# MODE OF INHERITANCE OF EARLINESS IN TOMATO (Lycopersicon esculentum Mil I.)

A.A. Midan<sup>1</sup>; M.A. Fattahallah<sup>1</sup>; A.A. Nawar<sup>2</sup> and Mona R. Khalil<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dep. of Horticulture, Fac. of Agric., Minufiya Univ., Shibin El-Kom.

(Received: Jun., 29, 2009)

ABSTRACT: Two tomato genotypes, i.e., the line  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  and the cultivar Super Strain B were used as parents in studying the inheritance of earliness. Populations studied were the parents,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  of the cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B". A Randomized Complete Block Design was used. Data obtained indicated that the number of days to first ripe fruit is controlled by single pair of genes with dominance to the short period to maturity and presence of additive gene effects. Early yield as fruit number is controlled by one pair of major genes with over-dominance of the large number of fruits. Furthermore, the expression of heterosis requires the presence of many minor genes. Early yield as fruit weight is controlled by several number of genes with over-dominance for high early yield. The superiority of the  $F_1$  population encourage the development of hybrid cultivars for early production.

Key words: Tomato, inheritance, early and total yield, additive, dominance.

## INTRODUCTION

Earliness of maturity is an important factor in usefulness of vegetable crops. Early tomato cultivars are financially important especially in the countries where the season is short. Earliness extends the harvest season makes tomato harvest more manageable to the grower. For the process its means more efficient in plant operation through more even delivery of row product to the factory.

Earliness in tomato usually measured either by the number of days from transplanting to first ripe fruit or by number and weight of fruits per plant harvested in the first three harvests. Hassan *et al.* (1982), Nassar (1984) and Nassar (1986). Nassar (1988) reported that, about 86% of the variability in early yield among hybrids or cultivars of tomato was dependent on genotype.

The inheritance and types of gene actions were studied for earliness by many investigators. Khalil et al. (1983) studied the mode of inheritance of number of days from transplanting to first flower anthesis and number of days from transplanting to first ripe fruit using the progenies of the cross "K.J. x K.E.". They found that, a single major gene apparently control most of the genetic variability in the two earliness factors. They added that, the additive gene action was observed for number of days to flowering.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Dep. of Agronomy, Fac. of Agric., Minufiya Univ., Shibin El-Kom.

Meanwhile, complete dominance of the short period to maturity was observed. Furthermore, the expression of dominant genes requires the presence of many minor genes. High heritability and high genetic advance under selection were calculated, indicating that considerable progress can be realized by selection for the short period to maturity. Also, the obtained results suggested that, the dominance of short period to maturity facilitates to considerable extent the breeding of early hybrid cultivars in tomato.

Genetic variation, heritability and genetic advance analysis for many traits were conducted, using 20 tomato cultivars, by Singh et al. (2001). High heritability with high genetic advance were found for number of days to flowering and number of days to 30% fruit ripening, indicating that selection for these characters may be beneficial for improvement of tomato. High heritability along with high genetic advance for days required to ripening were also observed by Sashikala et al. (2002), suggesting the effect of additive genes for controlling this character. On the other hand, the non-additive gene action played the main role in the inheritance of early yield in tomato as reported by Hosseny (2002).

Devi et al. (2005) reported that, early maturity was predominantly controlled by additive gene effects combined with high magnitude of additive x dominance and complementary of epistasis.

According to Ahmed et al. (2006), considerable genetic variability for yield and yield components was observed among the studied 60 tomato genotypes for earliness. High estimates of BSH and high genetic advance as percent of mean were observed, indicating the significance of additive gene effects and effectiveness of selection for this trait. High heritability, high G.C.V, and high or moderate genetic advance were also found for number of days to maturity by Nitu et al. (2007).

The aim of this study is to detect the mode of earliness of inheritance in tomato.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was carried out at the Experimental Farm, Faculty of Agriculture, Minufiya University, Shibin El-Kom during two successive summer seasons from 2005 to 2006. The breeding line  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  and the commercial cultivar Super strain B, which were widely differed in their characteristics were chosen as parental genotypes in this study. In the first season (2005), seeds of the two parents with their  $F_1$  which were on hand from previous study to fulfill the requirements of Master Degree (Khalil, 2004) were sown into plastic house in the first week of January. The seedlings were transplanted in the field in the first week of March. Crossing was made between the two parents to produce the required  $F_1$  seeds, at the same time, parents were selfed to produce enough seeds. The  $F_1$  plants were selfed and

backcrossed to both parents to develop the required  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  seeds.

In the second season (2006), the six populations, i.e.,  $P_1$  ( $S_{65}$ - $R_2$ ),  $P_2$  (Super Strain B),  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  were grown in a Randomized Complete Block Design (R.C.B.D) with four replicates. In each replicate each of the six population was represented by one plot of 1-4 ridges. The ridge contains 10 plants. Number of ridges was one for each of the non-segregating populations ( $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$ ), two for each of  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$ , and four for the  $F_2$  population. The ridge was 4.0 meters long and one meter wide with spacing of 40 cm between plants. The total number of plants were 40, 80 and 160 plants for each of the non-segregating, each of backcross, and  $F_2$  populations, respectively. Fertilization, irrigation, disease and insect control programmes were carried out as usual in tomato.

Data were recorded on the individual plant of each population regarding the studied characters during the harvest period. Number of days from transplanting to first ripe fruit and total weight and number of mature fruits in the first three harvests were considered as expression for the earliness.

Data were statically analyzed using the standard method of a Randomized Complete Blocks Design (R.C.B.D), illustrated by Al-Rawi and Khalf-Allah (1980). The least significant differences (L.S.D) was used to test the significance of differences among the various means (Snedecor and Cochran, 1973).

#### Dominance relations:

(1) Heterosis percentages: Heterosis was determined as the percentage of deviation of the F<sub>1</sub> mean over the mid-parents (M.P.) and better parent (B.P.) according to Mather and Jinks (1971) formulas as follows:

$$H (M.P.) \% = \frac{\overline{F_1} - \overline{M.P.}}{\overline{M.P.}} \times 100$$

$$H (B.P.) \% = \frac{\overline{F_1} - \overline{B.P.}}{\overline{B.P.}} \times 100$$

where, H (M.P.)= heterosis from the mid-parents.

H (B.P.) = heterosis from the better parent.

 $F_1$  = the mean of  $F_1$  generation.

 $\overline{B.P.}$  = the mean of the better parent.

#### (2) Potence ratio (P):

This parameter was estimated to determine the nature of dominance and its direction. The formula used for estimating (P) according to Smith (1952) was as follow:

## A.A. Midan; M.A. Fattahallah; A.A. Nawar and Mona R. Khalil

$$P = \overline{F_1} - \overline{M.P.} / \frac{1}{2} (\overline{P_2} - \overline{P_1})$$

where, P = relative potence of gene set.

 $\overline{F_i}$  = first generation mean.

 $\overline{P_1}$  = the mean of lower parent.

 $\overline{P_2}$  = the mean of higher parent.

M.P.= mid-parent value  $[\frac{1}{2}(\overline{P_1} + \overline{P_2})]$ .

#### where,

- 1. Complete dominance is considered when potence ratio is equal  $\pm$  1.0.
- Partial dominance is considered when potence ratio is between <u>+</u> 1.0 and -1.0, but not equal zero.
- 3. Absence of dominance is indicated when potence ratio is equal zero.
- 4. Over dominance is considered when potence ratio exceeded + 1.0.
- (3) Inbreeding depression was estimated by the formula:

I.D. 
$$\% = \frac{\overline{F_1} - \overline{F_2}}{\overline{F_1}} \times 100$$

where,  $\overline{F}_1$  and  $\overline{F}_2$  are the means of first and second generations, respectively.

(4) Genetic coefficient of variance (G.C.V) % =  $\frac{\sqrt{VG}}{\overline{X}}\times 100$ 

Environmental variance (E) = 
$$\frac{VP_1 + VP_2 + VF_1}{3} \times 100$$

Genetical variance (VG) = VF<sub>2</sub> - E

Additive variance 
$$(\frac{1}{2}D) = 2VF_2 - (VBcp_1 + VBcp_2)$$

Dominance variance 
$$(\frac{1}{4}H) = VF_2 - (\frac{1}{2}D + E)$$

Where,  $VP_1$ ,  $VP_2$ ,  $VF_1$ ,  $VF_2$ ,  $VBcp_1$  and  $VBcp_2$  are the variances of  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$ , respectively.

 $\overline{X}$  = the mean of  $F_2$  population.

(5) Heritability: heritability in both broad (BSH) and narrow (NSH) sense were estimated as follows:

$$BSH \% = \frac{VG}{VP} \times 100$$
 (Allard, 1960)

NSH % = 
$$\frac{\frac{1}{2}D}{VP} \times 100$$
 (Mather, 1949)

where, VG = genetical variance.

VP = total variance (F<sub>2</sub> variance).

 $\frac{1}{2}$  D = additive variance.

(6) Predicted gain under selection (△G), was estimated according to Johanson *et al.* (1955) as follows:

$$\Delta G = K \cdot \sqrt{VF_2} \cdot NSH$$

where, K = a selection differential with a value of 2.06 under 5% selection intensity.

(7) Genetic advance under selection as percentage of  $F_2$  mean ( $\Delta G$ )% was estimated according to Miller et al. (1958) as follows:

$$\Delta G \% = \frac{\Delta G}{\overline{X}} \times 100$$

where,  $\overline{X}$  = mean of the  $F_2$  generation.

- (8) The minimum number of genes differentiating the parents was determined according to Castle and Wright (1921) and Burton (1951).
- (9) Chi-square test was used to compare the observed and theoretical ratios in segregating populations (Steel and Torrie, 1960).
- (10) Frequency distribution tables and curves were prepared for the populations tested concerning each studied character. In Each character, class interval was ½ ⅓ the arithmetic average of the standard deviation of the non-segregating populations (Khalil, 1974).

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of variance of population means showed that, there were no significant differences, at 5% level of significance, among the replicates in the studied characters. Consequently, data of the four replications of each studied populations ( $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$ ) were pooled and handled for genetic analysis and to form the frequency distribution.

# 1. Number of days to first ripe fruit:

Data concerning number of days to first ripe fruit are presented in Tables (1 & 2). The two parents significantly differed in number of days required to first ripe fruit. The number of days ranged from 76 to 88 in  $P_1$  ( $S_{65}$ - $R_2$ ) with an average of 81.5 days and from 63 to 74 in  $P_2$  (Super Strain B) with an average of 67.3 days as shown in Table (1). It is noticed that, the two parents have distinctly non-over Lapping ranges. The Super Strain B cultivar was earlier than the line  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  by a mean of 14.2 days.

Table (1). Statistics obtained for the number of days to first ripe fruit in parents and hybrid generations of tomato cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B".

Populations	Number of plants	Range	Obtained mean <u>+</u> SE	Theoretical mean	Variances S <sup>2</sup>	c.v.%
S <sub>65</sub> -R <sub>2</sub> (P <sub>1</sub> )	40	76 – 88	81.5 <u>+</u> 0.4	-	7.5	3.4
Super Strain B	40	63 – 74	67.3 <u>+</u> 0.5	_	10.1	4.7
(P <sub>2</sub> )	40	64 – 73	68.8 <u>+</u> 0.4	74.4	6.4	3.7
F <sub>1</sub>	160	62 – 86	71.0 <u>+</u> 0.5	71.6	34.3	8.3
F <sub>2</sub>	80	65 – 86	74.7 <u>+</u> 0.7	75.2	34.2	7.9
Bcp₁	80	63 – 76	69.2 <u>+</u> 0.4	68.1	11.6	4.9
Bcp <sub>2</sub>			_			

L.S.D at 5% and 1% level = 1.0 and 1.4, respectively.

Regarding  $F_1$  population, the number of days ranged from 63-73 with an average of 68.8 days. This average is very close to that of  $P_2$ , the early parent, suggesting dominance of short period to maturity. On the other hand, it was significantly lower than mid-parents value. The average degree of heterosis was estimated as -8.0 and 2.0% in relation to both mid-parents (MP) and better parent (BP), respectively. The high negative heterosis value from the mid-parents and the low value from the early parent revealed the complete dominance of early maturity. The estimated potence ratio (0.79) is relatively low according to the postulated complete dominance, and could be explained by the presence of some additive effects in the inheritance of this trait. The distribution of  $F_1$  population (Table 2) suggests a strong evidence for the complete dominance. All plants were distributed within the range of the earlier parent ( $P_2$ ).

Regarding F<sub>2</sub> plants, the number of days showed wide range, they ranged from 62.0 – 86.0. The obtained and theoretical means (71.0 and 71.6, respectively) were very close. Theoretical F<sub>2</sub> mean was calculated for one factor-pair difference using Powers (1955) formula:  $\overline{F_2} = \overline{P_1} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right) + \overline{P_2} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)$ ,

where,  $P_1$  is the mean of the dominant parent and  $P_2$  is the mean of recessive parent. The absence of significant difference between actual and theoretical means reflected presence of one pair of genes is responsible and control this character.

According to the postulated monogenic hypothesis,  $F_2$  plants should segregate into two classes with 3: 1 ratio. The first class should be similar to  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  populations, and the second class should be similar to  $P_1$ , the other parent. As shown in Table (2) this was a real. About 72.5% of the plants covered the range exhibited by  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  plants, and the remaining portion (27.5%) covered the range exhibited by  $P_1$  plants. This ratio represent 3: 1

ratio using  $X^2$  test with probability of 0.20 - 0.50 and support the monogenic hypothesis.

Support to the monogenic inheritance of number of days from transplanting to first ripe fruit could be shown by the segregation of  $Bcp_1$  plants. They segregated into two classes with a ratio of 55.0 : 45.0%. The first class was distributed within the range of  $P_1$ , while the second class was distributed within the range of  $P_2$  and  $P_1$  populations. This ratio was fit a 1 : 1 ratio using  $X^2$  test with probability 0.20-0.50.

All plants of  $Bcp_2$ , except three ones, were distributed within the range of  $F_1$  and  $P_2$  without any segregation. This is expected when the character is controlled by single pair of genes and dominance of the short period to maturity.

The obtained and theoretical means were approximately similar in the two backcrosses, supporting the monogenic inheritance. The actual means of Bcp<sub>1</sub> and Bcp<sub>2</sub> were significantly different, supporting the dominance of the short period.

An examination of variances and variability of all tested populations, as shown in Table (1), show that the non-segregating populations, i.e.,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  were the least variable as shown by the calculated variances and coefficient of variability. This indicates that, they are more homogeneous compared with the segregating populations, i.e.,  $F_2$  and  $Bcp_1$ , which are consist of homozygous and heterozygous plants.

A heritability was estimated as 76.7 and 65.9% in broad (BSH) and narrow (NSH) sense, respectively, indicating that the character is controlled by dominant and additive genes. Genetic coefficient of variation (G.C.V%), predicted gain ( $\Delta$ G) and genetic advance under selection ( $\Delta$ G%) were estimated as 7.2, 7.92 and 11.2%, respectively. these estimated genetic parameters indicate that considerable progress could be realized by breeding and selection. High estimates of each of BSH, ( $\Delta$ G) and genetic ( $\Delta$ G%) were also obtained by Ahmed *et al.* (2006) and Nitu (2006).

Minimum number of genes controlling the number of days to maturity was found to be 0.9 and 1.1 using Castle-Wright and Burton formulae, respectively, indicating that the number of gene pairs is at least one. The additive ( $\frac{1}{2}$  D) and dominance genetic variances ( $\frac{1}{4}$  H) were calculated as 22.6 and 3.7, respectively.

Finally, it could concluded that the number of days from transplanting to the first ripe fruit in the cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B" is controlled by single pair of genes with dominance of the short period and presence of additive effects. The monogenic inheritance and the dominance of short period to maturity with presence of additive gene effects was also reported by Khalil *et al.* (1983) in tomato.

## A.A. Midan; M.A. Fattahallah; A.A. Nawar and Mona R. Khalil

Table (2). Frequency distribution for number of days from transplanting to first fruit for  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  of the tomato cross "S<sub>65</sub>-R<sub>2</sub> × Super Strain B".

Upper class	Number of plants of each tested population						
limit	$\mathbf{P}_1$	P <sub>2</sub>	F <sub>1</sub>	F <sub>2</sub>	Bcp₁	Bcp <sub>2</sub>	
60							
61							
62				6			
63		2		10		3	
64		1	1	4		_	
65		15	3	3	7	5	
66		5	7	20	6	14	
67		3	1	8	1	11	
68		1	5	13	5	9	
69		_	4	16	2	4	
70		6	9	4	-	5	
71		2	4	9	3	1	
72		2	2	9	2	10	
73		2	4	5 9	2 6 2	8	
74		1		9	6	7	
75	_			_	2	-	
76	1			10	7	3	
77	1			11	3		
78	7			6	16		
79	1			2	5		
80	1			6	5		
81	9			1	1		
82	2			-	1		
83	13			4	1		
84	1			-	_		
85	2			_	2		
86	_			4	3		
87	_			-	_		
88	2			_	-		

# 2. Early yield (fruit number):

Data of number of fruits of early yield are shown in Tables (3 & 4). Significant difference was observed between the two parents in this character. The number of early fruits ranged from 4 - 9 with an average of 6.3

fruits / plant and from 12 – 17 with an average of 14.6 fruits / plant in the breeding line  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  ( $P_1$ ) and the cv. Super Strain B ( $P_2$ ), respectively. It is clear that Super Strain B cultivar exceeded  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  by about 138.0% in early fruit number.

Table (3). Statistics obtained for early fruit number in parents and hybrid generations of tomato cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B".

Populations	Number of plants	Range	Obtained mean <u>+</u> SE	Theoretical mean	Variances S <sup>2</sup>	c.v.%
S <sub>65</sub> -R <sub>2</sub> (P <sub>1</sub> )	40	4 – 9	5.3 <u>+</u> 0.2	-	1.8	20.9
Super Strain B	40	12 – 17	14.6 <u>+</u> 0.3	_	1.6	11.4
(P <sub>2</sub> )	40	15 – 19	17.2 <u>+</u> 0.2	10.0	1.2	7.6
F <sub>1</sub>	160	7 – 18	12.8 <u>+</u> 0.3	12.6	3.4	24.2
F <sub>2</sub>	80	5 – 17	11.0 <u>+</u> 0.5	11.3	4.1	33.6
Bcp₁	80	13 – 18	15.5 <u>+</u> 0.2	15.9	1.5	8.2
Bcp <sub>2</sub>						

L.S.D at 5% and 1% level = 0.70 and 0.97, respectively.

Table (4). Frequency distribution of early number for  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  of the tomato cross "S<sub>65</sub>-R<sub>2</sub> × Super Strain B".

Upper class	Number of plants of each tested population						
limit	P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	F <sub>1</sub>	F <sub>2</sub>	Bcp₁	Bcp <sub>2</sub>	
4	4						
5	8				4		
6	9				3		
7	12			8	17		
8	5			16	17		
9	2			21			
10				9			
11				7			
12		2		2			
13		10		10	1	8	
14		12		21	14	16	
15		3	5	21	8	17	
16		6	6	24	11	13	
17		7	12	16	5	19	
18			11	5		7	
19			6				

The  $F_1$  population exceeded the two parents in this respect. Its mean was 17.2 fruits / plant, suggesting over dominance or / hybrid vigour for the high early fruit number. The average degree of heterosis (ADH%) was estimated as 63.8 and 17.8% based on MP and BP values, respectively supporting the over-dominance postulated. The over-dominance was also verified by the high estimated potence ratio (1.6).

Variances of the non-segregating populations, i.e.,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  differed, indicating that the environmental variance varies considerably among different genotypes. However, they were the least variable comparing with the segregating populations as shown by the lowest cv.% values, which were 20.9, 11.4 and 7.6 for  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  populations, respectively (Table 3). This indicates that they were more homogeneous than the  $F_2$  and Bc populations which had greater variances.

The means of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  populations significantly differed. The mean of  $F_2$  (12.8) was lower than that of the  $F_1$  by 4.4 fruits / plant. The calculated inbreeding depression was 25.6%; this relatively high value is expected when the character is controlled by over-dominance genes. The distribution of  $F_1$  plants clearly reveals the over-dominance of the large number of early fruits / plant. As shown in Table (4), the number of fruits ranged from 12-17 in  $F_2$  (better parent) and from 15-19 in  $F_1$  plants. About 42.5% of the  $F_1$  plants had higher number of fruits than the early parent and the remaining portion (56.5%) is similar to the cv. Super Strain B.

Plants of the Bcp<sub>1</sub> segregated into almost two equal portions. The two classes were (51.25 and 48.75%) and exhibited distributions similar to P<sub>1</sub> and P<sub>2</sub>. Their distribution fit a 1 : 1 ratio using  $X^2$  test with a probability of 0.50 – 0.95. This ratio support that number of early fruits is monogenic character. On the other hand, plants of the Bcp<sub>2</sub> did not segregate and had a mean number of fruits approximately similar to that of P<sub>2</sub> (Super Strain B cv.) plants. This result support the advanced suggestion, that the character is controlled by few number of genes with dominance for the high fruit number. The dominance hypothesis was evident from the means of both Bcp<sub>1</sub> and Bcp<sub>2</sub> which showed significant differences. The monogenic inheritance was also verified by the obtained means of F<sub>2</sub>, Bcp<sub>1</sub> and Bcp<sub>2</sub> which were very close to the expected means.

For  $F_2$  plans, the number of fruits/plant ranged from 7–18 with an average of 12.8. The plants distributed on a wide range without distinct classes. About 38% of the plants had an average number of fruits within the range of  $P_1$  and the remaining portion (62.0%) had an average within the range of  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  plants. According to the presented hypothesis (monogenic trait), more than 62.0% of the  $F_2$  plants should have an average fruit number similar to those of  $P_2$  and  $F_1$ . This unexpected distribution of  $F_2$  plants could be explained, however, if it is assumed that the appearance of

the high fruit number character requires the presence of many minor genes. Segregation of such miner genes in the  $F_2$  population would be independent upon the other major genes. Consequently, chances would be very small that all minor and major genes present in  $F_2$  plants, particularly, since the size of  $F_2$  population in this test was only 160 plants. This result is in agreement with Khalil *et al.* (1983) who suggested that the appearance of earliness in tomato requires the presence of many minor genes.

Variances of plants of  $Bcp_1$  was higher than those of  $F_2$  and  $Bcp_2$ . This could be due to that the character is controlled by one pair of major genes with over dominance of the large number of fruits. Also, the presence of many minor genes with the major genes would make this Bc distribution stretched evenly over a wide range of the number of fruits scale, thus increasing the variance of this population. On the other hand, the overdominance of the large number of fruits would result much skewness of  $F_2$  plants, consequently, decreasing their variance.

Heritability in Broad-sense (BSH) was estimated as 83.2% and in narrow-sense was 31.3%, this values indicative with the postulated hypothes. The minimum number of genes was calculated as 0.86 and 1.0 using Castle and Wright (1921) and Burton (1951) equations. According to this result, it could be concluded that this character is controlled by one pair of genes with over-dominance of the large number of early fruits. However, the expression of heterosis requires the presence of many minor genes.

The estimated additive variance ( $\frac{1}{2}$  D) and dominance variance ( $\frac{1}{4}$  H) were 7.4 and 6.0, respectively. Predicted gain ( $\Delta$ G) and genetic advance under selection ( $\Delta$ G%) were estimated as 7.38 and 57.65%, respectively. The high heritability and high genetic advance for early fruit number were also found by Singh (2001) and Sashikala (2002).

The over-dominance of the large number of early fruits, which is an important component of commercial earliness, facilitates a considerable extent for breeding of early hybrid cultivars by heterosis breeding. Hybrid vigour for large early number fruit was found by Hassan *et al.* (2000).

# 3. Early yield (fruit weight):

Data of early yield as fruit weight showed that the two parents significantly differed in early fruit weight. The cultivar Super Strain B ( $P_2$ ) exceeded the line  $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  ( $P_1$ ) by about 30.8%. The early fruit weight ranged from (0.520 - 1.080) and from (0.920–1.400) kg/plant in  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively (Tables 5 & 6).

The  $F_1$  population exceeded the two parents in this trait. Its mean was 1.286 kg / plant. Plants of  $F_1$  ranged from 1.080 – 1.560, it is clear that about 22.5% of  $F_1$  plants had higher early yield than  $P_2$  (the earlier parent), the remaining protein was similar to  $P_1$  plants, since they distributed within the range of Super Strain B cultivar (better parent). The average degree of

heterosis in relation to both mid parent (MP) and better parent (BP) was estimated as 34.5 and 18.7%, respectively. These high values suggested presence of hybrid vigour for the high early yield. The postulated hybrid vigour is verified by the high estimated potence ratio (2.58).

Table (5). Statistics obtained for the early fruit weight in parents and hybrid generations of tomato cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B".

Populations	Number of plants	Range	Obtained mean <u>+</u> SE	Theoretical mean	Variances S <sup>2</sup>	c.v.%
S <sub>65</sub> -R <sub>2</sub> (P <sub>1</sub> )	40	0.520-1.080	0.828 <u>+</u> 0.037	-	0.055	25.7
Super Strain B (P <sub>2</sub> )	40	0.920-1.400	1.083 <u>+</u> 0.026	_	0.027	16.2
F <sub>1</sub>	40	1.080-1.560	1.286 <u>+</u> 0.022	0.956	0.020	12.6
F <sub>2</sub>	160	0.600-1.560	1.018 <u>+</u> 0.023	1.100	0.084	26.9
Bcp₁	80	0.520-1.480	0.887 <u>+</u> 0.027	1.057	0.058	24.1
Bcp <sub>2</sub>	80	0.840-1.480	1.112 <u>+</u> 0.017	1.185	0.024	13.3

L.S.D at 5% and 1% level = 0.070 and 0.097, respectively.

Table (6). Frequency distribution for early fruit weight for  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  of the tomato cross " $S_{65}$ - $R_2$  × Super Strain B".

Upper class	Number of plants of each tested population						
limit	$P_1$	P <sub>2</sub>	F <sub>1</sub>	F <sub>2</sub>	Bcp₁	Bcp <sub>2</sub>	
0.440							
0.520	4				3		
0.600	5			11	3		
0.680	3			15	11		
0.760	7			12	11		
0.840	5			14	14	3	
0.920	8	8		12	8	7	
1.000	5	6		13	7	16	
1.080	3	8	4	18	6	18	
1.160		5	4	13	4	12	
1.240		3	8	9	4	9	
1.320		7	6	10	4	6	
1.400		3	9	9	3	2	
1.480			4	15	2		
1.560			5	9			

The obtained mean of  $F_2$  (1.018) was significantly lower than that of the  $F_1$  (1.286) with an inbreeding depression of 20.8%. The reduction of  $F_2$  yield comparing with  $F_1$  may be due to the observed over-dominance in the  $F_1$  population. The expected and obtained  $F_2$  means were also different, indicating that this character clearly affected by the environmental factors and may be controlled by several pairs of genes. The  $F_2$  plants distributed within the range of both parents and  $F_1$  plants, ranging from 0.600 – 1.560 kg / plant without distinct classes. In other word, the distribution of  $F_2$  plants was continuous, suggesting that this trait is under polygenic control.

Also, the plans of  $Bcp_1$  (the recessive parent) distributed in a wide range on the early yield scale with markedly skewness towards the  $P_1$  (the lower parent in early yield). Therefore, the obtained mean of this population was significantly lower than the theoretical one. Moreover, continues distribution of  $Bcp_1$  plants without distinct classes again suggests that the character is under polygenic control. The means of  $Bcp_1$  and  $Bcp_2$  are significantly differed due to the over-dominance of the high early yield. Their means were (0.887 and 1.112 kg/plant), respectively. Most plants of  $Bcp_2$  were distributed within the range exhibited by  $F_1$  and  $P_2$  as expected according to dominance hypothesis.

Examination of variances and variability of various studied populations showed that the non-segregating populations in addition to,  $Bcp_2$  were the least variable as indicated by the calculated variances and cv.%. This indicates that, these populations are more homogeneous comparing with both  $F_2$  and  $Bcp_1$ , which are consisted of different genotypes, particularly when the trait is controlled by many genes.

Estimation of broad sense heritability (BSH%) showed moderate value (59.4%). Genetic coefficient of variation (G.C.V%), predicted gain ( $\Delta$ G) and genetic advance under selection ( $\Delta$ G%) were came to be 22.0, 35.0 and 34.4%, respectively. From all these findings it could be concluded that early yield as fruit weight in this investigation is controlled by several number of genes with over-dominance / or hybrid vigour for the high early yield. The superiority of F<sub>1</sub> production encourage the development of hybrid cultivars for early yield production. Similar results were reported by Khalil (1979), Hassan *et al.* (2000) and Hatem (2003), who mentioned that hybrid vigour was strongly expressed in early yield in tomato.

#### REFERENCES

Ahmed, N.; M. I. Khan and A. J. Gupta (2006). Variability and heritability in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). Environment and Ecology 245 (Special 2): 386 – 388.

Allard, A. M. (1960). Principles of plant breeding. Jhon Wielly and Sons. Inc., New York, U.S.A., p. 92.

- Al-Rawi, K.M. and A.M. Khalf-Allah (1980). Design and analysis of Agriculture Experiments. Text Book, El-Mousil Univ. Press. Ninwa, Iraq, p. 287.
- Burton, G.W. (1951). Quantitative inheritance in pearl millet, (*Pennisetum glaucum*). Agron., 43: 409 417.
- Castle, W.E. and S. Wright (1921). An improved method of estimating the number of genetic factors concerned in cases of blending inheritance. Sci., 54: 223.
- Devi, E.S.; N.B. Singh; A.B. Devi; N.G. Singh and J.M. Laishram (2005). Gene action for fruit yield and its components in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). Indian J. of Genetics and plant Breeding, 65 (3): 221 222.
- Hassan, A.A.; A.E. El-Bagdady and I.A.M. Desouki (1982). Tomato cultivar evaluation: 1980 Summer trials in Giza and Kalubiah. Egypt. J. Hort., 9 (2): 139 152.
- Hassan, A.A.; K.E.A. Abdel-Ati; S.E.S. Moustafa and A.A. Mohammed (2000). Genetics of some tomato fruit quality characters. II. Chemical characters. Egyptian J. Hort., 27 (2): 265 274.
- Hatem, M.K. (2003). Breeding studies on tomato under stress conditions. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric. Minufiya Univ., Egypt, p. 333.
- Hosseny, M. H. (2002). Studies on combining ability of quantitative characters in some tomato cultivars. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 27 (3): 1825 1831.
- Johanson, H.W.; H.F. Robinson and R.E. Comstock (1955). Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans. Agric. J., 47: 314 318.
- Khalil, Mona R. (2004). Breeding studies on tomato. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Minufiya Univ., Egypt, p. 140.
- Khalil, R.M. (1974). Genetical and physiological studies on some pepper varieties. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Ain Shams Univ., p. 87.
- Khalil, R.M.; T.M. El-Gazar and M.M. El-Sayed (1983). Genetics and heritability of number of fruits per plant and fruit weight in tomato, *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. Minufiya J. Agric. Res., 7: 301 317.
- Mather, K. (1949). Biometrical genetics. Dover Publications, Inc., London.
- Mather, K. and J. L. Jinks (1971). Biometrical genetics (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Chapman and Hall, LTD. London, p. 382.
- Miller, P.A.; J.C. Williams; H.F. Robinson and R.E. Comstock (1958). Estimates of genotypic and environmental variances and covariance in upland cotton and their implications in selection. Agron. J., 50:126 131.
- Nassar, H.H. (1982). Tomato cultivar evaluation for summer production in Fayoum. Zagazig Univ. Res. Bull, p. 591.
- Nassar, H.H. (1986). Genotypic variation in yield potential and fruit quality of fall grown fresh market tomatoes. Acta Horticulturae, 190: 545 551.

- Nassar, H.H. (1988). Evaluation of yield and fruit characteristics of some tomato F<sub>1</sub> hybrids grown in Fayoum, Egypt. Annals Agric. Sci., Fac. Agric., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, Egypt, 33 (1): 399 410.
- Nassar, S.H.; W.L. Sims and A.A. Hassan (1984). Nation wide programme of tomato cultivar evaluation in Egypt. 1980 1982 trails. Egypt. J. Hort., 11 (2): 163 190.
- Nitu, K.; J. P. Srivastava; A. K. S. Shekhavat; J. R. Yadav and B. Singh (2007). Genetic variability and heritability of various traits in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). Progressive Agric., 7 (1/2): 08 83.
- Powers, L. (1955). Components of variance method and partitioning method of genetic anlaysis applied to weight per fruit of tomato hybrid and parental populations. U.S. Dept. Agric. Tech. Bull., p. 1131.
- Sashikala, P.; C.P. Suresh and J. Kabir (2002). Studies on post-harvest fruit characters influencing shelf-life of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). Res. on Crops, 3 (1):129 133.
- Singh, B.; S.P. Singh; D. Kumar and H.P.S. Verma (2001). Studies on variability, heritability and genetic advance in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*). Progressive Agric., 1 (1): 76 78.
- Smith, H.H. (1952). Fixing transgressive vigourin *Nicotiana rustiana* rustica. Inheterosis, Iowa State College Press. Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.
- Snedecor G. W. and W. G. Cochran (1973). Statistical Methods. Iowa State Univ., Press, Ames. Iowa. U.S.A.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie (1960). Principals and Procedures of Statistics. Mc Graw, W.Y., p. 481.

1.

# طبيعة وراثة صفة التبكير في الطماطم

عبد الرازق عبد القادر ميدان' ، محمد عبد الفتاح فتح الله' ، عبد الحميد أحمد نوار' ، منى رشدى خلبل'

' قسم البساتين - كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنوفية - شبين الكوم

لا قسم المحاصيل - كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنوفية - شبين الكوم

# الملخص العربي

أجريت هذه الدراسة بمزرعة كلية الزراعة بشبين الكوم – جامعة المنوفية لدراسة طبيعة وراثة صفة التبكير (عدد الأيام من الشتل حتى احمرار أول ثمرة على النبات ، عدد ثمار المحصول المُبكر ، وكمية المحصول المُبكر ) . أستخدم في الدراسة السلالة إس $_{7}$  – آر  $_{7}$  والصنف سوير سترين ب كآباء حيث أجريت التهجينات بينهما للحصول على عشائر الجيل الأول والثاني والجيل الرجعي الأول لكلا الأبوين . وزُرعت التراكيب الوراثية الستة في تجربة مُصمّمة بطريقة القطاعات الكاملة العشوائية وسُبلت القراءات اللازمة على النباتات الفردية لكل عشيرة .

ولقد أوضحت النتائج المتحصل عليها الآتى:

تُعتبر صفتى عدد الأيام من الشتل حتى النضج وعدد ثمار المحصول المُبكر من الصفات البسيطة التوريث حيث يتحكم فيها زوج واحد من العوامل الوراثية ، مع الاختلاف فى درجة السيادة ، فكانت السيادة تامة لفترة النضج القصيرة مع وجود التأثير المُضيف للجينات .

بالنسبة لعدد الثمار فأظهرت سيادة فائقة (قوة هجين) للعدد الكبير من الثمار ، فضلاً عن وجود الفعل المُضيف أيضاً ، ووجود بعض الجينات المُحوّرة (القليلة التأثير) التى تُسهم فى إظهار قوة الهجين الملاحظة فى الجيل الأول . كما أوضحت النتائج أيضاً أن صفة كمية المحصول المُبكر صفة كمية محكومة بعدد من العوامل الوراثية مع وجود السيادة الفائقة (قوة الهجين) للمحصول المُبكر العالى . وهذا يُشجع على إنتاج أصناف هجينية للإنتاج المُبكر فى الطماطم .