# COMBINING ABILITY AND CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD AND DIFFERENT CHARACTERS IN EGGPLANT FOR PRODUCING HIGH QUALITY OF LOCAL HYBRIDS. Melad, H.Z., Faten S. Saleeb and G.M. Salama

Veg. Res. Dept. Hort. Res. Inst., Cairo, Egypt.

#### ABSTRACT

A half diallel set crosses among six eggplant cultivars (*Solanum melongena* L.) viz., Brinjal Pusa Purple Cluster (P<sub>1</sub>), Egyptian White (P<sub>2</sub>), Long Purple (P<sub>3</sub>), Round Dark Purple (P<sub>4</sub>), Black Beauty (P<sub>5</sub>) and Brinjal Pusa Bharav (P<sub>6</sub>) was done. All the hybrids and parents were evaluated under greenhouse and open field during winter and summer months respectively from 2002 to 2004 at Kaha Vegetable Research Station, Kalubia, Egypt.

Both general combining ability and specific combining ability (GCA and SCA) were significant for plant height, number of primary branches per plant, number of flowers per cluster, early yield, total yield, number of fruits per plant, fruit length, fruit diameter, average fruit weight and total soluble solids, indicating the importance of both additive and non-additive gene actions for inheritance of these traits. The GCA: SCA ratio suggested that additive gene action played a greater role in the inheritance of all studied characters.

Among the cultivars, (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>), (P<sub>3</sub>), (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>6</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>) proved to be the best combiners for number of flowers per cluster, early yield, total yield and number of fruits per plant respectively and recommended for use in breeding programs.

The crosses ( $P_3 \times P_5$ ), ( $P_4 \times P_5$ ) and ( $P_5 \times P_6$ ) were a good specific combination for total yield per plant and fruit characters and considered as the promising hybrids for growing under greenhouses and open field.

Positive correlation was found between total yield (Kg/plant) and both of plant height, number of primary branches per plant, number of flowers per cluster, number of fruits per plant, fruit length, fruit diameter and fruit weight under the two growing systems. These results are indicating that the increase in total yield of eggplant fruits would be associated with an increasing in these characters.

# INTRODUCTION

Eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.) is an important vegetable crop grown in Egypt under protected cultivation and open field. Eggplant genotypes differed significantly for plant height, primary branches per plant, fruit length, fruit diameter, number of fruits per plant, fruit weight and yield as reported by Das and Barua (2001). Eggplant is a cold-sensitive vegetable crop that requires a long warm season for best yields. Esmat (1972) found that plant height was reduced by low night temperature (14-15.9°C) and increased by high night temperature (17.8-18.9°C). Also, Lee *et al* (2003) found that plant height, total number of fruits and marketable fruits were higher when the night temperature was 16°C comparatively to 12°C.

Numerous investigators suggested that both additive and nonadditive components were important for fruit diameter (Chaudhary and Pathania, 2000), plant height, number of fruits per plant, fruit yield per plant (Chezhian *et al* 2000; Das and Barua, 2001), fruit weight (Chezhian *et al* 2000; Vaghasiya *et al* 2000 ; Das and Barua, 2001) and fruit length (Das and Barua, 2001). Additive genetic variance played an important role in the inheritance of fruit weight (Salehuzzaman and Alam, 1983; Chaudhary and Pathania, 2000), early yield (Sanguineti *et al* 1985), fruit diameter (Ingale and Patil, 1997; Das and Barua, 2001; Major *et al* 2002; Singh *et al* 2002), fruit length (Ingale and Patil, 1997; Major *et al* 2002; Singh *et al* 2002), number of branches per plant (Das and Barua, 2001; Major *et al* 2002; Singh *et al* 2002) and number of fruits per plant (Major *et al* 2002; Singh *et al* 2002). On the other hand, non-additive gene action was important for inheritance of total soluble solids (Chaudhary *et al* 1998), fruit yield per plant (Chaudhary *et al* 1998; Vaghasiya *et al* 2000) and plant height, fruit diameter and number of fruits per plant (Vaghasiya *et al* 2000).

The magnitude of heterosis were observed in different eggplant crosses for fruit diameter (Prasath *et al* 1998), fruit yield, number of fruits per plant, fruit weight (Prasath *et al* 1998 ; Babu and Thirumurugan, 2001; Das and Barua 2001), plant height, number of branches per plant (Prasath *et al* 1998; Babu and Thirumurugan, 2001) and fruit length (Babu and Thirumurugan, 2001). On the other hand, negative heterosis was found for plant height, number of branches per plant, fruit length, number of fruits, fruit weight and fruit yield (Babu and Thirumurugan, 2000).

Positive correlation was found between total yield and both of plant height (Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Prasath *et al* 2001), number of flowers per cluster (Kumar *et al* 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995), number of primary branches per plant (Kumar *et al* 1990; Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995; Prasath *et al* 2001), number of fruits per plant (Kumar *et al* 1990; Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995; Mohanty and Prusti, 2000; Prasath *et al* 2001), fruit length (Kumar *et al* 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995); fruit diameter (Prasath *et al* 2001) and fruit weight (Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Mohanty and Prusti, 2000; Prasath *et al* 2001).

Since yield is known to be a complex trait highly affected by environmental conditions thus, the preset investigation was carried out to 1) evaluating different local  $F_1$  eggplant hybrids 2) study the combining ability and heterosis for different qualitative and quantitative characters to select the best hybrids; 3) investigate the correlation between total yield and different characters.

# MATERIAL AND METHODS

Six eggplant cultivars (*Solanum melongena* L) viz., Brinjal Pusa Purple Cluster (Bangladesh), Egyptian White (Egypt), Long Purple (Egypt), Round Dark Purple (China), Black Beauty (Egypt) and Brinjal Pusa Bharav (Bangladesh) were used in this study. Selfing for the parents was done for two generations to insure the purity of each parent before crossing. On 14 March 2002 half diallel set of crosses was made between the six parents giving a total of 15 F1 crosses. Hybrids and varieties were planted on 15 October 2002 and 2003 (winter season) under unheated greenhouse (experiment 1) and on 16 March 2003 and 2004 (summer season) under open field conditions (experiment 2). All the previous genotypes were planted in randomized complete block design with four replicates at Kaha Vegetable Research Station, Kalubia, Egypt. Each genotype consisted of 15 plants. A spacing of 50 cm between rows and 50cm between plants within each row was maintained. All cultural operations were similar to those practiced in commercial field production. Data were recorded for the different characters as following:

- 1- Growth characters: plant height (cm), number of flower per cluster and number of primary branches per plant.
- 2- Yield: early yield (Kg/plant) measured as the weight of fruits harvested during the first 3 weeks of harvesting period. Total yield (Kg/plant) were measured as the weight of all fruits harvested. Number of fruits per plant was recorded from all harvesting fruits.
- 3- Fruit quality: average fruit weight (gm) was determined as the mean weight of six fruits randomly chosen from each replicate. Fruit length and fruit diameter were measured by using a caliper. Total soluble solids (TSS) were determined in four fruits per replicate using a hand refractometer.

The statistical analysis for combining ability based on mean values was done as method II Model 1 of Griffing (1956).

The degree of heterosis based on the mid parent was estimated according to the formula given by Mather and Jinks (1982) as follow: Heterosis =  $\{(F_1 - MP) / MP\} \times 100$ 

Where:  $F_1$  = the first hybrid generation, MP = mid parent.

Simple correlation was performed according to Singh and Chaudhary (1979).

Temperature distribution in winter and summer seasons under greenhouse and open field respectively during, 2002 to 2004 were recorded according to Central Laboratory of Climate, Ministry of Agriculture, Dokki, Giza, Egypt (Table 1).

Table 1: Average minimum and maximum temperatures (°C) in Kalubia under greenhouse and open field during winter and summer seasons respectively in the two seasons.

		Green	house	;			Open field				
Month	20	02	2003		2004		Month	20	03	2004	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Мах	WOITTI	Min	Max	Min	Max
October	15.97	34	18.35	36.03			March	10.2	22.2	11.6	24.8
November	14.07	34.28	14.26	32.53			April	14.2	27.3	14.5	28.3
December	12.27	31.06	9.99	29.03			May	17.3	23.9	18.6	32.2
January			11.03	30.92	8.85	27.63	June	20.2	33.7	20.8	34.6
February			9.61	29.45	9.42	28.96	July	21.8	33.6	23.1	35.2
March			9.32	29.66	10.65	31.48	August	22.4	34.5	22.5	34.9
April			13.12	33.23	13.41	33.93					

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The general characteristics of six varieties and fifteen hybrids grown under the two growing systems are presented in Table (2) and Fig (1). It is clear that fruit shape and fruit color differed between different genotypes. Moreover, the fruit color of the parents was stable for the environments, while some crosses were depended on the light conditions through out different seasons for producing the good fruit color.

oggplant			r		
Genotypes	Fruit shape	Fruit color	Seasonal effect on		
construction			fruit color		
(P <sub>1</sub> ): Brinjal pusa	Short-slender	Purple	No effect		
purple cluster					
(P <sub>2</sub> ): Egyptian White	Long-slender	White (non-purple)	No effect		
(P <sub>3</sub> ): Long Purple	Long-slender	Dark purple	No effect		
(P <sub>4</sub> ): Round Dark Purple	Round	Purple	No effect		
(P <sub>5</sub> ): Black Beauty	Oval to deep globe	Dark glossy maroon	No effect		
(P <sub>6</sub> ): Brinjal pusa Bharav	Oval or egg	Dark purple	No effect		
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>2</sub>	Medium-slender	Light violet	Affected in winter		
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	Medium-slender	Dark purple	No effect		
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	Egg shaped	Violet	Affected in winter		
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	Elongated oval	Dark glossy maroon	Affected in winter		
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	Elongated oval	Glossy maroon	Affected in winter		
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	Long slender	Reddish purple	Affected in winter		
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	Egg shaped	White	Affected in winter		
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	Elongated oval	Glossy maroon	Affected in winter		
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	Egg shaped	Dark purple	Affected in winter		
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	Egg shaped	Dark purple	No effect		
P3 x P5	Elongated oval	Dark purple	No effect		
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	Egg shaped	Violet black	No effect		
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	Round	Violet black	No effect		
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	Round	Purple	No effect		
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	Oval	No effect			

Table 2.	General	characteristics	of	six	varieties	and	fifteen	hybrids	of
	eqqpla	nt.							

Fig1

#### **1-Growth characters**

There were highly significant differences among parents and crosses either grown in greenhouse or open field conditions for growth character, i.e. plant height, number of branches per plant and number of flowers per cluster as shown in Table (3). Similar results were reported by Das and Barua (2001). Moreover it is clear that the cultivars (P<sub>3</sub>), (P<sub>5</sub>), (P<sub>6</sub>) and cross (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) had the highest significant values regarding plant height in two previous growing systems (Table 4). Cultivar's (P<sub>2</sub>), (P<sub>3</sub>) and cross (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) had the highest significant values regarding number of branches per plant while, (P<sub>1</sub>) and crosses (P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>2</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>3</sub>) had the highest significant values for number of flowers per cluster in two previous growing systems during the two seasons (Table 4). Generally, the growth characters had the highest values under open field than greenhouse. This could be attributed to the increase of the minimum temperatures under open field (summer season) than greenhouse (winter season) as shown in table (1), which affected on these traits as recorded by Esmat (1972), and Lee *et al* (2003).

Results in Table (3) showed that the mean squares due to general and specific combining ability (GCA and SCA) for plant height, number of branches per plant and number of flowers per cluster were highly significant at two environmental conditions and growing systems. This would indicate that either additive or non-additive effects are important for inheritance of these traits under such conditions. Therefore, it is suggested that both simple recurrent selection (additive) and heterosis breeding (non-additive) may be used to exploit genetic components of variations in eggplant. Similar results were reported by Chezhian *et al* (2000) and Das and Barua (2001) on plant height.

It is apparent from Table (3) that the ratio of GCA/SCA are higher than unity, for the previous traits, indicating that the additive gene action is more important than the non-additive gene action in inheritance of these traits under the two previous conditions. These results coincided with that of Das and Barua (2001), Major *et al* (2002), Singh *et al* (2002) on number of branches per plant. In contrast to our results, Vaghasiya *et al* (2000) recorded that the non-additive gene action played an important role in the inheritance of plant height.

The GCA ranged from -11.13 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 8.69 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -9.38 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 7.67 (P<sub>5</sub>) for plant height; -0.67 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 0.69 (P<sub>3</sub>) and -0.61 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.54 (P<sub>3</sub>) for number of branches per plant and -0.61 (P<sub>5</sub>) to 1.17 (P<sub>1</sub>) and -0.57 (P<sub>5</sub>) to 1.04 (P<sub>1</sub>) for number of flowers per cluster with significant positive (useful) estimates under greenhouse in the two-winter seasons respectively (Table 5). Moreover, the GCA ranged from -11.62 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 11.10 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -8.43 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 9.53 (P<sub>5</sub>) for plant height; -0.59 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.53 (P<sub>3</sub>) and -0.61 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.59 (P<sub>3</sub>) for number of branches per plant and -0.58 (P<sub>5</sub> and P<sub>6</sub>) to 1.07 (P<sub>1</sub>) and -0.59 (P<sub>5</sub>) to 1.01(P<sub>1</sub>) for number of flowers per cluster with significant positive (useful) estimates under open field in the two summer seasons respectively (Table, 5). This would indicate that the cultivars (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>), (P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>) showed significant positive estimates for plant height, number of branches per plant and number of plant height.

Table	3.	Mean	squares	for ge	enotypes	s, general a	nd s	pecific con	nbining
		ability	GCA (GCA	and	SCA)	difference	of	eggplant	under
		green	house an	d ope	n field.				

Greenhouse											
Chanastana	Geno	otype	G	CA	SC	CA	GCA	\ SCA			
Characters	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003			
Plant height (cm)	888.330**	647.706**	515.952**	401.093**	222.829**	154.171**	2.315	2.602			
Number of branches /plant	2.717**	1.854**	2.742**	1.815**	0.293**	0.219**	9.349	8.286			
Number of flowers/ cluster	2.785**	2.486**	3.404**	2.804**	0.103**	0.170**	33.133	16.450			
Early yield (Kg\ plant)	0.011**	0.011**	0.010**	0.007**	0.002	0.002	6.673	3.224			
Total yield (Kg\ plant)	0.580**	0.580**	0.369**	0.337**	0.135**	0.146**	2.745	2.310			
Number of fruits / plant	16.105**	16.166**	15.398**	16.587**	2.025**	1.656**	7.603	10.018			
Fruit length	11.398**	7.507**	10.856**	7.322**	1.447**	0.896**	7.501	8.173			
Fruit diameter	13.691**	13.788**	15.445**	15.786**	0.936**	0.866**	16.493	18.223			
Average fruit weight	5635.877**	5686.666**	6285.784**	6416.989**	409.573**	388.411**	15.347	16.521			
TSS (%)	0.287*	0.268*	0.366**	0.338**	0.005	0.007	66.975	50.834			
			Open field	I							
Characters	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004			
Plant height (cm)	886.709**	934.960**	605.694**	447.899**	192.195**	266.238**	3.151	1.682			
Number of branches /plant	1.727**	1.879**	1.769**	2.065**	0.178**	0.147**	9.946	14.061			
Number of flowers/ cluster	2.557**	2.393**	2.979**	2.735**	0.143**	0.152**	20.774	18.003			
Early yield (Kg\ plant)	0.022**	0.017**	0.014**	0.010**	0.005**	0.004**	2.813	2.455			
Total yield (Kg\ plant)	0.824**	0.609**	0.522**	0.357**	0.192**	0.152**	2.717	2.354			
Number of fruits / plant	15.052**	12.970**	15.233**	12.885**	1.612**	1.470**	9.450	8.767			
Fruit length	11.878**	10.767**	11.265**	7.778**	1.524**	2.193**	7.392	3.547			
Fruit diameter	15.248**	14.881**	17.745**	16.533**	0.862**	1.103**	20.582	14.993			
Average fruit weight	6436.708**	6318.207**	7147.807**	7323.039**	478.157**	367.079**	14.949	19.949			
TSS (%)	0.251**	0.256**	0.296**	0.330**	0.013	0.004	23.050	81.133			

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

Table 4. Mean performance of six parental cultivars and  $F_1$  crosses for growth characters of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.

<b>.</b>	F	Plant hei	ight (cm	ı)	Num	ber of per p	f brand blant	ches	Numl	ber of clus	flower ster	s per
Genotypes	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open field	
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004
P <sub>1</sub>	97.87	101.67	105.33	115.07	4.00	4.27	4.43	4.50	5.03	4.94	5.21	5.14
P <sub>2</sub>	133.67	134.00	138.20	136.73	6.93	6.07	6.47	6.83	2.70	2.72	2.90	2.72
P <sub>3</sub>	136.33	137.40	139.36	143.27	6.50	6.37	6.57	6.80	2.00	1.99	2.10	2.17
P <sub>4</sub>	130.87	128.87	133.37	136.95	3.67	4.00	4.23	4.33	1.97	2.00	2.08	2.10
P₅	147.33	148.87	161.20	155.20	5.77	5.33	5.87	5.80	1.03	1.07	1.40	1.33
$P_6$	143.80	143.87	148.47	149.54	5.57	5.83	5.73	5.67	1.07	1.13	1.17	1.27
$P_1 x P_2$	132.00	133.67	137.07	138.45	6.13	6.10	6.30	6.20	3.67	3.73	3.70	3.85
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	156.67	155.33	160.00	161.73	5.67	5.27	5.53	5.67	3.30	3.33	3.41	3.31
P1 x P4	132.00	132.33	134.30	134.17	4.31	4.75	4.97	5.00	3.00	2.85	3.22	3.14
P₁ x P₅	152.67	155.23	160.67	185.00	5.33	5.50	5.67	5.83	1.85	1.77	1.92	1.92
P1 x P6	126.67	132.00	138.77	146.69	5.53	5.49	5.49	5.40	2.33	2.21	2.63	2.58
$P_2 x P_3$	153.33	155.33	160.00	170.00	6.75	6.77	7.00	7.13	2.10	2.21	2.51	2.70
$P_2 x P_4$	149.67	148.33	153.33	161.14	6.60	6.10	6.27	6.37	1.97	2.07	2.57	2.69
$P_2 x P_5$	148.33	150.33	158.33	161.67	5.34	6.50	6.43	6.57	1.67	1.78	1.90	1.81
$P_2 x P_6$	128.33	133.33	138.37	144.97	6.25	6.33	6.53	6.63	1.67	1.70	1.89	1.87
$P_3 x P_4$	126.67	132.67	139.00	138.73	6.40	6.43	6.50	6.60	1.87	1.90	2.08	2.30
P₃x P₅	180.00	166.33	188.67	185.33	6.80	6.93	7.03	6.97	1.67	2.09	2.22	2.36
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	168.33	164.33	173.33	175.00	6.57	6.73	6.60	6.70	1.63	1.78	1.97	2.13
$P_4 x P_5$	133.33	134.67	141.50	137.87	4.67	5.43	5.83	5.93	1.67	2.05	2.04	2.05
$P_4 x P_6$	131.20	128.20	142.40	146.99	5.00	5.70	5.69	5.57	1.43	2.01	2.13	2.06
$P_5 x P_6$	145.33	144.00	151.67	156.23	5.17	5.77	5.43	5.40	1.07	1.07	1.19	1.43
L.S.D (5%)	21.67	18.07	21.10	18.76	0.92	0.82	0.54	0.46	0.63	0.55	0.53	0.47
L.S.D (1%)	29.01	24.18	28.25	25.11	1.23	1.09	0.72	0.62	0.84	0.74	0.72	0.62

Estimates of SCA effects for growth characters of the single crosses (Table 5) revealed significant positive values in some crosses. The best crosses for plant height under both growing systems were  $(P_1 \times P_3)$ ,  $(P_2 \times P_6)$ ,  $(P_3 \times P_5)$  and  $(P_3 \times P_6)$ . Moreover, the best crosses for number of branches per plant were  $(P_1 \times P_2)$ ,  $(P_2 \times P_4)$ ,  $(P_3 \times P_4)$  and  $(P_3 \times P_5)$  for both growing systems. Also, the best crosses for number of flowers per cluster was  $(P_1 \times P_2)$ ,  $(P_4 \times P_5)$  and  $(P_4 \times P_6)$  for both growing systems. Therefore, it could be concluded that these hybrids seemed to be good F<sub>1</sub> cross combinations in this respect.

	Pl	ant hei	ght (cn	1)	Num	nber o	f bran	ches	Number of flowers per			
Characters				, 	-	per	plant		-	CIU	ster	
	Green	nouse	Oper	h field	Green	house	Oper	n field	Green	house	Oper	field
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004
Parents				Ge	neral	combi	ning a	bility				
P1	-11.13*	-9.38*	-11.62**	-8.01*	-0.58**	-0.61**	-0.59**	-0.61**	1.17**	1.04**	1.07**	1.01**
P <sub>2</sub>	-0.73	0.26	-1.37	-1.32	0.66**	0.42**	0.49**	0.57**	0.20*	0.18*	0.20*	0.17*
P <sub>3</sub>	9.11*	7.73*	8.16*	7.14*	0.69**	0.54**	0.53**	0.59**	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04	0.02
P <sub>4</sub>	-6.28	-6.62*	-7.15*	-8.43*	-0.67**	-0.52**	-0.48**	-0.48**	-0.13	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07
P <sub>5</sub>	8.69*	7.67*	11.10**	9.53*	-0.10	0.03	0.08	0.04	-0.61**	-0.57**	-0.58**	-0.59**
P <sub>6</sub>	0.33	0.33	0.88	1.09	0.00	0.14	-0.04	-0.12	-0.58**	-0.55**	-0.58**	-0.55**
L.S.D (gi) 5%	6.80	5.67	6.62	5.88	0.29	0.26	0.17	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.17	0.15
L.S.D (gi) 1%	11.27	9.40	10.98	9.76	0.48	0.42	0.28	0.24	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.24
L.S.D (gi-gj) 5%	10.53	8.78	10.25	9.12	0.45	0.40	0.26	0.23	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.23
L.S.D (gi-gj)%	17.46	14.56	17.01	15.12	0.74	0.66	0.43	0.37	0.51	0.45	0.43	0.38
Crosses				Sp	ecific	combi	ning a	bility				
P1 x P2	3.17	1.80	2.28	-3.68	0.39*	0.50**	0.46**	0.24**	0.18	0.30**	0.34**	0.24**
P1 x P3	18.01**	15.99**	15.69**	11.14**	-0.10	-0.45**	-0.35**	-0.31**	0.05	0.11	0.00	-0.15*
P1 x P4	8.72*	7.35*	5.29	-0.86	-0.11	0.09	0.10	0.09	-0.16	-0.33**	-0.18*	-0.23**
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	14.42**	15.95**	13.41**	32.01**	0.35*	0.29*	0.25**	0.40**	-0.83**	-0.90**	-0.95**	-0.92**
P1 x P6	-3.22	0.05	1.73	2.15	0.45**	0.17	0.19*	0.13	-0.38**	-0.48**	-0.26**	-0.31**
P2 x P3	4.26	6.35*	5.43	12.72**	-0.27	0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.18	-0.16	-0.04	0.08
P2 x P4	15.98**	13.71**	14.07**	19.43**	0.94**	0.40**	0.32**	0.28**	-0.23*	-0.25**	0.04	-0.16*
P2 x P5	-0.32	1.41	0.82	1.99	-0.88**	0.25	-0.07	-0.05	-0.04	-0.04	-0.12	-0.19*
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	18.21**	15.28**	16.52**	15.31**	0.21	0.26*	0.17*	0.23**	0.13	0.15	0.20*	0.23**
P3 x P4	-16.85**	-9.43**	-9.79**	-11.43**	0.71**	0.62**	0.51**	0.50**	-0.09	-0.21*	-0.20*	-0.08
P3 x P5	21.51**	9.94**	21.63**	17.20**	0.54**	0.57**	0.49**	0.34**	0.19	0.17	0.46**	0.51**
P3 x P6	18.21**	15.28**	16.52**	15.31**	0.21	0.26*	0.17*	0.23**	0.13	0.15	0.20*	0.23**
P4 x P5	-9.77**	-7.37*	-10.23**	-14.70**	-0.23	0.13	0.30**	0.38**	0.28**	0.48**	0.30**	0.28**
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-3.54	-6.50*	0.89	2.87	0.00	0.28*	0.27**	0.17**	0.01	0.43**	0.38**	0.25**
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-4.38	-5.00	-8.09*	-5.85	-0.40*	-0.20	-0.54**	-0.52**	0.13	-0.02	-0.05	0.14
L.S.D. (sij) 5%	6.92	5.77	6.74	5.99	0.29	0.26	0.17	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.17	0.15
L.S.D. (sij) 1%	9.65	8.05	9.40	8.36	0.41	0.36	0.24	0.21	0.28	0.25	0.24	0.21
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 5%	21.68	18.07	21.11	18.77	0.92	0.82	0.54	0.46	0.63	0.55	0.53	0.47
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 1%	30.22	25.20	29.43	26.17	1.28	1.14	0.75	0.65	0.88	0.77	0.75	0.65

Table	5.	General	and	specific	combining	ability	effects	on	growth
	cha	racters of	f eaa	plant und	er Greenhou	use and	open fie	eld.	

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

High positive heterosis for plant height was observed on the crosses  $(P_1 \times P_3)$ ,  $(P_1 \times P_5)$  and  $(P_3 \times P_5)$  under two growing systems which estimated as (33.79 and 29.95%); (24.52 and 23.92%) and (26.91and 16.21%) on greenhouse during the two-winter seasons respectively and as (30.78 and 25.21%); (20.56 and 36.90%) and (25.54 and 24.19%) on open field during the two-summer seasons respectively (Table 6). In general, high heterosis was noticed by the crossing with parents having high GCA status. Moreover,

٥٢.

high positive heterosis for number of branches per plant was observed on the cross ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) under two growing systems, which estimated as (25.90and 24.12%) and (20.37and 18.56%) on greenhouse and open field during the two seasons respectively. Also, high positive heterosis for number of flowers per cluster was observed on the cross ( $P_3 \times P_5$ ) under two growing systems, which estimated as (11.11and 36.53%) and (31.28 and 34.86%) on greenhouse and open field during the two seasons respectively. These results coincided with that of Prasath *et al* (1998) and Babu and Thirumurugan (2001) on plant height and number of branches per plant. In contrast to our results, Babu and Thirumurugan (2000) found negative heterosis for plant height and number of branches per plant.

sses	P	lant he	ight (cr	n)	Num	per of b pla	oranche ant	es per	Number of flowers per cluster				
2 2	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field	
0	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	
$P_1 x P_2$	14.02	13.44	12.57	9.97	12.20	18.06	15.60	9.41	-5.17	-2.52	-8.75	-1.91	
$P_1 x P_3$	33.79	29.95	30.78	25.21	8.06	-0.94	0.61	0.29	-6.16	-3.80	-6.57	-9.36	
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	15.42	14.81	12.52	6.48	12.35	15.00	14.62	13.21	-14.29	-17.96	-11.75	-13.22	
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	24.52	23.92	20.56	36.90	9.22	14.58	10.03	13.27	-38.90	-40.95	-41.78	-40.55	
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	4.83	7.52	9.35	10.87	15.68	8.65	8.07	6.23	-23.50	-27.22	-17.57	-19.52	
$P_2 x P_3$	13.58	14.47	15.29	21.43	0.50	8.85	7.42	4.65	-10.64	-6.02	0.47	10.50	
$P_2 x P_4$	13.16	12.86	12.93	17.76	24.53	21.19	17.13	14.03	-15.71	-12.29	3.21	11.62	
$P_2 x P_5$	5.58	6.29	5.77	10.76	-15.91	14.04	4.32	3.96	-10.71	-5.81	-11.85	-10.53	
$P_2 x P_6$	-7.50	-4.03	-3.47	1.28	0.00	6.44	7.10	6.13	-11.50	-11.59	-7.13	-6.19	
$P_3 x P_4$	-5.19	-0.35	1.93	-0.98	25.90	24.12	20.37	18.56	-5.88	-4.59	-0.56	7.81	
$P_3 x P_5$	26.91	16.21	25.54	24.19	10.87	18.52	13.14	10.58	11.11	36.53	31.28	34.86	
$P_3 x P_6$	20.18	16.85	20.44	19.53	8.84	10.38	7.32	7.49	6.52	13.98	20.61	24.27	
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-4.15	-3.02	-3.93	-5.62	-1.06	16.43	15.51	17.11	9.89	33.48	17.32	19.22	
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-4.47	-5.99	1.05	2.61	8.30	15.93	14.25	11.33	-5.93	28.51	27.05	22.57	
$P_5 x P_6$	-0.16	-1.62	-2.05	2.53	-8.82	3.28	-6.32	-5.81	1.59	-3.03	-7.53	10.00	

 Table 6. Heterosis (%) in fifteen crosses of eggplant for growth characters under greenhouse and open field.

#### 2- Yield

The results indicated that the genotypes were different significantly for early yield, total yield (Kg/plant) and number of fruits per plant under greenhouse and open field conditions (Table 3). Similar results were reported by Das and Barua (2001). Moreover, it is clear that cultivar (P<sub>3</sub>) had the highest significant values for early yield on two previous growing systems during the two seasons (Table 7). Cultivar (P<sub>5</sub>) gave the highest total yield (Kg/plant) followed by cultivar (P<sub>6</sub>), while cultivar (P<sub>1</sub>) gave the lowest yield and the largest number of fruits per plant (Table 7). Among crosses, the highest early yield was produced by hybrids (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) and (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) in greenhouse during the two growing seasons and by hybrids (P<sub>2</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) in open field during the two summer seasons respectively. The highly significant total yield in greenhouse was produced by hybrids (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) in the second season. While, the highest significant yield in open field was produced by hybrids (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) and (P<sub>5</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) in the first season and (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) and (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>5</sub>) and (P<sub>5</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) in the first season and by hybrids (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>4</sub>) and (P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>6</sub>) in the

#### Melad, H.Z.et al.

 $(P_4 \times P_6)$  in the second season (Table 7). Moreover, the highest significant number of fruits per plant was produced by hybrid  $(P_1 \times P_2)$  in the two growing systems during the two seasons (Table 7). Generally, the early yield, total yield (Kg/plant) and number of fruits per plant were relatively higher under open field than greenhouse during summer and winter seasons respectively. This could be attributed to the increase of the minimum temperatures during summer than winter season as shown in Table (1), which affected these traits as recorded by Lee *et al.* (2003).

l l	under greenhouse and open field.											
	Early	/ yield	(Kg\p	olant)	Tota	yield	(Kg \ p	lant)	Numb	per of fr	uits per	plant
Gonotypos	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field
Genotypes	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004
P <sub>1</sub>	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.81	0.97	1.07	1.19	16.83	17.49	17.83	17.71
P <sub>2</sub>	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.21	1.03	1.22	1.14	1.32	13.36	13.70	14.20	14.67
P <sub>3</sub>	0.42	0.39	0.48	0.46	1.13	1.08	1.25	1.52	11.54	12.18	12.82	13.14
P <sub>4</sub>	0.23	0.22	0.25	0.25	1.19	1.44	1.20	1.45	9.64	10.16	10.53	10.88
P <sub>5</sub>	0.31	0.24	0.34	0.33	1.84	2.03	2.06	2.20	10.33	11.47	11.85	12.14
P <sub>6</sub>	0.38	0.33	0.36	0.40	1.73	2.13	2.14	2.16	10.17	10.84	11.17	11.45
$P_1 x P_2$	0.25	0.28	0.29	0.31	1.41	1.60	1.35	1.74	17.80	18.14	18.40	18.07
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	0.31	0.26	0.38	0.36	1.78	2.01	1.90	2.07	16.17	16.48	16.58	16.47
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	0.28	0.30	0.31	0.35	1.46	1.78	1.98	2.22	16.48	16.88	17.17	17.43
$P_1 x P_5$	0.33	0.36	0.46	0.49	2.06	2.22	2.47	2.43	13.65	14.02	14.15	14.04
$P_1 \times P_6$	0.35	0.35	0.45	0.41	1.53	1.85	1.89	2.23	13.34	12.92	13.14	13.51
$P_2 x P_3$	0.33	0.32	0.39	0.39	1.13	1.60	1.53	1.94	14.91	14.56	14.74	15.21
$P_2 x P_4$	0.29	0.27	0.28	0.35	1.86	1.93	2.25	2.14	14.93	14.59	14.92	15.08
$P_2 x P_5$	0.38	0.35	0.50	0.46	1.83	2.09	2.17	2.25	12.88	12.55	12.71	13.43
$P_2 x P_6$	0.31	0.34	0.45	0.43	1.78	2.16	2.28	2.22	10.38	10.48	10.89	11.33
$P_3 x P_4$	0.34	0.36	0.43	0.45	1.98	2.53	2.31	2.55	13.80	14.18	14.48	14.79
$P_3 x P_5$	0.38	0.33	0.37	0.42	1.72	1.96	2.44	2.48	12.98	12.64	12.98	13.45
$P_3 x P_6$	0.29	0.28	0.38	0.36	2.15	2.24	2.39	2.62	12.53	12.96	13.22	13.54
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	0.39	0.38	0.44	0.46	2.38	2.23	2.45	2.65	12.08	12.42	13.09	12.95
$P_4 \times P_6$	0.39	0.37	0.44	0.45	2.22	2.49	2.71	2.69	12.33	11.44	12.11	13.05
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	0.35	0.36	0.43	0.41	2.28	2.34	2.68	2.63	11.32	10.99	11.75	12.02
L.S.D (5%)	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.66	0.56	0.34	0.32	1.54	1.48	1.06	0.85
L.S.D (1%)	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.88	0.75	0.45	0.44	2.06	1.98	1.42	1.14

Table 7. Mean performance of six parental cultivars and F1 crosses	for
early and total yields and number of fruits per plant of egg	plant
under greenbouse and open field	

Combing ability analysis (Table 3) revealed that GCA and SCA variances were highly significant for early, total yields (Kg/plant) and number of fruits per plant at two growing systems. This would indicate to the importance of both additive and non-additive gene actions for inheritance of these characters. Similar results were reported by Chezhian *et al* (2000) and Das and Barua (2001) on total yield and number of fruits per plant.

Higher GCA: SCA ratio (Table 3) exhibited additive gene effects for inheritance of all these studied characters suggesting their exploitation through simple breeding methods under the two previous conditions. These results coincided with that of Sanguineti *et al* (1985) on early yield, Major *et al* (2002) and Singh *et al* (2002) on number of fruits per plant. Although, these results disagree with those of Chaudhary *et al* (1998) and Vaghasiya *et al* (2000) on total yield per plant and Vaghasiya *et al* (2000) on number of fruits

0 7 7

per plant who found that non-additive gene actions were important for inheritance of these characters.

The GCA ranged from -0.04 (P<sub>2</sub>) to 0.06 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.03 (P<sub>2</sub>) to 0.05 (P<sub>5</sub>) for early yield; -0.24 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.27 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.24 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.26 (P<sub>6</sub>) for total yield per plant and -1.53 (P<sub>6</sub>) to 2.33 (P<sub>1</sub>) and -1.65 (P<sub>6</sub>) to 2.47 (P<sub>1</sub>) for number of fruits per plant with significant positive (useful) estimates under greenhouse in the two-winter seasons respectively (Table 8). Moreover, the GCA ranged from -0.03 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.07 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.04 (P<sub>2</sub>) to 0.06 (P<sub>5</sub>) for early yield; -0.24 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.31 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.25 (P<sub>2</sub>) to 0.24 (P<sub>5</sub>) for total yield per plant and -1.60 (P<sub>6</sub>) to 2.36 (P<sub>1</sub>) and -1.47 (P<sub>6</sub>) to 2.10 (P<sub>1</sub>) for number of fruits per plant with significant positive (useful) estimates under open field in the two-summer seasons respectively (Table 8). This would indicate that the cultivars (P<sub>3</sub>), (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>6</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>) showed significant positive estimates for early yield and total yield (Kg/plant) and number of fruits per plant respectively and considered to be the best combiners to improve these traits under two growing systems.

 Table 8. General and specific combining ability effects on early yield, total yield and number of fruits per plant of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.

Characters	Early	/ yield	(Kg \ p	olant)	Total yield (Kg \		plant) Numl		ber of fruits pe		r plant	
Characters	Green	house	Oper	n field	Green	house	Oper	n field	Green	house	Open	field
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004
Parents					Gene	ral co	mbinir	ng abili	ty			
P1	-0.03*	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.03*	-0.24*	-0.24*	-0.27**	-0.23**	2.33**	2.47**	2.36**	2.10**
P <sub>2</sub>	-0.04*	-0.03*	-0.04*	-0.04*	-0.21*	-0.19*	-0.25**	-0.25**	0.64*	0.50*	0.48**	0.54**
P <sub>3</sub>	0.06**	0.05**	0.07**	0.06**	-0.09	-0.10	-0.10	-0.03	0.12	0.19	0.17	0.20
P <sub>4</sub>	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.01	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	-0.45	-0.48*	-0.43*	-0.38*
P <sub>5</sub>	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.27*	0.20*	0.31**	0.24**	-1.11**	-1.02**	-0.98**	-0.99**
P <sub>6</sub>	0.03*	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.21*	0.26*	0.29**	0.23**	-1.53**	-1.65**	-1.60**	-1.47**
L.S.D (gi) 5%	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.21	0.18	0.11	0.10	0.48	0.46	0.33	0.27
L.S.D (gi) 1%	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.34	0.29	0.18	0.17	0.80	0.77	0.55	0.44
L.S.D (gi-gj) 5%	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.32	0.27	0.16	0.16	0.75	0.72	0.52	0.41
L.S.D(gi-gj) %	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.53	0.45	0.27	0.26	1.24	1.19	0.86	0.69
Crosses					Spec	ific co	mbiniı	ng abili	ty			
P1 x P2	0.00	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.18	0.13	-0.11*	0.09	1.62**	1.79**	1.82**	1.41**
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	0.02	-0.02	0.03*	0.01	0.43**	0.45**	0.29**	0.20**	0.51*	0.44	0.30	0.15
P1 x P4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.04	0.05	0.24**	0.29**	1.39**	1.51**	1.49**	1.70**
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-0.01	-0.03*	0.05**	0.07**	0.35**	0.36**	0.45**	0.29**	-0.77**	-0.82**	-0.97**	-1.08**
P1 x P6	0.04*	0.05**	0.07**	0.03*	-0.12	-0.06	-0.12*	0.10*	-0.67*	-1.27**	-1.37**	-1.14**
P2 x P3	0.04*	0.06**	0.05**	0.05**	-0.25*	-0.01	-0.10	0.08	0.93**	0.48*	0.34*	0.45**
P2 x P4	0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.32**	0.18*	0.49**	0.22**	1.52**	1.19**	1.12**	0.90**
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	0.04*	0.02	0.10	0.03*	0.09	0.18*	0.14*	0.12*	0.14	-0.32	-0.53**	-0.13
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-0.06**	-0.04**	-0.03*	-0.04*	0.36**	0.18*	0.21**	0.29**	0.72**	1.04**	0.90**	0.79**
P3 x P4	0.03*	0.07**	0.08**	0.08**	0.33**	0.66**	0.40**	0.42**	0.91**	1.09**	0.98**	0.95**
P3 x P5	0.01	-0.01	-0.07**	-0.02	0.22*	0.25**	0.25**	0.13*	0.76**	0.09	0.04	0.23
P3 x P6	-0.06**	-0.04**	-0.03*	-0.04**	0.36**	0.18*	0.21**	0.29**	0.72**	1.04**	0.90**	0.79**
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	0.03*	0.02	0.03*	0.03*	0.36**	0.26**	0.14*	0.25**	0.45*	0.54*	0.75**	0.31*
P4 x P6	0.05**	0.06**	0.06**	0.06**	0.27*	0.27**	0.41**	0.31**	1.10**	0.29*	0.39*	0.89**
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-0.05**	-0.03*	-0.04**	-0.06**	0.29**	0.26**	0.17**	0.15**	0.45	0.27	0.58**	0.47**
L.S.D. (sij) 5%	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.21	0.18	0.11	0.10	0.49	0.47	0.34	0.27
L.S.D. (sij) 1%	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.29	0.25	0.15	0.14	0.69	0.66	0.47	0.38
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 5%	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.66	0.56	0.34	0.33	1.54	1.48	1.06	0.85
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 1%	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.92	0.78	0.47	0.45	2.15	2.06	1.48	1.19

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

Estimates of SCA effects (Table 8) for early yield, total yield (Kg / plant) and number of fruits per plant of the single crosses revealed significant positive values in some crosses. The best crosses for early yield under both growing systems were ( $P_2 \times P_3$ ), ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) and ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ). Moreover, the best crosses for total yield per plant were ( $P_3 \times P_5$ ), ( $P_3 \times P_6$ ), ( $P_4 \times P_5$ ), ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ) and ( $P_5 \times P_6$ ) for both growing systems. Also, The best crosses for number of fruits per plant were ( $P_1 \times P_2$ ), ( $P_1 \times P_4$ ) and ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ) for both growing systems. Therefore, it could be concluded that these hybrids seemed to be good  $F_1$  cross combinations in this respect.

High positive heterosis for early yield was observed on the crosses  $(P_2 \times P_4)$  at the first season and  $(P_3 \times P_4)$  at the second season under greenhouse, which estimated as (39.20 and 56.52%) respectively. While, high positive heterosis for early yield was observed on the crosses ( $P_2 \times P_6$ ) at the first season and (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>4</sub>) at the second season under open field, which estimated as (60.71 and 53.41%) respectively (Table 9). Moreover, high positive heterosis for total yield was observed on the cross (P1 x P3) at the first season and (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>4</sub>) at the second season under greenhouse, which estimated as (83.16 and 100.53 %) respectively. While, high positive heterosis for total yield was observed on the crosses (P2 x P4) at the first season and (P<sub>3</sub> x P<sub>4</sub>) at the second season under open field, which estimated as (92.58 and 71.72%) respectively (Table 9). In addition, high positive heterosis for number of fruits per plant was observed on the cross ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) under greenhouse and open field in the two seasons, which estimated as (30.29, 26.97, 24.01 and 23.16%) respectively (Table 9). These results coincided with that of Prasath et al (1998), Babu and Thirumurugan (2001) and Das and Barua (2001) on total yield and number of fruits per plant.

Table 9. Heterosis (%) in fifteen crosses of eggplant for early yield, total yield and number of fruits per plant under greenhouse and open field.

S	Earl	y yield	(Kg \ p	lant)	Tota	al yield (	Kg \ pl	ant)	Number of fruits per plant					
osse	Greenhouse		Open field		Greenhouse		Open field		Greenhouse		Open field			
Cro	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004		
$P_1 x P_2$	16.54	23.88	30.83	28.28	52.74	46.87	22.41	38.54	17.94	16.32	14.91	11.61		
$P_1 x P_3$	14.11	5.33	29.55	20.44	83.16	97.06	63.86	52.83	13.99	11.05	8.17	6.79		
$P_1 \times P_4$	18.57	23.61	27.03	33.76	46.33	47.44	75.04	68.22	24.56	22.07	21.05	21.98		
$P_1 x P_5$	1.01	15.90	27.52	34.86	55.72	48.33	58.22	43.22	0.56	-3.22	-4.64	-5.91		
$P_1 x P_6$	13.51	27.68	46.45	23.00	19.90	19.70	18.04	32.80	-1.21	-8.78	-9.38	-7.32		
$P_2 x P_3$	32.43	51.56	45.34	42.68	4.34	39.53	27.86	36.46	19.73	12.51	9.16	9.42		
$P_2 x P_4$	39.20	32.79	27.82	51.43	67.29	45.36	92.58	54.09	29.78	22.36	20.71	18.07		
$P_2 x P_5$	23.50	20.23	48.77	38.31	27.77	28.88	35.97	27.53	8.77	-0.30	-2.38	0.24		
$P_2 x P_6$	9.41	30.32	60.71	39.89	28.45	28.88	39.17	27.46	-11.80	-14.60	-14.12	-13.20		
$P_3 x P_4$	26.71	56.52	47.73	53.41	71.47	100.53	88.57	71.72	30.29	26.97	24.01	23.16		
$P_3 x P_5$	5.94	3.70	-8.94	5.49	15.86	26.10	47.23	33.15	18.70	6.91	5.22	6.45		
$P_3 x P_6$	-14.56	-0.58	8.06	-2.28	50.35	39.50	40.81	42.39	15.36	12.60	10.24	10.14		
$P_4 x P_5$	20.41	23.50	22.02	30.52	57.44	28.53	50.61	45.02	21.04	14.84	16.95	12.54		
$P_4 x P_6$	25.68	41.82	44.26	39.49	51.83	39.37	62.40	49.22	24.50	8.94	11.63	16.95		
$P_5 \times P_6$	-12.03	0.00	2.77	-4.69	27.54	12.75	27.98	20.64	10.47	-1.49	2.04	1.91		

T10

#### Melad, H.Z.et al.

These results disagree with those of Babu and Thirumurugan (2000) who found negative heterosis for total yield and number of fruits per plants.

# 3- Fruit quality

Significant differences among genotypes were observed for fruit quality (fruit length, fruit diameter, average fruit weight and T.S.S.) under greenhouse and open field conditions as presented in Table (3). Similar results were reported by Das and Barua (2001). Moreover it is clear that's cultivars (P5) and (P6) had the highest significant values regarding the all previous fruit quality under both greenhouse and open field (Table 10). The hybrids ( $P_5 \times P_6$ ) and ( $P_3 \times P_6$ ) had the highest significant values regarding fruit length in greenhouse during the two seasons respectively. Moreover, the hybrids ( $P_3 \times P_5$ ) and ( $P_3 \times P_6$ ) had the highest significant values regarding fruit length in open field during the two seasons respectively (Table 10). The hybrids ( $P_4 \times P_5$ ) and ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ) had the highest significant values regarding fruit diameter in both greenhouse and open field during the two seasons. While, the hybrids (P5 x P6) had the highest significant values regarding average fruit weight and T.S.S. in both greenhouse and open field during the two seasons. Generally, the fruit length, fruit diameter and average fruit weight had the highest values under open field than greenhouse. This could be attributed to the increase of minimum temperatures during summer than winter season as shown in Table (1).

Both GCA and SCA mean squares were significant for the fruit length, fruit diameter and average fruit weight, indicating the importance of both additive and non-additive gene actions for inheritance of these traits. While, GCA mean square was significant for T.S.S. content, indicating the importance of additive gene action for inheritance of this trait (Table 3). Similar results were reported by Das and Barua (2001) on fruit length, Chaudhary and Pathania (2000) on fruit diameter and Chezhian *et al* (2000); Vaghasiya *et al* (2000) and Das and Barua (2001) on fruit weight.

It is apparent from Table (3) that the ratio of GCA/SCA are higher than unity, for the fruit quality, indicating that the additive gene action is more important than that non-additive gene action in inheritance of these traits under the two previous conditions. These results coincided with that of Ingale and Patil (1997); Major *et al* (2002) and Singh *et al* (2002) on fruit length, Ingale and Patil (1997); Das and Barua (2001); Major *et al* (2002) and Singh *et al* (2002) on fruit diameter and Salehuzzaman and Alam (1983) and Chaudhary and Pathania (2000) on fruit weight. In contrast to our results, Vaghasiya *et al* (2000) on fruit diameter and Chaudhary *et al* (1998) on total soluble solids recorded that the non-additive gene action played an important role in the inheritance of these traits.

The GCA ranged from -1.74 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 1.09 (P<sub>6</sub>) and -1.45 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 0.94 (P<sub>6</sub>) for fruit length; -1.50 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 1.74 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -1.50 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 1.78 (P<sub>5</sub>) for fruit diameter; -27.04 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 38.89 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -26.09 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 37.50 (P<sub>5</sub>) for fruit weight and -0.24 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.27 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.28 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.24 (P<sub>5</sub>) for T.S.S. with significant useful estimates under greenhouse in the two-winter seasons respectively (Tables 11 and 12). Moreover, The GCA ranged from -1.90 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 1.04 (P<sub>6</sub>) and -1.46 (P<sub>4</sub>) to 0.89 (P<sub>6</sub>) for fruit length; -1.64 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 1.84 (P<sub>5</sub>)

and -1.67 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 1.50 (P<sub>5</sub>) for fruit diameter, -30.72 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 40.92 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -28.64 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 42.21 (P<sub>5</sub>) for average fruit weight and -0.30 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.21 (P<sub>5</sub>) and -0.32 (P<sub>1</sub>) to 0.22 (P<sub>5</sub>) for T.S.S. with significant useful estimates under open field in the two-summer seasons respectively (Tables 11 and 12). This would indicate that the cultivars (P<sub>6</sub>, P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>3</sub>), (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>6</sub>, P<sub>4</sub>), (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>6</sub>) and (P<sub>5</sub>, P<sub>6</sub>) showed significant positive estimates for fruit length, fruit diameter, average fruit weight and T.S.S. and considered to be the best combiners to improve these traits under two growing systems.

Estimates of SCA effects (Tables 11 and 12) for fruit length, fruit diameter and average fruit weight of the single crosses revealed significant values in some crosses. The best crosses for fruit length were ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ), ( $P_4 \times P_5$ ) under greenhouse and ( $P_2 \times P_3$ ) and ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ) under open field during the two seasons respectively. Moreover, The best crosses for fruit diameter were ( $P_4 \times P_6$ ) under greenhouse and ( $P_5 \times P_6$ ) under open field during the two seasons respectively.

and	open field.													
Charaotoro		Fruit len	igth (cm)		Fruit diameter (cm)									
Cildidelers	Greenh	nouse	Oper	n field	Green	nouse	Open	field						
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004						
Parents	General combining ability													
P <sub>1</sub>	-1.07**	-0.81**	-0.94**	-0.93**	-1.50**	-1.50**	-1.64**	-1.67**						
P <sub>2</sub>	0.06	-0.03	0.11	0.03	-1.30**	-1.24**	-1.37**	-1.30**						
P <sub>3</sub>	0.70**	0.59*	0.86*	0.71*	-0.88**	-0.96**	-0.92**	-0.85**						
P <sub>4</sub>	-1.74**	-1.45**	-1.90**	-1.46**	0.80**	0.69**	0.82**	0.82**						
P <sub>5</sub>	0.96**	0.75**	0.84*	0.76**	1.74**	1.78**	1.84**	1.49**						
P <sub>6</sub>	1.09**	0.94**	1.04**	0.89**	1.13**	1.23**	1.28**	1.50**						
L.S.D (gi) 5%	0.26	0.42	0.55	0.45	0.22	0.18	0.31	0.21						
L.S.D (gi) 1%	0.43	0.69	0.91	0.74	0.37	0.29	0.52	0.35						
L.S.D (gi-gj) 5%	0.41	0.65	0.85	0.69	0.34	0.27	0.49	0.33						
L.S.D (gi-gj) 1%	0.67	1.08	1.42	1.14	0.57	0.45	0.81	0.55						
Cross	Specific combining ability													
$P_1 x P_2$	0.25	1.10**	0.51	1.26**	-1.37**	-1.29**	-0.99**	-0.90**						
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	1.12**	0.20	0.90**	1.15**	0.45**	0.54**	0.51**	0.55**						
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	-0.55**	-0.49*	-0.80**	-1.05**	-0.40**	-0.54**	-0.46**	-0.35**						
P₁ x P₅	-0.39**	-0.80**	-0.48	-0.83**	-0.63**	-0.76**	-0.35*	-0.45**						
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-1.61**	-1.32**	-0.81**	-1.30**	-0.93**	-0.98**	-0.82**	-1.02**						
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	0.61**	0.28	1.58**	1.66**	-0.04	-0.06	-0.43**	-0.49**						
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	1.08**	0.03	0.80**	0.23	0.45**	0.53**	0.80**	0.81**						
$P_2 x P_5$	-1.77**	-1.21**	-1.74**	-1.09**	-0.99**	-0.96**	-0.82**	-0.73**						
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-0.62**	0.55*	-0.38	0.46*	0.85**	0.78**	1.12**	1.85**						
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	0.17	0.93**	1.19**	1.21**	0.74**	0.91**	0.89**	0.90**						
$P_3 x P_5$	-1.20**	-0.16	0.38	-0.77**	-0.38**	-0.57**	-0.14	-0.01						
$P_3 x P_6$	-0.62**	0.55*	-0.38	0.46*	0.85**	0.78**	1.12**	1.85**						
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	0.58**	1.15**	0.88**	1.07*	0.70**	0.88**	1.09**	0.96**						
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	1.15**	1.06**	1.52**	1.97**	0.37**	0.63**	0.25	0.22*						
$P_5 x P_6$	0.28*	-0.34	-0.16	0.88**	1.56**	1.03**	1.47**	-1.55**						
L.S.D. (sij) 5%	0.27	0.43	0.56	0.45	0.23	0.18	0.32	0.22						
L.S.D. (sij) 1%	0.37	0.59	0.78	0.63	0.32	0.25	0.45	0.30						
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 5%	0.84	1.34	1.76	1.42	0.71	0.56	1.00	0.68						
L.S.D. (sii-sik) 1%	1.16	1.86	2.45	1.98	0.99	0.78	1.40	0.94						

Table 11. General and specific combining ability effects on fruit length (cm) and fruit diameter (cm) of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

	Av	erage frui	t weight (	gm)		T.	.S.S.						
Characters	Greer	house	Öper	field	Green	house	Open	field					
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004					
Parents			Gene	ral combii	ning abi	lity							
P <sub>1</sub>	-27.04**	-26.09**	-30.72**	-28.64**	-0.24*	-0.28*	-0.30**	-0.32**					
P <sub>2</sub>	-22.06**	-24.81**	-24.36**	-25.52**	-0.20*	-0.18*	-0.09	-0.04					
P <sub>3</sub>	-17.43**	-16.34**	-16.98**	-17.25**	0.00	0.08	0.07	0.10					
P <sub>4</sub>	-2.20	-2.44	0.03	-2.70	-0.07	-0.05	-0.07	-0.13					
P <sub>5</sub>	38.89**	37.50**	40.92**	42.21**	0.27*	0.24*	0.21*	0.22*					
P <sub>6</sub>	29.83**	32.17**	31.10**	31.91**	0.24*	0.19*	0.18*	0.17*					
L.S.D (gi) 5%	4.67	5.62	4.41	6.95	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.16					
L.S.D (gi) 1%	7.74	9.31	7.32	11.53	0.29	0.29	0.27	0.27					
L.S.D (gi-gj) 5%	7.23	8.70	6.84	10.77	0.27	0.27	0.25	0.26					
L.S.D (gi-gj) 1%	12.00	14.43	11.34	17.87	0.45	0.45	0.42	0.42					
Cross	Specific combining ability												
$P_1 x P_2$	-2.36	1.96	-5.41*	4.26	0.07	0.04	-0.05	-0.01					
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	30.48**	33.23**	32.07**	35.42**	-0.02	-0.04	-0.13	-0.06					
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	9.88**	5.36	13.43**	15.11**	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.02					
P₁ x P₅	14.79**	16.89**	20.47**	16.09**	-0.09	-0.11	-0.05	-0.09					
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-5.58*	-0.18	-2.41	-9.17	-0.08	-0.07	-0.04	-0.08					
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	-14.64**	-16.51**	-16.08**	-18.67**	-0.02	-0.04	0.04	-0.02					
$P_2 x P_4$	38.23**	38.32**	46.40**	38.95**	0.00	-0.03	0.02	0.06					
$P_2 x P_5$	-1.53**	-14.79**	-11.22**	-10.03**	-0.09	-0.10	-0.04	-0.05					
$P_2 x P_6$	-5.13*	-1.16	-0.61	4.01	-0.03	-0.04	-0.18	0.02					
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	14.50**	15.94**	15.96**	9.68	0.05	0.00	0.07	-0.03					
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-19.19**	-17.71**	-11.27**	-11.30**	-0.04	-0.07	-0.19	0.01					
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-5.13*	-1.16	-0.61	4.01	-0.03	-0.04	-0.18	0.02					
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-20.12**	-18.96**	2.86	-13.09**	-0.06	0.09	-0.05	-0.07					
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-6.09*	-13.29**	-22.69**	-11.31**	-0.06	-0.08	-0.05	-0.06					
$P_5 x P_6$	12.92**	6.43*	5.32*	1.51	0.10	0.07	0.11	0.07					
L.S.D. (sij) 5%	4.76	5.72	4.49	7.09	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.17					
L.S.D. (sij) 1%	6.63	7.98	6.27	9.88	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.23					
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 5%	14.89	17.91	14.07	22.18	0.55	0.56	0.52	0.53					
L.S.D. (sij-sik) 1%	20.76	24.98	19.62	30.93	0.77	0.79	0.72	0.73					

Table 12. General and specific combining ability effects on average fruit weight (gm) and T.S.S. content of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

Also, The best crosses for average fruit weight were ( $P_2 \times P_4$ ) under greenhouse and open field during the two seasons. On the other hand, the estimates of SCA effects for T.S.S. (Table 12) of the single crosses revealed un-significant values for this trait.

High positive heterosis for fruit length was observed on the crosses ( $P_2 \times P_4$ ) at the first season and ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) at the second season under greenhouse, which estimated as 14.56 and 23.46% respectively. While, high positive heterosis for fruit length was observed on the crosses ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) at the first and second seasons under open field, which estimated as 32.70 and 33.36% respectively (Table 13). Moreover, high positive heterosis for fruit diameter was observed on the cross ( $P_1 \times P_2$ ) under greenhouse during two seasons, which estimated as 58.75 and 51.50% respectively. While, high positive heterosis for fruit diameter was observed on the crosses ( $P_1 \times P_2$ ) at the first season and ( $P_3 \times P_4$ ) at the second season under open field, which

#### J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 30 (1), January, 2005

estimated as (47.80 and 51.15%) respectively (Table 13). Also, high positive heterosis for average fruit weight was observed on the cross ( $P_1 \times P_3$ ) under greenhouse and open field in the two seasons, which estimated as (114.38, 98.24, 90.48 and 100.12%) respectively (Table 13). One the other hand, no heterosis for T.S.S. was observed under greenhouse and open field in the two seasons. These results coincided with that of Babu and Thirumurugan (2001) on fruit length, Prasath *et al* (1998) on fruit diameter and Prasath *et al* (1998); Babu and Thirumurugan (2001) and Das and Barua (2001) on fruit weight.

u	luer gre	Emit lan		pen nei	u.				
0	•	Fruitien	gtn (cm)	Cali	<b>0</b>	Fruit dian	neter (cm)	Cali	
Crosses	Green	nouse	Open		Green	nouse	Open		
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	
$P_1 X P_2$	-4.33	6.17	1.97	9.34	58.75	51.50	47.80	41.84	
$P_1 X P_3$	8.02	3.07	15.40	17.80	33.79	33.33	36.71	44.87	
$P_1 X P_4$	-3.08	-1.80	-2.47	-4.50	0.83	-1.27	3.56	4.62	
$P_1 X P_5$	-11.30	-12.88	-8.74	-13.54	-22.49	-23.71	-12.70	-16.16	
$P_1 X P_6$	-21.93	-16.18	-11.09	-16.39	-27.07	-24.91	-18.29	-19.53	
$P_2 x P_3$	1.89	5.49	20.17	22.22	15.71	18.03	10.34	18.40	
$P_2 x P_4$	14.56	6.53	15.90	11.13	23.00	31.11	39.10	39.41	
$P_2 x P_5$	-21.93	-14.06	-17.39	-13.59	-26.62	-23.16	-16.21	-14.78	
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-22.39	-8.86	-16.42	-21.97	-19.43	-8.72	7.44	15.01	
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	8.94	23.46	32.70	33.36	38.02	48.12	45.66	51.15	
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-13.84	-0.39	7.07	-3.67	-11.05	-12.44	-1.03	4.09	
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-9.53	6.65	1.28	6.95	14.25	17.54	25.88	45.29	
$P_4 x P_5$	5.70	15.27	7.41	12.28	5.66	11.23	16.29	14.65	
$P_4 x P_6$	11.00	15.70	18.62	21.84	5.14	14.54	10.34	11.71	
$P_5 x P_6$	-7.06	-6.70	-6.58	-14.09	-29.85	-20.59	-21.79	-21.68	
	Ave	erage fruit	t weight (g	gm)		Т.S	6.S.		
Crosses	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open field		
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	
$P_1 x P_2$	32.25	39.55	19.31	41.60	0.32	-0.85	-4.17	-2.30	
$P_1 x P_3$	114.38	98.24	90.48	100.12	-2.13	-3.41	-8.45	-3.64	
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	55.09	42.47	64.46	58.98	-1.45	1.97	-1.77	-1.54	
$P_1 x P_5$	22.54	20.79	30.87	22.02	-4.74	-4.51	-4.81	-4.79	
$P_1 x P_6$	5.52	10.76	4.10	1.34	-4.41	-3.79	-4.48	-4.23	
$P_2 x P_3$	-11.72	-17.36	-12.85	-17.17	-1.91	-3.77	-2.13	-1.26	
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	66.56	61.26	72.63	52.64	-1.23	-2.00	0.10	0.86	
$P_2 x P_5$	-1.27	-15.52	-6.14	-9.10	-4.52	-4.82	-2.97	-2.42	
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-5.55	-2.91	-10.95	-5.52	-4.28	-3.94	-2.64	-1.85	
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	34.24	31.59	39.57	26.09	0.68	-0.93	-0.93	-1.83	
$P_3 x P_5$	-14.03	-15.57	-3.32	-7.34	-2.63	-3.64	-8.56	-1.08	
P <sub>3</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	-3.33	-0.30	-2.07	2.98	-2.39	-3.42	-8.29	-0.51	
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	-9.98	-13.00	12.28	-5.55	-3.21	2.14	-2.97	-3.27	
P <sub>4</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	0.20	-6.63	-10.77	-5.07	-2.97	-2.97	-2.64	-2.70	
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	3.69	-1.71	-0.23	-3.63	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.49	

Table 13. Heterosis (%) in fifteen crosses of eggplant for fruit characte	rs
under greenhouse and open field.	

#### Correlation

The correlation coefficients (r) between total yield (Kg/plant) and different characters under greenhouse and open field are presented in Table (14). Significant positive correlation was found between total yield (Kg/plant)

#### Melad, H.Z.et al.

and both of plant height, number of primary branches per plant, number of flowers per cluster, number of fruits per plant, fruit length, fruit diameter and fruit weight under the two growing systems. These results be indicating that the increase in total yield of eggplant would be associated with increasing of these characters. The coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) indicating that 10 to 11 % for plant height, 15 to 17% for number of primary branches per plant. 10 to 11 % for number of flowers per cluster, 12 to 14 % for number of fruits per plant, 10 to 11 % for fruit length, 16 to 18 % for fruit diameter and 20 to 23 % for fruit weight of the variation on total yield (Kg/plant) in greenhouse can be due to the effect of different previous characters. Moreover, the coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) is indicating that 14 to 15 % for plant height, 16 to 18% for number of primary branches per plant, 10 to 12 % for number of flowers per cluster, 17 to 19 % for number of fruits per plant, 14 to 16 % for fruit length, 18 to 19% for fruit diameter and 20 to 26% for fruit weight of the variation on total yield (Kg/plant) in open field can be due to the effect of previous characters. It can be concluded that average fruit weight had the highest positive direct effect in total yield (Kg/plant) followed by the fruit diameter, number of primary branches per plant and number of fruits per plant. Similar results were found by (Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Prasath et al 2001) of plant height, (Kumar et al 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995) on number of flowers per cluster, (Kumar et al 1990; Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995; Prasath et al 2001) on number of primary branches per plant, (Kumar et al 1990; Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995; Mohanty and Prusti, 2000; Prasath et al 2001) on number of fruits per plant, (Kumar et al 1990; Narendra and Kumar, 1995) on fruit length, (Prasath et al 2001) on fruit diameter and (Mishra and Mishra, 1990; Mohanty and Prusti, 2000; Prasath et al 2001) on fruit weight.

Table 14. Correlation (r) and Coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) between total yield (Kg/plant) and different characters of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.

Character correlated		Greenh	ouse		Open field				
		r	R <sup>2</sup>		r		r	.2	
Total yield and:	2002	2003	2002	2003	2003	2004	2003	2004	
Plant height	0.34*	0.33*	0.11	0.10	0.39**	0.38**	0.15	0.14	
Number of primary branches per plant	0.41**	0.39**	0.17	0.15	0.43**	0.40**	0.18	0.16	
Number of flowers per cluster	0.28*	0.32*	0.10	0.11	0.31*	0.35*	0.10	0.12	
Number of fruits per plant	0.39**	0.35*	0.14	0.12	0.41**	0.44**	0.17	0.19	
Fruit length	0.34*	0.30*	0.11	0.10	0.38**	0.40**	0.14	0.16	
Fruit diameter	0.43**	0.40**	0.18	0.16	0.44**	0.43**	0.19	0.18	
Fruit weight	0.48**	0.45**	0.23	0.20	0.51**	0.48**	0.26	0.20	

\*, \*\* Significant differences at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability, respectively.

# CONCLUSION

In general, it can be concluded that the hybrids ( $P_3 \times P_5$ ), ( $P_4 \times P_5$ ) and ( $P_5 \times P_6$ ) were a good specific combination for total yield per plant and good fruit characters and considered as promising hybrids for growing under greenhouse and open field.

# REFERENCES

- Babu, S. and T. Thirumurugan (2000). Effect of heterosis in brinjal (*Solanum melongena*). Journal of Ecotoxicology and Environmental Monitoring, 10(1):63-66.
- Babu, S. and T. Thirumurugan (2001). Studies on heterosis effect in brinjal (Solanum melongena L.). Journal of Ecotoxicology and Environmental-Monitoring, 11(3-4):259-262.
- Baig and Patil (2002). Combining ability over environments for shoot and fruit borer resistance and other quantitative traits in *Solanum melongena* L. Indian J. Genet, 62(1) : 42-45.
- Chaudhary, D.R.; K. Sanjay and S. Kumar (1998). Diallel analysis for the study of combining ability in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research, 24(1-2):55-61.
- Chaudhary, D.R. and N.K. Pathania (2000). Inheritance of agronomical and physiological growth parameters in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research, 26(1-2):62-66.
- Chezhian, P.; S. Babu and J. Ganesan (2000). Combining ability studies in Eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.). Tropical Agricultural Research, 12: 394-397.
- Das, G. and N.S. Barua (2001). Heterosis and combining ability for yield and its components in brinjal. Annals of Agricultural Research, 22(3):399-403.
- Esmat, H. A.B. A. (1972). Studies of some characters in eggplant. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ.
- Griffing, B. (1956).Concepts of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems. Anst. J. Biol. Sci. 9:463-493
- Ingale, B.V. and S.J. Patil (1997). Diallel analysis of fruit characteristics in eggplant. PKV Research Journal, 21(1):30-34.
- Kumar, R.N.; J.K. Bisht and M.C. Joshi (1990). Interrelationship of quantitative traits in eggplant. Madras Agricultural Journal, 77(2):86-89.
- Lee EunMo; Kim WoonSeop; Yang JinSu; Oh SeHyen and Lee YoungBok; Um YeongCheol; E.M. Lee; W.S. Kim; J.S.Yang; S.H. Oh; Y.B. Lee and Y.C. Ym (2003). Comparison of growth and productivity of eggplant under different night temperature, grafted plant, and soil heating. Journal of the Korean Society for Horticultural Science, 44(3):330-334.
- Major, S.; G. Kalloo; M.K. Banerjee; S.N. Singh and M. Singh (2002). Genetics of yield and its component characters in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). Vegetable Science, 29(1):24-26.
- Mather, K. and J.L. Jinks (1982). Biometrical Genetics. Great Britain, Univ. Press, 3 rd. Ed., 396 pp.
- Mishra, S.N. and R.S. Mishra (1990). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in brinjal (*Solanum melongena*). Environment and Ecology, 8(1A):162-166.
- Mohanty, B.K. and A.M. Prusti (2000). Genotype x environment interaction and stability analysis for yield and its components in brinjal (*Solanum melongena*). Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 70(6):370-373.

- Narendra, K. and N. Kumar (1995). Inter-relationship of quantitative traits in brinjal. Madras Agricultural Journal, 82(6-8): 488-490.
- Prasath, D.; S. Natarajan and S. Thamburaj (1998). Studies on heterosis in eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.). South Indian Horticulture, 46( 3-6):247-250.
- Prasath, D.; S. Natarajan and S. Thamburaj (2001). Correlation and path analysis in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). Horticultural Journal, 14(2):143-147.
- Salehuzzaman, M. and M.S. Alam (1983). Genetic analysis of yield and its components in the eggplant. SABRAO Journal, 15(1):11-15.
- Sanguineti, M.C.; C. Coltelli and S. Conti (1985). Heterosis and combining ability in eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.). Genetica-Agraria, 39(3):345.
- Singh, R.K. and B.D. Chaudhary (1979). Biometrical methods in quantitative genetic analysis. Kalyani publishers, New Delhi, India.
- Singh, H.V.; S.P. Singh; S. Major; S. Satyendra; M. Singh and S. Singh (2002). Genetic analysis of quantitative traits in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). Vegetable Science, 29(1):84-86.
- Vaghasiya, M.H.; K.B. Kathiria; M.K. Bhalala and K.M. Doshi(2000). Gene action for yield and its components in two crosses of brinjal (*S. melongena* L.). Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding, 60(1):127-130.

القدرة على الانتلاف والارتباط بين المحصول والعديد من الخواص في الباذنجان لإنتاج. أعلى جودة من الهجن المحلية

ميلاد حلمي زكى ، فاتن شفيق صليب وجاد الرب محمد سلامة أقسام بحوث الخضر – معهد بحوث البساتين – مركز البحوث الزراعية – القاهرة – مصر.

استخدمت طريقة التهجين الممكنة (بدون استخدام الهجن العكسية) للتهجين بين ستة أصناف من الباذنجان هي برنجال بيسا بيربيل كلاستر (P1) ، ايجييشين هوايت (P2) ، لونج بيربيل (P3) ، روند دارك بيربيل (P4) ، بلاك بيوتى (P5) ، برنجال بيسا بهراف (P6). وقد تم تقييم جميع الهجن والأباء في الصوبة والأرض المكشوفة خلال أشهر الشتاء والصيف بالتتابع من سنة ٢٠٠٢ حتى ٢٠٠٤ بمحطة أبحاث الخضر بقها – قليوبية- مصر.

وقد وجد أن هناك فروق معنوية لكل من القدرة العامة والخاصة على الائتلاف لكل من طول النبات، عدد الفروع الأولية للنبات، عدد الأزهار في العنقود، المحصول المبكر، المحصول الكلى، عدد الثمار للنبات، طول الثمرة، قطر الثمرة، متوسط وزن الثمرة ومحتوى المواد الصلبة، وقد دلت النتائج على أهمية كل من تأثيرات الجينات المضيفة والغير مضيفة في توريث هذه الصفات. وقد كانت النسبة بين القدرة العامة إلى القدرة الخاصة على الائتلاف عالية مما يدل على أن التأثيرات المضيفة تلعب دوراً هاماً في توريث هذه الصفات السابقة.

ومن بين الأصناف المستخدمة كان الصنف (P1, P2) و (P3) و (P5, P6) و (P5, P2) و (P1, P2) من أفضل التوافيق لكل من عدد الأز هار في العنقود، المحصول المبكر، المحصول الكلى وعدد الثمار للنبات بالتتابع ويوصى بها باستخدامها في برامج التربية.

وقد كانت الهجن (P3 x P5) و(P4 x P5) و(P5 x P6) من أفضل التوافيق الخاصة للمحصول الكلي للنبات وصفات الثمار وتعتبر من الهجن التي يوصي بها للزراعة تحت الصوب والأرض المكشوفة.

وقد وجد ارتباط موجب بين المحصول الكلى (كجم/نبات) وبين كل من طول النبات، عدد الفروع الأولية للنبات، عدد الأز هار في العنقود، عدد الثمار للنبات، طول الثمرة، قطر الثمرة ومتوسط وزن الثمرة وذلك تحت نظم الزراعة المختلفة. وهذه النتيجة تدل على أن آي زيادة في المحصول الكلى لثمار الباذنجان ترتبط مباشرة بزيادة هذه الصفات.

Ŭ	Fruit length (cm)				Fruit diameter (cm)				Average fruit weight (gm)				T.S.S.			
Ganatypas	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house		-	Green	house	Open	field	Green	house	Open	field
Genotypes	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004	2002	2003	2003	2004
P1	9.13	9.79	10.00	10.07	2.23	2.47	2.43	2.57	30.17	31.30	33.80	33.53	3.07	3.03	3.03	3.10
P <sub>2</sub>	11.63	10.96	12.03	11.70	2.47	2.55	2.48	2.60	61.93	59.23	73.20	67.83	3.13	3.27	3.37	3.57
P <sub>3</sub>	12.05	11.03	11.43	11.10	2.60	2.53	2.83	2.63	70.00	72.51	80.33	77.60	3.50	3.80	3.83	3.87
P <sub>4</sub>	6.00	6.50	6.20	6.90	5.83	5.43	6.00	6.10	89.77	93.53	96.40	99.10	3.37	3.40	3.37	3.40
P <sub>5</sub>	13.87	12.93	14.03	14.30	10.07	10.03	10.17	9.60	196.70	201.18	203.08	214.52	4.10	4.07	4.03	4.13
P <sub>6</sub>	14.18	13.03	14.37	14.33	8.37	8.19	8.50	8.70	177.50	181.78	201.17	194.93	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.00
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>2</sub>	9.93	11.02	11.23	11.90	3.73	3.80	3.63	3.67	60.90	63.17	63.83	71.77	3.11	3.12	3.07	3.26
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	11.44	10.73	12.37	12.47	3.23	3.33	3.60	3.77	107.37	102.90	108.70	111.20	3.21	3.30	3.14	3.36
P <sub>1</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	7.33	8.00	7.90	8.10	4.07	3.90	4.37	4.53	93.00	88.93	107.07	105.43	3.17	3.28	3.14	3.20
P1 x P5	10.20	9.90	10.97	10.53	4.77	4.77	5.50	5.10	139.00	140.40	155.00	151.33	3.41	3.39	3.36	3.44
P1 x P6	9.10	9.57	10.83	10.20	3.87	4.00	4.47	4.53	109.57	118.00	122.30	115.77	3.39	3.38	3.34	3.40
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>3</sub>	12.07	11.60	14.10	12.93	2.93	3.00	2.93	3.10	58.23	54.43	66.90	60.23	3.25	3.40	3.52	3.67
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>4</sub>	10.10	9.30	10.57	10.33	5.11	5.23	5.90	6.07	126.33	123.17	146.39	127.40	3.21	3.27	3.37	3.51
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>5</sub>	9.95	10.27	10.77	11.23	4.60	4.83	5.30	5.20	127.67	110.00	129.67	128.33	3.45	3.49	3.59	3.76
P <sub>2</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	10.02	10.93	11.03	10.16	4.37	4.90	5.90	6.50	113.07	117.00	122.17	124.13	3.43	3.49	3.57	3.71
P3 x P4	9.83	10.82	11.70	12.00	5.82	5.90	6.43	6.60	107.23	109.25	123.33	111.40	3.46	3.57	3.57	3.57
P3 x P5	11.17	11.94	13.63	12.23	5.63	5.50	6.43	6.37	114.63	115.55	137.00	135.33	3.70	3.79	3.60	3.96
P3 x P6	11.87	12.83	13.07	13.60	6.27	6.30	7.13	8.23	119.63	126.77	137.83	140.33	3.68	3.77	3.58	3.91
P4 x P5	10.50	11.20	10.87	11.90	8.40	8.60	9.40	9.00	128.93	128.20	168.13	148.10	3.61	3.81	3.59	3.64
P4 x P6	11.20	11.30	12.20	12.30	7.47	7.80	8.00	8.27	133.90	128.53	132.77	139.57	3.59	3.59	3.57	3.60
P <sub>5</sub> x P <sub>6</sub>	13.03	12.11	13.27	13.93	6.47	7.23	7.30	7.17	194.00	188.20	201.67	197.30	4.08	4.03	4.01	4.09
L.S.D (5%)	0.84	1.34	1.76	1.42	0.71	2.47	1.00	0.68	14.89	17.91	14.07	22.17	0.55	0.56	0.52	0.53
L.S.D (1%)	1.12	1.79	2.35	1.90	0.95	2.55	1.34	0.91	19.93	23.97	18.83	29.68	0.74	0.75	0.69	0.70

Table 10. Mean performance of six parental cultivars and F<sub>1</sub> crosses for fruit characters of eggplant under greenhouse and open field.