# IMPROVING LINT YIELD AND ITS COMPONENTS IN EARLY SEGREGATING GENERATIONS OF GIZA 45 X GIZA 75 COTTON CROSS

EL-OKKIAH, A.F.H. 1, M.M. KASSEM2, G.A. SARY2 AND M.M. EL-LAWENDEY1

1 Cotton Res. Inst., ARC, Giza 2 Crop Sci., Fac. of Agric., Moshtohor, Zagazig Univ.

(Manuscript received 3 March 2007)

#### **Abstract**

The present study was conceived in an effort to investigate: 1-The genetic, phenotypic and environmental variances and covariances among traits in an intraspecific population generated from a cross between two Egyptian cotton cultivars, Giza 45 (extra long staple ELS) and Giza 75 (long staple LS). 2- The magnitudes of the genotypic and phenotypic correlations between traits. 3-Compare the relative efficiencies of nine selection procedures measured in terms of the expected and realized response to selection. A field trial was carried out at Sakha Agricultural Research Station, A.R.C., Egypt during 2000-2002 growing seasons. The results indicated that F<sub>4</sub> means were higher than those of F<sub>3</sub> for all studied traits except seeds/boll. Maximum realized genetic advance for lint yield was achieved using the direct phenotypic trait selection for lint/seed (Ix<sub>3</sub>). The selection index, I<sub>23</sub> exhibited the highest predicted genetic advance from  $F_3$  to  $F_4$  for lint yield trait. From F<sub>4</sub> to F<sub>5</sub> the predicted genetic advance of lint yield exhibited maximum values using the index Ixw. Also, maximum predicted responses to selection for lint percentage and seed index in F4 generation were achieved using the direct phenotypic trait selection for lint/seed and seeds/boll, respectively.

#### INTRODUCTION

The ultimate aim of cotton breeding programs is to increase yield as well as improving fiber properties. Therefore, in producing cotton varieties higher in yielding capacity and better in technological traits, cotton breeders can be guided in selection programs by selection indices which have received much attention in recent years. Undoubtedly, recent progress in statistical genetics and biometrics helped greatly in the construction and use of these indices. Smith (1936) and Hazel (1943) illustrated the procedure for constructing a selection index that gives maximum advance from selection. Walker (1960) mentioned that the lint yield of spaced individual plants was differentiated into three components viz.: bolls/plant, seeds/boll and lint/seed. El-Kilany (1976) found that seven selection indices and phenotypic individual character selection for lint/seed were efficient selection procedures for improving lint yield in both  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  generations. El-Okkiah (1979) reported that the highest predicted genetic advance for lint yield was achieved by selecting for yield alone. He also

reported that selection for yield and two other yield components (seeds/boll and lint/seed) resulted in reduction of predicted advance. Predicted yield advance was decreased following deletion of any one of the two yield components.

The objectives of this study were to obtain information regarding, 1- Phenotypic, genotypic and environmental variances for lint yield and lint components, 2- Magnitude of the phenotypic and genotypic correlations between studied characters, and 3-Relative effectiveness of different selection procedures in improving lint yield.

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### **Field Procedures:**

The present investigation was carried out at Sakha Experimental Farm, Sakha Agricultural Research Station, A.R.C., Egypt, during 2000-2002 growing seasons. The breeding materials used in this study were F<sub>2</sub>, F<sub>3</sub> and F<sub>4</sub>-generations of an intraspecific population generated from a cross between Giza 45 (extra long staple variety) and Giza 75 (long staple variety). In (2000), the  $F_2$  generation along with the original parents were grown in non-replicated rows 7.5 meters long and 60 cm wide, with one skipped row between each two consecutive planted rows. Each row contained 15 single plants spaced 50 cm apart. All plants were self pollinated and 300 F2 guarded plants were chosen in the field mainly on the basis of yield productivity. Five percent selection intensity in F<sub>2</sub> gave 15 superior plants for each phenotypic trait selection, viz. i.e., lint yield/plant (Xw), bolls/plant ( $X_1$ ), seeds/boll ( $X_2$ ) and lint/seed ( $X_3$ ). The total selected plants by the four phenotypic traits selection were 50 plants. The selfed seeds for each selected plant was divided into two unequal parts. In 2001, part I of selfed seeds (F<sub>3</sub>) were evaluated with the two parents and a random sample of F<sub>3</sub> seeds (bulked seeds). Each selected plant was grown in one row 4.5 meter in length and 60 cm in width, in hills spaced 30 cm and two plants were left per hill at thinning time. The progenies were evaluated in the field trial. The experimental design was randomized complete block design with three replications (R.C.B.D.). The 50 progenies were ranked using nine selection procedures involving the four characters and 10 selected progenies were evaluated with the two parents and a random sample of F4 (bulked seeds) in RCB design with three replications in 2002. The same agronomic practices in 2001 were applied in 2002 experiment. Selection procedures were as follows:

 $I_{w123}$  = Selection index involving lint yield/plant, bolls/plant, seeds/boll and lint/seed.

 $I_{123}$  = Selection index involving bolls/plant, seeds/boll and lint/seed.

 $I_{12}$  = Selection index involving bolls/plant and seeds/boll.

 $I_{13}$  = Selection index involving bolls/plant and lint/seed.

I<sub>23</sub> = Selection index involving seeds/boll and lint/seed.

 $I_{xw}$  = Phenotypic selection for lint yield/plant.

Ix<sub>1</sub> = Phenotypic selection for bolls/plant.

Ix<sub>2</sub> = Phenotypic selection for seeds/boll.

Ix<sub>3</sub> = Phenotypic selection for lint/seed.

The characters scored were: lint yield (g)/plant  $(X_w)$ , bolls/plant  $(X_1)$ , seeds/boll  $(X_2)$ , lint (g)/seed  $(X_3)$ , lint percentage and seed index (g).

#### **Method of Analysis:**

The formula suggested by Smith (1936) and Hazel (1943) was used in calculating various selection indices. The relative economic importance  $(a_i)$  was calculated according to Walker (1960). Predicted genetic advance in lint yield was estimated as given Walker (1960) and Miller and Rawlings (1967). The predicted changes in unselected characters were calculated according to Walker (1960). The phenotypic (PCV) and genotypic (GCV) coefficients of variation were estimated using the formula developed by Burton (1952). Phenotypic  $(r_p)$  and genotypic  $(r_g)$  correlation coefficients were calculated among the studied characters as outlined by Steel and Torrie (1960).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### 1. Variance components:

Estimates of variance components for lint yield and its components are presented in Table 1. Both phenotypic and genotypic variances were larger in  $F_2$  generation than  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations for all studied characters. In  $F_3$  generation, significant phenotypic variances were detected for all studied characters. The phenotypic variances in  $F_4$  generation were higher than  $F_3$  generation for all studied characters except lint percentage. The increase in phenotypic and most genotypic variances in  $F_4$  generation is due to the efficiency of selection procedures in creating substantial genetic variation. This finding is in agreement with those obtained by El-Okkiah (1979) and Gooda (2001). With regard to environmental variances, it is clear that all values with an exception of these pertaining to lint yield and bolls/plant were small in magnitude and would be minor to affect genetic parameters.

| Characters                  | Generations    | ^σ²p       | ^σ²g     | ^σ²e     |  |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|--|
| Link . dalah                | F <sub>2</sub> | 184.4941+  | 122.6641 | 61.8300  |  |
| Lint yield/                 | F <sub>3</sub> | 3.6217**   | 2.2413   | 1.3804   |  |
| plant (g) (X <sub>w</sub> ) | F <sub>4</sub> | 7.7098*    | 5.4495   | 2.2603   |  |
| Pollo/plant                 | F <sub>2</sub> | 202.3592+  | 125.4782 | 76.8810  |  |
| Bolis/plant                 | F <sub>3</sub> | 3.5376**   | 1.9603   | 1.5773   |  |
| (X <sub>1</sub> )           | F <sub>4</sub> | 7.5165*    | 4.5034   | 3.0131   |  |
| Seeds/boll                  | F <sub>2</sub> | 2.3770+    | 0.9786   | 1.3984   |  |
| (X <sub>2</sub> )           | F <sub>3</sub> | 0.5982**   | 0.3200   | 0.2782   |  |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub> | 1.3178*    | 0.8600   | 0.4578   |  |
| Lint/seed (g)               | F <sub>2</sub> | 0.000038+  | 0.000023 | 0.000015 |  |
| (X <sub>3</sub> )           | F <sub>3</sub> | 0.000007** | 0.000004 | 0.000003 |  |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub> | 0.000015*  | 0.000010 | 0.000005 |  |
| Lint                        | F <sub>2</sub> | 4.5966+    | 2.5532   | 2.0434   |  |
| percentage                  | F <sub>3</sub> | 2.0813**   | 1.4081   | 0.6732   |  |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub> | 1.6041*    | 1.1552   | 0.4489   |  |
| Seed index                  | F <sub>2</sub> | 0.8668+    | 0.4658   | 0.4010   |  |
| (g)                         | F <sub>3</sub> | 0.2063**   | 0.1445   | 0.0618   |  |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub> | 0.2988     | 0.1234   | 0.1754   |  |

Table 1. Estimates of phenotypic, genotypic and environmental variances for lint yield and its components in  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations.

### 2. Means, ranges, phenotypic and genotypic coefficients of variation and heritability estimates:

 $F_2$  means for lint yield/plant, bolls/plant and seeds/boll (Table 2) were higher than those of the succeeding generations although intensive selection was practiced. Wide ranges in lint yield, bolls/plant and seeds/boll in  $F_2$  generation were noticed compared with those of the other segregating generations. The difference among generation means may be due to the wider spacings between either rows or hills in  $F_2$  than  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations, in addition the number of plants/hill differed from one plant/hill in  $F_2$  to two plants per hill in both  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations.

PCV% and GCV % were larger in  $F_2$  generation than those of the succeeding generations for all the studied characters. This indicates that, the magnitude of the genetic variability persisting in these material helps the breeder to provide substantial amounts of improvement through the selection of superior progenies. Similar results were obtained by El-Okkiah (1979) and Meena *et al.* (2001).

Comparing means of  $F_3$  generation with those of  $F_4$  generation, it is apparent that the means of  $F_4$  were higher than those of  $F_3$  for all studied characters except seeds/boll. Also, comparing the lowest and highest values of  $F_3$  with those of  $F_4$  (Table 2), it is clear that the lowest and the highest of  $F_4$  surpassed those of  $F_3$  for all studied

<sup>\*, \*\*</sup> significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.

<sup>+</sup> Estimates of phenotypic variance for 300 F<sub>2</sub> plants.

characters except seeds/boll and lint percentage. This may be attributed to the efficiency of selection procedures applied in this study.

Table 2. Means, standard errors, ranges, phenotypic (PCV) and genotypic (GCV) coefficients of variation and broad sense heritability  $(h^2_b)$  for six characters in  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations.

| Characters                  | Generations     | Mean <u>+</u> S X     | Range       | PCV%  | GCV%          | h² <sub>b</sub> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|---------------|-----------------|
| Lint yield/                 | F <sub>2</sub>  | 29.37 <u>+</u> 0.784  | 3.4–68.7    | 46.2  | 3 <u>7.</u> 7 | 66.5            |
| plant (g) (X <sub>w</sub> ) | _F <sub>3</sub> | 12 <u>.22</u> +1.175  | 8.7–16.4    | 15.6  | 12.3          | 61.9            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 15.40 <u>+</u> 1.503  | 11.2–19.1   | 18.0  | 15.2          | 70.7            |
| Bolls/plant                 | F <sub>2</sub>  | 33.63 <u>+</u> 0.821  | 5.0-79.0    | 42.3  | 33.3          | 62.0            |
| (X <sub>1</sub> )           | F <sub>3</sub>  | 15.31 <u>+</u> 1.256  | 11.5-19.5   | `12.3 | 9.1           | 55.4            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 16.63 <u>+</u> 1.736  | 12.9–21.5   | 16.5  | 12.8          | 59.9            |
| Seeds/boll                  | F <sub>2</sub>  | 18.34 <u>+</u> 0.089  | 14.6–22.0   | 8.4   | 5.4           | 41.2            |
| (X <sub>2</sub> )           | F <sub>3</sub>  | 17.25 <u>+</u> 0.527  | 15.0-19.1   | 4.5   | 3.3           | 53.5            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 15.71 <u>+</u> 0.677  | 14.4–17.9   | 7.3   | 5.9           | 65.3            |
| Lint/seed (g)               | F <sub>2</sub>  | 0.046 <u>+</u> 0.0004 | 0.030-0.062 | 13.4  | 10.4          | 60.5            |
| (X <sub>3</sub> )           | F <sub>3</sub>  | 0.04 <u>6+</u> 0.002  | 0.041-0.053 | 5.8   | 4.3           | 57.1            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 0.059 <u>+</u> 0.002  | 0.052-0.064 | 6.6   | 5.4           | 66.7            |
| Lint                        | F <sub>2</sub>  | 33.58 <u>+</u> 0.124  | 26.4–39.7   | 6.4   | 4.8           | 55.5            |
| percentage                  | F <sub>3</sub>  | 33.94 <u>+</u> 0.820  | 30.6–37.3   | 4.3   | 3.5           | 67.7            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 34.60 <u>+</u> 0.670  | 31.5–36.4   | 3.7   | 3.1           | 72.0            |
| Seed index                  | F <sub>2</sub>  | 9.05 <u>+</u> 0.054   | 6.1–11.4    | 10.3  | 7.5           | 53.7            |
| (g)                         | F <sub>3</sub>  | 8.99 <u>+</u> 0.249   | 8.0-10.3    | 5.1   | 4.2           | 70.0            |
|                             | F <sub>4</sub>  | 11.22 <u>+</u> 0.419  | 10.0-12.0   | 4.9   | 3.1           | 41.3            |

Low estimates of PCV% and GCV % in  $F_3$  generation, were detected compared with  $F_4$  ones for lint yield/plant, bolls/plant, seeds/boll and lint/seed. Both lint yield and bolls/plant exhibited the highest estimates of PCV% and GCV%. However, seeds/boll, lint/seed, lint percentage and seed index gave moderate to low variabilities.

Regarding heritability estimates in broad sense (Table 2), high estimates (> 50%) were found for all characters in the three generations except seeds/boll in  $F_2$  and seed index in  $F_4$  generations. However, high heritability estimates were detected from  $F_3$  to  $F_4$  generations for all characters except seed index.

#### 3. Phenotypic and genotypic correlation:

Estimates of phenotypic  $(r_p)$  and genotypic  $(r_g)$  correlation coefficients between studied characters in  $F_{2r}$ ,  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations are presented in Table (3).

The phenotypic and genotypic correlations between lint yield/plant and bolls/plant in the three generations were positive and highly significant indicating that bolls/plant was the most effective yield-contributing variable. Similar results were reported by Abo-Sen (2001). Slight insignificant positive or negative correlations between lint yield/plant and seeds/boll were detected in  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  generations indicating variable relationship between the two traits. El-Okkiah (1979) and Hassaballa *et al.* (1987) reported similar findings.

The relationship between lint yield and lint/seed changed from low insignificant in  $F_2$  to highly significant and positive in  $F_4$ . The change in correlation coefficient from low to high was also observed by El-Okkiah (1979) and Gooda (2001).

Phenotypic and genotypic correlation coefficients between lint yield and lint percentage were significant and positive in both  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  generations. Similar results were reported by Gooda (2001).

Lint yield/plant showed significant positive relationship with seed index in  $F_2$  generation and increased in  $F_4$  generation. These results coincided with those reported by El-Kilany (1976) and Singh *et al.* (1985).

Bolls/plant showed low negative or positive association with seeds/boll and seed index over the generations. El-Kilany (1976) also found that genetic associations between bolls/plant and seeds/boll were negative and minor to the extent that would make them mutually incompatible in a selection program.

The  $r_p$  and  $r_g$  between bolls/plant and each of lint/seed and lint percentage were positive and moderate to low in magnitude in the generations. This finding was similar to those obtained by El-Kilany (1976), Singh *et al.* (1985) and El-Harony (1999).

Generally, seeds/boll exhibited negative associations with each of lint/seed, lint percentage and seed index in  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  generations. Gooda (2001) found that the phenotypic and genotypic correlations between seeds/boll and each of lint/seed, lint percentage and seed index were negative and low in magnitude.

The  $r_p$  and  $r_g$  between lint/seed and each of lint percentage and seed index were positive and highly significant for the most of studied generations.

Lint percentage was negatively significant or insignificant associated with seed index in the three generations. Singh *et al.* (1985) and El-Harony (1999) also reported similar findings.

| Table 3. | Estimates | of   | phenotypic   | $(r_p)$ | and                           | genotypic   | $(r_g)$ | correlation | coefficients |
|----------|-----------|------|--------------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------|
|          | between s | tudi | ed character | s in F  | <sub>2</sub> , F <sub>3</sub> | and F₄ gene | eratio  | ns.         |              |

| Relationships                               | <u>F</u> | . 2            | F        | 3           | F <sub>4</sub> |             |
|---|----------|----------------|----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
|   | rp       | r <sub>g</sub> | rp       | $r_{\rm g}$ | rp             | $r_{\rm q}$ |
| Lint yield (g)/plant and bolls/plant        | 0.957**  | 0.957**        | 0.917**  | 0.935**     | 0.843**        | 0.845**     |
| 2. Lint yield (g)/plant and seeds/boll      | -0.025   | -0.029         | 0.237    | 0.300*      | 0.046          | 0.104       |
| 3. Lint yield (g)/plant and lint (g)/seed   | 0.096    | 0.096          | 0.499**  | 0.522**     | 0.641**        | 0.789**     |
| 4. Lint yield (g)/plant and lint percentage | 0.245**  | 0.244**        | 0.440**  | 0.535**     | 0.476          | 0.549       |
| 5. Lint yield (g)/plant and seed index (g)  | 0.167**  | 0.170**        | -0.045   | -0.180      | 0.330          | 0.567       |
| 6. Bolls/plant and seeds/boll               | -0.113*  | -0.116*        | 0.043    | 0.150       | -0.393         | -0.340      |
| 7. Bolls/plant and lint (g)/seed            | 0.043    | 0.043          | 0.295*   | 0.364**     | 0.312          | 0.476       |
| 8. Bolls/plant and lint percentage          | 0.138*   | 0.137*         | 0.350*   | 0.487**     | 0.448          | 0.581       |
| 9. Bolls/plant and seed index (g)           | 0.048    | 0.052          | -0.138   | -0.277      | -0.080         | -0.010      |
| 10. Seeds/boll and lint (g)/seed            | -0.066   | -0.068         | -0.322*  | -0.385**    | 0.009          | 0.064       |
| 11. Seeds/boll and lint percentage          | -0.219** | -0.229**       | -0.183   | -0.145      | -0.431         | -0.588      |
| 12. Seeds/boll and seed index (g)           | -0.073   | -0.076         | -0.151   | -0.245      | 0.520          | 1.018**     |
| 13. Lint (g)/seed and lint percentage       | 0.194**  | 0.192**        | 0.633**  | 0.666**     | 0.684**        | 0.836**     |
| 14. Lint (g)/seed and seed index (g)        | 0.301**  | 0.301**        | 0.293*   | 0.247       | 0.552          | 0.454       |
| 15. Lint percentage and seed index (g)      | -0.121*  | -0.119*        | -0.513** | -0.582**    | -0.226         | -0.117      |

<sup>\*, \*\*</sup> significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.

#### 4. Predicted and realized genetic advances of lint yield:

Table (4) shows predicted and realized genetic advances of lint yield (g)/plant and percent advances estimated from  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  means for different selection procedures. The results indicated that the highest predicted genetic advance of  $F_3$  generation for lint yield occurred when index selection involved of lint/seed and seeds/boll ( $I_{23}$ ). On the other hand, the lowest predicted genetic advances for lint yield were found when selecting for only one of the two traits. El-Okkiah (1979) showed that the selection for yield and the other two yield components (seeds/boll and lint/seed) resulted in reduction of predicted advance.

The highest predicted genetic advance of  $F_4$  generation for lint yield was achieved when selecting for lint yield alone ( $I_{xw}$ ). The lowest predicted genetic advances for lint yield occurred with the indices  $I_{x2}$  and  $I_{w123}$ .

The results indicate that overall estimates of predicted genetic advances either as lint (g)/plant or as percentage of generation mean were obviously higher in the  $F_3$  than those of the  $F_4$  generations.

The highest realized genetic advance for lint yield occurred when selecting for lint/seed only ( $Ix_3$ ). Estimates of phenotypic and genotypic correlation coefficients between lint yield/plant and lint/seed indicated that lint/seed was the most effective yield contributing character and was positively associated with lint yield. On the other hand, the index  $Ix_1$  exhibited lowest realized gain in lint yield/plant but, it was a desirable and useful value.

Table 4. Predicted and realized genetic advances of lint yield (g)/plant and advances % as estimated from F<sub>3</sub> and F<sub>4</sub> means for different selection procedures.

| Indices           | Genetic              | advances lint (g     | ı)/plant                         | Advances from generation mean %           |       |                                  |  |  |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------|----------------------------------|--|--|
|                   | Predicted from       | Realized from        | Predicted                        | Predicted from Realized from              |       | Predicted                        |  |  |
| İ                 | F <sub>3</sub> to F4 | F <sub>3</sub> to F4 | from                             | F <sub>3</sub> to F4 F <sub>3</sub> to F4 |       | from                             |  |  |
|                   |                      |                      | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> |   |       | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> |  |  |
| I <sub>w123</sub> | 2.11                 | 2.99                 | 0.12                             | 17.27                                     | 22.43 | 0.78                             |  |  |
| I <sub>123</sub>  | 3.00                 | 1.89                 | . 1.21                           | 24.55                                     | 14.18 | 7.86                             |  |  |
| I <sub>12</sub>   | 2.74                 | 1.89                 | 1.08                             | 22.42                                     | 14.18 | 7.01                             |  |  |
| I <sub>13</sub>   | 2.45                 | 2.14                 | 0.90                             | 20.05                                     | 16.05 | 5.84                             |  |  |
| I <sub>23</sub>   | 4.90                 | 2.37                 | 0.94                             | 40.10                                     | 17.78 | 6.10                             |  |  |
| Ι× <sub>w</sub>   | 2.43                 | 1.89                 | 4.04                             | 19.89                                     | 14.18 | 26.23                            |  |  |
| Ix <sub>1</sub>   | 2.15                 | 1.80                 | 3.14                             | 17.59                                     | 13.50 | 20.39                            |  |  |
| Ix <sub>2</sub>   | 0.68                 | 2.34                 | 0.40                             | 5.56                                      | 17.55 | 2.60                             |  |  |
| Ix <sub>3</sub>   | 1.24                 | 4.19                 | 3.09                             | 10.15                                     | 31.43 | 20.06                            |  |  |

 $\overline{F_3} = 12.22$   $\overline{F_4} = 15.40$  Check mean = 13.33

#### 5. Correlated response to selection for lint yield and unselected traits:

Predicted and realized responses to selection obtained from using nine different selection procedures for lint percentage and seed index are given in Table (5).

The indices  $I_{23}$ ,  $Ix_3$ , Ixw and  $I_{13}$  gave high values of predicted advances for lint percentage in  $F_3$  generation, while the indices  $Ix_3$ ,  $I_{23}$  and  $I_{13}$  exhibited positive values of predicted advance for seed index. The highest predicted advances for both lint percentage and seed index in  $F_4$  generation were obtained by using  $Ix_3$  and  $Ix_2$ , respectively. There was a close agreement between the predicted and realized responses for lint percentage obtained from most selection procedures. On the other hand, there was disagreement between predicted and realized responses for seed index obtained from all indices. The large discrepancies between predicted and realized gains were expected because genotypic variances and covariances used to calculate predicted gains were likely biased by certain genotypic x environment interaction. Similar results were obtained by Culp and Harrell (1975) and Gooda (2001).

Table 5. Predicted and realized responses to selection using nine different selection procedures as estimated from F<sub>3</sub> and F<sub>4</sub> means for lint percentage and seed index.

| Indices           |                                  | Lint percentage                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  | Seed index (g)                   |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                   | Predicted                        | Realized                         | Predicted                        | Predicted                        | Realized %                       | Predicted                        | Predicted                        | Realized                         | Predicted                        | Predicted                        | Realized %                       | Predicted                        |
|                   | (g) from                         | (g) from                         | (g) from                         | % from                           | from                             | % from                           | (g) from                         | (g) from                         | (g) from                         | % from                           | from                             | % from                           |
|                   | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>3</sub> to F <sub>4</sub> | F <sub>4</sub> to F <sub>5</sub> |
| I <sub>w123</sub> | 0.49                             | 1.07                             | 0.13                             | 1.44                             | 3.10                             | 0.38                             | -0.039                           | 2.35                             | 0.024                            | -0.43                            | 26.80                            | 0.21                             |
| I <sub>123</sub>  | 0.34                             | 0.87                             | 0.10                             | 1.00                             | 2.52                             | 0.29                             | -0.028                           | 2.25                             | 0.006                            | -0.31                            | 25.66                            | 0.05                             |
| I <sub>12</sub>   | 0.26                             | 0.87                             | 0.06                             | 0.77                             | 2.52                             | 0.17                             | -0.037                           | 2.25                             | 0.005                            | -0.41                            | 25.66                            | 0.04                             |
| I <sub>13</sub>   | 1.01                             | 0.94                             | 0.15                             | 2.98                             | 2.72                             | 0.43                             | 0.012                            | 2.37                             | 0.021                            | 0.13                             | 27.02                            | 0.19                             |
| I <sub>23</sub>   | 2.01                             | 1.03                             | 0.14                             | 5.92                             | 2.98                             | 0.40                             | 0.073                            | 2.45                             | 0.130                            | 0.81                             | 27.94                            | 1.16                             |
| Ixw               | 1.03                             | 0.87                             | 1.02                             | 3.03                             | 2.52                             | 2.95                             | -0.111                           | 2.25                             | 0.345                            | -1.23                            | 25.66                            | 3.07                             |
| Ix <sub>1</sub>   | 0.89                             | 0.75                             | 1.00                             | 2.62                             | 2.17                             | 2.89                             | -0.161                           | 1.88                             | -0.006                           | -1.79                            | 21.44                            | -0.05                            |
| Ix <sub>2</sub>   | -0.26                            | -0.04                            | -1.05                            | -0.77                            | -0.12                            | -3.03                            | -0.140                           | 2.11                             | 0.595                            | -1.56                            | 24.06                            | 5.30                             |
| Ix <sub>3</sub>   | 1.25                             | 1.34                             | 1.51                             | 3.68                             | 3.88                             | 4.36                             | 0.149                            | 2.44                             | 0.265                            | 1.66                             | 27.82                            | 2.36                             |

Generation means of lint percentage

 $F_3 = 33.94$ 

Generation means of seed index

 $F_3 = 8.99$ 

 $F_4 = 34.60$ 

 $F_4 = 11.22$ 

Check mean of lint percentage

= 34.55

Check mean of seed index

= 8.77

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Abo-Sen, Z.F. 2001. The relative contributions of yield components to cotton lint yield. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 26(2): 681-685.
- 2. Burton, G.W. 1952. Quantitative inheritance in grasses. Proc. 6<sup>th</sup> Internat. Grassland Congr. 1: 277-283.
- 3. Culp, T.W. and D.C. Harrell. 1975. Influence of lint percentage, boll size, and seed size on lint yield of Upland cotton with high fiber strength. Crop Sci., 15(6): 741-746.
- El-Harony, H.A. 1999. Evaluation of genetic variances and correlations between cotton yield and its components among biparental progenies. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 24(3): 935-944.
- 5. El-Kilany, M.A. 1976. Comparative studies of selection techniques in developing and maintaining Egyptian cotton. Ph.D. Thesis, Cairo Univ., Egypt.
- 6. El-Okkiah, A.F.H. 1979. Evaluation of selection indices in Egyptian cotton (*G. barbadense* L.). Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Kafr El-Sheikh, Tanta Univ., Egypt.
- Gooda, B.M.R. 2001. Application of certain selection techniques in evaluating and maintaining Egyptian cotton varieties. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Kafr El-Sheikh, Tanta Univ., Egypt.
- 8. Hassaballa, E.A., E.E. Mahdy, M.A. Khalifa and F.G. Younis. 1987. Correlation and path-analysis as affected by selection procedures in an inter-specific cotton population. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., 18(3): 85-100.
- Hazel, L.N. 1943. The genetic basis for constructing selection indices. Genetics 28: 476-490.
- Meena, R.A., M.N. Mishra and R.G. Dani. 2001. Genetic variability and correlation for seed-quality parameters Upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). Indian J. Agric. Sci., 71(6): 417-420.
- 11. Miller, P.A. and J.O. Rawlings. 1967. Selection for increased lint yield and correlated responses in Upland cotton, *Gossypium hirsutum* L. Crop Sci., 7: 637-640.
- 12. Singh, M., V.P. Singh and K. Paul. 1985. Selection for yield and quality of *Gossypium hirsutum* L. Indian J. Agric. Sci., 55(8):521-525.
- 13. Smith, H.F. 1936. A discriminant function for plant selection. Ann. Eugenics, 7, 240-250.
- 14. Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1960. Principles and procedures of statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., New York. U.S.A.
- Walker, J.T. 1960. The use of a selection index technique in the analysis of progeny row data. Emp. Cott. Gr. Rev. 37: 81-107.

## تحسين محصول الشعر ومكوناته في الأجيال المبكرة لهجين القطن جيزه ٥٥ × جيزه ٥٧

أحمد فؤاد حسن العكية ' ، محمد قاسم محمد ' ، جابر عبداللطيف سارى ' ، محمد محمد اللاوندى '

1 - معهد بحوث القطن ــ مركز البحوث الزراعية - الجيزة

٢- كلية زراعة مشتهر ــ جامعة الزقازيق

#### يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة:

- ۱- التباينات والتباينات المرافقة المظهرية والوراثية والبينية لمحصول النبات من القطن الشعر ومكوناته للهجين (جيزه ٥٠ × جيزه ٥٠).
  - ٧- التلازمات المظهرية والوراثية بين الصفات المدروسة.
  - ٣- الكفاءة النسبية لأدلة الانتخاب (٥ أدلة) والانتخاب المظهرى المباشر للصفة (٤ أدلة).

#### ولتحقيق هذه الأهداف:

- في عام ٢٠٠٠م تم انتخاب أعلى ٥% لكل من محصول القطن الشعر/نبات ، عدد اللوز/نبات ، عدد اللوز/نبات ، عدد البذور/لوزة ووزن الشعر/بذرة لعشيرة الجيل الثاني للهجين (جيزه ٤٠ × جيزه ٥٠) وقد تم انتخاب أعلى ٥٠ نبات على أساس الصفات الأربع السابقة.
- في عام ٢٠٠١م استخدم جزء من البذرة الذاتي للـ ٥٠ عائلة للتقييم مـع الأبـوين والعينـة العشوائية للجيل الثالث (F3) باستخدام تصميم قطاعات كاملة العشوائية ذات ثلاث مكررات.
- تم ترتيب العائلات المقيمة باستخدام تسع أدلة انتخابية المتضمنة الأربع صفات ثم انتخاب أعلى 7% لكل دليل. وفي عام ٢٠٠٢م تم استعمال البذرة الذاتية لنسل هذه العائلات المنتخبة من حقل التربية في زراعة الجيل الرابع مع الأبوين ومخلوط بذرة الجيل تحت الدراسة باستخدام تصميم قطاعات كاملة العشوائية ذات ثلاث مكررات بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بسخا.

#### ويمكن تلخيص النتائج المتحصل عليها كما يلى:

- اظهر التباين المظهرى في الجيل الرابع قيما أعلى من الجيل الثالث لكل الصفات المدروسة ماعدا صفة معدل الحليج ، وقد يرجع ذلك إلى فاعلية أدلة الانتخاب التي تدببت في تلك الزيادة.
- ٢- أظهرت متوسطات الجيل الرابع قيما أعلى من الجيل الثالث لكل الصفات المدروسة عدا صفة عدد البذور/لوزة.
- "- أظهر الانتخاب المظهرى المباشر لصفة وزن الشعر/بذرة أعلى تحسين وراثى فعلى لمحصول القطن الشعر/نبات.
- 3- أظهر دليل الانتخاب المتضمن عدد البذور/لوزة ووزن الشعر/بذرة أعلى تاثير في تحسين محصول القطن الشعر حيث أعطى أقصى تحسين وراثى متوقع من الجيل الثالث إلى الجيل الرابع بينما أعطى الانتخاب المظهرى المباشر لصفة محصول القطن الشعر/نبات أقصى تحسين وراثى متوقع لمحصول القطن الشعر/نبات من الجيل الرابع إلى الجيل الخامس.
- أوضحت النتائج أن الزيادة في محصول القطن الشعر/نبات قد صاحبها زيادة متوقعة لصفتي معدل الحليج ومعامل البذرة في الجيل الرابع عند استخدام دليلي الانتخاب IX2, IX3