

Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research Vol. 8, Issue, 12, pp.43430-43433, December, 2016 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## ESTIMATION OF HETEROSIS, INBREEDING DEPRESSION AND TRANSGRESSIVE SEGREGATION IN MUNGBEAN (VIGNA RADIATA (L.) WILCZEK)

### \*Salunke, M. D., Dr. Pithia, M. S. and Dr. Metha, D. R

Pulses Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh 362 001, Gujarat, India

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT							
Article History: Received 25 <sup>th</sup> September, 2016 Received in revised form 18 <sup>th</sup> October, 2016 Accepted 14 <sup>th</sup> November, 2016 Published online 30 <sup>th</sup> December, 2016	Two mungbean crosses namely, GM 4 x BPMR 145 and K 851 x AKM 6822 made during <i>kharif</i> season (2012) were studied for estimation of heterosis, inbreeding depression and transgressive segregation. The $F_2$ and $F_3$ generations of both the crosses were sown in randomized block design and data were recorded on days to initiation of flower, days to maturity, plant height, number of branches per plant, number of clusters per plant, number of pods per cluster, number of pods per plant, pod length, 100 seed weight and seed yield per plant. The significant and positive heterosis was fond in							
Key words:	100 seed weight in both the crosses. None of character showed significant inbreeding depression in cross K 851 x AKM 6822 and in cross GM 4 x BPMR 145, 100 seed weight showed positive and gignificant inbracking depression. In F. concertion of CM 4 y BPMR 145, forty per cert plant							
Heterosis, Inbreeding depression, Transgressive segregation, Mungbean.	significant inbreeding depression. In $F_2$ generation of GM 4 x BPMR 143, forty per cent plant population showed transgression for seed yield per plant, while in $F_3$ generation 50 % of plant population showed upper limit transgression segregants for seed yield per plant. However in cross K 851 x AKM 6822, $F_2$ generation showed the 80 % transgressive segregants for seed yield per plant while in $F_3$ population maximum 90 % of transgressive segregants were observed for seed yield.							

*Copyright©2016, Salunke et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Salunke, M. D., Dr. Pithia, M. S. and Dr. Metha, D. R, 2016. "Estimation of Heterosis, Inbreeding depression and Transgressive Segregation in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek)", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (12), 43430-43433.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Mungbean (Vigna radiata (L.) Wilczek) is an important source of protein in India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam, among other countries. Farmers grow it as a supplemental crop or cash crop. Mungbean is the shortest maturing field crop. However, its yield is low compared to other grain legumes. The annual increase in production comes mainly from the increase in cultivated area. Yield productivity is not easily achieved by the current methods of cultivar improvement and cultural practices. Using hybrid cultivars can improve the vield limitation in pure line cultivars. Heterosis or hybrid vigor is manifested by F1 hybrids. Hybrid varieties have contributed greatly worldwide to the production of many crop species, including the most important food crops such as maize and rice. The commercial exploitation of heterosis has been one of the driving forces behind the rapid and extensive development of seed production. Heterosis breeding has allowed yield breakthroughs in several crops, including crosspollinated, often cross-pollinated, and self-pollinated species. The exploitation of heterosis to raise productivity in grain legumes, as in any other crop, depends on three major factors: the magnitude of heterosis, feasibility of large-scale production of hybrid seeds and type of gene action involved.

#### \*Corresponding author: Salunke, M. D.,

Pulses Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh 362 001, Gujarat, India.

The conventional idea of hybridization is to combine the desirable characteristic in a new derivative already present in the parents. Perhaps a more imaginative approach to plant breeding is to consider the possibilities of transgressive segregation. Transgressive segregants are obtained in segregating generations due to accumulation of favorable alleles by means of segregation and recombination, from the parent involved in the hybridization. Studies of quantitative traits in segregating hybrid populations sometimes report the presence of phenotypes that are extreme relative to those of either parental line (deVicente and Tanksley, 1993; Rieseberg and Ellstrand, 1993; Cosse et al., 1995). The generation of these extreme phenotypes is referred to as transgressive segregation, and this is a major mechanism by which extreme or novel adaptations observed in new hybrid ecotypes or species are thought to arise. If transgressive segregation is frequent, then an important evolutionary role for hybridization is more easily explained. Note that transgressive segregation is a phenomenon specific to segregating hybrid generations and refers to the fraction of individuals that exceed parental phenotypic values in either a negative or positive direction. This is caused in part by heterosis, which is most pronounced in first-generation hybrids, and is implicated when the mean trait value of the hybrids exceeds (in a positive direction only) the phenotypic values of both parental lines. As will be shown below, the genetic basis of transgressive segregation appears to be largely distinct from that underlying heterosis.

		Cross I (GM 4 x B	PMR 145)	Cross II (K 851 x AKM 6822)					
Characters	Per cent	heterosis over	Interesting domagning (0/)	Per cent	heterosis over	Inhuseding domagning (9/)			
	Better parent	Standard heterosis	indreeding depression (%)	Better parent Standard heteros		indiceding depression (%)			
Days to initiation of flower	$4.97 \pm 3.18$	$4.98 \pm 3.19$	$-1.34* \pm 3.13$	$3.41 \pm 3.17$	$10.36 \pm 2.91$	$0.94 \pm 2.81$			
Days to maturity	$0.97 \pm 2.52$	$0.41 \pm 2.47$	$-1.35^* \pm 2.93$	$1.90 \pm 3.73$	$4.36 \pm 3.66$	$0.29 \pm 3.86$			
Plant height (cm)	$-13.48 \pm 4.32$	$0.97 \pm 4.33$	$-7.44 \pm 6.39$	$3.68 \pm 5.65$	$16.70 \pm 5.11$	$-11.30 \pm 5.42$			
Number of branches per plant	$3.95 \pm 4.23$	$0.00 \pm 0.56$	$13.30 \pm 5.15$	$9.95 \pm 3.51$	$7.39 \pm 0.59$	$5.66 \pm 4.18$			
Number of clusters per plant	$2.75 \pm 0.90$	$45.69 \pm 4.23$	$1.67 \pm 1.24$	$12.64 \pm 0.94$	$52.96 \pm 3.73$	$-7.21 \pm 1.22$			
Number of pods per cluster	$11.25 \pm 12.63$	$2.75 \pm 0.90$	$14.76 \pm 16.78$	$14.82 \pm 11.02$	$3.59 \pm 0.78$	$-1.65 \pm 16.63$			
Number of pods per plant	$-6.88 \pm 0.54$	$46.70 \pm 12.63$	$3.62 \pm 0.53$	$2.78 \pm 0.50$	$65.07 \pm 11.59$	$2.70 \pm 0.64$			
Pod length (cm)	$19.09 \pm 2.03$	$26.28 \pm 2.04$	$17.38 \pm 1.76$	$9.56 \pm 2.05$	$10.27 \pm 2.18$	$7.39 \pm 1.85$			
100- Seed weight (g)	$1.61 \pm 0.34$	$29.05^{**} \pm 0.40$	$26.48* \pm 0.41$	$23.13 \pm 0.42$	$20.49^{**} \pm 0.50$	$-11.34 \pm 0.51$			
Seed yield per plant (g)	$16.75\pm2.83$	$18.51 \pm 2.83$	$9.55 \pm 3.93$	$35.91\pm2.70$	$26.71 \pm 2.89$	$-5.82 \pm 7.09$			

Table 1. Estimates of heterosis and inbreeding depression in cross I (GM 4 x BPMR 145) and cross II (K 851 x AKM 6822) of mungbean

\*, \*\* Significant at P=0.05 and P=0.01, respectively

Table 2. Significant transgressive segregants in F<sub>2</sub> and F<sub>3</sub> populations of GM 4 x BPMR 145 (Cross I)

Characters	P <sub>1</sub> (GM 4)	P <sub>2</sub> (BPMR 145)	$F_2$	F <sub>3</sub>	Per cent improvement of $F_3$ over $F_2$		I	F2		F <sub>3</sub>			
Characters						No. (L)	%	No. (U)	%	No. (L)	%	No. (U)	%
Days to initiation of flower	$40.17\pm0.58$	$45.47\pm0.49$	$42.73\pm0.39$	$41.05\pm0.33$	-3.93	0	0	1	5	2	10	0	0
Days to maturity	$65.13 \pm 0.48$	$64.77 \pm 0.51$	$66.28\pm0.49$	$67.90 \pm 0.38$	2.44	4	20	12	60	0	0	19	95
Plant height (cm)	$41.07\pm0.83$	$47.93 \pm 0.72$	$44.55 \pm 1.21$	$43.98 \pm 0.91$	-1.28	4	20	4	20	5	25	3	15
Number of branches per plant	$2.30 \pm 0.14$	$2.47 \pm 0.11$	$2.22 \pm 0.90$	$2.23 \pm 0.10$	0.45	8	40	3	15	7	35	4	20
Number of clusters per plant	$9.97 \pm 0.55$	$13.47 \pm 1.10$	$12.12 \pm 0.76$	$10.70 \pm 0.56$	-11.72	4	20	4	20	6	30	2	10
Number of pods per cluster	$4.73 \pm 0.14$	$4.53 \pm 0.20$	$4.78 \pm 0.22$	$5.44 \pm 0.22$	13.81	9	45	6	30	4	20	15	75
Number of pods per plant	$29.40 \pm 1.80$	$38.77 \pm 3.88$	$36.77 \pm 2.78$	$35.50 \pm 2.07$	-3.45	2	10	5	25	3	15	5	25
Pod length (cm)	$6.64 \pm 0.50$	$7.02 \pm 0.35$	$6.91 \pm 0.27$	$6.65 \pm 0.24$	-3.76	4	20	7	35	7	35	4	20
100- seed weight (g)	$3.27 \pm 0.07$	$4.15 \pm 0.80$	$3.10 \pm 0.07$	$4.45 \pm 0.10$	43.55	11	55	0	0	0	0	4	20
Seed yield per plant (g)	$13.40\pm0.56$	$11.79\pm0.50$	$14.08\pm0.73$	$14.78\pm0.76$	4.97	4	20	8	40	4	20	10	50

L = Lower limit; U = Upper limit

Table 3. Significant transgressive segregants in F<sub>2</sub> and F<sub>3</sub> populations of K 851 x AKM 6822 (Cross II)

Characters	P <sub>1</sub> (K 851)	P <sub>2</sub> (AKM 68 22)	$F_2$	F <sub>3</sub>	Per cent improvement of $F_3$ over $F_2$		I	F2		F <sub>3</sub>			
						No. (L)	%	No. (U)	%	No. (L)	%	No. (U)	%
Days to initiation of flower	$45.40\pm0.7$	$42.87 \pm 0.54$	$44.75\pm0.38$	$44.77\pm0.34$	0.04	2	10	4	20	2	10	5	25
Days to maturity	$67.33 \pm 0.66$	$66.70 \pm 0.54$	$67.77 \pm 0.44$	$68.40\pm0.60$	0.93	3	15	9	45	4	20	12	60
Plant height (cm)	$46.23 \pm 1.13$	$45.77 \pm 1.30$	$53.27 \pm 0.71$	$45.62 \pm 0.96$	-14.36	0	0	19	95	6	30	7	35
Number of branches per plant	$2.40\pm0.10$	$2.20 \pm 0.10$	$2.40 \pm 0.11$	$2.40 \pm 0.09$	0.00	5	25	8	40	6	30	10	50
Number of clusters per plant	$11.43\pm0.38$	$13.20 \pm 0.67$	$13.90 \pm 0.57$	$16.28 \pm 0.65$	17.12	2	10	9	45	0	0	17	85
Number of pods per cluster	$4.20\pm0.22$	$4.32 \pm 0.25$	$5.25 \pm 0.23$	$5.29 \pm 0.15$	0.76	1	5	16	80	0	0	18	90
Number of pods per plant	$34.93 \pm 1.39$	$42.27 \pm 3.03$	$49.33 \pm 2.95$	$48.8 \pm 2.46$	-1.07	2	10	11	55	0	0	11	55
Pod length (cm)	$6.26\pm0.44$	$6.50 \pm 0.36$	$6.76 \pm 0.24$	$6.96 \pm 0.24$	2.96	3	15	9	45	3	15	13	65
100- seed weight (g)	$3.20 \pm 0.05$	$2.87 \pm 0.05$	$4.39\pm0.08$	$3.67 \pm 0.05$	-16.40	0	0	20	100	0	0	18	90
Seed yield per plant (g)	$11.31\pm0.45$	$12.41 \pm 0.61$	$16.49\pm0.75$	$16.21\pm0.67$	-1.70	1	5	16	80	0	0	18	90

L = Lower limit; U = Upper limit

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Four diverse genotypes of mungbean viz., GM 4, BPMR 145, K 851 and AKM 6822 were used for crossing. The two crosses, GM 4 x BPMR 145 (Cross I) and K 851 x AKM 8802 (Cross II) were attempted during *kharif* 2012. Half of the  $F_1$  seeds of both the crosses were sown in summer 2013,  $F_1$ s were selfed to get  $F_2$  seeds of both the single crosses, and  $F_2$ s were selfed to get  $F_3$  seeds of both the single crosses. The final experiment comprising of two F<sub>2</sub>s and F<sub>3</sub>s along with the parent were grown in randomized block design with three replications at Pulses Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during summer 2014. Each plot consisted of 5 meter row length with inner and intra row spacing of 45 x 10 cm, respectively. The parents and F<sub>1</sub>s were grown as single row each; whereas, each F2s and F3s had two rows. The observations were recorded on 10 randomly selected plants in each parent and F<sub>1</sub>s and 20 randomly selected plants for F<sub>2</sub> and  $F_3$  generations for 10 quantitative traits. The heterotic effects in terms of superiority of F<sub>1</sub> over better parent (Heterobeltiosis) as per Fonseca and Patterson (1968) and standard heterosis were worked out, the data on individual plant for each character were taken and mean, range, standard deviations, standard error of means, variances and standard variates were computed following standard statistical methods (Panse and Sukhatme, 1985).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this investigation of heterosis and inbreeding depression of both the crosses, there is not a single character which showed significant desirable heterobeltiosis in cross I as well as in cross II, while, in case of standard heterosis, significant and positive heterosis was fond in 100 seed weight in both the crosses (Table 1.). The observed heterosis was found to have resulted either due to the action of dominance component only or due to the epistasis for 100 seed weight. Similar results were reported by Singh and Pathak (1992), Singh et al. (1993), Vikas et al. (1998), Vikas and Singh (1998), Sawale et al. (2003), Patil et al. (2014), Yadav et al. (2015). It is also interesting to note the prevalence of significant inbreeding depression for 100 seed weight in cross I. But it was negative and non significant in cross II. The extent of heterosis over standard variety GM 4 was more than 45 per cent in case of number of clusters per plant and number of pods per plant in both the crosses. In seed yield, heterosis over better parent and standard variety GM 4 were also considerable with non significant value of inbreeding depression. Similar results were found by Patil et al. (1992), Reddy et al. (2003), Sawale et al. (2003), Khan et al. (2005), Tyagi et al. (2006), Ramakant and Shrivastava (2012), Patil et al. (2014) and Yadav et al. (2015). None of character showed significant inbreeding depression in cross II, while in cross I, 100 seed weight showed positive and significant inbreeding depression (Table. 1). Similar results were reported by Joseph and Santosh kumar (2000). But days to initiation of flower and days to maturity showed negative significant inbreeding depression. Ramakant and Srivastava (2012) reported that negative and significant inbreeding depression for days to 50 % flowering and days to maturity during kharif. In cross I, the F<sub>2</sub> generation of GM 4 x BPMR 145, forty per cent plant population showed transgression for seed yield per plant, while in  $F_3$  generation 50 % of plant population showed upper limit transgressive segregants for seed yield per plant, with of 4.97 of per cent improvement of  $F_3$  over  $F_2$  (Table 2.). In other hand

all the yield contributing traits showed less transgressive segregants in F2 as well as F3 except number of pods per cluster (30 %, 75 %) in cross I. In case of cross II,  $F_2$  generation showed the 80 % transgressive segregants for seed yield per plant and 100 % transgressive segregants in 100 seed weight. But in case of F<sub>3</sub> population maximum (90 %) of transgressive segregants were observed for seed yield and 100 seed weight (Table 3.). Most of the yield contributing traits in  $F_2$  and  $F_3$ generation also showed maximum transgressive segregants, such as number of branches per plant (40 %, 50 %) number of pods per cluster (80 %, 90 %), number of pods per plants (55 %, 55 %), pod length (45 %, 65 %). Reddy et al. (1999) also reported that F<sub>2</sub> generation showed transgression for seed yield per pod, seed yield per plant and pods per plant. Singh et al. (1996) also observed, desirable transgressive segregants in advance generation for plant height, number of branches per plant, pods per plant, pod length and seed yield per plant. Dhole and Reddy (2011) reported that transgressive segregants were recorded in F<sub>2</sub> generation for 100 seed weight and seed yield per plant. Ajay et al. (2014) also reported, highest transgressive segregants in F2 and F3 generations of mungbean for pods per plant and seed yield per plant.

#### REFERENCES

- Ajay, B.C., Byregowda, M., Prashanth, B. H., Veer Kumar, G. N. and Reena, M. 2014. Variability and transgressive segregation for yield and yield contributing traits in pigeonpea crosses. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 5: 786-791.
- Cosse, A. A., Campbell, M. G., Glover, T. J., Linn, C. E., Todd, J. L., Baker, T. C. and Roelofs, W. L. 1995. Pheromone behavioral responses in unusual male European corn borer hybrid progeny not correlated to electrophysiological phenotypes of their pheromone specific antennal neurons. *Experientia*, 51:809-816.
- De Vicente, M. C. and Tanksley, S. D. 1993. QTL analysis of transgressive segregation in an interspecifc tomato cross. *Genetics*, 134: 585-596.
- Dhole, V. J. and Reddy, K. S. 2011. Genetic analysis and transgressive segregation for seed weight and seed yield in F<sub>2</sub> populations of mungbean. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 2: 384-391.
- Fonseca, S and Patterson, L. 1968. Hybrid vigour in a seven parents diallel crosses in common winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Crop Sci.*, 8: 85-88.
- Joseph, J. and Santosh kumar, A. V. 2000. Heterosis and inbreeding depression in green gram (*Vigna radiata*). *Legume Res.*, 23: 118-121.
- Khan, M. S. S., Abdul, L. T. S. and Latafat, P. 2005. Expression of heterosis in mungbean for yield and yield components in semi-arid region. *Indus J. Plant Sci.*, 4:530-534.
- Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. 1985. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. Indian council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi.
- Patil, A. B., Desai, N. C., Chuhan, D. A. and Chougule, G. R. 2014. Heterosis for seed yield and yield attributing traits in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *BIOINFOLET*. 11: 386-390.
- Patil, A. B., Desai, N. C., Chuhan, D. A. and Chougule, G. R. 2014. Heterosis for seed yield and yield attributing traits in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *BIOINFOLET*. 11: 386-390.

- Patil, A. J., Wanjari, K. B. Patil, A. N., Raut, B. R. and Ghawghawe. 1992. Studies on heterosis in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *Journal of soils and Crops*, 2 : 1-4.
- Ramakant, and Srivastava, R. K. 2012. Heterosis and inbreeding depressing in urdbean (*Vigna mungo* L. Hepper). *Journal of Food Legume*. 25 : 102-108.
- Ramakant, and Srivastava, R. K. 2012. Heterosis and inbreeding depressing in urdbean (*Vigna mungo* L. Hepper). *Journal of Food Legume*. 25 : 102-108.
- Reddy, V. L. N., Reddisekhar, M., Reddy, K. R. and Reddy, K. H. 2003. Heterosis for yield and its components in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *Legume Res.*, 26: 248-253.
- Rieseberg, L. H. and Ellstrand, N. C. 1993. What can morphological and molecular markers tell us about plant hybridization? *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*, 12: 213-241.
- Sawale, V. S., Patil, J. V., Deshmukh, R. B. and Kute, N. S. 2003. Heterosis and inbreeding depression for yield and yield components in mungbean. *Legume Res.*, 26: 134-136.
- Singh, M. N., Singh, R. M. and Singh, U. P. 1996. Studies on hybrids and transgressive segregates in wide crosses of mungbean and urdbean. *Indian J. Genet.*, 56: 109-113.
- Singh, R. P. and Pathak, M. M. 1992. Heterosis in mungbean (Vigna radiata L. Wilczek). Agric. Sci. Digest., 12: 44-46.

- Singh, V. P., Singh, V. N., Verma, M. M., Virk, D. S. and Chahal, G. S. 1993. Heterosis for nodulation and yield traits in mungbean. Heterosis breeding in crop plants theory and application: short communications: symposium Ludhiana 23-24 February 1993. 120-121.
- Tyagi, K., Kumar, A., Tomer, Singh, V. K. and Nandan, R. 2006. Heterosis and inbreeding depression in mungbean (*Vigna radiate* (L.)Wilczek). *Res. on crops.*,7: 458-460.
- Vikas, and Singh, S. P. 1998. Heterosis for yield and its contributing characters over environments in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *Annals of Biology*, 14: 175-179.
- Vikas, Paroda, R. S. and Singh, S. P. 1998. Heterosis in line x tester crosses for yield and yield contributing characters over environments in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). Ann. Agric. Bio. Res., 3: 217-222.
- Yadav, P. S., Lavanya, G. P., Vishwakarma, M. K., Saxesna, R. R., Baranwal, D. K. and Singh, S. 2015. Heterosis studies using diallel analysis for yield and component characters in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *The Bioscan*, 10: 711-713.
- Yadav, P. S., Lavanya, G. P., Vishwakarma, M. K., Saxesna, R. R., Baranwal, D. K. and Singh, S. 2015. Heterosis studies using diallel analysis for yield and component characters in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *The Bioscan*, 10: 711-713.

\*\*\*\*\*\*