# COMBINING ABILITY IN CHICKPEA

# C. L. L. GOWDA\* and P. N. BAHL

Division of Genetics, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi-110 012

To form a sound basis for any breeding programme aimed to achieve higher yields, breeders must have genetic information on the nature of the combining ability of the elite parents to be used in hybridization programmes. The present investigation was undertaken to get information on the combining ability for yield and yield components of seven chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cultivars by diallel analysis.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Seven chickpea cultivars, P-813 (Mexico), P-851 (USSR), P-1139 (India), C-235 (India), P-9624 (Mexico), ICP-71 (Jordan) and P-1821 (USA) were crossed in all possible combinations, without reciprocals. The 21  $F_1$ 's and 7 parents were planted during *rabi* 1973–74 in a randomized block design with two replications at the Division of Genetics, IARI, New Delhi. The seeds were dibbled in 1.5 meter long rows at 15 cm intervals and row to row distance was 60 cm. Observations were recorded on three random plants in each plot. In rabi 1974–75, the 21  $F_2$ 's and 7 parents were planted in randomized block design with four replications. Each entry was sown in a plot of 5 rows of 2 meter length at a spacing of 60  $\times$  20 cm. Twenty random plants were selected from the middle three rows for taking observations. Data were recorded on seven characters, viz., plant height (cm), number of branches per plant, flowering time (number of days from seedling to flowering), number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod (in  $F_2$ ), 100-seed weight (gm) and seed yield (gm) per plant. The combining ability analysis was done according to Model I, Method 2 of Griffing (1956).

## RESULTS

The analysis of variance for general and specific combining ability are presented in Table 1. In  $F_1$ , mean squares due to general and specific combining ability were significant for plant height, flowering time, pod number and seed yield. Branch number and 100-seed weight showed significant variation for s.c.a. and g.c.a. respectively. In  $F_2$ , mean squares due to g.c.a. were significant for all characters except branch number and seed yield.

Variance for general combining abilty for plant height  $(F_1, F_2)$  100-seed weight  $(F_1, F_2)$ , flowering time  $(F_2)$  and pod number  $(F_2)$  were higher than s.c.a. variances for these traits. The magnitude of s.c.a. variances were higher than g.c.a. variances in case of branch number and seed yield in both the generations.

Combining ability effects: Estimates of g.c.a. effects for different characters in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations are given in Table 2. P-1821, P-9624 and ICP-71

A part of thesis submitted by C. L. L. Gowda for the Ph.D. degree of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi.

<sup>\*</sup>Present address: ICRISAT, 1-11-256, Begumpet, Hyderabad-500 016, INDIA.

ы
_
1
<b>m</b>
<
r i

Gener- ation	Gener- Source d.f. ation	d.f.	Plant height	Branch number	Flowering time	Pod number	Seeds per pod	100-seed weight	Sced yield
     <b>1</b> 4	G C.A.	1 9 1	166.061** 51.857**	2.552 1.016	84.798** 124.911**	980.328** 6348.722**	0.019**	83 · 068** 150 · 884**	
	S.C.A.	$^{21}_{21}$	16.852* 13.458	3.346*1.019	$20.910^{**}$ 42.381	$601 \cdot 872 * * 593 \cdot 918$	$() \cdot 004^{**}$	$\frac{1\cdot372}{0\cdot559}$	15.259** 33.629
, - «	Error		$8.609 \\ 9.189$	$\begin{array}{c}1\cdot 628\\0\cdot 737\end{array}$	3.625 45.491	206.769 591.030	0.001	$0.799 \\ 0.749$	4.856 27.726
<u>-</u>	Vgca	1 1	17.495 4.740	$\begin{array}{c} 0\cdot103\\ 0\cdot031\end{array}$	9.019 8.824	$\frac{85.951}{639.743}$	0.002	9.141 16.681	6.745 0.000
Т. Ч.	Vsca		8.243 4.269	$1 \cdot 720 \\ 0 \cdot 282$	17.285 0.000	$395 \cdot 103$ $2 \cdot 888$	0.003	0.573 0.000	10.403 $\overline{5}.903$

respectively.
levels
1 0 C
and
at 5%
**=significant
* and

showed g.c.a. for tallness, while P-813, C-235 and P-851 for dwarfness either in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . P-9624 and C-235 contributed towards earliness and P-813 and P-821 for lateness in both the generations. For high pod number P-813 and C-235 were good combiners. P-9624 followed by ICP-71 and P-1821 was the best general combiner for 100-seed weight in  $F_1$  as well as  $F_2$  generations. For seed yield *per se* P-9624 and ICP-71 were the good combiners. Also, considering the overall performance for all the characters, P-9624 and ICP-71 were the best general combiners.

Estimates of s.c.a. effects of the 21 crosses are summarised in Table 3. Four crosses, P-813  $\times$  ICP-71, P-813  $\times$  P-1821, C-235  $\times$  P-9624 and ICP-71  $\times$  P-1821 showed significant s.c.a. effects for seed yield and pod number. Out of the five parents involved in these four crosses, two were high combiners for yield as well as 100-seed weight, two for pod number and one for 100-seed weight only. Two of the crosses, P-813  $\times$  P-1821 and P-851  $\times$  C-235 exhibited positive significant s.c.a. effects for plant height. For higher branch number three cross combinations, P-851  $\times$  P-1821, P-1139  $\times$  P-9624 and P-1139  $\times$  ICP-71 showed highly significant s.c.a. effects. P-813  $\times$  P-1821 gave highly significant s.c.a. for earliness though both the parents of this cross are good combiners for late flowering.

# DISCUSSION

In the present investigation, variances due to g.c.a. were of higher magnitude than corresponding s.c.a. variances in respect of plant height, 100-seed weight, flowering time  $(F_2)$  and pod number  $(F_2)$ . However, for seeds per pod, both g.c.a. and s.c.a. variances were equally important. Combining ability analysis, therefore, suggests that additive genetic variance is playing more important role in the inheritance of these characters. Earlier studies by Athwal and Sandha (1967), Zafar and Khan (1968), Lal (1972) and Dhaliwal and Gill (1973) also showed predominantly additive genetic control for one or more of these characters. However, Gupta and Ramanujam (1974) reported nonadditive gene action to be more prominent for these characters in their material. In case of branch number and seed yield s.c.a. variances were higher than the corresponding g.c.a. indicating the predominance of non-additive gene action. Such results were reported earlier by Gupta and Ramanujam (1974).

Estimates of g.c.a. effects showed that it was difficult to pick good combiners for all the characters together because the combining ability effects were not consistent for all the yield components, possibly because of negative association among some of the characters. However, P-9624 and ICP-71 were found to be good combiners for seed yield *per se* and for most of the yield components. From the tabulated data it could be generalized that parents which showed high g.c.a. effects for pod number and 100-seed weight resulted in specific cross combinations which excelled in seed yield. Also, crosses showing positive significant s.c.a. effects for seed yield invariably showed significant s.c.a. effects for high pod

C1
Ξ
AB
H

.

Estimates of general combining ability effects for various characters in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ 

Parent	Parent Generation	Plant height	Branch number	Flowering time	Pod number	Seeds per pod	100-seed weight	Seed yield
P-813	یہ <mark>ہے</mark> ا	$-1 \cdot 199 *$ -2 · 462 **	-0.046 0.485	2.458	5.360 17.372*	0.072**	-2.887** -3.441**	-1.511* -1.301
<b>P-</b> 851	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-6 •255** -2 •402**	-0.285 0.306	0.882 2.000**	-10.436* $25.504**$	-0.006	-2.558** - $3.566$ **	$-2 \cdot 804 ** -1 \cdot 236$
P-1139		0.754 -1.434	-0.637 0.122	-1.541*0.972	-3·751 19·116**	-0.018	-0.438 -1.215**	$-1 \cdot 116$ 2 $\cdot 021$
C-235	'ĔĔ	$-4 \cdot 365 ** -0 \cdot 297$	-0.599 -0.085	$-1 \cdot 116 $ -0 $\cdot 915$	11 · 525* 22 · 025**	$0.043^{**}$	$-2\cdot 359 ** -3\cdot 526 **$	-0.318 -6.558
<b>P-9624</b>	, F. F.	4.550 ** 2.609 **	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \cdot 659 \\ -0 \cdot 401 \end{array}$	-5.560 ** - $8.004$ **	4 ⋅ 842 - 35 ⋅ 122**	- 0 • 067**	5.580** 7.009**	5.254** 2.618
ICP-71	'ĽĽ	5.327** $0.287$	0.492 -0.022	$1 \cdot 161 $ $1 \cdot 014$	$8.821 \\ -23.860 $	-0-006	1.483** 3.304**	1.745*0.165
<b>P-</b> 1821	[파파 4 0	$1 \cdot 188 \\ 3 \cdot 700 **$	0.417 -0.404	3 · 716** 2 · 808**	-16·361** -25·035**	-0.013	1 • 180** 1 • 435**	$-1 \cdot 248 \\ -1 \cdot 708$
SE (gi) SE (gi)	FT L	$\pm 0.901$ $\pm 0.936$	N.S.	± 0.579 ± 0.628	$\frac{\pm 4.437}{\pm 7.502}$	±0.011	$\pm 0.276$ $\pm 0.267$	$\pm 0.680$ N.S.
<b>#</b>	and **=signifi	nificant at 5% and 1% levels respectively; NS=Non-significant.	1% levels re	spectively; NS=	=Non-signific:	ant.		

248

51. No.	Cross	Plant height	<b>Bra</b> nch number	Flowering time	Pod number	100-seed weight	Seed yield
P-81	~ - P-	-2.005	0.638	$-2 \cdot 100$	23.401*	0.241	1 · 005
P-81	$\times$ P.	0.064	-0.349	-0.505	11.546	$2.238^{**}$	0.978
P-8]	č × ∞	2.934	0.612	-0.431	-28.236*	0.450	-3.690*
4. P-815	$3 \times P.9624$	$2 \cdot 188$	-0.806	2.513	$-31 \cdot 377*$	0.580	-5.523**
P-81	$3 \times 10^{\circ}$	-0.508	0.020	0.460	45.803 * *	-0.493	6.385**
P.81	З Х Р-	5.630*	0.765	-5.264**	31.326*	0.490	7.349**
	ا × ا	3.871	-0.110	-0.260	9-173	-0.040	0.571
	ز × -	$5 \cdot 821 *$	0.021	4 • 144**	$6 \cdot 895$	-0.598	0.572
	$\times$ P-	3.074	-0.737	4.918**	-1.250	-0.878	-2.649
	$\times$ IC	$-2 \cdot 121$	$-1 \cdot 400$	$1 \cdot 856$	2.600	1.407	1.929
	ч Ч	-10.063 **	$5 \cdot 173 **$	-1.519	-5.876	-1.248	-0.647
	с ×	-3.348	$1 \cdot 043$	2.568	$8 \cdot 881$	0.961	1.924
	ч Х	3·814	3.115**	$5.013^{**}$	18.394	0.271	2.632
	$\frac{1}{2}$	$0 \cdot 708$	1.951*	$1 \cdot 209$	$6 \cdot 085$	-0.332	$0 \cdot 141$
15. P-1139	<b>ь</b> Х	-1.493	$-1 \cdot 813$	2.594	-13.060	0.721	$-2 \cdot 115$
		1.514	0.907	1.757	31.616*	-0.967	3.833**
	×	$3 \cdot 408$	$-1 \cdot 086$	-1.964	$-13 \cdot 361$	-0.641	$-1 \cdot 157$
	<b>Ъ</b> ×	$-3 \cdot 533$	-0.511	-0.360	$-26 \cdot 008*$	-0.267	-2.844
	×	-3.758	-0.344	3 · 309 : *	$-23 \cdot 838$	-2.161 * *	5·409**
	Ъ Х	2.630	0.229	9.084**	$-1 \cdot 825$	0.112	-2.706
	Ч Ч	l •683	1.556	$1 \cdot 361$	38 · 025 * *	0.088	5.692**
SF /S	( <b>S</b> ::)	0.530	010 0		000001	0000	

# July, 1978]

249

\* and \*\*=significant at 5% and 1% levels respectively.

**TABLE** 3

Estimates of specific combining ability effects for various characters in F.

number. These results suggest that grain yield is largely dependent upon pod number and 100-seed weight. Similar conclusions were reported earlier by path coefficient analysis in chickpea (Bahl, Mehra and Raju, 1976).

Predominance of additive genetic variability for plant height, flowering time, pod number, seeds per pod and 100-seed weight indicates that genetic advance in these characters can be made by simple breeding procedures involving selection based on progeny performance. Non-additive genetic variances in case of branch number and yield *per se*, as indicated by the predominance of s.c.a. variances, can possibly be exploited through heterosis breeding. However, in the absence of biological feasibility—a pre-requisite for heterosis breeding—such genetic variability could be exploited by recurrent selection. Also, it can be concluded from the data that genetically diverse and high combining parents should be used in formulating cross combinations. Selection by progeny testing as well as recurrent selection can then be used to evolve lines which may transgress both the combining parents.

## SUMMARY

The present investigation was undertaken to study combining ability for yield and yield components in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). Of the seven parents in this study, P-9624 and ICP-71 were good combiners for yield per se and also for most of the yield characters. It is evident from the results of g.c.a. and s.c.a. effects that seed yield is largely dependent upon pod number and 100-seed weight. General combining ability variances were higher than s.c.a. variances for plant height, flowering time, pod number and 100-seed weight. Simple breeding procedure involving selection based on progeny performance, which is expected to mop up additive variances effectively, has been suggested for improving these traits. For branch number and yield per se s.c.a. variances were more important indicating the predominance of non-additive genetic variances in the inheritance of these characters. Therefore, genetic advance for branch number and yield per se will be difficult by simple selection. Recurrent selection can be effectively used for making improvement in these two characters. It is further concluded that simple selection by progeny testing and recurrent selection should be used to evolve high yielding lines in this crop.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors express their deep sense of gratitude to Dr. H. K. Jain, Director, IARI, for suggesting the problem and fcr constant guidance and constructive criticism throughout the course of this investigation. Thanks are also due to Mr. R. B. Mehra, who went through the manuscript critically and offered very useful suggestions. Senior author gratefully acknowledges the grant of research fellowship by ICAR for his post-graduate study.

#### REFERENCES

Athwal, D. S. and G. S. Sandha (1967). Inheritance of seed size and seed number per pod in Cicer. Indian J. Genet., 27: 21-33. July, 1978]

- Bahl, P. N., R. B. Mehra and D. B. Raju (1976). Path analysis and its implications for chickpea breeding.
   *Z. Pflanzenziichtg*, 77: 67-71.
   Dhaliwal, H. S. and A. S. Gill (1973). Studies of heterosis, combining ability and inheritance of yield and
- and yield components in a diallel cross of Bengal gram (Cicer arietinum L.). Theor. appl. Genet., 43: 381-86.
- Griffing, B. (1956). Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel cross systems. Aust. J. Biol. Sci., 9: 463-92.
  Gupta, V. P. and S. Ramanujam (1974). Genetic architecture of yield and yield components in chickpea. Indian J. Genet. 34A: 793-97.
  Lal, B. (1972). Diallel analysis of grain yield and some other quantitative traits in Bengal gram (Cicer).

- arietinum L.). M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Punjab Agric. Univ. Ludhiana. Zafar, A. M. and M. A. Khan (1968). Genetic studies in gram (Cicer arietinum L.). Comparative studies on gram hybrids and their parents. W. Pak. J. agric. Res., 6: 33-41.