Genetic Variability and Association Analysis in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) for Seed Yield Characters

Yerasi Viswanatha Reddy[1*], G. Roopa Lavanya[1] and Ch. Laasya Bharathi[1]

[1]Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Naini Agricultural Institute, Faculty of Agriculture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad – 211007, India.

ABSTRACT:

The present experiment was conducted at field experimentation centre of the Genetics and Plant Breeding, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad to evaluate genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in twenty six chickpea genotypes including one check variety Uday for twelve quantitative traits during Rabi, 2019-2020. The analysis of variance showed significant differences among the genotypes for all the characters under the study, indicating a high degree of genetic variability present in the experimental material. C-224, C-201, ICC-16693, C-1028, C-129, C-213, C-130, and C-1025 genotypes are identified as a best performing lines among the genotypes included in the study. The values of PCV were found higher than GCV for all the traits studied representing environmental factors influencing the characters. High PCV and GCV were observed for biological yield per plant indicates large extent of genetic variability for these traits in the material. High heritability were recorded by plant height, days to 50% flowering, harvest index, biological yield per plant, hundred seed weight, seed yield per plant and number of pods per plant. High heritability coupled with high genetic advance as percent of mean was observed for the traits, viz., biological yield per plant, seed index, harvest index, number of pods per plant, seed yield per plant and plant height indicated that these characters were predominantly governed by additive gene effects. So, direct selection of these characters by simple selection method would be effective due to accumulation of more additive genes leading to further improvement of chickpea genotypes. Grain yield per plant showed positive significant genotypic and phenotypic correlations with number of seeds per plant, number of pods per plant, biological yield per plant, number of primary branches per plant, number of secondary branches per plant as well as plant height. At phenotypic level, biological yield per plant and number of seeds per plant had high positive direct effect on grain yield per plant had given the maximum contribution on yield

per plant. So significance should be given to these characters throughout the selection for yield improvement in chickpea.

Key words: Chickpea, Phenotypic coefficient of variation, Genotypic coefficient of variation, Heritability and Genetic advance, Correlation and Path coefficient.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Pulses are an essential group of food crops that hold a unique position in the world of agriculture due to their high protein content. Pulses are an imperative part of the Indian diet, provided that roughly 30% of the daily protein ingestion.

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.), a foremost winter pulse crop in India, contributes appreciably to the pulse economy. This crop is vital part of our daily nourishment because it is an admirable source of protein, adapts well to farming techniques, and can resist drought. It generates 126 kg of protein per hectare on average, building it the most protein-rich legume after groundnut and soybean.

Chickpea is identified by a variety of names in India, counting Chana, Gram, Bengalgram, Chani, Chhole, Chola, Harbara, Boot, Sanagalu, Kadalai, and Kadala.

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is an autogamous crop with 2n = 2x = 16 chromosomes and a genome size of 732 megabytes that belongs to the fabaceae family. Southwest Asia and the Mediterranean were predictable as primary centres of diversity by Vavilov [1], while Ethiopia was designated as a secondary centre of diversity.

Pakistan, Mexico, Turkey, Canada, Iran, Australia, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Spain, and Burma are all chief producers of chickpea. Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, and Karnataka are the key chickpea-growing states in our nation, and they mainly cultivate in rainfed circumstances.

Chickpea is principally grown in India through the *rabi* season, on the other hand there has recently been substantiation of chickpea production extending from Northern India's cool season to the warm climates of Central and Southern India Kuldeep *et al*. [2].

Chickpeas are a high-protein crop that can be used to supplement cereal-based diets. Chickpeas are high in both protein and carbohydrates. Chickpea protein is higher than that of pigeonpea, blackgram, and greengram legumes Kaur and Singh [3].

Chickpea seeds enclose 23% protein, 64% total carbohydrates (47% starch, 6% soluble sugar), 5% fat, 6% crude fibre, and 2% ash on average, as well as micronutrients such as phosphorus (340 mg/100 g), calcium (160 mg/100 g), magnesium (140 mg/100 g), iron (5 mg/100 g), zinc (4.1 mg/100 g) Jukanti et al. [4]. Cereals and pulses correspond to a huge part of billions of people's diets throughout the World, chickpeas are being targeted in many nations to assist combat malnutrition to some extent.

The degree to which yield and yield-related traits are inherited from generation to generation and the extent of genetic variability enclosed in the breeding material are the most essential factors in crop development. Estimates of genotypic and phenotypic coefficients are requisite to comprehend the force of the environment on various traits.

Heritability and genetic advance expressed as a percent of the mean is a useful tool in the selection programme for determining the extent to which various characters can be improved by selection. The identification of high-yielding chickpea genotypes aids breeders in identifying donors for future breeding programmes.

Yield is a complicated attribute that is determined by a number of factors. It would be beneficial to intend enhanced genotypes by identifying vital characters and their interrelationships. As a result, selection based on yield component traits can result in a significant raise in yield.

Correlation collective with path coefficient analysis is the finest approach to measure the inter-relationship among essential yield components. These strategies were engaged in the breeding programme to take full advantage of the yield prospective of chickpeas in order to enhance efficiency and produce high-yielding improved varieties. The mutual association between the variables is known as correlation, and it contributes in establishing the most efficient procedures for genotype selection. Breeding strategies would be quite effective when there is a positive correlation among major yield components, but selecting becomes awfully difficult when there is a negative association. Due to mutual termination of component characters, estimates of correlation coefficients alone might be ambiguous. As a result, in the study of yield contributing characters, correlation analysis combined with path analysis is a more effective tool. Path coefficient analysis is a helpful technique for unravelling the direct and indirect effects of the causal components on the complex component in the correlation coefficient.

Earlier studies had revealed that assessment of genetic variability is one of the important breeding objective. **Kishore et al.** [5] concluded that number of pods per plant followed by biological yield per plant, number of seeds per plant, seed yield per plant, number of primary branches par plant, 100-seed weight had high phenotypic and genotypic coefficient of variation. **Akanksha et al.** [6] concluded that harvest index, seeds per pod, total number of pods per plant, seed yield per plant, days to maturity had showed high heritability. **Mohammed et al.** [7] concluded that grain yield, number of pods per plant and biomass yield had showed high heritability coupled with high genetic advance as percent of mean. **Astereki et al.** [8] concluded that number of pods per plant and harvest index showed highly significant and positive association with seed yield per plant. **Tiwari et al. [9]**

revealed that harvest index, 100 seed weight, seeds per pod, total number of pods per plant showed high positive direct effect on seed yield per plant.

Based on importance of the above aspects, an attempt has been made in the present experiment to examine the **"Genetic Variability and Association Analysis in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) for Seed Yield Characters"** was carried with the following objectives.

Objectives

1. To study the nature and magnitude of genetic variability in experimental population for yield and its contributing traits in chickpea.
2. To estimate the inter relation between quantitative traits and seed yield.
3. To estimate direct and indirect effects of various quantitative traits on seed yield.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The current research consists of twenty six genotypes of chickpea in Rabi 2019-2020 at experimentation centre of Genetics and Plant Breeding, SHUATS, Prayagraj. The experiment was laid in randomized complete block design with three replications during Rabi 2019-2020 with inclusion of the suggested packages and practices required for a vigorous crop. Data for twelve quantitative characters were recorded *viz*., days to 50% flowering, days to 50% pod setting, plant height (cm), number of primary branches per plant, number of secondary branches per plant, number of days to maturity, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per plant, seed index (gm), biological yield per plant (gm), harvest index (gm) and seed yield per plant (gm). Days to 50% flowering, days to 50% pod setting, number of days to maturity were accounted on a plot basis and plant height, number of primary branches per plant, number of secondary branches per plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per plant, seed index (gm), harvest index (gm), biological yield per plant (gm) and seed yield per plant (gm) were predictable from random sample of five plants in each plot. Data were subjected to statistical analysis to work out genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) and Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), heritability, genetic advance and genetic advance as percent mean as per standard methods. Standard statistical manner was used for the analysis of variance, genotypic coefficient of variation and phenotypic coefficient of variation Burto [10], heritability Burton and Devane [11] and genetic advance Johnson et al. [12]. The genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients were computed using genotypic and phenotypic variances and co-variances Ai Jibouri et al. [13]. The path coefficient analysis was made according to the technique suggested by Dewey and Lu [14].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The analysis of variance revealed significant differences between the genotypes for all the characters under the study (Table 1). Hence, it indicated substantial amount of genetic variability among twenty six chickpea genotypes.

3.1 Estimation of genetic parameters:

Assessment of genetic parameters, correlation and path coefficient analysis helps to examine, important characters throughout the selection for improving yield of chickpea. Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), heritability, genetic advance (GA) and genetic advance as percent of mean GA (%), for all the yield contributing traits are shown in Table 2.

PCV was higher than the corresponding GCV for all the characters indicative of that there was an influence of the environment. Highest GCV and PCV were recorded for biological yield per plant (26.833 and 32.118) and moderate GCV and PCV were observed for number of pods per plant (14.277, 18.306), seed index (14.128, 17.061), harvest index (13.186, 15.457), seed yield per plant (12.427, 15.735), number of seeds per plant (11.651, 15.100), number of primary branches per plant (11.621, 16.712) and plant height (10.316, 10.942). High to moderate estimates of GCV and PCV suggesting ample variability among these characters and thus offer scope for genetic enhancement through effective selection. Similar findings have been reported by Thakur and Sirohi [15], Shweta and Yadav [16] and Tsehaye et al. [17].

The estimates of genotypic coefficient of variation reveal the overall amount of genotypic variability present in the material. However, the proportion of this genotypic variability which is transmitted from parents to offspring is reflected by heritability. Lush [18] gave the theory of broad sense heritability. It determines the usefulness with which we can use the genotypic variability in a breeding programme. The estimates of heritability from the current examination are presented in Table 2.

The traits considered moderate to high heritability ranging from 45.7% to 88.9%. Among the traits studied the highest heritability was recorded by plant height (88.900), days to 50% flowering (83.000), harvest index (72.800), biological yield per plant (69.800), seed index (68.600), seed yield per plant (62.400) and number of pods per plant (60.800). The high heritability values of the traits considered in this study exposed that they were less predisposed by the environment, allowing for successful selection of traits based on phenotypic appearance using a simple selection method and representing the potential for genetic progress. Similar findings have been reported by Ali et al. [19], Borate et al. [20], Khan et al. [21], Gaikwad et al. [22], Babbar et al. [23] and Yucel et al. [24].

Heritability assessment provides information on the degree of the inheritance of traits from parents to offspring, whereas genetic advance is helpful in determining the real gain expected beneath selection.

In the present study, high heritability coupled with moderate genetic advance were observed for biological yield per plant (69.800, 10.672) and plant height (88.900, 10.482) indicative of that these traits were inclined by both additive and dominance gene effects. Hence, cautious selection may direct towards progress of these traits in chickpea.

The evaluation of genetic advance as percent mean helps to comprehend the type of gene action concerned in the appearance of a trait. The estimates of genetic advance as percent of mean for present study, which are presented in Table 2.

High heritability along with high genetic advance as percent of mean estimated the highest for biological yield per plant (69.800, 46.179), seed index (68.600, 24.102), harvest index (72.800, 23.172), number of pods per plant (60.800, 22.938), seed yield per plant (62.400, 20.219) and plant height (88.900, 20.035) demonstrating that these traits are most likely under the control of additive gene action and hence these traits can be predetermined by appropriate selection. Similar findings have been reported by Vaghela et al. [25], Parameshwarappa et al. [26], Jakhar et al. [27], Srivastava et al. [28], Chopdar et al. [29], Thakur et al. [30], Arora et al. [31] and Anusha et al. [32].

So direct selection of these characters based on phenotypic expression by simple selection process would be efficient due to addition of more additive genes leading to further enlargement. Similar findings have been reported by Shivashish et al. [33].

3.2 Estimation of correlation coefficient among the traits:

Associations among yield and yield contributing characters were studied during analysis of correlation between them. Phenotypic and genotypic correlation coefficients between the studied characters of 26 chickpea genotypes are presented in Table 3. Correlation analysis among the yield and its causative traits shown that the genotypic correlation coefficients in most cases were higher than their phenotypic correlation coefficients representing the association was mainly due to genetic factor Bhattacharyya *et al*. [34]. The phenotypic correlation coefficients in some cases were higher than their genotypic correlation, which indicates the suppressing effect of the environment that can modify the expression of characters at the phenotypic level.

Grain yield per plant showed positive significant genotypic and phenotypic correlation with number of seeds per plant (0.985**, 0.833**), number of pods per plant (0.983**, 0.781**), biological yield per plant (0.830**, 0.687**), number of primary branches per plant (0.812**, 0.633**), number of secondary branches per plant (0.719**, 0.533**) and plant height (0.596**, 0.515**).

Days to 50% flowering exhibited positive significant genotypic and phenotypic correlation with days to 50% pod setting (0.977**, 0.892**), number of pods per plant (0.345**, 0.261*) and number of seeds per plant (0.330**, 0.242*) and primary branches per plant (0.346** at genotypic level), biological yield per plant (0.291** at genotypic level).

Days to 50% pod setting showed significant positive correlation with number of pods per plant (0.399**), number of seeds per plant (0.353**), biological yield per plant (0.229*) and number of primary branches per plant (0.271*) at genotypic level only. At phenotypic level, days to 50% pod setting exhibited non significant positive correlation for all the characters except seed index (-0.037), harvest index (-0.009) and number of secondary branches per plant (-0.006) showed non significant negative correlations.

Plant height registered significant and positive association with number of pods per plant (0.580**, 0.437**), number of seeds per plant (0.535**, 0.452**) and biological yield per plant (0.389**, 0.324**) at both genotypic and phenotypic level but number of primary branches per plant (0.237*), number of secondary branches per plant (0.237*) at genotypic level only.

Number of primary branches per plant showed positive significant association with number of pods per plant (0.880**, 0.681**), number of secondary branches per plant (0.846**, 0.757**), biological yield per plant (0.839**, 0.516**) and number of seeds per plant (0.788**, 0.615**) at both genotypic and phenotypic levels. It had significant negative correlation with harvest index (-0.503**, -0.238*) at both genotypic and phenotypic level but seed index (-0.232*) at genotypic level only.

Number of secondary branches per plant revealed positive significant correlation with number of pods per plant (0.660**, 0.529**), biological yield per plant (0.660**, 0.466**) and number of seeds per plant (0.544**, 0.399**) at both genotypic and phenotypic levels where as it showed significant negative correlation with harvest index (-0.526**, -0.305**) at both genotypic and phenotypic level but seed index (-0.334**), number of days to maturity (-0.305**) at genotypic level only.

Number of days to maturity showed significant positive correlation with harvest index (0.281*) while significant negative correlation with biological yield per plant (-0.253*) at genotypic level only.

Number of pods per plant exhibited significant positive correlation with number of seeds per plant (0.959**, 0.832**) and biological yield per plant (0.823**, 0.571**) whereas, it showed significant negative correlation with harvest index (-0.486**, -0.239*).

Number of seeds per plant registered significant positive correlation with biological yield per plant (0.864**, 0.644**) whereas significant negative correlation with harvest index (-0.504**, -0.264*) at both genotypic and phenotypic levels.

Seed index showed non significant positive association at both genotypic and phenotypic level for biological yield per plant (0.026, 0.080). It showed significant negative correlation at genotypic level for harvest index (-0.241*) and non significant negative correlation at phenotypic level for harvest index (-0.195).

Biological yield per plant had significant negative correlation with harvest index (-0.872**, -0.669**) at both genotypic and phenotypic levels.

Correlation study exposed that grain yield per plant exhibited significant and positive correlations with number of seeds per plant, number of pods per plant, biological yield per plant, number of primary branches per plant, number of secondary branches per plant and plant height at both genotypic and phenotypic levels respectively (Table 3). Similar results were reported by Babbar et al. [35], Meena et al. [36], Gul et al. [37], Kuldeep et al. [38], Vartika singh et al. [39] and Manasa et al. [40].

3.3 Estimation of Path coefficient analysis:

Path coefficient investigation is one of the reliable statistical techniques in quantifying the interdependence of traits and the degree of control of independent characters either directly or indirectly on seed yield Mushtaq et al. [41]. The idea of direct and indirect influence of yield contributing characters on the final end product yield in any crop is of chief importance in selecting high yielding germplam. The direct and indirect effects of twelve characters were presented in Table 4. The path analysis showed that the utmost positive direct effects contributing to seed yield was registered by biological yield per plant (0.432), number of seeds per plant (0.419) followed by harvest index (0.285), number of secondary branches per plant (0.188), plant height (0.142), number of pods per plant (0.127), days to maturity (0.040) and seed index (0.029) which implies direct that direct selection for these characters would progress the seed yield per plant. Similar findings were reported by Renukadevi and Subbalakshmi [42], Naveed et al. [43], Dehal et al. [44], Tadesse et al. [45] and Agarwal et al. [46].

Biological yield per plant showed positive indirect effect *via* number of seeds per plant (0.279), number of pods per plant (0.247), number of primary branches per plant (0.223), number of secondary branches per plant (0.202), plant height (0.14), days to 50% flowering (0.094), days to 50% pod setting (0.045) and seed index (0.035). Whereas, negative indirect effect *via* harvest index (-0.289) days to maturity (-0.072).

Contribution of number of seeds per plant through number of pods per plant (0.349), biological yield per plant (0.27), number of primary branches per plant (0.258), plant height (0.189), number of secondary branches per plant (0.168), days to 50% flowering (0.101) and days to 50% pod setting (0.07) and negative indirect effect through harvest index (-0.111) days to maturity (-0.013), seed index (-0.008).

From the path study the characters biological yield per plant and number of seeds per plant exhibited high positive direct effects on seed yield per plant. Both these characters exhibited significant and positive association with seed yield per plant.

4. CONCLUSION

In the present study, genetic variability, correlation and path analysis revealed that biological yield per plant, number of seeds per plant, number of pods per plant, number of primary branches per plant, number of secondary branches per plant, harvest index, seed index and plant height contribute higher seed yield per plant. Therefore, to improve the yield potential in chickpea the importance should be given to the selection based on these characters.

REFERENCES

1. Vavilov NI. Studies on the origin of cultivated plants. Leningrad. 1926;pp:129-238.
2. Kuldeep R, Pandey S, Babbar A, Prakash V. Genetic diversity analysis in chickpea grown under heat stress conditions of Madhya Pradesh. Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding. 2015;6(2):424-433.
3. Kaur M, Singh N. Studies on functional, thermal and pasting properties of flours from different chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cultivars. Food Chemistry. 2005;91(3):403-411.
4. Jukanti AK, Gaur PM, Gowda CLL, Chibbar RN. Nutritional quality and health benefits of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L): a review. British Journal of Nutrition. 2012;108:S1-S26.
5. Kishor L, Swarup I, Nehra A, Kirar G, Rajesh CJ. Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences. 2018;6(4):141-144.
6. Akanksha K, Anita B, Namita P. Genetic Variability, Correlaiton and Path Analysis in Yield and Yield Components in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Genotypes Under Late Sown Condition. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2016;8(54):2884-2886.
7. Mohammed A, Tesso B, Ojiewo C, Ahmed S. Assessment of Genetic Variability and Heritability fo Agronomic Traits of Ethiopian Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Landraces. 2019;2(1):10-15.
8. Astereki HP, Sharifi M, Pouresmael. Correlation and path analysis for grain yield and yield components in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Genetika. 2017;49(1):273-284.
9. Tiwari A, Babbar A, Pal N. Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in yield and yield components in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) genotypes under late sown condition. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2016;54(8):2884-2886.
10. Burton GW. Quantitative inheritance in grasses. Proceedings of 6th International Grassland Congress. 1952;1:227-283.
11. Burton GW, Dewane EM. Estimating heritability from replicated clonal material. Agronomy Journal. 1953;45:478-481.

12. Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Comstock RE. Genotypic and phenotypic correlations in soybeans and their implication in selection. Agronomy Journal. 1955;47:477-483.
13. Al-Jibouri HA, Miller PA, Robinson HF. Genotypic and environmental variances and covariances in upland cotton crosses of interspecific origin. Agronomy Journal. 1958;50:633-636.
14. Dewey DR, Lu KH. A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass and seed production. Agronomy Journal. 1959;51:515-7.
15. Thakur SK, Sirohi A. Studies on genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under different environments. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2008;4(1):242-245.
16. Shweta YAK, Yadav RK. Studies on genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L). Journal of Food Legumes. 2013;26(3 & 4):139-140.
17. Tsehaye A, Fikre A, Bantayhu M. Genetic variability and association analysis of desi type chickpea (*Cicer arietimum* L.) advanced lines under potential environment in north Gondar, Ethiopia. Cogent Food & Agriculture. 2020;6(1):1806668.
18. Lush JL. Heritability off quantitative characters in farm animals. Proc. Amer. Soc. Animal Prod. 1947;35:293-301.
19. Ali MA, Nawab N, Rasool G, Saleem M. Estimates of variability and correlations for quantitative traits in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of Agriculture and Social Sciences. 2008;4(4):177-179.
20. Borate VV, Dalvi VV, Jadhav BB. Estimation of genetic variability and heritability in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural University. 2010;35(1):047-049.
21. Khan R, Farhatullah, Khan S. Dissection of genetic variability and heritability estimates of chickpea germplasm for various morphological markers and quantitative traits. Sarhad Journal of Agriculture. 2011;27(1):67-72.
22. Gaikwad AR, Desai NC, Langhi AM, Jadhav SD. Studies on Genetic variability in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Ecology, Environment and Conservation Paper. 2011;17(3):585-588.
23. Babbar A, Prakash V, Prakash T, Iquabal MA. Genetic variability of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under late sown condition. Legume Research. 2012;35(1):1-7.
24. Yucel D. Genotypic and Phenotypic Variability for Yield and its Components in Normal and Late Sown Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Legume Research-An International Journal. 2020;43(1):18-24.
25. Vaghela MD, Poshiya VK, Savaliya JJ, Kavani RH, Davada BK. Genetic variability studies in kabuli chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Legume Research. 2009;32(3):191-194.
26. Parameshwarappa SG, Salimath PM, Upadhyaya HD, Patil SS, Kajjidoni ST. Genetic variability studies in minicore collection of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under different environments. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2012;25(3):305-308.

27. Jakhar DS, Singh R, Kamble MS. Genetic diversity studies in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Kolhapur region of Maharashtra. Bangladesh Journal of Botany. 2016;45(3):459-464.
28. Srivastava S, Lavanya GR, Lal GM. Genetic variability and character association for seed yield in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(4):748-750.
29. Chopdar DK, Bharti B, Sharma P, Dubey RB, Brajndra, Meena BL. Studies on genetic variability, character association and path analysis for yield and its contributing trais in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Legume Research. 2017;40(5):824-829.
30. Thakur NR, Toprope VN, Phanindra KS. Estimation of Genetic Variability, Correlation and Path Analysis for Yield and Yield Contributing Traits in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7(2):2319-7706.
31. Arora RN, Kumar K, Manav M. Principal component analysis of kabuli chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2018;6(2):2767-2768.
32. Anusha T, Trivikrama Reddy A, Jayalakshmi V, Khayum Ahammed S. Genetic Variability Studies for Yield and Quality Traits in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9(9):2995-3000.
33. Shivashish V, Nagaraju M, Sai Kumr H, Suresh BG, Lavanya GR. Evaluation of Chickpe (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Germplasm for Yield and Yield Attributing Traits in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Prdesh. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9(10):1944-1956.
34. Bhattacharya A, Ganguly SB. Genetic diversity in chickpea under normal and late sown codition. Legume Research. 2007;21(3):171-176.
35. Babbar A, Patel SK. Correlation and path analysis in desi chickpea under Kymore Plateau Zone of Madhya Pradesh. J.N.K.V. Research Journal. 2005;39(1):47-51.
36. Meena HS, Kumar J, Deshmukh PS. Genetic variability and correlation studies for traits related to drought tolerance in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding. 2006;66(2):140.
37. Gul R, Khan H, Bibi M, Ain QU, Imran B. Genetic analysis and interrelationship of yield attributing traits in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences. 2013;23(2):521-526.
38. Kuldeep RK, Pandey S, Babbar A, Mishra DK. Genetic variability, character association and path coefficient analysis in chickpea grown under heat stress condition. Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding. 2014;5(4):812-819.
39. Singh V, Vimal SC, Shrivastav SP, Maurya V, Singh N. Character association and path analysis of yield contributing traits and quality parameter in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(5):1488-1492.

40. Manasa B, Priya MS, Jayalakshmi V, Umamaheswari P. Character Association and Path Coefficient Analysis in Extra Large and Large Seeded Kabuli Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences.7(5):166-171.
41. Mushtaq MA, Bajwa MM, Saleem M. Estimation of genetic variability and path analysis of grain yield and its components in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Science and Engineering Research. 2013;4(1):1-4.
42. Renukadevi P, Subbalakshmi B. Correlations and path coefficient analysis in chickpea. Legume Research. 2006;29(3):201-204.
43. Naveed MT, Ali Q, Ahsan M, Hussain B. Correlation and path coefficient analysis for various quantitative traits in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal for Agro Veterinary & Medical Sciences. 2012;6(2):97-106.
44. Dehal IB, Kalia R, Kumar B. Genetic estimates and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under normal and late sown environments. Legume Research. 2016;39(4):510-516.
45. Tadesse M, Fikre A, Eshete M, Girman N, Korbun L, Mohamed R, Bekele D, Funga A, Ojiewo CO. Correlation and path coefficient analysis for various quantitative traits in desi chickpea genotypes under rainfed conditions in Ethiopia. Journal of Agricultural Science. 2016;8(12):112.
46. Agarwal T, Kumar A, Kumar S, Kumar A, Kumar RR, Kumar S, Singh PK. Correlation and Path Coefficient Analysis for Grain Yield and Yield Components in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Under Normal and Late Sown conditions of Bihar, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7(2):1633-1642.

Table 1. Analysis of variance for different characters in chickpea

S. No.	Characters/traits	Mean Sum of Squares		
		Replication (df =02)	Treatments (df = 25)	Error (df = 50)
01	Days to 50% Flowering	2.71	33.74**	2.15
02	Days to 50% pod setting	0.17	29.23**	3.95
03	Plant height	3.83	91.04**	3.64
04	Number of primary branches/plant	0.20	0.84**	0.22
05	Number of secondary	0.22	0.89**	0.25

	branches/plant			
06	Days to maturity	10.76	10.08**	1.93
07	Number of pods per plant	193.59	125.13**	22.11
08	Number of seeds per plant	134.59	135.93**	25.11
09	Seed index	12.26	34.24**	4.54
10	Biological yield per plant	16.80	132.00**	16.64
11	Harvest index	7.63	87.10**	9.66
12	Seed yield per plant	1.82	4.23**	0.71

** indicates 1% level of significance

Table 2. Estimation of genetic parameters for twelve characters in chickpea genotypes

Traits	**GCV**	**PCV**	**h^2 (Broad Sense)**	**GA**	**GAM**
Days to 50% flowering	4.900	5.377	83.000	6.092	9.199
Days to 50% pods setting	3.218	3.899	68.100	4.935	5.470
Plant height	10.316	10.942	88.900	10.482	20.035
Number of primary branches per plant	11.621	16.712	48.300	0.652	16.645
Number of secondary branches per plant	9.092	13.449	45.700	0.644	12.663
Number of days to maturity	1.382	1.807	58.400	2.595	2.176
Number of pods per plant	14.277	18.306	60.800	9.414	22.938
Number of seeds per plant	11.651	15.100	59.500	9.660	18.519

100 seed weight	14.128	17.061	68.600	5.368	24.102
Biological yield per plant	26.833	32.118	69.800	10.672	46.179
Harvest index	13.186	15.457	72.800	8.928	23.172
Seed yield per plant	12.427	15.735	62.400	1.762	20.219

PCV: Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation, GCV: Genotypic Coefficient of Variation, h^2*: heritability (Broad sense), GA: Genetic Advance, GAM: Genetic Advance as Percent of Mean*

Table 3. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficient for yield and yield contributing traits in twenty six chickpea genotypes

Traits	r	DFF	D50%P	PH	PB/ P	SB/ P	DM	Pods/ P	Seeds/ P	SI	BY/ P	HI	SYPP
DF50%	G	1.000	0.977**	0.034	0.346**	0.170	-0.143	0.345**	0.330**	0.001	0.291**	-0.179	0.192
	P	1.000	0.8920 **	0.054	0.172	0.087	-0.071	0.2610 *	0.2422 *	0.004	0.218	-0.086	0.135
DP50%	G		1.000	0.016	0.271*	-0.017	0.089	0.399**	0.353**	-0.013	0.229*	-0.080	0.196
	P		1.000	0.076	0.084	-0.006	0.112	0.218	0.166	-0.037	0.103	-0.009	0.068
PH	G			1.000	0.253*	0.237*	0.114	0.580**	0.535**	0.046	0.389**	-0.208	0.596**
	P			1.000	0.202	0.189	0.113	0.4372 **	0.4522 **	0.047	0.3242 **	-0.153	0.515**
NPBP	G				1.000	0.846**	-0.106	0.880**	0.788**	-0.232*	0.839**	-0.503**	0.812**
	P				1.000	0.7572 **	-0.051	0.6810 **	0.6155 **	-0.117	0.5169 **	-0.2382 *	0.633**
NSBP	G					1.000	-0.305**	0.660**	0.544**	-0.334**	0.660**	-0.526**	0.719**
	P					1.000	-0.136	0.5295 **	0.3999 **	-0.207	0.4669 **	-0.3057 **	0.533**
DM	G						1.000	0.082	-0.087	-0.082	-0.253*	0.281*	-0.095
	P						1.000	0.101	-0.031	-0.026	-0.165	0.205	0.019
NPP	G							1.000	0.959**	-0.165	0.823**	-0.486**	0.983**
	P							1.000	0.8327 **	-0.121	0.5718 **	-0.2392 *	0.781**
NSP	G								1.000	-0.081	0.864**	-0.504**	0.985**
	P								1.000	-0.019	0.6444 **	-0.2643 *	0.833**
SI	G									1.000	0.026	-0.241*	-0.107
	P									1.000	0.080	-0.195	-0.045
BYP	G										1.000	-0.872**	0.830**
	P										1.000	-0.6693 **	0.687**
HI	G											1.000	-0.490**
	P											1.000	-0.212
SYP	G												1.000
	P												1.000

, Significant at P<0.05, P<0.01, respectively. DF50%: Days to 50% flowering, DP50%: Days to 50% pod setting, PH: Plant height, NPBP: Number of primary branches per plant, NSBP: Number of secondary branches per plant, DM: Days to maturity, NPP: Number of pods per plant, NSP: Number of seeds per plant, SI: Seed index, BYP: Biological yield per plant, HI: Harvest index, SYP: Seed yield per plant*

Table 4. Direct (diagonal) and indirect (off diagonal) effects of 12 traits on grain yield in chickpea evaluated during *Rabi* 2019-2020

Traits	**DF50%**	**DP50%**	**PH**	**NPBP**	**NSBP**	**DM**	**NPP**	**NSP**	**SI**	**BY/P**	**HI**	**SYP**
DF50%	-0.063	-0.056	-0.003	-0.011	-0.005	0.004	-0.016	-0.015	0.000	-0.014	0.005	0.135
DP50%	-0.024	-0.027	-0.002	-0.002	0.000	-0.003	-0.006	-0.005	0.001	-0.003	0.000	0.068
PH	0.008	0.011	0.142	0.029	0.027	0.016	0.062	0.064	0.007	0.046	-0.022	0.515**
NPBP	-0.003	-0.002	-0.004	-0.020	-0.015	0.001	-0.014	-0.012	0.002	-0.010	0.005	0.633**
NSBP	0.016	-0.001	0.036	0.142	0.188	-0.026	0.100	0.075	-0.039	0.088	-0.058	0.533**
DM	-0.003	0.005	0.005	-0.002	-0.006	0.040	0.004	-0.001	-0.001	-0.007	0.008	0.019
NPP	0.033	0.028	0.056	0.086	0.067	0.013	0.127	0.106	-0.015	0.073	-0.030	0.781**
NSP	0.101	0.070	0.189	0.258	0.168	-0.013	0.349	0.419	-0.008	0.270	-0.111	0.833**
SI	0.000	-0.001	0.001	-0.003	-0.006	-0.001	-0.004	-0.001	0.029	0.002	-0.006	-0.045
BYP	0.094	0.045	0.140	0.223	0.202	-0.072	0.247	0.279	0.035	0.432	-0.289	0.687**
HI	-0.024	-0.003	-0.044	-0.068	-0.087	0.058	-0.068	-0.075	-0.056	-0.191	0.285	-0.212

*Residual effect: 0.407. ** Significant at P<0.01, respectively. DF50%: Days to 50% flowering, DP50%: Days to 50% pod setting, PH: Plant height, NPBP: Number of primary branches per plant, NSBP: Number of secondary branches per plant, DM: Days to maturity, NPP: Number of pods per plant, NSP: Number of seeds per plant, SI: Seed index, BYP: Biological yield per plant, HI: Harvest index, SYP: Seed yield per plant*