

Physiological Basis of Heterosis in Cotton

Somashekhargouda Patil, B. C. Patil

Received 2 June 2018; Accepted 4 July 2018; Published on 25 July 2018

Abstract A field experiment was conducted during *kharif* season of 2013-14 and 2014-15 to study the studies on physiological basis of heterosis in cotton. The experiment consisted of 30 *hirsutum* × *hirsutum* cotton hybrids and their 23 parents laid out in randomized block design with three replications on medium black soil and worked out heterosis. Hybrids and their heterosis were assessed for yield, number of bolls, boll weight, total dry weight, leaf area, plant height and specific leaf weight. Seed cotton yield were significant among the hybrids. The seed cotton yield ranged from 1178.2 to 2184.9 kg/ha where the hybrid RGR × SG-4 recorded highest seed cotton yield (2184.9 kg/ha). This higher seed cotton yield was mainly attributed to its close association with total dry matter (209.5 g/plant), leaf area (148.41), medium plant height (89.1) and specific leaf weight (3.28). Heterosis for seed cotton yield was maximum in RGR × SG-2 (72.3%). The total dry matter, leaf area, plant height and specific leaf

weight were recorded more in RGR × RGR-4 (44.5%), RGR × SG-2 (1047.6%), SG × RGR-5 (35.3%) and SG × RGR-2 (152.9 %), This all will lead to increase the number of bolls per plant (32.1) and boll weight (5.99). There by it increase seed cotton yield in RGR × SG-4.

Keywords Heterosis, Total dry matter, Plant height, Specific leaf weight, Seed cotton yield.

Introduction

India is the first country in the world to exploit heterosis commercially in cotton and now interspecific and intraspecific hybrids are being grown widely throughout the country. Lot of work has been done on genetic and other morphological characters; hardly any attempts have been made on genetics of physiological characters (Marani and Avieli 1973). There are different milestones in the history of Indian cotton which have acted as turning points to a significant impact on development of cotton.

Studies on hybrid research at Dharwad focused on evaluation a large number of crosses over years, constantly observing the most potential crosses and attempting to infer about the causes of high heterosis. Answers were searched for why some combinations are potential, what would be the probable causes for high potentiality revealed by specific crosses ? Attempts were made to understand the mechanism of complementation between parents for

Somashekhargouda Patil*
 Division of Plant Physiology, Central Coffee Research Institute,
 Coffee Research Station, Post 577117, Chikmagalur District,
 Karnataka, India

B. C. Patil
 Professor and Head
 Department of Crop Physiology,
 University of Agricultural Sciences,
 Dharwad 580005, Karnataka, India
 e-mail : patil4033@gmail.com
 *Corresponding author

plant type and physiological mechanism leading to high heterosis. On the basis of the information generated on these lines heterotic groups were formed and these groups are being constantly revised by adding new genotypes to these groups, arranging genotypes of a groups in the order of combining ability (refining them) (Patil 2012).

This exercise of grouping genotypes done over years has revealed some broader groups of genotypes such as compact group, high RGR group, stay green group, robust types with high relative growth rate (RGR) and some smaller groups and even solitary groups consisting of single genotype (Patil 2009). These groups have shown broadly a definite pattern of combining ability status with other groups of genotypes. The between group crosses of some of them have given rise to some of the most potential hybrids that have proved to be potential. The complementation for physiological processes involved in development of biomass and its partitioning can give rise to potential hybrids. Parents with strong expression for traits contributing to biomass, photosynthetic ability and stay green nature give rise to good hybrid when crossed with two parents. The pattern of complementation of plant features has given rise to staygreen \times compact, robust \times compact, robust \times RGR and stay green \times RGR which in general give rise to high yielding hybrids.

Following these line of expectation physiological parameters were considered most important base for evaluation of these heterotic groups and present study were carried out according to this expectation and some of the genotypes belonging to different heterotic groups were evaluated for morphological parameters.

Materials and Methods

A field experiment was conducted during *kharif* season of 2013-14 and 2014-15 in Agriculture Research Station, Dharwad at an altitude of 678 m above mean sea level at a latitude 15°26'1 N and longitude 76°71 East with fertile medium black soil best suited for cotton cultivation. The experiment consisted of 30 *hirsutum* \times *hirsutum* cotton hybrids and their 23 parents laid out in randomized block design with three

replications. From each plot, three plants were selected randomly, cut at base and each plant was partitioned into different parts viz., stem, leaf and reproductive parts at different growth stages. The samples were dried at 80°C till a constant weight was achieved and expressed as g per plant. From these observations, the total dry matter production per plant and its distribution in stem, leaf and reproductive parts was worked out, which was used further for computing other growth parameters.

The leaf area was worked out by disc method. For this purpose, a leaf punch having diameter of 1.0 cm was used to remove 20 to 30 discs randomly at different positions of the plant and the discs were dried in the oven at 80°C. Rest of the leaves of the sampled plants was also dried separately. The dried leaf discs were used for computing leaf area per plant on dry weight basis and expressed in dm² per plant. The average plant height of five tagged plants was recorded at harvest from base of the plant to the growing tip and is expressed in centimeters. The specific leaf weight or the leaf thickness was determined by the following formula and expressed as g per dm². It is the total seed cotton yield of all the pickings from five tagged plants averaged and expressed as yield per plant in grams. Seed cotton obtained from net plot area from various pickings were considered for computation of cotton yield per hectare and expressed as kilograms per hectare.

Total number of bolls picked from the five tagged plants counted and the average was worked out. Seed obtained from 20 bolls selected randomly from the net plot covering top to bottom were weighted and mean boll weight was worked out. Heterosis over mid parent is calculated by using the following formula (Panse and Sukhatme 1987).

$$\text{Heterosis} = \frac{F_1 - MP}{MP} \times 100$$

Where, F_1 = hybrid, MP= Mid - parent value.

Results and Discussion

The pooled data of 2013-14 and 2014-15 on yield

Table 1. Effect of physiological basis of heterosis on yield and yield components of cotton. RGR-High Relative Growth Rate types, SG-Stay Green types.

| Sl. No. | Treat-ments | Yield (g/plant) | Yield (kg/ha) | Number of bolls per plant | Boll weight (g/boll) |
|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| RGR types | | | | | |
| RGR×SG | | | | | |
| 1. | RGR×SG-1 (F ₁) | 39.2 | 1411.3 | 13.9 | 3.47 |
| | Heterosis | 29.6 | 42.9 | 29.7 | 34.70 |
| 2. | RGR×SG-2 (F ₁) | 53.2 | 2005.0 | 28.3 | 4.70 |
| | Heterosis | 72.3 | 89.5 | 166.0 | 102.94 |
| 3. | RGR×SG-3 (F ₁) | 55.5 | 2090.7 | 26.0 | 5.54 |
| | Heterosis | 54.0 | 69.3 | 109.0 | 125.57 |
| 4. | RGR×SG-4 (F ₁) | 58.0 | 2184.9 | 32.1 | 5.99 |
| | Heterosis | 38.0 | 51.7 | 73.7 | 54.38 |
| SG×RGR | | | | | |
| 5. | SG×RGR-1 (F ₁) | 41.6 | 1570.4 | 16.8 | 3.76 |
| | Heterosis | 20.8 | 33.1 | 34.6 | 45.96 |
| 6. | SG×RGR-2 (F ₁) | 38.5 | 1437.6 | 14.0 | 3.22 |
| | Heterosis | 14.7 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 23.09 |
| 7. | SG×RGR-3 (F ₁) | 43.8 | 1621.6 | 15.3 | 3.12 |
| | Heterosis | 53.1 | 65.5 | 74.7 | 34.72 |
| 8. | SG×RGR-4 (F ₁) | 47.1 | 1694.7 | 14.1 | 3.71 |
| | Heterosis | 24.3 | 30.5 | 12.6 | 33.84 |
| 9. | SG×RGR-5 (F ₁) | 37.5 | 1348.5 | 14.0 | 2.97 |
| | Heterosis | 10.3 | 15.7 | 19.0 | 4.87 |
| 10. | SG×RGR-6 (F ₁) | 42.2 | 1517.4 | 20.5 | 3.51 |
| | Heterosis | 16.2 | 21.8 | 55.3 | 28.48 |
| RGR×Robust | | | | | |
| 11. | RGR×Robust-1 (F ₁) | 49.9 | 1795.7 | 18.6 | 3.22 |
| | Heterosis | 65.2 | 78.3 | 78.2 | 42.73 |
| Robust×RGR | | | | | |
| 12. | Robust×RGR-1 (F ₁) | 50.1 | 1803.5 | 18.3 | 3.51 |
| | Heterosis | 65.9 | 74.0 | 80.1 | 52.87 |
| Robust×SG | | | | | |
| 13. | Robust×SG-1 (F ₁) | 43.2 | 1555.5 | 15.8 | 3.61 |
| | Heterosis | 42.5 | 50.1 | 57.4 | 40.14 |
| 14. | Robust×SG-2 (F ₁) | 46.1 | 1658.4 | 16.2 | 3.32 |
| | Heterosis | 67.0 | 75.2 | 52.3 | 55.14 |
| 15. | Robust×SG-3 (F ₁) | 35.8 | 1286.2 | 11.5 | 3.37 |
| | Heterosis | 30.3 | 40.3 | 6.1 | 23.35 |
| 16. | Robust×SG-4 (F ₁) | 52.4 | 1887.2 | 23.1 | 4.01 |
| | Heterosis | 61.7 | 70.0 | 114.7 | 63.27 |
| Compact×Robust | | | | | |
| 17. | Compact×Robust-1 (F ₁) | 34.6 | 1243.2 | 11.5 | 2.62 |
| | Heterosis | 2.0 | 12.9 | -1.9 | 8.44 |
| RGR×RGR | | | | | |
| 18. | RGR×RGR-1 (F ₁) | 42.8 | 1542.1 | 16.6 | 3.71 |
| | Heterosis | 18.4 | 26.3 | 22.8 | 33.84 |
| 19. | RGR×RGR-2 (F ₁) | 47.6 | 1712.1 | 17.2 | 3.22 |
| | Heterosis | 39.2 | 46.1 | 32.3 | 22.15 |
| 20. | RGR×RGR-3 (F ₁) | 37.9 | 1363.9 | 15.3 | 3.37 |
| | Heterosis | 6.2 | 13.4 | 12.5 | 20.70 |
| 21. | RGR×RGR-4 (F ₁) | 36.6 | 1315.3 | 11.2 | 2.97 |
| | Heterosis | 7.0 | 12.2 | -13.8 | 12.67 |
| 22. | RGR×RGR-5 (F ₁) | 50.7 | 1826.3 | 19.8 | 3.66 |
| | Heterosis | 54.2 | 68.8 | 53.7 | 39.06 |

Table 1. Continued

| Sl. No. | Treat-ments | Yield (g/plant) | Yield (kg/ha) | Number of bolls per plant | Boll weight (g/boll) |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Stay green types | | | | | |
| SG×SG | | | | | |
| 23. | SG×SG-1 | 34.9 | 1255.9 | 10.7 | 2.82 |
| | Heterosis | 4.2 | 9.5 | 5.7 | 5.54 |
| 24. | SG×SG-2 (F ₁) | 40.6 | 1462.3 | 15.4 | 2.82 |
| | Heterosis | 27.2 | 34.7 | 42.6 | 7.14 |
| 25. | SG×SG-3 (F ₁) | 32.4 | 1166.6 | 9.3 | 3.51 |
| | Heterosis | 11.1 | 16.8 | -19.8 | 39.51 |
| 26. | SG×SG-4 (F ₁) | 42.5 | 1528.4 | 13.9 | 2.92 |
| | Heterosis | 54.7 | 62.2 | 28.2 | 6.88 |
| Robust types | | | | | |
| Robust×Robust | | | | | |
| 27. | Robust×Robust-1 (F ₁) | 36.3 | 1306.2 | 17.8 | 3.32 |
| | Heterosis | 15.3 | 21.0 | 71.2 | 39.73 |
| 28. | Robust×Robust-2 | 39.0 | 1405.5 | 15.6 | 3.47 |
| | Heterosis | 34.7 | 41.6 | 57.9 | 49.83 |
| 29. | Robust×Robust-3 (F ₁) | 41.4 | 1490.1 | 17.7 | 3.81 |
| | Heterosis | 48.9 | 56.5 | 99.3 | 75.09 |
| 30. | Robust×Robust-4 (F ₁) | 32.7 | 1178.2 | 8.8 | 2.03 |
| | Heterosis | 3.6 | 12.9 | -30.6 | -25.15 |
| | Bunny Bt. (Check) | 58.09 | 2531.8 | 35.30 | 5.50 |
| | Mean | 35.2 | 929.7 | 21.0 | 11.35 |
| | SEM± | 5.32 | 45.39 | 2.37 | 0.41 |
| | CD at 5% | 16.78 | 128.69 | 6.46 | 1.12 |

and yield components of cotton hybrids and genotypic variation in yield and yield components and its per cent heterosis (mid parent) in cotton hybrids recorded at harvest is presented in Table 1. There was significant difference among the cotton genotypes. The hybrid, RGR×SG-4 (RGR-High Relative Growth types, SG-Stay Green types) recorded significantly higher yield (58.0) followed by RGR×SG-3 (55.5), while SG×SG-3 recorded the least (34). The highest heterosis for yield was recorded by the hybrid RGR×SG-2 (72.3%) followed by Robust×SG-2 (67.0%) while least was recorded by the hybrid Compact×Robust-1 (2.0%). The hybrid, RGR×SG-4 recorded significantly higher yields (1986.2 kg/ha) followed by the hybrid RGR×SG-3 (2184.9 kg/ha), while SG×SG-3 recorded the least (1166.6 kg/ha). The highest heterosis for yield was recorded by the hybrid RGR×SG-2 (89.5%) followed by the hybrid Robust×SG-2 (75.2%) while least was recorded by the hybrid Compact×Robust-1 (12.9%).

The hybrid, RGR × SG-4 recorded significantly more number of bolls per plant (32.1) followed by the hybrid RGR × SG-2 (28.3), while Robust × Robust-4 recorded the least (8.8). The highest heterosis for number of bolls per plant was recorded by the hybrid RGR × SG-2 (166.0%) followed by the hybrid RGR × SG-3 (109.0%) while least was recorded by the hybrid SG × SG-3 (-19.8%). The hybrid, RGR × SG-4 recorded significantly highest boll weights (5.99) followed by the hybrid RGR × SG-3 (5.54), while Robust × Robust-4 recorded the least (2.03). The highest heterosis for boll weight was recorded by the hybrid RGR × SG-3 (125.57%) followed by RGR × SG-2 (102.94%) while least was recorded by the hybrid Robust × Robust-4 (-25.15%). Yield in cotton is a complex character not readily amenable to genetic analysis. It is dependent on number of traits such as number of bolls, boll weight (Sikka and Joshi 1960). The main yield components like bolls per plant and their size in turn are the product of interaction between physiological processes in development and morphological frame work of the plant.

All the crosses recorded comparatively higher yields. RGR × SG-4 and RGR × SG-3 were high yielding. Results from heterosis studies indicated that all the crosses recorded positive and significant heterosis over mid parent for seed cotton yield. The mid-parent heterosis (89.5%) was recorded by the crosses RAH-4 and DSG-3-5, which produced highest seed cotton yield among the different genotype crosses studied. Major factors attributed for the differences in yield of seed cotton were yield components like boll weight, number of squares and bolls, morphological characters like phenological and physiological characters. Various yield contributing characters (number of bolls per plant, boll weight and biomass) and yield of cotton recorded in the present investigation were significantly influenced by various hybrids and parents.

The pooled data of 2013-14 and 2014-15 on total dry weight, leaf area, plant height and specific leaf weight of cotton hybrids and its per cent heterosis (mid parent) in cotton hybrids recorded at different growth stages is presented in Table 2. RGR × SG-4 recorded significantly more total dry weight

Table 2. Effect of total dry matter (g/plant), leaf area, plant height and specific leaf weight and its per cent heterosis (mid parent) in cotton hybrids and their parents. RGR-High Relative Growth Rate types, SG-Stay Green types.

| Sl. No. | Treat-ments | Total dry matter | Days after sowing | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| | | | Leaf area | Plant height | Specific leaf weight |
| RGR types | | | | | |
| RGR × SG | | | | | |
| 1. | RGR × SG-1 (F ₁) | 166.3 | 13.86 | 85.1 | 3.00 |
| | Heterosis | 20.7 | 25.1 | -1.9 | -26.31 |
| 2. | RGR × SG-2 (F ₁) | 190.4 | 123.35 | 92.7 | 0.39 |
| | Heterosis | 36.2 | 1047.6 | 3.9 | -90.80 |
| 3. | RGR × SG-3 (F ₁) | 170.2 | 141.35 | 89.8 | 0.64 |
| | Heterosis | 37.0 | 751.5 | -11.1 | -67.83 |
| 4. | RGR × SG-4 (F ₁) | 209.5 | 148.41 | 89.1 | 0.37 |
| | Heterosis | 36.8 | 255.9 | 14.7 | -61.18 |
| SG × RGR | | | | | |
| 5. | SG × RGR-1 (F ₁) | 138.1 | 20.93 | 82.5 | 1.53 |
| | Heterosis | 18.2 | 57.5 | -16.1 | -36.72 |
| 6. | SG × RGR-2 (F ₁) | 149.5 | 12.74 | 104.6 | 3.28 |
| | Heterosis | 31.2 | -45.0 | 13.3 | 152.90 |
| 7. | SG × RGR-3 (F ₁) | 165.0 | 10.17 | 90.6 | 4.63 |
| | Heterosis | 24.4 | 75.3 | 5.0 | -25.36 |
| 8. | SG × RGR-4 (F ₁) | 173.3 | 47.07 | 69.4 | 0.93 |
| | Heterosis | 37.1 | 74.2 | -14.4 | -25.19 |
| 9. | SG × RGR-5 (F ₁) | 189.1 | 14.94 | 105.0 | 3.15 |
| | Heterosis | 47.5 | -34.2 | 35.3 | 39.49 |
| 10. | SG × RGR-6 (F ₁) | 152.3 | 20.48 | 95.3 | 1.85 |
| | Heterosis | 20.7 | 40.0 | 0.7 | -16.67 |
| RGR × Robust | | | | | |
| 11. | RGR × Robust-1 (F ₁) | 169.5 | 16.07 | 84.9 | 2.86 |
| | Heterosis | 22.6 | 63.7 | 9.5 | -37.11 |
| Robust × RGR | | | | | |
| 12. | Robust × RGR-1 (F ₁) | 166.3 | 13.01 | 80.4 | 3.41 |
| | Heterosis | 48.1 | 10.4 | 23.0 | 52.84 |
| Robust × SG | | | | | |
| 13. | Robust × SG-1 (F ₁) | 172.9 | 16.07 | 97.0 | 2.89 |
| | Heterosis | 29.4 | 80.3 | 7.0 | -34.99 |
| 14. | Robust × SG-2 (F ₁) | 171.6 | 43.07 | 88.9 | 1.03 |
| | Heterosis | 51.1 | 111.1 | 9.3 | -41.30 |
| 15. | Robust × SG-3 (F ₁) | 165.8 | 38.39 | 99.9 | 1.18 |
| | Heterosis | 37.5 | 121.9 | 14.9 | -70.71 |
| 16. | Robust × SG-4 (F ₁) | 181.8 | 95.31 | 95.7 | 0.54 |
| | Heterosis | 35.5 | 384.7 | 18.3 | -85.68 |
| 17. | Compact × Robust-1 (F ₁) | 161.8 | 15.30 | 70.7 | 2.61 |
| | Heterosis | 21.3 | 72.6 | -10.4 | -44.28 |
| RGR × RGR | | | | | |
| 18. | RGR × RGR-1 (F ₁) | 139.3 | 15.89 | 59.7 | 1.99 |
| | Heterosis | 23.6 | 9.2 | -21.8 | 12.22 |
| 19. | RGR × RGR-2 (F ₁) | 142.6 | 20.48 | 96.1 | 1.55 |
| | Heterosis | 23.0 | 69.2 | 6.0 | -39.63 |
| 20. | RGR × RGR-3 (F ₁) | 147.2 | 9.77 | 89.0 | 3.58 |
| | Heterosis | 31.1 | -41.0 | 1.7 | 132.09 |
| 21. | RGR × RGR-4 (F ₁) | 167.5 | 8.42 | 99.9 | 5.90 |
| | Heterosis | 44.5 | -30.4 | 10.1 | 129.81 |

Table 2. Continued.

| Sl. No. | Treatments | Total dry matter | Days after sowing | | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| | | | Leaf area | Plant height | Specific leaf weight |
| 22. | RGR×RGR-5 (F ₁) | 178.4 | 101.03 | 85.1 | 0.93 |
| | Heterosis | 39.4 | 541.3 | 5.5 | -49.25 |
| | Stay green types | | | | |
| | SG×SG | | | | |
| 23. | SG×SG-1 | 163.9 | 6.08 | 76.2 | 6.52 |
| | Heterosis | 20.3 | -72.6 | -8.1 | 90.97 |
| 24. | SG×SG-2 (F ₁) | 181.8 | 18.45 | 82.1 | 2.58 |
| | Heterosis | 33.5 | 88.3 | -14.9 | -41.25 |
| 25. | SG×SG-3 (F ₁) | 159.3 | 5.81 | 85.1 | 7.02 |
| | Heterosis | 28.5 | -68.3 | -9.6 | 102.42 |
| 26. | SG×SG-4 (F ₁) | 167.9 | 21.02 | 110.1 | 2.25 |
| | Heterosis | 39.2 | 21.5 | 26.7 | -44.15 |
| | Robust types | | | | |
| | Robust × Robust | | | | |
| 27. | Robust × Robust-1 (F ₁) | 142.4 | 37.44 | 92.3 | 1.04 |
| | Heterosis | 8.2 | 476.0 | 12.9 | -81.33 |
| 28. | Robust × Robust-2 | 177.1 | 19.26 | 77.1 | 2.25 |
| | Heterosis | 25.4 | 129.0 | -13.2 | -53.40 |
| 29. | Robust × Robust-3 (F ₁) | 161.1 | 40.14 | 82.1 | 1.02 |
| | Heterosis | 23.6 | 369.3 | 14.1 | -77.63 |
| 30. | Robust × Robust-4 (F ₁) | 141.4 | 13.55 | 73.7 | 2.47 |
| | Heterosis | 1.0 | -38.5 | -19.6 | 18.58 |
| | Bunny Bt. (Check) | 154.6 | 40.7 | 105.3 | 1.23 |
| | Mean | 112.7 | 54.91 | 65.5 | 1.34 |
| | SEm± | 7.40 | 1.51 | 2.60 | 0.20 |
| | CD at 5% | 20.98 | 7.80 | 7.36 | 0.62 |

(209.5) followed by RGR × SG-2 (190.4). While, RGR × RGR-1 recorded the least total dry weight (139.3). The highest heterosis for total dry weight was recorded by Robust × SG-2 (51.1) followed by Robust × RGR-1 (48.1) while least was recorded by the Robust × Robust-4 (1.0). RGR × SG-4 recorded significantly more leaf area (148.41) followed by RGR × SG-3 (141.35). While, SG × SG-3 recorded the least leaf area (5.81). The highest heterosis for leaf area was recorded by RGR × SG-2 (461.3) while least was recorded by SG × SG-1 (-72.6).

SG × SG-4 recorded significantly more plant height (110.1), followed by SG × RGR-5 (105.0), while RGR × RGR-1 recorded the least (59.7). The highest heterosis for plant height was recorded by SG × RGR-5 (35.3), while least was recorded by RGR × RGR-1 (-21.8). There was significantly more SLW

recorded in SG × SG-3 (7.02) followed by the hybrid SG × SG-1(6.52), while least was recorded by RGR × SG-3 (0.35). The highest heterosis for SLW was recorded in SG × RGR-2 (152.9), while least was recorded by RGR × SG-2 (-90.80).

Total dry matter is the physiological efficiency of a genotype. Leaf area index, leaf photosynthetic rate appeared to be the major determinants of total dry matter (Yoshida 1972). In the present investigation genotypes showed significant differences in total dry matter production at harvest. Higher total dry matter accumulation was noticed in hybrid compared to parents. Hybrids, RGR × SG-4 recorded more dry matter and also recorded higher yields (Mundas 1992). Even though the hybrid RGR × SG-3 accumulated moderate total dry matter and maximum yield. This may due to increased translocation of assimilates to reproductive parts. This was also true with parent RAH-97. It is not the total dry matter alone which is important but its favorable partitioning into reproductive parts is also important in realizing higher yields (Wells and Meredith 1984). All other parents produced lower dry matter and yields.

Heterosis studies revealed that all the crosses recorded positive significant heterosis over mid parent which further confirmed the higher dry matter accumulation in hybrids as compared to parent. Wells and Meredith (1984) 32% heterosis for total dry matter prior to last harvest. Similarly, Gupta et al. (1980) also reported heterosis for total dry matter. Leaf area indicates the size of assimilatory apparatus of the plant and serves as a primary value for estimation of other growth characters. Somashekhargouda et al. (2014) concluded that, the rate of leaf area expansion has a greater influence on dry matter production. At the harvest the SG × SG-4 (110.1) and SG × RGR-5 (105.0) recorded maximum plant height and were not associated with total dry matter and yield. This variation may be genetically controlled. Patil (1989) indicated no close relationship between plant height and yield. This may be because increased translocation of stored photosynthates from stem reserves when the current photosynthesis is reduced due to shifting of plant towards senescence particularly during post anthesis period. Specific leaf weight is an integral structure

of leaf which indicates the thickness of the leaf and is known to have a positive correlation with photosynthetic rate (Bhardwaj et al. 1988). In present study, all the hybrids recorded significantly more SLW which is further confirmed by positive heterosis, for specific leaf weight over mid parent. Bhardwaj et al. (1988) observed that increasing SLW from 0.6 to 0.85 was at par with increasing a unit LAI to produce same amount of biomass.

Conclusion

On the basis of two year field experiment it may be concluded that the cotton hybrid RGR × SG-4 significantly recorded high boll numbers per plant, boll weight, total dry weight, leaf area, medium plant height and specific leaf weight content it ultimately gives rise to high seed cotton yield. It was also influenced by its potential parents leads to high heterosis in these cotton hybrid.

References

- Bhardwaj S, Saini AD, Singh M, Singh KP (1988) Effect of temperature and photosynthetically active radiation on boll weight in upland cotton *G. hirsutum* L. Ind J Agric Sci 58 : 557—558.
- Gupta SN, Avtar Singh, Mor BR, Jatasra DS (1980) Growth analysis of parents and hybrids for developmental trait in upland cotton. Ind J Genet 40 : 338—346.
- Marani A, Avieli E (1973) Heterosis during the early phases of growth in intra specific crosses of cotton. Crop Sci 13 : 15—18.
- Mundas MB (1992) Physiological aspects of bollworm tolerance in (*G. hirsutum* L.) cotton. MSc (Agric) thesis. Univ Agric Sci, Dharwad.
- Panse VG, Sukhatme PV (1987) Statistical methods for agricultural workers. ICAR, New Delhi.
- Patil SA (1989) Genetics of yield, yield related physiological and morphological characters and their breeding implication in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). PhD thesis Univ Agric Sci, Dharwad, Karnataka, India.
- Patil SS (2009) Bt. Cotton : Opportunities and prospects. Proc Nat Symp, CICR, Nagpur, Nov 17—19.
- Patil SS (2012) Novel approaches for production of hybrid seeds. Annual progress report CICR Adhoc project.
- Sikka SM, Joshi AB (1960) Cotton in India A. Monograph 1 : 137—402.
- Somashekhargouda Patil, Patil BC, Venkatesh M Dore, Renukswamy NS (2014) Effect of moisture stress during different growth stages and their impact on growth, development and yield in cotton genotypes. Environ Ecol 32 (3) : 858—863.
- Wells R, Meredith WR (1984) Comparative growth of obsolete and modern cotton cultivars II. Reproductive dry matter partitioning. Crop Sci 24 : 863—868.
- Yoshida S (1972) Physiological aspects of grain yield. Ann Rev Physiol 23 : 437—464.