



E-ISSN: 2278-4136

P-ISSN: 2349-8234

JPP 2018; 7(5): 1586-1588

Received: 22-07-2018

Accepted: 24-08-2018

**Patel Nikita S**

Department of Genetics and  
Plant Breeding, Junagadh  
Agricultural University,  
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

**Raval Lata J**

Department of Genetics and  
Plant Breeding, Junagadh  
Agricultural University,  
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

## Selection indices for yield improvement in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under late sown condition

Patel Nikita S and Raval Lata J

**Abstract**

The discriminant-function technique was used to construct selection indices in 48 genotypes of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under late sown condition. Thirty-one selection indices involving grain yield per plant and its four components were constructed using discriminant function technique. The efficiency of selection increased with inclusion of more number of characters in the selection index. The index based on three characters *viz.*, grain yield per plant, number of productive tiller per plant and biological yield per plant recorded the highest genetic gain and relative efficiency followed by index based on four characters *viz.*, grain yield per plant, number of productive tiller per plant, plant height and biological yield per plant. The use of these indices is advocated for selecting high yielding genotypes of bread wheat.

**Keywords:** Selection indices, discriminant function, relative efficiency and bread wheat

**Introduction**

Wheat is the staple food for a large part of the world population including India. It is now well recognized that grain yield is a complex polygenic character and depends upon the action and interaction of a number of factors. It is felt that progress can be accelerated if simultaneous selection for most of the economic characters contributing to grain yield is considered. For this purpose, the utilization of an appropriate multiple selection criteria based on the selection indices would be more desirable. An application of discriminant function developed by Fisher (1936) and first applied by Smith (1936) helps to identify important combination of yield components useful for selection by formulating suitable selection indices. Therefore, the object of the present study was to construct and assess the efficiency of selection indices in bread wheat.

**Materials and methods**

A field trial was conducted using forty-eight diverse genotypes of bread wheat during *Rabi* 2016-17 in a Randomized Block Design with three replications at Wheat Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh. The characters studied were days to 50 % heading, days to anthesis, days to maturity, grain filling period, number of productive tillers per plant, plant height, spike length, number of spikelets per spike, number of grains per spike, 1000-grain weight, grain yield per plant, biological yield per plant, harvest index, flag leaf area, chlorophyll content and canopy temperature depression. For constructing the selection indices, the characters which had high and positive correlation with grain yield per plant and direct effects on grain yield were considered. In this context, grain yield per plant ( $X_1$ ), number of productive tillers per plant ( $X_2$ ), plant height ( $X_3$ ), biological yield per plant ( $X_4$ ) and harvest index ( $X_5$ ) were identified and considered in late and very late sown conditions. The model suggested by Robinson *et al.* (1951) [8] was used for the construction of selection indices and the development of required discriminant function. A total of 31 selection indices were constructed using five traits per sowing condition. The respective genetic advance through selection was also calculated as per the formula suggested by Robinson *et al.* (1951) [8]. The relative efficiency of different discriminant functions in relation to straight selection for grain yield were assessed and compared, assuming the efficiency of selection for grain yield per plant as 100%.

**Results and Discussion**

Selection indices for grain yield per plant and other characters were constructed and examined to identify their relative efficiency in the selection of superior genotypes. The results on

**Correspondence**

Patel Nikita S

Department of Genetics and  
Plant Breeding, Junagadh  
Agricultural University,  
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

selection indices, discriminant functions, expected genetic gain and relative efficiency are presented in Table 1. The results showed that the genetic advance and relative efficiency assessed for different indices were higher than straight selection when the selection was based on component characters which further increased considerably with the inclusion of two or more characters. The highest efficiency was noted when three or four characters were considered. Selection indices are, thus, more realistic for selecting desirable genotypes since they are constructed by giving proper weightage on the characters associated with yield. Robinson *et al.* (1951) [8] in corn recorded a progressive increase in efficiency of selection indices with inclusion of every additional character in the index formula. Hazel and Lush (1943) [4] stated that the superiority of selection based on index increases with an increase in the number of characters under selection and Mcvetty and Evans (1980) [6] and Esheghi *et al.* (2011) [1] also suggested that the selection index to be superior to direct selection in wheat.

The maximum relative efficiency in single character discriminant function was 1114.27% was exhibited by biological yield per plant. However, it increased up to 1154.63% in two character combination (grain yield per plant and biological yield per plant); 1193.31% in three character combination (grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant and biological yield per plant); 1190.86 % in case of four characters (grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant, plant height and biological yield per plant) and in case of five characters, it was 1134.05% (grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant, plant height, biological yield per plant and harvest index). Fredous *et al.* (2010), Kemelew (2011) [5] and Shah *et al.* (2016) [9] were also with the same opinion that an increase in

characters resulted in an increase in genetic gain and that the selection indices improve the efficiency than the straight selection for grain yield per plant.

Further, it was observed that the straight selection for grain yield was not that much rewarding (GA = 5.09g, RI = 100%) as it was through its components like number of productive tillers per plant, plant height, biological yield per plant and harvest index or in their combinations. The maximum efficiency in selection for grain yield was exhibited by a discriminant function involving grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant and biological yield per plant, which had a genetic advance and relative efficiency of 60.70g and 1193.31%, respectively, followed by an index of four characters (grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant, plant height and biological yield per plant) with 60.58g genetic advance and 1190.86% relative efficiency. High efficiency in selection based on grain yield per plant, biological yield per plant, days to maturity and number of effective tillers per plant or in combination of all these four characters has been reported by Patel (2006) [7].

The present study showed consistent increase in the relative efficiency of the succeeding index with simultaneous inclusion of each character. However, in practice the plant breeder might be interested in maximum gain with minimum number of characters. In this context, the selection index consisting grain yield per plant, number of productive tillers per plant and biological yield per plant could be advantageously exploited in the wheat breeding programmes. The present study also revealed that the discriminant function method of making selections in plants appeared to be the most useful as compared to the straight selection for grain yield alone and hence, due weightage should be given to the important selection indices while making selection for yield advancement in wheat.

**Table 1:** Selection index, discriminant function, expected genetic advance in grain yield and relative efficiency from the use of different selection indices in late sown condition of bread wheat

S. No.	Selection index	Discriminant function	Expected genetic advance	Relative efficiency (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	X <sub>1</sub> : Grain yield per plant	0.688 X <sub>1</sub>	5.09	100.00
2	X <sub>2</sub> : Number of productive tillers per plant	0.884 X <sub>2</sub>	1.88	36.86
3	X <sub>3</sub> : Plant height	0.736 X <sub>3</sub>	5.37	105.46
4	X <sub>4</sub> : Biological yield per plant	0.905 X <sub>4</sub>	56.68	1114.27
5	X <sub>5</sub> : Harvest index	0.740 X <sub>5</sub>	4.44	87.32
6	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub>	0.342 X <sub>1</sub> +1.698 X <sub>2</sub>	7.23	142.17
7	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>3</sub>	0.465 X <sub>1</sub> +0.544 X <sub>3</sub>	8.94	175.65
8	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	0.663 X <sub>1</sub> +0.769 X <sub>4</sub>	58.74	1154.63
9	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.368 X <sub>1</sub> +0.442 X <sub>5</sub>	8.03	157.76
10	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub>	1.141 X <sub>2</sub> +0.477 X <sub>3</sub>	6.54	128.50
11	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	3.647 X <sub>2</sub> +0.726 X <sub>4</sub>	58.34	1146.84
12	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.646 X <sub>2</sub> +0.451 X <sub>5</sub>	4.83	94.93
13	X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	1.119 X <sub>3</sub> +0.781 X <sub>4</sub>	58.22	1144.56
14	X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	-1.434 X <sub>3</sub> -2.311 X <sub>5</sub>	29.63	582.42
15	X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.760 X <sub>4</sub> +0.693 X <sub>5</sub>	53.16	1044.99
16	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub>	0.353 X <sub>1</sub> +2.065 X <sub>2</sub> +0.524 X <sub>3</sub>	10.98	215.74
17	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	0.304 X <sub>1</sub> +4.693 X <sub>2</sub> +0.727 X <sub>4</sub>	60.70	1193.31
18	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.236 X <sub>1</sub> +1.811 X <sub>2</sub> -0.512 X <sub>5</sub>	9.57	188.05
19	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	0.692 X <sub>1</sub> +0.472 X <sub>3</sub> +0.763 X <sub>4</sub>	58.32	1146.49
20	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.393 X <sub>1</sub> -0.607 X <sub>3</sub> -0.453 X <sub>5</sub>	11.77	231.32
21	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.750 X <sub>1</sub> +0.730 X <sub>4</sub> +0.196 X <sub>5</sub>	55.41	1089.22
22	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	4.419 X <sub>2</sub> +0.276 X <sub>3</sub> +0.708 X <sub>4</sub>	57.98	1139.85
23	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	1.016 X <sub>2</sub> +0.526 X <sub>3</sub> -0.490 X <sub>5</sub>	9.06	178.16
24	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	4.078 X <sub>2</sub> +0.687 X <sub>4</sub> -0.254 X <sub>5</sub>	54.95	1080.17
25	X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.449 X <sub>3</sub> +0.760 X <sub>4</sub> -0.757 X <sub>5</sub>	52.66	1035.09
26	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub>	0.332 X <sub>1</sub> +5.353 X <sub>2</sub> +0.328 X <sub>3</sub> +0.711 X <sub>4</sub>	60.58	1190.86
27	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.204 X <sub>1</sub> +2.201 X <sub>2</sub> +0.577 X <sub>3</sub> +0.569 X <sub>5</sub>	13.42	263.79
28	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.734 X <sub>1</sub> +5.093 X <sub>2</sub> +0.637 X <sub>4</sub> -0.348 X <sub>5</sub>	57.63	1132.98
29	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	0.944 X <sub>1</sub> +0.513 X <sub>3</sub> +0.706 X <sub>4</sub> -0.028 X <sub>5</sub>	55.18	1084.77
30	X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	4.811 X <sub>2</sub> +0.317 X <sub>3</sub> +0.671 X <sub>4</sub> +0.253 X <sub>5</sub>	54.76	1076.38
31	X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub> X <sub>3</sub> X <sub>4</sub> X <sub>5</sub>	1.029 X <sub>1</sub> +5.793 X <sub>2</sub> +0.341 X <sub>3</sub> +0.584 X <sub>4</sub> -0.776 X <sub>5</sub>	57.72	1134.56

## References

1. Esheghi R, Javid O, Samira S. Genetic gain through selection indices in hulless barley. *Int. J Agric. and Biol.* 2011; 13:191-197.
2. Ferdous MF, Shamsuddin AKM, Hasna D, Bhuiyan MMR. Study on relationship and selection index for yield and yield contributing characters in spring wheat. *J Bangladesh Agril. Univ.* 2010; 8:191-194.
3. Fisher RA. The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. *Annals Eugen.* 1936; 7:179-188.
4. Hazel LN, Lush JL. The efficiency of three method of selection. *J Hered.* 1943; 33:393-399.
5. Kemelew M. Selection index in durum wheat (*Triticum turgidum* var. *durum*) variety development. *Academic J Pl. Sci.* 2011; 4:77-83.
6. McVetty PB, Evans LE. Breeding Methodology in Wheat. II. Productivity, harvest index and height measured on F<sub>2</sub> spaced plants for yield selection in spring wheat. *Crop Sci.* 1980; 20:587-589.
7. Patel VV. Character association and selection indices in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Unpublished M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis submitted to Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, 2006.
8. Robinson HF, Comstock RE, Harvey PH. Genotypic and phenotypic correlations in corn and their implications in selection. *Agron. J.* 1951; 43:282-287.
9. Shah S, Mehta DR, Raval LJ. Selection indices in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Electronic J Plant Breed.* 2016; 7:459-463.
10. Smith HF. A discriminant function for plant selection. *Ann. Eugn.* 1936; 7:240-250.