

Article history : Received : 13.02.2017 Revised : 21.04.2017 Accepted : 06.05.2017 THE ASIAN JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURE Volume 12 | Issue 1 | June, 2017 | 46-50



DOI: 10.15740/HAS/TAJH/12.1/46-50

## **RESEARCH PAPER**

# Association of characters and their direct and indirect contribution for yield in off- season bottle gourd [Lagenaria siceraria (Mol.) Standl]

# **HEMANT KUMAR SINGH AND D.R. SINGH<sup>1</sup>**

#### Members of the Research Forum

Associated Authors: <sup>1</sup>Post Graduate College, GHAZIPUR (U.P.) INDIA

ABSTRACT: Correlation and path analysis were carried out in order to quantify the contribution of explanatory characters towards yield for off- season bottle gourd cultivation. The characters like number of fruits per plant, average number of seed per fruit, average fruit weight, vine length and days to first male flower anthesis, number of fruit per plant, average fruit weight and days to first male flower anthesis had the highest positive direct effect on fruit yield per plant.

KEY WORDS: Off- season, Bottle gourd, Association, Path co-efficient

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE : Singh, Hemant Kumar and Singh, D.R. (2017). Association of characters and their direct and indirect contribution for yield in off- season bottle gourd [Lagenaria siceraria (mol.) standl]. Asian J. Hort., 12(1): 46-50, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/TAJH/12.1/46-50.

HEMANT KUMAR SINGH Post Graduate College, GHAZIPUR (U.P.) INDIA

Author for correspondence :

T is true that off- season cultivation of this crop (in plains and river beds)has opened a better marketing window to the growers for better return of their produce ,which ultimately result better livelihoods of forming community (Singh and Kumar, 2002). In eastern up the temperature and photo radiations are sub optimal which provide conductive environment for off season cultivation of the crop. The statistical quantification of the relationship among the component characters as well as relative share towards economic yield is useful for selection /improvement in off season cultivation (Sharma and Bhutani, 2001 and Nimbalker et al., 2002).

Bottle gourd (Lagenaria siceraria),2n=22 is an important cucurbitaceae crop grown throughout the country. It is a warm season vegetable, which thrives well in warm and humid climates but it can be grown throughout the year in northern Indian plane as offseason vegetable. The bottle gourd fruits in the green stage are used as vegetable which is available throughout the year and also for preparation of some delicious sweets. It is highly digestive and reduced cough. As medicinal properties, it has cooling cardiotonic and diuretic. Its also useful in controlling asthma, bronchitis and ulcers.

It is a monoecious and highly cross pollinated crop in which a large amount of variation is observed in many economically important traits. Variation found in shape, size and colour of fruits is most conspicuous. The variability of different characters is pre-requisite for crop improvement (Ramesh et al., 2000). Variability also exists with respect to other quantitative and qualitative morphological traits in local land races of bottle gourd availability of wide range of variability in India, very little attention has been paid for their rigorous collection, evaluation and documentation. Local varieties /land races are most commonly used by growers because very few improved varieties are available in this crop for cultivation. The great extent of natural variation present in various characters among the genotypes of bottle gourd suggests good scope for improvement in economic traits through conventional selection techniques (Prasad and Prasad, 1978; Narayan *et al.*,1996 and Singh *et al.*,1996).Improvement through selection in any characters depend upon the genetic variability present in the germplasm. Greater the genotypic variability better are the chances for improvement through selection. Most of the agronomically important characters including yield are polygenically controlled and one highly influenced by environmental factors. Since yield is complex characters dependent on several components (Grafius, 1964).

### **RESEARCH METHODS**

The experiment was carried out during the winter season(off- season) of 2013-2014 at Vegetable Research Farm, Department of Horticulture, P.G. College Ghazipur (U.P.).

The materials for the present study comprised of twenty five germplasm of bottle gourd which were planted in Randomized Block Design and replicated thrice. Correlation co-efficients were calculated for all quantitative characters combinations at phenotypic and genotypic level by the formula given by Al Jibouri *et al.* (1958). The direct and indirect contribution of various characters to yield was calculated through path coefficiant analysis as suggested by Wright, 1921 and elaborated by Dewey and Lu (1959).

## **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Correlation analysis provides a good measure of the linear association between characters and helps to identify the most important characters to be considered

| Table 1 :  | Estimat                          | tes genotyp                               | oic and phen                                | otypic corre                          | lation co-eff                           | icients for y         | ield and its       | contributin                 | g characte                   | rs in bottle                   | gourd                         |
|------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Characters | Number of days to<br>germination | Node no.to first male<br>flower emergence | Node no.to first female<br>flower emergence | Days to first male<br>flower anthesis | Days to first female<br>flower anthesis | Days to first harvest | Vine length(m)     | Average fruit<br>weight(kg) | Number of fruit per<br>plant | Average no. of seed per fruits | Edible fruit yield<br>(q/ha.) |
| 1          | rg<br>rp                         | 0.0655<br>-0.0569                         | -0.2464<br>-0.2438*                         | 0.6235<br>0.6107**                    | 0.5515<br>0.5461**                      | 0.4009<br>0.3837**    | 0.1490<br>0.1341   | -o.1650<br>-0.1412          | 0.1748<br>0.1657             | -0.0876<br>-0.0824             | 0.2818<br>0.2656*             |
| 2          | rg<br>rp                         |   | 0.7913<br>0.7627**                          | -0.0724<br>-0.0719                    | 0.0100<br>0.0130                        | 0.0178<br>0.0192      | -0.0454<br>-0.0473 | 0.2846<br>0.2607*           | 0.0619<br>0.0564             | 0.3785<br>0.3426**             | 0.1853<br>0.1817              |
| 3          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   | -0.1204<br>-0.1173                    | -0.1166<br>-0.1124                      | -0.0786<br>-0.0812    | 0.0673<br>0.0727   | 0.3138<br>0.2581*           | -0.0308<br>-0.0280           | 0.4229<br>0.4002**             | 0.0318<br>0.0341              |
| 4          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       | 0.8969<br>0.8798**                      | 0.8157<br>0.7752**    | 0.4069<br>0.3993** | 0.2690<br>0.2337*           | -0.0484<br>-0.0829           | -0.0825<br>-0.0755             | 0.3387<br>0.3309**            |
| 5          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   | 0.9188<br>0.8796**    | 0.4133<br>0.3970** | 0.1863<br>0.1461            | -0.0715<br>-0.0677           | -0.0899<br>-0.0914             | 0.1994<br>0.1921              |
| 6          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   |                       | 0.3864<br>0.3635** | 0.1461<br>0.1038            | -0.2487<br>-0.2060           | -0.2064<br>-0.1832             | 0.0531<br>0.0492              |
| 7          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   |                       |                    | 0.3954<br>0.3366**          | -0.2083<br>-0.1852           | 0.0699<br>0.0731               | 0.2845<br>0.2767*             |
| 8          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   |                       |                    |                             | -0.4145<br>-0.3247**         | 0.4700<br>0.3624**             | 0.3567<br>0.2983**            |
| 9          | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   |                       |                    |                             |                              | 0.0870<br>0.0825               | 0.5740<br>0.5360**            |
| 10         | rg<br>rp                         |   |   |                                       |   |                       |                    |                             |                              |                                | 0.4047<br>0.3854**            |

\*and\*\* indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively,

rp= Phenotypic correlation co-efficient, rg= Genotypic correlation co-efficients

for effective selection for increasing yield. In the present investigation correlations were worked out both at phenotypic and genotypic levels for all possible character combinations. In general genotypic correlations coefficients were higher in magnitude than phenotypic correlations co-efficients (Chander *et al.*, 2000) in the same direction and magnitude indicated that there is a strong inherent association between each pair of characters which might be due to masking or modifying effect of the environment.

On the basis of analysis (Table 1) the edible fruit yield had highly significant and positive association with number of fruit per plant (rp=0.5360), average number of seed per fruit (rp=0.3854), days to first male flower

anthesis (rp=0.3309) and average fruit weight (rp=0.2983), but was negatively correlated with average number of seed per fruits and number of fruit per plant whereas number of fruit per plant had negative and significant correlation with fruit yield per plant (rp=0.3247). Number of days to germination exhibited a positive and significant association with days to first male flower anthesis (rp=0.6107) followed by days to first female flower anthesis (rp=0.5461) and days to first harvest (rp=0.3837) whereas negative and significant correlation with node number to first female flower emergence (rp=-0.2438).

Node number to first male flower emergence exhibited a positive and significant association with node

| Table 2 : Genotypic and phenotypic path analysis showing direct and indirect effect on fruit yield of bottle gourd |                |                                  |  |                                    |                                       |   |                       |                    |                             |                              |                                   |                               |
|--|----------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Characters   |                | Number of days to<br>germination | Node no. to first male<br>flower emergence | Node no. to first<br>female flower | Days to first male<br>flower anthesis | Days to first female<br>flower anthesis | Days to first harvest | Vine length(m)     | Average fruit<br>weight(kg) | Number of fruit per<br>plant | Average no. of seed<br>per fruits | Edible fruit yield<br>(q/ha.) |
| Number of<br>days to<br>germination  | G<br>P         | 0.1429<br>-0.0529                | 0.0094<br>-0.0030                          | -0.0352<br>0.0129                  | 0.0891<br>-0.0323                     | 0.0788<br>-0.0289                       | 0.0573<br>-0.0203     | 0.0213<br>-0.0071  | -0.0236<br>0.0075           | 0.0250<br>-0.0088            | -0.0125<br>0.0044                 | 0.2818<br>0.2656              |
| Node no.to<br>first male<br>flower emerge  | G<br>P<br>ence | -0.0196<br>-0.0222               | 0.2992<br>0.3893                           | 0.2368<br>0.2969                   | -0.0217<br>-0.0280                    | 0.0030<br>0.0051                        | 0.0053<br>0.0075      | -0.0136<br>-0.0184 | 0.0852<br>0.1015            | 0.0185<br>0.0220             | 0.1133<br>0.1334                  | 0.1853<br>0.1817              |
| Node no to<br>first female<br>flower emerge  | G<br>P<br>ence | 0.1103<br>0.1027                 | -0.3542<br>-0.3213                         | -0.4477<br>-0.4212                 | 0.0539<br>0.0494                      | 0.0522<br>0.0473                        | 0.0252<br>0.0342      | -0.0301<br>-0.0306 | -0.1405<br>-0.1087          | 0.0138<br>0.0100             | -0.1893<br>-0.1686                | 0.0318<br>0.0341              |
| Days to first<br>male flower<br>anthesis   | G<br>P         | 0.3622<br>0.4583                 | -0.0421<br>-0.0540                         | -0.0700<br>-0.0880                 | 0.5809<br>0.7505                      | 0.5210<br>0.6602                        | 0.4738<br>0.5817      | 0.2364<br>0.2997   | 0.1562<br>0.1754            | -0.0493<br>-0.0622           | -0.0479<br>-0.0566                | 0.3387<br>0.3309              |
| Days to first<br>female<br>flower anthes   | Р              | -0.6807<br>-0.3128               | -0.0124<br>-0.0074                         | 0.1439<br>0.0644                   | -1.1071<br>-0.5039                    | -1.2343<br>-0.5728                      | -1.1341<br>-0.5038    | -0.5107<br>-0.2274 | -0.2300<br>-0.0837          | 0.0883<br>0.0388             | 0.1109<br>0.0524                  | 0.1994<br>0.1921              |
| Days to first<br>harvest   |                | 0.2816<br>0.0018                 | 0.0125<br>0.0001                           | -0.0552<br>-0.0004                 | 0.5730<br>0.0036                      | 0.6455<br>0.0041                        | 0.7025<br>0.0046      | 0.2714<br>0.0017   | 0.1026<br>0.0005            | -0.1747<br>-0.0009           | -0.1450<br>-0.0008                | 0.0531<br>0.0492              |
| Vine length (m)  | G<br>P         | 0.0376<br>0.0380                 | -0.0115<br>-0.0134                         | 0.0170<br>0.0206                   | 0.1027<br>0.1132                      | 0.1044<br>0.1125                        | 0.0975<br>0.1030      | 0.2524<br>0.2834   | 0.0998<br>0.0952            | -0.0526<br>-0.0525           | 0.0176<br>0.0207                  | 0.2845<br>0.2767              |
| Average<br>fruit<br>weight(kg)   | G<br>P         | -0.1001<br>-0.0312               | 0.1727<br>0.0577                           | 0.1905<br>0.0571                   | 0.1632<br>0.0517                      | 0.1131<br>0.0323                        | 0.0887<br>0.0230      | 0.2400<br>0.0743   | 0.6070<br>0.2213            | -0.2516<br>-0.0718           | 0.2853<br>0.0802                  | 0.3567<br>0.2983              |
| Number of<br>fruit per<br>plant  | G<br>P         | 0.1643<br>0.1059                 | 0.0582<br>0.0361                           | -0.0289<br>-0.0152                 | -0.0797<br>-0.0530                    | -0.0672<br>-0.4333                      | -0.3238<br>-0.1317    | -0.1958<br>-0.1184 | -0.3896<br>-0.2076          | 0.9400<br>0.6393             | 0.0818<br>0.0527                  | 0.5740<br>0.5360              |
| Average no.<br>of seed per<br>fruits   | Р              | -0.0167<br>-0.0220               | 0.0721<br>0.0917                           | 0.0806<br>0.1071                   | -0.0157<br>-0.0202                    | -0.0171<br>-0.0245                      | -0.0393<br>-0.0490    | 0.0133 0.0196      | 0.0896<br>0.0970            | 0.0166<br>0.9221             | 0.1906<br>0.2677                  | 0.4047<br>0.3854              |

Genotypic residual effect=0.4784, Phenotypic residual effect=0.1600

number to first female flower emergence (rp=0.7627), average fruit weight (rp=0.2607) and average number of seed per fruits (rp=0.3426). While node number to first female flower emergence showed positive and significant correlation with average fruit weight (rp =0.2581) and average number of seed per fruit (rp=0.4002) whereas negatively and non-significant correlated with days to first male flower anthesis (rp =-0.1173), days to first female flower anthesis (rp =-0.1124), days to first harvest (0.0812) and number of fruit per plant (rp=-0.028). Similar finding given by Singh et al. (2011) and Islam et al. (2009). Days to first male flower anthesis showed significant and positive correlation with days to first female flower anthesis (rp=0.8798), days to first harvest (rp=0.7752), vine length (rp=0.3993) and average fruit weight (rp=0.2337), while days to first female flower anthesis exhibited a positive and significant association with days to first harvest (rp=0.8796) and vine length (rp=0.3970). Similar observations were also reported by Rahman et al. (2010).

Vine length showed positive and significant correlation with average fruit weight (rp=0.3360) and negatively associated with number of fruit per plant (rp= -0.1852), While average fruit weight showed positive and significant correlation with average number of seed per fruit(rp=0.2624) and yield per plant (rp=0.2983) where as negatively and significant correlation with number of plant (rp=-0.3247). Number of fruit per plant exhibited positive and significant association with fruit yield per plant (rp=0.5360) whereas average number of seed per fruits showed positive and significant association with edible fruit yield (rp=0.3854). Similar finding was given by Narayan et al. (1996); Singh et al. (1996); Kumar et al. (2011) and Bahve et al.(2003).

Path co-efficient analysis is simply a standardized partial regression co-efficient which split the correlation co-efficient into the measures of direct and indirect effect. In other words it measures the direct and indirect contribution of various independent character on a dependent character. The results of path co-efficient studies on the phenotypic data basis showing direct and indirect effects on yield and its component using fruit yield as dependent variable have been given in Table 2.

Path co-efficient analysis of different traits contributing towards edible fruit yield showed that days to first male flower anthesis (0.7505) had the highest positive direct effect followed by number of fruit per plant (0.6393), node number to first male flower emergence (0.3893), vine length (0.2834) and average number of seed per fruit (0.2677). Similar observation were also reported by Prasad (1985) and Narayan et al. (1996).

Number of fruit per plant (0.9221), days to first female flower anthesis (0.6602), days to first harvest (0.5817), days to germination (0.4583) and vine length (0.2997) showed considerable positive indirect effect on fruit yield per plant viz., number of fruit per plant residual effect was (0.1600). Similar observations were also reported by Tikka et al.(1974); Grebensickov (1979); Dora et al. (2002) and Sharma and Bhutani (2001).

The path co-efficient anthesis estiruated at genotypic level is presented in Table 2 number of fruit per plant (0.9400), days to first harvest (0.7025), average fruit weight (0.6070), days to first male flower anthesis (0.5809) and node number to first male flower emergence (0.2992) exerted high order positive direct effect on edible fruit yield per plant.

Days to first female flower anthesis (0.6455), days to first male flower anthesis (0.5730), days to first harvest (0.4738), days to germination (0.3622), average number of seed per fruits (0.2853), vine length (0.2714) and node number to first female flower emergence (0.2368) indicated substantial indirect positive contribution on fruit yield viz., number of fruit per plant where as days to first female flower anthesis (-1.234) and node number to first female flower emergence (-0.4477) had made considerable direct negative contribution on fruit yields while days to germination (-0.6807), node number to first male flower emergence (-0.3542), vine length (-0.5107), average fruits weight (0.3896) had made considerable indirect negative contribution on fruit yield per plant viz., number of fruit per plant. The contribution residual factors towards variation in fruit per plant was (0.4784). Similar observation were also reported by Kumar et al. (2011) and Rajput et al. (1995).

#### REFERENCES

Al-Jibouri, H.A, Miller, P.A. and Robinson, H.F. (1958). Genotypic and environmental variance and co-variances in an upland cotton cross of inter specific origin. Agron. J., 50: 633-636.

Bahve, S.G., Bendale, V.W., Pethe, V.B., Berde, S.A. and Mehta, J.L. (2003). Correlation and path analysis in segregating generations of bitter gourd . J. Soil and Crops, 13 (1): 33-40.

Chander, Prakash, Singh, K.P. and Kalloo, G. (2000). Variability analysis and cause and effect relationship in ash gourd. Indian

#### J. Pl., Genet. Resour., 13(3): 298-301.

**Dewey, D.R. and Lu, K.H. (1959).** A correlation and path coefficient analysis of yield component of the crested wheat grass seed production. *Agron .J.*, **51**: 515-518.

Dora,D.K., Acharya, G.C. and Das, S. (2002). Path analysis in pointed gourd (*Trichosanthes dioica* Roxb.). *Veg. Sci.*, 29(2): 180-181.

Grafius, J.E. (1964). A geometry of plant breeding .*Crop Sci.*, 4:241-255.

**Grebensickov, IGORI (1979).**Notes on cucurbits for estimation of the influence of plant length and fruit number upon fruit yield per plant in cucurbita by means of path analysis. *Kultur: Pflanze.*, **27**(0): 197-206.

Islam, M.R. Hossain, M.S., Bhuiyan, M.S.R., Husna, A. and Syed, M.A. (2009). Genetic variability and path co-efficient analysis of bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L). *Internat. J. Sust.Agric.*, **1**(3): 53-57.

Kumar, K.H., Patil, M.G., Hanchinamani, C.N., Goud, Shanker and Hiremath, S.V. (2011).Genetic relationship of growth and development traits with fruit yields in f2 population of BGDLX Hot season of cucumber. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, **24** (4): 497 - 500.

Narayan, R. Singh, S.P., Sharma, D.K. and Rastogi, K.B. (1996). Genetic variability and selection parameters in bottle gourd. *Indian J. Hort.*, **53** : 53-58.

Nimbalkar, C.A., Navale, P.A. and Gandhi, H.T. (2002). Regression approach for selecting high yielding genotypes in okra. *J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ.*, **27** : 46-48.

Prasad, A. and Prasad, R. (1978). Correlation studies flowering characters and yields in bottle gourd [Lagenaria siceraria

(Mol.)] standal.]. *Pl. Sci.*, **10**: 25-28.

**Prasad, M. (1985).** Genetic analysis of yield and its component in bottle gourd [*Lagenaria siceraria* (Mol.) standal.] Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Horticulture C.S.A.University of Agricultural and Technology, Kanpur, U.P. (INDIA).

Rahman, M.A., Hossain, M., Heritability, D., Islam, M.S., Biswas, D.K. and Aniduzzaman (2010). Genetic variability and path analysis in snake gourd (*T. orguinal* L.). *Pak. J. Bio.Sci.*, 13 (3): 284-286.

**Rajput, J.C., Paranjape, S.P. and Jamadagni, B.M. (1995).** Correlation and path analysis studies to fruit yield in bitter gourd. *J. Maharashtra Agric., Univ.*, **20** (3): 377-379.

Ramesh, B. Kumar, P. and Kumar, B. (2000). Genetic variability characters association and path analysis and component characters in Lentil. *Indian J. Pl. Genet*. *Resour.*, 13:22-26.

Sharma, N.K. and Bhutani, R.D. (2001). Correlation and path analysis studies in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.) *Haryana J. Hort. Sci.*, **30**: 84-86.

Singh, D.K., Maurya, S.K., Jaiswal, H.R., Singh, A. and Lohani, M. (2011). Character association and path co-efficient analysis in ridge gourd. *Pantnagar J. Res.*, 10 (2): 189-195.

Singh, S.P.,Singh,N.K.and Maurya, I.B. (1996). Genetic variability and correlation studies in bottle gourd [*Lagenaria siceraria* (Mol.) standal.] *P.K.V.J.*, **20** (1) : 88-89.

**Tikka, S.B.S., Sachan, S.C.P., Jaimini, S.N. and Dayal, N.** (1974). Path co-efficient analysis of yield componenst in watermelon [*Citrullus lanatus* (thumb.) Mansf.]. *Indian J. Heredity*, **6** (1&2): 77 - 88.

Wright, S. (1921). Correlation and causation. *J. Agric. Res.*, 20: 557 - 587.

