

Studies on Inter-Relationship and Path Coefficient Analysis for Seed yield/plant and Qualitative traits in Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L. Czern and cos)

ABSTRACT:

The present investigation was carried out with ten Indian mustard genotypes in biochemistry laboratory of ICAR-DRMR, Bharatpur, during 2021-22. Analysis of oil, fatty acid profiling and estimation of glucosinolate was done to study the inter-relationship and path coefficient analysis between seed yield and among all nine qualitative traits taken. It is found that the genotypic correlation was higher than phenotypic correlation due to genetic effect. The positive correlation of seed yield/plant is associated at both phenotypic and genotypic levels with palmitic acid, linoleic acid, oleic acid, stearic acid and linolenic acid whereas negatively associated with glucosinolate, erucic acid and eicosenoic acid. Oleic acid was positively correlated with linoleic acid. Path coefficient analysis studies revealed that the high positive direct effect on seed yield/plant was exhibited by linoleic acid, linolenic acid and stearic acid while negative direct effect by erucic acid, glucosinolate, oil and eicosenoic acid on seed yield/plant. Selection of the plants based on these traits would certainly leads to improvement in seed yield.

Keywords: Correlation coefficient, Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L. Czern and Cos), Inter-relationship, path coefficient analysis, qualitative traits, seed yield/plant.

Introduction: Indian mustard is cultivated throughout the world. Oilseeds are the backbone of agricultural economy of India. (Patel *et al.*, 2012, Kumar *et al.*, 2017). Since, *Brassica juncea* is the second most important oilseed crop in the country, it should be emphasized on the seed yield, quality and quantity of oil to increase the productivity through developing high yielding varieties and to provide best diet to the people. Mustard seed contains about 38% to 43% of oil and is considered to be the healthiest and nutritious cooking medium. It contains low amount of saturated fatty acids (SFAs) includes Palmitic acid, stearic acid, whereas, an appreciable amount of unsaturated fatty acids are either monounsaturated (MUPAs) i.e. erucic acid (anti- nutritional factor) and oleic acid or polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs) such as omega-3- alpha- linolenic acid, omega-6- linoleic acid and Eicosenoic acid (Rai *et al.*, 2018). It also contains high glucosinolate content (80-125 μ moles/g) which are major Sulphur components in crucifers. High concentrations in the oil cake consumption affects human and animal health. There is a greater need to reduce the glucosinolate in seed meal and erucic acid in fatty acid composition to improve the quality of mustard oil. Main thrust in breeding of Indian mustard is to enhance its seed yield along with good oil and meal quality. These important traits of Indian mustard are influenced by the environment because of their polygenic nature (Yadava *et al.*, 2011, Chauhan *et al.*, 2011).

Therefore, Inter-relationship and path coefficient studies provide a better understanding of the association among qualitative characters and their direct and indirect effect on seed yield/plant, which help breeders to formulate an appropriate breeding strategy to improve a number of traits simultaneously and effectively.

Materials and methods:-

Comment [A1]: Kindly reframe the sentence. The meaning is not conveyed.

In the present study, ten open pollinated Indian mustard genotypes were taken for the analysis of oil, fatty acid profiling and for glucosinolate estimation. The analysis of these qualitative traits was done in the biochemistry laboratory of ICAR-DRMR, Bharatpur during 2021-2022. Field trial of these 10 genotypes was conducted in the Field Experimentation Centre, SHUATS, Prayagraj. The data was recorded for 10 characters viz; Oil (%), palmitic acid(%), stearic acid (%), oleic Acid (%), linoleic acid (%), linolenic acid (%), eicosenoic acid (%), erucic acid (%), glucosinolate ($\mu\text{g/g}$) and Seed yield / plant. Oil extraction was done by Soxhlet apparatus. Chemical used was Hexane. Fatty acid profiling was done with Gas Chromatography (Nucon Model 5765) using SP 2300 + 2310 SS columns.

Process of Fatty acid Estimation:

- a) 35-40 seeds were grinded,
- b) The mix was taken into test tube,
- c) 10ml hexane added and left it for 24 hrs
- d) Supernatant collected and NaOH 500 μL added
- e) After 45 min NaCl 700 μL added
- f) After 30 min readings were taken by Gas Chromatography

Glucosinolate estimation was done by spectrophotometer method at 425nm (Mawlong *et al* 2017). The genotypic and phenotypic correlations were calculated as per the method given by Al-Jibouri *et al.* (1958). Path coefficient analysis was done according to the method suggested by Wright (1921) and illustrated by Dewey and Lu (1959). Knowledge of correlations and path analysis between the seed yield and quality traits is of great importance for a successful breeding programme.

Results and Discussion

Correlation coefficient is the mutual association between various characters and determines the component characters on which the selection can be based on improvement in yield. Path coefficient analysis is to assist partition of correlation coefficients into direct and indirect effects of independent variables on dependant variables. The correlation coefficient values do not reveal the true pattern of association between independent and dependent variables. It solely considers the variables magnitude and direction. The standard partial regression coefficient or path coefficient analysis, divides the correlation coefficient into measures of direct and indirect effects of independent factors on dependent factors. When the deciding component features are correlated, this approach is even more significant for understanding the genetic makeup of a dependent trait.

In the present investigation, It was found that the genotypic correlation was higher than phenotypic correlation due to genetic effect. Johnson *et al.* (1955) also reported that higher genotypic correlation than phenotypic correlation indicated an inherent association between various characters. Similar results have been reported by Sirohi *et al.* (2004).

Inter-relationship/correlation coefficient analysis: -

Phenotypic correlation coefficient analysis revealed that palmitic acid (0.365*) showed positive significant association with seed yield/plant while linoleic acid (0.2893), oleic acid (0.2823), stearic acid (0.2788) and linolenic acid (0.0373) showed positive non- significant association with seed yield/plant. Glucosinolate (-0.476*) showed negative significant

association with seed yield/plant where as erucic acid (-0.3588), eicosenoic acid (-0.3211) and oil (-0.032) showed negative non- significant association with seed yield/plant. Genotypic correlation coefficient analysis revealed that stearic acid (0.546*), oil (0.517*) and palmitic acid (0.363*) showed positive significant association with seed yield/plant while oleic acid (0.3150), linoleic acid (0.2292) and linolenic acid (0.1019) showed positive non-significant association with seed yield/plant. Glucosinolate (-0.466*) and erucic acid (-0.413*) showed negative significant association with seed yield/plant where as eicosenoic acid (-0.115) showed negative non- significant association with seed yield/plant. It was found that erucic acid and oleic acid were negatively correlated. Hence an increase in the level of oleic acid, (Table 1&2), would result in the reduction of erucic acid content. This negative relationship between erucic and oleic acid has also been reported earlier by Zhou and Liu. (1987), Singh *et al.* (2001), Meena (2006), Kumar (2013). Linoleic acid exhibited significant but negative correlation with erucic acid. Similar pattern of correlation among these traits have also been reported by Singh *et al.* (2001), Kumar *et al.* (2013), Meena *et al.* (2014).

Path coefficient analysis: -

Path coefficient analysis at phenotypic level revealed that linoleic acid (0.5411), linolenic acid (0.5319) and stearic acid (0.0758) had direct positive effect on seed yield/plant, where as oleic acid (-1.3150), erucic acid (-1.2418), glucosinolate (-0.2823), palmitic acid (-0.2092), oil (-0.1749) and eicosenoic acid (-0.0419) showed negative direct effect on seed yield/plant. Path coefficient analysis at genotypic level, revealed that the linoleic acid (0.5603), linolenic acid (0.4089) and stearic acid (0.1032) had a direct positive effect on seed yield/plant while oleic acid (-1.7244), erucic acid (-1.5875), glucosinolate (-0.3046), palmitic acid (-0.2082), oil (-0.1528) and eicosenoic acid (-0.0497) showed negative direct effect on seed yield/plant. Saiyad *et al.*, 2020 also reported that negative direct effects on seed yield/plant were recorded for erucic acid.

Conclusion :-

At both the levels, Seed yield/plant showed positive association with oleic acid and linoleic acid while it showed negative association with glucosinolate and erucic acid. Seed yield/plant showed positive association with oil content at genotypic level. Similar findings were also reported by Singh *et al.* (2011) indicating that environment played an important role in their expression as these are the major yield attributing traits.

Path Coefficient analysis at phenotypic and genotypic levels, showed that linoleic acid, linolenic acid and stearic acid had positive direct effect on seed yield/plant, thereby improvement of these traits through various breeding programmes enhances the seed yield of the plant. As erucic acid and glucosinolate had negative direct effect on seed yield/plant, reducing of these traits which is one of the important breeding objective can be achieved through different breeding technologies which also increases the seed yield/plant.

Table 1. Estimation of phenotypic correlation coefficient for different traits in Indian mustard.

*Significant at 5% level, **Significant at 1% level.

| TRAITS | Oil (%) | Palmitic acid(%) | Stearic acid (%) | Oleic Acid (%) | Linoleic acid (%) | Linolenic acid (%) | Eicosenoic acid (%) | Erucic acid (%) | Glucosinolate (µg/g) | Seed yield / plant |
|----------------------|---------|------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Oil (%) | 1.0000 | 0.0527 | 0.1318 | 0.0114 | -0.2223 | 0.1941 | -0.3395 | 0.0232 | 0.2293 | -0.0032 |
| Palmitic acid (%) | | 1.0000 | -0.0963 | 0.0571 | 0.3373 | 0.370* | -0.470* | 0.0142 | -0.2961 | 0.365* |
| Stearic acid (%) | | | 1.0000 | -0.2272 | -0.3165 | 0.3130 | 0.470* | 0.0372 | -0.0146 | 0.2788 |
| Oleic acid (%) | | | | 1.0000 | 0.740** | 0.0288 | -0.1621 | -0.952** | -0.588** | 0.2823 |
| Linoleic acid (%) | | | | | 1.0000 | -0.1126 | -0.2904 | -0.690** | -0.750** | 0.2893 |
| Linolenic acid (%) | | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.2106 | -0.0184 | -0.1520 | 0.0373 |
| Eicosenoic acid (%) | | | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.0220 | 0.1122 | -0.3211 |
| Erucic acid (%) | | | | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.653** | -0.3588 |
| Glucosinolate (ug/g) | | | | | | | | | 1.0000 | -0.476* |
| Seed yield /plant(g) | | | | | | | | | | 1.0000 |

Table 2. Estimation of genotypic correlation coefficient for different traits in Indian mustard.

| TRAITS | Oil (%) | Palmitic acid | Stearic acid (%) | Oleic acid (%) | Linoleic acid (%) | Linolenic acid (%) | Eicosenoic acid (%) | Erucic acid (%) | Glucosinolate (ug/g) | Seed yield / plant |
|----------------------|---------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Oil (%) | 1.0000 | 0.389* | 0.1842 | 0.0022 | -0.1855 | -0.0307 | -0.668** | 0.0819 | 0.2598 | 0.517* |
| Palmitic Acid | | 1.0000 | -0.0592 | 0.0720 | 0.362* | 0.695** | -0.679** | 0.0241 | -0.3532 | 0.363* |
| Stearic Acid (%) | | | 1.0000 | 0.2284 | -0.371* | 0.545* | 0.545* | 0.0230 | -0.0449 | 0.546* |
| Oleic Acid (%) | | | | 1.0000 | 0.843** | 0.0801 | -0.1139 | -0.961** | -0.605** | 0.3150 |
| Linoleic Acid (%) | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.2696 | -0.1389 | -0.772** | -0.910** | 0.2292 |
| Linolenic Acid (%) | | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.1613 | -0.1289 | -0.2420 | 0.1019 |
| Eicosenoic Acid (%) | | | | | | | 1.0000 | -0.0396 | 0.0349 | -0.3115 |
| Erucic Acid (%) | | | | | | | | 1.0000 | 0.673** | -0.413* |
| Glucosinolate (ug/g) | | | | | | | | | 1.0000 | -0.466* |
| Seed yield / plant | | | | | | | | | | 1.0000 |

*Significant at 5% level, **Significant at 1% level.

Table 3. Direct and indirect effects of qualitative traits on seed yield (phenotypic)

| Traits | Oil (%) | Palmitic Acid | Stearic Acid (%) | Oleic Acid (%) | Linoleic Acid (%) | Linolenic Acid (%) | Eicosenoic Acid (%) | Erucic Acid (%) | Glucosinolate (ug/g) | Seed yield / plant |
|------------------------|---------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Oil (%) | -0.1749 | -0.0092 | -0.0231 | -0.0020 | 0.0389 | -0.0339 | 0.0594 | -0.0041 | -0.0401 | -0.0032 |
| Palmitic Acid | -0.0110 | -0.2092 | 0.0201 | -0.0119 | -0.0705 | -0.0774 | 0.0983 | -0.0030 | 0.0619 | 0.365* |
| Stearic Acid (%) | 0.0100 | -0.0073 | 0.0758 | -0.0172 | -0.0240 | 0.0237 | 0.0356 | 0.0028 | -0.0011 | 0.2788 |
| Oleic Acid (%) | -0.0150 | -0.0751 | 0.2987 | -1.3150 | -0.9733 | -0.0379 | 0.2131 | 1.2516 | 0.7737 | 0.2823 |
| Linoleic Acid (%) | -0.1203 | 0.1825 | -0.1713 | 0.4005 | 0.5411 | -0.0609 | -0.1571 | -0.3732 | -0.4058 | 0.2893 |
| Linolenic Acid (%) | 0.1032 | 0.1967 | 0.1665 | 0.0153 | -0.0599 | 0.5319 | 0.1120 | -0.0098 | -0.0809 | 0.0373 |
| Eicosenoic Acid (%) | 0.0142 | 0.0197 | -0.0197 | 0.0068 | 0.0122 | -0.0088 | -0.0419 | -0.0009 | -0.0047 | -0.3211 |
| Erucic Acid (%) | -0.0288 | -0.0177 | -0.0462 | 1.1819 | 0.8564 | 0.0228 | -0.0273 | -1.2418 | -0.8114 | -0.3588 |
| Glucosinolate (ug/g) | -0.0647 | 0.0836 | 0.0041 | 0.1661 | 0.2117 | 0.0429 | -0.0317 | -0.1844 | -0.2823 | -0.476* |
| Seed yield/plant | -0.0032 | 0.365* | 0.2788 | 0.2823 | 0.2893 | 0.0373 | -0.3211 | -0.3588 | -0.476* | 1.0000 |
| Partial R ² | 0.0006 | -0.0763 | 0.0211 | -0.3712 | 0.1566 | 0.0198 | 0.0135 | 0.4456 | 0.1343 | |

*Significant at 5% level, **Significant at 1% level.

Table 4. Direct and indirect effect of qualitative traits on seed yield (genotypic)

| Traits | Oil (%) | Palmitic Acid | Stearic Acid (%) | Oleic Acid (%) | Linoleic Acid (%) | Linolenic Acid (%) | Eicosenoic Acid (%) | Erucic Acid (%) | Glucosinolate (ug/g) | Seed yield / plant |
|------------------------|---------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Oil (%) | -0.1528 | -0.0594 | -0.0282 | -0.0003 | 0.0284 | 0.0047 | 0.1021 | -0.0125 | -0.0397 | 0.517* |
| Palmitic Acid | -0.0809 | -0.2082 | 0.0123 | -0.0150 | -0.0753 | -0.1447 | 0.1414 | -0.0050 | 0.0735 | 0.363* |
| Stearic Acid (%) | 0.0190 | -0.0061 | 0.1032 | -0.0236 | -0.0383 | 0.0562 | 0.0562 | 0.0024 | -0.0046 | 0.546* |
| Oleic Acid (%) | -0.0038 | -0.1242 | 0.3938 | -1.7244 | -1.4544 | -0.1381 | 0.1964 | 1.6571 | 1.0431 | 0.3150 |
| Linoleic Acid (%) | -0.1040 | 0.2026 | -0.2080 | 0.4725 | 0.5603 | 0.1510 | -0.0778 | -0.4326 | -0.5096 | 0.2292 |
| Linolenic Acid (%) | -0.0132 | 0.2981 | 0.2338 | 0.0343 | 0.1156 | 0.4289 | 0.0692 | -0.0553 | -0.1038 | 0.1019 |
| Eicosenoic Acid (%) | 0.0332 | 0.0337 | -0.0271 | 0.0057 | 0.0069 | -0.0080 | -0.0497 | 0.0020 | -0.0017 | -0.3115 |
| Erucic Acid (%) | -0.1300 | -0.0382 | -0.0365 | 1.5255 | 1.2258 | 0.2046 | 0.0629 | -1.5875 | -1.0677 | -0.413* |
| Glucosinolate (ug/g) | -0.0791 | 0.1076 | 0.0137 | 0.1842 | 0.2770 | 0.0737 | -0.0106 | -0.2048 | -0.3046 | -0.466* |
| Seed yield per plant | 0.517* | 0.363* | 0.546* | 0.3150 | 0.2292 | 0.1019 | -0.3115 | -0.413* | -0.466* | 1.0000 |
| Partial R ² | -0.0791 | -0.0756 | 0.0563 | -0.5432 | 0.1284 | 0.0437 | 0.0155 | 0.6557 | 0.1418 | |

*Significant at 5% level, **Significant at 1% level.

References: -

- Al-Jibouri, H. A., Miller, P.A. and Robinson, H. F. (1958). Genotypic and environmental variances in upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. *Agronomy Journal*, 50: 633-637.
- Chauhan, J.S., Bhadauria, V. P. S., Singh, M., Singh, K. H. and Kumar, A. (2007). Quality characteristics and their interrelationships in Indian rapeseed mustard (*Brassica* spp) varieties. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 77: 616-620.
- Chauhan, J. S. and Kumar, S. (2011). Assessment of oil and seed meal quality parameters of rapeseed mustard group of crops. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 81: 140-144.
- Craske, J. D. and Bannon, C. D. (1987). Gas liquid chromatography analysis of the fatty acid composition of fats and oils: A total system for high accuracy. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists Society*, 64(10):1413-1417.
- Devi, B. (2018). Correlation and path analysis in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in agro-climatic conditions of Jhansi (U.P.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(1):1678-1681.
- Dewey, D.R. and Lu, K. H. (1959). A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. *Agronomy Journal*, 51:515-518.
- Johnson, H. W., Robinson, H. F. and Comstock, R. E. (1955). Estimate of genetic and environmental variability in soybean. *Agronomy Journal*, 47:314-318.
- Kumar, R., Singh, H., Kaur, S., Singh, I. and Kaur, R. (2017). Quantitative analysis for yield and its components in IC lines of Indian mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern & Coss.]. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 6: 2257-2260.
- Kumar, S. (2013). Genetic analysis of oil content and quality parameters in Indian mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss]. *Scholarly Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(8):299-304.
- Mawlong, I., Sujith, Kumar, M.S., Gurung, B., Singh, K.H., and Singh, D. (2017). A simple spectrophotometric method for estimating total glucosinolates in mustard deoiled cake. *International Journal of Food Properties*, 20: 21,3274-3281.
- Meena, H.S, Ram, B., Kumar, A., Singh, B.K, Meena, P.D., Singh, V.V and Singh, D. (2014). Hetero beltiosis and standard heterosis for seed yield and important traits in *B.juncea*. *Journal of Oilseed Brassica* 5: 134-140
- Meena, S. S. (2006). Inheritance of seed coat colour, fatty acids and total glucosinolate contents in Indian mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern & Coss]. Ph. D Thesis, GBPUA&T Pant Nagar U.S. Nagar (Uttarakhand).
- Patel, A. M., Prajapati, D. B. and Patel, D. G. (2012). Heterosis and combining ability studies in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Indian Journal of Scientific Research and Technology*. 1(1):38-40.
- Rai, G. K., Bagati, S., Rai, P. K, Rai, S. K. and Singh, M. (2018). Fatty Acid Profiling in Rapeseed Mustard (*Brassica* species). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 7(5):148-157

Comment [A2]: This reference doesn't exist anywhere in the manuscript.

Comment [A3]: This reference is not present in the manuscript

Saiyad et al (2020) Study of correlation and path coefficient among the quantitative and qualitative characters of Indian mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss] *International Journal of Chemical Studies* 2020; 8(2): 2112-2116.

Singh, B., Sachan, J. N., Singh, S.P., Pant, D. P., Khan, R. A. and Rakesh. K. (2001). Correlation among fatty acids of Brassica and related species. *Cruciferae News* 123: 9-10.

Singh, V.K., Singh, D. and Singh, A.K. (2011) Genetic divergence for important economic and quality traits in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L. Czern &Coss), Pantnagar Journal of Research, 9(2):183-188.

Sirohi, S.P.S., Sanjai, M. and Kumar, A. (2004). Correlation and path analysis of Indian mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern & Coss.]. *Ann. Agric. Res.*, 25(4): 491-494.

Wright, S. (1921). Correlation and causation. *Journal of Agricultural Research*, 20:557-585.

Yadava, D. K., Giri, S. C., Vignesh, M, Vasudev, Sujata, Yadav, K. A., Dass, B., Singh, R., Singh, N., Mohapatra, T. and Prabhu, K. V. (2011). Genetic variability and trait association studies in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 81: 712-716.

Zhou, Y. M. and Liu, H. L. (1987). Studies on inheritance of major fatty acid composition in the oil of rapeseed (*Brassica napus* L.) *Acta Agronomica Sinica* 13: 1-10.

UNDER PEER REVIEW