Annals of R.S.C.B., ISSN: 1583-6258, Vol. 24, Issue 2, 2020, Pages.1122-1126
Received 24 October 2020; Accepted 15 December 2020

A Compressive Review on Principles of Plant Breeding and Molecular Genetics

K.R. Saravanan[1], Karthikeyan P*[2], S. Vennila[3], And R. Sureshkumar[4]

1&3 - Assistant Professor, 2-Associate Professor, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding
4 - Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture
Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Chidambaram,
*- Corresponding Author: karthikeyan06oct@gmail.com

Abstract

In any hybrid program, the opportunity to recognize the integration of two (or more) parents to increase the variability in the number of births and, consequently, to identify the culprits among the divided people is the most difficult challenge for the followers. Since mixing power was developed in 1942, it is widely accepted in wood production to compare line performance with hybrid composites. Also, the ability to predict genetic linkage is helpful for various behaviors based on molecular genetic data that will enable programmed plant growth. These articles review the current understanding of the combination of plant fertility and recent advances in research in this area. It introduces the combination of capacity and the concept of combined total and specific capacity, methods for forecasting the combined capacity, and a comparison of the attributes related to the QTL.

Keywords: Mating designs, Plant Breeding**,** molecular genetic data, variability

Introduction

Two critical factors included in most crop improvement programs are identifying the most efficient lines (for commercial address) and lines that can be used as parent lines for future crossings. The lines with the best performance for the desired performance are selected based on tests in different environments after statistical analysis. Design tests in combination with statistical analysis distinguish between genetic factors and environmental impact. When implementing such constructs, the genetic influence of a lineage can be divided into additive and non-additive components [1-6].Crossing one line with a few others provides the average performance of the line over all of its crosses. Crossbreeding or productivity is defined as the ability of the parent (s) to combine during the hybridization process so that the desired genes or traits are passed on to their offspring. In another definition, the skill mix is an estimate of the value of genotypes based on the performance of their offspring in a specific mating project.

Ideas of combined total capacity

In rare cases, it can only be assessed based on the parental phenotype and then quantified by genealogical testing. When mother plants produce strong offspring, they are said to mix well. Initially, combining combinations used to classify an inline according to its properties was a familiar concept, but this has since changed. The ideas of combined total capacity (ACG) and specific combined capacity (ACS) have significantly impacted the assessment of suction lines and population development in plant reproduction. They defined SCA as those cases where certain hybrid combinations perform better or worse than expected based on the average performance of parental intake lines. Parents who show high mating ability in crossbreeds are considered to have good GCA. Still, if their mating potential is limited to a particular combination, they should have good ACS [7-11].

Annals of R.S.C.B., ISSN: 1583-6258, Vol. 24, Issue 2, 2020, Pages.1122-1126
Received 24 October 2020; Accepted 15 December 2020

Specific power combined with a variety of dominance

Specific power combined with a variety of dominance (non-additive effects) and all three types of components of the epistemic interaction, as epistasis, is considered an indicator of loci. These include plugin and command-command interactions.It is clear from the above definitions that the ability to connect lines for key features was evaluated by examining a set of children and statistical analyzes designed with good experimental design. In addition, the parents are chosen to participate in raising and evaluating the offspring.Numerous methods have been used to assess the relative importance of GCA and SCA in plant reproduction. The first step is to check if GCA and SCA are significant at P = 0.05 or higher probability levels (0.01 or 0.001 etc.). If the GCA and SCA classifications are irrelevant, the effect of the epistatic gene can play a significant role in determining these traits (Nature Publications Source accessed) [12-16].The measure of predictability determines the type of activity factors involved in defining the trait and allows assumptions about the optimal resource allocation in hybrid cultivation:

$2\sigma^2 gca/2\ \sigma^2 gca+\sigma^2 sca$

However, because, in most cases, small parents are used for crossings, the size of the GCA and SCA is estimated using the ratio of their total squares to the total number of squares crossed.

New plant breeding techniques

Manufacturing companies were asked if they used any of the seven methods. In addition, they should indicate for which companies and characteristics the methods have been used, as well as the stage of development of any commercial products based on these methods. Studies show that two or four of the 17 new drugs studied are used internally. Entrepreneurs have managed to develop cultures using some of these methods.

Cisgenesis/intragenesis products at stages 1-3 included maize, canola (unstable traits), and potatoes (fungal resistance). With this method, since cisgenesis/intragenesis is subject to mandatory reporting in the EU and the information is stored in a public research database, we were able to supplement the research results with an analysis of the field studies conducted in the EU-26. The EU database shows potato field trials for late starch production and resistance to stasis via cisgenesis and intragenesis [17-22].According to research, agro-infiltration is used to grow potatoes, canola, and lettuce. In the case of lettuce, the aim was to test different types of resistance in the lettuce. Eventually, the use of RdDM in maize and oilseed rape was reported (up to level 3), and the development of relapses in some crops was accepted, but only in one phase of research.

The economic benefits have led to the introduction of new techniques for growing plants. Experts appreciate the time saved compared to a standard creation. Several new plant breeding techniques speed up the breeding process, and hence the expected market results can be achieved, increasing the value of R&D investments. Cisgenesis uses the same gene pool as normal reproduction but is much faster when the appropriate gene is inserted directly into the elite precursors of the genus, saving transposition time. For example, Plant Research International took 12 years to develop cisgenic apples for apple skin resistance. Conversely, it took about 50 years for conventional methods to cross the elite strain with wild-type strains (which carry the resistance gene) [23-26].

Challenges of new techniques

Annals of R.S.C.B., ISSN: 1583-6258, Vol. 24, Issue 2, 2020, Pages.1122-1126
Received 24 October 2020; Accepted 15 December 2020

Another consequence of the classification of plants as GMOs is the need to develop methods for the quantitative detection or identification of the final marketed product. This is a mandatory requirement in some regions, such as the EU5, but comes into play elsewhere due to global agricultural trade and differences in authorization requirements between trading partners.

A major factor affecting visibility and recognition is preliminary DNA sequence information for a particular product. Plants obtained using the ZFN-1, and ZFN-2 methods (targeted modification of one or more nucleotides; Table 1) cannot be determined by DNA-based methods such as PCR, but rather there are predictions that introduced the change of nucleotide sequences. However, identification is not possible because identical changes may be caused by other methods of mutagenicity or natural genetic variation. The same conclusion can be applied to the ODM method [27-35].

Conclusion

The interest of regulators and regulators in new agricultural practices is based on the assumption that the agricultural industry uses these practices and that commercialization is inevitable. However, there is no evidence that the facts support this hypothesis. Here we show that the products of various new technologies are making significant progress, indicating that the commercial sector has included them in important agricultural improvement programs. The industry is embracing new breeding methods because of potential technical and economic advantages over alternative methods. The extent to which methods are adopted and applied across a wider range of cultures depends on many factors, including the need to improve the technical efficiency of processes and decisions regarding their legal status around the world. In the coming years, many regulatory jurisdictions worldwide will make decisions to manage new crop cultivation practices that impact technology adoption.

References

[1]. Kyetere, D., Okogbenin, E., Okeno, J., Munyaradzi, J., Nangayo, F., Kouko, E&Abdourhame, I. (2019). The role and contribution of plant breeding and plant biotechnology to sustainable agriculture in Africa. *Afrika Focus, 32*(2), 83-108.
[2]. Luthra, S. K., Pandey, S. K., Singh, B. P., Kang, G. S., Singh, S. V., &Pande, P. C. (2006). Potato breeding in India. *Central Potato Research Institute, 3*, 71.
[3]. Borgen, A. (2016). Screening wheat varieties for resistance with purified virulence races of common bunt (Tilletia caries). In *Abstract of the XIX international Workshop on Smuts and bunts*.
[4]. Dossey, John A. *The mathematics report card: Are we measuring up? Trends and achievement based on the 1986 National Assessment*. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Road, Princeton, NJ 08541-0001, 1988.
[5]. Trefil, Pavel, and Steffen Weigend. "XITH EUROPEAN SYMPOSIUM ON POULTRY GENETICS."
[6]. Brousseau, Michael O. *Socio-environmental factors influencing team learning with implications for performance outcomes*. Wayne State University, 1997.
[7]. Scarascia-Mugnozza, G. T., D'amato, F., &Avanzi, S. (1993). Mutation breeding for durum wheat (Triticumturgidum ssp. durum Desf.) improvement in Italy.
[8]. Robinson, R. (2013). *Genetics for Cat Breeders: International Series in Pure and Applied Biology*. Elsevier.
[9]. Thanh, N. M. (2009). Stock improvement of giant freshwater prawn (Macrobrachiumrosenbergii) in Vietnam: Experimental evaluations of crossbreeding, the impact

of domestication on genetic diversity and candidate genes. *Unpublished Docteral thesis, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia*.

[10]. Haley, C. S. (1991). Considerations in the development of future pig breeding program-Review. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, *4*(4), 305-328.

[11]. Das, Suresh Chandra, Sudripta Das, and Mridul Hazarika. "Breeding of the tea plant (Camellia sinensis) in India." In *Global tea breeding*, pp. 69-124. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.

[12]. Ceballos, H., Iglesias, C. A., Perez, J. C., & Dixon, A. G. (2004). Cassava breeding: opportunities and challenges. *Plant molecular biology*, *56*(4), 503-516.

[13]. Kaushik, P., Plazas, M., Prohens, J., Vilanova, S., &Gramazio, P. (2018). Diallel genetic analysis for multiple traits in eggplant and assessment of genetic distances for predicting hybrids performance. *Plos One*, *13*(6), e0199943.

[14]. Carson, M. J. (1986). *Control-pollinated seed orchards of best general combiners: A new strategy for radiata pine improvement*. Rotorua: New Zealand Forest Service.

[15]. Hallauer, A. R. (2007). History, contribution, and future of quantitative genetics in plant breeding: lessons from maize. *Crop science*, *47*, S-4.

[16]. Torres, Edgar Alonso, and Isaias O. Geraldi. "Partial diallel analysis of agronomic characters in rice (Oryza sativa L.)." *Genetics and Molecular Biology* 30 (2007): 605-613.

[17]. Lusser, M., Parisi, C., Plan, D., & Rodríguez-Cerezo, E. (2011). New plant breeding techniques. *Stateof-the-art and prospects for commercial development.(= JRC Scientific and Technical Reports/EUR 24760 EN)*.

[18]. Schaart, J. G., van de Wiel, C. C., Lotz, L. A., & Smulders, M. J. (2016). Opportunities for products of new plant breeding techniques. *Trends in Plant Science*, *21*(5), 438-449.

[19]. Lusser, M., & Davies, H. V. (2013). Comparative regulatory approaches for groups of new plant breeding techniques. *New biotechnology*, *30*(5), 437-446.

[20]. Purnhagen, Kai P., Esther Kok, Gijs Kleter, Hanna Schebesta, Richard GF Visser, and Justus Wesseler. "EU court casts new plant breeding techniques into regulatory limbo." *Nature Biotechnology* 36, no. 9 (2018): 799-800.

[21]. Purnhagen, Kai P., Esther Kok, Gijs Kleter, Hanna Schebesta, Richard GF Visser, and Justus Wesseler. "The European Union Court's Advocate General's Opinion and new plant breeding techniques." *Nature Biotechnology* 36, no. 7 (2018): 573-575.

[22]. Lusser, Maria, Claudia Parisi, Damien Plan, and Emilio Rodriguez-Cerezo. "Deployment of new biotechnologies in plant breeding." *Nature biotechnology* 30, no. 3 (2012): 231-239.

[23]. Acquaah, G. (2009). *Principles of plant genetics and breeding*. John Wiley & Sons.

[24]. Collard, Bertrand CY, and David J. Mackill. "Marker-assisted selection: an approach for precision plant breeding in the twenty-first century." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 363, no. 1491 (2008): 557-572.

[25]. Weltzien, Eva, Margaret E. Smith, Laura S. Meitzner, and Louise Sperling. "Technical and institutional issues in participatory plant breeding-from the perspective of formal plant breeding: A global analysis of issues, results, and current experience." (2003).

[26]. Conner, Anthony J., Travis R. Glare, and Jan-Peter Nap. "The release of genetically modified crops into the environment: Part II. Overview of ecological risk assessment." *The Plant Journal* 33, no. 1 (2003): 19-46.

[27]. Traon, Daniel, Laurence Amat, Ferdinand Zotz, and Patrick du Jardin. *A Legal Framework for Plant Biostimulants and Agronomic Fertiliser Additives in the EU-Report to the*

Annals of R.S.C.B., ISSN: 1583-6258, Vol. 24, Issue 2, 2020, Pages.1122-1126
Received 24 October 2020; Accepted 15 December 2020

European Commission, DG Enterprise & Industry. No. Contract n° 255/PP/ENT/IMA/13/1112420. 2014.

[28]. Allam, Hesham, NajebAssi, and M. Hamdan. "An economic analysis of food safety standards and its implication on agricultural trade in the context of EU-MED partnership: the case of SPS Standards and EUREPGAP Requirements." (2005): 22-12.

[29]. Clifton-Brown, John, Antoine Harfouche, Michael D. Casler, Huw Dylan Jones, William J. Macalpine, Donal Murphy-Bokern, Lawrence B. Smart et al. "Breeding progress and preparedness for mass-scale deployment of perennial lignocellulosic biomass crops switchgrass, miscanthus, willow and poplar." *Gcb Bioenergy* 11, no. 1 (2019): 118-151.

[30]. Fulton, Murray, Hartley Furtan, Dustin Gosnell, Richard Gray, Jill Hobbs, Jeff Holzman, Bill Kerr, Jodi McNaughten, Jan Stevens, and Derek Stovin. "Transforming agriculture: the benefits and costs of Genetically Modified crops." *Canadian Biotechnology Advisory Committee Project Steering Committee on the Regulation of Genetically Modified Foods* (2001).

[31]. Shaffer, G. (2008). A structural theory of WTO dispute settlement: why institutional choice lies at the center of the GMO case. *NYUJ Int'l L. & Pol.*, *41*, 1.

[32]. Rizov, Ivelin, Gerhard Rühl, Maren Langhof, Jonas Kathage, and Emilio Rodríguez-Cerezo. *Best practice document for the coexistence of genetically modified potato with conventional and organic farming*. No. JRC109645. Joint Research Centre (Seville site), 2018.

[33]. Schmid, O., Dabbert, S., Eichert, C., Gonzálvez, V., Lampkin, N., Michelsen, J., ...&Zanoli, R. (2008). *Organic Action Plans. Development, implementation and evaluation. A resource manual for the organic food and farming sector*. Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL); CH-Frick and European Union Group of the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Brussels.

[34]. Aguirre, E. K. (2015). Sickeningly Sweet: Analysis and Solutions for the Adverse Dietary Consequences of European Agricultural Law. *J. Food L. &Pol'y*, *11*, 252.

[35]. Khan, F. (2019). *Safety of Genetically Modified Crops: Indian Policy Response* (Doctoral dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University).