

## Original Research Article

### ESTIMATION OF COMBINING ABILITY IN BREAD WHEAT USING LINE X TESTER ANALYSIS

#### Abstract

Nine bread wheat genotypes were evaluated at experimental research farm during 2023-24 to study general and specific combining ability for some quantitative characters in bread wheat. These genotypes were crossed with three wheat cultivars to produce twenty-seven crosses using Line x tester analysis. The genotypes (parents and crosses) exhibited highly significant variation for all traits studied indicating the presence of genotypic differences among these twelve genotypes under investigation. The mean square of parent vs crosses was found to be highly significant for all traits studied except 1000 grain weight. Further partitioning of crosses mean squares i.e., Line x tester analysis showed highly significant for all traits studied. The lines PBW 725, GW 273 and tester PBW 343 exhibited significant GCA for grain yield. The lines PBW 725, HD 2893 and Phuleunnat which performed good combining ability effects for biological yield per plant were also good combiners. Among the cross combination PBW 725 × PBW 343 showed significant positive SCA for grain yield and biological yield per plant, whereas, PBW 725 × Faisalabad 2005, HD 2893 × HW 2045 and GW 273 × PBW 343 was a good specific combiner for 1000 grain weight.

**Keywords:** Bread wheat, line × tester analysis, GCA, SCA, Combining ability

#### Introduction

Bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. em. Theil) is one of the world's most important cereal crops, providing a major source of dietary energy and protein for millions of people worldwide (FAOSTAT 2021). Bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. em. Theil) belongs to the Poaceae family whose chromosome number is 42. This cereal grain is highly nutritious and plays a vital role in ensuring food security, and sustaining livelihoods. Its significance lies in being an essential dietary component that contributes to the well-being and economic stability of populations. It has been described as the 'King of cereals' because of the acreage it occupies, high productivity, nutritive value, and the prominent position it holds in the international food grain trade. It consists of about 55% carbohydrates, 10-18% protein and 19% of calories required for humans, and it is also used as a straw for feeding animals.

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the worldwide production of wheat in 2022-23 was approximately 806.2 million tonnes (FAO, 2023). The top five wheat producing countries in the world are China, India, Russia, the United States, and Canada. India is the world's second-largest producer of wheat (Jaiswal *et al.*, 2010). In India, it is the second most important food crop after rice both in terms of area and production. According to the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Production of wheat during 2022-23 is estimated at record 1105.54 Lakh tonnes. It is higher by 28.12 Lakh tonnes than

**Comment [WU1]:** This line must be after the objective. This is the period of conducting research

**Comment [WU2]:** This is an objective of the study but not related to the main title

**Comment [WU3]:** How many of them are lines and testers from nine genotype

**Comment [WU4]:** Write with long form as versus

**Comment [WU5]:** Which characters (agronomical traits) were studied (please refer all character here)

**Comment [WU6]:** Write the long form

**Comment [WU7]:** There is no description about the method and material such as design and replication since it is a field work.

**Comment [WU8]:** Write long form

**Comment [WU9]:** Do not use abbreviations here

**Comment [WU10]:** The introduction is so shall, that needs more clarification and it is not coherent.

**Comment [WU11]:** One you inform it is suggested to say "It" or this

**Comment [WU12]:** Citation

previous year's wheat production of 1077.42 Lakh tonnes and by 48.23 Lakh tonnes than the average wheat production of 1057.31 Lakh tonnes.

**Comment [WU13]:** Similarly citation is needed. What is your source?

In plant breeding programs, selecting parents with the desired characteristics that have strong general combining ability effects on grain yield and its components, as well as significant estimations for specific combining ability effects, is crucial. These estimations will aid in developing solid, efficient, and successful breeding techniques to achieve quick and deliberate development in this crop. The current study focused to analyze the capacity and genetic makeup of grain yield and yield related traits in wheat crossings using a line × tester design.

### Materials and Methods:

**Comment [WU14]:** Add here the subtopic as Plant materials and procedure, Data Collection, Statistical analysis

The experimental material consisted twelve genotypes of bread wheat consisting nine lines viz., HD 2851, HD 2893, HD 3226, PBW 677, HD 3086, PBW 725, Phulesamadhan, Phuleunnat, GW 273 and three testers viz., Faisalabad 2005, HW 2045, PBW 343 were crossed in all possible combinations using line × tester mating design during Rabi 2022-23 at wheat research farm. A set of 39 entries (12 parents and 27 crosses) were sown in randomized block design with three replications during Rabi 2023-24. Observations were recorded on randomly selected 5 tagged plants and different yield contributing traits viz., days to 50% heading, days to maturity, flag leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>), plant height, number of tillers per plant, spike length, 1000-grain weight (g), grain yield per plant (g), number of spikelets per spike, number of grains per spike, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Line × tester analysis was carried out for determining the effect due to general and specific combining ability as described by Kempthorne adapted by Singh and Chaudhary.

**Comment [WU15]:** How many locations you have used. Because you would study environmental effect on the breeding season.

**Comment [WU16]:** What are those crosses (F1, F2)

**Comment [WU17]:** It is suggested to have plot size

**Comment [WU18]:** It is also better to analyze soil type

**Comment [WU19]:** How many rows and columns were used?

**Comment [WU20]:** Please show here how to calculate General GCA and specific SCA

**Comment [WU21]:** Just the result is nice but you have to discuss in detail about your findings comparatively with other scholars that would be inline or antagonistic to yours. Still didn't see any discussion.

### Results and Discussion

#### Analysis of variance

Significant ( $P \leq 0.05$  or  $0.01$ ) differences were found among the genotypes for all studied traits (Table 1) indicating the presence of sufficient genetic variation among the lines, testers, and their crosses. Obvious differences observed between the minimum and maximum of mean values of the genotypes for the studied traits were 16.00 days, 19.33 days, 22.47cm, 3.53 tillers, 3.07cm, 8.26cm<sup>2</sup>, 4.07g, 15.8g, 3.46 spikelet, 21.74 grains, 26.86g, and 12.08% for DH, DM, PH, NT/P, SL, FLA, TGW, GY/P, NS/S, NG/S, BY/P, and HI%, respectively (Table 2). Parents and crosses exhibited significant ( $P \leq 0.05$  or  $0.01$ ) differences for all traits. Significant ( $P \leq 0.05$  or  $0.01$ ) differences were found for the contrast parents vs. crosses for all traits except days to heading and plant height indicating considerable amount of average heterosis was reflected in their crosses for most traits (Table 1). Partitioning mean squares of crosses (line × tester) revealed that variance due to both of lines and testers were significant for most traits of lines and testers and days to heading of testers. The variance due to line × tester was significant for all traits studied indicating that the nine lines did express effective role with the three testers according to their crosses performance (Table 1). Similar findings were also reported by Abd El-Aty et al., 2016, El-Gammaa et al., 2019, Abroet et al., 2021 and Roy et al., 2021.

**Comment [WU22]:** Why is this so explain in the discussion part

**TABLE 1. Mean squares for line × tester design for the studied traits**

Sources	Df	Days to 50% heading	Days to maturity	Plant height (cm)	Number of tillers per plant	Spike length(cm)
Rep	2	5.88	7.59	2.04	0.06	0.02
Genotypes	38	41.17**	56.95**	65.80**	2.29**	1.87**
Parents	11	20.18**	64.81**	102.12**	2.56**	2.70**
Crosses	26	6.18**	33.57**	52.46**	1.98**	1.54**
P vs C	1	1181.70**	578.51**	13.33**	7.23**	1.36**
Lines	8	15.41**	67.15**	120.58**	3.03**	2.49*
Testers	2	7.27**	108.79**	164.18**	9.93**	0.68
L x T	16	1.43	7.38*	4.44**	0.47**	1.17**
Error	76	3.02	3.45	1.05	0.12	0.10

\*\*,\* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

**Comment [WU23]:** Add as of variation

**Table1 :Continued...**

Sources	Df	Flag leaf area(cm) <sup>2</sup>	1000-grain weight (g)	Grain yield per plant (g)	Number of spikelets per spike	Number of grains per spike
Rep	2	2.03	0.12	0.35	0.36	3.31
Genotypes	38	11.65**	2.96**	26.04**	2.85**	59.04*
Parents	11	19.45**	3.76**	58.02**	4.95**	115.67**
Crosses	26	4.86**	2.72**	6.79**	1.62**	33.21**
P vs C	1	102.35**	0.36	174.77**	11.49**	107.55**
Lines	8	7.19**	1.89	11.40	1.83	67.06**
Testers	2	16.81**	8.67*	30.69**	2.26	119.16**
L x T	16	2.21**	2.40**	1.49	1.44**	5.54**
Error	76	0.49	0.35	1.13	0.35	1.29

\*\*,\* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

**Comment [WU24]:** Please join this fragment tables together in one

**Table1 :Continued...**

Sources	Df	Biological yield per plant (g)	Harvest index (%)
Rep	2	0.08	1.05
Genotypes	38	73.01**	31.30**
Parents	11	143.77**	62.36**
Crosses	26	26.80**	16.42**
P vs C	1	496.14**	76.43**
Lines	8	46.81**	37.94**
Testers	2	68.24**	34.48**
L x T	16	11.62**	3.40
Error	76	1.54	5.46

\*\*,\* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

For line, L3 recorded the earliest line in days to 50% heading by 94.67 days and the lowest line in each of days to maturity (127.33 days), flag leaf area (16.60cm<sup>2</sup>), biological yield/plant (48.67g) (Table 2). Moreover, L3 gave the highest values for each of plant height (85.20cm), number of tiller/plant (7.87 tillers), spike length(10.60cm), 1000-grain weight (38.13g), grain yield/plant (20.07g), number of spikelet/spike (18.87 spikelet), number of grains/spike (56.13 grains) and harvest index (41.21%). The line L7 gave the highest values for each of days to maturity(141.33 days). Line L2recorded the flag leaf area (24.73cm<sup>2</sup>), biological yield (73.73g). (Table 2).

For testers,T1 gave the highestvalues for each of days to 50% heading (100.33), number of tiller/plant (9.07 tillers), number of spikelet/spike (19.93 spikelet) (Table2). T2 gave the highest values for eachof days to maturity(137.33 days), spike length (11.27cm), 1000-grain weight (40.27g).T3 recorded the highest values for plant height (85.93cm), flag leaf area(23.20cm<sup>2</sup>), grain yield/plant (24.07g), number of grains/ spike (67.07 grains), biological yield (62.53g), harvest index (38.47%) (Table 2). Similar results are in line with conclusions of Abroet *al.*,2021, Roy *et al.*,2021, Balochet *al.*,2016.

Concerning crosses, cross L3 × T3 recordedthe earliest cross for days to 50% heading(89.33 days). L5 × T3 recordedthe highest values for plant height (91.00cm).L2× T3 gave the highest values for each of flag leaf area(21.33), grain yield/plant (22.40) and biological yield/plant (60.80). L3 × T2 gave the highest values foreach of spike length (11.53) and number of spikelet/ spike (19.80). L8 × T3 recorded the highest number of grains/spike (68.00 grains).L1× T1 recorded the highest tillers/plant (10.00 tillers), L2× T3 gave the highest biological yield (60.80g) and L3 × T3 recorded the highest harvest index (40.05%).

**TABLE 2. Mean performance for the studied traits of the 9 lines, 3 testers and their 27 F1s crosses**

Genotypes	Days to 50% heading	Days to maturity	Plant height (cm)	Number of tillers per plant	Spike length(cm)	Flag leaf area(cm) <sup>2</sup>
L1	99.33	137.67	79.40	9.80	10.87	17.80
L2	97.33	135.67	76.33	7.40	10.27	24.73
L3	94.67	127.33	85.20	7.87	10.60	16.60
L4	100.33	130.33	78.47	7.93	8.20	22.53
L5	97.00	130.67	92.80	9.47	11.00	22.07
L6	100.33	140.67	76.93	7.60	9.27	20.80
L7	105.33	141.33	70.33	8.13	10.87	19.80
L8	101.00	131.00	76.27	7.27	9.20	22.27
L9	98.33	136.67	78.67	9.33	11.00	18.07
T1	100.33	131.67	81.87	9.07	10.67	19.40
T2	99.33	137.33	76.80	8.00	11.27	18.00
T3	99.67	129.33	85.93	7.13	11.00	23.20
L1 × T1	94.67	130.00	81.07	10.00	10.20	16.60
L1 × T2	93.67	133.33	78.33	8.07	11.00	17.13
L1 × T3	94.33	128.67	82.40	7.80	10.47	17.80
L2 × T1	94.33	131.33	76.80	7.40	8.87	18.40
L2 × T2	90.67	132.33	76.33	7.33	10.87	17.67

L2 × T3	92.67	128.67	80.60	6.60	10.40	21.33
L3 × T1	89.67	125.67	83.17	7.80	10.53	17.20
L3 × T2	89.67	127.67	80.00	7.53	11.53	16.47
L3 × T3	89.33	125.00	87.07	6.47	10.67	17.40
L4 × T1	94.00	126.00	79.13	8.47	8.53	18.47
L4 × T2	93.00	126.33	77.07	7.53	9.87	17.87
L4 × T3	93.67	122.00	83.93	8.13	9.60	21.07
L5 × T1	92.33	128.67	89.73	8.73	10.20	19.07
L5 × T2	92.67	128.33	86.27	7.40	10.67	18.13
L5 × T3	91.67	126.33	91.00	7.20	10.00	20.20
L6 × T1	93.33	129.67	78.67	7.60	9.60	18.87
L6 × T2	91.67	130.67	78.93	7.40	8.87	18.07
L6 × T3	92.67	131.00	82.27	6.87	10.07	21.13
L7 × T1	93.67	134.33	78.07	8.47	10.73	18.60
L7 × T2	93.00	137.00	72.87	8.07	9.33	17.40
L7 × T3	93.33	128.00	78.67	7.33	10.27	17.60
L8 × T1	92.67	128.67	77.80	7.60	9.67	18.87
L8 × T2	91.67	129.67	78.40	6.73	9.87	18.40
L8 × T3	93.67	127.00	80.27	6.60	9.60	19.00
L9 × T1	92.67	131.33	78.67	9.20	11.07	17.87
L9 × T2	92.00	135.67	76.93	8.40	10.00	18.53
L9 × T3	91.67	128.33	83.07	7.47	10.67	18.00
LSD 5%	2.83	3.02	1.67	0.57	0.53	1.14
LSD 1%	3.75	4.01	2.22	0.76	0.71	1.52

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343.

**Table2** :Continued...

Genotypes	1000-grain weight (g)	Grain yield per plant (g)	Number of spikelets per spike	Number of grains per spike	Biological yield per plant (g)	Harvest index (%)
L1	37.47	21.13	16.87	55.87	51.93	40.69
L2	39.27	31.67	18.87	48.93	73.73	42.96
L3	38.13	20.07	18.87	56.13	48.67	41.21
L4	40.80	23.60	17.27	45.33	60.00	39.36
L5	38.07	17.73	18.20	62.80	57.47	30.88
L6	38.33	16.40	16.60	51.47	53.07	30.97
L7	39.13	21.67	16.87	58.40	52.40	41.39
L8	40.27	19.20	16.47	62.13	57.00	33.67
L9	37.67	16.00	16.47	56.27	50.47	31.73
T1	39.80	18.33	19.93	62.13	52.27	35.09
T2	40.27	16.93	19.27	56.53	52.20	32.44
T3	38.33	24.07	19.27	67.07	62.53	38.47
L1 × T1	38.73	18.00	18.20	55.67	50.67	35.52
L1 × T2	38.40	16.87	18.33	56.67	50.80	33.21

**Comment [WU25]:** Please narrate the correlation between Biological yield per plant (g) and other agronomic characters in the essay part

L1 × T3	39.00	19.00	18.87	59.60	51.47	36.93
L2 × T1	38.33	19.00	18.87	55.47	51.67	36.79
L2 × T2	40.20	17.80	19.40	56.93	51.67	34.46
L2 × T3	38.00	22.40	18.87	56.27	60.80	36.85
L3 × T1	37.80	18.33	19.00	61.07	47.13	38.94
L3 × T2	39.73	17.07	19.80	56.40	46.87	36.46
L3 × T3	38.87	18.93	18.87	60.93	47.27	40.05
L4 × T1	39.67	18.33	19.27	56.13	51.87	35.42
L4 × T2	38.67	17.40	16.87	54.93	50.00	34.86
L4 × T3	38.93	20.47	17.80	59.60	57.87	35.46
L5 × T1	38.13	17.00	18.20	62.40	51.53	33.01
L5 × T2	38.60	16.73	18.47	59.07	51.80	32.30
L5 × T3	40.20	17.73	18.07	64.80	54.40	32.60
L6 × T1	37.73	16.40	18.87	55.87	51.33	31.96
L6 × T2	39.07	16.13	17.67	55.60	50.73	31.83
L6 × T3	38.33	16.87	18.33	59.47	51.27	32.88
L7 × T1	36.73	18.73	19.80	57.47	51.80	36.15
L7 × T2	39.40	17.33	18.60	57.33	51.27	33.85
L7 × T3	40.67	20.60	19.00	61.60	51.80	39.80
L8 × T1	38.87	18.27	17.80	62.93	52.27	34.96
L8 × T2	39.73	16.93	18.20	62.67	51.07	33.13
L8 × T3	40.60	18.47	18.73	68.00	55.73	33.17
L9 × T1	37.67	16.33	19.80	58.67	48.73	33.59
L9 × T2	38.53	15.87	17.27	55.73	49.67	31.96
L9 × T3	38.07	16.80	19.00	61.73	49.47	34.01
LSD 5%	0.96	1.73	0.97	1.85	2.02	3.80
LSD 1%	1.28	2.30	1.29	2.45	2.68	5.04

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343.

### Combining ability effects and variances

The general and specific combining ability are the main criteria of rapid genetic assaying of the tested genotypes under line × tester design. The effects of general combining ability ( $\hat{g}_i$ ) of the parents (lines and testers) are useful tools for selecting the cross parents. According to this, the effects of GCA of the parents for the studied traits are presented in Table 3. Among the nine parental lines, line L3 showed significant negative GCA effects for days to 50% heading, hence it is considered a good combiner for earliness. Line L1 showed highly significant positive GCA effects for DH. For days to maturity, line L3, L4, L5 and tester T3 had significant negative GCA effects. The two lines L3 and L5 and tester T3 showed significant ( $P \leq 0.05$  or  $0.01$ ) positive GCA effects for plant height hence it was a good combiner for tallness that are desired to straw yield while, the line L2, L7, L8, L9 and tester T2 were a good combiner for shortness that preferred for resistance for lodging.

**Comment [WU26]:** You are doing in the field so it is better to add genetic advance, heterosis and heritability for the selection of the best line and tester

**Comment [WU27]:** Which parents were more suitable and promising of high yielding

GCA effects for plant height, Consequently, it can be realized that positive or insignificant negative GCA effects increasing the plant height were more than the significant negative effects. It is similar for spike length except the two parents L4, L6, L8 and T2. For spike length, L1, L3, L9 had highly significant positive GCA effects and considered a good combiner for long spike. The three line L1, L4, L9 and tester T1 as good general combiner for NT/P. For flag leaf area, line L2, L4, L5, L6 and tester T3 showed highly significant positive GCA effect and had good combining ability. GCA effect for 1000 GW, line L8 and tester T2, T3 showed highly significant positive effect. Line L2, L4 and L7 was found to be best and showed positive significant GCA effect for GY/P. Line L5, L8 and tester T3 was a good donor for NG/S, where it gave high significant positive GCA effects for them. The three lines, L2, L4, L5, L8 and tester T3 were a good donor for BY/P, where it showed high significant positive GCA effects for these traits. Significant ( $P \leq 0.05$  or  $0.01$ ) positive GCA effects estimated for HI for line L3, L7 and tester T3. These consequences are in arrangement with those reported by El-Gammaa *et al.*, 2019, Abroet *et al.*, 2021, Roy *et al.*, 2021, Ijazet *et al.*, 2017, Rajput *et al.*, 2018, Alhossary *et al.*, 2020, Gupta *et al.*, 2020 and Chaudhary *et al.*, 2022. In self-pollination species, specific combining ability (SCA) effects can be utilizing to select lines with homozygosity that appear transgressive segregation in early generations.

**TABLE 3. General combining ability GCA effects for the studied traits of the 9 lines and 3 testers**

Parents	Days to 50% heading	Days to maturity	Plant height (cm)	Number of tillers per plant	Spike length (cm)	Flag leaf area (cm) <sup>2</sup>
Lines						
L1	1.691**	1.346*	-0.048	0.911**	0.440**	-1.235**
L2	0.025	1.457*	-2.737**	-0.600**	-0.072	0.721**
L3	-2.975**	-3.210**	2.763**	-0.444**	0.795**	-1.390**
L4	1.025	-4.543**	-0.604	0.333**	-0.783**	0.721**
L5	-0.309	-1.543*	8.352**	0.067	0.173	0.721**
L6	0.025	1.123	-0.693*	-0.422**	-0.605**	0.943**
L7	0.802	3.790**	-4.115**	0.244*	-0.005	-0.546*
L8	0.136	-0.877	-1.826**	-0.733**	-0.405**	0.343
L9	-0.420	2.457**	-1.093**	0.644**	0.462**	-0.279
Se (g <sub>i</sub> )	0.580	1.187	0.343	0.117	0.108	0.234
Testers						
T1	0.506	0.198	-0.304	0.652**	-0.183**	-0.198
T2	-0.531	1.901**	-2.300**	-0.104	0.106	-0.672**
T3	0.025	-2.099**	2.604**	-0.548**	0.077	0.869**
Se (g <sub>t</sub> )	0.334	0.685	0.198	0.067	0.062	0.135

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3 HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343, \*\*, \* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

**Table 3:** Continued...

Parents	1000-grain weight (g)	Grain yield per plant (g)	Number of spikelets per spike	Number of grains per spike	Biological yield per plant (g)	Harvest index (%)
Lines						
L1	-0.128	0.037	-0.123	-1.689**	-0.538	0.402
L2	0.005	1.815**	0.454*	-2.777**	3.195**	1.211
L3	-0.040	0.193	0.632**	0.464	-4.427**	3.665**
L4	0.249	0.815*	-0.612**	-2.111**	1.728**	0.426
L5	0.138	-0.763*	-0.346	3.089**	1.062*	-2.182**
L6	-0.462*	-1.452**	-0.301	-2.022	-0.405	-2.596**
L7	0.094	0.970**	0.543**	-0.200	0.106	1.779*
L8	0.89**	-0.030	-0.346	5.534**	1.506**	-1.069
L9	-0.751**	-1.585**	0.099	-0.289	-2.227**	-1.635*
Se (g)	0.197	0.354	0.199	0.378	0.414	0.779
Testers						
T1	-0.654**	-0.096	0.277*	-0.593**	-0.738	0.327
T2	0.309**	-1.015**	-0.301*	-1.740**	-1.086	-1.258**
T3	0.346**	1.111**	0.025*	2.334**	1.825*	0.930*
Se (g)	0.113	0.204	0.114	0.218	0.239	0.449

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343, \*\*, \* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

Comment [WU28]: Write the caption

Table 4 showed the effects of specific combining ability (Sij) of the twenty-seven crosses for the studied traits. Only one cross L7 × T3 showed significant negative (desirable) SCA for days to maturity, indicating this cross could be used to select early maturity lines. Four crosses, L4 × T3, L6 × T2, L7 × T1 and L8 × T2 showed significant positive (P≤0.05 or 0.01) SCA effects for plant height, it could be considered a good combiner for high straw yield. Two crosses, L1 × T1 and L4 × T3 showed significant positive effect. These crosses is highly desirable for effective selection. Six crosses, L2 × T2, L3 × T2, L4 × T2, L6 × T3, L7 × T1 and L9 × T1 significant positive SCA effects for spike length. For flag leaf area, five crosses L2 × T3, L4 × T3, L6 × T3, L7 × T1 and L9 × T2 performed best with both parents involved in the cross having good SCA effect. Two crosses, L2 × T3 and L3 × T1 exhibited highly significant positive SCA effects for biological yield/plant. For number of spikelets/spikes, three crosses L3 × T2, L4 × T1 and L9 × T1 had significant positive (P≤0.05 or 0.01) SCA effects. So, these crosses could be used for selecting high tillering ability lines.

Regarding grain yield per plant, L2 × T3 exhibited significant positive (0.01) SCA effects. This cross could be a good combiner for high yielding of grain. For number of grains/spikes, two crosses L2 × T2 and L3 × T1 had significant positive (P≤0.05 or 0.01) SCA effects. Four crosses L2 × T2, L4 × T1, L5 × T3 and L7 × T3 for 1000 grains weight showed significant positive (P≤0.05 or 0.01) SCA effects, they considered a good donor for these traits. These results are in line with those reported by El-Gammalet *et al.*, 2019, Ijazet *et al.*, 2017, Rajput *et al.*, 2018, Alhossaryet *et al.*, 2020, Gupta *et al.*, 2020, Ranjithaet *et al.*, 2018, Dhootet *et al.*, 2020 and El Nahaset *et al.*, 2021.

**TABLE 4. Specific combining ability SCA for the studied traits of the 15 F1's crosses**

Comment [WU29]: Put it in bracket

Crosses	Days to 50% heading	Days to maturity	Plant height (cm)	Number of tillers per plant	Spike length(cm)	Flag leaf area(cm) <sup>2</sup>
L1 × T1	-0.062	-0.864	0.770	0.726**	-0.173	-0.380
L1 × T2	-0.025	0.765	0.033	-0.452*	0.338	0.627
L1 × T3	0.086	0.099	-0.804	-0.274	-0.165	-0.247
L2 × T1	1.272	0.358	-0.807	-0.363	-0.995**	-0.536
L2 × T2	-1.358	-0.346	0.722	0.326	0.716**	-0.795
L2 × T3	0.086	-0.012	0.085	0.037	0.279	1.331**
L3 × T1	-0.395	-0.642	0.059	-0.119	-0.195	0.375
L3 × T2	0.642	-0.346	-1.111	0.370	0.516**	0.116
L3 × T3	-0.247	0.988	1.052	-0.252	-0.321	-0.491
L4 × T1	-0.062	1.025	-0.607	-0.230	-0.617**	-0.469
L4 × T2	-0.025	-0.346	-0.678	-0.407*	0.427*	-0.595
L4 × T3	0.086	-0.679	1.285*	0.637**	0.190	1.064*
L5 × T1	-0.395	0.691	1.037	0.304	0.094	0.131
L5 × T2	0.975	-1.346	-0.433	-0.274	0.272	-0.328
L5 × T3	-0.580	0.654	-0.604	-0.030	-0.365	0.198
L6 × T1	0.272	-0.975	-0.985	-0.341	0.272	-0.291
L6 × T2	-0.358	-1.679	1.278*	0.215	-0.751**	-0.617
L6 × T3	0.086	2.654*	-0.293	0.126	0.479*	0.909*
L7 × T1	-0.173	1.025*	1.837**	-0.141	0.805**	0.931*
L7 × T2	0.198	1.988	-1.367*	0.215	-0.884**	0.205
L7 × T3	-0.025	-3.012**	-0.470	-0.074	0.079	-1.136**
L8 × T1	-0.506	0.025	-0.719	-0.030	0.138	0.309
L8 × T2	-0.469	-0.679	1.878**	-0.141	0.049	0.316
L8 × T3	0.975	0.654	-1.159*	0.170	-0.188	-0.625
L9 × T1	0.049	-0.642	-0.585	0.193	0.672**	-0.069
L9 × T2	0.420	1.988	-0.322	0.148	-0.684**	1.072**
L9 × T3	-0.469	-1.346	0.907	-0.341	0.012	-1.002*
Se (sij)	1.004	2.056	0.594	0.203	0.188	0.405

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343, \*\*, \* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

**Table 4:** Continued...

Crosses	1000-grain weight (g)	Grain yield per plant (g)	Number of spikelets per spike	Number of grains per spike	Biological yield per plant (g)	Harvest index (%)
L1 × T1	0.677	0.141	-0.543	-1.051	0.427	-0.028
L1 × T2	-0.620	-0.074	0.168	1.096	0.909	-0.750
L1 × T3	-0.057	-0.067	0.375	-0.045	-1.336	0.778
L2 × T1	0.143	-0.637	-0.454	-0.162	-2.306**	0.428
L2 × T2	1.047**	-0.919	0.657	2.451**	-1.958**	-0.315
L2 × T3	-1.190**	1.556*	-0.202	-2.289**	4.264**	-0.113

L3 × T1	-0.346	0.319	-0.499	2.187**	0.783	0.125
L3 × T2	0.625	-0.030	0.879*	-1.323*	0.864	-0.764
L3 × T3	-0.279	-0.289	-0.380	-0.864	-1.647	0.639
L4 × T1	1.232**	-0.304	1.012**	-0.162	-0.640	-0.155
L4 × T2	-0.731*	-0.319	-0.810*	-0.215	-2.158**	0.869
L4 × T3	-0.501	0.622	-0.202	0.377	2.798**	-0.714
L5 × T1	-0.190	-0.059	-0.321	0.904	-0.306	0.045
L5 × T2	-0.686*	0.593	0.523	-1.282	0.309	0.920
L5 × T3	0.877*	-0.533	-0.202	0.377	-0.002	-0.964
L6 × T1	0.010	0.030	0.301	-0.518	0.960	-0.595
L6 × T2	0.380	0.681	-0.321	0.363	0.709	0.867
L6 × T3	-0.390	-0.711	0.020	0.155	-1.669	-0.273
L7 × T1	-1.546**	-0.059	0.390	-0.740	0.916	-0.777
L7 × T2	0.158	-0.541	-0.232	0.274	0.731	-1.491
L7 × T3	1.388**	0.600	-0.158	0.466	-1.647*	2.268
L8 × T1	-0.212	0.474	-0.721*	-1.007	-0.017	0.882
L8 × T2	-0.309	0.059	0.257	-0.126	-0.869	0.632
L8 × T3	0.521	-0.533	0.464	1.133	0.886	-1.514
L9 × T1	0.232	0.096	0.83*	0.549	0.183	0.076
L9 × T2	0.136	0.548	-1.121**	-1.237	1.464*	0.032
L9 × T3	-0.368	-0.644	0.286	0.689	-1.647*	-0.108
Se (sij)	0.341	0.614	0.344	0.655	0.718	1.349

L1 HD 3226, L2 PBW 725, L3HD 2851, L4 HD 2893, L5 PBW 67, L6 HD 3086, L7 GW 273, L8 PhuleUnnat, L9 PhuleSamadhan, T1 HW 2045, T2 Faisalabad 2005, T3 PBW 343, \*\*, \* significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

### Conclusion

Line × tester analysis is used in predicting the effects of the general combining ability of parents and specific ability combining of their crosses. The lines PBW 725 and tester PBW 343 were a good donor for biological yield/plant, number of spikelets / spikes and grain yield/ plant. Also, HD 2893 and Phuleunnat were found to be the best and good general combiner for BY/P. Tester Faisalabad 2005 and PBW 343 were good donors for these traits in addition to 1000 grains weight. One cross, PBW 725 × PBW 343 exhibited excellent combiners for specific combining ability for grain yield/plant. It's recommended to use these genotypes in wheat breeding programs by selection to achieve transgressive segregation.

### References

1. Jaiswal, K. K., Pandey, P., Marker, S., & Anurag, P. J. (2010). Heterosis studies for improvement in yield potential of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Advances in Agriculture & Botany*, 2(3), 273-278.
2. Kempthorne, O. (1957). An introduction to genetic statistics.
3. Singh, R. K., & Chaudhary, B. D. (1977). *Biometrical methods in quantitative genetic analysis*. *Biometrical methods in quantitative genetic analysis*.

**Comment [WU30]:** Since you are studying the genotype please incorporate genetic components, heritability and genetic advance for ten wheat traits, environmental effect and so on.....

**Comment [WU31]:** You didn't study about genetic advance and heritability, therefore why you could conclude here?

**Comment [WU32]:** The writing style of references are not consistent and incomplete

**Comment [WU33]:** Some of the references are too old. It is better to use updated reference otherwise this shows that the study is considered as mathematical formula and acts like theory that stands for long period of times

4. Abd El-Aty, M. S. M., Kamara, M. M., &Abdo, M. S. M. (2016). Genetic analysis of some bread wheat crosses under normal and water stress conditions. *Egyptian Journal of Plant Breeding*, 20(6), 907-928.
5. El-Gammaal, A. A. (2019). Evaluation of Bread Wheat Crosses via Line X Tester Mating Design. *East African Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Life Sciences*, 2(3), 171-178.
6. Abro, S. A., Baloch, A. W., Baloch, M., Baloch, G. A., Baloch, T. A., Soomro, A. A., ...& Ali, M. (2021). 35. Line× tester analysis for estimating combining ability in F1 hybrids of bread wheat. *Pure and Applied Biology (PAB)*, 5(3), 647-652.
7. Roy, A., Kumar, A., Rawat, V., & Singh, A. (2021). Analysis of combining ability and gene action studies for grain yield and its component traits in bread wheat utilizing line x tester mating design. *Environment Conservation Journal*, 22(3), 289-298.
8. Baloch, M., Baloch, A. W., Siyal, N. A., Baloch, S. N., Soomro, A. A., Baloch, S. K., &Gandahi, N. (2016). Heterosis Analysis in F1Hybrids of Bread Wheat. *Sindh University Research Journal-SURJ (Science Series)*, 48(2).
9. Ijaz, S., &Kaukab, S. (2017). Exploitation of heterosis and combining ability effects in wheat breeding. *Journal of Agricultural Research (03681157)*, 55(2).
10. Rajput, R. S., &Kandalkar, V. S. (2018). Combining ability and heterosis for grain yield and its attributing traits in bread wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(2), 113-119.
11. Alhossary, A. A. (2020). Estimation of combining ability and gene action by using line x tester procedure in bread wheat (*Triticumastivum*., L). *Annals of Agricultural Science, Moshtohor*, 58(4), 923-930.
12. Gupta, V. K., Agrawal, A. P., Yadav, R. K., Parihar, R., Meshram, P., Banjare, A. K., ... & Singh, N. (2020). Combining ability studies on terminal heat tolerance in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) under late sown irrigated condition using Line X Tester analysis. *IJCS*, 8(5), 774-778.
13. Chaudhary, D., Swati, Nagar, K., &Dhyani, R. (2022). Genetic analysis of yield and its attributes in bread wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L. em. Theil) under irrigated and rainfed conditions. *Euphytica*, 218(9), 135.
14. Ranjitha, K. M., Biradar, S. S., Desai, S. A., Naik, V. R., Singh, S. K., Satisha, T. N., ... &Uday, G. (2018). Combining ability of six wheat genotypes and their F1 diallel crosses for nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) and related traits under 50 per cent nitrogen condition. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci*, 7(1), 1237-1243.
15. Dhoot, M., Sharma, H., Dubey, R. B., Badaya, V. K., &Dhoot, R. (2020). Combining ability analysis for yield and some of its associated characters in late sown condition in bread wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L. em. Thell). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 9(2), 283-286.
16. El Nahas, M. M., & Ali, O. A. (2021). Estimation of combining ability and heterosis for wheat yield and its components under water stress conditions. *Egyptian Journal of Agronomy*, 43(2), 277-293.