STUDIES ON THE INDUCTION OF NEW GENETIC VARIABILITY FOR QUANTITATIVE TRAITS BY GAMMA RAYS IN RICE (Oryza sativa L.).

Abd Allah, A.A.; A. M. El-Ekhtyar; W. M. El Khoby; S.M.Shehata and A. S. Abd El Lateef

Rice Research and Training Center, Field Crop Research Institute

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was carried out at the Farm of the Rice Research and Training Center, Sakha, Kafr El Sheikh Egypt during rice growing seasons 2006 and 2007. Dry seeds of the four rice varieties namely: Sakha 101. Sakha 102. Sakha 104, and Egyptian Yasmine were irradiated with 100, 200 and 400 Gy gamma rays. The seeds of the different treatments in addition to the parental varieties (as control) were grown and transplanted individually in a randomized complete block design with three replications for each treatments along with the control to study the response of different rice varieties to different doses of Gamma rays for some agronomic characters, grain yield and its components and to select some useful mutants carrying desirable characters from different populations in M2 generation such as earliness, short stature, resistance to blast, and high yielding ability. The results of the M₁ generation indicated that in general, germination percentage decreased and the reduction was significant for the Sakha 101cv, while number of days to heading, plant height and panicle length, were decreased by increasing the doses of Gamma rays for most of the studied varieties. On the other hand, the mean values of number of panicles per plant were increased by increasing the dose of gamma rays for the Sakha 101. Sakha 102 cvs. The spikelet sterility increased with the increase in the dose of gamma rays for all studied varieties and therefore, grain yield per plant was decreased. In the M2 generation, increasing the dose of gamma rays decreased germination %, and plant height for the two rice varieties; Sakha 102, and Egyptian Jasmine. The mean values of number of panicles per plant were increased for the Sakha 101, 102 and Sakha 104 cvs, while it decreased with Egyptian Yasmine. One hundred grain weight was decreased for Sakha 102, Sakha 104 and Egyptian Yasmine, while the Sakha101 variety was not affected by gamma rays for this trait. Panicle length and chlorophyll content was increased by the dose of gamma rays for the three varieties; Sakha 101, Sakha 104, and Egyptian Yasmine. Sterility % was increased and the highest increase was observed for the indica rice variety Egyptian Jasmine and therefore, grain yield per plant was decreased for these varieties. Wide ranges of variability were detected in M₂ irradiated populations of all varieties for most of the characters studied comparing with the controls, indicating the possibility of selecting mutants with desirable traits to be tested in subsequent generations. The genetic parameters of studied characters for both control and M2 irradiated populations of all varieties indicated that, in most cases, there were considerable increases by irradiation for both phenotypic and genotypic variances, genetic coefficient of variation, heritability as well as expected genetic advance. Keywords: Rice, Yield traits, Genetic variability, Heritability.

INTRODUCTION

Rice is not only the most important food crop but a model plant that has attracted broad interests in basic and applied research. The publication of the draft rice genome (Patnaik et al., 2006; Li et al., 2005; and Chemma and Atta, 2003) presents exciting opportunities to assign function to each of

the estimated 5000 genes, many of which are potentially useful for improvement of rice as well as other cereals. To achieve this goal, diverse genetic resources including germplasm, near isogenic lines, mapping and mutant populations held and developed by rice growing countries are important to the identification of genetic variation utilized for trait improvement. Ionizing radiation mutagenesis has been routinely used to create genetic variability for breeding research and genetic studies. More than crop varieties were released by the end of the last century using irradiation mutagenesis; among them 434 are rice varieties were developed (Wang 1991). Induced mutagenesis, with the discovery of an array of radiation mutagens and improved treatments methods, offers a possibility for the induction of desired changes in various attributes, which can be exploited as such or through recombination breeding. Previous reports on rice suggest that micro- mutational approach might prove effective in improving complex quantitative traits like yield, maturity, height, etc. The idea of producing artificial mutations and utilizing them for breeding cultivars plants was indicated as early as 1901, and the first induced mutations in rice were achieved by Icchijima, 1934 by the use of X-rays. The induction of mutations for factors which govern the heredity of quantitative characters is a promising tool for creating new genotypes. It is an established fact that mutagen. besides causing changes in major genes, also induce mutations at loci governing the quantitative characters. These micro-mutations can be detected in the form of increased variance M2 generation. Since most of the economic traits show polygenic inheritance, more information on the induction of genetic variability in them through mutations is needed. In Egypt, mutation breeding method was started for rice in 1960 by Serry and Masooad, when they used X-rays and gamma rays for treating the old rice cvs, Arabi, Nahda and Agami M.1. There are many kinds of ionizing radiation, namely X-rays, gamma rays, protons, neutrons, alpha and beta particles. However, gamma rays are widely employed for mutation studies as they have shorter wavelength and possess more energy per photon than X-rays and penetrate deeply into the tissue. The new rice varieties Sakha 101, Sakha 102, Sakha 104, and Egyptian Jasmine are a popular varieties virtue of its early to moderate maturing and higher yield, but now some of them having some defects such as susceptibility to blast, late maturity, also their cooking quality has some defects, keeping in view the drawbacks of these varieties, a study was undertaken to explore the possibility of improving them with respect to these defects through quantitative mutational approaches. So, the present study was undertaken in order to analysis the influence of gamma rays on mean values and variance of some quantitative characters of rice in the M2 generation and also to explore the possibilities of isolating desirable phenotypic mutants for their utilizing directly or indirectly cross breeding programs for the quick improvement the defects of these cultivars.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Four varieties of rice were used in the present study, namely, Sakha 101, Sakha 102, Sakha 104, and Egyptian Jasmine. These varieties were obtained from the genetic stock of the Rice Research Section. Field Crop Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt. The Present study was carried out at the Farm of the Rice Research & Training Center (RRTC). Sakha, Kafr El-Sheikh, Egypt, during 2006 and 2007rice growing seasons with different doses of gamma rays. Samples of 250 of high quality and purified dry seeds of uniform size from each variety (stabilized at 13% moisture level) were irradiated in the Co⁶⁰ source at the National Center for Radiation Research and Technology, Nasr city, Cairo, Egypt. The doses administered were 100, 200 and 400 Gy and dry unirradiated seeds were used as control. In 2006 season seeds of the above mentioned four rice varieties. were treated by different doses of gamma irradiation along with their respective controls. All the seeds of all varieties were directly sown after treatments in germination plastic plates in order to raise M₁ plants. Germination percentage was recorded at 15 days after sowing. After thirty days from sowing, seedlings were transplanted (one seedling/hill) in the experimental plots. Distances between plants and rows was 20cm apart. respectively, were maintained. Fertilizers were applied as recommended rate and time of application. Weeds were chemically controlled by applying 2 liters of Saturn/Feddan four days after transplanting. To avoid out-crossing, first three panicles in each of the 50 randomly selected plants in each treatment were bagged at the time of panicles emergence. At the time of maturity, the seeds were harvested from the three bagged tillers, as well as unpaged tillers, separately from each individual plant. In 2007 season, the M₂ generation was raised in a randomized complete block design with three replications. The seeds from the main tillers in each of the 50 selected plants were planted in nursery beds. Thirty days old seedlings were transplanted in a well prepared field. Progeny of the selected plants in each treatment was transplanted in a progeny row trial, with three replications, with spacing 20 x 20 cm. Each replication had 50 rows per treatment. The population was carefully screened in the nursery beds for chlorophyll mutations and the identification and classification of chlorophyll was done as proposed by Gustafsson, 1947. Viable mutation in M2 progeny was examined periodically through the entire growth period for visible mutations affecting various morphological attributes. In order to study the magnitude and nature of induced polygenic variability in M2 generation, observations on various quantitative traits i.; germination percentage chlorophyll mutation, days to heading (days), plant height (cm), number of panicles/ plant, sterility percentage, one hundred grain weight (g), grain yield/ plant (g) recorded on all the plants in each treatment. The data obtained were subjected to the statistical analysis to estimate means and standard error (Duncan, D. B. (1955). For comparing the mean values and variance within and between families, the analysis of variance was done for each character of each variety to estimate genotypic and phenotypic variances, genotype coefficient of variation (GCV), heritability (h²), genetic advance, genetic advance of main(GS%), separately as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme, 1957.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

M₁ generation:

For M1 generation gamma rays treatments in general affected significantly the germination percentage in all the studied varieties, Table (1). Germination percentage in general was decreased by increasing the dose of gamma radiation in all the tested varieties, and the highest germination percentage was recorded at 100 Gy in Egyptian Yasmine (93.0%), while the lowest percentage was observed at 400 Gy treatments for Sakha 101(51.66%). Sabbour et al. (1993); and Chemma et al., (2003) found a decrease in germination percentage with increasing the dose in M₁ generation.

The results indicated that gamma rays caused earliness in all the studied varieties with different effects according to the variety and its background, these results were in close agreement with that obtained by Sanjeev (2000); Shadakshari et al. (2001); Kumar (2005); Do et al. (2006), Le, x.T (2006). Plant height at maturity was decreased significantly for all varieties studied by increasing the dose of gamma rays (Table,1). Significant differences were obtained between the untreated and all treatments in all varieties studied and among treatments itself for all varieties except for Sakha 101. The most affected variety was Sakha 104 (23 cm) at 400Gy. The lowest reduction in plant height was found to be 7 cm for the rice variety Jasmine. The same results were obtained by Sanjeev (2000); Shadakshari et al. (2001); Kumar (2005); Do et al. (2006); Mohamed et al. (2006); Le, x. T (2006).

Number of panicles/plant, (Table 1) was increased with gamma rays treatments and the cases of significant increases were found in the varieties; Sakha 101 at 200 and 400 Gy; Sakha 102 at 400 Gy; Sakha 104 and Egyptian Yasmine at100Gy. These findings indicated that these varieties are more sensitive to higher doses of gamma rays. The maximum increase in number of panicles/plant was found for the variety Egyptian Yasmine (26.86 panicles), and this could be reflected on the yield for the respective treatment, while the lowest increase was observed for the variety Sakha 101 (22.06 panicles). It could be concluded that the most effective dose of gamma rays was 400 Gy for this character in most of the varieties studied and this could be attribute to varietal genetic differences. Similar results were reported by Gomma et al. (1995a) and Abdul-Majeed (1997).

Sterility percentage was significantly increased by increasing the dose of gamma rays in all studied varieties (Table 1). The highest sterility percentage was recorded at 400 Gy treatment followed by 200 Gy. The most affected varieties were Sakha 102 (55.99%) and Sakha 101 (54.28%), respectively. The most effective treatment in all varieties was 400 Gy, while the lowest increase in sterility percentage was detected at 100 Gy treatments. The pervious results reported that the decrease in seed fertility or the

increase in sterility percentage with gamma rays was mainly due to chromosomal aberrations in the mitotic division and mitotic of the pollen formation stage Sarawagi and Soni (1993); Gomma et al. (1995b) Meheter et al. (1996), Mohankumar (1998) and Chemma et al. (2003) also reported the same findings.

Grain yield per plant was decreased with the increasing gamma rays doses in all the varieties. The lowest value of grain yield per plant was recorded at 400 Gy in all the studied varieties, while the lowest decrease in grain yield per plant was detected at 100 Gy. The decreasing trend in grain yield per plant may be attributed to the increasing in sterility percentage (Table, 1). Similar results were reported by El-Shouny et al. (1991); Katoch et al. (1992) and Sarawagi and Soni (1993) as well as Abd Allah et al. (2002).

From the foregoing results, it could be concluded that all the treatments proved to be effective, as was evident from the tendency of the treated genotypes showing decreased germination percentage and increased spikelet sterility, among other deleterious effects. Decrease in germination or increase in sterility percentage increased with increasing dose of the mutagen employed. Such linear dose- event relationship with respect to M₁ indices has been reported in rice by several workers in the past. Comparing of the four rice varieties for their relative irradiation sensitivity revealed that in general, most of japonica rice varieties were more sensitive to mutagenic treatments than indica rice varieties. Differential sensitivity of the genotypes to mutagenic treatments has been attributed to various factors including genetic differences.

Generation:

Regarding to M2 generation, the overall frequency of chlorophyll mutations in the M₂ of four rice varieties are given in Table (2). The frequency of chlorophyll mutations varied from variety to another and between treatment to treatment. In general, gamma ray induced different numbers of chlorophyll mutations in all studied varieties. In this regard, irrespective of the indica and japonica rice varieties, some varieties were more responsive to certain mutagen than the others, while some varieties like Egyptian Jasmine were quite sensitive to gamma rays treatment. Thus the mutation frequencies in the M₂ generation seem to be depend upon genotypic and the selection from the data cleared in Table (2). The number of chlorophyll mutations increased by increasing gamma rays doses up to 200 Gy where it produced the highest number of chlorophyll mutations in all studied varieties as shown in table (2). In Table (3) the chlorophyll mutations were divided in two types; i.e. albino and partial albino (xantha, viridis and others). With respect to the varieties, the maximum frequency of chlorophyll mutations was observed for Egyptian Jasmine (72) and Sakha 102 (58). While, the lowest chlorophyll mutations was obtained from Sakha 104 (35). These chlorophyll mutations may be attributed to chromosomal aberrations. These results have been reported by Pillai et al. (1993); Kumar (1998) and Singh and Santhi, (2001).

Table (1): The mean values of germination %, days to heading (days), plant height (Cm), no. of panicles/plant (gm), sterility % and grain yield/plant(g) as affected by gamma rays for the rice varieties studied in M₁ generation.

| | generali | U11. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|--------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|
| Variety | Treatments | Germination % | | Days to heading (day) | | Plant hei | eight (cm) No. of p | | Sterilit | | y(%) | Grain yie | Grain yield/plant (g) | |
| | (Gy) | Actual | 100% of control | Actual | 100% of control | Actual | 100% of control | Actual | 100% of control | Actual | 100% of control | Actual | 100% of control | |
| Sakha 101 | Control | 99.33a | 100.00 | 109.00a | 100.00 | 94.88a | 100.00 | 18.35b | 100.00 | 8.00c | 100.00 | 45.00a | 100.00 | |
| | 100 | 90.00b | 90.00 | 94.66c | 86.23 | 88.13b | 92.88 | 17.00b | 92.64 | 13.31bc | 166.37 | 30.05b | 66.79 | |
| ł | 200 | 85.00b | 85.00 | 105.00b | 96.33 | 84.06b | 88.59 | 19.53b | 106.43 | 25.60b | 320.00 | 35.00b | 77. 7 7 | |
| | 400 | 51.66c | 51.66 | 109.00a | 100.00 | 85.66b | 90.28 | 22.06a | 120.21 | 54.28a | 678.50 | 23.66c | 52.57 | |
| Sakha 102 | Control | 100.00a | 100.00 | 96.00a | 100.00 | 109.66a | 100.00 | 18.03b | 100.00 | 8.66d | 100.00 | 39.66a | 100.00 | |
| | 100 | 90.00b | 90.00 | 92.00b | 95.83 | 106.46ab | 97.08 | 16.93b | 93.89 | 26.90c | 310.62 | 34.51b | 87.01 | |
| | 200 | 87.00b | 87.00 | 93.00b | 96.87 | 105.00bc | 95.75 | 18.40b | 102.05 | 42.56b | 491.45 | 26.63c | 67.14 | |
| | 400 | 80.00c | 80.00 | 92.00b | 95.83 | 102.13c | 93.13 | 24.73a | 137.16 | 55.99a | 646.53 | 18.15d | 45.76 | |
| Sakha 104 | Control | 100.00a | 100.00 | 100.00a | 100.00 | 106.00a | 100.00 | 19.00a | 100.00 | 11.00b | 100.00 | 43.00a | 100.00 | |
| | 100 | 90.00b | 90.00 | 91.00b | 91.000 | 91.93c | 86.72 | 20.06a | 93.89 | 22.46ab | 204.18 | 30.03b | 69.83 | |
| | 200 | 90.00b | 90.00 | 93.00b | 93.00 | 85.00d | 90.10 | 17.06b | 102.05 | 34.40ab | 312.72 | 27.73b | 64.48 | |
| | 400 | 70.00c | 70.00 | 92.00b | 92.00 | 83.00d | 78.30 | 17.06b | 137.16 | 47.48a | 341.63 | 20.04c | 46.61 | |
| Egyptian | Control | 96.66a | 100.00 | 113.33a | 100.00 | 90.00a | 100.00 | 22.33b | 100.00 | 10.66c | 100.00 | 36.66a | 100.00 | |
| Jasmine | 100 | 93.00a | 96.21 | 109.00b | 96.17 | 93.00b | 93.93 | 26.86a | 102.28 | 30.82b | 289.11 | 25.66b | 69.99 | |
| | 200 | 85.00b | 87.93 | 109.00b | 96.17 | 91.13b | 92.05 | 19.66b | 88.04 | 38.86a | 364.54 | 33.78a | 92.14 | |
| | 400 | 78.00c | 80.69 | 93.00c | 82.30 | 86.56c | 86.42s | 20.20b | 90.46 | 31.72b | 297.56 | 34.30a | 93.56 | |

Letters M₂

J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 33 (10), October, 2008

Table (2): Frequency of chlorophyll mutations in M₂ generation in studied varieties.

| Variety | Doses (Gy) | Chlorophyll mutants | Frequency of chlorophyll mutants (%) |
|------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Cont. | | - |
| 0 11 404 | 100 | 8 | 19.04 |
| Sakha 101 | 200 | 24 | 57.14 |
| | 400 | 10 | 23.80 |
| | Cont. | - | • |
| 0.11400 | 100 | 18 | 31.03 |
| Sakha 102 | 200 | 32 | 55.17 |
| | 400 | 8 | 13.79 |
| | Cont. | | - . |
| 0.11.404 | 100 | 10 | 28.57 |
| Sakha 104 | 200 | 17 | 48.57 |
| | 400 | 8 | 22.95 |
| | Cont. | - | |
| | 100 | 14 | 24.59 |
| Egyptian Yasmine | 200 | 50 | 63.93 |
| | 400 | 8 | 13.11 |

Table (3): Spectrum of M₂ chlorophyll mutations.

| Variety | Doses (Gy) | Albino | Xantha | Virdis | Others | Total no. of mutant seedlings |
|------------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------------|
| | Cont. | - | - | - | - | |
| Sakha 101 | 100 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 8 |
| Sakna 101 | 200 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 24 |
| | 400 | 2 | 3. | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| | Cont. | - | - | | | |
| Sakha 102 | 100 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 18 |
| Sakha 102 | 200 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 32 |
| | 400 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| | Cont. | - | • | - | • | • |
| Sakha 104 | 100 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Sakiia 104 | 200 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| | 400 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| | Cont. | | | - ~ | - | |
| Egyptian | 100 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| Jasmine | 200 | 25 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 50 |
| | 400 | 5 | • | 2 | 1 | 8 |

Regarding chlorophyll content (Table, 4) the results revealed an inconsistent trend in mean values by increasing the dose of gamma rays. On the other hand, the average chlorophyll content was increased significantly by increasing the dose of gamma rays for the three japonica rice varieties Sakha; also 101, Sakha 102 and Sakha 104. The highest increase of this trait was at the treatment 400 Gy. Within these three varieties, significant differences were detected between means of both control and the different doses of gamma rays for the variety Sakha 101; between the control and all other treatments for the variety Sakha 104, moreover, between the control

and all other treatments except 100 Gy for the variety Sakha 102. The opposite trends of the first one and the other three varieties indicated that the varieties differed in their response to gamma rays regarding this trait. These findings were in agreement with those reported by Wang *et al.* (1993) and Muhamed *et al.* (2003).

Table (4): Means, and standard error (SE) of chlorophyll content, days to heading, plant height, no. of panicle/plant, 100-grain weight, sterility % and grin yield/plant as affected by gamma

rays for the studied varieties in M₂ generation.

| | the studied varieties in M2 generation. | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Treatment | | | Variety | | | | |
| Character | Sakha 101 | Sakha 102 | Sakha 104 | Egyptian Jasmine | | | |
| Chlorophyll cont. | | | | | | | |
| Control | 46.01a± 1.99 | 46.09a± 2.43 | 46.09a± 2.43 | 39.19a± 1.61 | | | |
| 100Gy | 48.33b ± 1.09 | | 49.71 b± 1.73 | 39.68 a± 1.31 | | | |
| 200Gy | 49.24b ± 0.22 | 48.82 b± 1.76 | $50.85b \pm 2.73$ | 39.68 a± 1.31 | | | |
| 400Gy | $50.13b \pm 2.64$ | 48.11b ± 1.27 | 50.74 b± 2.25 | 38.67a ± 4.15 | | | |
| Days to heading(day) | | | | | | | |
| Control | 109a ± 0.28 | 96 b±0.44 | 105a±1.67 | 118c±1.74 | | | |
| 100Gy | 110a ± 0.61 | 103 a±0.12 | 104ab±1.94 | 123a ±1.69 | | | |
| 200Gy | 109a ± 0.53 | 103 a±0.42 | 104ab±2.88 | 126a±2.88 | | | |
| 400Gy | 109a ± 1.52 | 103 a±0.47 | 106a±0.40 | 128a±3.42 | | | |
| Plant height (cm). | | _ | | | | | |
| Control | 92 a±1.75 | 109 a± 1.98 | 105 a± 1.44 | 120 a±1.50 | | | |
| 100Gy | 95.18 a±1.11 | 108.6 a±7 2.61 | 106.66 a± 2.51 | 94.33 c±1.60 | | | |
| 200Gy | 93.10 a ±0.11 | 103.32 b± 1.78 | 102.66a± 1.89 | 94.00c ±1.72 | | | |
| 400Gy | 90.56 a± 1.57 | 88.66 c± 1.66 | 100.33 b ±120 | 86.33 d±1.39 | | | |
| No. of panicles/plant. | | | | | | | |
| Control | 23.00 a ±0.82 | 20.00 a± 1.52 | 22.00 a± 1.58 | 19.00 a ±0.76 | | | |
| 100Gy | 18.34 b ±0.18 | 19.54 b ±1.42 | 17.95 b± 1.94 | 14.33 c ±1.29 | | | |
| 200Gy | 21.91 a± 0.01 | 23.00 c± 1.45 | 22.66 a ±0.81 | 16.00 b ±1.44 | | | |
| 400Gy | 25.00 c± 2.42 | 20.60 a±2.77 | 17.00 b± 2.77 | 16.00 b± 1.64 | | | |
| 100-grain weight(g) | | | | | | | |
| Control | 2.80a ± 0.009 | 2.74 a ±0.001 | 2.67 b± 0.002 | 2.67 a±0.004 | | | |
| 100Gy | 2.60 a ± 0.19 | 2.71 a±0.001 | 2.70 ab±0.002 | 2.74 a± 0.002 | | | |
| 200Gy | 2.73 a± 0.06 | 2.67 a±0.001 | 2.79 a±0.004 | 2.80 a± 0.008 | | | |
| 400Gy | 3.00 a ±0.006 | 2.56 b±0.006 | 2.56 c±0.002 | 2.39 b± 0.007 | | | |
| Sterility (%) | | | | | | | |
| Control | 7.66 c± 0.47 | 8.33 b± 0.20 | 8.00 b± 1.11 | 9.35 d± 0.01 | | | |
| 100Gy | 14.00 b± 1.39 | 9.68 b± 0.20 | 13.65 ab± 0.45 | 15.68 c± 2.46 | | | |
| 200Gy | 16.00 b± 2.29 | 9.86 b± 1.09 | 15.28 a± 0.63 | 26.16 b± 2.48 | | | |
| 400Gy | 25.53 a± 2.60 | 20.36 a± 0.44 | | 33.59 a± 1.17 | | | |
| Grain yield(g) | | | | | | | |
| Control | 45.00 a±1.54 | 40.50 a± 1.83 | 42.0 a± 1.62 | 33.63a± 0.36 | | | |
| 100Gy | 40.80 b ±1.61 | | 39.33ab± 1.39 | 29.26b±1.47 | | | |
| 200Gy | 39.16 b ±0.17 | | | 31.5ab±1.24 | | | |
| 400Gy | 48.00 ca ±0.87 | | 33.60c± 0.44 | 23.26c±1.35 | | | |
| | 10.00 Ou 20.01 | 00.00 02 0.11 | 33.000± 0.44 | | | | |

Variations due to gamma irradiation treatments were not of much significance in all the varieties treated except Sakha 102. The heritability broad sense estimates were found to be low for treatments with different doses of gamma rays in all the varieties studied for this trait. The values ranged from 24 to 47% in Sakha 104 and Egyptian Jasmine cvs, respectively. The lower values of heritability for this trait were mainly attributed to the lower

values of genotypic variance. The genetic advance (GS %) as percent of mean by irradiation ranged from 1.86 to 5.51% for Sakha 104 and Sakha 102 Cvs, respectively.

Regarding days to heading, the results of the present study (Table, 4) show that delay in heading occurred gradually by increasing the doses of gamma rays and maximized with 400 Gy for Sakha104 and Egyptian Jasmine. This means that the four nice varieties are differ in their radiosensitivity, and the variety Egyptian Jasmine are more radio-sensitivity than other tested varieties, where, it was the most affected variety for this trait with 10 days delay in heading. These findings indicated that the differences in radio-sensitivity between rice varieties depend largely on the genetic constitution and background within a species, beside the physical and physiological conditions of irradiated material.

On the other hand, Chemma et al. (2003) reported that the differential radio-sensitivity of indica and japonica sub-species appeared to be due to the differences in the physical and chemical nature of husk in addition to some genetic factors. The same results were found by Sanjeev (2000): Shadakshari et al. (2001); Kumar (2005); Do et al. (2006) and Le, (2006). Induced variation by gamma rays was not of much significance in the varieties Sakha 101, Sakha 102 and Sakha 104. However, in case of Egyptian Yasmine induced variations were significantly increased more than that of the control, indicating the differential response of genotypes to the mutagen used. Heritability (Hb) estimates were found to be moderate to high for treatments in all the studied varieties. This is indicative of the fact that irradiation not only induces higher proportion of chromosomal and physiological changes but also brings about a high frequency of gene mutations. Expected genetic advance was higher than the control .This finding can, therefore, also be of considerable values in planning mutations experiment with respect to the choice of reliable stage of selection for the improvement of earlier plants.

Concerning plant height, insignificant differences between mean values of the control and the treatment 100 Gy were observed for the rice varieties Sakha 101, Sakha 102 and Sakha 104(Table, 4). The most affected varieties were Egyptian Jasmine, and Sakha 102 which decreased by 33.67. and 20.34 cm, respectively. These findings indicated that the differential response in the mutagenic effectiveness and efficiency in different varieties was mainly attributed to the genetic background of the material under study and it plays an important role in the occurrence of the mutations. Similar results were found by Sanjeev (2000); Shadakshari et al. (2001); Kumar (2005); Do et al. (2006); Mohamed et al (2006) and Le, (2006). Genotypic variance (GV) value for all varieties was significantly higher by irradiation than the control or untreated seeds (Table, 5). Genetic coefficients of variation (GCV %) increased also in irradiated population and ranged from 3.39% for Sakha 101 to 11.12% for Egyptian Jasmine. The heritability (Hb) in broad sense and genetic advance were comparatively high in the gamma raytreated populations than those in the control. The values ranged from 46% for Sakha 101 to 95% for Egyptian Jasmine. The expected genetic advances upon selection as percents of the mean (GS %) were higher by irradiation

7019

and amounted 0.76 for Sakha 102 and 10.65% for Sakha104. Similar results were obtained by Gomma et al. (1995a); Meheter et al. (1996) and Uttam et al. (2005).

Number of panicles/plant in the three Japonica varieties; Sakha 101; Sakha 102 and Sakha 104 (Table, 5) were increased by using 200 and 400 Gy. Significant differences were observed between the control and most of the treatments on one hand and among the treatments itself for all the varieties on the other hand. The highest increase in number of panicles per plant was recorded for the variety Sakha 101, while the most affected variety was Egyptian Yasmine. These results indicated that the effectiveness of gamma rays was found with the increase of the doses of gamma rays with either plus or minus effect. Furthermore, the results revealed that the varieties responded differently. These results were in disagreement with Gomma et al. (1995b). Mean while, Abdul-Majeed (1997) found that no definite trend was evident with regard to such character.

Genetic coefficients of variation (GCV%) was found to be higher in the irradiated populations compared with the controls(Table,5). These results are in agreement with the previous reports in rice that the gamma rays induced considerable genetic variation for number of panicles per plant. Heritability Estimates (Hb) was increased by irradiation and the highest heritability values were found at Egyptian Yasmine (92%). Genetic advance as the percentages of the mean (GS%) were increased by irradiation comparing with the controls.

It is clear from Table (4) that one hundred grain weight was decreased significantly by increasing the dose of gamma rays up to 400Gy for all the studied varieties. However, there were no differences between the control and each 100 and 200 Gv treatments. These results were in agreement with those reported by Mohamed et al. (2006). increases in genotypic variance (GV) for this trait were obtained by irradiation as compared with the respective control (Table, 5). The genetic coefficients of variation (GCV %) values were increased by irradiation and ranged from 2.70% to 13.69%. Heritability in broad sense values (Hb) were higher in all irradiated populations as compared with the original varieties and ranged from 74% to 92%. The expected genetic advance (GS %) were also higher by irradiation and ranged from 2.79% to 60.86%. These results means that the four rice varieties are differ in their radio sensitivity, whereas some of them more radio- resistant than the others. Similar results have been reported by Bordholi and Taluker (1999); Shanthi and Singh (2001) and Elayaraja et al. (2005).

Differences were significant among the gamma rays treatments for the sterility percentage in all varieties studied Table (4). It is worthy to note that sterility percentage was increased by increasing the doses of gamma ray. The most effective dose was 400 Gy, where this treatment recorded the highest sterility percentage in all varieties. Remarkable increase in sterility percentage was found in indica rice variety Egyptian Jasmine (24.24%). The lowest sterility percentage was obtained from the treatment 100 Gy for all the studied varieties. The differential response in the mutagenic effectiveness and efficiency in different varieties indicated that the genetic back-ground of

J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 33 (10), October, 2008

the material under study plays an important role in the occurrence of the mutations. The same results were obtained by Mohankumar (1998) and Chemma et al. (2003). Genetic coefficient of variation (GCV), were increased by irradiation and ranged from 9.93% to 16.66%. Low to high heritability (Hb) values were obtained for this trait and ranged from 44% to 89%. The genetic advance as percent of means (GS %) values in irradiated populations were higher and reached 28.12% for Egyptian Yasmine followed by 26.38% for Sakha 102(Table,5). High estimates of genetic parameters for this trait by irradiation were found by Meheter and Talukar (1996); Bordholi and Talukar (1999) and Elavaraja et al. (2005).

From Table (4) the data showed that significant differences were found among the gamma rays treatments for grain yield per plant for all varieties studied in one hand and between the control and the treatments on the other hand. The mean values of grain yield per plant decreased consistently by increasing the dose of gamma rays in indica rice variety Egyptian Yasmine. While, it decreased by increasing the dose of gamma rays up to 200 Gy, then increased at 400 Gy for the variety Sakha 101 and it decreased for 100 Gy and 400 Gy and then increased at 200 Gy for the varieties Sakha 102 and Sakha 104.

The most effective treatments were 200 Gy for Sakha 102 and Sakha 104; 400 Gy for Sakha 101. The same results were obtained by Sarawagi and Soni (1993) and Road (2003). Genotypic variances (GV) were ranged from medium to high among irradiated population, where the values of (GV) reached the maximum for Sakha 102 (34.00) while, the minimum value was detected for Sakha 104 (11.33). Genotypic coefficients of variation (GCV %) were higher by irradiation and ranged from 7.46% in Sakha 101 to 15.76% in Sakha102. Broad sense heritability (Hb) values were ranged from 69% in Sakha 104 to 79% in Sakha101. Percentages of the expected gain from selection (GS %) were higher by irradiation and reached its maximum of 27.57% for Sakha102, while the minimum value was found to be 13.62% for Sakha 101(Table, 5). These results are in agreement with those reported by Meheter et al. (1996); Bordholi and Talukar (1999); Kalamani and Sakila (2000); Santhi and Singh(2001),Abd Allah.(2002) and Elayaraja et al. (2005).

Table (5): Genetic parameters of chlorophyll content, days to heading, plant height, no. of panicle/plant, 100-grain weight, sterility % and grain yield/plant of both control and irradiation

populations in M₂ generation.

| popt | และเบเเจ แ | INIS AG | ileiauo | 11. | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------|------|------|
| Character | Population | PV | GV | GCV | PCV | Hb | GS | GS % |
| Chlorophyll conten | | | | | | | | |
| | cont. | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.09 |
| Sakha_101 | Irrad. | 1.41** | 0.43** | 1.39** | 2.53** | 0.30 | 0.74 | 1.59 |
| | cont. | 0.95 | 0.11 | 0.73 | 2.15 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.48 |
| Sakha 102 | Irrad. | 9.84** | 3.80** | 4.30** | 6.92** | 0.38 | 2.49 | 5.51 |
| Sakha 104 | cont. | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.08 |
| | Irrad. | 2.84** | 0.70** | 1.82** | 3.68** | 0.24 | 0.85 | 1.86 |
| Egyptian Jasmine | cont. | 0.98 | 0.10 | 0.83 | 2.62 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.68 |
| -97Ptian 043mme | Irrad. | 2.95** | 1.40** | 3.13** | 4.55** | 0.47 | 1.67 | 4.45 |

Abd Allah, A.A. et al.

Table (5): Continued.

| Sakha 101 | Table (5): Continue | u | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|------|-------|-------|
| Sakha 101 | Days to heading (day) | | _ | | | | | | |
| Sakha 102 | Sakha 101 | | | | | | | | 0.01 |
| Sakha 104 | | Irrad. | | | | | | | 1.37 |
| Sakha 104 | Sakha 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 5.86** 4.49** 2.03** 2.32** 0.76 3.78 3.6 1.55 0.92 1.86 0.24 1.15 0.99 5.50 Plant height(cm) Sakha 101 cont. 1.45 0.03 0.18 1.25 0.2 0.04 0.04 Sakha 101 cont. 1.45 0.03 0.18 1.25 0.2 0.04 0.04 Irrad. 15.31** 9.93* 3.39** 4.21** 0.46 3.70 3.99 Sakha 102 cont. 2.47 1.02 0.92 1.44 0.41 0.37 0.33 Sakha 104 cont. 1.93 0.45 0.60 1.26 0.23 0.65 0.55 Irrad. 105.78** 81.16* 8.99** 10.26** 0.76 16.06 0.76 Sakha 104 cont. 1.93 0.45 0.60 1.26 0.23 0.65 0.55 Irrad. 34.44** 31.16 5.45** 5.67** 0.91 11.00 10.6 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 5.03 1.68 1.22 2.11 0.33 1.52 1.45 Irrad. 108.21** 103.77* 11.12** 11.36** 0.95 22.22 0.99 Panicle numbers Sakha 101 cont. 1.00 0.17 1.04 2.96 0.17 0.35 1.75 Sakha 102 cont. 0.20 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.35 Irrad. 1.20** 0.94 4.61** 5.21** 0.78 1.76 8.35 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.25 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.47 2.00 0.23 0.29 3.28 20.5 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.76 Irrad. 0.13** 0.12** 13.69** 14.20 0.92 0.88 2.68 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.76 Sakha 101 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.76 Irrad. 0.13** 0.12** 13.69** 14.20 0.92 0.68 26.8 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.006 0.001 0.003 0.007 0.009 0.001 0.001 0.001 Irrad. 0.12** 0.89** 11.09** 12.87** 0.74 0.52 19.6 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.001 0.001 Irrad. 0.10** 0.75** 0.82** 11.09** 0.92 0.68 26.8 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.05** 0.08** 11.09** 0.09** 0.002 0.00 0.001 0.001 Irrad. 1.00 | | Irrad. | | | | | | | 5.95 |
| Egyptian Jasmine | Sakha 104 | | | | | | | | 1.23 |
| | | Irrad. | | | | | | | 3.63 |
| Plant height(cm) Sakha 101 | Egyptian Jasmine | | | 1.35 | | | | | |
| Sakha 101 cont. 1.45 0.03 0.18 1.25 0.2 0.04 0.05 Sakha 102 cont. 2.47 1.02 0.92 1.44 0.41 0.37 0.33 Sakha 104 cont. 1.93 0.45 0.60 1.26 0.23 0.65 0.57 Sakha 104 cont. 1.93 0.45 0.60 1.26 0.23 0.65 0.57 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 5.03 1.68 1.22 2.11 0.33 1.52 1.43 Faricle numbers cont. 1.00 0.17 1.04 2.96 0.17 0.35 1.73 Sakha 101 cont. 1.00 0.17 1.04 2.96 0.17 0.35 1.73 Sakha 102 cont. 0.52 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.33 Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.33 1.57 0.17 0.34 1.51 Egyp | | Irrad. | 25.66** | 17.22** | 3.30** | 4.03** | 0.67 | 6.99 | 5.56 |
| Irrad. 15.31** 9.93* 3.39** 4.21** 0.46 3.70 3.98 | | T | 4.45 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 4.05 | | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Sakha 102 | Sakna 101 | | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 104 | 0-1-1 | | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 104 cont. 1.93 0.45 0.60 1.26 0.23 0.65 0.56 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 5.03 1.68 1.22 2.11 0.33 1.52 1.43 Irrad. 108.21*** 103.77** 11.12*** 11.36*** 0.95 22.22 2.99 Panicle numbers Sakha 101 cont. 1.00 0.17 1.04 2.96 0.17 0.35 1.72 Sakha 102 cont. 0.52 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.33 Sakha 104 cont. 0.52 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.33 Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.13 1.57 0.78 1.76 8.3 Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.33 1.57 0.17 0.07 0.33 Irrad. 0.74*** 0.64*** 4.51*** 4.85*** 0.66 1.52 8.5 | Sakha 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 34.44** 31.16* 5.45** 5.67** 0.91 11.00 10.6 | 0-1-1 404 | | | | | | | | |
| Egyptian Jasmine | Sakna 104 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 108.21** 103.77* 11.12** 11.36** 0.95 22.22 0.95 | 5NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN - N | | | | | | | | |
| Panicle numbers | Egyptian Jasmine | | | | | | | | |
| Cont. 1.00 0.17 1.04 2.96 0.17 0.35 1.75 Irrad. 2.79** 1.92* 6.68** 8.05** 0.68 2.33 11.25 Cont. 0.52 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.35 Irrad. 1.20** 0.94 4.61** 5.21** 0.78 1.76 8.35 Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.33 1.57 0.17 0.34 1.92 Irrad. 0.74** 0.64** 4.51** 4.85** 0.86 1.52 8.55 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.25 Irrad. 3.08** 2.77* 10.33** 10.67** 0.92 3.28 20.3 100-grain weight(g) Sakha 101 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.76 Irrad. 0.13** 0.12** 13.69** 14.20 0.92 0.68 26.8 Sakha 102 cont. 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.001 Irrad. 0.06** 0.005* 2.70** 3.01 0.80 0.73 2.75 Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.003 0.007 0.009 0.001 0.001 Irrad. 1.00** 0.75** 10.82** 39.52** 0.75* 1.54 60.8 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.55 Sakha 101 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.55 Irrad. 14.68** 7.91** 9.93** 37.84** 0.53 4.18 4.77 Sakha 102 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.55 Irrad. 1.205** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.06 Irrad. 1.205** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.06 Irrad. 1.205** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Irrad. 1.00** 1.50* 1.50* 1.66** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Irrad. 1.205** 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.50* 1.5 | Deniele aumbere | irrad. | 108.21** | 103.77 | 11.12*** | 11.36*** | 0.95 | 22.22 | 0.95 |
| Irrad. 2.79** 1.92** 6.68** 8.05** 0.68 2.33 11.2 | Panicie numbers | | 1.00 | 0.17 | 1.04 | 2.06 | 0.17 | 0.25 | 4 72 |
| Sakha 102 cont. 0.52 0.09 1.47 1.66 0.17 0.07 0.38 Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.33 1.57 0.17 0.34 1.52 8.53 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.22 100-grain weight(g) Sakha 101 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.70 Sakha 102 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.70 Sakha 104 cont. 0.006 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.08 2.68 26.8 Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.000 Irrad. 0.06*** 0.005*** 2.70*** 3.01 0.80 0.73 2.75 Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.003 0.007 < | Sakha 101 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 1.20** 0.94 4.61** 5.21** 0.78 1.76 8.37 | Salaba 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 104 cont. 0.17 0.17 1.33 1.57 0.17 0.34 1.92 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.28 100-grain weight(g) 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.28 20.3 100-grain weight(g) 2.77 10.33** 10.67*** 0.92 3.28 20.3 Sakha 101 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.70 Sakha 102 cont. 0.01 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.00 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.00 | Sakha 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad 0.74** 0.64** 4.51** 4.85** 0.86 1.52 8.55 | Sakha 104 | | | | | | | | |
| Egyptian Jasmine cont. 1.59 0.38 2.42 2.00 0.23 0.59 3.27 Irrad. 3.08*** 2.77 10.33*** 10.67*** 0.92 3.28 20.3 100-grain weight(g) | Sakila 104 | | | | | 1.57 | | | |
| Irrad. 3.08** 2.77 10.33** 10.67** 0.92 3.28 20.3 | Ecyptian Jasmine | | | | | | | | |
| 100-grain weight(g) Sakha 101 | Egyptian Jasinine | | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 101 cont. 0.006 0.001 1.10 1.71 0.16 0.02 0.70 Irrad. 0.13** 0.12** 13.69** 14.20 0.92 0.68 26.8 Sakha 102 cont. 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.00 Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.003 0.007 0.009 0.001 0.00 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002 0.00 | 100-grain weight(g) | ıırau. | 3.00 | 2.77 | 10.33 | 10.67 | 0.92 | 3.20 | 20.3 |
| Irrad. 0.13** 0.12** 13.69** 14.20 0.92 0.68 26.8 | | cont | 0.006 | 0.001 | 1 10 | 1 71 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.70 |
| Sakha 102 cont. 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.003 0.002 0.001 0.00 Irrad. 0.06** 0.005** 2.70*** 3.01 0.80 0.73 2.79 Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.003 0.007 0.009 0.001 0.001 0.00 Irrad. 1.00** 0.75** 10.82** 39.52** 0.75* 1.54 60.8 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.001 0.004 0.007 0.006 0.004 0.002 0.00 Irrad. 0.12** 0.89** 11.09** 12.87** 0.74 0.52 19.6 Sterility % Sakha 101 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.55 Irrad. 14.68** 7.91** 9.93** 37.84** 0.53 4.18 4.77 Sakha 102 cont. 1.10 0.10 3.16 3.48 0.09 0.19 | Outria 101 | _ | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 0.06** 0.005** 2.70** 3.01 0.80 0.73 2.75 | Sakha 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 104 cont. 0.001 0.003 0.007 0.009 0.001 0.001 0.00 Irrad. 1.00** 0.75** 10.82** 39.52** 0.75* 1.54 60.8 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 0.001 0.004 0.007 0.006 0.004 0.002 0.00 Irrad. 0.12** 0.89** 11.09** 12.87** 0.74 0.52 19.6 Sterility % Sakha 101 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.57 Sakha 102 cont. 1.10 0.10 3.16 3.48 0.09 0.19 1.09 Irrad. 5.39** 4.82** 16.20** 24.39** 0.89 4.25 26.3 Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.08 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyp | Jakila 102 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 1.00** 0.75** 10.82** 39.52** 0.75* 1.54 60.8 | Sakha 104 | | | | | | | | |
| Egyptian Jasmine | Junia 104 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 0.12** 0.89** 11.09** 12.87** 0.74 0.52 19.6 | Fountian Jasmine | | | | | | | | |
| Sterility % Sakha 101 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.57 Irrad. 14.68** 7.91** 9.93** 37.84** 0.53 4.18 4.77 Sakha 102 cont. 1.10 0.10 3.16 3.48 0.09 0.19 1.09 Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.00 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.63 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Sakha 101 cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.11 | Egyptian dasmine | _ | | | | | | | |
| Sakha 101 cont. 1.05 0.038 1.77 4.31 0.03 0.06 0.57 Irrad. 14.68** 7.91** 9.93** 37.84** 0.53 4.18 4.77 Sakha 102 cont. 1.10 0.10 3.16 3.48 0.09 0.19 1.09 Irrad. 5.39** 4.82** 16.20** 24.39** 0.89 4.25 26.3 Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.08 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.63 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Sakha 101 cont. 0.08 </td <td>Sterility %</td> <td>mau.</td> <td>0.12</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>11.00</td> <td>12.07</td> <td>0.74</td> <td>0.52</td> <td>13.00</td> | Sterility % | mau. | 0.12 | 0.00 | 11.00 | 12.07 | 0.74 | 0.52 | 13.00 |
| Irrad. 14.68** 7.91** 9.93** 37.84** 0.53 4.18 4.77 | | cont. | 1.05 | 0.038 | 1.77 | 4.31 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.57 |
| Sakha 102 cont. 1.10 0.10 3.16 3.48 0.09 0.19 1.09 Irrad. 5.39** 4.82** 16.20** 24.39** 0.89 4.25 26.3 Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.08 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.63 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Sakha 101 cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** <td>101</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 101 | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 5.39** 4.82** 16.20** 24.39** 0.89 4.25 26.3 Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.08 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.65 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) | Sakha 102 | | | | | | | | 1.09 |
| Sakha 104 cont. 1.95 0.002 2.00 6.63 0.08 0.06 0.06 Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.65 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) 0.01 0.02 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** <td></td> <td></td> <td>5.39**</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>26.38</td> | | | 5.39** | | | | | | 26.38 |
| Irrad. 12.05** 5.32** 16.20** 24.39** 0.44 3.15 22.1 | Sakha 104 | | | | | | | | |
| Egyptian Jasmine cont. 2.55 0.23 4.35 6.51 0.09 0.29 2.65 Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.1 Grain yield /plant(g) Cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Irrad. 17.0** 13.5** 7.46** 8.37** 0.79 6.70 13.6 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | | | | | | | | | 22.13 |
| Irrad. 26.90** 18.60** 16.66** 20.09** 0.68 7.26 28.18 | Egyptian Jasmine | | | | | | | | 2.63 |
| Grain yield /plant(g) cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Irrad. 17.0** 13.5** 7.46** 8.37** 0.79 6.70 13.6 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33*** 9.18*** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | | | | | | | | | 28.12 |
| Sakha 101 cont. 1.97 1.03 1.27 0.82 0.38 0.88 2.10 Irrad. 17.0** 13.5** 7.46** 8.37** 0.79 6.70 13.6 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | Grain yield /plant(g) | | | | | | | | |
| Irrad. 17.0** 13.5** 7.46** 8.37** 0.79 6.70 13.6 Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.04 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | | cont. | 1.97 | 1.03 | 1.27 | 0.82 | 0.38 | 0.88 | 2.10 |
| Sakha 102 Irrad. cont. 0.08 0.08 0.04 0.09 0.02 0.06 0.02 Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | | | | | | | | | 13.62 |
| Irrad. 46.0** 34.0** 15.76** 18.33** 0.73 10.19 27.5 | Sakha 102 Irrad. | | | 0.08 | 0.04 | | | | 0.04 |
| Sakha 104 cont. 0.70 0.30 0.50 0.65 0.09 0.48 0.17 [Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | | | | | | | | | 27.57 |
| Irrad. 16.26** 11.33** 9.18** 11.00** 0.69 5.72 15.6 | Sakha 104 | | | | | | | | 0.17 |
| | | | | | | | | | 15.63 |
| | Egyptian Jasmine | cont. | 0.55 | 0.93 | 0.65 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.43 | 0.54 |
| | | | | | | | | | 23.74 |

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, A. A; A. B. El-Abd and A.A. El- Hissewy (2002). Effect of gamma rays on some root characters and grain yield in M₂ generation of different rice varieties (*Oryza sativa* L.), Six Arab Conference on the Peaceful uses of Atomic Energy, Cairo, Egypt, 14- 18 Dec. vol. IV, 193-200.
- Abdul-majeed, A.A. (1997). Varietal differences in the effect of gamma irradiation on rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) seeds. Sarhad. J.I of Agric, 13 (4): 363-396.
- Bordholi, P. K and P. Talukar (1999). Comparison of genetic variances in M_1 and M_2 generations induced by gamma rays in rice. Annals of Biology, Ludhiana. 15 (1): 21- 24.
- Chemma, M.A.A.; R. Muhamed and Q. Zia-ul (2003). Effect of gamma rays on M₁ generation in Basmati rice. Pakistan Journal of Botany. 33 (3): 811-813.
- Do, K. T.; M. S.; P. Q. Hung and C. T. Nguyen (2006). Rice mutation improvement for short duration, High yield and Tolerance to adverse conditions in Mekong Delta of Vietnam. Plant mutation Reports, Vol. 1, No. 1:-48: 53.
- Duncan, D. B. (1955). Multiple ranges and multiple F-tests. Biometrics, 11: 1-42.
- Elayaraja, K.; M. Prakash; K. Saravanan; S. B. Kumar and J. Ganesan (2005). Studies on variability, heritability and genetic advance for certain quantitative characters in mutant population of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) crop Research-Hisar. 12(1): 134-137.
- EL Shony, K.A.: A.A.Mohamed and S.A.Azer. (1991). Induction of Lax compact panicle mutation by gamma rays in rice. Egyptian Journal of Agronomy 16: 1-2, 203-
- Gomaa, M. E.; A. A. El-Hissewy; A. B.Khattab and A. A. Abd-Allah (1995a). Improvement of yield and some Related characters of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), BY Irradiation. Menofiya J. of Agric. of Res, Vol. 20, No. 2: 395-408.
- Gomaa, M. E.; A. A. El-Hissewy, A.B. Khattab and A.A. Abd-Allah (1995b). Days to heading and plant height of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), Affected by Gamma Rays. Menofiya J. of Agric.I of Res., Vol. 20, No. 2: 409-421.
- Gustafsson, A. (1947). Mutations in agricultural plants. Hereltas. 33:1-100.
- Icchijima, K. (1934). On the artificially induced mutations and polyploidy plants of rice occurring in subsequent generations. Pro. Imp. Acad. 10: 355-391.
- Kalamani, A and M. Sakila (2000). Assessment of Induced genetic variability in M_3 generation in rice. Research on crops. 1 (2): 258-260.
- Katoch, P. C.; E. J. Masar and P.Plaha (1992). Effect of gamma irradiation on variation in segregation generations of F₂ seeds of rice. Indian Journal of Genetics and plant breeding 52 (3): 213-218.
- Kumar, A. R. C. (2005). Stable dwarf mutants of a high quality tall rice variety white Ponni. Mutation breeding Newsletter and Reviews. (1): 15- 16.

- Kumar, M. D. H. (1998). Frequency and spectrum of chlorophyll mutations induced by gamma rays in two rice varieties. Karnataka- J. of Agric. Sci. (3): 637-640.
- Le, X. T. (2006). Development of photoperiod-insensitive mutant lines using gamma irradiation of Traditional aromatic rice. Plant mutation reports. 1 (1): 53.
- Li, J.W.; W.Chanjian; L.cailin; B.Maraoidan; B.Alicia; and H.Leung. 2005. Chemical and irridation induced mutants of indica rice for forward and reverse genetics. Plant molecular biology, 59:85-97.
- Meheter, S. S.; A. P. Patil; R. C. Mahajan and B. R. Shinde (1996). Variability, heritability, character association and genetic divergence studies in M₂ generation of gamma irradiation upland paddy. Crop Research Hisar. 12 (2): 155- 161.
- Mohamed, O.; B. N. Mohd; 1. Alias; S. Azlan; H. Abdul-Rahim; M. Z. Abdullah; O. Othman; K. Hadzim; A. Saad; H. I Habibuddin and F. Golam (2006). Development of Improved Rice varieties through use of induced mutation in Malaysia. Plant mutation Report. 1, (1):27-33.
- Mohankumar, H. D (1998). Gamma ray induced variation in M₁ generation of two rice varieties. Karnatake-Journal of Agriculture Science. 11 (4): 920-926.
- Muhamed, A. ; A. A. Chemma; A. A. M. Rashid; Z. Qumar. (2003). Effect of gamma rays on M₁ generation in Basmati rice. Pakistan, Journal of Botany. 35(5): 791-795.
- Panse, V.G.and P.V. Sukhatme. (1957). Statistical methods for agriculture workers. Indian Council of Agric.Res.New Delhi, India.
- Patnaik, D.; D. Chaudhary.; and G.J.N.Rao . 2006. Genetic improvement of long grain aromatic rice through mutation approach. Plant mutation report, Vol.1, May 2006.
- Pillai, M. A.; M. Subramanian and S. Murugan. (1993). Effectiveness and efficiency of gamma rays and EMS for chlorophyll mutation on upland rice. Annals of Agricultural research. 14 (3) 302-305.
- Sabbour, Am; A. A. Mohamed and M. A. Khattab (1993). Radio sensitivity of two rice varieties treated with gamma rays. Bulletin of Faculty of Agriculture, University of Cairo. 44 (3): 663-684.
- Sanjeev, S. (2000). Gamma rays induced mutating is Basmati rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), Indian J. of Genetic and plant breeding 60 (2): 143- 144.
- Sanjeev, S.; J. Sing and K. R. Singh (2001). Gamma ray, EMS and sodium azide induced effectiveness and efficiency of chlorophyll mutations in basmati rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), Crop Research Hisar 22 (1): 113-120.
- Santhi, P. and J. Singh (2001). Variability studies in induced mutants of Mahsuri rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), Mardars Agricultural Journal. 88 (10/12): 707-709.
- Sarawgi, A. K. and D. K. Soni (1993). Induced genetic variability M₁ and M₂ population of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) advances in plant sciences. 6 (1): 24-33.
- Serry, E.S. and M.A. Masoud. (1960). Genetic variability and heritability in segregating generation of rice crosses. Annals of Agricultural Research, 16 (2):: 201-205.

- Shadakshari, G. Y.; H. Chandrappa; S. R. Kulkami and E.h. Shashidhar (2001) induction of beneficial mutants in Indian J. of Genetic and plant Breeding. 61 (3): 274-276.
- Sing, J.; P. Santhi (2001). Induced chlorophyll mutants in Basmati rice (Oryza sativa L.) Mardars agricultural journal. 85(8/10): 507-511.
- Uttam, C.; C. P. Katoch and K. Vijay (2005). Variability studies in some macromutions induced by EMS and gamma rays in Basmati rice T-23. Annals of Biology. 21 (2): 137-141.
- Wang, C. L.; M. Shen; N. K. Zhao and F. Q, Chen (1993). Mutagenic effects of combined treatment of C s 137 gamma rays and sodium azide on *Oryza sativa* L. Acta-Agricultural-Nucleatae-Sinica. 7 (1): 21-28.
- Wang, L.Q.1991.Induced mutation improvement in China, A review. Plant Mutation Breeding in Crop Improvement. Proc.Int.Symp.Breedto crop improvement.IAEA, pp: 9-32.
- دراسات على احداث تباينات وراثية جديدة فى الصفات الكمية في الأرز بواسطة اشعة جاما
- عبدالله عبدالنبي عبدالله ، أحمد محمد الاختيار، وليد محمد الخبي، سعيد محمد شحاتة و اشرف صلاح عبداللطيف.
- مركز البحوث و التدريب في الأرز، معهد بحوث المحاصيل الحقلية، مركز البحوث الزراعية ، سخا ، كفر الشيخ، مصر.

اقيمت هذه الدراسة بمزرعة مركز البحوث و التدريب في الأرز، سخا ، كفــر الــشيخ، مــصر وذلك خلال موسمى ٢٠٠٦ و ٢٠٠٧ على التوالي في هذه الدراسة تم تعريض البذور الجافسة لأصسناف الأرز، سخا ١٠١ ، سخا ١٠٢ ،سخا ١٠٤ وياسمين المصرى للتشعيع بالجرعــات التاليــة : ٢٠٠، ٢٠٠ .٠٠٠ جراى من اشعة جاما. تم زراعة البنور من المعاملات المختلفة و الأصلاف الأبويية (كمعاملة مقارنة) وبعد ٣٠ يوم تم شتل النباتات فرديا في تصميم القطاعات الكاملة العشوائية في ثلاث مكررات لكـــل صنف لدارسة استجابة اصناف الأرز المختلفة للجرعات المختلفة من اشعة جاما لبعض الصفات الخصرية ، محصول الحبوب و مكوناتة ولانتخاب بعض الطفرات المفيدة من العشائر المختلفة للجيل الطغوري التُّاني مثَّل التبكير، قصر الساق ،المقاومة للفحة والقدرة المحصولية العالية. اشارت نتائج الجيـــل الأول لانخفــاض نسبة الأنبات معنويا للصنف سخا ١٠١ بينما قل عدد الأيام للطرد و طول النبات وطــول الــسنبلة و عــدد السنابل بزيادة جرعات اشعة جاما لمعظم الأصناف المختبرة. وعلى الجانب الأخر وجد زيادة في متوسط القيم لعدد السنابل للنبات زاد بزيادة جرعة اشعة جاما للأصناف سخا ١٠١ ، و سخا ١٠٢ .نسبة العقم بالسنيبلات ابضا بزيادة الجرعات الأشعاعية لكل الأصناف المدروسة و من ثم قبل المحتصول في الجيل الثباني الاشعاعي وجد ان زيادة الجرعة الاشعاعية انت الى نقص في نسبة الأنبسات و طــول النباتـــات للـــصنفين سخا٢٠٢ وياسمن مصري .متوسط القيم لعدد السنابل بالنبات زاد للاصناف سخا ١٠١ وسخا ١٠٢ و ســخا ١٠٤ بينما قل للصنف ياسمين مصري. قل وزن المئة حبة قل في الأصــناف ســخا ١٠٢ و ســخا ١٠٤ و ياسمين مصري بينما لم تتأثّر في سخًا ١٠١ بالمعاملات لهـذة السصفة . زاد طــول الــسنبلة و محتــوي الكلور فيل بزيادة الجرعة الأشعاعية وذلك للاصناف الثلاثة سخا ١٠١ وسخا ١٠٤ و ياسمين مصري .نــسبة العقم زانت بزيادة الجرعة وكانت اعلى زيادة لها للصنف ياسمين المصري و من ثم انخفض محصول الحبوب بالنبات لتلك الأصناف . ولقد لوحظ ان هناك مدي واسع من التباين لعشائر الجيل الشاني مقارنـــة بالمعاملة القيلسية (الاباء) مشيرة الى امكانية انتخاب طفرات لبعض الصفات المرغوبة فسى الأجيال التالية . اشارت القيااسات الو راثية للصفات المدروسة لكل من الاباء و عشائر الجيل الانسمعاعي الشاني

لكل الأصناف انه في معظم الحالات وجدت زيادات عالية ومعنويه لكل من التباين الـــوراثي و المظهـــري و

معامل التباين الوراثي ودرجة التوريث و التحسين الوراثي المتوقع.