www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

Raval Kalpesh
Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding, N. M College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University, Navsari,
Gujarat, India

RK Patel
Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding, N. M College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University, Navsari,
Gujarat, India

Rajesh Panchal
Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding, N. M College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University, Navsari,
Gujarat, India

KG Modha
Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding, N. M College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University, Navsari,
Gujarat, India

Morpho-biochemical characterization to assess the genetic diversity, correlation and path analysis in mango ginger (*Curcuma amada* ROXB.)

Raval Kalpesh, RK Patel, Rajesh Panchal and KG Modha

Abstract
The present investigation was carried out at the Research Farm, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari (Gujarat) during the *kharif*-2018. Twelve different quantitative characters related to rhizome yield were recorded and subjected for estimation of analysis of variance revealed significant differences between genotypes indicating presence of sufficient amount of variability in all the studied characters. The studied materials revealed wide range of variation by virtue of exhibiting highly significant genotypic differences for all the twelve traits. The magnitudes of genotypic correlations were higher as compared to the corresponding phenotypic correlations indicating that there was an inherent association between all the characters at genotypic level. Path coefficient analysis showed rhizome width, leaf width, mother rhizomes per plant, leaf length and leaves per plant exhibited positive direct effects on green rhizome yield per plant. Hence, priority should be given to these traits in mango ginger improvement programme.

Keywords: Correlation, heritability, mango ginger, path analysis, variability

Introduction
Mango ginger (*Curcuma amada* Roxb., 2n = 42) is an important member of the genus *Curcuma* and is commonly known as mango ginger due to morphological resemblance of its aromatic rhizome with ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) and having raw unripe mango like aroma. The specific epithet *amada* is derived from Bengali meaning mango ginger referring to the rhizome having characteristic flavour of unripe mango. The crop is popular by many vernacular names like mango ginger in English, ama-haldi in Hindi, ambahaldar in Gujarati, karpuraharidra in Sanskrit, amada in Bengali, mavinakayi in Kannad, mangaiinji in Tamil, mamidiallamu in Telugu and manga inchi in Malayalam. The crop is found in wild as well as in cultivated forms and its distribution is confined to South-East Asia mainly India, Myanmar and Bangladesh. In India, it is under small scale cultivation in West Bengal, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and in the North-Eastern states. The crop originated in the Indo-Malayan region and distributed widely in the tropics from Asia to Africa and in Australia (Sasikumar, 2005) [26]. Out of 10 *Curcuma* species, 2 species *Curcuma amada* and *Curcuma zeodaria* are distributed throughout India in the wild and cultivated forms; 4 species, *Curcuma aeruginosa, Curcuma brog, Curcuma caesia* and *Curcuma sylvatica* occurs in wild conditions and distributed throughout North-Eastern part of India. *Curcuma malabarica* and *Curcuma aromatic* occur in South India, while *Curcuma raktakanta* and *Curcuma harita* are distributed throughout Kerala (Velayudhan *et al.*, 1999) [34]. Many species belonging to this genus having a significant value as medicines, dyes and spices (Islam, 2004) [9].

Estimation of genetic variability in conjunction with heritability and genetic advance gives an idea about possible ways of improvement in the character. Studies on mango ginger with an objective of assessing their genetic variability and genetics of agronomic characters have been attempted only to a limited extent. Hence, the present experiment has been designed with the objectives of analyzing the genetic variability, character association and genetic divergence of *Curcuma amada* Roxb. based on accessions collected from various areas of Gujarat state, so as to generate additional information and also to identify the best performing genotypes from them. This research will be useful for the sake of efficient management and differentiation of various land races and would also be helpful to the plant breeders to select readily varied parents, which will add new germplasm base for future mango ginger breeding programmes to meet the ever-increasing demand of mango ginger for industrial and pharmaceutical uses.

Corresponding Author:
Raval Kalpesh
Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding, N. M College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University, Navsari,
Gujarat, India

Materials and Methods
The experimental materials comprised of thirty diverse genotypes of mango ginger (Table 6), which were maintained at Research Farm, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari. The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Block Design with 30 treatments and 3 replications. The planting was done on raised beds spaced row to row 45 cm with plant to plant distance of 30 cm. All the recommended package of practices was adopted for raising a successful and healthy crop. Data was collected from five randomly selected plants, excluding the border ones, from each plot of all the three replications were tagged and used for recording the observations. The average value of data from these plants was computed and used for statistical analysis.

The data recorded for all the characters were subjected to analysis of variance with the formula suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1978) [16]. Phenotypic and genotypic components of variance were estimated by applying the formula as suggested by Cochran and Cox (1959) [4]. Heritability in broad sense refers to the proportion of genetic variation to the total observed variance in the population. It has been estimated as per the formula given by Allard (1960) [1]. Genetic advance for each character was predicted by the formula given by Johnson et al. (1955). Phenotypic and genotypic co-efficient of variation were calculated by using formulae suggested by Cockerham (1963) [5]. Analysis of covariance for all possible pairs of characters was carried out using the procedure of Panse and Sukhatme (1978) [16]. Path analysis suggested by Wright (1921) [36] and Dewey and Lu (1959) [6] was adopted for each genotype separately in order to partition the genotypic correlation between variables with rhizome yield into direct and indirect effects of those variables on yield.

Results and Discussion
1. Analysis of variance
The mean sums of squares of all the twelve studied characters of mango ginger are summarized in (Table 1). The present experimental material showed a wide range of variation by virtue of exhibiting highly significant genotypic differences for all the studied twelve traits *viz.*, for plant height, tillers per plant, leaves per plant, leaf length, leaf width, rhizome length, rhizome width, rhizome weight, mother rhizomes per plant, primary fingers per rhizome, secondary fingers per rhizome and green rhizome yield. The preferred processing quality attributes like dry rhizome weight recovery, powder recovery and total oil content have also shown variation (Table 5). The investigation had shown ample amount of variability present in our experimental germplasm with wide range of phenotypic variability and significant genotypic differences for all the traits. This suggests that there is ample scope to develop high green rhizome yielding materials, provided that the material is subjected to judicious clonal selection pressure. Similar results in related *Zingiberaceae* family crops for most of the characters were also reported by Singh et al. (2000) [28], Hazra et al. (2002) [8], Singh et al. (2003) [31], Chattopadhyay et al. (2004) [3], Dhatt et al. (2008) [7], Rao et al. (2008) [21], Chaturvedi et al. (2009), Jadhav et al. (2009) [10], Jan et al. (2012) [11], Ravishanker et al. (2013) [24] and Nandkangre et al. (2016) [14].

2. Genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation
The value of phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) (Table 2) was recorded higher and closer to the respective genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for majority of traits under study indicates less influence of environment. The higher magnitude of genotypic coefficient of variation was observed for plant height (44.16%), leaves per plant (20.20%), leaf length (20.85%), rhizome width (21.12%), rhizome weight (23.16%), mother rhizomes per plant (24.90%) and green rhizome yield (32.87%) indicated the inherent connection between genotypic and phenotypic expression of these traits, hence offers a better opportunity for improvement through clonal selection. Analogous results were also given by Singh et al. (2003) [31], Chattopadhyay et al. (2004) [3], Singh et al. (2008) [29], Singh et al. (2012) [30], Ravishanker et al. (2013) [24], Prajapati et al. (2014) [17], Bahadur et al. (2016) [2] and Nandagakre et al. (2016) [14].

3. Heritability and genetic advance (%)
High estimates of heritability **(Table 2)** were observed for plant height (95.71%) followed by mother rhizomes per plant (86.59%), leaf length (85.57%), rhizome weight (85.55%), green rhizome yield (84.39%), rhizome width (82.90%), leaves per plant (82.05%), rhizome length (80.91%), primary fingers per rhizome (75.19%) and leaf width (66.72%) suggesting the existence of sufficient heritable variation and so selection based on phenotypic value could be effective for isolating better types. The genetic advance in percent was observed highest for plant height (89.00%) followed by green rhizome yield (62.20%) and mother rhizome per plant (47.73%). High heritability coupled with high genetic advance was found for plant height, tillers per plant, leaves per plant, leaf length, leaf width, rhizome length, rhizome width, rhizome weight, mother rhizomes per plant, primary fingers per rhizome and green rhizome yield indicated that these characters were governed by additive gene action. Hence, there are good chances of improvement of these traits through direct phenotypic clonal selection in the present materials. The above result was in resemblance with Singh et al. (2012) [30], Ravishanker et al. (2013) [24], Prajapati et al. (2014) [17], Rajyalakshmi et al. (2014) [19], Verma et al. (2014) [35], Bahadur et al. (2016) [2], Nandkangre et al. (2016) [14], Salimath et al. (2017) [25] and Veena et al. (2017) [33].

4. Correlation coefficients
Correlation study (Table 3), for all the traits revealed that genotypic correlations were higher as compared to corresponding phenotypic correlations for majority of the traits under study indicating that there was an inherent association between these characters at genotypic level. Green rhizome yield showed positive and significant correlation with plant height(r_g = 0.887 and r_p= 0.783), leaves per plant(r_g = 0.621 and r_p= 0.512), leaf length(r_g= 0.570 and r_p= 0.453), leaf width(r_g = 0.753 and r_p= 0.549), rhizome length(r_g = 0.949 and r_p= 0.767), rhizome width(r_g = 0.999 and r_p= 0.802), rhizome weight (r_g = 0.927 and r_p= 0.766), primary fingers per rhizome(r_g = 0.420 and r_p= 0.345) and secondary fingers per rhizome(r_g = 0.915 and r_p= 0.652) at both genotypic and phenotypic level. These association of characters was in the desirable direction, thus, selection practiced for the improvement in one character will automatically result in the improvement of other even though direct selection for improvement has not made for the green rhizome yield. Similar result was found by Raveendra et al. (2001) [22], Panja et al. (2002) [15], Prasad et al. (2004) [18],

Tomar *et al.* (2005) [32], Kumar *et al.* (2007) [12], Rao *et al.* (2008) [21], Ravishanker *et al.* (2013) [24], Prajapati *et al.* (2014) [17], Rajyalakshmi *et al.* (2014) [19], Verma *et al.* (2014) [35], Bahadur *et al.* (2016) [2].

Green rhizome yield per plant showed negative and significant correlation with mother rhizomes per plant at genotypic level and phenotypic level, while tillers per plant exhibited non-significant effect on green rhizome yield. Hence, direct weightage should not be given to these traits during improvement programme.

5. Path coefficient analysis

As per path coefficient analysis (Table 4), highest positive direct effect on green rhizome yield was exerted by rhizome width (10.035) followed by leaf width (2.740), mother rhizome per plant (0.966), leaf length (0.573) and leaves per plant (0.249) indicated that these traits may provide expected advance from selection for rhizome yield. The result was also in favor with Chattopadhyay *et al.* (2004) [3], Kumar *et al.*

(2007) [12], Sharon *et al.* (2011) [27] and Prajapati *et al.* (2014) [17]. Thus, these characters turned-out to be the major components of green rhizome yield. It also revealed that there was true relationship between these characters and green rhizome yield and hence direct selection of these characters could be highly rewarding in crop improvement programs.

There were some characters also which exhibited highest negative direct effect on green rhizome yield such as plant height (-4.934) followed by rhizome weight (-2.716), tillers per plant (-1.987), rhizome length (-1.920), secondary fingers per rhizome (-1.744) and primary fingers per rhizome (-0.954) but, they also exhibited positive indirect effect *via* other characters. Similar results were also observed by Prajapati *et al.* (2014) [17], Verma *et al.* (2014) [35], Bahadur *et al.* (2016) [2] and Ravi *et al.* (2017) [23].

Mother rhizomes per plant exhibited positive direct effect with negative correlation at both genotypic and phenotypic level. Hence, it would be better to avoid direct selection for this character when rhizome yield is to be increased.

Table 1: Analysis of variance (mean sum of square) for different characters of mango ginger

Source of Variation	df	Plant height (cm)	Tillers per plant	Leaves per plant	Leaf length (cm)	Leaf width (cm)	Rhizome length (cm)
Replication	2	20.32	2.96	0.72	2.41	0.12	0.63
Genotype	29	3681.06**	6.20**	83.23**	104.23**	7.00**	17.53**
Error	58	54.24	1.10	5.66	5.55	1.00	1.28
S.Em ±		4.25	0.61	1.37	1.36	0.58	0.65
C.D. at 5%		12.04	1.72	3.89	3.85	1.63	1.85
C.D at 1%		16.02	2.29	5.17	5.12	2.17	2.46
CV%		9.35	10.78	9.45	8.56	9.54	9.65

Source of Variation	df	Rhizome width (cm)	Rhizome weight (kg)	Mother rhizomes per plant	Primary fingers per rhizome	Secondary fingers per rhizome	Green rhizome yield (t/ha)
Replication	2	1.97	0.001	0.13	1.65	0.23	1.96
Genotype	29	32.61**	0.012**	16.40*	65.20**	6.27**	82.04**
Error	58	2.10	0.001	0.80	6.46	1.12	4.77
S.Em ±		0.84	0.01	0.52	1.47	0.61	1.26
C.D. at 5%		2.37	0.04	1.47	4.15	1.73	3.57
C.D at 1%		3.15	0.06	1.95	5.53	2.31	4.75
CV%		9.59	9.51	9.80	9.40	9.62	14.14

* and ** indicates significance at 5% and 1% levels of probability, respectively

Table 2: Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), heritability and genetic advance as per cent of mean for different characters of mango ginger

Sr. No	Characters	GCV %	PCV %	Heritability (Broad sense %)	Genetic advance	Genetic advance (% of mean)
1	Plant height (cm)	44.16	45.14	95.71	70.07	89.00
2	Tillers per plant	13.36	17.16	60.58	2.09	21.42
3	Leaves per plant	20.20	22.30	82.05	9.49	37.69
4	Leaf length (cm)	20.85	22.54	85.57	10.93	39.73
5	Leaf width (cm)	13.50	16.53	66.72	2.38	22.72
6	Rhizome length (cm)	19.86	22.08	80.91	4.31	36.81
7	Rhizome width (cm)	21.12	23.20	82.90	5.98	39.62
8	Rhizome weight (kg)	23.16	25.03	85.55	0.12	44.12
9	Mother rhizomes per plant	24.90	26.76	86.59	4.37	47.73
10	Primary fingers per rhizome	16.36	18.87	75.19	7.90	29.22
11	Secondary fingers per rhizome	11.88	15.28	60.41	2.10	19.02
12	Green rhizome yield (t/ha)	32.87	35.78	84.39	9.60	62.20

Table 3: Genotypic (r_g) and phenotypic (r_p) correlations of green rhizome yield with other characters of mango ginger

Traits	r	PH	TPP	LPP	LL	LW	RL	RWD	RWT	MRPP	PFPR	SFPR	GRY
PH	r_g	1.000	-0.118[NS]	0.472**	0.506**	0.782**	0.828**	0.912**	0.860**	-0.634**	0.311**	0.737**	0.887**
	r_p	1.000	-0.093[NS]	0.433**	0.453**	0.607**	0.747**	0.830**	0.792**	-0.549**	0.252*	0.540**	0.783**
TPP	r_g		1.000	0.090[NS]	0.257*	0.023[NS]	0.053[NS]	0.058[NS]	-0.186[NS]	-0.098[NS]	-0.132[NS]	-0.109[NS]	0.031[NS]
	r_p		1.000	0.188[NS]	0.130[NS]	-0.030[NS]	-0.002[NS]	0.075[NS]	-0.125[NS]	-0.074[NS]	-0.098[NS]	0.003[NS]	0.025[NS]
LPP	r_g			1.000	0.306**	0.416**	0.634**	0.611**	0.623**	-0.298**	0.318**	0.611**	0.621**

			LPP	LL	LW	RL	RWD	RWT	MRPP	PFPR	SFPR	GRY
	r_p		1.000	0.245*	0.286**	0.514**	0.519**	0.552**	-0.248*	0.287**	0.411**	0.512**
LL	r_g			1.000	0.489**	0.383**	0.471**	0.553**	-0.277**	0.089NS	0.312**	0.570**
	r_p			1.000	0.390**	0.324**	0.386**	0.475**	-0.249*	0.018NS	0.203NS	0.453**
LW	r_g				1.000	0.881**	0.653**	0.706**	-0.472**	0.211*	0.433**	0.753**
	r_p				1.000	0.625**	0.490**	0.519**	-0.359**	0.166NS	0.299**	0.549**
RL	r_g					1.000	0.883**	0.803**	-0.505**	0.458**	0.855**	0.949**
	r_p					1.000	0.754**	0.686**	-0.416**	0.360**	0.590**	0.767**
RWD	r_g						1.000	0.872**	-0.605**	0.419**	0.909**	0.999**
	r_p						1.000	0.751**	-0.509**	0.325**	0.626**	0.802**
RWT	r_g							1.000	-0.402**	0.348**	0.789**	0.927**
	r_p							1.000	-0.340**	0.283**	0.547**	0.766**
MRPP	r_g								1.000	0.093NS	-0.504**	-0.461**
	r_p								1.000	0.065NS	-0.363**	-0.409**
PFPR	r_g									1.000	0.301**	0.420**
	r_p									1.000	0.174NS	0.345**
SFPR	r_g										1.000	0.915**
	r_p										1.000	0.652**
GRY	r_g											1.000
	r_p											1.000

* and ** indicates significance at 5% and 1% levels of probability, respectively

PH = Plant height (cm)   TPP = Tillers per plant   LPP = Leaves per plant   LL = Leaf length (cm)
LW = Leaf width (cm)   RL = Rhizome length (cm)   RWD = Rhizome width (cm)   RWT = Rhizome weight (kg)
MRPP = Mother rhizomes per plant   PFPR = Primary fingers per rhizome   SFPR = Secondary fingers per rhizome
GRY = Green rhizome yield (t/ha)

Table 4: Direct and indirect effect of eleven causal variables on green rhizome yield of Mango ginger

Traits	PH	TPP	LPP	LL	LW	RL	RWD	RWT	MRPP	PFPR	SFPR
PH	-4.934	0.580	-2.329	-2.498	-3.860	-4.083	-4.501	-4.243	3.128	-1.535	-3.638
TPP	0.234	-1.987	-0.179	-0.511	-0.046	-0.106	-0.115	0.370	0.194	0.262	0.217
LPP	0.118	0.023	0.249	0.076	0.104	0.158	0.152	0.155	-0.074	0.079	0.152
LL	0.290	0.147	0.175	0.573	0.280	0.219	0.270	0.317	-0.159	0.051	0.178
LW	2.144	0.063	1.139	1.340	2.740	2.415	1.791	1.934	-1.295	0.578	1.188
RL	-1.589	-0.102	-1.217	-0.734	-1.692	-1.920	-1.695	-1.541	0.969	-0.879	-1.642
RWD	9.154	0.580	6.133	4.721	6.557	8.861	10.035	8.749	-6.071	4.200	9.122
RWT	-2.336	0.506	-1.692	-1.501	-1.916	-2.180	-2.368	-2.716	1.090	-0.946	-2.144
MRPP	-0.613	-0.094	-0.288	-0.268	-0.456	-0.488	-0.585	-0.388	0.966	0.090	-0.487
PFPR	-0.297	0.126	-0.303	-0.085	-0.201	-0.437	-0.399	-0.332	-0.089	-0.954	-0.287
SFPR	-1.286	0.190	-1.066	-0.543	-0.756	-1.491	-1.585	-1.376	0.879	-0.525	-1.744
Correlation coefficient	0.887**	0.031NS	0.621**	0.570**	0.753**	0.949**	0.999**	0.927**	-0.461**	0.420**	0.915**

* and ** indicates significance at 5% and 1% levels of probability, respectively

Residual = 0.358, Bold diagonal figures are direct effect of causal factor

PH = Plant height   TPP = Tillers per plant   LPP = Leaves per plant   LL = Leaf length
LW = Leaf width   RL = Rhizome length   RWD = Rhizome width   RWT = Rhizome weight
MRPP = Mother rhizomes per plant   PFPR = Primary fingers per rhizome   SFPR = Secondary fingers per rhizome
GRY = Green rhizome yield

Table 5: Mean values of genotypes for different traits of mango ginger

Genotypes	PH	TPP	LPP	LL	LW	RL	RWD	RWT	MRPP	PFPR	SFPR	GRY	DRWR	PR	TOC
NVMG-1	57.98	11.20	29.20	30.74	8.60	8.77	12.37	0.24	12.00	22.47	9.47	10.16	26.36	83.00	3.24
NVMG-2	53.81	9.43	22.53	28.29	8.99	8.27	12.11	0.20	9.40	17.93	11.33	10.66	21.52	84.50	3.87
NVMG-3	64.72	10.20	36.07	25.80	8.61	11.75	19.17	0.29	6.93	26.67	12.73	17.77	18.77	91.00	4.22
NVMG-4	56.80	9.47	19.47	32.29	10.39	11.40	13.00	0.22	12.13	31.73	10.13	11.39	24.12	85.50	3.50
NVMG-5	56.05	9.73	19.13	25.02	9.49	8.74	12.67	0.19	9.80	27.73	9.13	8.94	19.89	86.00	3.20
NVMG-6	58.04	9.87	24.20	30.33	9.66	10.55	14.34	0.25	11.80	26.33	9.33	13.78	28.95	86.00	3.02
NVMG-7	60.08	9.87	25.73	23.11	10.20	11.48	12.78	0.30	10.40	26.93	9.93	11.73	18.27	85.00	3.70
NVMG-8	191.86	7.60	30.27	37.55	11.53	16.04	24.66	0.46	4.47	30.47	14.60	30.83	24.29	86.00	2.55
NVMG-9	63.86	9.07	25.93	33.64	12.39	12.43	13.37	0.31	9.80	21.53	11.47	18.71	24.29	88.00	2.93
NVMG-10	83.10	8.27	21.00	23.52	11.43	12.11	14.49	0.23	8.27	21.87	9.67	14.53	25.76	86.50	4.81
NVMG-11	171.92	12.27	30.33	45.53	15.07	15.80	22.75	0.41	5.43	29.40	11.87	27.78	21.50	83.50	2.37
NVMG-12	54.23	9.60	18.53	30.60	9.89	8.87	12.48	0.24	10.20	22.20	9.67	10.41	21.43	84.00	4.55
NVMG-13	164.15	9.33	34.47	30.58	13.93	18.42	22.41	0.36	3.67	28.60	13.93	22.82	23.44	78.00	2.44
NVMG-14	60.65	10.27	19.20	23.10	9.84	9.13	13.38	0.22	10.20	21.60	9.20	11.99	23.97	82.50	3.72
NVMG-15	65.50	11.87	21.07	21.61	9.08	12.32	17.28	0.25	9.40	29.70	12.07	17.23	21.97	85.00	4.68
NVMG-16	75.96	8.80	20.20	21.92	11.12	11.37	12.46	0.20	6.40	22.20	10.60	10.81	30.71	86.00	2.72
NVMG-17	108.89	8.67	32.20	22.27	11.37	14.36	16.77	0.35	12.00	33.27	12.33	19.67	32.33	87.50	3.85
NVMG-18	73.77	11.33	23.53	22.90	10.25	12.06	12.79	0.21	7.30	25.27	9.60	12.66	22.69	86.50	3.05

	PH	TPP											GRY	
NVMG-19	70.15	10.93	20.47	23.20	9.90	12.56	15.95	0.25	8.60	23.73	13.33	17.59	27.29	89.00	3.69
NVMG-20	68.95	12.93	30.07	32.50	9.43	12.62	15.26	0.20	10.60	32.40	11.53	18.11	27.13	76.00	3.14
NVMG-21	72.13	8.80	19.73	31.30	9.62	9.85	12.62	0.26	11.80	24.13	10.20	12.85	29.53	82.00	2.63
NVMG-22	73.43	8.27	21.00	20.97	8.52	8.98	13.43	0.25	10.60	25.60	11.53	11.36	24.12	83.00	4.77
NVMG-23	82.25	8.80	19.20	20.84	11.43	13.16	16.69	0.26	11.60	32.80	11.27	18.38	19.97	84.00	3.15
NVMG-24	66.84	12.13	30.40	31.89	12.11	13.51	15.23	0.28	8.00	22.80	11.80	17.35	21.38	93.00	3.96
NVMG-25	60.06	7.60	28.53	21.15	9.65	10.81	12.43	0.24	9.80	25.20	10.47	12.54	29.28	77.50	2.81
NVMG-26	77.03	7.47	25.80	34.07	10.53	12.92	15.02	0.30	10.00	33.90	12.20	18.43	24.99	74.00	2.70
NVMG-27	58.54	9.20	23.53	29.27	9.36	10.83	13.72	0.26	7.40	33.70	10.07	13.09	27.68	88.50	3.41
NVMG-28	65.95	9.20	23.53	22.07	10.27	8.70	12.72	0.20	7.80	32.40	9.47	10.20	27.35	90.00	2.78
NVMG-29	80.13	9.20	34.60	22.71	11.90	13.46	16.47	0.31	12.10	35.10	11.33	18.99	29.10	81.00	3.86
NVMG-30	65.19	11.27	25.40	26.40	9.73	10.24	14.13	0.26	6.80	23.70	10.53	12.47	27.56	82.50	2.72
CD	16.02	2.29	5.17	5.12	2.17	2.46	3.15	0.06	1.47	5.53	2.31	4.75	--	--	--

PH = Plant height   TPP = Tillers per plant   LPP = Leaves per plant   LL = Leaf length   DRWR = Dry rhizome weight recovery (%)
LW = Leaf width   RL = Rhizome length   RWD = Rhizome width   RWT = Rhizome weight   PR = Powder recovery (%)
MRPP = Mother rhizomes per plant   PFPR = Primary fingers per rhizome   SFPR = Secondary fingers per rhizome
GRY = Green rhizome yield   TOC = Total oil content (%)

Table 6: List of mango ginger germplasm used in the experiment

Sr. No.	Genotype	Source	Sr. No.	Genotype	Source
1)	NVMG-1	NAU, Navsari	16)	NVMG-16	NAU, Navsari
2)	NVMG-2	NAU, Navsari	17)	NVMG-17	NAU, Navsari
3)	NVMG-3	NAU, Navsari	18)	NVMG-18	NAU, Navsari
4)	NVMG-4	NAU, Navsari	19)	NVMG-19	NAU, Navsari
5)	NVMG-5	NAU, Navsari	20)	NVMG-20	NAU, Navsari
6)	NVMG-6	NAU, Navsari	21)	NVMG-21	NAU, Navsari
7)	NVMG-7 (C)	NAU, Navsari	22)	NVMG-22	NAU, Navsari
8)	NVMG-8	NAU, Navsari	23)	NVMG-23	NAU, Navsari
9)	NVMG-9	NAU, Navsari	24)	NVMG-24	NAU, Navsari
10)	NVMG-10	NAU, Navsari	25)	NVMG-25	NAU, Navsari
11)	NVMG-11	NAU, Navsari	26)	NVMG-26	NAU, Navsari
12)	NVMG-12	NAU, Navsari	27)	NVMG-27	NAU, Navsari
13)	NVMG-13	NAU, Navsari	28)	NVMG-28	NAU, Navsari
14)	NVMG-14	NAU, Navsari	29)	NVMG-29	NAU, Navsari
15)	NVMG-15	NAU, Navsari	30)	NVMG-30	NAU, Navsari

NVMG 7 (C): Check Variety

Conflict of Interest
There has been no pronouncement of a conflict of interest.

References
1. Allard RW. Principles of Plant Breeding. John Wiley and sons, New York. 1960, 485.
2. Bahadur V, Yeshudas V, Meena OP. Nature and magnitude of genetic variability and diversity analysis of Indian turmeric accessions using agromorphological descriptors. Canadian journal of plant science. 2016;96(3):371381.
3. Chattopadhyay N, Hore JK, Bandyopadhyay. A study on character association and genetic variability in turmeric. Horticultural Journal. 2004;17(3):259-266.
4. Cochran W, Cox GM. Experimental designs, Asia publishing house, Bombay. 1959, 293-304.
5. Cockerham CC. Estimation of genetic variance in statistical Genetics and Plant breeding. National research council, Washington, DC. 1963, 53.
6. Dewey JR, Lu KH. Correlation and path analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. Agron Journal. 1959;51:515-518.
7. Dhatt AS, Arora S, Chawla N, Sidhu AS, Garg N. Evaluation of elite turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) clones for growth, yield and quality attributes. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2008;78(7):589-591.
8. Hazra P, Roy A, Bandyopadhyay A. Growth characters as rhizome yield components of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Crop Research. 2002;19(2):235-240.
9. Islam MA. Genetic diversity of the genus Curcuma in Bangladesh and further biotechnological approaches for *in vitro* regeneration and long-term conservation of C. longa germplasm. Ph.D. thesis, University of Hanover, Germany. 2004.
10. Jadhav GG, Kankal DS. Ganvir MM. Evaluation of turmeric genotypes in relation to growth, yield and quality parameters. Annals of Plant Physiology. 2009;23(2):204-206.
11. Jan HU, Rabbani MA, Shinwari ZK. Estimation of genetic variability in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) germplasm using agro-morphological traits. Pakistan Journal of Botany. 2012;44:231-238.
12. Kumar RA, Vijayalatha KR, Alagesan A, Chezhiyan N. Correlation and path coefficient for morphological traits and yield in turmeric (*Curcuma longa*) genotypes. Journal of Ecobiology. 2007;19(1):33-36.
13. Linnaeus C. Species Plantarum: A Facsimile of the First Edition 1753. Adlard and Son for the Ray Society. 1957.
14. Nandkangre H, Ouedraogo M, Nanema RK, Bado S, Ouedraogo N, Sawadogo M. Variability, correlations, heritability and genetic advance of rhizome yield and

yield related traits in ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Rosc.) landraces from Burkina Faso. J Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci. 2016;6(8):54-60.

15. Panja B, De DK, Basak S, Chattopadhyay SB. Correlation and path analysis in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Journal of Spices and Aromatic Crops. 2002;11(1):70-73.

16. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. ICAR, New Delhi. 1978, 103-108.

17. Prajapati KN, Patel MA, Patel JR, Joshi NR, Patel AD. Genetic variability, character association and path coefficient analysis in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding. 2014;5(1):131-137.

18. Prasad R, Yadav LM, Yadav RC. Correlation study in turmeric. Journal of Applied Biology. 2004;14(1):44-45.

19. Rajyalakshmi R, Naidu LN, Rajasekhar M, Sudhavani V. Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Journal of Spices and Aromatic Crops. 2014;22(1):104-107.

20. Rao AM, Rao PV, Reddy YN, Ganesh M. Variability and correlation studies in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Crop Research Hisar. 2004;27(2-3):275281.

21. Rao BL, Mehra V, Bhan MK, Dhar AK. Natural variation and correlation studies of morphological traits in a population of Curcuma amada Roxb. J Trop. Agric. and Fd. Sc. 2008;36(1):53-59.

22. Raveendra BH, Hanamashetti SI, Hegde LN. Correlation studies with respect to growth and yield of sixteen cultivars of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Journal of Plantation Crops. 2001;29(3):61-63.

23. Ravi Y, Narayanpur VB, Hiremath JS, Saraswati SS, Eragegowda M. Correlation and path coefficient analysis in ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Rose.). Int. J Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2017;6(4):1224-1230.

24. Ravishanker SK, Chatterjee A, Baranwal DK, Solankey SS. Genetic variability for yield and quality traits in ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Roscoe). The Bioscan. 2013;8(4):1383-1386.

25. Salimath S, Venkatesha J, Kotikal YK, Sheety RR, Kattimani KN. Genetic variability studies in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) under southern dry zone of Karnataka. Int. J Pure App. Biosci. 2017;5(4):719-722.

26. Sasikumar B. Genetic resources of curcuma: diversity, characterization and utilization. Plant Genetic Resources. 2005;3(2):230-251.

27. Sharon A, Shoba N, Rajamani K, Manonmani S. Correlation studies in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Research on Crops. 2011;12(1):195-197.

28. Singh AK, Singh A, Singh LN. Evaluation of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) germplasm under low hill condition of Himachal Pradesh. Crop Research Hisar. 2000;20(2):324-326.

29. Singh B, Kumar M, Kumar D, Pal MK. A study on character association, variability, heritability and genetic advance in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Advances in Plant Sciences. 2008;21(2):641-643.

30. Singh AP, Pandey VP, Rehman SMA, Pervez R. Genetic variability and character association in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Trends in Biosciences. 2012;5(1):11-13.

31. Singh Y, Mittal P, Katoch V. Genetic variability and heritability in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research. 2003;29(1/2):31-34.

32. Tomar NS, Nair SK, Gupta CR. Character association and path analysis for yield components in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Journal of Spices and Aromatic Crops. 2005;14(1):75-77.

33. Veena H, Shetty GR, Agasimani AA. Correlation studies in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) under hill zone of Karnataka. Hort. Flora Research Spectrum. 2017;6(1):51-54.

34. Velayudhan KC, Muralidharan VK, Amalraj VA, Gautam PL, Mandal S, Kumar D. Curcuma genetic resources. Scientific monograph. 1999, 4.

35. Verma RK, Pandey VP, Solanke SS, Verma RB. Genetic variability, character association and diversity analysis in turmeric. Indian J Hort. 2014;71(3):367-372.

36. Wright S. Correlation and causation. Journal of agricultural research. 1921;20(7):557585.