

## Genetic variability and correlation studies in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> families of groundnut derived from the cross GKVK-13 × KCG-2

### Abstract:

Sustaining plant productivity under water-limited condition is a major challenge to a breeder. Genetic variability is a major component which helps in selecting better genotypes under different environmental conditions, with this aim an experiment was conducted to understand the genetic potential, heritability, genetic advance and traits association of yield contributing characters for F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> families derived from the cross GKVK-13 × KCG-2 at the University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore in an augmented block design along with three checks *viz.*, TMV-2, KCG-6 and KCG-2 during summer and *Kharif* 2017. Results from analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that highly significant differences were observed for all the characters studied. High genetic variability was observed for major yield contributing characters like the number of pods per plant (g), pod yield (g), kernel yield per plant (g), SMK% (sound mature kernel *per cent*), SCMR (SPAD chlorophyll meter reading) and SLA (specific leaf area) (cm<sup>2</sup>/g). Narrow difference between GCV (genotypic coefficient of variation) and PCV (phenotypic coefficient of variation) was observed for pods per plant, pod yield, SCMR and SLA and high heritability coupled with moderate genetic advance *per cent* mean was recorded for pod yield, SCMR and SLA indicating the involvement of additive gene action in controlling these traits. Among 84 families studied 14 families have been selected based on high SCMR values, low SLA, more number of pods per plant, high shelling % and high pod yield over parents and checks were identified to be the important characters that could be used in selection for yield and the selected families will be tested further in multi rows for yield stabilization.

**Keywords:** GCV, PCV, Heritability, GAM, water use efficiency, Groundnut.

## Introduction

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) is a self-pollinated, cleistogamous annual herb belonging to the family Leguminaceae with a chromosome number of  $2n=40$ . It is the most important oilseed crop of India and the world in terms of area and production. It is vernacularly known by different names as peanut, monkey nut, earthnut and pigmy nut. Cultivated groundnut is classified into two subspecies, subs. *fastigiata* and subs. *hypogaea*. The subs. *fastigiata* contains four botanical varieties, var. *vulgaris*, var. *fastigiata*, var. *peruviana*, and var. *aequatoriana*. The subs. *hypogaea* contain two varieties, var. *hypogaea* and var. *hirsuta*. Each of those botanical types has the contrasting plant, pod and seed characteristics (Krapovickas and Gregory, 1994). Yield is a complex trait, governed by many traits and there is ample evidence to show that selection directly for grain yield in plants is not easy. Since the economic part of groundnut may be a pod that's developed under the soil, prediction of its performance supported aerial morphological characters is nearly difficult (Weiss, 2000). Gain under direct selection for pod yield in groundnut is low and slow as pod yield isn't only polygenically controlled but also influenced by its component characters (Alam *et al.*, 1985). The knowledge of existing variability and degree of association between pod yield and its contributing characters and their relative contribution to pod yield is important for developing high yielding genotypes. Heritability and genetic advance is a useful tool for breeders in determining the amount of genetic variation present in crops. Correlation analysis is useful to work out the magnitude of association among the characters and their relative contribution to pod yield. More than 70% of the groundnut growing area falls under arid and semi-arid regions, where groundnut frequently experiences drought stresses for various durations and intensities (Reddy *et al.*, 2003). Yield losses attributable to drought are highly variable depending on timing, intensity and duration in addition to other location-specific environmental stress factors like high irradiation and temperature (Kambiranda *et al.*, 2011). Losses in yield that are due to water stress can be tackled partially by developing varieties that are better adapted to water scarce conditions (Ravi *et al.*, 2011).

Water use efficiency is defined as the amount of water utilized in transpiration to produce dry matter during a specific growth period. Water Use Efficiency (WUE) is one such trait which will contribute to productivity under drought. There are numerous easily

measurable traits having a high correlation with WUE that are identified as surrogate traits. Traits that have practical advantages for WUE are specific leaf area (SLA) and soil-plant analysis development and SPAD chlorophyll meter reading (SCMR). Nageswara Rao *et al.* (2001) and Sheshashayee *et al.* (2006) reported a direct correlation between SLA and carbon isotope discrimination, and an indirect correlation with WUE in groundnut, suggesting that SLA can be used as a surrogate trait to measure WUE in groundnut. SCMR has been used effectively to determine leaf nitrogen content non-destructively in several crops including groundnut (Nageswara Rao *et al.*, 2001) reported significant and high negative inter-relationship among SLA and SCMR. Zhang *et al.* (2022), identified the genotypes PI 502120 and AU-NPL 17 as water spender genotypes as they showed high yield,  $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ , photosynthesis, and stomatal conductance under drought. Upadhyaya (2002) used SCMR and SLA as surrogate traits for assessing WUE in groundnut mini core germplasm collection and reported a negative correlation between SCMR and SLA. There are many reasons which are attributed to low yield levels *viz.*, lack or non-availability of improved high yielding cultivars, cultivation under shallow soils of low fertility, uneven rainfall distribution, continuous cropping without rotation of crop, low plant population and incidence of foliar diseases and pests are cited as the major limiting factors in most of the groundnut growing regions. Keeping all the above points in view, an effort has been made to study the genetic variability, an association of traits related to WUE with pod yield and its component traits, and to identify superior families performing better under drought stress conditions in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation families derived from the cross of GKVK-16 × KCG-2.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Plant material and experimental site**

The present study was conducted during summer and *Kharif* 2017 at the experimental field, GKVK, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore. The experimental material for the present study comprised of 36 F<sub>6</sub> and 24 F<sub>7</sub> families of the cross *viz.*, GKVK-13 × KCG-2 and checks KCG-6, KCG-2 and TMV-2. The populations were developed by crossing the parents which were contrasting for

the traits, SLA, SCMR, pod yield per plant, kernel yield per plant and pods per plant. The selected families from the F<sub>5</sub> generation of the cross were forwarded to the F<sub>6</sub> generation and the same procedure was repeated to rise F<sub>7</sub> generation. Statistical analysis of the mean data was analyzed in WINDOSTAT *version* 8.5 for augmented design and SPSS for descriptive statistics.

### **Evaluation of F<sub>6</sub> generation**

The F<sub>6</sub> plants of the cross, their respective parents and checks (KCG-2, KCG-6 and TMV-2) were raised in a plant to progeny row method in an augmented design during summer 2017 with 5 m row length and 30 cm and 10 cm inter and intra row spacing respectively.

### **Evaluation of F<sub>7</sub> generation**

Individual F<sub>6</sub> progenies which had mean values higher than the families grand mean and mean more than the checks and the parents for the traits *viz.*, SPAD chlorophyll meter reading (SCMR), pod yield, kernel yield, shelling *per cent* and sound mature kernel (SMK) *per cent* and the low mean values for specific leaf area (SLA) were selected and sown in a plant to progeny row for F<sub>7</sub> evaluation of yield and water use efficiency-related traits as the salient features of parents and checks were given in (Table 1).

### **Morphological data**

The data on ten morphological characters namely days to 50% flowering (days to first flowering), plant height (cm), primary branches per plant, pods per plant, pod yield per plant (g), kernel yield per plant (g), shelling percentage, sound mature kernel (SKM) *per cent*, specific leaf area (SLA) and SPAD chlorophyll meter reading (SCMR) were recorded. Shelling percentage: was calculated by using the following formulae. Kernel weight (g)/Pod weight (g) ×100, Sound mature kernel (SMK) *per cent*: was calculated by using the following formulae. Number of well-developed kernels/Total number of kernels ×100.

## **Water use efficient traits**

Specific leaf area (SLA): The second or third fully expanded leaf of the main axis was collected in butter paper covers at 65 days after sowing. The leaf area was measured using a leaf area meter. Then the leaves were kept in an oven at 70 °C for 3 days. The dry weight of the leaf was accurately measured using a sensitive balance. SLA was computed using the formula given below and expressed as cm<sup>2</sup>/g.

SPAD Chlorophyll Meter Reading (SCMR): Leaf nitrogen content normally influences the leaf chlorophyll content. A device has been developed by Minolta company, New Jersey USA (SPAD-502) which measures the light attenuation at 430 nm (the peak wavelength for chlorophyll a and chlorophyll b) and 750 nm (near-infrared) with no transmittance. The unit less value measured by the chlorophyll meter is termed SCMR (SPAD chlorophyll meter reading), which provides information on the relative amount of leaf chlorophyll. The SPAD meter (soil-plant analytical development) is a simple handheld instrument, which operates with a DC power of three Volts.

The second or third leaf from the apex was selected to record the SCMR. The selected leaf of groundnut was clamped avoiding the midrib region into the sensor head of the SPAD meter. A gentle stroke was given to record the SPAD reading and the average of such four strokes per leaflet was considered. Since groundnut is a tetra-foliolate leaf, SCMR was recorded in all four leaflets and the average value was recorded. The SCMR was recorded under normal sunlight between 9.00 am to 4.00 pm.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Analysis of variance for traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations of groundnut.**

Analysis of variance was carried out for growth, traits related to water use efficiency, yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations of the cross *viz.*, GKVK-13 × KCG-2 of groundnut and is presented in Table 2 and Figure 1. Mean sum of squares

of families exhibited highly significant difference for all the traits. Further, mean sum of squares of checks *versus* families exhibited greater significant difference for all the characters like days to first flowering, plant height, branches per plant, SCMR, SLA, pod yield per plant, kernel yield per plant and sound mature kernel *per cent* except SMK *per cent* except plant height in SMK *per cent* in F<sub>6</sub> generation. Hence the choice of material for the study is suitable and further selections could be practiced.

### **Estimates of genetic variability parameters traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations of groundnut.**

Information on genetic variability in the source population for different characters is prerequisite for breeding programme aimed at improving yield and other characters under consideration. The genotypic variance indicates the magnitude of variance arising due to differences in genotypic values. Whereas the phenotypic variance indicates the amount of variance which is due to the differences in phenotypic and genotypic values, environment and interaction of genotype and environment. The absolute values of genotypic and phenotypic variance cannot be used for comparing the degree of variability for different characters because these characters have different units. Hence the coefficient of variation which expresses variance as *per cent* of mean is used for the comparisons. A higher estimate of these characters indicates greater variability and *vice-versa*. In this context, narrow difference between the phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) implies lesser impact of environment on the expression of the characters.

The genetic variability parameters were analyzed and presented in the table 3. From our study the presence of wider range of variation was observed for plant height (25 to 35 cm with the mean of 30.22), SCMR (26.29 to 42.91 with the mean of 35.99), pods per plant (13 to 41.14 with the mean of 25.18), pod yield per plant (8.35 to 32.64 with the mean yield of 20.13) kernel yield per plant (3.82 to 19.51 with the mean of 11.45), SMK *per cent* (24.88 to 89.36 with the mean of 61.61) and shelling *per cent* (35.70 to 80.86 with the mean of 60.76) in F<sub>6</sub> generation, similarly wider range of variation was observed for plant height (11.50 to 46.45 cm with the mean of 30.17), SCMR (33.56 to 50.78 with the mean of 41.36), pods per plant (9 to 52 with the mean of 27.70), pod yield per plant (6.28 to

43.25 with the mean yield of 23.17) kernel yield per plant (3.60 to 27.20 with the mean of 13.74), SMK *per cent* (26.37 to 94.01 with the mean of 61.90) and shelling *per cent* (50.48 to 69.84 with the mean of 61.30) in F<sub>7</sub> generation, suggest that there is presence of wider range of phenotypes hence selection can be practiced.

The high GCV and high PCV coupled with narrow difference between GCV and PCV for plant height, pods per plant, pod yield per plant, kernel yield per plant and SMK *per cent* in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation. The high estimates of GCV and PCV for the above mentioned traits suggests the presence of higher magnitude of variation for these traits. Thus individual plant selection can be practiced for these characters. Chauhan *et al.* (2022) reported high GCV, PCV for shelling %, kernel yield per plant and pod yield per plant in BC<sub>1</sub>F<sub>1</sub>, BC<sub>1</sub>F<sub>2</sub> and BC<sub>1</sub>F<sub>3</sub> populations. Similar results were reported by Meta and Monpara (2010), Makhan *et al.* (2003); Golakia *et al.* (2005); John *et al.* (2005); Rao *et al.* (2012) in groundnut. Sridevi *et al.* (2022). The high estimates of GCV and PCV for the above-mentioned traits suggest the presence of a higher magnitude of variation for these traits. The moderate GCV and moderate PCV coupled with narrow difference between GCV and PCV was noticed for plant height, pods per plant, and SLA in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations. Therefore, for selection of superior families these traits can also be used. These results are in confirmation with the reports of Vishnuvardhan *et al.* (2012) in groundnut. Lower GCV and PCV were recorded for days to first flowering and SCMR in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation, this indicates the lower magnitude of variability for days to first flowering and SCMR. Narrow difference between GCV and PCV indicates that the environmental influence is less and the variability present is mostly genotypic. This indicates lower magnitude of variation for days to first flowering and SCMR. Same results were reported by (Makhan Lal *et al.*, 2003) for days to first flowering and for SCMR (Nandini *et al.*, 2011 and John *et al.*, 2013). Khote *et al.* (2009). These results are in confirmation with the results of Vishnuvardhan *et al.* (2012) and Maurya *et al.* (2014) for days to first flowering in groundnut.

Heritability and genetic advance are important selection parameters. The ratio of GCV to the PCV or total variance (broad sense) or the ratio of additive genetic variance to the phenotypic variance (narrow sense) is known as heritability, which indicates the

heritable portion of phenotypic variance and a good index of the transmission of characters from parents to offspring. Heritability estimates along with genetic advance are normally more helpful in predicting the gain under selection than heritability estimate alone, it is not necessary that a character showing high heritability will also exhibit high genetic advance (Johnson *et al.*, 1955).

Heritability value alone cannot provide information on the amount of genetic progress that would result from selection of best individuals. Johnson *et al.* (1955) reported that heritability estimates along with genetic gain would be more useful in predicting the effectiveness of selecting the best individuals. High heritability coupled with high genetic advance over mean was recorded for the traits plant height, pods per plant, pod yield per plant, kernel yield per plant and SMK *per cent* in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation. Similar results of High heritability coupled with high genetic advance over mean were reported by Nath *et al.* (2002) and Golakia *et al.* (2005) for plant height, pods per plant and pod yield per plant which indicates that these characters are under the influence of additive genetic control and selection will be effective and may rapidly contribute to yield. Rao *et al.* 2012 for pods per plant, Padmaja *et al.* 2013a for pod yield per plant, Zaman *et al.* 2011 and Rao *et al.* 2012 for kernel yield per plant, Reddi *et al.* 1991; Venkataravana *et al.* 2001 for SMK *per cent*. High heritability accompanied with low to moderate genetic advance as *per cent* of mean was noticed for traits like days to first flowering, SCMR and SLA, in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation. This indicates the presence of non-additive gene action and narrow range of variation for these traits. Suggests that limited scope for further improvement of these characters. Similar results were reported by Makhan *et al.* (2003) in groundnut.

#### **Association studies traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations of groundnut.**

Correlation coefficient is an essential tool. Correlation studies between yield and its component traits would help plant breeders to enhance crop growth and yield of crop. In the present study phenotypic correlation between pod yield per plant with component characters and also with physiological traits were studied in both F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations.

Phenotypic correlation coefficients for traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and yield and its component traits are presented in Table 4. Phenotypic correlation coefficient revealed that pod yield per plant had significant positive correlation with SCMR (0.85, 0.55), pods per plant (0.77, 0.85), kernel yield per plant (0.83, 0.91), DFF (0.11, 0.17) and plant height (0.44, 0.31), however, Pod yield per plant had significant negative correlation with SLA (-0.38, -.45), SMK *per cent* (-0.58, -.49) and shelling *per cent* (-0.58, -0.49) in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation. This indicated that improvement in SCMR, pods per plant, kernel yield per plant and plant height will lead to improvement in yield. These results are in accordance with the reports of Sridevi *et al.* (2022), Mukhtar *et al.* (2011), Shoba *et al.* (2012). Koolachart *et al.* (2013) and Thakur *et al.* (2013). This indicates that selection of traits for low SLA leads to improvement in yield.

Shelling percentage showed significant positive correlation with kernel yield per plant (0.68, 0.55) in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation indicated the shelling *per cent* could be improved by selecting more number of pod per plant with bold kernels. Similar result was noticed by Nandini *et al.* (2012). SLA exhibited significant negative correlation with SCMR (-0.34, -0.55), pods per plant (-0.38, -0.45), pod yield per plant (-0.58, -0.61) and kernel yield per plant (-0.57, -0.49) in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation, suggesting the improvement of yield and water use efficiency could be done by selecting families that show low SLA. Rekha (2005) and Reddy *et al.* (2003) also reported similar kind of outcomes. SCMR exhibited highly significant positive association with pods per plant (0.64, 0.77), pod yield per plant (0.57, 0.69), kernel yield per plant (0.75, 0.64) and SMK *per cent* (0.54, 0.65), further, SCMR showed negative correlation with SLA (-0.34, -0.55) in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation. Therefore, selection of genotypes with high SCMR offers the scope for simultaneous improvement of yield and water use efficiency in groundnut as higher SCMR indicate high photosynthetic efficient genotypes. The results are in agreement with the reports of Songsri *et al.* (2009) and Rekha (2005). John *et al.*, 2005 for SCMR. This shows that selection of families whose SCMR value were higher than checks, which indirectly lead to improvement of yield in groundnut as high SCMR indicates high photosynthetic efficient genotypes with high water use efficiency. The reports of Nageshwar Rao *et al.* (2001), Talwar *et al.* (2004), Rekha (2005), John *et al.* (2005) and Krishnamurthy *et al.* (2007) also confirmed the same association in groundnut.

## **Conclusions**

Analysis of variance for all the characters studied in both F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations revealed highly significant differences among the families suggesting the presence of sufficient amount of variability. Further, genetic variability estimates such as PCV and GCV coupled with high heritability and genetic advance as *per cent* mean for kernel yield per plant, pod yield per plant and sound mature kernel percentage, SLA indicating the presence of sufficient variability and involvement of additive gene action in both F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generations for these traits. Days to first flowering SCMR exhibited lower PCV and GCV estimates and thus indicating less variation for this trait. Phenotypic correlation coefficient depicted significant positive association of SCMR, pods per plant and kernel yield per plant with pod yield per plant. SLA exhibited significant negative association with pod yield per plant and SCMR. Therefore, superior genotypes for high yield and water use efficiency were selected depending on the relationship between SLA, SCMR and pod yield. From the overall study fourteen superior families from cross GKVK-13×KCG-2 were selected from F<sub>7</sub> generation for multi-location evaluation.

## References

- Alam, M. S., Rahman, A. R. M. S. and Khair, A. B. M. A. (1985). Genetic variability and character association in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L. of Bangladesh]. *Bangladesh Journal of Agriculture (Bangladesh)*.
- Chauhan, S., Savithamma, D. L. and Kundu, S. (2022). Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance for yield and its related traits in BC1F1, BC1F2 and BC1F3 back cross generation of two crosses of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.).
- Golakia, P. R., Makne, V. G. and Monpara, B. A. (2005). Heritable variation and association in Virginia runner and Spanish bunch group of groundnut. *National Journal of Plant Improvement*, 7(1), 50-53.
- John, K., Vasanthi, R. P., Sireesha, K. and Krishna, T. G. (2013). Genetic Variability Studies in Different Advanced Breeding Genotypes of Spanish Bunch Groundnut (*Arachis Hypogaeae* L).
- John, K., Vasanthi, R. P., Venkateswarlu, O. and Sudhakar, P. (2005). Genetic variability and correlation studies among F1s and parents in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Legume Research-An International Journal*, 28(4), 262-267.
- Johnson, H. W., Robinson, H. F., & Comstock, R. E. (1955). Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans. *Agronomy journal*, 47(7), 314-318.
- Kambiranda, D. M., Vasanthaiah, H. K., Katam, R., Ananga, A., Basha, S. M. and Naik, K. (2011). Impact of drought stress on peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) productivity and food safety. *Plants and environment*, 1, 249-272.

- Khote, A. C., Bendale, V. W., Bhawe, S. G. and Patil, P. P. (2009). Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in some exotic genotypes of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Crop Research (Hisar)*, 37(1/3), 186-191.
- Koolachart, R., B. Suriharn, S. Jogloy, N. Vorasoot, S. Wongkaew, C. C. Holbrook, N. Jongrunklang, T. Kesmla. and A. Patanothai (2013). "Relationships between physiological traits and yield components of peanut genotypes with different levels of terminal drought resistance." *SABRAO Journal of Breeding and Genetics*, 45(3), 422-446.
- Krapovickas, A. and Gregory, W. C. (1994). Taxonomia Del Genero "Arachis (leguminosae)". *Bonplandia*, 1-186.
- Krishnamurthy, L., Vadez, V., Devi, M.J., Serraj, R., Nigam, S.N., Sheshshayee, M.S., Chandra, S. and Aruna, R. (2007). Variation in transpiration efficiency and its related traits in a groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) mapping population. *Field Crops Research*, 103(3), pp.189-197.
- Makhan Lal, Roy, D. and Ojha, O. P. (2003). Genetic variability and selection response for root and other characters in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Legume Research*, 26(2), 128-130.
- Maurya, M. K., Rai, P. K., Kumar, A., Singh, B. A. and Chaurasia, A. K. (2014). Study on genetic variability and seed quality of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) genotypes. *International Journal of Emerging Technology and Advanced Engineering*, 4(6), 818-823.
- Meta, H. R. and Monpara, B. A. (2010). Genetic variation and trait relationships in summer groundnut, (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Journal of Oilseeds Research*, 27(1), 8-11.
- Mukhtar, A. A., Tanimu, B. S., Ibrahim, B. S., Abubakar, I. U. and Babaji, B. A. (2011). Correlations and path coefficients analysis between pod yield and some quantitative parameters in ground nuts (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *International Journal of Science and Nature*, 2(4), 799-804.
- Nageswara Rao, R. C., Talwar, H. S. and Wright, G. C. (2001). Rapid assessment of specific leaf area and leaf nitrogen in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) using a chlorophyll meter. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*, 186(3), 175-182.
- Nandini, C., Savithamma, D. L. and Babu, N. N. (2011). Genetic variability analysis for water use efficiency in F8 recombinant inbred lines of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Current Biotica*, 5(3), 282-288.
- Nath, U. K. and Alam, M. S. (2002). Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance of yield and related traits of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2(11), 762-764.
- Padmaja, D., Eswari K. B., Rao, B. M. V. and Reddy, S. M. (2013a). Genetic variability, heritability for late leaf spot tolerance and productivity traits in a recombinant inbred line population of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *IOSR Journal of agriculture and veterinary science*, 5, 36-41.

- Rao, V. T., Bhadru, D., Murthy, K. G. K. and Bharathi, D. (2012). Genetic variability and association among the various characters in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L). *International journal of Applied Biology and Pharmaceutical*, 3, 337-341.
- Ravi, K., Vadez, V., Isobe, S., Mir, R. R., Guo, Y., Nigam, S. N., Gowda, M. V. C., Radhakrishnan, T., Bertioli, D. J., Knapp, S. J. and Varshney, R. K. (2011). Identification of several small main-effect QTLs and a large number of epistatic QTLs for drought tolerance related traits in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, 122, pp.1119-1132.
- Reddy, M. V., Reddy, K. R., Reddy, K. H. P., & Rao, J. A. (1991). Heritability, genetic advance and character association in groundnut over three environments. *Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities (India)*.
- Reddy, P. V., Sudhakar, P., Sujatha, D., Babitha, M. and Latha, P. (2003). Transgressive segregation in groundnut. In *Proceedings of National Seminar on Physiological Interventions for Improved Crop Productivity and Quality: Opportunities and Constraints*, Indian Society for Plant Physiology, New Delhi (Vol. 84).
- Rekha, D. (2005). Genetic Analysis and Molecular Characterization for water use efficiency in groundnut. *M.Sc. (Agri.)* thesis submitted to the University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore.
- Sheshshayee, M. S., Bindumadhava, H., Rachaputi, N. R., Prasad, T. G., Udayakumar, M., Wright, G. C. and Nigam, S. N. (2006). Leaf chlorophyll concentration relates to transpiration efficiency in peanut. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 148(1), 7-15.
- Shoba, D., Manivannan, N. and Vindhivarman, P. (2012). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.), *Madras Agricultural Journal*, 99(1-3), 18-20.
- Songsri, P., Jogloy, S., Holbrook, C. C., Kesmala, T., Vorasoot, N., Akkasaeng, C. and Patanothai, A. (2009). Association of root, specific leaf area and SPAD chlorophyll meter reading to water use efficiency of peanut under different available soil water. *Agricultural water management*, 96(5), 790-798.

- Sridevi, S., Meenakumari, B., Manivannan, N. and Ravichandran, V. (2022). Assessment of genetic variability, character association and path analysis of kernel yield and yield components in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 13(2), 476-481.
- Talwar, H. S., Nageshwar Rao, R. C., Nigam, S. N. and Wright, G. C. (2004). Leaf Anatomical characteristics associated with Water Use Efficiency in groundnut. In *proceedings of National symposium on enhancing productivity for sustaining food and nutritional security, NRCG, Junagadh* (p. 128).
- Thakur, S. B., Ghimire, S. K., Chaudhary, N. K., Shrestha, S. M. and Mishra, B. (2013). Variability in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) to *Cercospora* Leaf spot disease tolerance. *International Journal of Life Sciences Biotechnology and Pharm Research*, 2, 254-262.
- Upadhyaya, H. D., Bramel, P. J., Ortiz, R. and Singh, S. (2002). Developing a mini core of peanut for utilization of genetic resources. *Crop Science*, 42(6), 2150-2156.
- Vishnuvardhan, K. M., Vasanthi, R. P., Reddy, K. and Reddy, B. V. (2012). Genetic variability studies for yield attributes and resistance to foliar diseases in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.).
- Makhan Lal, Roy, D. and Ojha, O. P. (2003). Genetic variability and selection response for root and other characters in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Legume Research*, 26(2), 128-130.
- Weiss, E. A. (2000). *Oilseed crops* (Second Ed.). Blackwell Science Ltd., London.
- Zaman, M. A., Tuhina-Khatun, M., Ullah, M. Z., Moniruzzamn, M. and Alam, K. H. (2011). Genetic variability and path analysis of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *The Agriculturists*, 9(1-2), 29-36.
- Zhang, Q., Dang, P., Chen, C., Feng, Y., Batchelor, W., Lamb, M. and Sanz-Saez, A. (2022). Tolerance to mid-season drought in peanut can be achieved by high water use efficiency or high efficient use of water. *Crop Science*, 62(5), 1948-1966.

**Table 1: Salient features of parents and checks used in the study.**

| <b>Genotypes</b> | <b>SCMR</b> | <b>SLA (cm<sup>2</sup>/g)</b> | <b>Pods/plant</b> | <b>Pod yield (g/plant)</b> | <b>SMK (%)</b> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| GKVK-13          | 42.44       | 140.17                        | 27.32             | 25.00                      | 87.00          |
| *KCG-2           | 34.25       | 160.20                        | 22.00             | 20.29                      | 71.00          |
| *KCG-6           | 45.39       | 142.00                        | 30.14             | 29.28                      | 65.12          |
| *TMV-2           | 35.38       | 152.15                        | 18.00             | 15.00                      | 60.75          |

**Table 2: Analysis of variance for growth, traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation.**

| SV                         | Generations    | df    | DFF     | Plant height (cm) | Primary Branches plant <sup>-1</sup> | SCMR     | SLA(cm <sup>2</sup> /g) | Pods Plant <sup>-1</sup> | Pod yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g) | Kernel yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g) | Shelling (%) | SMK (%)  |
|----------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| <b>Blocks</b>              | F <sub>6</sub> | 5.00  | 17.95   | 58.97**           | 0.64                                 | 13.47    | 134.06                  | 21.51                    | 16.86                             | 15.51                                | 34.35        | 128.73   |
|                            | F <sub>7</sub> | 3.00  | 12.75   | 43.95*            | 0.23                                 | 28.42    | 131.41                  | 78.19                    | 15.48                             | 14.76                                | 32.84        | 258.34*  |
| <b>Checks</b>              | F <sub>6</sub> | 2.00  | 12.88   | 20.86             | 0.24                                 | 25.83    | 156.16                  | 90.84*                   | 17.25                             | 27.07                                | 36.33        | 372.23** |
|                            | F <sub>7</sub> | 2.00  | 12.23   | 25.49             | 1.007                                | 34.42    | 126.58                  | 25.88                    | 18.95                             | 36.87                                | 18.34        | 109.08   |
| <b>Families</b>            | F <sub>6</sub> | 35.00 | 30.14** | 47.15**           | 10.15**                              | 194.82** | 248.65**                | 129.85**                 | 104.57**                          | 87.42**                              | 77.95**      | 280.86** |
|                            | F <sub>7</sub> | 23.00 | 20.82** | 171.53**          | 10.53**                              | 221.56** | 244.56**                | 116.39**                 | 95.49**                           | 100.11**                             | 89.02**      | 256.33** |
| <b>Checks vs. Families</b> | F <sub>6</sub> | 70.00 | 59.25** | 183.04**          | 33.96**                              | 311.98** | 370.93**                | 553.97**                 | 138.76**                          | 116.81**                             | 125.54**     | 89.56    |
|                            | F <sub>7</sub> | 46.00 | 25.68*  | 152.10**          | 20.15**                              | 322.55** | 300.12**                | 655.16**                 | 122.05**                          | 133.60**                             | 129.84**     | 337.43*  |
| <b>Error</b>               | F <sub>6</sub> | 20.00 | 2.08    | 7.21              | 0.14                                 | 5.99     | 17.80                   | 12.73                    | 11.01                             | 9.11                                 | 13.15        | 25.54    |
|                            | F <sub>7</sub> | 12.00 | 2.66    | 6.48              | 0.04                                 | 6.64     | 13.25                   | 14.33                    | 13.81                             | 6.57                                 | 15.16        | 28.35    |

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 probability level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 probability level.

SV- Source of variation, df: Degrees of freedom, DFF: Days to first flowering

**Table 3: Estimates of genetic variability parameters for growth, traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component characters in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation.**

| Traits                               | Crosses        | Mean   | Range  |        | Standardized Range | GCV (%) | PCV (%) | $h^2_{(bs)}\%$ | GAM%  |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------------|---------|---------|----------------|-------|
|                                      |                |        | Min.   | Max.   |                    |         |         |                |       |
| DFF                                  | F <sub>6</sub> | 30.22  | 25.00  | 35.00  | 0.33               | 05.30   | 06.79   | 78.14          | 09.54 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 32.13  | 30.00  | 35.00  | 0.16               | 03.43   | 03.87   | 88.64          | 27.86 |
| Plant height (cm)                    | F <sub>6</sub> | 37.86  | 25.12  | 50.60  | 0.67               | 12.75   | 15.92   | 80.15          | 26.29 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 30.17  | 11.50  | 46.45  | 01.18              | 21.39   | 24.37   | 87.81          | 44.09 |
| Primary branches plant <sup>-1</sup> | F <sub>6</sub> | 04.18  | 03.00  | 05.00  | 0.48               | 08.30   | 12.29   | 67.61          | 27.24 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 05.03  | 04.05  | 06.13  | 0.41               | 12.85   | 14.60   | 88.06          | 26.49 |
| SCMR                                 | F <sub>6</sub> | 35.99  | 26.29  | 42.91  | 0.46               | 08.82   | 10.42   | 84.69          | 03.15 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 41.36  | 33.56  | 50.78  | 0.41               | 08.23   | 10.08   | 81.73          | 12.81 |
| SLA(cm <sup>2</sup> /g)              | F <sub>6</sub> | 156.22 | 131.00 | 204.80 | 0.47               | 07.14   | 9.67    | 73.90          | 14.76 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 127.50 | 90.00  | 189.00 | 0.78               | 12.09   | 13.48   | 89.70          | 16.02 |
| Pods plant <sup>-1</sup>             | F <sub>6</sub> | 25.18  | 13.00  | 41.14  | 01.12              | 17.84   | 19.94   | 89.51          | 20.33 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 27.70  | 09.00  | 52.00  | 01.54              | 27.27   | 35.18   | 77.54          | 41.69 |
| Pod yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g)    | F <sub>6</sub> | 20.13  | 08.35  | 32.64  | 01.21              | 17.54   | 22.70   | 77.28          | 22.11 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 23.17  | 06.28  | 43.25  | 01.61              | 34.23   | 39.46   | 86.75          | 54.25 |
| Kernel yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g) | F <sub>6</sub> | 11.45  | 03.82  | 19.51  | 01.37              | 30.56   | 33.99   | 89.92          | 27.96 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 13.74  | 03.60  | 27.20  | 01.81              | 37.04   | 43.16   | 85.84          | 31.87 |
| Shelling (%)                         | F <sub>6</sub> | 60.76  | 35.70  | 80.86  | 0.74               | 10.74   | 14.41   | 74.57          | 19.36 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 61.30  | 50.48  | 69.84  | 0.32               | 06.13   | 07.37   | 83.29          | 20.50 |
| SMK (%)                              | F <sub>6</sub> | 61.61  | 24.88  | 89.36  | 01.05              | 20.76   | 23.61   | 87.93          | 42.77 |
|                                      | F <sub>7</sub> | 61.90  | 26.37  | 94.01  | 01.20              | 20.44   | 23.98   | 85.25          | 42.11 |

**Note:** GCV - Genotypic coefficient of variation, PCV- Phenotypic coefficient of variation,  
 $h^2_{(bs)}\%$  - Heritability in broad sense, GAM %- Genetic advance as *per cent* of mean.

**Table 4: Phenotypic correlation coefficients for growth, traits related to water use efficiency, pod yield and its component traits in F<sub>6</sub> and F<sub>7</sub> generation.**

| Traits                                     | Generations    | Plant height (cm) | Primary branches plant <sup>-1</sup> | SCMR  | SLA (cm <sup>2</sup> /g) | Pods Plant <sup>-1</sup> | Pod yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g) | Kernel yield plant <sup>-1</sup> (g) | Shelling (%) | SMK (%) |
|--|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------|
| <b>DFP</b>                                 | F <sub>6</sub> | 0.25*             | 0.36**                               | 0.32* | 0.24*                    | -0.33*                   | 0.11                              | 0.45*                                | -0.22*       | 0.24*   |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 0.30**            | 0.50**                               | 0.29* | 0.15                     | -0.46**                  | 0.17                              | 0.29*                                | -0.27*       | 0.31**  |
| <b>Plant height (cm)</b>                   | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | -0.25*                               | 0.34* | -0.29*                   | 0.36**                   | 0.44**                            | 0.37*                                | 0.36*        | 0.11    |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | -0.17*                               | 0.22* | -0.12                    | 0.22*                    | 0.31**                            | 0.33**                               | 0.22*        | 0.25*   |
| <b>Primary branches plant<sup>-1</sup></b> | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 0.19* | -0.05                    | -0.19*                   | 0.30**                            | 0.24*                                | -0.15        | 0.22**  |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 0.32* | -0.08                    | -0.12*                   | 0.25*                             | 0.33**                               | -0.18        | 0.28**  |
| <b>SCMR</b>                                | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | -0.34*                   | 0.64**                   | 0.57**                            | 0.75*                                | 0.27*        | 0.53*   |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | -0.55**                  | 0.77**                   | 0.69*                             | 0.64**                               | 0.22*        | 0.65**  |
| <b>SLA (cm<sup>2</sup>/g)</b>              | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | -0.38*                   | 0.58**                            | 0.57**                               | -0.23*       | 0.20*   |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | -0.45**                  | -0.61                             | 0.49**                               | 0.35*        | 0.32**  |
| <b>Pods plant<sup>-1</sup></b>             | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | 1.00                     | 0.77**                            | 0.53**                               | 0.52*        | -0.33** |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | 1.00                     | 0.85**                            | 0.74**                               | 0.40*        | -0.41** |
| <b>Pod yield plant<sup>-1</sup>(g)</b>     | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | 1.00                     | 1.00                              | 0.83*                                | -0.58*       | 0.85**  |
|  | F <sub>7</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | 1.00                     | 1.00                              | 0.91**                               | -0.49*       | 0.55*   |
| <b>Kernel yield</b>                        | F <sub>6</sub> | 1.00              | 1.00                                 | 1.00  | 1.00                     | 1.00                     | 1.00                              | 1.00                                 | 0.68*        | 0.73**  |

|                              |                |  |  |  |  |  |  |      |       |        |
|------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|-------|--------|
| <b>plant<sup>-1</sup>(g)</b> | F <sub>7</sub> |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.55* | 0.61*  |
| <b>Shelling (%)</b>          | F <sub>6</sub> |  |  |  |  |  |  |      | 1.00  | 0.40** |
|                              | F <sub>7</sub> |  |  |  |  |  |  |      | 1.00  | 0.56** |
| <b>SMK (%)</b>               | F <sub>6</sub> |  |  |  |  |  |  |      |       | 1.00   |
|                              | F <sub>7</sub> |  |  |  |  |  |  |      |       | 1.00   |

Note: \*Significant at 0.05 probability level. \*\* Significant at 0.01 probability level




Figure 1: Box plots depicting variation in studied traits of groundnut

UNDER PEER REVIEW