

Genetic Variability Studies for grain yield and its attributes in Proso millet (Panicum miliaceum L.)

N Anuradha, T.S.S.K. Patro, Y Sandhya Rani, U Triveni and P Kranthi Priya

Agricultural Research Station, Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, Vizianagaram, A.P.

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of 20 proso millet breeding lines was attempted during *kharif*, 2021 at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram to assess genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance for ten yield contributing traits. Number of productive tillers per plant and number of leaves per plant recorded high variability indicating much scope of improvement for these characters with simple selection. High heritability coupled with high GAM were recorded for number of productive tillers per plant, leaf length and number of leaves per plant indicating preponderance of additive gene action which is very much selection responsive. Narrow range of variations for PCV and GCV were observed for days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, indicating less environmental influence for these traits. They also recorded high heritability with low GAM indicating that these two traits may be governed by few genes with non additive gene action. Hence, selection for these traits may be attempted through heterosis breeding. VP008 and VP 033 were found to be promising for earliness and VP021 for higher grain yield.

Key words: Heritability and genetic advance, Proso millet and Variability.

Small millets are the hitherto staple food for millions of people residing in arid and semiarid regions of Asian and African countries and are currently restricted to certain traditional growing areas. Increased health problems, due to changes in lifestyle, have driven people to pay attention to their food habits and deliberately shift toward nutritional crops, such as small millets (Anuradha et al., 2022). Proso millet (Panicum miliaceum L.) also called as common millet or broomcorn millet is one of the oldest cultivated millet crop and consumed as a staple food among the majority of people who live in arid and semiarid tropics of the world, such as Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe (Lu et al., 2009). Several reports have shown that millet is superior to other major cereals in nutritional value (Pathak et al., 2000). Proso millet-based products own a lower glycemic index (GI) than corn, appears to be a good ingredient for producing low-GI products (McSweeney et al., 2017). For any crop improvement programme knowing about genetic variability among the population is a prerequisite. Genetic improvement through traditional breeding approaches depends mainly on the availability of diverse germplasm and the presence of variability. An insight into the nature and magnitude of genetic variability present in the gene pool is of immense value for starting any systematic breeding programme because, the presence of considerable genetic variability in the base material ensures better chances of evolving desirable plant type. Hence, an attempt was made to estimate the extent of variation for yield contributing traits in the germplasm accessions by studying PCV, GCV, Heritability and Genetic advance which may provide suitable selection indices for improvement of the crop.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experimental was conducted with 20 proso millet lines including check (Co 5) and they were evaluated at Agricultural Research Station, Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh during *kharif*, 2021. Genotypes were planted in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with two replications and a spacing of 22.5×10 cm per each entry. Every genotype was grown in 10 lines each of 3 m length. Fertilizers, DAP (87 kg/ha) and Urea (22 kg/ha) were applied basally at the time of land preparation and remaining 22 kg/ha Urea was applied three weeks

after sowing. Standard management practices were followed to maintain a healthy crop. Observations were recorded on five plants for plant height (cm), number of productive tillers per plant and panicle length (cm). Days to 50% flowering, days was recorded by visualizing the entire plot. Fodder yield and grain yield were recorded on per plot basis and then converted into per hectare.

The mean of all the plants for each trait under each replication was subjected to ANOVA as per the method suggested by (Panse and Sukhathme, 1967). The estimates of GCV and PCV were worked out according to the method suggested by (Burton, 1952). Heritability in broad sense was calculated as per the formula given by (Lush, 1940). Range of heritability was categorized as suggested by (Robinson *et al.* 1949). Genetic advance was estimated according to the method suggested by (Johnson *et al.* 1955).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of variance showed significant differences among the genotypes for all the characters included under study (Table 1). The extent of variability in respect of range, mean, phenotypic coefficient of variability, genotypic coefficient of variability, heritability, genetic advance and genetic advance as percent of mean presented in (Table 3). In the present study VP 033 was the earliest with 64 days to maturity followed by VP 008 with 66 days to maturity (Table 2). These two genotypes can be utilized for breeding early varieties in proso millet. VP 008 was 8 days earlier compared to the check, Co 5 and also had yield advantage of 111kg/ha over the check, hence it may be used as a variety after multilocation evaluation. VP 024 can be used for breeding nonlodging genotypes since it was observed to be the shortest (100 cm) among all the genotypes studied followed by VP 033 with (101 cm). The entry, VP 033 with short plant height and early duration and on par yield with check also appears to be promising and it also has to be tested in multilocation trials. Highest grain yield was recorded by VP 031 (2111 kg/ha) which had out yielded the check variety Co 5(1695 kg/ha) by 416kg/ha though statistically not significant.

The values of PCV obtained for yield and its attributing characters ranged from 6.44 for days to maturity to 34.37 for number of productive tillers per plant. Similarly, the values of GCV ranged from 6.08 for days to maturity to 31.03 for number of productive tillers per plant. High PCV and GCV for number of productive tillers per plant and low values for days 50% flowering was also reported earlier by Salini et al. (2010), Anuradha et al. (2020). Phenotypic coefficient of variability is higher than genotypic coefficient of variability for all the characters. The difference between PCV and GCV were wider for grain yield, fodder yield and plant height while it was narrower for days to 50% flowering and days to maturity indicating higher GE interaction for former traits and lesser GE for later traits. Number of productive tillers per plant and number of leaves per plant with high GCV and PCV has a greater scope for improvement and selections can be performed between genotypes. Whereas moderate variations recorded for panicle length, leaf length and narrow variation for all other traits indicates less scope for selection of these traits among genotypes.

Presence of variability implies possibility of selections. For reliable selection one has to depend on heritability studies. Highly heritable traits are governed by genotypic variances rather than with environmental variance. Hence, there is more chance for success in selection of genotypes based on heritability. However, heritability informs whether the variation is genetic or non genetic while Genetic Advance as Percent Mean (GAM) enlightens the aspect of gene action. Heritability along with GAM studies are meaningful. In the present investigation, high heritability was recorded for days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, number of productive tillers per plant, leaf length and number of leaves per plant. Similarly high heritability for all characters were reported by Salini et al. (2010) while high heritability was reported for number of leaves, tillers, plant height and days to maturity during both years of their study by Calamai et al. (2020). High GAM were recorded for number of productive tillers per plant, leaf length, leaf width and number of leaves per plant. High heritability coupled with high GAM was recorded for number of productive tillers per plant, leaf length and number of leaves per plant indicating preponderance of additive gene action is very much selection responsive. Whereas high heritability with moderate GAM was recorded for plant height and panicle length indicating both additive and non additive gene action. Grain yield and fodder yield recorded moderate

2022

heritability with moderate GAM indicating the importance of both gene actions while for days to 50% flowering and days to maturity it is preponderance of non additive gene action because of its high heritability with low GAM. Days to 50% flowering and days to maturity may have dominant and epistatic gene action which can be improved by heterosis breeding. Salini *et al.* (2010) recorded high heritability with moderate GAM for days to 50% flowering. Calamai *et al.* (2020) also recorded moderate heritability for grain yield. Conversely high heritability and high GAM was reported by Anuradha *et al.* (2020) for grain yield and fodder yield.

The study reveals that VP021, VP008, VP033 are promising genotypes for one or the other traits. Ample variation existed among genotypes for the characters studied. Selection for number of productive tillers per plant, leaf length and number of leaves per plant may be rewarding while selection for grain yield and maturity requires breeding efforts.

		-	-								
Source of	Df				Me	an Sum	of Squar	es			
Variations	וען	DFF	DM	PH	NPT	PL	LL	LW	NL	GY	FY
Treatments	19	27.65**	41.68**	322.18**	4.58**	52.52**	64.03**	0.21**	5.24**	102764*	569463*
Replications	1	0.22	0.4	1.37	0.68	4.49	4.9	0.45*	0.26	9364	394463
Error	19	0.7	2.4	83	0.47	16.22	14.02	0.08	0.75	42456	251229

Table 1: ANOVA of twenty proso millet (Panicum miliaceum L.) genotypes.

**Significant at 1% and * significant at 5% level

Note: Df: Degrees of freedom; DFF: Days to 50% flowering; DM: Days to maturity; PH: Plant height (cm); NPT: No. of productive tillers per plant; PL: Panicle length (cm); LL: Leaf Length; LW: Leaf Width; NL: Number of leaves per plant; GY: Grain yield (kg/ha); FY: Fodder yield (kg/ha)

LITERATURE CITED

- Anuradha N, Patro T S S K, Ashok Singamsetti, Sandhya Rani Y, Triveni U, Nirmala Kumari, Nagappa Govanakoppa, Lakshmi Pathy T and Vilas A Tonapi 2022. Comparative study of AMMI and BLUP based simultaneous selection for grain yield and stability of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.) genotypes. *Frontiers in Plant Science section Plant Breeding*.
- Anuradha N, Patro T S S K, Triveni U, Rao P J and Priya P K 2020. Genetic Variability Studies of Grain Yield and its Attributes in Proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, Special Issue-11: 1445-1449.
- Burton G W 1952. Quantitative inheritance in grasses. Proc. 6th Int. Grassland Cong., 1: 277 - 283.
- Calamai A, Masoni A, Marini L, Dell'acqua M, Ganugi P, Boukail S and Palchetti E 2020. Evaluation of the agronomic traits of 80 accessions of proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.) under Mediterranean

pedoclimatic conditions. *Agriculture*, *10* (12), 578.

- Johnson H W, Robinson H F and Comstock R E 1955. Estimation of genetic variability and environmental variability in soybean. *Agronomy Journal*. 47: 314-318.
- Lush J L 1940. Intra-sire correlation and regression of offspring on dams as a method of estimating heritability of characters. In: Proc. of "American Society of Animal Production". 33: 293-301.
- Lu H, Zhang J, Liu K, Wu N, Li Y, Zhou K and Li Q 2009. Earliest domestication of common millet (*Panicum miliaceum*) in East Asia extended to 10,000 years ago. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.106(18): 7367–7372
- McSweeney M B, Seetharaman K, Ramdath D D and Duizer L M 2017. Chemical and physical characteristics of proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum*)-based products. *Cereal Chemistry Journal*. 94(2): 357–362.

) genotypes
l L.)
1 miliaceum
Panicun
ť
o mille
proso
f twenty
ance o
: Perform
2: P
Table 2

S.No	Entry	DFF	DM	Hd	TqN	ΡL	TT	ΓM	N	GY(kg/ha)	FY(kg/ha)
1	VP 010	43	75	103.3	5.0	31.9	26.8	1.3	8	1917	4819
2	VP 002	40	70	114.7	5.1	37.9	34.9	2.0	10	2056	4417
3	VP 016	41	69	112.9	3.1	40.4	32.9	1.4	7	1778	4389
4	VP 008	38	99	104.2	6.0	32.2	27.1	1.7	5	1806	3625
5	VP 026	41	71	129.6	6.0	39.9	28.0	1.8	8	1528	4083
9	VP 027	42	73	118.2	5.8	34.0	30.7	1.7	7	1389	4250
7	VP 028	43	74	103.2	3.1	22.6	19.9	0.8	9	1584	4806
8	VP 021	49	79	111.3	4.1	31.8	39.9	1.9	9	2069	5111
6	VP 022	47	78	132.4	2.4	39.7	37.0	1.8	9	1834	4722
10	VP 003	46	LL	108.7	4.0	33.9	27.2	1.6	6	1306	4139
11	VP 024	45	75	100.0	6.6	37.1	33.1	1.6	7	1972	5028
12	VP 029	43	73	124.9	6.9	36.0	40.2	1.5	5	2000	4917
13	VP 020	42	73	135.3	2.2	34.1	35.0	1.9	10	1639	4417
14	VP 030	41	71	136.0	3.0	42.8	28.9	2.0	5	1750	4306
15	VP 031	53	85	111.6	5.9	30.9	36.8	1.3	9	2111	5500
16	VP 032	41	72	133.9	4.3	42.1	26.9	1.2	8	1695	5250
17	VP 033	36	64	101.0	6.0	31.2	29.2	1.6	8	1722	5014
18	VP034	42	73	133.9	2.5	25.8	39.1	2.0	5	1667	3361
19	VP 035	43	75	109.2	6.0	34.9	33.0	1.2	6	2056	4556
20	CO 5	43	74	123.0	4.4	34.9	41.0	1.7	7	1695	4250
	Mean	42.68	72.95	117.37	4.62	34.71	32.38	1.60	7.10	1777.80	4547.92
	CD (1%)	2.39	4.43	26.06	1.95	11.52	10.71	0.78	2.48	589.40	1433.76
	CD (5%)	1.75	3.24	19.07	1.43	8.43	7.84	0.57	1.82	431.20	1048.92
	CV (%)	1.96	2.12	7.76	14.77	11.60	11.56	17.10	12.22	11.59	11.02
Note: D	Note: DFF: Days to 50% flowering; DM: Days to maturity; PH: Plant height (cm); NPT: No. of productive tillers per plant; PL: Panicle	flowering; L	M: Days to	maturity; PH:	Plant height	(cm); NPT:]	No. of produ	ctive tillers p	er plant; P	L: Panicle	
length (ci	length (cm); LL: Leat Length; LW: Leat Width; NL: Number of leaves per plant; GY: Grain yield (kg/ha); FY: Fodder yield (kg/ha)	igth; LW: Le	ut Widith; inl	.: Number of h	eaves per pia	nt; u Y: uraii	ı yield (kg/n	a); FY: Foddi	er yield (kg	(/ha)	

Anuradha et al.,

Table 3: Genetic parameters of twenty proso millet (Panicum miliaceum L.) genotypes

1Mean 42.68 72.95 117.37 4.62 34.71 32.38 1.60 7.10 1777.80 4547.92 2Minimum 36.00 63.50 63.50 100.00 2.20 22.60 19.90 0.80 5.00 1305.50 3361.11 3Maximum 53.00 84.50 136.00 6.90 42.80 41.00 2.00 1305.50 3361.11 4GCV 8.60 608 9.32 31.03 12.28 15.44 16.25 2111.00 5500.00 5PCV 8.80 6.44 12.13 34.37 16.89 192.9 23.59 24.39 15.16 14.09 6ECV 1.96 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.09 7H ² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 38.78 7H ² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 38.78 8Genetic Advance 7.37 862 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.057 511.69 9GAM 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 23.59 511.69	S. No	Parameter	DFF	MQ	Hd	NPT	μΓ	ΓΓ	ΓM	NL	GY(kg/ha)	FY(kg/ha)
Minimum 36.00 63.50 100.00 2.20 22.60 19.90 0.80 5.00 1305.50 Maximum 53.00 84.50 136.00 6.90 42.80 41.00 2.00 10.00 2111.00 CCV 8.60 6.08 9.32 31.03 12.28 15.44 16.25 21.10 9.77 PCV 8.82 6.44 12.13 34.37 16.89 19.29 23.59 24.39 15.16 H2(Y) 196 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.59 H2(B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	-	Mean	42.68	72.95	117.37	4.62	34.71	32.38	1.60	7.10	1777.80	4547.92
Maximum 53.00 84.50 136.00 6.90 42.80 41.00 2.00 10.00 2111.00 GCV 8.60 6.08 9.32 31.03 12.28 15.44 16.25 21.10 9.77 PCV 8.82 6.44 12.13 34.37 16.89 19.29 23.59 24.39 15.16 H2(Y) 1.96 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.59 H2(B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 GM 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	2	Minimum	36.00	63.50	100.00	2.20	22.60	19.90	0.80	5.00	1305.50	3361.11
GCV 8.60 6.08 9.32 31.03 12.28 15.44 16.25 21.10 9.77 PCV 8.82 6.44 12.13 34.37 16.89 19.29 23.59 24.39 15.16 ECV 1.96 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.59 H ² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 GAM 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	3	Maximum	53.00	84.50	136.00	6.90	42.80	41.00	2.00	10.00	2111.00	5500.00
PCV 8.82 6.44 12.13 34.37 16.89 19.29 23.59 24.39 15.16 ECV 1.96 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.59 H ² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gametic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gametic Advance 77.28 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	4	GCV	8.60	6.08	9.32	31.03	12.28	15.44	16.25	21.10	9.77	8.77
ECV 1.96 2.12 7.76 14.77 11.60 11.56 17.10 12.22 11.59 H ² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gametic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gametic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gametic Advance 77.28 18.18 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	5	PCV	8.82	6.44	12.13	34.37	16.89	19.29	23.59	24.39	15.16	14.09
H² (B) 95.07 89.11 59.03 81.53 52.82 64.08 47.45 74.88 41.53 Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gamma 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	9	ECV	1.96	2.12	7.76	14.77	11.60	11.56	17.10	12.22	11.59	11.02
Genetic Advance 7.37 8.62 17.31 2.67 6.38 8.25 0.37 2.67 230.52 Gam 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	7	H ² (B)	95.07	89.11	59.03	81.53	52.82	64.08	47.45	74.88	41.53	38.78
GAM 17.28 11.81 14.75 57.72 18.38 25.47 23.06 37.62 12.97	8	Genetic Advance	7.37	8.62	17.31	2.67	6.38	8.25	0.37	2.67	230.52	511.69
	6	GAM	17.28	11.81	14.75	57.72	18.38	25.47	23.06	37.62	12.97	11.25

Note: DFF: Days to 50% flowering; DM: Days to maturity; PH: Plant height (cm); NPT: No. of productive tillers per plant; PL: Panicle length (cm); LL: Leaf Length; LW: Leaf Width; NL: Number of leaves per plant; GY: Grain yield (kg/ha); FY: Fodder yield (kg/ha)

GCV: Genotypic Coefficient of Variance, PCV: Phenotypic Coefficient of Variance; ECV: Environmental Coefficient of Variance; H²(B): Heritability in Broad sense; GAM: Genetic Advance as Percent Mean

- Panse V G and Sukathme P V 1967. Statistical method for agricultural workers. ICAR, New Delhi.pp.381.
- Pathak P, Srivastava S and Grover S 2000. Development of food products based on millets, legumes and fenugreek seeds and their suitability in the diabetic diet. International Journal of Food Sciences & Nutrition. 51(5): 409–414.
- Robinson H F, Comstock R E and Harvey P H 1949. Estimates of heritability and the degree of dominance in corn (*Zea mays*). *Agronomy Journal*. 41: 353-359.
- Salini K, Nirmalakumari A, Muthiah A R and Senthil N 2010. Evaluation of proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.) germplasm collections. *Electronic Journal of plant breeding*, 1(4), 489-499.

Received on 02.05.2022 and Revised on 16.09.2022