



## Genetic Analysis of Yield and Yield Component Traits in Three Crosses of *Pennisetum typhoides* in India

Abhishek SINGH<sup>1\*</sup> Brijesh SINGH<sup>2\*</sup> Rajesh SINGH<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi-221005

<sup>2</sup> Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Sri Murli Manhor Town PG College, Ballia-277001.

\* Corresponding author e-mail: abhishek6886@gmail.com

### Citation:

Singh A., Singh B., Singh R., 2017. Genetic Analysis of Yield and Yield Component Traits in Three Crosses of *Pennisetum typhoides* in India. Ekin J. 3(1):72-82.

Received: 08.10.2016

Accepted: 10.12.2016

Published Online: 29.01.2017

Printed: 31.01.2017

### ABSTRACT

The study was based on six generations from three crosses viz, 863B x P 7-7 (1), 843B x P 7-4 (2), and 81B x ICMP 451(3), of pearl millet in two environments, Varanasi (irrigated) ( $E_1$ ) and Mirzapur (Rainfed) ( $E_2$ ). The estimates for mean and dominance were reduced in Rainfed environment of Mirzapur. Though all type of digenic interactions were prevalent, the dominance x dominance gene effects with duplicate epistasis were pronounced. It is suggested that cyclic breeding particularly reciprocal recurrent selections should be practised to improve yield and its attribute traits in Pearl millet rather than going only for simple selections methods.

**Keywords:** Generation Mean Analysis, genetics, gene effects pearl millet, rainfed,.

### Introduction

Pearl millet (*Pennisetum typhoides* (Burn) Stapf and C.E. Hubbard) is one of the important crops of semi-arid tropical regions and is particularly adaptable to nutrient-poor soil and low rainfed conditions, yet it is capable of rapid and vigorous growth under favourable conditions. (Maiti and Bidinger, 1981). The crop is cultivated in 26 million ha in the arid tropical region of Asia and Africa (Rai *et al.*, 2007), in USA and Europe, the crop is grown as fodder crop. It is cultivated in 7.95 million hectares in India with an annual production of 8.80 million tonnes (Annual Report of Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, 2013-14.) There is trend of low productivity (11.38 q/ha) and wide year to year fluctuations in terms of production and productivity. So, development and improvement of varieties particularly under rainfed situation is very important. Genetic variability for yield and its component traits is the key component of the breeding programme for broadening gene pool of crops. However, genetic variability for many traits is

limited in germplasm (Sabu *et al.*, 2009). The overall performance of a genotype may vary due to changes in the environment, and if the heritability for the traits is higher, the selection process will be simpler and response to selection will be greater (Sagar and Singh 1996, Larik *et al.*, 1997 & 2000, Singh and Sagar, 2001, Soomro *et al.*, 2008, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010).

The genetic improvement of crops for quantitative traits requires reliable estimates of genetic variability, heritability, and genetic advancement of breeding materials (Dudley and Moll 1969, Izge *et al.*, 2006, Chand *et al.*, 2008, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010). The information on variability and heritability of characters is essential for identifying characters amenable to genetic improvement through selection (Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010). In the present study an attempt has been made to study the genetics of important quantitative characters including yield using generation mean analysis. The generations mean analysis is one of the important methods to understand the nature and magnitude of genetic variance. The gene

effects, variability parameters, heritability and genetic advance for yield and its important attributing traits have been estimated and results discussed.

### Material and Methods

The study was conducted involving six generations viz,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  of three Pearl millet crosses viz., 863B x P 7-7 (1), 843B x P 7-4 (2), and 81B x ICMP 451 (3) at two locations. The parents of the crosses were stable inbred with good genetic-agronomic base and combining ability. The six generations of each cross were grown in randomized complete block design with three replications at two locations. The two locations were Agriculture Research Farm of Banaras Hindu University under irrigated conditions ( $E_1$ ) and Rajiv Gandhi South Campus, Mirzapur under rainfed condition ( $E_2$ ) during *Kharif* 2011-12. Two rows for each parent ( $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ), three for each of  $F_1$  and backcrosses ( $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ) and eight for  $F_2$ , were grown in each replication. The rows were 4 m long with 45 cm row to row and 20 cm plant to plant distance. Observations were recorded on five competitive plants on seven quantitative characters in each row. The means and variances of a population worked out in a replication were used to calculate the weighted mean and variance over the replication. The Joint Scaling Test (Cavalli 1952); was performed using the weighted least squares. The estimates of various genetic parameters were obtained by Jinks and Jones (1958); model. The estimates of the components of genetic variance were obtained following (Mather 1949); Heritability and Genetic Advance were estimated according to (Allard 1960).

### Results and Discussion

The mean values for seven quantitative characters of six generations of the three crosses 863B x P 7-7 (1), 843B x P 7-4 (2), and 81B x ICMP 451 (3) in two environments (Agriculture Research Farm of Banaras Hindu University under irrigated conditions ( $E_1$ ) and Rajiv Gandhi South Campus, Mirzapur under rainfed condition ( $E_2$ )) are presented in Table 1. In general, the performance of the three crosses of various characters over different generations was better in Varanasi ( $E_1$ ) than in Mirzapur ( $E_2$ ). The poor performance in Mirzapur ( $E_2$ ) was mainly due to poor fertility and low water holding capacity of the soil. All these characters exhibited reduced expression under water stress; however, this was less for such characters as plant height and ear length.

These observations confirm earlier findings (Sagar 1982, Sagar and Singh 1996, Larik *et al.*, 1997 & 2000, Singh and Sagar 2001, Oosterom *et al.*, 2006, Soomro *et al.*, 2008, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010). The  $F_1$ s of all

the crosses performed better than both the parents and mid-parents in both the environments for all the characters, except for days to maturity in crosses 843B x P 7-4 and 81B x ICMP 451 in Varanasi. This indicated prevalence of heterobeltosis, which could arise due to true over-dominance or dispersion of completely or incompletely dominant genes. Negative heterosis for days to maturity indicated dominance for earliness. Higher heterosis in case of pearl millet, an allogamous species, is expected. Virk, (1986) has noted positive heterosis for quantitative characters including grain yield (-56.62 to 424.16%), but negative heterosis for days to flowering. The better performance of  $F_1$  than both the parents for grain yield and other attributes even under moisture stress shows that hybrids will withstand moisture stress. The  $F_2$  means, lesser than the  $F_1$  in both the environments for all the characters and crosses except for ear length for cross 843B x P 7-4 in Varanasi indicated high amount of inbreeding depression. Smaller  $F_2$  mean than  $F_1$  could be due to elimination of dominance effects, as in all the crosses the dominance exceeded the additive component and may be responsible for bringing reduction in  $F_2$  mean. The  $F_2$  mean exceeding all other generations for ear length could be due to transgression and fixable epistatic effects. Both the backcrosses exceeded the respective recurrent parents in most of the cases, indicating the prevalence of allelic and non-allelic interactions for genetic control of important traits in pearl millet. Gupta and Phul 1981; Girgla *et al.*, 1985, Singh and Sagar 2001, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010 also reported similar results.

To study the genetics and gene interactions the data was subjected to three parameter model of Cavalli (1952); and later six parameter model of Jinks and Jones (1958). The estimates of 6-parameter model along with their significance have been presented in Table 2.

The analysis revealed the inadequacy of additive-dominance model for all the seven traits studied. Some of the traits such as ear weight and grain yield per plant for cross 843B x P 7-4 indicated significant  $X^2$  values. This analysis led to the conclusion that variability present in the material could not be ascribed to only additive and dominance gene effects, albeit the epistatic gene effects also played an important role in genetic control of the characters studied. The present study also revealed that only additive effect was not sufficient and significant to explain the variability for all the traits. Further, significant dominance effects were important for only ear weight per plant for cross 81B x ICMP 451 in Varanasi Environment. In general preponderance of dominance variance was observed

for all the traits in both the environments and all the three crosses. Similar observations were made in Pearl Millet by Virk (1986); Sagar and Singh (1996); Singh and Sagar (2000); Govindaraj *et al.*, (2010). The comparative analysis of simple vs. higher order of gene interactions indicated that while additive effect was less effective than the dominance effects when compared with their corresponding digenic or higher order of interactions. This indicated that the expression of the additive effects was affected at the cost of their digenic interactions. In few cases additive and additive x additive effects were important such as fodder yield in cross 843B x P 7-4; and 81B x ICMP 451 in Varanasi Environment. This suggests that fixable nature of variation could be exploited by simple selection for these specific characters and crosses. Additive x dominance type was the other lone significant digenic integrations for number of effective tillers per plant for cross 863B x P 7-7 in both the environments. The dominance x dominance type of digenic interactions was high and significant in a number of cases. This type of epistasis advocate for searching desirable specific cross combinations. In general, additive x additive and additive x dominance interactions were observed for grain yield in cross 863B x P 7-7 in Varanasi environment, while three and four parameter combinations of simple and digenic interactions were found to be significant in a number of cases, but all the five parameters exhibited significance in case of ear weight for the cross 843B x P 7-4 in Varanasi Environment. Days to maturity for cross 863B x P 7-7 and 843B x P 7-4 in Varanasi environment, ear length for cross 863B x P 7-7 in Varanasi environment, plant height for crosses 843B x P 7-4 in Mirzapur environment exhibited significance for four parameters. Even the six parameter model failed to detect the significance of any of five genetic parameters for tillers per plant for crosses 843B x P 7-4 and 81B x ICMP 451 in Varanasi Environment and Mirzapur environment, respectively. though the three parameter model was found to be inadequate in both the environments. The discrepancy for the significance of parameters studied in 3 and 6 parameters model may be due to non-orthogonality nature of the estimates in the former model. The present study indicates that dominance and epistatic effects were important in explaining the variability in the present material. The present finding supports the earlier findings of Sagar and Singh (1996); Singh and Sagar (2001); and Singh *et al.*, (1990) but contradicts the findings of Grafius (1959) as he observed that non-allelic interactions prevail for yield but not for its components. The digenic and trigenic epistasis and linked digenic interactions have been observed by Gupta and Phul (1981); in Pearl

millet. The study revealed that characters such as plant height, ear length, ear weight, days to maturity, and dry fodder yield are complex traits as controlled by number of parameters significant in the 3 crosses in two environments. As reported earlier grain yield and tiller number are also complex traits, the significance of only one or two parameters in present materials are probably due to non availability of enough variability for these traits in present genetic materials. The study indicated that dominance (h) and dominance x dominance (l) interactions accounted for high proportions of total genetic variability and even increased under moisture stress conditions in most of the cases. This indicated that hybrids will perform better even under moisture stress conditions. This is in conformity with earlier findings such as (Sagar 1982); Sagar and Kapoor (1988); Sagar and Singh (1996); Singh and Sagar (2001); Govindaraj *et al.*, (2010). It is suggested that cyclic breeding particularly reciprocal recurrent selections should be practised to improve pearl millet rather than going only for simple selections methods.

The estimates of components of genetics variance viz., additive (D), dominance (H), environmental (E) are given in Table 3. The dominance variance exceeded the additive variance indicating thereby preponderance of dominance gene action for all the characters of all the crosses in both the environments except for tillers per plant for cross 863B x P 7-7 in Mirzapur environment and cross 843B x P 7-4 in Varanasi environment, for ear length for cross 843B x P 7-4 in Mirzapur environment, days to maturity for cross 843B x P 7-4 in Varanasi environment and ear weight for cross 863B x P 7-7 in Mirzapur environment. This concedes the nature of heterobeltiosis observed from the generations mean analysis. The magnitude of dominance gene effects was comparably higher than additive gene effect in 3 as well as 6 parameter model. The preponderance of dominant gene effects in pearl millet has been observed by Sagar and Singh 1996, Singh and Sagar 2000, Virk 1986, Sheoran *et al.*, 2000, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010). In general importance of dominance effect was observed in the present materials except in some cases like fodder yield in cross 843B x P 7-4, grain yield in cross 81B x ICMP 451, where additive and additive x additive effects were important and this indicated that variation in these crosses were fixable nature and simple selection can improve these characters of particular crosses.

The heritability values broad and narrow sense along with their genetic advance have been presented in Table 4. In general, both the type of heritability was low in Varanasi than in Mirzapur environment.

Broad sense heritability estimates were generally high for all the characters for all the three crosses in both the environments. Low narrow sense heritability estimates support the prevalence of epistatic effects as also noted from the generations means. The high estimates of heritability in Mirzapur (rainfed) environment are encouraging and offer greater scope of selection in that environment, but further studies are necessary in this direction. The high estimates under water stress may be due to either narrowing down of the variance under stress, as is usually observed and has been reported by Johnson and Frey 1967, Moeljopaviro and Ikehashi 1981, Sagar and Singh 1996, Larik *et al.*, 1997 & 2000, Singh and Sagar, 2001, Soomro *et al.*, 2008, Govindaraj *et al.*, 2010). Estimates of expected genetic advance expressed as

percentage of mean were low to medium for all the characters including grain yield. But very high gain was obtained for number of effective tillers (191.36%) for cross 863B x P7-7 and high estimates for gain yield (55.24%) for cross 843B x P7-4 in Mirzapur environment. It suggested greater scope for improvement of these characters.

In general, the study suggests that the sufficient variability exist in the present pearl millet breeding materials with preponderance of dominance simple and higher order of gene effects (dominance x dominance and dominance x additive) with high heritability of important traits. This suggest cyclic breeding with reciprocal recurrent selections should be adopted to improve pearl millet rather than going only for simple selections methods.

Table 1. Mean performance of six generations of seven quantitative traits in two environments.

Cross	Generation	Environment	Plant Ht (cm)	Tillers/Plant	Ear Size	Days to mat	Ear weight	Grain Yield	Dry fodder yield
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Cross1</b>									
	863B (P <sub>1</sub> )	E1	181.0	1.99	18.8	74.5	27.6	12.9	75.1
		E2	106.7	1.57	15.3	68.5	11.5	8.5	15.5
	P7-7 (P <sub>2</sub> )	E1	200.3	2.30	20.1	71.7	26.2	13.5	77.8
		E2	128.8	1.66	17.9	55.5	14.5	6.7	14.5
	F <sub>1</sub>	E1	216.6	2.83	21.5	75.6	56.5	31.9	96.3
		E2	155.1	2.01	20.4	55.7	13.3	10.7	17.5
	B <sub>1</sub>	E1	213.3	2.60	20.8	68.6	47.6	27.0	85.1
		E2	148.7	2.35	21.2	56.7	8.6	4.4	19.9
	B <sub>2</sub>	E1	174.9	2.27	23.2	70.9	48.3	28.6	87.0
		E2	137.4	1.69	20.1	54.9	15.8	6.1	12.6
<b>Cross2</b>									
	843B (P <sub>1</sub> )	E1	190.0	2.36	15.1	67.0	41.4	20.9	34.5
		E2	130.8	1.20	14.1	61.0	5.5	3.4	7.5
	P7-4 (P <sub>2</sub> )	E1	199.3	2.44	17.1	70.7	50.5	38.8	94.4
		E2	127.9	2.11	16.1	69.0	7.5	7.3	10.8
	F <sub>1</sub>	E1	230.2	3.71	21.6	70.5	91.5	60.4	99.6
		E2	166.9	3.11	15.7	69.5	10.4	6.5	11.4
	F <sub>2</sub>	E1	220.3	3.62	25.3	71.1	44.8	22.3	69.0
		E2	150.3	1.40	14.3	61.5	5.8	4.4	9.1
	B <sub>1</sub>	E1	230.3	3.91	19.1	71.8	47.0	25.6	80.3
		E2	150.0	1.85	15.7	69.1	7.1	6.0	11.6
	B <sub>2</sub>	E1	221.3	3.90	20.3	71.1	60.1	25.3	87.1
		E2	161.5	1.61	16.8	72.5	6.8	5.6	11.0

Continuing table 1

Cross	Generation	Environment	Plant Ht (cm)	Tillers/ Plant	Ear Size	Days to mat	Ear weight	Grain Yield	Dry fodder yield
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Cross3</b>									
	81B (P <sub>1</sub> )	E1	165.7	2.07	15.3	78.9	26.5	14.4	80.6
		E2	103.1	1.03	11.6	67.1	4.4	3.3	6.6
	ICMP 451 (P <sub>2</sub> )	E1	197.7	3.65	17.9	81.8	28.2	50.7	90.3
		E2	157.4	1.60	14.2	76.1	4.1	3.2	7.5
	F <sub>1</sub>	E1	242.7	4.23	21.7	81.9	61.0	37.7	107.5
		E2	156.5	3.23	18.8	71.5	6.7	5.7	18.9
	F <sub>2</sub>	E1	217.5	2.25	17.4	78.7	53.6	27.6	69.3
		E2	135.4	1.75	19.7	71.5	7.5	6.3	8.8
	B <sub>1</sub>	E1	213.5	2.58	16.3	79.5	54.5	24.2	111.1
		E2	131.6	1.79	19.5	67.6	7.6	4.7	12.4
	B <sub>2</sub>	E1	232.5	3.90	21.8	80.3	52.2	25.1	80.8
		E2	151.5	2.18	17.9	79.5	7.6	8.4	21.4

Table 2. Gene effect of six-parameter model for seven yield and component traits of Pearl Millet in two environments

Character	Cross	Environment	M	D	H	I	J	L	Type of Epistasis
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Plant Height	1	E1	152.09 +6.96	6.33** ±0.99	58.51** ±16.57	40.90** ±6.88	80.56** ±4.33	7.10 ±10.18	
		E2	120.86 ±10.12	10.53** ±1.42	58.01** ±24.28	-3.60 ±10.13	41.63** ±6.28	-28.81 ±14.86	
	2	E1	180.13 ±9.62	1.13 +0.94	112.47** ±21.38	21.00** ±8.57	21.25** ±6.30	-61.45** ±11.49	D
		E2	108.44 ±3.79	4.53** ±0.33	121.79** ±8.90	17.90** ±3.78	-1.64 ±2.13	-65.30** ±5.43	D
	3	E1	157.59 ±7.92	12.50* ±0.96	148.64** ±18.63	31.58** ±7.86	-23.66** ±4.55	-53.56** ±11.19	D
		E2	85.02 ±8.68	14.53 ±0.68	129.72 ±20.84	39.64 ±7.64	3.07 ±4.27	-57.35** ±12.09	D
Number of effective tillers per plant	1	E1	3.34 ±0.73	0.23 ±0.15	-2.03 ±1.87	-1.34 ±0.71	1.14* ±0.58	1.52 ±1.21	
		E2	0.06 ±0.73	0.07 ±0.15	4.44 ±2.93	1.38 ±1.25	1.87** ±0.67	1.82 ±1.72	
	2	E1	2.52 ±0.85	0.14 ±0.13	3.26 ±2.00	-0.22 ±0.84	-0.87 ±0.41	-2.21 ±1.26	
		E2	0.37 ±1.11	-0.47** ±0.09	1.43 ±2.64	1.30 ±1.11	1.43** ±0.64	1.35 ±1.67	
	3	E1	-2.22 ±0.93	0.80** ±0.14	10.53** ±2.23	5.02** ±0.92	-1.10 ±0.59	-4.18 ±1.38	D
		E2	-0.87 +1.19	0.23 ±0.14	5.11 ±2.75	1.34 ±1.18	-0.41 ±0.66	-1.21 ±1.67	
Ear length	1	E1	16.68 ±1.02	1.17** ±0.15	12.69** ±2.54	2.21* ±1.01	-2.72 ±0.72	-7.51** ±1.62	D
		E2	7.31 ±1.64	0.80** ±0.21	26.19** ±3.91	8.12 ±1.72	3.78** ±1.00	-7.10 ±2.46	D
	2	E1	16.45 ±1.26	1.90** ±0.20	10.92** ±2.98	2.78 ±1.24	3.13** ±0.79	-4.43** ±1.75	D
		E2	3.58 ±1.82	1.27** ±0.20	27.67** ±4.21	12.21** ±1.81	0.41 ±0.99	-12.53 ±2.55	D
	3	E1	12.99 ±1.38	1.30** ±0.17	13.82** ±3.27	2.23 ±1.32	-4.03** ±0.81	-6.11** ±2.21	D
		E2	13.84 ±1.99	1.30** ±0.24	17.36** ±4.76	0.06 ±1.97	1.84 ±1.22	-11.41 ±3.06	D

Continuing table 2

Character	Cross	Environment	M	D	H	I	J	L	Type of Epistasis
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Days to maturity	1	E1	109.09 ±0.85	1.64 ±0.16	-84.78** ±2.03	-39.36** ±0.84	-1.43* ±0.56	50.15** ±1.27	D
	2	E1	66.12 ±0.85	2.34 ±0.98	11.65** ±2.30	2.22** ±0.97	5.25** ±0.57	-7.23** ±1.40	D
	3	E1	71.47 ±1.44	1.47** ±0.26	18.40** ±0.26	8.17** ±1.42	2.51 ±0.94	-7.97** ±2.13	D
	3	E1	71.47 ±1.44	1.47** ±0.26	18.40** ±0.26	8.17** ±1.42	2.51 ±0.94	-7.97** ±2.13	D
Ear weight per plant	1	E1	31.75 ±3.50	0.14 ±0.64	30.48** ±8.38	-3.61 +1.44	-4.97* ±2.30	13.51** ±5.28	C
		E2	10.63 ±1.97	0.87* ±0.27	-8.25 ±4.59	-1.81 ±1.95	1.33 ±1.13	10.41** ±3.28	
	2	E1	11.43 ±7.31	3.03** ±0.96	45.44** ±17.45	34.06** ±7.11	-24.44** ±4.22	39.11** ±10.11	C
		E2	4.94 ±2.25	0.93** ±0.30	-3.22 ±5.29	1.66 ±2.23	2.33 ±1.22	8.44** ±3.26	
	3	E1	36.95 ±5.69	0.34 ±0.49	38.67** ±13.11	-9.27 ±4.67	-5.34 ±3.11	-9.21 ±6.27	
	Grain yield per plant	1	E1	20.37 ±3.47	0.30 ±0.60	15.26 ±8.36	-7.20** ±3.42	-6.60** ±2.30	2.24 ±5.23
E2			6.32 ±1.45	0.54** ±0.23	-6.99* ±3.43	-1.26 ±1.43	-0.39 ±0.78	9.11** ±2.20	D
2		E1	11.88 ±7.04	3.00** ±0.94	-12.06 ±16.42	12.22 ±6.98	6.51 ±4.08	59.31** ±9.86	
3		E1	27.13 ±3.38	0.50 ±0.33	-1.86 ±8.05	-10.96** ±3.36	-2.08 ±2.11	7.27 ±4.87	
1		E1	15.29 ±9.18	0.83 ±1.36	114.30* ±21.61	61.66** ±9.08	5.83 ±5.53	-23.27 ±13.36	
		E2	5.64 ±6.47	0.43 ±1.07	50.77** ±15.40	16.54** ±6.38	17.40** ±4.12	-32.66** ±9.51	D
Dry fodder yield per plant	2	E1	30.43 ±26.10	5.44** ±1.83	77.24 ±60.63	59.54** -26.03	-1.79 +14.10	-0.07 ±35.71	
		E2	4.07 ±3.76	1.07** ±0.33	37.15** ±8.90	12.80** ±3.78	-4.71* ±2.13	-21.68** ±5.43	D
	3	E1	-8.24 ±20.29	4.33** ±1.10	161.38** ±47.24	89.23** ±22.26	53.01** ±11.92	-12.26 ±22.99	
		E2	-23.01 ±3.17	1.64** ±0.28	86.33** ±7.49	24.11** ±2.24	-25.65** ±1.82	-25.17** ±4.69	D

\* Significant at 5 per cent level

\*\* Significant at 1 per cent level

D Duplicate

C Complementary epistasis



Table 3. Estimates of components of genetic variance for 7 characters in pearl millet.

Character	Cross	Additive (D)		Dominance (H)		Epistasis (E)	
		E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>
Plant height	1	57.00	90.50	170.64	370.52	31.02	61.14
	2	199.12	127.46	204.50	545.60	35.12	21.44
	3	90.87	112.05	178.14	313.36	27.28	17.05
Number of Effective Tillers/plant	1	1.66	1.76	2.52	1.35	0.50	0.51
	2	1.12	1.18	1.04	4.61	0.58	0.61
	3	0.57	1.12	3.08	4.21	0.61	0.68
Ear length	1	0.74	1.64	2.08	9.76	0.77	1.82
	2	1.82	8.66	3.36	3.08	1.28	1.75
	3	2.10	1.44	6.52	14.60	1.02	3.02
Day to Maturity	1	0.91	1.33	1.76	0.92	0.74	2.22
	2	1.84	1.32	0.76	0.67	0.56	2.23
	3	1.81	1.51	3.52	2.22	1.89	2.32
Ear weight Plant	1	11.74	8.99	16.87	3.82	11.11	2.51
	2	19.64	7.36	238.60	12.36	29.74	3.12
	3	31.02	8.40	153.36	12.08	9.09	2.27
Grain Yield Plant	1	7.24	3.22	37.40	1.36	11.51	2.14
	2	29.72	22.02	175.68	27.04	22.75	2.10
	3	3.33	1.84	61.76	52.96	4.40	2.72
Dry fodder Yield/plant	1	126.26	27.68	169.32	110.16	61.28	37.79
	2	455.18	21.88	327.64	48.36	121.43	15.21
	3	622.28	17.38	151.48	35.20	71.80	5.12

Table 4. Estimates of heritability and genetic variance, for quantitative characters in pearl millet.

Character	Cross	$h^2$ (BS)		$h^2$ (NS)		Genetic advance (as % of mean)	
		$E_1$	$E_2$	$E_1$	$E_2$	$E_1$	$E_2$
Plant height	1	65.91	71.05	20.88	23.01	4.38	4.71
	2	71.81	85.96	53.41	25.73	6.31	5.39
	3	75.26	90.51	37.10	34.50	3.80	6.30
Number of Effective Tillers/plant	1	64.47	85.13	47.82	81.58	48.95	191.36
	2	55.15	71.16	37.72	44.48	26.77	55.13
	3	62.80	70.30	25.85	34.45	21.91	52.28
Ear length	1	52.61	61.15	21.21	17.15	3.47	4.23
	2	54.75	71.45	30.03	63.21	5.19	24.74
	3	44.43	55.13	28.38	9.74	6.12	2.77
Day to Maturity	1	44.76	67.43	34.19	37.89	1.01	22.72
	2	71.98	88.72	47.29	65.24	1.97	12.13
	3	52.91	65.32	22.26	43.34	1.20	-20.75
Ear weight Plant	1	45.11	67.42	20.01	57.82	52.34	36.68
	2	63.32	65.45	9.79	36.21	5.50	42.91
	3	81.85	91.08	24.64	43.22	6.50	41.64
Grain Yield Plant	1	51.72	55.45	13.04	37.90	3.77	27.69
	2	71.28	81.74	18.04	38.28	15.79	55.24
	3	81.28	82.60	8.69	1.75	3.66	6.24
Dry fodder Yield/plant	1	67.27	78.51	35.35	24.79	17.21	35.64
	2	88.35	80.78	20.54	34.76	21.01	47.39
	3	87.28	72.82	41.50	27.01	35.67	29.07

## References

- Allard RW (1960) Principles of Plant Breeding, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, pp. 463.
- Cavalli LL (1952). An analysis of linkage in quantitative inheritance In: ECR Reevee, and CH Waddington, eds., Quantitative Inheritance, HMSO, London, pp.135-144.
- Chand N, Vishwakarma SR, Verma OP, Kumar M(2008). Worth of genetic parameters to sort out new elite barley lines over heterogeneous environments. Barley Gen. Newslett. 38: 10-13.
- Dudley JW, Moll RH (1969). Interpretation and use of heritability and genetic estimates in plant breeding. Crop Sci. 9: 257-262.
- Girgla KS, Phul PS, Nanda GS (1985). Detection of epistasis and estimation of certain genetic parameters for some quantitative characters in pearl millet. SABRAO J. Breed. Genet. 17: 7-12.
- Govindraj M, Shanmugasundaram P, Muthiah AR (2010). Estimates of genetic parameters for yield and yield attributes in elite lines and popular cultivars of India's pearl millet. Afr. J. Agric. Res. 5(22): 3060-3064.
- Grafius IE (1959). Heterosis in barley. Agron. J. 51:551-554.
- Gupta SK, Phul PS (1981). Analysis of quantitative genetic variation from generation means in pearl millet. Z Pflanzenzuchtg. 87: 319-329.
- Izge AU, Kadam AM, Gungla DT (2006). Studies on character association and path analysis of certain quantitative character among parental lines of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.) and their F1 hybrids in a diallel cross. J. African. 5: 194-198.
- Jinks JL, Jones RM (1958). Estimation of the components of heterosis. *Genetics*, 43: 223-234
- Johnson GR, Frey KJ (1967). Heritabilities of quantitative attributes of oats (*Avena* sp.) at varying levels of environmental stress. Crop Sic. 7:43-46.
- Larik AS, Ansari SR, Kumbhar MB (1997). Heritability analysis of yield and quality components in *G. hirsutum*. Pak. J. Bot. 29: 97-101.
- Larik AS, Malik SI, Kakar AA, Naz MA (2000). Assessment of heritability and genetic advance for yield components in *G. hirsutum*. Scient. Khyber 13: 39-44.
- Maiti RK, Bidinger FR (1981). Growth and development of pearl millet plant. ICRISAT Res. Bull. 6.
- Mather K (1949). Biometrical Genetics. 1<sup>st</sup> edition. *Mathuem, London*.
- Moeljopaviro S, Ikehashi H (1981). Inheritance of salt tolerance in rice. *Euphytica*. 30:291-300.
- Oosterom EJ Van, Weltzien E, Yadav OP, Bidinger FR (2006). Grain yield components of pearl millet under optimum conditions can be used to identify germplasm with adaptation to arid zones. Field Crops Research, 96: 407-421.
- Poehlman JM, Borthakur D (1969). Breeding Asian field crops with special reference to crops of India. Holt, Rinchart and Winston Inc, New York. pp. 151-181.
- Rai KN, Velu G, Bhattacharjee R, Kulkarni VN, Muralidharan V, Longvah T, Raveendran TS (2007). Gene action for grain zinc content in pearl millet. International conference on Zinc crops. Turkey
- Sabu KK, Abdullah MZ, Lim LS, Wickneswari R (2009). Analysis of heritability and genetic variability of agronomically important traits in *Oryza sativa* x *O. rufipogon* cross. Agron. Res. 7(1): 97-102.
- Sagar P (1982). Genetics of grain yield and other quantitative characters under different levels of water stress in pearl millet (*Pennisetum typhoides* (Burm) S. & H.). Ph.D. Thesis. Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar.
- Sagar P, Kapoor RL (1988). Genetics of grain yield and drought index in pearl millet (*Pennisetum typhoides*) under moisture stress. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 58(2):104-109.
- Sagar P, Singh R (1996). Analysis of genotype-environment interaction in Pearl millet. Indian J. Genetics. 55(1):31-35.
- Sheoran RK, Govila OP, Malik JS, Singh B (2000). Estimates of gene effects for quantitative traits in pearl millet. Intern. J. Trop. Agric. 18(2): 173-176.
- Singh R, Sagar P (2001). Genetic analysis of grain yield and its component in Pearl millet. Madras J. 88 (719): 512-514.
- Singh YP, Khairwal IS, Singh S (1990). Detection of epistasis and estimation of additive and dominance components in pearl millet. Crop Improvement, 17: 78-80.
- Soomro ZA, Larik AS, Kumbhar MB, Khan NU, Panhwar NA (2008). Correlation and path analysis in hybrid cotton. SABRAO J. Breed.Genet., 40: 49-56.
- Virk DS (1986). Quantitative analysis in pearl millet. Paper presented at International Pearl Millet Workshop held at ICRISAT, from April 7-11, 1986 (Mimeographed).