

Plant Archives

Journal homepage: http://www.plantarchives.org DOI Url : https://doi.org/10.51470/PLANTARCHIVES.2025.v25.no.1.228

ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC VARIABILITY IN FINGER MILLET (*ELEUSINE CORACANA* (L.) GAERTN) GENOTYPES FOR AGRO-MORPHOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL TRAITS

Purnima Ray^{1*}, H.E. Patil², V.B. Patel³, R.K. Patel¹, Madhu Bala¹, Alok Shrivastava⁴, H.R. Patel¹, D.D. Patel¹, Ashita Patel¹ and G.M. Patel¹
¹Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari- 396 450, India.
²Main Sorghum Research Station, Navsari Agricultural University, Atwa line, Surat, Gujrat-395007, India.
³Department of Basic Science and Humanities, College of Forestry, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari- 396 450, India.
⁴Department of Agricultural Statistics, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari- 396 450, India.
⁴Department of Agricultural University, Navsari- 396 450, India.
⁴Department of Agricultural University, Navsari- 396 450, India.
⁶Corresponding author E-mail: purnimaroy36@gmail.com
(Date of Receiving : 08-01-2025; Date of Acceptance : 13-04-2025)

The investigation was carried out to know the genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance analysis of 55 finger millet genotypes. The experiment was carried out at four locations viz., Hill Millet Research Station, NAU, Waghai, The Dangs; Niger Research station, NAU, Vanarasi, Gujarat; Agronomy Farm, N. M. College of Agriculture, NAU, Navsari and Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Dediyapada, Gujarat during Kharif - 2022 essentially for creating four environments. All the 55 genotypes were screened under field conditions by adopting Randomized Block Design with three replications. The results revealed that the values of phenotypic coefficients of variability were greater than genotypic coefficients of variability for all the traits studied. Moderate genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation found for the traits viz, days to 50% flower, fingers per panicle, Ear head weight (g), 1000 grain weight (g), harvest index (%), calcium content (mg/100g) and protein content (%). The analysis **ABSTRACT** of variance revealed that highly significant differences were recorded among the genotypes for all the studied characters, which indicate the presence of wide range of variability among genotypes and scope of selection for improvement. The high heritability coupled with high genetic advance as per cent of mean was observed for the traits viz., days to 50% flowering, ear head length (cm), 1000 seed weight (g), protein content (%), calcium content (mg/100g) and iron content (mg/100g). It forces to conclude that these characters are governed by additive gene action and phenotypic selection based on these traits in the segregating generations would likely to be more effective. In addition to the genetic variability, knowledge on heritability and expected genetic advance helps the breeder to employ the suitable breeding strategy.

Key words : Finger millet, genetic variability, heritability, genetic advance, breeding

Introduction

Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn) is an annual *kharif* crop and knows as African millet and Ragi. It is self-pollinated tetraploid species (2n=4x=36, AABB), belong to family poaceae and the genus *Eleusine* and plant mainly grown in two major continents, Africa and Asia for both grain and forage purpose (Sood *et al.*, 2017; Sood *et al.*, 2019). The name finger millet was coined from its morphological appearance of fingers/spikes, which look like human fingers. From the cultivation point of view, it is the sixth largest cropafter wheat,rice, maize, sorghum and bajra mainly among the rural populations of Africa and India and fourth important crop among millets globally (Ceasar *et al.*, 2018). In India, it is mainly grown in the

states of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand. Among the various millets, finger millet ranks fourth on a global scale of production next tosorghum pearl and foxtail millet (Maharajan *et al.*, 2019). It serves as a food-security crop because of its high nutritional value and excellent storage qualities (Ramashia *et al.*, 2018). It is being Used as food (grains) in developing countries and as animal Feed (straw) in developed countries indicating that it is considered as a poor man's food (Ceasar *et al.*, 2018; Wambi *et al.*, 2020).

Finger millet is highly nutritious crop as its grain contains 65–75% carbohydrates, 2.5–3.5% minerals, 5–8% protein, 15–20% dietary fiber (Chetan and Malleshi, 2007). The grains of finger millet are rich in fiber, protein, minerals has low glycemic index which helps to manage diabetes and blood pressure. Its calcium (Ca) content (344 mg 100 g-1) is tenfold higher than wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), maize (*Zea mays*), and rice (*Oryza sativa*) and three times higher than milk (Shobana *et al.*, 2013; Kumar *et al.*, 2016). Millets are suitable staples when focusing on the food and nutritional security of the common people (Tiwari *et al.*, 2022, Yadav *et al.*, 2023, Swapnil *et al.* 2024).

Exploitation of genetic variability existing in the working germplasm is the first principle in the improvement of any crop. Knowledge on the magnitude of variability present in a crop species for different traits is of utmost importance as it provides the basis for effective selection (Singh et al. 2020). The utilization of any species in a breeding program depends upon its genetic diversity and adaptability in different environments (Rai and Jat, 2022). Genetic improvement through conventional breeding approaches depends mainly on the availability of diverse germplasm and presence of enormous genetic variability. The characterization and evaluation are the important pre-requisites for effective utilization of germplasm and also to identify sources of useful genes and superior genotypes. The phenotype of a character is the result of interaction between genotype and environment. Partitioning of phenotypic variability into heritable and non-heritable components is essential to get a true indication of the genetic variation of the trait. Heritability measures the relative amount of the heritable portion of variability. Consistency in the performance of selection in succeeding generations depends on the magnitude of heritable variation present in relation to phenotypic variation. Basic information on heritability is a pre-requisite for planning any breeding program. Genetic advance indicates the amount of progress that could beexpected with

selection for a particular character. Estimates of heritability along with estimates of geneticadvance are more useful in selection method ratherthan heritability or genetic advance alone.

Therefore, study of genetic variability of grain yield and its component characters among different varieties provides a strong basis for selection of desirable genotypes for augmentation of yield and other agronomic characters. The objective of the current study was to identify the best genotypes as parents for further breeding program based on the genetic variability of various finger millet genotypes based on their agro-morphological characteristics.

Materials and Methods

The investigation was carried out to know the genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance analysis of 55 finger millet genotypes (Table 1). The expriment was carried out at four location viz., Hill Millet Research Station, NAU, Waghai, The Dangs; Niger Research station, NAU, Vanarasi, Gujarat; Agronomy Farm, N.M. College of Agriculture, NAU, Navsari and Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Dediyapada, Gujarat during Kharif - 2022 essentially for creating four environments. All the 55 genotypes were screened under field conditions by adopting Randomized Block Design with three replications. Each entry was planted in a plot size of 51.5×8.75 m²accommodating 4 row each entry with 2.25 m row length), keeping row-torow and plant-to-plant distance of 22.5 cm × 7.5 cm, respectively. All recommended practices were followed and timely plant protection measures were taken to avoid damage through insect-pests and diseases. Both sowing and transplanting at all four locations was done. Various observations were recorded on five competitive plants selected randomly from each single row plot in each replication excluding border except for days to 50 % flowering and days to maturity, where it was recorded on population basis. Observations were recorded for morphological and biochemical observations is given as follows: Days to 50 % flowering, Days to maturity, Plant height (cm), Productive tillers per plant, Fingers per ear head, Main ear head length (cm), Finger width (cm), 1000 seed weight (g), Grain yield per plant (g), Fodder yield per plant (g), Weight of matured panicle per plant (g), Protein Content (%), Calcium content (mg/100g) and Iron content (mg/100g). The data were subjected to analysis of variance according to the method recommended by Panse and Sukhatme (1985). Phenotypic and genotypic coefficients of variation were computed according to the method suggested by Burton (1952). Heritability on broad sense was

calculated as per formula given by Allard (1960). Genetic advance was expressed by using the formula

suggested by Johnson et al. (1955).

Та	b	le	1	:	List	of	gen	otype	98
----	---	----	---	---	------	----	-----	-------	----

S. No.	Genotype	S. No.	Genotype	S. No.	Genotype
1.	FM-3009	19.	FM-3003	37.	FM-4002
2.	FM-3015	20.	FM-3011	38.	FM-4011
3.	FM-3012	21.	FM-3006	39.	FM-4007
4.	FM-3013	22.	FM-3014	40.	FM-4010
5.	FM-3023	23.	FM-3028	41.	WN-494
6.	FM-3010	24.	FM-3005	42.	WN-544
7.	FM-3024	25.	FM-3016	43.	WN-548
8.	FM-3018	26.	FM-3021	44.	WN-550
9.	FM-3019	27.	FM-3004	45.	WN-560
10.	FM-3020	28.	FM-3025	46.	WN-569
11.	FM-3022	29.	FM-4008	47.	WN-581
12.	FM-3001	30.	FM-4012	48.	WN-591
13.	FM-3027	31.	FM-4006	49.	WN-561
14.	FM-3017	32.	FM-4004	50.	WN-562
15.	FM-3008	33.	FM-4001	51.	WN-566
16.	FM-3002	34.	FM-4009	52.	WN-572
17.	FM-3007	35.	FM-4003	53.	WN-575
18.	FM-3026	36.	FM-4005	54.	WN-577
				55.	WN-592

Results and Discussion

Genetic parameters of variability

Genetic variability studies provide basic information regarding the genetic parameters of the genotypes based on which breeding methods are constituted for further crop improvement. These studies are also helpful to know about the nature and extent of variability that can be attributed to different causes, sensitivity of crop to environment, heritability of the character, genetic advance and genetic divergence. The analyses of variance for all the fifteen traits in individual environments are presented in the Table 2. Mean sum of squares for replication under each environment was found non-significant for all traits except for finger width (cm) in the environment E3 (Navsari) and E4 (Dediyapada) which means that experimental sites were homogenous at all the locations. Mean sum of squares for genotypes was found highly significant all the characters across all the environments under study. This suggested that large amount of variability and diversity is present among all the genotypes in all the environments which can be further utilized by the plant breeders for selecting desired genotypes having all favourable traits in order to improve yield and its component traits. The analysis of variance showed a wide range of variation and significant differences for all the characters under study, indicating the presence of adequate variability

for further improvement. The estimates of mean, range, phenotypic variance. and genotypic variance. phenotypic coefficient of variation, genotypic coefficient of variation, heritability, genetic advance and genetic advance as percent of mean are presented in Table 4. Mean performance of genotypes in respect of fifteen characters under study have been presented in Table 3. Considering per se performance for all traits it can be suggested that most promising genotypes in respect of grain yield per plant (g) were FM-3022, FM-3001, FM-3008, FM-3026, FM-4012, FM-4007, WN-544, WN-548, WN-550, WN-581, WN-591, WN-561, WN-562, WN-566, WN-575, WN-577 and WN-592 as they recorded higher grain yield per plant. Most promising genotypes in respect of fodder yield per plant (g) were FM-3013, FM-3024, FM-3008, FM-3026, FM-3016, FM-4003, FM-4005, WN-494, WN-550, WN-569, WN-591, WN-561, WN-562, WN-566, WN-572, WN-575 and WN-577. The earliest genotype FM-3021 flowered at 55.00 days whereas the late genotype FM-3010 flowered at 93.00 days. The highest productive tillers per plant was observed in WN-592 (6.16) and lowest for FM-3013 (4.59). The highest spikes per panicle were observed in WN-592 (9.23) and lowest for FM-3025 (4.77). Genotype FM-3019 (0.69 cm) had lowest finger width while genotype WN-577 and WN-592 (1.04 cm) had highest finger width among all the genotypes under study across all environments. Value for 1000 grain weight (g) ranged from 2.11 g (FM-4010) to 3.30 g (FM-3026). The general mean for this trait was 2.68 g. Hence, these genotypes had highest value of above-mentioned desirable characters. These genotypes may be used as donor parent for transferring these characters in recipient parent in combination breeding program.

Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV):

Moderate genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation found for the traits *viz.*, days to 50% flower, fingers per panicle, Ear head weight (g), 1000 grain weight (g), harvest index (%), calcium content (mg/100g) and protein content (%). Similar findings were also reported by Singamsetti *et al.* (2018), Keerthana *et al.* (2019). Low to moderate genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation found for the traits *viz.*, plant height (cm). Low genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation found for the traits *viz.*, days to maturity, productive tillers per plant and finger width. Thus, there is little or no scope for improvement for such characters. On top of that their heritability and genetic advance estimates were also low to moderate so there is absence of any room for improvement for such characters utilizing current population.

Source of	DE	F	Plant he	ight (cm	ı)	Days to 50 % flowering				Days to maturity			
Variation	D. F.	E ₁	$\mathbf{E_2}$	E ₃	E_4	E ₁	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	E ₄	E ₁	E ₂	E ₃	E ₄
Replications	2	6.17	5.65	5.39	4.80	1.73	3.65	8.82	2.35	4.50	5.87	1.92	5.43
Genotypes	54	4.51**	3.86**	3.44**	3.19**	3.01**	3.15**	3.00**	3.02**	3.12**	3.39**	2.84**	3.46**
Error	108	1.03	9.75	8.82	9.14	7.33	9.61	1.10	6.65	10.00	6.74	5.92	5.22
Total	164	2.91	2.60	2.37	2.24	1.04	1.10	1.06	1.04	1.09	1.16	9.74	1.17
Source of	Γ	Drody	notivo til	llorg nor	nlant	E	ngorg n	or nonic		Б	inconw	idth (an	•)
Source of Variation	D. F.	Frout	E E	E E	piant	F	ngers p	er pante	F	Г	mger w	Iatii (Cii	1) F
variation		\mathbf{E}_1	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	E ₄	\mathbf{E}_1	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	E ₄	E ₁	E ₂	E ₃	E ₄
Replications	2	1.65	6.52	5.72	1.52	6.67	6.68	1.02	5.29	1.13	3.87	1.96	1.69
Genotypes	54	3.32**	3.10**	4.03**	4.43**	5.72**	3.63**	3.97**	2.74**	1.67**	1.81**	1.87**	1.93**
Error	108	5.04	6.31	4.16	3.01	4.07	4.67	4.92	4.07	3.17	3.25	3.16	3.72
Total	164	1.44	1.42	1.61	1.66	1.91	1.23	1.34	9.30	5.70	6.18	6.38	6.60
		Ear haad langth (am)			For bood Woight (g)								
Source of		Fa	r hood l	onath (a	m)	Fa	r hood	Woight	(g)	10)A grain	woight	(g)
Source of Variation	D. F.	Ea	r head l	ength (c	em)	E	r head	Weight	(g) E	10 E	00 grain	weight	(g)
Source of Variation	D. F.	Ea E ₁	r head l E ₂	ength (c E ₃	em) E ₄	E_1	r head	Weight E ₃	(g) E ₄	10 E ₁	00 grain E ₂	weight E ₃	(g) E ₄
Source of Variation Replications	D. F. 2	Ea E ₁ 8.04	r head l E ₂ 5.12	ength (c E ₃ 1.18	Em) E ₄ 8.00	E a E 1 1.95	E ₂ 2.20	Weight E ₃ 1.66**	(g) E ₄ 1.68**	10 E ₁ 5.34	00 grain E ₂ 4.82	weight E ₃ 4.59	(g) E ₄ 4.32
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes	D. F. 2 54	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07**	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04**	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05**	Em) E ₄ 8.00 1.04**	Ea E ₁ 1.95 9.31**	E 2 2.20 8.30**	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46**	(g) <u>E</u> ₄ 1.68** 7.98**	10 E ₁ 5.34 3.46**	00 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12**	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94**	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82**
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error	D. F. 2 54 108	Ea E1 8.04 1.07** 2.91	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24	E 4 8.00 1.04** 3.18	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20	E 2 2.20 8.30** 1.23	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29	(g) E ₄ 1.68** 7.98** 1.12	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48	D0 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12** 3.14	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total	D. F. 2 54 108 164	Ea E1 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49	Em) E ₄ 8.00 1.04** 3.18 3.46	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09	E2 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81	E3 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51	(g) E ₄ 1.68** 7.98** 1.12 3.56	100 E1 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43	D0 grain E2 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total	D. F. 2 54 108 164	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49	Eq. E4 8.00 1.04** 3.18 3.46	Ea E ₁ 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla	(g) E ₄ 1.68** 7.98** 1.12 3.56 pt (g)	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H	00 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 ndex (9)	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total Source of Variation	D. F. 2 54 108 164 D. F.	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55 Grai	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46 in yield	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49 per plan F	m) E4 8.00 1.04** 3.18 3.46 mt (g) F	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09 Fodd	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla	(g) E ₄ 1.68** 7.98** 1.12 3.56 nt (g) F	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H F	00 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29 arvest l	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 ndex (%	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17 6)
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total Source of Variation	D. F. 2 54 108 164 D. F.	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55 Grai E ₁	r head l E_2 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46 in yield E_2 2.28	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49 per plan E ₃ 1.04	E4 8.00 1.04** 3.18 3.46 nt (g) E4 1.50	Ea E ₁ 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09 Fodd E ₁	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield E ₂ 1.55	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla E ₃ 1.21	(g) E_4 1.68^{**} 7.98^{**} 1.12 3.56 nt (g) E_4 1.21	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H E ₁ 2.05	00 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29 farvest l E ₂ 2.02	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 ndex (% E ₃ 2.97	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17 6) E ₄ 5.12
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total Source of Variation Replications	D. F. 2 54 108 164 D. F. 2	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55 Grai E ₁ 2.83	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46 in yield E ₂ 2.38	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49 per plan E ₃ 1.94	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{E_4} \\ 8.00 \\ 1.04^{**} \\ 3.18 \\ 3.46 \\ \mathbf{t} \ (\mathbf{g}) \\ \mathbf{E_4} \\ 1.50 \\ 1.50 \\ \end{array}$	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09 Fodd E1 1.91	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield E ₂ 1.55	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla E ₃ 1.31	(g) E_4 1.68^{**} 7.98^{**} 1.12 3.56 nt (g) E_4 1.21 1.21	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H E ₁ 2.95	00 grain E ₂ 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29 (arvest l E ₂ 3.03 2.004	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 ndex (% E ₃ 2.97	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17 (6) E ₄ 5.12 5.25±±
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total Source of Variation Replications Genotypes	D. F. 2 54 108 164 D. F. 2 54	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55 Grai E ₁ 2.83 8.64**	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46 in yield E ₂ 2.38 6.41**	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49 per plan E ₃ 1.94 4.37**	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{E_4} \\ 8.00 \\ 1.04^{**} \\ 3.18 \\ 3.46 \\ \mathbf{t} \ (\mathbf{g}) \\ \mathbf{E_4} \\ 1.50 \\ 3.19^{**} \end{array}$	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09 Fodd E1 1.91 5.75**	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield E ₂ 1.55 4.65**	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla E ₃ 1.31 4.52**	$(g) \\ E_4 \\ 1.68^{**} \\ 7.98^{**} \\ 1.12 \\ 3.56 \\ nt (g) \\ E_4 \\ 1.21 \\ 4.66^{**} \\ \end{cases}$	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H E ₁ 2.95 5.78**	D0 grain E2 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29 arvest I E2 3.03 3.89**	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 index (% E ₃ 2.97 7.26**	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17 6) E ₄ 5.12 8.25**
Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error Total Source of Variation Replications Genotypes Error	 D. F. 2 54 108 164 D. F. 2 54 108 	Ea E ₁ 8.04 1.07** 2.91 3.55 Grai E ₁ 2.83 8.64** 5.70	r head l E ₂ 5.12 1.04** 3.66 3.46 in yield E ₂ 2.38 6.41** 4.71	ength (c E ₃ 1.18 1.05** 4.24 3.49 per plan E ₃ 1.94 4.37** 3.70	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{E_4} \\ 8.00 \\ 1.04^{**} \\ 3.18 \\ 3.46 \\ \mathbf{t} \ (\mathbf{g}) \\ \mathbf{E_4} \\ 1.50 \\ 3.19^{**} \\ 2.78 \end{array}$	Ea E1 1.95 9.31** 1.20 4.09 Fodd E1 1.91 5.75** 3.45	r head E ₂ 2.20 8.30** 1.23 3.81 er yield E ₂ 1.55 4.65** 2.97	Weight E ₃ 1.66** 7.46** 1.29 3.51 per pla E ₃ 1.31 4.52** 2.47	$(g) \\ E_4 \\ 1.68^{**} \\ 7.98^{**} \\ 1.12 \\ 3.56 \\ nt (g) \\ E_4 \\ 1.21 \\ 4.66^{**} \\ 2.25 \\ (g) \\ (g)$	100 E ₁ 5.34 3.46** 3.48 1.43 H E ₁ 2.95 5.78** 5.02	D0 grain E2 4.82 3.12** 3.14 1.29 arvest I E2 3.03 3.89** 4.87	weight E ₃ 4.59 2.94** 2.97 1.22 index (% E ₃ 2.97 7.26** 4.69	(g) E ₄ 4.32 2.82** 2.82 1.17 6) E ₄ 5.12 8.25** 3.78

Table 2 : Analysis of variance (environment wise) for all fifteen traits under study

Source of Variation	DE	Ι	ron conten	t (mg/100g	()	Calcium content (mg/100g)			
Source of variation	D. F.	E ₁	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	E_4	E ₁	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	$\mathbf{E_4}$
Replications	2	5.75	2.81	1.23	6.61	5.13	9.60	4.25	1.13
Genotypes	54	1.21**	1.24**	1.24**	1.25**	2.48**	3.19**	2.36**	2.74**
Error	108	4.11	3.89	4.25	4.01	3.72	3.58	2.56	3.00
Total	164	4.01	4.12	4.11	4.13	8.43	1.07	7.96	9.22

Source of	ПЕ	Protein (%)						
Variation	D . г.	E ₁	\mathbf{E}_2	E ₃	E_4			
Replications	2	7.40	1.16	4.70	8.19			
Genotypes	54	2.79**	2.73**	2.90**	2.73**			
Error	108	2.50	2.39	2.19	2.56			
Total	164	9.36	9.16	9.69	9.17			

* and ** significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively.

Sr.	Characters	Ra	nge	Maan	Variance			
No.	Characters	Minimum Maximum		Mean	Phenotypic	Genotypic	Environmental	
1	Plant height (cm)	88.34	137.41	120.06	188.26	112.37	75.89	
2	Days to 50 % flowering	54.94	93.30	76.61	107.30	99.56	7.74	
3	Days to maturity	91.75	129.40	115.00	111.41	100.89	10.53	
4	Productive tillers per plant	4.59	6.16	5.22	0.16	0.08	0.08	
5	Fingers per panicle	4.77	9.23	6.71	1.37	0.82	0.55	
6	Finger width (cm)	0.69	1.04	0.86	0.01	0.01	0.0007	
7	Ear head length (cm)	4.53	13.29	7.88	3.53	3.50	0.04	
8	Ear head weight (g)	12.80	19.05	15.95	3.56	2.65	0.91	
9	1000 Seed weight (g)	2.11	3.30	2.68	0.12	0.10	0.02	
10	Grain yield per plant (g)	4.95	10.13	7.06	2.17	1.71	0.45	
11	Fodder yield per plant (g)	11.98	25.48	18.50	18.18	13.06	5.11	
12	Harvest index (%)	19.23	38.38	28.00	24.04	14.07	9.97	
13	Iron content (mg/100g)	2.03	4.88	3.12	0.42	0.41	0.003	
14	Calcium content (mg/100g)	205.05	336.30	277.13	919.15	818.75	100.40	
15	Protein content (%)	6.03	9.59	7.40	0.95	0.92	0.03	

Table 3: Mean, minimum and maximum values for all fifteen characters along with respective phenotypic, genotypic and environmental

Table 4 : Genotypic and Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation (GCV and PCV) for all fifteen characters along with respective heritability, genetic advance and genetic advance (% of mean)

Sr. No.	Characters	GCV (%)	PCV (%)	ECV (%)	Heritability (Broad sense %)	Genetic advance	Genetic advance (% of mean)
1.	Plant height (cm)	8.83	11.43	7.26	59.70	16.87	14.05
2.	Days to 50 % flowering	13.03	13.52	3.63	92.80	19.80	25.84
3.	Days to maturity	8.73	9.18	2.82	90.60	19.69	17.12
4.	Productive tillers per plant	5.32	7.54	5.34	49.80	0.40	7.73
5.	Fingers per panicle	13.50	17.44	11.04	59.90	1.44	21.12
6.	Finger width (cm)	8.76	9.27	3.04	89.30	0.15	17.04
7.	Ear head length (cm)	23.73	23.85	2.38	92.00	3.83	48.64
8.	Ear head weight (g)	10.21	11.83	5.97	74.50	2.89	18.14
9.	1000 Seed weight (g)	11.85	13.13	5.65	81.50	0.59	22.04
10.	Grain yield per plant (g)	18.53	20.83	9.52	69.10	2.40	33.96
11.	Fodder yield per plant (g)	19.53	23.04	12.22	71.50	6.31	34.11
12.	Harvest index (%)	13.40	17.51	11.28	58.50	5.91	21.12
13.	Iron content (mg/100g)	20.55	20.64	1.94	99.10	1.32	42.40
14.	Calcium content (mg/100g)	10.33	10.94	3.62	89.10	55.63	20.08
15.	Protein content (%)	12.96	13.15	2.19	97.20	1.95	26.33





Fig. 1(a) : Bar graph depicting ECV, GCV & PCV for morphological character under study

Fig. 1(b): Bar graph depicting Heritability, Genetic advance & Genetic advance (% of mean) for morphological characters under stud y

Similar result were reported by Ganapathy et al. (2011) for days to maturity, Jahnavi and Lal (2023) for days to maturity and peduncle length, Karad and Patil (2013) and Opole et al. (2018). The phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) was higher than genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for all characters. This indicates the effect of environmental factors on these characters. This shows presence of largevariation in the genotypes for these characters. Therefore, simple selection can be obtained for the improvement of these characters.

Heritability and genetic advance

High estimates of heritability were found in iron content (99.10 %) followed by protein content (97.20 %), days to 50 % flower (92.80 %), ear head length (92.0 %), days to maturity (90.60 %), finger width (89.30 %), calcium content (89.10 %), 1000 seed weight (81.50 %), ear head weight (74.50 %), fodder vield per plant (69.10 %). Moderate amount of heritability was found in fingers per panicle (59.90 %), plant height (59.70 %), harvest index (58.50 %) and productive tillers per plant (49.80). The high genetic advance expressed as per cent of mean was obtained for ear head length (48.64 %) followed by iron content (42.20 %), fodder yield per plant (34.11 %), protein content (%) (26.33 %), days to 50% flowering (25.84 %), 1000 seed weight (22.04 %) harvest index, fingers per panicle (21.12 %), calcium content (20.08 %). Moderate genetic advance expressed as per cent of mean was obtained for ear head weight (18.14 %) followed by days to maturity (17.12 %), finger width (17.04 %), plant height (14.05 %). Low genetic advance expressed as per cent of mean was obtained for productive tillers per plant (7.73 %). Heritability estimates along with genetic gains were more effective and reliable in predicting the improvement through selection. Estimates of genetic advance in general helped to predict the extent of improvement that could be achieved for improving different characters. In the present study, high heritability coupled with high genetic advance as per cent of mean was observed for the traits viz., days to 50% flowering, ear head length (cm), 1000 seed weight (g), protein content (%), calcium content (mg/100g) and iron content (mg/100g). These observations led to conclusions that these characters were governed largely by additive gene action and selection would be rewarding. Similar findings were earlier reported by Mahanthesha et al. (2017), Devaliya et al. (2018), Patel et al. (2018), Singamsetti et al. (2018), Keerthana et al. (2019), Chavan et al. (2019), Sindhuja et al. (2019), Anuradha et al. (2020), Srilatha et al. (2020), Karvar et al. (2021), Bharathi et al. (2022), Madhusri et al. (2022), Udamala et al. (2022), Chandra et al. (2023), Singh et al. (2023), Jahnavi et al. (2023) and Patel et al. (2024) for various traits. High heritability along with moderate genetic advance as per cent of mean was present in days to maturity, finger width and ear head weight indicating that the genotypes under study were diverse with immense genetic potential and further improvement in these traits would possible by practicing simple selection technique. Similar results were also obtained by John et al. (2006), Ulaganathan and Nirmala Kumari (2011) and Anuradha et al. (2020). Contrasting results were obtained by Mahanthesha et al. (2017), Anuradha et al. (2019) and Udamala et al. (2022).

Conclusion

The genotypes were FM-3022, FM-3001, FM-3008, FM-3026, FM-4012, FM-4007, WN-544, WN- 548, WN-550, WN-581, WN-591, WN-561, WN-562, WN-566, WN-575, WN-577 and WN-592 as they showed better performance for yield components and can be used as parents in future improvement program. The GCV and PCV were both observed to be good for days to 50% flower, fingers per panicle, Ear head weight (g), 1000 grain weight (g), harvest index (%), calcium content (mg/100g) and protein content (%). Thus, these characters provide a good source of variation and hence they are useful in improvement programme for finger millet. High heritability estimates were obtained for almost all the characters, indicating less influence from environmental effects.

References

- Allard, R.W. (1960). *Principles of Plant Breeding*. John Willey and Sons, Inc., New York. 85 95
- Anuradha, N., Patro, T.S.S.K., Triveni, U. and Rao, P.J. (2020). Assessment of genetic variability in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* L. Gaertn.). J. pharmacogn. phytochem.,9 (4), 764-767.
- Bharathi, G., Radhika, K., Anuradha, N., Jayalalitha, K., Rao, V.S., Elangovan, M. and Patro, T.S.S.K. (2022). Genetic parameters for yield and yield attributing traits in Finger Millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.) genotypes. *The Pharma innov. J.*, 11 (3), 1883-1885.
- Ceasar, S., Maharajan, T., Ajeesh Krishna, T., Ramakrishnan, M., Victor Roch, G., Satish, L., 2018. Finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.] improvement: current status and future interventions of whole genome sequence. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 9, 1054.
- Chavan, B.R., Jawale, L.N., Dhutmal, R.R. and Kalambe, A.S. (2018a). Stability analysis for yield and yield contributing traits in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn). J. pharmacogn. phytochem., **7**(5), 296-300.
- Devaliya, S.D., Singh, M., Intawala, C.G. and Bhagora, R.N. (2018). Genetic variability studies in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn). *Int. J. Pure Appl. Biosci*, 6(1), 1007-1011.
- Singh, D., Kumar, A., Kumar, R., Kushwaha, N., Mohanty, T.A. and Kumari, P. (2020). Genetic Variability Analysis of QPM (*Zea mays L.*) In breds using Morphological Characters. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.* 9(02), 328-338.
- Ganapathy, S., Nirmalakumari, A. and Muthiah, A.R. (2011). Genetic variability and interrelationships analyses for economic traits in finger millet germplasm. *World Journal* of Agricultural Sciences **7**(2), 185–88.
- Jahnavi, A. and Gaibriyal M.L. (2023). Genetic Variability for Yield and Yield Attributing Traits in Finger Millet (*Eleusine coracana* L. Gaertn) under Irrigation in Central India. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 35(19), 392-403.
- Johnson, H.W., Robinson, H.F. and Comstock, R.E. (1955a). Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybean. J. Agron., 47: 314-318.
- Karad, S.R., Patil, J.V. (2013). Assessment of genetic diversity among finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn) genotypes. *Int. J. Integra. Sciences. Innov. Tec. Journal.* 2(4), 37-43.

- Keerthana, K., Chitra, S., Subramanian, A., Nithila, S. and Elangovan, M. (2019a). Studies on genetic variability in finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn] genotypes under sodic conditions. *Electron. J. Plant Breed.*, **10** (2), 566-569.
- Kumar, A., Metwal, M., Kaur, S., Gupta, A.K., Puranik, S., 2016. Nutraceutical value of finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.], and their improvement using omics approaches. Frontiers in Plant Science 7, 934.
- Madhusri, D., Lavanya, G. R. and Elangovan, M. (2022). Phenotypic diversity of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.) genotypes for grain yield characters. *Int. J. PlantSci.*, **34** (20), 139-148.
- Mahanthesha, M., Sujatha, M., Meena, A. K. and Pandravada, S. R. (2017). Studies on variability, heritability and genetic advance for quantitative characters in finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn] germplasm. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, 6 (6), 970-974.
- Maharajan, T., Ceasar, S.A., Krishna, T.P.A., Ignacimuthu, S. (2019). Phosphate supply influenced the growth, yield, and expression of PHT1 family phosphate transporters in seven millets. Planta, **250**, 1433–1448.
- Opole, R.A., Prasad, P.V.V., Djanaguiraman, M., Vimala, K., Kirkham, M.B., Upadhyaya, H.D. (2018). Thresholds, sensitive stages and genetic variability of finger millet to high temperature stress. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*, **204**(5), 477–492.
- Panse, V.G. and Sukhatme, P.V. (1985). In: "Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers (Second edition)", ICAR, New Delhi, pp. 361.
- Patel, S.N., Patil, H.E., Modi, H.M. and Thokchom, J.S. (2018a). Genetic variability study in little millet (*Panicum miliare* L.) genotypes in relation to yield and quality traits. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 7(6), 2712-2725.
- Patel, U., Patil, H., Parekh, V., Vadodaria, G. and Shrivastava, A. (2024). Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* L.) genotypes. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*. 15(2), 471-477.
- Rai, S.K., Jat, L. (2022). Genetic diversity studies for drought tolerance among various genotypes of *Brassisa juncea* L. using SSR markers. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 11(6), 1627–1630.
- Ramashia, S.E., Gwata, E.T., Meddows-taylor, S., Anyasi, T.A., Jideani, A.I.O. (2018). Some physical and functional properties of finger millet (*Eleusine Coracana*) obtained in sub-Saharan Africa. *Food Research International*, **104**, 110–118.
- Singamsetti, A., Patro, T. S. S. K., Anuradha, N. and Divya, M. (2018). Studies on genetic variability for yield and yield attributing traits in finger millet *Eluesine coracana* L. Gaertn. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, **7**: 90-95.
- Singh, A., Sehrawat, K., Sehrawat, A., Singh, M. and Sehrawat A. R. (2023). Assessing the genetic diversity of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) germplasm for agronomic traits. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. **93** (5), 489–494.
- Sood, S., Joshi, D.C., Chandra, A.K., 2019. Phenomics and genomics of finger millet: current status and future prospects. *Planta* **250**, 731–751.

- Sood, S., Kant, L., Pattanayak, A. (2017). Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.)-A minor crop for sustainable food and nutritional security. *Asian Journal of Chemistry* 29(4), 707–710.
- Swapnil, Parveen, R., Singh, D., Imam, Z., Singh, M.K. (2024). Breeding Kodo Millet for Biotic and Abiotic Stress Tolerance. In: Mishra, S., Kumar, S., Srivastava, R.C. (eds) Genetic improvement of Small Millets. Springer, Singapore.
- Tiwari, H., Naresh, R.K., Kumar, L., Kataria, S.K., Tewari, S., Saini, A., Yadav, R.K., Asati, R. (2022). Millets for food and nutritional security for small and marginal farmers of north west India in the context of climate change: a

review. International Journal of Plant and Soil Science, **34**(23), 1694–1705.

- Udamala, A., Vijayalakshmi, B., Anuradha, N., Patro, T. S. S. K. and Sekhar, V. (2022). Studies on genetic variability for yield and quality traits in finger millet (*Eluesine coracana* (L.) Gaertn). *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, 9 (9), 2020.
- Ulaganathan, V. and Nirmalakumari, A. (2011). Genetic variability for yield and yield related traits in finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn] genotypes. Department of Millets, Centre for Plant Breeding and Genetics, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.