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## ABSTRACT

Study of GCA, CSA and genetic hybrids of wheat grain quality traits (Triticum aestivum L.), Adana, Goz, 2 July, Site Mall, Research 22, Rashid, Milano, Sham 6, Aba 99. and Abu Ghraib. Half hybridization to obtain (45) hybrids. These hybrids were grown with my knowledge using the RCBD design for the first generation 2018 and 2019 and the second generation 2019 and are suitable for the characteristics (good plant yield and protein content). The method and method of camels and fathers against groups of camels and fathers plus camels was significant at the (1\%) level for recovery, while the method of sweeping on camels was not significant for the characteristic that enables it to work. The 2019 generation for the protein percentage and the first generation 2019 for the average total protein percentage in the other generations for the protein percentage and that the ratio of components between the estimators was less than intelligent for the plant productivity characteristic and for all generations, the first generation 2018 for the protein percentage and the next generation 2019 the first alternative 2019 for the protein percentage and the first generation 2019 for the protein percentage. The first 2018 for the protein percentage and the first generation 2019 The next 2019 The first alternative 2019 for the protein percentage and the first generation 2019 This is important for additional and non-additional effects. 4 and 7 are superior. Hybrids (1x8), (6x9) have their own general ability to achieve maximum accuracy.
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## Introduction

Bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) is one of the most important strategic crops and the most cultivated in terms of area. The importance of this crop is due to the fact that it has a high nutritional content for humans, which is used in the production of the best types of bread and pastries. It contains 7-17 proteins, the percentage of protein more than 12 and 2-3 and some other mineral elements. The protein content of wheat grains is of great importance for the flour characteristics, as it contains wet gluten between $30-35 \%$, which contains protein substances consisting of Gliadin and Glutinin, and the importance of elasticity and size of bread and pastries ( Amiri and et al, 2018). Breeding programs synchronized with increased grain yield. The introduction of genotypes in a group of reciprocal crosses is one of the important methods that plant breeders consider in extra to it is one of the approved methods to reach the nature of the genetic action and the general and private general capabilities, which in turn give a set of conclusions to know which of the breeding methods are suitable for the circulation of these clans in subsequent generations (AL Zubaidi, and, et al, 2023), and in that, obtaining new general, it is possible to take advantage of the phenomenon of hybrid strength and the two general and private general capabilities of parents and hybrids resulting from the specific characteristics under study. In a study of the protein ratio, (Arash, et al,2021) found that the grain yield trait is under the influence of the additional genetic action. (Javed and et al,2015) concluded in their study of the components of the outcome that the additional genetic action was more influential to the yield trait. (Abd ElMohsen, et al,2015) also found that the two capacities are The two federations were not significant in protein percentage, as (Assoc,2013) explained that the characteristics of grain yield and the ratios of protein and protein fall under the influence of additional genetic action.( Graziano,2019) indicated that the ratios of protein and gluten were high and
significant in the first generation, and high for gluten in the first and second generations. A study of two generations of bread wheat, so( Nie et al,2019) explained in their study of reciprocal crosses of fine wheat that the mean squares of the two federal values of general and special were not significant in protein percentage and that their percentage was less than the correct one. The study also aims to evaluate the performance of ten genotypes of wheat ( Li, et al.2013) Bread and its semireciprocal hybrids in order to assess the effects of the general and specific capacity, the strength of the hybrid for the individual plant yield, and some qualitative characteristics to determine the best breeding methods and improve the bread wheat population.

## Materials and Methods

Half cross crosses of ten genotypes of bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) for the 2016-2019 seasons in eastern Diyala province, which were obtained from the Research Center in season 2016, were planted with ten genotypes (parents). Single hybrids were planted according to the second Griffing method (1956), where parents were planted with crossbreeds in mid-November 2017 using an RCBD design with three replications. Each duplicate contained 55 lines of 2 m length and the distance between one line and another is 60 cm . Each line has 20 with a distance between and another 10 cm , after choosing them randomly. Superphosphate fertilizer was added at a rate of 320 kg . ha-(P2O5), and urea fertilizer (\% N46) was added at the branching stage, and in the second season 2017_2018, the parents and the first generation hybrids were planted to obtain the second generation in midNovember using the RCBD design with three and the distances the same as what was mentioned in the first generation, and all agricultural operations were performed as in the previous season, and the amounts of fertilizers were added as mentioned in the first season. For both generations, all the data were recorded, and in the 2018-2019 season all the parents and their hybrids were planted for the first
generation 2018 and 2019 and the second generation 2019 to estimate (individual plant yield and protein percentage). All data were analyzed for the first generation 2018 and 2019 and the second generation 2019 and the synthesis, then part The mean of its squares to the general and private federal estimates using the second Griffing method of the random model, Griffing, (1956). Here, the effect of the variations of the general and private general estimates for all generations is estimated by in addition to the combination analysis, the strength of the two hybrids was estimated on the basis of the deviation of the first generation from the average parents and the best of them for all generations. The arithmetic averages were compared at (1\%) and (5\%) probability levels.

## Results

Single plant
It is evident from the table of analysis of variance for the characteristic of plant yield Vegetation, Table 1, that there are statistically significant differences in this characteristic for all generations, and the combination analysis, parents, and hybrids, while the parents against hybrids did not show significant differences in all generations and the meta-analysis, and from the same table it was found that the variance The general and special general capabilities were significant at the probability level (1\%) for all generations except for the first generation 2019 of the general ability was significant at the probability level (5\%), and that the ratio between the values of the two variance components was less than the correct one for all generations. The significance of both the variance of the general and private general ability indicates that the additional and nonrestrictive effects of the genes that control the quality of the individual plant yield, and that its percentage value is less than the correct one. This means that the sovereign variance is the most controlling of his inheriting this trait.

Table 2 for the first generation 2018 shows the performance of the effect of the two abilities, and from the average of the parents it
was noted that the Father 4 was significantly superior to the other parents for this trait, which reached $61,06 \mathrm{~g}$. Vegetation, while the lowest for this trait was the parent 7, which was 31,12 g. The superiority of Father 1 was observed significantly at the level of probability ( $1 \%$ ) and in the desired direction at the level of probability ( $1 \%$ ) and positive in significance in the desired direction at the level of probability (5\%) for parent 9 , whose values were 3.109 g . And the difference values of the effect of their special general ability were 6070.075 and 384.324 respectively, and this indicates that parent 1 transferred the effect of his genes to part of his crosses without the other, while parent 9 transferred the effect of his genes to most hybrids on a regular basis. From the same table for the first generation 2019 of the average parents, we find that the Father 4 outperformed the other parents of this trait by $59,73 \mathrm{~g}$. Vegetable, while the lowest average of 7 for this trait was $37,787 \mathrm{~g}$. As for the effect of the general ability of this generation on it, it is noticed that there are significant differences at the level of probability (5\%) for Father 4 and in the desired direction, and that the highest parents in the effect of their general ability were for parents 4 and 9 , which amounted to 2.73 and 2,133 respectively, and the difference values of the effect of their special general ability amounted to 537,238 And 307.067, respectively, and their values are the median of the variations of the effect of the special federal ability of the parents, which means that they distribute the genes that control the trait for most of their hybrids, but in the meta-analysis and from the average of the parents, the parent 4 was significantly superior to the other parents, it reached 60.396 g . 7 It reached $34,453 \mathrm{gm}$. Vegetation, the effect of the general ability was significant in the desired direction at a probability level (5\%) for Lap 9, and this confirms the possession of parent 9 in the first generation assessment for the year 2018 and 4 and 9 in the first generation assessment for the year 2019, a latent ability in increase the grain yield of the plant when they enter the crosses,
and that Father 9 was stable in possessing this ability as he excelled in the two seasons and aggregation, which is recommended to be included in breeding and crossbreeding programs to increase and improve this trait in misc for the wheat These results were similar to his findings Zörb, et al,(2017) also had the same results were with Friedli,(2018).

The results of Table 3 show the performance of camels and the effect of the general special capacity for the 2018 generation. From the average of the hybrids, it is noticed that the hybrid $(1 \times 2)$ outperformed other hybrids, which reached 64.46 g . ${ }^{1}$, and the effect of the federal ability for this trait was positive in the desired direction at a probability level $(1 \%)$ for $(1 \times 2),(1 \times 8),(1 \times 10) 6 \times 9)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ and a positive significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level $(5 \%)$ in $(2 \times 9),(3 \times 7)$ and $(3 \times 8)$ hybrids. As for the strength of the hybrid over the average of the two parents, it was positive at the probability level (1). \%) And in the desired direction in hybrids $(1 \times 2),(1 \times 8),(1 \times 10),(2$ $\times 6),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$ and $(3)(6 \times),(3 \times$ $8),(3 \times 9),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 9),(6 \times 10),(7$ $\times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ ) And $(8 \times 9)$ and a positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 6),(5 \times 7)$ and $(6 \times 7)$ hybrids, and for the strength of the hybrid over the best parents, a positive significance is observed at the level of probability ( $1 \%$ ) and in the desired direction in the hybrid $(1 \times 2),(1 \times 8),(1 \times 10),(2 \times 6),(2$ $\times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$ and $(3 \times 8),(3 \times 9),(6 \times$ $8),(6 \times 9),(7 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$.
As for the first generation (2019) and from the average, it was noticed that the superiority of camels $(4 \times 5)$ was the highest for this trait was $59,287 \mathrm{~g}$, while the lowest hybrids for this trait $(4 \times 6)$ reached $34,017 \mathrm{~g}$, and from the effect of the special general ability it is noticed the presence of positive morale in the desired direction At a probability level of ( $1 \%$ ) in hybrids $(3 \times 7),(4 \times 10)$ and $(8 \times 9)$, and for the strength of the hybrid over the mean of the parents, it was found that there is a positive
significant hybrid force in the desired direction at a probability level $(1 \%)$ in hybrids. $(1 \times 8)$, $(1 \times 10),(2 \times 6),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9),(3 \times$ $6),(3 \times 7)$ and $(3 \times 8),(3 \times 9),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 8)$, $(4 \times 10),(6 \times 9),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ And $(8 \times 9)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, and positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level ( $5 \%$ ) in hybrids ( $6 \times 8$ ).As for the strength of the hybrid over the best parents, it was significant in the desired direction at the probability level ( $1 \%$ ) in $(2 \times 7)$, $(2 \times 8),(2 \times$ 9), $(3 \times 6),(3 \times 7),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 9),(3 \times 10)$ and $((6 \times 9),(7 \times 8),(7 \times 8),(7 \times 9),(8 \times 9)$, and $(9$ $\times 10$ ). For this trait, it was $55,896 \mathrm{~g}$. Vegetation, and the lowest for this trait $(4 \times 6)$ was 34,016 g. Vegetation, and the effect of the general Special Estimator was moral. A positive state in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 2),(1 \times 8),(1 \times 10),(3 \times 7),(6 \times$ $9)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ hybrids, while The strength of the hybrid over the average of the two parents was positive in the desired direction at a probability level of $(1 \%)$ in the crosses $(1 \times 2),(1 \times 8),(1$ $\times 10),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 9)$ and $(3 \times 7),(3 \times 8),(6 \times$ $9),(7 \times 8),(7 \times 9),(8 \times 9)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, and a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of ( $5 \%$ ). (In camels ( $3 \times 6$ ), $(3$ $\times 9)$ and $(6 \times 8)$, it is noted that the camels $(1 \times$ $2),(1 \times 8),(1 \times 10),(6 \times 9)$ and $(7) \times 8)$ and $(7$ $\times 9)$, the strength of the hybrid and the two cohorts were significant in the first generation of the 2018 and aggregate season, as a deviation from the mean of the parents. And hybrids ( $3 \times$ 7) and $(8 \times 9)$ in the first generation 2019 , and at the same time these hybrids had significant effects and in the same direction to the effects of special ability, so it is possible to recommend breeding with hybrid strength in these hybrids. From the average hybrids for the second generation 2019, it is noticed that the hybrid (4 $\times 10$ ) is superior to the rest of the hybrids for this trait, which reached $59,287 \mathrm{~g}$, and the lowest for this characteristic $(4 \times 6)$ was 34,017 g. Desirable at a probability level of (1\%) in (1 $\times 2),(1 \times 8),(3 \times 8)$ and $(8 \times 9)$, and a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level (5\%) in $(2 \times 9)$ hybrids. And
$(3 \times 6),(4 \times 8)$ and $(6 \times 9)$, as for the hybrid strength over the average of the parents, it is noticed that there is a positive morale in the desired direction at the probability level ( $1 \%$ ) in the $(1 \times 8)$ and $(2)$ hybrids $(\times 9),(3 \times 6),(3 \times$ 7), $(3 \times 8),(3 \times 9),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 10),(6 \times 8)$, $(6 \times 9))$ And $(6 \times 10),(7 \times 10),(8 \times 9),(8 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, and the strength of the hybrid for the best parents was positive in the desired direction at the probability level of ( $1 \%$ ) in Hybrids $(3 \times 6),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 10),(6 \times 8),(6 \times$ $10), 8 \times 9),(8 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, and it is noted that the two hybrids $(6 \times 9)$ and $(1 \times 8)$ had positive Moral effects for the general special ability and had a Moral hybrid force in the two concepts in the first generation of the two seasons and the second generation, and this results from the presence of a dispersion of alleles. For you hybrids that showed significant hybrid strength only in the second generation without having high hybrid strength in the first generation, this is a result of the fixed effects of the genes controlling the trait. As for those that were high in the first generation and did not decrease significantly in the second generation, the additional influence of the genes would control the inheritance of this trait, while if the hybrid strength was high in the first generation and deteriorated greatly in the second generation, then the dominance effect of genes is clear in its performance on the trait. This is in line with findings by Saud and et al, 2018).

Table 4 shows that all genotypes, parents, hybrids and for all generations were significant at a probability level (1\%) for parents versus hybrids. It was significant at a probability level (1\%) in the first generation 2018 and 2019, and significant at a probability level (5\%) for the meta-analysis and was not significant. For the second generation 2019, the general ability was significant at the probability level (1\%) for all generations except for the second generation 2019, while the special general ability was significant at the probability level (1\%) for all generations, and that the ratio between the components of the general and special general capabilities was less than the correct one for all
generations except for the first generation 2018. From the above, it appears that both the variations of the general and private general capabilities are important, which reflects the importance of both the additional and dominant variations in the inheritance of the protein ratio in the first generation. The right one.

Table 5 indicates that among the averages of parents in the first generation 2018, the parent (10) outperformed the highest protein ratio of $14.893 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage was in the parent (6) which was $13.103 \%$. In parents 4,5 and 10 , and positive morale at the probability level (5\%) in parent 9, and higher in the effect of the general ability of parents 4 and 5 , the values of their effects were 0.297 and 0.281 , respectively, while the variance values of the effect of their special general ability were 1.940 and 2.181 Respectively, which are low values, indicating that these two parents transfer their genes to their crosses on a regular basis, which makes it easier to trace them in future generations.

Table 6 for the first generation 2018 shows the superiority of hybrids $(6 \times 10)$ with the highest protein percentage reaching $16.54 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $12.56 \%$. In camels $(1 \times 4),(1$ $\times 6),(1 \times 10),(2 \times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 9),(4 \times 8)$ and $(5 \times 8)$ And $(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ and positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(2 \times 4)$ and $(3 \times 5)$ and $(4 \times 9)$ and ( $7 \times 9$ ). From the same generation, it is noticed that the hybrid strength of the mean of the two parents is positive and significant in the desired direction at the level of probability $(1 \%)$ in the crosses $(1 \times 4),(1 \times$ 6), $(2 \times 3),(2 \times 4)$ and $(2 \times 5),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8)$, $(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(4 \times 5),(4 \times 6),(4 \times 7)$ $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(5 \times 6),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8)$, $(6 \times 9),(6 \times 10)$ and $((7 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ and significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 10)$ and $(4 \times 3)$ hybrids, while the strength of the hybrid was positive for the best parents in the desired direction at the level of probability ( $1 \%$ ) in hybrids $(2 \times 3),(2 \times 4),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(4 \times 8)$,
$(4 \times 9),(5 \times 8)$ and $(6 \times) 8)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ and a significant positive at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(5 \times 2)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ hybrids. The hybrid $(4 \times 8)$ outperformed the highest protein ratio of $16.150 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(8 \times 10)$ was (12.790). As for the rest of the hybrids, it was a median between the two ratios. ( $1 \%$ ) in hybrids $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(2 \times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$, $(3 \times 5)$ and $(3)(\times 7),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 7)$, $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8))$ And ( $9 \times 10$ ) and positive significance of the desired direction at a probability level of (5\%) in ( $1 \times$ $10),(6 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ hybrids. And the strength of the hybrid over the average of the hybrid was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of ( $1 \%$ ) in $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$ and $($ $3 \times 4,(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(3 \times 7),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 10)$, $(4 \times 5),(4 \times 7)$ and $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(4 \times 10) 5 \times$ $6),(5 \times 7),(5 \times 8),(5 \times 10),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8)$ and $(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8),(8 \times 9)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the crossbreed over the best parents was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of (1\%) in $(2 \times$ $3)$ and $(2 \times 3)$ hybrids. $2 \times 7,2 \times 8,(3 \times 5),(3$ $\times 7),(3 \times 8),(4 \times 7),(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9)$ and $(5 \times 8)$ And $(5 \times 10),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8)$ and $(9 \times$ $10)$, positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(5 \times$ 6) hybrids. From the average of the hybrids in the pooled analysis, the superiority of the hybrid ( $6 \times 10$ ) was observed with the highest protein percentage reaching $16,213 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $12.938 \%$. $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(1 \times 10),(2$ $\times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(4 \times 8)$ and $(4)(\times$ $9),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8)$ and positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(3 \times 10)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ hybrids ) And ( $7 \times 9$ ), while the strength of the crossbreed over the average of the two parents was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level (1\%) in the hybrids $(1 \times 4)$ and $(1 \times 6)$ and $(2 \times 3) 2 \times 7)$ and $(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(3 \times 7),(3$ $\times 8),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 5)$ and $(4)(\times 7),(4 \times 8),(4$
$\times 9),(5 \times 6),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$, $(7 \times 8)$ ) And $(7 \times 9)$ and $(8 \times 9)$ and positive significance in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(4 \times 2),(3 \times 4),(4$ $\times 10),(5 \times 10)$ and $(5 \times 10)$ hybrids. $(6 \times 9)$ and ( $9 \times 10$ ). From the above, it is noticed that the hybrids $(2 \times 7)$ and $(2 \times 8)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ and $(4 \times$ $8)$ and $(4 \times 9)$ and $(5 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ were of hybrid strength Moral positive and in both concepts and influences of the special general ability is positive and Moral, which is recommended for breeding with hybrid strength in such hybrids. And in the second generation 2019, the superiority of the hybrid $(4 \times 8)$ is observed with the highest protein percentage reaching $15.917 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $13.223 \% .4 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the hybrid over the average of the two parents was positive and significant at a probability level $(1 \%)$ in the $(1 \times 10),(2 \times 6)$ and $(2 \times) 9),(2 \times 10),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 6)$, $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(4 \times 10)$ and $(5 \times 10)$ And $(6 \times$ 8) $6 \times 10),(7 \times 10),(8 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the crossbreed over the best parents was positive and significant at the probability level ( $1 \%$ ) in the hybrids ( $2 \times 6$ ). ( 2 $\times 9),(3 \times 5) 4 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times$ 10 ), and a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of (5\%) in (4× 6) hybrids.

## Discussion

From the results of the first generation 2019, and from the average of the parents, it is noticed that parent 1 excelled with the highest protein ratio of $15.203 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage that was in parent 3 was $11.973 \%$. And a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level (5\%) in parent 6, and the 5 and 9 parents were distinguished by the highest effect of the general ability, amounting to 0.409 and 0.256 , respectively. The effect variance values of their own ability were 5.182 and 2.858 , respectively, and this indicates that parent 5 transmitted a gene effect. For the protein trait to be part of his hybrid without the other, Father 9 transfers this trait to
one part of his hybrid regularly. In the metaanalysis, parent 1 outperformed the other parents with the highest protein ratio of $14.82 \%$, where the lowest protein percentage in Fath 3 was $13.12 \%$, and the effect of the general ability was significantly desirable in the desired direction at a probability level (1\%) in the 5 parents and 9 and 10 , and a significant positive in the desired direction, at a probability level ( $5 \%$ ) in 4 . Which confirms that parents 5, 9 , and 10 have a latent ability to increase the protein percentage when they are included in the crossbreeding programs, as it has positive and significant effects of the general ability. And $15.013 \%$, respectively, while the lowest protein percentage in parent 10 was $11,560 \%$, and from the same generation the effect of the general federal ability was significantly positive.

In the desired direction at a probability level ( $1 \%$ ) in parents 8 and 9 . It is noticed that parent 9 had a general ability to increase the percentage of protein in all generations, indicating that he possessed an inherent federal ability across generations to improve this trait. Table 6 for the first generation 2018 shows the superiority of hybrids $(6 \times 10)$ with the highest protein percentage reaching $16.54 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $12.56 \%$. In camels $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(1$ $\times 10),(2 \times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 9),(4 \times 8)$ and $(5 \times$ 8) And $(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ and positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(2 \times 4)$ and $(3 \times 5)$ and $(4 \times 9)$ and $(7 \times 9)$. From the same generation, it is noticed that the hybrid strength of the mean of the two parents is positive and significant in the desired direction at the level of probability $(1 \%)$ in the crosses $(1 \times 4),(1 \times$ 6), $(2 \times 3),(2 \times 4)$ and $(2 \times 5),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8)$, $(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(4 \times 5),(4 \times 6),(4 \times 7)$ $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(5 \times 6),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8)$, $(6 \times 9),(6 \times 10)$ and $((7 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ and significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 10)$ and $(4 \times 3)$ hybrids, while the strength of the hybrid was positive for the best parents in the desired direction at the level of probability ( $1 \%$ ) in
hybrids $(2 \times 3),(2 \times 4),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(4 \times 8)$, $(4 \times 9),(5 \times 8)$ and $(6 \times) 8)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ and a significant positive at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(5 \times 2)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ hybrids. The hybrid $(4 \times 8)$ outperformed the highest protein ratio of $16.150 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(8 \times 10)$ was (12.790). As for the rest of the hybrids, it was a median between the two ratios. ( $1 \%$ ) in hybrids $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(2 \times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$, $(3 \times 5)$ and $(3)(\times 7),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 7)$, $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8))$ And ( $9 \times 10$ ) and positive significance of the desired direction at a probability level of (5\%) in ( $1 \times$ $10),(6 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 9)$ hybrids. And the strength of the hybrid over the average of the hybrid was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of (1\%) in $(1 \times 4),(1 \times 6),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9)$ and $($ $3 \times 4,(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(3 \times 7),(3 \times 8),(3 \times 10)$, $(4 \times 5),(4 \times 7)$ and $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(4 \times 10) 5 \times$ 6), $(5 \times 7),(5 \times 8),(5 \times 10),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8)$ and $(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8),(8 \times 9)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the crossbreed over the best parents was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of (1\%) in ( $2 \times$ $3)$ and $(2 \times 3)$ hybrids. $2 \times 7,2 \times 8,(3 \times 5),(3$ $\times 7),(3 \times 8),(4 \times 7),(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9)$ and $(5 \times 8)$ And $(5 \times 10),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8)$ and $(9 \times$ 10), positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level of (5\%) in (5 $\times$ 6) hybrids. From the average of the hybrids in the pooled analysis, the superiority of the hybrid $(6 \times 10)$ was observed with the highest protein percentage reaching $16,213 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $12.938 \%$. $(1 \div 4),(1 \times 6),(1 \times 10),(2$ $\times 3),(2 \times 7),(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(4 \times 8)$ and $(4)(\times$ 9), $(5 \times 8),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 8)$ and positive significant in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(3 \times 10)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ hybrids ) And ( $7 \times 9$ ), while the strength of the crossbreed over the average of the two parents was positive and significant in the desired direction at a probability level (1\%) in the hybrids $(1 \times 4)$ and $(1 \times 6)$ and $(2 \times 3) 2 \times 7)$ and $(2 \times 8),(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 6),(3 \times 7),(3$
$\times 8),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 5)$ and $(4)(\times 7),(4 \times 8),(4$ $\times 9),(5 \times 6),(5 \times 8),(6 \times 7),(6 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$, $(7 \times 8)$ ) And $(7 \times 9)$ and $(8 \times 9)$ and positive significance in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in $(4 \times 2),(3 \times 4)$, $(4$ $\times 10),(5 \times 10)$ and $(5 \times 10)$ hybrids. $(6 \times 9)$ and ( $9 \times 10$ ). From the above, it is noticed that the hybrids $(2 \times 7)$ and $(2 \times 8)$ and $(4 \times 7)$ and $(4 \times$ $8)$ and $(4 \times 9)$ and $(5 \times 8)$ and $(7 \times 8)$ were of hybrid strength Moral positive and in both concepts and influences of the special general ability is positive and Moral, which is recommended for breeding with hybrid strength in such hybrids. And in the second generation 2019, the superiority of the hybrid $(4 \times 8)$ is observed with the highest protein percentage reaching $15.917 \%$ and the lowest protein percentage in the hybrid $(1 \times 8)$ reaching $13.223 \% .4 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the hybrid over the average of the two parents was positive and significant at a probability level $(1 \%)$ in the $(1 \times 10),(2 \times 6)$ and $(2 \times) 9),(2 \times 10),(3 \times 5),(3 \times 10),(4 \times 6)$, $(4 \times 8),(4 \times 9),(4 \times 10)$ and $(5 \times 10)$ And $(6 \times$ 8) $6 \times 10),(7 \times 10),(8 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, while the strength of the crossbreed over the best parents was positive and significant at the probability level ( $1 \%$ ) in the hybrids $(2 \times 6)$. ( 2 $\times 9),(3 \times 5) 4 \times 8),(6 \times 10),(7 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times$ 10), and a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of (5\%) in (4× 6) hybrids.

## Conclusions

which is recommended to be included in breeding and crossbreeding programs to increase and improve this trait in misc for the wheat. While if the hybrid strength was high in the first generation and deteriorated greatly in the second generation, then the dominance effect of genes is clear in its performance on the trait. This is in line with findings by Saud and Al- Mamoun et al, 2018). general ability of parents 4 and 5, the values of their effects were 0.297 and 0.281 , respectively, while the variance values of the effect of their special general ability were 1.940 and 2.181 Respectively, which are low values, indicating
that these two parents transfer their genes to their crosses on a regular basis, which makes it easier to trace them in future generations. the protein percentage when they are included in the crossbreeding programs, as it has positive and significant effects of the general ability. And $15.013 \%$, respectively, while the lowest protein percentage in parent 10 was $11,560 \%$, and from the same generation the effect of the general federal ability was significantly positive. While the strength of the crossbreed over the best parents was positive and significant at the probability level (1\%) in the hybrids $(2 \times 6) .(2 \times 9),(3 \times 5) 4 \times 8),(6 \times 10)$, $(7 \times 10)$ and $(9 \times 10)$, and a significant positive in the desired direction at a probability level of $(5 \%)$ in (4×6) hybrids.

- Use of fathers 4 and 7
- Use and follow the hybrids (1 x 8), (6 x $9)$ and $(7 \times 10)$. And $(8 \times 10),(2 \times 6)$ and $(2 \times$ 10)
- Using the hybridization method to develop new hybrids
- Use the mentioned fertilizer ratios
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Table (1): Analysis of variance for the first generation 2018, 2019, pooled, and second generation 2019 for plant yield (g. Vegetation)

| D.F | df. | Ms. |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| F | Comb | F1 2018 | F1 2019 | Comb | F2 2019 |
| Years | 1 |  |  | 437.58 |  |
| Rep | 4 | 3823.22 | 6534.05 | 5178.63 | $\mathbf{1 6 4 8 9 . 8 8}$ |
| Geneotyps | 54 | $* * 189.12$ | $* * 141.14$ | $* * 238.50$ | $* * \mathbf{2 2 7 5 . 2 7}$ |
| P | 9 | $* * 229.87$ | $* * 207.30$ | $* * 355.28$ | $* * \mathbf{1 4 3 . 9 8}$ |
| H | 44 | $* * 184.77$ | $* * 130.16$ | $* * 219.09$ | $* * \mathbf{2 7 6 2 . 8 9}$ |
| P/H | 1 | 14.19 | 28.76 | 41.67 | NS 1.59 |
| G/y | 54 |  |  | $* * 91.76$ |  |
| par./y | 9 |  |  | 81.89 |  |
| Cr./y | 44 |  |  | $* * 95.84$ |  |
| Par. vs. cr. Vs. y | 1 |  |  | 1.27 |  |
| Error | 108 | 43.32 | 56.15 |  | $\mathbf{6 8 3 . 6 8 2}$ |
| Error Comp | 216 |  |  | 49.74 |  |
| GCA | 9 | $* * 52.81$ | $* 38.60$ | $* * 65.86$ | $* * \mathbf{6 8 1 . 5 0 0}$ |
| SCA | 45 | $* * 65.09$ | $* * 48.74$ | $* * 82.23$ | $* * \mathbf{7 7 3 . 8 0 9}$ |
| GCA x y | 9 |  |  | 25.55 |  |
| SCA x y | 45 |  |  | $* * 31.59$ |  |
| Error | 108 | 14.44 | 18.72 |  | $\mathbf{2 2 7 . 8 9}$ |
| Error Comp | 216 |  |  | 16.58 |  |
| Perc GCA/SCA |  | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.80 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 8 0 7}$ |
| GCA x y/GCA |  |  |  | 0.39 |  |
| SCA x/SCA |  |  |  | 0.38 |  |

Tables (2): Parent performance, the effect of general ability, and the variations of the general and private values of each Father for protein percentage

| F2 2019 |  | COMP |  |  | F1 2019 |  | F1 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCA | AV _P |  | AV_P | $\sigma_{s}^{2}$ | $\sigma_{g}^{2}$ | GCA | AV _P | $\sigma_{s}^{2}$ | $\sigma_{g}^{2}$ | GCA | AV _P | Par |
| -0.441 | 62.920 | 1.94 | 50.92 | 3327.113 | 275.068 | 0.775 | 56.253 | 6070.075 | 251.944 | **3.109 | 45.587 | 1 |
| -6.216 | 45.877 | -0.86 | 39.043 | 119.415 | 3.705 | $\begin{gathered} *_{-} \\ 2.611 \end{gathered}$ | 39.210 | 262.460 | -0.678 | 0.889 | 38.877 | 2 |
| -4.496 | 43.587 | -0.40 | 43.253 | 571.630 | -0.662 | 0.498 | 43.587 | 133.315 | -0.647 | -1.307 | 42.920 | 3 |
| -3.376 | 59.730 | 1.15 | 60.396 | 537.238 | 22.208 | *2.730 | 59.730 | 369.546 | 3.700 | -0.437 | 61.063 | 4 |
| -5.118 | 58.413 | -1.00 | 51.746 | 49.877 | 0.792 | -1.402 | 55.080 | 59.733 | 6.695 | -0.596 | 48.413 | 5 |
| -4.561 | 49.260 | -0.91 | 42.093 | 356.026 | 3.112 | -0.483 | 48.593 | 261.407 | 2.090 | -1.345 | 35.593 | 6 |
| **13.138 | 55.453 | $\begin{array}{r} * *_{-} \\ 3.31 \end{array}$ | 34.453 | 371.276 | -1.286 | $2.507$ | 37.787 | 514.554 | -0.020 | $\begin{gathered} *_{-} \\ 4.118 \end{gathered}$ | 31.120 | 7 |
| -1.470 | 45.817 | 0.43 | 37.816 | 272.119 | 5.771 | 0.941 | 37.817 | 493.675 | 1.727 | -0.087 | 37.817 | 8 |
| -2.104 | 50.193 | *2.29 | 42.693 | 307.067 | 21.122 | 2.113 | 43.860 | 384.324 | 32.149 | *2.474 | 41.527 | 9 |
| **14.645 | 45.387 | 0.68 | 45.72 | 344.517 | 1.804 | -0.055 | 39.053 | 120.443 | 7.174 | 1.417 | 52.387 | 10 |
| 7.160 | 10.914 | 2.19 | 1.699 |  |  | 2.33 | 1.806 |  |  | 2.05 | 1.256 | LSD 5\% |
| 7.223 | 10.804 | 2.87 | 1.682 |  |  | 3.074 | 1.788 |  |  | 2.70 | 1.243 | LSD 1\% |

Table (3): The performance of hybrids and the effect of the special ability and the strength of the hybrid for the mean of the two parents, the best of which are for the individual plant yield

| F2 2019 |  |  |  | COMP |  |  | F1 2019 |  |  |  | F1 2018 |  |  |  | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H | A-P | SCA | A-H | PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H | PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H |  |
| **-13.445 | 0.113 | **9.246 | 54.460 | **21.072 | *9.32 | 54.46 | **-20.965 | **-6.854 | 1.084 | 44.460 | **41.401 | **52.634 | **17.55 | 64.46 | $2 \times 1$ |
| **-30.705 | **-18.127 | -3.334 | 43.600 | **-16.608 | -6.33 | 39.265 | **-22.493 | **-12.66 | -2.885 | 43.600 | **-23.369 | **-21.061 | **-9.78 | 34.93 | $3 \times 1$ |
| **-25.407 | **-23.467 | -1.122 | 46.932 | **-15.676 | -0.22 | 46.933 | **-21.424 | **-19.069 | -1.783 | 46.933 | **-23.14 | **-11.986 | 1.35 | 46.93 | $4 \times 1$ |
| **-20.904 | **-17.967 | 3.454 | 49.767 | **-26.753 | *-7.40 | 37.6 | **-32.863 | **-32.156 | -6.818 | 37.767 | **-22.68 | **-20.355 | **-7.99 | 37.43 | $5 \times 1$ |
| **-34.011 | **-25.976 | -5.349 | 41.520 | *-10.722 | -3.57 | 41.52 | **-26.191 | **-20.799 | -3.983 | 41.520 | **-8.920 | *2.291 | -3.15 | 41.52 | $6 \times 1$ |
| **-25.143 | **-20.421 | **-17.46 | 47.100 | **-13.868 | -5.92 | 36.766 | **-34.048 | **-21.097 | -6.380 | 37.100 | **-20.079 | **-5.006 | *-5.47 | 36.43 | $7 \times 1$ |
| **-6.887 | **7.758 | **8.626 | 58.587 | **23.782 | *8.49 | 54.92 | **-7.703 | **10.386 | 4.992 | 51.920 | **27.055 | **38.891 | **11.99 | 57.92 | $8 \times 1$ |
| **-25.683 | **-17.321 | -2.567 | 46.760 | **-17.191 | *-9.54 | 38.76 | **-28.727 | **-19.904 | *-8.006 | 40.093 | **-17.9 | **-14.074 | **-11.06 | 37.43 | $9 \times 1$ |
| **-19.373 | **-6.321 | $\begin{gathered} *_{-} \\ 15.346 \end{gathered}$ | 50.730 | **15.680 | *9.21 | 55.896 | **-9.818 | **6.456 | 4.799 | 50.730 | **16.563 | **24.653 | **13.63 | 61.06 | 10x1 |
| **-15.280 | **-13.111 | -2.293 | 38.867 | -5.545 | -3.92 | 38.866 | **-10.829 | **-6.115 | -4.232 | 38.867 | **-9.443 | **-4.967 | -3.62 | 38.87 | $3 \times 2$ |
| **-20.910 | **-10.535 | 4.960 | 47.240 | -4.988 | 2.89 | 47.24 | **-20.911 | **-4.507 | 1.909 | 47.240 | **-22.638 | **-5.463 | 3.88 | 47.24 | $4 \times 2$ |
| **-30.112 | **-21.711 | 0.286 | 40.823 | **-19.250 | -5.54 | 36.656 | **-31.935 | **-20.479 | -3.709 | 37.490 | **-26.005 | **-17.921 | **-7.38 | 35.82 | $5 \times 2$ |
| **-6.996 | **-3.689 | 4.719 | 45.813 | 9.231 | 2.03 | 44.313 | **-5.720 | **4.354 | 3.696 | 45.813 | **10.126 | **14.981 | 0.36 | 42.81 | $6 \times 2$ |
| **-15.490 | **-7.503 | **-11.93 | 46.863 | **17.094 | 3.14 | 43.03 | **11.018 | **13.07 | 3.436 | 43.530 | **9.397 | **21.52 | 2.85 | 42.53 | $7 \times 2$ |
| **-10.010 | **-10.069 | -2.956 | 41.230 | 5.551 | -3.06 | 40.563 | **5.151 | **7.053 | -2.312 | 41.230 | **2.623 | **4.042 | -3.81 | 39.90 | $8 \times 2$ |
| 0.431 | **4.944 | *6.858 | 50.411 | **28.649 | 7.08 | 52.576 | **14.934 | **21.368 | 5.696 | 50.410 | **31.827 | **36.172 | *8.47 | 54.74 | $9 \times 2$ |
| **-15.999 | **-15.548 | **-21.76 | 38.537 | -9.072 | -5.34 | 38.536 | -1.717 | -1.520 | -4.009 | 38.537 | **-26.438 | **-15.548 | -6.68 | 38.54 | 10×2 |
| **-41.676 | **-32.563 | **-9.163 | 34.837 | **-31.172 | *-9.13 | 35.67 | **-41.676 | **-32.563 | **-13.60 | 34.837 | **-40.221 | **-29.79 | -4.66 | 36.50 | $4 \times 3$ |
| **-27.921 | **-17.444 | -0.154 | 42.103 | **-18.379 | -3.88 | 38.77 | **-29.611 | **-21.412 | -5.538 | 38.770 | **-19.919 | **-15.102 | -2.23 | 38.77 | $5 \times 3$ |
| **12.755 | **19.645 | *812.73 | 55.543 | *10.631 | 4.47 | 47.21 | **7.442 | **13.278 | 6.984 | 52.210 | -1.654 | **7.523 | 1.95 | 42.21 | $6 \times 3$ |
| 0.871 | **12.957 | -4.577 | 55.937 | **26.810 | *8.93 | 49.27 | **28.334 | **37.482 | **12.73 | 55.937 | -0.737 | **15.082 | *5.12 | 42.60 | $7 \times 3$ |
| **23.026 | **26.095 | **10.461 | 56.367 | **23.432 | 5.95 | 50.033 | **21.673 | **30.298 | 6.383 | 53.033 | **9.583 | **16.51 | *5.52 | 47.03 | $8 \times 3$ |
| 1.002 | **8.118 | 5.425 | 50.697 | *10.991 | 1.75 | 47.696 | **7.987 | **8.325 | -0.459 | 47.363 | **11.906 | **13.752 | 3.96 | 48.03 | $9 \times 3$ |
| **13.498 | **15.794 | **-10.51 | 51.513 | 4.556 | 2.18 | 46.513 | **18.186 | **24.669 | 5.859 | 51.513 | **-20.756 | **-12.885 | -1.51 | 41.51 | $10 \times 3$ |
| **-31.352 | **-30.587 | -2.374 | 41.003 | **-26.279 | -2.87 | 41.336 | **-31.352 | **-28.572 | -5.536 | 41.003 | **-31.759 | **-23.874 | -0.21 | 41.67 | $5 \times 4$ |
| **-43.049 | **-37.578 | **-9.918 | 34.017 | **-33.620 | **-10.28 | 34.016 | **-43.049 | **-37.194 | **-13.441 | 34.017 | **-44.293 | **-29.613 | -**7.11 | 34.02 | $6 \times 4$ |
| **-17.701 | **-14.646 | **-12.48 | 49.157 | **-19.192 | -3.57 | 38.323 | **-17.702 | 0.817 | 3.722 | 49.157 | **-54.981 | **-40.358 | **-10.86 | 27.49 | $7 \times 4$ |



Table (4): Analysis of variance for the first generation 2018, 2019, pooled, and second generation 2019 for protein percentage \%

| D.F | df. | Ms. |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| F | Comb | F1 2018 | F1 2019 | Comb | F2 2019 |
| Years | 1 |  |  | 0.19 |  |
| Rep | 4 | 7.32 | 9.43 | 8.37 | $\mathbf{3 7 . 1 6}$ |
| Geneotyps | 54 | $* * 1.70$ | $* * 2.70$ | $* * 3.57$ | $* * \mathbf{1 . 4 4}$ |
| P | 9 | $* * 1.00$ | $* * 3.01$ | $* * 2.43$ | $* * \mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ |
| H | 44 | $* * 1.84$ | $* * 2.47$ | $* * 3.65$ | $* * \mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ |
| P/ H | 1 | $* * 1.85$ | $* * 9.93$ | $* 10.18$ | NS 0.60 |
| G/y | 54 |  |  | $* * 0.83$ |  |
| par./y | 9 |  |  | $* * 1.58$ |  |
| Cr./y | 44 |  |  | $* * 0.66$ |  |
| Par. vs. cr. Vs. Y | 1 |  |  | $* 1.60$ |  |
| Error | 108 | 0.10 | 0.17 |  | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5 6}$ |
| Error Comp | 216 |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| GCA | 9 | $* * 0.62$ | $* * 0.77$ | $* * 1.04$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 2 5}$ |
| SCA | 45 | $* * 0.56$ | $* * 0.93$ | $* * 1.22$ | $* * \mathbf{0 . 5 1 0}$ |
| GCA x y | 9 |  |  | $* * 0.34$ |  |
| SCA x y | 45 |  |  | $* * 0.26$ |  |
| Error | 108 | 0.03 | 0.06 |  | $\mathbf{0 . 2 5 2}$ |
| Error Comp | 216 |  |  | 0.05 |  |
| Perc GCA/SCA |  | 16 | 0.11 |  |  |
| GCA x y/GCA |  |  |  | 0.85 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 3 7}$ |
| SCA x y/SCA |  |  |  | 0.33 |  |

Table (5): Indicates that among the averages of parents in the first generation

| F2 2019 |  | C OM |  | F1 2019 |  |  |  | F1 2018 |  |  |  | par |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCA | AV _P | GCA | AV_P | $\sigma_{S}^{2}$ | $\sigma_{g}^{2}$ | GCA | AV_P | $\sigma_{s}^{2}$ | $\sigma_{g}^{2}$ | GCA | AV _P | Par |
| **-0.157 | 15.437 | **-0.23 | 14.82 | 6.440 | -0.002 | -0.051 | 15.203 | 6.536 | 0.063 | **-0.400 | 14.44 | 1 |
| 0.079 | 14.747 | **-0.21 | 13.63 | 6.265 | 0.078 | **-0.321 | 13.547 | 2.494 | 0.002 | *-0.109 | 13.73 | 2 |
| *-0.157 | 14.617 | **-0.29 | 13.12 | 7.981 | 0.110 | **-0.364 | 11.973 | 2.125 | 0.044 | **-0.212 | 14.28 | 3 |
| 0.033 | 14.503 | *0.12 | 13.72 | 6.325 | 0.013 | -0.066 | 13.270 | 1.940 | 0.047 | **0.297 | 14.17 | 4 |
| 0.127 | 14.620 | **0.34 | 14.61 | 5.182 | 0.137 | **0.409 | 14.617 | 2.181 | 0.042 | **0.281 | 14.620 | 5 |
| -0.011 | 13.770 | 0.04 | 13.60 | 2.871 | 0.004 | *0.158 | 14.103 | 5.567 | 0.013 | -0.080 | 13.103 | 6 |
| -0.036 | 14.570 | *-0.13 | 13.73 | 5.551 | 0.051 | **-0.230 | 12.903 | 1.952 | 0.003 | -0.024 | 14.570 | 7 |
| **0.207 | 15.493 | 0.01 | 13.48 | 8.451 | 0.041 | 0.103 | 13.480 | 6.175 | 0.000 | -0.086 | 13.493 | 8 |
| **0.206 | 15.013 | **0.18 | 14.76 | 2.858 | 0.068 | **0.256 | 14.857 | 1.133 | 0.003 | *0.101 | 14.680 | 9 |
| **-0.291 | 11.560 | **0.17 | 14.74 | 8.867 | 0.005 | 0.106 | 14.593 | 6.880 | 0.028 | **0.233 | 14.893 | 10 |
| 0.137 | 0.210 | 0.11 | 0.090 |  |  | 0.13 | 0.099 |  |  | 0.10 | 0.075 | LSD 5\% |
| 0.142 | 0.208 | 0.15 | 0.089 |  |  | 0.17 | 0.098 |  |  | 0.13 | 0.075 | LSD 1\% |

Table (6): The performance of the hybrids and the effect of the special ability and the strength of the cross between the parents average and the best of the two for the protein ratio trait

| F2 2019 |  |  | COMP |  |  |  | F1 2019 |  | F1 2018 |  |  |  |  |  | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H | A-P | SCA | A-H | PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H | PEST-P | A-P | SCA | A-H |  |
| **-11.509 | **-9.486 | *-0.823 | 13.660 | **-4.609 | *-0.39 | 13.573 | **-9.098 | **-3.860 | -0.183 | 13.820 | **-7.688 | **-5.372 | **-0.59 | 13.33 | $2 \times 1$ |
| **-5.916 | **-3.349 | 0.276 | 14.523 | **-5.528 | **-0.68 | 13.201 | **-13.089 | **-2.759 | **-0.747 | 13.213 | **-8.635 | **-8.147 | **-0.62 | 13.19 | $3 \times 1$ |
| **-8.507 | **-5.655 | -0.313 | 14.123 | **4.811 | **0.67 | 14.956 | -0.526 | **6.228 | **0.866 | 15.123 | *2.447 | **3.402 | **0.47 | 14.79 | $4 \times 1$ |
| **-5.268 | **-2.694 | 0.092 | 14.623 | -0.651 | 0.10 | 14.623 | **-3.815 | -1.922 | -0.109 | 14.623 | 0.022 | 0.653 | 0.32 | 14.62 | $5 \times 1$ |
| **-6.413 | -1.072 | 0.054 | 14.447 | **6.555 | **0.93 | 15.143 | 1.995 | **5.823 | **1.025 | 15.507 | *2.378 | **7.334 | **0.84 | 14.78 | $6 \times 1$ |
| **-2.828 | -0.022 | 0.633 | 15.000 | -**6.980 | **-0.76 | 13.281 | **-12.98 | **-5.858 | **-0.864 | 13.230 | **-8.487 | **-8.067 | **-0.66 | 13.33 | $7 \times 1$ |
| **-14.651 | **-14.495 | **-1.387 | 13.223 | **-8.584 | **-1.24 | 12.938 | **-12.388 | **-7.123 | *-81.107 | 13.320 | $13.022$ | $10.085$ | **-1.38 | 12.56 | $8 \times 1$ |
| **-13.215 | **-12.008 | **-1.213 | 13.397 | **-9.446 | **-0.96 | 13.396 | **-11.883 | **-10.867 | **-1.183 | 13.397 | **-8.742 | **-7.979 | **-0.73 | 13.40 | $9 \times 1$ |
| **-6.629 | **6.778 | 0.300 | 14.413 | 0.980 | **0.58 | 14.926 | *-2.170 | -0.1678 | *0.444 | 14.873 | 0.581 | *2.148 | **0.72 | 14.98 | $10 \times 1$ |
| -1.672 | -1.237 | 0.017 | 14.500 | **13.05 | **1.23 | 15.13 | **11.959 | **18.861 | **1.476 | 15.167 | **5.670 | **7.758 | **0.99 | 15.09 | $3 \times 2$ |
| -0.904 | -0.079 | -0.059 | 14.613 | *3.173 | -0.19 | 14.113 | 0.075 | -0.957 | **-0.708 | 13.280 | **5.481 | **7.144 | *0.34 | 14.95 | $4 \times 2$ |
| 1.152 | 1.589 | 0.150 | 14.917 | -0.22 | *-0.43 | 14.096 | **-9.167 | **-5.716 | **-1.187 | 13.277 | *2.029 | **5.232 | 0.32 | 14.92 | $5 \times 2$ |
| **2.622 | **6.136 | 0.504 | 15.133 | 0.091 | **-0.59 | 13.633 | *-2.150 | -0.180 | *-0.413 | 13.800 | -1.917 | 0.372 | **-0.77 | 13.47 | $6 \times 2$ |
| -1.198 | -0.602 | -0.033 | 14.570 | **8.943 | **0.85 | 14.911 | **10.138 | **12.817 | **1.095 | 14.920 | **2.287 | **5.323 | **0.61 | 14.90 | $7 \times 2$ |
| **-7.099 | **-4.805 | -0.453 | 14.393 | **7.354 | 0.37 | 14.56 | **9.248 | **8.978 | **0.569 | 14.727 | **4.831 | **5.742 | 0.17 | 14.39 | $8 \times 2$ |
| **3.507 | **4.435 | 0.695 | 15.540 | **4.764 | **0.52 | 14.88 | 0.201 | **4.823 | **0.576 | 14.887 | 1.317 | **4.704 | **0.46 | 14.87 | $9 \times 2$ |
| **-3.051 | **8.692 | -0.052 | 14.297 | **-3.905 | **-0.72 | 13.636 | **-8.794 | **-5.401 | **-0.850 | 13.310 | **-6.244 | *-2.433 | **-0.58 | 13.96 | $10 \times 2$ |
| **-7.343 | **-6.982 | *-0.894 | 13.543 | *2.650 | *-0.45 | 13.78 | -1.909 | **3.129 | **-0.928 | 13.017 | 1.820 | *2.225 | 0.04 | 14.54 | $4 \times 3$ |
| **3.944 | **3.956 | 0.666 | 15.197 | **11.34 | **0.99 | 15.446 | **9.669 | **20.572 | **1.610 | 16.030 | 1.664 | **2.848 | *0.37 | 14.86 | $5 \times 3$ |
| **-2.896 | 0 | -0.200 | 14.193 | **6.689 | 0.11 | 14.26 | 1.583 | **9.881 | 0.157 | 14.327 | -0.630 | **3.651 | 0.06 | 14.19 | $6 \times 3$ |
| **-2.006 | -1.850 | -0.044 | 14.323 | **6.756 | 0.36 | 14.34 | **16.43 | **20.783 | **1.242 | 15.023 | **-6.268 | **-5.337 | **-0.53 | 13.66 | $7 \times 3$ |
| **-9.143 | **-6.498 | -0.534 | 14.077 | **7.182 | 0.14 | 14.263 | **9.668 | **16.16 | **0.668 | 14.783 | **-3.780 | -1.044 | *-0.38 | 13.74 | $8 \times 3$ |
| **-6.616 | **-5.366 | -0.589 | 14.020 | *-2.640 | **-0.71 | 13.58 | **-8.593 | 1.23 | **-0.688 | 13.580 | **-7.493 | **-6.226 | **-0.73 | 13.58 | $9 \times 3$ |
| 0.410 | **12.135 | 0.563 | 14.677 | **5.316 | *0.40 | 14.676 | 0.571 | **10.489 | **0.560 | 14.677 | -1.454 | 0.605 | 0.23 | 14.68 | $10 \times 3$ |
| -0.387 | 0.011 | -0.158 | 14.563 | **5.13 | 0.04 | 14.896 | 1.915 | **6.837 | 0.179 | 14.897 | 1.892 | **3.485 | -0.10 | 14.90 | $5 \times 4$ |
| *2.068 | **4.715 | 0.221 | 14.803 | 1.036 | **-0.75 | 13.803 | **-4.372 | -1.461 | **-0.980 | 13.487 | -0.352 | **3.544 | **-0.52 | 14.12 | $6 \times 4$ |
| *-2.493 | *-2.270 | -0.351 | 14.207 | **8.34 | *0.49 | 14.873 | **12.082 | **13.653 | **0.795 | 14.873 | *2.081 | **3.502 | 0.18 | 14.87 | $7 \times 4$ |


| Ahmed et al., 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | https://nvjas.journals.ekb.eg/ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table (6): Continued |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.732 | **6.122 | **1.116 | 15.917 | **17.86 | **1.51 | 16.033 | **19.807 | **20.748 | **1.738 | 16.150 | **12.327 | **15.074 | **1.28 | 15.92 | $8 \times 4$ |
| 1.021 | **2.766 | 0.367 | 15.167 | **7.096 | **0.56 | 15.255 | **3.275 | **9.101 | **0.778 | 15.343 | **3.315 | **5.141 | *0.35 | 15.17 | $9 \times 4$ |
| 0.804 | **12.188 | 0.317 | 14.620 | *2.728 | -0.06 | 14.62 | 0.182 | **4.940 | 0.206 | 14.620 | -1.835 | 0.607 | *-0.33 | 14.62 | $10 \times 4$ |
| *-2.029 | 0.904 | -0.354 | 14.323 | **3.785 | -0.14 | 14.645 | *2.394 | **4.224 | 0.025 | 14.967 | *-2.029 | **3.330 | -0.30 | 14.32 | $6 \times 5$ |
| **-3.465 | **-3.300 | -0.538 | 14.113 | -1.393 | **-0.64 | 13.98 | **-2.987 | **3.052 | -0.374 | 14.180 | **-5.745 | **-5.584 | **-0.90 | 13.78 | $7 \times 5$ |
| *-2.022 | 0.819 | 0.285 | 15.180 | **12.76 | **1.09 | 15.846 | **8.415 | **12.801 | **0.960 | 15.847 | **8.390 | **12.734 | **1.23 | 15.85 | $8 \times 5$ |
| *-2.020 | -0.719 | -0.183 | 14.710 | 0.113 | -0.21 | 14.71 | -0.987 | -0.181 | -0.330 | 14.710 | 0.204 | 0.409 | -0.09 | 14.71 | $9 \times 5$ |
| 1.413 | **13.267 | 0.429 | 14.827 | *2.491 | 0.13 | 15.046 | **4.447 | **4.530 | 0.377 | 15.267 | -0.447 | 0.474 | -0.11 | 14.83 | $10 \times 5$ |
| -1.830 | 0.940 | -0.210 | 14.303 | **4.633 | -0.01 | 14.303 | 1.418 | **5.924 | 0.000 | 14.303 | -1.830 | **3.372 | -0.01 | 14.30 | $7 \times 6$ |
| *-2.345 | **3.405 | 0.373 | 15.130 | **11.701 | **0.68 | 15.13 | **7.279 | **9.703 | *0.493 | 15.130 | **12.129 | **13.774 | **0.87 | 15.13 | $8 \times 6$ |
| **-2.619 | 1.586 | -0.135 | 14.620 | *2.332 | -0.10 | 14.516 | **-2.984 | -0.460 | -0.376 | 14.413 | -0.408 | **5.243 | 0.18 | 14.62 | $9 \times 6$ |
| **12.878 | **22.726 | **1.284 | 15.543 | **14.39 | **1.61 | 16.213 | **8.839 | **10.698 | **1.245 | 15.883 | **11.079 | **18.181 | **1.97 | 16.54 | $10 \times 6$ |
| **-6.002 | **-3.115 | -0.168 | 14.563 | **10.90 | **0.82 | 15.096 | **11.993 | **14.441 | **0.848 | 15.097 | **3.614 | **7.59 | **0.78 | 15.10 | $8 \times 7$ |
| **-2.930 | -1.476 | -0.156 | 14.573 | **4.461 | *0.44 | 14.888 | 0.089 | **7.132 | *0.469 | 14.870 | 1.544 | 1.925 | *0.41 | 14.91 | $9 \times 7$ |
| **2.516 | **14.325 | 0.703 | 14.937 | **-3.698 | **-0.73 | 13.713 | **-10.484 | **-4.982 | **-1.187 | 13.063 | **-3.558 | *-2.500 | -0.27 | 14.36 | $10 \times 7$ |
| **-4.754 | **-3.256 | -0.216 | 14.757 | **3.769 | 0.07 | 14.66 | -1.974 | **2.787 | -0.171 | 14.563 | 0.522 | **4.756 | 0.32 | 14.76 | $9 \times 8$ |
| **-6.906 | **6.628 | -0.054 | 14.423 | **-7.970 | **-1.59 | 12.99 | **-12.357 | **-8.881 | **-1.794 | 12.790 | **-11.437 | **-7.069 | **-1.38 | 13.19 | $10 \times 8$ |
| **5.395 | **19.091 | **1.348 | 15.823 | *2.377 | 0.36 | 15.106 | **5.833 | **6.779 | **0.987 | 15.723 | **-2.708 | *-2.006 | -0.27 | 14.49 | $10 \times 9$ |
| 0.710 | 0.614 | 0.414 | 0.446 | 0.316 | 0.196 | 0.191 | 0.340 | 0.295 | 0.198 | 0.211 | 0.2565 | 0.222 | 0.149 | 0.160 | LSD 5\% |
| SE HBp | SE HMp | SE Sij | 0.441 | SE HMp | SE Sij | 0.189 | SE HBp | SE HMp | SE Sij | 0.209 | SE HBp | SE HMp | SE Sij | 0.158 | LSD 1\% |
| 0.410 | **12.135 | 0.563 | 14.677 | **5.316 | *0.40 | 14.676 | 0.571 | **10.489 | **0.560 | 14.677 | -1.454 | 0.605 | 0.23 | 14.68 | 10x3 |

