

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

**EFFECTIVENESS OF CLASSES OF TESTERS FOR
EVALUATION OF LINES AS POTENTIAL
PARENTS FOR GRAIN SORGHUM
[*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench] HYBRIDS**

by

JEUTONG FABIEN

A DISSERTATION

**Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

Major: Agronomy

Under the Supervision of Professor David Andrews

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 1996

UMI Number: 9700091

UMI Microform 9700091
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

DISSERTATION TITLE

Effectiveness of Classes of Testers for Evaluation of Lines as Potential

Parents for Grain Sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench] Hybrids

BY

Jeutong Fabien

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

David J. Andrews

Signature

7. 31. 96.

David J. Andrews

Typed Name

Blaine E. Johnson

Signature

31 July 96

Blaine E. Johnson

Typed Name

Jeffrey F. Pedersen

Signature

31 July 96

Jeffrey F. Pedersen

Typed Name

Kent M. Eskridge

Kent M. Eskridge

Typed Name

July 31, 1996

Signature

Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name



GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

EFFECTIVENESS OF CLASSES OF TESTERS FOR EVALUATION OF
LINES AS POTENTIAL PARENTS FOR GRAIN SORGHUM
[*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench] HYBRIDS

Jeutong Fabien, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1996

Advisor: David Andrews

The choice of appropriate testers, which are still not well defined in sorghum, for initial evaluation of sorghum lines as potential parents for hybrids determine the success of hybrid breeding programs. In two experiments over 2 to 3 locations in 2 to 3 years, effectiveness of inbreds, F1's or double cross was compared, and a population (KP9B) as testers in determining general combining abilities (GCA) of new inbred lines as parents for sorghum grain hybrids in the Milo-Kafir cytoplasmic male sterility system. Effectiveness was based on higher GCA's of testers, consistency in classifying lines across environments, simplicity in use, and higher dispersion ability in testcrosses.

Trials in experiments one and two included testcross hybrids involving a maximum of twelve male sterilized restorers and sixteen male sterilized maintainers used as testers to evaluate fourteen heterotic maintainer and fifteen restorer lines respectively and the corresponding inbred parental lines. Experiment one was conducted at Mead, Nebraska, and Hesston Kansas, in 1993-1994 and experiment two at Mead, 1992-1994.

Regardless of tester types, GCA's were more important than specific combining abilities. GCA's of some high yielding inbreds were greater than or equal to GCA's of related F1 testers. The latter were greater than or equal to GCA's of F1's related to low yielding inbred testers and were in general greater than or equal to GCA of low yielding testers of any kind.

Rank correlations for similarity of testers in classifying lines within environments or between testcross yields and yields of parental lines, and for consistency of any tester in ranking lines across environments were low. However consistency in identifying the majority of the best 45% lines across environments was slightly in favor of the F1 and low yielding inbred testers. Few high yielding inbred testers tended to discriminate among lines more effectively than other testers.

When considering all attributes, no single tester was effective. These results suggest that one more dispersive inbred and one more consistent and less biased F1 tester used simultaneously may effectively identify new B and R hybrid parental lines with good combining abilities before extensive hybrid testing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TO:

- **My advisor, Prof. David J. Andrews, for his guidance throughout the course of my study and this research,**
- **My reading committee members, Drs. Blaine E. Johnson and Jeffrey F. Pedersen, for their valuable contributions,**
- **My committee member, Dr. Kent M. Eskridge, for his suggestions and support without which it would have been difficult to complete this research,**
- **Dr. Paula Bramel-Cox for providing all assistance and supervision needed in carrying out the trials in Kansas and for her suggestions for data analysis,**
- **Dr. Stephen Kachman for his contributions to statistical analysis.**
- **Drs. John Rajewski and Daryl Travnicek, Alan Heng, Michael Martinson, and Patsy Lang for their willingness in providing technical assistance,**
- **The Departments of Agronomy and Biometry for providing the facilities necessary for the completion of this study,**
- **The USAID Mission to the Cameroon, for founding support**
- **My family for encouragement and patience during my absence,**
- **And finally to my late grand-parents, and my parents to whom this work is dedicated, kindly accept my profound appreciation and gratitude.**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Appendix Tables	viii
Introduction	1
Literature review	5
Heterosis in Sorghum.....	5
Sterility Systems and Hybrid Seed Production.....	10
Genetic Male Sterility Systems	10
Cytoplasmic Genetic Male Sterility Systems.....	11
Methods of Line Evaluation for Hybrid Seed Production	15
Line <i>per se</i> Versus Testcross Evaluation	15
Combining Ability	19
Tester Choice.....	22
Materials and methods	28
Sorghum Materials and Mating Designs	28
Field Experimental Procedures for Germplasm Evaluation.....	33
Statistical Procedure	37
Models	37
Estimation of the General and Specific Combining Abilities.....	44
Similarity, Consistency and Differences in Discriminatory Power of the Testers	46
Results and discussion	49
Analysis of Variance and Tester Mean Comparisons.....	49
Analysis of Variance.....	49
Tester Testcross Mean Comparisons	60
Combining Ability	68
Similarity, Consistency and Discriminatory Power of the Testers	79
Similarity of the Testers.....	80
Consistency of the Testers	87

	iii
Discriminatory Power of the Testers	93
Conclusions	100
References	104
Appendices	115

PREVIEW

List of Tables

Table 1.	List of testers (female) and lines (males) with parentage (in parentheses), and the associated codes of sorghum parental materials in experiment one.....	29
Table 2.	List of testers (female) and lines (males) with parentage (in parentheses), and the associated codes of sorghum parental materials in experiment two.....	29
Table 3.	Number of lines, testers and testcross hybrids by tester types included in experiments one and two conducted at Mead and Hesston in 1992, 1993 and 1994.....	32
Table 4.	Designs for hybrid and inbred line trials of experiments one and two conducted at Mead and Hesston in 1992, 1993 and 1994.	35
Table 5.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and inbred parental line trials in experiment one at Mead, 1993.....	50
Table 6.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and inbred parental line trials in experiment one at Hesston, 1993.	51
Table 7.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and inbred parental line trials in experiment one at Mead, 1994.....	52
Table 8.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and inbred parental line trials in experiment one at Hesston, 1994.	53
Table 9.	Combined analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) of hybrid trial in experiment one conducted at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	54

Table 10.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and parental line trials in experiment two at Mead, 1992.....	56
Table 11.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and parental line trials in experiment two at Mead, 1993.....	57
Table 12.	Analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) for hybrid and parental line trials in experiment two at Mead, 1994.....	58
Table 13.	Combined analysis of variance (F test) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), average plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) of hybrid trial in experiment two conducted at Mead, 1993-1994.....	59
Table 14.	Rainfall data in millimeters recorded at Mead 1992-1994 and Hesston 1993-1994 from the months of June to November.....	59
Table 15.	Estimated average grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	61
Table 16.	Estimated average grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	65
Table 17.	Estimates of general combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining ability of tester*line, and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	69
Table 18.	Estimated difference in general combining abilities (Diff) and standard error of the difference between inbred testers and their related F1 testers, the average of the related F1 testers, and KP9B tester for grain yield (GYD), the number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and the number of heads per square meter (HNB) from experiment one.	72

Table 19.	Estimates of general combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining ability of tester*line, and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.....	74
Table 20.	Estimated difference in general combining abilities (Diff) and standard error of the difference between inbred testers and their related F1 testers, the average of the related F1 testers, and KP9B tester for grain yield (GYD), the number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and the number of heads per square meter (HNB) from experiment two.	76
Table 21.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarities of testers in ranking the lines for grain yield, the number of days to midbloom (in upper right and left triangles), and for the number of heads per square meter and plant height (in lower right and left triangles) in the combined analysis from experiment one.	81
Table 22.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarities of inbred testers and related and unrelated broader genetic base testers in ranking the lines for grain yield (GYD), the number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) and the number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment one.	82
Table 23.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarities of inbred testers and related and unrelated broader genetic base testers in ranking the lines for grain yield, the number of days to midbloom (in upper right and left triangles), and for the number of heads per square meter and plant height (in lower right and left triangles) from the combined analysis in experiment two.....	84
Table 24.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarities of inbred testers and related and unrelated broader genetic base testers in ranking the lines for grain yield (GYD), the number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) and the number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment two.	85
Table 25.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for consistency of testers in ranking the lines for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) across environments in experiment one.	88

Table 26.	Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for consistency of testers in ranking the lines for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) across environments in experiment two.	89
Table 27.	Number of potential high yielding lines identified by each tester across environments from the top 45% selections based on estimates of general combining ability of the lines from the combined analysis of experiments one and two.	92
Table 28.	Within tester testcross variance (DP) and standardized differences in DP's between the inbred testers (top row) and the testers (first column) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment one.	94
Table 29.	Within tester testcross variance (DP) and standardized differences in DP's between the inbred testers (top row) and the testers (first column) for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment two.	95

List of Appendix Tables

Table A1.	Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Mead, 1993.....	115
Table A2.	Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Hesston, 1993.....	115
Table A3.	Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Mead, 1994.....	116
Table A4.	Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Hesston, 1994.....	116
Table A5.	Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	117
Table A6.	Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one at Mead, 1993.....	118
Table A7.	Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one at Hesston, 1993.....	119
Table A8.	Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one at Mead, 1994.....	119
Table A9.	Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one at Hesston, 1994.....	120
Table A10.	Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeter of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment one, Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	121
Table A11.	Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeter of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Mead, 1993.....	122
Table A12.	Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Hesston, 1993.....	122

Table A13. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Mead, 1994.	123
Table A14. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, Hesston, 1994.....	123
Table A15. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment one, at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.....	124
Table A16. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, at Mead, 1993.	125
Table A17. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, at Mead, 1993.	125
Table A18. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, at Hesston, 1994.....	126
Table A19. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment one, at Hesston, 1994.....	126
Table A20. Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two, Mead, 1992.....	127
Table A21. Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two, Mead, 1993.....	128
Table A22. Estimated grain yields and standard errors in Mg ha ⁻¹ of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two, Mead, 1994.....	129
Table A23. Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	130
Table A24. Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	131
Table A25. Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	132

Table A26. Estimated number of days to midbloom and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	133
Table A27. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	134
Table A28. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	135
Table A29. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	136
Table A30. Estimated plant height and standard errors in centimeters of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	137
Table A31. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	138
Table A32. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	139
Table A33. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	140
Table A34. Estimated number of heads per square meter and standard errors of testcross hybrids (tester*line) in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	141
Table A35. Estimated grain yield (GYD) in Mg ha ⁻¹ , number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) in centimeters, number of heads per square meter (HNB), and standard errors of inbred parental lines in experiment one conducted at Mead and Hesston, 1993, and Hesston, 1994.	142
Table A36. Estimated grain yield (GYD) in Mg ha ⁻¹ , number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) in centimeters, number of heads per square meter (HNB), and standard errors of parental lines in experiment two conducted at Mead, 1992.	144

Table A37. Estimated grain yield (GYD) in Mg ha ⁻¹ , number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) in centimeters, number of heads per square meter (HNB), and standard errors of parental lines in experiment two conducted at Mead, 1993.	145
Table A38. Estimated grain yield (GYD) in Mg ha ⁻¹ , number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT) in centimeters, number of heads per square meter (HNB), and standard errors of parental lines in experiment two conducted at Mead, 1994.	146
Table A39. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line, and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ in experiment one, Mead, 1993.	147
Table A40. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ in experiment one, Hesston, 1993.	147
Table A41. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ in experiment one, Mead, 1994.	148
Table A42. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha ⁻¹ in experiment one, Hesston, 1994.	149
Table A43. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.	150
Table A44. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment one at Mead, 1993.	151
Table A45. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment one at Hesston, 1993.	152
Table A46. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment one at Mead, 1994.	153

Table A47. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment one at Hesston, 1994.	154
Table A48. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.	155
Table A49. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment one at Mead, 1993.	156
Table A50. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment one at Hesston, 1993.	157
Table A51. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment one at Mead, 1994.	158
Table A52. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment one at Hesston, 1994.	159
Table A53. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), and standard errors for the number heads per square meter from the combined analysis of experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.	160
Table A54. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining ability of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number heads per square meter in experiment one at Mead, 1993.	161
Table A55. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining ability of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number heads per square meter in experiment one at Hesston, 1993.....	162
Table A56. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining ability of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number heads per square meter in experiment one at Mead, 1994.	163

Table A57. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of heads per square meter in experiment one at Hesston, 1994.	164
Table A58. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific grain yield in Mg ha-1 in experiment two, Mead, 1992.	165
Table A59. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha-1 in experiment two, Mead, 1993.	166
Table A60. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for grain yield in Mg ha-1 in experiment two, Mead, 1994.	167
Table A61. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	168
Table A62. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	169
Table A63. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL). specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	170
Table A64. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of days to midbloom in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	171
Table A65. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	172
Table A66. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	173

Table A67. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	174
Table 68. Estimated general combining abilities of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for plant height in centimeters in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	175
Table A69. General combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), and standard errors for the number of heads per square meter from the combined analysis of experiment two at Mead, 1993-1994.	176
Table A70. General combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of heads per square meter in experiment two at Mead, 1992.	177
Table A71. General combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of heads per square meter in experiment two at Mead, 1993.	178
Table A72. General combining ability of testers (GCAT) and lines (GCAL), specific combining abilities of tester*line (SCA), and standard errors for the number of heads per square meter in experiment two at Mead, 1994.	179
Table A73. Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarity; of testcrosses and male parental lines <u>per se</u> for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment one at Mead and Hesston 1993 (M93, H93), and Mead and Hesston 1994 (M94, H94).	180
Table A74. Rank correlations ($r \times 10^2$) for similarity; of testcrosses and male parental lines <u>per se</u> for grain yield (GYD), number of days to midbloom (BLM), plant height (PHT), and number of heads per square meter (HNB) in experiment two at Mead, 1992, 1993, 1994 (M92, M93, M94).	180
Table A75. Ranking (descending order) of the lines based on general combining ability of the lines, and ranking of the lines by tester (in testcrosses) in experiment one at Mead and Hesston, 1993-1994.	181
Table A76. Ranking (descending order) of the lines based on general combining ability of the lines, and ranking of the lines by tester (in testcrosses) in experiment two at Mead, 1992-1994.	183

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of cytoplasmic male sterility in sorghum by Stephens and Holland (1954) led to large scale exploitation of heterosis in sorghum through use of hybrids. The authors found that cytoplasmic male sterility was a trait resulting from the interaction between the female *mi* cytoplasm and the male nuclear *kafir* genome. Since the discovery, experimental and commercial sorghum hybrids have been easily made by crossing sterile versions, *A*-lines, of male fertile lines, *B*-lines, in the *mi* cytoplasm with pollinator lines, *R*-lines known to restore male fertility of the resulting F_1 hybrid progenies.

Although this sterility system ease in making hybrids, evaluation of large number of experimental lines is not practical due to large amounts of resources needed for sterilizing and testing new lines, and the usual and limited resources of most breeding programs. Methods developed by maize breeders or geneticists to alleviate this problem will be reviewed later with some details. Basically, the methods consist of using testers to identify potentially superior lines prior to extensive testing in hybrid combinations. The choice of appropriate testers, whether narrow or broad genetic base types used in the early or late stage of line development process, relies in the concept that the identification of good combining lines best come from testing in combination using testers from a contrasting or heterotic group. Such heterotic groups were previously determined empirically. This methodology is also consistent with the theory of reciprocal recurrent selection where gain from

selection is increased by using progeny resulting from crosses made between two populations. This approach in reducing the number of new lines to only those showing good potential as parents for hybrids has readily been adopted by sorghum breeders.

A summary of alternate male sterile cytoplasms found in sorghum was given by Shertz (1983). The sorghum heterotic groups used for line evaluation were rather established by classifying lines to groups based on their similarities in their sterility/fertility relationships with the milo cytoplasm (A_1), as well as four other major sterile cytoplasms designated A_2 , A_3 , A_4 and 9E by Shertz and Richey (1978), Quinby (1980) and Shertz (1983), Worstell *et al.* (1984), and Webster (1980).

A survey of sorghum germplasm base in the USA by Harvey (1977) revealed that 97.1% of the total sorghum production used the cytoplasmic male sterility system (CMS) of milo-kafir origin. The other CMS were used for breeding purposes.

Evaluations of the A_1 CMS R-lines in testcrosses have been conducted easily by making direct crosses with A_1 CMS tester seed parents. The screening of the A_1 CMS B-lines has been more difficult due to the sterilization requirement prior to making crosses with R-lines. Lee *et al.* (1992) suggested a relatively simple method to overcome this problem by evaluating the A_1 CMS B-lines (pollinators) with A_3 CMS seed parent versions of the A_1 CMS R-lines used as testers. Grain yields of the resulting hybrids were equivalent to that of the reciprocal hybrids made in alternate cytoplasms. However the technique requires additional rows of male

fertile plants as the experimental hybrids being evaluated are male sterile. This result suggested that both A_1 and A_3 CMS can be used simultaneously as breeding tools for making CMS testers to evaluate A_1 CMS *R*-lines and *B*-lines respectively on equal basis, in conformity with the concept of testing with representatives of appropriate heterotic groups.

Chungu (1993) using three female testers, an inbred tester, an F_1 tester both sterilized versions of A_1 CMS restorers in A_3 CMS, and sterile plants from the KP9B ms, did not arrive at a clear conclusion about which tester or tester type best identified the potentially superior *B*-lines. The tester abilities to separate the lines were also confounded with the tester types.

The present study, using the previous relevant strategies in choosing appropriate testers, re-examines the effectiveness of testers and tester types by comparing inbred, their related or unrelated F_1 's and the KP9B population testers in their abilities to properly and efficiently identify potential A_1 CMS heterotic *B*-lines and *R*-lines as parents for grain sorghum hybrids.

The main features considered for effective testers were:

- Larger general combining ability (GCA) versus specific combining ability (SCA) with the lines as defined by Sprague and Tatum (1942). Viewed as the main effect of a tester resulting from its additive gene actions, one may expect that the higher the GCA compared to SCA, the better the tester predictive value in determining potential good lines.