



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Unraveling heterosis and combining ability for enhancing yield and its component traits in cabbage

Aruna T. S.^{1*}, Chander Parkash², Sandeep Kumar², B. S. Tomar¹, T. K. Behera³, Naveenkumar B. S.⁴, Rajender Singh², Kanwar P. Singh² and Satish Kumar²

Abstract

The present study explores heterosis, combining ability, gene action and proportional contribution of lines, testers and their interactions for yield and its contributing traits in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. *capitata*). Evaluating 30 F₁ populations, 11 parents (6 CMS lines and 5 DH testers) and a standard check (Pusa Cabbage Hybrid-81) in RCBD during winter 2018, the results revealed that KTCB-836A, KTCB-50-1 and cross, KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-1 found superior for yield and its component traits based on GCA and SCA estimates respectively. Further, KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-19, KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-2, KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-3 and KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-6 identified as superior hybrids for yield per hectare based on estimates of standard heterosis and heterobeltiosis. The gene action studies indicated that non-additive gene action predominantly controls most quantitative traits, as the dominant variance (σ^2D) was more than the additive variance (σ^2A) and the variance ratio was less than one for most of the quantitative traits. While higher contribution of line × tester interactions also highlighted the effective role of testers. Heterosis breeding can thus be commercially exploited to develop superior cabbage hybrids.

Keywords: Cabbage, Cytoplasmic male sterility, Doubled haploid (DH), Combining ability, heterosis.

¹Division of Vegetable Science, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), Pusa, New Delhi, India.

²ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI) Regional Station, Katrain, Kullu Valley, Himachal Pradesh, India.

³ICAR-Indian Institute of Vegetable Research, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India.

⁴University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot, Karnataka, India.

*Corresponding author; Email: arunts387@gmail.com

Citation: Aruna, T. S., Parkash, C., Kumar, S., Tomar, B. S., Behera, T. K., Naveenkumar, B. S., Singh, R., Singh, K. P. and Kumar, S. (2024). Unraveling heterosis and combining ability for enhancing yield and its component traits in cabbage. *Vegetable Science*, 51(1), 24-32.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

Received: 07/03/2024 **Revised:** 27/05/2024 **Accepted:** 28/05/2024

Introduction

Cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. *capitata*) is a major brassica vegetable, traditionally grown in temperate regions but now cultivated throughout the world. Despite its diversity, traditional cultivars often perform poorly in head formation, yield and other traits. These problems can be addressed by developing F₁ hybrids, which are early maturing, uniform, higher yielding, and more resistant to pests, diseases, and adverse weather. Heterosis, or hybrid vigor, manifested as the superior performance of F₁ hybrid over its parents. In cabbage, F₁ hybrid seeds are produced using self-incompatibility (SI) or cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS). While most hybrids have been developed using the SI system, it is less stable at high temperatures and challenging to maintain. The CMS system, being more stable, is a better alternative for producing F₁ hybrids. As cabbage is highly heterozygous in nature, producing 100% pure homozygous parental lines through conventional breeding is impossible. Therefore, doubled haploid (DH) lines, created via isolated microspore culture, are completely homozygous in nature. Similarly, both general combining ability (GCA), linked with additive gene action, and specific combining ability (SCA), associated with non-additive effects, are crucial for the development of breeding populations. The knowledge on the nature and magnitude of gene action controlling the inheritance of yield and other quantitative traits would

facilitate to exploit the materials for heterotic effect and assessing the proportional contributions of lines, testers, and their interactions is useful for selecting parents effectively to improve quantitative traits (Kumar and Kumar, 2017).

Materials and Methods

Experimental site and layout plan

The present research was carried out at Naggar Experimental Farm of ICAR-IARI, Regional Station, Katrain, Himachal Pradesh, India. The most divergent cabbage genotypes consisting of 6 CMS lines and 5 DH testers selected based on molecular characterization (Table 1), were crossed in a line \times tester mating design during April-June, 2018, producing 30 F₁ hybrids. In September 2018, these hybrids, along with their 11 parents and a standard check (Pusa Cabbage Hybrid-81), were planted in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Each plot, measuring 3.0 \times 1.5 m², maintained 18 plants with 45 \times 45 cm² spacing.

Sampling and statistical analysis

Observations were recorded on five randomly selected plants from three replications of each genotype/hybrid for all the 14 quantitative traits under study *viz.*, plant height (cm), plant spread (cm), number of non-wrapper leaves, head polar diameter (cm), head equatorial diameter (cm), head size (cm²), stalk length (cm), days to head maturity, head core length (cm), gross plant weight (kg), net head weight (kg), head compactness (%), harvest index (%) and yield (t/ha). Data recorded from thirty crosses, eleven parents, and standard checks were analyzed using the Line \times Tester model (Kempthorne, 1957) with MS-Excel and the OPSTAT package (Sheoran, 2006).

Combining ability analysis was carried out using Kempthorne's (1957) method. The additive and dominance components of variances were estimated using the following formulae (Singh and Chaudhary, 2012).

Results and Discussion

Combining ability studies

Combining ability plays a crucial role in selecting desirable parents in breeding programs and understanding gene

effects on quantitative traits. It is evaluated using various mating designs, including line \times tester, North Carolina designs I, II, and III, and diallel (Fasahat *et al.*, 2016) and we employed Line \times Tester mating design (Kempthorne, 1957), an extension of top cross analysis. The experimental results concerning to significant desirable general combining ability (GCA) effects of 11 parental lines have been presented in Table 2, which revealed mean sum of squares for lines and testers were significant for all studied characters. A perusal of GCA effects relating to good plant stature (plant height, plant spread and number of non-wrapper leaves) revealed that lines *viz.*, KTCB-836A, KTCB-831A and tester KTCB-50-1 were best combiners for plant height due to their significant positive GCA effects (Table 2), whereas the lines KTCB-5A (-3.16; -1.03) and KTCB-1A (-3.04; -0.49) and tester KTCB-51-19 (-2.37; -0.82) were good general combiners for plant spread and number of non-wrapper leaves due to their significant negative GCA effects. KTCB-836A exhibits significantly negative GCA for days to head maturity (-3.69), indicating it matures earlier. Different cabbage genotypes with early maturity have been reported by Nieuwhof and Garretsen (1975), Parkash *et al.* (2015), Li *et al.* (2011) and also More and Wallace (1984). The two parents, KTCB-836A and KTCB-50-1, were excellent general combiners for yield and related traits *viz.*, head polar and equatorial diameter, gross and net head weight (Table 2). This implies the genetic worthiness of KTCB-836A line for developing high-yielding, early hybrids. Verma *et al.* (1989) also found Pride of Asia to be a good general combiner for gross weight, net weight and head size index. Similar desirable GCA effects for yield traits in cabbage have been reported by Gill *et al.* (1975), Fang and Sun (1982), More and Wallace (1987), and Liu *et al.* (1996). SCA effects, which help to identify the best cross combinations for various traits, have also been studied and presented in Table 3. Among the 30 crosses, six were good combiners for plant height as they exhibited significant positive SCA effects, whereas four hybrids for plant spread and six hybrids for a number of non-wrapper leaves were good specific combiners due to their significant negative SCA effects (Table 3). Whereas, two crosses, including KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 and KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-3, showed significantly negative SCA effects for earliness traits (Table 3). Verma *et al.* (2016) also reported two earliest cabbage hybrids through SCA analysis. For commercial traits *viz.* head polar and equatorial diameter, gross and net head weight, head size, and yield per hectare, several crosses exhibited significantly high SCA effects. Notably, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 showed the highest positive SCA effects for all these traits (Table 3). These findings align with previous studies of Gill *et al.* (1975), Nieuwhof and Garretsen (1975), Parkash *et al.* (2015), Thakur (2016), Fang and Sun (1982), Verma *et al.* (2016) as well as More and Wallace (1987) who reported significant SCA effects for yield and its components.

Table 1: List of cabbage parental genotypes and a standard check

S. No.	Genotype	Sr No.	Genotype
	Lines (CMS lines) = 6		Testers (DH) = 5
1.	KTCB-1A (L1)		KTCB-50-1 (T1)
2.	KTCB-5A (L2)		KTCB-50-3 (T2)
3.	KTCB-6A (L3)		KTCB-51-2 (T3)
4.	KTCB-208A (L4)		KTCB-51-6 (T4)
5.	KTCB-831A (L5)		KTCB-51-19 (T5)
6.	KTCB-836A (L6)		
	Standard check: Pusa Cabbage Hybrid-81		

Table 2: Estimates of general combining ability (GCA) effects of parents for different quantitative traits in cabbage

S. No.	Parent(s)	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)	Number of non-wrapper leaves	Head polar diameter (cm)	Head equatorial diameter (cm)	Head size (cm ²)	Head compactness (%)	Head core length (cm)	Stalk length (cm)	Days to head maturity	Gross head weight (kg)	Net head weight (kg)	Harvest Index (%)	Yield per hectare (q)
<i>Lines</i>															
1.	KTCB 1A	-1.17*	-3.04*	-0.49*	-0.10	-0.58	-8.41	2.5*	-0.08	-0.10*	6.18*	-0.08*	0.00	2.38*	0.12
2.	KTCB 5A	-0.65*	-3.16*	-1.03*	-0.46*	-1.35*	-25.28*	4.3*	0.23	-0.20*	-2.62	-0.23*	-0.07*	3.71*	-28.61*
3.	KTCB 6A	-1.00*	-0.29	0.79*	-0.86*	-0.99*	-27.46*	0.0	-0.71*	0.08*	-1.62	-0.23*	-0.17*	-3.23*	-66.04*
4.	KTCB 208A	-0.26	1.55*	0.42*	-1.05*	-0.19	-20.14*	-0.2	0.09	0.18*	1.38	-0.17*	-0.12*	-2.10*	-48.79*
5.	KTCB 831A	1.04*	1.12	0.42*	-0.22*	-0.10	-7.28	-1.3	-0.02	0.08*	0.38	-0.07	-0.07*	-1.97*	-27.37*
6.	KTCB 836A	2.04*	3.81*	-0.10	2.70*	3.20*	88.58*	-5.4	0.49*	-0.04	-3.69*	0.78*	0.43*	1.20	170.69*
<i>Testers</i>															
7.	KTCB 50-1	1.10*	2.07*	0.27	1.02*	0.95*	28.28*	-3.12*	0.20	-0.01	-2.78	0.23*	0.11*	-0.88	43.05*
8.	KTCB 50-3	0.03	1.45*	1.35*	-0.14	0.40	3.51	-3.51*	0.30*	0.09*	-2.17	0.03	-0.07*	-5.11*	-28.30*
9.	KTCB 51-2	-0.31	-0.91	-0.41*	-0.23*	-0.31	-7.24	2.01*	-0.41*	0.10*	4.61*	-0.07*	0.00	2.05*	-0.59
10	KTCB 51-6	0.05	-0.23	-0.39*	-0.51*	-0.26	-13.04*	1.88*	-0.12	-0.08*	1.00	-0.08*	-0.02	1.06	-8.27
11.	KTCB 51-19	-0.87*	-2.37*	-0.82*	-0.13	-0.78*	-11.51*	2.74*	0.03	-0.10*	-0.67	-0.11*	-0.02	2.89*	-5.88
S.E. (gj) Lines		0.19	0.75	0.21	0.11	0.32	4.56	0.84	0.15	0.04	1.64	0.04	0.03	0.96	9.92
S.E. (gj) Testers		0.17	0.67	0.19	0.10	0.28	4.08	0.75	0.13	0.04	1.46	0.03	0.02	0.86	8.87
C.D. _(0.05) (gj) Lines		0.38	1.47	0.42	0.22	0.62	8.94	1.64	0.29	0.09	3.20	0.07	0.05	1.88	19.43
C.D. _(0.05) (gj) Testers		0.34	1.31	0.37	0.20	0.55	8.00	1.46	0.26	0.08	2.87	0.07	0.04	1.68	17.38

*Significant at 5% level of significance

Table 3: Estimates of specific combining ability (SCA) effects of crosses for different quantitative traits in cabbage

S. No.	Gross combination(s)	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)	Number of non-wrapper leaves	Head polar diameter (cm)	Head equatorial diameter (cm)	Head size (cm ²)	Head compactness (%)	Head core length (cm)	Stalk length (cm)	Days to head maturity	Gross head weight (kg)	Net head weight (kg)	Harvest Index (%)	Yield per hectare (q)
1.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-1	1.73*	1.19	-0.92*	3.08*	2.56*	86.06*	-5.28*	1.26*	0.14	-7.96*	0.72*	0.45*	2.47	177.50*
2.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-3	-1.14*	-0.59	1.10*	-1.40*	-1.40*	-40.38*	0.50	-0.45	-0.11	-7.23*	-0.32*	-0.22*	-4.47*	-88.18*
3.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-2	0.20	1.03	-1.67*	-0.37	-0.69	-17.62	7.55*	-0.26	-0.16	6.32	-0.15*	0.03	9.57*	14.05
4.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-6	-0.49	-0.42	0.34	-0.73*	-0.11	-12.12	-0.75	0.15	-0.06	-0.07	-0.13	-0.12*	-2.16	-45.54*
5.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-19	-0.30	-1.21	1.15*	-0.57*	-0.37	-15.94	-2.02	-0.69*	0.18*	8.93*	-0.12	-0.15*	-5.41*	-57.83*
6.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-1	0.28	3.41*	0.26	-0.43	0.66	-0.52	-1.35	0.25	0.02	0.18	0.01	0.00	-1.31	-1.89
7.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-3	0.91*	0.53	-0.93*	0.50*	0.91	17.18	0.01	0.58	-0.01	2.23	0.14	0.14*	3.04	55.84*
8.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-2	0.85*	0.85	0.60	0.32	1.35*	20.51*	-4.26*	0.20	0.02	-4.21	0.19*	0.06	-3.16	22.52
9.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-6	-1.17*	-3.17*	0.25	0.36	0.00	6.03	-0.67	-0.94*	-0.03	1.73	0.02	0.00	-0.66	0.85
10.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-19	-0.86*	-1.62	-0.18	-0.75*	-2.91*	-43.20*	6.27*	-0.09	0.00	0.07	-0.36*	-0.20*	2.10	-77.32*
11.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-1	-1.21*	-1.23	-0.40	-1.14*	-0.67	-26.59*	2.77	-0.40	-0.04	1.18	-0.22*	-0.11*	0.72	-42.92*
12.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-3	-0.45	0.36	0.71	-0.54*	0.21	-5.66	-0.97	-0.84*	0.05	4.90	-0.03	-0.04	-1.80	-15.14
13.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-2	0.09	-2.69	1.61*	-0.22	-1.31*	-18.76*	-1.35	0.34	-0.14	-3.88	-0.14	-0.16*	-6.09*	-62.28*
14.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-6	0.84*	1.23	-1.14*	1.69*	0.84	36.78*	-1.03	-0.11	-0.04	0.40	0.27*	0.20*	4.34*	79.60*
15.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-19	0.72	2.34	-0.78	0.21	0.93	14.22	0.58	1.00*	0.17	-2.60	0.12	0.10*	2.83	40.74
16.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-1	0.16	0.03	-1.20*	-0.48*	-0.57	-15.90	4.14*	-0.59*	-0.07	4.51	-0.13	0.00	4.61*	-0.99
17.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-3	0.92*	2.25	-0.66	-0.15	-0.05	-3.85	1.53	-0.05	-0.03	-3.77	-0.03	0.03	2.37	11.35
18.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-2	-0.78*	0.21	0.96*	-0.49*	-0.98	-18.44*	0.11	0.01	-0.04	-3.21	-0.14	-0.13*	-3.70	-51.21*
19.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-6	0.68	1.09	0.46	0.42	0.37	12.94	-2.39	0.56	0.10	5.07	0.08	0.01	-1.71	3.92
20.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-19	-0.98*	-3.57*	0.43	0.71*	1.23	25.25*	-3.40*	0.07	0.04	-2.60	0.22*	0.10	-1.57	36.93
21.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-1	-0.02	0.66	1.27*	-0.41	-0.92	-19.17*	-1.05	-0.44	-0.12	-0.82	-0.14	-0.16*	-4.77*	-64.86*
22.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-3	-0.20	-3.34*	-0.41	0.42	-0.12	4.26	0.51	-0.05	0.01	-0.10	0.04	0.04	1.32	16.77
23.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-2	-0.85*	3.24*	-1.39*	0.11	0.90	13.25	1.44	-0.02	0.08	9.46*	0.10	0.14*	5.00*	55.91*
24.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-6	0.40	-0.62	0.90*	-0.08	-0.11	-0.11	-2.06	0.46	0.22*	-4.93	-0.02	-0.07	-3.43	-27.34
25.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-19	0.66	0.05	-0.37	-0.05	0.25	1.77	1.15	0.04	-0.19*	-3.60	0.02	0.05	1.88	19.52
26.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-1	-0.94*	-4.06*	0.99*	-0.62*	-1.07	-23.89*	0.76	-0.09	0.06	2.91	-0.23*	-0.17*	-1.73	-66.84*
27.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-3	-0.05	0.80	0.19	1.17*	0.45	28.45*	-1.58	0.81*	0.09	3.97	0.20*	0.05	-0.45	19.35
28.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-2	0.49	-2.65	-0.12	0.66*	0.73	21.05*	-3.50*	-0.28	0.24*	-4.48	0.14	0.05	-1.61	21.01
29.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-6	-0.26	1.90	-0.82	-1.66*	-0.99	-43.52*	6.89*	-0.11	-0.18*	-2.20	-0.22*	-0.03	3.62	-11.49
30.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-19	0.75*	4.01*	-0.25	0.46*	0.87	17.91*	-2.58	-0.33	-0.20*	-0.20	0.11	0.10	0.17	37.97
	S.E. (Sij)	0.39	1.50	0.43	0.23	0.63	9.12	1.67	0.29	0.09	3.27	0.08	0.05	1.92	19.83
	C.D. _(10,05) (Sij)	0.75	2.94	0.83	0.44	1.24	17.88	3.27	0.58	0.17	6.41	0.15	0.10	3.76	38.87

*Significant at 5% level of significance

Table 4: Estimates of standard heterosis (%) for different quantitative traits in cabbage

S. No.	Cross combination(s)	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)	Number of non-wrapper leaves	Head polar diameter (cm)	Head equatorial diameter (cm)	Head size (cm ²)	Head compactness	Head core length (cm)	Stalk length (cm)	Days to head maturity	Gross head weight (kg)	Net head weight (kg)	Harvest Index (%)	Yield per hectare (q)
1.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-1	10.12*	-10.25*	-17.03*	22.59*	13.67*	39.12*	-12.51	10.72	-4.29	-12.50*	35.44*	44.21*	6.12	44.56*
2.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-3	-10.12*	-14.46*	4.37	-17.18*	-15.62*	-30.24*	4.24	-20.72*	-17.18	-10.83	-28.18*	-38.61*	-14.85*	-38.46*
3.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-2	4.97	-15.74*	-26.90*	-10.59*	-15.62*	-24.73*	43.37*	-30.98*	-21.47	14.58*	-24.97*	-6.68	24.94*	-6.45
4.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-6	-6.69	-17.08*	-12.87*	-15.06*	-11.50	-24.87*	17.18	-17.32*	-29.45*	2.08	-24.22*	-23.21*	1.09	-23.03*
5.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-19	-10.39*	-22.22*	-10.31	-11.29*	-16.59*	-25.92*	15.88	-30.72*	-7.98	11.25	-25.05*	-25.65*	-1.59	-25.47*
6.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-1	5.32	-6.59	-12.64*	-4.71	-3.69	-8.33	5.07	-2.88	-25.15	-13.33*	-8.73	-6.93	1.52	-6.71
7.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-3	3.09	-12.71*	-13.33*	-6.35	-5.64	-11.58	8.07	5.56	-18.40	-10.00	-11.81	-10.28	1.73	-10.06
8.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-2	1.03	-16.27*	-14.94*	-8.24*	-7.38	-14.98*	11.98	-15.69	-15.34	-9.58	-15.09*	-11.66	3.54	-11.44
9.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-6	-7.55	-22.10*	-17.24*	-9.88*	-15.84*	-24.28*	22.77*	-32.48*	-36.20*	-6.67	-23.94*	-18.87*	6.39	-18.68*
10.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-19	-10.63*	-23.15*	-23.22*	-15.06*	-38.18*	-46.17*	47.00*	-12.68	-35.28*	-10.83	-44.81*	-37.49*	14.99*	-37.34*
11.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-1	-4.12	-9.68*	-4.60	-12.47*	-9.98	-21.29*	4.76	-33.99*	-4.29	-10.83	-20.36*	-26.21*	-7.70	-26.03*
12.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-3	-5.66	-7.99	10.57	-16.42*	-7.81	-23.05*	-8.08	-40.52*	13.50	-5.42	-21.06*	-36.92*	-20.38*	-36.77*
13.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-2	-4.63	-17.43*	4.60	-14.82*	-22.34*	-33.99*	7.93	-31.37*	-3.07	-7.92	-31.68*	-41.70*	-14.99*	-41.56*
14.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-6	1.03	-9.39*	-14.25*	-3.29	-8.03	-11.17	8.49	-34.64*	-11.04	-7.08	-11.48	-8.72	2.74	-8.50
15.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-19	-4.29	-11.20*	-14.71*	-11.06*	-10.85	-20.82*	16.17	-9.80	6.75	-12.92*	-20.55*	-17.68*	3.34	-17.48*
16.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-1	6.69	-4.26	-12.64*	-9.18*	-4.12	-13.03	8.34	-22.22	1.23	-2.92	-13.12*	-11.67	1.72	-11.46
17.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-3	5.15	-1.46	-1.49	-15.06*	-4.34	-18.87*	-0.98	-9.47	15.34	-12.50*	-17.89*	-26.17*	-10.42	-26.00*
18.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-2	-5.32	-9.15*	-2.41	-18.12*	-14.97*	-30.49*	11.77	-22.22*	14.11	-3.33	-28.83*	-34.74*	-8.37	-34.58*
19.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-6	3.95	-6.41	-5.75	-13.65*	-5.86	-18.75*	3.58	-5.88	10.43	2.50	-18.05*	-23.08*	-6.49	-22.89*
20.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-19	-9.26*	-18.31*	-8.97	-8.94*	-3.69	-12.41	3.09	-12.42	4.29	-9.17	-12.31	-14.38	-2.80	-14.17
21.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-1	12.52*	-3.91	4.37	-2.82	-5.86	-8.63	-11.18	-21.24*	-11.66	-10.83	-7.95	-22.10*	-15.63*	-21.91*
22.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-3	6.09	-11.98*	0.23	-5.18	-4.23	-9.25	-7.55	-11.44	9.51	-9.17	-8.78	-19.58*	-12.15	-19.38*
23.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-2	1.03	-4.61	-18.62*	-8.00*	-2.17	-10.05	12.52	-24.84*	16.56	11.25	-10.71	-3.15	8.21	-2.91
24.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-6	9.26*	-10.15*	-2.76	-11.29*	-8.46	-18.84*	1.25	-9.80	12.58	-11.25	-17.95*	-25.49*	-9.47	-25.31*
25.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-19	5.92	-12.74*	-14.48*	-8.47*	-9.54	-17.28*	13.87	-15.03	-25.77	-11.67	-17.22*	-13.39	3.92	-13.18
26.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-1	12.86*	-7.46	-1.15	16.28*	14.69*	33.18*	-18.42*	-4.58	-6.75	-11.25	30.86*	26.08*	-3.97	26.39*
27.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-3	12.01*	-0.06	0.80	20.71*	20.98*	45.82*	-26.90*	15.03	5.21	-9.17	42.82*	29.73*	-9.51	30.05*
28.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-2	13.04*	-10.20*	-13.45*	16.47*	18.22*	37.50*	-15.71	-20.26*	19.63	-11.25	34.14*	36.95*	1.74	37.28*
29.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-6	10.98*	-1.05	-18.16*	-1.88	7.38	5.22	16.23	-11.11	-35.58*	-12.92*	15.46*	27.07*	9.71	27.38*
30.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-19	11.49*	-1.11	-17.24*	15.76*	16.05*	34.10*	-10.57	-12.42	-38.65*	-12.50*	30.72*	39.82*	6.66	40.15*

*Significant at 5% level of significance

Table 5: Estimates of heterosis (%) over better parent for different quantitative traits in cabbage

Sr. No.	Cross combination(s)	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)	Number of non-wrapping leaves	Head polar diameter (cm)	Head equatorial diameter (cm)	Head size (cm ²)	Head compactness	Head core length (cm)	Stalk length (cm)	Days to head maturity	Gross head weight (kg)	Net head weight (kg)	Harvest Index (%)	Yield per hectare (t)
1.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-1	6.47	0.60	-8.86	35.32*	24.76*	89.31*	-23.22*	34.44*	-9.57	-8.30	81.83*	99.75*	9.72	99.75*
2.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-50-3	-21.79*	-4.12	8.10	-8.57*	-0.26	-3.96	-8.52	-3.73	7.14	-13.01*	-4.10	-6.41	-6.93	-6.41
3.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-2	-9.92*	-5.56	-24.29*	-1.30	-9.53	-10.68	25.81*	-16.19	-17.68	12.24*	-12.09	26.64*	36.57*	26.64*
4.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-6	-4.56	-7.06	-2.57	-6.23	11.78	8.22	-10.61	0.40	-36.64*	-0.41	6.70	17.07	2.11	17.07
5.	KTCB-1A × KTCB-51-19	-1.43	-12.81*	-4.85	-2.08	-0.39	2.31	1.69	-15.87	-12.54	9.88	1.74	7.08	4.45	7.08
6.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-1	1.49	6.80	-4.04	6.86	5.71	12.40	-7.36	13.87	-29.28*	-9.17	10.60	26.67*	4.97	26.67*
7.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-50-3	-10.30*	-0.20	-12.33*	5.01	3.57	8.42	6.36	23.75*	5.56	-10.00	6.87	22.11*	13.39	22.11*
8.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-2	-4.23	-4.27	-13.95*	1.43	-0.70	0.89	10.20	-1.15	-11.25	-9.58	-0.52	19.89	15.41*	19.89
9.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-6	-10.91*	-10.93*	-7.46	1.06	-7.62	-7.16	-6.35	-20.84*	-39.71*	-6.67	-7.84	10.42	7.46	10.42
10.	KTCB-5A × KTCB-51-19	-13.88*	-12.13*	-18.54*	-4.75	-32.14*	-33.99*	33.25*	2.38	-38.48*	-10.83	-33.12*	-14.93	22.06*	-14.93
11.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-1	-7.30	-0.06	4.80	2.76	-1.19	5.05	-7.64	1.00	-0.95	-6.55	4.76	2.20	-4.56	2.20
12.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-50-3	-17.91*	1.81	17.32*	-2.68	4.68	2.70	-16.27*	-9.00	46.83*	-7.72	3.83	-12.18	-15.49*	-12.18
13.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-2	-9.59*	-8.65	10.98	-5.85	-16.74*	-21.68*	-1.69	5.00	1.61	-9.80	-19.96*	-20.88	-9.77	-20.88
14.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-6	3.33	0.26	-4.11	13.54*	4.43	18.56	-17.24*	0.00	-7.94	-9.35	16.43	27.09*	3.77	27.09*
15.	KTCB-6A × KTCB-51-19	13.41*	-1.10	-9.51	1.34	1.23	5.68	5.31	38.00*	10.48	-13.99*	4.50	14.61	9.68	14.61
16.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-1	3.15	1.61	-4.04	12.87*	5.24	18.34	-4.48	-20.67*	-4.35	1.75	16.64	22.34*	5.18	22.34*
17.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-50-3	-8.51*	4.97	-10.73*	-1.10	13.08	11.70	2.37	-10.64	49.21*	-9.87	9.64	22.89	11.99	22.89
18.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-2	-10.24*	-2.93	-5.67	-9.49*	-8.84	-17.51*	18.29	-18.49*	19.61	-0.43	-16.62*	-11.43	6.39	-11.43
19.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-6	6.32	-1.53	5.40	9.55*	12.73	23.28*	-20.98*	7.46	-0.83	5.58	17.52	26.06	-5.55	26.06
20.	KTCB-208A × KTCB-51-19	-3.82	-9.03	-3.41	3.75	15.03	20.97*	-6.55	-13.55	-0.87	-6.44	19.03*	23.31*	3.17	23.31*
21.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-1	8.79*	17.71*	14.65*	20.76*	3.33	24.33*	-21.69*	-19.13*	-16.52	-6.55	23.59*	7.90	-12.76*	7.90
22.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-50-3	-7.69*	7.82	-9.17	10.41*	13.21	24.94*	-4.43	-9.06	41.67*	-11.38	21.81*	33.87*	9.83	33.87*
23.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-2	-4.23	16.86*	-21.33*	1.69	4.88	6.73	17.60	-21.23*	22.19	8.98	4.61	31.44*	25.65*	31.44*
24.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-6	11.75*	10.07	8.74	13.90*	14.36	30.32*	-22.76*	2.99	1.10	-13.41*	24.34*	22.10	-8.56	22.10
25.	KTCB-831A × KTCB-51-19	8.33	6.89	-9.27	4.29	8.03	14.24	3.22	-12.75	-29.45*	-12.76*	12.36	24.72*	10.31	24.72*
26.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-1	7.17	-1.79	8.59	18.80*	25.88*	77.02*	-28.07	6.57	-11.88	-6.99	67.97*	74.64*	-0.71	74.64*
27.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-3	-2.54	6.46	-8.65	23.32*	43.00*	93.82*	-24.43*	28.47*	36.11*	-11.38	83.32*	115.95*	13.13	115.95*
28.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-2	7.15	-4.05	-16.33*	18.99*	26.74*	63.16*	-10.80	-10.95	25.40	-13.06*	57.16*	85.85*	18.14*	85.85*
29.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-6	5.37	4.11	-8.48	0.24	35.62*	39.85*	-11.33	1.49	-42.15*	-15.04*	48.20*	108.24*	10.81	108.24*
30.	KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-19	5.86	10.13*	-12.20*	18.27*	38.60*	78.24*	-18.94*	-2.19	-41.69*	-13.58*	67.79*	101.35*	13.21*	101.35*

*Significant at 5% level of significance

Table 6: Estimates of genetic components of variance and proportional contribution of lines, testers and their interactions to sum of squares of the hybrids for quantitative traits in cabbage

Traits	σ^2g	σ^2s	σ^2A	σ^2D	$(\sigma^2g)/(\sigma^2s)$	Per cent contribution of		
						Lines	Testers	Lines \times Testers
Plant height	0.86	0.64	3.43	2.57	1.34	57.75	17.54	24.71
Plant spread	3.97	3.18	15.87	12.70	1.25	47.37	19.52	33.11
Number of non-wrapper leaves	0.40	0.85	1.60	3.40	0.47	22.42	33.90	43.68
Head polar diameter	0.82	1.17	3.27	4.67	0.70	58.57	10.41	31.02
Head equatorial diameter	1.17	1.04	4.69	4.15	1.13	60.57	9.90	29.53
Head size	856.05	926.51	3424.20	3706.05	0.92	63.54	9.11	27.35
Head compactness	7.59	9.63	30.34	38.54	0.79	35.67	28.72	35.61
Head core length	0.05	0.25	0.19	1.00	0.20	29.81	13.89	56.30
Stalk length	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.03	1.00	44.28	18.67	37.05
Days to head maturity	5.43	12.07	21.73	48.27	0.45	29.06	19.34	51.61
Gross head weight	0.07	0.06	0.27	0.22	1.17	67.86	8.44	23.69
Net head weight	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.99	63.93	5.71	30.36
Harvest index	5.73	13.2	22.93	52.82	0.43	24.27	29.85	45.88
Yield per hectare	2978.44	3819.13	11913.74	15276.53	0.78	64.13	5.67	30.20

Where, σ^2g = General combining ability (GCA) variance, σ^2s = Specific combining ability variance, σ^2A = Additive variance, σ^2D = Dominance variance and $(\sigma^2g)/(\sigma^2s)$ = Variance ratio.

Heterosis studies

The estimates of heterosis for 30 hybrids, compared to the standard check and better parent, revealed significant heterosis in both directions for all quantitative traits except plant spread, which showed standard heterosis in only one direction (Tables 4 and 5). The highest significant positive standard heterosis was observed in the crosses KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-2 (13.04) for plant height, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (22.59) for head polar diameter, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (20.98) for head equatorial diameter, KTCB-836A \times KTCB 50-3 (45.82) for head size, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (24.05) for head compactness, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (42.82) for gross head weight, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (44.21) for net head weight, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-51-2 (24.94) for harvest index and KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (44.56) for yield per hectare (Table 4), while high significant negative heterosis was observed in the crosses KTCB-5A \times KTCB-51-19 (-23.15) for plant spread, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-51-2 (-26.90) for number of non-wrapper leaves, KTCB-6A \times KTCB-50-3 (-40.52) for head core length, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-19 (-38.65) for stalk length, KTCB-5A \times KTCB-50-1 (-13.33) for days to head maturity (Table 4) implies that these crosses were most desirable for the respective traits and cross combinations viz. KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-1 (44.56), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-19 (40.15), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-2 (37.18), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (30.05) and KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-6 (27.38) were regarded as top five hybrids for yield per hectare based on standard heterosis (Table 4).

The highest significant positive heterobeltiosis observed in the crosses KTCB-6A \times KTCB-51-19 (13.41) for plant height, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (35.32) for head polar diameter, KTCB-

836A \times KTCB-50-3 (43.00) for head equatorial diameter, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (93.82) for head size, KTCB-5A \times KTCB-51-19 (33.25) for head compactness, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (83.32) for gross head weight, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (115.95) for net head weight, KTCB-1A \times KTCB-51-2 (36.57) and KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (115.95) for yield per hectare (Table 5). Whereas cross combinations viz., KTCB-1A \times KTCB-51-19 (-12.81), KTCB-1A \times KTCB-51-2 (-24.29), KTCB-831A \times KTCB-51-2 (-21.23), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-6 (-42.15) and KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-6 (-15.04) exhibited highest significant negative heterobeltiosis for plant spread, number of non-wrapper leaves, head core length, stalk length and days to head maturity respectively (Table 5). Previously, Singh *et al.* (2009) also observed significant negative heterosis over a standard check and better parent for 48 and 16 cabbage hybrids, respectively for various traits. The cross combinations viz., KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3 (115.95), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-6 (108.24), KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-19 (101.35), KTCB-1A \times KTCB-50-1 (99.75) and KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-2 (85.85) were identified as top five hybrids for yield per hectare based on estimates of better parent heterosis (Table 5). Similarly, significant standard and better parent heterosis was also observed for net head weight in the past by Singh *et al.* (2009), indicating the potentiality for increasing cabbage yield.

Gene action

The presently used line \times tester (Kempthorne, 1957) mating design not only assists in the evaluation of combining ability but also reveals the nature of gene action controlling the traits under consideration. Analysis showed that SCA variance (σ^2s) was greater than GCA variance (σ^2g) for most

of the studied traits indicating they were governed by non-additive gene action. Conversely, traits viz., plant height, plant spread, head equatorial diameter, stalk length, and gross head weight had higher σ^2_g , suggesting role of additive gene action in governing them (Table 6). These findings were further confirmed by the higher dominant variance (σ^2_D) compared to additive variance (σ^2_A) and variance ratios less than one for most traits, demonstrating their non-additive gene action. Therefore, heterosis breeding can be effectively used to improve yield and its components. These results were in conformity with past studies by Gill *et al.* (1975), More and Wallace (1984), and Verma *et al.* (1989), who reported non-additive gene action for yield and its components.

Proportional contribution of lines, testers and their interactions (%)

The proportional contribution of lines was higher than that of testers and line \times tester interactions for plant height (57.75%), plant spread (47.37%), head polar diameter (58.57%), head equatorial diameter (60.57%), head size (63.54%), head compactness (35.67%), stalk length (44.28%), gross head weight (67.86%), net head weight (63.93%), and yield per hectare (64.13%) (Table 6). Although testers had a negligible contribution to all traits, the contribution of line \times tester interactions was higher for the number of non-wrapper leaves (43.68%), head core length (56.30%), days to head maturity (51.61%), and harvest index (45.38%), indicating the effective role of testers in heterosis breeding programs (Table 6) (Kumar and Kumar, 2017).

Conclusion

The study concluded that KTCB-836A and KTCB-50-1 are superior for yield per hectare and traits like head polar and equatorial diameter, gross and net head weight, based on general combining ability. These can be used for future heterosis breeding in cabbage. Further, crosses KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-19, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-2, KTCB-836A \times KTCB-50-3, and KTCB-836A \times KTCB-51-6 were top hybrids for yield per hectare, based on standard heterosis and heterobeltiosis, and can be further evaluated at multiplications for release. Gene action studies revealed that non-additive gene action controls most traits, highlighting the role of heterosis breeding in improving quantitative traits.

Acknowledgments

The authors are highly thankful to the ICAR, New Delhi, for funding this research and IARI, RS, Katrain, for providing infrastructure facilities for carrying out this research program.

References

- Fang, Z. Y., & Sun, P. T. (1982). Preliminary analysis of combining ability for some quantitative characters of inbred cabbage lines. *Scientia Agricultura Sinica*, 1, 49-55.
- Fasahat, P., Rajabi, A., Rad, J. M., & Derera, J. (2016). Principles and utilization of combining ability in plant breeding. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 4(1), 1-24.
- Gill, H. S., Swarup, V., & Singh, J. P. (1975). Combining ability studies in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*). *Vegetable Science*, 2, 50-55. <https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/19911619955>
- Kempthorne, O. (1957). An introduction to genetic statistics (1st ed). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. ISBN 9780813823751.
- Kumar, R., & Kumar, S. (2017). Usefulness of combining ability and gene action studies for parthenocarpic gynocious hybrid development in cucumber. *Journal of Hill Agriculture*, 8(2), 158-165.
- Li, N., Li, C., Ren, X., Song, H. & Si, J. (2011). Combining ability and heritability analysis of bolting characters in cabbage. (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* L.). *China Vegetables*, 10, 50-53.
- Liu, Y. W., Wang, X. W., Fang, Z. Y, Sun, P. T. & Yang, L. M. (1996). An analysis of the combining ability and genetic effects of the main quantitative characters in self-incompatible lines of early maturing autumn cabbage. *Journal of South-West Agricultural University*, 18, 421-424.
- More, T. A. & Wallace, D. H. (1984). Line \times tester analysis for combining ability in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var *capitata* L.). *Vegetable Science*, 11, 52-63.
- More, T. A., & Wallace, D. H. (1987). Combining ability and heterosis studies using self-incompatible lines in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* L.). *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding*, 47, 20-27. <http://worldveg.tind.io/record/9578>
- Nieuwhof, M. and Garretsen, F. (1975). Hybrid breeding in early spring cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*). *Euphytica*, 24, 87-97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00022355>
- Parkash, C., Dey, S. S., Bhatia, R., & Dhiman, M. R. (2015). Indigenously developed SI and CMS lines in hybrid breeding of cabbage. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 72(2), 212-217.
- Sheoran, O. P. Online statistical analysis tool OPSTAT, 2006.
- Singh, B. K., Sharma, S. R., & Singh, B. (2009). Heterosis for antioxidants and horticultural traits in single cross hybrids of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 79(9), 703.
- Singh, R. K., & Chaudhary, B. D. (2012). *Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis* (12th ed). Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi. ISBN 8176633070.
- Singh, S., Bhatia, R., Kumar, R., Sharma, K., Dash, S., & Dey, S. S. (2018). Cytoplasmic male sterile and doubled haploid lines with desirable combining ability enhances the concentration of important antioxidant attributes in *Brassica oleracea*. *Euphytica*, 214(11), 207. [10.1007/s10681-018-2291-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10681-018-2291-3)
- Singh, S., Dey, S., Bhatia, R., Kumar, R., Sharma, K., & Behera, T. K. (2019). Doubled haploid based parental lines are most suitable in predicting heterosis using microsatellites and in development of highly heterotic F_1 hybrids in *Brassica oleracea*. *BioRxiv*, 1-69. <https://doi.org/10.1101/511055>
- Thakur, H. (2016). Comparing of Self-Incompatibility and Cytoplasmic Male Sterility Systems for the performance of F_1 hybrids in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 7(3), 602-610. [10.5958/0975-928X.2016.00077.6](https://doi.org/10.5958/0975-928X.2016.00077.6)
- Verma, T.S., Thakur, P.C., Joshi, S., & More, TA. (1989). Combining ability studies in cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var *capitata*). *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 46, 496-501.
- Verma, V.K., & Kalia, P. (2016). Analysis of combining ability and gene action in mid maturity self-incompatible based Indian cauliflower lines. *The Bioasean*, 11(3), 823-1828.

सारांश

वर्तमान अध्ययन 30 एफ1 जनसंख्या, 11 माता-पिता (6 सीएमएस लाइनें) का मूल्यांकन करके हेटेरोसिस, संयोजन क्षमता, जीन क्रिया और लाइनों के आनुपातिक योगदान, परीक्षकों और उपज के लिए उनकी बातचीत और गोभी (ब्रैसिका ओलेरासिया एल. वेर. कैपिटटाटा) में इसके योगदान देने वाले लक्षणों का पता लगाता है। और 5 डीएच परीक्षक और सर्दियों, 2018 के दौरान आरसीबीडी में एक मानक जांच (पूसा हाइब्रिड-81)। परिणामों से पता चला कि माता-पिता के बीच, केटीसीबी-836ए, केटीसीबी-50-1 और एफ1 के भीतर, केटीसीबी-1ए × केटीसीबी-50 -1 को क्रमशः जीसीए और एससीए अनुमानों के आधार पर उपज और उसके घटक गुणों के लिए बेहतर पाया गया। इसके अलावा, KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-19, KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-2, KTCB-836A × KTCB-50-3 और KTCB-836A × KTCB-51-6 जैसे क्रॉस संयोजनों को बेहतर संकर के रूप में पहचाना गया। मानक हेटेरोसिस और हेटेरोबेल्डिओसिस के अनुमान के आधार पर प्रति हेक्टेयर उपज के लिए। जीन क्रिया अध्ययनों ने अधिकांश मालात्मक लक्षणों को नियंत्रित करने में गैर-योज्य जीन क्रिया की प्रमुख भूमिका का संकेत दिया क्योंकि विचरण के प्रमुख घटक (σ^2D) योगात्मक घटकों (σ^2A) से अधिक थे और अधिकांश के लिए विचरण अनुपात का अनुमान एक से कम पाया गया। अध्ययन किए गए अधिकांश लक्षणों के लिए लाइन्स × टेस्टर इंटरैक्शन के मालात्मक लक्षण और आनुपातिक योगदान को लाइन्स और परीक्षकों के व्यक्तिगत योगदान से अधिक पाया गया और इन लक्षणों को सुधारने में परीक्षकों की प्रभावी भूमिका को भी रेखांकित किया गया। इसलिए गोभी की संकर किस्मों के विकास के लिए हेटेरोसिस प्रजनन का व्यावसायिक रूप से उपयोग किया जा सकता है जो उपज और उससे संबंधित लक्षणों के लिए बेहतर हैं।