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
| D | $23.10 \pm 2.35$ | $25.69 \pm 2.45$ | $6.07 \pm 1.66$ | $6.50 \pm 1.43$ | $21.84 \pm 3.77$ | $39.66 \pm 7$ | $4.14 \pm 1.1$ | $11.59 \pm 1.59$ |
| F | $8.94 \pm 5.74$ | $11.05 \pm 5.98$ | $8.57 \pm 4.05$ | $8.71 \pm 3.48$ | $8.82 \pm 9.22$ | $39.84 \pm 17.11$ | $5.20 \pm 2.68$ | $18.52 \pm 3.89$ |
| H1 | $38.38 \pm 5.97$ | $37.70 \pm 6.21$ | $13.57 \pm 4.21$ | $13.58 \pm 3.62$ | $42.90 \pm 9.58$ | $74.63 \pm 17.77$ | $13.12 \pm 2.78$ | $23.74 \pm 4.04$ |
| H2 | $30.17 \pm 5.33$ | $28.86 \pm 5.55$ | $10.12 \pm 3.76$ | $10.42 \pm 3.23$ | $33.18 \pm 8.55$ | $50.02 \pm 15.88$ | $11.11 \pm 2.49$ | $15.83 \pm 3.61$ |
| $\hat{h}_{2}$ | $73.05 \pm 3.59$ | $64.81 \pm 3.74$ | $11.01 \pm 2.53$ | $17.00 \pm 2.18$ | $11.02 \pm 5.76$ | $12.87 \pm 10.69$ | $12.55 \pm 1.67$ | $8.21 \pm 2.43$ |
| E | $0.26 \pm 0.89$ | $0.15 \pm 0.92$ | $0.19 \pm 0.63$ | $0.10 \pm 0.54$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.72 \pm \\ 1.43 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $0.53 \pm 2.65$ | $0.14 \pm 0.41$ | $0.14 \pm 0.6$ |
| (Ĥ1/D̂) 0.5 | 1.29 | 1.21 | 1.5 | 1.45 | 1.4 | 1.37 | 1.78 | 1.43 |
| ( $\mathrm{H} 2 / 4 \mathrm{H} 1$ ) | 0.2 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 0.17 |
| KD/KR | 1.35 | 1.43 | 2.79 | 2.54 | 1.34 | 2.16 | 2.09 | 3.53 |
| h(n.s) | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.57 | 0.48 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| YD | 78.8 | 81 | 148.21 | 147.8 | 91.53 | 87.02 | 5.83 | 6.55 |
| Yr | 116.55 | 116.87 | 163.35 | 164.81 | 116.45 | 155.27 | 9.72 | 20.05 |
| R | -0.87 | -0.82 | -0.97 | -0.96 | -0.53 | -0.33 | -0.97 | -0.76 |
| t^2 | 9.6 | 17.79 | 1.46 | 0.68 | 2.39 | 0.07 | 0.5 | 1.29 |
| B | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.4 | 0.62 | 0.26 | 0.4 |

Table (3). Cont.

| Parameters | No. of grains/spike |  | Spike length |  | 1000 - Grain weight |  | Grain yield/plant |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
| D | $30.19 \pm 42.21$ | $43.78 \pm 71.99$ | $3.55 \pm 0.63$ | $5.30 \pm 0.58$ | $60.22 \pm 11.38$ | $60.53 \pm 16.65$ | $4.48 \pm 2.83$ | $5.04 \pm 17.34$ |
| F | $34.21 \pm 103.12$ | $2.78 \pm 175.88$ | $3.02 \pm 1.54$ | $4.46 \pm 1.44$ | $103.20 \pm 27.8$ | $112.45 \pm 40.68$ | $-1.14 \pm 6.92$ | $6.35 \pm 42.37$ |
| H1 | $440.24 \pm 107.15$ | $718.70 \pm 182.76$ | $7.74 \pm 1.6$ | $5.61 \pm 1.5$ | $137.04 \pm 28.89$ | $164.88 \pm 42.27$ | $24.25 \pm 7.19$ | $113.28 \pm 44.03$ |
| H2 | $345.50 \pm 95.72$ | $543.40 \pm 163.27$ | $5.37 \pm 1.43$ | $3.88 \pm 1.34$ | $83.30 \pm 25.81$ | $100.69 \pm 37.77$ | $21.27 \pm 6.42$ | $106.90 \pm 39.33$ |
| $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{2}$ | $441.74 \pm 64.43$ | 628.87 $\pm 109.89$ | $0.07 \pm 0.96$ | $0.00 \pm 0.9$ | $3.27 \pm 17.37$ | $5.24 \pm 25.42$ | $3.20 \pm 4.32$ | $130.78 \pm 26.47$ |
| $\hat{E}$ | $0.44 \pm 15.95$ | $0.82 \pm 27.21$ | $0.09 \pm 0.24$ | $0.14 \pm 0.22$ | $0.22 \pm 4.3$ | $0.17 \pm 6.29$ | $0.13 \pm 1.07$ | $0.22 \pm 6.56$ |
| (H11/D) ${ }^{0.5}$ | 3.82 | 4.05 | 1.48 | 1.03 | 1.51 | 1.65 | 2.33 | 4.74 |
| ( $\mathrm{H} 2 / 4 \mathrm{H} 1$ ) | 0.2 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.24 |
| KD/Kr | 1.35 | 1.02 | 1.81 | 2.38 | 3.63 | 3.57 | 0.9 | 1.31 |
| h(n.s) | 0.34 | 0.44 | 0.5 | 0.54 | 0.2 | 0.19 | 0.44 | 0.09 |
| YD | 48.75 | 29.25 | 8.8 | 10.14 | 13.82 | 30.22 | 13.56 | 22.15 |
| Yr | 74.77 | 113.86 | 17.02 | 22.81 | 185.64 | 118.59 | 19.68 | 21.19 |
| r | -0.11 | 0.31 | 0.78 | 0.66 | -0.17 | -0.27 | -0.49 | -0.92 |
| $\mathrm{t}^{\text {2 }}$ | 73.51 | 46.17 | 0.43 | 1.3 | 0.95 | 0.57 | 9.38 | 29.76 |
| b | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.76 | 1.11 | 0.94 | 0.44 | 0.29 | -0.02 |

grain yield /plant at normal fertilization and that would indicate the absence of the dominance effect over all loci in the heterozygotes in all crosses and that could be due to presence of a considerable amount of canceling dominance effects in the parental varieties. Similar results were previously obtained by Okan (2009), Kumar et al., (2015) and Ali (2018).

The average degree of dominance ( $\mathrm{H} 1 / \mathrm{D})^{1 / 2}$ was found be greater than unity at the two different nitrogen levels for all traits under investigations, indicating the presence of over dominance for these traits.

When positive and negative genes are equally distributed in the parental varieties, the proportion ( $\hat{\mathrm{H}} 2 / 4 \hat{\mathrm{H}} 1$ ) is expected to be 0.25 . The estimated values of ( $\hat{\mathrm{H}} 2 / 4 \hat{\mathrm{H}} 1$ )were found to be close to this value ( 0.25 ) for grain yield /plant; indicating that positive and negative alleles were equally distributed among the parents for this trait. However, the estimated values of ( $\mathrm{H} 2 / 4 \hat{\mathrm{H}} 1$ ) were fund to be below ( 0.25 ) for the remainder of the character studied, indicating that positive and negative alleles were not equally distributed among the parents in these traits.

Estimates of the ratio of dominant to recessive alleles in the parents ( $K_{D} / K_{R}$ ) were found to be more than unity for all traits studied at the two different nitrogen levels, except grain yield per plant at the normal nitrogen level only. This further confirming the existence of more dominant than recessive genes in the parental varieties as previously discussed concerning the positive values of ( $F$ ) parameter. It is of interest to mention that, $K_{D} \backslash K_{R}$ ratio was found to be more than unity for grain yield per plant at the stress condition but it was less than unity at the normal nitrogen fertilizer level (Table 3) this indicate an excess of dominant genes at nitrogen
level and excess of recessive genes at the other nitrogen level, suggesting that the excess of dominant or recessive genes controlling this trait was not consistent at the two different levels, therefor the degree of dominance or recessiveness may be determined by growing conditions. Similar results were previously obtained by Abd El Rahman et al., (2008), Kumar et al., (2015), Fellahi et al., (2016) and Ali (2018).

The correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) between the parental values $\left(Y_{r}\right)$ and the parental order of dominance ( $\mathbf{W r}+\mathrm{Vr}$ ) for all characters studied at the two different fertilizer levels are presented in Table (3). If the correlation is negative, it means that the parents containing most increasing genes have the lowest values of $(\mathrm{Wr}+\mathrm{Vr})$ and thus contain most dominant genes, and the correlation would be positive if the case is reverse. Thus, on this basis, it could be concluded whether or not the increasing or decreasing genes are the dominant ones. Also, when the correlation between parental mean values and ( $\mathrm{Wr}+\mathrm{Vr}$ ) is small, it suggests that the dominant genes with positive and negative effects in the parental line could be in equal proportions. If the correlation coefficient is high, the most dominant alleles will act in one direction and most recessive alleles will act in the opposite one (Hayman, 1954). In the present study, the correlation coefficients were found to be negative for all traits studied except number of grainslspike at stress condition and spike length at the two different fertilizer levels, however days to heading, days to maturity and number of spikes per plant at the two different fertilizers and spike length at normal condition and grain yield per plant at stress condition were found to be highly significant, and that would indicate the prevalence of dominant genes.

It is of interest to mention that the sign of the correlation coefficient values for number of grains per spike were found to be different at the two different fertilizer levels which would ascertain that dominant genes could be increases or decreases according to the growing environmental conditions. The estimated values of correlation coefficient were found to be low for plant height, number of grains per spike and 1000 grain weight at both nitrogen levels which would indicate that the dominant genes of positive and negative effects in the parental lines could be in equal proportion.

Heritability in narrow sense was estimated for all the studied characters at the two different fertilizer levels are presented in Table (3). Moderate heritability values were detected for heading date, plant height and spike length Therefore, the genetic system controlling these traits might be attributed to additive effects of genes. Consequently, pedigree selection program for these characters would be preferred for other traits; low heritability in narrow sense was detected. Therefore, breeding programs towards pure line selections seemed to be meaningless. Therefore, the bulk method program for these traits might be quite promising. These results are in harmony with AINaggar et al., (2015), Ahmed et al., (2016), Salehi et al., (2014), Ali (2018) and Farshadfar et al., (2013).

## 3- Jones Method (1965)

The data obtaind here in were subjected further to the analysis of wariance of the diallel table as suggested by Jones (1965) to test the existence of both additive variation and dominance variation which controlled the inheritance of the characters under study (Table 4).

In Jones model, the (a) component which test the existence of additive effects control the inheritance of the characters under study were found to be higly significant for all characters studied in both $n$ and $s$, these results are ascertained by the significant values of additive variation which obtained from the methods studied i.e. Hayman (1954) for most characcters under study (Table 3). Jones method also, exhibited that the (b) items were highly significant for all characters studied under both nitrogen fertilizer levels which indicating the existence of dominance variation of some loci. The (b) item, main effects, has been spilt into three components, b1, b2, and b3. In general item (b1) is considered as ameasure of the mean deviation of the $F_{1}$ 's from their mid parental values were found to be highly significant for all characters studied under the two nitrogen fertilizer levels except for spike length under both $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{S}$. These results are in harmony with those previously obtained for the corresponding parent vs. crosses mean squares (Table 2). Item (b2) which is taken as a further dominance deviation due to asymmetrical gene distribution were detected to be highly significant for all traits studied under both nitrogen levels, reflecting the asymmetry of the gene frequency in the parental lines.

The item (b3) which is considered a test of the part of dominance deviation that is unique for each F1 (Hayman 1954) were found to be highly significant for all traits under study at both nitrogen levels

It is worth to mention that, the (a) values were found to be lager in magnitude than the corresponding (b) values for most traits studied (Table 4).

Similar results in wheat were previously obtained by Farshadfar et al., (2012) and Rania A.R. El-Said (2018).

## H. Dawwam, et al.,

Table (4). The analysis of variance of the dialle table (Jones method 1965)

| Source of <br> variance | D.F | Heading date |  | Maturity date |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
|  |  | M.S | M.S | M.S | M.S |
| a | 5 | $42.220^{* *}$ | $44.865^{* *}$ | $3.298^{* *}$ | $4.378^{* *}$ |
| b | 15 | $11.857^{* *}$ | $11.188^{* *}$ | $3.545^{* *}$ | $3.789^{* *}$ |
| b1 | 1 | $112.933^{* *}$ | $100.119^{* *}$ | $17.143^{* *}$ | $26.312^{* *}$ |
| b2 | 5 | $8.865^{* *}$ | $9.063^{* *}$ | $1.493^{* *}$ | $1.349^{* *}$ |
| b3 | 9 | $2.289^{* *}$ | $2.486^{* *}$ | $3.174^{* *}$ | $2.643^{* *}$ |
| Error | 40 | 0.248 | 0.142 | 0.181 | 0.103 |

Table (4). Cont.

| Source of variance | D.F | Plant height (cm) |  | No. of spikes/plant |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
|  |  | M.S | M.S | M.S | M.S |
| a | 5 | $41.591^{* *}$ | $47.646^{* *}$ | $2.855^{* *}$ | $4.400^{* *}$ |
| b | 15 | $10.148^{* *}$ | $16.455^{* *}$ | $3.652^{* *}$ | $5.380^{* *}$ |
| b1 | 1 | $17.238^{* *}$ | $20.318^{* *}$ | $19.480^{* *}$ | $12.787^{* *}$ |
| b2 | 5 | $10.466^{* *}$ | $17.909^{* *}$ | $0.886^{* *}$ | $3.451^{* *}$ |
| b3 | 9 | $9.183^{* *}$ | $15.218^{* *}$ | $3.430^{* *}$ | $5.629^{* *}$ |
| Error | 40 | 0.279 | 0.516 | 0.146 | 0.131 |

Table (4). Cont.

| Source of <br> variance | D.F | No . of grains/spike |  | Spike length |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
|  |  | M.S | M.S | M.S | M.S |
| a | 5 | $115.980^{* *}$ | $281.224^{* *}$ | $5.305^{* *}$ | $5.957^{* *}$ |
| b | 15 | $117.417^{* *}$ | $185.213^{* *}$ | $1.699^{* *}$ | $1.269^{* *}$ |
| b1 | 1 | $681.925^{* *}$ | $970.954^{* *}$ | 0.192 | 0.112 |
| b2 | 5 | $97.697^{* *}$ | $201.956^{* *}$ | $2.018^{* *}$ | $0.988^{* *}$ |
| b3 | 9 | $65.649^{* *}$ | $88.606^{* *}$ | $1.690^{* *}$ | $1.554^{* *}$ |
| Error | 40 | 0.432 | 0.785 | 0.098 | 0.134 |

Table (4). Cont.

| Source of <br> variance <br>  $\boldsymbol{*}$ D.F | $1000-$ Grain weight |  | Grain yield/plant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stress | Normal | Stress | Normal |
|  |  | M.S | M.S | M.S | M.S |
| a | 5 | $26.284^{* *}$ | $24.736^{* *}$ | $14.128^{* *}$ | $7.912^{* *}$ |
| b | 15 | $27.818^{* *}$ | $33.526^{* *}$ | $5.907^{* *}$ | $33.260^{* *}$ |
| b1 | 1 | $5.230^{* *}$ | $8.230^{* *}$ | $5.044^{* *}$ | $201.958^{* *}$ |
| b2 | 5 | $29.377^{* *}$ | $37.672^{* *}$ | $4.387^{* *}$ | $5.516^{* *}$ |
| b3 | 9 | $29.461^{* *}$ | $34.033^{* *}$ | $6.847^{* *}$ | $29.928^{* *}$ |
| Error | 40 | 0.188 | 0.162 | 0.137 | 0.22 |
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تربية القمح الدارج لبعض الصفات الكمية بإستخدام الهجن التبادلية

> حسان دوام(')، سمير راضى(")، عادل خطاب(')، خالد فتحي سالم(٪)، مروه هنداوي(') (') قسم المحاصيل - كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنوفية
> (") معهر الهندسة الوراثية - جامعة مدينة السادات

الملخص العربي
أجريت هذه الاراسة خله موسمين متتالين حيث استخام لهذه الاراسـة ستة تراكيب وراثية من قــح الخبز متباعدة




ذات ثلاث مكررات تحت ظروف التسميا العادي ( • V كجم نتروجين/ف) والتسميا المنخفض ( • 「 كجم نيتروجين/ف).

 - الصفات المدروسة هى: ميعاد طرد السنابل، ميعاد النضج، طول النبات، عدد السنابل في النبات، طول السنبلة، وزن الألف حبة، عدد الحبوب في السنبلة، محصول النبات الفردي من الحبوب. وتتلخص أهم نتائج الاراسة فيما يلي :
1- التاين الراجع لمستويات التسميا الأزوتى معنويا لكل الصفات المدروسه ما عدا صفة ميعاد النضج وطول النبات.「- كانت قيم التباين الراجع إلى التركيب الوراثيه والاباء والهجن عالى المعنويه لمعظم الصفات المدروسه تحت مستويي التسميا الأزوتى والتحليل المشترك لهما r- كما أظهر تحليل البيانات بطريقه هايمن النتائج التاليه : ■ كان التباين الوراثي المضيف (D) عالى المعنويه لكل الصفات المدروسه مـا عدا عدد الحبوب في السنبله ومحصول
 الجزء المضيف من التباين وذلك لجميع الصفات المدروسه في كل من مستويي التسميد الأزوتى العالمى والمنخفض.
 تحت الاراسه تحت مستويي التسميا الأزوتى ما عدا صفات محصول النبات الفردى . ■ كانت قيم درجة التوريث بمعناها الاقيق متوسطه لصفات ميعاد طرد السنابل ، طول النبات ، وطول اللسنبله بينما كانت منخفضه لبقيه الصفات المدروسه . - أظهر تحليل البيانـات بطريقه جونز (1965) أن التباين الوراثي المضيف عالى المعنويـه لجميع الصفات المدروسـه تحت مستويي التسميد الأوتتى والتباين السيادى أيضا عالى المعنويه لكل الصفات المدين المدوسـه تحت مستويي التسميا الأزوتى وقل وجد أن التباين الوراثي المضيف أكبر في قيمته من التباين السيادى لمعظم الصفات تحت الاراسه.
(للسادة المحكمين
أ.د/ر رمضان أحمد إسماعيل المركز القومى للبحوث - القاهرة أ.د/ شعبان الشمارقـــــــة كلية النزاعة - جامعة المنوفية


[^0]:    Comb. = combined data.

    * and ** significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability , respectively.

[^1]:    Comb. = combined data.

    * and ** significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability , respectively.

