Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding

Research Article



Comprehensive assessment of combining ability and heterosis for the development of superior three-line hybrids in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.)

R. Nivedha¹, S. Manonmani^{1*}, T.Kalaimagal², M. Raveendran³ and S. Kavitha⁴

² Centre for Plant Breeding and Genetics, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore- 641 003, Tamil Nadu, India, ³ Directorate of Research, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore- 641 003, Tamil Nadu, India

⁴Department of Seed Science and Technology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore- 641 003, Tamil Nadu, India.

*E-Mail: manonmanitnau@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study involved assessment of 70 three-line hybrids obtained by crossing five CMS lines and 14 testers using line x tester mating design for combining ability and heterosis for 13 yield and grain quality traits. The Analysis of Variance identified significant difference among crosses and the ratio of GCA and SCA variances were less than unity indicating non-additive gene action for all the traits. The line COMS 24A and testers RNR 15048, WGL 32100, CBSN 504, CBSN 509, CBSN 511 and IR64 DRT were identified as best general combiners through gca effects. Among the hybrids, COMS 24A X WGL 32100, COMS 24A X CBSN 504, COMS 25A X CBSN 511, COMS 25A X CBSN 517, COMS 23A X IR64 DRT and COMS 23A X CBSN 509 demonstrated outstanding sca effects, mean and standard heterosis over CORH 3 and CORH 4. Two hybrids *viz.*, COMS 25A X CBSN 511 and COMS 25A X RNR 15048 had medium slender grain type and hold promise for commercial exploitation in south India especially Tamil Nadu.

Keywords: GCA, SCA, three-line hybrid, heterosis, combining ability

INTRODUCTION

Rice, the staple food crop of more than half of the global population is cultivated across an extensive area of 165.25 million hectares (Statista, 2024). However, the march of industrialization has resulted in an annual decline of cultivable land by more than 1% (Rahman *et al.*, 2022). Additionally, the challenges posed by climate change in agriculture have escalated the demand for a sustainable increase in rice production, which can be achieved through the development of hybrids. The success of hybrid breeding largely hinges on the judicious selection of parents. The phenotypic performance of parents alone proves to be an unreliable strategy since lines with

superior phenotype may not necessarily yield favourable recombination in subsequent generations. Addressing this challenge, combining ability analysis evaluates the potential of parents to pass on genetic information to their progenies thereby facilitating the development of superior hybrids. A line x tester mating design proposed by Kempthrone in 1957 provides insights into heterosis, General Combining Ability (GCA) of parents and Specific Combining Ability (SCA) of hybrids along with the nature of gene action controlling the expression of traits. In this study, 70 hybrid combinations generated by crossing 5 lines and 14 testers using line x tester mating design are

¹Department of Rice, Centre for Plant Breeding and Genetics, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore- 641 003, Tamil Nadu, India,

evaluated for combining ability and heterosis to identify good combiners among parents and superior hybrid combinations for commercial exploitation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

experimental material comprised five The of Cytoplasmic Male Sterile (CMS) lines and fourteen testers with diverse origin (Table 1). They were crossed in line x tester mating design during Kharif, 2022 at Paddy Breeding Station of Tamil Nadu Agricultural University located at 11.0°N, 77.0°E and an elevation of 426.72 meters above sea level. Subsequently, seeds of resulting 70 F₁s along with parents and two hybrid checks (CORH 3 and CORH 4) were raised with a spacing of 30 x 20 cm in a Randomized Block Design with two replications and evaluated during Rabi, 2022. All the standard agronomic and intercultural operations were performed throughout the crop season. Thirteen yield and grain quality traits were recorded from five

random selected plants of each genotype. During the flowering stage, pollen fertility was assessed by staining pollen from matured anthers of five individual plants with 1% Potassium lodide solution (Ali *et al.*, 2014) and examined under a light microscope (stained pollen (dark blue) – fertile; unstained (colourless) pollen – sterile) and pollen fertility per cent was calculated Subsequently, panicles were covered with butter paper covers to record spikelet fertility at maturity.

Other biometrical traits recorded include days to 50% flowering, plant height, number of productive tillers per plant, panicle length, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, single plant yield, hundred grain weight, grain length, grain breadth and grain length breadth ratio.

Grain type classification: The best performing hybrids were identified and examined for the grain type as per the classification given by IRRI (2002) as follows,

Category (size)	Length (mm)	Category (shape)	Length/breadth (ratio)
Extra long	>7.5	Slender	>3
Long	6.6 – 7.5	Medium	2.1 – 3
Medium	5.51 – 6.6	Bold	1.1 – 2.0
Short	<5.5	Round	<1.1

Statistical analysis: The recorded data for yield and grain characters were subjected to Analysis of Variance following the method suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1985). The combining ability analysis was conducted using the program 'line x tester with parents' of TNAUSTAT. The general combining ability (gca) of parents and specific combining ability (sca) of hybrids were determined based on the methods given by Kempthorne (1957) and Experiment-II of Comstock and Robinson (1952). Heterobeltiosis and standard heterosis were estimated as per the methods given by Hayes *et al.* (1955) and Singh and Singh (1994).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Analysis of Variance for combining ability analysis revealed significant difference among the crosses for all the characters under study (**Table 2**). The variance of the cross was partitioned into line, tester and line x tester interactions. All the lines exhibited significant difference for the traits studied, except for flag leaf width. Similarly, testers and line x testers demonstrated significant differences of sufficient variation between parents and crosses. This variation creates an opportunity for heterosis and hybrid vigour across all the characters. The variance of General Combining Ability and Specific Combining Ability indicated that SCA variances were consistently higher than GCA variances for all the yield and grain characters. The ratio

between GCA and SCA was less than unity for all the traits signifying the prevalence of non-additive (dominance and epistatic) gene action. The presence of non-additive gene action suggests the potential for exploiting heterosis in the genetic material. A similar pattern of non-additive gene action was reported in previous studies for traits such as plant height, pollen fertility, number of productive tillers per plant, panicle weight, single plant yield and hundred seed weight by Singh and Babu (2012) and Manivelan et al. (2022). The proportional contribution of line x tester was observed to be more than the contribution of lines or testers individually for all the characters except flag leaf length (Fig. 1). This further confirmed the higher influence of specific combining ability effects for total variation which is in agreement with the findings of Sanghera and Hussain (2012).

The gca effects of parents as presented in **Table 3** serves as a valuable tool for selecting optimal parents in hybrid breeding by leveraging additive gene action. The preferred direction for gca/sca effects was considered positive for traits contributing to yield and negative for traits related to days to 50% flowering (early hybrids), plant height (non-lodging hybrids), and grain breadth (slender grained hybrids). Notably, none of the lines and testers exhibited significance for all the traits simultaneously. Among CMS lines, COMS 24A displayed highly significant positive gca for single plant yield (6.11). This line also had highly

S. No	Line/ Tester	Name of the genotype	Origin	Subspecies
1	L ₁	TNAU CMS 2A	Tamil Nadu	indica
2	L ₂	COMS 23A	Tamil Nadu	indica
3	L ₃	COMS 24A	Tamil Nadu	indica
4	L ₄	COMS 25A	Tamil Nadu	indica
5	L ₅	COMS 30A	Tamil Nadu	indica
6	T ₁	CO 51	Tamil Nadu	indica
7	T ₂	ADT 53	Tamil Nadu	indica
8	T ₃	ADT 56	Tamil Nadu	indica
9	T ₄	RNR 15048	Telangana	indica
10	T ₅	WGL 32100	Telangana	indica
11	Т ₆	CBSN 504	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
12	T ₇	CBSN 517	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
13	T ₈	CBSN 499	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
14	T ₉	CBSN 506	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
15	T ₁₀	CBSN 513	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
16	T ₁₁	CBSN 511	Tamil Nadu	Wild rice derivative
17	T ₁₂	CBSN 509	Tamil Nadu	indica-japonica cross derivative
18	T ₁₃	CBSN 510	Tamil Nadu	indica
19	T ₁₄	IR64 DRT	Andhra Pradesh	indica

Table 1. List of lines and tester used for crossing

Table 2. ANOVA for combining ability analysis

Source of variation	DF	DFF	PF	SF	PH	NPTPP	PL	FLL	FLW	SPY	HGW	GL	GB	L/B
Replication	1	0.01	0.18	1.05	0.58	34.01	4.26	23.53	0.01	6.28	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Cross	69	118.75**	2156.24**	1741.16**	286.37**	73.14*	13.94*	26.29 [*]	0.03*	402.60**	0.13**	0.01**	0.00**	0.39**
Line	4	476.62**	2183.57**	1580.09**	438.91**	137.32**	21.25**	93.67**	0.03	350.98**	0.15**	0.04**	0.01**	1.24**
Tester	13	134.64**	4914.13**	3639.27**	651.93**	49.82 [*]	21.98**	26.08 [*]	0.03*	699.54**	0.15**	0.02**	0.00**	0.56**
LXT	52	87.25**	1464.67**	1279.02**	183.24**	74.03 [*]	11.37*	21.16 [*]	0.03*	332.34**	0.12**	0.01**	0.00**	0.28**
Error	69	0.49	3.71	3.41	4.52	11.28	4.97	12.32	0.02	2.74	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	139	817.75	10722.51	8243.99	1565.56	379.60	77.20	146.16	0.16	1794.47	0.57	0.08	0.01	2.48
σ²GCA		0.53	11.60	7.75	1.73	0.01	0.04	0.06	0.00	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
σ²SCA		43.38	730.48	637.81	89.36	31.37	3.20	7.72	0.02	164.80	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.14
σ ² GCA/ σ ² SCA		0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01

DF – degrees of freedom; DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio

significant positive gca effects for spikelet fertility (4.83), number of productive tillers per plant (3.00), flag leaf length (2.37), hundred grain weight (0.08), grain length (0.04) and grain length breadth ratio (0.06). On the other hand, lines TNAUCMS 2A (-5.69) and COMS 25A (-2.09) demonstrated highly significant negative gca effects for days to 50% flowering. Among the testers, RNR 15048 (9.44), WGL 32100 (12.22), CBSN 504 (2.97), CBSN 513

(5.11), CBSN 511 (10.81), CBSN 509 (6.03) and IR64 DRT (5.03) showed highly significant positive gca effects for single plant yield. Among these, CBSN 511 and IR64 DRT exhibited highly significant positive gca effects for pollen and spikelet fertility, hundred grain weight and grain length. WGL 32100 displayed highly significant positive gca effects for pollen and , spikelet fertility, flag leaf width and desirable negative gca effects for plant height. The



Fig 1. Proportional contribution of lines, testers, line x tester for the total variance

DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio

significant positive gca effects of parents for traits such as pollen fertility, spikelet fertility, grain yield, panicle length, grain length, grain breadth and grain length breadth ratio align with the findings reported by Bhageri and Jeoldar (2010).

EIPB

The sca effects of hybrids for the yield and grain traits are provided in Table 4. None of the cross combinations exhibited desirable and significant sca effects for all the traits simultaneously, consistent with the findings of yuga et al. (2018) and Gramaje et al. (2020). The significant and desirable negative sca effects for days to 50% flowering were observed in 32 hybrids. For the trait plant height, 23 hybrids had a highly significant negative sca effects. Among 70 hybrids, 30 hybrid combinations demonstrated significant positive sca effects for single plant yield ranging from 2.50 (TNAU CMS 2A X CBSN 504) to 35.88 (COMS 24A X CBSN 517). The hybrid TNAU CMS 2A X ADT 56 displayed highly significant desirable sca effects for days to 50% flowering (-3.01), pollen fertility (27.44), spikelet fertility (17.55), number of productive tillers per plant (7.92), panicle length (2.38) and single plant yield (3.19). Another notable hybrid, COMS 23A X ADT 56 exhibited significant sca effects for days to 50% flowering (-3.61), pollen fertility (10.90), spikelet fertility (19.10), plant height (-5.63), single plant yield (14.41), hundred grain weight (0.31), grain breadth (-0.02) and grain length breadth ratio (0.40). Additional hybrids, including TNAU CMS 2A X CO51, TNAU CMS 2A X CBSN 509, COMS 23A X CBSN 509, COMS 23A X IR64 DRT, COMS 24A X WGL 32100, COMS 24A

X CBSN 499, COMS 25A X CBSN 506, COMS 30A X CBSN 510 also exhibited significant desirable sca effects for yield contributing and grain quality traits. The cross combinations with significant negative sca effects for days to 50% flowering and plant height coupled with positive sca effect for other traits were reported in studies by Faiz et al. (2006) and Deepika et al. (2023). The desirable sca effects of crosses were derived from parents with diverse gca effects. Among 30 hybrids with positive sca effects for yield, 50% were derived from low x high combiners followed by low x low combiners (Fig. 2). The high sca of hybrids derived from low x high combiners resulted from both non-additive and additive gene actions by the interaction of recessive and dominant alleles from poor and good combiners respectively. Consequently, such crosses are deemed suitable for heterosis breeding. The heterosis observed in crosses with high x high combiners is attributed to the interaction between positive alleles of both parents, while that from from low x low combiners is due to overdominance/epistasis. Similar findings for low x high and low x low were reported by Rahimi et al. (2010) and Reddy et al. (2024).

The heterobeltiosis was estimated to compare the generated hybrids with the better parent. Forty-three hybrids for the trait days to 50% flowering and 47 hybrids for the trait plant height exhibited highly significant negative heterobeltiosis. The heterobeltiosis for single plant yield ranged from -93.53 in TNAU CMS 2A X CBSN 517 to 99.64 in COMS 23A X CBSN 509 (**Fig. 3**). The significant positive heterobeltiosis for single plant yield

Parents	DFF	PF	SF	PH	NPTPP	PL	FLL	FLW	SPY	HGW	GL	GB	L/B
Lines													
L ₁	-5.69 ** (87.5**)	-5.12 **	-0.25 ns	-0.50 ns	-0.32 ns	-0.47 ns	-1.37 **	0.0 ns	-0.77 *	0.04 ns	-0.05 **	-0.01 **	-0.04 **
L ₂	-0.09 ns	-7.58 **	-6.97 **	-4.46 **	-1.18 ns	-1.16 **	-1.53 **	-0.01 ns	-0.66 *	-0.09 **	0.03 **	-0.02 **	0.33 **
L ₃	4.38 **	0.62 ns	4.83 **	6.28 **	3.00 **	0.59 ns	2.37 **	-0.03 ns	6.11 **	0.08 **	0.04 **	0.01 **	0.06 **
L ₄	-2.09 **	-2.77 **	-7.50 **	-1.74 **	1.25 ns	0.16 ns	-0.04 ns	-0.01 ns	-3.01 **	0.03 ns	0.01 ns	0.02 **	-0.17 **
L ₅	3.49 **	14.84 **	9.88 **	0.42 ns	-2.75 **	0.88 **	0.57 ns	0.05 **	-1.66 **	-0.06 *	-0.03 **	0.01 **	-0.18 **
SE	0.13	0.36	0.35	0.40	0.63	0.42	0.42	0.02	0.31	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01
Testers													
T ₁	-7.04 **	-22.08 **	-17.37 **	-10.97 **	3.66 **	-0.44 ns	-2.84 **	0.02 ns	-6.77 **	0.03 ns	-0.02 **	0.01 **	-0.23 **
T ₂	-1.24 **	-26.85 **	-22.78 **	-10.19 **	3.16 **	-0.83 ns	-2.00 **	0.02 ns	-12.49 **	0.07 ns	0.04 **	0.03 **	-0.12 **
Τ ₃	-3.14 **	-24.34 **	-18.50 **	-8.03 **	1.86 ns	-1.20 *	-1.48 [*]	-0.06 ns	-6.64 **	-0.04 ns	0.07 **	-0.01 **	0.47 **
Τ ₄	3.26 **	20.58 **	23.03 **	0.70 ns	3.56 **	-0.18 ns	1.04 ns	0.07 *	9.44 **	-0.12 *	0.01 ns	-0.02 **	0.29 **
T ₅	3.26 **	24.82 **	24.26 **	-4.08 **	0.16 ns	-0.77 ns	0.20 ns	0.11 **	12.22 **	-0.07 ns	-0.03 **	-0.02 **	0.15 **
T ₆	2.06 **	-7.42 **	-0.81 ns	3.45 **	-3.04 **	0.12 ns	-0.15 ns	-0.04 ns	2.97**	-0.06 ns	-0.05 **	-0.01 *	-0.12 **
T ₇	-6.94 **	-18.44 **	-16.56 **	1.96 **	-1.34 ns	-0.82 ns	-0.47 ns	-0.04 ns	-9.98 **	0.05 ns	0.03 **	0.00 ns	0.09 **
T ₈	-0.54 *	10.41 **	-2.06 **	-6.82 **	- 2.74 *	-1.37 **	-0.58 ns	-0.13 **	-8.43 **	0.12 *	0.02 **	0.01 **	-0.06 **
Т ₉	4.36 **	-29.06 **	-26.16 **	-6.54 **	-0.44 ns	-1.99 **	0.88 ns	-0.03 ns	-6.33 **	-0.26 **	-0.06 **	0.02 **	-0.44 **
T ₁₀	-0.24 ns	20.78 **	21.72 **	8.60 **	-0.34 ns	1.57 **	2.22 **	0.03 ns	5.11 **	-0.02 ns	-0.06 **	-0.01 **	-0.13 **
T ₁₁	1.26 **	16.72 **	17.24 **	7.53 **	-0.64 ns	0.39 ns	2.33 **	-0.07 *	10.81 **	0.17 **	0.02 **	-0.00 *	0.11 **
T ₁₂	3.16 **	30.53 **	21.50 **	10.35 **	-1.94 ns	1.17 *	1.66 *	0.00 ns	6.03 **	0.03 ns	0.02 **	0.00 ns	0.08 **
T ₁₃	-1.14 **	-14.39 **	-12.90 **	14.10 **	-1.34 ns	4.08 **	0.49 ns	0.06 ns	-0.98 ns	-0.11 *	-0.05 **	0.00 ns	-0.23 **
T ₁₄	2.86 **	18.69 **	9.40 **	-0.06 ns	-0.64 ns	0.25 ns	-1.32 ns	0.06 ns	5.03 **	0.21 **	0.06 **	0.00 ns	0.15 **
SE	0.22	0.61	0.58	0.67	1.06	0.71	0.71	0.03	0.52	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.02

Table 3. General combining ability effects of parents

*significant at p=0.05 level; **significant at p=0.01 level

DF – degrees of freedom; DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio



Fig. 2. Combination of parents with different gca effects yielding superior sca effects of hybrids for single plant yield

L – Low gca effect; M- Medium gcs effect; H – High gca effect

Table 4. SCA effects of hybrids

	DFF	PF	SF	PH	NPTPP	PL	FLL	FLW	SPY	HGW	GL	GB	L/B
$L_1 X T_1$	-2.11 **	31.68 **	31.96 **	-4.31 **	-0.38 ns	-7.31 **	-0.20 ns	-0.11 ns	13.95 **	-0.23 [*]	-0.01 ns	0.01 *	-0.17 **
$L_1 X T_2$	1.09 *	-14.55 **	-15.12 **	12.91 **	9.12 **	0.08 ns	-3.54 *	0.02 ns	- 2.46 *	-0.14 ns	0.05 **	-0.00 ns	0.16 **
$L_1 X T_3$	-3.01 **	27.44 **	17.55 **	5.42 **	7.92 **	2.38 *	-1.06 ns	0.07 ns	3.19 **	0.02 ns	0.01 ns	0.04 **	-0.46 **
$L_1 X T_4$	8.09 **	16.02 **	9.47 **	-0.93 ns	1.22 ns	-0.32 ns	-0.87 ns	-0.13 ns	4.45 **	0.20 ns	0.10 **	-0.01 ns	0.57 **
$L_1 X T_5$	-4.41 **	6.53 **	1.84 ns	-0.03 ns	6.62 **	0.77 ns	2.26 ns	0.05 ns	2.57 *	0.13 ns	-0.01 ns	0.01 **	-0.20 **
$L_1 X T_6$	4.79 **	1.52 ns	-4.74 **	-13.90 **	-2.68 ns	0.27 ns	-0.89 ns	0.27 **	2.50 *	-0.21 [*]	-0.00 ns	0.01 ns	-0.12 **
$L_1 X T_7$	-3.21 **	-40.01 **	-41.44 **	6.30 **	-4.38 ns	1.40 ns	1.93 ns	0.09 ns	-13.23 **	-0.11 ns	-0.04 **	0.00 ns	-0.19 **
L ₁ XT ₈	-4.11 **	-27.66 **	-7.69 **	-6.31 **	-6.48 **	1.74 ns	-3.70 *	-0.00 ns	2.06 ns	0.04 ns	0.07 **	0.01 ns	0.11 **
L ₁ XT ₉	2.99 **	-27.74 **	-32.89 **	-7.04 **	0.72 ns	-1.14 ns	1.33 ns	-0.13 [*]	-15.12 **	-0.11 ns	-0.03 *	-0.00 ns	-0.08 *
$L_1 X T_{10}$	-4.91 **	5.82 *	4.83 **	-8.15 **	-3.38 ns	-1.16 ns	-2.92 ns	0.03 ns	-3.94 **	0.10 ns	0.05 **	-0.03 **	0.61 **
$L_1 X T_{11}$	-5.41 **	15.33 *	7.06 **	0.73 ns	-0.58 ns	0.85 ns	1.00 ns	0.08 ns	-3.36 **	-0.02 ns	-0.07 **	-0.00 ns	-0.22 **
$L_1 X T_{12}$	-1.31 **	6.57 [*]	13.59 **	3.37 *	1.72 ns	-2.24 ns	2.39 ns	-0.05 ns	6.08 **	0.01 ns	-0.04 *	-0.01 *	0.01 ns
$L_1 X T_{13}$	8.99 **	6.99 *	-5.75 **	11.87 **	-6.38 **	1.17 ns	2.47 ns	-0.09 ns	7.91 **	0.03 ns	-0.04 **	-0.03 **	0.16 **
$L_1 X T_{14}$	2.49 **	-7.89 *	21.35 **	0.08 ns	-3.08 ns	3.50 **	1.78 ns	-0.10 ns	-4.60 **	0.30 **	-0.04 **	0.00 ns	-0.20 **
$L_2 XT_1$	-4.71 **	-32.16 **	-32.22 **	4.28 **	-4.52 ns	1.71 ns	1.12 ns	0.02 ns	-13.27 **	0.05 ns	-0.11 **	-0.02 **	-0.19 **
$L_2 X T_2$	-8.51 **	-20.69 **	-17.28 **	-4.13 **	0.48 ns	0.85 ns	-0.88 ns	0.06 ns	-10.18 **	-0.28 **	0.05 **	-0.04 **	0.61 **
$L_2 XT_3$	-3.61 **	10.90 **	19.10 **	-5.63 **	2.28 ns	0.75 ns	0.93 ns	-0.08 ns	14.14 **	0.31 **	0.02 ns	-0.02 **	0.40 **
$L_2 XT_4$	-11.51 **	19.18 **	15.84 **	5.98 **	-0.92 ns	2.36 *	0.42 ns	0.07 ns	3.47 **	0.01 ns	0.05 **	-0.01 ns	0.33 **
$L_2 XT_5$	5.49 **	2.89 *	12.91 **	-2.58 ns	5.48 *	0.21 ns	-1.77 ns	-0.18 **	6.29 **	0.04 ns	-0.04 *	0.02 **	-0.38 **
$L_2 XT_6$	-6.31 **	-21.52 **	-18.77 **	-0.62 ns	0.18 ns	-0.93 ns	-2.90 ns	0.07 ns	-8.90 **	-0.05 ns	-0.06 **	0.00 ns	-0.27 **
$L_2 XT_7$	-6.31 **	53.00 **	45.18 **	-4.88 **	-11.02 **	-0.25 ns	-4.91 **	0.02 ns	-8.49 **	-0.19 ns	-0.05 **	-0.01 *	-0.10 **
$L_2 XT_8$	13.79 **	-6.35 **	-5.56 **	-0.67 ns	-0.62 ns	0.52 ns	0.20 ns	-0.05 ns	-3.75 **	-0.04 ns	-0.04 **	-0.04 **	0.31 **
$L_2 X T_9$	-0.11 ns	-18.58 **	-18.52 **	2.22 ns	-2.42 ns	-3.58 **	-2.26 ns	0.06 ns	7.89 **	0.05 ns	0.02 ns	0.03 **	-0.27 **
$L_2 XT_{10}$	6.49 **	14.78 *	15.75 **	-0.92 ns	-2.52 ns	1.40 ns	4.40 **	-0.00 ns	8.79 **	0.13 ns	-0.01 ns	0.03 **	-0.50 **
$L_2 XT_{11}$	-1.01 *	-32.66 *	-21.87 **	1.82 ns	-0.22 ns	0.96 ns	-1.21 ns	-0.12 ns	-21.14 **	-0.08 ns	0.08 **	-0.01 ns	0.40 **
$L_2 XT_{12}$	8.59 **	9.53 *	-24.63 **	-12.68 **	4.08 ns	-1.24 ns	-3.54 *	0.08 ns	10.35 **	-0.45 **	0.08 **	-0.02 **	0.56 **
$L_2 XT_{13}$	6.39 **	0.45 n	5.47 **	3.57 *	14.48 **	1.55 ns	2.98 ns	-0.13 ns	-4.95 **	0.12 ns	-0.06 **	0.05 **	-0.79 **
$L_2 XT_{14}$	1.39 **	21.22 *	24.62 **	14.24 **	-4.72 [*]	-4.32 **	7.44 **	0.19 **	19.76 **	0.37 **	0.05 **	0.02 **	-0.10 **
$L_{3}XT_{1}$	3.82 **	4.44 **	4.45 **	0.41 ns	4.80 *	2.73 *	1.54 ns	-0.04 ns	-4.23 **	0.31 **	0.18 **	0.01 *	0.50 **
L_3XT_2	-0.98 *	7.71 **	3.17 *	-4.20 **	-3.70 ns	2.97 *	5.18 **	-0.01 ns	-1.67 ns	0.26 *	-0.02 ns	0.02 **	-0.33 **
L_3XT_3	-0.08 ns	-31.90 **	-33.93 **	0.39 ns	-3.90 ns	-0.62 ns	3.61 *	0.06 ns	-19.41 **	-0.04 ns	-0.03 *	-0.02 **	0.13 **
$L_{3}XT_{4}$	0.02 ns	-8.72 **	-8.01 **	-0.75 ns	0.40 ns	-0.97 ns	-2.32 ns	0.18 **	-4.55 **	-0.07 ns	-0.01 ns	0.01 *	-0.23 **
L_3XT_5	-4.98 **	3.04 *	1.96 ns	3.19 *	-6.70 **	1.46 ns	-2.23 ns	0.11 ns	7.28 **	0.24 *	0.07 **	0.00 ns	0.21 **
L_3XT_6	-2.28 **	28.28 **	22.53 **	33.99 **	0.00 ns	2.23 ns	5.20 **	-0.26 **	8.32 **	0.23 *	0.00 ns	0.03 **	-0.36 **
L ₃ XT ₇	-3.78 **	-46.35 **	-35.92 **	-4.76 **	19.80 **	-6.01 **	4.69 **	-0.01 ns	-12.46 **	-0.17 ns	0.05 **	-0.04 **	0.74 **
L ₃ XT ₈	-6.18 ~~	10.45 **	14.35 ~	-12.41 ~~	3.70 ns	-0.01 ns	0.80 ns	-0.18 ~~	4.48 ~~	0.22	0.04	-0.00 ns	0.10 **
L ₃ XI ₉	-2.08	6.42	17.70	-0.36 ns	2.90 ns	1.73 ns	-0.36 ns	-0.19	1.63 ns	0.05 ns	-0.02 ns	-0.01 ns	0.04 ns
L ₃ XT ₁₀	-2.48	10.08	-2.70	-0.16 ns	4.30 ns	0.55 ns	-1.84 ns	0.12 ns	0.85 ns	-0.13 ns	-0.06	0.00 ns	-0.26
L ₃ XT ₁₁	19.52 **	3.64	2.98	5.92 ~	2.60 ns	-0.95 ns	-1.11 ns	0.00 ns	17.44 **	-0.14 ns	-0.08 **	-0.01 ns	-0.21
L ₃ XT ₁₂	-0.38 ns	-5.97 *	-2.29 ns	1.59 ns	-10.60 **	0.51 ns	-2.94 ns	0.15 *	-5.98 **	-0.04 ns	-0.04 **	0.02 **	-0.42 **
L ₃ XT ₁₃	2.42	8.95	4.07 ~~	-18.16 **	-12.70 **	-2.56	-3.77	0.11 ns	8.70 ~	-0.33 **	-0.08 **	-0.03 **	0.02 ns
L ₃ XT ₁₄	-2.58	9.97	11.67 **	-4.70 **	-0.90 ns	-1.07 ns	-6.46	-0.04 ns	-0.43 ns	-0.39 **	0.02 ns	-0.00 ns	0.09
$L_4 X T_1$	-6.21	-40.18	-31.93	2.34 ns	-5.95	0.02 ns	-3.83	-0.13 ns	-11.54	0.02 ns	-0.02 ns	-0.00 ns	-0.01 ns
L ₄ XT ₂	2.49 ~	-6.90 **	-8.81 **	-6.52 **	-5.45	-3.39 **	-0.54 ns	-0.16	-3.99 ~	-0.21	-0.06 **	-0.02 **	0.00 ns
L ₄ XT ₃	4.89 ~	-29.41 **	-22.01 **	0.49 ns	-3.15 ns	-2.94	-0.15 ns	-0.12 ns	-6.99 **	0.02 ns	0.02 ns	-0.00 ns	0.05 ns
$L_4 X T_4$	0.49 ns	0.97 ns	10.32 **	-8.24 **	-2.35 ns	-0.21 ns	2.59 ns	0.15 *	10.09 **	0.16 ns	-0.08 **	-0.02 **	-0.09 **

Table 4. Continued..

	DFF	PF	SF	PH	NPTPP	PL	FLL	FLW	SPY	HGW	GL	GB	L/B
L_4XT_5	5.49 **	-4.27 **	1.04 ns	-6.96 **	-3.45 ns	-2.11 ns	0.92 ns	-0.08 ns	-5.94 **	0.15 ns	0.08 **	0.02 **	0.03 ns
L_4XT_6	2.69 **	33.17 **	30.46 **	-5.83 **	-0.25 ns	-0.25 ns	1.27 ns	-0.12 ns	15.27 **	0.10 ns	0.03 *	0.00 ns	0.07 *
L_4XT_7	8.69 **	50.79 **	48.66 **	1.50 ns	-0.45 ns	4.13 **	-1.20 ns	0.03 ns	35.88 **	0.37 **	0.05 **	0.04 **	-0.30 **
L_4XT_8	-0.71 ns	15.84 **	-21.10 **	19.77 **	3.45 ns	0.98 ns	2.21 ns	0.16 *	0.85 ns	-0.17 ns	-0.01 ns	0.00 ns	-0.06 ns
$L_4 X T_9$	-0.11 ns	53.76 **	38.15 **	-3.50 *	0.15 ns	1.10 ns	3.99 *	0.08 ns	8.57 **	0.02 ns	0.04 **	-0.02 **	0.40 **
L_4XT_{10}	1.49 **	- 23.53 [*]	-12.12 **	3.36 *	-1.45 ns	-0.96 ns	-1.60 ns	-0.10 ns	-16.19 **	0.02 ns	0.01 ns	0.00 ns	0.00 ns
L_4XT_{11}	-8.01 **	14.33 *	17.61 **	-10.07 **	2.35 ns	- 2.52 [*]	-2.20 ns	-0.01 ns	19.71 **	-0.03 ns	-0.00 ns	0.00 ns	-0.05 ns
$L_4 XT_{12}$	-1.91 **	3.72 *	22.11 **	4.27 **	8.15 **	0.74 ns	-2.03 ns	-0.14 *	-9.57 **	0.02 ns	-0.01 ns	-0.00 ns	-0.02 ns
L_4XT_{13}	-14.61 **	-47.81 [*]	-36.65 **	17.86 **	4.05 ns	5.03 **	1.13 ns	0.22 **	-18.30 **	-0.02 ns	0.04 *	0.01 **	-0.00 ns
$L4XT_{14}$	5.39 **	-20.44 *	-35.71 **	-8.48 **	4.35 ns	0.36 ns	-0.55 ns	0.22 **	-17.86 **	-0.44 **	-0.09 **	-0.02 **	-0.03 ns
$L_5 XT_1$	9.21 **	36.22 **	27.74 **	-2.73 ns	6.05 *	2.84 *	1.36 ns	0.25 **	15.09 **	-0.14 ns	-0.04 **	-0.00 ns	-0.13 **
$L_5 XT_2$	5.91 **	34.44 **	38.05 **	1.94 ns	-0.45 ns	-0.52 ns	-0.23 ns	0.10 ns	18.30 **	0.37 **	-0.01 ns	0.04 **	-0.44 **
$L_5 XT_3$	1.81 **	22.98 **	19.29 **	-0.67 ns	-3.15 ns	0.43 ns	-3.34 *	0.06 ns	9.07 **	-0.31 **	-0.02 ns	-0.00 ns	-0.13 **
$L_5 XT_4$	2.91 **	-27.44 **	-27.61 **	3.94 *	1.65 ns	-0.86 ns	0.19 ns	-0.27 **	-13.45 **	-0.29 **	-0.06 **	0.03 **	-0.58 **
$L_5 XT_5$	-1.59 **	-8.18 **	-17.75 **	6.38 **	-1.95 ns	-0.33 ns	0.82 ns	0.11 ns	-10.21 **	-0.56 **	-0.10 **	-0.06 **	0.33 **
$L_5 XT_6$	1.11 *	-41.44 **	-29.47 **	-13.65 **	2.75 ns	-1.31 ns	-2.68 ns	0.03 ns	-17.20 **	-0.08 ns	0.02 ns	-0.05 **	0.67 **
$L_5 XT_7$	4.61 **	-17.42 **	-16.47 **	1.84 ns	-3.95 ns	0.72 ns	-0.51 ns	-0.14 *	-1.71 ns	0.11 ns	-0.00 ns	0.01 ns	-0.14 **
$L_{5}XT_{8}$	-2.79 **	7.73 **	20.00 **	-0.38 ns	-0.05 ns	-3.24 **	0.48 ns	0.08 ns	-3.64 **	-0.06 ns	-0.05 **	0.03 **	-0.46 **
$L_{5}XT_{9}$	-0.69 ns	-13.85 **	-4.44 **	8.68 **	-1.35 ns	1.88 ns	-2.70 ns	0.19 **	- 2.97 [*]	-0.01 ns	-0.01 ns	0.01 ns	-0.09 *
$L_5 XT_{10}$	-0.59 ns	-7.14 [*]	-5.75 **	5.87 **	3.05 ns	0.16 ns	1.96 ns	-0.05 ns	10.49 **	-0.12 ns	0.01 ns	-0.01 *	0.15 **
$L_5 XT_{11}$	-5.09 **	-0.63 n	-5.77 **	1.61 ns	-4.15 ns	1.67 ns	3.53 *	0.05 ns	-12.66 **	0.27 **	0.07 **	0.01 *	0.08 *
$L_5 XT_{12}$	-4.99 **	-13.84 *	-8.78 **	3.45 *	-3.35 ns	2.22 ns	6.12 **	-0.03 ns	-0.88 ns	0.46 **	0.00 ns	0.01 ns	-0.12 **
$L_5 XT_{13}$	-3.19 **	31.43 *	32.87 **	-15.14 **	0.55 ns	-5.19 **	-2.81 ns	-0.10 ns	6.64 **	0.20 ns	0.13 **	-0.01 [*]	0.60 **
$L_5 XT_{14}$	-6.69 **	-2.85 *	-21.92 **	-1.14 ns	4.35 ns	1.53 ns	-2.21 ns	-0.27 **	3.12 **	0.16 ns	0.07 **	-0.00 ns	0.24 **

*significant at p=0.05 level; **significant at p=0.01 level

DF – degrees of freedom; DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio





were observed for thirteen hybrids among which COMS 23A X CBSN 509 (99.64), COMS 24A X CBSN 517 (86.52), COMS 23A X CBSN 513 (57.77) and COMS 24A X CBSN 511 (54.59) notably had high heterobeltiosis. Among these thirteen hybrids, TNAU CMS 2A X CBSN 509 possessed positive heterobeltiosis for pollen fertility, spikelet fertility and negative heterbeltiosis for plant height. Similarly, the hybrid COMS 25A X CBSN 517 had desirable heterobeltiosis for pollen fertility, plant height

and hundred grain weight. Azad *et al.* (2022) also reported negative heterobeltiosis for plant height which is desirable for developing short duration hybrids.

The standard heterosis was estimated to assess the performance of hybrids using two checks, namely, CORH 3 for short duration and CORH 4 for medium duration (**Fig. 4, 5**). Among 70 hybrids, for the trait single plant yield, COMS 23A X IR64 DRT (32.57, 15.62), COMS 24A



Fig. 4. Range of Standard heterosis against CORH 3 for yield and grain characters in hybrids



Fig. 5. Range of Standard heterosis against CORH 4 for yield and grain characters in hybrids

DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio

X WGL 32100 (36.53, 19.07), COMS 24A X CBSN 511 (59.87, 39.42), COMS 25A X CBSN 517 (9.29, 12.76) and COMS 25A X CBSN 511 (41.60, 23.49) demonstrated highly significant positive heterosis over both the checks CORH3 and CORH4 (Table 5). Four hybrids viz., COMS 23A X CBSN 509 (10.17), COMS 23A X WGL 32100 (15.87), COMS 24A X CBSN 504 (14.63), COMS 25A X RNR 15048 (12.27) and COMS 25A X CBSN 504 (8.84) were heterotic over CORH 3 for yield. The hybrids with significant negative heterosis over both checks for days to 50% flowering were TNAU CMS 2A X CO 51 (-1.74, -15.50), TNAU CMS 2A X CBSN 517 (-2.91, -16.50), COMS 25A X CO 51 (-2.33, -16.00) and COMS 25A X CBSN 510 (-5.23, -18.50). These combinations can be instrumental in developing short duration hybrids. Apart from yield, COMS 25A X CBSN 511 showed standard heterosis in desirable direction for days to 50% flowering (-9.50), plant height (-29.16), number of productive tillers per plant (42.42) and grain length breadth ratio (-3.85) over the check CORH 4. The hybrid COMS 23A X IR64 DRT exhibited standard heterosis for plant height (-18.38) and hundred seed weight (20.73) over CORH 4, along with standard heterosis for flag leaf length (39.81, 27.43), flag leaf width (43.18, 25.50), grain length (4.74, 9.34) and grain length breadth ratio (12.42, 11.38) over both hybrid checks. The discussed cross combinations were highyielding, short duration and semi-dwarf. The semi-dwarf nature of plant is much desirable to withstand lodging in rice crop which can be attained in the above hybrid cross combinations.

Based on significant mean, gca effects of parents, sca effects of hybrids, heterobeltiosis and standard heterosis for yield and contributing traits, among 70 hybrid

Nivedha et al.,

combinations, the top ten hybrids namely COMS 24A X WGL 32100, COMS 24A X CBSN 504, COMS 25A X RNR 15048, COMS 25A X CBSN 511, COMS 25A X CBSN 517, COMS 23A X IR64 DRT, COMS 23A X CBSN 509, COMS 24A X CBSN 511, COMS 23A X WGL 32100 and COMS 25A X CBSN 504 were identified. The grains of these hybrids were classified according to IRRI classification (2002) based on kernel length and kernel length breadth ratio (Table 6). Five hybrids belonged to long slender grain type which were derived from indica-japonica derivatives, wild rice magic derivative, WGL 32100 and IR64 DRT. The F₁s of cross between the CMS line COMS 25A and testers CBSN 511 and RNR 15048 produced medium slender grains which are much preferred for consumption in south Indian market especially Tamil Nadu. Hence the cross COMS 25A X CBSN 511 can be released as short duration hybrid since it has high yield, medium slender grains with significant mean and desired sca effects for days to 50% flowering.

In conclusion, the ratio of GCA and SCA variances put forth the occurrence of non-additive gene action for all the traits under study. Based on general combining ability effects, the line COMS 24A and testers RNR 15048, WGL 32100, CBSN 504, CBSN 509, CBSN 511 and IR64 DRT stood out as the best combiners. Most of the superior hybrids were derived from crossing between parents with low x high gca effects. The significant sca effects, mean, heterobeltiosis and standard heterosis for yield and grain quality traits identified COMS 25A X CBSN 511 and COMS 25A X RNR 15048 as promising short and medium duration hybrids respectively and can be recommended for multilocation or multi-season testing for commercial exploitation.

S. No. Hybrids			S	ingle plant	yield	Desirable sca effects	gca effect of	
			sca Hetero- effect beltiosis		Sta hete	ndard erosis	for other traits	parents for single plant vield
					CORH 3	CORH 4	_	J
1	COMS 24A X WGL 32100	51.20**	7.28**	10.11**	36.53**	19.07**	DFF, PF, HGW, GL, L/B	НхН
2	COMS 24A X CBSN 504	42.98**	8.32**	-15.69**	14.63**	-0.03 ns	DFF, PF, SF, FLL, HGW	НхН
3	COMS 25A X CBSN 511	53.10**	19.71**	36.93**	41.60**	23.49**	DFF, PF, SF, PH	LxH
4	COMS 25A X CBSN 517	48.48**	35.88**	86.52**	29.29**	12.76**	PF, SF, PL, GL	LxL
5	COMS 23A X IR64 DRT	49.72**	19.76**	35.22**	32.57**	15.62**	PF, SF, FLL, FLW, HGW, GL	LxH
6	COMS 23A X CBSN 509	41.32**	10.35**	99.64**	10.17**	-3.92 ns	PF, PH, GL, GB, L/B	LxH
7	COMS 24A X CBSN 511	59.95**	17.44**	54.59**	59.87**	39.42**	PF, SF	НхН
8	COMS 23A X WGL 32100	43.45	6.29**	-6.56 ns	15.87**	1.05 ns	PF, SF, NPTPP	LxH
9	COMS 25A X CBSN 504	40.82**	15.27**	-19.95**	8.84**	-5.04 ns	PH, PF, SF, GL, L/B	LxH
10	COMS 25A X RNR 15048	42.10**	10.09**	-21.40**	12.27**	-2.09 ns	SF, PH, FLW, GB	LxH

Table 5. Details of best hybrids

DF – degrees of freedom; DFF- Days to 50% flowering; PF- Pollen Fertility; SF- Spikelet Fertility; PH- Plant Height; NPTPP- Number of Productive Tillers per Plant; PL- Panicle Length; FLL- Flag Leaf Length; FLW- Flag Leaf Width; SPY- Single Plant Yield; HGW- Hundred Grain Weight; GL- Grain Length; GB- Grain Breadth; L/B- Grain Length Breadth ratio

S. No	Hybrid	Kernel length	Kernel breadth	Kernel length breadth ratio	Grain type
1	COMS 24A X WGL 32100	0.72	0.22	3.27	LS
2	COMS 24A X CBSN 504	0.60	0.24	2.50	MM
3	COMS 25A X CBSN 511	0.65	0.21	3.10	MS
4	COMS 25A X CBSN 517	0.72	0.24	3.00	LS
5	COMS 23A X IR64 DRT	0.72	0.20	3.60	LS
6	COMS 23A X CBSN 509	0.72	0.20	3.62	LS
7	COMS 24A X CBSN 511	0.62	0.24	2.58	MM
8	COMS 23A X WGL 32100	0.60	0.20	3.00	MM
9	COMS 25A X CBSN 504	0.67	0.20	3.33	LS
10	COMS 25A X RNR 15048	0.64	0.21	3.05	MS
11	CORH3	0.66	0.22	3.00	MS
12	CORH4	0.66	0.22	3.00	MS

Table 6. Grain type classification of best hybrids according to IRRI (2002)

LS – Long Slender; MM – Medium Medium; MS – Medium Slender

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author acknowledges the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research for providing CSIR-SRF grant (File. No: 09/641(0177)/2021-EMR-I) and the scheme CRP on Hybrid Rice Technology.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M., Hossain, M. A., Hasan, M. J. and Kabir, M. E. 2014. Identification of maintainer and restorer lines in local aromatic rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research*, **39** (1): 1-12. [Cross Ref]
- Azad, A.K., Sarker, U., Ercisli, S., Assouguem, A., Ullah, R., Almeer, R., Sayed, A.A. and Peluso, I. 2022. Evaluation of combining ability and heterosis of popular restorer and male sterile lines for the development of superior rice hybrids. *Agronomy*, **12** (4): 965. [Cross Ref]
- Comstock, R. and Robinson, H. 1952. Estimation of average dominance of genes. In Heterosis-MA record of researches directed towards explaining and utilizing the vigor of hybrids. Iowa State College Press. United States: Iowa Ames: 494-516.
- Deepika, K., Manimaran, R., Pushpa, R., Bama, K.S., Umamageswari, C. and Suresh, R. 2023. Studies on variability and heterosis for yield and nutritional traits in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, **14** (3): 1135-1146. [Cross Ref]
- Faiz, F.A., Sabar, M., Awan, T.H., Ijaz, M. and Manzoor, Z. 2006. Heterosis and combining ability analysis in basmati rice hybrids. *Journal of Animal and Plant Science*, **16** (1-2): 56-59.

- Gramaje, L.V., Caguiat, J.D., Enriquez, J.O.S., dela Cruz, Q.D., Millas, R.A., Carampatana, J.E. and Tabanao, D.A.A. 2020. Heterosis and combining ability analysis in CMS hybrid rice. *Euphytica*, **216**: 1-22. [Cross Ref]
- Hayes, H., Immer, F. and Smith, D. 1955. Methods of plant breeding. McGraw-Hill Co. Inc New York: 497-518.
- IRRI. 2002. Standard Evaluation System for Rice, International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines.
- Kempthorne, O. 1957. An introduction to genetic statistics (Oxford, England: Wiley).
- Panse, V. and Sukhatme, P. 1985. Statistical methods for agricultural Research. ICAR, New Delhi, 8: 308-318.
- Manivelan, K., Hepziba, S.J., Suresh, R., Theradimani, M., Renuka, R. and Gnanamalar, R.P. 2022. Combining ability and heterosis for yield and grain quality characters in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, **13** (2): 410-418. [Cross Ref]
- Rahman, M.M., Sarker, U., Swapan, M.A.H., Raihan, M.S., Oba, S., Alamri, S. and Siddiqui, M.H. 2022. Combining ability analysis and marker-based prediction of heterosis in yield reveal prominent heterotic combinations from diallel population of rice. *Agronomy*, **12** (8): 1797. [Cross Ref]
- Rahimi, M., Rabiei, B., Samizadeh, H. and Kafi, G.A. 2010. Combining ability and heterosis in rice (*Oryza*

https://doi.org/10.37992/2024.1501.005

sativa L.) cultivars. Journal of Agriculture and Scientific Technology, **12**: 223-231.

- Ramakrishna, T., Krishna, L., Mohan, Y.C., Shankar, V.G. and Naik, D.S. 2022. Studies on gene action and combining ability in rice (*Oryza sativa*. L) hybrids. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, **13** (4): 1312-1318. [Cross Ref]
- Reddy, D.V., Suneetha, Y. and Kumar, B.R. 2024. Combining ability studies of promising restorer lines for yield and yield components in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Agriculture Science Digest*: 1-7. [Cross Ref]
- Sanghera, G. S. and Hussain W. 2012. Heterosis and combining ability estimates using line x tester analysis to develop rice hybrids for temperate conditions. *Notulae Scientia Biologicae*, **4** (3): 131-142. [Cross Ref]
- Singh, C. M. and Babu, G. S. 2012. Magnitude of heterosis and combining ability in relation to yield and some morphological traits for improvement of upland rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Madras Agricultural Journal*, **99** (7-9): 447-453. [Cross Ref]
- Singh, R.K. and Singh, P.K. 1994. A manual on genetics and plant breeding. experimental techniques. *Kalyani Publication*: 99-107.
- Statista. 2024. World rice acerage from 2010 to 2021 (in million hectares). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/271969/world-rice-acreage-since-2008/
- Yuga, M. E., Kimani, P. M., Olubayo, M. F., Muthomi, J. W. and Nzuve, F. M. 2018. Combining ability of heterosis for agronomic and yield traits in *indica* and *japonica* rice crosses. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, **10** (12): 92–103. [Cross Ref]