Click www.researchjournal.co.in/online/subdetail.html to purchase.

International Journal of Plant Sciences (2006) **1** (1) : 137-138 Short Communication Selection criteria for genetic improvement in mungbean (Vigna radiata (L) Wilczek)

ANIL SIROHI* AND LOKENDRA KUMAR¹

Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, S.V.B.P. University of Ag. & Tech., Meerut (U.P.) 1 Department of Ag. Botany, C.C.R. (P.G.) College, Muzaffarnagar (U.P.)

(Accepted : September 2005)

 \mathbf{S} election of an elite genotype on the basis of yield itself is not a relevant procedure in a crop improvement programme. The success rate of selection in any crop undoubtly depend upon the authentic information on magnitude and direction of inter-relationship of various component characters. It is a well known fact that a significant positive relation between two desired traits are always favourable and on the other hand a negative association between two desirable traits are always a nuiscence to a plant breeder. Therefore, in view of the relationship of various component traits of seed yield.

Nineteen genotypes of mungbean were grown in a randomized block design with three replications during the *kharif* season of 1999 with a distance of 30 cm and10 cm. between the rows and plants respectively at the CSK HPKV, Research station, Berthin, Distt. Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh, (31°12'30" to 31°35'30" N latitude and 76°23'45" to 76°55'40" E longitude, 625 meters above mean sea level). The plot size consisted of three rows of 2.5 meter length each. The data were recorded on a sample of five random

| 1able 1. Ocholyble (O) and bhenolyble (F) conclandin coefficients among seed view and combonent traits in multiple | Table | :1: | Genotypic | (\mathbf{G}) |) and | phenotypic | (\mathbf{P}) | correlation | coeffic | cients ar | mong seed | vield | l and com | ponent tra | its in mun | gbear |
|--|-------|-----|-----------|----------------|-------|------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|------------|------------|-------|
|--|-------|-----|-----------|----------------|-------|------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|------------|------------|-------|

| Characters | | Days to | Days to | Plant | Number | Productive | Productive | Number | 100 | Biological | Seed |
|------------------|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | | 50% | 80% | height | clusters/ | branches/ | pods/ | of seeds/ | seed | yield/ | Yield/ |
| | | flowering | maturity | of (cm.) | plant | plant | plant | pod | weight(g) | plant (g) | plant |
| Days to 50 % | G | 1.000 | 0.084 | -0.431 | 0.829 | 0.902 | 0.754 | -0.124 | 0.115 | 0.899 | 0.882 |
| flowering | Р | | 0.248 | -0.051 | 0.266 | 0.278 | 0.276 | 0.031 | -0.39 | 0.292 | 0.202 |
| 5 | ~ | | 1 0 0 0 | 0.010 | | 0.000 | 0.50 | 0.000 | | 0.015 | 0.400 |
| Days to 80 % | G | | 1.000 | 0.918 | 0.384 | 0.099 | 0.726 | 0.889 | -0.58/ | 0.917 | 0.403 |
| maturity | Р | | | 0.416 | 0.124 | 0.068 | 1.07 | 0.505 * | -0.284 | 0.162 | 0.149 |
| Plant | G | | | 1.000 | 0.608 | -0.752 | 0.023 | 0.490 | -0.621 | -0.243 | -0.495 |
| height (cm) | P | | | 1.000 | -0.157 | -0.091 | -0.17 | 0.500 * | -0.365 | 0.247 | 0.268 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of | G | | | | 1.000 | -0.461 | 0.713 | 0.026 | 0.060 | 0.586 | 0.902 |
| clusters/ Plant | Р | | | | | 0.484 * | 0.710 ** | * 0.217 | 0.160 | 0.468 | * 0.717 ** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Productive | G | | | | | 1.000 | 0.487 | 0.071 | 0.215 | 0.751 | 0.907 |
| branches/ Plant | Р | | | | | | 0.241 | 0.098 | -0.052 | 0.591 * | ** 0.358 |
| Productivo | G | | | | | | 1 000 | 0.102 | 0.416 | 0.057 | 0.006 |
| Productive | D | | | | | | 1.000 | 0.193 | -0.410 | 0.937 | 0.900 |
| pous /Plant | Р | | | | | | | -0.27 | -0.048 | 0.398 | 0.750 |
| Number of | G | | | | | | | 1.000 | -0.125 | 0.472 | -0.001 |
| seeds/ pod | Р | | | | | | | | -0.062 | 0.212 | 0.131 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 Seed | G | | | | | | | | 1.000 | -0.292 | -0.017 |
| weight (g) | Р | | | | | | | | | -0.085 | 0.176 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biological | G | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | 0.923 |
| yield/ Plant (g) | Р | | | | | | | | | | 0.346 |
| | _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seed yield / | G | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 |
| plant (g) | Р | | | | | | | | | | |

* Significant at 5 % level of probability

** Signigicant at 1 % level of probability

aforesaid facts the present study was undertaken to establish an authentic selection criteria for genetic improvement in mungbean through an analysis of interplants from each plot for ten characters including seed yield per plant (Table 1). Genotypic and phenotypic correlations between the characters studied revealed that

*Author for correspondence