Genetic variability and correlation analysis of yield and its contributing traits in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) for drought tolerance

S. Singh, A. H. Madakemohekar, L. C. Prasad and R. Prasad

Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Institute of Agricultural Sciences Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi- 221005, India.

(Received: November 2014; Revised: December 2015; Accepted: January 2015)

Abstract

The experimental material comprised of 25 most diverse genotypes along with 2 checks varieties were sown in randomized block design with four replications in both rainfed and irrigated environment. Significant variations were revealed for all the characters under study. High GCV and PCV were observed for peduncle length followed by number of grain per ear and grain yield per plant under both environments. The estimates of broad sense heritability was highest for number of grain per ear, plant height, peduncle length and flag leaf length in irrigated environment, while in rainfed environment it was highest for peduncle length, plant height, flag leaf length and 1000 grain weight. Positive and significant association was shown by grain yield per plant with plant height, flag leaf length, flag leaf length, flag leaf length, flag leaf width and number of grains per ear. Path coefficient analysis revealed direct high positive effect on number of grains per ear, 1000 grain weight, flag leaf width and number of effective tillers per plant.

Key words: Barley, drought tolerance, heritability, correlation

Introduction

Barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) is one of the founder crops of Old World agriculture and has fourth rank among the major food grains. The global acreage and production of barley is 58.69 million ha and 150 million tonnes respectively, with an average yield potential of 2540 kg per ha. The important countries growing this crop are European union, Russia, Ukrain, Canada, Australia, Turkey and USA. India ranked 21st position in area and 18th position in production (FAO 2013-14). Barley has a bright future as salinity resistant and dual purpose crop for green forage and grain, and also in the form of regenerate crop, especially in arid region. Looking the global warming situation barley has a hope as edge crop to sustain the food security. Barley is an important winter cereal crop in the northern plains of India. It is primarily grown as a rain-fed crop in poor marginal soils of the states. The growing area and production of barley in the country has now stabilized in the last few years with minor fluctuation depending on the demand and price situation as well as weather condition. During rabi, 2013-14 about 1730 thousand tonnes of barley has been produced with 25.5 g/ha average productivity in 671thousand hectares. Among the states, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh leads in both area and production while Punjab has an edge over other states in terms of average yield followed by Haryana and Uttar Pradesh.

Till date availability of desirable genotypes with better yielding is not completely satisfactory. Hence effort is being made to develop the desirable genotype which also can be adopted in various range of environmental stress; it is the ultimate goal of plant breeders (Sabaghpour et al., 2003). This can be possible only when we select the desirable genotypes and traits to be transferred. Also the studies on genetic variability for yield and yield contributing traits and direct and indirect contribution of important yield components towards grain yield as well as to identify the characters of utmost importance that may be used as selection criteria will be of great significance in a barlev breedina programme. Identifvina and understanding mechanisms of drought tolerance is crucial to the development of tolerant commercial cultivars. Thus, the responses of plants to various stresses have for decades been the focus of physiological and molecular studies (Levitt 1980). In view of above fact the present investigation was undertaken.

Corresponding authors- e-mail: <u>anant.madke@gmail.com</u> Published by the Indian Society of Genetics, Biotechnology Research and Development Biotech Bhawan 5 E Nikhil Estate, DPS Road, Shastripuram, Agra 282007 Online management by <u>www.isgbrd.co.in</u>

Materials and methods

Twenty five genotypes derived from different crosses were used as test genotypes along with two checks (Lakhan and Jyoti). These genotypes were developed and maintained by All India Co-ordinated Barley Improvement Project. The present investigation was conducted during the rabi season at the Agriculture Research Farm of Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with four replications. Each entry was sown with a six row of 5 meter length with row to row spacing of 25 cm and plant to plant spacing of 10 cm. Recommended package of all agronomic practices were followed to raise a good crop. Ten competitively plants were selected randomly for recording the data on yield and its contributing traits viz., days to 50 percent heading, days to maturity, plant height, number of effective tillers per plant, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, peduncle length, spike length with awn, number of grains per spike, grain yield per plant and 1000 grain weight. The mean data of each plot was used for statistical analysis.

Genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation were estimated as per Burton (1952). The broad sense heritability and genetic advance as percent of mean were calculated as proposed by Johnson *et al.* (1955). Correlation coefficient were estimated using the variance and covariance components as given by Miller et al (1958). and path coefficient analysis was estimated according to the method suggested by Dewey and Lu (1959).

Results and discussion

The analysis of variance indicated highly significant difference among the genotypes for all the eleven characters studied in both the environment. Highest estimate of genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variance was noted for peduncle length, grain yield per plant, and number of grains per ear in both irrigated and rainfed environments. Hence, these traits could be utilized for selection programme. Similar results were also reported by Shahinnia *et al.* (2005), Mishra *et al.* (2008), Singh *et al.* (2008) and Jalata *et al.* (2011). Heritability in broad sense was high for grains per ear, plant height, peduncle length, flag leaf length and 1000 grain weight. These finding was in accordance with Singh *et al.* (2006), Mohammadii *et al.* (2006), Pal *et al.* (2010), and Eshghi *et al.* (2011). High heritability coupled with high genetic advance as percent of mean were observed for peduncle length, number of grains per ear, grain yield per plant and leaf length. Mishra et al. (2007), Singh *et al.* (2008), Eshghi *et al.* (2011) and Jalata *et al.* (2011) also reported similar result which supported the present finding (Table 1).

Correlation coefficient under irrigated condition with grain yield per plant exhibit positive and significant correlation with plant height, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, number of grains per ear and 1000 grain weight. Hence selection of one or more of these traits would improve the grain yield per plant. These result were consonance with Al-Nashash et al. (2005), Singh et al. (2006), Pal et al. (2010) and Nikkhah et al. (2010). While for rainfed condition grain yield per plant showed positive and significant correlation with plant height, peduncle length, ear length, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, number of effective tillers per plant, number of grains per ear, 1000 grain weight and days to 50 percent flowering. These results are in conformity with the findings of Ataei et al. (2006), Singh et al. (2007) and Nikkhah et al. (2010) (Table 2). Path coefficient analysis revealed that grain yield per plant was directly influenced by number of grains per ear, 1000 grain weight, flag leaf width and number of effective tillers per plant in irrigated and Plant height, number of grains per ear, number of effective tillers per plant, days to 50 percent flowering and peduncle length in rainfed condition. Kara (2008), Mittal et al. (2009), Eshghi et al. (2011) and Zaefizadeh et al. (2011) also found the similar results (Table 3).

Table 1. Genetic parameter for yield and its component traits

| S. No. | Character | Mean | | Range | | PCV | | GCV | | Heritability in broad sense % | | Genetic advance as % of mean | |
|--------|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | | Rainfed | Irrigated | Rainfed | Irrigated | Rainfed | Irrigated | Rainfed | Irrigated | Rainfed | Irrigated | Rainfed | Irrigated |
| 1 | Days to75% heading | 76.22 | 80.85 | 72.2-79.7 | 77.2-84.7 | 2.83 | 2.41 | 5.56 | 2.13 | 81.92 | 77.95 | 4.77 | 3.87 |
| 2 | Days to Maturity | 105.09 | 111.66 | 101.2-113.5 | 108.2-116.2 | 2.80 | 2.13 | 2.52 | 1.81 | 80.98 | 71.98 | 4.67 | 3.16 |
| 3 | Plant Height(cm) | 83.46 | 103.22 | 63.8-117.4 | 78.7-128.9 | 13.98 | 10.98 | 13.87 | 10.92 | 98.47 | 98.91 | 28.36 | 22.36 |
| 4 | Peduncle length (cm) | 7.89 | 10.01 | 1.3-13.6 | 3.5-16.3 | 45.46 | 36.30 | 45.24 | 35.92 | 99.01 | 97.95 | 92.74 | 73.24 |
| 5 | Ear length(cm) | 17.35 | 19.02 | 14.5-20.4 | 15.3-22.6 | 10.07 | 8.71 | 8.76 | 6.91 | 75.65 | 62.77 | 15.70 | 11.27 |
| 6 | Flag leaf length(cm) | 9.76 | 13.96 | 7.1-11.8 | 10.6-18.6 | 18.64 | 12.96 | 15.46 | 15.05 | 97.99 | 96.75 | 37.64 | 30.48 |
| 7 | Flag leaf width (cm) | 1.17 | 1.50 | 0.8-1.3 | 1.2-1.9 | 16.83 | 16.45 | 14.84 | 13.13 | 77.78 | 63.75 | 26.97 | 21.60 |
| 8 | No. of effective tiller/plant | 4.08 | 4.58 | 3.3-4.7 | 3.9-5.1 | 9.87 | 6.97 | 9.03 | 5.62 | 83.73 | 65.10 | 17.02 | 9.35 |
| 9 | No. Of grains/ear | 51.62 | 58.61 | 22.8-63.0 | 27.1-76.7 | 24.15 | 24.52 | 23.36 | 24.46 | 93.58 | 99.61 | 46.56 | 50.30 |
| 10 | 1000 grain weight(g) | 48.08 | 51.06 | 40.8-54.2 | 41.8-59.2 | 7.31 | 8.49 | 7.18 | 8.33 | 96.43 | 96.25 | 14.52 | 16.84 |
| 11 | Grain yield/plant(g) | 5.97 | 7.66 | 3.4-9.7 | 4.1-11.04 | 25.46 | 24.17 | 22.71 | 22.40 | 79.59 | 85.89 | 41.74 | 42.77 |

S. Singh et al.

| Charecters | Environm ents | Plant Height (cm) | Peduncle length (cm) | Ear Length (cm) | Flag leaf length (cm) | Flag leaf width (cm) | Eeffective tiller/plant | No. Of grains/ ear | 1000 grain weight (g) | Days to75% heading | Days to maturity | Grain yield/ plant(g) |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Dianat Liaischt (ana | Rainfed | 1.00 | 0.638** | 0.548** | 0.512** | 0.537** | 0.114 | 0.336** | 0.363** | 0.308** | 0.533** | 0.664** |
| Plant Height (cm | Irrigated | 1.00 | 0.269** | 0.332** | 0.225* | 0.213* | -0.002 | 0.184 | 0.427** | 0.055 | 0.149 | 0.275** |
| Peduncle length (cm) | Rainfed | | 1.00 | 0.123 | 0.353** | 0.482** | 0.059 | 0.137 | 0.219* | 0.044 | 0.229* | 0.456** |
| | Irrigated | | 1.00 | -0.42 | 0.250* | 0.123 | -0.166 | 0.029 | 0.274** | -0.171 | 0.009 | 0.146 |
| E - u la cantle dans | Rainfed | | | 1.00 | 0.409** | 0.203* | 0.016 | 0.440** | 0.160 | 0.316** | 0.463** | 0.373** |
| Ear length (cm | Irrigated | | | 1.00 | 0.159 | -0.049 | -0.115 | 0.191* | 0.095 | 0.051 | 0.206* | 0.141 |
| | Rainfed | | | | 1.00 | 0.487** | 0.272** | 0.090 | 0.352** | 0.118 | 0.274** | 0.376** |
| Flag leaf length (cm) | Irrigated | | | | 1.00 | 0.486** | 0.037 | 0.354** | 0.378** | -0.071 | -0.057 | 0.469** |
| | Rainfed | | | | | 1.00 | 0.254* | 0.312** | 0.019 | 0.092 | 0.148 | 0.401** |
| Flag lear width (cm) | Irrigated | | | | | 1.00 | -0.063 | 0.505** | 0.202* | 0.227 | 0.131 | 0.544** |
| | Rainfed | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.159 | -0.118 | -0.195* | -0.164 | 0.329** |
| Eenective tiller/plant | Irrigated | | | | | | 1.00 | -0.055 | -0.025 | -0.302** | -0.295** | 0.082** |
| | Rainfed | | | | | | | 1.00 | -0.224* | 0.101 | 0.198* | 0.475** |
| No. Of grains/ ear | Irrigated | | | | | | | 1.00 | -0.169 | -0.007 | -0.006 | 0.624** |
| 1000 grain weight | Rainfed | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.156 | 0.211* | 0.198* |
| (g) | Irrigated | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.013 | 0.043 | 0.269** |
| Days to75% | Rainfed | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.763** | 0.287** |
| heading | Irrigated | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.769** | -0.018 |
| Davis ta incaturit | Rainfed | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | 0.406** |
| Days to maturity | Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 | -0.027 |
| | Rainfed | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 |
| Grain yield/plant(g) | Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

 Table 2. Correlation coefficient analysis for yield and its components

Table 3. Path coefficient analysis for yield and its components

| Characters | Environ -ments | Plant Height (cm) | Peduncle length (cm) | Ear length (cm) | Flag leaf length (cm) | Flag leaf width (cm) | Eeffective tiller /plant | No. Of grains/ ear | 1000 grain weight (g) | Days to75% heading | Days To maturity | Correl- ation (r) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Plant Height (om | Rainfed | 0.397 | 0.086 | -0.055 | 0.009 | -0.035 | 0.032 | 0.114 | 0.039 | 0.050 | 0.024 | 0.665 |
| Flain Height (Chi | Irrigated | -0.036 | 0.013 | 0.013 | 0.009 | 0.038 | -0.003 | 0.106 | 0.136 | 0.001 | -0.006 | 0.275 |
| Dedunale length (am) | Rainfed | 0.253 | 0.135 | -0.012 | 0.006 | -0.031 | 0.017 | 0.046 | 0.024 | 0.007 | 0.010 | 0.456 |
| reduitcle lengui (ciii) | Irrigated | -0.009 | 0.049 | -0.001 | 0.010 | 0.022 | -0.023 | 0.016 | 0.087 | -0.004 | -0.001 | 0.146 |
| For length (cm | Rainfed | 0.218 | 0.016 | -0.101 | 0.007 | -0.013 | 0.004 | 0.149 | 0.017 | 0.052 | 0.021 | 0.372 |
| Ear lengui (enr | Irrigated | -0.012 | -0.002 | 0.039 | 0.006 | -0.009 | -0.016 | 0.110 | 0.030 | 0.001 | -0.008 | 0.140 |
| Flag loof longth (am) | Rainfed | 0.203 | 0.047 | -0.041 | 0.018 | -0.032 | 0.078 | 0.030 | 0.038 | 0.019 | 0.012 | 0.376 |
| Flag lear length (Chi) | Irrigated | -0.008 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.040 | 0.087 | 0.005 | 0.204 | 0.120 | -0.001 | 0.002 | 0.469 |
| Flag loof width (cm) | Rainfed | 0.213 | 0.065 | -0.020 | 0.009 | -0.066 | 0.070 | 0.105 | 0.002 | 0.015 | 0.006 | 0.401 |
| Flag lear width (Chi) | Irrigated | -0.007 | 0.006 | -0.002 | 0.019 | 0.180 | -0.008 | 0.292 | 0.064 | 0.005 | -0.005 | 0.544 |
| Eaffactive tiller/plant | Rainfed | 0.045 | 0.008 | -0.001 | 0.005 | -0.016 | 0.287 | 0.054 | -0.013 | -0.032 | -0.007 | 0.329 |
| L'effective tiffet/plant | Irrigated | 0.001 | -0.008 | -0.004 | 0.001 | -0.011 | 0.140 | -0.030 | -0.007 | -0.007 | 0.011 | 0.082 |
| No. Of grains/ oar | Rainfed | 0.134 | 0.018 | -0.044 | 0.002 | -0.020 | 0.045 | 0.339 | -0.024 | 0.016 | 0.009 | 0.475 |
| No. Of grains/ car | Irrigated | -0.006 | 0.001 | 0.007 | 0.014 | 0.090 | -0.007 | 0.578 | -0.054 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 0.624 |
| 1000 grain waight (g) | Rainfed | 0.144 | 0.029 | -0.016 | 0.006 | -0.001 | -0.034 | -0.076 | 0.109 | 0.025 | 0.009 | 0.198 |
| 1000 grani weight (g) | Irrigated | -0.015 | 0.013 | 0.003 | 0.015 | 0.036 | -0.003 | -0.097 | 0.319 | 0.003 | -0.001 | 0.269 |
| Dava to 75% baading | Rainfed | 0.012 | 0.005 | -0.032 | 0.002 | -0.006 | -0.056 | 0.034 | 0.017 | 0.164 | 0.035 | 0.287 |
| Days 1075% neading | Irrigated | -0.002 | -0.008 | 0.002 | -0.002 | 0.040 | -0.042 | -0.004 | 0.004 | 0.025 | -0.030 | -0.018 |
| Dave to meturity | Rainfed | 0.211 | 0.031 | -0.046 | 0.005 | -0.009 | -0.047 | 0.067 | 0.023 | 0.125 | 0.045 | 0.406 |
| Days to maturity | Irrigated | -0.005 | 0.004 | 0.008 | -0.002 | 0.023 | -0.041 | -0.003 | 0.013 | 0.019 | -0.039 | -0.027 |

References

- Al-Nashash A., Migdadi H., Saoubm H. and Mausoud S. 2005. Evaluation of Jordanian barley landraces in contrasting environments as influenced by the adaptation level of barley germ plasm. Annals of Applied Biology, 147: 235-244.
- Ataei, M. 2006. Path abalysis of barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) yield. *Tarim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(3): 227-232.
- Burton G.W. 1952. Quantitative inheritance in grasses. Proc 6th Int. Grass land cong. 1: 211-283.
- 4. **Dewey D.R. and Lu K.H. 1959.** A correlation and path coefficient analysis of component of crested wheat grass seed production. *Agron. J.*, **51**: 515-518.
- Eshghi R.J., Ojaghi and Salayeva S. 2011. Genetic gain through selection indices in hulless barley. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology*. 13 (2): 191-197.
- Jalata Z., Ayana A. and Zeleke H. 2011. Variability, heritability and genetic advance for some yield and yield related traits in Ethiopian Barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) landraces and crosses. International Journal of Plant Breeding and Genetics. 5(1): 44-52.
- Johnson H.W., Robinson H.F. and Comstock R.E. 1955. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybean. *Agron. J.*, 47: 314-318.
- Kara B. 2008. Effects of different tillage practices on the trait association in barley. *Turkish Journal* of Field Crops. 13(1): 32-43.
- Levitt J. 1980. Chilling, freezing and high temperature stress, in responses of plants to environmental stress. *Academic, New York*, pp. 105-135.
- Miller D.A., Williams J.C., Robinson H.F. and Comstock K.B. 1958. Estimates of genotypic and environmental variances and covariances in upland cotton and their implication in selection. *Agron. J.*, 50: 126-131.
- 11. Mishra C.N., Singh S.K., Singh P.C., Bhardwaj D.N. and Singh H.L. 2007. Genetic variability in barley. International Journal of Plant Science,

3(2):220-221.

- 12. Mittal V.P., Brar K.S. and Singh P. 2009. Interrelationships and path coefficient analysis for yield and component characters in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Science,*. **5**(1): 151-153.
- Nikkhan H.R., Saberi M.H. and Mahlouji M. 2010. Study of effective traits on grain yield of two and six row barley genotypes (Hordeum vulgare L.) under terminal drought stress conditions. *Iranian Journal of Crop Sciences*, 12(2): 170-184.
- Pal S., Singh T. and Ramesh B. 2010. Estimation of genetic parameters in barley (Hordeum vulgare L.). *Crop Improvement*, 37(1): 52-56.
- Sabaghpour S.H., Sadeghi E. and Malthora S. 2003. Present status and future prospects of chickpea cultivation in Iran. International check pea conference (20-22 Jan. 2003). Raipur Chhattisgarh, India.
- Shahinnia F., Rezai A.M. and Tabatabaei B.E. 2005. Variation and path coefficient abalysis of important agronomic traits in two and six-rowed recombinant inbred lines of barley (*Horedum vulgare* L.) *Czech Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding*, 41: 246-250.
- Singh H.L., Singh S.K., Singh P. and Singh B.C. 2006. Genetic variability and characters association in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). *International Journal of Plant Sciences* (*Muzaffarnagar*), 1 (2): 256-258.
- Singh S.K., Hasmat Ali, Mishra C.N., Daya R., Singh H.L. and Bhardwaj D.N. 2007. Character asociation among some quantitative traits in barley (Hordeum vulgare L.). Internat. J. Plant Sci., 207(2) :202-204
- Singh S.K., Sirohi A., Kerkhi S.A., Singh D., Kumar V., Singh A., Singh S.P. and Singh R.P. 2008. Genetic variability and correlation coefficient for grain yield in barley. *Environment* and Ecology, 26(4C):2379-2381.
- 20. Zaefizadeh M., Ghasemi M., Azimi J., Khayatnezhad M. and Ahadzadeh B. 2011. Correlation analysis and path analysis for yield and its components in hulless barley. *Adcances in Ecnironment Biology*, 5(1): 123-126