Sl. No.	Season	Location	Conditions	Material used	Traits
1	1	MRS, Hebbal	low moisture stress	QTL-NILs	Shoot, root and yield traits
			well watered conditions	pyramids	
2	2	) D U P H U V ¿ H O G	low moisture stress	QTL-NILs	Shoot and yield traits
		Pavagada, Tumkur	well watered conditions	pyramids	
3	3	MRS, Hebbal	low moisture stress	QTL-NILs	Shoot and root traits
			well watered conditions	pyramids	
4	3	ZARS, GKVK	low moisture stress	QTL-NILs	Shoot, root and yield traits
			well watered conditions	pyramids	
5	3	) D U P H U V ¿ H O G	submerged	QTL-NILs	Shoot, root and yield traits
		Dodjala, Bangalore		pyramids	
6	3	) D U P H U V ¿ H O G	aerobic, non-stress	QTL-NILs	Shoot, root and yield traits
		Shettigere, Bangalore		pyramids	

Table 4: / L V W R I ¿ H O G H [S H U L P H Q W V F R Q G X F W H G L Q W K L V V W X G \

Where,

n : number of environments

v : number of genotypes with $l_j = 0$

e total variation is partitioned into genotypes, environment, environment (linear), genotype x environment (linear), pooled deviation and pooled error.

F test

a. To test the signi cance of di erences among the genotypic means, the 'F' test followed was:

$F = MS_1 / MS_3$

Where, MS_1 : mean sum of squares of varieties

MS_3 : mean sum of squares of pooled deviation

b. To test individual from linear regression, the formula is as follows,

$F = \sum_j \delta^2_{ij} / (n-2) / MS_e$

Where, n: number of environments

δ^2_{ij}: sum of squares of deviations from the regression line

MS_e: pooled error

c. To test the hybrids/ varieties which do not di er for their regression on the environmental index, the appropriate test was,

$$t = \frac{b_i - 1}{SE\ b} \text{ or } \frac{b_i}{SE\ b}$$

$$SE\ b = \sqrt{\frac{Y^2 - (Y^2/n) - (XY - (X)(Y)/n)^2 / (X^2 - (X)^2/n)}{n-2}}$$

Where,

X : environmental index

n : number of environments

A joint consideration of the three parameters such as

1. e mean performance of the genotype over the environments (x)

2. e regression co-e cient (b)

3. e deviation from linear regression (S^2di) is used to de ne stability of a genotype.

e estimate of deviations from regression (^2di) suggests that the degree of reliance that should be put to linear regression in interpretation of the data. If these values are signi cantly deviating from zero, the expected phenotype cannot be predicted satisfactorily. When, deviations (S^2di) are not signi cant, the conclusion may be drawn by the joint consideration of mean, yield and regression co-e cient (b) values as given below (Table 1).

While interpreting the results, ^2di is rst looked into. A non-signi cant deviation from $S^2di=0$, then stability is interpreted based on bi and mean values. If bi=1, a genotype is considered to possess averag stability i.e., same performance in all the growth conditions. If bi is more than unity, then the genotype is said to have less than average stability i.e., good performance under favorable environments. If bi is less than unity, then the genotype is said to possess above averag stability i.e., good performance under poor environments. us, genotypes possessing unit regression coe cient and non-signi cant deviation from regression were considered ideal, widely adapted and stable genotypes.

Results

Environment- wise analysis of variance indicated a signi cant mean sum of squares for the QTL-NILs and the generated pyramids for most characters studied. Combined Analysis of Variance for the pyramids qRT24-9 x qRT11-7 (data not shown) indicated signi cant variance for genotype as well as for genotype x environment [33] model for stability analysis was applied as the genotype x environment component of variance was found signi cant. e performance of genotypes in di erent environments for ve selected characters based on two-way analysis of variance and Bartlett's test are elaborated below (Table 5).

Plant height

e varying environmental indices indicated that there was a signi cant di erence for plant height across environments and across genotypic entries. qRT6-2 x qRT19-1+7 was the shortest (47.74cm), while qRT6-2 x qRT11-7 was the tallest (62.77 cm). e bi and ^2di were found to be non-signi cant for all the genotypes studied.

Seed yield per plant

As indicated by the environmental indices and the environmental means, seed yield per plant showed signi cant di erences across


Genotypes
Source
df
PHT
NOT
NOP
PWT
PL
DFL
NS
NC
TWT
SWT0 0 1 513.460.L

Citation: Selvi GSA, Kahani F, Hittalmani S (2015) Stability Analysis of Rice Root QTL-NILs and Pyramids for Root Morphology and Grain Yield. J Rice Res 3: 153. doi:10.4172/2375-4338.1000153

environments. qRT11-7 x qRT6-2 recorded the highest seed yield (9.95 g), while qRT11-7 x qRT18-1+7 recorded the least seed yields (6.92 g). e bi and s²di were found to be non-signi cant for all the genotypes studied.

Total Biomass per plant

e varying environmental indices indicated that there were signi cant di erences for total biomass across environments. qRT6-2 x qRT19-1+7 was the lightest (35.82 g), while qRT20-1+7 x qRT18-1+7 was the heaviest (50.92 g). e bi and s²di were found to be non-signi cant for all the genotypes studied.

Maximum root length

As indicated by the environmental indices and the environmental means (11.86 to 18.63), maximum root length showed signi cant di erences across genotypes. e QTL-NILs recorded the highest mean maximum root length (18.63 cm), while qRT11-7 x qRT6-2 recorded the least root length (11.86 cm). e bi and s²di were found to be non-signi cant for all the genotypes studied (Table 6).

Total number of roots per plant

e varying environmental indices indicated that there were signi cant di erences for total number of roots across environments. qRT6-2 x qRT11-7 had the highest mean number of roots (59.13), while qRT11-7 x qRT18-1+7 had the least mean number of roots (52.65). e bi and s²di were found to be non-signi cant for all the genotypes studied.

Discussion

Phenotype of an individual is determined by the interaction of the genotype and environment surrounding it, the e ects of genotype and environment on phenotype may not always be independent. e phenotypic response to change in environment is not the same for all the genotypes. e interplay in the genetic and non-genetic e ects on development is termed as “genotype environment” interaction (Comstock and Moll, 1963) and is of major consequence to the breeder in the process of evolution of improved genotypes.

In the present study, twenty nine near isogenic lines of IR64