NEW ERA AGRICULTURE MAGAZINE

Combining Ability Analysis through Biometrical Genetics: Implications for Hybrid Development

Ehsas Pachauri[1] Harshit Kumar[2] Richa Dubey[3]

1. Introduction:

Overview of Hybrid Development and Its Importance

Hybrid development is a pivotal strategy in plant breeding that exploits **heterosis** or **hybrid vigor** — the phenomenon where hybrid progeny outperform their parents in terms of yield, stress tolerance, and other agronomic traits (Shull, 1908). The deliberate crossing of genetically diverse parents leads to offspring with superior characteristics, making hybrids crucial in ensuring food security, improving crop productivity, and meeting the demands of a growing population (Duvick, 1999). The commercial success of hybrid varieties in crops such as maize, rice, and sunflower has revolutionized modern agriculture, showcasing the transformative impact of systematic hybrid development.

Role of Genetics and Biometrical Approaches

The success of hybrid breeding largely depends on a breeder's ability to understand the genetic architecture of traits of interest. Traditional genetics lays the foundation by elucidating Mendelian principles and patterns of inheritance, while **biometrical genetics** extends this understanding by providing quantitative tools to dissect complex traits controlled by multiple genes (Mather and Jinks, 1982). Biometrical approaches enable the estimation of genetic parameters such as additive and dominance variance components, offering deeper insights into the nature of gene action and inheritance mechanisms. Thus, the integration of biometrical genetics into breeding programs allows for more precise prediction and selection of superior genotypes (Kempthorne, 1957).

2. Need for Combining Ability Analysis

Combining ability analysis is an essential component of biometrical genetics aimed at identifying parents with desirable gene combinations and predicting the performance of their progenies. The analysis

Ehsas Pachauri[1] Harshit Kumar[2] Richa Dubey[3]
[1]MSc Scholar, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding,
IARI- Central Arid Zone Research Institute, Jodhpur
[2]MSc Scholar, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding
Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut
[3]MSc Scholar, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding
Sardar Krushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, Palanpur

distinguishes between **General Combining Ability (GCA)**, attributed to additive gene effects, and **Specific Combining Ability (SCA)**, associated with non-additive gene effects like dominance and epistasis (Sprague and Tatum, 1942). Assessing GCA and SCA helps breeders select optimal parental lines and hybrid combinations for commercial exploitation. In the context of hybrid breeding, understanding combining ability is vital to maximize heterosis and genetic gains efficiently (Griffing, 1956).

3. Concept of Combining Ability

Definition of General Combining Ability (GCA) and Specific Combining Ability (SCA)

Combining ability refers to the capacity of a parental line to transmit desirable traits to its offspring when crossed with other lines. It serves as an essential measure for predicting the performance of hybrids.

1. **General Combining Ability (GCA)** is the average performance of a line when crossed with several other lines, mainly due to **additive gene effects** (Sprague and Tatum, 1942).
2. **Specific Combining Ability (SCA)** reflects the deviation of the performance of a specific cross from what would be predicted based on the GCA of the parents, mainly due to **non-additive gene effects** such as dominance and epistasis (Griffing, 1956).

Thus, while GCA is useful for selecting good parents, SCA is critical for identifying superior hybrid combinations.

Theoretical Basis (Additive vs Non-additive Gene Action)

The genetic basis of combining ability can be explained through the type of gene action involved:

1. **Additive gene action** refers to the cumulative effect of individual genes. It is predictable and transmittable to progenies, and is primarily associated with GCA (Falconer and Mackay, 1996).
2. **Non-additive gene action** includes dominance (interaction between alleles at the same locus) and epistasis (interaction between alleles at different loci). These are less predictable and mainly contribute to SCA (Mather and Jinks, 1982).

A thorough understanding of additive and non-additive gene actions is crucial for designing effective breeding strategies, especially for crops intended for hybrid development.

Historical Background (Griffing's Method, Sprague and Tatum)

The concept of combining ability was first formalized by **Sprague and Tatum**

(1942), who distinguished between general and specific combining abilities in maize single-cross hybrids. They emphasized that selection of parental lines based solely on per se performance could be misleading without evaluating their combining abilities. Later, **Griffing (1956)** developed detailed biometrical models for analyzing combining ability through diallel crosses. His methods partition the total genetic variation into GCA and SCA components, enabling breeders to dissect the genetic control of complex traits more accurately.

4. **Methods for Estimating Combining Ability**

Diallel Analysis

Diallel analysis involves crossing a set of parental lines in all possible combinations to evaluate their combining ability. This design allows estimation of both GCA and SCA components.

1. **Full diallel**: All possible crosses including selfs and reciprocals.
2. **Half diallel**: Only one set of crosses without reciprocals.
3. **Partial diallel**: Only a selected subset of crosses is made to reduce workload (Griffing, 1956).

Griffing's Method (Method I, II, III, IV)

Griffing (1956) proposed four methods for diallel analysis:

1. **Method I**: Parents, F_1s, and reciprocals included.
2. **Method II**: Parents and one set of F_1s included (no reciprocals).
3. **Method III**: Only F_1s and reciprocals included (parents excluded).
4. **Method IV**: Only one set of F_1s without parents or reciprocals.

Selection of a method depends on experimental objectives and resources available.

Hayman's Approach

Hayman (1954) developed an alternative method focusing on the genetic interpretation of diallel data using graphical approaches (Vr–Wr graphs). It emphasizes partitioning genetic variance into additive and dominance components.

Line × Tester Analysis

Line × Tester analysis is a simplified mating design where selected lines (usually inbred) are crossed with a set of testers. It provides estimates of both GCA of lines/testers and SCA of specific crosses (Kempthorne, 1957).

Topcross and Polycross Analysis

1. **Topcross** involves crossing lines with a common tester (often an open-pollinated variety) to evaluate their GCA.
2. **Polycross** is a random mating system where selected lines are grown

together, and open-pollinated seed is collected to assess performance.

North Carolina Designs (I, II, III)

The **North Carolina Designs** (Comstock and Robinson, 1948) are structured mating designs used for estimating additive and dominance variances:

1. **NCD I**: Random mating design.
2. **NCD II**: Each male is crossed with several females (fixed set).
3. **NCD III**: Backcrosses involving segregating generations to test gene action.

5. Statistical Models and Interpretation

Linear Models for GCA and SCA

The phenotypic value of a cross in combining ability analysis can be modeled as:

Yij = μ + gi + gj + sij + eij, where:

a. **μ** = overall mean,
b. **gi, gj** = GCA effects of parents i and j,
c. **sij** = SCA effect between i and j,
d. **eij** = random error (Griffing, 1956).

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Tables

ANOVA is used to partition the total variation into GCA, SCA, and error components.

The significance of GCA and SCA mean squares informs about the relative importance of additive and non-additive gene actions.

Estimation of Variances and Mean Squares

Variance components for GCA and SCA are estimated using mean squares from ANOVA.

1. A higher GCA variance indicates predominance of additive gene action.
2. A higher SCA variance suggests predominance of non-additive effects (Griffing, 1956).

Genetic Parameters Derived from Combining Ability Analysis

Combining ability analysis can estimate important genetic parameters such as:

1. Additive genetic variance (VA)
2. Dominance variance (VD)
3. Degree of dominance
4. Predictability ratios

These parameters help guide the breeding strategy (Falconer and Mackay, 1996).

6. Implications of GCA and SCA in Hybrid Development

Identifying Superior Parents

Lines exhibiting high GCA effects are selected as superior parents for hybrid programs. These lines possess favorable additive alleles for important traits (Sprague and Tatum, 1942).

Predicting Hybrid Performance

Hybrids between parents with high GCA and/or complementary SCA effects often show superior performance. This predictive ability reduces the number of field evaluations needed.

Selection of Crosses for Further Evaluation

Crosses with significant SCA effects are considered for advanced multi-location testing. Such crosses may exploit heterosis arising from specific gene interactions.

Relationship Between Heterosis and Combining Ability

There is a strong association between heterosis and SCA. Hybrids exhibiting high SCA generally show higher levels of heterosis due to dominance and over-dominance effects (Shull, 1908; Falconer and Mackay, 1996).

Conclusion

Combining ability analysis has emerged as a pivotal tool in modern plant breeding programs, particularly in the context of hybrid development. By partitioning genetic variance into general combining ability (GCA) and specific combining ability (SCA) components, breeders can efficiently identify parental lines and hybrid combinations with superior genetic potential. GCA highlights the importance of additive gene action and is critical for selecting parents that consistently pass on desirable traits. Conversely, SCA reveals the significance of non-additive gene effects, guiding the identification of cross combinations that exhibit heterosis or hybrid vigor.

The historical contributions of researchers like Sprague, Tatum, and Griffing laid a strong theoretical foundation, while the development of various biometrical models and mating designs, such as diallel, line × tester, and North Carolina Designs, has further refined the estimation of combining ability. Statistical models and analysis of variance provide breeders with the necessary framework to interpret genetic parameters and make informed selection decisions.

Understanding the relationship between combining ability and hybrid performance is instrumental in maximizing genetic gains. Hybrids developed through careful exploitation of GCA and SCA not only exhibit higher yield potential but also greater stability and adaptability across diverse environments. Thus, combining ability analysis remains an indispensable component of biometrical genetics, offering significant implications for the sustainable development of superior hybrid cultivars.

References

1. Comstock, R. E., & Robinson, H. F. (1948). The components of genetic variance in populations of biparental progenies and their use in estimating the average degree of dominance. *Biometrics*, 4, 254-266. https://doi.org/10.2307/3001412

2. Falconer, D. S., & Mackay, T. F. C. (1996). *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics* (4th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
3. Griffing, B. (1956). Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems. *Australian Journal of Biological Sciences*, 9(4), 463–493. https://doi.org/10.1071/BI9560463
4. Hayman, B. I. (1954). The theory and analysis of diallel crosses. *Genetics*, 39(5), 789–809.
5. Kempthorne, O. (1957). *An Introduction to Genetic Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Mather, K., & Jinks, J. L. (1982). *Biometrical Genetics: The Study of Continuous Variation* (3rd ed.). Chapman and Hall.
7. Shull, G. H. (1908). The composition of a field of maize. *Journal of Heredity*, 4(1), 296–301. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a107700
8. Sprague, G. F., & Tatum, L. A. (1942). General vs. specific combining ability in single crosses of corn. *Journal of the American Society of Agronomy*, 34(10), 923–932. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1942.00021962003400100008x
9. Duvick, D. N. (1999). Heterosis: Feeding people and protecting natural resources. In *Genetics and Exploitation of Heterosis in Crops* (pp. 19–29). ASA, CSSA, SSSA. https://doi.org/10.2135/1999.geneticsheterosis.c2
10. Griffing, B. (1956). Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems. *Australian Journal of Biological Sciences*, 9(4), 463–493. https://doi.org/10.1071/BI9560463
11. Kempthorne, O. (1957). *An Introduction to Genetic Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
12. Mather, K., & Jinks, J. L. (1982). *Biometrical Genetics: The Study of Continuous Variation* (3rd ed.). Chapman and Hall.
13. Shull, G. H. (1908). The composition of a field of maize. *Journal of Heredity*, 4(1), 296–301. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a107700
14. Sprague, G. F., & Tatum, L. A. (1942). General vs. specific combining ability in single crosses of corn. *Journal of the American Society of Agronomy*, 34(10), 923–932. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1942.00021962003400100008x