

Yield Evaluation and Genetic Variability Assessment in Sesame (*Sesamum Indicum L.*) Mutant Population Using Morphological Characters and Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR) Markers

Dagmawi Belete Asfaw^{1*} and Tamene Milkessa Jiru²

¹Academic and researcher at Dilla University, Ethiopia.

²Institute of Biotechnology University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Abstract

The assessment of genetic variability is of utmost importance in crop improvement and the conservation of genetic resources. In the current study, two high-yielding sesame cultivars, namely SI 10 and SI 04, were subjected to treatment were applied to both cultivars. In this study we aimed to evaluate the genetic variability in a mutant population of sesame (*Sesamum indicum L.*) by employing morphological characters and Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR) markers.

per plant and seeds per capsule, indirectly indicating their potential as superior yielders. Furthermore, molecular genetic variation was assessed using twenty-eight SSR markers that were widely distributed across the sesame genome to

Euclidean similarity test and a complete link clustering method, were performed to construct a dendrogram based on the morphological data. The mutants were clustered into two major groups and two minor groups. In contrast, the SSR marker-based dendrogram clustering resulted in the discovery of two major clusters, A and B, with a similarity

markers provided a more accurate representation of the true variability in the mutants compared to morphological

importance of assessing genetic variability in sesame mutants using both morphological and molecular approaches.

utilization of SSR markers for accurate characterization of genetic diversity.

*Corresponding author: Dagmawi Belete Asfaw, Academic and researcher at

Received:

Editor Assigned:

Citation: Asfaw DB, Jiru TM (2024) Yield Evaluation and Genetic Variability Assessment in Sesame (*Sesamum Indicum L.*) Mutant Population Using Morphological Characters and Simple Sequence Repeat (SSR) Markers. *Adv Crop Sci Tech* 12: 656.

, F 1. B, , C D C C,
22 .
C B
14 . I
38% 90%. , 5 I 10. I 04
C A C 9

(IC). 0.07 0.21,
0.16 24 .
0.95,
IC.
0.75 0.94,
H .
0.53. 0.04 1.00, .I
(7 5) 25 .
B, 10% 20%,
C A, 79%.
I (I, II, III, IV).
I 04 (C1 31 I04, C3 12 I04,

.H , F . (2015). C1 18 I10, C2 02 I10 .I E

29 . , C2 14 I10, .B

.I 5 , C4 13 I04 .A , C1 18

7 , I04, , C4 13

10% 51.2% , C1 10 I04, .

. (2015), 34 .

30 . .B

(H ., 2002; < ., 2004; ., 2015; , .F

., 2015). ,

I , 35 .

2015), (D ., 2005; , , R

(IC) IC 0.90 10% 51.2%. , R

17 . (2015), 31 .

A , A C1 18 I 10, C3 06 I 10, C4 10 I 04, C4 13 I 04, C1 10 I 04, C1 18 I 10, .I

. (2015). 0.52, .

32 . .B .F ,

10% 51.2% 10% 23%, .

7 (., 1996) 33 .

.A , C1 18 I10, C3 06 I10, .D

C4 10 I04 , C4 13 I04, C1 10 I04, .E (0.5%)

. F
