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#### Abstract

The present study explicates the genetics of 15 (eight yield traits and seven quality traits) basmati traits by employing generation mean analysis in six crosses of basmati rice crosses. Generation mean analysis is a biometrical tool which not only can identify presence of epistasis but also explain its types and role in inheritance of traits. Simple and Joint scaling test indicated role of epistasis in inheritance all the six crosses except for alkali spread value in the cross HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509, which showed dominance gene action. 90 individual tests each of simple and joint scaling tests divulged role of one or the other type of epistasis in inheritance of different traits in all the six crosses except for alkali spread value in cross HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509, which showed dominance gene action. Complementary digenic interaction were observed for yield per plant trait; however, other traits showed equal importance of complementary and duplicate digenic interaction in inheritance of different traits examined in the present study. Most of the traits were governed by epistatic gene action which suggested that traits of such population can be improved when the selection process is delayed. However, selection can be practiced at early stage of breeding program in such traits which were governed by additive gene action.
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## INTRODUCTION

Basmati is an important crop in India as it one of the major agriculture-based export commodities fetching billions of dollars every year. In year 2022-23 India exported 4.6 million MT of basmati and gained 4.79 billion US dollars, which is the second highest among any agriculture commodity exported from the country, following buffalo meat (APEDA, 2022-23). However, the quantity of nonbasmati exported was approximately 3.9 times less than basmati. Besides its economic importance, basmati is famous among its consumers, every other person prefers basmati over non-basmati rice. Few of the many reasons behind the consumers enamor towards basmati are slender kernel, increased length after cooking, cooked rice texture and aroma.

There are 34 basmati varieties available in India among which only few are exported viz., Tarori Basmati, PuB1, PuB-1121 and PuB-1509. A crop which affects socioeconomic structure of India so magnanimously demands more variety to be developed. A rice variety can be called as basmati only when it meets all the standards stipulated by Export of Basmati Rice (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 2003 (Sharma et al., 2021). Besides this, a rice variety can be called as basmati variety only when one of the parents used in breeding program is a traditional basmati variety (Jaiswal and Sharma, 2022). Basmati Rules 2003 define two types basmati varieties viz., traditional and evolved (Sharma et al. 2021). In general, traditional basmati possess excellent quality traits but
gives poor yield (Ahuja et al. 1995, Nagaraju 2002 and Siddiq et al. 2012), poor general combining ability (Ahuja et al. 1995), scarce genetic variability (Siddiq et al. 2012). Poor general combining ability in traditional basmati varieties have been reported by Kour et al. (2019) and Sharma and Jaiswal (2020a).

Basmati breeding program is a complex task. Its intricacy can be worked out by decerning the nature of gene action and gene interaction which governs inheritance of different traits of basmati rice. Hence, a study was undertaken using six best performing $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ of diallel mating design conducted in previous season which further were advanced to obtain $F_{2}, B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ to study gene action of yield and quality traits by employing Generation Mean Analysis

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Generation of experimental material for the present study was carried out with the help of nine Basmati varieties in two cropping season Kharif 2016 and 2017 at Agriculture Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh. In Kharif 2016, nine varieties of Basmati namely, Type-1(T-3), Basmati-370, Taraori Basmati (TB), Ranbir Basmati, Pusa Basmati (PuB-1), CSR-30, Pusa Basmati-1121 (PuB-1121), HUBR 10-9 and Pusa Basmati 1509 (PuB-1509) were subjected to diallel mating design (without reciprocals) which resulted in $36 \mathrm{~F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. In Kharif 2017, nine parents and single lines of 10 plants each of 36 F1s were raised in a separate crossing block. In Kharif 2017, work plan was done in two phases. In the first phase, $6 F_{1} s$ out of $36 F_{1} s$ were selected at early stage of plant growth based on number of tillers. $F_{2}$ seeds of these selected $6 F_{1} s$ were harvested separately. In the second phase: $B_{1}, B_{2}$ were developed of the six selected crosses; by crossing the $F_{1}$ with $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ respectively. And at the same time, fresh $F_{1} s$ were also developed in the crossing block. Thus, by the end of kharif, 2017, six generations of each of the six selected crosses (Cross $\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{VI}$ ) constituting of $\mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{P}_{2}, \mathrm{~F}_{1}, \mathrm{~F}_{2}, \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ were obtained.

During Kharif 2018, $\mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{P}_{2}, \mathrm{~F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~F}_{2} \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{~s}$ of the six selected crosses namely: T-3 x PuB-1 (Cross I); T-3 x PuB-1121 (Cross II); PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 (Cross III), CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 (Cross IV), PuB-1121 x HUBR109 (Cross V) and HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 (Cross VI) were raised in Compact Family Block Design in three replications. Plant to plant and row to row distance was kept $10 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ and all package of practice for Basmati rice was followed to raise a healthy crop and a better crop stand. Observations were recorded on eight yield traits (days to 50 percent flowering, days to maturity, plant height, panicle length, number of panicles per plant, number of grains per panicle, 100-grain weight, yield per plant) and seven grain quality traits (kernel length, kernel breadth, kernel length after cooking, kernel breadth after cooking, alkali spreading value, aroma and amylose
content). From each cross, data was collected on $30 P_{1}$, $P_{2}$ and $F_{1} ; 60 B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$; and $150 F_{2}$ plants from all the three replications. The traits were evaluated following guidelines and standard protocol given in Standard Evaluation System, IRRI, 2013.

Aroma was tested by five-member panel. To measure the presence or absence of aroma in the experimental material, the polished rice kernels were kept in $1.7 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ solution in a petri dish for 10 minutes at $25-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After ten minutes, the panel members smelled and assessed the strength of aroma in comparison to aroma of Taraori basmati. Taraori basmati was taken as standard to compare the strength of aroma present in each sample and were scaled in order of 1 to3, where $1=$ non aromatic, $2=$ slightly aromatic and $3=$ strongly aromatic. The average of five panel members for each sample was taken as final reading of aroma.

ANOVA for Compact Family Block Design were carried out by following Panse and Sukhatme (1967). Further, ANOVA of each of the six crosses were calculated separately (Panse and Sukhatme). Presence of epistasis in the inheritance of traits was examined by using simple (Marther, 1949) and Joint Scaling tests (Cavalli, 1952). Accordingly, the genetics of traits which showed allelic interaction were studied by using 6 -parameter model (Hayman, 1958), while, the inheritance of traits which showed non-allelic interaction were studied by applying 3-paramter model proposed by Jinks and Jones (1958).

Estimation of presence of epistasis: To observe presence of epistasis in governance of different traits, two scaling tests were used viz., simple scaling tests and Joint scaling tests. A, B and C scaling tests, and Chi-square tests were employed to assess the role of epistasis in simple and Joint scaling tests respectively. Values of A, B and C scales were calculated by using following formula

| Scales | Variance of scales |
| :--- | :--- |
| $A=2 \bar{B}_{1}-\bar{P}_{1}-\bar{F}_{1}$ | $V A=4 V\left(\bar{B}_{1}\right)+V\left(\bar{P}_{1}\right)+V\left(\bar{F}_{1}\right)$ |
| $B=2 \overline{\mathrm{~B}}_{2}-\bar{P}_{2}-\bar{F}_{1}$ | $V B=4 V\left(\bar{B}_{2}\right)+V\left(\bar{P}_{2}\right)+V\left(\bar{F}_{1}\right)$ |
| $C=4 \bar{F}_{2}-2 \bar{F}_{1}-\bar{P}_{1}-\bar{P}_{2}$ | $V C=16 V\left(\bar{F}_{2}\right)+4 V\left(\bar{F}_{1}\right)+V\left(\bar{P}_{1}\right)$ |
|  | $+V\left(\bar{P}_{2}\right)$ |

Where, $A, B$ and $C$ are the scales and $\bar{P}_{1}, \overline{\mathrm{P}}_{2}, \overline{\mathrm{~F}}_{1}, \overline{\mathrm{~F}}_{2}, \overline{\mathrm{~B}}_{1}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{B}}_{2}$ are generation means for a particular character. $V \bar{A}, V \bar{B}$, and $V \bar{C}$ are corresponding variances of the scales and $\vee\left(\bar{P}_{1}\right), \vee\left(\bar{P}_{2}\right)$ etc. are the variance of the sample means of respective generations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ANOVA was conducted at two levels viz., for each of the six cross generations following Compact Family Block Design and for each trait within a cross following Randomized Block Design. Compact Family Block Design ANOVA illustrated significant results in all the six
cross generations (Table 1). In case of ANOVA results of Randomized Block Design within each cross for different traits, all crosses manifested significant results except for one trait, viz., number of panicles per plant in Cross I (T-3 x PuB-1) (Table 2). Similar findings have been recorded by Ramli et al. (2016), Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a) and Kour et al. (2019) in aromatic rice crop.

Detection of epistasis by applying scaling tests : Presence of epistasis was examined by following simple and Joint scaling tests for the inheritance of 15 traits studied in the experiment. Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a), and Krishna et al. (2018) have also employed both scaling tests to discern the presence of epistasis in inheritance of different traits. In the present study, backcross population

Table 1. ANOVA of compact family block design of six crosses of basmati rice

| Traits | Source of variation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Replication | Cross | Error A | Progeny within cross | Error B |
|  | df =2 | df =5 | df $=10$ | df $=30$ | df $=60$ |
| Days to 50 percent flowering | 2.60 | 75.58*** | 1.50 | 22.42*** | 2.37 |
| Days to maturity | 1.09 | 63.01*** | 1.80 | 24.29*** | 2.21 |
| Plant height (cm) | 29 | 1489.42*** | 6.95 | 306.94*** | 7.33 |
| Panicle length (cm) | 3.75 | 11.28*** | 0.59 | 3.59*** | 0.83 |
| Number of panicles per plant | 1.59 | 25.64*** | 1.23 | 12.51*** | 2.70 |
| Number of grains per panicle | 723.06 | 6364.85*** | 124.43 | 1486.10*** | 100.03 |
| 100-grain weight (g) | 0.001 | 0.62*** | 0.001 | 0.11*** | 0.001 |
| Yield per plant (g) | 13.42 | 443.20*** | 10.07 | 105.33*** | 6.75 |
| Kernel length (mm) | 0.001 | 1.26*** | 0.001 | 0.51*** | 0.01 |
| Kernel breadth (mm) | 0.001 | 0.02*** | 0.001 | 0.01*** | 0.001 |
| Kernel length after cooking (mm) | 0.00 | 24.76*** | 0.18 | 10.46*** | 0.28 |
| Kernel breadth after cooking (mm) | 0.005 | 0.03*** | 0.003 | 0.02*** | 0.003 |
| Alkali spreading value (scale 1-7) | 1.27 | 9.93*** | 0.24 | $1.44^{* * *}$ | 0.22 |
| Aroma (scale 1-3) | 0.01 | 0.19*** | 0.02 | 0.15*** | 0.01 |
| Amylose content (\%) | 0.81 | 1.70*** | 0.29 | $3.19^{* * *}$ | 0.25 |

Significance Levels *** $=<.001$

Table 2. Mean sum of square of progenies of six crosses of basmati rice

| Traits | Mean Sum of Square of progenies (df=5) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cross I | Cross II | Cross III | Cross IV | Cross V | Cross VI |
| Days to 50 percent flowering | 19.15** | 23.69* | 12.66** | 53.85** | 33.79** | 33.79** |
| Days to maturity | 17.89** | 33.01** | 19.45** | 65.06** | 30.40** | 30.40** |
| Plant height (cm) | 1321.16** | 450.77** | 380.81** | 594.14** | 55.30** | 55.30** |
| Panicle length (cm) | 17.75** | 9.02** | 8.53** | 7.06** | 12.18** | 12.18** |
| Number of panicles per plant | 3.04 | 18.27** | 4.29* | 48.84** | 6.77** | 6.09* |
| Number of grains per panicle | 1313.58** | 619.60** | 808.35** | 2151.61** | 3472.11** | 3472.11** |
| 100-grain weight (g) | 0.02** | 0.31** | 0.06** | 0.11** | 0.20** | 0.20** |
| Yield per plant (g) | 101.88** | 121.53** | 570.83** | 634.05** | 505.47** | 505.47** |
| Kernel length (mm) | 0.22** | 1.41** | 0.22** | 0.18** | 0.84** | 0.84** |
| Kernel breadth (mm) | 0.02** | 0.00** | 0.00** | 0.01** | 0.00** | 0.00** |
| Kernel length after cooking(mm) | 6.74** | 23.18** | 5.65** | 1.20** | 17.84** | 17.84** |
| Kernel breadth after cooking (mm) | 0.06** | 0.04** | 0.03** | 0.02* | 0.07** | $0.07 * *$ |
| Alkali spreading value (scale 1-7) | 4.37** | 3.54** | 0.90** | 0.01** | 2.77** | 2.77** |
| Aroma (scale 1-3) | 1.15** | 0.97** | 0.19** | 0.33** | 0.26** | 0.26** |
| Amylose content (\%) | 4.46** | 3.99** | 5.55** | 7.17** | 5.39** | 5.39** |

[^0]were used and hence only A, B C simple scaling tests were performed. Joint scaling tests were performed using chi square test $\left(\mathrm{X}^{2}\right)$. Simple scaling tests and joint scaling tests were in congruence with each other in all the 90 cases. Since, there were 15 traits and six crosses hence 90 tests were performed to know the presence of epistasis (Table 3-5). Here, term "case" represents as one test conducted either for simple or joint scaling tests. However, contradictory results of simple and Joint scaling tests were reported by Divya et al. (2014) in 5 out of 20 cases, Krishna et al. (2018) four out of 70 cases. Presence of epistasis was observed in all cases, except for one trait of Cross VI (HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509). For the traits which showed epitasis, six parameter model was used to further decipher which type of non-allelic gene interaction is governing the inheritance of those traits. Similarly, trait, alkali spreading value in Cross VI did not show epistasis in scaling test hence three parameter model was applied to estimate type of gene action in the trait. It was observed that, dominance [ $\hat{h}]$ gene action was governing the trait inheritance. Similarly, Ganapati et al. (2020) found one trait, namely 1000-grain weight which showed absence of epistasis in its inheritance. Except for one case, traits were governed by both allelic and nonallelic interactions. However, many authors have reported that traits were governed by epistasis only. In the present findings, traits which did not fit into additive dominance model i.e., which showed presence of epistasis in scaling tests were further examined to elucidate which type of epistasis were controlling the traits.

Assessment of Gene effects and gene interaction yield attributing traits: Traits which are negatively correlated yield viz., days to 50 percent flowering, days to maturity and plant height showed dominance gene effects, additive $x$ additive and dominance $x$ dominance types of epistasis. Similar findings have been recorded by authors viz., Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a) and Bano et al. (2017). Panicle length showed dominance and dominance $x$ dominance (I) type of gene interaction (Table 4). Hasib et al. (2002) recorded additive and dominance gene action and Krishna et al. (2018) observed all type of gene interaction in their studies. Panicles per plant directly contribute to the increase in yield, this trait showed d, h, i and I type of epistasis. However, authors viz., Murugan and Ganesan (2006) and Krishna et al. (2018) observed additive [ $\hat{d}]$ and dominance [ $\hat{h}$ ] type of gene action all types inter-allelic interaction effects. Number of
seed per panicle and 100-grain weight are positively correlated with yield per plant traits (Sharma and Jaiswal, 2020) and these traits were controlled by h and I type of epistasis (Table 5). Similar findings have been recorded by Krishna et al. (2018), and Bano et al. (2017) in aromatic rice.

Among digenic interaction in which the direction of $h$ and I type of epitasis are considered and accordingly termed as complementary when h and I have same direction either positive or negative. In same way, if $h$ and I show contrasting direction of gene interaction then it is called as duplicate epistasis (Hayman and Mather, 1955). In the present findings, yield attributing traits showed equal importance of both complementary and duplicate epistasis. Though, yield per plant traits showed only complementary epistasis. Aforementioned experimental findings have been also recorded by Gopikanan and Ganesh (2014), Rani et al. (2015), and Ganapati et al. (2020) in rice crop.

Organoleptic traits: Among organoleptic traits, slender kernel astounds rice consumers, hence, rice kernel dimension plays an important role in breeding for basmati rice variety. Kernel dimension related traits viz., length and breadth before and after cooking were found to be controlled by mostly both, gene effects (additive and dominance) and epistasis (additive $x$ additive and dominance $x$ dominance) (Table 5). Similar findings have been recorded by rice workers viz., Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a) in aromatic rice and by Bano et al. (2017) in basmati rice varieties for rice kernel related traits. Alkali spreading value gives an indirect explanation of amylose content present in rice kernel based on spreading of polished kernels in $1-7 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ solution. The alkali spreading value showed dominance type of gene effect, and additive $x$ additive, dominance $x$ dominance type of gene interaction. However, in one Cross VI (HUBR10$9 \times$ PuB-1509) the trait did not show significant value neither in simple scaling tests nor in joint scaling test and hence Jinks and Jones three parameter model was used to discern the gene effect and it was found that the trait showed dominance type of gene effect. Aroma and amylose content showed presence of dominance $x$ dominance type of gene interaction (Table 6). For aroma, Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a) recorded all types of gene effects and interaction in their study in aromatic rice. For amylose content, additive and dominance gene action,

Table 3. Estimates of genetic parameter in non-interacting trait following Jinks and Jones

| Alkali spreading value | $[\hat{m}]$ | $[\hat{d}]$ | $[\hat{h}]$ | Simple scaling <br> test <br> (A, B and C) | Joint scaling <br> test |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $6.3^{* * *} \pm 0.13$ | $-0.31 \pm 0.18$ | $-1.37^{*} \pm 0.64$ | NS | NS |

Significance Levels * $=<.05,^{* *}=<.01 \&{ }^{* * *}=<.001$
Table 4. Estimates of gene effects following Hayman's six parameter model for yield traits of basmati rice

| CROSS | $[\hat{m}]$ | $[\hat{d}]$ | $[\hat{h}]$ | $[\hat{l}]$ | $[\hat{j}]$ | $[\hat{l}]$ | Type of interactions | Simple scaling test |  |  | Joint <br> scaling <br> test <br> $x^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | B | C |  |
| Days to fifty percent flowering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $105.03^{* * *} \pm 2.15$ | $1.52^{* *} \pm 0.08$ | $-15.25 * * * 2.15$ | $-12.3^{* * *} \pm 2.15$ | $-0.47 \pm 0.55$ | $3.7 \pm 2.9$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $106.63^{* * *} \pm 0.45$ | $-1.78 * \pm 0.77$ | $-17.23^{* * *} \pm 2.35$ | $-11.83^{* * *} \pm 2.35$ | $-1.18 \pm 0.77$ | $1.8 \pm 3.56$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | 103.61*** $\pm 0.37$ | $-1.22 \pm 0.65$ | $-6.09^{* *} \pm 1.97$ | $-4.33 * \pm 1.96$ | $-0.28 \pm 0.65$ | $-8.37^{* *} \pm 3$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | 106.59*** $\pm 0.46$ | $-0.4 \pm 0.82$ | $-3.29 \pm 2.47$ | $-2.97 \pm 2.47$ | $-6.95 \pm 0.82$ | $9.81 * * \pm 3.76$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | 102.85*** $\pm 0.38$ | $-3.3^{* * *} \pm 1$ | $-3.24 \pm 2.53$ | $3.68 \pm 2.53$ | $-4.98 \pm 1$ | $-21.18^{* * *} \pm 4.31$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $105.87^{* * *} \pm 0.35$ | $0.07 \pm 0.79$ | $-13.48^{* * *} \pm 2.13$ | $-6.09^{* *} \pm 2.12$ | $3.55 \pm 0.8$ | $-8.27 * \pm 3.48$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Days to maturity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $134.94^{* * *} \pm 0.49$ | $1.62^{* *} \pm 0.63$ | $-21.29 * * * 3.06$ | $-19.66^{* * *} \pm 2.31$ | $-2.32 \pm 2.09$ | $25.76{ }^{* * *} \pm 5.1$ | D | ** | NS | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $138.79^{* * *} \pm 0.48$ | $-1.7 * \pm 0.82$ | $-32.56{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.54$ | $-26.71^{* * *} \pm 2.53$ | $-2.25 \pm 0.82$ | $29.54^{* * *} \pm 3.82$ | D | ** | NS | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $136.23 * * \pm 0.42$ | $-0.83 \pm 0.67$ | $-24.5^{* * *} \pm 2.15$ | $-21.53^{* * *} \pm 2.14$ | $-1.57 \pm 0.67$ | $18.87 * * \pm 3.17$ | D | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $139.18^{* * *} \pm 0.48$ | $0.05 \pm 0.89$ | $-22.9^{* * *} \pm 2.63$ | $-20.62^{* * *} \pm 2.62$ | $-6.5 \pm 0.89$ | $29.89^{* * *} \pm 4.06$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $132.3^{* * *} \pm 0.43$ | $-3.07^{* *} \pm 1$ | $-8.58{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.66$ | $-1.47 \pm 2.66$ | $-5.25 \pm 1.01$ | $-8.03 \pm 4.39$ | -- | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | 134.81*** $\pm 0.38$ | $-0.22 \pm 0.83$ | $-18.49 * * \pm 2.27$ | $-9.35 * * \pm 2.26$ | $3.05 \pm 0.84$ | $-2.01 \pm 3.69$ | -- |  |  |  |  |
| Plant height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $132.39^{* * *} \pm 1.36$ | $-8.17^{* * *} \pm 3.51$ | $45.12{ }^{* * *} \pm 8.89$ | $-3.27 \pm 1.35$ | $-0.19 \pm 0.48$ | $20.69 \pm 15.08$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $136.79^{* * *} \pm 1.41$ | $-11.41^{* *} \pm 3.63$ | $-19.24 * \pm 9.22$ | $-18.02 \pm 9.2$ | $-29.63 \pm 3.65$ | $32.33 * \pm 15.62$ | -- | ** | ** | NS | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $122.87^{* * *} \pm 1.39$ | $10.51^{* * *} \pm 2.74$ | $2.39 \pm 7.84$ | $2.97 \pm 7.81$ | $18.9 \pm 2.76$ | $-72.69^{* * *} \pm 12.37$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $122.79^{* * *} \pm 1.3$ | $-3.25 \pm 2.45$ | $51.6^{* * *} \pm 7.17$ | $41.65 * * \pm 7.14$ | $-22.74 \pm 2.84$ | $-18.57 \pm 11.16$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $123.79^{* * *} \pm 1.15$ | $4.56 \pm 2.53$ | $5.05 \pm 6.87$ | $-2.72 \pm 6.84$ | $2.93 \pm 2.57$ | $-10.78 \pm 11.18$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | 117.01*** $\pm 1.11$ | $-1.83 \pm 2.51$ | $67.42 * * * 6.71$ | $46.84 * * \pm 6.7$ | $-9.33 \pm 2.53$ | $-97.72^{* * *} \pm 11.02$ | D | NS | NS | ** | ** |
| Panicle length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $27.76{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.25$ | $-0.25 \pm 0.45$ | $0.31 \pm 1.39$ | $-3.27^{*} \pm 1.35$ | $-0.19 \pm 0.48$ | $21.55^{* * *} \pm 2.17$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $28.11^{* * *} \pm 0.22$ | $-1.76^{* * *} \pm 0.5$ | $-2.06 \pm 1.35$ | $-5.0 * * * 1.33$ | $-2.79 \pm 0.53$ | $13.89^{* * *} \pm 2.23$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $29.31^{* * *} \pm 0.20$ | $0.89 \pm 0.45$ | $6.63{ }^{* * *} \pm 1.22$ | $2.5 * \pm 1.2$ | $-0.08 \pm 0.47$ | $1.29 \pm 2.01$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $26.67^{* * *} \pm 0.20$ | $-1.41^{* * *} \pm 3.89$ | $6.28 * * \pm 1.14$ | $3.1{ }^{* *} \pm 1.1$ | $-1.21 \pm 0.44$ | 4.15* $\pm 1.84$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $28.00 * * * 0.20$ | $0.55 \pm 0.61$ | $3.97 * * 1.47$ | $-1.14 \pm 1.46$ | $1.22 \pm 0.63$ | $9.28 * * * 2.58$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $28.16^{* * *} \pm 0.21$ | $0.29 \pm 0.44$ | $3.64 * \pm 1.23$ | $-1.36 \pm 1.22$ | $-0.18 \pm 0.45$ | $9.61^{* * *} \pm 1.99$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| No. of panicles/plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $8.89 * * \pm 0.28$ | $-1.32 * \pm 0.67$ | $6.67 * * * 1.77$ | $4.42^{*} \pm 1.75$ | $-1.27 \pm 0.69$ | $-4.09 \pm 2.94$ | -- | NS | NS | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $10.8^{* * *} \pm 0.24$ | $-6.35^{* * *} \pm 0.86$ | $8.67 * * * 2.02$ | $5.83 * * 1.96$ | $-5.48 \pm 0.91$ | $-10.53^{* *} \pm 3.7$ | D | ** | ** | NS | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $10.68{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.29$ | $1.43 \pm 0.76$ | $6.43^{* * *} \pm 1.95$ | $5.21^{* *} \pm 1.92$ | $2.22 \pm 0.79$ | $-11.58^{* * *} \pm 3.34$ | D | ** | NS | NS | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $10.2^{* * *} \pm 0.25$ | $-0.05 \pm 0.61$ | $10.18^{* * *} \pm 1.67$ | $0.70 \pm 1.58$ | $-0.37 \pm 0.7$ | $20.43^{* * *} \pm 2.86$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $10.27^{* * *} \pm 0.31$ | $-1.40 \pm 0.77$ | $10.82{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.05$ | $7.77^{* * *} \pm 1.96$ | $-1.28 \pm 0.81$ | $-8.74 * \pm 3.52$ | D | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $10.98{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.38$ | $-4.00^{* * *} \pm 1.00$ | $11.83^{* *} \pm 4.14$ | $4.81 \pm 2.51$ | $-2.35 \pm 1.04$ | $9.35 \pm 7.86$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |

[^1]Table 5. Estimates of gene effects following Hayman's six parameter model for yield and quality traits of basmati rice

| CROSS | [ $\hat{m}]$ | $[\hat{d}]$ | $[\hat{h}]$ | $[\hat{l} \hat{l}]$ | [ $\hat{j}]$ | [ $\hat{l}]$ | Type of interactions | Simple scaling test |  |  | Joint scaling test X2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | B | C |  |
| Number of grains/plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $83.37^{* * *} \pm 2.16$ | $-53.47^{* * *} \pm 4.22$ | $32.5{ }^{* *} \pm 12.37$ | $18.53 \pm 12.08$ | $-44.4 \pm 4.55$ | $54.06{ }^{* *} \pm 19.69$ | C | ** | NS | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $85.57{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.34$ | $-1.57 \pm 4.83$ | $-45.03{ }^{* * *} \pm 13.55$ | $-69.09{ }^{* * *} \pm 13.44$ | $-15.67 \pm 4.91$ | $85.36{ }^{* * *} \pm 21.73$ | D | ** | NS | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $118^{* * *} \pm 3.11$ | $-15.12{ }^{*} \pm 6.65$ | $39.48^{*} \pm 18.48$ | $20.31^{* *} \pm 18.22$ | $4.15 \pm 7.02$ | $34.85{ }^{* * *} \pm 30$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $89.32^{* * *} \pm 2.16$ | $-48.62^{* * *} \pm 5.84$ | 42.09** 14.94 | $41.89 * \pm 14.53$ | -28.05 $\pm 6.6$ | $70.15 * \pm 25.87$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $83.09{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.64$ | $3.37 \pm 5.79$ | $63.82{ }^{* * *} \pm 15.98$ | $38.79{ }^{*} \pm 15.66$ | $52.43 \pm 6.12$ | $36.95 \pm 26.21$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 $\times$ PuB-1509 | $91.19^{* * *} \pm 2.74$ | $31.08^{* * *} \pm 5.82$ | $24.82 \pm 16.26$ | $-4.58 \pm 15.97$ | $-10.32 \pm 6.13$ | $130.68^{* * *} \pm 26.43$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| 100-Grain weight (g) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $2.27^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $0.04 \pm 0.03$ | $-0.16 \pm 0.09$ | $-0.32{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.09$ | $-0.05 \pm 0.03$ | $0.64{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.14$ | -- | ** | ** | NS | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $2.27^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $-0.4{ }^{\star * *} \pm 0.04$ | $1.23^{* * *} \pm 0.1$ | $0.88^{* * *} \pm 0.1$ | -0.06 $\pm 0.04$ | $0.010 \pm 0.16$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $2.27^{* * *} \pm 0.01$ | $-0.13^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $0.17^{* *} \pm 0.07$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.07$ | 0.04 $\pm 0.02$ | $0.45^{* * *} \pm 0.10$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $2.4{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $0.003 \pm 0.04$ | $0.43^{* * *} \pm 0.12$ | $0.22^{*} \pm 0.11$ | -0.16 $\pm 0.04$ | $0.82^{* * *} \pm 0.18$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $2.59 * * * \pm 0.02$ | $0.4 * * * 0.05$ | $-0.27 * \pm 0.13$ | $-0.52^{* * *} \pm 0.13$ | $0.17 \pm 0.05$ | $1.82{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.21$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $2.58^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $-0.25^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $0.5^{* * *} \pm 0.1$ | $0.24 * \pm 0.1$ | $-0.008 \pm 0.04$ | $0.5{ }^{* *} \pm 0.16$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Yield per plant (g) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $8.4{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.37$ | $-5.34^{* * *} \pm 1.05$ | $24.46^{* * *} \pm 2.65$ | $18.73^{* * *} \pm 2.57$ | $-6.11 \pm 1.14$ | $14.3{ }^{* *} \pm 4.64$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $14.33^{* * *} \pm 0.57$ | $-6.57^{* * *} \pm 1.24$ | $5.0 \pm 3.45$ | $-5.68 \pm 3.63$ | $-5.53 \pm 1.29$ | $47.59{ }^{* * *} \pm 5.68$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $16.77^{* * *} \pm 0.63$ | $-1.84 \pm 1.81$ | $39.92{ }^{* * *} \pm 4.52$ | $13.44^{* *} \pm 4.42$ | $5.96 \pm 1.84$ | $61.07{ }^{* * * \pm 7.9}$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $14.23^{* * *} \pm 0.52$ | $-7.65{ }^{* * *} \pm 1.36$ | $31.15 * * * 3.63$ | $8.36 * \pm 3.42$ | $-3.74 \pm 1.44$ | $87.17^{* * *} \pm 6.32$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $14.53{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.65$ | $0.84 \pm 1.58$ | $37.12^{* * *} \pm 4.19$ | $14.49^{* * *} \pm 4.09$ | $7.68 \pm 1.62$ | $60.95 * * * 7.1$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $18.18^{* * *} \pm 0.91$ | $-1.82 \pm 1.99$ | $20.78^{* * *} \pm 5.51$ | $2.75 \pm 5.4$ | $-4.9{ }^{* * *} \pm 2.02$ | $75.55^{* * *} \pm 9.04$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Kernel length (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $7.03{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $-0.39 * * * 0.08$ | $1.54{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.23$ | $1.12^{* * *} \pm 0.22$ | $-0.44 \pm 0.09$ | $-2.36 * * * 0.38$ | D | NS | ** | NS | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $7.08{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.03$ | $-0.81 * * \pm 0.09$ | $2.24 * * * 0.23$ | 1.89 *** $\pm 0.23$ | $0.10 \pm 0.10$ | $-1.17^{* *} \pm 0.41$ | D | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $7.55{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.03$ | $0.07 \pm 0.06$ | $-0.14 \pm 0.18$ | $-0.27 \pm 0.18$ | $0.36 \pm 0.06$ | $-0.98{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.28$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $7.41^{* * *} \pm 0.03$ | $0.28^{* * *} \pm 0.06$ | $0.59{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.18$ | $0.40 * \pm 0.18$ | $0.47 \pm 0.07$ | $-1.67^{* * *} \pm 0.29$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $7.83{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.06$ | $0.89{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.09$ | $-1.82{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.31$ | $-1.86{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.3$ | $0.34 \pm 0.1$ | $4.18^{* * *} \pm 0.44$ | D | ** | NS | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $7.86{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $-0.68 * * \pm 0.1$ | $-0.11 \pm 0.25$ | $0.24 \pm 0.24$ | $-0.31 \pm 0.1$ | $-1.64 * * * 0.43$ | -- | ** | ** | NS | ** |
| Kernel breadth (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $1.84 * * * 0.01$ | $0.05 * \pm 0.02$ | $-0.6{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.07$ | $-0.54{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.07$ | $-0.01 \pm 0.02$ | $0.87^{* * *} \pm 0.1$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $1.85 * * * \pm 00$ | $-0.06{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.01$ | $-0.08 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.04 \pm 0.04$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.02$ | $-0.08 \pm 0.07$ | -- | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $1.72{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.00$ | $-0.04 * \pm 0.02$ | $-0.01 \pm 0.05$ | $0.04 \pm 0.05$ | $0.002 \pm 0.02$ | $0.09 \pm 0.08$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $1.83{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.01$ | $-0.07 * * * \pm 0.02$ | -0.006 $\pm 0.06$ | $0.08 \pm 0.06$ | $-0.16 \pm 0.02$ | $-0.25 * * \pm 0.09$ | -- | NS | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $1.79 * * * \pm 0.01$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.02$ | $-0.06 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.07 \pm 0.02$ | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ | -- | ** | ** | NS | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $1.82{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.01$ | $-0.03 \pm 0.02$ | $-0.06 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.04 \pm 0.05$ | 0.01 $\pm 0.02$ | $-0.1 \pm 0.08$ | -- | ** | NS | NS | ** |

[^2]Table 6. Estimates of gene effects following Hayman's six parameter model for quality traits of basmati rice

| CROSS | $[\hat{m}]$ | $[\hat{d}]$ |  | $[\hat{l} \hat{l}]$ | $[\hat{j}]$ | $[\hat{l}]$ | Type of interactions |  | Simple scaling test |  | Joint scaling test X2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B | C |  |
| Kernel length after cooking (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $12.53^{* * *} \pm 0.17$ | $0.43 \pm 0.36$ | $-1.71 \pm 0.99$ | $1.42 \pm 0.97$ | $1.31 \pm 0.36$ | $-9.59^{* * *} \pm 1.6$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $13.06 * * * 0.17$ | $-3.34^{* * *} \pm 0.47$ | $4.61 * * \pm 1.18$ | $2.93 * \pm 1.16$ | $0.06 \pm 0.49$ | $6.25{ }^{* *} \pm 2.05$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $14.8{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.26$ | $-0.75 * \pm 0.37$ | $0.205 \pm 1.28$ | $-3.21^{*} \pm 1.26$ | $-1.27 \pm 0.39$ | $4.19 * \pm 1.84$ | -- |  | NS |  |  |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $11.92^{* * *} \pm 0.17$ | $0.06 \pm 0.24$ | $6.51 * * * \pm .85$ | $6.08^{* * *} \pm 0.84$ | $0.15 \pm 0.26$ | $-9.66^{* * *} \pm 1.22$ | D |  |  |  |  |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $15.19^{* * *} \pm 0.22$ | $1.48{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.36$ | $-8.9 * * \pm 1.14$ | $-7.73^{* * *} \pm 1.13$ | $-1.99 \pm 0.4$ | $13.08^{* * *} \pm 1.72$ | D |  | NS |  |  |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $15.54 * * \pm 0.18$ | $-2.01^{* * *} \pm 0.38$ | $2.46 * \pm 1.06$ | $2.82 * \pm 1.04$ | $0.51 \pm 0.4$ | $-11.61^{* * *} \pm 1.7$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Kernel breadth after cooking(mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $2.24 * * \pm 0.02$ | $0.12^{* *} \pm 0.05$ | $-0.5^{* * *} \pm 0.13$ | $-0.7 * * * 0.13$ | $0.02 \pm 0.05$ | $1.65{ }^{* * *} \pm 7.96$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $2.33 * * \pm 0.02$ | $-0.24{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $0.27^{* *} \pm 0.10$ | $0.09 \pm 0.10$ | $-0.26 \pm 0.04$ | $0.36 * \pm 0.17$ | C |  | NS |  |  |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $2.26{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $-0.08 \pm 0.04$ | $-0.23 * \pm 0.11$ | $-0.39^{* * *} \pm 0.11$ | $-0.04 \pm 0.04$ | $1.14{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.18$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $2.34 * * \pm 0.02$ | $-0.03 \pm 0.04$ | $-0.20 \pm 0.12$ | $-0.10 \pm 0.12$ | $0.01 \pm 0.04$ | $0.47 * \pm 0.19$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $2.3{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $0.01 \pm 0.05$ | $0.02 \pm 0.12$ | $-0.26 * \pm 0.12$ | $0.03 \pm 0.05$ | $1.34 * * * 0.2$ | -- |  |  |  |  |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $2.35{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.02$ | $-0.09 * \pm 0.03$ | $-0.31 * * \pm 0.1$ | $-0.28 * * \pm 0.1$ | $-0.18 \pm 0.03$ | $0.72^{* * *} \pm 0.16$ | D |  | NS | NS |  |
| Alkali spreading value <br> (scale 1-7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $4.07^{* * *} \pm 0.1$ | $0.1 \pm 0.25$ | $0.62 \pm 0.64$ | $3.61^{* * *} \pm 0.64$ | $0.65 \pm 0.25$ | $-8.13^{* * *} \pm 1.06$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $4.01^{* * *} \pm 0.09$ | $-0.07 \pm 0.23$ | $3.27 * * \pm 0.58$ | $4.85 * * \pm 0.58$ | $1.18 \pm 0.23$ | $-6.37^{* * *} \pm 0.99$ | D |  | NS |  |  |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $5.64 * * \pm 0.09$ | $-0.13 \pm 0.11$ | $1.75 * * * 0.4$ | $2.83 * * \pm 0.4$ | $0.28 \pm 0.11$ | $-5.02 * * * 0.55$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $3.78{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.09$ | $-0.97^{* * *} \pm 0.19$ | $-0.16 \pm 0.53$ | $2.73^{* * *} \pm 0.53$ | $-0.83 \pm 0.19$ | $-0.2 \pm 0.84$ | -- |  | NS |  |  |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $5.53^{* * *} \pm 0.12$ | $-0.52 \pm 0.28$ | $-2.98{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.73$ | $-2.81 * * \pm 0.73$ | $-0.62 \pm 0.28$ | $10.24^{* * *} \pm 1.23$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Aroma (scale 1-3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $1.36{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.1$ | $-0.11 \pm 0.24$ | $0.4 \pm 0.24$ | $-0.52 \pm 0.1$ | $2.77^{* * *} \pm 0.4$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $1.44 * * \pm 0.04$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.09$ | $0.11 \pm 0.25$ | $0.61 * \pm 0.25$ | $-0.52 \pm 0.09$ | $2.03^{* * *} \pm 0.41$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1 $\times$ HUBR10-9 | $1.56{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $0.17 \pm 0.09$ | $-0.04 \pm 0.24$ | $-0.04 \pm 0.24$ | $0.17 \pm 0.09$ | $1.84 * * * 0.4$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $1.51^{* * *} \pm 0.05$ | $-0.05 \pm 0.1$ | $-0.6 * \pm 0.27$ | $-0.59 * \pm 0.27$ | $-0.05 \pm 0.1$ | $3.16^{* * *} \pm 0.44$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $1.45{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.04$ | $0.12 \pm 0.09$ | $0.11 \pm 0.25$ | $0.11 \pm 0.25$ | $0.12 \pm 0.09$ | $1.99{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.4$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $1.34 * * \pm 0.04$ | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ | $0.17 \pm 0.25$ | $0.17 \pm 0.25$ | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ | $2.29{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.4$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Amylose content (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-3x PuB-1 | $23.38^{* * *} \pm 0.19$ | $-3.07^{* * *} \pm 0.2$ | $-0.43 \pm 0.86$ | $0.21 \pm 0.86$ | $-3.0 \pm 0.22$ | $2.62 * \pm 1.13$ | D | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| T-3x PuB-1121 | $24.02^{* * *} \pm 0.22$ | $0.73 \pm 0.55$ | $-6.12^{* * *} \pm 1.41$ | $-7.21^{* * *} \pm 1.41$ | $-0.47 \pm 0.55$ | $12.73^{* * *} \pm 2.37$ | D |  |  | NS |  |
| PuB-1 x HUBR10-9 | $23.5{ }^{* * *} \pm 0.2$ | $-1.73^{* * *} \pm 0.41$ | $0.02 \pm 1.15$ | $-2.18 \pm 1.41$ | $-2.54 \pm 0.42$ | $10.06{ }^{* * *} \pm 1.83$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| CSR-30 x HUBR10-9 | $23.47^{* * *} \pm 0.2$ | $0.2 \pm 0.29$ | $1.39 \pm 0.1$ | $-2.33 * \pm 0.99$ | $0.32 \pm 0.31$ | $10.67^{* * *} \pm 1.44$ | -- | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| PuB-1121 x HUBR10-9 | $23.38^{* * *} \pm 0.19$ | $0.91 * * 0.28$ | 8.85*** $\pm 0.96$ | $6.11^{* * *} \pm 0.95$ | $1.4 \pm 0.29$ | $-10.31^{* * *} \pm 1.37$ | D |  | NS |  |  |
| HUBR10-9 x PuB-1509 | $23.66^{* * *} \pm 0.2$ | $-3.32^{* * *} \pm 0.26$ | $2^{*} \pm 0.95$ | $-0.51 \pm 0.94$ | $-3.38 \pm 0.27$ | $3.34 * \pm 1.32$ | C | ** | ** | ** | ** |

Significance Levels * $=<.05,{ }^{* *}=<.01 \&{ }^{* * *}=<.001$; NS=not significant
and all the three types of gene interaction was reported by Bano et al. (2017) and Sravan and Jaiswal. Whereas, Srivastava et al. (2012) observed additive, dominance additive x additive, dominance x dominance type of gene interaction.

Digenic studies revealed that both complementary and duplicate epistasis were contributing to inheritance of organoleptic traits among different generations of six crosses. Ramli et al. (2015), Sravan and Jaiswal (2017a), and Kour et al. (2019) have recorded similar findings for different quality traits of rice. However, duplicate digenic interaction were recorded more than complementary among organoleptic traits. Similar findings have been reported by Kacharabhai (2015) in rice crop for kernel length and breadth.

Yield and quality traits of basmati rice were found to be predominantly controlled by epistasis. In such situation, the traits improvement viz., increase in yield or tweaking the amylose content, increase in aroma, slender kernel before and after cooking can be achieved by heterosis breeding. Generous amount of genetic variability was present which was evident from the significant ANOVA results both between and within cross generations used in the experiment. Along with heterosis breeding, pedigree breeding method can be also used to improve quality or yield traits of the experimental material of the present study. Eventually, the breeder has to take into consideration the digenic interaction too. The traits which showed complementary epistasis can be used as a parameter to assess the genetic worth of the selected plant for further improvement. However, in view of trait improvement, if selection is practiced for such plants which show duplicate epistasis or large number of epistasis for that trait. Then in such case, selection practices will be inefficient.
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[^0]:    Significance Levels * $=<.05$, and ${ }^{* *}=<.01$

[^1]:    Significance Levels * $=<.05,{ }^{* *}=<.01 \&{ }^{* * *}=<.001$; NS $=$ not significant

[^2]:    Significance Levels * $=<.05,{ }^{* *}=<.01 \&{ }^{* * *}=<.001$; NS=not significant

