

EVIDENCE OF IMPROVING YIELD AND MORPHOLOGICAL ATTRIBUTES VIA HALF-SIB FAMILY RECURRENT SELECTION IN MAIZE

Muhammad Noor^{*1}, Hidayatur Rahman¹, Muhammad Iqbal², Irfan Ahmed Shah², Ihteramullah¹ and Farhan Ali ²

¹. Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan

² Cereal Crops Research Institute, Pirsabak, Nowshera, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

1. ABSTRACT

Grain yield is a complex phenomenon which results from the interaction of various contributing factors highly influenced by different selection procedures. Recurrent selection is vital selection method for improving morphological and yield related attributes in maize crop. Half-sib families (HS) were generated from the most adapted maize variety "Pahari" at Cereal Crop Research Institute, CCRI Pakistan with the objective to improve its yield in 2009 and 2010, respectively. All the HS families were detassled well before pollen shedding to avoid any kind of selfing. At maturity, each family was harvested and shelled separately for evaluation in the respective years. 12 x 12 and 11 x 11, Partial balanced lattice square design were used during summer crop seasons 2009 and 2010, respectively at The University of Agriculture, Peshawar Pakistan. Results revealed significant differences in both cycle among families for all traits. High heritability (0.74) was observed for grain yield in C₀, while moderate heritability (0.45) was recorded for kernel rows ear⁻¹ in C₁. Selection differential was quite reasonable and varied according to the traits of interest. Observed response (815.74) was greater for grain yield in C₀ than the expected response (681.76). Negative value of gain cycle⁻¹ for plant height and ear height showed a declining trend, while positive value for grain yield validated selection for high yield. Regression of all the morphological and yield related traits were calculated based on the selected individuals in each cycle. Highly significant positive correlation was observed among grain yield with all the traits under investigation.

Key words: Half-sib recurrent selection, Maize, Heritability, Correlation, Expected response and observe response

*Corresponding author: E-mail address: noor_pbg49@yahoo.com

2. INTRODUCTION

Maize (*Zea mays* L.), the sole cultivated member of genus *Zea* and tribe Maydeae, ranks as one of the three essential cereal crops in the world after wheat and rice. It has been assessed that more than half of the increased demand in the world's food in term of cereals as a whole will produce from maize farmers and consumers (Yan et al., 2011). Maize is the major staple food in many countries of Latin America and Africa and is used as a fodder crop in different parts of the world. Being a major source of staple food in Africa, increasing maize productivity is a key priority for African agricultural development to diminish poverty and hunger in this region and thus a cornerstone of the proposed African Green Revolution (Ejeta, 2010). About two third of the total world production of maize is used for livestock feed or for commercial starch and oil production. It has a great nutritional value as it contains about 66.7% starch, 10% protein, 4.8% oil, 8.5% fiber, 3% sugar and 7% ash (Chaudhary, 1983).

Maize yield in most of the developing country is extremely low while it has been estimated that the expected 9 billion people in the world will require 70% more food by 2050 than today's population. A huge proportion of this increased demand will come from developing countries (Yan et al., 2011). The reason for low maize production in developing countries is the unavailability of high yielding hybrids and varieties. The obligatory increase in maize production required substantial changes in agronomic practices and approaches of genetic improvement. However, a hazard is that these improved yields will come at a high environmental cost due to over-application of synthetic fertilizers, which cannot be sustained (Robertson and Vitousek, 2009). Furthermore, adaptation of new technologies among the farmers is a big issue to be solved by a convincing and easiest way by the breeding community. Several methods of maize improvement particularly mass selection, modified ear to row selection, S_1 line, reciprocal, full sib and half sib recurrent selection methods have been used by maize breeders for developing high yielding maize varieties. In any recurrent selection program, progress from selection is directly related to the expected change in allelic frequency and the magnitude of genetic variance in breeding population (Helms et al., 1989). Therefore, population improvement through recurrent methodology focuses on two main objectives, first the improvement of mean performance of population though an increase in the frequency of favorable alleles and secondly, maintaining adequate genetic variability in the improved population for continued selection and genetic improvement in subsequent generations (Ali et al., 2011). Evaluation of recurrent selection (RS) programs can lead to increase knowledge about the basic ideas and support for better management of breeding programs (Guimaraes, 2001) in the under develop countries. Realized progress with any breeding scheme, however, depends largely upon the ability of the breeders to identify superior genotypes and the precision of experiment (Khalil et al., 2010). The S_1 progeny selection and half-sib family selection are of particular interest in improving the per unit area of maize crop in the last few decades (Beavis et al., 1994).

The ultimate goal of all breeding scheme is improvement of yield in one way or the other. Sprague and Eberhart (1977) summarized results of several diverse population improvement programs involving different populations and selection methods. They found an average gain cycle⁻¹ for grain yield of 2.0, 3.1, 3.4, 3.8, and 4.6% cycle⁻¹ for S₂ progeny, full-sib, mass selection, ear-to-row, and S₁-progeny selection, respectively. Eyherabide and Hallauer (1991) reported a 6.5% cycle⁻¹ increase in grain yield for the population cross. In a reciprocal full-sib selection program between BS10 (formerly, Iowa two-ear synthetic) and BS11 (formerly, Pioneer two-ear composit). Keertinijakal and Lamkey (1993) also reported a 7.0% cycle⁻¹ increase in yield in the population cross between Iowa Stiff Stalk Synthetic (BSSS) and Iowa Corn Borer Synthetic No.1 (BSCB1). Lamkey (1992) reported that seven cycles of half-sib family selection in BSSS increased grain yield by 3.9% cycle⁻¹ where as six cycles of S₂-progeny selection following seven cycles of half-sib selection gave no response.

Identification of superior genotypes in a mixed or base population is one of the major aims of plant breeders. Keeping in view the foresaid problem and adequacy of half-sib recurrent selection the present study were performed to identify superior half-sib families for high yield and yield related traits that can be used in future maize breeding programs.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Breeding Material

Breeding materials used in this experiment comprised 144 and 121 half-sib (HS) lines. These lines were developed from maize variety "Pahari" by growing the selected HS lines with composite male of selected HS lines in isolation at Cereal Crops Research Institute (CCRI), Pakistan. Pahari is the most adaptable variety in most maize growing area and is a composite of Shaheen x PS-7930 but its yield is relatively low in certain plan areas of Pakistan. It is a white, semi dent variety having medium tall stature, semi dense tassel with profused branching.

Procedure and Field Experiment

The selected lines along with the composite male were grown in isolation at CCRI and through regular visits the female lines were detasseled well before pollen shedding. The detasseled HS lines were allowed to be pollinated naturally by the bulk male lines. At physiological maturity (black layer formation at hilum of maize kernel) plants were hand harvested. HS lines with maximum grain filling, ear length and good looking cob were selected. During Kharif (summer) of 2009 and 2010, HS lines along with one check were evaluated in replicated trial using partially balanced lattice square design with two replications at research farm of Agricultural University Peshawar, Pakistan (AUP). Row length was kept at 5 m with plant to plant spacing of 0.25 m and row to row spacing of 0.75 m. At 4-6 leaf stage the number of plants were reduced to one plant hill⁻¹ through thinning to maintain population size of 53300 plants ha⁻¹. In both seasons standard cultural practices were carried out and the field was irrigated based on the requirement of plants.

Fertilizer was applied in the form of diammonium phosphate (DAP) and urea at the rate of 125 and 250 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. Entire DAP was broadcasted at the time of sowing while half of urea was applied before sowing during seedbed preparation and rest was applied when plants were at knee height stage. Data were recorded on the following parameters as and when appropriate, plant height, ear height, kernel rows ear⁻¹, ear length and grain yield (kg ha⁻¹).

Grain Yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Grain yield was calculated using fresh weight plot⁻¹ and moisture content for all the plots using the following formula (Carangal *et al.*, 1971):

$$\text{Grain Yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{) (15\% G.M)} = \frac{\text{Fresh weight (kg plot}^{-1}\text{)} \times (100 - \text{MC}) \times 0.8 \times 10000}{(100 - 15) \times \text{Area harvested (plot size)}}$$

GM = Grain moisture

MC = Moisture content (%) in grains at harvest.

0.8 = Shelling coefficient.

Area plot⁻¹ = 3.75 m²

1 hectare = 10,000 m²

15% = moisture content required in grain at storage.

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance according to randomized complete block design was computed according to format (Table A) on the data for each year and each trait (Miles *et al.*, 1980), to derive mean squares for half-sib families using computer package 'MstatC'.

Table A: ANOVA format for single cycle

SOV	DF	MS	Expected MS
Replication(r)	r-1		
Block(k)	r(k-1)		
Treatments(t)	(k ² -1)	M2	$\sigma^2_E + r\sigma^2_G$
Error	(k-1)(rk-k-1)	M1	σ^2_E

Estimates of genotypic and phenotypic components were calculated from the ANOVA and were used to calculate heritability on entry mean basis. (Carson *et al.*, 2004) as:

136 $\delta^2_E = M1$ (Error mean squares)
 137 $\delta^2_E + r\delta^2_G = M2$ (Genotypic/families mean squares)
 138 $\delta^2_G = M2 - M1$ (Genotypic variance (δ^2_G))
 139 $\delta^2_G + \delta^2_{E/r} = \text{Phenotypic variance } (\delta^2_P)$
 140 $h^2_{BS} = \text{Broad sense heritability}$
 141 $h^2_{BS} = \delta^2_g / \delta^2_g + \delta^2_e$ (Fehr, 1987)
 142 Selection differential was calculated as:
 143 $S = \mu_{HS} - U$ where on
 144 $S = \text{selection differential}$
 145 $\mu_{HS} = \text{Mean of selected half sib families}$
 146 $\mu = \text{Population mean}$
 147 Expected response (R_e) was calculated as:
 148 $R_e = S \times h^2$
 149 Observed response (R_o) was calculated by subtracting population mean from the mean of the
 150 progenies of the selected S_1 lines (Khalil et al. 2010).
 151 $R_o = R_o = \mu_P - \mu$
 152 Base population at each evaluation was used as a check to find out gain from each cycle.
 153 Percent gain per selection was estimated as (Kelling, 1982):
 154 $\% \text{ Gain cycle}^{-1} = \frac{(\text{Cycle}_1 - \text{Cycle}_0)}{\text{Cycle}_0} \times 100$

155 4. RESULTS

156 Plant Height (cm)

157 Analysis of variance for plant height revealed highly significant differences ($P \leq 0.01$) among the
 158 half sib families in both cycles. Moderate heritability was observed for plant height in both C_0 and
 159 C_1 (Table 1). Grand mean for plant height was 164.52 and 155.49 cm in C_0 and C_1 , respectively
 160 while Selection differential and Expected Response for plant height were 5.48 cm and 2.61 cm,
 161 respectively in C_0 . Observed response for plant height in C_0 was 5.48 cm. Similarly, in C_1 S was
 162 1.43 cm and R_e was 0.70 cm (Table 2). Gain cycle⁻¹ for plant height was -5.49 % and Co-efficient
 163 of variation in C_0 was 7.17 % and in C_1 was 6.54 % (Table 3).

164 Highly significant positive correlated for plant height was observed in C_0 with ear height, ear
 165 length and grain yield, while negatively and non-significantly correlation was revealed with

number of kernel rows ear⁻¹ (Table 3). Similarly, in C₁ plant height was positively and highly significantly correlated with ear height and grain yield, while positively and non-significantly correlated with ear length and number of kernel rows ear⁻¹.

Ear Height (cm)

Analysis of variance showed highly significant differences ($P \leq 0.01$) with moderate heritability estimates for ear height (Table 1). Mean values of population and selected half-sib (μ HS) indicated in table 2. Population mean (μ) for ear height was 72.02 and 68.46 cm and selection differential for ear height was 2.98 and 3.50 cm in C₀ and C₁, respectively. Expected response was 1.59 and 1.93 cm in both the cycles, respectively (Table 2). Observed response in C₀ for ear height was 2.98 cm and Gain cycle⁻¹ for ear height was -4.94 % (Table 2).

Ear height in C₀ was positively and high significantly correlated with ear length and grain yield, although it was negatively and non-significantly correlated with kernel rows ear⁻¹ (Table 3). Similarly, in C₁ ear height was positively and non-significantly correlated with ear length, kernel rows ear⁻¹, whereas positive and significantly correlated with grain yield (Table 3).

Table1. Mean square values, heritability (h^2_{BS}), selection differential (S) and expected response (Re) for different parameters observed during C₀ and C₁ in maize population.

Parameter	Mean squares		h^2_{BS}		S		Re	
	C ₀	C ₁	C ₀	C ₁	C ₀	C ₁	C ₀	C ₁
Plant height	265.33**	213.00**	0.48	0.49	5.48	1.43	2.61	0.70
Ear height	198.65**	102.21**	0.53	0.55	2.98	3.50	1.59	1.93
Kernel Rows	1.88*	3.27**	0.63	0.45	0.86	-1.19	0.17	-0.54
Ear length	3.09*	4.55**	0.67	0.53	0.25	6.48	0.54	3.44
Grain yield	1274827.78**	676804.11**	0.74	0.64	927.22	639.84	681.76	410.20

** Highly significant

* Significant

^{NS} Non-significant

Number of Kernel Rows Ear⁻¹

Table 1 revealed significant variation ($P \leq 0.05$) for number of kernel rows ear⁻¹ in C₀, while highly significant differences ($P \leq 0.01$) in C₁. Heritability estimates for number of kernel rows ear⁻¹ were 0.63 and 0.45 in C₀ and C₁, respectively (Table 1). Population-mean (μ) and mean of selected half-sib (μ HS) was 13.14 and 14.00 in C₀, respectively (Table 2). Likewise, in C₁ population mean was 18.17 and mean of selected half-sib was 16.98 (Table 2). Selection differential of 0.86 and expected response of 0.17 was divulged during C₀ (Table 2). Similarly, in C₁ selection differential was -1.19 and expected response was -0.54 (Table 2). Observed response of 0.86 was observed for number of kernel rows ear⁻¹ in C₀ (Table 2). Gain cycle⁻¹ for number kernel rows ear⁻¹ was 38.28%. Co-efficient of variation was 9.02 % and 7.23% in C₀ and C₁, respectively. Number of kernel rows ear⁻¹ was positively and highly significantly correlated with grain yield in both C₀ and C₁ (Table 3).

Ear Length (cm)

Analysis of variance disclosed significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$) among the half-sib for ear length in C₀ and highly significant differences ($P \leq 0.01$) in C₁ (Table 1). Heritability estimates were 0.67 and 0.53 for ear length in both C₀ and C₁, respectively (Table 1). Mean ear length of the population was 14.75 cm and of selected half-sib lines (μ HS) was 15.00 cm for ear length in C₀ (Table 2), while population mean of 16.41 cm and selected half-sib lines (μ HS) mean 22.89 cm was revealed for ear length in C₁ (Table 2). Selection differential of 0.25 cm and expected response of 0.54 cm was revealed for ear length in C₀ (Table 2). Genotypic variance (σ^2 G) and environmental variance (σ^2 E) for ear height were 52.86 and 92.93, respectively in C₀. Similarly, in C₁ genotypic variance (σ^2 G) for ear height was 28.22 and environmental variance (σ^2 E) was 45.77 (data not shown). Observed response for ear length in C₀ was 0.25 cm (Table 2). Both selection differential and expected response in C₁ were 6.48 and 3.44 cm, respectively (Table 2). Ear length was positively correlated with grain yield in both C₀ and C₁ (Table 3). Population means 14.75 cm and 15 cm was shown for ear length in C₀ and C₁, respectively. Maximum (18.5 cm) ear length was observed for HS-2 and minimum (12 cm) for HS-32, 77 and 20 in C₀, while in C₁ maximum (20 cm) was shown by HS-59 and minimum (11 cm) by HS-45. Variance components (genotypic and environmental variance) for ear length were 0.52 and 2.06 in C₀ and 1.21 and 2.14 in C₁, respectively. Low co-efficient of variation was observed in both C₀ and C₁ for ear length.

Table 2. Means of population (μ), selected half-sib families (μ HS), Progeny (μ P), observed response (Ro) and gain cycle⁻¹ for different parameters observed after two cycles (C₀ and C₁) of recurrent half-sib family selection in maize.

Parameter	μ		μ HS		μ P	Ro	Gain (%)
	C ₀	C ₁	C ₀	C ₁	C ₁	C ₀	
Plant height (cm)	164.52	155.49	170.00	156.92	170.00	5.48	-5.49
Ear height (cm)	72.02	68.46	75.00	71.96	75.00	2.98	-4.94
Kernel Rows	13.14	18.17	14.00	16.98	14.00	0.86	38.28
Ear length (cm)	14.75	16.41	15.00	22.89	15.00	0.25	11.25
Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	3150.61	3309.26	4077.83	3949.10	3966.00	815.74	5.05

Grain Yield (kg ha⁻¹)

The analysis of variance regarding grain yield revealed highly significant variations ($P \leq 0.01$) among half-sib lines in C₀ and C₁. Heritability of 0.74 and 0.64 was revealed for grain yield in C₀ & C₁, respectively (Table 1). Maximum grain yield in C₀ were observed for the HS-51 (6932.50 kg ha⁻¹) family showing almost double increase in the yield in comparison with the base population, followed by HS-75 (Fig.1). In C₁ maximum grain yield (4419.50 kg ha⁻¹) was shown by HS-120 while the average yield of the base population was 3188 kg ha⁻¹ (Fig.2). Population mean and mean of selected half-sib lines for grain yield was 3150.61 and 4077.83 kg ha⁻¹ in C₀, respectively, likewise in C₁ population mean of 3309.26 kg ha⁻¹ and mean of selected half-sib lines mean (μ HS) of 3949.10 kg ha⁻¹ was observed for grain yield. Selection differential and expected response for grain yield in C₀ were 927.22 kg ha⁻¹ and 681.76 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 2), respectively. Similarly, in C₁ selection differential was (639.84 kg ha⁻¹) and expected response (410.20 kg ha⁻¹) (Table 2). Greater observed response of 815.74 kg ha⁻¹ than the expected 681.76 kg ha⁻¹ was observed for grain yield. Gain cycle⁻¹ observed for grain yield was 5.05% (Table 3). The multiple regression analysis of Grain yield with all the traits are listed in the supplementary material with complete detail for each cycle.

Table 3. Phenotypic correlation among grain yield related traits in Cycle-0 (above diagonal) and Cycle-1 (below diagonal).

	PH	EH	KR	EL	YLD
PH	-	0.70 ^{**}	-0.08 ^{NS}	0.17 ^{**}	0.29 ^{**}
EH	0.74 ^{**}	-	-0.05 ^{NS}	0.17 ^{**}	0.26 ^{**}
KR	0.10 ^{NS}	0.06 ^{NS}	-	0.03 ^{NS}	0.15 ^{**}
EL	0.07 ^{NS}	0.11 ^{NS}	0.85 ^{**}	-	0.29 ^{**}
YLD	0.17 ^{**}	0.27 ^{**}	0.62 ^{**}	0.69 ^{**}	-

^{**} significant at 1%, * Significant at 5% ^{NS} Non-significant

PH Plant height,

EH Ear height

EL Ear length,

KR Kernel row ear⁻¹

YLD Grain yield

Fig.1. Comparison of selected HS-families based on grain yield (kg/ha) with the base population (B.POP) in C₀.





Fig.2. Comparison of selected HS-families based on grain yield (kg/ha) with the base population (B.POP) in C₁.



Supplementary Material

Table a, b, c. Complete information of multiple regressions of all the studied traits with grain yield in Cycle 0 (C₀)

a,

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.407295284
R Square	0.165889449
Adjusted R Square	0.154058093
Standard Error	825.200615
Observations	

b,

ANOVA

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	4	38238102	9559525	14.08795	1.7E-10
Residual	283	1.92E+08	678560.4		
Total	287	2.3E+08			

c,

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	-2612.642698	861.011	-3.03439	0.002634	-4307.44	-917.844
PHT	12.41453003	4.79494	2.58909	0.010121	2.976257	21.8528
EHT	6.620901108	5.641568	1.173592	0.241545	-4.48386	17.72566
K.Row	118.6577976	39.14855	3.030963	0.002663	41.59851	195.7171
Ear L	114.2389498	28.89925	3.953007	9.76E-05	57.35418	171.1237

Table d, e, f. Complete information of multiple regression of all the studied traits with grain yield in Cycle 1 (C₁)

Table d,

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.72869
R Square	0.530989
Adjusted R Square	0.523073
Standard Error	463.9816
Observations	242

Table e,

ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	4	57763383	14440846	67.07969	6.93E-38
Residual	237	51021112	215279		
Total	241	1.09E+08			

Table f,

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	-2001.41	485.9472	-4.11857	5.27E-05	-2958.74	-1044.08
P.HT	-4.47013	3.611295	-1.23782	0.217008	-11.5845	2.644213
E.HT	20.72852	5.240472	3.955467	0.000101	10.40466	31.05237
EAR L	75.67225	37.07378	2.041126	0.042346	2.636018	148.7085
K rows	195.5034	33.12419	5.902136	1.23E-08	130.248	260.7589

5. DISCUSSION

Plant Height (cm)

Plant height is an important agronomic character which plays a vital role in plant lodging and affects grain yield. Breeders also give consideration to plant height in order to improve lodging resistance in breeding maize populations. The scientists have observed highly significant differences for plant height while conducting selection among and within half-sib families for improving the overall performance of maize crop (Pommer and Gerald, 1983 and Akbar et al. 2008). Our results were in agreement with that of Stromberg & Campton (1989) who also reported highly significant differences regarding plant height after 10 cycles of full-sib recurrent selection in Nebraska Krung open pollinated maize. The heritability estimates reflected that there were optimum environmental influences on plant height. Wolf et al. (2000) reported high heritability estimates for plant height while Ajala et al. (2009) predicted low heritability for the plant height.

Low value of selection differential for plant height showed that the variety was almost stable for this character and chances for further improvement were low in one cycle. Santos et al. (2005) reported expected response of $-4.06 \text{ cm plant}^{-1}$ for plant height. Positive value of expected response for plant height showed that plant height can be increased up to some extent through recurrent selection. The correlation co-efficient of plant height with different traits showed the importance of improving this trait for enhancing the total yield. Plant height contributes positively to ear height, 100 grain weight and grain yield while it has no effect on the kernel rows (Salami et al. 2007). Betran & Hallauer (1996) also observed positive and highly significant correlation between plant height and grain yield. Plant height was strongly associated with the flowering date, because internode formation stops at floral initiation, which means that earlier flowering maize is usually shorter (Troyer and Larkins, 1985). Observed response for the plant height was greater than the expected one which may be to some heterosis during recombination phase. Gain cycle⁻¹ for plant height was observed revealing that via recurrent selection improvement in the trait is possible.

Ear Height (cm)

Similar to the effect of plant height on lodging, ear height also has an effect on plant lodging and ultimately grain yield. Placement of ear in maize is of great importance in the production of a successful crop. If ear is placed above the middle, there is a chance to be damaged by lodging, but if it is present too low, then the wild animal can damage it, so for producing lodging resistant maize population it needs proper attention. Pommer and Gerald (1983) also observed highly significant differences for ear height while conducting selection among and within half-sib families in Opaque-2 maize population. Moderate heritability of the trait showed that the trait is under genetic control and further selection for ear height would be effective. Betran and Hallauer (1996)

reported highly heritability and Akbar et al. (2008) reported low heritability for ear height during evaluation of maize 3-way crosses through genetic variability, broad sense heritability, characters association and path analysis. Similarly, Salami et al. (2007) also reported low heritability, while evaluating the genetic variability among maize cultivars.

Central or near central placement of top ear were desirable for resistance to lodging. Greater observed response was observed for ear height than the expected one during C_0 . As the selection was primarily practiced for yield, therefore a pronounced response was not expected for ear height.

Ear height both in C_0 and C_1 was positively and highly significantly correlated with grain yield, although positively and non-significantly correlated with percent grain moisture content at harvest. Correlation between ear height and kernel rows ear^{-1} was negatively non-significant and positively non-significant in C_0 and C_1 , respectively. Suranyi and Mandy (1955) reported a correlation between earliness and ear height in maize. The higher the ear is, the later the plant matures, but earliness and lower ear height have no absolute reciprocal relationship. Obilana and Hallauer (1974) found a significant correlation between plant and ear height in unselected inbred. Negative value of gain per cycle showed a declining trend for ear height as high placement of top ear results in lodging (Santos et al. 2005).

Number of Kernel Rows Ear^{-1}

Number of kernel rows ear^{-1} along with ear length, ear diameter and grain weight contributes to the final grain yield. Manivannan (1998) suggested that ear girth and number of kernel rows ear^{-1} should be given more importance while doing selection for grain yield improvement in maize. Rafique et al. (2004) results were concurrent with the results in this experiment regarding significance level and heritability for kernel rows ear^{-1} . Similarly, Wolf et al. (2000) also observed high heritability for kernel rows ear^{-1} , while estimating the genetic variance in an F_2 maize population.

Number of kernel rows ear^{-1} was positively and significantly correlated with grain yield. Mehmood et al. (2004) observed high influence of kernel row number with the total yield of maize. Gain cycle^{-1} for number kernel rows ear^{-1} was 38.28 %. Variance components (genotypic and environmental variance) for kernel rows ear^{-1} were 0.24 and 1.43 in C_0 and 0.74 and 1.79 in C_1 . Low co-efficient of variation was observed in both in C_0 and C_1 .

Ear Length (cm)

Analysis of variance showed significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$) for ear length in C_0 and highly significant differences ($P \leq 0.01$) in C_1 . Similar findings were reported by Khan et al. (2003) in their experiment on "Grain and Stover yield of corn with varying times of plant density reduction". Moderate heritability estimates were observed for ear length in C_0 and C_1 , respectively. Zivanovic et al. (2007) observed high heritability for ear length in their experiment. Beyene (2005) observed

low heritability for ear length during his experiment on “phenotypic diversity for morphological and agronomic traits in traditional Ethiopian highland maize accessions”. Based on heritability and selection differential, expected responses for ear length were 0.54 and 3.44 cm in C_0 and C_1 , respectively. Observed response for ear length in C_0 was 0.25 cm, lower than the expected one. Ear length in C_0 was positively and non-significantly correlated with 100 grain weight, while positively and highly significantly correlated with grain yield in C_1 . Nemati et al. (2009) reported a positive correlation between ear length and grain yield. Similarly, Broccoli and Burak (2004) also observed positive and highly significant correlation between ear length and grain yield. Majaya and Lambert (2007) reported negative correlation among ear length, kernel weight and kernel rows. Gain cycle⁻¹ for ear length was 11.25 %, manifesting that after two cycles of half-sib recurrent selection 11.25 % improvement was made for ear length.

Grain Yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Increased grain yield is the main objective of every plant breeding program. Procedures often used for the improvement of grain yield in maize are of four main types: mass selection, selection based on half sib (testcross or topcross) progeny performance, full sib progeny selection, and selfed progeny selection (Horner *et al.*, 1969). Grain yield in maize is the most complex character with which a plant breeder works and is controlled by other yield factors like kernels weight, kernels rows ear⁻¹, ear length, ear diameter and prolificacy. Therefore selection for desirable genotypes should be made based on grain yield as well as other yield components which could influence the yield. Our results also confirmed the findings of Rahman et al. (2007) who reported highly significant differences for the yield components while comparing original and selected maize populations for grain yield traits. Similarly, Sharifi et al. (2009) and Badu-Apraku et al. (2008),) also observed highly significant differences for grain yield while evaluating maize genotypes. High heritability of 0.74 and 0.64 for grain yield was revealed in C_0 and C_1 , respectively showing effective control of this trait by the genetics of maize lines. Weyhrich et al. (1998) and Betran & Hallauer (1996) reported moderate heritability for half-sib and BSSCO X BSCB1C0, respectively. Similarly Santos et al. (2005) also observed high heritability (65.63) in C_0 and low heritability (56.61) in C_3 . Selection differential showed that through half-sib recurrent selection we can increase the total production of maize. Weyhrich et al. (1998) observed 0.67 selection differential for grain yield (Mg ha⁻¹), while comparing responses to seven methods of recurrent selection in the BS11 maize population. Expected response for the grain yield in C_0 was 681.76 kg ha⁻¹ and 410.20 kg ha⁻¹ in C_1 . Greater observed response for grain yield than the expected response showed the worth of selection for grain yield. Santos et al. (2005) reported (6.76 %) expected response for grain yield (g plant⁻¹). Gain cycle⁻¹ observed for grain yield was 5.05 %, showing that after two cycles of half-sib recurrent selection grain yield was increased by 5.05 %. Santos et al. (2005) also reported similar results of low co-efficient of variation (11.92%) for grain yield. In C_1 the grain yield of all the lines were almost in the same range and more or

less an acceptable amount of yield can be increase after two cycles of half-sib recurrent selection. Furthermore, the stability of grain yield showed us an appropriate selection during both the cycles.

6. Conclusions

These results suggest that half-sib family recurrent selection is the most important breeding procedure for improving the overall production of maize. The selected families can be used for further improvement of yield with the easiest method of half-sib recurrent selection.

7. Acknowledgment

I present my eternal gratitude to prof. Dr. Farhatullah chairman department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, The University of Agriculture Peshawar, Pakistan for his encouragement and providing field and other research facility to conduct the experiment.

8. LITERATURE CITED

Ajala, S.O., C.E. Ago and G. Olaoye. 2009. Comparison of predicted responses to three types of recurrent selection procedures for the improvement of a maize (*Zea mays* L.) population. J. Plant Breeding and Crop Scie. 1(8): 284-292.

Akbar, M., M.S. Shakoor, A. Hussain and M. Sarwar. 2008. Evaluation of maize 3-way crosses through genetic variability, broad sense heritability, Characters association and path analysis. J. Agric. Res. 46 (1): 39-45.

Badu-Apraku, B., M.A.B. Fakorede and A.F. Lum. 2008. S₁ Family Selection in early-maturing maize populations in *Striga*-Infested and *Striga*-Free environments. Crop Sci. 48:1984-1994.

Beavis, W.D., O.S. Smith, D. Grant and R. Fisher. 1994. Identification of quantitative trait loci using small sample of topcrossed and F₄ progeny from maize. Crop Sci. 34: 882-896.

Betran, F.J and A. R. Hallauer. 1996. Characterization of inter-population genetic variability in three hybrid maize populations. J. Heredity 87 (4): 319-928.

Beyene, Y., A.M. Botha and A.A. Myburg. 2005a. Phenotypic diversity for morphological and agronomic traits in traditional Ethiopian highland maize accessions. South Afric. J. Plant and Soil 22:100-105.

Broccoli, A.M. and R. Burak. 2004. Effect of genotype x environment interactions in popcorn maize yield and grain quality. Span. J. Agric. Res. 2 (1): 85-91.

433 Carangal, V.R., S.M. Ali, A.F. Koble, E.H. Rinke and J.C. Sentz. 1971. Comparison of S₁ with
434 testcross evaluation for recurrent selection in maize. Crop Sci. 11: 658-661.

435 Carson, M.L., C.W. Stuber and M. L Senior. 2004. Identification and mapping of quantitative trait
436 loci conditioning resistance to southern leaf blight of maize caused by *Cochliobolus*
437 *heterostrophus* race O. Phytopathology 94: 862- 867.

438 Chaudhary, A. H. 1983. Effect of population and control of weeds with herbicides in maize. Field
439 crop Abst. 35(5): 403.

440 Ejeta, G. 2010. African Green Revolution needn't be a mirage. Science 327(5967):831-832. <http>

441 Eyherabide, G.H. and A.R. Hallauer. 1991. Reciprocal full-sib selection in maize: I. Direct and
442 Indirect responses. Crop Sci. 31: 952-959.

443 Guimaraes, P.E. 2001. Effect of long term recurrent selection program on the genetic structure of
444 BSSS maize population. PhD. Thesis Iowa State Uni. Ames Iowa, USA.

445 Helms, T.C., A.R. Hallauer and O.S. Smith. 1989. Genetic drift and selection evaluated from
446 recurrent selection program in maize. Crop Sci. 29: 602-607.

447 Horner, E. S., W. H. Chapman, M. C. Lutrick, and H. W. Lundy. 1969. Comparison of selection
448 based on yield of S₂ progenies in maize. Crop Sci. 9: 539-543.

449 Kelling, B.I. 1982. Effect of soybean mosaic virus on root volume and dry weight of soybean plants.
450 Crop Sci.22:629-639.

451 Khalil. I A, Rahman, H, Durrishahwar, Nawaz. I, Ullah. H and Ali. F. 2010. Response to selection
452 for grain yield under maydis leaf blight stress environment in maize (*Zea mays*). Biodicon. 3/1 :
453 121-127.

454 Khan, K., M. Iqbal, Z. Shah, B. Ahmad, A. Azim and H. Sher. 2003. Grain and Stover yield of corn
455 with varying times of plant density reduction. Pak. J. Bio. Sci. 6 (19): 1641-1643.

456 Lamkey, K.R. 1992. Fifty years of recurrent selection in the Iowa stiff stalk synthetic maize
457 population. Maydica 37:19-28.

458 Manivannan, N. 1998. Character association and component analysis in maize. Madras Agric.
459 J. 85: 293-294.

- 460 Mahmood, Z., S.U. Ajmal, G. Jilani, M. Irfan and M. Ashraf. 2004. Genetic studies for high yield of
461 maize in Chitral valley. *Int. J. Agri. Biol.* 6 (5): 788-789.
- 462 Miles, J.W., J.W. Dudley, D.G. White and R.J. Lambert. 1980. Improving corn population for grain
463 yield and resistance to leaf blight and stalk rot. *Crop Sci.* 20: 247-250.
- 464 Nemati, A., M. Sedghi, R.S. Sharifi, M.N. Seiedi. 2009. Investigation of correlation between traits
465 and path analysis of corn (*zea mays* L.) grain yield at the climate of Ardabil Region (Northwest
466 Iran). *Not. Bot. Hort. Agrobot. Cluj.* 37 (1): 194-198.
- 467 Obilana, A.T. and A.R. Hallauer. 1974. Estimation of variability of quantitative traits in BSSS by
468 using unselected maize inbred lines. *Crop Sci.* 14: 99–103.
- 469 Pommer, C.V and I.O. Geraldi. 1983. Selection among and within half-sib families in Opaque-2
470 maize population. *Brazil J. Genetics.* 6 (3): 461-472.
- 471 Rafique, M., A. Hussain, T. Mahmood, A.W. Alvi and M.B. Alvi. 2004. Heritability and
472 interrelationships among grain yield and Yield components in maize (*Zea mays* L). *Int. J. Agri.*
473 *Biol.* 6 (6): 1113-1114.
- 474 Rahman, H., I.H. Khalil, N. Islam, Durrishahwar and A. Rafi. 2007. Comparison of original and
475 selected Maize populations for grain yield traits. *Sarhad J. Agric.* 21(2): 231-235.
- 476 Robertson, L.A., C.E. Kleinschmidt, D.G. White, G.A. Payne, C.M. Maragos and J.B. Holland.
477 2006.
- 478 Robertson, G.P. and P.M. Vitousek (2009). Nitrogen in agriculture: balancing an essential
479 resource. *Annu. Rev. Energy Environ.* 34:97–125.
- 480 Salami, A.E., S.A.O. Adegoke and O.A. Adegbite. 2007. Genetic variability among maize cultivars
481 grown in Ekiti-State, Nigeria. *Middle-East J. Sci. Res.* 2 (1): 09-13.
- 482 Santos, M.F., G.V. Moro, A.M. Aguiar and C.L. de Souza Jr. 2005. Responses to reciprocal
483 recurrent selection and changes in genetic variability in IG-1 and IG-2 maize populations. *Genet.*
484 *and Mole. Biol.* 28 (4): 781-788.
- 485 Sharifi, R.S., M. Sedghi and A. Gholipouri. 2009. Effect of plant density on yield and yield
486 attributes of maize hybrids. *Res. J. Biol. Sci.* 4 (4): 375-379.
- 487 Sprague, G.F. and S.A. Eberhart. 1977. Corn breeding. P. 305-362. in G. F. Sprague (ed.) *Corn*
488 *and corn improvement.*, Am. Soc. Agron., Madison, WI.

- 489 Stromberg, D.C. and W.G. Compton. 1989. Ten cycles of full-sib recurrent selection in maize. Crop
490 Sci. 29: 1170-1172.
- 491 Suranyi, J. and G.Y. Mandy. 1955. A kukorica. (Corn) Magyarország kultúrája. (Culture flora of
492 Hungary) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- 493 Troyer, A.F. and J.R. Larkins. 1985. Selection for early flowering in corn: 10 late synthetics. Crop
494 Sci. 25: 695-697.
- 495 Yan, J., Warburton, M. and Crouch, J. 2011. Association Mapping for Enhancing Maize
496 (Zea mays L.) Genetic Improvement. Crop Sci. 51 (2): 433-449.
- 497 Weyhrich, R.A., K.R. Lamkey and A.R. Hallauer. 1998. Responses to seven methods of recurrent
498 selection in the BS11 maize population. Crop Sci. 38: 308-321.
- 499 Wolf, D.P., L.A. Peternelli and R.A. Hallauer. 2000. Estimates of genetic variance in F2 maize
500 population. The American Genet. Assoc. 91: 384-391.