

Original Research

Genetic analysis of F2 population of tomato for studying quantitative traits in the cross between Bushbeef x Nagina

Authors:

Mehboob Ahmad<sup>1</sup>,  
Mazhar Iqbal<sup>1</sup>,  
Zishan Gul<sup>1</sup>,  
Bilal Ahmed Khan<sup>1</sup>,  
Muhammad Shahid<sup>2</sup>,  
Maria saleem<sup>1</sup> and  
Nayyer Iqbal Khan<sup>1</sup>

Institution:

1. Hazara Agricultural Research Station Abbottabad
2. Agricultural research station Baffa. Mansehra, Pakistan

ABSTRACT:

This study aims to determine the genetic components like Vg(Variance of genotype), Vp ( Variance of phenotype), GCV (Genotypic co-efficient of variation), PCV (Phenotypic coefficient of variation), Hb (Heritability) and GA% (Genetic advance in percentage of means) in F2 generation of the cross Nagina x Bushbeef-steak for predicting quantitative traits. Data was collected on P1, P2 F1 and F2 generation for various yield components and were analyzed. Analyzed data showed relatively high difference between, GCV, Vp and PCV for the traits: Flowers/cluster, Fruits/cluster and Fruit weight and relatively low difference was noted for Vg, GCV and Vp, PCV values in the traits: Fruit diameter, Fruit length and fruits/plant. Highest value of GCV (79.90%) and PCV (92.79%) were noted in the trait: yield/plant and the lowest values of GCV (14.68%) and PCV (16.78%) were noted for fruit-length. Highest value (84.08%) of broad sense heritability %(Hb%) was noted in fruit diameter and the lowest value of heritability(27.58) was noted for the trait fruits/cluster. Moderate value of heritability (74.13%) along with low value (15.22) of GA% was noted for yield/plant.

Keywords:

Tomato, F2, Genetic analysis, heritability, genetic advance

Corresponding author:

Mehboob Ahmad

Email Id:

mehboob05pbg@yahoo.co.uk

Article Citation:

Mehboob Ahmad, Mazhar Iqbal, Zishan Gul, Bilal Ahmed Khan, Muhammad Shahid, Maria saleem and Nayyer Iqbal Khan

Genetic analysis of F2 population of tomato for studying quantitative traits in the cross between Bushbeef x Nagina

Journal of Research in Biology (2016) 6(1): 1922-1927

Dates:

Received: 18 Sep 2015 Accepted: 11 Nov 2015 Published: 05 Jan 2016

Web Address:

<http://jresearchbiology.com/documents/RA0583.pdf>

This article is governed by the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which gives permission for unrestricted use, non-commercial, distribution and reproduction in all medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## INTRODUCTION

Tomato is the world's second most important crop just after potato where it is consumed in raw form as well as processed form like tomato ketchup or cooked in meal. The fruit is valuable being a contributor of medically important components in our diet like lycopene as well as other necessary dietary elements like vitamin B1, B6, vitamin C and small amount of ascorbic acids (Hasan *et al.*, 2014).

Intense need is being felt to increase the production of this crop to fulfill the dietary demands of growing world population (Ahmad *et al.*, 2015). Like other crops, this crop may also be improved by breeding techniques for the traits like disease tolerance, yield, yield components and shelf life. For any breeding programme it is indispensable to have information about the genetic variability and corresponding heritability as the selection of superior genotypes depend on the degree of genetic variability and extent to which the characters are inherited (Nechifor *et al.*, 2011). Genetic improvement in the breeding programme depends on the utilization of available or created genetic variability. The chances of selection of superior genotypes are directly proportional to the influence of genetic make-up and inversely proportional to the environmental influence. Phenotypic selection for yield in tomato may be ineffective, often, because of its being polygenic trait and dependence on other traits. Thus magnitude, nature and interaction of genotypic and environmental interaction influences the achievements in breeding. (Khanom *et al.* 2008). Parting the total variation into heritable and non-heritable components with the help of genetic parameters i.e. genotypic and phenotypic co-efficient of variation, heritability and genetic advance is helpful in finding the effect of environmental fluctuation on the yield components (Maniee *et al.*, 2009).

Heritability provides information to the breeders about the contribution of genetic and environmental factors to phenotypic variability, therefore, it is the one

of important part of breeding research. Genetic advance is another parameter on which effectiveness of selection depends on (Johnson *et al.*, 1955). For the selection to be effective and for making improvement in the crop, moderate or high heritability should be accompanied by sufficient amount of genetic advance (Eid, 2009).

The objective of our research is to find the variability related parameters like GCV, PCV  $V_g$ ,  $V_p$ , heritability and genetic advance for quantifying yield and yield components. The study will help the researchers in making judicious selection in F<sub>2</sub> generation for the desired parameters.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### (A). Field data

The experiment was conducted at Hazara Agricultural Research station, Abbottabad during the sowing seasons of 2013 to 2015 (Fig. 1). Crossing was done between two varieties of diverse characteristics Nagina and Bush beefsteak in the month of July 2013. Then F<sub>1</sub> seeds were collected from the fruits formed through crossing. In the year 2014, F<sub>1</sub> seeds were sown in the month of April and nursery was transplanted in June 2014. Some F<sub>1</sub> seeds were reserved for the next sowing season. F<sub>2</sub> seeds were collected from F<sub>1</sub> generation and data were also collected. In January 2015 the seed of P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, F<sub>1</sub> and F<sub>2</sub> were sown in nursery. The plants in nursery were sown in March 2015. Plant to plant distance was kept as 50 cm, row to row distance was kept as 100cm. 500 plants of F<sub>2</sub> generation were transplanted in three blocks along with P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub> and F<sub>1</sub> in each block. Data were collected on F<sub>2</sub> population and five plants each from P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub> and F<sub>1</sub> on the parameters: No of flowers/cluster, No of fruits/cluster, fruit length (cm), fruit diameter (cm), fruit weight (grams), No of fruits/plant and yield (grams)/plant.

### (B). Statistical analysis

$V_g$  (Variance of genotype),  $V_p$  (Variance of phenotype) and broad sense heritability ( $H_b$ ) were

**Table 1:** Variance of genotype(Vg), Variance of phenotype(Vp),Variance of environment(Ve), Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), Phenotypic coefficient of variance(PCV) ,broad-sense heritability(Hb),Expected genetic advance (GA) and Genetic advance percentage (GA%) for F2 population of cross combination *Nagina x Bushbeefsteak*.

Parameters	Mean	Range	Vg	Vp	Ve	GCV	PCV	Hb%	GA	GA%
Flowers/ cluster	4.18	1-9	0.48	1.44	0.95	16.57	28.73	33	0.82	19.72
Fruits/cluster	1.87	0-6	0.29	1.07	0.77	29.01	55.33	27.58	0.58	31.44
Fruit weight	63.37	20-147	115.71	328.91	213.20	16.97	28.61	35.17	13.14	20.73
Fruit diameter	4.60	2.1-6.5	0.53	0.63	0.10	15.82	17.26	84.08	1.37	29.89
Fruit length	4.49	2.9-6.53	0.43	0.56	0.13	14.68	16.78	76.82	1.193	26.55
Fruits/plant	15.07	0-79	89.47	108.31	18.83	62.72	69.01	82.60	17.70	117.43
Yield/plant	930.85	0-3010	553205	746202	192997	79.90	92.79	74.13	141.72	15.22

calculated on MS-Excel by using the following formula suggested by Globerson *et al.* (1987).

$$Hb = \{VF2 - [1/3 (VP1 + VP2 + VF1)]\} / VF2$$

$$\text{Where } Ve = Vp1 + Vp2 + Vf1/3$$

$$Vp = VF2 \text{ and } Vg = Vp - Ve \text{ So } Hb = Vg / Vp$$

Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), genotypic coefficients of variation (GCV) , expected genetic advance (GA) and percentage of genetic advance (GA%) were calculated according to the following formulas used by Bozokalfa *et al.* (2010) in their study.

$$PCV = (sp / X) \times 100$$

$$GCV = (sg / X) \times 100$$

$$(GA) = isph^2$$

$$(GA \%) = \times 100$$

Where, sp: phenotypic standard deviation, sg: genotypic standard deviation X: grand mean of the traits and i: standardized selection differential, a constant (2.06) respectively.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results regarding F2 population of cross combination *Nagina x Bush beefsteak* for phenotypic variance (Vp), genotypic variance (Vg), genotypic coefficient of variance (GCV), phenotypic Coefficient of

Variance (PCV), Heritability% (Hb) and percentage of genetic advance (GA%) are shown in Table-1. Analyzed data showed that variance of genotype (Vg) was lower than the variance of phenotype (Vp) in the F2 populations for all traits under study. Same were the findings of Mohamed *et al.* (2012) and Ghosh *et al.* (2010) except for fruit-length and fruit diameter in their study . Higher difference was noted between Vg and Vp for the traits flowers/cluster, fruits/cluster, fruit weight, fruits/plant and yield/plant while lower difference was found between Vg and Vp for the traits like fruit diameter and fruit length as shown in Table-1. High difference between Vg and Vp indicated that the environment has more contribution than their genetic make-up in the phenotypic magnitude of the traits.

Relatively higher difference was noted between GCV and PCV values in the traits: flowers/cluster fruits/cluster and fruit weight and relatively low difference was noted for GCV and PCV value in the traits: fruit diameter, fruit length and fruits/plant. Khanom *et al.* (2008) also found smaller difference between GCV and PCV value for the trait fruits/length while Kaushik *et al.* (2011) found small difference between GCV and PCV for fruit diameter. Moderate difference was noted



**Figure 1. Plant Breeding experiment on the host plant**

between GCV and PCV in the parameter yield/plant. Higher difference between GCV and PCV for the traits revealed that the traits are under the influence of environmental effect and are determined by non-dominance and non-additive gene action. Highest value of GCV (79.90%) and PCV (92.79%) were noted in the trait: yield/plant which indicated that diversity is highest than any other trait. So, there available a wide range of selection for the breeder. Sivaprasad *et al.* (2009) also reported high value of GCV and PCV for yield/plant. There is a moderate difference between GCV% and PCV% for the yield/plant. Lowest values of GCV (14.68%) and PCV (16.78%) were noted for fruit-length which depicted that variation in the trait is lowest than in any other trait.

Highest value (84.08%) of broad sense heritability (Hb) was noted in fruit diameter followed by fruits/plant and fruit length i.e. 82.6% and 76.82% and, respectively. The results confirmed that additive gene action is involved in the traits and influence of environment is less. Lowest value of heritability (27.58) was noted for the trait fruits/cluster. Flowers/cluster and fruit weight also showed relatively lower value of Hb i.e. 33% and 35.17%, respectively.

GA% is highest (117.43%) in fruits/plant among all the traits. The trait has also shown relatively higher

value of Hb%. Our results matched with the findings of Haydar *et al.* (2007) and Sharanappa and Mogali (2014) who also found high value of heritability and GA% for the trait. Lower values of GA% for flowers/cluster (19.72%), fruits/cluster (31.44%) and fruit weight (20.73%) are coupled with lower heritability. The result showed that these traits are under the influence of non-additive gene actions. Mere phenotypic selection for such traits cannot bear any fruitful result in the next generation.

Moderate value of heritability was found for yield/plant i.e. 74.13%. However, relatively lower GA% (15.22) was noted for the trait. Our results matched with the findings of Saleem *et al.* (2015) who also found relatively lower value of GA% (21%) coupled with low value of heritability. The traits having high heritability with high genetic advance are deemed to be under the control of additive genes, whereas with high heritability and low genetic advance are under the control of non-additive (dominant or epistatic) genes which limits the scope of improvement through selection (Akbar *et al.*, 2003). Therefore it is suggested that selection for the trait yield/plant in our study on phenotypic basis is not much effective.

## CONCLUSION

Yield/plant is the most variable trait, however, heritability for the trait is moderate with low genetic advance, therefore, mere phenotypic selection is not effective. The selection for fruit size traits may be effective due to the higher value of heritability.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the scientists at Ayub Agricultural Research Institute Faisalabad, Pakistan for their compliance and provision of germplasm which has enabled us to initiate our breeding programme.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad M, Gul Z, Khan ZU, Iqbal M, Khan B, Saleem M and Ullah I. (2015). Study of heterosis in different cross combinations of tomato for yield and yield components. *International Journal of Biosciences*, 7(2):12-18.
- Akbar M, Mahmood T, Yaqub M, Anwar M, Ali M and Iqbal N. (2003). Variability, correlation and path coefficient studies in summer mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences* 2: 696-698.
- Bozokalfa MK, Ilbi DE and Ascioğul TK. (2010). Estimates of genetic variability and association studies in quantitative plant traits of *Eruca* spp. landraces. *Genetika*, 42(3):501-512.
- Eid MH. (2009). Estimation of heritability and genetic advance of yield traits in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under drought condition. *International Journal of Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 1(7):115-120.
- Globerson D, Genizi A and Staub JE. (1987). Inheritance of seed weight in *Cucumis sativus* (L.) var. *sativus* and var. *hardwickii* (Royle) Kitamura. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, 74(4):522-526.
- Ghosh KP, Islam AKMA, Mian MAK and Hossain MM. (2010). Variability and Character Association in F<sub>2</sub> Segregating Population of Different Commercial Hybrids of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). *Journal of Applied Sciences and Environmental Management*, 14 (2):91-95.
- Haydar A, Mandal MA, Ahmed MB, Hannan MM, Karim R, Razvy MA, Roy UK and Salahin M. (2007). Studies on genetic variability and interrelationship among the different traits in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill). *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 2(3-4):139-142.
- Hasan N, Saeed A, Shakeel A, Saleem MF, Ahmad A and Yasin S. (2014). Genetic analysis to find suitable parents for development of tomato hybrids. *Agriculture and Forestry*, 4(60):255-265.
- Johnson HW, Robinson HF and Comstock RE. (1955). Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soya beans. *Agronomy Journal*, 47(7):318-324.
- Kaushik SK, Tomar DS and Dixit AK. (2011). Genetics of fruit yield and its contributing characters in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*). *Journal of Agricultural Biotechnology and Sustainable Development*, 3(10):209-213.
- Khanom MSR, Khan MHK and Hassan L. (2008). Variability, heritability and genetic advance for yield and yield contributing characters in tomato (*lycopersicon esculentum* mill.). *Progress Agriculture*, 19(1):1-5.
- Maniee M, Kahrizi D and Mohammadi R. (2009). Genetic variability of some morpho-physiological traits in durum wheat (*Triticum durum* var. *Durum*). *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 9(7):1383-1387.
- Mohamed SM, Ali EE and Mohamed TY. (2012). Study of Heritability and Genetic Variability among Different Plant and Fruit Characters of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon* L.). *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 1(2):55-58.
- Nechifor B, Filimon R and Szilagyi L. (2011). Genetic variability, heritability and expected genetic advance as indices for yield and yield components selection in common bean (*phaseolus vulgaris* l.). *Scientific Papers: UASVM Bucharest: Series*. 14.
- Saleem M, Asghar M and Iqbal Q. (2015). Analysis of Genetic Proximity in Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) Genotypes. *Journal of Environmental and Agricultural Sciences*, 3:8-13.
- Sharanappa KP and Mogali SC. (2014). Studies on

genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance for yield and yield components in F2 segregating population of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon* L.). *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 27(4):524-525.

**Sivaprasad K, Sridevi O and Salimath PM. (2009).** Genetic variability studies in biparental mating populations of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon* (Mill) Wettst.). *Indian Journal of Crop Science*, 4(1 and 2):121-125.

Submit your articles online at [www.jresearchbiology.com](http://www.jresearchbiology.com)

**Advantages**

- **Easy online submission**
- **Complete Peer review**
- **Affordable Charges**
- **Quick processing**
- **Extensive indexing**
- **You retain your copyright**

[submit@jresearchbiology.com](mailto:submit@jresearchbiology.com)

[www.jresearchbiology.com/Submit.php](http://www.jresearchbiology.com/Submit.php)