Correlation and path analysis in bunch groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)

H.B. VEKARIYA, M.D. KHANPARA, J.H. VACHHANI, L.L. JIVANI, K.J. VAGADIYA AND H.J. REVAR

Received : May, 2010; Accepted : July, 2010

SUMMARY

Fifty diverse genotypes of bunch groundnut were evaluated during *Kharif* 2009 for genetic parameter *viz.*, correlation and path analysis. The magnitudes of genotypic correlation coefficients were higher as compared to the corresponding phenotypic correlation coefficients. The pod yield per plant had highly significant and positive correlations at phenotypic levels with number of mature pods per plant, 100-pod weight, 100-kernel weight, kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index. Path analysis revealed that the kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index had high and positive direct effects on pod yield per plant.

Vekariya, H.B., Khanpara, M.D., Vachhani, J.H., Jivani, L.L., Vagadiya, K.J. and Revar, H.R. (2011). Correlation and path analysis in bunch groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Internat. J. Plant Sci.*, **6** (1): 11-15.

Key words : Correlation, Path analysis, Groundnut

roundnut is an important oil seed crop. The knowledge \mathbf{J} of association among the yield and yield contributing characters would be of great help in constructing a suitable plant type and in planning breeding programme. However, the correlation coefficient does not give any indication about comparative magnitude of contribution made by various component characters. Therefore, genotypic path coefficient analysis was carried out to find the direct and indirect effects of yield components and their correlation with pod yield per plant. Pod yield, a polygenic trait, is influenced by its various components directly as well as indirectly via other traits, which create a complex situation before a breeder for making selection. Therefore, path coefficient analysis could provide a more realistic picture of the interrelationship, as it considers direct as well as indirect effects of the variables by partitioning the correlation coefficient.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifty genotypes of groundnut were sown in a

Correspondence to:

J.H. VACHHANI, Main Oilseeds Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA

Email : jivanvachhani@yahoo.in

Authors' affiliations:

M.D. KHANPARA, Regional Cotton Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA

K.J. VAGADIYA AND H.J. REVAR, Department of Agricultural Botany, Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA

Randomized Block Design with three replications during Kharif 2009. Each entry was accommodated in a single row of 3.0 m length with a spacing of 45 cm between rows and 10 cm between plants within the row. The fertilizer in the experimental area was applied at the rate of 25.0 kg N and 50.0 kg P_2O_5 ha⁻¹ as it is a recommended dose for Kharif cultivation of groundnut in the region. All the recommended package of practices were followed for raising healthy crop. Data were recorded for days to first flower, days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, plant height, primary branches per plant, number of mature pods per plant, number of immature pods per plant, 100-pod weight, 100- kernel weight, shelling out-turn, oil content, protein content, kernel yield per pod, pod yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index. The phenotypic and genotypic correlation coefficients of all the characters were worked-out as per Al-Jibouri et al. (1958) and path coefficient analysis was carried-out as per the method suggested by Dewey and Lu (1959).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of variance revealed that highly significant differences among the genotypes were observed for all the traits except oil content, which indicating the presence of good amount of genetic variability among the material studied. The genotypic correlations were higher than the phenotypic correlation for most of the character studied that indicating least environmental effects on the expression of the traits (Table 1). In the present study, pod yield per plant was found to be highly significant and positively correlated with number of mature pods per plant,

ి కా పాలికి కా కారించింది.	30.2 (°-) 2.	a a co co co co c	(1.) corrora	"O. 2000"	ີເຈັດເລີຍ	D.8. 6 C.E.	2002 - 3	00-8 J.S							
	Dey.	10 Deys (0	Days (o		Viene C	No. 0.	N. 0.	(8) "M		S'-c''-B	0. 001/001	³ .0'.c'n 601'.cn'	Kerre. Vic.el	3.0.05.cc. V.c.C/	L'Erves. Index (%)
		awain a		(com)	Parane.	20ćs/ "5`zr".	2063/5 22		w (8)	(3/3)	(%)	(a/a)	Dien (B)	ý. zr. (8)	
Piciójen (B)	0	0.00	0.025	0.12	0.059	0.863	0.300	0.255	0.273	0.183	0.023	0020	0.918	0.579	0.738
		0.073	. 50'0	0.085	0.036	-0.81 20**	0.182	**8/60	0.258**	0.079	0.00	800	0.880**	0.500**	0.678**
DEYS (D . **		0.8.3	0.112	0.093	0,226	0.227	0.22.1	01.10	0.267	0.235	0.187/	0.038	02/2	0.033	01.0
.owc:		0.752**	** 11.10	0.077	0.07	0.200*	0.222	0.095	0.25/ **	0.200*	0,056	0.003	02.144	0.025	0.27
Days to 50%			0.931	0,026	0.156	0.189	0.230	.5.0	0.250	0.379	0.051	16:0	0.2/2		0.225
OWCTTB			0.663**	600.0	0.038	0.162*	0.096	0.098	0.188*	0.27/3**	0.00/	0.063	0.195*	063*	0.190*
Jeys to metanty				0.186	0.068	0.136	0.360	0.229	0,299	0.522.	0.036	0.180	0.22.	1.120	0.78
				0	0.080.0	0.087	0.082	0.5.	0.11	0.259**	0.0.2	67.00	0.103	11.0	1/0'0
" and " wight (am)					0.293	0.260	61.0.0	0.315	0.200	0.257	0.299	0.550	0.195	0.08/	0.02
					⊕⊕.*	0.195*	0.0.	0.22. **	160'0	0.096	0.158	0.289**	0.25	0.053	0.168*
Variantery						0.162	0.052		0.651	0.008	11:0		1	0.069	0.187
mandings / Same						0.00	0.027	0.186*	** 11.6° 0	0.071	0.130	0.062	0.031		0.039
v. o							0.313	0.132	0.100	0.191	0.005	0.356	0.939	07.00	0.699
nočs/niemi							0.250	0.083	10:0	0.350**	0.027	0.223**	0.87// **	0.3/ 9**	0.593**
ňa. a								90	0.036		1:00:0	. J dr. dr.	0.261	0.3	0.7
nis/sieri								0.023	0.017	0.123	0.078	0.027	*\$1.70	\$/.8. °C	0.088
the pact weight									011.0		0.3/6	0.053	0.315	0.032	182.0
									0°9/0**	0.132	0.059	0.0.9	0.255**	0.021	0.279**
and accord.										0,266	0.536	0.260	0.306	10	0.7:8
vaigin (8)										0.213**	0.3/	.7.0.0	0.29.**	0.087	0.35"**
the second second											0.52	6.5°12.	0.5/7	0.35	0.212.
9(a)											ter and	*96.0	0.5.9**	1 under 13	0.035
)												6.838	0.13	0.2.5	0.236
												0.397/##	.800	0.165*	13 1 ° M
2.00,00m 8.00m/0m/													0.399	15.0	0.396
9(a)													1. 2000 w	90.0	\$269#
New C.														0.122	0.735
icidiyan (B)														0./03**	0.592**
štočogiceč vicić															10.0
9. a. (2)	5 ^{4 2}	τ	C. 1940 70 0	0.0											0.257**

[Internat. J. Plant Sci., 6 (1); (Jan., 2011)]

●HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE●

	2° C (%) &	c Accouction	S. () 250	COO	SC ECE YS	S S TOWN TO	E. 1960 & 16	- 100- 10C	8	0.000	8. 78.6.60.78		S. Co			
	Y.aC.	a Deys to	Days to	and the	Anonia	No. o.	10.0.	1747 - 1747 -	and .	8	0	Drocaria	Kerne.	3.0.08.0		Constant and
Construction in the		50%0 Tr Coworing	A	(renonce hi en		cocs/	WC: P	weigin'	(%)	607.077 (%)	(%)	y.c.c hizer	z. y.c.c. 5.z.: (g)	(%)	wr.r. 200. Viciel
						Anna and a	and the second	(3)	(2)				(3)			D' Tree
WYY CO SAV		1. n. n. h.	5000	- 1742 47	800.4	0.003	Somme	Lanar ar	800.0	Earah an	2000	(2 draw "	Earsto ar	131341 13 232341 43	Errer 2	15:0
owc:	5.0 G	5 0.03/	0.02.	0.002	0.003	60000	0.006	0000		60000	0.003	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.005	0.159
3503 00 sost	20-0-2	9 0.0/8	110.0	0.001	Franch w	0.009	0.0.	1.000	0.0.2	0.018	0.002	0.006	0.012	0.009	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	0.102
COWGER &	S 0.07	0.037	162.0	2002 0	. 00°.0	940.0	1000	1000	1.00.0	0.0.0	winds w	6000	1.000 00	9000	1.000	0.073
المحمد	CO.O 5	Charm 1.	1 8 45 M	1.0.0	500.0	1. 1. °	0.028	0.0.3	0.023	0100	800.0	0.0.0	1. 15 15	6.00	42 42	0.025
y	5° 0.00	2000 /	800.0	- 1742 AZ	44 Arar -	.000	. 1218 12 . 2219 23	. 1742° 12	42 2242 -	Cardran ar	ananan an Urupup up	- 1842 - 18 - 1842 - 18	- 1212'12 , 4949'42	. 1242 12 24242 42	121212" 12 272727 27	. 80.0
"I man have have a had	19 C.C.	Sur. 0. 20	0.0.3	690'0	0.020	8.0.0	Son a	1815 43	1.0.0	0.0.0	.000	0.039	8.0.0	Barrow as	10000	02
(am)	20 °.W	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	ርካ ሰካብኑ " "ሆኑ ሲካሪኑ "	0.0.0	the courses	Sur. a	ፈንፈንፈንግፈን ዲያዲያዲያ ዲ/	Erry is	12 Cray "	474 CARA "	100 m	Sum o	12 1212	1247 42 *****	6000	0.085
Anna termina grange	. 0. 00	5000 8	Corr. a	0.0.0	0.033	500.0	0.002	1.200	0.022.	ararar ar	0.026	1.00	- 1212 12 - 1212 12	Card as	9000	650'0
mano cos ha and	0.00	and an and an	17. 122215 19. 122215	22012 12	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	0000	636365"6) 222922 21	42472,42 424742,42	17177-17 191917-17	121242, 12 22242, 23	anana an	424242 XI	124242° 42	246727°54 284827°54	121212,12 424747,42	0.035
	a 0.03	9600	8.0.0	0.035	6.022	0.35	6100	8.00	1.00	1.90 0	. 00 m	0.0/8	1.6 . 0	1500	16000	0,853
počsvi zmi	0.00	5000 9	0.003	500.0	800.0	0.030	Ser. a	800.0	0.003	12 40 4 4	1. W. W.	1 1000 0	0.026	12 AN 42	0.0.8	00 190 190 190
No. of	E 0.02	2003	5000	:000	the draft "	100.0	1:00	0.002	the draft "	Strap of	0.000	Contract.	1000	1000	8000	0.300
počs/p.z.	0.00 0.00	ግ ለጉስት ብታ ት	" 1223" 13 " 1225" 13	121112 12 221112 23	araran ar	0.003	C. C. C.	121122 42 424242 42	1717717 27 292727 27	. 1212 12 - 4212 42	. mm 12	121242 1) 434942 1)	Carars ar	an crance	" mar a	0.327
. W poć wojęt	E U.U.	5.00 /	6.000	0.029	1100	17. 28° "	13 42 42	0.035	550.0	1. Car in	6200	Som O	1. Car is	Earth ar	0.025	0.255
(8)	m. 0. 20	ላን ለአስት . - ግብላው	17. (24)	0.003	00.0	N. N. N.	12012-1) 1222-1	1 12 12	\$00.0	12 1212 -	1200-12 12-12-12	121212 () 121212 ()	0.002	171727-17 222221-12	0.002	0.2/3
. W. Kerne.	10 m	0.0.9	0.022	0.0.5	0.0/8	8000	0.003	1.900 0	1.00	0.020	0.0.0	6.00	0.023	6000	0.031	0.273
weight (B)	20°0	0.002	.00.0	.00.0	0.002	. 00 0 . 00 0	12000 C)	200.0	6000	0.002	. mm. m	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	800.0	, 1212, 12 , 1212, 12	0.003	0.258
Secting out	5 0.00	5000 8	1.000	0.003	ararar ar ararar	1. 4442.42	the ward	0.001	Low as	5.4.4	1 100 00	1 andre 1	1 1212 12	2000	1000	0.183
(main (%)	\$0.05 E	6/400 8	9100	0.028	1.00	44 - 44 - 44 -	0.036	0.038	0.062	0.289	0.630	1.50.0	05.0	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	0.0.0	61.0.0
De arren man (B)	20°0.	S 0.003	0.002	1.0.0	0.035	131312 V	17. 17.17	0.0.0	0.025	0.027	0.076	0.038	0.008	0.00	0 W V	0.023
the solution of the	0.00	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	0000	0.003	Com a	ፈንረንሳን. ላን ፈንረንሳን. ላን	Strange as	000	0.002	0.002	9:00	0.006	1. 181. 13	0.003	0.002	.00.0
Protoin contant	E. 0.04	0.003	1200 0	0.0.2	0.0°	800.0	0.002	111.12	0.006	0.012	0.0.8	0.02.	800.0	0.003	0.008	0.200
(0/0)			0.001	0.005	.00.0	1000	0.000	ANANAN AN	0.00.	0.003	1.0000	0.0.1	0.003	0.002	10000	0.108
Xarro yici I	2.0 3.	8.03	160.0	0.083	1000	00/0		0.31	.2.0	0.232.	11 man	121 - 23 238 - 23	0.726	0. 30	03.3	0.918
y'er' (8)	0.1	8 0.36	100	180.0	0.023	0.5.3	0.23	61. 0	1060	0.36/	0.022	01.0	42 - 12 - 42 -	1.87.0	5.70	0.880
.3.0.08.sz.	0.0.	86000 /.	1.6. 12	0.0/3	0.035	0.206	09.0	1. 0. 13	0.059	690.0	4.5 ° ° ° 4.8	6/.0:0	6.2.9	1.50	0.053	0.579
Viciolo and (B)	-0.0X	8 0.052	0.016	1.00	1000	· · · · 2	0.060	1 and as	0.028	- 1212 12	0.053	0.037	0.3.	0.3.9	0.085	0.500
L'ETVOS	E 0 C	0 0.32	0.086	0.060	0.108	6070	0.083	0.10	0.2/5	0.159	0.138	0.232	0.73.	0.061	0.586	0.738
(%) * 2mj ** indige (%)	10.0 c.0	7 0.072 2. 07 VE 1.08 E	0.017	0.05/	0.0.5 CVC 8 TC8	0.22/ scot 1 vol v	0.033 2.04 - 1	0.09/	0.133	0.0.1	0.053	6100	0.22/	0.0	0.378	0.678

•HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE•

[Internat. J. Plant Sci., 6 (1); (Jan., 2011)]

number of immature pods per plant, 100-pod weight, 100 kernel weight, kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index at phenotypic levels. Similar results were obtained by Sharma and Gupta (2008) for number of mature pods per plant and harvest index, John et al. (2009) for number of mature pods per plant and 100kernel weight, John et al. (2008) for kernel yield per plant, John et al. (2005) for biological yield per plant. The pod yield per plant was positively correlated at both phenotypic and genotypic levels with primary branches per plant (John et al., 2008 and Savaliya et al., 2008), number of immature pods per plant (Paramesharappa et al., 2008) and shelling out-turn (Mane et al., 2008 and Paramesharappa et al., 2008). Pod yield per plant exhibited negative correlation with days to first flower, days to 50% flowering, plant height and protein content at both phenotypic and genotypic levels. The negative association between these traits has been reported by Awatade et al., (2010) for plant height and John et al. (2005) for days to first flower and days to 50% flowering. The present results on correlation coefficients thus, revealed that the days to 50% flowering, primary branches per plant, number of mature pods per plant, 100-pod weight, 100-kernel weight, kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index were the most important attributes and may contribute considerably towards higher pod yield. The interrelationship among yield components would help in increasing the yield levels and therefore, more emphasis should be given to these components while selecting better types in groundnut.

The path coefficient analysis indicated that the kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index exhibited high and positive direct effects on pod yield per plant (Table 2). Thus, these characters turned-out to be the major components of pod yield. Plant height and 100kernel weight exhibited moderate and positive direct effects towards pod yield. The highest positive direct effect on pod yield per plant also conformed by John et al. (2007), Sharma and Gupta (2008) and Sharma and Dashora (2009). The maximum and positive direct effects of kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index have also been reported by Bera and Das (2000) and Awatade et al. (2010). It was apparent from the path analysis that maximum direct effects as well as appreciable indirect influences were exerted by plant height, 100-kernel weight, kernel yield per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index towards pod yield. These characters also exhibited positive association with pod yield per plant except plant height and hence, they may be considered as the most important yield contributing characters and due emphasis should be placed on these components while breeding for high yielding types in groundnut.

REFERENCES

- Al-Jibouri, H.A., Miller, P.A. and Robinson, H.F. (1958). Genotypic and environmental variances in upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. *Agron. J.*, **50**: 633-635.
- Awatade, S.M., Thaware, B.L., Jadhav, B.B. and Gaikwad, K.J. (2010). Correlation and path analysis in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ.*, **35**(1): 29-31.
- Bera, S.K. and Das, P.K. (2000). Path coefficient analysis in groundnut at different locations and years. *Agril. Sci. Digest.*, **20**: 9-12.
- Dewey, D.R. and Lu, K.H. (1959). Correlation and path analysis of component of created wheat grass seed production. *Agron. J.*, **51**: 513-518.
- John, K., Vasanthi, R.P. and Venkateswarlu, O. (2007). Variability and correlation studies for pod yield and its attributes in F_2 generation of six Virginia x Spanish crosses of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Legume Res.*, **30**(4):292-296.

- John, K., Vasanthi, R.P. and Venkateswarlu, O. (2009). Studies on variability and association in Spanish bunch groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Legume Res.*, 32(1):65-69.
- John, K., Vasanthi, R.P., Venkateswarlu, O. and Sudhakar, P. (2005). Genetic variability and correlation studies among F_1 and parents in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). Legume Res., **28**(4):262-267.
- John, K., Vasanthi, R.P., Venkateswarlu, O., Muralikrishna, T. and Naidu, P.H. (2008). Genetic analysis and regression studies for yield and yield attributes in F_2 segregating populations of groundnut crosses. *Legume Res.*, **31**(1):26-30.
- Mane, P.S., Lad, D.B. and Jagtap, P.K. (2008). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in summer bunch groundnut. *J. Maharashtra agric. Univ.*, **33**(2): 174-176.
- Parameshwarappa, K.G., Mahabasari, T.A. and Lingaraja, B.S. (2008). Analysis of correlation and path effect among yield attributing traits in two crosses of large seeded groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). J. Oilseeds Res., 25(1): 4-7.

•HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE•

- Savaliya, J.J., Pansuriya, A.G., Sodavadiya, P.R. and Leva, R.L. (2008). Character association study in interspecific and intraspecific hybrids derivatives of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) under high dose of fertilizers. *Internat. J. Biosci. Reporter*, **6**(2):217-221.
- Sharma, M. and Dashora, A. (2009). Character association and path analysis in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *J. Oilseeds Res.*, **26**(Special Issue): 614-616.
- Sharma, L.K. and Gupta, S.C. (2008). Nature and magnitude of association of pod yield with different morphological character in parents and hybrids of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Nantl. J. Pl. Improv.*, **10**(2): 129-132.

******* *****