

Turkish Journal of Field Crops

field-crops.org

# Identification of Morphological Agronomic and Quality Characteristics of Hungarian Vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.) Mutants

# Berna EFE<sup>1\*</sup> (D), Sabahaddin ÜNAL<sup>2</sup> (D), Hacer MİNTAŞ<sup>3</sup> (D), Erdal Eren YELER<sup>4</sup> (D), Mustafa NALBANT<sup>5</sup> (D)

<sup>1</sup> Department of Meadow-Rangeland and Forage Crops, Central Research Institute for Field Crops, Ankara, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup> Department of Meadow-Rangeland and Forage Crops, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu, Türkiye

<sup>3</sup> Department of Meadow-Rangeland and Forage Crops, Central Research Institute for Field Crops, Ankara, Türkiye

<sup>4</sup> Department of Sales, Marketing, and Legal, Central Research Institute for Field Crops, Ankara, Türkiye

<sup>5</sup> Department of the Herbarium, Directorate of National Botanical Garden of Türkiye, Ankara, Türkiye

Corresponding author: berna.efe@tarimorman.gov.tr

## ARTICLE INFO

# ABSTRACT

Research Article Received: 5 November 2024 Accepted: 11 March 2025 Published: XX June 2025

| Keywords:       |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Breeding        |  |
| Gamma ray       |  |
| Hungarian vetch |  |
| Mutant lines    |  |
| Mutations       |  |

**Citation:** Efe, B., Ünal, S., Mintaş, H., Yeler, E. E., & Nalbant, M. (2025). Identification of morphological agronomic and quality characteristics of Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.) mutants. *Turkish Journal of Field* Crops, 30(1), 43-54. https://doi.org/10.17557/tjfc.1579717 Gamma-ray irradiation of seeds is an effective method for creating genetic variation in plant breeding. This study aimed to evaluate the morphological, agronomic, and quality characteristics of Hungarian vetch (Vicia pannonica Crantz.) mutant lines obtained through gamma radiation. The experiment was carried out in Golbaşı-Ankara during the 2019 and 2020 growing seasons according to Randomized Complete Block Design with four replications involving eleven mutant lines and two control cultivars. The mutant lines exhibited a range of outcomes, including both positive and negative effects. However, no significant alterations were observed in the quality characteristics. The TB1007 mutant line demonstrated superior yield and quality, whereas the TB1002 and TB1005 mutant lines only performed well in terms of yield. The highest hay yields were obtained from TB1007 and TB1002, with 42.50 and 41.93 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, followed by the cv. Tarm Beyazi-98 and TB1005 mutant, with 39.14 and 39.01 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, in 2019. The TB1007 mutant line had the highest digestible protein content, with a content of 16.4% in 2019 and 16.7% in 2020, averaging at 16.5%. These lines are suitable for breeding programs that, especially studies involving crosses.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The *Vicia* genus, which belongs to the Fabaceae family, includes nearly 200 species, many of which are winter annual legumes commonly referred to as vetches (Renzi et al., 2020; Acikgoz, 2021). Vetches are valuable the forage crops of economic importance (Zhang and Mosjidis,1998) and are also known for improving soil fertility (Acikgoz, 2021). These crops in dry regions with continental climates, where their high production potential makes them an excellent choice for forage (Uzun et al., 2004, Sahin-Demirbag et al., 2008, Erkovan, 2022).

Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.) is commonly cultivated as a winter crop due to its high forage yield potential and resistance to both cold and drought. Its cultivation has been expanding in semi-arid regions, particularly in Türkiye. A diploid annual legume (2n=2x=12) Hungarian vetch is found across Southern and Central Europe, Anatolia, North-West Africa, and Caucasia (Naydenova and Aleksieva, 2014; Acikgoz, 2021). This species adapts well to the continental climate, and is planted in autumn, even in areas with harsh winters, such as Central and Eastern Anatolia (Acikgoz, 2021). Hungarian vetch is mainly grown for hay production, though its seeds are also valuable in poultry feed. In Türkiye's semi-arid regions, forage yields of Hungarian vetch range from 7.5 to 35 tons per hectare, while hay yields range from 2 to 7 tons per hectare (Unal et al., 2011; Erdogdu et al., 2016). Yield varies greatly depending on environmental conditions and genotypes. The wide genetic diversity of genotypes is a key element for an effective and efficient breeding programme focusing on yield-related traits (Ergun et al., 2023). However, many forage crops, including vetches, suffer from limited genetic diversity, restricting breeding efforts (De la Rosa et al., Acikgoz, 2021).

Mutation breeding is a key method in plant breeding for enhancing genetic resources (Chaudhary et al. 2019; Shi et al., 2020; Sarsu et al. 2021). Mutations, sudden changes in a plant's genetic structure, can be induced using physical or chemical mutagens (Karim et al., 2008; Acikgoz, 2021). Plant breeding programs utilize both direct and indirect mutation methods to generate new traits, which can then be used for further crossbreeding and genetic improvement (Sagel et al., 1994; Sehirali and Ozgen, 2007; Sabanci and Ayranci, 2015; Cimen et al., 2019). However, only five mutant cultivars have been released in fodder crops to date, which is relatively few (Acikgoz, 2021). Notable examples of vetch cultivars developed through mutation breeding, and the Toplesa variety, developed through the use of a mutant line in crossing. Additionally, two vetch lines, VSMP 04 and Mutant Line No. 1, have shown improvements in grain yield. (Micke, 1993; Artik and Pekşen, 2006; Aleksieva and Naidevova, 2012; Efe and Unal, 2017; Mikić et al., 2019).

Mutation breeding of Hungarian vetch began in 2010 at the Field Crops Central Research Institute, to increase genetic variation. The test material, Tarm Beyazi-98, was exposed to various doses of Gamma radiation. Plants with desirable traits were selected from the  $M_2$  to  $M_4$  generations, and by the  $M_5$  generation, line selection and seed multiplication had begun. In 2019 and 2020, yield trials were conducted with 11 mutant lines and two control cultivars.

The primary objectives of this research were to (1) investigate the morphological, agronomical, and forage quality traits of the mutant lines under semi-arid conditions, (2) compare the mutant lines to control cultivars in order to assess the effects of the mutations, and (3) provide detailed data on the development of genetic diversity, particularly focusing on yield and quality traits.

# 2. MATERIAL AND METHOD

#### Material

Eleven mutant lines and two control cultivars (cv. Kansur and cv. Tarm Beyazi-98) were used as plant material in the study (Table 1).

| Number | Lines Cultivars | Doses (Gy) | Mutant lines |
|--------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| 1      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 60         | TB603        |
| 2      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 60         | TB605        |
| 3      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 80         | TB802        |
| 4      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 80         | TB805        |
| 5      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 80         | TB806        |
| 6      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1002       |
| 7      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1005       |
| 8      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1006       |
| 9      | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1007       |
| 10     | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1008       |
| 11     | Tarm Beyazi-98  | 100        | TB1009       |
| 12     | Kansur          | -          | Control      |
| 13     | Tarm Beyazi-98  | -          | Control      |

Table 1. The mutant lines and control cultivars of Hungarian vetch

The soil condition at experimental area was slightly alkaline and poor in organic matter while the levels of P2O5, K2O, and CaCO3 were relatively high.

Rainfall in spring and autumn is necessary for germination, emergence, growth, and development of plants in Hungarian vetch cultivation in the Central Anatolian region. Rainfall in the experimental years was lower than the long-term average (Table 2) (Anonymous, 2021). 2020 also received more precipitation than the first year, especially higher amounts in April, May and June. Temperature values were lower than the long-term average in the first year and higher in the second year. Relative humidity was below the long-term average in both years.

| Mountha       | Pre    | cipitation (n | nm)    | Ten   | nperature ( | °C)   | Relati | Relative moisture (%) |       |  |
|---------------|--------|---------------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------------------|-------|--|
| Mountuis      | 2019   | 2020          | LT*    | 2019  | 2020        | LT    | 2019   | 2020                  | LT    |  |
| January       | 36.2   | 17.4          | 32.5   | -0.8  | -2.2        | -1.4  | 83.9   | 74.8                  | 88.2  |  |
| February      | 36.4   | 33.2          | 22.7   | 2.2   | 0.5         | 1.0   | 75.0   | 70.9                  | 80.9  |  |
| March         | 20.6   | 14.2          | 40.3   | 5.0   | 5.6         | 5.1   | 59.2   | 60.7                  | 71.2  |  |
| April         | 23.4   | 39.0          | 24.5   | 7.9   | 8.2         | 9.6   | 61.1   | 54.8                  | 63.6  |  |
| May           | 3.8    | 40.6          | 47.5   | 15.1  | 13.3        | 14.3  | 55.4   | 55.9                  | 62.6  |  |
| June          | 15.0   | 74.3          | 38.1   | 18.7  | 17.3        | 18.5  | 58.7   | 53.7                  | 58.9  |  |
| July          | 7.2    | 0.6           | 9.5    | 17.8  | 23.1        | 22.2  | 54.3   | 42.3                  | 46.1  |  |
| August        | 9.2    | 0.0           | 8.1    | 20.8  | 22.7        | 22.5  | 47.1   | 37.5                  | 45.0  |  |
| September     | 4.2    | 11.6          | 18.5   | 16.3  | 20.9        | 18.0  | 47.2   | 47.8                  | 49.5  |  |
| October       | 9.2    | 20.0          | 33.0   | 12.0  | 15.6        | 12.0  | 54.6   | 54.3                  | 64.6  |  |
| November      | 35.2   | 2.4           | 15.6   | 6.7   | 4.5         | 5.6   | 64.4   | 77.8                  | 74.9  |  |
| December      | 21.4   | 10.2          | 28.1   | 0.9   | 4.0         | 0.8   | 83.6   | 86.7                  | 85.8  |  |
| Total/Average | 221.80 | 263.50        | 318.40 | 10.22 | 11.13       | 10.68 | 62.04  | 59.77                 | 65.94 |  |

Table 2. Climatic data of experimental field (TSMS, 2021)

## Method

Hungarian vetch cultivar, Tarm Beyazi-98, was performed for Cobalt-60 (Co60) gamma irradiation at different doses (40, 60, 80, 100, 120, and 140 Gy) (105 seeds for each dose) in 2010 at the Turkiye Atomic Energy Authority (TAEK), Ankara Nuclear Research and Training Centre (ANAEM). M1 plants were grown in bulk. In the following generations (M2, M3, M4), observations were made on the mutant plants and the plants with the desired characteristics were carried to the next generation. When M5 generation was achieved, line selection and seed multiplication were started. However, as lines with the desired performance could not be obtained with 40, 120 and 140 gamma ray doses, these lines are not included in the present study. During the 2016-2018 growing seasons, sufficient seed of the mutant lines was produced to conduct the field yield trial. At this stage, the performance of the mutant lines was determined to be used in the further breeding process. In 2019 and 2020 growing seasons, yield trials were conducted in the research Institute, Ankara.

This research was carried out in a Randomized Comlepte Block Design with four replications in the field of Field Crops Central Research Institute Gölbaşı-İkizce Agricultural Research and Application Field in dry conditions in 2019 and 2020 growing seasons. The seeds of the mutant lines and the check cultivars were sown by hand in plots consisting of 6 rows with a row spacing of 25 cm. The length and width of the plots were fixed at 5 m and 1.5 m respectively. A distance of 2 m between blocks and 0.5 m between plots was left. At the same time as planting, DAP fertiliser was applied at a rate of 100 kg per hectare.

Morphological and agronomic data were collected between 15 May - 21 June 2019 and 21 May - 2 July 2020. The following morphological and agronomical traits were determined: natural plant height habitus (NPH) (cm), plant height (PH) (cm), stem diameter (SD) (mm), stem number (SN), pods per plant (PPP) (number), seeds per pod (SPP) (number) and 1000 seed weight (SW) (g), forage yield (FY) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), hay yield (HY) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), biological yield (BY) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), grain yield (GY) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (HI) (%). The quality traits of dry matter (DM) (%), digestible dry matter (DDM) (%), crude protein (CP) (%), digestible crude protein (DCP) (%), Acid Detergent Fibre (ADF) (%), Neutral Detergent Fibre (NDF) (%) and Relative Feed Values (RFV) (%) were identified through NIRS (Forage calibration package Lhay5fe.eqa). The significance levels of the differences between the examined traits of the mutant lines and check cultivars were determined using two-year combined analysis of variance (ANOVA) and then the genotypes were grouped according to Student's t multiple comparison tests (LSD) at 5% probability. Hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) was performed to determine the similarities between the mutant lines and the control cultivars. Correlation-based Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was also used to examine the relationships between characters and to identify the dominant genotypes with respect to these characters. HCA and PCA were carried out using Jump 11 statistical software.

# **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### Morphological traits

The natural plant height habitus, plant height, stem diameter, stem number, pods per plant, number of seeds per pod and 1000 seed weight (ANOVA) results of mutant lines and check cultivars are given in Table 3. Combined ANOVA results showed that there weren't significant differences among study genotypes for morphological traits in Table 3. Year effects seemed significant for stem number (P<0.01) and 1000 seed weight (P<0.01). No significant differences appeared on year x genotype interactions for traits.

**Table 3.** The combined variance analysis results (mean squares) of natural plant height habitus, plant height, stem diameter, stem number, pods per plant, number of seeds per pod and 1000 seed weight

| Source            | DF | Natural<br>plant height<br>habitus (cm) | Plant<br>height<br>(cm) | Stem<br>diameter<br>(mm) | Stem<br>number | Pods per<br>plant<br>(number) | Seeds per<br>pod<br>(number) | 1000 seed<br>weight<br>(g) |
|-------------------|----|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Years             | 1  | 38.02                                   | 206.13                  | 0.08                     | 43.16**        | 61.85                         | 6.01                         | 1599.96**                  |
| Error 1           | 3  | 65.41                                   | 48.15                   | 0.30                     | 0.32           | 26.28                         | 0.73                         | 2.54                       |
| Genotypes         | 12 | 30.35                                   | 41.52                   | 0.06                     | 0.21           | 24.42                         | 0.37                         | 18.02                      |
| Years x Genotypes | 12 | 29.13                                   | 39.82                   | 0.05                     | 0.30           | 18.67                         | 0.51                         | 13.69                      |
| Combined error    | 72 | 31.37                                   | 36.25                   | 0.05                     | 0.25           | 13.25                         | 0.51                         | 18.68                      |

\*\* Significant at 1%; DF Degrees of freedom

**Table 4.** Natural plant height habitus, plant height, stem diameter and stem number of the standard varieties and mutant lines in 2019,2020 and two-years averages

| Genotypes      | Nat  | ural plant<br>habitus (ci | height<br>m) | Plant height (cm) |         |      | Stem diameter (mm) |      |      | Stem number |      |      |
|----------------|------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------|------|--------------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|
| •••            | 2019 | 2020                      | Ave.         | 2019              | 2020    | Ave. | 2019               | 2020 | Ave. | 2019        | 2020 | Ave. |
| TB603          | 36.3 | 37.9 bc                   | 37.1         | 41.8              | 42.1 b  | 42.0 | 2.3                | 2.4  | 2.3  | 3.7         | 3.0  | 3.3  |
| TB605          | 38.7 | 37.2 bc                   | 38.0         | 43.2              | 41.9 b  | 42.6 | 2.2                | 2.2  | 2.2  | 3.8         | 2.6  | 3.2  |
| TB802          | 38.4 | 36.0 bc                   | 37.7         | 44.1              | 40.8 b  | 42.4 | 2.1                | 2.3  | 2.2  | 3.7         | 2.4  | 3.0  |
| TB805          | 41.7 | 36.9 bc                   | 39.3         | 47.7              | 39.8 bc | 43.8 | 2.7                | 2.3  | 2.5  | 3.8         | 2.5  | 3.1  |
| TB806          | 36.3 | 36.9 bc                   | 36.6         | 41.7              | 40.2 bc | 40.9 | 2.3                | 2.4  | 2.3  | 4.0         | 2.6  | 3.3  |
| TB1002         | 39.8 | 36.2 bc                   | 38.0         | 45.5              | 40.7 b  | 43.1 | 2.2                | 2.2  | 2.2  | 3.9         | 2.2  | 3.0  |
| TB1005         | 40.6 | 39.8 b                    | 40.2         | 45.9              | 42.9 b  | 44.4 | 2.2                | 2.3  | 2.3  | 3.8         | 2.6  | 3.2  |
| TB1006         | 39.1 | 32.1 c                    | 35.6         | 44.4              | 33.2 c  | 38.8 | 2.1                | 2.3  | 2.2  | 3.4         | 2.3  | 2.8  |
| TB1007         | 41.2 | 36.9 bc                   | 39.1         | 48.9              | 42.7 b  | 45.8 | 2.2                | 2.3  | 2.2  | 4.4         | 2.2  | 3.3  |
| TB1008         | 38.9 | 47.0 a                    | 42.9         | 44.4              | 51.4 a  | 47.9 | 2.4                | 2.4  | 2.4  | 4.1         | 2.8  | 3.4  |
| TB1009         | 38.5 | 37.8 bc                   | 38.2         | 43.3              | 44.3 ab | 43.8 | 2.1                | 2.3  | 2.2  | 3.3         | 2.7  | 3.0  |
| Kansur         | 34.9 | 36.6 bc                   | 35.7         | 41.8              | 40.2 bc | 41.0 | 2.2                | 2.3  | 2.3  | 3.8         | 2.5  | 3.1  |
| Tarm Beyazi-98 | 39.5 | 35.9 bc                   | 37.7         | 44.6              | 40.5 b  | 42.6 | 2.3                | 2.3  | 2.3  | 3.9         | 2.5  | 3.2  |
| Mean           | 38.8 | 37.6                      | 38.2         | 44.4              | 41.6    | 43.0 | 2.2                | 2.3  | 2.3  | 3.8         | 2.5  | 3.1  |
| LSD. (0.05)    | 9.3  | 6.5                       | 5.6          | 10.0              | 7.1     | 6.0  | 0.4                | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.8         | 0.7  | 0.5  |
| CV. (%)        | 16.8 | 12.0                      | 14.7         | 15.6              | 11.9    | 14.0 | 13.0               | 6.8  | 10.3 | 14.3        | 18.4 | 15.9 |

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

When the natural plant height habitus (NPH) is examined, the highest and lowest values were obtained from the genotypes TB1008 (42.9 cm) and TB1006 (35.6 cm), respectively (Table 4). NPH in Hungarian vetch was reported to change between 35.7-54.0 cm (Aggunlu, 1999). The data in present study are in agreement with the researcher. The highest plant height (PH) was obtained from line TB1008 (47.9 cm), followed by mutant line TB1007 (45.8 cm). The lowest PH was measured by the line numbered TB806 (40.9 cm) (Table 4). PH results are also similar to the findings of Sayar et al. (2012); Eviz (2016); Hashalıcı et al. (2017) and Tankus (2020). It was observed that the mutation had no effect on stem diameter (SD). SD varied between 2.2 and 2.5 mm (Table 4). The data of the present study are consistent with the findings of different researchers such as Sayar (2014); Efe and Unal (2017). It has been determined that the mutagen does not significantly affect stem number (SN), but it does affect plant height (PH). The stem count ranged from 2.8 to 3.4 (Table 4). These findings are consistent with previous studies conducted by Sayar (2014); Efe and Unal (2017).

| Canatanaa      | Pods p | per plant (nu | imber) | Seeds | per pod (nu | mber) | 1000 | 1000 seed weight (g) |      |  |  |
|----------------|--------|---------------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|------|----------------------|------|--|--|
| Genotypes      | 2019   | 2020          | Ave.   | 2019  | 2020        | Ave.  | 2019 | 2020                 | Ave. |  |  |
| TB603          | 13.6   | 13.1          | 13.4   | 4.7   | 5.1         | 4.9   | 46.0 | 55.0                 | 50.5 |  |  |
| TB605          | 11.5   | 15.7          | 13.6   | 4.4   | 5.2         | 4.8   | 46.8 | 53.0                 | 49.9 |  |  |
| TB802          | 12.8   | 15.8          | 14.3   | 4.9   | 5.0         | 4.9   | 51.6 | 54.7                 | 53.1 |  |  |
| TB805          | 13.2   | 20.0          | 16.6   | 4.9   | 5.2         | 5.0   | 48.5 | 55.9                 | 52.2 |  |  |
| TB806          | 14.8   | 15.6          | 15.2   | 4.5   | 5.3         | 4.9   | 48.9 | 53.5                 | 51.2 |  |  |
| TB1002         | 14.3   | 16.9          | 15.6   | 4.3   | 5.1         | 4.7   | 49.6 | 53.9                 | 51.7 |  |  |
| TB1005         | 17.9   | 15.4          | 16.6   | 4.8   | 4.5         | 4.6   | 45.8 | 55.3                 | 50.6 |  |  |
| TB1006         | 15.2   | 14.2          | 14.7   | 4.9   | 4.7         | 4.8   | 44.2 | 54.2                 | 49.2 |  |  |
| TB1007         | 15.5   | 18.0          | 16.7   | 4.8   | 4.6         | 4.7   | 44.9 | 55.5                 | 50.2 |  |  |
| TB1008         | 12.2   | 17.1          | 14.6   | 4.5   | 5.2         | 4.8   | 43.9 | 54.6                 | 49.3 |  |  |
| TB1009         | 12.9   | 14.4          | 13.7   | 4.4   | 5.3         | 4.8   | 43.8 | 54.9                 | 49.3 |  |  |
| Kansur         | 13.4   | 9.1           | 11.3   | 4.6   | 6.1         | 5.4   | 44.3 | 52.3                 | 48.3 |  |  |
| Tarm Beyazi-98 | 10.7   | 12.8          | 11.7   | 4.2   | 4.7         | 4.5   | 44.3 | 51.8                 | 48.0 |  |  |
| Mean           | 13.7   | 15.2          | 14.4   | 4.6   | 5.1         | 4.8   | 46.4 | 54.2                 | 50.3 |  |  |
| LSD. (0.05)    | 5.0    | 5.4           | 3.6    | 1.0   | 1.1         | 0.7   | 6.7  | 5.6                  | 4.3  |  |  |
| CV. (%)        | 25.5   | 24.9          | 25.2   | 15.1  | 14.6        | 14.8  | 10.1 | 7.2                  | 8.6  |  |  |

**Table 5.** Number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod and 1000 seed weight of the standard of varieties and mutant lines in2019, 2020 and two-year averages

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

The mutagen effect was higher in PPP than in other traits and higher variation occurred for this trait. Therefore, coefficient of variation was found to be high in PPP. According to the average results, the lowest, highest and average PPP were 11.3, 16.7, and 14.4 respectively. The number of SPP ranged from 4.5 to 5.4, with an average of 4.8. SW changed from 48.0 to 53.1 g and the average value had 50.3 g. When Tarm Beyazi-98 had 11.7 PPP, mutant lines were found between 13.4 and 16.7. The same situation was observed in SW. While SW in Tarm Beyazi-98 was 48 g, this value reached up to 53.1 g in mutant lines. The increase in these two traits in mutant lines naturally led to increased seed yield. When PPP was evaluated TB1007 (16.7 number) gave the highest number of pods. This was followed by line TB1005 (16.6 number). The lowest PPP was obtained from the control cultivar Kansur (11.3 number) (Table 5). In a study of Diyarbakır conditions, PPP was determined to vary between 15.6 and 29.5 (Seydosoglu, 2014). PPP values we obtained are in agreement with the researcher. SPP and SW values were 4.5-5.4 number and 48.0-53.1 g respectively. In the previous study SPP was counted as 2.8-5.7 number (Efe and Unal, 2017) and 2.5-3.2 number (Seydosoglu, 2014). SW values were also detected to change from 29.9 to 46.6 g in the past study (Seydosoglu, 2014).

It is widely acknowledged in the scientific literature that the effects of mutation applications vary considerably according to the species, variety, and line of the plant in question. Furthermore, these effects can be either positive or negative in terms of the plant's physiological, morphological, and agricultural characteristics (Aleksieva ve Naidevova, 2012; Efe ve Unal, 2017; Ogutcen et al., 2018). The results of this study indicate that the impact of gamma-ray treatment on morphological and agricultural characteristics in mutant lines is variable. This finding is consistent with other studies in this area.

#### Agronomic traits

The results of the variance analysis for forage and hay yields, biological yield, grain yield and harvest index in the genotypes are presented in Table 6. As indicated in Table 6, significant differences were identified between the genotypes for biological yield and harvest index at the p < 0.01 level. A significant difference (P < 0.01/P < 0.05) was observed for all traits in the years x interactions category. There was no significant difference between years at observed traits in Table 6. However, year values are given to show similarities. Evaluations and comments were made based on general average values. While there was no difference in forage yields between genotypes in 2020, there were significant differences in 2019 data, so they were grouped. Furthermore, genotypes responded differently to years, so the year x genotype interaction was significant.

Table 6. The combined variance analysis results (mean squares) of forage and hay yields, biological yield, grain yield and harvest index

| Source            | DF | Forage yield<br>(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Hay yield<br>(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Biological yield<br>(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Harvest index<br>(%) |
|-------------------|----|--|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Years             | 1  | 2970.01                                | 2294.11                             | 24.94                                      | 5.41                               | 15.70                |
| Error 1           | 3  | 3142.24                                | 250.51                              | 105.64                                     | 7.51                               | 22.68                |
| Genotypes         | 12 | 939.48                                 | 78.02                               | 67.32**                                    | 2.67                               | 70.05**              |
| Years x Genotypes | 12 | 1165.30*                               | 85.60*                              | 86.77**                                    | 4.37**                             | 115.40**             |
| Combined error    | 72 | 519.42                                 | 43.61                               | 25.70                                      | 1.52                               | 19.15                |

\* Significant at 5%; \*\* Significant at 1%; DF: Degrees of freedom

| Canatynaa      | Forage      | yield (kg ha-1) |        | Нау у     | ield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | )     |
|----------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Genotypes      | 2019        | 2020            | Ave.   | 2019      | 2020                        | Ave.  |
| TB603          | 100.87 bcd  | 98.29           | 99.58  | 32.48 abc | 24.57                       | 28.53 |
| TB605          | 101.87 bcd  | 79.58           | 90.73  | 31.46 bc  | 19.90                       | 25.68 |
| TB802          | 90.71 cd    | 98.63           | 94.67  | 27.12 c   | 24.66                       | 25.89 |
| TB805          | 116.67 abcd | 76.08           | 96.38  | 34.15 abc | 19.02                       | 26.59 |
| TB806          | 91.47cd     | 90.00           | 90.73  | 30.84 bc  | 22.50                       | 26.67 |
| TB1002         | 131.13 ab   | 95.61           | 113.37 | 41.93 a   | 23.90                       | 32.92 |
| TB1005         | 129.53ab    | 105.39          | 117.46 | 39.01 ab  | 26.35                       | 32.68 |
| TB1006         | 111.60 abcd | 79.72           | 95.66  | 34.74 abc | 19.93                       | 27.33 |
| TB1007         | 140.60 a    | 95.83           | 118.22 | 42.50 a   | 23.96                       | 33.23 |
| TB1008         | 100.13 bcd  | 125.96          | 113.05 | 31.54 bc  | 31.49                       | 31.51 |
| TB1009         | 87.33 d     | 110.39          | 98.86  | 27.12 c   | 27.60                       | 27.36 |
| Kansur         | 92.53 cd    | 105.50          | 99.02  | 29.36 bc  | 26.38                       | 27.87 |
| Tarm Beyazi-98 | 121.60 abc  | 116.11          | 118.86 | 39.14 ab  | 29.03                       | 34.08 |
| Mean           | 108.93      | 98.24           | 103.58 | 33.95     | 24.56                       | 29.26 |
| LSD. (0.05)    | 31.20       | 34.11           | 22.72  | 10.33     | 8.53                        | 6.58  |
| CV. (%)        | 19.97       | 24.21           | 22.00  | 21.2      | 24.21                       | 22.57 |

| Table | 7. Forage and | l hay y | ields of | the standard | varieties and | mutant lines | in 2019. | 2020 and | two-year | averages |
|-------|---------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|       | 0             | ~ ~ ~   |          |              |               |              |          |          | -        | <u> </u> |

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

According to the results of the combined analysis of the Tarm Beyazi-98 had the highest forage yields (FY) (118.86 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the TB605 and TB806 was the lowest FY (90.73 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Table 7). FYs were reported as 122.7-233.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in Sayar et al. (2012), 100.39-173.39 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in Tankus (2020), and 116.07-260.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in Hashalıcı et al. (2017). As the present study results were smaller than the data of Sayar et al. (2012), but they were similar to the values of Tankus (2020) and Hashalıcı et al. (2017). The combined analysis of Tarm Beyazi-98 produced the highest hay yields (HY) (34.08 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) while TB605 had the lowest HY (25.68 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Table 7). These research results correspond with the findings of Sayar et al. (2012), Eviz (2016), Hashalıcı et al. (2017), Tankus (2020), Ertekin et al. (2020).

| Table 8. I | Biological | yield. | grain | yield and h | arvest index | of the | e standard | varieties | and mutant | lines in | 2019, | , 2020 an | d two-y | year av | verages |
|------------|------------|--------|-------|-------------|--------------|--------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
|------------|------------|--------|-------|-------------|--------------|--------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|

| Canatura            | Biolog     | gical yield (kg | g ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Grain yie  | eld (kg ł | na <sup>-1</sup> ) | Harvest index (%) |          |         |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|
| Genotype            | 2019       | 2020            | Ave.                 | 2019       | 2020      | Ave.               | 2019              | 2020     | Ave.    |
| 1 (TB603)           | 24.03 abcd | 20.42 de        | 22.23 c              | 3.72 de    | 5.20      | 4.46               | 16.1 cd           | 26.0 a   | 21.0 b  |
| 2 (TB605)           | 24.22abcd  | 26.13 cde       | 25.18 abc            | 4.59 abcde | 4.68      | 4.63               | 18.9 cd           | 17.7 cd  | 18.3 bc |
| 3 (TB802)           | 22.77 cd   | 20.96 cde       | 21.86 c              | 4.17 cde   | 4.31      | 4.24               | 18.9 cd           | 20.4 bc  | 19.6 b  |
| 4 (TB805)           | 22.37 cd   | 27.17 abcd      | 24.77 abc            | 3.81 de    | 4.72      | 4.26               | 17.4 cd           | 17.1 cd  | 17.3 bc |
| 5 (TB806)           | 20.87 d    | 22.95 cde       | 21.91 c              | 5.59 abc   | 3.00      | 4.29               | 27.2 ab           | 13.6 d   | 20.5 b  |
| 6 (TB1002)          | 18.47 d    | 24.75 cde       | 21.61 c              | 6.29 a     | 5.35      | 5.82               | 34.0 a            | 21.1 abc | 27.6 a  |
| 7 (TB1005)          | 29.13 abc  | 18.77 e         | 23.95 bc             | 5.07 abcd  | 4.87      | 4.97               | 16.8 cd           | 25.4 a   | 21.1 b  |
| 8 (TB1006)          | 28.89 abc  | 28.20 abc       | 28.54 ab             | 6.19 ab    | 4.95      | 5.57               | 21.6 bc           | 18.0 cd  | 19.8 b  |
| 9 (TB1007)          | 30.60 a    | 26.69 bcd       | 28.64 ab             | 5.04 abcd  | 5.30      | 5.17               | 17.0 cd           | 19.8 bc  | 18.4 bc |
| 10 (TB1008)         | 29.91 ab   | 21.27 cde       | 25.59 abc            | 3.83 de    | 5.20      | 4.51               | 13.1 d            | 24.5 ab  | 18.8 bc |
| 11 (TB1009)         | 24.84 abcd | 34.73 a         | 29.79 a              | 4.57 bcde  | 6.73      | 5.65               | 18.8 cd           | 19.4 c   | 19.1 bc |
| 12 (Kansur)         | 23.27 bcd  | 33.82 ab        | 28.54 ab             | 3.17 e     | 5.51      | 4.34               | 13.4 d            | 16.4 cd  | 14.9 c  |
| 13 (Tarm Beyazi-98) | 21.87 d    | 28.12 abc       | 24.99 abc            | 3.30 e     | 5.43      | 4.36               | 15.4 cd           | 19.2 c   | 17.3 bc |
| Mean                | 24.71      | 25.69           | 25.20                | 4.56       | 5.02      | 4.79               | 19.1              | 19.9     | 19.5    |
| LSD. (0.05)         | 6.91       | 7.61            | 5.05                 | 1.71       | 1.83      | 1.23               | 7.37              | 4.95     | 4.36    |
| CV. (%)             | 19.50      | 20.66           | 20.12                | 26.10      | 25.42     | 25.76              | 26.87             | 17.33    | 22.43   |

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

According to the average biological yields (BY) the TB1002 and TB1009 had the lowest and highest averages at 21.61 and 29.79 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively (Table 8). In a previous study it was found as 19.69 - 39.07 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Cebeci, 2017). Furthermore some study results were reported that BY in different Hungarian vetch varieties were found to be 18.8-26.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Ucar, 2022) and 27.20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Koç, 2020). The findings of these studies align with each other. Based on the two-year averages the TB802 and TB1002 had the lowest and highest grain yields (GY) at 4.24 and 5.82 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively (Table 8). Similar to this study Koç (2020) calculated GY of Hungarian vetch to be 5.32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. A comparison of the cultivar (Tarm Beyazi-98) with GY of the lines (TB1002, TB1009, TB1006, TB1007 and TB1005) revealed that the lines exhibited higher yields, ranging from 13.99 to 33.49%. It is thought that the high GY can be explained by mutations impacting PPP and SW (Sattler et al., 2014; Shi et al., 2020). This increase in GY clearly shows

No significant differences were observed between the years for the five aforementioned traits. The genotypes exhibited disparate responses to varying rainfall and temperature levels in both years, resulting in notable alterations in their yearly rankings. Consequently, the genotype-by-year interaction was found to be statistically significant at the 1 or 5% level.

#### Quality traits

Variance analysis results of of dry matter, digestible dry matter, crude protein, digestible protein, acid detergent fiber, neutral detergent fiber and relative feed values for genotypes are given in Table 9. When Table 9 was observed there was no significant difference between the genotypes, years and year x genotype interaction in terms of these four traits.

**Table 9.** The combined variance analysis results (mean squares) of dry matter, digestible dry matter, crude protein, digestible protein, acid detergent fiber, neutral detergent fiber and relative feed values

|                   | р      | Dry    | Digestible Dry | Crude   | Digestible | Acid Detergent | Neutral         | Relativ |
|-------------------|--------|--------|----------------|---------|------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Source            | D<br>E | Matter | Matter         | Protein | Protein    | Fiber          | Detergent Fiber | e Feed  |
|                   | Г      | (%)    | (%)            | (%)     | (%)        | (%)            | (%)             | Values  |
| Years             | 1      | 0.17   | 2.10           | 0.83    | 0.35       | 3.46           | 32.05           | 288.21  |
| Error 1           | 3      | 0.07   | 1.09           | 0.82    | 0.28       | 1.80           | 0.06            | 6.92    |
| Genotypes         | 12     | 0.09   | 1.38           | 1.18    | 0.55       | 2.27           | 6.11            | 66.10   |
| Years x Genotypes | 12     | 0.04   | 1.16           | 1.08    | 0.48       | 1.92           | 9.41            | 85.95   |
| Combined error    | 72     | 0.14   | 1.72           | 0.64    | 0.32       | 2.84           | 8.62            | 90.20   |

DF: Degrees of freedom

**Table 10.** Dry matter, digestible dry matter, crude protein and digestible protein values of the standard varieties and mutant lines in 2019, 2020 and two-year averages

| Genotypes           | Dry Matter (%) |      |      | Digestible Dry Matter (%) |      |      | Crude Protein (%) |      |      | Digestible Protein (%) |      |      |
|---------------------|----------------|------|------|---------------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------------------------|------|------|
|                     | 2019           | 2020 | Ave. | 2019                      | 2020 | Ave. | 2019              | 2020 | Ave. | 2019                   | 2020 | Ave. |
| 1 (TB603)           | 88.6           | 88.8 | 88.7 | 62.1                      | 62.3 | 62.2 | 24.1              | 22.0 | 23.1 | 17.1                   | 15.7 | 16.4 |
| 2 (TB605)           | 89.2           | 88.9 | 89.0 | 62.2                      | 62.9 | 62.5 | 22.6              | 21.7 | 22.2 | 16.1                   | 15.5 | 15.8 |
| 3 (TB802)           | 88.9           | 88.7 | 88.8 | 62.1                      | 60.6 | 61.3 | 22.5              | 21.4 | 21.9 | 16.0                   | 15.2 | 15.6 |
| 4 (TB805)           | 88.8           | 88.7 | 88.7 | 60.8                      | 62.5 | 61.7 | 21.3              | 21.9 | 21.6 | 15.1                   | 15.6 | 15.4 |
| 5 (TB806)           | 88.7           | 88.7 | 88.7 | 61.7                      | 60.8 | 61.2 | 22.6              | 22.8 | 22.7 | 16.0                   | 15.9 | 15.9 |
| 6 (TB1002)          | 89.3           | 88.9 | 89.1 | 60.9                      | 61.7 | 61.3 | 21.6              | 22.0 | 21.8 | 15.3                   | 15.6 | 15.4 |
| 7 (TB1005)          | 88.9           | 88.8 | 88.9 | 61.8                      | 61.0 | 61.4 | 22.8              | 21.1 | 21.9 | 16.1                   | 15.0 | 15.6 |
| 8 (TB1006)          | 88.8           | 88.6 | 88.7 | 62.0                      | 61.7 | 61.9 | 22.0              | 22.7 | 22.3 | 15.7                   | 16.0 | 15.8 |
| 9 (TB1007)          | 89.0           | 88.9 | 88.9 | 62.4                      | 63.8 | 63.1 | 23.1              | 23.4 | 23.3 | 16.4                   | 16.7 | 16.5 |
| 10 (TB1008)         | 88.8           | 88.9 | 88.9 | 60.0                      | 62.0 | 61.0 | 22.0              | 22.3 | 22.2 | 15.5                   | 15.8 | 15.7 |
| 11 (TB1009)         | 88.7           | 88.7 | 88.7 | 60.8                      | 62.2 | 61.5 | 22.7              | 21.9 | 22.3 | 15.9                   | 15.6 | 15.7 |
| 12 (Kansur)         | 89.0           | 89.1 | 89.1 | 61.7                      | 62.5 | 62.1 | 23.0              | 22.3 | 22.6 | 16.2                   | 15.8 | 16.0 |
| 13 (Tarm Beyazi-98) | 89.1           | 88.7 | 88.9 | 61.9                      | 61.7 | 61.8 | 22.4              | 24.0 | 23.2 | 15.9                   | 16.8 | 16.4 |
| Mean                | 88.9           | 88.8 | 88.8 | 61.6                      | 62.0 | 61.8 | 22.5              | 22.3 | 22.4 | 15.9                   | 15.8 | 15.9 |
| LSD. (0.05)         | 1.1            | 0.4  | 0.5  | 3.0                       | 2.7  | 1.9  | 2.0               | 1.5  | 1.2  | 1.4                    | 1.0  | 0.8  |
| CV. (%)             | 0.6            | 0.2  | 0.4  | 2.3                       | 2.0  | 2.1  | 4.0               | 3.0  | 3.6  | 4.2                    | 2.9  | 3.6  |

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

The two-year average results indicated that dry matter (DM) content exhibited a range of values between 88.7 and 89.0%, with an average of 88.8%. The amount of digestible dry matter (DDM) changed in a range of 61.0 and 63.1% in the present study (Table 10). Furthermore, the literature indicates that DDM ratios range from 59.43 to 63.21% (Bingöl et al., 2007), 59.10 to 68.69% (Aksoy and Nursoy, 2010), 62.4% (Cacan and Y1lmaz, 2015), and 56.0 to 65.5% (Bayar and Cacan, 2019). In this study crude protein (CP) rates ranged from 21.6 to 23.3% (Table 10). In addition in the literature CP rates were measured at 15.10-21.35% (Elvan, 2019); 23.1-26.8% (Bayar and Cacan, 2019); 17.66-24.89% (Guzelogulları and Albayrak, 2012); 22.0-27.0% (Eviz, 2016). Except for Elvan's (2019) earlier experiments support our findings. The concept of digestibility pertains to the capacity of feed materials for utilisation by livestock. A higher degree of digestibility indicates that a greater proportion of the ingested feed content can be processed by the digestive tract (Sari et al., 2018). Digestible protein (DP) ratio is lower than CP ratio. Consequently, DP ratio exhibited fluctuations between 15.4% and 16.5% in the present study (Table 10).

| Canatrinas          | Acid D | etergent Fi | ber (%) | Neutral | Detergent Fi | Relative Feed Values |       |       |       |
|---------------------|--------|-------------|---------|---------|--------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Genotypes           | 2019   | 2020        | Ave.    | 2019    | 2020         | Ave.                 | 2019  | 2020  | Ave.  |
| 1 (TB603)           | 34.4   | 34.1        | 34.3    | 51.1    | 45.9         | 48.5                 | 114.8 | 126.5 | 120.7 |
| 2 (TB605)           | 34.2   | 33.4        | 33.8    | 47.0    | 47.0         | 47.0                 | 123.3 | 124.3 | 123.8 |
| 3 (TB802)           | 34.5   | 36.3        | 35.4    | 45.5    | 49.6         | 47.5                 | 127.0 | 113.9 | 120.5 |
| 4 (TB805)           | 36.0   | 33.9        | 34.9    | 52.4    | 44.9         | 48.7                 | 108.1 | 129.7 | 118.9 |
| 5 (TB806)           | 34.9   | 36.1        | 35.5    | 46.7    | 47.7         | 47.2                 | 122.9 | 118.6 | 120.7 |
| 6 (TB1002)          | 36.0   | 34.9        | 35.4    | 49.8    | 46.8         | 48.3                 | 113.8 | 122.9 | 118.3 |
| 7 (TB1005)          | 34.7   | 35.8        | 35.3    | 47.0    | 47.2         | 47.1                 | 122.4 | 120.2 | 121.3 |
| 8 (TB1006)          | 34.5   | 34.9        | 34.7    | 47.6    | 47.6         | 47.6                 | 121.2 | 120.6 | 120.9 |
| 9 (TB1007)          | 34.0   | 32.3        | 33.1    | 45.0    | 42.4         | 43.7                 | 129.2 | 139.8 | 134.5 |
| 10 (TB1008)         | 37.1   | 34.5        | 35.8    | 49.3    | 44.8         | 47.1                 | 113.9 | 129.0 | 121.4 |
| 11 (TB1009)         | 36.1   | 34.3        | 35.2    | 47.8    | 45.7         | 46.7                 | 118.7 | 126.6 | 122.6 |
| 12 (Kansur)         | 34.9   | 33.9        | 34.4    | 46.1    | 47.2         | 46.6                 | 125.1 | 123.8 | 124.4 |
| 13 (Tarm Beyazi-98) | 34.7   | 34.9        | 34.8    | 47.5    | 45.5         | 46.5                 | 121.3 | 127.1 | 124.2 |
| Mean                | 35.1   | 34.6        | 34.8    | 47.9    | 46.3         | 47.1                 | 120.1 | 124.8 | 122.5 |
| LSD. (0.05)         | 3.9    | 3.4         | 2.5     | 7.4     | 5.2          | 4.3                  | 22.5  | 18.7  | 13.9  |
| CV. (%)             | 5.1    | 4.6         | 4.8     | 7.1     | 5.1          | 6.2                  | 8.6   | 6.9   | 7.8   |

 Table 11. Acid detergent fiber, neutral detergent fiber and relative feed values of the standard varieties and mutant lines in 2019, 2020

 and two-year averages

LSD Least significant differences; CV (%) Coefficient of variation

The two-year average revealed that acid detergent fiber (ADF), neutral detergent fiber (NDF) and relative feed values (RFV) ranged from 33.1 to 35.5%, 46.5 to 48.7%, 8.3 to 134.5 respectively (Table 11). ADF ratios were found to be between 34.1% and 37.3% (Kusvuran et al., 2014), 34.1% (Cacan and Yılmaz, 2015), 30.01%-37.14% (Hashalıcı et al., 2017), 30.0%-42.3% (Bayar and Cacan, 2019), and 32.19%-39.87% (Elvan, 2019). Furthermore NDF ratios were identified at 38.3-45.0% (Kara, 2013), 40.7% (Cacan and Yılmaz, 2015), 39.05-46.79% (Hashalıcı et al., 2017), 37.2-7.5% (Bayar and Cacan, 2019), 45.87-54.46% (Elvan, 2019). RFV were determined to be 106-180 (Aksoy and Nursoy, 2010), 143.2 (Cacan and Yılmaz, 2015), 118.8 (Yılmaz et al., 2015), 112.0-163.8 (Bayar and Cacan, 2019), and 98.77 and 125.45 (Elvan, 2019).

Feeds are classified according to quality standards as either prime, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th quality. The properties of crude protein (CP), acid detergent fiber (ADF), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), digestible dry matter (DDM) and relative feed value (RFV) can be employed to categorise feed according to its quality requirements (Cacan et al., 2015; Elvan, 2019). For this reason, the following parameters were determined in terms of forage quality: DM, DDM, CP, digestible protein (DP), ADF, NDF and RFV. The results of the current study are in agreement with those of previous trials (Hashalıcı et al., 2017; Bayar and Cacan, 2019; Ertekinet al., 2020). The results of the quality criteria analysis indicated that, while there was no significant difference between the genotypes in terms of mutagen applications, the TB1007 line demonstrated first-class feed value. The remaining genotypes exhibited a second-class quality of feed.

#### Hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA)

It is of significant importance to be aware of the similarities in agro-morphological traits associated with high forage yield in order to facilitate the development of effective breeding programs. The efficacy of breeding programs during the initial breeding period is contingent upon the accurate phenotype selection of numerous individual plants within the nursery plot.

Upon further examination, it becomes evident that there are two main groups (Figure 1). The groups are categorised according to the quantity of FY and HY. The group A is divided into two subgroups (A1 and A2) based on the observed differences in NPH, PH, and SN traits. Similarly, the group B is also classified into two subgroups (B1 and B2) due to the presence of distinct NPH, PH, SN, and SD traits. Upon analysis of the six traits in question, it was observed that there was a close relationship between NPH and PH, as well as between FY and HY. The TB805 line differed from other lines in terms of SD. The TB1006 line exhibited notable differences in PH and SN compared to other genotypes.



Figure 1. Dendrogram as determined by cluster analysis according to agro- morphological values and quality traits of genotypes

#### Principal component analysis (PCA)

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was employed to ascertain the degree of correlation between traits and genotypes in the present study, as depicted on the biplot graph. The analysis also aimed to quantify the contribution of these traits and genotypes to the overall variation observed in the study data set (Figure 2).

Figure 2 presents the PCA results concerning the averages of the measured traits and genotypes. The mean value was calculated over two years. PCA1 and PCA2 collectively accounted for 57.1% and 23.3% of the total variation, respectively. When added together, they account for 80.4% of the total variation.

The examined traits were classified into six groups (Figure 2). The first group included NPH and PH, while the sixth included FY and HY. The TB1005 mutant line was located opposite other mutant lines such as TB605 and TB802. The TB1007, TB1005 and TB1002 mutant lines exhibited the highest data for both -FY and HY traits. The lowest yields were observed in the TB605, TB802, TB806 and TB1009 mutant lines. Additionally, the mutant line TB1006 exhibited the lowest SN.



Figure 2. Biplot of principal component analysis on observed traits

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

A total of 13 line/variety sets, comprising 11 mutant lines and two control varieties, were subjected to an evaluation process to study the effects of mutations on morphological, agronomic and quality traits. Evaluation of the mutant lines revealed a range of effects on the traits examined, including both positive and negative results. A negative effect in the TB1006 mutant and a positive effect in the TB1008 mutant was observed in plant height. This has broadened the genetic base of Hungarian vetch. Nevertheless, the quality criteria remained largely unaltered. While the TB1002 and TB1005 mutant lines exhibited a yield advantage, the TB1007 mutant line demonstrated a yield and quality advantage. These three mutant lines are recommended for use in breeding programs, particularly in future crossing studies.

## FUNDING

We would like to express our gratitude to the General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policies for their invaluable support in the conduct of this research project, which is registered under the following number: TAGEM/TBAD/16/A03/P01/004.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest associated with this study.

#### REFERENCES

Acikgoz, E. (2021). Forage Crops. Ankara: Republic of Turkiye Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Publication.

- Aggunlu, H. (1999). An Investigation on yield and yield factors of some hungarian vetch cultivars and lines in Isparta ecological conditions. Master's thesis. Süleyman Demirel University.
- Aksoy, İ., & Nursoy, H. (2010). Determination of the varying of vegetation harvested hungarian vetch and wheat mixture on nutrient content, degradation kinetics, *in vitro* digestibility and relative feed value. *Kafkas University Veterinary Faculty Journal*, 16(6), 925-931.
- Aleksieva, A., & Naidevova, G. (2012). A new mutant spring forage vetch line (*Vicia sativa* ssp. sativa L.) with increased pod number per fertile node. *Banat's Journal of Biotechnology*, 3(6), 5.
- Anonymous. (2021). Climate Data for Many Years and 2019-2020. Ankara: General Directorate of Meteorology.
- Artık, C., & Pekşen, E. (2006). The effects of gamma irradiation on seed yield and some plant characteristics of faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) in M<sub>2</sub> generation. *Anadolu Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 21(1), 95-104. https://doi.org/10.7161/anajas.2006.21.1.95-104
- Bayar, M., & Cacan, E. (2019). The change of some herbage yield and quality characteristics of Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz) at harvested in different times. I. International Harran Multidisciplinary Studies Congress. Şanlıurfa.
- Bingöl, N.T., Karsli, M.A., Yilmaz, I.H., & Bolat, D. (2007). The effects of planting time and combination on the nutrient composition and digestible dry matter yield of four mixtures of vetch varieties intercropped with barley. *Turkish Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences*, 31(5), 297-302.
- Cacan, E., Aydın, A., & Basbag, M. (2015). Determination of quality charecteristics of some grasses forage crops in Bingöl university campus. *Turkish Journal of Agricultural and Natural Sciences*, 2(1), 105-111.
- Cacan, E., & Yılmaz, Ş. (2015). Effects on hay yield and quality of different Hungarian vetch + wheat mixture ratio in Bingol conditions. *Turkish Journal of Agricultural and Natural Sciences*, 2(3), 290-296.
- Cebeci, H. (2017). Effect of Different Phosphorus Fertilizer Doses on Seed Yield and Yield Components in Some Hungarian Vetch (*Vicia Pannonica* Crantz.) Varieties. PhD diss., Ankara University.
- Chaudhary, J., Deshmukh, R., & Sonah, H. (2019). Mutagenesis approaches and their role in crop improvement. *Plants*, 8(11), 467. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants8110467
- Cimen, B., Yesiloglu, T., İncesu, M., Yılmaz, B., & Tuzcu, Ö. (2019). Evaluation of robinson mutant population derived by gamma irradiation. *Journal of Agriculture Faculty of Ege University*, 56(3),375-381. https://doi.org/10.20289/zfdergi.526322
- De la Rosa, L., Zambrana, E., & Ramirez-Parra, E. (2020). Molecular bases for drought tolerance in common vetch: designing new molecular breeding tools. *BMC plant biology*, 20, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12870-020-2267-z
- Efe, B., & Unal, S. (2017). Effect of different gamma ray doses on some quantitative characteristics in the Hungarian vetch varieties. *Journal of Agriculture and Nature*, 20, 135-143. https://doi.org/10.18016/ksudobil.349182
- Elvan, H. (2019). Determination of Feed Value of Some Hungarian Vetch Lines. Master's thesis, Namik Kemal University.
- Erdogdu, İ., Sever, A.L., & Atalay, A.K. (2016). Forage and seed yields of Hungarian vetch lines and varieties under Eskişehir ecological conditions. *Journal of Field Crops Central Research Institute*, 25(2), 230-234.
- Ergun, N., Akdoğan, G., Unver İkincikarakaya, S., & Aydoğan, S. (2023). Determination of optimum gamma ray irradiation doses for hulless barley (*Hordeum vulgare var. nudum* L. Hook. f.) genotypes. *Yuzuncu Yil University Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 33(2), 219-230. https://doi.org/10.29133/yyutbd.1248710

- Erkovan, Ş. (2022). Row seeding configuration regulates yield, quality and competition in common vetch (*Vicia sativa* L.)sudangrass (*Sorghum sudanense* (Piper.) Stapf.) mixture. Turkish Journal of Field Crops, 27(1), 87-94. https://doi.org/10.17557/tjfc.1056749
- Ertekin, İ., Atış, İ., & Yılmaz, Ş. (2020). The effects of different organic fertilizers on forage yield and quality of some vetch species. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 25(2), 243-255. https://doi.org/10.37908/mkutbd.739805
- Eviz, Ş. (2016). Winter Compliance with Siirt Requirements Some Hunger (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz) Genotiplerin Determination of Efficiency and Efficiency Components. Master's thesis, Siirt University.
- Fang, C.Q., Wang, C.T., Wang, P.W., Tang, Y.Y., Wang, X.Z., Cui, F.G., & Yu, S.L. (2012). Identification of a novel mutation in FAD2B from a peanut EMS mutant with elevated oleate content. *Journal of Oleo Science*, 61(3), 143-8. https://doi.org/10.5650/jos.61.143
- Guzelogulları, E., &Albayrak, S. (2016). The effects of different sowing and harvest times on forage yield and quality of some vetch (*Vicia* spp.) species under Isparta ecological conditions. *Journal of Field Crops Central Research Institute*, 25(2), 158-165.
- Hashalici, S., Uzun, S., Ozaktan, H., & Kaplan, M. (2017). Determination of forage yield and quality of some Hungarian vetch cultivars at Kayseri arid conditions. *Journal of The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Erciyes University*, 14(3), 113-123.
- Kara, İ. (2013). Cahanging of Dry Matter Yield and Forage Quality of Common Vetch Hungarian Vetch and Forage Pea Harvested in Different Growth Stages. Master's thesis, Atatürk University.
- Karim, K.M.R., Islam, A.K.M.R., Hossain, M.M., Azad, H.M.S., & Rahman, M.W. (2008). Effect of Gamma Rays on Yield and Yield Attributes of Large Seeded Chickpea. *Journal of Soil and Nature*, 2(2), 19-24.
- Koç, Y.E. (2020). Determination of Genotype-Environmental Interaction of Hungarian Vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.). Master's thesis, Eskisehir Osmangazi University.
- Kusvuran, A., Kaplan, M., & Nazlı, R. I. (2014). Effects of mixture ratio and row spacing in Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* crantz.) and annual ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum* Lam.) intercropping system on yield and quality under semiarid climate conditions. *Turkish Journal of Field Crops*, 19 (1), 118-128.
- Maluszynski, M., Nichterlein, L., Zanten, V., & Ahloowalia, B.S. (2000). Officially Released Mutant Varieties. *The FAO/IAEA DATABASE*. August 02, 2024.
- Micke, A. (1993). Mutation breeding of grain legumes. Plant and Soil, 152, 81-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00016335
- Mikić A., Mihailović, V., Karagić, D., Milošević, B., Milić, D., Vasiljević, S., Katanski, S., & Živanov, D. (2019). Common vetch (Vicia sativa) multi-podded mutants for enhanced commercial seed production. Proceedings on Applied Botany, Genetics and Breeding, 180(1), 78-81. https://doi.org/10.30901/2227-8834-2019-1-78-81
- Naydenova, G.K., & Aleksieva, A.K. (2014). Phenotypic performance and genotypic variance for reproductive characteristics in Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica Crantz*). *Romanian Agricultural Research*, 31, 69-74.
- Ogutcen, E., Pandey, A., Khan, M.K., Marques, E.R., Penmetsa, V., Kahraman, A. & Von Wettberg. Eric, J.B. (2018). Pod shattering: a homologous series of variation underlying domestication and an avenue for crop improvement. *Agronomy*, 8(8), 137. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8080137
- Renzi, J.P., Chantre, G.R., Smýkal, P., Presotto, A.D., Zubiaga, L., Garayalde, A.F., & Cantamutto, M.A. (2020). Diversity of naturalized hairy vetch (*Vicia villosa* Roth) populations in central Argentina as a source of potential adaptive traits for breeding. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 11, 189. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00189
- Sabancı, C.O., & Ayrancı, R. (2015). Plant Breeding. Kırşehir: Ahi Evran University Faculty of Agricuture Publishing.
- Sagel, Z., Tutluer, M., & Peskircioglu, H. (1994). Mutations in plant breeding. *Journal of Field Crops Central Research Institute*, 3: 1-2.
- Sari, N., Ridwan, R., Fidriyanto, R., Astuti, W.D., & Widyastuti, Y. (2018). Characteristic of different level of fermented concentrate in the rumen metabolism based on in vitro. *Journal of the Indonesian Tropical Animal Agriculture*, 43(3), 296-305. https://doi.org/10.14710/jitaa.43.3.296-305
- Sattler, S.E., Saballos, A., Xin, Z., Funnell-Harris, D.L., Vermerris, W., & Pedersen, J.F. (2014). characterization of novel sorghum brown midrib mutants from an EMS-Mutagenized population. G3: Genes. Genomes. *Genetics*, 4(11), 2115-2124. https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.114.014001
- Sayar, M. S., Karahan, H., Han, Y., Tekdal, S., & Basbag, M. (2012). Determination of forage yield, its affecting components and relationships among traits of some Hungarian Vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.) genotypes in K1z1ltepe ecological conditions. *International Journal of Agricultural and Natural Sciences*, 5(2), 126-130.
- Sayar, M.S. (2014). Determination of forage yield performance and the possibilities at entering crop rotation system for some annual forage legumes species in ecological conditions of Cinar district. *Dicle University Journal of the Institute of Natural and Applied Sciences*, 3(1), 19-28.
- Seydosoglu, S. (2014). Determination of Yield and Yield Components of Some Hungarian Vetch Genotype in Diyarbakir Ecological Conditions. *Türk Doğa ve Fen Dergisi*, 3(1), 49-54.
- Sahin-Demirbag, N., Kendir, H., Khawar, K.M., & Aasim, M. (2008). In vitro plant regeneration from Hungarian vetch (Vicia Pannonica Crantz) using cotyledonary node explants. Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment, 22(4), 929–932. https://doi.org/10.1080/13102818.2008.10817581
- Sarsu, F., Bimpong, I.K., & Jankuloski, L. (2020). Contribution of induced mutation in crops to global food security. ACI Avances en Ciencias e Ingenierías, 12(3), 10-10. https://doi.org/10.18272/aci.v12i3.2031
- Shi, H., Geng, B., Zhao, Y., Liu, Y., Huang, R., Zhao, P., & Guo, Z. (2020). EMS-Induced mutations in common vetch (*Vicia sativa* L.) and two mutants without anthocyanin accumulation showing increased cold tolerance. *Grassland Science*, 67(2),148-155 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/grs.12301
- Sehirali, S., & Ozgen, M. (2007). Plant Breeding. Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Agricuture Publishing.
- Tankus, H. (2020). Determination of Agricultural Characteristics in Variant Harvest (Vicia sativa L.), Hungary Fee (Vicia pannonica Crantz.) and Feed Pea (Pisum sativum L.). Master's Thesis, Harran University.
- TSMS. (2021). Climate data for many years, 2019 and 2020. Turkish State Meteorological Service, Ankara.

Ucar, R., Ekmekci, M., Cacan, E., Ozdemir, S., Kökten, K., Kutlu, M.A., & Mokhtarzadeh, S. (2022). Evaluation of Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz) varieties in terms of straw yield and straw quality. *ADYUTAYAM*. 10(1), 75-82.

Unal, S., Mutlu, Z., & Firincioğlu, H.K. (2011). Performances of some winter Hungarian vetch accessions (*Vicia pannonica* crantz.) on the highlands of Turkiye. *Turkish Journal of Field Crops* 16(1), 1-8.

Uzun, A., Bilgili, U., Sincik, M., & Acikgoz, E. (2004). Effects of seeding rates on yield and yield components of Hungarian vetch (*Vicia pannonica* Crantz.). *Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry*, 28(3), 179-182.

Zhang, X., & Mosjidis, J.A. (1998). Rapid prediction of mating system of *Vicia* species. *Crop Science*, 38(3), 872-875. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1998.0011183X003800030041x