www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; 11(3): 652-657 © 2022 TPI www.thepharmajournal.com Received: 16-12-2021

Accepted: 28-02-2022

BS Thorat

Department of Agricultural Botany Genetics and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

SG Bhave

Department of Agricultural Botany Genetics and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

BD Waghmode

Department of Agricultural Botany Genetics and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author: BS Thorat Department of Agricultural Botany Genetics and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli,

Maharashtra, India

Studies on multienvironmental genetic variability in Niger (*Guizotia abyssinica* L.)

BS Thorat, SG Bhave and BD Waghmode

Abstract

The present experiment was conducted with forty niger genotypes at five locations in *Kharif*, 2018 and Kharif, 2019 in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications for examine the genetic variability and its other parameters. The significant variation was present among the genotypes for all the traits except capitulum diameter and 1000 seed weight. The environment wise phenotypic coefficient of variation for various characters were ranged from 4.56 to 30.20 (E1), 3.98 to 20.88 (E2), 5.10 to 20.51 (E3), 3.50 to 27.91 (E4) and 5.30 to 23.66 (E5), respectively. The location wise range of genotypic coefficient of variation for various characters was 3.62 to 28.75 (E1), 3.07 to 17.14 (E2), 2.72 to 17.69 (E3), 2.63 to 25.70 (E4) and 3.32 to 20.67 (E5), respectively. The PCV greater than GCV was reported for all the traits under study indicating role of environment in the expression of these traits. The high magnitude of genotypic coefficient of variation for number of primary and secondary branches plant-1, number of capitulum plant⁻¹, number of seeds plant⁻¹, seed yield plant⁻¹ and seed yield plot⁻¹ revealed the presence of high genetic variability. The environment wise heritability varied 26.93 to 90.58 per cent (E1), 28.78 to 77.92 per cent (E2), 28.55 to 85.97 per cent (E3), 35.88 to 84.80 per cent (E4) and 35.02 to 83.78 per cent (E5), respectively. The highest heritability was found in number of capitula⁻¹, days to 50 per cent flowering, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹ and number of primary branches plant⁻¹ while lowest in oil content and protein content. Most of the characters *i.e.*, days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height, number of primary branches plant⁻¹, number of secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula plant⁻¹, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, 1000 seed weight, seed yield plant⁻¹, seed yield plot⁻¹ and days to maturity were exhibited high heritability coupled with high genetic advance indicating additive gene action in the expression of these characters while capitulum diameter, oil content and protein content under the control of non-additive gene action.

Keywords: Niger, variability, heritability, genetic advance and GAM

Introduction

The Niger (Guizotia abyssinica L.) belongs to the Compositae family with diploid chromosome number (2n=2x=30). The genus *Guizotia* is small with only six species, which are all native of tropical Africa (Chavan, 1961 and Arora et al., 2003)^[8, 4]. From the place of origin, it was migrated to East Africa and India through the Persian Gulf traders along with other crops, which is popularly known as the 'Savannah complex' (Dagne, 2001)^[9]. Niger although considered a minor oilseed crop, is important in terms of its 32 to 40% content of quality oil with 18 to 24% protein in the seed (Nagraj and Patil, 2004; Ramteke et al., 2001; Dagne and Jonsson, 1997) ^[19, 25, 10]. It is used as a substitute for olive oil, can be adulterated with rapeseed, sesame and linseed oil. The oil from the seed is used to treat burns and in the treatment of scabies. The seed is eaten fried as a baby food (Chibto and litlit) and used as a condiment (Vles and Gottenbos, 1989) ^[32]. Niger oil has good keeping quality and has < 70%unsaturated fatty acids free from toxins. It is premium oil because of high linoleic acid content (45-60 per cent) and oleic acid (13-39 per cent) (Dutta et al., 1994)^[12]. Niger oil contains Omega 3 and Omega 6 fatty acids which are thought to help reduce the risk of heart disease and also to promote healthy skin. They are also used along with diet and exercise to help lower levels of a certain blood fat (triglyceride) and to raise levels of good cholesterol (HDL) (Ramdan and Morsel, 2003 and Staughton, 2017)^[24, 29]. The crop is capable of giving better seed yield even under low soil fertility, moisture stress and poor crop management. Niger has an advantage of yielding oil and has good degree of tolerance to diseases, insect pests and attack of wild animals. Niger has great potential for soil conservation. These attributes favour its cultivation on hilly areas, marginal and sub marginal lands in and around the forests. Niger is primarily grown on the denuded soils in the tribal pockets under input starved conditions in India. Further it is the life line of tribal agriculture and economy (Ranganatha, 2013)^[26].

Worlds occupies 5.60 lakh ha area under Niger cultivation with 1.52 MMT production and its productivity was 271kg/ha (USDA, 2018-19)^[31]. It is grown in mainly India, Ethiopia, Nepal, Germany, Switzerland, France, USSR, Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Central and South Africa. India is the most important country accounting for more than 50% of world niger area and production. India tops in area, production and total export for niger in the world. In India, niger is grown on an area of 2.52 lakh ha. with the production of 0.85 MMT and its productivity was 337 kg/ha (FAO, 2018-19) [13]. India could earn the foreign exchange of Rs. 100 crores by export of niger seed and the oil meal. India is the largest exporter in the world and USA, Netherlands, Italy, Germany, Belgium and Spain are the regular buyers (Ranganatha et al., 2015)^[27]. In Maharashtra, it is grown on an area of 28000 ha, with the production of 80000 MT and productivity is 286 kg/ha (Anonymous, 2018-19a)^[2] which is very low compared to the national average. In Konkan region. 1530 ha area under niger cultivation with 452 MT production and its productivity is 295 kg/ha (Anonymous, 2018-19b)^[3].

Since, the beginning of agriculture, cultivated crops has been subjected to intensive natural, human selections and the trend continues. This has resulted in huge collection of different crop species, land races and varieties distributed throughout the world, which comprises valuable germplasm collection. The goal of every plant breeder is to develop superior varietal population; massive efforts are needed to obtain diverse types, generating variability and ultimately selection of desirable ideal genotypes.

An important step in cultivar development is studying the genetic variability found in genetic resources. The use of genetic resources to create new varieties is important for obtaining higher yields and for the technological transformations required for modernization of agribusiness. It is a dynamic process, but requires continuous enrichment and characterization of the materials maintained in germplasm collections. The genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation (GCV & PCV) are useful in detecting the amount of variability present in the available genotypes. Heritability and genetic advance help in determining the influence of environment in expression of the traits and the extent to which improvement is possible after selection. So, the present investigation was carried out for estimation of magnitude and extent of genetic variability, heritability and gene action in niger.

Materials and Methods

The present investigation was carried out at five locations viz., ARS, Phondaghat (E1), ARS, Shirgaon (E2), Dept. of Agril. Botany, Dapoli (E3), RARS, Karjat (E4) and ARS, Palghar (E5) during Kharif, 2018 and Kharif, 2019. The experimental trial was included 40 niger genotypes (Table 1) laid out in Randomized Block design replicated thrice. Row to row and plant to plant spacing were maintained at 30 and 10 cm, respectively. All the agronomic package of practices was followed to grow a healthy crop in each replication. Randomly five plants were selected and tagged for observation in each entry. Observations were recorded on thirteen characters viz., days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height (cm), number of primary branches plant⁻¹, number of secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula plant⁻¹, capitulum diameter (cm), number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, 1000 seed weight (g), seed yield plant⁻¹ (g), seed yield plot⁻¹ (g),

days to maturity, oil content (%) and protein content (%). The recorded data were analysed as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1985)^[21] for analysis of variance. The genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variance was calculated as per the formula suggested by Burton and De Vane (1952)^[7] and Johnson *et al.* (1955)^[16] for heritability and genetic advance.

Results and Discussion

The mean sum of square (Table 2) was highly significant for all traits except capitulum diameter and 1000 seed weight, indicating the presence of wide variability in the genotypes. The tantamount findings were also reported by Rani *et al.* (2010) ^[28], Panda and Sial (2012) ^[20], Yadav *et al.* (2012) ^[33], Ahmad *et al.* (2016) ^[1], Benalli *et al.* (2017), Jay Laxami (2017) ^[15] and Kusumlata *et al.* (2018) ^[17].

The environment wise phenotypic variances (Table 3) for different characters were ranged from 0.01 to 529.51 (E1), 0.01 to 580.68 (E2), 0.01 to 975.19 (E3), 0.01 to 342.40 (E4) and 0.01 to 667.32 (E5), respectively. The location wise range of genotypic variances for various characters from 0.01 to 212.37, 0.01 to 254.48, 0.01 to 284.22, 0.00 to 103.93 and 0.01 to 193.51 for E1, E2, E3, E4 and E5, respectively. The location wise environmental variances were ranged from 0.00 to 317.14 (E1), 0.00 to 326.21 (E2), 0.00 to 690.97 (E3), 0.00 to 238.48 (E4) and 0.00 to 473.81 (E5), respectively for various characters. The highest genotypic, phenotypic and environmental variance (Table 3) was found in number of primary and secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula plant⁻¹, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, seed yield plant⁻¹, seed yield plot⁻¹ while lowest in capitulum diameter. In general, the magnitudes of phenotypic variances were greater than genotypic variances for all the traits. This is because of the addition of environmental variance into the phenotypic variance. These findings were in conformity to those of Rani et al. (2010)^[28], Yadav et al. (2012)^[33], Ahmad et al. (2016) ^[1], Benalli et al. (2017), Kusumlata et al. (2018) ^[17] and Fekadu (2020)^[14].

The environment wise phenotypic coefficient of variation (Table 4) for different traits were ranged from 4.56 to 30.20 (E1), 3.98 to 20.88 (E2), 5.10 to 20.51 (E3), 3.50 to 27.91 (E4) and 5.30 to 23.66 (E5), respectively. The location wise range of genotypic coefficient of variation for various characters was 3.62 to 28.75 (E1), 3.07 to 17.14 (E2), 2.72 to 17.69 (E3), 2.63 to 25.70 (E4) and 3.32 to 20.67 (E5), respectively. The high magnitude of genotypic coefficient of variation (Table 4) for number of primary and secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitulum plant⁻¹, number of seeds plant⁻¹, seed yield plant⁻¹ and seed yield plot⁻¹ revealed the presence of high genetic variability. In the present study, the highest GCV and PCV was found in number of primary and secondary branches plant⁻¹ while lowest in days to maturity. In general, phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) were found to be maximum than corresponding genotypic coefficients of variation (GCV) for all the characters. This is because of the insertion of environmental coefficient of variation into the phenotypic coefficient of variation. The similative results were also reported by Panda and Sial (2012) [20], Ahmad et al. (2016) [1], Dudhe et al. (2017)^[11], Kusumlata et al. (2018)^[17], Survanarayana et al. (2018a)^[30] and Fekadu (2020)^[14].

The environment wise heritability (Table 4) was ranged from 26.93 to 90.58 per cent (E1), 28.78 to 77.92 per cent (E2), 28.55 to 85.97 per cent (E3), 35.88 to 84.80 per cent (E4) and

35.02 to 83.78 per cent (E5), respectively. The highest heritability (Table 4) was found in number of capitula⁻¹, days to 50 per cent flowering and number of primary branches plant⁻¹ while lowest in 1000 seed weight, plant height, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹ and oil content. These traits were governed by additive genes and selection for improvement of these traits may useful. The tantamount findings were also reported by Rani *et al.* (2010) ^[28], Ahmad *et al.* (2016) ^[11], Dudhe *et al.* (2017) ^[11], Kusumlata *et al.* (2018) ^[17], Suryanarayana *et al.* (2018a) ^[30] and Fekadu (2020) ^[14].

The environment wise genetic advance (Table 4) was ranged from 0.12 to 22.38 per cent (E1), 0.14 to 21.75 per cent (E2), 0.15 to 18.75 per cent (E3), 0.08 to 11.57 per cent (E4) and 0.11 to 10.38 per cent (E5), respectively whereas genetic advance per cent mean was ranged from 3.87 to 56.36 per cent (E1), 3.39 to 28.99 per cent (E2), 3.00 to 32.59 per cent (E3), 4.07 to 48.75 per cent (E4) and 4.07 to 37.20 per cent (E5), respectively. The maximum genetic advance and genetic advance per cent mean (Table 4) was found in number of primary and secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula⁻¹, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, seed yield plant⁻¹ and seed yield plot⁻¹. These genotypes were controlled by additive genes and selection is beneficial for such traits. These findings were in conformity to those of Rani *et al.* (2010) ^[28], Panda and Sial (2012) ^[20], Ahmad *et al.* (2016) ^[1], Dudhe *et al.* (2017) ^[11], Kusumlata *et al.* (2018) ^[17], Suryanarayana *et al.* (2018a) ^[30] and Fekadu (2020) ^[14].

Most of the characters *i.e.*, days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height, number of primary branches plant⁻¹, number of secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula plant⁻¹, number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, 1000 seed weight, seed yield plant⁻¹, seed yield plot⁻¹ and days to maturity were under the control of additive gene action (Table 4) in the expression of these characters. Therefore, improvement of these traits having high heritability along with and high genetic advance would be more effective if the selection in the present material could be rigorously applied. These results are in harmony with the findings of Patil and Duhoon (2005)^[22], Rani et al. (2010) [28], Yadav et al. (2012) [33], Dudhe et al. $(2017)^{[11]}$ and Survanaravana *et al.* $(2018a)^{[30]}$. On the other hand, characters viz., capitulum diameter, oil content and protein content showed high heritability coupled with low genetic advance, indicating substantial contribution of nonadditive gene action in the expression of these traits. Therefore, improvement of these traits having high heritability along with and low genetic advance would be less effective if the selection in the present material could be rigorously applied. The similative quests were also reported by Mathur and Gupta (1993)^[18], Pradhan *et al.* (1995)^[23] and Borole and Patil (1997)^[6].

Sr. No.	Genotype code	Name of Genotypes	Source	Sr. No.	Genotype code	Name of Genotypes	Sourse
1.	G1	GP-54	ZARS, Igatpuri	21.	G21	NMLT-12	ZARS, Igatpuri
2.	G2	GP-57	ZARS, Igatpuri	22.	G22	NMLT-13	ZARS, Igatpuri
3.	G3	IGPN 14-2	ZARS, Igatpuri	23.	G23	NMLT-14	ZARS, Igatpuri
4.	G4	IGPN 14-6	ZARS, Igatpuri	24.	G24	NMLT-15	ZARS, Igatpuri
5.	G5	IGPN 14-9	ZARS, Igatpuri	25.	G25	NGR -1	ARS, Shirgaon
6.	G6	IGPN 15-1	ZARS, Igatpuri	26.	G26	NGR -3	ARS, Shirgaon
7.	G7	IGPN 15-3	ZARS, Igatpuri	27.	G27	NGR -4	ARS, Shirgaon
8.	G8	IGPN 15-4	ZARS, Igatpuri	28.	G28	NGR -5	ARS, Shirgaon
9.	G9	IGPN 15-5	ZARS, Igatpuri	29.	G29	NGR -6	ARS, Shirgaon
10.	G10	NMLT-1	ZARS, Igatpuri	30.	G30	NGR -18	ARS, Shirgaon
11.	G11	NMLT-2	ZARS, Igatpuri	31.	G31	NGR -22	ARS, Shirgaon
12.	G12	NMLT-3	ZARS, Igatpuri	32.	G32	NGR -24	ARS, Shirgaon
13.	G13	NMLT-4	ZARS, Igatpuri	33.	G33	Devadi Local 2	Devadi, Solapur
14.	G14	NMLT-5	ZARS, Igatpuri	34.	G34	Devadi Local 3	Devadi, Solapur
15.	G15	NMLT-6	ZARS, Igatpuri	35.	G35	Devadi Local 4	Devadi, Solapur
16.	G16	NMLT-7	ZARS, Igatpuri	36.	G36	Devadi Local 5	Devadi, Solapur
17.	G17	NMLT-8	ZARS, Igatpuri	37.	G37	Modnimb Local 2	Modnimb, Solapur
18.	G18	NMLT-9	ZARS, Igatpuri	38.	G38	Sahyadri	ZARS, Igatpuri
19.	G19	NMLT-10	ZARS, Igatpuri	39.	G39	Phule Karala	ZARS, Igatpuri
20.	G20	NMLT-11	ZARS, Igatpuri	40.	G40	Phule Vaitrna	ZARS, Igatpuri

Table 2: Environment wise analysis of variance for quantitative and qualitative traits in 40 genotypes of niger

C. No	Characters	ARS, PI	hondaghat (E	1)	ARS, S	Shirgaon (E2)	Dept. of Agril. Botany, Dapoli (E3)				
Sr. No.	Characters	Replication	Treatment	Error	Replication	Treatment	Error	Replication	Treatment	Error		
	DF	2	39	78	2	39	78	2	39	78		
1.	DFPF	11.56	20.67**	1.82	2.79	25.64**	2.21	2.10	37.84**	1.95		
2.	PH (cm)	15.04	271.81**	34.21	6.50	113.62**	39.57	32.10	235.52**	44.21		
3.	NPBPP	0.23	13.33**	0.99	0.63	9.62**	1.34	0.17	7.63**	0.92		
4.	NSBPP	4.52	53.63**	3.49	2.18	30.00**	5.10	2.26	23.50**	3.29		
5.	NCPP	0.23	404.45**	13.55	6.47	90.96**	19.30	7.94	170.62**	13.15		
6.	CD (cm)	0.001	0.03	0.001	0.01	0.02	0.001	0.001	0.03	0.001		
7.	NSPC	17.11	43.37**	10.27	1.79	32.33**	7.60	3.66	42.27**	9.16		
8.	1000 SW (g)	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.10	0.03		
9.	SYPp (g)	0.26	0.23**	0.08	0.03	0.23**	0.06	0.23	0.26**	0.09		
10.	SYPP (g)	638.71	954.25**	317.14	612.87	1089.64**	326.21	2619.18	1543.62**	690.97		
11.	DM	1.71	38.56**	2.99	0.01	24.60**	3.93	15.27	42.39**	10.13		

The Pharma Innovation Journal

12.	OC (%)	2.43	10.11**	4.80	4.31	7.44**	3.36	1.07	6.32**	2.88
13.	PC (%)	1.06	3.36*	0.66	2.76	3.71*	1.31	1.51	2.58*	0.66

*Significant at 5% level of significance **Significant at 1% level of significance

DFPF: Days to 50 per cent flowering PH: Plant height NPBPP: No. of primary branches plant⁻¹NSBPP: No. of secondary branches plant⁻¹ NCPP: No. of capitula plant⁻¹ CD: Capitulum diameterNSPC: No. of seeds capitulum⁻¹

SYPp: Seed yield plant⁻¹ PC: Protein content

SYPP: Seed yield plot⁻¹ DM: Days to maturity

SW: Seed weight

http://www.thepharmajournal.com

OC: Oil content

Table 2: Table Contd...

C. N.	<u>Classications</u>	RA	RS, Karjat (E4)		ARS, Palghar (E5)						
Sr. No.	Characters	Replication	Treatment	Error	Replication	Treatment	Error				
	DF	2	39	78	2	39	78				
1.	DFPF	0.09	37.30**	2.13	3.39	33.47**	2.03				
2.	PH (cm)	45.61	90.93**	30.45	11.82	144.00**	39.91				
3.	NPBPP	0.64	12.48**	0.70	1.41	11.60**	1.09				
4.	NSBPP	4.08	29.19**	2.50	13.58	30.90**	4.02				
5.	NCPP	36.88	112.91**	10.22	3.70	109.77**	10.18				
6.	CD (cm)	0.01	0.01	0.001	0.001	0.02	0.001				
7.	NSPC	1.93	11.80**	4.41	5.26	30.96**	9.27				
8.	1000 SW (g)	0.02	0.12*	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.05				
9.	SYPp (g)	0.01	0.11*	0.04	0.06	0.16**	0.07				
10.	SYPP (g)	128.34	550.26**	238.48	297.46	1054.34**	473.81				
11.	DM	3.26	19.80**	4.05	7.39	45.24**	6.44				
12.	OC (%)	2.13	8.29**	2.13	3.28	7.36**	2.78				
	PC (%)	0.23	3.59*	1.31	6.00	3.08*	1.18				

*Significant at 5% level of significance **Significant at 1% level of significance

DFPF: Days to 50 per cent flowering PH: Plant height NPBPP: No. of primary branches plant-1NSBPP: No. of secondary branches plant-1 CD: Capitulum diameter NSPC: No. of seeds capitulum⁻¹ NCPP: No. of capitula plant⁻¹ SW: Seed weight SYPp: Seed yield plant⁻¹ SYPP: Seed yield plot⁻¹ DM: Days to maturity

PC: Protein content

Table 3: Environment wise components of variation of pooled data for quantitative and qualitative traits in 40 genotypes of niger

Sr. No.	Characters	ARS,	, Phonda (E1)	aghat	ARS, Shirgaon (E2)			Dept. of A	Dept. of Agril. Botany, Dapoli (E3)				at (E4)	ARS, Palghar (E5)		
190.		б²р	б²g	б²е	б²р	б²g	б²е	б²р	б²g	б²е	б²р	б²g	б²е	б²р	б²g	б²е
1.	DFPF	8.10	6.28	1.82	10.02	7.81	2.21	13.91	11.96	1.95	12.51	10.48	2.03	13.86	11.72	2.13
2.	PH (cm)	113.41	79.20	34.21	64.26	24.68	39.57	107.98	63.77	44.21	74.61	34.70	39.91	50.61	20.16	30.45
3.	NPBPP	5.10	4.11	0.99	4.10	2.76	1.34	3.16	2.24	0.92	4.59	3.50	1.09	4.63	3.92	0.70
4.	NSBPP	20.21	16.71	3.49	13.40	8.30	5.10	10.03	6.74	3.29	12.98	8.96	4.02	11.40	8.90	2.50
5.	NCPP	143.85	130.30	13.55	43.18	23.89	19.30	65.64	52.49	13.15	43.38	33.20	10.18	44.45	34.23	10.22
6.	CD (cm)	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
7.	NSPC	21.30	11.03	10.27	15.84	8.24	7.60	20.20	11.04	9.16	16.50	7.23	9.27	6.87	2.47	4.41
8.	1000 SW (g)	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.08	0.02	0.06
9.	SYPp (g)	0.13	0.05	0.08	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.15	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.04
10.	SYPP (g)	529.51	212.37	317.14	580.68	254.48	326.21	975.19	284.22	690.97	667.32	193.51	473.81	342.40	103.93	238.48
11.	DM	14.85	11.86	2.99	10.82	6.89	3.93	20.88	10.75	10.13	19.37	12.93	6.44	9.30	5.25	4.05
12.	OC (%)	6.57	1.77	4.80	4.72	1.36	3.36	4.03	1.15	2.88	4.31	1.53	2.78	4.18	2.05	2.13
13.	PC (%)	1.56 0.90 0.66		2.11	0.80	1.31	1.30	0.64	0.66	1.81	0.63	1.18	2.07	0.76	1.31	

 6^2 p: Phenotypic variance, 6^2 g: Genotypic variance and 6^2 e: Environmental variance DFPF: Days to 50 per cent flowering PH: Plant height

NPBPP: No. of primary branches plant-1NSBPP: No. of secondary branches plant-1 SW: Seed weight

OC: Oil content

NCPP: No. of capitula plant⁻¹ SYPp: Seed yield plant⁻¹

CD: Capitulum diameter NSPC: No. of seeds capitulum⁻¹ SYPP: Seed yield plot⁻¹ DM: Days to maturity

PC: Protein content

Table 4: Environment wise estimates of genetic parameters of pooled data for quantitative and qualitative traits in 40 genotypes of Niger

Sr. No.	Characters		ARS, Phondaghat (E1)						ARS, Shirgaon (E2)						Dept. of Agril. Botany, Dapoli (E3)				
SF. NO.	Characters	PCV	GCV	H ² b	GA	GAM	Ga	PCV	GCV	H ² b	GA	GAM	Ga	PCV	GCV	H ² b	GA	GAM	Ga
1.	DFPF	5.72	5.03	77.55	4.55	9.13	Α	6.43	5.67	77.92	5.08	10.32	Α	7.67	7.11	85.97	6.61	13.59	Α
2.	PH (cm)	8.07	6.75	69.83	15.32	11.61	Α	6.42	3.98	38.41	6.34	5.08	Α	7.37	5.66	59.06	12.64	8.97	Α
3.	NPBPP	25.46	22.85	80.61	8.75	42.27	Α	20.88	17.14	67.38	8.81	28.99	Α	20.51	17.27	70.96	8.60	29.98	Α
4.	NSBPP	28.18	25.63	82.71	7.66	48.02	Α	18.24	14.35	61.94	4.67	23.27	Α	19.61	16.08	67.19	4.38	27.14	Α
5.	NCPP	30.20	28.75	90.58	22.38	56.36	Α	17.54	13.05	55.31	7.49	19.99	Α	19.78	17.69	79.97	13.35	32.59	Α
6.	CD (cm)	9.20	8.27	80.82	0.16	15.31	NA	9.93	7.90	63.30	0.14	12.94	NA	9.75	8.00	67.39	0.15	13.54	NA
7.	NSPC	13.83	9.95	51.79	4.92	14.75	Α	13.12	9.46	52.04	4.27	14.06	Α	13.90	10.27	54.65	5.06	15.64	Α
8.	1000 SW (g)	6.53	3.81	33.95	6.12	4.57	Α	6.71	4.43	43.62	10.15	6.03	Α	8.81	5.75	42.56	10.20	7.73	Α
9.	SYPp (g)	13.37	8.45	39.90	10.30	10.99	A	12.02	8.41	48.93	10.34	12.12	A	11.00	6.97	40.13	10.32	9.09	Α

OC: Oil content

The Pharma Innovation Journal

NCPP: No. of capitula plant-1

PH: Plant height

W: Seed weight

DM: Days to maturity

http://www.thepharmajournal.com

10.	SYPP (g)	10.11	6.40	40.11	19.01	8.35	А	10.54	6.98	43.82	21.75	9.51	Α	13.41	7.24	49.14	18.75	8.05	Α
11.	DM	4.56	4.08	79.85	6.34	7.50	Α	3.98	3.18	63.70	4.32	5.22	Α	5.67	4.07	51.50	4.85	6.02	Α
12.	OC (%)	6.98	3.62	26.93	1.42	3.87	NA	5.72	3.07	28.78	1.29	3.39	NA	5.10	2.72	28.55	1.18	3.00	NA
13.	PC (%)	6.74	5.13	57.88	1.49	8.04	NA	7.55	4.65	37.96	1.14	5.90	NA	5.70	3.99	49.15	1.16	5.77	NA
PCV: Ph	enotypic Coeff	ficient	of Va	riation		GCV:	Ger	otypic	Coef	ficient	of Var	iation	n H2b: Heritability (Broad Sense)						
GA: Genetic Advance GAM: Genetic									GAM: Genetic Advance Per cent Mean					Ga: Gene Action					
NA · Non-Additive							A · Additive						DFPF Days to 50 per cent flowering						

NPBPP: No. of primary branches plant-1

Table 4: Table Contd...

CD: Capitulum diameter

SYPp: Seed yield plant-1

OC: Oil content

DFPF: Days to 50 per cent flowering NSBPP: No. of secondary branches plant-1 NSPC: No. of seeds capitulum-1 S SYPP: Seed yield plot-1 PC: Protein content

Sr.	Chanastana		ŀ	RARS, Ka	rjat (E4)			ARS, Palghar (E5)							
No.	Characters	PCV	GCV	H ² b	GA	GAM	Ga	PCV	GCV	H ² b	GA	GAM	Ga		
1.	DFPF	7.21	6.63	84.60	6.49	12.56	Α	7.32	6.70	83.78	6.10	12.64	Α		
2.	PH (cm)	5.18	3.27	39.83	5.84	4.25	Α	6.27	4.28	46.51	8.28	6.01	Α		
3.	NPBPP	27.91	25.70	84.80	8.76	48.75	Α	23.66	20.67	76.31	8.37	37.20	Α		
4.	NSBPP	23.54	20.80	78.06	5.43	37.85	Α	21.51	17.87	69.02	5.12	30.58	Α		
5.	NCPP	18.20	15.97	77.00	10.58	28.87	Α	18.35	16.05	76.53	10.38	28.93	Α		
6.	CD (cm)	9.00	5.90	42.91	0.08	7.96	NA	10.05	7.99	63.30	0.13	13.10	NA		
7.	NSPC	12.52	7.50	35.88	5.94	9.25	Α	16.32	10.81	43.82	3.67	14.74	Α		
8.	1000 SW (g)	11.59	5.98	36.64	10.15	6.36	Α	10.01	4.59	38.07	10.11	4.34	Α		
9.	SYPp (g)	10.32	6.53	40.08	10.20	8.52	Α	12.48	6.68	38.63	10.19	7.36	Α		
10.	SYPP (g)	9.42	5.19	38.35	11.57	5.89	Α	11.89	6.40	39.00	15.43	7.10	Α		
11.	DM	3.50	2.63	56.46	3.55	4.07	Α	5.30	4.33	66.75	6.05	7.29	Α		
12.	OC (%)	5.54	3.88	49.09	2.07	5.60	NA	5.57	3.32	35.47	1.52	4.07	NA		
13	PC (%)	7 50	4 54	36 74	1.09	5 67	NΔ	7.09	4 20	35.02	0.97	5 11	NΔ		

PCV: Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation

GA: Genetic Advance NA: Non-Additive PH: Plant height

NCPP: No. of capitula plant-1 SW: Seed weight DM: Days to maturity GCV: Genotypic Coefficient of Variation GAM: Genetic Advance per cent Mean A: Additive NPBPP: No. of primary branches plant-1 CD: Capitulum diameter SYPp: Seed yield plant-1 OC: Oil content

DFPF: Days to 50 per cent flowering NSBPP: No. of secondary branches plant-1 NSPC: No. of seeds capitulum-1 SYPP: Seed yield plot-1 PC: Protein content

H2b: Heritability (Broad Sense)

Conclusion

It is concluded that yield is controlled by both GCV and PCV also to use appropriate selection procedure for improvement of the characters in general and yield in particular since high heritability with high genetic advance was indicated the influence of additive gene action. The heritability provides the information on the magnitude of inheritance of quantitative characters, but it does not indicate the magnitude of genetic gain obtained by selection of best individual from the best population. So, heritability along with genetic advance is more useful for selection than the heritability alone. This study helps in the selection of genetically superior parents for their exploitation in hybridization programmes. Therefore, improvement in these traits would be more efficiently done by selection method in the present materials. Depending upon the variability, heritability and genetic advance estimates, it could be predicted that improvement by selection was possible in niger for traits like days to 50 per cent flowering, plant height, number of primary branches plant⁻¹, number of secondary branches plant⁻¹, number of capitula plant⁻¹, total number of seeds capitulum⁻¹, 1000 seed weight, seed yield plant⁻¹, seed yield plot⁻¹ and days to maturity.

References

 Ahmad, Ekhlaque, Singh MK, Paul A, Ansari AM, Singh DN. Genetic studies of yield and yield component of niger (*Guizotia abyssinica* Cass.) in rainfed condition of western plateau of Jharkhand., International Journal of Tropical Agriculture. 2016;34(4):1127-1133. 2. Anonymous, 4th Advance Estimates, Agriculture Statistics Division, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, DAC and FW, GOI New Delhi, 2018-19a.

Ga: Gene Action

- Anonymous, A report of the research work on oilseed, Research Review Committee, MPKV, Rahuri. (M. S.). 2018-19b
- Arora RK, Roshani NE, Pandy A. Centers of Origin and gene pool in edible oilseed A global perspective, J. Oilseed Res. 2003;20(2):180-194.
- Benelli V, Allen F, Wang M. Variability in seed oil content and fatty acid composition, phenotypic traits and self-incompatibility among selected niger germplasm accessions. Plant Genetic Resources. 2017;15(4):348-354.
- 6. Borole RD, Patil HS. Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in Niger. J Oilseed Res. 1997;14(1):40-43.
- Burton GW, De Vane. Quantitative inheritance in grass. Pro. 6th 11411. Grassland Congress J.I. 1952, pp. 277-283.
- 8. Chavan VM. Niger I. Origin and history of niger. In niger and safflower published by the, Indian Central Oilseed Committee Gandhi Bhavan Hyderabad, 1961.
- 9. Dagne K. Cytogenetics of new *Guizotia* Cass. (Compositae), interspecific hybrids pertaining to genomic and phylogenetic affinities. Plant Systematics and Evolution. 2001;230:1-11.
- Dagne K, Jonsson A. Oil content and fatty acid composition of seeds of *Guizotia* Cass. (Compositae). J of the Sci. of Food and Agric. 1997;73:274-278.

- 11. Dudhe MY, Madhuri P, Rajguru AB, Bhoite KD. Genetic evaluation and identification of stable sunflower genotypes under semi-arid dryland conditions of Telangana and Maharashtra State, Sabrao Journal of Breeding and Genetics. 2017;49(1):83-93.
- Dutta PC, Helmersson S, Kebedu E, Appelqvist LA. Variation in lipid composition of niger seed (*Guizotia abyssinica* L.) samples collected from different regions in Ethiopia. J of the Amer. Oil Chemists Society. 1994;71:839-843.
- 13. FAO, Statistical Database of crops area harvested, yield and production data. Available from, 2018-19. http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC.
- Fekadu Amsalu. Genetic variability correlation and path coefficient analysis of Niger seed (*Guizotia abyssinica* [I.F.] Cass.) genotypes, International Journal of Research Studies in Agricultural Sciences. 2020;6(3):8-16.
- 15. Jay Laxami. Stability analysis of Basmati rice genotypes using AMMI model., M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis submitted to Sher-e-Kasmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Jammu, Main Campus, Chatha, Jammu, India, 2017.
- Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Comstock RE. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in Soybean. Agron. J. 1955;47:314-318.
- Kusumlata Baghel JL, Salam RR, Kanwar, Bhanwar RR. Genetic Variability Analysis of Yield and its Components in Niger [(*Guizotia abyssinica* (L. f.) Cass.]. Int. J Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2018;7(08):4266-4276.
- Mathur RK, Gupta SC. Yield component analysis and its implication for selection in niger. (*Guizotia abyssinica* (L.f.) Cass) J Oilseed Res., 1993, pp. 6-10.
- Nagaraj G, Patil HS. Quality and Oil composition of Niger, (*Guizotia abyssinica* (L.f.) Cass). A Review. J Oilseed Res. 2004;21(2):224-229.
- 20. Panda S, Sial P. Assessment of Existing Genetic Variability and Yield Component Analysis in Niger (*Guizotia abyssinica* Cass). Indian Journal of Innovations and Developments. 2012;1(7):511-514.
- 21. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers, I C A.R., New Delhi, 1985.
- 22. Patil HS, Duhoon SS. Nature of variability, association and path analysis in Niger. J Oilseed Res. 2005;22(2):438-449.
- Pradhan K, Mishra RC, Paikaray RK. Genetic Variability and character association in niger. Indian J Genet. 1995;55(4):457-459.
- 24. Ramadan MF, Morsel JT. Analysis of glycolipids from black cumin (*Nigella sativa* L.), coriander (*Coriandrum sativum* L.) and niger (*Guizotia abyssinica* Cass.). Food Chemistry. 2003;80:197-204.
- 25. Ramteke JR, Patil BP, Athaley SS. Niger: Neglected but multipurpose crop Shetkari, 2001, pp. 28-30.
- Ranganatha ARG. Improved technology for maximizing production of niger., ed. Project Coordinator, AICRP on Sesame and Niger, ICAR, JNKKVV Campus, Jabalpur, 2013, pp. 1-19.
- Ranganatha ARG, Pandey AK, Bisen R, Jain S, Sharma S. Niger. In; Breeding oilseed crops for sustainable production Ed; S. Gupta, Elsevier, London, 2015, pp. 169-199.
- 28. Rani MG, Sreekanth M, Rao SR. Genetic variability in morphological and quantitative characters in Niger

(Guizotia abyssinica) germplasm. Crop Res. (Hisar). 2010;40(1/3):132-134.

- 29. Staughton John. Best Benefits of Niger Seed Oil. *Organic facts*, 2017. www.organicfacts.net/healthbenefits/oils/niger-seed-oil.html
- Suryanarayana L, Sekhar D, Tejeswara Rao K. Studies on genetic variability, character association and path analysis in Niger (*Guizotia abyssinica* L.) Genotypes, Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2018a;7(4):3339-3341.
- 31. USDA. In: World Agricultural Production, 2018-19. http://www.usda.gov/data/world-agricultural-production
- 32. Vles RO, Gottenbos JJ. Nutritional characteristics and food use of vegetables oil Niger. In Robbelen, G., Downy, R. K. and Ashri, A. edited Oil crops of the world McGraw Hill, New York, 1989, pp. 63-86.
- Yadav S, Hussain Z, Suneja P, Nizar MA, Yadav SK, Dutta M. Genetic divergence studies in niger (*Guizotia abyssinica*) germplasm. Biomass and Bioenergy. 2012;44:64-69.