

CHARACTER ASSOCIATION AND PATH ANALYSIS IN GARLIC (ALLIUM SPP.) GERMPLASM UNDER SUB TROPICAL ENVIRONMENT OF JAMMU

Genetic variability of 41 genotypes of garlic collected from different agroclimatic zone of Jammu division was

assessed for yield, quality and other agronomic characters. The analysis of variance revealed greater variability for

all the traits studied except number of leaves/plant, leaf length, dry matter content, total soluble solids and

equatorial diameter. High heritability coupled with high genetic advance as percent of mean was observed for

plant height (69.23%), average weight of cloves (66.3%), yield/ hectare (54.00%), leaf length (36.04%), equatorial diameter (32.20%) and average weight of bulbs (74.8%) which lead to additive gene action and their expression

and phenotypic selection for their amenability can be brought about. Average bulb weight showed positive and

significant correlation with number of leaves/plant, leaf length, average weight of cloves, equatorial diameter, while it was negative and significantly correlated with total soluble solids. Positive direct effect on average weight

of bulb was observed for average weight of 10 cloves/bulb (0.950), dry matter (0.575), equatorial diameter

(0.419), leaf length (0.127) and plant height (0.222). Therefore it can be inferred from the present study that good scope for garlic improvement in this region is possible through positive selection pressure on suitable traits in

SATESH KUMAR*, R.K.SAMNOTRA, MANOJ KUMAR AND SHILPI KHAR

Division of Vegetable Science and Floriculture,

ABSTRACT

desirable genotypes.

Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Jammu, Faculty of Agriculture, Main Campus, Chatha - 180 009

e-mail: sks.vegetable@gmail.com

KEYWORDS Genetic variability Heritability Correlation Path analysis Allium sativum L

Received on : 29.07.2015

Accepted on : 27.10.2015

*Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Common garlic (Allium sativum L.), a diploid species (2n = 2x = 16) and great headed garlic (Allium ampeloprasum L.), a tetraploid species (2n = 2x = 32), regarded as one of the important bulb crops grown and used as a spice crop or condiment throughout India (Singh and Srivastava, 1999). Theyare cultivated extensively throughout subtropical plains to intermediate higher reaches of Jammu, covering an area of 530 ha with a production of 7070 MT and productivity of 13.33MT/ha (Anonymous, 2014). Districts of Jammu region showing preponderance of garlic cultivation are Jammu, Rajouri and its adjoining areas like Nowshera, Jaba-Anjana and Dudasanwala; Poonch district including Manjakot, Surankot, Mandi, Loran and Mendhar; whole of Kathua districtincluding parts of Bani and Basoli; Udhampur (Basht and Chenani) and Doda (Bhadarwah). Garlic displays considerable variability with respect to morphological features, vield, guality features as well as resistance to important insect pests and diseases. It also shows adaptation to wide range of soil types, temperatures, day length etc making its farming possible from tropics to temperate latitudes. It also showed greater climatic adaptability, some being heat tolerant and others being frost hardy (Maab and Klass, 1995). Lack of flowering in most of the cultivated clones and seed sterility in those that do flower have restricted the sexual breeding and genetic studies in garlic (lpek et al., 2003). It is assumed that the vast diversity that has been observed in cultivated garlic goes back to variation generated from sexual reproduction in the wild crop (Simon, 2001). Existence of this natural variation even in respect of the plant parts that is economically important suggests the possibility of improvement in garlic. Once quantitatively and qualitatively superior clones are identified, their maintenance through vegetative propagation is assured (Singh and Chand,2003).Given that the germplasm of *Allium spp.* is highly variable for morpho-physiologic traits (Avento et *al.*,1998 and Langerano *et al.*, 1995), clones could be identified on the basis of canopy structure and yield related traits (Zepeda,1997). It was therefore considered important to study genetic variability,character association pattern and direct indirect effect of the contributing characters on bulb

MATERIALS AND METHODS

yield under subtropical environment of Jammu.

A collection of 41 garlic genotypes comprising of fourteen hexaploids (*Allium ampeloprasum* L) and twenty seven diploids (*Allium sativum* L), from different zones of Jammu division including four released varieties from NHRDF Karnal, Haryana were evaluated against two checks *i.e.*, AgrifoundParvati (G-313) and Yamuna Safed (G-50) for ten morphological, yield and quality traits (Table 1). All the recommended cultural practices were followed during the entire growth period of crop to raise a healthy crop. Chatha is located in the subtropical zone of Jammu and Kashmir at 32°40 ´ North latitude and 74°58 ´ East longitude having an elevation of 332 m above msl. Its climate is subtropical with hot dry summer, warm humid rainy season and cold winters. The maximum temperature goes up to 47°C during summer (May to June) and minimum temperature falls below 10°C during winter (December-January). The mean annual rainfall during 2012 was 27.2mm whereas it was 13.2mm during 2013 (Source: Agro meteorological section, Division of Agronomy, SKUAST-lammu). The soil of the experimental area was near neutral in reaction (pH = 6.3) with medium in nitrogen and phosphorus concentration but low in potassium level. All the observations were recorded as per standard procedures from five randomly selected plants of each genotype in all the three replications and their mean were worked out for statistical analysis (Panse and Sukhatme, 1967). Plant height was measured from base of the plant to the upper leaf at 80 days after sowing. Leaf length of the 4th leaf was measured from leaf axil up to its tip and leaf width was measured from the middle of the 4th leaf with the help of graduated scale whereas pseudostem length was measured from the soil level to inner leaf lamina notch of the plants and diameter was recorded below leaf level of the plant with the help of vernier calliper. All the morphological observations were recorded as per the standard procedure recommended for the crop in the Proceedings of All India Network Research Project on Onion and Garlic, Directorate of Onion and Garlic Research, Pune (Mah.). The phenotypic and genotypic coefficient of variance were calculated according to formulae (Burton and De-Vane, 1953). Heritability (broad sense) and expected genetic advance was calculated as per Johnson et al. (1955). The characters showing significant correlation with yield were utilized to compute direct and indirect contribution (Dewey and Lu, 1959).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of variance showed considerable amount of variability in all the genotypes of garlic among various traits like plant height, leaf length, pseudostem length, average weight of 10 cloves, equatorial diameter, average weight of bulb, yield/ha except total soluble solids, dry matter weight and number of leaves (Table 2) and thus can be initialized for improvement of quantitative attributes of the crop (Nagi *et al.*, 2013).

Phenotypic variability

Allium sativum is considered a species complex, shows great immense variability (Kamenetsky, 2007). Although belonging to a same group, the collections showed clear distinguishable features in many respects viz., leaf shape, colour and orientation, bulb shape and colour, days to harvest etc. 9 genotypes were broad leaved (leaf width >1.5cm) and spreading in orientation, 7 were narrow leaved (leaf width <1.5cm) and erect including check Yamuna Safed (G-50), 13 were broad leaved and erect in orientation including check AgrifoundParvati(G-313), whereas 10 genotypes were broad leaved showing prostate orientation. On the basis of clove colour, broadly two categories: white and pink white emerged among the collections. 20 genotypes showed whitish cloves where as 21 genotypes including both the checks showed pink-white cloves of the bulbs. On bulb shape basis, 30 genotypes showed ovate bulbs whereas 11 genotypes showed broadly ovate shape of the bulbs. Regarding foliage

2n) = 16,32 Ploidy level Diploid Hexaploid Diploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Diploid Karlah Selection-1 (Udhampur, J&K) Karlah Selection-2 (Udhampur, J&K) Dudasanwala (Poonch, J&K) ower Loren (Poonch, J&K) Chanamandi (Rajouri, J&K) aba-Anjana (Rajouri, J&K) NHRDF, Karnal, Haryana NHRDF, Karnal, Haryana Karnal, Haryana Karnal, Haryana Karnal, Haryana Karnal, Haryana Surankote (Poonch, J&K) Surankote (Poonch, J&K) Dandidhar (Poonch,J&K) Surankote (Poonch,J&K) ²anjgran (Rajouri, J&K) Marh, Jammu, J&K Marh, Jammu, J&K Rajouri, J&K NHRDF, NHRDF, NHRDF, NHRDF, Source /amuna Safed (G-282) Yamuna Safed (G-323) Yamuna Safed (G-1) Yamuna Safed (G-50)* Agrifound Parvati (G-313)* Genotype(s) SJG-12-03 SJG-12-04 SJG-11-24 SJG-11-29 SJG-11-30 SJG-12-02 SJG-11-22 SJG-11-25 SJG-11-26 SJG-11-28 SJG-11-23 SJG-11-27 SJG-11-31 SJG-12-01 G-408 Ŷ s. (2n) = 16, 32Ploidy level Hexaploid Diploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Hexaploid Diploid Nowshera (Rajouri, J&K) Surankote (Poonch, J&K) Surankote (Poonch, J&K) Khaneter (Poonch, J&K) Manjakot (Rajouri, J&K) Kanachak (Jammu, J&K) Kanachak (Jammu, J&K) Chandak (Poonch, J&K) Chandak (Poonch, J&K) Bhaderwah(Doda,J&K) Upper Loren (Poonch, J&K)Rajouri, J&K Mandi (Poonch, J&K) Poonch, J&K Rajouri, J&K Poonch, J&K Poonch, J&K Rajouri, J&K <athua, J&K <athua, J&K Rajouri, J&K Source Genotype(s) SJG-11-20SJ SJG-11-06 SJG-11-07 SJG-11-02 SJG-11-03 SJG-11-04 SJG-11-05 SJG-11-08 SJG-11-09 SJG-11-10 SJG-11-11 SJG-11-12 SJG-11-13 SJG-11-14 SJG-11-15 SJG-11-16 SJG-11-17 SJG-11-18 SJG-11-19 SJG-11-01 G-11-21 °Z 2021 2021 s.

Table 1: List of garlic genotypes and their source of collection

| S. No. | Genotype(s) | Average weight of 10 cloves (g) | Average weight of bulbs (g) | Bulbil formation | Bulb shape | Clove Colour | Days to harvest | Dry matter content (%) | Equatorial diameter (cm) |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | SIG - 11 – 01 | 13.26 | 26.23 | Present | Ovate | White | 190 | 44.6 | 3.63 |
| 2 | SIG - 11 - 02 | 9.33 | 28.13 | Present | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 39 | 3.46 |
| 3 | SIG - 11 – 03 | 15.56 | 27 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 37.6 | 3.4 |
| 4 | SIG - 11 – 04 | 16.16 | 30.3 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 38.3 | 3.36 |
| 5 | SIG - 11 – 05 | 19.7 | 28.3 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 39 | 4.03 |
| 6 | SJG - 11 – 06 | 9.8 | 18.73 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | White | 190 | 28.6 | 2.46 |
| 7 | SJG - 11 – 07 | 22.83 | 25.6 | Absent | Ovate | White | 205 | 39.6 | 3.8 |
| 8 | SJG - 11 – 08 | 20.96 | 29.13 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 28 | 3.7 |
| 9 | SJG - 11 – 09 | 19.4 | 30.9 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 38.6 | 3.5 |
| 10 | SJG - 11 – 10 | 23.5 | 43.4 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 41 | 4.16 |
| 11 | SJG - 11 – 11 | 15.96 | 21.63 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 40.3 | 3.66 |
| 12 | SJG - 11 – 12 | 17.63 | 27.3 | Absent | Ovate | White | 205 | 36 | 3.63 |
| 13 | SJG - 11 – 13 | 13.13 | 22.83 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | White | 190 | 42.6 | 3.3 |
| 14 | SJG - 11 – 14 | 16.66 | 16.3 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 26 | 2.3 |
| 15 | SJG - 11 – 15 | 17.5 | 17.16 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 51 | 3.7 |
| 16 | SJG - 11 – 16 | 7.8 | 8.56 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 43.3 | 2.76 |
| 17 | SJG - 11 – 17 | 8 | 9.3 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 36.6 | 2.23 |
| 18 | SJG - 11 – 18 | 9.9 | 17.96 | Present | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 27 | 2.86 |
| 19 | SJG - 11 – 19 | 9.33 | 26.83 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 39.3 | 2.7 |
| 20 | SJG - 11 – 20 | 30.56 | 38.4 | Present | Ovate | White | 190 | 34.3 | 4.33 |
| 21 | SJG - 11 – 21 | 17.96 | 21.76 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 23.6 | 2.23 |
| 22 | SJG - 11 – 22 | 17.2 | 20.13 | Present | Ovate | White | 190 | 42.3 | 3.9 |
| 23 | SJG - 11 – 23 | 8.26 | 28.73 | Present | Ovate | White | 190 | 35.3 | 2.73 |
| 24 | SJG - 11 – 24 | 12.66 | 28.2 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | White | 190 | 42.3 | 3.4 |
| 25 | SJG - 11 – 25 | 9.3 | 25.66 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 35.6 | 3.66 |
| 26 | SJG - 11 – 26 | 22.76 | 40.86 | Present | Ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 43 | 4.4 |
| 27 | SJG - 11 – 27 | 7.26 | 32.86 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 35 | 2.6 |
| 28 | SJG - 11 – 28 | 10.13 | 30.76 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 39 | 2.86 |
| 29 | SJG - 11 – 29 | 20.4 | 15.2 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 37.3 | 3.56 |
| 30 | SJG - 11 – 30 | 18.1 | 34 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 43 | 4.1 |
| 31 | SJG - 11 – 31 | 14.6 | 20.2 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 37 | 2.66 |
| 32 | SJG - 12 – 01 | 17.3 | 18.63 | Present | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 43 | 3.8 |
| 33 | SJG - 12 – 02 | 13.53 | 15.2 | Present | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 41.6 | 2.83 |
| 34 | SJG - 12 – 03 | 24.96 | 21.23 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 37 | 2.66 |
| 35 | SJG - 12 – 04 | 31.16 | 39.56 | Present | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 34.3 | 4.13 |
| 36 | Yamuna Safed (G- 1) | 21.26 | 38.06 | Present | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 37 | 4.2 |
| 37 | Yamuna Safed (G-282) | 22.9 | 29.1 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 45 | 3.93 |
| 38 | Yamuna Safed | 20.86 | 28.5 | Absent | Ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 44 | 3.83 |
| 39 | G – 408 | 21.1 | 25.96 | Absent | Ovate | White | 190 | 41 | 3.6 |
| 40 | Yamuna Safed | 6.46 | 19.5 | Absent | Broadly-ovate | Pink-white | 190 | 48.6 | 2.83 |
| 41 | Agri found Parvati | 30.46 | 15.56 | Present | Ovate | Pink-white | 205 | 44 | 2.73 |
| | (U-313) (Check) | 16 72 | 25.4F | | | | 102.2 | 29 5 | 2.25 |
| | iviedn | 10.72 | 23.45 | - | - | - | 193.2 | 30.3 9 E | 3.33 |
| | $S.E. \pm C.D.(E.9)$ | ∠.40 6.00 | 2.59 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| | C.U.(5%) C.V. | 6.99 25.73 | 7.3 17.66 | - | - | - | - | 23.8 38.32 | 1.12 20.63 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | |

Table 2: Mean performance of various morphological, yield and quality characters in garlic genotypes

colour, four categories emerged, out of which, 6 genotypes showed green colour foliage, 11 genotypes showed dull green foliage, 14 genotypes showed light green and 10 genotypes were having bright dark green foliage. G-408 had dull dark green foliage colour. On the basis of crop duration, the genotypes were harvested in two lots *i.e.*, one at 190 days after sowing and second at 205 days after sowing, thereby showing a difference of 15 days with a mean value of (193.20days). 8 genotypes including check Yamuna Safed (G-50) namely SJG-11-07, SJG-11-12, SJG-11-17, SJG-11-19, SJG- 11-26, SJG-11-28, G-408 and Yamuna Safed(G-282) were harvested 15 days late *i.e.*, at 205 days after sowing as compared to rest of the genotypes which were harvested at 190 days after sowing. Variability with respect to the ability of formation of aerial bulbils (propagating material) is concerned, 12 genotypes including check Agrifound Parvati (G-313) and Yamuna Safed (G-50) showed the ability to produce aerial bulbils (Table 2). Similar variability in germplasm was observed by Singh and Chand, 2003, Monpara *et al.*, 2005, Hosamani *et al.*, 2010 and Singh *et al.*, 2012.

Table 2: Cont.....

| S.No. | Foliage colour | Leaf length (cm) | Leaf type | Number of leaves/ plant | Plant height (cm) | Pseudostem length (cm) | Total soluble solids (°B) | Yield / ha (q) |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Bright dark green | 25.73 | Spreading & Broad | 7.6 | 37.5 | 2.4 | 24.5 | 71.73 |
| 2 | Bright dark green | 27.2 | Spreading &Broad | 9.7 | 38.73 | 4 | 23.86 | 77.2 |
| 3 | Green | 37 | Erect & Narrow | 6.9 | 50.53 | 3.56 | 23.76 | 73.56 |
| 4 | Green | 32.5 | Erect & Broad | 7.6 | 39.3 | 3.3 | 24.26 | 83.86 |
| 5 | Dull green | 34.9 | Prostate & Broad | 10 | 47.03 | 2.7 | 25.4 | 88 |
| 6 | Dull green | 29.36 | Prostate & Broad | 6.8 | 45.36 | 3.33 | 23.93 | 58.2 |
| 7 | Bright dark green | 30 | Prostate & Broad | 8.1 | 46.43 | 4.56 | 24.76 | 79.6 |
| 8 | Bright dark green | 28.86 | Prostate & Broad | 5.8 | 39.33 | 2.93 | 22.8 | 90.63 |
| 9 | Dull green | 25.13 | Erect & Broad | 8.3 | 34.03 | 2.66 | 23.9 | 90.8 |
| 10 | Light green | 29.5 | Erect & Broad | 7.9 | 36.8 | 2.5 | 24.1 | 134.96 |
| 11 | Dull green | 28.26 | Erect & Broad | 8.4 | 33.16 | 2.13 | 24.8 | 68.23 |
| 12 | Light green | 25.93 | Prostate & Broad | 8.2 | 35.5 | 3.16 | 23.6 | 84.86 |
| 13 | Bright dark green | 32.73 | Prostate & Broad | 7.7 | 47.6 | 2.53 | 23.96 | 60.66 |
| 14 | Light green | 31.2 | Erect & Broad | 7.86 | 38.6 | 3.7 | 26.1 | 50.63 |
| 15 | Light green | 35.8 | Erect & Broad | 7.76 | 52.1 | 3.2 | 25.1 | 53.33 |
| 16 | Light green | 30.2 | Erect & Broad | 6.1 | 39.7 | 4 | 24.4 | 37.1 |
| 17 | Bright dark green | 15.4 | Prostate & Broad | 5.5 | 22 | 1.86 | 24.16 | 36.23 |
| 18 | Light green | 31.8 | Prostate & Broad | 8.4 | 38.3 | 2.1 | 22.8 | 55.86 |
| 19 | Bright dark green | 22.83 | Erect & Narrow | 5.3 | 33.4 | 2.53 | 24.66 | 83.5 |
| 20 | Dull green | 21.3 | Spreading &Broad | 5.5 | 31.5 | 4.5 | 23.53 | 119.53 |
| 21 | Light green | 19.23 | Erect & Broad | 4.8 | 27.13 | 3 | 26.4 | 57.26 |
| 22 | Light green | 22.86 | Erect & Broad | 8.1 | 32.06 | 3.46 | 24.56 | 62.7 |
| 23 | Light green | 21.56 | Erect & Narrow | 5.7 | 28.5 | 3.66 | 23.6 | 79 |
| 24 | Dull green | 29.66 | Spreading &Broad | 7.03 | 40.13 | 4.8 | 23.2 | 77.3 |
| 25 | Light green | 22.8 | Erect &Broad | 6.5 | 34.96 | 4.16 | 23.6 | 79.86 |
| 26 | Light green | 22.66 | Erect & Narrow | 5.9 | 32.2 | 3.5 | 24.3 | 127 |
| 27 | Light green | 25.86 | Erect & Broad | 6.56 | 38.26 | 3.43 | 23.23 | 102.33 |
| 28 | Light green | 21.6 | Erect & Broad | 8.2 | 25.83 | 2.73 | 23.9 | 95.63 |
| 29 | Light green | 21.66 | Erect & Narrow | 6.6 | 30.47 | 3.46 | 24.56 | 47.36 |
| 30 | Dark green | 22.03 | Erect & Narrow | 6.3 | 30.76 | 3.33 | 24.33 | 116.6 |
| 31 | Green | 25.53 | Erect & Broad | 7.6 | 33.1 | 3.16 | 23 | 73.3 |
| 32 | Green | 25.6 | Spreading &Broad | 6.7 | 38.26 | 2.26 | 22.23 | 128.9 |
| 33 | Dull green | 24.73 | Erect & Narrow | 5.8 | 36.73 | 3.4 | 24.2 | 49.33 |
| 34 | Dull green | 29.9 | Spreading &Broad | 7.9 | 40.63 | 2.43 | 27.7 | 100.83 |
| 35 | Green | 32.5 | Erect & Broad | 9.3 | 41.6 | 2.7 | 29.86 | 88.53 |
| 36 | Dull green | 34.5 | Erect & Narrow | 6.53 | 49.76 | 1.76 | 23.73 | 59.16 |
| 37 | Bright dark green | 35.66 | Spreading &Broad | 8 | 48.16 | 1.83 | 23.7 | 58 |
| 38 | Dull green | 31.3 | Erect & Broad | 7.5 | 38.73 | 3.06 | 25.2 | 47.3 |
| 39 | Dull dark green | 25.3 | Prostate & Broad | 5.9 | 31.1 | 3.1 | 24.33 | 123.06 |
| 40 | Bright dark green | 28 | Prostate & Broad | 6.1 | 45.66 | 4.7 | 24.9 | 70.73 |
| 41 | Green | 20.93 | Erect & Broad | 6.16 | 26.6 | 3.36 | 24.1 | 78.46 |
| | - | 27.3 | - | 7.13 | 37.5 | 3.14 | 24.36 | 78.56 |
| | - | 3.1 | - | 1.07 | 2.59 | 0.61 | 1.41 | 11.76 |
| | - | 8.74 | - | N.S | 7.31 | 1.73 | N.S | 33.52 |
| | - | 19.71 | - | 26.07 | 11.99 | 33.87 | 10.03 | 26.25 |

An insight into the magnitude of variability present in a crop species is of utmost importance as it provides basis for effective selection. More the variability in germplasm, more is the chance for selecting desirable genotypes (Vavilov, 1951). Most of the economic traits are quantitative in nature, exhibit continuous variation under the control of both heritable and non heritable factors and effective selection would therefore depend upon the relative heritable portion(Fisher, 1918). In the present investigation, PCV was observed to be higher than the corresponding GCV for all the characters studied (Table 3). High estimates of PCV were observed for average weight of cloves (44.35%), average weight of bulbs (35.19%), yield /ha (38.81%), dry matter content (34.75%), plant height (21.62%) and leaf length (24.64%). However, the differences were narrow which implied their relative resistance to environmental variations. It also described that genetic factors were predominantly responsible for expression of these attributes and selection could be made effective on the basis of phenotypic performance. The traits which showed high phenotypic and genotypic coefficient of variation are of

Table 3: Estimates of various genetic parametersforvarious characters in garlic genotypes

| Character(s) | Mean \pm S.E. | Range | PCV (%) | GCV(%) | h ² (%) Broad sense | GA (%) | GA (% of mean) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| Average weight of bulb (g) | 25.45 ± 2.59 | 8.56 - 43.40 | 35.19 | 30.44 | 74.80 | 13.80 | 54.23 |
| Average weight of 10 cloves (g) | 16.72 ± 2.48 | 6.46 - 31.16 | 44.35 | 36.12 | 66.30 | 10.13 | 60.60 |
| Dry matter content (%) | $3.85~\pm~0.85$ | 2.36 - 5.10 | 34.75 | 16.15 | 21.60 | 0.59 | 15.46 |
| Equatorial diameter (cm) | 3.35 ± 0.40 | 2.23 - 4.40 | 25.06 | 14.22 | 32.20 | 0.55 | 16.62 |
| Leaf length (cm) | 27.30 ± 3.10 | 15.4 - 37.0 | 24.64 | 14.79 | 36.04 | 4.99 | 18.29 |
| Number of leaves / plant | 7.13 ± 1.07 | 4.80 - 10.00 | 27.38 | 8.37 | 9.30 | 0.37 | 5.27 |
| Pseudostem length (cm) | 3.14 ± 0.61 | 1.76 - 4.80 | 37.06 | 15.05 | 16.59 | 0.39 | 12.59 |
| Plant height (cm) | 37.50 ± 2.59 | 22.00 - 52.10 | 21.62 | 17.99 | 69.23 | 11.56 | 30.83 |
| Total soluble solids (°B) | 24.36 ± 1.41 | 22.23 - 29.86 | 9.84 | 1.97 | 4.00 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| Yield/ha (q) | 78.56 ± 11.76 | 36.23-134.90 | 38.81 | 28.59 | 54.00 | 34.08 | 43.37 |

Table 4: Estimates of genotypic (G) and phenotypic (P) correlation coefficients among various characters in garlic genotypes

| Character(s) | | Average weight of 10cloves (g) | Dry matter content (%) | Equatorial diameter (cm) | Leaf length (cm) | Number of leaves/ plant | Plant height (cm) | Pseudostem length (cm) | Total soluble solids (°B) |
|----------------------------|-----|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Average weight of 10 | (G) | - | | | | | | | |
| cloves (g) | (P) | - | | | | | | | |
| Dry matter content (%) | (G) | -0.178* | - | | | | | | |
| | (P) | -0.03 | - | | | | | | |
| Equatorial diameter (cm) | (G) | 0.748** | -0.528** | - | | | | | |
| | (P) | 0.389** | 0.073 | - | | | | | |
| Leaf length (cm) | (G) | 0.173 | -0.048 | 0.480** | - | | | | |
| | (P) | 0.093 | 0.035 | 0.127 | - | | | | |
| Number of leaves/ plant | (G) | 0.405** | -0.276** | 0.690** | 0.15 | - | | | |
| | (P) | 0.016 | -0.038 | 0.17 | 0.337** | - | | | |
| Plant height (cm) | (G) | 0.045 | -0.172 | 0.356** | 0.222* | 0.859** | - | | |
| | (P) | 0.018 | 0.002 | 0.181* | 0.618** | 0.202* | - | | |
| Pseudostem length(cm) | (G) | -0.252** | -0.146 | -0.171 | -0.190* | -0.599** | 0.046 | - | |
| | (P) | -0.045 | 0 | 0.031 | -0.091 | -0.085 | 0.002 | - | |
| Total soluble solids (°B) | (G) | -0.282** | -0.334** | 0.187* | -0.299** | -0.269** | -0.06 | 0.842** | - |
| | (P) | 0.221* | 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.079 | 0.073 | 0.048 | 0.016 | - |
| Average weight of bulb (g) | (G) | 0.478** | 0.103 | 0.898** | 0.211* | 0.256** | 0.114 | -0.026 | -0.220* |
| | (P) | -0.278** | 0.074 | 0.409** | 0.054 | 0.128 | 0.049 | -0.041 | -0.004 |

*, ** Significant at 5 % and 1% level respectively

economic importance and there is scope for improvement of these traits through selection. Results of Marey *et al.*, 2012,Yadav *et al.*, 2012 and Gashua *et al.*, 2013 also suggested for selection of traits with high GCV and PCV in any crop improvement programme.

Heritability

Heritability in broad sense ranged from (4.00% to 74.80%). High estimates of heritability in broad sense (Table 3) were recorded for characters like plant height (69.23%), average weight of cloves (66.3%), yield/ hectare (54.00%), leaf length (36.04%), equatorial diameter (32.20%) and average weight of bulbs (74.8%) indicating that selection for such characters be fairly easy because traits would be least influenced by environmental modifications and selections based on phenotypic performance would be reliable (Singh *et al.*, 2012 and Yadav *et al.*, 2012).

Genetic advance

It is the improvement over the base population that can potentially be made from the selection. It is the function of the heritability of the traits, the amount of phenotypic variation and the selection differential (s) that the breeder uses. The estimates of heritability and genetic advance should always be considered simultaneously as high heritability is not always associated with high genetic gain (Johnson et al., 1955). Burton (1952) suggested that GCV along with heritability give the best picture of the genetic advance to be expected from selection. The estimates of genetic advance as percent of mean ranged from 0.81% to 60.60 % for total soluble solids and average weight of 10 cloves, respectively (Table 3). This indicates that selection from top 5% of the base population could result in an advantage of 0.81 to 60.60% over base population mean. High genetic advance coupled with high heritability was obtained for average weight of cloves, average weight of bulb, plant height and yield/ha. Hence due to additive gene action selection for these characters is likely to be more effective (Panse et al., 2013). The characters like number of leaves/ plant, leaf length, pseudo stem length, dry matter content, total soluble solids and equatorial diameter showed low heritability coupled with high to low genetic gain and GCV depicting that these characters were governed by non-additive genes and would not be effective. The above results were confirmed to the earlier reports of Panthee et al. (2006), Morsey et al. (2011), Singh et al. (2012) and Barad et al. (2012).

SATESH KUMAR et al

Table 5: Estimates of genotypic (G) and phenotypic (P) path coefficients of various characters on bulb weight in garlic genotypes

| Character (s) | | AWC | DM | ED | LL | NOL | РН | PSL | TSS | CAWB |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Average weight of 10 cloves (g) | G | 0.95 | -0.169 | 0.71 | 0.164 | 0.385 | 0.043 | -0.239 | -0.219 | 0.478** |
| | Р | 0.106 | -0.003 | 0.041 | 0.009 | 0.008 | 0.002 | -0.004 | 0.023 | 0.278** |
| Dry matter content (%) | G | -0.102 | 0.575 | 0.304 | -0.027 | -0.158 | -0.099 | -0.084 | -0.192 | 0.103 |
| | Р | -0.001 | 0.036 | 0.002 | 0.011 | -0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.074 |
| Equatorial diameter (cm) | G | 0.314 | -0.221 | 0.419 | 0.201 | 0.289 | 0.149 | -0.071 | 0.078 | 0.898** |
| | Р | 0.089 | 0.016 | 0.228 | 0.029 | 0.039 | 0.041 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.409** |
| Leaf length (cm) | G | 0.022 | -0.006 | 0.061 | 0.127 | 0.146 | 0.155 | -0.024 | -0.038 | 0.211* |
| | Р | -0.004 | -0.001 | -0.006 | -0.051 | 0.017 | -0.031 | 0.004 | -0.004 | 0.054 |
| Number of leaves / plant | G | -0.156 | 0.106 | -0.266 | -0.444 | -0.386 | -0.331 | 0.231 | -0.49 | 0.256** |
| | Р | 0.001 | -0.003 | 0.013 | 0.027 | 0.08 | 0.016 | -0.006 | 0.005 | 0.128 |
| Plant height (cm) | G | 0.01 | -0.038 | 0.079 | 0.272 | 0.191 | 0.222 | 0.01 | -0.013 | 0.114 |
| | Р | -0.009 | -0.002 | -0.003 | -0.012 | -0.004 | -0.02 | -0.002 | -0.001 | 0.049 |
| Pseudostem length (cm) | G | -0.033 | -0.019 | -0.022 | -0.025 | -0.079 | -0.006 | -0.133 | 0.112 | 0.026 |
| | Р | 0.005 | 0.005 | -0.001 | 0.009 | 0.003 | -0.001 | -0.029 | -0.001 | -0.041 |
| Total soluble solids (B°) | G | -0.402 | -0.104 | 0.058 | -0.094 | -0.398 | -0.018 | 0.263 | -0.313 | -0.220* |
| | Р | -0.011 | -0.002 | -0.001 | -0.003 | -0.003 | -0.002 | -0.002 | -0.049 | -0.004 |

Residual effect (G) = 0.659; Residual effect (P) = 0.821

Phenotypic and genotypic correlation

The studies revealed significant and positive association of average weight of bulb with number of leaves / plant, leaf length and equatorial diameter at both phenotypic and genotypic levels (Table 4). Negative and significant correlation with average weight of bulb was shown by total soluble solids at genotypic levels. Significant and positive correlation of plant height was observed with number of leaves, leaf length and equatorial diameter at both genotypic and phenotypic levels and results are supported by the findings of Marey et al. (2012), Panse et al. (2013) and Dhall and Brar (2013). Significant positive correlation of number of leaves/plant with equatorial diameter and average weight of cloves was observed at genotypic level and with leaf length at phenotypic level. Similarly, significant but negative correlation of number of leaves / plant was observed with pseudo-stem length, total soluble solids and dry matter content at genotypic levels. Leaf length showed positive and significant correlation with equatorial diameter and negative but significant correlation with total soluble solids at genotypic levels. The results are in accordance with the results reported earlier by Naruka and Dhaka (2004) and Singh et al. (2006). Pseudostem length was significantly and positively correlated with total soluble solids but negatively with average weight of cloves. Average weight of cloves/bulb showed positive and significant correlation with equatorial diameter, whereas negative and significantly correlated with dry matter content and total soluble solids.Significant positive correlation was observed of equatorial diameter with total soluble solids butsignificant negative correlation with dry matter content. On the other hand, dry matter showed positive significant correlation with total soluble solids. The results of Vatsyayan et al. (2014) and Desai et al. (2015) are in agreement with the present study.

Path coefficient analysis

It is a powerful tool which enables partitioning of the given relationship in its further components. *i.e.*, it enables partitioning of total correlation coefficient into direct and indirect effects. In the present investigation, path coefficient analysis was carried out for eight characters under study using genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients and taking average bulb weight as dependant variable (Table 5). Positive direct effect of average weight of 10 cloves/bulb (0.950),dry matter (0.575), equatorial diameter (0.419), leaf length (0.127) and plant height (0.222) on average weight of bulb was observed and the results are in propinquity with Mohanty (2001) and Agarwal et al. (2009). These characters exhibit the significant correlation with average weight of bulb, thus their contribution towards yield cannot be ignored. However, highest negative direct effect was observed in number of leaves/plant (-0.386), TSS (-0.313) and pseudo stem length (-0.133) on average weight of bulb. The positive indirect effect on average weight of bulb was recorded for equatorial diameter via., average weight of cloves/bulb (0.710), number of leaves/ plant via., average weight of 10 cloves (0.385) and equatorial diameter via., dry matter content (0.304). This indicated that indirect effect was the cause of correlation and the indirect causal factors are to be considered simultaneously for selection. The findings of Hosamani et al. (2010) in garlic, Degewione et al. (2011) in shallot and Dhall and Brar (2013) also in garlic supported the present study.

The present investigations indicated that there is a good scope for garlic improvement through selection of suitable traits among the genotypes in this region of J&K.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, A. and Tiwari, R. S. 2009. Character association and path analysis in garlic. *Vegetable Science* **36(1):** 69-73.

Anonymous 2014. Area under vegetables in Jammu division during rabi (2012-13). *Vegetable Agronomist*. Directorate of Agriculture, Talab Tillo, Jammu, pp. 17-18.

Avento, P., Miccolis, V. and Tursi, F. 1998. Agronomic evaluation and essential oil content of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) ecotypes grown in South Italy. *Advancement of Horticultural Sciences*. **12(4)**: 201-204.

Barad, Y. M., Kathiria, K. B. and Modha, K. G. 2012. Correlation and path coefficient studies in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) over different environments. *Vegetable Science*. **39(1):** 79-82.

Burton, G. W. 1952. Quantitative inheritance in grasses. In: Proc. 6th

International Grassland Congress 1: 277-283.

Burton, G. W. and De-Vane, E. H. 1953. Estimating heritability in tall fescue (*Festuca arundinaceae*) from replicated clonal material. *Journal of Agronomy* **45**: 478-481.

Degewione, A., Alameren, S. and Tabor, G. 2011. Genetic variability and association of bulb yield and related traits in shallot. *Ethiopia International J. Agricultural Research.* 6(7): 517-536.

Desai, K., Tank, C. J., Gami, R. A., Patel, A. M. and Chuhan, R. M. 2015. Genetic variability in indigeneous collection of chickpea (*C. arietinum* L.) genotypes for seed yield and quality traits. *The Ecoscan.* 9(1&2): 59-62.

Dewey, D. R. and Lu, K. H. 1959. Correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. J. Agronomy. 51: 515-518.

Dhall, R. K. and Brar, P. S. 2013. Genetic variability and path coefficient studies in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.).*Vegetable Science*. **40(1)**: 102-104.

Fisher, R. A.1918. The correlation between relatives on the supposition of Mendelian inheritance. *Trans Royal Society*. Edin burgh. **52**: 399-433.

Gashua, I. B., Simon, S. Y., Bashir, L. U. and Kadams, A. M. 2013. Inheritance studies of some quantitative traits in onion (*Allium cepa* L.). *International J. Biosciences.* **3(4):** 135-141.

Haydar, A., Sharker, N., Ahmed, M. B., Hannan, M. M., Razvy, M. A., Hossain, M., Hoque, A. and Karim, R. 2007. Genetic variability and interrelationship in onion (*Allium cepa L.*) *Middle East J. Science and Research.* 2(3-4): 132-134.

Hosamani, R. M., Patil, B. C. and Ajjappalavara, P. S. 2010. Genetic variability and character association studies in onion (*Allium sativum* L.). Karnataka J. Agricultural Sciences. 23(2): 302-305.

Ipek, M., Ipek, A. and Simon, P. 2003. Gene comparison of AFLP,s RAPD markers and isozymes for diversity assessment of garlic and detection of putative duplicates in germplasm collection. *J. American Society for Horticultural Science*.**128:** 246-252.

Johnson, H. W., Robinson, H. F. and Comstock, R. E. 1955. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybean. *Agronomy J.* 47: 314-318.

Kamenetsky, R. 2007. Garlic: Botany and Horticulture. *Horticultural Reviews.* 33: 123-172.

Langerano, P., De Carlo, D., Candido, V., Martelli, G., Miccolis, V. and Greco, I. 1995. Analisidellavariabilita genetic con marcatori biochimici in *Allium sativum* L. *Proc. 'L' orticoltura in Basilicata: situazioneattuale e prospettive.' Metaponto.* 2 March 1994. *In:* Vito Radio (Eds.). pp. 107-119.

Maab, H. I. and Klaas, M. 1995. Genetic analysis of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) germplasm collection from Argentina. *Scientia Horticulturae.* 38: 183-189.

Marey, R. A., Abo, A., Dahab, M. A., Karam, S. S. and Geries, L. S. M. 2012. Phenotypiccorrelation and path coefficient in some onion genotypes (*Allium cepa L.*) grown in upper Egypt. *J. Agricultural Research.* 38(1): 154-168.

Mohanty, B. K. 2001. Genetic variability, inter relationship and path analysis in onion (Allium cepa L.) J. Tropical Agriculture. 39: 1720.

Monpara, B. A., Chhatrola, M. D., Golani, I. J. and Vaddoria, M. A. 2005. Evaluation of onion germplasm variability and trait relationship studies. *National J. Plant Improvement.* 7(1): 11-14.

Morsey, M. G., Marey, R. A. and Geries, L. S. M. 2011. Genetic variability, heritability, genetic advance and phenotypic correlation in some onion varieties. *J. Agricultural Research.* **37(1)**: 57-72.

Nagi, K., Sharma, R. N., Nandah, C. and Kanwer, S. S. 2013. Genetic variability and asso- ciation studies among yield attributes in Pigeon Pea (*C cajan* L.) accessions of Bastar. *The Ecoscan Special issue*. IV: 267-271.

Naruka, I. S. and Dhaka, R. S. 2004. Correlation studies in garlic (Allium sativum L.). Progressive Horticulture. 36(1): 128-131.

Panse, R., Jain, P. K., Gupta, A. and Sasode, D. S. 2013. Morphological variability and character association in diverse collection of garlic germplasm. *African J. Agricultural Research.* 8(23): 2861-2869.

Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. 1967. (Eds) In: *Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers*. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. p. 361.

Panthee, D. R., Regmi, H. N., Subedi, P. P., Bhattarai, S. and Dhakal, J. 2006. Diversity analysis of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) germplasm available in Nepal based on morphological characters. *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution*. 53: 205-212.

Singh, Y., Chand, R., Sharma, S. and Sharma, A. 2006. Correlation and path analysis studies in garlic (*Allium sativum L.*) *Himachal J. Agricultural Research.* 32(1): 51-55.

Singh, R. K., Dubey, B. K., Bhonde, S. R. and Gupta, R. P. 2012. Studies on variability, heritability and genetic advance in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) *Vegetable Science*. **39(1):** 86-88.

Singh,L.and Srivastava,K.J.1999.Garlic development in India-role of NHRDF, NHRDF Newsletter.14(1): 5

Simon, P. W. 2001. The origins and distribution of garlic:how many garlics are there?USDA,ARS,Vegetable Crop Research Unit, Department of Horticulture,University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI-53706.

Vatsyayan, S., Brar, P. S., Dhall, R. K. and Singh, H. 2014. Correlation and path analysis in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.).Vegetable Science. **41(1)**: 54-55.

Vavilov, N. I. 1951. The origin, variation, immunity and breeding of cultivated plants. *Chronica Botanica*. 13(1-6): 364.

Yadav, N. K., Singh, K. P., Naidu, A. K. and Nair, B. 2012. Estimation of genetic variability for yield and its components in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) *Progressive Agriculture*. **12(1):** 26-34.

Yudhvir, S. and Chand, R. 2003. Performance studies of some garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) clones. *Himachal J. Agricultural Research*. 29(1&2): 35-42.

Zepeda, A. H. 1997. Number of cloves per bulb, selection criteria for garlic improvement.In: Burba J L and Galmarini C R (Eds.). Results with 'chilegno' type. *Proceedings of Ist International Symposium on Edible* Alliaceae. Acta Horticulturae. **433**: 265-270.