Variability, heritability and genetic advance in propagation parameters of mulberry (Morus species)

Thus, the information gathered on different propagation parameters of mulberry accessions would be useful for selecting the appropriate accessions for further use.

References

- Bhat, G.G. and Hittalmani, S. (1996). Clonal differences in mulberry (*Morus* spp.) for root growth parameters. *Indian J. Sericulture*, **31** (1): 5-8.
- Chloupek, O. and Rod, J. (1992). The root system as a selection criterion. *Plant Breeding Abstract*, **62 (12) :** 1337-1341.
- Dorcus David and Vivekanandan. (1997). Exploitation of mulberry for drought resistance potential. *Journal of Sericultrual Science* of Japan, **66 (2) :** 71–80.
- Goel, A. K., Ravindran, S., Rao, A.A., Naik, V.G., Tikader, A., Mukherjee, P. and Sekar, S. (1998). Variability in rooting parameters at juvenile stage in mulberry (*Morus* spp.) germplasm. *Indian J. Sericulture*, **37(2):** 109-112.
- Hartman, H.T. and Kester, D.E. (1978). Plant propagation, Principle and Practices. Prentice

Hall of India Private limited, Third Edition, New Delhi 110 001, pp. 255 and 662.

- Tikakader, A., Shamsuddin, M., Vijayan, K. and Pavankumar, T. (1995). Survival potential in different varieties of mulberry (*Morus* species). *Ind. J. Agric. Sciences*, 65(2): 133 – 135.
- Tikader, A., Vijayan, K., Roy, B.N. and Pavankumar, T. (1996). Studies on propagation efficiency of mulberry (*Morus* spp.) at ploidy level. Sericologia, **36**(2): 345 – 349.
- Tikader, A. and Pavankumar, T. (1998). Variation analysis among some rooting parameters in mulberry (*Morus* spp.). *Indian J. Forestry*, 21(4): 304 – 307.
- Tikader, A. and Roy, B.N. (1999), Correlation and path analysis studies in rooting parameters of exotic mulberry germplasm accessions (*Morus* spp.). *Indian J. Forestry*, **22(4):** 357 – 361.
- Singh, R.K. and Chaudhury, B.D. (1979). Biometrical methods in quantitatice genetic analysis. Kalyani Publishers, 1/1, Rajendranagar, Ludhiana, pp 39-63.

Madras Agric. J., 93 (1-6) : 111-115 January-June 2006

https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.1007332

Research Notes

Studies on relationship between yield and its components in Indian mustard

J.M. PATEL, K.M. PATEL, K.P. PRAJAPATI, AND C.J. PATEL Main Castor and Mustard Research Station, S.D. Agricultural Univ., Sardarkrushinagar-385 506, Gujarat

Understanding the relationship between yield and its components is of paramount importance for making best use of these relationships in selection. Correlation coefficient and path analysis are the important parameters for achieving this purpose. The correlation coefficient would reveal direct effect due to common association inherent in trait interrelationship. Therefore, information derived from the correlation coefficients may be augmented by partitioning correlations into direct and indirect effects by path analysis. The aim of the present study was to work out interrelationship among 13 traits and their direct and indirect effects on seed yield in Indian mustard.

Forty genotypes were grown in *rabi* 2002-2003 at Agricultural Research Station, GAU, Ladol. The experiment was planned in randomized block design with three replications, keeping the row to row and plant to plant distance 45 cm and 15 cm, respectively. Ten competitive plant selected randomly in each plot per replication were used to record observations for thirteen characters. Analysis of genotypic and phenotypic correlation was carried out as per formula suggested by Burton (1952). The path coefficient analysis was carried out according to the method given by Dewey and Lu (1959).

The data presented in Table 1, revealed that genotypic correlation was greater in magnitude than phenotypic ones with exception of that between length of main branch. It suggested that there is strong association between these characters genetically. Seed yield per plant was positively and significantly correlated with number of secondary branches (0.733), plant height (0.641), number of primary branches (0.530), days to flowering (0.520), days to maturity (0.469), number of siliquae per plant (0.402), test weight (0.247)and length of siliqua (0.241). Mahala et al. (2003) also reported similar findings for plant height, seeds per siliqua and length of main branch. These results are in conformity with the report of Khubie and Pant (1999) for

number of primary branches, number of secondary branches, number of siliquae per plant, length of siliqua and test weight.

Number of primary branches, number of secondary branches, plant height and days to fifty per cent flowering, exhibited significant and positive association with seed yield and these components in turn exhibited positive correlation with each other. The results indicated that selection for one of these traits may automatically help to combine many useful other variables as indicated above. Khan and Gupta (1998) reported similar result for plant height, days to fifty per cent flowering and report of Khuble and Pant (1999) for number of secondary branches per plant. Oil content showed non-significant and negative correlation with all the characters except days to flowering, number of secondary branches, length of main branch and length of siliqua. Harvest index also showed negative association with all the characters under study except length of main branch and oil content.

The direct and indirect effects of characters on seed yield are presented in Table 2. The number of primary branches per plant showed the highest direct effect, followed by plant height, seeds per siliqua, test weight, length of siliqua and length of main branch.

Number of primary branches did exert indirect effect mainly through plant height, seeds per siliqua and number of secondary branches. Plant height had indirect effects mainly through number of primary branches and seeds per siliqua. Indirect effect through oil content was negligible. In case of number of primary branches per plant, plant height and test weight, the correlation with seed yield was high and positive along with high direct effect. Hence direct selection may be

| Characters | | Days to flowering | Days to maturity | Plant height | Length of main branch | No.of primary branches/ plant | No.of secondary branches/ plant | no.of siliquae / plant | Length of siliqua | Seeds / siliqua | Test weight | Oil content | Harvest index |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Seed yield per plant | r _g rp | 0.520** 0.475** | 0.469** 0.404** | 0.641** 0.584** | 0.066 0.069 | 0.530* 0.463* | 0.733** 0.593** | 0.402** 0.359** | 0.241** 0.135 | -0.008 -0.020 | 0.247** 0.237* | -0.053 -0.045 | -0.434** -0.237* |
| Days to flowering | r _g r _p | | 0.756** 0.703** | 0.800** 0.753** | -0.396** -0.350** | 0.853** 0.736** | 0.621** 0.491** | 0.390** 0.351** | 0.086 0.081 | 0.297** 0.256** | 0.010 0.010 | -0.226* -0.207* | -0.857** -0.670** |
| Days to maturity | r _g r _p | | | 0.797** 0.692** | -0.049 -0.038 | 0.611** 0.499** | 0.371** 0.269** | 0.115 0.109 | 0.446** 0.293** | 0.226* 0.181 | 0.228* 0.203* | -0.095 -0.084 | -0.836** -0.582** |
| Plant height | r _g r _p | | | | -0.192* -0.122 | 0.602** 0.520** | 0.510** 0.422** | 0.120 0.119 | 0.128 0.084 | 0.147 0.135 | 0.122 0.115 | -0.176 -0.149 | -0.825** 0.630** |
| Length of main branch | r _g r _p | | | | | -0.667** -0.557** | -0.468** -0.343** | -0.522** -0.375** | 0.535** 0.377** | -0.323** -0.205* | 0.633** 0.554** | -0.110 -0.086 | 0.361** 0.251** |
| No.of primary branches/plant | r _g r _p | | | | | | 0.925** 0.768** | 0.689** 0.578** | -0.071 -0.061 | 0.406** 0.340** | -0.295 0.250** | -0.110 -0.084 | -0.826** -0.527** |
| No.of secondary branches/plant | r _g r _p | | | | | | | 0.777** 0.613** | -0.190 -0.143 | 0.421** 0.286** | -0.424** -0.327** | -0.031 -0.025 | -0.884** -0.430** |
| No.of siliquae / plant | r _g r _p | | | | | | | | -0.052 -0.035 | 0.424** 0.314** | -0.516** -0.445** | -0.090 -0.067 | -0.301** -0.160 |
| Length of siliqua | r _g r _p | | | | | | | | | -0.201* -0.040 | 0.541** 0.430** | 0.024 0.009 | -0.043 -0.068 |
| Seeds / siliqua | r _g r _p | | | | | | | | | | -0.568** -0.493 | -0.120 -0.090 | -0.055 -0.037 |
| Test weight | r _g r _p | | | | | | | | | | | -0.008 -0.002 | -0.069 -0.045 |
| Oil content | r _g | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.111 0.095 |

Table 1. Genotypic (r_g) and Phenotypic (r_p) correlation co-efficient of different traits in Indian mustard.

* and ** significant at 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

| Character | Days to flowering | Days to maturity | Plant height | Length of main branch | No.of primary branches/ | No.of secondary branches/ plant | No.of siliquae / plant plant | Length of siliqua | Seeds / siliqua | Test weight | Oil content | Harvest index | Genotype correlation with seed yield |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| Days to flowering | -1.248 | -1.680 | 1.307 | -0.137 | 1.386 | 0.165 | -0.371 | 0.082 | 0.367 | 0.110 | 0.000 | -0.360 | 0.520** |
| Days to maturity | -0.945 | -1.220 | 1.304 | -0.017 | 1.754 | 0.099 | -0.109 | 0.422 | 0.299 | 0.241 | 0.000 | -0.352 | 0.469** |
| Plant height | -0.999 | -1.772 | 1.634 | -0.067 | 1.720 | 0.135 | -0.114 | 0.121 | 0.207 | 0.129 | 0.000 | -0.347 | 0.641** |
| Length of main | 0.494 | 0.109 | -0.315 | 0.346 | -1.907 | -0.124 | 0.397 | 0.505 | -0.348 | 0.668 | 0.000 | 0.152 | 0.060 |
| branch | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No.of primary | -1.043 | -1.363 | 0.984 | -0.231 | 1.856 | 0.245 | -0.656 | -0.067 | 0.458 | -0.311 | 0.000 | -0.348 | 0.530** |
| branches / plant | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of secondary | -0.776 | -0.826 | 0.843 | -0.162 | 0.642 | 0.265 | -0.739 | -0.180 | 0.473 | -0.447 | 0.000 | -0.351 | 0.733** |
| branches/plant | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No.of siliquae / | -0.487 | -0.255 | 0.197 | -0.181 | 1.969 | 0.206 | -0.951 | -0.049 | 0.601 | -0.544 | 0.000 | -0.127 | 0.402** |
| plant | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Length of siliqua | -0.108 | -0.992 | 0.210 | 0.185 | -0.204 | -0.050 | 0.050 | 0.944 | -0.320 | 0.571 | 0.000 | -0.018 | 0.241** |
| Seeds / siliqua | -0.434 | -0.627 | 0.320 | -0.114 | 1.238 | 0.119 | -0.541 | -0.286 | 1.058 | -0.706 | 0.000 | -0.059 | -0.008 |
| Test weight | -0.014 | -0.508 | 0.200 | 0.219 | -0.843 | -0.112 | 0.491 | 0.512 | -0.709 | 1.054 | 0.000 | -0.029 | 0.247** |
| Oil content | 0.283 | 0.212 | 0.289 | 0.041 | -0.317 | 0.008 | 0.087 | 0.023 | -0.147 | -0.005 | -0.001 | 0.047 | -0.053 |
| Harvest index | 1.070 | 1.857 | 1.349 | 0.125 | -1.361 | -0.221 | 0.287 | -0.040 | -0.150 | -0.074 | 0.000 | 0.420 | -0.434 |

Table 2. Path co-efficient analysis showing direct (bold) and indirect effect of different traits on seed yield in Indian mustard.

Residual effect : 0.203, * and ** significant at 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

with make these was and high but the direct undesirable to be simultaneous selection model is correlation with seed yield with and harvest index showed negative 5 be considered indirect causal the cause of correlation indirect effect seemed and number of siliquae per plant days to 50 the contrary, the correlation of (Singh and Kakkar, 1977). positive characters viz., practiced for anInntinn improve negative. seed yield use followed to nullify the situations, direct of effects per cent flowering the the these seeds In factors effect. simultaneously was positive direct effect а this yield. in order to per siliqua characters restricted so the should ð Under effect case, The On be

per length effective considered that number of primary branches The overall results suggested plant, of selection siliqua most reliable and plant height criteria should and for þ

improvement of Indian mustard.

seed

yield in

also high. direct \mathbf{of} length through Indirect effects of other characters relatively plant height, of primary branches the effects of these component higher siliqua test characters on and positive weight seed which were per plant, yield. some were and had

analysis, it appears that number

From

the

result

of

path

Studies on relationship between yield and its components in Indian mustard

References

- Burton, G.W. (1952). Quantitative inheritance in grasses. Proc. 6 *Int. Grasid Congr.*, **1:** 227-283.
- Deway, D.R. and Lu, K.H. (1959). A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. *Agron. J.*, **51:** 515-518.
- Khan, M.N. and Gupta, S.C. (1998). Analysis of characters contributing to seed yield in Indian mustard. *J. Oilseeds Res.*, **15:** 54-59.
- Khuble, R.K. and Pant, D. P. (1999). Correlation coefficient and path analysis of yield and its components in Indian mustard, *Crop Res.*, **17(3):** 371-375.
- Mahala, H.R., Jambholkar, S.J., Yadav, D.K. and Sharma, R. (2003). Correlation and Path analysis in Indian mustard [*Brassicajuncea* (L.) Czern & Coss]. *Indian J. Genet.*, 63 (2): 131-132.
- Singh, R.H. and Kakkar, S.N. (1977). Control of individual traits during index selection Proc. *Third Congr. SABRAO* (Canberra) 3 (d): 22-25.

Madras Agric. J., 93 (1-6): 115-119 January-June 2006

Research Notes

Inter trait association and path coefficient analysis in irrigated finger millet (*Eleusine coracana (L) Gaertn*)

P. SUMATHI, A. JOHN JOEL AND V. MURALIDHARAN Centre for Plant Breeding and Genetics, Tamil Nadu Agricultural Univ., Coimbatore – 641 003.

Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L) *Gaertn*) plays a vital role in providing quality nutrition to human of South Asia and Africa. Many kinds of traditional and processed foods are produced from finger millet. It is one of the important small millets, which is very well adapted to marginal lands, hilly regions and shallow soils. In any breeding programme, selection based on the knowledge and direction of association between different yield attributes and yield is very useful. The present investigation was undertaken to determine the associations between yield and yield components in hybrids and parents of finger millet.

The experimental material for the present study comprised of eight parents which were selected on the basis of desirable agronomic, morphological characters including five female parents (CO 9, CO 10, CO 11, CO 12, CO 13) and three pollen parents (TNAU 946, GPU 28 and DPI 2011), and these were crossed in line x tester fashion during *kharif* 2002. The resulting 15 hybrids along with eight parents were evaluated in a RBD with three replications by adopting a spacing of 22 x 10 cm at the field of Department of Millets, TNAU, Coimbatore during *rabi* 2002-2003. Observations were recorded on five