# Heritability, combining ability and heterosis in glucosinolate content in seed of winter rape (*Brassica napus* L.) estimated with diallel crosing between double haploid lines

#### Teresa Pietka, Krystyna Krotka, Jan Krzymanski, Teresa Cegielska-Taras

Plant Breeding and Acclimatization Institute, Department of Genetic and Breeding of Oilseed Crops, Strzeszynska 36, 60-479 Poznan, Poland Email: sspas@nico.ihar.poznan.pl

#### Abstract

Six DH lines with very different glucosinolate content were crossed in complete diallel design. Obtained hybrids of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations and parental lines were grown in field trial in complete random block design in replications. Analyses of glucosinolate content and composition were made using gas chromatography of sillyl derivatives of desulphoglucosinolates. Calculation of GCA and SCA were performed according to Griffings method. Analysis of variance showed that the GCA effects for the investigated glucosinolate were statistically very significant. Significant effects of SCA were found for gluconapin and progoitin. SCA for 4-hydroxybrassicin was not significant. Heterosis effects were calculated for pedigrees of individual parents and for hybrids as compared with parent means. Highly significant heterosis effects in  $F_1$  generation lost its significance in  $F_2$  generation. Variance analysis according to Hayman showed very significant additive effects of genes for the examined glucosinolate. Different methods for estimation of heritabilities of glucosinolate contents in seeds were compared. The expected heritabilities were calculated according to Mather in a narrow and wide sense. Realized heritabilities between  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations were investigated by calculations of regression coefficient, correlation coefficient and determination coefficient. The best heritabilities verse. Good agreement was found for heritabilities in narrow sense (h<sup>2</sup>=0.914) and determination coefficient (r<sup>2</sup>=0.908) for progoitrin content and slightly worse for gluconapin (h<sup>2</sup>=0.868, r<sup>2</sup>=0.913). Heritability in a narrow sense according to Mather for 4-hydroxybrassicin was not confirmed by determination coefficient between  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations.

Key words: heritability, GCA, SCA, heterosis, variability, alkenyl glukosinolate, indol glucosinolate, DH lines

# Introduction

Increase in demand on rapeseed and soybean meals is observed in last years because of withdrawal animal products from fodder production. (Pastuszewska, Raj 2003). In this circumstances the quality of rapeseed meal became a very important problem. The content of glucosinolate in seeds of winter rape is the main factor determining nutritional value of rapeseed meal for use as high protein component of fodder production. Further improvement of rapeseed meal quality is still connected with breeding of new varieties with decreased alkenyl glucosinolate level. This concerns both line varieties and hybrids. (Bartkowiak-Broda 1998; Krzymanski et al. 199; Friedt 1999, Raney et al. 2003). Feeding experiments showed that the most detrimental effects to animals have alkenyl glucosinolate – especially progoitrin. Lowering the level just of these seed components should be the next target of breeding works. Indol glucosinolates are less detrimental for animals and some products of its hydrolysis may have positive effects (Rakowska, Ochodzki 1995; Shone et al. 2003; Wang Y et al. 2003).

Better understanding of glucosinolate inheritance in rapeseed should make the breeding more effective and speed up the variety breeding process. Knowledge of genetic background of heterosis and general and specific combining abilities are basis for hybrid breeding. Their occurrence and changes between  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generation are also important.

### **Material and Methods**

Six DH lines with very different in glucosinolate contents and compositions were crossed in complete diallel design. Obtained hybrids of  $F_1$  generation and parental lines were grown in field trial in complete random block design in four replications. Seeds of  $F_2$  generation were obtained with selfing from  $F_1$  plants. Next autumn the trial with hybrids of  $F_2$  generation and parents were grown in two replications.

Analyses of glucosinolate content and composition were made using gas chromatography of sillyl derivatives of desulphoglucosinolates (Michalski et al. 1995).

Calculation of GCA and SCA were performed according Griffings method (Griffing 1956). Heterosis effects were calculated for pedigrees of individual parents and for hybrids as compared with parent means. Different methods for estimation of heritabilities of glucosinolate contents in seeds were compared.

Study was done for three the most characteristic for rapeseed glucosinolates. They are two alkenyl glucosinolates - gluconapin and progoitrin and one indol glucosinolate 4-hydroxybrasscin. Parental lines and hybrids of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations were very significantly differentiated according contend and composition of these glucosinolates.

# Results

Results of chemical analyses and statistical calculations are shown in tables 1 to 7.

|         | Glucosinolate |      |            |      |                      |      |                                   |      |                        |     |
|---------|---------------|------|------------|------|----------------------|------|-----------------------------------|------|------------------------|-----|
| DH line | Gluconapin    |      | Progoitrin |      | 4-hydroxy- brassicin |      | Total of alkenyl<br>glucosinolate |      | Total of glucosinolate |     |
|         | μM/g          | %    | μM/g       | %    | μM/g                 | %    | μM/g                              | %    | μM/g                   | %   |
| H1-112  | 0.5           | 10.9 | 0.6        | 13.0 | 3.4                  | 73.9 | 1.2                               | 26.1 | 4.6                    | 100 |
| H5-771  | 0.3           | 6.8  | 0.4        | 9.1  | 3.7                  | 84.1 | 0.8                               | 18.2 | 4.4                    | 100 |
| H5-925  | 0.3           | 6.7  | 0.4        | 8.9  | 3.8                  | 84.4 | 0.8                               | 17.8 | 4.5                    | 100 |
| W-86    | 1.2           | 22.2 | 3.3        | 61.1 | 0.7                  | 13.0 | 4.8                               | 88.9 | 5.4                    | 100 |
| 174-26  | 14.7          | 33.6 | 24.5       | 56.1 | 3.1                  | 7.1  | 40.5                              | 92.7 | 43.7                   | 100 |
| 174-99  | 12.2          | 25.9 | 26.7       | 56.7 | 5.5                  | 11.7 | 41.6                              | 88.3 | 47.1                   | 100 |

| fable 1. Glucosinolate contents | (µM/g of | f seed) and com | position (%) i | in seeds of parental line |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|

# Table 2. Analysis of variance according to Hayman for glucosinolate content in seeds from plants of F1 and F2 generations of hybrids between DH lines of winter oilseed rape.

| Source of variation                   | Degree of  | ree of F <sub>1</sub>     |                               |             |            | $F_2$       |             |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| Source of variation                   | freedom    | Sum square                | Mean square                   | F statistic | Sum square | Mean square | F statistic |  |  |
|                                       |            |                           | Gluconar                      | oin         |            |             |             |  |  |
| Dominance                             | 15         | 102.66                    | 6.84                          | 8.48***     | 44.65      | 2.98        | 3.54**      |  |  |
| Unidirection                          | 1          | 20.69                     | 20.69                         | 25.64***    | 0.02       | 0.02        | 0.03        |  |  |
| Asymmetry                             | 5          | 36.42                     | 7.28                          | 9.03***     | 5.06       | 1.01        | 1.20        |  |  |
| Residue                               | 9          | 45.55                     |                               |             | 39.56      |             |             |  |  |
| Additivity                            | 5          | 755.10                    | 151.02                        | 187.15***   | 394.41     | 78.88       | 93.77***    |  |  |
|                                       |            |                           | Progoitri                     | in          |            |             |             |  |  |
| Dominance                             | 15         | 117.70                    | 7.85                          | 4.57***     | 131.87     | 8.79        | 3.97***     |  |  |
| Unidirection                          | 1          | 3.84                      | 3.84                          | 2.24        | 11.20      | 11.20       | 5.06*       |  |  |
| Asymmetry                             | 5          | 17.96                     | 3.59                          | 2.09        | 7.98       | 1.60        | 0.72        |  |  |
| Residue                               | 9          | 95.89                     |                               |             | 112.69     |             |             |  |  |
| Additivity                            | 5          | 1530.75                   | 306.15                        | 178.41***   | 1435.12    | 287.02      | 129.65***   |  |  |
|                                       |            |                           | 4-hydroxybra                  | assicin     |            |             |             |  |  |
| Dominance                             | 15         | 4.04                      | 0.27                          | 2.00*       | 1.69       | 0.11        | 0.81        |  |  |
| Unidirection                          | 1          | 1.11                      | 1.11                          | 8.22**      | 0.02       | 0.02        | 0.14        |  |  |
| Asymmetry                             | 5          | 1.54                      | 0.31                          | 2.29        | 1.08       | 0.22        | 1.56        |  |  |
| Residue                               | 9          | 1.39                      |                               |             | 0.59       |             |             |  |  |
| Additivity                            | 5          | 14.14                     | 2.83                          | 20.97**     | 7.10       | 1.42        | 10.24***    |  |  |
| *** - significant at $\alpha = 0.001$ | ** _ cioni | ficant at $\alpha = 0.01$ | * - significant at $\alpha =$ | 0.05        |            |             |             |  |  |

significant at  $\alpha = 0.001$ significant at  $\alpha = 0.01$  \* - significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ 

# Table 3. Characteristics of lines and of diallel crosses between DH lines - glucosinolate content in seeds of F1 and F2 generations

| Moons    | Gluco          | napin          | Prog           | Progoitrin     |                | ybrassicin     |
|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Ivicalis | F <sub>1</sub> | F <sub>2</sub> | $F_1$          | F <sub>2</sub> | F <sub>1</sub> | F <sub>2</sub> |
| Total    | 6.85           | 4.83           | 8.87           | 8.55           | 3.58           | 3.60           |
| Parents  | 5.15           | 4.78           | 8.14           | 9.8            | 3.19           | 3.55           |
| Hybrids  | 7.18           | 4.85           | 9.01           | 8.3            | 3.66           | 3.61           |
|          |                | Means o        | f line progeny |                |                |                |
| H1-112   | 5.61           | 3.95           | 6.25           | 6.28           | 3.41           | 3.57           |
| H5-771   | 4.08           | 2.76           | 4.69           | 4.52           | 3.73           | 3.82           |
| H5-925   | 4.58           | 3.14           | 5.90           | 5.37           | 3.59           | 3.59           |
| W-86     | 5.12           | 3.46           | 7.09           | 6.39           | 2.94           | 2.96           |
| 174-26   | 10.46          | 7.51           | 13.68          | 13.41          | 4.11           | 3.91           |
| 174-99   | 12.15          | 8.20           | 15.99          | 14.68          | 3.93           | 3.79           |

#### Table 4 Estimation of heterosis effects for progenies in relation to parent lines for individual glucosinolate content in seeds of F1 and F<sub>2</sub> generations.

|        |        |         | -0         |          |                |                    |                |
|--------|--------|---------|------------|----------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| No. Li | Lino   | Gluco   | Gluconapin |          | oitrin         | 4-hydroxybrassicin |                |
| INO.   | Linc   | $F_1$   | $F_2$      | $F_1$    | F <sub>2</sub> | $F_1$              | F <sub>2</sub> |
| 1      | H1-112 | 3.53*** | 1.82       | 4.79***  | 2.84           | 0.31               | 0.08           |
| 2      | H5-771 | 3.36*** | 1.94       | 3.89**   | 3.16           | 0.14               | 0.36           |
| 3      | H5-925 | 3.63*** | 1.97*      | 4.90***  | 3.49*          | 0.13               | 0.10           |
| 4      | W-86   | 2.25*   | 0.90       | 2.32     | 0.98           | 2.55***            | 0.01           |
| 5      | 174-26 | -0.81   | -3.73***   | -5.79*** | -10.39***      | -0.26              | -0.04          |
| 6      | 174-99 | 0.25    | -2.47*     | -4.85*** | -9.05***       | -0.05              | -0.12          |

# Table 5. Genetics parameter according to Mather for glucosinolate content in seeds harvested from plants of diallel hybrids of F<sub>1</sub> generations between DH lines.

| Parameter   | Glukonapin | Progoitrin | 4-hydroxybrassicin |
|---|------------|------------|--------------------|
| D   | 24.47      | 80.23      | 1.62               |
| F   | -21.28     | -20.00     | 0.84               |
| H(1)  | 16.39      | 13.51      | 0.39               |
| H(2)  | 12.07      | 12.26      | 0.27               |
| $h^2$   | 11.49      | 2.13       | 0.62               |
| Mean degree of dominance                            | 0.818      | 0.410      | 0.49               |
| Number of gene group showed dominance               | 1          | 0          | 2                  |
| Product of frequency in loci (u*v) showed dominance | 0.184      | 0.227      | 0.17               |
| Ratio of dominant to recessive allel number         | 0.306      | 0.534      | 3.277              |
| Narrow sense heritability                           | 0.868      | 0.914      | 0.689              |
| Broad sense heritability                            | 0.972      | 0.969      | 0.793              |

# Table 6. Comparison of different heritability estimation of glucosinolate content in seeds of winter oilseed rape from diallel crosses of DH lines.

| Parameter                 | glukonapin                         | progoitrin | 4-hydroxybrassicin |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Expected heritabi         | lity according to Mather           |            |                    |
| Narrow sense              | 0.868                              | 0.914      | 0.69               |
| Broad sense               | 0.972                              | 0.969      | 0.79               |
| Realized heritability be  | etween $F_1$ and $F_2$ generations |            |                    |
| Regression coefficient    | 0.685                              | 0.934      | 0.467              |
| Correlation coefficient   | 0.956                              | 0.953      | 0.635              |
| Determination coefficient | 0.913                              | 0.908      | 0.403              |

#### Table 7- Heritability for combining abilities between F<sub>1</sub> and F<sub>2</sub>generations

| -                       | -                          | -          |                    |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Parameter               | glukonapin                 | progoitrin | 4-hydroxybrassicin |
|                         | General combining ability  |            |                    |
| Correlation coefficient | 0.997**                    | 0.997**    | 0.993**            |
|                         | Specific combining ability |            |                    |
| Correlation coefficient | 0.682**                    | 0.547*     | -0.327             |
|                         | Reciprocal effects         |            |                    |
| Correlation coefficient | 0.514*                     | 0.423      | 0.104              |
|                         |                            |            |                    |

# Discussion

Analysis of variance for  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations showed that the GCA effects of parental lines for investigated glucosinolate were statistically very significant. Significant effects of SCA were found for gluconapin and progoitrin. SCA for 4-hydroxybrassicin was not significant. Differences between reciprocal crosses were also not significant (table 2). Calculated results for combining abilities for alkenyl glucosinolates suggested that more important in controlling these glucosinolate content are genes with additive effects. This conclusion is confirmed by genetic parameters calculated according Mather method presented in table 5. Also high correlation coefficients for alkenyl glucosinolate GCA and SCA between two generations may suggest the same conclusion.

4-hydroxybrassicin performed differently as compared with alkenyl glucosinolate. It looks so that this indol glucosinolate content is mainly influenced by non-heritable factors.

Data presented in tables 3 and 4 concern heterosis effects on glucosinolate contents in seeds. Highly significant and mainly positive heterosis effects observed in  $F_1$  generation lost its significance in  $F_2$  generation. This observation can be explained by disappearing of non-additive effects in  $F_2$  generation. Inversely the results obtained for  $F_2$  generation should be more useful for pedigree breeding.

Different methods for estimation of heritabilities of glucosinolate contents in seeds were compared. The expected heritabilities were calculated according Mather in narrow and in wide sense. Realised heritabilities between  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations were investigated by calculations of regression coefficient, correlation coefficient and determination coefficient. The best heritability estimation should be determination coefficient, because the hybrid generations were grown in different conditions in two following years. Good agreement was found for heritabilities in narrow sense (h<sup>2</sup>=0.914) and determination coefficient (r<sup>2</sup>=0.908) for progoitrin content. A little worse for gluconapin (h<sup>2</sup>=0.868, r<sup>2</sup>=0.913). Heritability in narrow sense according Mather for 4- hydroksybrassicin was to high and was not confirmed by determination coefficient between  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  generations.

# Conclusions

Alkenyl glucosinolate content in seeds and its composition were controlled genetically on additive manner with partial heterosis mainly in direction to higher content. This heterosis effect was diminished in  $F_2$  generation. High heritability was find for these compounds.

Variability in 4-hydroxybrassicin was mainly conditioned by non-heritable factors and its heritability was much lower.

#### References

- Bartkowiak-Broda I. 1998. Odmiany mieszancowe rzepaku Osiągnięcia i perspektywy. (Hybrid varieties of rapeseed achievements and perspectives) Rosliny Oleiste- Oilseed Crops, XIX(2): 359-370.
- Friedt W. 1999. Breeding of rapeseed (*Brassica napus* L.) for modified seed quality Synergy of conventional and modern approaches. Proc. 10<sup>th</sup> Intern. Rapeseed Congress 26-29. 09.1999, Canberra, Australia. CD-ROOM.
- Griffing B. 1956. Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 9: 463-492.
- Krzymanski J., Pietka T., Michalski K., Krotka K. 1999. Study of winter oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.) very low in aliphatic glucosinolate content. Bulletin GCIRC 16: 64-71.
- Michalski K., Kolodziej K. Krzymanski J. 1995. Quantitative analysis of glucosinolates in seeds of oilseed rape. Effect of sample preparation on analysis results. Proc. 9<sup>th</sup> Intern. Rapeseed Congress, UK, 4-7. 07.1995, Cambridge, 3: 911-913.
- Pastuszewska B., Raj St. 2003. Sruta rzepakowa jako pasza białkowa i energetyczna ograniczenia i perspektywy. (Rapeseed meal as protein and energetic fodder - achievements and perspectives). Rosliny Oleiste - Oilseed Crops, XXIV (2): 525-536.
- Rakowska M., Ochodzki P. 1995. Chemiczna i zywieniowa ocena srut rzepakowych otrzymanych roznymi metodami. (Rapeseed meals obtained with different methods and their chemical and nutritional evaluation) Rosliny Oleiste - Oilseed Crops, XVI (2):345-350.
- Raney J. Ph., Olsson T. V., Rakow G., Ripley Van L. 2003. Selection of near zero aliphatic glucosinolate *Brasssica juncea* from an interspecific with *Brassica napus*. Proc. 11<sup>th</sup> Intern. Rapeseed Congress 6-10. 07. 2003. Copenhagen 1: 284-286.
- Schone F., Leiterer M., Hartung H. 2003. Rapeseed feeds, glucosinolates and iodine in pigs. Proc. 11th Intern. Rapeseed Congress 6-10. 07. 2003. Copenhagen 4: 1228-1230.
- Wang Y., Campbell L. D., Slonimski B.A., Crow G. 2003. Response to diet glucosinolate in the laying hen. Proc. 11<sup>th</sup> Intern. Rapeseed Congress 6-10. 07. 2003. Copenhagen 4: 1247-1249.