

# The Performance of Multi-Parental Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) Hybrid Genotypes

Ferhat ÇAKMAK<sup>1</sup>, Volkan Mehmet ÇINAR<sup>2</sup>, Şerife BALCI<sup>3</sup>, Aydın ÜNAY<sup>4</sup><sup>£C</sup> <sup>1</sup>Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Aydın/TÜRKİYE, <sup>2</sup>Postdoctoral Researcher, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Field Crops, Aydın/TÜRKİYE, <sup>3</sup>Cotton Research Institute, Nazilli-Aydın/TÜRKİYE, <sup>4</sup>Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Field Crops, Aydın/TÜRKİYE <sup>1</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2211-2145, <sup>2</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5822-5649, <sup>3</sup>https://orcid.org0000-0001-8348-3674 <sup>4</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7278-4428 🖂: aunay@adu.edu.tr

### ABSTRACT

We aimed to evaluate the possibilities of increasing the ginning outturn in multi-parent hybrid populations of cotton. Two genotypes with high ginning out-turn were crossed with seven F<sub>3</sub> populations obtained from double crosses, and then fourteen  $F_1$  populations were created in 2020. The  $F_1$  populations, their grandparents, and two parents, a total of 23 genotypes, were compared by Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications in 2021. Significant differences were detected among genotypes, including crosses and parents for seed cotton yield per plant, ginning out-turn, fiber fineness, and fiber strength. The orthogonal contrasts indicated that the average performance of hybrids was significantly higher than that of parents for ginning out-turn, seed cotton yield per plant, and fiber fineness. Standard heterosis was between -11.19% and 20.54%for seed cotton yield per plant; 4.71% and 16.03% for ginning outturn. [(ST-468 × Claudia) × (Gloria × Carisma)] × Esperia should be transferred to further generations. Multi-parent hybrids could be used to create the required variance and maintain dominance for the improvement of yield and ginning out-turn.

#### **Field Crops**

**Research Article** 

Article HistoryReceived: 18.04.2023Accepted: 04.01.2024

Keywords Fiber Quality F1 Populations Ginning Out-Turn Orthogonal Contrasts Standard Heterosis

Çok Ebeveynli Pamuk (Gossypium hirsutum L.) Melez Genotiplerinin Performansı

## ÖZET

Çok ebeveynli melez pamuk popülasyonlarında çırçır randımanını artırma olanakları değerlendirilmiştir. Sekiz adet çift melez F3 melez popülasyonu ile yüksek çırçır randımanına sahip iki genotip melezlenmiş ve 14 farklı F1 melez popülasyonu elde edilmiştir. Melezlerden ve ebeveynlerden oluşan genotipik farklılık tek bitki kütlü pamuk verimi, çırçır randımanı, lif inceliği ve lif dayanıklılığı vönünden önemli bulunmuştur. Ortogonal karşılaştırmalar melezlerin ortalama performansının çırçır randımanı, tek bitki kütlü pamuk verimi ve lif inceliği yönünden ebeveyn ortalamasından önemli düzeyde farklı olduğunu göstermiştir. Standart heterosis tek bitki kütlü pamuk için %-11.19 ile %20.54; çırçır randımanı için %4.71 ile %16.03 arasında değişmiştir. [(ST-468 × Claudia) × (Gloria × Carisma)] × Esperya melez kombinasyonunun ileri generasyonlara aktarılması gerektiği saptanmıştır. Çırçır randımanı ve kütlü pamuk verimini artırmayı amaçlayan ıslah çalışmalarında dominantlığı sürdürmek ve varyasyonu oluşturmak için çok ebeveynli melezlerin kullanılabileceği sonucuna varılmıştır.

## Tarla Bitkileri

#### Araştırma Makalesi

Makale Tarihçesi

Geliş Tarihi : 18.04.2023 Kabul Tarihi : 04.01.2024

#### Anahtar Kelimeler

Çırçır Randımanı Fı Popülasyonları Lif Kalitesi Ortogonal Karşılaştırma Standart Heterosis

Attf İçin:Çakmak, F., Çınar, V.M., Balcı, Ş., & Ünay, A. (2024). Çok Ebeveynli Pamuk (Gossypium hirsutum L.) Melez<br/>Genotiplerinin Performansı. KSÜ Tarım ve Doğa Derg 27 (4), 901-909. DOI: 10.18016/ksutarimdoga.vi.<br/>1285098

To Cite:Çakmak, F., Çınar, V.M., Balcı, Ş., & Ünay, A. (2024). The Performance of Multi-Parental Cotton (Gossypium<br/>hirsutum L.) Hybrid Genotypes. KSU J. Agric Nat 27 (4), 901-909. DOI: 10.18016/ksutarimdoga.vi.1285098

## INTRODUCTION

Cotton, grown in tropical, semi-tropical, and semi-

arid areas of the world, is included in the genus Gossypium. Cotton fiber and seed provide raw materials to the textile and edible oil industries,

respectively (Shahzad et al., 2019; Tarazi et al., 2020). In Türkiye, the pricing of cotton by cooperatives and private buyers is primarily based on the ginning outturn (GOT). In addition, GOT is one of the most important yield components, and genotypic performance for high GOT has been extensively used in cotton breeding (Desalegn, 2016). The quantitative characteristics such as seed cotton yield and ginning out-turn exhibited polygenic heritage and broad variations in segregating generation of cotton (Memon et al., 2017; Monicashree et al., 2017; Premalatha et al., 2020; Balci et al., 2021b). Therefore, cotton breeders concentrate on optimizing the high ginning out-turn and seed cotton yield with fiber characteristics within commercial limits (Akbar et al., 2009; Ahuja et al., 2018). The results of simple correlation and path analysis demonstrated that ginning out-turn is one of the attributes most to seed cotton yield (Zhou, 1986; Choudhari et al., 1988; Ahmad ve Azhar, 2000; Salahuddin et al., 2010; Erande et al., 2014).

Ibragimov (1989) announced that higher seed cotton yield and ginning out-turn brought with coarse fiber in cotton genotypes. The significant and negative association between seed cotton yield and ginning out-turn (Dinakaran et al., 2012; Parmar et al., 2015) and ginning out-turn with seed weight, boll weight, fiber length, and fiber fineness (Karademir et al., 2010) were underlined. The presence of a negative genetic correlation among ginning out-turn, seed cotton yield, and fiber quality characters can often limit the success of breeding (Yu et al., 2013), and this negative association needs to be broken by the different methods (Islam et al., 2016). A multiparent advanced generation inter-cross (MAGIC) population can be a good method to eliminate the mentioned linkage compared with negative bi-parental populations having low allelic diversity (Jenkins et al., 2008). MAGIC populations can result from cycles of recurrent selection aimed at combining favorable alleles.

In another study,  $F_4$  and  $F_5$  cotton plants were crossed with opposite and diverse testers to determine the performances of heterotic groups and the combining abilities of testers (Girish et al., 2019). To compare the heterotic populations and to predict the double cross performance, the robust and compact cotton types were crossed in Line × Tester mating design, and it was concluded that crosses involving between group genotypes (interplant type) are highly heterotic (Ranganatha et al., 2013).

Heterobeltiosis and standard heterosis are the performance of  $F_1$  over the better parent and over the standard check to identify the best cross combination (Shashibhushan & Patel, 2019; Kumbhalkar et al., 2021; Chapara & Madugula, 2021).

The previous studies on double cross population

assessed the hybrid performance in terms of yield, yield components, and fiber quality characteristics (Yehia et al., 2009; El-Hashash, 2013; Ekinci et al., 2016). In this study, seven  $F_3$  populations of double crosses obtained from recurrent selection were crossed with two parents with high ginning out-turn, and then 14  $F_1$  populations having five parents were obtained. We aimed (1) to evaluate the cross combinations, (2) to compare the performance of cross combinations over different check varieties via contrast parameters, and (3) to determine the cross combinations to be transferred to the further generations.

## MATERIALS and METHODS

The 7  $F_3$  populations derived from 4 × 3 reciprocal line × tester crosses and recurrent selection (cycle 1) were crossed with Esperia (ES) and advanced line (Genotype-I; G1) having high ginning out-turn in 2020. The details of the  $F_3$  population development were described by Balci et al., 2021a; Balci et al., 2021b) and summarized in Figure 1.

Since the theoretical segregation in the  $F_3$  generation was 75% homozygous and 25% heterozygous, at least 1 cross was made from each plant of all  $F_3$ populations. Fourteen  $F_1$  populations and 9 of their grandparents and parents, 23 genotypes, were planted in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications in 2021. The weather of the experimental location (Nazilli-Aydin/Turkey; 37°86' N, 28°37' E) was defined as mild, generally warm, and temperate within the class of Csa by Köppen and Experimental soil characteristics Geiger. were high lime content, slightly alkali, adequate potassium, low organic matter, nitrogen, and phosphorus.

The seeds of  $F_1$  and their parents were planted 0.12 m apart with 0.70 m of row spacings. Each plot consisted of one row of 6 m long. Field practices such as fertilization, irrigation, pest, and weed control were managed according to the national recommendation for the cotton growing of the Aegean Region in Türkiye. Ten plants per experimental unit were randomly exampled for data collection, as suggested by Sahito et al. (2016). Seed cotton yield per plant (g), ginning out-turn (%), fiber fineness (mic.), fiber length (mm), and fiber strength ( $g tex^{-1}$ ) were recorded. The laboratory roller gin was used for ginning out-turn, and the USTER® HVI-1000 instrument was used to determine fiber quality properties.

Data were subjected to analysis of variance using the JMP® 14 statistical program (SAS Institute Inc. 2018), and genotypic differences were tested by using the LSD (0.05) test (Steel & Torrie, 1980). The LSD means contrast function, as implemented in JMP® 14, has been used to test orthogonal contrasts between

treatments using F statistics for different means. Orthogonal contrasts for ginning out-turn;  $C_1$ ; Esperia crosses vs. Genotype-I crosses,  $C_2$ ; All crosses vs. mean of Esperia and Genotype-I,  $C_3$ ; All crosses vs. all parents,  $C_4$ ; Esperia crosses vs. best variety,  $C_5$ ; Genotype-I crosses vs. best variety and  $C_6$ ; all crosses vs. best variety. Orthogonal contrasts for other characters;  $C_7$ ; all crosses vs. check variety (Gloria), and  $C_8$ ; all crosses vs. best variety.



Figure 1. Breeding actions between 2013 and 2021 Sekil 1. 2013 ve 2021 yılları arasında sürdürülen ıslah çalışmaları

The  $F_1$  performance over standard over-check variety was defined as standard heterosis, and the formula;

Standard heterosis (%) =  $\frac{F1-check \ variety}{check \ variety} \times 100$ (Fonseca and Patterson, 1968). (1) The standard error for the significance of standard heterosis was  $\sqrt[2]{\frac{2 \times mean \ sum \ of \ square \ due \ to \ error}{number \ of \ replications}}}$ , according to Cohran & Cox (1957). (2)

## **RESULTS and DISCUSSION**

Genotypic differences were found to be significant for seed cotton yield per plant, ginning out-turn, fiber fineness, and fiber strength (Table 1). The results are in concordance with the findings of Arain (2015), Baloch et al. (2015), Memon et al. (2017), Monicashree et al. (2017) and Premalatha et al. (2020).

## Seed cotton yield

 $\begin{array}{l} [({\rm CA}\times{\rm ST})\times~({\rm ST}\times~{\rm CL})]\times{\rm G1}~(53.66~{\rm g}), \\ [({\rm ST}\times{\rm CL})\times~({\rm GL}\times{\rm CR})]\times~{\rm G1}~(54.04~{\rm g}) \\ {\rm and}~[({\rm CR}\times{\rm CA})\times~({\rm GL}\times{\rm FL})]\times~{\rm ES}~(54.44~{\rm g}) \\ {\rm were}~{\rm exhibited}~{\rm the}~{\rm lowest}~{\rm seed} \end{array}$ 

cotton yield per plant in crosses, whereas the highest seed cotton yield per plant recorded in  $[(ST \times CL) \times$  $(GL \times CR)$ ] × ES (73.89 g). The comparison of genotypic means indicated that Esperia had the highest seed cotton yield per plant (71.82 g) among parents (Table 2). In addition, mean data showed that seed cotton yield per plant of 6 out of 14 combinations was over the grand mean of crosses (60.57 g). Although orthogonal contrast  $(C_3)$  between parents (55.76 g) and crosses means (60.57 g) was favorable significant, crosses vs. check variety (61.30 g) and crosses vs. best variety (71.82 g) were unfavorable significant (C7 and C8) (Table 3). In this case,  $[(ST \times CL) \times (GL \times CR)] \times ES$  was superior for seed cotton yield per plant and was followed by combinations  $[(GL \times FL) \times (GL \times CR)] \times G1$ ,  $[(CR \times CR)] \times G1$ CA × (GL × FL)] × G1 and [(JU × ST) × (CR × CA)] × ES. The positive and significant standard heterosis value of all four combinations corrected the performance of cross combinations. In previous studies, it was revealed that standard heterosis ranged from -12.63% to 30.90%, with 25 of 36 crosses being positive (Bilwal et al., 2018) and from -28.29 to 47.03% with significant and positive in 9 out of 32

crosses (Rathava et al., 2018). We also estimated that standard heterosis was between -12.47% and 20.53%, and 4 out of 14 crosses had significant and positive values (Table 4). In this study, the grandparents and parents in pedigrees of hybrids were the important

Table 1. Means	used for orthogonal contrasts
----------------	-------------------------------

Cizalda 1	Ortogona	lkareilaei	tırmələr ic	in kullanılar	ortalama dačarlar	
Çizeige i	. Ortogonal	ı naişilaşı	umanan iç.	ш кипашап	i ontanama uegenter	

yineige i. orrogonai narynayni manar iym nanannan orrananna aegerier							
Means	SCY	GOT	$\mathbf{FL}$	$\mathbf{FF}$	$\mathbf{FS}$		
The grand mean of Crosses	$60.57 \pm 0.91$	$45.22 \pm 0.24$	$29.58 \pm 0.17$	$5.34 \pm 0.04$	$31.22 \pm 0.19$		
The grand mean of Parents	$55.76 \pm 1.44$	$42.64 \pm 0.30$	$29.66 \pm 0.18$	$4.91 \pm 0.05$	$31.42 \pm 0.33$		
Grand Mean of Genotypes	$58.69 \pm 0.84$	$44.21 \pm 0.24$	$29.61 \pm 0.13$	$5.17 \pm 0.04$	$31.30 \pm 0.18$		
Mean of Esperia Crosses		$43.99 \pm 0.17$					
Mean of Genotype-I Crosses		$46.45 \pm 0.23$					
Mean of Esperia and Genotype-I		$44.89 \pm 0.51$					
	$(\alpha/)$		), <b>DD</b> , <b>D</b> '1 (*	( •	$\cdot$ ), EQ. E1		

SCY: Seed cotton yield (g); GOT: Ginning out-turn (%); FL: Fiber length (mm); FF: Fiber fineness (micronaire); FS: Fiber strength (g tex<sup>-1</sup>).

## **Ginning Out-Turn**

The main purpose of our study is to increase the ginning out-turn in cross combinations. The range of ginning out-turn was 43.32 - 48.00% in cross combinations and 40.73 - 46.11% in parents and grandparents. The ginning out-turn of all cross combinations was higher than all parents except Genotype-I, while four cross combinations,  $[(JU \times ST)]$  $\times$  (CR  $\times$  CA)]  $\times$  G1, [(GL  $\times$  FL)  $\times$  (GL  $\times$  CR)]  $\times$  G1,  $[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$  and  $[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$ (CR) × G1, were higher than Genotype-I (Table 2). In addition, the mean of all crosses and Genotype I crosses were 45.22% and 46.45%, respectively (Table 1). The significant orthogonal contrast values, such as  $C_2$  and  $C_3$ , indicated that the performance of all crosses was superior to the mean of Esperia and Genotype-I and all parents (Table 3). Although no significant  $C_5$  confirmed the equality of the mean of the Genotype-I crosses and the best variety (Genotype-I), the mean of all crosses was significantly lower than the best variety Genotype-I ( $C_6$ ). Moreover, standard heterosis (compared to Gloria) was between 4.71% and 16.03%, with 9 out of 14 crosses being significant. Murthy et al. (2017) found that the mean performance of 4  $F_1$  populations ranged from 35.74% to 40.98%, and heterosis over two check varieties was completely favorable. Mudhalvan et al. (2021) determined that the ginning out-turn was between 25.47% and 39.10% in 30  $F_1$  combinations (Gossypium hirsutum L), and standard heterosis was mostly negative and significant (Table 4). In another study, the values of the advanced lines selected for ginning out-turn varied between 36.50% and 45.50%, and the average of the control varieties was 40.9% (Coban and Cicek, 2017). We recorded higher performance for all cross combinations than the mentioned studies regarding ginning out-turn.

## Fiber Length

The most important fiber quality characteristics are fiber length, fineness, and strength in terms of the fiber value for spinning into yarn and marketing. Developing new cultivars with improved fiber properties is the main target of cotton breeders (Constable et al., 2015). The range of fiber length was 28.71 - 30.87 mm for cross combination and 28.63 -30.87 mm for all parents (Table 2). Although genotypic differences were nonsignificant, the mean of all crosses (29.58) was significantly shorter than that of the best variety, Carmen (30.87 mm). These findings were incompatible with the results obtained by Monicashree et al. (2017) and Premalatha et al. (2020). Despite all this, the maximum fiber length value in our study was higher than that of Arain et al. (2015) and Baloch et al. (2015). [(ST  $\times$  CL)  $\times$  (GL  $\times$ (CR) × G1,  $(CA \times ST) \times (ST \times CL)$  × G1,  $(CA \times ST) \times$  $(GL \times FL)$ ] × G1 and  $[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times ES$ were highly performed for fiber length over 30.0 mm, while standard heterosis was favorable in the first three of these hybrids (Table 4). Earlier studies reported that the means of fiber length were 30.0 mm for crosses and 28.1 mm for parents, and standard heterosis was between 2.75%and 14.43% (Ashokkumar et al., 2013). It was seen that genetic variability and standard heterosis were not created for fiber length in the population where nine commercial varieties and advanced lines were crossed.

## Fiber Fineness

The stronger and faster yarn process can only be realized thanks to finer mature fibers (Steadman, 1997). The earlier opposite association has been reported among ginning out-turn and fiber length and micronaire, while the direct association between ginning out-turn and strength and micronaire (Percy et al., 2006). Fiber fineness of cross combinations and

cultivars grown in recent years. Therefore, the maximum level of standard heterosis in our crosses was lower than that of Bilwal et al. (2018) and Rathawa et al. (2018).

parents were 5.06 - 5.58 (mic.) and 4.61 - 5.11 (mic.), respectively (Table 2). Although,  $[(ST \times CL) \times (GL \times CR)] \times ES$ ,  $[(ST \times CL) \times (GL \times CR)] \times G1$  and  $[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times CR)] \times ES$  exhibited the fiber fineness between 5.06 and 5.13 (mic.), other 11 cross combinations had coarse fibers. The fiber fineness of Carisma was considerably finer, and it was seen that three combinations with acceptable fibers have Carmen in their pedigrees. All defined orthogonal contrasts for fiber fineness were significant, and the mean of crosses (5.34 min.) was coarser than the mean of all parents (4.91 min.), standard variety (Gloria; 4.88 mic.), the finest variety (Carisma; 4.61 mic.). These findings indicated that our hybrid population evolved in the direction of coarse fibers. The significant association between ginning out-turn and fiber fineness (Saeed et al., 2014) indicated that coarse fibers could arise from high ginning out-turn in cotton breeding. As Çakmak et al. (2023) emphasized, ginning out-turns should be kept at a certain level to obtain fiber fineness values between certain limits.

Table 2. Mean values of the grandparents, parents, and cross combinations. Cizelge 2. Ebeveypler ve melez kombinasyonlara iliskin ortalama değerler

Gizeige 2. Ebeveymer ve meiez kombinasyc	illara ilişkili ort	alalla degellel			
	SCY	GOT	$\mathbf{FL}$	FF	FS
Combinations					
$[(CA \times ST) \times (ST \times CL)] \times ES$	56.60 de	43.78 e-g	28.77	5.48 a-c	31.13 b-g
$[(CA \times ST) \times (ST \times CL)] \times G1$	$53.66~\mathrm{fg}$	$45.62~\mathrm{c}$	30.74	5.32 a-f	$29.60~{ m g}$
$[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times CR)] \times ES$	$60.58~\mathrm{c}$	$43.32~\mathrm{g}$	29.87	5.13 b-h	31.10 b-g
$[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times CR)] \times G1$	$60.50 \mathrm{c}$	46.16 bc	29.45	5.38 a-e	30.90 d-g
$[(\mathrm{CR}\times\mathrm{CA})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{FL})]\times\mathrm{ES}$	54.44 e-g	$45.63~\mathrm{c}$	28.76	5.58 a	31.23 b-g
$[(CR \times CA) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$	66.90 b	45.01 d	29.22	5.45 a-d	30.17 e-g
$[(JU \times ST) \times (CR \times CA)] \times ES$	65.59 b	$43.47~\mathrm{fg}$	28.71	5.15 b-h	31.37 b-g
$[(JU \times ST) \times (CR \times CA)] \times G1$	57.76 d	48.00 a	29.36	5.41 a-e	31.00 c-g
$[(\mathrm{ST}\times\mathrm{CL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{ES}$	73.89 a	43.95 of	29.08	5.06 e-h	32.50 a-d
$[(\mathrm{ST}\times\mathrm{CL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{G1}$	$54.04~{ m fg}$	45.84 c	30.87	5.12 b-h	31.63 b-g
$[(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{FL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{ES}$	62.78 с	44.10 e	29.50	5.49 ab	32.13 a-e
$[(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{FL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{G1}$	66.97 b	47.84 a	29.47	5.58 a	30.93 d-g
$[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times ES$	57.74 d	43.67 e-g	30.06	5.40 a-e	31.63 b-g
$[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$	56.59 de	46.65 b	30.33	5.22 a-g	31.70 b-f
Grandparents					
ST-468 (ST)	$61.53  ext{ cd}$	42.71 hı	28.63	5.10 d-h	30.37 e-g
GLORIA (GL)	61.30 с	41.37 j	30.15	4.88 g-1	30.70 d-g
FLASH (FL)	$53.28~{ m g}$	40.73 k	29.94	4.89 g-1	$29.83~{ m fg}$
CARISMA (CR)	$53.21~{ m g}$	42.45 1	28.88	4.64 1	30.40 e-g
JULIA (JU)	48.60 h	41.64 j	29.86	5.11 c-h	33.13 ab
CARMEN (CA)	47.11 h	41.83 j	30.87	4.83 h-1	33.03 a-c
CLAUDÍA (CL)	49.32 h	43.31 gh	30.12	4.96 f-1	33.90 a
Parents					
Genotype-I (G1)	55.70 d-f	46.11 bc	29.64	4.84 h-1	30.57 d-g
ESPERIA (ES)	71.82 a	43.66 e-g	28.87	4.97 f-1	30.87 d-g
LSD (0.05)	2.33	0.61	-	0.38	$2.0\overline{5}$

SCY: Seed cotton yield (g); GOT: Ginning out-turn (%); FL: Fiber length (mm); FF: Fiber fineness (micronaire); FS: Fiber strength (g tex<sup>-1</sup>).

Table 3. The significance of orthogonal contrasts *Cizelge 3. Ortogonal karsılastırmaların önemliliği* 

9100	ge of offogenal narynayth mararin onenningi					
	Orthogonal contrasts	SCY	GOT	$\mathbf{FL}$	FF	$\mathbf{FS}$
$C_1$	Esperia crosses vs. Genotype-I crosses		**			
$C_2$	All crosses vs. mean of Esperia and Genotype-I		**			
$C_3$	All crosses vs. all parents	**	**	ns	**	ns
$C_4$	Esperia crosses vs. best variety		**			
$C_5$	Genotype-I crosses vs. best variety		ns			
$C_6$	All crosses vs. best variety		**			
$C_7$	All crosses vs. check variety (Gloria)	**	ns	ns	**	ns
$C_8$	All crosses vs. best variety	**	ns	*	**	**

\*: Significant at P < 0.05 and \*\*: Significant at P < 0.01. SCY: Seed cotton yield (g); GOT: Ginning out-turn (%); FL: Fiber length (mm); FF: Fiber fineness (micronaire); FS: Fiber strength (g tex<sup>-1</sup>).

Table 4. Standard heterosis (%) Cizelge 4. Standart heterosis değerleri (%)

Çizeige 4. Drandart neterosis degerieri (70)					
Combinations	SCY	GOT	$\mathbf{FL}$	FF	$\mathbf{FS}$
$[(CA \times ST) \times (ST \times CL)] \times ES$	-7.66**	5.83	-4.59	12.36**	1.41
$[(CA \times ST) \times (ST \times CL)] \times G1$	-12.47**	10.27**	1.97	8.95*	-3.58
$[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times CR)] \times ES$	-1.17	4.71	-0.94	5.05	1.30
$[(JU \times ST) \times (GL \times CR)] \times G1$	-1.31	11.58**	-2.33	10.25 **	0.65
$[(CR \times CA) \times (GL \times FL)] \times ES$	-11.19**	10.30**	-4.62	14.41**	1.74
$[(CR \times CA) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$	9.14**	8.80**	-3.10	11.61**	-1.74
$[(JU \times ST) \times (CR \times CA)] \times ES$	7.00**	5.08	-4.79	5.60	2.17
$[(JU \times ST) \times (CR \times CA)] \times G1$	-5.78**	16.03**	-2.62	10.79**	0.98
$[(\mathrm{ST}\times\mathrm{CL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{ES}$	20.54**	6.24*	-3.56	3.62	5.86
$[(\mathrm{ST} \times \mathrm{CL}) \times (\mathrm{GL} \times \mathrm{CR})] \times \mathrm{G1}$	-11.84**	10.80**	2.39	4.85	3.04
$[(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{FL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{ES}$	2.41	6.60*	-2.14	12.50 **	4.67
$[(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{FL})\times(\mathrm{GL}\times\mathrm{CR})]\times\mathrm{G1}$	9.25**	15.64 **	-2.27	14.28**	0.76
$[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times ES$	-5.81**	5.56	-0.30	10.66**	3.04
$[(CA \times ST) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$	-7.68**	12.76**	0.61	7.04	3.26

\*: Significant at P < 0.05 and \*\*: Significant at P < 0.01. SCY: Seed cotton yield (g); GOT: Ginning out-turn (%); FL: Fiber length (mm); FF: Fiber fineness (micronaire); FS: Fiber strength (g tex<sup>-1</sup>).

## Fiber Strength

The use of favorable fiber strength improved both ring- and open-end spinning and yarn strength (Simpson & Murray, 1978), and modern textile industries demand stronger, longer, finer, and more uniform cotton fibers (Chapara & Madugula, 2021). In our study, the highest fiber strength recorded in  $32.50 \text{ g tex}^{-1} [(\text{ST} \times \text{CL}) \times (\text{GL} \times \text{CR})] \times \text{ES and } 32.13 \text{ g}$ tex<sup>-1</sup> [(GL  $\times$  FL)  $\times$  (GL  $\times$  CR)]  $\times$  ES cross combinations, while Claudia (33.90 g tex<sup>-1</sup>), Julia  $(33.13 \text{ g tex}^{-1})$  and Carmen  $(33.03 \text{ g tex}^{-1})$  were the grandparents with the highest fiber strength (Table 2). When the mean of all crosses  $(31.22 \text{ g tex}^{-1})$  was compared with the grand mean of parents (31.42 g tex<sup>-1</sup>) and check variety, Gloria (30.70 g tex<sup>-1</sup>), the differences were nonsignificant as confirmed by orthogonal comparisons (C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>7</sub>), whereas all cross combinations performed poorly against the best variety, Claudia (C8) (Table 3). The standard heterosis of all cross combinations except  $[(CA \times ST) \times$  $(ST \times CL)$ ] × G1 and  $[(CR \times CA) \times (GL \times FL)] \times G1$ indicated that a certain genetic improvement over  $31.0 \text{ g tex}^{-1}$  was achieved in the cross population (Table 4). Sirisha et al. (2019) mostly detected positive standard heterosis between -6.52% and 13.94%. In a study evaluating the mean performances and standard heterosis for fiber strength, Chapara & Madugula (2021) reported performance between 25.20 - 31.15 g tex<sup>-1</sup> and significant and positive standard heterosis in only 2 of the 20 crosses. When the findings of our study and related literature are evaluated together, standard heterosis varies widely, depending on the performance of the parents used and the standard variety used.

### CONCLUSIONS

The  $F_1\ cross\ combinations\ of\ double\ cross\ F_3$ 

populations with variety (Esperia) or advanced line (Genotype-I) were successful in terms of seed cotton and ginning out-turn, whereas vield cross combinations have evolved in the direction of coarse fiber, and improvement in fiber length and strength was limited. It was concluded that optimizing yield, ginning out-turn and fiber quality is a challenge for cotton breeding. Based on this information, [(ST-468 × Claudia) × (Gloria × Carisma)] × Esperia with high ginning out-turn. yielding. medium-high fiber fineness of 5.06 mic, fiber length of 29.08 mm and fiber strength of 32.50 g tex<sup>-1</sup> should be evaluated in advanced generations. Genotype-I could be used as a parent in breeding programs, aiming to increase ginning out-turn. However, [(Gloria × Flash) × (Gloria × Carisma)] × Genotype-I and [(Carisma × Carmen) × (Gloria × Flash)] × Genotype-I hybrids have high ginning out-turn, medium-high seed cotton yield but coarse fibers. It would be beneficial to cross these genotypes with Gossypium hirsutum L., Gossypium barbadense L., or a hybrid of two species, which can adapt in terms of fine fiber.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This manuscript is based on an ongoing recurrent selection breeding study and is part of a master thesis carried out by Ferhat ÇAKMAK. The authors gratefully thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions to improve the quality of this manuscript.

### Contribution of the Authors as Summary

The authors declare the contribution of the authors is equal.

### Statement of Conflict of Interest

The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

## KAYNAKLAR

- Ahmad, M., & Azhar, F. M. (2000). Genetic correlation and path coefficient analysis of oil and protein contents and other quantitative characters in F<sub>2</sub> generation of *G. hirsutum* L. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences 3*, 1049-1051.
- Ahuja, S. L., Ahmad, S., Saim, S. K., & Meena, R. A. (2018) Heterosis studies for high ginning out-turn percent and related traits in *G. hirsutum* cotton. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 10(12), 6465-6468.
- Akbar, M., Anwar, J., Hussain, M., Qureshi, M. H., & Khan, S. (2009). Line tester analysis in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*). Journal of Agricultural Research 47(1), 411-420.
- Arain, B. T., Baloch, M. J., Sial, P., Arain, M. A., & Baloch, A. (2015). Estimation of heterosis and combining ability in F<sub>1</sub> hybrids of upland cotton for yield and fiber traits: upland cotton yield and fiber traits. *Biological Sciences-PJSIR 58*(3), 132-139.
- Ashokkumar, K., & Ravikesavan, R. (2013). Genetic variation and heterotic effects for seed oil, seed protein, and yield attributing traits in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *African Journal* of *Biotechnology* 12(33), 5183-5191. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5897/AJB2013.13016
- Balci, S., Cinar, V.M., & Unay, A. (2021a). The effects of modified recurrent selection on fiber characteristics and neps in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). ANADOLU Journal of Aegean Agricultural Research Institute 31(2), 137-142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18615/anadolu.1029812
- Balci, S., Cinar, V. M., & Unay, A. (2021b). Genetic analysis for yield and ginning out turn in F<sub>1</sub> and F<sub>2</sub> populations of upland cotton. *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding 81*(4), 104-106. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31742/ISGPB.81.4.15
- Baloch, M. J., Sial, P., Arain, B. T., & Arain, M. A. (2015). Assessment of heterotic effects in F<sub>1</sub> hybrids of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *Pakistan Journal of Agriculture, Agricultural Engineering and Veterinary Sciences* 31(2), 193-202.
- Bilwal, B. B., Vadodariya, K. V., Lahane, G. R., & Rajkumar, B. K. (2018). Heterosis study for seed cotton yield and its yield attributing traits in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum L.*). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* 7(1), 1963-1967.
- Çakmak, F., Çınar, V. M., Balcı, Ş., & Ünay, A. (2023). Yield and fiber quality balance in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) breeding. *Bangladesh Journal of Botany*, 52(2), 283–290. https://doi.org/10.3329/bjb.v52i2.67025
- Chapara, R., & Madugula, S. (2021). Heterosis for seed fiber quality traits cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.). Journal of Forest Research 10, 253-258.

- Choudhari, P. N., Borole, D. N., Patil, S. D., & Narkhede, B. N. (1988). Path analysis in deshi cotton. *Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities 13*, 54-55.
- Çoban, M., & Çiçek, S. (2017). Identification of yield and fiber quality properties of some cotton lines for Nazilli conditions. *KSU Journal of Agriculture and Nature 20*, 222-226. https://doi.org/10.18016/ ksudobil.349210
- Cohran, W. G., & Cox, G. M. (1957). *Experimental* designs. John Willey Sons Inc, New York.
- Constable, G., Llewellyn, D., Walford, S. A., & Clement, J. D. (2015). Cotton breeding for fiber quality improvement. In: Cruz VMV, Dierig DA (eds) Industrial Crops. Handbook of Plant Breeding, vol 9. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 191-232. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1447-0\_10
- Desalegn, Z. (2016). High ginning out turn and the improvement of Ethiopian cotton production.
  World Cotton Research Conference - 6Goiânia -Goiás, Brazil, 2 - 6 May.
- Dinakaran, E., Thirumeni, S., & Paramasivam, K. (2012). Yield and fiber quality components analysis in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) under salinity. *Annals of Biological Research 3*(8), 3910-3915.
- Ekinci, R., Basbag, S., & Gencer, O. (2016). Heterotic effects for lint yield in double cross hybrids on cotton. *Ekin Journal of Crop Breeding and Genetics 2*(1), 40-44.
- El-Hashash, E. F. (2013). Heterosis and gene action among single and double-cross hybrids performances in cotton. *American-Eurasian Journal of Sustainable Agriculture 13*(4), 505-516.
  DOI: https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.aejaes.2013.13.
  04.1955
- Erande, C. S., Kalpande, H. V., Deosarkar, D. B., Chavan, S. K., Patil, V. S., Deshmukh, J. D., ... & Puttawar, M. R. (2014). Genetic variability, correlation, and path analysis among different traits in desi cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum L.*). *African Journal of Agricultural Research 9*(29), 2278-2286. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5897/ AJAR2013.7580
- Fonseca, S., & Patterson, F. L. (1968). Hybrid vigor in seven parent diallel cross in common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Crop Science, 8, 85–88. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1968.0011183X 000800010025x
- Girish, T., Patil, S. S., & Kencharaddi, H. G. (2019). Consistency of combining ability in segregating generations of a heterotic box subjected to reciprocal selection in cotton. *Journal of Cotton Research and Development 33*(1), 26-35.
- Ibragimov, P. (1989). *Genetic Correlations Between Characters.* Khlopok, No.4, 45.

- Islam, M. S., Thyssen, G. N., Jenkins, J. N., Zeng, L., Delhom, C. D., McCarty, J. C., ... & Fang, D. D. (2016). A MAGIC population-based genome-wide association study reveals a functional association of the GhRBB1\_A07 gene with superior fiber quality in cotton. *BMC Genomics* 17(1), 903-920. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-3249-2
- Jenkins, J. N., McCarty Jr, J. C., Gutierrez, O. A., Hayes, R. W., Bowman, D. T., Watson, C. E., & Jones, D. C. (2008). Registration of RMUP-C5, a random mated population of Upland cotton germplasm. *Journal of Plant Registrations 2*(3), 239–242. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3198/jpr2008. 02.0080crg
- JMP. (2018). SAS Institute Inc. 2018. JMP Statistical Software, Version 14. Cary, USA.
- Karademir, E., Karademir, Ç., Ekinci, R., & Gençer, O. (2010). Relationship between yield, fiber length and other fiber-related traits in advanced cotton strains. Notulae Botanicae Horti Agrobotanici Cluj-Napoca, 38(3), 111-116. https://doi.org/ 10.15835/nbha3834889
- Kumbhalkar, H. B., Gawande, V. L., Desmukh, S. B., Gotmare, V. P., & Waghmare, V. N. (2021).
  Stabilized heterosis studies for seed cotton yield and component traits in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 10(7), 99-113.
- Memon, S., Jatoi, W. A., Khanzada, S., Kamboh, N., & Rajput, L. (2017). Line × tester analysis for earliness yield and yield contributing traits in Gossypium hirsutum L. Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences 13, 287-292. DOI: https://doi.org/10.6000/1927-5129.2017.13.47
- Monicashree, C., Balu, P. A., & Gunasekaran, M. (2017). Combining ability and heterosis studies on yield and fiber quality traits in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences 6*(8), 912-927.
- Mudhalvan, S., Rajeswari, S., Mahalingam, L., Jeyakumar, P., Muthuswami, M., & Premalatha, N. (2021). Combining ability estimates and heterosis analysis on major yield attributing traits and lint quality in American cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding* 12(4), 1111-1119. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37992/ 2021.1204.153
- Murthy, K. G. K., Pradeep, T., Reddy, S. S., & Krishna, K. R. (2017) Estimation of standard heterosis in multiple cross derivatives of upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) for yield, plant type, and fiber quality. *International Journal of Pure & Applied Bioscience 5*(6), 691-697. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.4062
- Parmar, M. B., Joshi, N. R., Patel, S. M., & Kapadia, V. N. (2015). Genetic variability studies in bt cotton hybrids (H x H). AGRES – An International

e-Journal 4(2), 145-150.

- Percy, R. G., Cantrell, R. G., & Zhang, J. (2006). Genetic variation for agronomic and fiber properties in an introgressed recombinant inbred population of cotton. *Crop Science*, 46(3), 1311-1317. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2005.08-0284
- Premalatha, N., Kumar, M., & Mahalingam, L. (2020). Combining ability analysis for yield and fiber quality traits in intraspecific hybrids of *Gossypium hirsutum* L. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding* 11(4), 1085-1092. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37992/2020.1104.176
- Ranganatha, H. M., Patil, S. S., Swathi, P., Rajeev, S., Srivalli, P., & Kanti, V. M. (2013). Development of heterotic pairs or groups of cotton genotypes based on predicted double cross performance. *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences 6*(5), 231-235.
- Rathava, P., Patel, S. R., Patel, D. M., Patel, H. N., Dinisha, A., & Patil, S. S. (2018). Heterosis studies for seed cotton yield and other traits in tetraploid cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum L.*). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry 7(4), 1642-1648.
- Saeed, F., Farooq, J., Mahmood, A., Riaz, M., Hussain, T., & Majeed, A. (2014). Assessment of genetic diversity for Cotton leaf curl virus (CLCuD), fiber quality and some morphological traits using different statistical procedures in *Gossypium hirsutum* L. *Australian Journal of Crop Science 8*(3), 442-447.
- Salahuddin, S., Abro, S., Kandhro, M. M., Salahuddin, L., & Laghari, S. (2010). Correlation and path coefficient analysis of yield components of upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum L.*) sympodial. World Applied Sciences Journal 8(8), 71-75.
- Shahzad, K., Li, X., Qi, T., Guo, L., Tang, H., Zhang, X., Wang, H., Zhang, M., Zhang, B., Qiao, X., & Xing, C. (2019). Genetic analysis of yield and fiber quality traits in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) cultivated in different ecological regions of China. *Journal of Cotton Research* 2(1), 14-25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s42397-019-0031-4
- Shashibhushan, D., & Patel, U. G. (2019). Heterosis for seed cotton yield and other agro morphological traits in GMS-based hybrids of upland cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry 8(5), 572-576.
- Simpson, J., & Murray, M. F. (1978). Effect of cotton fiber fineness and strength on mechanical processing, open-end spinning, and yarn properties. *Textile Research Journal 48*(5), 270-276. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0040517578048 00505
- Sirisha, A. B. M., Ahamed, M. L., Kumar, P. R., Kumari, S. R., & Rao, V. S. (2019). Heterosis

studies for fiber quality traits in upland cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.). The Andhra Agricultural Journal, 66(2), 293-295.

- Steadman, R. G. (1997). Cotton testing. Textile Progress 27(1), 1-63. DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.1080/00405169708688868
- Steel, R. G. D., & Torrie, J. H. (1980). Principles and Procedures of Statistics. 2nd ed., McGraw Hill Book Co, New York, U.S.A.
- Tarazi, R., Jimenez, J. L. S., & Vaslin, M. F. (2020).
  Biotechnological solutions for major cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) pathogens and pests. *Biotechnology Research and Innovation 3*, 19–26.
  DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biori.2020.01.001
- Yehia, W. M. B., Hamoud, H. M. E., & Abo, E. Y. (2009). Double crosses analysis for yield

component and fiber traits in Egyptian cotton (Gossypium barbadense L.). Journal of Agricultural Chemistry and Biotechnology 34(3), 1581-1598. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21608/ jacb.2009.90290

- Yu, J., Zhang, K., Li, S., Yu, S., Zhai, H., Wu, M., ... & Zhang, J. (2013). Mapping quantitative trait loci for lint yield and fiber quality across environments in a *Gossypium hirsutum* x *Gossypium barbadense* backcross inbred line population. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 126, 275–287. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-012-1980-x
- Zhou, Y. Y. (1986). Yield components in upland cotton. Acta Agricultura Universitatis Pekinensis 12(3), 269-274.