



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
 P-ISSN: 2349-8234
 JPP 2018; 7(2): 2419-2422
 Received: 21-01-2018
 Accepted: 22-02-2018

Nidhi Tyagi
 Department of Vegetable
 Science, Narendra Deva
 University of Agriculture and
 Technology, Kumarganj,
 Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

VB Singh
 Department of Vegetable
 Science, Narendra Deva
 University of Agriculture and
 Technology, Kumarganj,
 Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Praveen Kumar Maurya
 Department of Vegetable
 Science, Narendra Deva
 University of Agriculture and
 Technology, Kumarganj,
 Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Character association and path coefficient analysis of bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.) genotypes

Nidhi Tyagi, VB Singh and Praveen Kumar Maurya

Abstract

Estimates of correlation and path coefficients can help the mutual relationship between various plant characters and determines component characters on which selection can be based or improvement in yield. It might be easier to increase yield by increasing the smallest yield components on an otherwise good cultivar. Thirty one genotypes of bitter gourd were evaluated for yield contributing characters to observe their associations and direct and indirect effect on fruit yield. The study revealed that in most of cases the genotypic correlation coefficient was higher than the respective phenotypic correlation coefficients. This indicated that the suppressive effect of the environment modified the phenotypic expression of these characters by reducing phenotypic correlation values. Fruit yield per plant (kg) showed significant positive association with average fruit weight (g) at genotypic and phenotypic level. Path analysis revealed that average fruit weight (g) and number of fruits per plant had the greatest direct effect on yield both at phenotypic and genotypic level suggesting their importance while imposing selection for correlation of yield in bitter gourd.

Keywords: correlation analysis, path coefficient analysis, bitter gourd genotypes

Introduction

Bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.) is also called balsam pear or bitter cucumber or bitter melon (Hazra and Som 2015) [12]; is a tropical and subtropical cucurbitaceous crop belongs to the family Cucurbitaceae. The center of origin of this crop is India, with a secondary center of diversity in China and South East Asia (Grubben 1977) [10]. It is a common cucurbit of wild flora of tropical Africa which offers great resources for breeding of cultivated bitter gourd for desirable qualitative traits, tolerance to biotic and abiotic factors etc. The tender and immature fruits are highly nutritious (Gopalan *et al.* 1982) [9] and rich source of calcium (20 mg/100 g), phosphorus (55 mg/100 g), iron (1.8 mg/100 g), vitamin A (219 IU/100 g) and vitamin C (88 mg/100 g). The roots, vines, leaves, flowers and seeds of bitter gourd are also used in medicinal preparations (Morton 1967) [15].

Correlation, in general, measures the extent and direction (positive or negative) of a relationship occurring between two or more characteristics (Gomez and Gomez 1984, Rohman *et al.* 2003) [8, 18]. Simple correlation only describes the overall relationship between the two or more characteristics under study, whereas the estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations describe the extent of genetic and phenotypic factors in establishing a relationship between two plant traits. The estimate of genetic correlation (r_g) refers to the association between two plant characters due to the genetic constitution of the plant, whereas phenotypic correlation (r_p) refers to the correlation between two plant characters due to their physical appearance at a morphological, anatomical, or biochemical level (Affifi 1984, Kang 1998, Zhang *et al.* 2005) [1, 14, 21]. The technique of path analysis was originally proposed in 1920s for analyzing data in social studies. It was then adopted in plant breeding experiments by Dewey and Lu (1959) [5]. More recently, path analysis has been used extensively in agronomic and environmental studies (Garcia del Moral *et al.* 2003, Zhang *et al.* 2005) [7, 21]. It is simply a standardized partial regression analysis and as such measures the direct influence of one variable upon the other and permits separation of correlation into direct and indirect effects. It has previously been reported that path analysis is a useful method for determining the contribution of component variables to a character (Rafi and Nath 2004, Zhang *et al.* 2005, Carlos *et al.*, 2005) [16, 21, 4]. The objective of this present research work has been undertaken in order to determine the nature of association, direct and indirect relationship between yield and yield contributing characters and relative contribution of each character towards fruit yield in bitter gourd through character association and path coefficient analysis.

Correspondence

Nidhi Tyagi
 Department of Vegetable
 Science, Narendra Deva
 University of Agriculture and
 Technology, Kumarganj,
 Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Materials and Methods

The experimental materials consisted of thirty one diverse bitter gourd genotypes including two check varieties (Pusa Vishes and Pusa Do Mausami). The crop was laid in Randomized Block Design with three replications during spring summer of 2015 at Main Experiment Station (Vegetable Research Farm), Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad, India (26.47° North latitude and 82.12° East longitudes at an altitude of 113 m above the mean sea level). The plot size was of 3 m x 2 m with row to row spacing of 2 m and plant to plant spacing of 0.50m. All the recommended package of practices was followed to raise a healthy crop. The observations were recorded on five randomly selected plants from each genotype in each replication for the characters *viz.*, node number to anthesis of first staminate flower, node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower, days to anthesis of first staminate flower, days to anthesis of first pistillate flower, days to first fruit harvest, vine length (m), number of nodes per vine, fruit length (cm), fruit diameter (cm), average fruit weight (g), number of fruits per plant and fruit yield per plant (kg). Genotypic and phenotypic correlations were calculated as per Al-Jibouri *et al.* (1958)^[2] using an ANOVA and covariance matrix in which total variability was split into replications, genotypes, and errors. The genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients were used to determine direct and indirect contribution toward yield per plot. The direct and indirect paths were obtained according to the method of Dewey and Lu (1959)^[5].

Results and Discussion

The correlation coefficients among characters were determined at the phenotypic and genotypic levels. Genotypic correlation coefficients were higher in magnitude than phenotypic correlation coefficients. This can be interpreted as a strong inherent genotypic relationship between characters studied, through their phenotypic expression was impeded by environmental influence.

The estimates of correlation coefficient (Table 1) revealed that fruit yield per plant was positively and significantly correlated with average fruit weight (rp= 0.805**, rg= 0.811**) while significant negative correlation were observed for node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (rg= -0.468**), number to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rg= -0.363*), days to anthesis of first staminate flower (rg= -0.433*), days to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rg= -0.675**), days to first fruit harvest (rg= -0.699**) which confirmed well with the

findings of Bhave *et al.* (2003)^[3], Dey *et al.* (2005)^[6], Singh *et al.* (2012)^[19]. Among the traits, average fruit weight recorded significant negative correlation coefficient with node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (rg= -0.448*), days to anthesis of first staminate flower (rg= -0.496**), days to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rg= -0.593**), days to first fruit harvest (rg= -0.720**) and number of fruits per plant (rp= 0.590**, rg= 0.425*) however, fruit length (rp= 0.085, rg= 0.107) was found positive correlation but non significant. Number of fruits per plant showed highly significant positive correlation coefficient with days to anthesis of first staminate flower (rg= 0.480**) and days to first fruit harvest (rg= 0.498**). Character like days to first fruit harvest was positively and significantly correlated with node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (rp= 0.445*, rg= 0.559**), node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rp= 0.381*), days to anthesis of first staminate flower (rp= 0.682**, rg= 0.923**) and days to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rp= 0.846**, rg= 0.854**), days to first fruit harvest (rg= -0.720**). While days to anthesis of first staminate flower showed highly significant and positive association with node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (rp= 0.519) and node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower (rp= 0.519**, rg= 0.547**). Hence, node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower showed highly significant and positive association with node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (rp= 0.625**, rg= 0.771**) The results are in conformity with the observations of Islam *et al.* (2009)^[13], Rani *et al.* (2015)^[17], Yadagiri *et al.* (2017)^[20].

The association of characters as determined by the simple correlation coefficient may not provide an exact representation of the relationship between yield and yield attributes. In contrast, path coefficient analysis permits a critical examination of specific direct and indirect effects of characters and measures the relative importance of each of them in determining the ultimate goal yield. Path analysis (Table 2) indicated that average fruit weight had highest positive direct effect on fruit yield per plant (1.210, 1.156) followed by number of fruits per plant (0.967, 0.528) and node number to anthesis of first staminate flower (1.468, 0.091) at the genotypic and phenotypic level. Thus, direct selection for these characters would be effective for crop improvement. Corroborating the findings of present investigation positive and direct effect on fruit yield per plant has also been reported in bitter gourd by Islam *et al.* (2009)^[13], Gupta *et al.* (2015)^[11], Rani *et al.* (2015)^[17], Yadagiri *et al.* (2017)^[20].

Table 1: Estimates of phenotypic (rp) and genotypic (rg) correlation coefficient among different characters of bitter gourd genotypes

| Characters | | Node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower | Days to anthesis of first staminate flower | Days to anthesis of first pistillate flower | Days to first fruit harvest | Number of nodes per vine | Vine length (m) | Fruit length (cm) | Fruit diameter (cm) | Number of fruits per plant | Average fruit weight (g) | Fruit yield per plant (kg) |
|--|----|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Node number to anthesis of first staminate flower | rp | 0.625** | 0.519** | 0.579** | 0.445* | -0.104 | 0.189 | -0.116 | -0.081 | -0.049 | -0.220 | -0.221 |
| | rg | 0.771** | 0.547** | 0.714** | 0.559** | -0.073 | 0.276 | -0.149 | -0.105 | 0.176 | -0.448* | -0.468** |
| Node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower | rp | | 0.265 | 0.578** | 0.381* | -0.287 | -0.059 | -0.175 | -0.089 | -0.277 | -0.081 | -0.064 |
| | rg | | 0.250 | 0.564** | 0.281 | -0.376* | -0.070 | -0.239 | -0.176 | -0.126 | -0.142 | -0.363* |
| Days to anthesis of first staminate flower | rp | | | 0.689** | 0.682** | 0.002 | -0.088 | -0.059 | 0.201 | -0.010 | -0.103 | -0.060 |
| | rg | | | 0.919** | 0.923** | -0.005 | -0.143 | -0.093 | 0.295 | 0.480** | -0.496** | -0.433* |
| Days to anthesis of first pistillate flower | rp | | | | 0.846** | -0.127 | -0.086 | -0.095 | 0.164 | -0.188 | -0.057 | -0.116 |
| | rg | | | | 0.854** | -0.237 | -0.170 | -0.189 | 0.168 | 0.292 | -0.593** | -0.675** |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|----------|----------|
| Days to first fruit harvest | rp | | | | | | 0.003 | -0.055 | -0.184 | 0.230 | -0.030 | -0.171 | -0.145 |
| | rg | | | | | | -0.083 | 0.537** | -0.330 | 0.300 | 0.498** | -0.720** | -0.699** |
| Number of nodes per vine | rp | | | | | | | 0.574** | 0.235 | 0.207 | 0.022 | -0.205 | -0.227 |
| | rg | | | | | | | -0.163 | 0.203 | 0.162 | 0.016 | -0.251 | -0.266 |
| Vine length (m) | rp | | | | | | | | 0.170 | 0.183 | -0.106 | -0.005 | -0.063 |
| | rg | | | | | | | | 0.142 | 0.139 | -0.162 | 0.003 | -0.062 |
| Fruit length (cm) | rp | | | | | | | | | 0.355* | -0.221 | 0.085 | -0.043 |
| | rg | | | | | | | | | 0.294 | -0.336 | 0.107 | -0.062 |
| Fruit diameter (cm) | rp | | | | | | | | | | -0.073 | -0.075 | -0.155 |
| | rg | | | | | | | | | | -0.127 | -0.112 | -0.236 |
| Number of fruits per plant | rp | | | | | | | | | | | -0.590** | -0.126 |
| | rg | | | | | | | | | | | -0.425* | 0.241 |
| Average fruit weight (g) | rp | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.805** |
| | rg | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.811** |

*, ** significant at $P \leq 0.05$ or $P \leq 0.01$, respectively.

rg = Genotypic correlation coefficient.

rp = Phenotypic correlation coefficient.

Table 2: Direct and indirect effects of different characters of fruit yield per plant (kg) at phenotypic and genotypic level of bitter gourd

| Characters | | Node number to anthesis of first staminate flower | Node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower | Days to anthesis of first staminate flower | Days to anthesis of first pistillate flower | Days to first fruit harvest | Number of nodes per vine | Vine length (m) | Fruit length (cm) | Fruit diameter (cm) | Number of fruits per plant | Average fruit weight (g) | Fruit yield per plant (kg) |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Node number to anthesis of first staminate flower | P | 0.091 | 0.057 | 0.047 | 0.053 | 0.040 | -0.009 | 0.017 | -0.010 | -0.007 | -0.004 | -0.020 | -0.221 |
| | G | 1.468 | 1.133 | 0.804 | 1.049 | 0.821 | -0.107 | 0.406 | -0.220 | -0.154 | 0.259 | -0.659 | -0.468** |
| Node number to anthesis of first pistillate flower | P | -0.062 | -0.099 | -0.026 | -0.057 | -0.038 | 0.028 | 0.005 | 0.017 | 0.008 | 0.027 | -0.008 | -0.064 |
| | G | -0.936 | -1.213 | 0.303 | -0.684 | -0.341 | 0.456 | 0.085 | 0.291 | 0.213 | 0.153 | 0.172 | -0.363* |
| Days to anthesis of first staminate flower | P | 0.001 | -0.000 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | -0.000 | -0.00 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | -0.060 |
| | G | -0.688 | -0.314 | -1.256 | -1.155 | -1.160 | 0.006 | 0.180 | 0.117 | -0.371 | -0.603 | 0.624 | -0.433* |
| Days to anthesis of first pistillate flower | P | -0.010 | 0.010 | -0.011 | -0.017 | -0.014 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 | -0.002 | 0.003 | 0.001 | -0.116 |
| | G | 0.850 | 0.671 | 1.093 | 1.189 | 1.016 | -0.282 | -0.202 | -0.225 | 0.200 | 0.348 | -0.705 | -0.675** |
| Days to first fruit harvest | P | 0.039 | -0.033 | 0.060 | 0.075 | 0.088 | 0.000 | -0.004 | -0.016 | 0.020 | -0.002 | -0.015 | -0.145 |
| | G | -0.564 | -0.284 | -0.931 | -0.862 | -1.009 | 0.084 | 0.164 | 0.333 | -0.303 | -0.503 | 0.727 | -0.699** |
| Number of nodes per vine | P | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.227 |
| | G | -0.014 | -0.274 | -0.001 | -0.046 | -0.016 | 0.197 | 0.106 | 0.040 | 0.032 | 0.003 | -0.049 | -0.266 |
| Vine length (m) | P | -0.004 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.001 | -0.014 | -0.024 | -0.004 | -0.004 | 0.002 | -0.000 | -0.063 |
| | G | -0.191 | 0.048 | 0.099 | 0.118 | 0.113 | -0.372 | -0.691 | -0.098 | -0.096 | 0.112 | -0.002 | -0.062 |
| Fruit length (cm) | P | -0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.001 | -0.000 | 0.000 | -0.043 |
| | G | 0.041 | 0.066 | 0.026 | 0.052 | 0.091 | -0.056 | -0.039 | -0.277 | -0.081 | 0.093 | -0.029 | -0.062 |
| Fruit diameter (cm) | P | 0.003 | -0.003 | -0.088 | -0.007 | -0.010 | -0.092 | -0.008 | -0.015 | -0.044 | 0.003 | 0.003 | -0.155 |
| | G | -0.061 | -0.103 | 0.171 | 0.098 | 0.176 | 0.095 | 0.081 | 0.172 | 0.585 | -0.074 | -0.066 | 0.236 |
| Number of fruits per plant | P | -0.026 | -0.146 | -0.005 | -0.099 | -0.016 | 0.011 | -0.056 | -0.116 | -0.039 | 0.528 | -0.312 | -0.126 |
| | G | 0.170 | -0.122 | 0.464 | 0.283 | 0.482 | 0.016 | -0.156 | 0.325 | -0.123 | 0.967 | -0.411 | 0.241 |
| Average fruit weight (g) | P | -0.254 | 0.094 | -0.119 | -0.066 | -0.198 | -0.237 | 0.000 | 0.098 | -0.087 | -0.683 | 1.156 | 0.805** |
| | G | -0.154 | -0.171 | -0.601 | -0.718 | -0.872 | -0.304 | 0.003 | 0.129 | -0.136 | 0.514 | 1.210 | 0.811** |

Diagonal bold figures represent direct effects; Phenotypic residual effect = 0.388; Genotypic residual effect = Sqrt (1-1.12835)

References

- Afifi AA. Computer-Aided Multivariate Analysis; Lifetime Learning Publications: Belmont, Calif, 1984.
- Al-Jibouri HA, Millar PA, Robinson HF. Genotypic and environmental variances and co-variances in an upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. *Agronomy Journal*. 1958; 50:633-636.
- Bhave SG, Bendale VW, Pethe UB, Berde SA, Mehta JL. Correlation and path analysis in segregating generations of bitter gourd. *Journal of Soils and Crops*. 2003; 13(1):33-40.
- Carlos AFS, Senalik D, Simon PW. Path analysis suggests phytoene accumulation is the key step limiting the carotenoid pathway in white carrot roots. *Genetics and Molecular Biology*. 2005; 28(2):287-293.
- Dewey OR, Lu KH. Correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass seed production. *Journal of Agronomy*. 1959; 51:515-518.
- Dey SS, Behera TK, Pal A, Munshi AD. Correlation and path coefficient analysis in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). *Vegetable Science*. 2005; 32(2):173-176.
- Garcia del Moral LF, Rharrabti Y, Villages D, Royo C. Evaluation of grain yield and its components in durum wheat under Mediterranean conditions: An ontogenic approach. *Agronomy Journal*. 2003; 95:266-274.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*. John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1984.
- Gopalan C, Ramashastry BV, Balasubramanian SC. Nutritive value of Indian foods. I. C. M. R., Hyderabad. 1982, 328.

10. Grubben GJH. Tropical vegetable and their genetic resources, IBPGR, Rome. 1977, 51-52.
11. Gupta N, Bhardwaj ML, Singh SP, Sood S. Correlation and path analysis of yield and yield components in some genetic stocks of bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). SABRAO Journal of Breeding and Genetics. 2015; 47(4):475-481.
12. Hazra P, Som MG. Vegetable Science. 2nd Revised Edition. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi. 2015, 327.
13. Islam MR, Hossain MS, Bhuiyan MSR, Husna A, Syed MA. Genetic variability and path-coefficient analysis of bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). International Journal of Sustainable Agriculture. 2009; 1(3):53-57.
14. Kang MS. Using genotype-by-environment interaction for crop cultivar development. Advances in Agronomy. 1998; 62:199-251.
15. Morton JF. The balsam pear-an edible medicinal and toxic plant. Economic Botany. 1967; 212:57-68.
16. Rafi SA, Nath UK. Variability, heritability, genetic advance and relationship of yield and yield contributing characters in dry bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). Journal of Biological Sciences. 2004; 4:157-159.
17. Rani KR, Raju CS, Reddy KR. Variability, correlation and path analysis studies in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). Agricultural Science Digest; 2015; 35(2):106-110.
18. Rohman MM, Iqbal ASM, Arifin MS, Akhtar Z, Husanuzzaman M. Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in mungbean. Asian Journal of Plant Sciences. 2003; 2(17-24):1209-1211.
19. Singh B, Pandey VP, Kumar S. Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.), New Agriculturist. 2012; 23(2):239-244.
20. Yadagiri J, Gupta NK, Tembhre D, Verma S. Genetic variability, correlation studies and path coefficient analysis in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017; 6(2):63-66.
21. Zhang H, Schroder JL, Fuharman JK, Basta NT, Storm DE, Payton ME. Path and multiple regression analyses of phosphorus sorption capacity. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 2005; 69:96-106.