

(Lycopersicon esculentum MiLL.)

3 2 1

Orient Sahelee12 : 2010 - 2009 -2008
 Cherry Saintpierr
 .(Scaling Test and Components of Generation Means)

	4x4	BC ₂	BC ₁	F ₃	F ₂
Sahelee12 x) (Sahelee12 x Cherry)		% (27.9) %	(18.39) %	(6.36) (42.87) %	(Orient

.()

(Rick,1974)

(C)

Solanaceae

	1	2	3
	-	-	()
	-	-	-
	.2012/9/24	2012/3/11	

(F₁)

, 2006)

.(Sofi

(%50) .(2005) ...
.(2007)

(% 95)
(% 100)

and Sullivan, 1987)

.(Farkas 1993 ; Miyao

.(1991)

(Monma and Kamimu ,1982)

nd ,1981)

(Daskalov Kostantinova

(F₁)

(1993)

(Kanno and Kamimura ,1985)

,1987)

(% 30-20)

(Petrescu)

(Conti ,1988)

,1990)

(Chen and Zhao

(Heterosis) Hybrid Vigor

; Tatsuya,1986)

(Hassan ,1987

(Falconer, 1960)

Wight ,1962)

(Meszoly and Farkas , 1971 ;

.(Kalloo, 1988)

Phenotypic super dominance

(Kanno and Kamimura ,1981)

/								
		:Cherry -						-1
	(1.913)							
	(9.88)							-2
:								.F ₁
:								-3
						.F ₁		F ₂
		:	-					-
		:						
		:2008	-					
(4×4)						(.2007)		
								:Sahelee12 -
F ₁		:2009	-			(g 200)		
		.F ₂				(. 6.212)		
	(BC ₂ BC ₁)				/	/	:	
	F ₂						/	
	.F ₃						/	
								:Orient -
						(110.7)		
		:2010	-					
BC ₂ BC ₁ F ₃ F ₂ F ₁ P ₂ P ₁ :								
						(. 3.58)		
(F ₁ P ₂ P ₁)								
	(F ₃ BC ₂ BC ₁)							
	(Checa ,2006)		F ₂					:Saintpierr -
	()					C (191.67)		
40	80				(. 4.231)			
							/	/

(2006)

(525)	(RAYPA)								
									-1 ^o
									-2 ^o
									-3 ^o
									-4 ^o
		:							
(CARBENDAZIM 50%)			-1						
100 -50	()								
			100/	:					-
(PROPARGITE)			-2	(50)	:				•
	/ 1.5								
(DIMETHOATE)			-3	(SART ORIUS)					
- 100		-		(³ 200)					
			100/ 150	:					•
THIOPHANATE-)			-4	:					-1
/ 100			(METHYL						
			100						
(FENPYROXIMATE)			-5					(DUR-HT)	
100 / 100				(10 -5)	:				-2
				(150)					
(AZOXYSTROBIN)			-6						
100/ 40 -10									
100/ 100 -40									
EMAMECTIN)			-7						
-175		(BENZOATE		(15)	:				-3
		/ 325						()	
								(CARBOLITE)	
				:					
			-	/				=	
SPSS- GenStat -12								100 ×	
			15	(10)	:				-4

Scaling) (Test and components of genetic means () ,1949)

(Mather)

$A = 2 B_1 - P_1 - F_1$

$B = 2 B_2 - P_2 - F_1$

$C = 4 F_2 - 2 F_1 - P_1 - P_2$

$D = 4 F_3 - 2 F_2 - P_1 - P_2$

$B_2, B_1, F_3, F_2, F_1, P_2, P_1$

(A,B,C,D)

(Hayman ,1958)

(Jinks and Jones,1958)

()

(1) %H_(mp)

(Fisher ,1970)

(2005)

H_(mp) %

(Sinha and Khanna,1975)

$H_{(MP)} = [(F_1 - MP) / MP] \times 100$

F1

MP

$MP = (P_1 + P_2) / 2$

(ID)

and Jinks ,1977)

F1

(Mather

$ID = [(F_1 - F_2) / F_1] \times 100$

F1

F2

T

$L.S.D._{0.05} = t_{0.05} \times \sqrt{\frac{3MSe}{2r}}$

$L.S.D._{0.01} = t_{0.01} \times \sqrt{\frac{3MSe}{2r}}$

T F1 F2

%1 % 5

$L.S.D._{0.05} = t_{0.05} \times \sqrt{\frac{2MSe}{r}}$

$L.S.D._{0.01} = t_{0.01} \times \sqrt{\frac{2MSe}{r}}$

Fejer, 1975 Brhane; , 1970) (:
 (Fedak and :% -
 (1999) (6.36)
 .3 (Sahelee12 x Orient)
 (1) :F₂ Orient x) (4.71) (Sahelee12 x Cherry)
 (2.62) (Saintpierr
 . F₁ F₂
 F₂ : % - :% -
 20.17) Sahelee12 x)
 (Sahelee12 x Orient) F₂ (%) (% 42.87) (Cherry
 Saintpierr x) F₂ (% 5.2) (% 12.93) (Sahelee12 x Saintpierr)
 .(Cherry (8.19) (Orient x Saintpierr)
 :% - .(6.59) (Sahelee12 x Orient)
 (% 38.76) :% -
 (Sahelee12 x Cherry) F₂
 F₂ (% 7.58) (18.39) (Sahelee12 x Cherry)
 .(Sahelee12 x Saintpierr) Orient) (10.16) (Sahelee12 x Saintpierr)
 :% - (9.67) (x Saintpierr
 .(% 3.6) (Sahelee12 x Orient)
 : -
 Sahelee12 x) F₂ (8.99) (Sahelee12 x Saintpierr) :
 Orient x) (Cherry Saintpierr) (Sahelee12 x Cherry)
 Sahelee12 x) (% 7.91) (Cherry 27.9 12.1) (x Cherry
 (6.11) (Saintpierr . % (18.9
 (2.65) (Saintpierr x Cherry) (1)
 (Sahelee12 x Orient)
 .(3.82) (Orient x Saintpierr) (3.70)
 :% -
 (11.12) (Khojah ,1993 ; Catala ,1991)
 (Sahelee12 x Cherry) F₂ :
 Orient x) F₂ (3.54) ; Chiang , 1996 ; Mason , 1996)
 .(Cherry and Deore, 1998 ; Badhe and Patil, 1997
 %H_(mp) (Salunke
 (1) Marani and Avieli, 1973)
 F₂ Betrán ,2003 ; Moutray and Frakes, 1973 ;

Singh , 1975)

Sarawat , 1994 (2)
 .(2011

(ID) %H_(mp) :(1)

		H _(MP)		I.D.		H _(MP)		I.D.	
		H _(MP)	I.D.	H _(MP)	I.D.	H _(MP)	I.D.	H _(MP)	I.D.
1	Sahelee12 x Orient	6.36**	20.17**	6.59**	8.09**	3.6**	3.70**	-3.15	7.63**
2	Sahelee12 x Saintpier	-3.63	16.49**	12.93**	7.58**	10.16**	6.11**	12.1**	8.26**
3	Sahelee12 x Cherry	4.71**	14.62**	42.87**	38.76**	18.39**	8.99**	27.9**	11.12**
4	Orient x Saintpierr	2.62**	15.04**	8.19**	7.17**	9.67**	3.82**	-0.11	9.30**
5	Orient x Cherry	0.39 ^{NS}	13.3**	-1.64	31.45**	-12.7	7.91**	-4.43	3.54**
6	Saintpierr x Cherry	-1.75	5.2**	-8.67	25.13**	0.77 ^{NS}	2.65**	18.9**	4.37**

:NS % 5 :*() % 1 :**

(Hayman , 1958) : .4

(Scaling Test and components of genetic means)

(Jinks and Jones,1958)

()

(2)

Scaling Test

(Mather , 1949)

A, B, C, D

(A ,B ,C ,D) :

P₁

F₂

F₁

P₂

B₁

F₃

للجين كافة

B₂

Scaling Test

:(2)

		A	B	C	D
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	-1.11±0.24**	-1.67±0.36**	-0.11±0.62 ^{NS}	-3.53±0.38**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	-0.74±0.20**	0.14±0.20 ^{NS}	0.07±0.38 ^{NS}	-1.09±0.20**
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	-1.00±0.23**	-1.10±0.24**	0.96±0.56 ^{NS}	-2.51±0.31**
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	-1.53±0.28**	-0.03±0.08 ^{NS}	-1.14±0.33**	-1.74±0.30**
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	-1.96±0.32**	-1.03±0.23**	-0.63±0.56 ^{NS}	-3.18±0.38**
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	-0.11±0.10 ^{NS}	-0.66±0.19**	0.11±0.32 ^{NS}	-1.04±0.21**
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	-0.23±0.13 ^{NS}	-0.23±0.14 ^{NS}	0.14±0.29 ^{NS}	-0.56±0.16**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	-0.04±0.18 ^{NS}	-0.36±0.15*	0.58±0.36 ^{NS}	-0.57±0.26*
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	0.17±0.19 ^{NS}	-0.54±0.17**	1.22±0.40**	-0.63±0.37 ^{NS}
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	-0.19±0.11 ^{NS}	-0.09±0.14 ^{NS}	1.01±0.32**	-0.53±0.28 ^{NS}
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	-0.39±0.15**	-0.63±0.19**	1.14±0.44*	-1.59±0.24**
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	-0.13±0.11 ^{NS}	-0.36±0.15*	-0.43±0.20*	-0.40±0.22 ^{NS}
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	3.21±0.48**	-1.37±0.46**	-0.75±0.57 ^{NS}	-4.52±0.46**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	-0.57±0.21**	-0.43±0.24 ^{NS}	-1.02±0.33**	-0.39±0.42 ^{NS}
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	-0.58±0.20**	0.77±0.29**	-0.27±0.32 ^{NS}	-1.25±0.29**
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	-2.81±0.39**	-0.26±0.26 ^{NS}	-2.54±0.51**	-2.22±0.60**
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	-2.65±0.39**	-0.41±0.17*	-2.34±0.48**	-1.31±0.63*
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	-0.93±0.22**	-0.64±0.19**	0.06±0.44 ^{NS}	-1.84±0.27**
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	0.01±0.04 ^{NS}	0.02±0.04 ^{NS}	0.07±0.07 ^{NS}	-0.02±0.07 ^{NS}
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	-0.02±0.03 ^{NS}	-0.02±0.03 ^{NS}	0.02±0.08 ^{NS}	0.06±0.11 ^{NS}
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	-0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	0.004±0.05 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.04 ^{NS}
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	-0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	0.004±0.03 ^{NS}	0.004±0.05 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.04 ^{NS}
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	0.004±0.04 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.03 ^{NS}
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	-0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	0.01±0.05 ^{NS}	-0.01±0.04 ^{NS}

.(× × ×)

.(×)

.(×)

B A

C

D

% 5

-
-
-
*
NS

(m) (3)

(×)

:% -

×) () :%

×) ()

(×) (×) :%

nd ,1981)

(Daskalov Kostantinova

:% -

(×)

(×)

:(3)

	m	d	h	i	j	l	
	%						
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	0.79±0.10**	-0.24±0.08**	-3.02±0.49**	-2.68±0.43**	0.57±0.18**	5.46±0.70**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	0.30±0.06**	-0.22±0.08**	-0.62±0.33 ^{NS}	-0.67±0.29*	-0.88±0.11**	1.27±0.50*
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	0.77±0.10**	0.001±0.01 ^{NS}	-3.03±0.44**	-3.06±0.39**	0.09±0.11 ^{NS}	5.16±0.56**
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	0.13±0.04**	-0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	-1.15±0.23**	-0.41±0.17*	-1.49±0.14**	1.97±0.36**
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	0.60±0.09**	0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	-2.93±0.41**	-2.37±0.35**	-0.93±0.16**	5.37±0.57**
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	0.24±0.05**	0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	-1.06±0.25**	-0.88±0.22**	0.55±0.09**	1.65±0.34**

%							
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	0.18±0.05**	0.004±0.04 ^{NS}	-0.52±0.24*	-0.60±0.21**	0.004±0.07 ^{NS}	1.05±0.34**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	0.33±0.06**	0.14±0.07*	-0.88±0.32**	-0.99±0.29**	0.32±0.09**	1.40±0.44**
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	0.52±0.08**	0.22±0.08**	-1.67±0.38**	-1.60±0.36**	0.71±0.11**	1.97±0.51**
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	0.37±0.07**	-0.07±0.05 ^{NS}	-1.35±0.30**	-1.30±0.29**	-0.10±0.07 ^{NS}	1.59±0.37**
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	0.56±0.08**	-0.01±0.03 ^{NS}	-2.13±0.37**	-2.17±0.34**	0.24±0.08**	3.19±0.45**
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	0.04±0.02 ^{NS}	0.003±0.03 ^{NS}	-0.30±0.14*	-0.06±0.11 ^{NS}	0.23±0.09**	0.54±0.24*
%							
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	0.69±0.09**	1.22±0.26**	1.04±0.67 ^{NS}	2.59±0.64**	4.58±0.33**	-4.42±1.18**
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	0.12±0.04**	-0.10±0.08 ^{NS}	-0.46±0.26 ^{NS}	0.01±0.22 ^{NS}	-0.14±0.15 ^{NS}	0.99±0.46*
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	0.21±0.05**	-0.54±0.13**	0.01±0.35 ^{NS}	0.47±0.33 ^{NS}	-1.35±0.17**	-0.67±0.61 ^{NS}
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	0.29±0.06**	-0.24±0.09*	-2.01±0.38**	-0.52±0.30 ^{NS}	-2.55±0.22**	3.58±0.63**
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	0.25±0.06**	0.05±0.06 ^{NS}	-2.15±0.33**	-0.72±0.25**	-2.24±0.21**	3.77±0.53**
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	0.42±0.07**	-0.02±0.02 ^{NS}	-1.85±0.34**	-1.64±0.29**	-0.29±0.12*	3.22±0.45**
%							
1	<i>Sahelee12 x Orient</i>	0.08±0.02**	-0.01±0.02 ^{NS}	0.89±0.08**	-	-	-
2	<i>Sahelee12 x Saintpierr</i>	0.66±0.01**	-0.01±0.01 ^{NS}	-0.69±0.06**	-	-	-
3	<i>Sahelee12 x Cherry</i>	0.47±0.01**	0.01±0.01 ^{NS}	-0.06±0.04 ^{NS}	-	-	-
4	<i>Orient x Saintpierr</i>	0.31±0.01**	0.01±0.01 ^{NS}	0.23±0.04**	-	-	-
5	<i>Orient x Cherry</i>	0.50±0.01	0.02±0.01*	-0.34±0.04 ^{NS}	-	-	-
6	<i>Saintpierr x Cherry</i>	0.62±0.01**	0.01±0.01*	-0.43±0.04**	-	-	-

.%5 : * : h : d : m
 .(×) : l (×) : j (×) : i

(Saintpierr x Cherry) :

.% : -1

-4 Sahelee12 x) (Sahelee12 x Orient)
 (Orient x Saintpierr) (Cherry)

.%

and Mc Neil, 1995) Sahelee12 x) : -2

(Moot (Sahelee12 x Saintpierr) (Orient
 Orient x) (Sahelee12 x Cherry)

-5 % (Saintpierr

.%

%H (mp) -6 Sahelee12 x) : -3
 (Sahelee12 x Cherry) (Saintpierr

- Catala, M.S.; Costa, J.J. and Suez, F. 1991. Evaluation of quality and yield in experimental hybrids of tomato. Madrid, Spain, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas. 101-106 p.
- Checa, O.; Ceballos, H. and Blair, M.W. 2006. Generation mean analysis of *climbing ability in common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.)*. *Journal of Heredity*. 97(5): 456-465.
- Chen, Q.S. and Zhao, Y.W., 1990. Study on genetical effects on four characteristics of tomato. *Journal of Jiangsu Agricultural College*, 11(4):33-38.
- Chiang, M. S.; Chen, C. Y.; Chen, M. S.; Chen, C. Y. and Chen, C. 1996. Study on the ideal cross combination of sorghum in Taiwan. *Memoirs of the College of Agriculture, National Taiwan University*. 36: 4, 289-303.
- Conti, S.; Sanguineti, M.C.; Toni, B. and Azzoni, A., (1988). Inheritance of quality traits in processing tomato (*L. esculentum* Mill.). *Euphytica*, 37:121-127.
- Daskalov, Hr. And Kostantinova, M., 1981. The inheritance of some quantitative characters determining tomato fruit quality in view of developing high quality lines and cultivars. In: *Genetics and Breeding of tomato proceeding of the Meeting of the Eucarpia Tomato Working Group*. Avignon-France, May, 18-21. 121-128.p.
- Falconer, D. S., 1960. *Introduction to quantitative genetics*. Printed in Great Britain for Olivier and Boyd, by Robert Mac Lehos and Comp. Lim Glasgow, (1972). P 281-286.
- Farkas j .1993: *Aparadicsom heterozis nemesitesenek alatalis problemai .Zoldsegtermesztesi Kutafo` Intezet* 25.51-55.
- Fedak, G. and Fejer, S.O. 1975. Yield advantage in F1 hybrids between spring and winter barley. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 55:547-553.
- Fisher, R.A. 1970. *Statistical methods for research workers*. 14th ed. Oliver and Boyd, London, UK.
- Hassan, A.A.; Abdel-Fattah, M.A. and Ali, K.E., 1987. Inheritance of total soluble solids and ascorbic acid content in tomato. Egypt. *J. Hort.*, 14(2):155-160.
- Hayman, B.I. 1958. The separation of epistasis from additive and dominance variation in generation means. *Heredity*. 12: 371-390.
- Jinks, J.L. and Jones, R.M. 1958. Estimation of the components of heterosis. *Genetics*. 43: 223-234.
- Kaloo, G., 1988. *Distant hybridization in vegetable crops*. Vegetable Breeding CRC Press, Inc. Fla. USA. , 1:137-170.
- Kanno, T. and Kamimura, S., 1985. Fruit firmness, structural factors and quality in tomato cultivars. *Bulletin of the Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Research Station*, Ser. B. 5:27-41.p.
- Kanno, T. and Kamimura, S., 1981. Fruit structure, firmness and quality, and relation between these factors in varieties and F1 hybrids of tomatoes. In: *Genetics and Breeding of tomato proceeding of the Meeting of the Eucarpia Tomato Working Group*. Avignon-France, May, 18-21, 99-119.p.
- Khojah, J.H. 1993. *Development of fresh market field tomato hybrid*. Ph. D. Thesis. Horticulture Breeding Research Institute, Kecskemét, Hongaria. P.122.
- Marani, A. and Avieli, E. 1973. Heterosis during the early phases of growth in intraspecific and interspecific of cotton. *Crop Sci.* 13:15-18.
- Mason, S. C.; Lasa, J. M.; Lasschuit, J. D.; CrozMason, N. E. and Garcia, A. 1996. Combining ability effects for sorghum emergence potential in crusted soils, coleoptile diameter and length, and kernel weight. *Madica*. 41:4, 295-299.
- Mather, K. 1949. *Biometrical genetics: the study of continuous variation*. *Dove publication Inc*. P: 350.
- Mather, K. and Jinks, J.L. 1977. *Introduction to biometrical genetics*. *Chapman and Hall Ltd*. London. P: 231.
- Meszoly, Gy. And Farkas, J., 1971. TMV resistance of some other species hybrid strains. *Report of the Tomato Genetics Cooperative*. 21-24. p.

- Miyao, G., Sullivan, J.D. 1987: Processing tomato Varieties in California over a hundred grown in state and continuing to change. *Calif. Tomato Grow* 8:4-5.
- Monma, S. and Kamimura, S., 1982. Inheritance of soluble solids and acidity, and relationships between soluble solids and growth habit in tomatoes for processing. *Bulletin of the Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Research Station. Ser.B. No.4*.15-26. p.
- Moot, D.J. and Mc Neil, D.L., 1995. Yield components, harvest index and Plant type in relation to yield difference in field pea genotypes. *Euphytica*, 86:31-40.
- Mountray, J.B.JR. And Frakes, R.V. 1973. Effects of genetic diversity on heterosis in tall fescue. *Crop Sci.* 13:1-4.
- Petrescu, C.; Rizescu, S.; Chirila, R. and Tatu, C., (1987). Biochemical characteristics of the fruits of some F1 tomato hybrids and of their parents. *Lucrary Scientifice. Inst. Agron. N. Balcescu. Bucuresti. Ser. 10*:89-100.p.
- Rick, C.M. 1974. The tomato. In King, R. C. (eds). *Handbook of genetics*, New York. 247-280.
- Salunke, C. B. and Deore, G. N. 1998. Heterosis and heterobeltiosis studies for grain yield and its components in rabi sorghum. *Annals of Plant Physiology.* 12: 1, 6-10.
- Sarawat, P.; Stoddard, F.L.; Marshall, D.R. and Somali. 1994. Heterosis for yield and related characters in pea. *Euphytica.* 80(4): 39-48.
- Singh, S.K. and Khanna, R. 1975. Physiological, biochemical and genetic bases of heterosis. *Adv. Agron.* 27: 123-174.
- Sinha, S. K. and Khanna, R. 1975. Physiological, biochemical and genetic basis of heterosis. *Adv. Agron.* 27: 123-174.
- Sofi, P.; Rather, A.G. and Venkatesh, S. 2006. Detection of epistasis by generation means analysis in maize hybrids. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences.* 9 (10): 1983-1986.
- Tatsuya, M.; Kamimura, S. and Ito, K., 1986. Inheritance of fruit firmness and tetratable acidity, and their relationships to fruit shape in processing tomato. *Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Research Station, Iwate, Series B, (6)*:1929.
- Wight, J.R.; Linglil, J.C.; Flocker, W.J. and Leonard, S.J., 1962. The effect of irrigation and nitrogen fertilization treatments on the yield, maturation and quality of canning tomatoes. *Proc. Amer.Soc. Hort.Sci*, 81:541-557.

Studying Some Genetic Indicators to Improve Fruits Quality in Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentom* MiLL.).

Ghailha Hasan¹, Mohammad Yahia Moualla², and Hassan Khojah³

ABSTRACT

This research was carried out at the Center of Agricultural Research in AL Qunaytirah, General Commission for Agricultural Scientific Research, during three seasons 2008, 2009 and 2010. Hybridization was performed under protected cultivation as half- diallel crossing using four varieties of tomatoes used as parents (Sahalee12, Orient, Saintpierr and Cherry). The evaluation was based on the Scaling Test to analyze the components of generation means using a randomized complete block design in four replications. The objective was to determine the effect of behavioral genetics, heterosis in first filial F₁ and inbreeding depression in F₂ of some fruits quality parameters (soluble solids content%, fibres %, total solids contents %, and percentage of cinders) in green house tomatoes. Hybridization was conducted by half-diallel crossing scheme 4x4; to obtain F₁ for all crosses, and then F₂, F₃, BC₁ and BC₂ generations. The results showed significant differences between the clans of each hybrid in the four studied parameters. The hybrid (Sahalee12 × Orient) gave the significantly highest values of heterosis in sold material percentage (% 6.36), and hybrid (Sahalee12 × Cherry) showed the highest values of heterosis in fibre percentage(% 42.87) and dry material percentage (%18.39) and in cinders percentage (% 27.9). The study demonstrated a significant inbreeding deterioration in the second generation, compatible with the direction of their hybrids vigor in most crosses for all studied traits. The proportion of regression ranged from simple, to medium and strong. Reaction genotype analysis of generation means revealed that the additive, dominance and epistasis genetic effects have contributed to the inheritance of some fruits quality values in most of the studied crosses.

Keywords: Tomatoes, Half-diallel Crosses, Inbreeding, Heterosis, Epistasis.

¹ Ph D student Department of Horticulture, Faculty of Agriculture, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

² Professor, Department of Crop, Faculty of Agriculture, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture-Faculty of Agriculture, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

Received on 11/3/2012 and Accepted for Publication on 24/9/2012.