Original Research Article

Accessing the performance of promising germplasm under red and black soil conditions.

Abstract

About 550 germplasm accessions were evaluated for quantitative traits during rabi 2019-20, among them twenty germplasm accessions were selected based on their seed yield. During rabi 2020-21, these selected germplasm accessions are raised in red and black soil conditions for accessing their performance through direct (variability, heritability, and genetic advance) and indirect selection parameters (correlation and path coefficient analysis). About seventeen quantitative traits were studied in both ~~the~~ soil condition. Under red and black soil condition, chlorophyll content, pods per plant, 100 seed weight, biological yield, and seed yield showed high PCV and GCV. In red soil condition, chlorophyll content, plant height, 100 seed weight, biological yield, and seed yield showed high heritability and genetic advance, while in black soil condition leaf area index, chlorophyll content, primary branches, and 100 seed weight showed high heritability coupled with genetic advance. By considering indirect selection parameters in the red soil condition leaf area index, the number of primary branches and biological yield per plant was the major direct contributors to seed yield.Similarly, under black soil condition leaf area index, leaflet size, and biological yield per plant were the major direct contributors to seed yield. By comparing the performance of twenty genotypes most of the genotypes perform well under red soil conditions than black soil condition.

Keywords: Chickpea, red soil, black soil, heritability, genetic advance, and indirect selection parameters.

Introduction

Chickpea *(Cicer arietinum* L.*)* is one of the most important and earliest cultivated legumes, known for cultivation for the last 7500 years (Maiti and WescheEbeling, 2001). It ranks second among the world's food legumes in terms of area. India is the largest producer (12.61 million tonnes) of chickpea with an average yield of 1077 kg/ha (DAC & FW. 2021). Chickpea shares about 34% area and 48% of the production of the total pulses in our country. In India, chickpea is grown on about 10.56 million ha that is spread over mainly in Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Jharkhand. The average productivity of chickpea in Bundelkhand is 1320 kg/ha which is more than the national average with a total production of 1.08 million tonnes (mt) from an area of 0.79 million ha (DAC & FW 2019). A large number of varieties of desi and Kabuli chickpea have been developed for different agro-ecological zones or

Comment [Mu1]: Add "s" to all condition in here

Comment [Mu2]: were

Comment [Mu3]: Add "s" to all chickpea in here

states. Its grains are rich in protein (22%), carbohydrates (60%), fat (4.5%), Ca (280 mg/100g), Fe (12.3 mg/100g) and P (301 mg/100 g) besides dietary fibre (Jukanti *et al*., 2012).

Cultivars with a narrow genetic base emerged due to the extensive use of few and closely related germplasm lines in the crop improvement program. Diverse genetic backgrounds of parental lines provide the allelic variation necessary to create favourable new gene combinations. Genetically diverse germplasm is therefore needed in breeding programs to enhance the productivity and diversity of cultivars. The introduction of germplasm remains a major strategy to enhance genetic diversity. The knowledge of genetic variability present in targeted material is essential for better understanding the worth of the germplasm material introduced and its utilization in the crop improvement program. Out of the several promising donors/genotypes, one should identify the genotype/donor having a combination of useful traits (Agronomically superior) for use in the breeding programme.

Material and method

This investigation was carried from rabi 2019-20 to *rabi* 2020-21. During *rabi* 2019-20, 550 germplasm accessions of chickpea were evaluated for qualitative and quantitative traits, among them twenty genotypes were selected based on their seed yield. In the next year, these selected twenty genotypes were raised in randomized block design, with three replications using four checks (RVG 202, RVG 203, JG 36 and RLBGK 1) in two sets viz., red and black soil condition. All these accessions were evaluated for about 17 quantitative traits viz., days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, chlorophyll fluorescence, leaf area index, leaf-let size, chlorophyll content, plant height, primary branches per plant, secondary branches, pods per plant, seeds per pod, pod length, peduncle length, 100 seed weight, biological yield per plant, harvest index and seed yield per plant. ~~And~~ these data were subjected to analysis of variation, and other biometrical methods were followed to estimate the phenotypic coefficient of variance, genotypic coefficient of variance, heritability, genetic advance, and correlation and path analysis.

Comment [Mu4]: Extra space between them

Results and discussion

Variability studies: Analysis of variance showed that all the traits studied under both soil types exhibited highly significant differences (Table 1&2). Genetic parameters of yield and their components are studied and given in Table 3&4. Under red soil condition, high GCV and PCV were reported for chlorophyll fluorescence (23.27 & 36.72), chlorophyll content (48.14 & 61.06), 100 seed weight (35.75 & 36.08), biological yield per plant (27.57 & 32.97), and seed yield per plant (23.44 & 29.18). While under black soil conditions, leaf area index (36.7 & 44.03), chlorophyll content (58.13 & 74.85), peduncle length (22.41 & 26.5), 100 seed weight (31.58 & 31.97), biological yield per plant (35.17 & 51.43) and seed yield per plant (38.15 & 55.92) showed high GCV and PCV value. The presence of high GCV and PCV for 100 seed weight, seed yield per plant, was earlier reported by Banik *et al.* (2018),

Jain *et al.* (2020), and Kishor *et al.* (2018). High GCV and PCV for 100 seed weight, seed yield per plant, and biological yield per plant were also reported earlier by Mohan *et al.* (2019). Under both soil conditions value of PCV is higher than the GCV which reveals the presence of high environmental influence on these traits.

High heritability coupled with genetic advance was reported for chlorophyll content, plant height, pods per plant, pod length, 100 seed weight, biological yield per plant, and seed yield per plant under red soil conditions. Similarly, under black soil conditions leaf area index, chlorophyll content, primary branches, secondary branches, peduncle length, and 100 seed weight exhibited high heritability and genetic advance. And remaining traits showed a high to moderate level of heritability and genetic advance (Table 3&4). Similarly, Ali *et al.* (2012) and Johanson *et al.* (2018) reported high genetic advances for chlorophyll content, grain yield, pods per plant, 100 seed weight. Similar results of high genetic advance were reported by Hagoes *et al.* (2015) for the number of pods per plant, and 100 seed weight. Latter Kishor *et al.* (2018) reported high genetic advances for primary branches per plant, pods per plant, biological yield per plant, and seed yield per plant which is similar to our result.

Comment [Mu5]: in

Comment [Mu6]: later

Character association studies.

In red soil condition, Seed yield per plant had a highly significant and positive association with leaf area index (0.813**), chlorophyll fluorescence (0.563**), primary branches (0.707**) and biological yield per plant (0.799**). It showed a significant negative correlation with chlorophyll content (-0.6512). Biological yield per plant had a highly significant and positive association with chlorophyll fluorescence (0.588**), leaf area index (0.74**), primary branches (0.663**), seed yield (0.7998**). Similarly, 100 seed weight, had a highly significant and positive association with leaf-let size (0.809**), pod length (0.680**) and peduncle length (0.551**). Pods per plant had a highly significant and positive association with primary branches (0.498*). Seed yield per plant is significantly positively correlated with leaf area index, primary branches, biological yield per plant (Table 5). Similar results were also reported by Kumar *et al*. (2020); Tesfamichael *et al*. (2015); Kumar *et al.* (2018); Hagoes *et al.* (2015); Mohan *et al.* (2019); Jan *et al*. (2015); Vaghela *et al.* (2009); Sohil *et al.* (2018).

Under black soil condition, seed yield per plant is positively correlated with leaf area index (0.842**), leaf-let size (0.446**), primary branches (0.956**), secondary branches (0.094**), peduncle length (0.642**), 100 seed weight (0.479**) and biological yield per plant (0.979**). While it is a significantly negative correlation with days to maturity (-0.544**). A similar report of high significant positive correlation was also reported by Noor *et al.* (2003); Arshad *et al.* (2004); Babbar *et al*. (2012); Bayahi *et al.* (2015); Tsehaye *et al*. (2020). Days to maturity showed a negative correlation with seed yield which is also reported earlier by Kumar *et al*. (2020); Kumar *et al.* (2018); Hagoes *et al.* (2015); Jain *et al*. (2019); Talebi *et al.*(2007); Ali *et al*. (2010); Tadesse *et al*. (2016); Jivani et al. (2013). Harvesting index had a highly significant

Comment [Mu7]: highly

Comment [Mu8]: was

Comment [Mu9]: add “the” before it

and negative association with days to 50% flowering (-0.707**), days to maturity (-0.792**), and pod length (-0.54**). Biological yield per plant showed a significant negative correlation with days to 50% flowering (-0.181**). Chlorophyll content had significant positive correlation with leaf area index (0.421*), plant height (0.503*), peduncle length (0.678**), and 100 seed weight (0.647**)(Table 5). And leaf area index had significant positive correlation with leaf-let size (0.546**), chlorophyll content (0.421*), primary branches (0.929**), secondary branches (0.824**), peduncle length (0.692**), pod length (0.684**), 100 seed weight (0.624**), biological yield per plant (0.726**), harvesting index (0.603**) and seed yield per plant (0.842**). Ali et al. (2012) reported chlorophyll content is negatively correlated with leaf area index which is similar to our results in black soil conditions.

Path coefficient analysis

In the red soil condition, biological yield per plant (0.934), harvesting index (0.056), 100 seed weight (0.141), plant height (0.115), leaf area index (0.014), primary branches (0.035), and seeds per pod (0.064) exhibited direct positive effect on seed yield. Leaf area index has a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.768), pod length (0.162), 100 seed weight (0.021), primary branches (0.040), and chlorophyll content (0.041). Biological yield per plant had a positive indirect effect on yield through leaf-let size (0.047), 100 seed weight (0.036), chlorophyll content (0.023), and primary branches (0.024). Chlorophyll fluorescence had a negative direct effect (-0.179) on seed yield. Chlorophyll fluorescence has a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.610), days to 50% flowering (0.124), leaf-let size (0.054), primary branches (0.031), and leaf area index (0.012). Primary branches had a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.688), pod length (0.095), plant height (0.017), chlorophyll content (0.019), leaf-let size (0.015), leaf area index (0.016)(Table 6).

The highest direct effect on seed yield per plant was exhibited by biological yield per plant, followed by theharvesting index, plant height, 100 seed weight, leaf area index, and days to maturity, and the same results are also reported by Arshad *et al.* (2004); Jivani *et al*. (2013); Khan and Gul (2016); Hagos *et al.* (2015); Paneliya *et al*. (2017); Kumar *et al*. (2018). And days to 50% flowering, chlorophyll content, secondary branches per plant, pods per plant, and seeds per pod showed the negative indirect effect on seed yield, and similar direct negative effects are also reported by Talebi *et al.* (2007), and Shafique *et al*. (2016).

Under black soil condition, biological yield per plant (0.957), harvest index (0.228), leaflet size (0.172), leaf area index (0.153), peduncle length (0.025), chlorophyll fluorescence (0.088), days to 50% flowering (0.025) and days to maturity (0.044) exhibited direct positive effect on seed yield. Leaf area index has a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.695), harvesting index (-0.138), leaf-let size (0.094), and chlorophyll fluorescence (0.021). Leaf-let size has a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.203), 100 seed weight

(0114), days to 50% flowering (0.178), and plant height (0.045). Primary branches had a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.825), harvesting index (0.130), leaf-let size (0.102), leaf area index (0.142), pod length (0.020), and seeds per pod (0.067). Secondary branches had a negative direct effect (-0.001) on seed yield. Secondary branches had a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.943), leaf area index (0.126), leaf-let size (0.119), chlorophyll fluorescence (0.032), seeds per pod (0.065), and harvesting index (0.062). 100 seed weight, had a negative direct effect (-0.302) on seed yield. 100 seed weight had a positive indirect effect on yield through biological yield per plant (0.435), leaf-let size (0.136), leaf area index (0.095), seeds per pod (0.095), and harvest index (0.062) (Table 7). The direct effect on seed yield per plant was exhibited by biological yield per plant, followed by harvesting index, days to 50% flowering. These results are also reported byVaghela *et al*. (2009). Agarwal *et al.* (2018) reported days to 50% flowering showed an indirect positive effect on yield through days to maturity, plant height, and 100 seed weight which is similar to the results of our set 2. Pods per plant showed an indirect positive effect on yield through plant height, and seeds per pod, which is reported earlier by Yadav *et al.* (2020).

Comment [Mu10]: was

Conclusion

The genotypes used in the present investigation exhibited wide variability and association among themselves for various traits under study. In the present study, the characters like leaf area index, primary branches, biological yield per plant, and 100 seed weight were identified as main selection criteria for improving seed yield in chickpea, as these characters exhibited strong positive correlation as well as high positive direct effects with seed yield per plant.Performance of the promising germplasms are accessed under two soil conditions viz., red and black soil condition. By considering the mean yield of these genotypes in the replicated design, it is concluded that performance of the most of the genotypes is better in red soil than in the back soil. Under red soil condition among the twenty germplasm highest yield per plant was observed for accession EC547398 (22.44 g/plant) over the best check RVG 203 (21g/plant). Under black soil condition, among the twenty germplasm highest yield per plant was observed for EC54381 (17.84 g/plant) over the best check RVG 202 (11.44g/plant).

Comment [Mu11]: characteristics

References

Ali, Q., & Ahsan, M. (2010). Genetic variability and trait association in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, *1*(3), 328–333.

Ali, Q., Elahi, M., Ahsan, M., Tahir, M. H. N., Khaliq, I., Kashif, M., Latif, A., Ahmed, T., Saeed, U., & Khan, N. H. (2012). Genetic analysis of Morpho-Physiological and quality traits in chickpea genotypes (Cicer arietinum L.). *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, *7*(23), 3403–3412.

Arshad, M., Bakhsh, A., & Ghafoor, A. (2004). Path coefficient analysis in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) under rainfed conditions. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, *36*(1), 75–82.

Babbar, A., Prakash, V., Tiwari, P., &Iquebal, M. A. (2012). *Genetic Variability for Chickpea (variability for Chickpea (Cicer Arietinum L.) under late sown season)*.

Banik, M., Deore, G. N., Mandal, A. K., &Mhase, L. B. (2018). Genetic Variability and Heritability Studies in Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 1–6.

Bayahi, K., &Rezgui, S. (2015). Agro-morphological characterization and genetic study of new improved accessions and cultivars of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Journal of Plant Breeding and Genetics*, *3*(3), 59–65.

DAC & FW. 2020. First advance estimates of production of food-grains for 2020-21. Directorate of Economics and Statistics. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India. pp. 02. Retrieved on 25-05-2021.

DAC & FW. (2019). Land use statistics information system. Special Data Dissemination Standard Division, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Govt. Of India, New Delhi.

Hagos, A. A., Desalegn, T., & Belay, T. (2018). Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis for quantitative traits of seed yield, and yield components in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) at Maichew, Northern Ethiopia. *African Journal of Plant Science*, *12*(3), 58–64.

Hama, S. (2019). Correlation and path coefficient analysis for seed yield and yield components in chickpea under rainfed condition. *Journal of Kerbala for Agricultural Sciences*, *6*(1), 26–35.

Indiastat. (2019). Estimates of area, production and yield of food grains, oilseeds and commercial crops in India-Part I. *India Agristat.*

Jain, R., Chand, P., Rao, S. C., & Agarwal, P. (2020). Crop and soil suitability analysis using multi-criteria decision making in drought-prone semi-arid tropics in India. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, *19*(3), 271-283.

Jivani, J. V., Mehta, D. R., Vaddoria, M. A., & Lata, R. (2013). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, *4*(2), 1167–1170.

Johnson, P. L., Sharma, R. N., & Nanda, H. C. (2018). Genetic Variability for Yield and Quality Chracters in Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) Under Rice Based Cropping

System. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, *6*, 1172–1182.

Jukanti, A. K., Gaur, P. M., Gowda, C. L. L., &Chibbar, R. N. (2012). Nutritional quality and health benefits of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.): A review. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *108*(S1), S11–S26.

Khan, H., & Gul, R. (n.d.). *Appraising Direct and Indirect Effect of Yield Gears on Yield of Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) Using Path Coefficient Analysis*.

Kishor, L., Swarup, I., Nehra, A., Kirar, G., &Jeeterwal, R. C. (2018). Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance Analysis in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci*, *6*(4), 141–144.

Kishor, L., Swarup, I., Nehra, A., Kirar, G., &Jeeterwal, R. C. (2018). Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance Analysis in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci*, *6*(4), 141–144.

Kumar, Amit, Kumar, M., Chand, P., Singh, S. K., Kumar, P., &Gangwar, L. K. (2020). Studies on genetic variability and inter relationship among yield and related traits of parents and F1 population in Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, *9*(3), 1434–1438.

Kumar, Anurag, Kumar, A., Yadav, A. K., Nath, S., & Kumar, J. K. Y. D. (n.d.). *Correlation and path coefficient analysis for various quantitative traits in chickpea (Cicer arietinum l.)*.

Maiti, R., and Wesche Ebeling, P. (2001). *Advances in chickpea science.* Science Publishers.

Mohan, S., & Thiyagarajan, K. (2019). Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) for yield and its component traits. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences,* 8(5), 1801-1808.

Noor, F., Ashaf, M., & Ghafoor, A. (2003). Path analysis and relationship among quantitative traits in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.). *Pakistan Journal* of *Biological Sciences, 6*(6), 551–555.

Paneliya, M. R., Mehta, D. R., Lata, J. Raval and Patel, C. K. (2017). Relationship between yield and yield contributing characters in F1 population of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *International Journal of Development Research*, 7(11). 16547-16554.

Shafiq, M., Rafiq, C. M., Naeem, M. K., & Amin, M. (2016). Grain yield stability of newly evolved desi chickpea strains under rainfed conditions. *The Journal of* Animal *and* Plant Sciences *26*, 481-486.

Sohail, A., Ahmad, S., Rahman, H., Burni, T., Shah, S. M. A., Ali, S., & Hussain, Q. (2018). 8. Genetic variability, heritability, genetic advance and correlation studies

among F7 populations of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Pure and Applied Biology (PAB)*, *7*(1), 57–65.

Tadesse, M., Fikre, A., Eshete, M., Girma, N., Korbu, L., Mohamed, R., Bekele, D., Funga, A., &Ojiewo, C. O. (2016). Correlation and path coefficient analysis for various quantitative traits in desi chickpea genotypes under rainfed conditions in Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, *8*(12), 112–118.

Talebi, R., Fayaz, F., &Jelodar, N.-A. B. (2007). Correlation and path coefficient analysis of yield and yield components of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) under dry land condition in the west of Iran. *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences*.

Tesfamichael, S. M., Githiri, S. M., Nyende, A. B., & Rao, N. (2015). Variation for agro-morphological traits among Kabuli chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) genotypes. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, *7*(7), 75–92.

Tsehaye, A., Fikre, A., &Bantayhu, M. (2020). Genetic variability and association analysis of Desi-type chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) advanced accessions under potential environment in North Gondar, Ethiopia. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, *6*(1), 1806668.

Vaghela, M. D., Poshiya, V. K., Savaliya, J. J., Kavani, R. H., & Davada, B. K. (2009). Genetic variability studies in kabuli chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Legume Research-An International Journal*, *32*(3), 191-194.

Yadav, A. K., Chaubey, S. K., Pyare, R., & Kumar, A. (202). *Correlation and path coefficient analysis of yield and its component in chick pea (Cicer arietinum L.)*.

Table 1. ANOVA for red soil condition

Sources of variation	DF	DF50	DM	CF	LAI	LS	CC	PH	PB	SB	PPP	SPP	PDL	PL	100SW	BYPP	SYPP	HI
Replication	2	2.04	15.72	0.81	0	0.16	0.21	10.53	0.9	2.22	20.42	0.086	0.14	2.11	11.60***	48.7	3.72	0.002
Genotype	23	201.7***	40.8***	0.63*	0.01*	4.5**	3.8***	271.8***	0.26**	13.18***	717.7***	0.130**	19.22***	4.10*	117.4***	261.8***	42.63***	0.015***
Error	46	4.56	7.21	0.21	0	0.87	0.64	4.89	0.17	3.63	77.79	0.050	0.84	1.88	0.72	32.85	6.60	0.004

Table 2. ANOVA for black soil condition

Sources of variation	DF	DF50	DM	CF	LAI	LS	CC	PH	PB	SB	PPP	SPP	PDL	PL	100SW	BYPP	SYPP	HI
Replication	2	5.18*	47.5**	0	0.38	1.96	0.072	17.5	0.23	0.15	162.6	0.037	526.2	11.1	3.99	1.69	3.55	0.017
Genotype	23	88.08***	57.8***	0.01*	1.16**	6.94***	4.63***	52.1***	1.44**	35.62***	356***	0.15***	562.13*	26**	100.5***	74.8***	2.85***	0.014*
Error	46	1.07	4.33	0	0.15	1.15	0.83	8.94	0.18	6.13	90.9	0.054	504.7	3	0.82	20.59	6.32	0.006

*and** indicate 5% and 1% level of significance

DF50=Days to 50% flowering; DM=Days to maturity; CF=Chlorophyll fluorescence; LAI=Leaf area index; LS=leaf-let size; CC=Chlorophyll content; PH=Plant hight; PB=Primary branches; SB=Secondary branches; PPP=Pods per plant; SPP=Seeds per pod; PDL= Pod length; Pl= Peduncle length; 100SW= Hundred seed weight, BYPP= Biological yield per plant; SYPP= Seed yield per plant; HI= Harvest index

Table 3 & 4. Estimation of PCV and GCV, heritability, genetic advance, and genetic advance as per mean for various characters in chickpea for red soil and black soil condition (2020-21).

S.No	Character	Coefficient of variance		Heritability	Genetic advance	Genetic advance as per mean
		GCV	PCV			
1	DF50	9.83	10.17	93.51	16.15	19.58
2	DM	2.39	3.07	60.82	5.38	3.85
3	CF	23.27	36.72	40.16	0.49	30.38
4	LAI	6.16	6.65	85.67	0.09	11.74
5	LS	8.64	11.34	58.1	1.73	13.57
6	CC	48.14	61.06	62.15	1.67	78.18
7	PH	15.67	16.09	94.79	18.92	31.42
8	PB	13.27	17.37	58.37	0.78	20.88
9	SB	9.04	13.24	46.66	2.51	12.72
10	PPP	14.08	16.45	73.28	25.75	24.83
11	SPP	11.74	19.91	34.77	0.2	14.26
12	PDL	13.05	13.93	87.87	4.78	25.21
13	PL	7.55	14.22	28.18	0.94	8.25
14	100SW	35.75	36.08	98.16	12.73	72.96
15	BYPP	27.57	32.97	69.91	15.05	47.49
16	SYPP	23.44	29.18	64.52	5.73	38.78
17	HI	12.86	18.42	48.72	0.09	18.48

S.No	Character	Coefficient of variance		Heritability	Genetic advance	Genetic advance as per mean
		GCV	PCV			
1	DF50	7.36	7.5	96.41	10.89	14.9
2	DM	3.77	4.2	80.44	7.8	6.96
3	CF	8.8	9.21	91.24	0.14	17.31
4	LAI	36.7	44.03	69.5	1	63.04
5	LS	10.8	13.65	62.55	2.26	17.59
6	CC	58.13	74.85	60.32	1.8	93
7	PH	7.95	10.12	61.67	6.14	12.86
8	PB	19.48	23.32	69.78	1.12	33.52
9	SB	20.82	26.53	61.6	5.07	33.66
10	PPP	16.99	24.2	49.29	13.6	24.57
11	SPP	13.14	21.04	38.98	0.24	16.9
12	PDL	21.03	73.11	3.65	1.72	8.28
13	PL	22.41	26.5	71.54	4.82	39.05
14	100SW	31.58	31.97	97.59	11.74	64.27
15	BYPP	35.17	51.43	46.75	5.99	49.53
16	SYPP	38.15	55.92	46.54	3.3	53.62
17	HI	9.89	19.17	26.6	0.05	10.5

Table 5. Estimation of the genotypic correlation coefficient for red and black soil. Values below the diagonal represent red soil, and values above the diagonal represent black soil.

	DF50	DM	CF	LAI	LS	CC	PH	PB	SB	PPP	SPP	PDL	PL	100SW	BYPP	HI	SYPP
DF50	1 **	0.5493 **	0.0553	-0.5401 **	-0.5945 **	-0.564 **	-0.1383	-0.4262 *	-0.3911	-0.1641	0.8389 **	-0.9501 **	-0.6396 **	-0.5842 **	-0.1813	-0.7073 **	-0.3493
DM	0.3174	1 **	-0.1728	-0.445 *	0.03	0.1388	0.0938	-0.4337 *	-0.3661	-0.4872 *	0.5045 *	-0.6089 **	-0.2729	-0.1185	-0.369	-0.7924 **	-0.5339 **
CF	-0.4153 *	0.1088	1 **	0.243	0.3082	0.2264	0.3818	0.3065	0.3609	0.346	-0.0326	0.2155	0.2607	0.3119	0.4204 *	-0.1222	0.3577
LAI	0.0697	0.2079	0.8484 **	1 **	0.5463 **	0.4214 *	0.3334	0.9294 **	0.8249 **	0.3918	-0.5532 **	0.684 **	0.6923 **	0.6244 **	0.7261 **	0.6036 **	0.8424 **
LS	-0.5945 **	-0.0167	0.2251	-0.0846	1 **	0.803 **	0.7022 **	0.5967 **	0.6915 **	-0.0828	-0.6059 **	-0.3519	0.9114 **	0.7932 **	0.5101 *	-0.2082	0.4465 *
CC	-0.5081 *	-0.1453	-0.0982	-0.6726 **	0.7039 **	1 **	0.6151 **	0.3806	0.4344 *	-0.087	-0.3038	-0.0712	0.6783 **	0.6476 **	0.3925	0.0508	0.3884
PH	-0.041	0.6726 **	0.0828	-0.1158	0.3866	0.5037 *	1 **	0.5024 *	0.6173 **	-0.1593	-0.3281	-0.5158 **	0.5518 **	0.4931 *	0.3641	0.1391	0.3673
PB	-0.1232	0.3464	0.881 **	0.931 **	0.0612	-0.3117	0.1476	1 **	0.9845 **	0.2845	-0.5061 *	-0.3301	0.7756 **	0.6214 **	0.8612 **	0.5697 **	0.9569 **
SB	0.4831 *	0.0295	-0.0148	0.1929	-0.5791 **	-0.0138	0.0118	0.089	1 **	0.0806	-0.4913 *	-0.0453	0.9037 **	0.713 **	0.9761 **	0.2705	0.954 **
PPP	-0.2399	0.1759	0.2049	0.3705	-0.149	0.2614	0.3713	0.4987 *	0.3121	1 **	-0.1463	-0.5004 *	-0.0455	-0.1314	0.1813	-0.0775	0.1311
SPP	0.4687 *	0.1694	-0.3478	-0.1135	-0.4618 *	-0.3487	0.0994	-0.1171	0.3785	-0.1162	1 **	-0.4863 *	-0.6174 **	-0.7174 **	-0.2523	-0.54 **	-0.367
PDL	-0.6134 **	0.0469	0.0583	-0.3531	0.9328 **	0.7796 **	0.5118 *	-0.2072	-0.612 **	-0.035	-0.4676 *	1 **	0.2971	0.9424 **	-0.3927	0.9122 **	0.0283
PL	-0.6638 **	-0.0639	0.0818	-0.2335	0.4835 *	0.6337 **	0.2202	-0.0637	-0.1294	0.0755	-0.6763 **	0.5331 **	1 **	0.8334 **	0.562 **	0.4005	0.6422 **
100SW	-0.5952 **	-0.2403	0.3783	0.1519	0.8096 **	0.3446	0.0967	0.0702	-0.7931 **	-0.251	-0.7941 **	0.6801 **	0.5518 **	1 **	0.4539 *	0.2706	0.479 *
BYPP	0.1467	0.3378	0.5884 **	0.74 **	0.1956	-0.3707	0.1805	0.663 **	-0.1345	-0.2835	-0.0043	-0.0301	-0.2965	0.2534	1 **	0.0185	0.9798 **
HI	-0.2019	-0.5111 *	-0.2259	-0.0479	-0.4023	-0.4879 *	-0.7167 **	-0.1459	-0.0817	-0.0354	0.0063	-0.4628 *	0.0993	-0.1166	-0.5575 **	1 **	0.2366
SYPP	-0.0578	0.0885	0.5635 **	0.8131 **	0.0461	-0.6512 **	-0.1722	0.7077 **	-0.269	-0.2903	0.0026	-0.2488	-0.1749	0.2816	0.7998 **	0.0414	1 **

Table 6. Genotypic Path matrix; direct and indirect effects of various characters on seed yield in chickpea for red soil condition.

	DF50	DM	CF	LAI	LS	CC	PH	PB	SB	PPP	SPP	PDL	PL	100SW	BYPP	HI
DF50	**-0.30**	0.019	0.074	0.001	-0.142	0.031	-0.005	-0.004	-0.003	0.003	0.030	0.282	-0.011	-0.084	0.152	-0.102
DM	-0.095	**0.061**	-0.019	0.003	-0.004	0.009	0.078	0.012	-0.000	-0.002	0.011	-0.022	-0.001	-0.034	0.351	-0.259
CF	0.124	0.007	**-0.179**	0.012	0.054	0.006	0.010	0.031	0.000	-0.002	-0.022	-0.027	0.001	0.053	0.610	-0.115
LAI	-0.021	0.013	-0.152	**0.014**	-0.020	0.041	-0.013	0.040	-0.001	-0.004	-0.007	0.162	-0.004	0.021	0.768	-0.024
LS	0.178	-0.001	-0.040	-0.001	**0.239**	-0.043	0.045	0.002	0.003	0.002	-0.030	-0.429	0.008	0.114	0.203	-0.204
CC	0.152	-0.009	0.018	-0.010	0.168	**-0.061**	0.058	-0.011	0.000	-0.003	-0.022	-0.358	0.010	0.048	-0.385	-0.247
PH	0.012	0.041	-0.015	-0.002	0.092	-0.031	**0.115**	0.005	-0.000	-0.004	0.006	-0.235	0.004	0.014	0.187	-0.363
PB	0.037	0.021	-0.157	0.016	0.015	0.019	0.017	**0.035**	-0.001	-0.006	-0.008	0.095	-0.001	0.010	0.688	-0.074
SB	-0.145	0.002	0.003	0.003	-0.138	0.001	0.001	0.003	**-0.006**	-0.004	0.024	0.281	-0.002	-0.112	-0.140	-0.041
PPP	0.072	0.011	-0.037	0.005	-0.036	-0.016	0.043	0.018	-0.002	**-0.011**	-0.007	0.016	0.001	-0.035	-0.294	-0.018
SPP	-0.141	0.010	0.062	-0.002	-0.110	0.021	0.011	-0.004	-0.002	0.001	**0.064**	0.215	-0.011	-0.112	-0.005	0.003
PDL	0.184	0.003	-0.010	-0.005	0.222	-0.047	0.059	-0.007	0.004	0.000	-0.030	**-0.460**	0.009	0.096	-0.031	-0.234
PL	0.199	-0.004	-0.015	-0.003	0.115	-0.038	0.025	-0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.044	-0.245	**0.017**	0.078	-0.308	0.050
100SW	0.178	-0.015	-0.068	0.002	0.193	-0.021	0.011	0.002	0.005	0.003	-0.051	-0.313	0.009	**0.141**	0.263	-0.059
BYPP	-0.044	0.021	-0.105	0.010	0.047	0.023	0.021	0.024	0.001	0.003	-0.000	0.014	-0.005	0.036	**0.934**	-0.282
HI	0.061	-	0.041	-	-	0.030	-	-0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.213	0.002	-	-	**0.506**

		0.031		0.001	0.096		0.083							0.016	0.579	

Table 7. Genotypic Path matrix; direct and indirect effects of various characters on seed yield in chickpea for black soil condition.

	DF50	DM	CF	LAI	LS	CC	PH	PB	SB	PPP	SPP	PDL	PL	100SW	BYPP	HI
DF50	**0.025**	0.024	0.005	-0.083	-0.102	0.027	0.014	0.010	0.000	0.023	-0.111	-0.008	-0.016	0.176	-0.174	-0.161
DM	0.014	**0.044**	-0.015	-0.068	0.005	-0.007	-0.010	0.010	0.000	0.070	-0.067	-0.005	-0.007	0.036	-0.353	-0.181
CF	0.001	-0.008	**0.088**	0.037	0.053	-0.011	-0.040	-0.007	-0.000	-0.050	0.004	0.002	0.007	-0.094	0.403	-0.028
LAI	-0.013	-0.020	0.021	**0.153**	0.094	-0.020	-0.035	-0.022	-0.001	-0.056	0.073	0.006	0.018	-0.189	0.695	0.138
LS	-0.015	0.001	0.027	0.084	**0.172**	-0.049	-0.073	-0.014	-0.001	0.012	0.080	-0.003	0.023	-0.240	0.488	-0.048
CC	-0.014	0.006	0.020	0.064	0.172	**-0.048**	-0.064	-0.009	-0.000	0.012	0.040	-0.001	0.017	-0.196	0.376	0.012
PH	-0.003	0.004	0.034	0.051	0.121	-0.030	**-0.104**	-0.012	-0.001	0.023	0.044	-0.004	0.014	-0.149	0.349	0.032
PB	-0.011	-0.019	0.027	0.142	0.102	-0.018	-0.052	**-0.024**	-0.001	-0.041	0.067	-0.003	0.020	-0.188	0.825	0.130
SB	-0.010	-0.016	0.032	0.126	0.119	-0.021	-0.064	-0.023	**-0.001**	-0.012	0.065	-0.000	0.023	-0.215	1.030	0.062
PPP	-0.004	-0.021	0.031	0.060	-0.014	0.004	0.017	-0.007	-0.000	**-0.143**	0.019	-0.004	-0.001	0.040	0.174	-0.018
SPP	0.021	0.022	-0.003	-0.085	-0.104	0.015	0.034	0.012	0.000	0.021	**-0.133**	-0.004	-0.016	0.217	-0.242	-0.123
PDL	-0.024	-0.027	0.019	0.105	-0.060	0.003	0.053	0.008	0.000	0.072	0.065	**0.008**	0.008	-0.285	-0.376	0.459
PL	-0.016	-0.012	0.023	0.106	0.156	-0.033	-0.057	-0.018	-0.001	0.007	0.082	0.003	**0.025**	-0.252	0.538	0.091
100W	-0.015	-0.005	0.028	0.095	0.136	-0.031	-0.051	-0.015	-0.001	0.019	0.095	0.008	0.021	**-0.302**	0.435	0.062
BYPP	-0.005	-0.016	0.037	0.111	0.088	-0.019	-0.038	-0.020	-0.001	-0.026	0.034	-0.003	0.014	-0.137	**0.957**	0.004
HI	-0.018	-0.035	-0.011	0.092	-0.036	-0.002	-0.014	-0.014	-0.000	0.011	0.072	0.017	0.010	-0.082	0.018	**0.228**