

## ***Original Research Article***

# SELECTION STRATEGY FOR YIELD IMPROVEMENT OF CHICKPEA GENOTYPES (*Cicerarietinum*L.)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

## **ABSTRACT**

An investigation was undertaken to assess the genetic variability parameters, correlation and path analysis in 25 chickpea genotypes for 12 quantitative traits ~~in during the Rabi~~season of 2022-23 ~~seasons~~ in a Randomized Block Design ~~in with~~ three replications. Analysis of variance indicated high significant differences among the genotypes for all the traits. Considerable variability existed in the genotypes for all the characters studied. The study found that CG23, CG159, and CG199 were the most superior genotypes for grain yield per plant among 25 chickpea genotypes. These were the genotypes with high mean values in desirable direction i.e., from the present investigation, it is concluded that among 25 chickpea genotypes, CG23 was found superior followed by CG159 and CG199 for seed yield per plant. High PCV, GCV, heritability and genetic advance as percent of mean were recorded for test weight and biological yield. ~~Seed-Grain~~ yield per plant showed positive significant association with number of pods, days to maturity, days to 50% pod initiation and number of primary branches. High and positive direct effect of ~~seed-grain~~ yield per plant at both phenotypic and genotypic levels were depicted by ~~Harvest-harvest~~ index. These characters may be taken into consideration for selection of quantitative characters for crop improvement.

Formatted: Font: Italic

**Keywords:** Genetic Variability, Path analysis, character association, Chickpea.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Pulses have been included into self-sustaining agricultural systems over time, enriching the soil through symbiotic atmospheric nitrogen fixation. Pulses have a well-known role in Indian agriculture, food, and nutrition because they fit well in crop rotation patterns and provide a significant amount of protein to the nation's mostly vegetarian population. They are also high in several key amino acids.

~~It~~ Chickpea (*Cicerarietinum* L.) is an annual grain legume that is self-pollinated and diploid (2n=16), classified in the subfamily Papilionoideae and family Leguminosae Leguminaceae. Chana (chickpeas) is referred to be the "King of Pulses" in India. It came from southeast Turkey.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Italic

**Selection** criteria like as heritability and genetic progress are significant. Heritability estimates combined with genetic progress are usually more useful than heritability estimates alone in estimating the gain under selection. As a result, understanding genetic progress in conjunction with heritability is quite beneficial. A high heritability character does not always imply a great genetic progress. To arrive at a more trustworthy result, high heritability should be accompanied with substantial genetic progress. The expected genetic progress expressed as a percentage of the mean illustrates the manner of gene activity in the manifestation of a characteristic, which aids in the selection of a suitable breeding approach (Kumar *et al.*, 2014).

**Comment [V1]:** Add few sentences about importance of variability if present in any germplasm.

As a result, it's critical to determine the component qualities that might help boost yield. Selection would be more successful for a characteristic with a high genetic progress and a strong link to grain output. The correlation coefficient among characters and their path direction is used to determine the degree of link between yield and yield-its components, ~~as well as other characteristics that have a significant impact on yield~~ (Singh, 2009). Hence, ~~the~~ there is present investigation's aim is to identify the high yielding chickpea genotypes of 12 quantitative traits and to study the interrelationships among grain yield and seed yield-its component characters. ~~To estimate direct and indirect effects on seed yield.~~

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present investigation was carried out at the Field Experimentation Center of Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj (Allahabad), U.P. during the Rabi season of 2022-23. The university is situated on the left side of Allahabad Rewa National Highway, about far away 5km from Prayagraj city. The experimental material consists of 25 chickpea genotypes viz. CG118, CG163, CG174, CG251, CG172, CG19, CG208, CG61, CG159, CG236, CG160, CG147, CG30, CG23, CG25, CG36, CG180, CG73, CG20, CG171, CG93, CG199, CG24, CG121, and CG14. These twentyfive genotypes were considered as treatments which were applied into a field laid out in a Randomized Block Design with three replications. All types of ~~facilities~~ necessary facilities for cultivation of ~~successful the~~ crop including field preparation inputs, irrigation facilities were provided from the ~~Department department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj (Allahabad), U.P.~~ On basis of five competitive plants selected at random from each replication, specific data were collected for following ~~thirteen twelve (1312)~~ quantitative traits: 1) Days to 50% flowering, 2) Days to 50% pod setting, 3) Days to maturity, 4) plant height, 5) Number of branches per plant, 6) Number of pods per plant, 7) Number of seedgrains per pod, 8) Number of seedgrains per plant, 9) Biological yield per plant, 10) Harvest index, 11) Seed index, 12) SeedGrain yield per plant.

**Formatted:** Normal

All the recorded data for the characters under consideration were analysed for variance using the ~~panse-Panse~~ and ~~sukhatme-Sukhatme~~ (1967) formula [1]. Additionally, the genetic parameters genotypic coefficient of variance (GCV), phenotypic coefficient of variance

(PCV), heritability in the broad sense, genetic advance as percent of mean, and correlation analysis were carried out by using the appropriate statistical procedure. These additional components of variance included phenotypic, genotypic, and environmental variance.

The software called “R- Language” was used to perform the analysis mentioned above.

The experimental material is subjected to Analysis of variance (Fisher, 1935), Coefficient of variation (Burton and De vane, 1952), Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), Heritability broad sense (Burton and Devane, 1953), Genetic advance (Johnson et al.,1955),Correlation coefficient analysis (Al Jibouri et al., 1958), Path coefficient analysis (Dewey and Lu, 1959).

~~The experimental material consists of 25 chickpea genotypes, CG118, CG163, CG174, CG251, CG172, CG19, CG208, CG61, CG159, CG236, CG160, CG147, CG30, CG23, CG25, CG36, CG180, CG73, CG20, CG171, CG93, CG199, CG24, CG121, and CG14.~~

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The variance analysis of the affecting factors and seed yield. The genotype-related mean squares were very significant for each character, indicating a considerable level of genetic variety in the material. Due to the range of materials employed and the environmental influences on phenotypes, variability may be present in significant amounts.

ANOVA for different characters are present in table 1. The mean squares due to genotypes showed highly significant differences for all characters indicating the presence of substantial amount of genetic variability among chickpea genotypes. In Table 2. And Fig. 1 which revealed a wide range of variation for all traits studies the mean values, the coefficient of variation (C.V.), standard error of the mean (SEM+), the critical difference (C.D.) at 5% and 1% range of 20 genotypes for 12 quantitative characters are presented.

On the basis of mean performance, the highest [seedgrain](#) yield per plant was observed for chickpea genotypes CG23 (30.5), CG199 (29.9), CG159 (29.9) were found to be superior in [SeedGrain](#) Yield per plant. From the present investigation, the PCV was higher than the corresponding GCV for every trait, indicating that the environment had an impact. The lowest GCV (percent) value was 1.05 (Days to maturity, Days to 50% pod initiation) and highest value was 20.86 ([seedgrain](#) yield per plant). A similar pattern was followed by PCV (percent), which ranged from lowest value of 1.75 (Days to maturity) to highest value of 21.75 ([SeedGrain](#) Yield per plant).

**Table 1. Analysis of Variance for 12 quantitative traits among 25 chickpea genotypes**

Sr.No.	Trait	MeanSum ofSquares		
		Replication	Treatment	Error
	Degrees of freedom	2	24	48
1	Plant height	30.795	45.072**	15.324

Formatted Table

2	Days to 50% flowering	2.44	11.414*	5.426
3	Days to 50% pod initiation	9.693	7.68*	3.86
4	Days to maturity	5.813	8.153**	3.063
5	Number of Primary branches	0.033	0.278**	0.017
6	Number of secondary branches	0.084	1.583**	0.072
7	Number of pods/plants	157.655	455.858**	54.4
8	Number of <a href="#">seedgrains</a> /pods	39.102	478.109**	74.931
9	Biological yield/plant	1.965	58.594**	7.506
10	Harvest Index	3.699	61.268*	27.972
11	<a href="#">Seed Index</a>	0.552	30.044**	2.234
12	<a href="#">SeedGrain</a> yield per plant	2.888	58.612**	1.648

\*\*significance at 1% level of significance

Comment [V2]: Seed index or 100 grain weight?

**Table2. Genetic parameters for 12 quantitative traits of chickpea genotypes**

Sl. No.	Characters	GCV	PCV	h <sup>2</sup> (Broad Sense)	GA	GAM
1	Plant height (cm)	6.16	9.82	39.29	4.07	7.95
2	Days to 50% flowering	2.12	4.09	26.89	1.51	2.27
3	Days to 50% pod initiation	1.44	2.89	24.81	1.16	1.48
4	Days to maturity	1.05	1.75	35.64	1.60	1.29
5	Number of Primary branches	14.37	15.73	83.47	0.55	27.05
6	Number of secondary branches	15.83	16.93	87.47	1.37	30.50
7	Number of pods/plants	13.04	15.47	71.10	20.09	22.66
8	Number of <a href="#">seedgrains</a> /pods	10.84	13.53	64.20	19.14	17.89
9	Biological yield/plant (g)	12.96	15.56	69.41	7.08	22.25
10	Harvest Index (%)	5.04	9.46	28.41	3.66	5.54
11	<a href="#">Seed Index</a>	15.35	17.09	80.58	5.63	28.38
12	<a href="#">SeedGrain</a> yield per plant	20.86	21.75	92.02	8.61	41.23

Comment [V3]: Seed index or 100 grain weight

GCV: Genotypic Coefficient of Variation, PCV: Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation, H<sup>2</sup>: Heritability, GA% of Mean: Genetic Advance at Percent of mean.

## 2.1 Heritability

From present investigation, the highest heritability (above 60%, it is high for all the parameters) was observed for [SeedGrain](#) Yield per Plant (92.016%), Number of Secondary Branches (87.468%), Number of Primary Branches (83.467%), [Seed Index](#) (80.58%), Number of Pods per Plant (71.097%), Biological Yield per Plant (69.406%), Number of [SeedGrains](#) per Pod (64.203%), Moderate heritability was observed for Plant Height (39.287%) followed by, Days to Maturity (35.644%), Low heritability was observed for Harvest Index (28.407%), Days to 50% Flowering (29.894%) and Days to 50% Pod Initiation (24.805%).

A higher heritability value suggests that the role of genotypic components may be greater. The estimates demonstrated that heritable factors dominated the variation in these traits, while environments and genetics equally influenced the expression of traits with moderately high heritability, indicating that environment influenced the trait expression more so than genetics.

## 2.2 Genetic Advance

In the present study a perusal of genetic advance showed that it was high for Number of Pods per Plant (20.093) followed by Number of [SeedGrains](#) per Pod (19.135), [SeedGrain](#) Yield per Plant (8.611), Biological Yield per Plant (7.082) and Seed Index (5.63) respectively and lowest for Number of Primary Branches (0.554), Days to 50% Pod Initiation (1.158), Number of Secondary Branches (1.367), & Days to 50% Flowering (1.509) respectively.

## 2.3 Genetic advance as percent mean

High genetic gain was recorded for Days to 50% Pod Initiation (41.228) followed by, Biological Yield per Plant (30.5), Days to 50% Flowering (28.375) and Number of Pods per Plant (27.048). Moderate estimates were recorded for Number of [SeedGrains](#) per Pod (22.655), Days to Maturity (22.248), Plant Height (17.891), [SeedGrain](#) Yield per Plant (7.948), Harvest Index (5.537) and Number of Secondary Branches (2.265). Low estimation of GCV was recorded for Seed Index (1.286) and Number of Primary Branches (1.478).

## 2.4 Phenotypic correlation coefficient

In the present investigation from Table 3. [SeedGrain](#) yield per plant showed positive significant association with Days to Maturity (0.289\*), Number of primary Branches (0.321\*), Number of Pods per Plant (0.492\*\*), Number of [seedgrains](#) per Pod (0.407\*\*), Biological Yield per Plant (0.689\*\*), Harvest Index (0.627\*\*) and Seed Index (0.760\*\*). Positive non-significant association showed with Days to 50% Pod Initiation (0.0813). Negative non-significant association showed with Plant height (-0.216) and Days to 50% Flowering (-0.1232).

## 2.5 Genotypic correlation coefficient

The correlation among the yield and yield attributing characters revealed that [SeedGrain](#) yield per plant was positively and significantly associated with Days to Maturity (0.516\*\*), Number of primary Branches (0.347\*), Number of Pods per Plant (0.462\*\*), Number of [seedgrains](#) per Pod (0.394\*\*), Biological Yield per Plant (0.842\*\*), Harvest Index (0.865\*\*) and Seed Index (0.866\*\*). Positive non-significant association showed with Days to 50% Pod Initiation (0.1823) only. Negative significant association showed only by Days to 50% Flowering (-0.291\*). Negative non-significant association showed with Plant Height (-0.0766) and Number of secondary Branches (-0.0974). These findings of correlation coefficient were supported by Sharma, R. K., Kumar, S., & Singh, M. (2019), Kumar, S., Singh, A. K., & Kumar, R. (2020), Choudhury, M. S., Hasan, M. A., & Islam, M. S. (2021).

## 2.6 Phenotypic Path Coefficient Analysis

Phenotypic path coefficients are calculated using the phenotypic correlation coefficient. It divides the phenotypic correlation coefficients into direct and indirect impact measurements (Dewey and Lu, 1959). A detailed analysis of diagonal values showed positive direct effect of Plant Height (0.0492), Days to 50% Pod Initiation (0.0050), Days to Maturity (0.0030), Number of primary Branches (0.2171), Number of Pods per Plant (0.2767), Biological Yield per Plant (0.2908) Harvest Index (0.1533) and Seed Index (0.4321). Negative direct effects were exhibited by Days to 50% flowering (-0.1122), Number of secondary Branches (-0.2065) and Number of [seedgrains](#) per Pod (-0.0268).

## 2.7 Genotypic Path Coefficient Analysis

A perusal of the results on path coefficient for yield and yield components genotypic to be of similar direction and magnitude in general. Further the genotypic path coefficient were observed to be of higher magnitude, compared to phenotypic path coefficient indicating the masking effect of environment. A detailed analysis of diagonal values showed positive direct effect of Plant Height (0.0643), Days to 50% Pod Initiation (0.2220), Number of primary Branches (0.3111), Number of [seedgrains](#) per Pod (0.3035), Biological Yield per Plant (0.1071), Harvest Index (0.2027) and Seed Index (0.4866). Negative direct effects were exhibited by Days to 50% flowering (-0.4856), Days to Maturity (-0.1956), Number of secondary Branches (-0.4185), Number of Pods per Plant (-0.2341). Similar findings of path coefficient analysis were given by **Kumar et al. (2020)**, **Patel and Mehta (2019)**.

**Table 3. Correlation coefficient analysis**

Phenotypic Correlation (Above diagonal ) and Genotypic Correlation (Below diagonal)												
TRAITS	PH	DF50	DP50	DM	NPB	NSB	NPP	NSP	BY	HI	SI	SYPP
PH	1	0.0016	-0.0646	0.14	0.0729	-0.066	-0.099	-0.0209	-0.1242	0.0011	-0.0864	-0.0216
DF50	-0.1476	1	-0.0005	-0.0479	-0.0741	-0.294*	-0.1078	0.0685	0.1387	-0.13	-0.1024	-0.1232
DP50	-0.706**	0.084	1	0.2153	0.0755	-0.0055	0.1348	-0.0537	-0.0088	0.0489	0.0406	0.0813
DM	0.270*	-0.344*	0.542**	1	0.0498	-0.0565	0.1025	0.099	0.341*	0.261*	0.1963	0.289*
NPB	0.1137	-0.1561	-0.0545	0.0991	1	0.450**	0.553**	0.499**	-0.0351	0.1869	0.0596	0.321*
NSB	-0.0999	-0.548**	0.0345	-0.0087	0.503**	1	0.300*	0.1121	-0.1458	0.1171	-0.0845	-0.0603
NPP	-0.269*	-0.343*	0.2097	0.231*	0.691**	0.322*	1	0.712**	0.1648	0.418**	0.129	0.492**
NSP	-0.1521	0.026	-0.034	0.309*	0.609**	0.1084	0.846**	1	0.1949	0.366*	0.111	0.407**
BY	-0.1947	-0.0221	0.1507	0.278*	0.073	-0.2093	0.2057	0.298*	1	0.494**	0.649**	0.689**
HI	-0.1115	-0.444**	0.585**	0.716**	0.495**	0.0987	0.512**	0.683**	0.915**	1	0.443**	0.627**
SI	-0.1102	-0.1206	0.223	0.326*	0.1314	-0.1223	0.1694	0.1318	0.861**	0.779**	1	0.760**
SYPP	-0.0766	-0.291*	0.1823	0.516**	0.347*	-0.0974	0.462**	0.394**	0.842**	0.865**	0.866**	1

Comment [V4]: Is this the abbreviation of SW (100 seed weight)

DF50: Days to 50% flowering, DP50: Days to 50% pod setting, DM: Days to maturity, PH: Plant height (cm), NPB: Number of primary branches, NSB: Number of secondary branches, NSPP: Number of seedgrains per plant, NPPP: Number of pods per plant, NSP: Number of SeedGrains per Pod BY: Biological yield per plant, SW: 100 seed weight (g), HI: Harvest Index (%), SY: SeedGrain yield per plant.

Comment [V5]: Write as grain weight

Comment [V6]: Arrange all the abbreviated characters in proper order and give its full form in food notes

**Table 4. Path coefficient analysis**

TRAITS		PH	DF50	DP50	DM	NPB	NSB	NPP	NSP	BY	HI	SI	SYPP
PH	P	0.0492	0.0001	-0.0032	0.0069	0.0036	-0.0032	-0.0049	-0.001	-0.0061	0.0001	-0.0042	-0.0216
	G	0.0643	-0.0095	-0.0454	0.0174	0.0073	-0.0064	-0.0173	-0.0098	-0.0125	-0.0072	-0.0071	-0.0766
DF50	P	-0.0002	-0.1122	0.0001	0.0054	0.0083	0.033	0.0121	-0.0077	-0.0156	0.0146	0.0115	-0.1232
	G	0.0717	-0.4856	-0.0408	0.1669	0.0758	0.2663	0.1664	-0.0126	0.0107	0.2155	0.0586	-0.291*
DP50	P	-0.0003	0	0.005	0.0011	0.0004	0	0.0007	-0.0003	0	0.0002	0.0002	0.0813
	G	-0.1567	0.0186	0.222	0.1202	-0.0121	0.0076	0.0466	-0.0076	0.0334	0.1298	0.0495	0.1823
DM	P	0.0004	-0.0001	0.0007	0.003	0.0002	-0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.001	0.0008	0.0006	0.289*
	G	-0.0528	0.0672	-0.1059	-0.1956	-0.0194	0.0017	-0.0451	-0.0603	-0.0544	-0.1399	-0.0637	0.516**
NPB	P	0.0158	-0.0161	0.0164	0.0108	0.2171	0.0976	0.1201	0.1083	-0.0076	0.0406	0.0129	0.321*
	G	0.0354	-0.0486	-0.017	0.0308	0.3111	0.1564	0.2151	0.1893	0.0227	0.1539	0.0409	0.347*
NSB	P	0.0136	0.0607	0.0011	0.0117	-0.0928	-0.2065	-0.0619	-0.0232	0.0301	-0.0242	0.0174	-0.0603
	G	0.0418	0.2294	-0.0144	0.0036	-0.2104	-0.4185	-0.1348	-0.0454	0.0876	-0.0413	0.0512	-0.0974
NPP	P	-0.0274	-0.0298	0.0373	0.0284	0.1531	0.083	0.2767	0.1969	0.0456	0.1157	0.0357	0.492**
	G	0.0629	0.0802	-0.0491	-0.054	-0.1619	-0.0754	-0.2341	-0.198	-0.0482	-0.12	-0.0397	0.462**
NSP	P	0.0006	-0.0018	0.0014	-0.0027	-0.0134	-0.003	-0.0191	-0.0268	-0.0052	-0.0098	-0.003	0.407**
	G	-0.0462	0.0079	-0.0103	0.0936	0.1847	0.0329	0.2567	0.3035	0.0904	0.2073	0.04	0.394**
BY	P	-0.0361	0.0403	-0.0026	0.0992	-0.0102	-0.0424	0.0479	0.0567	0.2908	0.1435	0.1887	0.689**
	G	-0.0208	-0.0024	0.0161	0.0298	0.0078	-0.0224	0.022	0.0319	0.1071	0.098	0.0922	0.842**
HI	P	0.0002	-0.0199	0.0075	0.04	0.0287	0.018	0.0641	0.0562	0.0757	0.1533	0.068	0.627**
	G	-0.0226	-0.09	0.1185	0.1451	0.1003	0.02	0.1039	0.1385	0.1855	0.2027	0.158	0.865**
SI	P	-0.0373	-0.0442	0.0175	0.0848	0.0258	-0.0365	0.0557	0.048	0.2804	0.1916	0.4321	0.760**
	G	-0.0536	-0.0587	0.1085	0.1586	0.0639	-0.0595	0.0825	0.0642	0.4191	0.3792	0.4866	0.866**

**DF50:** Days to 50% flowering, **DP50:** Days to 50% pod setting, **DM:** Days to maturity, **PH:** Plant height (cm), **NPB:** Number of primary branches, **NSB:** Number of secondary branches, **NSPP:** Number of [seedgrains](#) per plant, **NPPP:** Number of pods per plant, **NSP:** Number of [SeedGrains](#) per Pod **BY:** Biological yield per plant, **SW:** 100 seed weight (g), **HI:** Harvest Index (%), **SY:** [SeedGrain](#) yield per plant

**Comment [V7]:** Follow the similar style as suggested above




Figure 2. Phenotypic Path diagram




Figure 3. Genotypic Path diagram

### 3. CONCLUSION

Based on the current study, it was determined that out of 25 genotypes of chickpeas, CG23 had the highest [seedgrain](#) yield per plant, followed by CG159 and CG199. For [SeedGrain](#) Yield and biological yield, high PCV, GCV, heritability, and genetic advancement as a percentage of mean were noted. The number of pods, days to maturity, days to 50% pod initiation, and number of major branches all positively and significantly correlated with the amount of [seedgrain](#) produced per plant. The Harvest index showed a strong and favourable direct effect of [seedgrain](#) yield per plant at both the genotypic and phenotypic levels. When choosing quantitative characters for crop development, these characteristics could be taken into account.

### 4. REFERENCES

1. Ali, M.A., Nawab, N. N., Abbas, M., Zulkiffal, M. and M. Sajjad. (2011). Evaluation of selection criteria in (*Cicerarietinum*L.), using correlation coefficient and path analysis *Australian Journal of Crop Science*.3(2): 65-70.
2. Ali, Q. Sadaqat, A. Arshad, S. Farooq, J. Ahsan, M. Waseem, M. and Iqbal.A.(2011). Genetic variability and correlation analysis for quantitative traits in chickpea genotypes (*Cicerarietinum*L.). *Journal of Bacteriology*, 3: 6-9.
3. Anabesso, Y. Warkentin, T. Vandenberg, A and Bandra, M. (2006). Heritability and predicted grain from selection in component of crop duration in divergent chickpea. *Euphytica*, 152(1): 1-8.
4. Babbar, A., S. Pandey and R. Singh. (2015). Genetic studies on chickpea genotypes grown in late sown under Chickpea fallow conditions of Madhya Pradesh. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 6(3): 738-748.
5. Bala, I., Kalia, R. and Kumar, B. (2015). Exploitable genetic variability and determination of selection criteria using path coefficient analysis in chickpea. *Bangladesh Journal of Botany*, 44(1): 139-142.
6. Banik, M., Deore, G.N., Kumar, A.M., and Hasel, B. (2017). Genetic variability and Heritability studies in chickpea (*Cicerarietinum*L.). *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 31(1): 1-6.
7. Bhanu, A. N., Singh, M. N., Tharu, R. and Saroj, S. K. (2017). Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis for quantitative traits in chickpea genotypes. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Research*, 51(5): 425-430.
8. Burton, G. W. and Devane. (2000). Estimating heritability in tall fescues from replicated clonal material. *Agronomy Journal*, 45(3): 473-481.

9. Dev, A., Verma, P., and Kumhar, B. L., (2017). Genetic character variability studies in Desi Chickpea (*Cicer arretinum* L.) Genotypes. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, 15(2): 101-106.
10. Dewey, D. R., and Lu, K., (2001). A Correlation and path-coefficient Analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. *Agronomy Journal*, 51(9): 515-518.
11. Eswari, K. B. and Rao, M. V. B. (2006). Phenotypic stability for seed yield in Bengal gram. *Journal Research Acharya Nagarjuna Agriculture University*, 34(1): 101-104.
12. Fisher, R. A., and Yates, F., (2000). A statistical table for biological, agricultural and medical research. *Biometrical Journal*, 7(2): 124-125. *Forage Research*, 37(4): 258-262.
13. Gumbder, R. K. Singh, Surjeet and Rathore, Pankaj (2003). Genetic parameter for leaf and traits in chickpea. *Legume Research*, 26(9): 36-38.
14. Hussain, N, Ghaffar, A. Aslam, K. Hussain, A and Naem-ud-Din (2016): Assessment of Genetic variation and mode of inheritance of some qualitative traits in chickpea (*Cicer arretinum* L.). *The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences*. 26(5): 1334-1338.
15. Indu Bala Dehal, Kalia, R. and Kumar, B. (2016). Genetic estimates and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (*Cicer arretinum* L.) under normal and late sown environments. *Legume Research*, 39(4): 510-516.
16. Jeena, A. S., Arora, P. P. and Ojha, O. P. (2005). Variability and correlation studies for yield and its components in chickpea. *Legume Research*, 28(2): 146-148.
17. Jha, U. C., Bohra, A., Singh, N. P., (2014). Heat stress in crop plants: its nature, impacts and integrated breeding strategies to improve heat tolerance. *Plant Breeding*, 133(6): 67-70.
18. Kuldeep, R. K., Pandey, S., Babbar, A. and Mishra, D. K. (2014). Genetic variability, character association and path coefficient analysis in chickpea under heat stress condition. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*, 5(4): 812-819.
19. Kumar, A. Yadav, A. K. Kumar, B. Kumar, A. Yadav, P. K. (2016). Estimation of genetic variability in chickpea (*Cicer arretinum* L.). *Germplasm Research, Environment. Life Sciences*, 9(3): 362-364.
20. Kumar, S., Kumar, A., Kumar, A., Kumar, R. R., Roy, R. K. and Agarwal, T. (2017). Genetic variability of chickpea genotypes under heat stress condition: Character Association and path coefficient-based analysis. *Indian Journal of Ecology*. 44(4): 59-64
21. Kumar, A., & Singh, S. (2021). Genetic variability and direct and indirect effects of yield traits in pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 72(13), 4312-4324.

22. Meena, H.S.Kumar, J.andDeshmukh , D.S. (2006). Genetic variability and correlation studies for traits related to drought tolerance in chickpea (*Cicerarietinum L.*). *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding*, **66**(2): 140.
23. Patel, V. S., & Patel, M. H. (2019). Assessment of harvest index and its association with yield in different barley (*Hordeumvulgare L.*) cultivars. *Agricultural Sciences*, **10**(3), 301-310.
24. Saxena, M.C., (2008). Problems and potential of chickpea production. In chickpea in the nineties Production. Second International Workshop on chickpea improvement, 4-8<sup>th</sup> December, 1989 ICRIAT center, Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh India.
25. Sharma, R. N., Johnson, P. L., Nanda, H. C., Abhina, S., Sarawgi, A. K. U., Verma, S.K., Nirmodh, P., and Singh, A.K., (2019). Genetic variability, character association and co-heritability for yield traits over the locations in chickpea (*Cicerarietinum L.*). *Legume research*, **41**50:1-5
26. Singh, S.P., (2007). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (*Cicerarietinum L.*) seed proteins at different. *Legume Research*, **27**(1):46-49.