Generation mean analysis in maize (*Zea mays*) for yields and yield attributing traits

PREETI SHARMA^{1*}, MEHAR CHAND KAMBOJ¹, NARENDER SINGH^{1,2}, RAMESH KUMAR^{1,2} and NAVEEN KUMAR²

CCSHAU, Regional Research Station, Karnal, Haryana 132 001, India

Received: 27 March 2021; Accepted: 09 August 2021

ABSTRACT

The nature of gene action involved is mainly responsible for the genetic improvement of any crop. Generation means analysis for maize ($Zea\ mays\ L$.) yield and its traits for six generations, i.e. P_1 , $P_2\ F_1$, F_2 , BC_1 and BC_2 of six crosses evaluated at Karnal. Significant individual and joint scaling tests indicated inadequacy of three parameter models and presence of epistasis in all characters indicating greater genetic variation in parents. However, only shelling percentage in HKI 209 × HKI 163 showed additive-dominance. The presence of duplicate form of non-allelic gene interactions was prominent, except for days to maturity and cob diameter in HKI 325-17AN × HKI 163, cob length in HKI 209 × HKI 163 and shelling percentage in HKI 1332 × HKI 163 where complementary gene action is recorded. It suggests selection from F_3 generation onwards for character improvement. Dominance and duplicate type of epistatic effects were found to be more prominent for inheritance than additive effects alone for grain yield/plant, grains/cob, and plant height suggesting the reciprocal recurrent selection or bi-parental mating design to improve in these characters. In crosses where dominance was of major importance, the trait could be successfully utilized for the exploitation of hybrid vigour. Some significant additive and additive × additive effects were recorded in all of these crosses, and therefore gain from selection could be possible, fixable and heritable epistasis could be effectively used in the selection of superior inbred lines.

Keywords: Additive-dominance effect, Generation means, Gene effects, Maize, Non-allelic interactions

In the genetic improvement of any crop, the nature of gene action involved is mainly responsible for implementation of breeding method for quantitative traits. In subsequent generations, causes of genetic variability may be examined to predict the genetic regulation of various multigenetic parameters (Ali et al. 2019). For better understanding of the gene action involved in the expression of heterosis, the information on genetic variances, levels of dominance, and the importance of genetic effects have contributed significantly. However, the nature of gene action involved in the expression of heterosis for the grain yield of elite maize hybrids remains unresolved. The development of dominantce gene action would benefit the production of hybrids whereas additive gene action designating the standard procedures for selection would be effective in bringing about advantageous changes in character (Edwards et al. 1975, Ewool et al.

Present address: ¹CCSHAU, Regional Research Station, Karnal, Haryana; ²ICAR-Indian Institute of Maize Research, Ludhiana, Punjab. *Corresponding author e-mail: sharmapreeti.genetics@gmail.com.

2020). In classical breeding systems, grain yield would be improved by efficient breeding procedures that make use of additive genetic variance and non-allelic interaction. The success of any breeding programme lies in thorough understanding of the genetic architecture of the genotypes and the nature of the gene action (Lingaiah *et al.* 2020). Therefore, understanding concerning genetic composition of a character helps the breeders to set up their breeding programs. To accomplish this, the breeder will need basic information on the inheritance of grain yield and its closely related components to exploit the current genetic variability present in breeding material for grain yield.

Many mathematical models for estimating gene effects presume that epistasis is of low significance. However, the presence or absence of epistasis can be defined by generation mean analysis using a scaling test that accurately tests epistasis, whether complementary or duplicate at the digenic level. Therefore, generation mean analysis is a valuable technique to estimate the key genetic effects involved in the expression of quantitative characteristics such as yield and its components. Therefore, present study has been designed to understand the nature and inheritance of grain yield and quality traits of maize (*Zea mays* L.) for proper choice of breeding procedures in developing maize hybrids

with increased grain yield.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Research Station, Karnal, during 2013–2014 and 2015–2016. Six crosses, viz. HKI 209 × HKI 1128 (C1), HKI 209 × HKI 163 (C2), HKI 1332 × HKI 1128 (C3), HKI 1332 × HKI 163 (C4), HKI 325-17AN × HKI 1128 (C5) and HKI 325-17AN × HKI 163 (C6) were attempted in *kharif* 2013 to produce the $\rm F_1$ seeds where three inbred lines were used as female (HKI 209, HKI 1332 and HKI 325-17AN) and two inbred lines were used as male (HKI 1128 and HKI 163). In *rabi* 2013–2014 and *kharif* 2014, $\rm F_1$ s were sown along with five parental inbred lines and self pollinated to produce $\rm F_2$ seeds. Backcrosses, BC₁ and BC₂ of six crosses were also made within the stipulated period.

The experiment was laid out in randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications during kharif 2015 and 2016. The experimental material consisted of five parents, six F_1 , their F_2 , BC_1 and BC_2 , of six crosses. The parents, F₁'s, F₂'s, and back crosses were randomized separately in each replication. The P₁, P₂, F₁ were planted in one row whereas, the BC₁, BC₂ were planted in two rows and F₂ in 10 rows. The planting geometry was kept with 75 cm × 20 cm. Uniform agronomical standard practices were adopted in order to obtain the good phenotypic expression of characters. The observations were recorded on eleven quantitative characters, viz. days to 50% tasselling, days to 50% silking, days to maturity, plant height (cm), ear height (cm), cob length (cm), cob diameter (cm), grains/cob, 100 grain weight (g), grain yield/plant (g), shelling percentage, from 10 plants of parents and F₁; 20 plants of backcrosses and all the plants from F₂ generations.

Pooled mean data were first tested for non-allelic interaction by Individual scaling test- A, B, C and D given by Mather (1949). Further analysis of data was performed according to the method of "Joint scaling test" given by Cavalli (1952). To compute gene effects for grain yield and its components with six basic generations, Mather's (1949) three parameter model and Hayman's (1958) six parameter models were used in case of inadequacy of three parameter model. Generation mean analysis was performed for characters showing significant variations (P≤0.05) among generations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSSION

Genetic analysis of generation means with individual and joint scaling test depicted presence of epistasis (Table 1). Significant chi square (χ^2) values and failure of simple additive-dominance model in majority of the traits except for shelling percentage in HKI 209 × HKI 163 showed the adequacy of three parameter model. The failure of three parameter model may be either due to digenic or higher order interaction. So, a six parameter model applied to accommodate epistatic and other interactions (Table 2). In three crosses (C2, C3, C5), the predominance of additive

gene effect (negatively significant and desirable direction) was observed for days to 50% tasseling and hence it can be exploited effectively by selection. Significant additive effects (d) in C1, C4 and C6 showed that additive effects were found prominent in controlling inheritance of this trait and the results confirmed the earlier reports of Noor et al. (2018). However, C3 and C5 showed presence of both dominance as well as additive gene effects and there was partial agreement with the conclusions reached by Irshadul-haq et al. (2010). Frequent appearance of all types of epistasis (i, j and l) was observed for C2 to C5. Predominance of additive gene effects (negatively significant and desirable direction) was reported for days to 50% silking in all crosses except for C1 and C3. The dominance gene effects were also observed for days to 50% silking in C1, C3, C4 and C6. Prevalence of additive × dominance genes interaction was observed in all the crosses except C5. The additive effects observed for days to maturity were in close conformity with Sher et al. (2012). However, the dominance effect was more important than additive effects in governing the inheritance of this trait as there was prevalence of dominance effects in C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5.

Dominant gene effects for plant height were observed in all the crosses except C1 which is in agreement with Irshad-ul-haqet al. (2010). Whereas, additive gene effects were more pronounced for ear height in C1, C2 and C6. The dominance × dominance gene interactions and duplicate type of epistasis in all the crosses except C1 for plant height and C1 and C 6 for ear height showed dispersal of alleles that corroborates to Irshad-ul-haq et al. (2010). Dominant gene effects and additive × dominance genes interaction were observed for cob length in all the crosses except C1 and C3 (Shahrokhi et al. 2013). Duplicate type gene interactions in C4, C4 and C6 and complementary type in C2 were important for controlling inheritance of cob length which were in accordance with Alamet al. (2008). Complementary type of epistats is in C6 and dominance x dominance effects in all the crosses were of primary importance for controlling inheritance of cob diameter and that corroborated to Ali et al. (2007). Prevalence of dominant gene effects as well as digenic interactions of duplicate type were observed for number of grains per cob in all the crosses. Relative proportion of epistatic gene effects varied among six crosses for this trait suggesting importance of both additive and dominant effects, in conformity with Irshad-ul-haq et al. (2010). In three crosses (C1, C2, C4), the predominance of additive gene effect was observed for hundred grain-weight whereas dominance gene effect with duplicate type of epistasis was found in C5 and C6 that were in accordance with the reports of Noor et al. (2018). The additive x additive gene interactions in all the crosses except C1 indicated increase in 100-grain weight and is possible to fix during next generations.

All additive (C2, C3 and C6), dominant (C1, C4, and C5) and epistatic effects were important in controlling the inheritance of grain yield in all the crosses and corroborate to Noor *et al.* (2018). Prevalence of dominance effects with

Table 1 Estimates of different scaling tests for different traits of six maize crosses in different generations of maize hybrids

Cro	SS		Scalin	ng Test		Joint Scaling Test (Three Parameter Model)			
		A	В	С	D	m	d	h	$\chi^2 (df = 3)$
	C1	$-3.80* \pm 0.80$	-1.20 ± 1.20	-0.44 ± 2.23	-2.28 ± 1.21	$55.90* \pm 0.24$	-2.09* ± 0.240	-2.32* ± 0.41	23.42**
gui	C2	$-2.33* \pm 0.81$	$-6.33* \pm 0.81$	-4.00 ± 2.16	-2.33 ± 1.10	$55.96* \pm 0.22$	$2.40* \pm 0.211$	$-3.04* \pm 0.40$	62.7**
tasselli	C3	-1.20* ± 0.60	-5.40* ± 0.82	0.44 ± 1.36	-3.52* ± 0.75	$55.74* \pm 0.16$	$1.26* \pm 0.160$	-3.65* ± 0.29	47.16**
Days to 50% tasselling	C4	-0.40 ± 0.49	$-6.40* \pm 0.88$	2.16 ± 1.20	-4.48* ± 0.69	$55.88* \pm 0.17$	-0.27 ± 0.17	$-3.88* \pm 0.27$	62.42**
Days	C5	-2.80* ± 0.67	-0.60* ± 0.29	2.52 ± 1.33	-2.96* ± 0.66	$56.03* \pm 0.21$	-2.12* ± 0.204	-3.20* ± 0.352	29.46**
	C6	-2.20* ± 0.60	0.40 ± 0.66	-1.64 ± 1.49	-0.00 ± 0.72	$54.64* \pm 0.21$	$-2.07* \pm 0.202$	-1.95* ± 0.36	14.91**
	C1	$5.40* \pm 0.70$	0.20 ± 1.00	1.44 ± 2.20	2.08 ± 1.09	57.529* ± 0.291	-0.342* ± 0.276	-1.496* ± 0.467	18.99**
ing	C2	-2.33 ± 1.24	$-5.66* \pm 0.07$	-2.80 ± 2.27	-2.60* ± 1.38	$56.736* \pm 0.303$	$2.460* \pm 0.270$	-0.053 ± 0.671	59.51**
Days to 50 % silking	C3	-1.60 ± 0.92	-5.60* ± 1.04	1.12 ± 1.61	-4.16* ± 0.84	58.288* ± 0.299	2.269* ± 0.303	$2.269* \pm 0.479$	39.12**
/s to 50	C4	-1.80 ± 1.02	-5.60* ± 0.90	1.72 ± 1.34	-4.56* ± 0.87	58.666* ± 0.19	$0.878* \pm 0.195$	-3.665* ± 0.289	47.11**
Day	C5	-3.00* ± 0.69	-0.40 ± 0.69	2.04 ± 1.48	-2.72* ± 0.69	$58.682* \pm 0.203$	-1.882* ± 0.188	-2.373* ± 0.401	29.10**
	C6	$-2.40* \pm 0.53$	$1.40* \pm 0.87$	-2.52 ± 1.50	0.76 ± 0.79	57.44* ± 0.199	-1.526* ± 0.196	-1.397* ± 0.326	26.63**
	C1	$2.00* \pm 0.60$	$-3.80* \pm 0.66$	-1.08 ± 2.20	-0.36 ± 1.09	$86.48* \pm 0.22$	-0.32 ± 0.20	-3.72* ± 0.36	50.88
_	C2	-0.66 ± 2.62	-9.66* ± 2.28	9.80 ± 3.14	-10.06* ± 1.81	$89.86* \pm 0.62$	$3.37* \pm 0.64$	-4.65* ± 1.13	46.82
Days to maturity	С3	-0.60 ± 2.43	-5.40* ± 1.07	$13.60* \pm 2.02$	-9.80* ± 1.51	$89.18* \pm 0.30$	$2.97* \pm 0.30$	-4.811* ± 0.53	101.07
ays to	C4	4.40 ± 2.46	$-7.80* \pm 0.96$	13.96* ± 2.24	-8.68* ± 1.59	$89.46* \pm 0.32$	-0.33 ± 0.32	$-3.91* \pm 0.50$	131.93
Д	C5	-4.40* ± 0.63	-0.20 ± 0.68	$8.28* \pm 1.63$	-6.44* ± 0.81	89.50* ± 0.21	-2.38* ± 0.20	$-3.75* \pm 0.35$	94.26
	C6	-1.00 ± 0.60	-0.40 ± 0.60	-6.28* ± 1.29	$2.44* \pm 0.66$	$85.13* \pm .16$	$-1.56* \pm 0.15$	-1.27* ± 0.29	24.25
	C1	52.80* ± 5.93	$73.80* \pm 5.35$	45.08 ± 30.65	$40.76* \pm 14.87$	135.47* ± 1.73	-16.42* ± 1.43	$31.91* \pm 3.57$	201.64
	C2	123.33* ± 6.62	$63.33* \pm 6.95$	-74.80* ± 16.10	130.73* ± 7.76	107.39* ± 2.13	-5.93* ± 1.99	90.44* ± 3.93	517.22
height	C3	85.80* ± 1.02	73.00* ± 1.00	-21.76* ± 10.20	90.28* ± 5.13	120.85* ± 0.23	$8.66* \pm 0.23$	$72.08* \pm 0.40$	135.31
Plant height	C4	57.00* ± 4.50	$52.60* \pm 7.16$	-46.16* ± 15.00	77.88* ± 6.40	133.44* ± 1.87	$10.74* \pm 1.52$	$17.04* \pm 3.25$	307.572
	C5	75.80* ± 4.19	$61.60* \pm 3.61$	-59.32* ± 16.32	98.36* ± 8.33	115.91* ± 0.96	$5.06* \pm 0.94$	66.46* ± 1.68	593.57
	C6	71.80* ± 3.63	$84.80* \pm 2.65$	-22.92 ± 19.24	89.76* ± 9.54	119.67* ± 0.96	-13.24* ± 0.87	55.59* ± 1.85	1179.37

Table 1 (Continued)

Cross			Scalin	ng Test	Joint Scaling Test (Three Parameter Model)				
		A	В	C	D	m	d	h	$\chi^2 (df = 3)$
	C1	15.40* ± 3.72	39.20* ± 3.22	33.16* ± 13.80	10.72 ± 6.48	66.46* ± 1.09	-19.95* ± 0.88	7.27* ± 2.21	153.49**
	C2	50.66* ± 7.15	-12.00* ± 3.87	$-40.53* \pm 6.93$	39.60* ± 4.08	64.41* ± 1.40	-8.66* ± 1.37	$35.60* \pm 2.60$	117.58**
Ear height	C3	$20.20* \pm 3.92$	$24.00* \pm 3.50$	-0.44 ± 5.34	22.32* ± 3.68	$64.16* \pm 0.32$	$1.75* \pm 0.32$	$22.21* \pm 0.49$	73.09**
Ear h	C4	21.40* ± 3.79	$18.20* \pm 4.38$	$-17.36* \pm 7.39$	$28.48* \pm 3.52$	$62.63* \pm 0.64$	-3.53 ± 0.64	$11.52* \pm 1.74$	76.50**
	C5	28.40* ± 3.29	$20.80* \pm 2.16$	1.12 ± 8.85	24.04* ± 4.68	$5.70* \pm 0.65$	$3.23* \pm 0.64$	$28.56* \pm 0.93$	160.41**
	C6	-33.20* ± 8.28	47.00* ± 29.34	-34.68* ± 10.32	24.24 ± 15.38	71.22* ± 1.97	1.03 ± 2.05	$16.06* \pm 3.55$	22.95**
	C1	15.40* ± 3.72	39.20* ± 3.22	33.16* ± 13.80	10.72 ± 6.49	$13.22* \pm 0.07$	-0.70* ± 0.07	$2.95* \pm 0.12$	223.2**
zth	C2	$4.20* \pm 0.41$	$5.46* \pm 0.47$	-3.21 ± 2.12	6.44* ± 1.06	$10.79* \pm 0.11$	-0.23* ± 0.11	$3.44* \pm 0.22$	210.38**
Cob length	C3	$4.74* \pm 0.38$	$4.56* \pm 0.52$	0.12 ± 1.75	$4.59* \pm 0.90$	$10.50* \pm 0.06$	$0.32* \pm 0.06$	$4.60* \pm 0.17$	202.08**
Cob	C4	$5.22* \pm 0.43$	$4.68* \pm 0.43$	-6.62* ± 1.61	$8.26* \pm 0.75$	$9.63* \pm 0.10$	-0.00 ± 0.08	$2.52* \pm 0.22$	261.06**
	C5	$6.04* \pm 0.22$	$6.08* \pm 0.18$	-1.85 ± 1.58	$6.98* \pm 0.80$	$9.11* \pm 0.05$	-0.27* ± 0.05	$5.98* \pm 0.09$	1706.9**
	C6	$2.14* \pm 0.26$	$2.62* \pm 0.19$	$3.32* \pm 0.51$	$0.72* \pm 0.23$	$13.01* \pm 0.05$	-0.09 ± 0.05	$1.94* \pm 0.12$	190.43**
	C1	$1.06* \pm 0.25$	0.22 ± 0.25	0.50 ± 0.38	$0.39* \pm 0.16$	$3.85* \pm 0.06$	-0.18* ± 0.06	$0.30* \pm 0.13$	17.86**
i.	C2	$1.16* \pm 0.27$	0.50 ± 0.35	0.68 ± 0.74	0.49 ± 0.36	$3.60* \pm 0.06$	-0.20* ± 0.06	$0.45* \pm 0.15$	18.78**
nete	C3	$0.82* \pm 0.21$	$0.60* \pm 0.21$	0.80 ± 0.47	0.30 ± 0.22	$3.35* \pm 0.05$	0.06 ± 0.05	$0.93* \pm 0.12$	18.08**
Cob Diameter	C4	$1.16* \pm 0.20$	$0.68* \pm 0.18$	$1.84* \pm 0.52$	-0.004 ± 0.27	$4.19* \pm 0.05$	-0.09 ± 0.05	$0.85* \pm 0.08$	50.73**
O	C5	$0.76* \pm 0.18$	$0.72* \pm 0.13$	$0.61^*\pm0.26$	$0.43* \pm 0.13$	$3.89* \pm 0.04$	$0.14* \pm 0.04$	$0.30*\pm0.08$	41.41**
	C6	$0.96* \pm 0.14$	$0.84* \pm 0.13$	$1.41^{\textstyle *}\pm0.37$	0.19 ± 0.19	$3.49^*\pm0.03$	$-0.12* \pm 0.03$	$0.75^* \pm 0.07$	75.55**
	C1	130.60* ± 18.22	188.60* ± 16.91	-175.10* ± 75.26	247.20* ± 37.69	195.26* ± 5.11	-8.92 ± 4.97	161.74* ± 8.83	174.94**
er cob	C2	$219.00* \pm 14.08$	$248.30* \pm 10.30$	-122.50* ± 23.63	294.90* ± 12.61	179.52* ± 3.22	-11.16* ± 3.20	217.47* ± 5.57	916.75**
Number of grains per	С3	192.20* ± 9.96	215.00* ± 7.54	-7.76 ± 79.27	207.40* ± 39.72	180.96* ± 2.02	-12.18* ± 1.97	$161.36* \pm \\ 4.08$	108.89**
er of g	C4	173.60* ± 6.44	173.80* ± 4.26	-43.08 ± 80.07	195.20* ± 40.10	205.84* ± 1.12	-14.34* ± 1.17	135.26* ± 2.35	2088.1**
Nump	C5	184.60* ± 4.57	179.60* ± 4.47	-50.36 ± 45.89	207.30* ± 22.97	210.59* ± 1.05	-7.33* ± 1.02	134.54* ± 2.17	2707.6**
	C6	40.40 ± 32.50	240.80* ± 114.2	-244.80* ± 60.40	263.00 ± 64.59	243.21* ± 10.26	-6.20 ± 10.60	197.98* ± 10.91	24.14**
	C1	$4.21* \pm 0.54$	$4.94* \pm 0.64$	$6.69* \pm 1.81$	1.23 ± 0.82	$19.23* \pm 0.22$	-929* ± 0.16	$5.17* \pm 0.42$	97.58**
100 grain weight	C2	12.44* ± 1.57	2.46 ± 2.25	5.40 ± 2.78	4.75* ± 1.79	$18.34* \pm 0.41$	-1.65* ± 0.42	$6.56* \pm 0.57$	64.43**
in w	C3	$7.14* \pm 1.63$	6.72* ± 1.16	0.76 ± 3.10	6.55* ± 1.76	17.10* ± 0.27	-1.72* ± 0.27	$7.43* \pm 0.38$	51.41**
gra	C4	$2.98* \pm 0.61$	5.90* ± 0.42	0.66 ± 1.96	4.11* ± 1.01	19.07* ± 0.15	-1.52* ± 0.15	$5.33* \pm 0.18$	220.40**
100	C5	$3.21* \pm 0.36$	$5.80* \pm 0.47$	-1.19 ± 1.34	5.10* ± 0.68	19.42* ± 0.12	-2.05* ± 0.12	5.42* ± 0.21	216.00**
	C6	$6.91* \pm 1.87$	8.44 ± 8.78	-6.21* ± 3.05	9.57* ± 4.55	19.84* ± 0.67	-0.02 ± 0.75	$2.84* \pm 0.91$	20.50**

Table 1 (Concluded)

Cro	SS		Scalin	ng Test		Joint Scaling Test (Three Parameter Model)				
		A	В	С	D	m	d	h	$\chi^2 (df = 3)$	
	C1	72.87* ± 4.88	32.80* ± 4.88	-12.14 ± 20.85	58.91* ± 10.32	45.83* ± 1.33	-2.10 ± 1.24	40.30* ± 2.70	241.53**	
ant	C2	53.77* ± 2.35	$63.32* \pm 2.58$	-8.63 ± 11.87	62.86* ± 5.55	$57.10* \pm 0.44$	-7.07* ± 0.38	$13.42* \pm 1.01$	744.82**	
l per pl	С3	56.39* ± 2.69	$59.78* \pm 2.67$	32.09* ± 11.78	42.04* ± 5.28	$55.35* \pm 0.45$	-1.03* ± 0.43	14.19* ± 1.22	599.26**	
Grain yield per plant	C4	29.69* ± 1.15	36.60* ± 1.46	2.07 ± 13.42	32.11* ± 6.73	$75.36* \pm 0.20$	-1.61* ± 0.12	$2.14* \pm 0.41$	164.41**	
	C5	39.44* ± 1.05	44.42* ± 1.16	-24.11* ± 10.10	53.98* ± 4.98	$57.88* \pm 0.31$	-3.74* ± 0.25	$20.94* \pm 0.65$	1878.4**	
	C6	28.95* ± 6.43	61.55* ± 30.49	-28.14* ± 14.60	56.78* ± 16.92	184.39* ± 33.85	$4.62* \pm 0.74$	-272.30* ± 96.85	28.874**	
0	C1	$5.41* \pm 2.55$	$6.27* \pm 1.23$	2.76 ± 4.29	$4.46* \pm 2.13$	$74.60* \pm 0.58$	$-1.28* \pm 0.55$	$2.84*\pm0.96$	28.51**	
ntago	C2	7.10 ± 7.09	1.53 ± 2.10	-0.39 ± 5.03	4.51 ± 3.93	$73.84* \pm 1.00$	2.96* ± 1.02	$6.27* \pm 1.51$	1.66	
erce	C3	$5.11* \pm 0.57$	$3.10* \pm 0.72$	$7.38* \pm 2.73$	0.41 ± 1.36	$75.54* \pm 0.19$	$1.17* \pm 0.18$	$3.90* \pm 0.36$	86.91**	
d gu	C4	$5.40* \pm 0.54$	$7.27* \pm 0.58$	$13.25* \pm 1.51$	-0.47 ± 0.60	$60.75* \pm 0.30$	-5.41* ± 0.30	$30.80* \pm 0.54$	1149.5**	
Shelling percentage	C5	$6.74* \pm 0.48$	$7.70* \pm 0.29$	2.70 ± 1.53	$5.87* \pm 0.77$	$76.81* \pm 0.09$	-1.50* ± 0.09	$2.16* \pm 0.18$	783.77**	
S	C6	$2.86* \pm 0.92$	$2.92* \pm 0.64$	0.33 ± 2.00	2.72* ± 1.30	$77.33* \pm 0.22$	-0.55* ± 0.21	$4.22* \pm 0.38$	27.68**	

 $\text{C1- HKI 209} \times \text{HKI 1128; C2- HKI 209} \times \text{HKI 163; C3- HKI 1332} \times \text{HKI 1128; C4- HKI 1332} \times \text{HKI 163, C5- HKI 325-17AN}$ \times HKI 1128; C6- HKI 325-17AN \times HKI 163.

Table 2 Estimates of genetic effects for some quantitative traits in six maize crosses

Cross			Component							
		m	d	h	i	j	1		Epistasis	
	C1	54.36* ± 0.52	$3.00* \pm 0.63$	2.06 ± 2.46	4.56 ± 2.43	6.00 ± 1.37	-9.56* ± 3.37	23.42**	-	
lling	C2	54.50* ± 0.50	-4.00* ± 0.47	1.00 ± 2.24	$4.66* \pm 2.21$	$6.00* \pm 1.05$	-13.33* ± 2.86	62.7**	-	
50% tasselling	СЗ	53.44* ± 0.31	-3.20* ± 0.45	$3.14* \pm 1.54$	$7.04* \pm 1.52$	$-2.10* \pm 0.96$	-13.64* ± 2.25	47.16**	Duplicate	
to 50%	C4	53.16* ± 0.27	$2.80* \pm 0.45$	0.66 ± 1.42	$2.56* \pm 1.40$	$1.30* \pm 0.97$	-4.36* ± 2.15	62.42**	-	
Days to	C5	53.76* ± 0.28	$-2.40* \pm 0.35$	$2.76* \pm 1.37$	6.56* ± 1.33	$-3.00* \pm 0.86$	-13.36* ± 1.92	29.46**	Duplicate	
	C6	53.52* ± 0.33	$2.80* \pm 0.32$	2.82 ± 1.50	5.92* ± 1.46	1.10 ± 0.82	-9.32* ± 1.96	14.91**	-	
	C1	57.24* ± 0.50	$-1.20* \pm 0.44$	-5.36* ± 2.23	-4.16 ± 2.18	$6.33* \pm 1.14$	$9.76* \pm 2.84$	18.99**	Duplicate	
sing	C2	56.70* ± 0.52	$4.00* \pm 0.57$	1.86 ± 2.41	5.20* ± 2.37	$6.33* \pm 1.33$	-13.20* ± 3.24	59.51**	-	
Days to 50 % silking	C3	55.52* ± 0.32	$-3.60* \pm 0.55$	$4.72* \pm 1.76$	8.32* ± 1.69	-2.00* ± 1.32	-15.52* ± 2.72	39.12**	Duplicate	
s to 50	C4	56.12* ± 0.30	$2.40* \pm 0.63$	$5.62* \pm 1.77$	9.12* ± 1.75	$2.90* \pm 1.33$	-16.52* ± 2.86	47.11**	Duplicate	
Day	C5	56.64* ± 0.30	$2.80* \pm 0.34$	2.74 ± 1.45	5.44* ± 1.38	1.30 ± 0.82	$-8.84* \pm 2.03$	29.10**	-	
	C6	57.08* ± 0.34	$3.00* \pm 0.42$	-3.22** ± 1.62	-1.52 ± 1.59	$1.90* \pm 0.96$	0.52 ± 2.26	26.63**	Duplicate	

Table 2 (Continued)

Cross			$\chi^2 (df = 3)$	Type of Epistasis					
		m d h i j l							
	C1	82.72* ± 0.52	-1.40* ± 0.31	$5.02* \pm 2.21$	8.72* ± 2.17	$3.30* \pm 0.82$	-10.52 ± 2.54	50.88	Duplicate
	C2	85.30* ± 0.53	$1.80* \pm 0.39$	-4.7* ± 2.29	-3.20 ± 3.61	$3.30* \pm 3.25$	$1.80* \pm 1.22$	46.82	Duplicate
Days to maturity	С3	83.40* ± 0.43	-4.60* ± 1.25	$15.20* \pm 4.93$	19.60* ± 6.45	-2.40* ± 1.21	-25.60* ± 4.75	101.07	Duplicate
ays to 1	C4	83.96* ± 0.49	3.60* ± 1.24	$12.86* \pm 3.23$	15.36* ± 3.19	4.10 ± 2.59	-20.76* ± 5.47	131.93	Duplicate
ב	C5	$85.28* \pm 0.36$	$3.80* \pm 0.34$	8.98* ± 1.66	12.88* ± 1.62	$2.10* \pm 0.86$	-17.48* ± 2.14	94.26	Duplicate
	C6	$85.72* \pm 0.28$	$6.66* \pm 0.34$	-6.38* ± 1.37	18.44* ± 1.33	$4.49* \pm 0.77$	-28.78* ± 1.89	24.25	Comple- mentary
	C1	165.68* ± 7.35	$21.80* \pm 2.21$	-16.82 ± 30.05	-81.52* ± 29.74	6.50 ± 5.81	$208.12* \pm 31.90$	201.64	-
	C2	191.70* ± 3.48	13.60* ± 3.43	-143.9* ± 16.05	-226.0* ± 15.33	6.50 ± 8.48	382.6* ± 21.16	517.22	Duplicate
riant neignt	C3	173.64* ± 2.54	-13.00* ± 0.63	-102.96* ± 10.26	-180.56* ± 10.25	-19.60* ± 1.35	339.36* ± 10.51	135.31	Duplicate
Flant	C4	176.64* ± 2.98	-12.95* ± 2.29	-131.3* ± 13.58	-203.65* ± 12.80	-7.04 ± 6.312	340.90* ± 17.58	307.572	Duplicate
	C5	174.88* ± 3.99	-5.40* ± 2.38	-91.72* ± 16.74	-148.72* ± 16.65	-2.2 ± 5.19	258.30* ± 18.90	593.57	Duplicat
	C6	$180.08* \pm 4.70$	-18.66* ± 1.568	-110.3* ± 19.18	-215.0* ± 19.07	-29.10* ± 3.78	$401.60* \pm 20.24$	1179.37	Duplicat
	C1	73.76* ± 3.18	$26.00* \pm 1.31$	2.46 ± 13.25	-21.44 ± 12.97	$8.67* \pm 3.54$	$76.04* \pm 14.76$	153.49**	-
	C2	88.30* ± 1.12	29.00* ± 3.42	-33.53* ± 8.58	-59.20* ± 8.16	8.67 ± 7.58	93.86* ± 15.32	117.58**	Duplicat
cai iicigiii	C3	75.76* ± 1.31	0.00 ± 2.59	$-22.34* \pm 7.39$	-44.64* ± 7.37	-1.90 ± 5.22	88.84* ± 11.66	73.09**	Duplicat
Eal I	C4	75.64* ± 1.36	2.00 ± 2.24	-39.96* ± 7.47	-56.96* ± 7.04	-1.60 ± 4.68	96.56* ± 11.62	76.50**	Duplicat
	C5	72.72* ± 2.16	-9.00* ± 1.78	-20.88* ± 9.40	-48.08* ± 9.35	-3.80 ± 3.85	97.28* ± 11.32	160.41**	Duplicat
	C6	82.12* ± 1.85	33.20* ± 14.93	-31.38 ± 30.98	-48.48* ± 23.77	40.10 ± 30.26	62.28 ± 60.62	22.95**	-
	C1	14.40* ± 0.19	$0.88* \pm 0.15$	1.18 ± 0.85	-2.17* ± 0.84	$0.92* \pm 0.34$	8.14* ± 1.03	223.2**	-
	C2	14.42* ± 0.52	0.16 ± 0.24	$0.42* \pm 0.21$	-2.88 ± 2.13	0.08 ± 0.56	$7.64* \pm 2.35$	210.38**	Comple- mentary
coo icingiii	С3	13.55* ± 0.43	-0.28 ± 0.29	-3.35 ± 1.81	-9.18* ± 1.80	-0.47 ± 0.59	18.48* ± 2.10	202.08**	-
000	C4	14.38* ± 0.36	-0.18 ± 0.17	-10.89* ± 1.54	-16.52* ± 1.50	-0.27 ± 0.39	26.42* ± 1.75	261.06**	Duplicat
	C5	13.63* ± 0.39	$0.36* \pm 0.12$	-7.59* ± 1.60	-13.97* ± 1.59	0.02 ± 0.27	$26.08* \pm 1.66$	1706.9**	Duplicat
	C6	$14.06* \pm 0.10$	$1.07* \pm 0.11$	$-7.02* \pm 0.48$	-11.46* ± 0.46	$0.63* \pm 0.25$	$21.13* \pm 0.68$	190.43**	Duplicat

Table 2 (Continued)

Cross			$\chi^2 (df = 3)$	Type of					
		m d h i j l							Epistasi
	C1	4.02* ± 0.05	-0.20 ± 0.13	-0.18 ± 0.36	-0.78* ± 0.33	-0.34 ± 0.29	2.06* ± 0.64	17.86**	-
	C2	3.93* ± 0.16	-0.03 ± 0.18	-0.20 ± 0.75	-0.99 ± 0.73	-0.34 ± 0.38	$2.65* \pm 1.02$	18.78**	-
ameter	СЗ	3.84* ± 0.10	-0.02 ± 0.11	0.45 ± 0.47	-0.62 ± 0.45	-0.11 ± 0.26	$2.04* \pm 0.64$	18.08**	-
Cob Diameter	C4	4.33* ± 0.13	-0.14 ± 0.11	0.87 ± 0.56	0.008 ± 0.55	-0.52* ± 0.25	$1.83* \pm 0.69$	50.73**	-
•	C5	$4.06* \pm 0.05$	-0.16 ± 0.09	-0.40 ± 0.28	-0.86* ± 0.27	-0.02 ± 0.20	$2.34* \pm 0.44$	41.41**	-
	C6	$3.76* \pm 0.09$	0.08 ± 0.07	$0.79* \pm 0.38$	-0.38 ± 0.37	-0.06 ± 0.16	$2.18* \pm 0.47$	75.55**	Comple- mentary
	C1	352.68* ± 18.24	53.80* ± 9.48	-324.92* ± 75.94	-494.32* ± 75.37	-2.50 ± 23.10	813.52* ± 84.28	174.94**	Duplicate
r cob	C2	352.30* ± 5.15	8.00 ± 7.26	-345.86* ± 25.87	-502.00* ± 25.21	-2.50 ± 16.25	866.00* ± 37.45	916.75**	Duplicate
ains pe	СЗ	309.04* ± 19.70	23.00* ± 5.18	-199.16* ± 79.58	-414.96* ± 79.45	11.40 ± 11.21	822.16* ± 81.94	108.89**	Duplicate
Number of grains per cob	C4	320.72* ± 19.98	27.56* ± 3.32	-219.18* ± 80.23	-463.36* ± 80.19	$14.56* \pm 7.10$	930.48* ± 81.16	2088.1**	Duplicate
Numb	C5	330.44* ± 11.41	$7.00* \pm 2.62$	-258.06* ± 46.01	-429.36* ± 45.95	0.10 ± 5.69	$776.76* \pm 47.07$	2707.6**	Duplicate
	C6	397.12* ± 13.92	116.40* ± 58.27	-317.08* ± 129.70	-526.08* ± 129.18	100.20 ± 118.6	$807.28^* \pm 240.80$	24.14**	Duplicate
	C1	$22.06* \pm 0.40$	$0.76* \pm 0.18$	2.40 ± 1.69	-2.46 ± 1.642	-4.99* ± 0.73	11.60* ± 1.96	174.94**	-
ıţ	C2	21.05* ± 0.63	-2.94* ± 1.27	-2.97 ± 3.37	-9.50* ± 3.59	-4.99* ± 2.70	$24.40* \pm 5.80$	916.75**	-
grain weight	C3	22.12* ± 0.75	0.97 ± 0.94	-5.93 ± 3.56	-13.10* ± 3.54	-0.21 ± 1.96	$26.96* \pm 4.87$	108.89**	-
100 grai	C4	$22.14* \pm 0.48$	$2.74* \pm 0.32$	-3.37 ± 2.04	-8.22* ± 2.03	$1.46* \pm 0.73$	$17.11* \pm 2.35$	2088.1**	-
_	C5	23.39* ± 0.31	$2.64* \pm 0.24$	-4.66* ± 1.37	-10.20* ± 1.36	$1.30* \pm 0.55$	19.20* ± 1.64	2707.6**	Duplicate
	C6	22.44* ± 0.59	2.25 ± 4.40	$-16.39* \pm 7.15$	-19.14* ± 9.10	0.76 ± 8.95	34.49* ± 17.84	24.14**	Duplicate
	C1	83.21* ± 5.001	-13.90* ± 2.559	-61.66* ± 20.859	-117.81* ± 20.649	4.77 ± 5.863	223.49* ± 23.24	241.53**	Duplicate
lant	C2	91.95* ± 2.755	$10.58* \pm 0.706$	-65.09* ± 11.328	-125.73* ± 11.109	4.77* ± 1.683	$242.82^* \pm \\12.21$	744.82**	Duplicate
d per p	C3	$78.42* \pm 2.721$	3.59* ± 0.969	-23.82* ± 11.284	-84.08* ± 11.056	3.49 ± 2.16	196.25* ± 12.40	599.26**	Duplicate
Grain yield per plant	C4	81.14* ± 3.343	-7.27* ± 0.805	-29.28* ± 13.48	-64.22* ± 13.469	-11.07* ± 1.73	130.52* ± 13.80	164.41**	Duplicate
Š	C5	92.29* ± 2.485	-5.69* ± 0.373	-60.28* ± 10.01	-107.97* ± 9.967	-8.89* ± 0.99	$191.82^* \pm \\10.22$	1878.4**	Duplicat
	C6	99.26* ± 3.431	20.92* ± 15.47	-68.23* ± 33.94	-113.56* ± 33.847	16.30 ± 30.97	204.06* ± 63.58	28.874**	Duplicat

Table 2 (Concluded)

Cross			$\chi^2 (df = 3)$	Type of					
		m	d	h	i	j	1		Epistasis
	C1	77.26* ± 0.92	1.26 ± 1.08	-3.41 ± 4.40	-8.92* ± 4.26	-0.84 ± 2.54	20.60* ± 6.10	28.51**	-
agi	C2	$77.37* \pm 0.97$	-5.72 ± 3.42	-2.54 ± 8.03	-9.00 ± 7.87	-8.64 ± 7.24	17.67 ± 14.59	1.66	-
ercenta	C3	$76.85* \pm 0.66$	-1.95* ± 0.34	4.07 ± 2.74	-0.83 ± 2.71	-2.89* ± 0.81	$9.03* \pm 3.05$	86.91**	-
Shelling percentage	C4	75.94* ± 0.29	$1.95* \pm 0.14$	$6.00* \pm 1.30$	0.95 ± 1.21	1.12 ± 0.54	$11.36* \pm 1.61$	1149.5**	Comple- mentary
She	C5	79.31* ± 0.37	$1.53* \pm 0.23$	-7.09* ± 1.55	-11.73* ± 1.54	0.48 ± 0.50	$26.17* \pm 1.78$	783.77**	Duplicate
	C6	79.98* ± 0.46	0.53 ± 0.45	-0.85 ± 2.09	-5.44* ± 2.05	0.03 ± 1.04	$11.23* \pm 2.71$	27.68**	-

C1- HKI 209 × HKI 1128; C2- HKI 209 × HKI 163; C3- HKI 1332 × HKI 1128; C4- HKI 1332 × HKI 163, C5- HKI 325-17AN × HKI 1128; C6- HKI 325-17AN × HKI 163.

all types of epistatic components were also observed in all the crosses that corroborates to Shahrokhi et al. (2013). Dominance and duplicate type of epistatic effects were found to contribute more than additive effects alone and results were in conformity with Irshad-ul-haq et al. (2010). The important portion of inheritance for shelling percentage was controlled by additive effects in C3, and epistatic effects also contributed to some extent in all the crosses. Duplicate type of epistasis in C5 and complementary type in C4 was observed with conclusions reached by Noor et al. (2018). Preponderance of dominance gene effects thus suggests that conventional selection procedure may not be rewarding for improvement of maize traits rather positively significant and predominant nature of dominant gene actions observed in all crosses can be effectively utilized in hybrid breeding programs. Thus, it appears that selections may be practiced in later generations or intermitting among the selected segregants followed by one or two generations of selfing could be useful to break the undesirable linkage and allow accumulation of favourable alleles for improvement of these traits.

REFERENCES

Alam A K, Ahmed M M, Begum S M and Sultan M K. 2008. Heterosis and combining ability for grain yield and its contributing characters in maize. *Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research* 33(3): 375–79.

Ali A, Rahman H, Farhatullah and Shah Z. 2019. Genetic analysis of yield and its contributing traits in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture* **35**(2): 654–62.

Ali G, Rather A C, Ishfaq A, Dar S A, Wani S A and Khan M N. 2007. Gene action for grain yield and its attributes in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*

3(2): 278–81.

Cavalli L L. 1952. An analysis of linkage in quantitative inheritance. *Quantitative Inheritance*. pp. 135–44. Rieve ECR and Waddington CH (Eds), HM Stationery Office. London

Edwards L H, Ketata H and Smith E L. 1975. Gene Action of Heading Date, Plant Height, and Other Characters in Two Winter Wheat Crosses. *Crop Sciences* 16: 275–77.

Ewool M B, Kena A W, Amoah R A and Akromah R. 2020. Studies of genetic control of pro-vitamin A maize hybrids in Ghana. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology* **9**(2): 196–205.

Hayman B I. 1958. The separation of epistatic from additive and dominance variation in generation means. *Heredity* 12: 371–90.

Irshad-ul-haq, Ajmal M S, Munir M and Gulfaraz M. 2010. Gene action studies of different quantitative traits in maize. *Pakistan Journal of Botany* **42**(2): 1021–30.

Lingaiah N, Raju C S, Radhika K, Sarla N, Venkanna V and Reddy D V V. 2020. Estimation of gene effects through generation mean analysis in elite rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) crosses. *Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences* 8(1): 15–20.

Mather K. 1949. *Biometrical Genetics*, pp. 158. Dover publications Inc., New York.

Noor M, Fahad S, Rahman H U, Shahwar D, Yasir M, Alam M, Ullah H, Adnan M, Jamal Y, Wahid F and Ali F. 2018. Generation mean analysis for grain yield and its components in popcorn. *Open Agriculture* 3: 437–58.

Shahrokhi M, Khorasani S K and Ebrahimi A. 2013. Study of genetic components in various maize (*Zea mays* L.) traits, using generation mean analysis method. *International Journal of Agronomy and Plant Production* 4(3): 405–12.

Sher H, Iqbal M, Khan K, Yasir M and Rahman H. 2012. Genetic analysis of maturity and flowering characteristics in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine* **2**(8): 621–26.