



## **Genetical Study of a Climate Smart Crop Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Malwa Region of MP**

**S. K. Kaushik<sup>1\*</sup> and D. S. Tomer<sup>2</sup>**

Krishi Vigyan Kendra-Ujjain (MP)

(Rajamata Vijayaraje Scindhia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya-Gwalior)

\*Corresponding Author E-mail: kaushik.surendra@rediffmail.com

Received: 7.01.2021 | Revised: 13.02.2021 | Accepted: 20.02.2021

### **ABSTRACT**

*Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) commonly known as gram is the fifth most important food legume crop in the world following soybean, groundnut, drybean and dry pea. Despite its nutritional values and economic importance, chickpea production is relatively low in our country due to poor genetic make-up of cultivars available. The effectiveness of selection depends on magnitude of variability for yield and its component traits. Study of inter-relationships among yield and contributing traits is also necessary. Keeping all these facts in view, this study was conducted to determine the variability, heritability and correlations between yield and yield components in 39 genotypes of desi chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Present study was evaluated in completed randomized block design replicated thrice at research farm of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Ujjain during rabi-2017-18. Observations were recorded on days to 50 per cent flowering (DTF), days to maturity (DTM), seed index (SI) and seed yield (SY) on plot basis whereas plant height (PH), number of pods per plant and number of primary branches per plant (PBN) were recorded on ten randomly selected plant basis. The farm's income and B:C ratio were also observed. Results of present study revealed highly significant differences for days to 50 per cent flowering, days to maturity, plant height (cm), number of primary branches, number of pods per plant, 100-seed weight (gram) and seed yield (kg/ha). The genotypic variance was highest for number of pods per plant followed by number of primary branches per plant. Broad sense heritability ranged from 53.8% (seed yield) to 99% (days to 50 per cent flowering). Positive and significant relationships were determined between seed yield and number of pods per plant. On the basis of all the characters except seed yield over all the checks i.e. BG-256, JG-16, & GCP-101 and Ujjain-21 (local check) only four genotypes (10% genotypes) namely; HIR-70, Tungbhadrā, RKG-135 and BDNG 2001-2-1 found promising indicated that these promising genotypes can be utilised for further improvement of chickpea.*

**Keywords:** Chickpea, *Cicer arietinum*, Genetic variability, Heritability, Correlation coefficient analysis, Days to flowering, Pods per plant, 100-seed weight, Seed yield.

**Cite this article:** Kaushik, S. K., & Tomer, D. S. (2021). Genetical Study of a Climate Smart Crop Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Malwa Region of MP, *Ind. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 9(1), 389-396. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-2845.8590>

## INTRODUCTION

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) commonly known as gram is the fifth most important food legume crop in the world following soybean, groundnut, drybean and dry pea. It is the most important pulse crop of *rabi* season of India pre-dominantly grown on the vast rainfed area. As well as being an important source of food and animal feed, it also helps to improve soil fertility, particularly in drylands. The introduction of chickpea in a cereal based rotation, which is used particularly in developing countries, can break the disease and pest cycle, and increase the productivity of the entire rotation (Jodha & Subba Rao, 1987). There are two major types of chickpea *i.e.* kabuli and desi (brown). The former is grown in temperate regions while later *i.e.* desi chickpea is grown in semi-arid tropics (Muehlbauer & Singh, 1987). Chickpea plant is very sensitive to excess moisture, high humidity and cloudy weather which adversely affect its yield through limited flower production and seed set (Key, 1979).

Chickpea is cultivated on 8.74 million hectares with 7.35million tons production and average yield of 840 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Anonymous, 2010). The average yield of chickpea in our nation is very low and unstable as compared to other chickpea producing countries of the world. Gram is the cheapest and readily available source of protein (19.5%), fats (11.4%), carbohydrates (57-60%), ash (4.8%) and moisture (4.9% - 15.59%) (Huisman & Vander Poel, 1994).

Despite its nutritional values and economic importance, chickpea production is relatively low in our country. This is primarily due to poor genetic make-up of cultivars available. Hence, the presence of genetic variability is pre-requisite for any breeding programme aimed at improvement of crop yields. Because of increased recognition and its importance, evaluation and characterization of chickpea germplasm has received attention of the plant breeders (Virmani et al., 1983; & Bakhs et al., 1992).

The main objective of the most of the breeding programmes is to increase the yield (Lal & Tomer, 1980). To evolve cultivars having high yield potential, it becomes

necessary to study the extent of variability in the available germplasm. The effectiveness of selection depends on magnitude of variability for yield and its component traits. Study of inter-relationships among yield and contributing traits is also necessary. Keeping all these facts in view, the present investigation was planned to study the variability and associations between yield and its components in advance breeding lines of chickpea.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experimental material comprised of 39 diverse genotypes of desi chickpea (Table 4) including three checks namely; BG-256, JG-16, & GCP-101 and one local check (Ujjain-21) were evaluated in completed randomized block design replicated thrice at research farm of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Ujjain during *rabi*-2017-18. Each plot has four rows of four meter row length spaced at 30 cm apart. The recommended package of practices was followed to raise a good crop. Observations were recorded on days to 50 per cent flowering (DTF), days to maturity (DTM), seed index (SI) and seed yield (SY) on plot basis whereas plant height (PH), number of pods per plant and number of primary branches per plant (PBN) were recorded on ten randomly selected plant basis. Mean data of various characters were subjected to statistical analysis (Panse & Sukhatme, 1969). The genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) and phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), heritability in broad sense ( $h^2$ ) and genetic advance as per cent of mean were estimated using the procedure suggested by Johanson et al. (1955) as cited by Singh and Chaudhary (1979). Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients were computed as per method suggested by Fisher (1918). Lush (1949) method was used to estimate expected genetic advance.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of variance revealed highly significant differences among the genotypes for all the characters studied indicated that there is an ample scope for improvement in the traits studied. The general mean, range and

other parameters of genetic variability presented in table 1. Table 1 Unfolded that sufficient variability was present for days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height, primary branches per plant, number of pods per plant, seed index and seed yield. This variability can be utilized effectively to develop high yielding chickpea cultivars through hybridization followed by selection. Phenotypic coefficient of variation was maximum for number of pods per plant followed by primary branches per plant, seed yield, seed index, plant height, days to 50 per cent flowering and days to maturity. Genotypic coefficient of variation was found high for number of pods per plant and number of primary branches per plant. It was moderate for 100-seed weight, seed yield and plant height whereas low for days to 50 per cent flowering. Hasan et al. (2008) low genotypic coefficient of variation value for days to 50 per cent flowering and days to maturity, moderate for plant height, seed index and seed yield. Khan and Sharma (1999) reported high genotypic coefficient of variation for number of pods per plant. Similar trend was found for genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits though they were slightly low compared to PCV. The small difference between the value of phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits studied indicating the less role of environment in expression of these traits. The estimate of heritability in the broad sense was recorded highest for days to 50 per cent flowering (99.0%) followed by seed index (98.8%), number of pods per plant (97.3%), plant height (96.2%), primary branches per plant (95.5%) and days to maturity (88.6%). It indicates that though these characters are least influenced by the environmental effects, the selection for improvement of these characters may not be useful because broad sense heritability is based on total genetic variance which includes both fixable (additive) and non-fixable (dominance and epistatic) variances. Hasan et al. (2008) reported high heritability for seed index, days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height, number of primary branches per plant. Arun and Ram (1998) reported high heritability for days to 50 per cent flowering and seed index; Tripathi

(1998) and Kumar et al. (1999) reported high heritability for number of pods per plant and seed index. In the present study, seed yield showed moderate heritability (53.8%). Earlier study of Kumar and Krishna (1998) reported low heritability for seed yield. Though high heritability indicates the effectiveness of selection on the basis of phenotypic performance, it does not show any indication of the amount of genetic progress for selecting the best individuals. The high genetic advance was observed for seed yield (44.9%) indicated that the character (seed yield) is governed by additive genes and selection would be rewarding for improvement of the yield. The moderate genetic advance was recorded for number of pods per plant (28.6%), plant height (13.6%) and days to 50 per cent flowering (12.2%) whereas seed index, days to maturity and primary branches per plant revealed low genetic advance indicated non-additive type governance and heterosis breeding for improvement of days to maturity, seed index and number of primary branches per plant may be useful.

Heritability and genetic advance are the important selection parameters. The characters namely; days to maturity, number of primary branches per plant, and 100-seed weight showed high heritability accompanied with low genetic advance indicated the non-additive type of gene action. The high heritability is being exhibited due to favourable influence of environment rather than genotype and selection for these traits may not be rewarding. The characters namely; days to flowering, plant height, and number of pods per plant showed high heritability coupled with moderate genetic advance indicated the governance of additive type of gene action. The selection of genotypes based on these traits would be rewarding. The main economic trait *i.e.* seed yield had moderate heritability accompanied with high genetic advance showed that character was governed by additive gene effects. The moderate heritability is being exhibited due to environmental effects and selection would be rewarding for this character.

**Correlation Coefficients:** Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients among

different characters of chickpea are presented in the table 2. At phenotypic level, association of seed yield was positive and significant with number of pods per plant and 100-seed weight whereas it revealed significantly negative association with days to 50 per cent flowering and days to maturity. It indicated that late flowering genotypes had short reproductive period that results into low yield. Days to 50 per cent flowering revealed highly significant and positive association with days to maturity and plant height but highly significant negative correlation with number of pods per plant and seed yield, indicated that early flowering had more number of pods per plant that leads to higher yield. Days to maturity showed highly significant positive association with days to 50 per cent flowering and plant height whereas it was negative with seed yield. Plant height revealed significant positive association with days to 50 per cent flowering, days to maturity and number of pods per plant. Number of primary branches per plant showed positive correlation with number of pods per plant. Number of pods per plant revealed highly significant positive association with seed yield, number of primary branches per plant and plant height whereas it was negatively correlated with days to 50 per cent flowering. Mather and Mathur (1996) and Arshad et al. (2003) reported negative correlation of days to 50 per cent flowering with grain yield in chickpea. Tripathi (1998) and Yucel et al. (2005) found significant positive correlation of number of pods per plant with seed yield. Hasan et al. (2008) reported that seed yield showed positive significant association with number of pods per plant. Deshmukh and Patil (1995) and Khorgade (1995) also reported positive correlation of seed yield with number of pods per plant.

**Promising genotypes:** The promising genotypes which were significantly superior to the checks for various characters are as follows. Only one genotype BG-3004( $2444 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) found superior over checks for central zone (GCP-101 and JG-16) and local check (U-21) for seed yield whereas fifteen genotypes revealed higher seed yield over an another zonal check (BG-256).

**Days to 50 per cent flowering:** Fourteen genotypes revealed early flowering than Check JG-16 (60.7 days), twenty one genotypes showed early flowering than check GCP-101(62.3 days), twenty five genotypes showed early flowering than check BG-256 (63.7 days) and thirty one genotypes disclosed earliness in flowering than U-21(local check, 66.3 days) whereas remaining seven genotypes could not showed earliness in flowering over any check used in the trial.

**Days to maturity:** Nine genotypes revealed early maturity than Check JG-16 (99.0 days), fifteen genotypes showed early maturity than check GCP-101 (103.0 days), twenty nine genotypes showed early maturity than check BG-256(105.3 days) and all thirty eight genotypes disclosed earliness than U-21 (local check, 109.7 days) in the present study.

**Plant Height(cm):** Twenty-six genotypes showed tallness over local check U-21 (47.6 cm), twenty-three genotypes revealed higher plant height than check GCP-101(48.3 cm), nineteen genotypes showed tallness over check JG-16 (49.9 cm) and only four genotypes namely; GNG-1958 (59.5 cm), CSJ-515 (60.9 cm), GJG-0703 (63.6 cm) and H 04-75 (66.1 cm) disclosed higher plant height over check BG-256.

**Number of primary branches:** Thirteen genotypes showed superiority in primary branches over check JG-16(10.1), four genotypes revealed higher primary branches than check BG-256 (12.0), none of the genotype showed superiority in primary branches over check GCP-101 (16.3) whereas all thirty eight genotypes disclosed superiority in primary branches over U-21(local check, 3.5) in the present study.

**Number of pods:** Ten genotypes showed superiority over check JG-16 (48.9), fifteen genotypes revealed higher pods than check BG-256 (45.3), none of the genotype showed superiority in pod numbers over check GCP-101 (83.6) whereas twenty five genotypes disclosed superiority in pod numbers over local check, U-21(41.0).

**100-seeds weight(g):** Two genotypes (JG 9-3 & GNG-1958) showed superiority over check BG-256(29 g), twenty four genotypes revealed higher seed index than check JG-16 (21 g),

thirty two genotype showed superiority over check GCP-101 (18.7 g) whereas thirty five genotypes disclosed superiority over local check, U-21 (17.7 g).

**Seed Yield(kg/ha):** Eighteen genotypes showed yield superiority over check BG-256 (1861 kg/ha), three genotypes namely; BG-3004 (2444 kg/ha), U-21, LC (2425 kg/ha) & JG-16, C (2278 kg/ha) revealed higher seed yield than check GCP-101 (2274 kg/ha), two genotypes {BG-3004 (2444 kg/ha), U-21, LC (2425 kg/ha)} showed superiority over check JG-16 (2278 kg/ha) whereas only BG-3004 (2444 kg/ha) disclosed yield superiority over local check, U-21 (2425 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). These promising genotypes can be involved in future hybridization programme for developing high yielding varieties of desi chickpea.

As per the table 3; The present study revealed that only seven genotypes found promising over check (JG-16), nine genotypes including check JG-16 disclosed promising over check (GCP-101), ten genotypes exhibited superiority over check (BG-256) and twenty four genotypes including all three checks utilised for the study revealed superiority in desired direction for most of the characters studied. On the basis of all the characters except seed yield over all the checks i.e. BG-256, JG-16, & GCP-101 and Ujjain-21 (local check) only four genotypes (10 % genotypes) namely; HIR-70, Tungbhadrā, RKG-135 and BDNG 2001-2-1 found promising indicated that these promising genotypes can be utilised for further improvement of chickpea.

**Table 1: Genetic variability for seed yield and its component characters in chickpea**

Character	Mean	Range	GCV (%)	PCV (%)	b2 (%)	GA	GA (as % of mean)
DTF(50%)	61.0	45.3 - 70.3	9.76	9.81	99.0	12.2	20.0
DTM	102.9	94.0 - 109.7	3.41	3.60	88.6	6.8	6.6
PH(cm)	49.9	33.0 - 66.1	13.52	13.78	96.2	13.6	27.3
PBN	9.2	3.5 - 16.3	28.3	29.0	95.5	5.2	57.1
Pods/Pl	44.7	19.5 - 83.6	31.5	32.0	97.3	28.6	64.1
SI(g)	23.1	16.0 - 31.7	18.9	19.0	98.8	8.9	38.7
SY(kg/ha)	1815	1167 - 2444	16.4	22.4	53.8	44.9	24.8

DTF(50%) = Days to 50% flowering; DTM = Days to maturity; PH(cm) = Plant height (cm);

PBN = Number of primary branches per plant; Pods/Pl. = Number of pods per plant;

SI (g) = Seed Index(g); SY (kg/ha) = Seed Yield (kg/ha)

**Table 2: Genotypic (G) and phenotypic (P) correlation coefficients for seed yield and its component characters in chickpea**

Character		DTF(50%)	DTM	PH(cm)	PBN	Pods/Pl	SI(g)
<b>DTM</b>	G	0.559**					
	P	0.523**					
<b>PH(cm)</b>	G	0.355**	0.300**				
	P	0.346**	0.269**				
<b>PBN</b>	G	-0.017	0.150	-0.108			
	P	-0.018	0.152	-0.105			
<b>Pods/Pl</b>	G	-0.265**	-0.171	0.196*	0.356**		
	P	-0.261**	-0.148	0.189*	0.352**		
<b>SI(g)</b>	G	0.012	-0.107	-0.123	-0.010	-0.087	
	P	0.010	-0.102	-0.123	-0.006	-0.088	
<b>SY(kg/ha)</b>	G	-0.267**	-0.353**	-0.094	0.056	0.482**	-0.302**
	P	-0.198*	-0.243**	-0.068	0.036	0.329**	-0.205*

\*, \*\* significant at 5 and 1 per cent level of significance, respectively

DTF(50%)= Days to 50% flowering; DTM = Days to maturity; PH(cm) = Plant height (cm);

PBN = Number of primary branches per plant; Pods/Pl. = Number of pods per plant;

SI (g) = Seed Index(g); SY (kg/ha) = Seed Yield (kg/ha)

**Table 3: Promising genotypes over different checks for all the traits in chickpea**

SN	Check	Promising genotype	Check	Promising genotype	Check	Promising genotype	Local Check	Promising genotype
1	JG-16	Phule G 00110	GCP-101	HIR-70	BG-256	HIR-70	U-21	GJG-0703
2		HIR-70		JG-16(C)		JG-16(C)		H-04-08
3		Tungbhadra		Tungbhadra		Tungbhadra		HIR-70
4		RVSSG-1		RVSSG-1		GCP-101(C)		JG-16(C)
5		BG-3004		RKG-135		GNG-1936		H-04-75
6		RKG-135		JG-14-11		BG-3004		Tungbhadra
7		BDNG 2001-2-1		PBC-161		RKG-135		BG-256(C)
8				GL-26083		PBC-161		IPC-2004-1
9				BDNG 2001-2-1		BGM-569		GNG-1958
10						BDNG 2001-2-1		KGD-1209
11								IPC-1204-17
12								BAUG-7
13								GCP-101(C)
14								BAUG-12
15								GL-26054
16								RKG-135
17								RVSSG-2
18								RKG-141
19								JG-14-11
20								Phule G 97030
21								PBC-161
22								BGM-569
23								BDNG 2001-2-1
24								PBC--88

**Table 4: List of desi chickpea entries evaluated during Rabi 2017-18**

SN	Variety	SN	Variety
1.	GJG-0703	21.	KDG-1249
2.	BG-3003	22.	RVSSG-1
3.	H 04-08	23.	BAUG-12
4.	Phule G 00110	24.	GJG-0714
5.	JG 9-3	25.	BG-3004
6.	HIR-70	26.	GL-26054
7.	JG-16(C)	27.	RKG-135
8.	H 04-75	28.	RVSSG-2
9.	CSJ-515	29.	RKG-141
10.	NDG 9-21	30.	JG 14-11
11.	Tungbhadra	31.	NBcG-13
12.	BG-256(C)	32.	Phule G 97030
13.	IPC 2004-1	33.	PBC-161
14.	RSG-811	34.	GL 26083
15.	GNG-1958	35.	BGD-1053
16.	KDG-1209	36.	BGM-569
17.	IPC 2004-17	37.	BDNG 2001-2-1
18.	BAUG-7	38.	PBC-88
19.	GCP-101(C)	39.	U-21(LC)
20.	GNG-1936		

**REFERENCES**

Anonymous, (2010). Project Coordinator's Report of chickpea (2010). *Indian Institute of Pulses Research-Kanpur*.

Arshad, M., Bakhsh, A., Zubair, M., & Gafoor, A. (2003). Genetic variability and correlation studies in in chickpea

- (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Pak. J. Bot.* 35(4), 605-611.
- Arun, K., & Ram, K. (1998). Path coefficient analysis in chickpea. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 68(11), 747-749 [Pl. Br. Absts. 69(6), 5414; 1998].
- Bakhsh, A., Gafoor, A., & Malik, B. A. (1992). Evaluation of lentil germplasm. *Indian. J. Genet.*, 43, 54-58.
- Deshmukh, R. B., & Patil, J. V. (1995). Association among yield, yield components and morphological traits in chickpea. *Indian Pulses Res.* 8(2), 123-127 [Pl. Br. Absts. 67(10), 10484; 1997].
- Dewey, O. R., & Lu, K. H. (1959). A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. *J. Agron.* 57, 515-18.
- Fisher, R. A. (1918). The correlation between relatives on the supposition of mendelian inheritance. *Trans. Roy. Soc., Edinburgh*, 52, 399-433.
- Hasan, E. U., Arshad, M., Ahsan, M., & Saleem, M. (2008). Genetic variability and interrelationship for grain yield and its various components in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *J. Agric. Res.*, 46(2), 109-116.
- Huisman, J., & Van der Poel, A. F. B. (1994). Aspects of the Nutritional Quality and Use of Cool Season Food Legumes in Animal Feed. p. 53-76.
- Jodha, N. S., & Subba Rao, K. V. (1987). The Chickpea. In: Chickpea: World Importance and Distribution (Eds.: Saxena, M. C., & Singh, K. B.), CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, UK, pp. 1-10.
- Johnson, H. W., Robinson, H. F., & Comstock, R. E. (1955). Estimates of genetics and environmental variability in soybean. *Agron. J.* 47, 310-318.
- Key, D. (1979). Food Legumes. Tropical Development and Research Institute (TPI). *TPI crop and product digest No. 3. Pp: 48-71.* Tropical Products Institute, London, UK.
- Khorgade, P. W. (1995). Correlation studies in Bengal chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) with emphasis on path analysis. *Ann. Plant Physiol.* 2(2), 204-211 [Pl. Br. Absts. 59(11), 3379; 1989].
- Kumar, A., & Krishna, R. (1998). Heritability and genetic advance in gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.) genotypes of diverse origin. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 68(11), 747-749 [Pl. Br. Absts. 69(6), 5415; 1999].
- Kumar, V., Kar, C. S., Sharma, P. C., & Kumar, V. (1999). Variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Environment and Ecol.* 17(4), 936-939. [Pl. Br. Absts. 70(5), 4912; 2000].
- Lal, S., & Tomar, Y. S. (1980). Chickpea breeding programme at Hisar. *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Chickpea Improvement, Hyderabad, India.* pp: 208-220, ICRISAT, Patancheru, India.
- Mather, R., & Mathur, M. (1996). Estimation of genetic parameters and interrelationship of quantitative traits in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Madras Agri. J.*, 83(1), 9-11.
- Muehlbauer, F. J., & Singh, K. B. (1987). Genetics of chickpea. P. 99-126. In The Chickpea, Saxena, M. C., & Singh, K. B., (eds.), CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, OX10 8DE UK.
- Panse, V. G., & Sukhatme, K. V. (1969). Statistical methods for Agricultural Workers, I.C.A.R. Publication, New Delhi.
- Qureshi, A. S., Shaukat, A., Bakhsh, A., Arshad, M., & Ghafoor, A. (2004). An assessment of variability for economically important traits in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Pak. J. Bot.* 36(4), 779-785.
- Singh, R. K., & Chaudhary, B. D. (1979). Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi.

- Tripathi, A. K. (1998). Variability analysis in chickpea. *Adv. Pl. Sci.* 11(2), 291-292. [*Pl. Br. Absts.* 69(6), 5417; 1999].
- Virmani, S. S., Singh, K. B., Singh, K., & Malhotra, R. S. (1983). Evaluation of mungbean germplasm. *Pak. J. Sci. Ind. Res.*, 35, 48-49.
- Yucel, D. O., Anlarsal, A. E., & Yucel, C. (2005). Genetic variability, Correlation and Path Analysis of Yield, and Yield Components in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Turkish J. Agric.* 30, 183-188.