

Biological Forum – An International Journal

13(1): 768-775(2021)

ISSN No. (Print): 0975-1130 ISSN No. (Online): 2249-3239

Genetic Evaluation of Garden Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) for Pod Yield and its Contributing Traits

Dharminder Kumar^{1*}, Shubham², Balbir Singh Dogra³, Sunil Thakur⁴, Sandeep Kumar⁵, Kumari Shiwani⁶, V.G.S. Chandel⁷, Rajesh Kaler⁸, Vipan Guleria⁸ and Aanchal Chauhan⁹

¹Senior Scientist, RHR & TS Jachh, Nurpur, District Kangra, (Himachal Pradesh), India. ²Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Vegetable Science, HAU Hisar, (Haryana), India. ³Professor, Department of Vegetable Science,

Department of Vegetable Science, CoH & F Neri, Hamirpur, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁴ Associate Professor, Department of Plant Sciences, Central University, Shahpur, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁵Scientist, ICAR-IARI, RS-Katrain, Kullu Valley, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁶Scientist, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Thunag, Mandi, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁷Scientist, RHR & TS Jachh, Nurpur, District Kangra, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁸Principal Scientist, RHR & TS Jachh, Nurpur, District Kangra, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

⁹Assistant Professor, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Thunag, Mandi, (Himachal Pradesh), India.

Corresponding author: Dharminder Kumar*) (Received 13 March 2021, Accepted 20 May, 2021) (Published by Research Trend, Website: www.researchtrend.net)

ABSTRACT: The study was conducted to evaluate the performance of different genotypes of garden pea during Rabi, 2019-20 at Regional Horticultural Research and Training Station, Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Himachal Pradesh. The experiment was layout in the Augmented Block Design (ABD). Examination of the characteristics revealed substantial variability in the genotypes, indicating that sufficient variance was present throughout the germplasm under study. The maximum plant height was recorded in EC-838238 whereas, the minimum plant height was recorded in EC-838152. The minimum number of node at which the first flower appear was recorded in three genotypes viz. EC-838152, EC- 838161, EC-838233, whereas EC-838232 recorded the highest node at which the first flower appear. The lowest days to 50% flowering were reported in EC-838216 while the highest were documented in EC-838206. The EC-838220 showed the lowest number of seeds per pod and the EC-838211 expressed the highest number. In EC- 838143 the highest length of the pod were reported whereas, EC-838229 recorded the lowest pod length. Also, the highest weight of 100-seeds was recorded in EC-838141 while the lowest value was obtained in EC-838188. The minimum number of days to marketable maturity was recorded in EC-838146 whereas, maximum days to marketable maturity was recorded in EC-838192. Further, the maximum shelling percentage was observed in EC-838192 whereas the minimum shelling percentage was observed in EC-838156. The highest pod yield (kg/plot) and pod yield (q/ha) were observed in EC-838201 whereas, minimum values for these traits were recorded in EC-838219. The genotype EC-838166 recorded the highest total soluble solids and it was lowest in EC-838199. The genotypes EC-838199 and EC-838200 were reported to be moderately susceptible to the incidence of pea leaf miner whereas, DMK-11 was reported to be susceptible. Therefore, considering the highest pod yield genotype EC-838201 may be selected for further evaluation and growing under the conditions of sub-tropical climate of Himachal Pradesh.

Keywords: Garden pea, Pod yield, Mean and genotypes, Genetic Evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.), a member of Fabaceae family, is one of the principal legume vegetable crops grown throughout the world. It is second most important food legume worldwide after *Phaseolus vulgaris* (Tar'an *et al.*, 2005). It is native of Mediterranean region with Near East and Ethiopia as secondary centres (Blixt 1970). It is quite palatable and nutritious for human consumption as it is a rich source of protein (25%), slowly digestive starch (50%), sugars (12%), amino acids, carbohydrates, vitamins (A and C), calcium and phosphorus, apart from having a small quantity of iron (Smykal *et al.*, 2012). Besides, it also contains lysine, the limiting essential amino acid in

cereals (Ceyhan and Avci 2005). It is eaten as fresh, canned, frozen or in dehydrated forms.

In India, it is grown as winter season vegetable in the central and northern plains and as a summer and autumnwinter crop in the hilly regions. It is cultivated in an area of about 540.0 thousand hectares with an annual production of 5422.0 thousand metric tonnes (Anonymous, 2018). The major production states are Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Odisha, and Karnataka. In Himachal Pradesh, pea holds an important position as the leading off season vegetable grown over the state in an area of 23.65 thousand hectares with 277.20 thousand metric tones of yearly output (Anonymous, 2018). Hence, the present study was designed to evaluate performance of garden pea genotypes in low hills of Himachal Pradesh so that the best genotype(s) was selected and recommended to the framers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted during Rabi, 2019-20 at Regional Horticultural Research and Training Station, Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Jachh, situated at an altitude of 428 m above mean sea level, lying between 32°16'54.02"N latitude and 75°51'4.38" E longitude under sub-mountain and low hill sub-tropical agro-climatic zone of Himachal Pradesh, India. The experiment was layout in the Augmented Block Design (ABD). Experimental material comprised of 109 diverse genotypes of pea along with 6 check varieties. The observations were recorded on five competitive plants for pod yield and other qualitative characters viz., days to 50% flowering, node at which first flower appear (number), plant height (cm), number of pods per plant, pod length (cm), number of seeds/grains per pod, 100- seed weight (g), shelling percentage, days to marketable maturity, pod yield (kg/plot), pod yield (q/ha), total soluble solids (°Brix) and pea leaf miner incidence (%). The analysis of variance was done using SPAD (Statistical Package for Augmented Design) software developed by IASRI, New Delhi.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(i) Days to 50% flowering: The statistically important divergence variations were found between different genotypes. The value ranged from 47.50 to 80.40 days with general mean of 63.32 days as presented in Table 1. The days to 50% flowering were earlier in sixty-one genotypes along with checks as compared to the general mean. The least number of days to 50% flowering was reported in the EC-838216 (47.50 days) which was statistically identical to 27 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838141 (56.30 days), EC-838145 (54.10 days), EC-838144 (54.90 days), EC-838147 (53.70 days) and EC-838154 (54.20 days). The highest number of days to 50% flowering was reported in EC-838206 (80.40 days). Seventy three genotypes took less number of days to 50% flowering among all the genotypes under the analysis than the best check Arkel (65.50 days). The results revealing considerable variability concerning this feature were reported by Gupta et al., (2006); Kumari et al., (2012); Pallavi et al., (2013); Jaiswal et al., (2013); Sharma and Sharma (2013).

(ii) Node at which first flower appear (number): The statistically important divergence variations with regards to the node at which the first flower appears were found between different genotypes. The ranged value from 10.30 to17.60 with general mean 13.51 was observed during the studies (Table 1). Fifty three genotypes along with checks, were observed to have less number of node at which the first flower appear than the general mean. The least number of node at which the first flower appears were reported in the three genotypes *viz*. EC-838152 (10.30), EC-838161 (10.30) and EC- 838233 (10.30) which was statistically at par with 48 genotypes, along with checks *viz*. EC-838151 (11.60), EC-838161 (11.85), and EC-838154 (11.80). In EC-838232 (17.60) the highest number node at which the first flower appear was

observed. The thirteen genotypes had less number of node at which the first flower appears among all the genotypes under the analysis than the best check HFP-4 (11.47). The variability concerning this attribute was reported by Mehta *et al.*, (2005); Kumari *et al.*, (2012); Katiyar and Dixit (2009); Gupta *et al.*, (2006).

(iii) Plant height (cm): A significant variability between all the genotypes was observed for plant height as revealed from Table 1. The attribute's mean average output rating was 119.22 cm, whereas, it ranged from 82.40 to 179.80 cm including checks, the forty-three genotypes had more plant height than the populations mean 119.22 cm. The maximum plant height was recorded in EC- 838238 (179.80 cm) and minimum plant height was reported in EC-838152 (82.40 cm). Two genotypes, EC-838238 (179.80 cm) and EC-838235 (173.0 cm) acquired a plant height than the best check Rachna (170.12 cm). The significant variability in the plant height of the pea genotypes was also noted by Karayel and Bozoglu (2015); Georgieva *et al.*, (2016); Gudadinni *et al.*, (2017); Gupta *et al.*, (2006); Thapa *et al.*, (2020).

(iv) Number of pods per plant: As shown in the Table 1, the outcome for the pods number per plant demonstrated strong variability across all genotypes. The overall mean performance value for this attribute was 16.86 and it ranged from 7.20 to 37.60. The forty-nine genotypes had more number of pods per plant than the population mean (16.86) including checks. In EC-838208 (37.60) largest pods number per plant were reported, whereas, the lowest number of pods per plant was reported in EC-838181 (7.20) which were statistically identical to 27 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838143 (12.20), EC-838142 (11.30), EC-838144 (11.30) and EC- 838147(10.40). The results revealed that five genotypes produced more pods per plant than the best check DMR-7 (30.14). The consequences of the current examination are reliable with the observations recorded by Gupta et al., (2006); Jaiswal et al., (2013); Katiyar and Dixit (2009); Karayel and Bozoglu (2015); Pallavi et al., (2013); Mishra et al., (2014); Thapa et al., (2020).

(v) Pod length (cm): The mean results observed for pod length show large variability between all the genotypes as evident from the data presented in the Table 1. The overall mean performance value for the attribute was 6.89 cm and it ranged from 5.68 to 8.78 cm. The fifty-one genotypes including checks produced longer pod length than the population mean however EC-838143 (8.78 cm) recorded the highest pod length which was statistically equivalent to genotypes viz. EC-838145 (7.77cm), 10 EC-838141(8.57cm), EC-838148 (8.54cm) and EC-838139 (8.30 cm). While, in EC-838229 (5.68 cm) the lowest pod length was measured and it was statistically observed to be at par with 27 genotypes including all checks viz. EC-838176 (5.84 cm), EC-838162 (6.23 cm), EC-838169 (6.22 cm), EC-838158 (6.50cm), EC-838184 (6.22 cm) and EC-838214 (5.98 cm). Out of all the genotypes investigated, comparatively greater pod length was observed in eighteen genotypes than the best check Arkel (7.39 cm). This type of broad genetic variability has also been identified about this character by Singh *et al.*, (2011); Chaudhary and Sharma (2003); Jaiswal et al., (2013).

Sr. No.	Genotypes	Days to 50 %	Node at which first flower appear	Plant height (cm)	Number of pods/plant	Pod length	No. of seeds/ grains	100-seed weight	Shelling percentage
		nowering	(number)	110.00	10.00	(cm)	per Pod	(g)	(%)
1.	EC-838139	62.50	11.85	110.90	18.90	8.30	5.90	35.00	45.15
2.	EC-838141	56 30	13.05	116.90	20.20	8.57	5.03	37.50	35.76
4.	EC-838142	61.20	12.90	96.70	11.50	8.10	5.90	28.00	40.65
5.	EC-838143	68.30	13.20	93.30	12.20	8.78	6.50	27.00	42.37
6.	EC-838144	54.90	13.15	118.40	11.30	7.97	5.10	29.50	40.31
7.	EC-838145	54.10	12.70	91.30	8.30	7.77	4.85	31.50	49.74
8.	EC-838146	69.50 52.70	12.65	118.00	14.20	7.91	5.90	24.00	40.55
9. 10	EC-838148	55.70 60.00	12.30	97.10	13.30	7.70 8.54	6.33	25.30	41.00
10.	EC-838149	59.60	13.60	93.80	14.80	7.94	5.65	17.50	41.02
12.	EC-838150	63.70	11.90	83.10	11.00	7.71	5.50	24.50	41.63
13.	EC-838151	61.70	11.60	97.20	14.10	6.85	4.90	29.00	43.97
14.	EC-838152	60.30	10.30	82.40	17.20	7.63	5.35	25.50	49.88
15.	EC-838153	64.60	12.30	110.50	8.40	7.04	5.20	20.50	49.97
16.	EC-838154	54.20	11.80	108.40	14.20	6.75	4.85	19.50	48.40
17.	EC-838156	58.00	14.30	112 50	12.40	6.80	3.03 4.95	28.50	45.70
19.	EC-838157	55.60	16.50	128.30	15.90	6.99	5.80	26.00	51.65
20.	EC-838158	58.10	15.80	117.40	12.60	6.50	4.75	28.00	55.67
21.	EC-838159	60.30	14.60	112.40	24.30	6.99	5.15	28.50	51.34
22.	EC-838160	60.60	15.30	103.90	11.90	6.85	5.20	25.00	46.59
23.	EC-838161	51.00	10.30	114.90	20.40	7.00	5.55	25.50	45.73
24.	EU-838162 EC-838162	00.70 68.40	13.50	106.70	10.90	6.23	4.35	23.50	45.03
25.	EC-838164	59.90	12.90	117.70	12.90	6.95	6.05	18.50	37.30
27.	EC-838165	66.60	11.45	135.20	15.20	7.32	6.55	14.50	45.34
28.	EC-838166	55.95	11.48	127.50	23.50	7.38	6.45	15.50	44.56
29.	EC-838167	61.80	12.77	112.80	12.70	7.24	6.30	19.00	42.51
30.	EC-838168	67.80	14.30	112.50	12.91	7.28	6.25	16.50	50.01
31.	EC-838169	55.00	13.35	120.00	12.50	6.22	4.75	16.00	48.29
33	EC-838170	67.70	11.57	108.30	12.90	6.52	5.20	14 00	41.00
34.	EC-838172	53.00	15.20	155.10	19.90	6.89	5.15	15.00	44.21
35.	EC-838173	60.30	15.03	131.70	27.40	7.01	5.40	14.00	38.00
36.	EC-838174	59.20	14.15	112.60	21.80	6.91	6.10	19.00	45.31
37.	EC-838175	67.60	10.65	104.40	13.60	7.05	6.15	16.00	47.15
38.	EC-838176 FC-838177	57.95	14.05	102.20	13.50 26.70	5.84	5.25	19.50	44.31 55.51
40.	EC-838178	72.90	12.73	114.80	13.50	6.46	4.75	16.00	43.22
41.	EC-838179	53.50	14.57	130.60	16.20	6.44	5.15	19.50	40.80
42.	EC-838180	52.90	13.10	133.30	25.40	7.02	6.00	23.00	37.68
43.	EC-838181	57.80	13.65	102.60	7.20	7.85	5.55	22.50	49.50
44.	EC-838182	48.40	14.78	136.70	23.30	6.70	6.00	24.00	39.80
45.	EC-838184	65.90	14.33	121.50	20.00	6.22	5.65	16.00	42.30
47.	EC-838185	63.70	16.15	124.30	14.70	6.48	5.40	16.50	43.76
48.	EC-838186	60.60	12.40	123.90	15.50	6.34	5.15	14.50	48.81
49.	EC-838187	72.45	15.12	128.40	14.90	6.59	4.90	15.00	36.77
50.	EC-838188	76.60	15.28	141.80	17.10	6.33	4.75	12.50	42.11
51.	EC-838100	59.10	12.92	104.00	32.70 18.20	6.36	0.00	17.00	42.37
53.	EC-838191	58.85	12.75	115.70	15.50	6.17	4.95	19.00	50.93
54.	EC-838192	61.80	11.15	110.30	19.40	6.40	5.05	20.00	60.00
55.	EC-838193	60.40	12.35	112.90	17.60	7.10	5.75	20.50	41.91
56.	EC-838194	64.60	15.85	122.30	23.30	7.61	5.90	20.50	41.77
57.	EC-838195	55.20	13.95	138.40	24.50	6.79	4.90	23.00	45.00
50. 50	EC-838190 EC-838197	59.20 66.20	10.97	137.80	20.70	0.42 6.82	5.15 4.95	22.00	44.29
60.	EC-838198	53.75	15.13	113.40	20.80	7.04	6.05	18.00	49.31
61.	EC-838199	60.00	15.35	113.60	27.60	6.92	5.70	21.00	37.12
62.	EC-838200	60.30	15.59	106.70	13.40	6.77	5.00	15.00	45.24
63.	EC-838201	52.90	14.60	109.70	32.90	7.57	6.35	26.00	52.06
64.	EC-838202	66.10 72.20	10.97	112.30	17.80	7.34	6.30	20.00	45.30
66	EC-838204	72.20	13.63	119.00	18.10	6.85	5.20	19.00	40.05
67.	EC-838205	76.60	12.10	111.50	25.70	6.78	5.80	22.00	47.30
68.	EC-838206	80.40	12.62	104.80	11.30	6.43	5.70	23.00	41.56
69.	EC-838207	71.60	12.64	109.10	18.40	6.21	4.90	20.00	47.18
70.	EC-838208	61.20	13.35	113.90	37.60	6.38	5.35	33.00	38.97
72	EC-838209 EC-838210	63.25	12.09	118.60	21.20	0.05	5.50	28.00	42.95

Table 1: Mean performance of various garden pea genotypes with respect to different horticultural traits.

Kumar et al.,

13(1): 768-775(2021)

73.	EC-838211	61.60	13.23	115.10	21.00	7.08	6.60	28.50	42.94
74.	EC-838212	62.05	11.54	109.90	9.90	7.46	6.10	25.00	43.25
75.	EC-838213	58.80	15.42	144.30	9.70	6.10	5.00	27.50	35.32
76.	EC-838214	61.00	14.52	108.60	14.60	5.98	5.20	22.50	50.74
77.	EC-838215	72.00	13.27	101.70	9.70	6.27	5.55	31.00	44.60
78	EC-838216	47 50	13.77	117.60	12.40	6.62	5.15	19 50	47.83
79.	EC-838217	57.30	14.11	107.70	12.40	6.61	5.00	18.50	54.90
80	EC-838218	53.00	16.35	97.30	8 50	6.18	4 15	14 50	51.06
81 81	EC-838210	49.85	16.04	100.00	8.00	6.68	5 30	15.00	55.12
01. 02	EC-030217	76.00	12.45	06.50	7.20	6.12	2.50	16.00	52.76
02.	EC-030220	70.00	13.43	90.30	7.20	0.15	5.50	10.00	32.70
85.	EC-838221	72.05	13.30	105.50	8.90	0.78	5.55	17.50	48.91
84.	EC-838222	77.55	12.91	105.50	9.90	6.06	3.90	18.50	47.00
85.	EC-838223	75.30	11.15	105.90	12.20	7.00	5.10	16.50	46.00
86.	EC-838224	78.20	10.55	103.80	18.20	6.76	5.10	21.00	51.59
87.	EC-838225	65.60	14.15	118.50	14.70	7.40	6.25	16.50	50.97
88.	EC-838226	75.60	13.35	110.30	9.80	7.02	5.30	16.50	49.67
89.	EC-838227	65.70	14.80	121.50	11.30	6.82	5.15	17.00	58.15
90.	EC-838228	62.30	16.20	132.50	10.80	6.70	5.15	16.50	52.65
91.	EC-838229	68.50	15.60	117.50	9.30	5.68	5.65	14.50	46.81
92.	EC-838230	76.55	16.45	117.70	12.50	5.90	5.10	15.00	50.32
93.	EC-838231	78.15	15.50	131.30	12.20	6.99	5.70	14.00	50.60
94.	EC-838232	72.70	17.60	126.30	21.90	6.95	5.50	15.50	39.84
95	EC-838233	66.10	10.30	147.80	23.80	6.76	5 50	17.00	47.38
96	EC-838234	60.50	13.10	132.00	15.70	7.09	5.55	21.00	49.65
07	EC-030234	56.20	11.55	173.00	10.40	6.38	4.55	19.00	47.00
08	EC-030235	65.20	12.68	108 70	12.50	6.52	4.55	20.50	47.00
90.	EC-030230	65.30	11.00	112.20	0.50	6.52	5.60	20.50	42.37
99.	EC-838237	05.55	11.30	113.30	9.50	0.88	5.00	23.50	49.40
100.	EC-838238	62.10	14.20	1/9.80	12.40	6.23	4.90	17.50	47.18
101.	EC-838239	60.85	14.75	108.70	9.30	6.66	5.25	21.00	53.26
102.	EC-838240	60.40	16.53	106.70	8.60	6.56	4.65	18.00	49.17
103.	EC-838241	65.20	13.75	112.60	8.80	6.87	4.85	21.50	46.34
104.	EC-838242	55.20	14.19	121.60	21.40	7.01	6.05	20.50	40.73
105.	EC-838243	72.15	13.55	126.40	28.60	6.96	5.80	23.50	37.67
106.	EC-838244	64.30	12.73	122.00	24.80	7.04	6.00	13.00	43.27
107.	EC-838245	69.70	14.08	120.20	34.50	7.16	6.35	24.00	48.68
108.	EC-838246	63.20	12.12	121.70	27.80	7.21	5.80	27.50	42.16
109.	EC-838247	65.35	11.15	143.80	26.80	6.60	5.85	21.50	43.63
110	DMK-	60.40	10.57	120.07	20.20	6.60	1.62	21.20	25.62
110.	11(Check)	09.48	13.57	130.97	20.30	0.09	4.05	21.50	35.02
	Arkel	65.50	14.02	1.00.00	15.04	7.20	1.20	21.20	20.05
111.	(Check)	65.50	14.93	168.62	17.04	7.39	4.20	21.20	39.05
110	IC-279125	(7.71	10.05	140.04	15.01	6.00	4.1.6	22.00	11.01
112.	(Check)	67.71	13.85	149.04	17.31	6.80	4.16	22.80	44.84
	Rachna								
113.	(Check)	70.87	14.31	170.12	22.08	6.63	3.87	21.00	45.97
	DMR-7		44.00	101.51	00.44				10 5 1
114.	(Check)	71.35	14.39	134.56	30.14	6.55	3.70	21.80	42.74
	HFP-4								
115.	(Check)	65.84	11.47	138.80	13.31	6.51	4.64	21.50	45.55
	General								
	Mean	63.32	13.51	119.22	16.86	6.89	5.38	21.13	45.45
	Range								
	minimum	47.50	10.30	82.40	7.20	5.68	3.50	12.50	35.06
	Range								
	Maximum	80.40	17.60	179.80	37.60	8.78	6.60	37.50	60.00
	Genotypes								
	Mean	63.04	13.49	117.59	16.69	6.90	5.44	21.11	45.62
	Check								
	Mean	68.46	13.75	148.69	20.03	6.76	4.20	21.60	42.30
	Constrans								
	SELICTYPES :	6.13	1.83	9.94	3.06	0.49	0.48	2.05	7.51
		12 64	2 77	20.49	6.20	1.02	0.00	4.92	15 40
		12.04	5.//	20.48	0.30	1.02	0.99	4.23	13.48
	Cnecks :	2.74	0.82	4.45	1.37	0.22	0.21	0.92	3.36
	SE		1.00	0.15	0.00	0.15	0.11	1.00	6.02
	C.D. (0.05)	5.65	1.68	9.16	2.82	0.46	0.44	1.89	6.92
	Genotypes		4	0.55			a :-		
	Vs Check :	5.13	1.53	8.32	2.56	0.41	0.40	1.72	6.29
	SE								
1	C.D. (0.05)	10.57	3.15	17.13	5.27	0.85	0.82	3.54	12.95

(vi) Number of seeds/grains per pod: The data observed for the number of seeds per pod show large variability between all the genotypes as shown in the Table 1. The overall mean performance value for the attribute was 5.38 and it ranged from 3.50 to 6.60. The fifty-five genotypes had more number of seeds per pod than the population mean (5.38) including checks.

The highest number of seeds per pod was reported in EC-838211 (6.60) which were statistically at par with 34 genotypes along with checks *viz*. EC-838203 (6.20), EC-838212 (6.10), EC-838225 (6.25), EC-838243 (5.80) and EC-838247 (5.85). The lowest number of seeds per pod has been found in EC-838181 (7.20) but was statistically equivalent to seven genotypes along with checks *viz*. Arkel

Kumar et al., Biological Forum – An International Journal

13(1): 768-775(2021)

(4.20), IC-279125 (4.16), Rachna (3.87), DMR-7 (3.70), EC-838218(4.15), EC-838220 (3.50) and EC-838222 (3.90). The perusal of data revealed that one hundred and four genotypes generated more number of seeds per pod than the best check variety HFP-4 (4.64). The observations by Karayel and Bozoglu (2015); Katiyar and Dixit (2009); Pallavi et al., (2013); Jaiswal et al., (2013); Thapa et al., (2020) corresponded to the outcomes of the present analysis.

(vii) 100-Seed weight (g): The mean results observed for the weight (g) of 100-seeds show large variability between all the genotypes (Table 1). The overall mean performance value for the attribute was 21.13 g and it ranged from 12.50 to 37.50 g. The fifty genotypes had greater 100-seed weight than the population mean (21.13 g) including checks. The highest 100-seed weight was reported in EC-838141 (37.50g) which was statistically at par with genotypes EC-838139 (35 g) and EC-838140 (34.50 g). The lowest 100 seed weight (g) was observed in EC-838188 (12.50 g) which was statistically at par with 26 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838226 (16.50 g), EC-838165 (14.50 g), EC-838229 (14.50 g), EC-838230 (15.00 g) and EC-83823 (14.00 g). Forty three genotypes analyzed during these studies produced greater 100 seed weight (g) than the best check DMR-7 (21.80 g) variety. These results are in conformity with the findings of Saxesena et al. (2014), Georgieva et al., (2016); Katiyar and Dixit (2009); Pallavi et al., (2013).

(viii) Shelling percentage (%): The results observed for shelling percentage show large variability between all the genotypes as evident from the Table 1. The attribute mean performance value was 45.45 % and ranged from 35.06 to 60.00%. Among all the genotypes investigated, fifty-six genotypes had more shelling percentage than the population mean (45.45%) including checks. The highest shelling percentage was reported in EC-838192 (60%) which were statistically at par with 41 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838219 (55.12%), EC-838152 (49.88%), EC- 838158 (55.67%), EC-838168 (50.01%) and EC-838197 (55.06%). The lowest shelling percentage was observed in EC-838156 (35.06%) which were statistically at par with 78 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838140 (36.32%), EC-838142 (40.65%), EC-838144 (40.31%), EC-838148 (40.85%) and EC-838164 (37.30%). Lowest shelling percentage was observed in DMK-11 (35.62%) followed by Arkel (39.05%), DMR-7 (42.74%), IC-279125 (44.84%), HFP-4 (45.55%) and Rachna (45.97%). Fifty genotypes under the study produced greater shelling percentage than the best check Rachna (45.97%). The results observed in the present studies were consistent with the observations recorded by Chaudhary et al., (2003); Pallavi et al., (2013); Katiyar and Dixit (2009).

(ix) Days to market able maturity: The statistically important divergence variations were found between different genotypes with respect to days to marketable maturity. The value ranged from 125 to 156.60 days with general mean of 143.09 days as shown in Table 2. The 49 genotypes along with checks were observed to have marketable maturity earlier than the general mean. The least number of days to marketable maturity was reported in the EC-838146 (125 days) that were statistically identical to 11 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838141 (127.00 days), EC-838142 (129.50days), EC-838143(129.30 days), EC-838148 (128.70days) and EC-838149 (128.30). The highest number of days to marketable maturity was reported in EC-838192 (156.60 days) which were statistically at par with 14 genotypes viz. EC-838226 (151.60 days), EC-838228 (153.40days), EC-838229 (152.70 days), EC-838205 (153.10days) and EC-838211 (150.20 days). Seventy four genotypes took less number of days to marketable maturity in all the genotypes under the analysis than the best check DMK-7 (142.08 days). Considerable variability concerning this feature was reported by Chaudhary et al., (2003); Jaiswal et al., (2013); Katiyar and Dixit (2009).

(x) Pod yield (kg/plot): Perusal of data for pod yield show large variability among all the genotypes as evident from Table 2. The overall mean performance value for the attribute was 27.31 kg/plot and it ranged from 11.57 to 61.42 kg/plot. The fifty-two genotypes had more pod yield (Kg/plot) than the population mean (27.31 kg/plot) including checks. The highest pod yield was reported in EC-838201 (61.42 kg/plot) which was statistically at par with 34 genotypes along with EC-838208 (58.84 kg/plot), EC-838141 (52.18 kg/plot) and EC-838166 (56.21 kg/plot). The lowest pod yield was observed in EC-838219 (11.57 kg/plot) which was statistically at par with 12 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838239(14.85 kg/plot), EC-838240 (13.39 kg/plot), EC-838241 (13.27 kg/plot), EC-838212 (12.53 kg/plot) and EC- 838213 (14.99 kg/plot). Eighty-four genotypes among study produced a greater pod yield than the best check HFP-4 (17.73 kg/plot) variety. The findings of the present study are consistent with the results of similar investigations by Kumar et al., (2004); Rathi and Dhaka (2007); Sharma and Sharma and Sharma (2013); Gudadinni et al., (2017).

(xi) Pod yield(q/ha): The observations for pod yield (q/ha) showed large variability between all the genotypes as presented in Table 2. The overall mean performance value for this trait was 68.28q/ha and it ranged from 28.94 to 153.54q/ha. The fifty-three genotypes had more pod yield than the population mean (68.28 q/ha) including checks. The highest pod yield was reported EC-838201 (153.54 q/ha) which was statistically at par with EC-838166 (140.52 q/ha), EC-838205 (153.10 q/ha) and EC-838208 (147.10 q/ha). The lowest number of pod yield (q/ha) was observed in EC-838219 (28.94 q/ha) which was statistically at par with 17 genotypes along with checks viz. EC-838212 (31.33 q/ha), EC-838152 (34.06 q/ha), EC- 838213 (37.47q/ha), EC-838215 (35.73 q/ha) and EC-838159 (40.71 q/ha). Ninety-two genotypes among those studied, produced greater pod yield (q/ha) than the best check HFP-4 (44.32 q/ha) variety. Similar kind of results were reported by Gudadinni et al., (2017); Gupta et al., (2006); Karayel and Bozoglu (2015); Thapa et al., (2020) while studying various genotypes of pea.

Percentage of leaf infestation by leaf miner: Mean percentage of leaf infestation was recorded as 7.84 % with a range of 4.70 to11.03 %. Among the checks DMR-7 and HFP-4 showed the least percent of leaf infestation viz. 10.08 and 10.24 % respectively (Table 2). There were 2 genotypes viz. EC-838150 and EC-838174 with significantly more percent of leaf infestation than the

Kumar et al..

Biological Forum – An International Journal 13(1): 768-775(2021) DMR-7, whereas, in 10 genotypes *viz*. EC-838141, EC-838142, EC-838143, EC-838148, EC-838165, EC-838166, EC-838172, EC-838189, EC-838190 and EC-838241 percentage of leaf infestation was significantly at par with DMR-7. All other genotypes showed significantly lesser

per cent leaf infestation compared to DMR-7. Among the test genotypes the least percent leaf infestation (4.70 %) were recorded in EC-838199 which was significantly at par with EC-838200, EC-838224, EC-838236, EC-838201 and EC-838232.

Sr. No.	Genotypes	Days to marketable maturity	Pod yield (kg/plot)	Pod yield (q/ha)	Total soluble Solids (*Brix)	Pea leaf miner infestation (%)	
						Percentage of leaf Infested by leaf miner	Number of maggots per 10 leaves of pea plant
1.	EC-838139	132.10	37.52	93.81	13.25	9.50	1.14
2.	EC-838140	135.00	23.72	59.30	13.17	9.20	1.04
3.	EC-838141	127.00	52.18	130.46	16.16	10.00	1.16
4.	EC-838142	129.50	26.87	67.17	14.75	9.65	1.12
5.	EC-838143	129.30	26.56	66.39	15.61	10.05	1.15
6.	EC-838144	132.40	16.80	41.99	14.23	8.70	1.03
7.	EC-838145	133.10	34.86	87.14	13.28	9.55	1.10
8.	EC-838146	125.00	23.05	57.62	14.42	9.40	1.10
9.	EC-838147 EC 838148	134.20	28.98	72.40	15.43	8.40	1.03
10.	EC-030140	128.70	19.26	/5.08	13.03	8.85	1.17
12	EC-838150	123.30	24.71	61.78	15.09	10.85	1.10
13	EC-838151	129.50	30.88	77.20	17.08	8 4 5	1.25
14.	EC-838152	134.10	13.62	34.06	14.51	6.25	0.73
15.	EC-838153	134.20	35.47	88.68	18.92	5.80	0.74
16.	EC-838154	129.00	27.54	68.86	18.77	6.60	0.84
17.	EC-838155	136.15	21.60	54.00	20.56	6.65	0.82
18.	EC-838156	137.30	32.86	82.16	20.96	6.85	0.85
19.	EC-838157	138.60	23.24	58.11	16.13	7.70	0.92
20.	EC-838158	139.00	29.57	73.93	20.64	7.20	0.90
21.	EC-838159	137.60	16.28	40.71	20.45	7.50	0.86
22.	EC-838160	136.50	27.02	67.55	16.85	8.95	1.05
23.	EC-838161	133.10	26.21	65.52	20.22	7.10	0.95
24.	EC-838162 EC-838163	134.95	32.60	81.51	15.45	0.45	0.99
25.	EC-050105 FC-838164	130.40	20.55	51.38	16.00	9.25	1.10
20.	EC-838165	139.90	36.85	92.12	15.58	10.25	1.12
28.	EC-838166	140.90	56.21	140.52	22.90	9.95	1.14
29.	EC-838167	140.80	16.17	40.43	18.30	9.00	1.03
30.	EC-838168	141.20	20.75	51.87	19.25	8.70	1.07
31.	EC-838169	141.80	17.92	44.79	17.07	8.85	1.03
32.	EC-838170	138.10	23.19	57.98	20.17	7.40	0.88
33.	EC-838171	138.50	35.26	88.14	14.18	9.20	1.07
34.	EC-838172	139.90	33.49	83.73	17.01	9.90	1.13
35.	EC-838173	141.70	34.76	86.91	15.11	8.55	1.02
36.	EC-838174	141.60	36.84	92.09	16.75	10.60	1.23
37.	EC-030175 EC 939176	142.10	42.73	106.82	1/.4/	8.00	1.05
30.	EC-838170 FC-838177	141.80	24.73	60.57	16.00	9.10	1.00
40	EC-838178	140.60	29.87	74 67	16.00	6.65	0.89
41.	EC-838179	139.80	41.93	104.83	21.46	7.55	0.87
42.	EC-838180	140.10	19.04	47.61	14.56	9.30	1.11
43.	EC-838181	141.60	40.74	101.84	20.12	5.70	0.74
44.	EC-838182	142.20	32.08	80.20	16.48	6.50	0.81
45.	EC-838183	141.10	18.13	45.32	18.05	6.95	0.85
46.	EC-838184	140.50	20.32	50.81	12.60	7.05	0.93
47.	EC-838185	142.40	19.04	47.61	20.73	8.70	1.09
4ð. 40	EU-038180 EC 939197	141.90	19.24	40.10	15.50	6.05	0.94
49. 50	EC-030107 FC-838188	143.30	20.33	78.28	17.75	8 20	0.84
51.	EC-838189	145.70	29.80	74.50	19.88	9.75	1,10
52.	EC-838190	144.60	13.93	34.83	18.20	9.60	1.08
53.	EC-838191	145.80	25.42	63.55	14.65	7.50	0.87
54.	EC-838192	147.40	32.92	82.29	17.93	9.30	1.07
55.	EC-838193	149.60	36.37	90.92	18.45	9.10	1.07
56.	EC-838194	147.20	40.20	100.50	19.65	7.75	0.89
57.	EC-838195	149.80	41.57	103.93	13.87	7.95	0.96
58.	EC-838196	146.85	27.86	69.66	19.35	5.45	0.75
59.	EC-838197	146.00	30.26	75.66	20.88	7.05	0.91
60.	EC-838198	146.30	35.86	89.65	18.50	5.55	0.77
01. 62	EC-838199	143.20	20.92	67.30	12.55	4.70	0.63
63	EC-838200 EC-838201	144.00	61.42	40.8/	10.33	4.80	0.04

64.	EC-838202	150.50	30.08	75.21	17.36	6.05	0.78
65.	EC-838203	147.60	39.17	97.93	15.55	5.95	0.72
66.	EC-838204	148.00	41.45	103.62	21.03	6.10	0.78
67.	EC-838205	153.10	49.65	124.13	16.60	7.50	0.89
68.	EC-838206	147.80	19.74	49.35	14.30	7.80	1.00
69.	EC-838207	143.20	27.85	69.63	16.85	6.50	0.83
70.	EC-838208	144.55	58.84	147.10	21.27	7.60	0.89
71.	EC-838209	144.10	23.26	58.14	16.70	6.70	0.85
72.	EC-838210	149.80	31.99	79.99	14.61	5.95	0.84
73.	EC-838211	150.20	28.77	71.92	17.18	6.85	0.80
74.	EC-838212	148.40	12.53	31.33	16.65	8.15	1.03
75	EC-838213	148.65	14 99	37.47	16.70	6.25	0.84
76	EC-838214	145 70	17.77	44.43	15 33	7.20	0.91
77	EC-838215	147.45	14.29	35.73	17.15	6.85	0.91
78	EC-838216	147.10	17.77	44.43	20.05	6.85	0.85
79	EC-838217	145.10	17.99	44 97	1611	7.65	0.94
80	EC-838218	145.60	14.43	36.07	16.89	6.95	0.87
81	EC-838219	148 70	11.57	28.94	20.01	8.50	0.99
82	EC-838220	144.40	15.68	39.19	13.96	6.60	0.83
83	EC-838221	145 70	14 20	35.51	14.88	7 15	0.90
84	EC-838222	147 45	16.64	41.60	13.75	7.85	0.98
85	EC-838223	147.10	21.80	54 51	22.01	6.00	0.77
86	EC-838224	150.00	29.15	72.86	18 55	5 1 5	0.64
87	EC-838225	150.00	24.91	62.28	19.85	6.80	0.85
88	EC-838226	148.40	21.77	54.43	17.75	8.00	0.99
89	EC-838227	151.60	20.03	50.08	15.66	8.05	0.99
90	EC-838228	153.40	16.22	40.56	14.37	7.30	0.93
91	EC-838229	152.70	15.95	39.87	15.40	7.30	0.96
92	EC-838230	145.70	17.57	43.94	18.40	6.80	0.90
93	EC-838231	148.20	17.37	43.14	14.17	6.90	0.86
94	EC-838232	146.20	33.29	83.22	19.80	5 30	0.30
95	EC-838233	152.00	38.73	96.82	17.12	5.85	0.75
96.	EC-838234	151.50	18.90	47.25	15.85	6.30	0.86
97	EC-838235	153.40	15.92	39.80	17 30	5.85	0.73
98.	EC-838236	147.50	17.00	42.50	14.11	5.15	0.70
99.	EC-838237	145.50	13.67	34.18	20.10	5.60	0.72
100.	EC-838238	148.60	16.78	41.96	13.80	6.40	0.77
101.	EC-838239	142.70	14.85	37.13	13.85	8.75	1.00
102.	EC-838240	143.50	13.39	33.49	17.10	8.90	1.08
103.	EC-838241	144.50	13.27	33.19	17.12	10.25	1.15
104.	EC-838242	148.40	34.77	86.93	20.10	6.95	0.83
105.	EC-838243	149.80	42.77	106.93	20.15	7.50	0.89
106.	EC-838244	155.15	36.04	90.10	14.35	8.10	0.92
107.	EC-838245	154.50	44.64	111.59	19.95	7.35	0.92
108.	EC-838246	156.60	40.77	101.92	12.25	8.30	1.04
109.	EC-838247	153.10	42.50	106.25	16.75	7.50	0.94
110.	DMK-11(Check)	146.28	29.37	73.41	18.32	11.03	1.27
111.	Arkel (Check)	145.46	21.69	54.23	16.39	10.37	1.25
112.	IC-279125 (Check)	144.32	32.99	82.48	16.94	10.50	1.24
113.	Rachna (Check)	145.16	29.25	73.13	18.34	10.78	1.25
114.	DMR-7 (Check)	142.08	24.19	60.47	15.39	10.08	1.23
115.	HFP-4 (Check)	143.97	17.73	44.32	16.84	10.24	1.24
	General Mean	143.09	27.31	68.29	17.01	7.84	0.95
	Range minimum	125.00	11.57	28.94	12.25	4.70	0.63
	Range Maximum	156.60	61.42	153.54	22.90	11.03	1.27
	Genotypes Mean	143.01	27.39	68.48	17.01	7.69	0.94
	Check Mean	144.55	25.87	64.67	17.04	10.50	1.25
	Genotypes : SE	3.74	2.59	6.48	1.79	0.30	0.03
	C.D. (0.05)	7.71	5.34	13.36	3.69	0.61	0.07
	Checks : SE	1.67	1.16	2.90	0.80	0.13	0.01
	C.D. (0.05)	3.45	2.39	5.97	1.65	0.27	0.03
	Genotypes Vs Check : SE	3.13	2.17	5.43	1.50	0.25	0.03
	C.D. (0.05)	6.45	4.47	11.18	3.09	0.51	0.06
	(/			-			

CONCLUSION

From the present experimental findings it is concluded that the genotypes EC-838201, EC-838141, EC-838208 and EC-838166 were found to be superior for marketable pod yield and other significant characteristics based on overall performance. So these genotypes can be further use for evaluation or growing under the conditions of sub-tropical climate of Himachal Pradesh.

Conflict of Interest. Nil.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2018). Indian Horticulture Database. 2018. National Horticulture Board, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India, Gurgaon, p: 211, 253.
- Blixt, S. (1970). Pisum In: Genetic resources in plants-their Exploration and Conservation. (OH Frankel and E Bennet eds.). Int. Biol. Programme, Blackwell Scientific Publ. Oxford, pp 321-326.
- Ceyhan, E., & Avci, M. A. (2005). Combining ability and heterosis for grain yield and some yield components in

Biological Forum – An International Journal

pea (Pisum sativum L.). Pakistan Journal of Biology Sciences, 8: 1447-1452.

- Chaudhary, D. K., & Sharma, R. R. (2003). Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis for green pod yield and its components in garden pea. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 60(3): 251-256.
- Georgieva, N., Nikolova, I., & Kosev, V. (2016). Evaluation of genetic divergence and heritability in pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). Journal of Bio-Science and Biotechnology, 5(1): 61-67.
- Gudadinni, P., Bahadur, V., Ligade, P., Topno, S. E., & Prasad, V. M. (2017). Study on genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in garden pea (*Pisum sativum* var. hortense L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 6(8): 2384- 2391.
- Gupta, A. J., & Singh, Y. V. (2006). Genetic divergence in garden pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding, 66(4): 341-342.
- Jaiswal, N. K., Gupta, A. K., Dewangan, H., & Lavanya, G. R. (2013). Genetic variability analysis in field pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). International Journal of Science and Research, 4(2): 88-94.
- Karayel, R., & Bozoglu, H. (2015). Determination of morphological variability of local pea genotypes. *Ekin Journal of Crop Breeding and Genetics*, 1-2: 56-64.
- Katiyar, P. K., & Dixit, G. P. (2009). Multivariate analysis for genetic divergence in field pea (*Pisum sativum* L. var. *arvence*) germplasm. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 79 (3): 181-183.
- Kumar, P., Partap, P. S., & Rana, M. K. (2004). Correlation studies in garden pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). Haryana J. Hort. Sci., 33, (3-4): 243-245.

- Kumari, N., Srivastava, J. P., Singh, S. K., & Singh, I. P. (2012). Heritability and genetic advance in vegetable pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). Annals of Agricultural Sciences Journal, 33(4): 244-246.
- Mehta, S., Kohli, U.K., Mehta, D., & Kumar, D. (2005). Genetic variability studies in pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences, 34(2): 140-141.
- Pallavi, Singh, Y. V., Singh, A., Pandey, K. K., & Awasthi, A. K. (2013). Genetic variability, estimation for various characters in pea (*Pisum sativum L.*) for mollisal of Uttarakhand. *International Journal of Animal and Plant* and Environmental Science, 3(4): 90-91.
- Rathi, R. S., & Dhaka, R. P. S. (2007). Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in pea (*Pisum sativum L.*). *Indian Journal of Plant Genetic Resources*, 20(2): 126-129.
- Sharma, B. B., & Sharma, V. K. (2013). Studied the genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance studies in garden pea under mid hill condition of Garhwali Himalaya. *Journal of Hill Agriculture*, 31(1): 296-301.
- Singh, A., Singh, S., & Babu, J. D. P. (2011). The heritability, character association and path analysis studies early segregating population of field pea (*Pisum sativum* L. var arvense). International Journal of Plant Breeding and Genetics, 5(1): 86-92.
- Smykal, P., Aubert, G., Burstin, J., Coyne, C., & Ellis, N. (2012). Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) in the genomic era. Agronomy 2: 74-115.
- Tar'an B., Zang, C., Warkentin, T., Tullu, A. & Vandenberg, A. (2005). Genetic diversity among varieties and wild species accessions of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) based on molecular markers, morphological and physiological characters. *Genome*, 48: 358.

How to cite this article: Kumar, D., Shubham, Dogra, B.S., Thakur, S., Kumar, S., Shiwani, K., Chandel, V.G.S., Kaler, R., Guleria, V., and Chauhan, A. (2021). Genetic Evaluation of Garden Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) for Pod Yield and its Contributing Traits. *Biological Forum – An International Journal*, *13*(1): 768-775.