

Heterosis Studies in Single Cross Hybrids of Maize (Zea mays L.) for Yield and Yield Attributing Traits under Rice Fallow System

V Saida Naik, D Mohan Reddy, K Hariprasad Reddy, S Ismail and B V Bhaskar Reddy Department of Genetic and Plant Breeding, S V Agricultural College, A.N.G.R.A.U, Tirupati 517 502

ABSTRACT

In the present investigation, forty five F_1 single cross hybrids developed through crossing ten inbred lines in a half diallel fashion were evaluated under *rice fallow* situation. Maximum heterosis was obtained for yield which ranged from 37.89 (CM 210 × BML 6) to 202.12 (CM 120 × CM 131) per cent. The hybrids CM 120 × CM 131, CM 131 × BML 10 and CM 120 × BML 13 showed highest heterobeltiosis for grain yield per plant and also showed higher herterobeltiosis for plant height, ear girth, number of kernels per row and 100- kernel weight coupled with high *per se* performance. Hence, these crosses could be exploited to a maximum extent in future heteosis breeding programmes to improve the yield under *rice fallow* system.

Key words : Heterosis, Rice fallow maize.

Maize is the most important food crop in the world and it occupies a prominent position in global agriculture after wheat and rice. Maize is gaining popularity at a fast rate due to its increasing demand particularly as livestock feed besides being used as food for human and also as an industrial raw material. Therefore, there is a dire need to increase the maize production and productivity through the development of new hybrids exploring suitable non-conventional production systems. In Andhra Pradesh, of late rice fallow maize production has become popular and showing promising yield and returns to farmers especially in krishna godavari, narth coastal and central telangana zones. Hence, there is an immediate need to develop hybrids to suite the demands of the rice fallow maize production system. For any hybrid development programme heterosis studies is a valuable tool to determine superior hybrid combinations, for further use in hybrid breeding programmes. Therefore, heterotic studies can prove the basis for the exploitation of valuable hybrid combinations in the future breeding programme and their commercial exploitation. While selection of superior hybrids, a breeder must consider not only the *per se* performance of the hybrid but also the predictors of single cross hybrid value (or) heterosis between the parental inbred lines, which will increase the efficiency of hybrid breeding

programme (Betran *et al.*, 2003). Hence, the present investigation was under taken to assess the nature and magnitude of heterosis for yield and yield contributing traits between the recycled inbred lines aimed for grain yield improvement under *rice fallow* system.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experimental material comprised ten inbred lines of maize viz., CM 119, CM 120, CM 131, CM 133, CM 210, CM 211, BML 6, BML 7,BML 13 and BML 10, which were mated in a half diallel fashion to generate forty five cross combinations during kharif, 2010 at Sri Venkateswara Agricutural College farm, Tirupati. Ten parents and forty five F₁ single cross hybrids were sown in RBD with three replications separately in the contigenous experiments under rice fallow system during rabi, 2010-11. Each entry was planted in a single row plot of 4 m length and the row-to-row and plant to plant distance was maintained at 75 and 20 cm, respectively. Standard plant protection measures were adopted to minimize the effect of insect pests and diseases. The data were recorded on randomly selected five competitive plants for plant height, ear length, ear girth, number of kernel rows per ear, number of kernels per row, 100-kernel weight and grain yield per plant. However, the data for days to 50 per

cent tasseling, days to 50 per cent silking, anthesissilking interval and days to maturity were recorded on plot basis. The data were subjected to preliminary analysis of variance (Panse and Sukhatme, 1985) and heterotic effects were estimated by the method suggested by Hallauer and Miranda (1988).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of variance (Table 1) revealed highly significant differences among the F_1 's for all the characters studied except number of kernel rows per ear. The *per se* performance and better parent heterosis for grain yield per plant and its components were presented in Table 2. The *per se* performance for days to 50% tasselling ranged from 49.67 (CM 120 × CM 133) to 61.67 days (BML 7 × BML 13). Similarly the range varied from 53.00 (CM 120 \times BML 10) to 66.33 days (BML $7 \times$ BML 13) for days to 50% silking; 2.33 (CM 120 × BML 7, CM $120 \times BML$ 10 and CM $131 \times BML$ 10) to 5.00 days (CM 119 \times BML 7, CM 133 \times BML 10 and BML 7 \times BML 10) for anthesis-silking interval; 155.56 (CM 131× CM 210) to 228.99 cm (CM 211 \times BML 7) for pant height; 88.33 (BML 13 \times BML 10) to 105.00 days (CM 211 \times BML 7) for days to maturity; 15.69 (CM $210 \times BML 6$) to 21.01 cm (CM 211 \times BML 13) for ear length; 13.27 (CM $131 \times BML 13$) to 16.33 cm (CM $131 \times BML 6$) for ear girth; 13.46 (CM 211 × BML 10) to 15.33 (CM $131 \times BML 6$) for number of kernel rows per ear; 34.33 (CM 210 × BML 10) to 46.70 (CM 211 \times BML 7) for number of kernels per row; 24.36 (CM 210 × BML 6) to 34.67 (CM 120 × BML 10) for 100-kernel weight and 88.40 (CM 210 × BML 13) to 146.28 (CM 211 \times BML 7) for grain yield per plant.

The better parent heterosis for days to 50% tasselling ranged from -24.37% (CM 120 × CM 133) to -7.65% (CM 120 × CM 133). Similarly the range varied from -22.44% (CM 120 × BML 10) to -3.86% (BML 7 × BML 13) for days to 50% silking; -36.36% (CM 131 × BML 10) to 87.50% (CM 133 × BML 10) for anthesis-silking interval; 8.23% (CM 210 × BML 6) to 64.32% (CM 119 × CM 133) for pant height; -19.34% (CM 119 × CM 131) to -5.15% (CM 211 × BML 6) for days to maturity; 6.54% (CM 210 × BML 6) to 64.45% (CM 120 × BML 13) for ear length; 7.97% (CM 131 × BML 7) to 55.19% (CM 133 × CM 210) for ear girth; -10.96%

(CM 211 × BML 10) to 22.46% (CM 120 × CM 210) for number of kernel rows per ear; 32.21% (BML $6 \times$ BML 10) to 124.97% (CM 120 × BML 13) for number of kernels per row; -14.30% (CM 210 × BML 6) to 82.15% (CM 133 × CM 210) for 100-kernel weight and 37.89% (CM 210 × BML 6) to 202.12 (CM 120 × CM 131) for grain yield per plant.

Three crosses viz., CM 120 \times CM 133, CM 120 \times BML 10 and CM 119 \times CM 133 had highest negative heterosis with low per se value for days to 50 per cent tasselling and days to 50 per cent silking. Hence, these three crosses could be a good source material in future hybridization programmes aimed for earliness and there by the possibility of developing short duration hybrids. Similarly, the hybrid CM $120 \times BML 7$ was also recorded the highest negative heterosis coupled with low per se performance for the trait anthesissilking interval. Hence, this cross combination might be fruitful in future line of work to reduce anthesissilking interval in maize, so as to isolate the genotypes tolerant to moisture stress conditions. Balanos and Edmeades (1993) were also explained the usefulness of reduced anthesis-silking interval in the breeding drought tolerance lines. Likewise, for the trait, days to maturity, the hybrids CM 119 \times CM 120, CM 120 \times BML 6 and CM 120 \times CM 210 showed maximum heterobeltiosis in negative direction besides low *per se* performance and thus indicating that these crosses could be utilized successfully in the future breeding programmes to isolate genotypes which can mature early. In the present results it is pertinent to note that most of the crosses exhibited negative heterosis for days to 50 per cent tasselling, days to 50 per cent silking and days to maturity. Similar findings of negative heterosis were also recorded for days to 50 per cent tasseling by Muraya et al. (2006), days to 50 per cent silking and anthesis-silking interval by Yusuf et al. (2009) and for days to 50 per cent maturity by Perez- Velasquez et al. (1995).

In maize tall types are preferred over dwarf types and hence, positive heterosis is considered to be desirable for plant height (Premalatha and Kalamani, 2010). The crosses CM 119 × CM 133, CM 119 × BML 10 and CM 119 × CM 120 exhibited maximun percentage of heterobeltiosis besides high *per se* performance (Table 2). Further, all the

S.No.	Characters	S	ource of Variation	
		Replications (df=2)	Genotypes (df=44)	Error (df=88)
1	Days to 50 % tasseling	0.83	31.41**	0.90
2	Days to 50% silking	0.20	36.20**	0.91
3	Anthesis-silking interval	0.54	1.45**	0.54
4	Plant height (cm)	338.34	1084.81**	39.91
5	Days to maturity	2.80	49.25**	1.81
6	Ear length (cm)	2.71	6.14**	1.06
7	Ear girth (cm)	1.60	1.43**	0.60
8	Number of kernel rows per ear	0.90	0.40	0.49
9	Number of kernels per row	13.95	24.76**	4.69
10	100-Kernel weight (g)	4.75	19.86**	3.38
11	Grain yield per plant (g)	71.43	859.77**	105.76

Table 1. Analysis of variance for yield and yield components in maize.

*,** Significant at5% and 1% level, respectively.

hybrids exhibited significant positive heterobeltiosis for plant height, indicating that most of the hybrids showed tall stature. Positive heterosis for the cob features in addition to high *per se* performance is expected to yield better hybrids. For the trait, number of kernel rows per ear, the hybrids CM 120 × CM 210 and CM 210 × BML 13 manifested the highest percentage of positive heterobeltiosis in addition to high mean performance. Similarly, the hybrid viz., CM 120 x BML 13 also exhibited maximum positive heterobeltiosis coupled with high per se performance for the trait number of kernels per row. Similar results of high heterosis for this trait were also reported by Sallilari and Hoxa (1998). The estimates of heterosis for ear length revealed that the hybrids CM $120 \times BML$ 13 and CM 210 × BML 13 exhibited highest percentage of heterobeltiosis besides high per se performance. Forty four hybrids exhibited significant positive heterobeltiosis for ear length. Likewise, for both the traits viz., ear girth and 100-kernel weight, the hybrids CM 133 × CM 210 and CM 120 × BML 13 and CM 133 \times CM 210 and CM 131 \times BML 13 exhibited highest heterobeltiosis and also high per se performance. Significant positive heterobeltiosis was exhibited by forty two and thirty eight crosses

for ear girth and 100-kernel weight, respectively. Similar trend of significant positive heterosis was also observed for ear length by Abdel Moneam *et al.* (2009) and for ear girth and 100-kernel weight by Abhishek (2006).

Rice fallow maize, though restricted to krishna godawari, narth coastal and central telangana zone only, of late, it is gaining most popularity among the farming community in Andhra Pradesh. Hence, there is an immediate need to understand the heterosis pattern of maize under rice fallow system and the reports on such studies are very limited. In the present research done in rice fallow, the heterosis for grain yield varied from 37.89 per cent (CM 210 × BML 6) to 158.54 per cent (CM $131 \times BML 10$) and the promising top five crosses identified were viz., CM $120 \times CM$ 131, CM 131 × BML 10, CM 120 × BML 13, CM $133 \times CM 210$ and CM $120 \times BML 10$ which showed highest heterosis for yield. Out of these, the cross CM $120 \times BML$ 13 also showed low heterosis for days to 50% tasseling, days to 50% silking and days to maturity. Hence, this cross could be utilized for generating heterotic pools for exploiting high yield and ealy lines under rice fallow situations. Similarly, out of these five superior

Table	2. Per se performan	ice and hete	rosis over l	oetter parent (B	P) in F ₁ 's of	maize for yield	l and yield c	omponents in 1	<i>ice fallow</i> sit	uation.			
S. No.	Crosses	10		DS		AS		PH (cr		DM		EL (c	m)
		BP	Mean	BP	Mean	BP	Mean	BP	Mean	BP	Mean	BP	Mean
-	$CM 119 \times CM 120$	-16.24**	55.00	-14.63**	58.33	0.00	3.33	61.59**	202.79	-19.34**	89.33	21.43**	17.09
7	CM 119 × CM 131	-11.60^{**}	53.33	-11.46**	56.67	-9.09	3.33	45.11**	182.10	-11.19**	94.33	12.91*	15.89
ς, ω	$CM 119 \times CM 133$	-22.45**	50.67	-21.57**	53.33	-20.00	2.67	64.32**	206.21	-12.01**	95.33	14.48*	16.15
4 4	CM 119 × CM 210	-14.05**	53.00	-13.92**	55.67	-20.00	2.67	55.44 **	195.07	-12.24**	92.00	15.89**	16.31
n y	CM 119 × CM 211 CM 110 × DMT 6	-/.05 °.1 1 2 5 0 **	60.33 50 22	-/.23**	64.00 62 22	0.00	3.6/ 4.00	24.0.10 25.65**	220.91	-8.49**	100.6/	24.86** 22 56**	79 01
0 1-	$CM 119 \times BML 0$ $CM 119 \times BML 7$	-8 67**	59.67	-6.28**	02.33 64 67	3636*	5 00	32 83 **	213 19	-10.71	02.07 95.00	27 78**	19.21
~ ~ ~	$CM 119 \times BML 13$	-12.29**	52.33	-11.64**	55.67	0.00	3.33	48.65**	186.55	-10.65 **	93.67	22.24**	17.21
6	CM 119 \times BML 10	-17.20**	51.33	-15.46**	54.67	0.00	3.33	63.49**	208.73	-10.92**	94.67	31.04**	18.45
10	CM 120 × CM 131	-13.20 **	57.00	-11.71**	60.33	-9.09	3.33	53.11**	180.64	-18.44**	90.33	38.86^{**}	18.08
11	CM 120 × CM 133	-24.37**	49.67	-21.95**	53.33	37.50	3.67	57.39**	185.68	-17.54**	91.33	20.43**	16.99
12	$CM 120 \times CM 210$	-22.84**	50.67	-20.49**	54.33	22.22	3.67	36.38**	160.90	-18.74**	90.00	59.38**	18.86
13	$CM 120 \times CM 211$	-11.68**	58.00	-11.11**	61.33	-9.09 10.02	3.33	42.42**	213.22	-14.83**	94.33	37.56**	19.03
1 ·	$CM 120 \times BML 6$	-15.50**	56.33 20.33	-14.29**	60.00 52 33	10.00	3.67	35.25**	210.31	-19.04**	89.67	31.68**	19.40
<u>v</u> 1	$CM 120 \times BML/$	-19.29**	53.00	-19.81**	55.33 55.33	-36.36*	2.33	29.65**	208.08	-15.29**	00.69	21.00**	18.34
0 1	$CM 120 \times BML 15$	-19.80**	10.70	-19.02**	52.55	10.00	/ 0.7	4.0.04 	55.601 52.021	-18.14**	90.07	04.40 **20 F4	19.40
1 0	$CM 121 \times CM 122$		10.00		00.00	0.000	CC.2 F2 C	51 40**	CO.601	-14.00.+1-	CC.46 CC.30	4.1.70 **07.17	27.01
10	$CM 121 \times CM 123$	-22.43	51.22	-20.10.	54.55 54.67	0.00	2.22	20 88**	155 36	-12.01.**	55.06 22	57 01 **	19.40 20.56
(I ()	$CM 131 \times CM 211$	-10./0	50.12 50.23	-10.40	14.01 67.67	0.00	0.0 6 6 6	35 71 **		- 14.20	79 00 1	10.00×*	20.62
0 7 C	CM 121 × CM 211 CM 121 × DMT 6	18 00**	CC. CC	-9.10	58 22	60.6- 00.00	2.5J		11.002	11 22 **	10.001	49.01	C0.07
1 7 0	$CM 131 \times BML 0$	-13.07**	56.67	-10.0/-	50.33 60.33	0.00	2.07	27 19**	102.01	-13 21**	10.06	14.37 23 86**	18 77
1 7	$CM 131 \times BML 13$	-16.57**	50.33	-14 58**	54.67	18.18	4 33	63 92**	185 27	-10.56**	95.00	26.01 **	16.41
2 4	$CM 131 \times BML 10$	-10.75**	55.33	-10.82**	59.00	-36.36*	2.33	38.72**	177.11	-11.55**	94.00	38.86**	18.08
25	CM 133 × CM 210	-18.37**	53.33	-15.20 **	57.67	44.44*	4.33	48.04 **	173.07	-17.55**	89.33	33.14 * *	18.79
26	CM 133 × CM 211	-17.86**	53.67	-16.43**	57.67	9.09	4.00	33.90 **	200.47	-6.37**	103.00	35.13**	19.07
27	CM 133 \times BML 6	-19.00**	54.00	-18.57**	57.00	-10.00	3.00	20.53 **	187.42	-9.86**	97.67	24.06**	18.27
28	CM 133 \times BML 7	-14.80**	55.67	-14.98**	58.67	-18.18	3.00	20.29**	193.07	-14.11**	96.33	30.55**	19.79
29	CM 133 × BML 13	-19.90**	52.33	-17.16**	56.33	20.00	4.00	49.67**	168.71	-11.09**	96.33	20.06**	16.94
30	CM 133 × BML 10	-21.94**	51.00	-17.65**	56.00	87.50**	5.00	34.09**	171.19	-14.78**	92.33	15.14*	16.25
31	$CM 210 \times CM 211$	** 69.6-	59.00	-9.66**	62.33	-9.09	3.33	41.18**	211.37	-14.85**	93.67	49.94**	20.75
3 7 9 7	$CM 210 \times BML 6$	-19.00**	54.00	-18.57**	57.00	-10.00	3.00	8.23*	168.30	-16.27**	90.33 01.33	6.54 21 52 ##	15.69
λ) (λ) 4	$CM 210 \times BML/$	-21.94**	00.15	-21.20**	54.55 57 57	-9.09 40.00*	5.55	11.0/**	1/6.20	**98.CI- **00.0	94.33	21.02**	18.43
0 6 4 4	$CM 210 \times BML 13$ $CM 210 \times BMI 10$	-14.05 ** 20.91	00.60	-10.82**	10.10	40.00* 11 11*	4.0/	47.00.44 27.00.44	1 60 .04 1 60 63	-8.83**	91.00	04.0/** 30 03**	16.80
36	$CM 211 \times BML 6$	-10.20	57.33	-11.00	61 33	60 6	00 F	41 01**	719 58	-10.00	104 33	10.07 77 5C**	19.87
37	$CM 211 \times BML 7$	-14.29**	56.00	-13.53**	59.67	0.00	3.67	42.68**	228.99	-6.38**	105.00	35.01^{**}	20.46
38	$CM 211 \times BML 13$	-17.35**	54.00	-15.94**	58.00	9.09	4.00	37.56**	205.95	-13.94**	94.67	51.87**	21.01
39	CM 211 \times BML 10	-15.31**	55.33	-15.94**	58.00	-27.27	2.67	33.23**	199.47	-13.03**	95.67	33.56**	18.48
40	BML $6 \times BML 7$	-14.00**	57.33	-13.33**	60.67	-9.09	3.33	22.37**	196.40	-9.65**	101.33	26.24^{**}	19.13
41	BML $6 \times BML 13$	-15.50**	56.33	-14.29**	60.00	10.00	3.67	17.95**	183.42	-11.02**	96.00	30.69 **	19.25
42	BML $6 \times BML 10$	-10.00 **	60.00	-8.10**	64.33	30.00	4.33	8.31*	168.42	-9.48**	97.67	35.66**	19.98
4 . 6 .	BML $7 \times BML$ 13	-5.61**	61.67	-3.86**	66.33	27.27	4.67	23.97**	198.97	-14.11**	96.33 22	23.47**	18.71
44	BML $7 \times BML 10$	-8.67**	59.67	-6.28**	64.67 52.52	36.36*	5.00	28.70**	206.57	-11.43**	99.33 22	22.26**	18.53
45	BML13 \times BML 10	-10.22**	55.67	-8.25**	59.33	10.00	3.67	38.03**	176.22	-16.88**	88.33	37.59**	17.75
S ***	ignificant at 5 % and	11 % levels.	, respective	ly.									
DT=D	ays to 50% tasseling,	, DS=Days t	o 50% silk	ing, ASI=Anthe	esis-silking ir	nterval, PH=PI	ant height, I	OM= days to ma	turity, EL=Ea	ar length.			

534

Saida naik et al.,

AAJ 61

201	4													Н	et	er	osi	is	stı	ıd	ies	s ir	ı r	ice	e f	all	ov	v r	na	ize	e															
	Mean	111.93	124.96	96.75	114.42	115.35	145.70	142.50	94.04	135.36	125.32	98.67	106.87	127.39	141.59	123.99	124.63	128.93	92.72	107.95	119.09	144.71	135.97	114.51	143.03	111.79	98.73	113.43	146.18	106.53	92.42	124.10	102.48	126.81	88.40	135.26	120.75	146.28	124.49	115.82	124.37	110.76	144.75	106.59	141.20	100.68
GYP (BP	68.69**	88.33 **	45.81 **	72.45**	73.86**	96.05**	89.25**	41.73**	104.01^{**}	202.12**	105.77**	144.77**	103.27 **	90.52**	64.67**	156.44 **	151.46**	93.36**	147.08**	90.71**	94.72**	80.58**	135.63 **	158.54**	155.87**	57.53**	79.53**	94.13**	119.21**	67.05**	98.02**	37.89**	68.41**	81.91**	144.48**	62.48**	94.28**	98.64**	84.80 * *	65.17**	49.03**	94.77**	41.56**	87.52**	81.99**
W (g)	Mean	30.41	25.15	24.92	31.16	29.74	30.71	31.26	28.76	31.94	31.36	27.14	28.99	33.84	32.15	32.66	33.77	34.67	29.52	26.24	29.97	33.12	30.03	31.98	27.05	30.83	27.74	27.38	31.38	30.58	27.66	30.10	24.36	31.57	27.73	33.52	29.59	32.94	31.91	26.28	30.58	31.92	30.56	32.49	32.80	27.45
1 00K	BP	35.92**	12.40	11.37	39.29**	32.91 **	8.07	21.49**	28.56 **	42.74**	41.45**	22.40**	30.76**	51.89**	13.12*	26.93 **	52.30**	56.36**	51.14**	34.33**	34.50 **	16.55 **	16.70 **	63.74**	26.21 **	82.15**	24.52**	-3.67	21.96^{**}	61.30^{**}	29.07**	35.10 **	-14.30**	22.71**	46.27**	56.40 **	4.11	28.01 **	43.24**	17.94 **	7.59	12.33*	7.54	26.29 **	27.46**	28.09**
R	Mean	38.64	35.90	36.41	37.69	39.51	44.02	43.65	39.02	41.31	41.87	39.25	38.55	42.50	41.34	43.95	41.50	39.24	35.27	41.55	43.38	44.93	44.70	40.62	39.33	40.80	44.10	42.83	44.15	38.67	36.09	40.32	39.60	39.83	37.78	34.33	38.70	46.70	40.95	41.53	42.47	41.47	37.77	41.22	44.36	36.78
NKI	BP	52.39**	41.59**	43.58**	48.64 * *	55.82**	54.11**	52.61 * *	53.90 * *	62.90 **	95.75**	63.30^{**}	111.64^{**}	77.95**	44.73**	53.68**	124.97**	78.51**	46.75**	94.27**	81.62**	57.29**	56.28**	89.90**	78.89**	69.76**	83.51**	49.92**	54.38**	60.90 **	50.15**	68.82**	38.62**	39.25**	104.82**	56.15**	35.47**	63.29**	71.46**	73.89**	48.51**	45.17**	32.21**	44.11^{**}	55.12**	67.31**
RPE	Mean	14.84	14.39	14.73	14.79	14.64	15.09	14.73	14.08	14.52	14.26	14.80	14.79	14.39	13.77	14.93	14.53	13.73	14.79	14.63	14.22	15.33	14.38	14.93	14.53	14.66	14.66	14.73	14.93	15.09	14.75	14.79	14.77	14.66	14.99	14.69	14.59	14.49	14.72	13.46	14.35	14.88	14.39	14.06	14.39	14.76
NKF	BP	10.77*	7.33	-3.73	10.43*	-3.13	2.84	-0.02	5.13	8.36	6.34	-3.27	22.46**	-4.79	-6.13	1.31	14.11**	5.19	-3.29	9.12*	-5.91	4.45	-2.42	11.31^{**}	8.33	-4.16	-4.16	-3.68	-2.42	-1.35	-3.57	-2.14	0.66	-0.50	17.78**	12.59**	-3.46	-4.15	-2.60	-10.96 **	-2.60	1.39	-1.91	-4.57	-2.31	13.13**
cm)	Mean	15.28	14.13	15.06	14.33	15.21	15.01	15.91	15.67	15.64	15.07	14.40	14.51	14.94	15.85	15.27	15.64	15.06	15.03	15.67	15.73	16.33	14.72	13.27	15.19	15.99	14.84	15.12	15.42	14.35	13.82	15.13	13.95	15.72	14.69	14.17	16.04	16.14	15.24	14.33	15.12	16.24	15.51	15.15	15.28	14.31
EG (BP	32.90**	22.87**	30.99**	24.61 **	15.08**	17.02**	16.70 **	36.23**	35.11**	34.51**	33.10^{**}	34.14^{**}	13.04 **	23.60**	12.00 **	44.62**	30.10 **	34.16^{**}	39.87**	18.99**	27.31**	7.97	18.48^{**}	31.28**	55.19**	12.26**	17.91 **	13.13 **	39.31**	19.44**	14.50**	8.78	15.33**	48.08**	22.41**	21.39**	18.41**	15.33**	8.45	10.93*	26.64**	20.92**	11.12*	12.10^{**}	23.65**
Crosses		CM 119 × CM 120	$CM 119 \times CM 131$	CM 119 × CM 133	$CM 119 \times CM 210$	$CM 119 \times CM 211$	CM 119 × BML 6	CM 119 \times BML 7	CM 119 × BML 13	CM 119 \times BML 10	$CM 120 \times CM 131$	$CM 120 \times CM 133$	$CM 120 \times CM 210$	$CM 120 \times CM 211$	CM 120 \times BML 6	CM 120 \times BML7	CM 120 × BML 13	CM 120 \times BML 10	CM 131 × CM 133	$CM 131 \times CM 210$	CM 131 × CM 211	CM 131 × BML 6	CM 131 × BML 7	CM 131 × BML 13	CM 131 × BML 10	CM 133 × CM 210	CM 133 × CM 211	CM 133 × BML 6	CM 133 × BML 7	CM 133 × BML 13	CM 133 × BML 10	$CM 210 \times CM 211$	CM 210 \times BML 6	$CM 210 \times BML7$	$CM 210 \times BML 13$	$CM 210 \times BML 10$	CM 211 × BML 6	$CM 211 \times BML 7$	$CM 211 \times BML 13$	CM 211 \times BML 10	BML $6 \times BML 7$	BML $6 \times$ BML 13	BML $6 \times BML 10$	BML $7 \times$ BML 13	BML $7 \times$ BML 10	BML13 \times BML 10
S. No		-	7	ŝ	4	5	9	7	8	6	$1 \ 0$	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	6 4	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45

Table 2. Contd...

*,** Significant at 5 % and 1 % levels, respectively. EG=Ear girth, NKRPE=Number of kernel rows per ear, NKPR=Number of kernels per row, 100-KW=100-Kernel weight, GYP=Grain yield per plant.

heterotic hybrids the hybrids, CM $120 \times BML 13$, CM $133 \times CM 210$ and CM $120 \times BML 10$ showed high heterosis for important yield and yield contributing characters. Hence, these crosses could be exploited to improve yield under *rice fallow* situation. Similarly, Dornescu (1977) and Beck *et al.* (1990) also reported greater heterosis for grain yield followed by varying degrees of heterosis for various yield components.

In conclusion, the magnitude of heterosis exhibited in the present investigation indicated that there is ample scope for the exploitation of heterosis that exists in the present material. Further, it could be recommended that F_1 hybrid approach is likely to be more appropriate, more precise and quickest way for the construction of crop ideotype suitable for *rice fallow* situation in order to get a quantum jump in the maize productivity levels. The hybrids CM 120 × BML 13, CM 133 × CM 210 and CM 120 × BML 10 could be exploited under *rice fallow* situation since these hybrids showed high heterosis coupled with high *per se* performance for yield and important yield attributes.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abdel M M A, Attia N A, El-Emery M I and Fayed E A 2009 Combining ability and heterosis for some agronomic traits in crosses of maize. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 12 (5): 433-438.
- Abhishek K 2006 Evaluation of newly developed inbred lines for per se performance and combining ability in maize (*Zea mays* L.). M.Sc. Thesis, *University of Agricultural Sciences*, Bangalore. pp.114.
- Balanos J and Edmeades G O 1993 Eight cycles of selection for drought tolerance in lowland tropical maize I response in grain yield, biomass and radiation utilization. *Field crops research*, 31: 233-252.
- Beck D L, Vasal S K and Crossa J 1990 Heterosis and combining ability of CIMMYT'a tropical early and intermediate maturity maize (*Zea mays* L.) germplasm. *Maydica*, 35 (3): 279-285.

- Betran F J, Ribaut J M, Beck D and Leon D G 2003 Genetic diversity, specific combining ability and heterosis in tropical maize under stress and non-stress environments. *Crop Science*, 43:797-806.
- **Dornescu 1977** Heterosis of yield components in maize. *Cercetaria Agronomica in Maldova*, 6: 63-69.
- Hallauer A R and Miranda J B 1988 Quantitative Genetics in Maize Breeding. 2nd edition. Iowa State University Press, Iowa, Ames. USA. 2: 468.
- Malik I S, Malik H Z, Minhas N M and Munir M 2004 General and specific combining ability studies in maize diallel crosses. International Journal of Agriculture & Biology, 6 (5): 856–859.
- Muraya M M, Nadirangu C M and Omolo E
 O 2006 Heterosis and combining ability in diallel crosses involving maize (*Zea mays* L.) S₁lines. Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture, 46 (3): 387-394.
- Panse V G and Sukhatme P V 1985 Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. *Indian Council of Agricultural Research*, New Delhi, pp.100-174.
- Perez-Velasquez J C, Ceballos H, Pandei S and Diaz-Amaris C 1995 Analysis of diallel crosses among Colombian landraces and improved populations of maize. *Crop Science*, 35 (2): 572-578.
- Premalatha M and Kalamani A 2010 Heterosis and combining ability studies for grain yield and growth characters in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Indian Journal of Agriculture Research*, 44(1): 62-65.
- Salillari A and Hoxha S 1998 The performance of kernel and spike characters some maize hybrid crossings in relations to parental inbred lines. Bulletini-i-Shkenacave Bujqesore, 3: 51-54.
- Yusuf M, Ado S G and Ishiyak M F 2009 Heterosis in single crosses of quality protein maize inbred lines. *African Crop Conference Proceedings*, 9: 439-445.

(Received on 10.10.2012 and revised on 09.12.2012)