

# Stability analysis and genetic variability in buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench.)

## ABSTRACT:

**Aims:** To estimate the genetic variability and to identify the stable buckwheat genotype for growth and yield parameters

**Study design:** Eberhart and Russell model

**Place and duration of study:** Department of Plantation, Spices, Medicinal and Aromatic Crops, College of Horticulture, Bagalkot, Karnataka during Jan-April 2021-2022.

**Methodology:** Fifteen genotypes of buckwheat were assessed for stability parameters for 15 characters across three environments *i.e.*, full dose of recommended fertilizer (RDF), 3/4<sup>th</sup> dose of RDF and 1/2<sup>nd</sup> dose of RDF. The pooled data of these environments were used for estimation of genetic variability.

**Results:** The heritability estimates were moderate to high for all the characters. The genetic advance over mean was found highest for number of clusters per cyme (35.05%), seed yield per plot (32.68%) and seed yield per hectare (32.72%). The genotype EC-104035 was found stable for seed yield per plant, per plot and hectare, EC-386667, EC-3222, Nilgiri local, PRB-1 and Sangla B-460 for thousand seed weight, IC-313134 and EC-3222 for plant height at 45 days after sowing and at harvest, Shimla B-1 for plant height at 15 days after sowing, IC-49671, IC-274429 and Sangla B-460 for number of branches at 30 DAS, PRB-1 for days to first flowering and Nilgiri local for days to 50 percent flowering.

**Conclusion:** The genotypes stable for more traits with high genetic variability, will be considered for future breeding program.

**Keywords:** Buckwheat, *Fagopyrum esculentum*, Stability, Genotype, Genetic variability

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Common buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench.) is a dicotyledonous annual herb with erect branches with  $2n = 16$ , belongs to the family Polygonaceae. The genus includes four cultivated species, *i.e.*, common buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench.), tartary buckwheat (*Fagopyrum tataricum*), coarse buckwheat (*Fagopyrum sagittatum*) and Kashmir buckwheat (*Fagopyrum kashmirianum* Munshi) out of the 19 species under *Fagopyrum* (Munshi, 1982; Tahir and Farooq, 1988). The word "buckwheat" is derived from the Anglo-Saxon word "boc whoet (beech-wheat)" due to its seed resemblance (Edwardsen, 1995). Globally, 1.87 million tonnes of buckwheat is produced with Russian Federation as leading producer (919,147 tonnes) (Anonymous, 2021).

Buckwheat is grown on large scale in Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand and to some extent in North-Eastern states *i.e.*, Sikkim, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland and Manipur. It is also cultivated in some parts of Nilgiris and Palani hills in Southern India (Joshi, 1999). The most important components of this plant are flavonoids such as rutin (2729.9 mg/100 g), quercetin (12.23 mg/100 g), fagopyrin, anthocyanins, catechins, chlorogenic acid, 4-hydroxy-3-methoxy benzoic acid, caffeic acid, epicatechins, p-coumaric acid, ferulic acid *etc* (Tatsuro *et al.*, 2012).

Buckwheat is climatically more resilient and nutritionally richer than major cereal crops. They contain adequate amount of dietary fibers that helps in improving lipid metabolism. It is gaining much importance due to gluten free seeds and rich in protein and has strong resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses. As a medicine, buckwheat is used to improve blood flow by strengthening veins and small

46 blood vessels. It helps in decreasing the incidence of vascular complications such as retinal  
47 haemorrhage, apoplexy and coronary occlusion. Rutin is also used to treat the harmful effects of X-rays  
48 and used for persons exposed to dangerous atomic radiation (Farooqi and Sreeramu, 2004). Germany  
49 declared buckwheat as a medicinal plant of the year during 1999, because of its lot of health benefits.

50 Recommendation of widely adaptable and stable genotype is important for successful commercial  
51 cultivation of buckwheat. Joshi (2004) made a study on yield stability of 17 tartary buckwheat genotypes  
52 during two seasons of 1999 and 2000. Genotypes, GF-212, Sample-6-I and Sample-7 had above  
53 average yield and well adapted to all environment. Acc-2223 was adapted to low-yielding environments  
54 and Acc-2227-I, MY-2-27-I, GF-5234 and Sample-8 were adapted to high-yielding environments.  
55 Kandel and Shrestha, (2019) conducted an experiment, stability analysis in seven buckwheat  
56 genotypes for grain yield at 8 different hilly regions of Nepal during winter seasons of 2017 and 2018.  
57 The results showed that, the genotype x environment interaction for grain yield was significant ( $p=0.05$ )  
58 and genotypes, ACC#2227-1 and ACC#2223-1 were identified as more stable and adaptive across the  
59 locations. The performance of genotypes varies in different environments, the same is true with respect  
60 to buckwheat therefore, present study entitled "Genetic variability and stability analysis in buckwheat  
61 (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench.)" was proposed with an objective, to estimate the genetic variability  
62 and to identify the stable buckwheat genotype for growth and yield parameters.

## 63 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

64 The present experiment was conducted during the period between January 2022 to April 2022 at the  
65 experimental field of Department of Plantation, Spice, Medicinal and Aromatic crops, College of  
66 Horticulture, University of Horticultural sciences, Bagalkot, Karnataka. Fifteen genotypes of buckwheat  
67 were grown in randomized complete block design with two replications at a spacing of 30 X 10 cm. The  
68 15 genotypes viz, IC-79147, EC-323729, EC-386668, EC-386667, IC-313134, IC-49671, EC-104035,  
69 EC-3222, IC-274429, Shimla B-1, Nilgiri local, PRB-1, Sangla B-1, Sangla B-460 and EC-125940 were  
70 analyzed for stability, under three different environments i.e., Environment-I: Full doze of recommended  
71 dose of fertilizers (40:20:10 kg/ha of NPK), Environment-II: 3/4<sup>th</sup> of RDF (30:15:7.5 kg/ha of NPK) and  
72 Environment-III: 1/2<sup>nd</sup> of RDF (20:10:5 kg/ha of NPK). The pooled data of these environments were  
73 used for estimation of genetic variability. All the readings were recorded according to IPGRI descriptors  
74 for buckwheat.

75 Observations were recorded and data were analyzed to identify the stable genotype with stability  
76 parameters, i.e., mean ( $\bar{X}$ ), regression coefficient ( $b_i$ ) and deviation from regression ( $S^2_{di}$ ) were  
77 computed by the method given by Eberhart and Russell (1966).

78 Analysis of variance was done from the pooled data of three different environments obtained for each  
79 character. Genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation (GCV and PCV, respectively) were  
80 estimated as suggested by Burton and Devane (1953). Heritability ( $h^2$ ) was estimated as given by  
81 Falconer (1981). Genetic advance over percent mean (GAM) was calculated according to Johnson et  
82 al. (1955).

83 Both stability and genetic variability were analyzed using INDOSTAT software.

## 84 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 85 3.1 Estimation of genetic variability

86 Variability among the traits was compared with coefficient of variation. Estimation of genetic variability  
87 of buckwheat genotypes based on pooled analysis of three environments are given in Table-1. The  
88 genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation varied from 2.71 to 19.51 and 3.3 to 22.37 respectively.  
89 While GCV and PCV were low for plant height at 30 days after sowing (DAS), 45 DAS and at harvest,  
90 number of branches at 45 DAS, days to first flowering and days to fifty percent flowering, number of  
91 seeds per plant and thousand seed weight. Whereas, it was moderate for plant height at 15 DAS,  
92 number of branches at 30 DAS, number of cymes per plant, seed yield per plant, seed yield per plot  
93 and seed yield per hectare. For number of days to first germination and number of clusters per cyme  
94 GCV was low and PCV was moderate. The characters like, days to first flowering, days to 50 percent  
95 flowering, number of seeds per plant, seed yield per plot and seed yield per hectare showed least

96 difference between GCV and PCV which indicates there is least environmental influence on these traits.  
97 Similar results were also obtained by Hiremath *et al.* (2017), Bisht *et al.* (2018) and Dutta *et al.* (2008).

98 Heritability, or the degree to which a characteristic is handed down to the next generation is another  
99 factor that influences the choice of yield traits. Heritability in the current study was calculated as the  
100 proportion of genotypic variance to the phenotypic variance. In the present study, there were low to high  
101 estimates of genetic advance (0.46 to 92.08). The range of genetic advance over mean was from 4.57  
102 percent to 35.05 per cent, which is low to high. Heritability ranged from 43.09 percent to 97.23 percent  
103 which is moderate to high.

104 The characteristics like number of branches at 30 days after sowing, number of cyme per plant, number  
105 of cluster per cyme, seed yield per plant, seed yield per plot and seed yield per hectare had higher  
106 heritability with higher genetic advance over mean. The impacts of additive genes are shown by  
107 significant genetic progress and higher heritability, and selection of these highly heritable qualities was  
108 found successful in breeding programmes. Results of the research are near to the findings of Dutta *et al.*  
109 *al.* (2008), Hiremath *et al.* (2017) and Bisht *et al.* (2018).

## 110 **3.2 Stability analysis**

111 Pooled analysis of variance for growth and yield parameters across the three environments is presented  
112 in Table-2. The results revealed that there was significant difference among the genotypes tested for  
113 all the characters.

114 The results revealed that there was highly significant ( $p=0.01$ ) differences among the genotypes for  
115 number of branches at 30 and 45 days after sowing, number of flower clusters per cyme, seed yield per  
116 plant, per plot and per hectare ( $p\leq 0.001$ ). The environment was found highly significant ( $p=0.01$ ) for  
117 number of cyme per plant, whereas for plant height at 30, 45 days after sowing and at harvest, number  
118 of seeds per plant, seed yield per plot, seed yield per hectare and 1000-seed weight, it was significant  
119 at  $p=0.05$ . Genotype X environment interaction and environment and genotype X environment was  
120 found significant for number of flower clusters per cyme at  $p=0.05$ . Environment (linear) was found  
121 highly significant ( $p=0.01$ ) for plant height at 45 days after sowing and at harvest, number of cyme per  
122 plant, number of seeds per plant, seed yield per plot, seed yield per hectare and 1000 seed weight. But,  
123 it was found significant for plant height at 30 days after sowing and seed yield per plant only at  $p=0.05$ .  
124 Genotype X environment (linear) was found highly significant ( $p=0.01$ ) only for number of flower clusters  
125 per cyme. Pooled deviation was found highly significant ( $p=0.01$ ) for most of the characters *i.e.*, plant  
126 height at 15, 30, 45 DAS and at harvest, days to first flowering, days to 50 percent flowering, number  
127 of cyme per plant, number of seeds per plant, seed yield per plot, per hectare ( $p\leq 0.01$ ) and 1000-seed  
128 weight. For number of flower clusters per cyme and seed yield per plant, it was significant only at  $p=0.01$ .  
129 Similar results for various characters were also reported by Mohanty and Prusti (2000) in brinjal,  
130 Prakash *et al.* (2017) in okra and Kandel and Shrestha (2019) in buckwheat.

### 131 **3.2.1 Stability analysis for growth and flower parameters**

132 The genotype Shimla B-1 was found stable for plant height at 15 DAS. The genotypes like IC-313134  
133 and EC-3222 were found stable for plant height at 45 DAS, the genotypes like IC-313134 and EC-3222  
134 were found stable for plant height at harvest, the genotypes like IC-49671, IC-274429 and Sangla B-  
135 460 were found stable for number of branches at 30 DAS with higher mean values and regression  
136 coefficients near to unity with non-significant deviation from regression. The genotype PRB-1 was found  
137 stable for number for days to first flowering and the genotype Nilgiri local was found stable for number  
138 of days to 50 per cent flowering with lower mean value and regression coefficient near to unity with non-  
139 significant deviation from regression. Similar results were also noticed by Rai *et al.* (1998) in brinjal,  
140 Jyothi *et al.* (2012) in tomato and kakani *et al.* (2014) in fenugreek. The genotypes which show below-  
141 average stability with higher mean values and regression coefficients greater than one with non-  
142 significant deviation from regression, indicates that genotypes are specifically adapted to favourable  
143 environments. The genotypes which show above-average stability with higher mean values and less  
144 than one regression coefficient with non-significant deviation from regression, indicates that genotypes  
145 are specifically adapted to unfavourable environments. Stability parameters for growth and flower  
146 parameters are mentioned in Table-3 and Table-4 respectively.

147 **Table 1: Estimation of genetic variability of buckwheat genotypes based on pooled analysis of three environments**

Parameters	Range	Mean	GV	PV	GCV (%)	PCV (%)	Heritability (%)	GA	GAM (%)
<b>Days to first germination</b>	4.17-5.50	4.8	0.11	0.23	6.85	10.08	46.26	0.46	9.6
<b>Plant height at 15 DAS</b>	5.74-9.70	7.97	0.67	1.55	10.25	15.62	43.09	1.1	13.86
<b>Plant height at 30 DAS</b>	35.74-45.30	39.8	8.02	10.55	7.11	8.16	76.03	5.09	12.78
<b>Plant height at 45 DAS</b>	52.47-61.19	58.04	4.79	8.47	3.77	5.01	56.58	3.39	5.85
<b>Plant height at harvest</b>	52.97-61.67	58.56	4.99	8.68	3.82	5.03	57.48	3.49	5.96
<b>No. of branches at 30 DAS</b>	3.80-6.03	4.86	0.41	0.53	13.13	15	76.62	1.15	23.68
<b>No. of branches at 45 DAS</b>	8.47-11.07	9.88	0.58	0.67	7.73	8.27	87.5	1.47	14.9
<b>Days to first flowering</b>	25.64-29.00	26.74	1.01	1.15	3.76	4.01	87.87	1.94	7.25
<b>Days to 50% flowering</b>	29.34-32.17	30.43	0.68	1.01	2.71	3.3	67.22	1.39	4.57
<b>No. of cyme per plant</b>	17.22-31.09	24.4	12.95	18.27	14.75	17.52	70.9	6.24	25.58
<b>No. of cluster per cyme</b>	2.60-5.27	3.89	0.58	0.76	19.51	22.37	76.05	1.36	35.05
<b>No. of seeds per plant</b>	47.30-57.28	52.59	7.71	9.64	5.28	5.9	79.97	5.12	9.73
<b>Seed yield per plant</b>	3.19-5.61	4.78	0.47	0.54	14.41	15.45	86.98	1.32	27.68
<b>Seed yield per plot</b>	185.93-342.42	281.54	2056.13	2116.08	16.09	16.33	97.17	92.08	32.68
<b>Seed yield per hectare</b>	14.33-26.40	21.72	12.23	12.3	16.11	16.34	97.23	7.11	32.72
<b>1000-seed weight</b>	17.32-21.30	19.01	0.94	1.96	5.11	7.36	48.23	1.39	7.32

149 **Table 2: Pooled analysis of variance (mean square) for various growth and yield parameters of buckwheat genotypes**

150

Sl. No	Source of variation	Genotype	Environment	Genotype x Environment	Environment + (genotype x environment)	Environment (linear)	Genotype x Environment (linear)	Pooled deviation	Pooled error
	Degrees of freedom	14	2	28	30	1	14	15	42
1	Plant height at 15 DAS (cm)	3.18	3.88	1.71	1.85	7.77	1.03	2.22**	0.383
2	Plant height at 30 DAS (cm)	27.85	207.98*	37.98	49.32	415.96*	17.02	55.02**	3.73
3	Plant height at 45 DAS (cm)	19.89	311.16*	65.59	81.96	622.32**	77.78	49.84**	3.93
4	Plant height at harvest (cm)	20.53	314.45*	65.63	82.22	628.90**	76.61	51.00**	3.73
5	No. of branches at 30 DAS	1.41**	0.03	0.15	0.14	0.06	0.09	0.193	0.16
6	No. of branches at 45 DAS	1.87**	0.24	0.19	0.20	0.49	0.191	0.192	0.13
7	Days to 1 <sup>st</sup> flowering	3.15	0.91	1.39	1.35	1.81	1.24	1.43**	0.44
8	Days to 50% flowering	2.52	4.65	2.42	2.56	9.3	1.70	2.92**	0.79
9	No. of cyme per plant	46.85	263.66**	27.50	43.24	527.33**	18.98	33.62**	10.24
10	No. of flower clusters per cyme	1.99**	0.24	1.14*	1.08*	0.48	1.82**	0.43*	0.19
11	No. of seeds per plant	26.03	153.34*	28.46	36.79	306.68**	28.88	26.18**	2.46
12	Seed yield per plant (g)	1.53**	0.64	0.32	0.35	1.28*	0.37	0.26*	0.13
13	Seed yield per plot (g)	6258.29**	2948.38*	830.00	971.23	5896.77**	969.16	644.78**	184.72
14	Seed yield per hectare (q/ha)	37.27***	17.47*	4.94	5.78	34.94**	5.79	3.82***	1.10
15	1000-seed weight (g)	4.36	22.25*	3.82	5.05	44.51**	3.88	3.53**	1.21

151

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at  $p=0.05$ ,  $p=0.01$  and  $p\leq 0.001$  respectively.

152 **3.2.2 Stability analysis for yield parameters**

153 The genotype EC-104035 was found stable for seed yield per plant, per plot and per hectare and the  
154 genotypes like EC-386667, EC-3222, Nilgiri local, PRB-1 and Sangla B-460 were found stable for 1000-  
155 seed weight with higher mean values and regression coefficients near to unity with non-significant  
156 deviation from regression. The genotypes which show below average stability with higher mean values  
157 and regression coefficients greater than one with non-significant deviation from regression, indicates  
158 that genotypes are specifically adapted to favourable environments. The genotypes which show above  
159 average stability with higher mean values and less than one regression coefficient with non-significant  
160 deviation from regression, indicates that genotypes are specifically adapted to unfavourable  
161 environments. Results found are close to the findings of Joshi (2004) and Dhiman and Chahota (2003)  
162 in tartary buckwheat, Kandel and Shrestha (2019) in common buckwheat. Stability parameters for yield  
163 parameters are mentioned in Table-5.

164 **4. CONCLUSION**

165 From the present study, it can be concluded that the genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation  
166 were moderate for plant height at 15 DAS, number of branches at 30 DAS, number of cymes per plant,  
167 seed yield per plant, seed yield per plot and seed yield per hectare. The heritability estimates were  
168 moderate to high for all the characters. Whereas, least for plant height at 15 days after sowing (43.09%).  
169 The genetic advance over mean was found to be highest for number of clusters per cyme (35.05%),  
170 seed yield per plot (32.68%) and seed yield per hectare (32.72%). Selection of highly heritable traits  
171 was found successful in breeding programmes.

172 The genotypes stable for more number of traits will be considered for future breeding program. The  
173 genotype EC-104035 was found stable for seed yield per plant, seed yield per plot and seed yield per  
174 hectare. The genotypes, EC-386667, EC-3222, Nilgiri local, PRB-1 and Sangla B-460 were found stable  
175 for thousand seed weight. The genotypes like IC-313134 and EC-3222 were found stable for plant  
176 height at 45 days after sowing and also at harvest. The genotype, Shimla B-1 was found stable for plant  
177 height at 15 days after sowing. The genotypes like IC-49671, IC-274429 and Sangla B-460 were found  
178 stable for number of branches at 30 DAS. The genotype, PRB-1 was found stable for days to first  
179 flowering and genotype Nilgiri local was found stable for days to 50 percent flowering.

180

181

182 Table 3: Stability analysis for growth parameters

Sl. No	Genotype	Plant height at 15 DAS			Plant height at 30 DAS			Plant height at 45 DAS			Plant height at harvest			No. of branches at 30 DAS			No. of branches at 45 DAS		
		$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di
1	IC-79147	5.73	0.41	-0.61	38.06	-0.24	23.916 <sup>*</sup>	54.60	-1.07	45.418 <sup>**</sup>	55.10	-1.08	41.80 <sup>**</sup>	3.80	1.82	-0.08	8.47	-2.10	-0.04
2	EC-323729	8.03	1.02	5.66 <sup>**</sup>	40.48	0.98	74.521 <sup>***</sup>	55.03	-1.31	155.159 <sup>***</sup>	55.50	-1.27	161.20 <sup>***</sup>	4.17	-1.12	0.653 <sup>*</sup>	9.37	-1.54	-0.09
3	EC-386668	9.10	1.73	1.18	41.57	1.71	-0.17	61.18	1.41	17.19	61.67	1.44	16.30	5.27	6.18	-0.11	10.60	0.41	-0.07
4	EC-386667	8.10	2.414 <sup>*</sup>	-0.64	41.80	1.74	8.74	58.10	2.33	-4.59	58.67	2.31	-4.23	4.33	1.12	0.533 <sup>*</sup>	9.67	2.74	-0.10
5	IC-313134	6.97	1.42	-0.06	36.40	0.37	33.842 <sup>**</sup>	60.87	1.13	-4.71	61.30	1.12	-4.13	4.80	2.74	0.08	9.70	-2.62	-0.12
6	IC-49671	8.53	-0.86	0.18	36.53	2.44	4.71	57.23	2.55	15.07	57.70	2.57	17.07	5.57	1.01	-0.15	10.70	3.38	-0.13
7	EC-104035	7.27	3.60	-0.53	35.73	2.35	83.875 <sup>***</sup>	57.07	2.78	144.99 <sup>***</sup>	57.47	2.73	149.83 <sup>***</sup>	4.40	-1.82	-0.08	9.30	-0.61	0.03
8	EC-3222	7.87	-1.65	3.731 <sup>*</sup>	36.03	0.97	92.079 <sup>***</sup>	60.50	0.56	-5.99	61.20	0.56	-5.85	4.40	-1.22	0.41	9.37	3.90	-0.13
9	IC-274429	8.17	0.43	1.46	40.17	0.74	25.357 <sup>*</sup>	57.77	1.18	0.13	58.27	1.14	-5.94	5.83	1.12	-0.15	10.53	3.75	0.25
10	Shimla B-1	9.30	0.84	0.93	37.73	0.65	109.929 <sup>***</sup>	58.37	2.98	120.34 <sup>***</sup>	58.90	2.94	123.98 <sup>***</sup>	4.77	-5.07	-0.09	9.70	0.33	1.197 <sup>**</sup>
11	Nilgiri local	7.63	3.07	1.28	42.10	1.19	76.855 <sup>***</sup>	57.03	1.88	4.84	57.40	1.83	7.48	6.03	2.94	-0.10	11.07	0.18	0.05
12	PRB-1	9.70	1.52	-0.63	43.78	0.86	88.896 <sup>***</sup>	59.43	-0.65	0.05	59.97	-0.63	1.74	5.17	0.10	-0.14	10.80	4.83	0.14
13	Sangla B-1	8.73	0.59	-0.39	45.30	-0.10	6.01	60.23	0.01	21.343 <sup>*</sup>	60.87	0.07	25.05 <sup>*</sup>	4.33	-6.79	0.18	9.13	2.30	-0.11
14	Sangla B-460	8.77	-0.61	9.772 <sup>***</sup>	42.80	0.55	92.982 <sup>***</sup>	60.77	0.299 <sup>*</sup>	-6.14	61.43	0.291 <sup>**</sup>	-5.95	5.70	1.22	-0.14	10.70	-1.72	-0.10
15	EC-125940	7.13	1.05	2.327 <sup>*</sup>	38.60	0.79	33.742 <sup>**</sup>	52.47	0.93	158.74 <sup>***</sup>	52.97	0.98	157.54 <sup>***</sup>	4.40	12.77	-0.14	9.07	1.77	0.00
Mean		8.07			39.8			58.04			58.56			4.86			9.88		
S.E.(mean)		1.05			5.24			4.99			5.05			0.31			0.31		
S.E.bi			2.07			1.4086			1.17			1.10			6.63			2.43	

183 \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at  $p=0.05$ ,  $p=0.01$  and  $p\leq 0.001$  respectively.

184 Env.1- Full dose of Recommended fertilizers (RDF)

Env.2- 3/4<sup>th</sup> dose of RDF

Env.3-1/2<sup>nd</sup> dose of RDF

185 **Table 4: Stability analysis for flower parameters**

Sl. No	Genotype	Days to first flowering			Days to 50% flowering			No. of cyme per plant			No. of clusters per cyme		
		$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di
1	IC-79147	25.67	-0.37	-0.66	30.00	0.32	-0.96	19.50	0.61	-11.27	2.83	-0.58	1.161*
2	EC-323729	26.33	-3.50	-0.12	29.83	-0.73	0.45	25.13	1.58	-11.02	3.33	3.01	0.879*
3	EC-386668	26.50	-2.76	1.77	30.67	-0.24	10.736**	30.50	0.32	-11.16	4.83	7.088*	-0.27
4	EC-386667	26.83	3.82	-0.41	31.00	3.55	-1.20	21.68	1.10	-11.34	3.97	3.46	0.08
5	IC-313134	25.83	-1.56	-0.44	29.33	2.10	0.55	31.08	1.67	9.92	3.13	-6.26	0.18
6	IC-49671	28.00	3.18	4.472*	31.50	-1.29	5.573*	23.93	1.50	1.78	2.60	-12.24	0.34
7	EC-104035	26.33	5.75	-0.64	30.00	4.36	0.35	28.70	1.70	11.89	3.97	2.18	-0.14
8	EC-3222	26.00	0**	-0.81	29.67	0.16	-0.74	24.73	1.08	61.578*	3.50	2.68	-0.25
9	IC-274429	28.17	4.33	4.097*	31.33	0.32	1.21	22.50	0.60	27.30	4.07	4.99	-0.19
10	Shimla B-1	26.50	3.45	-0.75	30.67	2.50	-0.10	20.42	1.55	14.87	3.80	-15.74	0.49
11	Nilgiri local	26.00	-0.41	-0.33	29.67	1.13	-0.02	23.83	1.30	43.241*	5.27	8.00	0.06
12	PRB-1	26.17	0.74	-0.21	29.50	2.10	-0.62	28.22	1.81	155.18***	3.57	-1.57	0.37
13	Sangla B-1	28.00	6.21	1.03	31.67	1.61	0.16	17.22	0.99	-10.77	4.63	1.85	0.02
14	Sang la B-460	26.00	-2.76	1.77	29.50	-0.16	8.089*	24.20	-0.04	69.42*	5.27	12.49	-0.19
15	EC-125940	29.00	-1.10	0.54	32.17	-0.73	-0.55	24.38	-0.77	-6.43	3.53	5.65	-0.22
Mean		26.76			30.43			24.40			3.99		
S.E.(mean)		0.85			1.21			4.10			0.46		
S.E.bi			3.44			2.17			0.98			3.64	

186 \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at  $p=0.05$ ,  $p=0.01$  and  $p\leq 0.001$  respectively.

187 Env.1- Full dose of Recommended fertilizers (RDF)

Env.2- 3/4<sup>th</sup> dose of RDF

Env.3-1/2<sup>nd</sup> dose of RDF

188

189

190 **Table 5: Stability analysis for yield parameters**

Sl. No	Genotype	No. of seeds per plant			Seed yield (g) per plant			Seed yield (g) per plot			Seed yield (q) per hectare			1000-seed weight (g)		
		$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di	$\bar{X}$	bi	S <sup>2</sup> di
1	<b>IC-79147</b>	56.47	1.06	14.705*	3.19	1.59	-0.08	185.93	3.09	-127.48	14.32	3.10	-0.75	17.40	1.09	2.16
2	<b>EC-323729</b>	52.83	-1.52	49.27***	4.04	4.85	-0.08	235.98	3.33	463.75	18.19	3.33	2.77	18.73	-1.48	5.89
3	<b>EC-386668</b>	51.14	-0.42	-2.34	5.43	3.81	-0.01	305.26	2.58	18.00	23.52	2.58	0.15	20.00	-0.44	-1.25
4	<b>EC-386667</b>	50.13	0.97	14.8*	4.58	1.71	0.12	283.59	1.35	2679.87***	21.88	1.33	15.57***	19.49	0.56	0.18
5	<b>IC-313134</b>	55.41	1.19	41.436***	4.20	-1.65	0.536*	238.70	-1.22	341.65	18.40	-1.23	1.96	17.97	1.41	4.11
6	<b>IC-49671</b>	53.94	0.74	15.49*	5.20	1.19	0.493*	299.31	0.95	975.376*	23.08	0.95	5.75*	18.63	1.09	1.00
7	<b>EC-104035</b>	57.28	4.09	4.33	5.37	0.55	-0.13	317.21	1.02	-141.63	24.46	1.04	-0.84	17.40	3.49	1.40
8	<b>EC-3222</b>	53.37	1.31	69.562***	4.11	0.23	-0.07	237.25	0.70	-13.19	18.28	0.68	-0.08	19.05	1.37	9.03
9	<b>IC-274429</b>	50.46	1.77	8.838*	5.14	-1.90	-0.12	298.93	-1.27	-139.19	23.05	-1.27	-0.83	20.19	1.87	0.06
10	<b>Shimla B-1</b>	47.47	1.61	0.62	5.04	1.71	0.01	297.54	1.73	239.79	22.94	1.74	1.46	21.30	2.41	-0.26
11	<b>Nilgiri local</b>	52.37	0.19	5.50	5.61	1.95	-0.08	338.80	1.51	26.15	26.12	1.53	0.15	19.06	0.67	-0.30
12	<b>PRB-1</b>	54.92	1.23	2.81	5.53	-1.00	0.27	342.41	-0.47	596.787*	26.40	-0.49	3.64*	19.07	0.98	1.12
13	<b>Sangla B-1</b>	52.06	0.98	12.609*	4.64	0.21	0.11	269.79	0.71	1671.05**	20.79	0.71	10.01**	18.80	0.36	-1.13
14	<b>Sang la B-460</b>	47.30	0.89	-1.76	5.43	3.60	1.115**	334.07	2.56	116.99	25.77	2.57	0.69	20.77	0.78	1.10
15	<b>EC-125940</b>	53.74	0.92	116.35***	4.15	-1.83	-0.12	241.58	-1.55	98.49	18.62	-1.56	0.62	17.32	0.85	10.37
<b>Mean</b>		52.59			4.78			281.8			21.72			19.01		
<b>S.E.(mean)</b>		3.62			0.36			18.00			1.38			1.33		
<b>S.E.bi</b>			1.13			1.74			1.30			1.28			1.10	

191

192 \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at  $p=0.05$ ,  $p=0.01$  and  $p\leq 0.001$  respectively.

193 Env.1- Full dose of Recommended fertilizers (RDF)

Env.2- 3/4<sup>th</sup> dose of RDF

Env.3-1/2<sup>nd</sup> dose of RDF

194 **References**

- 195 Anonymous 2021. Food and Agriculture Organization. Corporate Statistical Database (FAOSTAT).  
196 Buckwheat production in 2021. Crops/Regions/World list/Production quantity (pick list)"  
197 (<http://faostat.fao.org>)
- 198 Bisht AS, Bhatt A, Singh P. Studies on variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis for seed yield in  
199 buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench.) germplasm. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and*  
200 *Phytochemistry*. 2018;5: 35-39.
- 201 Burton GW, Devane DE. Estimating heritability in tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) from replicated clonal  
202 material. *Journal of Agronomy*. 1953;45 (10): 478-481.
- 203 Dhiman KC, Chahota RK. Phenotypic stability in tartary buckwheat [*Fagopyrum tataricum* (L.) Gaertn.]  
204 under dry temperate condition of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant*  
205 *Breeding*. 2003 May 25;63(02):161-2.
- 206 Dutta M, Yadav VK, Bandyopadhyay BB, Pratap T, Prasad R. Genetic variability and path analysis in  
207 buckwheat. *Pantnagar Journal of Research*. 2008;6 (1): 23-28.
- 208 Eberhart SA and Russell WA. Stability parameters for comparing varieties. *Crop Science* 1966;6: 36-40.
- 209 Edwardson SE. Using growing degree days to estimate optimum windrowing time in buckwheat. In: Matano  
210 T, Ujihara A (Eds.). *Advances in buckwheat research: 6th Int. Symposium on buckwheat in Shinshi*  
211 1995; 24-29. Shinshu University, Nagano, Japan (pp. 509-514).
- 212 Falconer DS. *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, British Library*. 1981. New York.
- 213 Farooqi AA, Sreeramu BS. Cultivation of Medicinal and Aromatic Crops. 2004. (pp. 71-75).
- 214 Hiremath G, Desai SA, Lavanya V, Patel NB, Satisha TN, Biradar S, Naik VR. Genetic variability analysis  
215 in germplasm collections of buckwheat. *International Journal of Microbiology and Applied Sciences*  
216 2017;6 (12): 604-710.
- 217 Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Comstock RE. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans.  
218 *Journal of Agronomy* 1955;47 (7): 314-318.
- 219 Joshi BK. Yield stability of tartary buckwheat genotypes in Nepal. *Fagopyrum* 2004;21: 1-5.
- 220 Joshi BD. Status of buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench) in India. National Bureau of Plant Genetic  
221 Resources, Regional Station, Shimla, India, *Fagopyrum* 1999;16: 7-11.
- 222 Jyothi HK, Patil MG, Santhosha HM. Studies on stability of processing-type genotypes of tomato (*Solanum*  
223 *lycopersicum* L.). *Journal of Horticultural Sciences* 2012;7 (2): 138-141.
- 224 Kakani RK, Saxena SN, Meena SS, Chandra P. Stability analysis for yield and yield attributes in fenugreek  
225 under water limiting conditions (*Trigonella foenum-graecum* L.). *International Journal of Seed*  
226 *Spices* 2014;4 (2): 47-52.
- 227 Kandel M, Shrestha J. Genotype x environment interaction and stability for grain yield of buckwheat  
228 (*Fagopyrum tataricum* G.). *Syrian Journal of Agriculture Research* 2019;6 (3): 466-476.
- 229 Mohanty BK, Prusti AP. Genotype x environment interaction and stability analysis for yield and its  
230 components in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). *Indian Journal of Agriculture Sciences* 2000;70 (6):  
231 370-373.

- 232 Munshi AH. A new species of *Fagopyrum* from Kashmir Himalaya. *Journal of Economics Tax. Bot.* 1982;3:  
233 627-630.
- 234 Prakash M, Satish D, Alloli TB, Mansur CP, Raghavendra S, Venkateshalu and Hadimani HP. Assessment  
235 of genotype x environment interaction and stability analysis in okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.)  
236 Moench) genotypes for growth and yield components. *International Journal of Current Microbiology  
237 and Applied Science* 2017;6 (10): 372-379.
- 238 Rai N, Singh AK, Sarnaik DA. Evaluation of round shaped brinjal varieties for stability of their yield  
239 contributing attribute. *Vegetable Science* 1998;25 (2): 136-140.
- 240 Tahir I, Farooq S. Review article on buckwheat. Buckwheat Newsletter, *Fagopyrum* 1988;8: 33-53.
- 241 Tatsuro S, Yuji M, Tosikazu M, Sun-Ju K, Sun-hee W, Takahiro N, Shigenobu T, Hiroaki Y. Possible Roles  
242 of rutin in Buckwheat Plant. *European Journal of Plant Science and Biotechnology* 2012;6 (2): 37-  
243 4.

