Assessment of Genetic Diversity Using Morpho-Agronomical Traits in Horse Gram
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ABSTRACT

Horse gram [Macrotyloma uniflorum (Lam.) Verd.] is one of the highly nutritious minor pulse crop and has number of desirable traits like drought tolerance, high protein content, antioxidant activity, antimicrobial and medicinal properties. A total of 66 genotypes of horse gram comprising 61 accessions of indigenous collections belonging to 15 states of India, one exotic collection from Australia and four checks were evaluated in Randomized Block Design (RBD) consecutively for three years [Kharif seasons of 2013 (E1), 2014 (E2) and 2015 (E3)] at ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources (ICAR-NBPGR), Regional Station, Akola, Maharashtra. Accessions were evaluated for seven each of qualitative and quantitative traits. Significant variability was observed among the accessions for most of the quantitative traits. Highest coefficient of variation was observed in seed yield per plant (g) followed by pods per plant and pod length. The phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) were higher than the genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits. The highest magnitude of PCV and GCV were recorded for seed yield per plant (g) and pods per plant followed by plant height (cm). Shannon diversity index (SDI) varied from 0.078 to 0.686 showed existence of sufficient variability among the accessions for qualitative traits. Accessions were classified on the basis of Euclidean distances using Ward’s method. The dendrogram revealed two major clusters. Cluster I comprised of 17 accessions and cluster II comprised of 49 accessions. Cluster II was further classified in two sub-clusters (IIa and IIb). Most of the accessions from Tamil Nadu were confined to cluster I indicating their similarity for quantitative traits. Whereas accessions from rest of the states were well distributed in cluster II exhibiting high diversity for the traits studied. The accessions from cluster I could be used for hybridization program with the accessions from cluster II in order to develop superior horse gram genotypes/varieties for overall yield enhancement.
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Introduction

Horse gram (Macrotyloma uniflorum (Lam.) Verde.) is an important minor legume crop has its origin in India (Bogdan, 1977). It is mainly cultivated in the localities of underprivileged resource poor farmers in central and southern region (Chhatisgarh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra,
Odisha, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamilnadu) of the country. It has very high nutritional value which forms a very quality protein source to the farmers in tribal areas (Dikshit et al., 2014). Horse gram grains contains up to 27% protein (Kumar, 2007) high in lysine content compared to other pulses such as chick pea and red gram (Yadav, 2004). Taxonomically it belongs to the family Fabaceae with diploid chromosome number (2n=20, 22, 24). It has self-fertile cleistogamous flowers producing pods with 4-6 grains (Cook et al., 2005). Clinical studies reported that horse gram has extraordinary therapeutic properties and in our traditional ayurvedic treatments it used to treat the ailments related to kidney stones, urinary diseases, piles, cardiac problems, asthma etc. It has high dietary fibre content which is very useful for good bowel movements and reduction of symptoms related to obesity (Kumar, 2007; Bhartiya et al., 2015). Horse gram is also a very good source of iron and molybdenum micronutrients and overall chemical composition of grains is as good as other cultivated legumes (Vishwanatha et al., 2016). This crop has also high fodder value due to its protein richness and it is majorly used to feed milch animals and horses (Cook et al., 2005; Bhadana et al., 2013). Agronomically, it is very important for sustainable farming with its atmospheric nitrogen fixation ability. It also helps in reduction of soil erosion with good canopy cover over the soil. Horse gram crop takes about 120-180 days to mature. It is usually cultivated in resource poor soils as a rainfed crop. In paddy growing areas it is broadcasted immediately after the harvest of paddy so as to take maximum advantage of residual soil moisture. It is very hardy and drought tolerant crop. Very few efforts have been made for the improvement of this minor but very important pulse crop. High variability existed in horse gram germplasm for various traits. The utilization of this information for improvement is of high significance. The present investigation was targeted to study the genetic variability among the horse gram accessions collected from different states of India and to assess the correlation among the different traits of interest and drawing of inferences for utilization in the horse gram improvement.

Materials and Methods

A total of 66 horse gram genotypes comprising 61 accessions of indigenous collections from about 15 states of India, one exotic collection from Australia and four checks (Table 1) were evaluated at ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources (ICAR-NBPGR), Regional Station, Akola, Maharashtra in Randomized Block Design (RBD) consecutively for three years [Kharif seasons of 2013 (E1), 2014 (E2) and 2015 (E3)]. Recommended package of practices were followed to raise a good crop. Sowing was done with 90 × 30 cm crop geometry. Each genotype was sown in 3 rows of 3 meter length. The observations on seven quantitative traits viz., plant height (cm), primary branches per plant, pods per plant, pod length (cm), seeds per pod, 100 seed weight (g) and seed yield per plant (g) were recorded on five random plants. For qualitative traits visual scoring was done using standard descriptors for horse gram. Quantitative data was analysed using Windostat software to work out variability parameters. Diversity analysis using Euclidean distances (Wards’ method) was carried out with Paleontological Statistics Software Package for Education and Data Analysis (PAST) (Hammer et al., 2001) software (Ver. 3.14) freely available at www.folk.uio.no/ohammer/past/.

Results and Discussion

Horse gram with its importance as functional food is gaining attention worldwide
specifically in under developed and developing countries. In developed nations it is an important food for dietary fibres. There are various advantages of growing horse gram for its capabilities to fix atmospheric nitrogen, drought tolerance and cover crop to check soil erosion. It is mainly grown on resource poor soils with negligence of improved production technologies. Farmers use the remnant seeds to cultivate this crop which results in poor performance and reduction in overall productivity. Keeping this in view, a well-planned strategy is required to assess the genetic variability in horse gram for various important agronomic attributes, identification of association between the traits and effect of numerous traits on yield levels. The present investigation was also carried out to address these issues. A total 66 horse gram accessions were evaluated for three years and mean performance and variability parameters were assessed for further utilization in crop improvement programme. Significant differences were observed among the accessions for most of the traits except pod length (cm) and seeds per pod (Table 2). Highest coefficient of variation was observed in seed yield per plant followed by pods per plant and pod length (Parameshwarappa and Kumar 2002; Gupta et al., 2010; Kulkarni and Mogle, 2011). Among the 66 genotypes, IC 277625 (7.00), IC 277630 (6.70) and IC 145250 (6.63) recorded more primary branches per plant. For pods per plant, IC 53627 (49.60), IC 26132 (49.43) and IC 9623 were superior. Pod length (cm) and seeds per pod were almost similar in all the accessions studied. Tall plant types was observed in the accessions IC 277630 (90.65 cm) followed by IC 277677 (87.04 cm) and IC 277625 (83.49 cm). Superior genotypes for seed yield per plant (g) were IC 341308 (19.51 g), IC 145250 (13.66 g) and IC 22783 (13.29 g). Accessions, IC 139527 (3.59g), IC 15735 (3.57g) and IC277677 (3.36g) recorded highest 100 seed weight (g) (Table 2). Similar observations on agro-morphological traits were reported by Prakash and Khanure (2000); Prakash et al., 2008; Prakash et al., 2010; Sunil et al., 2014 and Vishwanatha et al., 2016 in horse gram.

Genetic variability estimates

The phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) were higher than the genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits. The characters seed yield per plant, pods per plant, plant height and 100 seed weight exhibited high estimates of GCV, PCV and ECV (Sunil et al., 2008; Gupta et al., 2010). The heritability estimates were also high for seed yield per plant, 100 seed weight and plant height. Genetic advance % of mean at 5% was high for seed yield per plant and pods per plant (Table 3).

Diversity for qualitative traits

Shannon diversity index varied from 0.078 to 0.686 showed existence of sufficient variability among the accessions (Table 4). High values for Shannon Diversity Index (SDI) were reported for the traits growth pattern, leaf surface, stem colour and pod surface. This indicated richness of this population for diverse phenotypes available for these traits. Sankar et al., 2015 reported high SDI for Per cent disease Index (PDI) trait in horse gram.

Diversity in quantitative traits

Accessions were classified in to different clusters on the basis of Euclidean distances using Ward’s method. The dendrogram revealed two major clusters. Cluster I comprised of 17 accessions and cluster II comprised of 49 accessions. Cluster II was further classified in two sub-clusters (IIa and IIb). Most of the accessions from Tamil Nadu were confined to cluster I indicating their similarity for quantitative traits.
| SN | IC/EC No. | State     | Country | SN | IC/EC No. | State     | Country |
|----|-----------|-----------|---------|----|-----------|-----------|---------|
| 1  | IC 9623   | Sikkim    | India   | 34 | IC 89010  | Tamil Nadu | India   |
| 2  | IC 9624   | Sikkim    | India   | 35 | IC 105588 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 3  | IC 9626   | Sikkim    | India   | 36 | IC 121640 | Himachal Pradesh | India |
| 4  | IC 10938  | Karnataka | India   | 37 | IC 123030 | Tamil Nadu  | India   |
| 5  | IC 15735  | Jharkhand | India   | 38 | IC 123033 | Bihar      | India   |
| 6  | IC 15775  | Manipur   | India   | 39 | IC 139331 | Maharashtra | India |
| 7  | IC 19552  | Odisha    | India   | 40 | IC 139527 | Andhra Pradesh | India |
| 8  | IC 22750  | Madhya Pradesh | India | 41 | IC 139544 | Uttarakhand | India |
| 9  | IC 22783  | Chhattisgarh | India | 42 | IC 145245 | Himachal Pradesh | India |
| 10 | IC 23444  | Chhattisgarh | India | 43 | IC 145250 | Himachal Pradesh | India |
| 11 | IC 23510  | Chhattisgarh | India | 44 | IC 145268 | Gujarat    | India   |
| 12 | IC 26132  | Karnataka | India   | 45 | IC 264704 | Kerala     | India   |
| 13 | IC 26135  | Karnataka | India   | 46 | IC 277625 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 14 | EC 28842  | -         | Australia | 47 | IC 277630 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 15 | IC 45748  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 48 | IC 277659 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 16 | IC 47119  | Andhra Pradesh | India | 49 | IC 277670 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 17 | IC 47129  | Andhra Pradesh | India | 50 | IC 277671 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 18 | IC 49290  | Maharashtra | India   | 51 | IC 277677 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 19 | IC 49555  | Maharashtra | India   | 52 | IC 277687 | Karnataka  | India   |
| 20 | IC 53627  | Chhattisgarh | India | 53 | IC 282589 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 21 | IC 55065  | Manipur   | India   | 54 | IC 321300 | Tamil Nadu  | India   |
| 22 | IC 68593  | Kerala    | India   | 55 | IC 336492 | Bihar      | India   |
| 23 | IC 71725  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 56 | IC 341308 | Maharashtra | India |
| 24 | IC 71730  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 57 | IC 343105 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 25 | IC 71743  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 58 | IC 343190 | Chhattisgarh | India |
| 26 | IC 71763  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 59 | IC 347181 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 27 | IC 71766  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 60 | IC 385839 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 28 | IC 71770  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 61 | IC 561038 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 29 | IC 71781  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 62 | IC 561040 | Jharkhand  | India   |
| 30 | IC 71783  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 63 | AK-21     | Maharashtra | India |
| 31 | IC 71803  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 64 | AK-26     | Maharashtra | India |
| 32 | IC 71817  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 65 | HGGP      | -          | India   |
| 33 | IC 71825  | Tamil Nadu | India   | 66 | PHG-9     | -          | India   |
Table 2: Mean performance of horse gram genotypes for various traits

| SN | IC/EC No. | PRI BRN | POD PLT | POD LT | PLT HGT | SED POD | YLD PLT | SED WGT |
|----|------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1  | IC 9623    | 5.90    | 48.47   | 4.34   | 57.13   | 4.43    | 7.65    | 3.03    |
| 2  | IC 9624    | 5.03    | 28.20   | 3.98   | 47.74   | 3.90    | 4.26    | 2.53    |
| 3  | IC 9626    | 5.53    | 19.67   | 4.08   | 65.39   | 4.03    | 3.76    | 2.83    |
| 4  | IC 10938   | 5.97    | 24.27   | 4.21   | 58.56   | 4.00    | 8.52    | 2.64    |
| 5  | IC 15735   | 5.90    | 31.97   | 4.34   | 64.93   | 4.33    | 3.66    | 3.57    |
| 6  | IC 15775   | 5.63    | 30.97   | 4.05   | 62.86   | 3.90    | 3.16    | 3.29    |
| 7  | IC 19552   | 5.03    | 26.10   | 4.35   | 61.22   | 4.13    | 7.93    | 2.96    |
| 8  | IC 22750   | 5.97    | 26.23   | 4.09   | 57.30   | 4.20    | 5.44    | 2.64    |
| 9  | IC 22783   | 6.23    | 46.43   | 4.10   | 61.25   | 4.35    | 13.29   | 3.07    |
| 10 | IC 23444   | 5.27    | 29.90   | 4.24   | 66.69   | 4.27    | 5.93    | 3.26    |
| 11 | IC 23510   | 6.22    | 35.23   | 4.27   | 70.15   | 4.63    | 9.71    | 3.14    |
| 12 | IC 26132   | 5.83    | 49.23   | 4.40   | 66.36   | 4.23    | 9.93    | 2.89    |
| 13 | IC 26135   | 6.03    | 29.50   | 4.16   | 63.80   | 4.33    | 6.21    | 3.11    |
| 14 | EC 28842   | 5.57    | 23.60   | 4.65   | 74.33   | 4.53    | 4.95    | 3.08    |
| 15 | IC 45748   | 5.13    | 28.33   | 4.32   | 60.32   | 4.50    | 5.23    | 2.89    |
| 16 | IC 47119   | 5.80    | 39.40   | 4.25   | 60.59   | 4.37    | 5.96    | 3.28    |
| 17 | IC 47129   | 5.50    | 29.57   | 5.66   | 65.33   | 4.33    | 6.04    | 3.15    |
| 18 | IC 49290   | 5.57    | 43.03   | 4.05   | 63.90   | 3.97    | 3.92    | 2.30    |
| 19 | IC 49555   | 5.37    | 31.60   | 4.20   | 53.16   | 4.30    | 5.11    | 2.39    |
| 20 | IC 53627   | 5.47    | 49.60   | 4.27   | 57.45   | 3.97    | 6.50    | 3.04    |
| 21 | IC 55065   | 5.60    | 46.07   | 4.24   | 64.23   | 4.83    | 6.38    | 2.88    |
| 22 | IC 68593   | 5.93    | 36.97   | 4.46   | 68.03   | 4.47    | 7.03    | 3.01    |
| 23 | IC 71725   | 6.47    | 41.70   | 3.80   | 68.32   | 3.93    | 3.26    | 3.18    |
| 24 | IC 71730   | 5.87    | 24.93   | 4.52   | 60.90   | 4.50    | 3.67    | 2.60    |
| 25 | IC 71743   | 6.13    | 33.43   | 4.17   | 54.63   | 4.07    | 8.75    | 2.97    |
| 26 | IC 71763   | 5.93    | 39.63   | 4.35   | 55.30   | 4.57    | 5.88    | 3.12    |
| 27 | IC 71766   | 5.47    | 32.27   | 4.59   | 55.68   | 4.53    | 3.24    | 2.52    |
| 28 | IC 71770   | 5.17    | 31.60   | 4.53   | 59.97   | 4.50    | 3.68    | 2.44    |
| 29 | IC 71781   | 5.13    | 31.60   | 4.22   | 50.47   | 4.37    | 3.40    | 2.59    |
| 30 | IC 71783   | 5.13    | 26.43   | 4.55   | 55.15   | 4.13    | 3.35    | 2.50    |
| 31 | IC 71803   | 5.63    | 22.27   | 4.43   | 52.75   | 4.20    | 3.73    | 2.96    |
| 32 | IC 71817   | 6.00    | 27.23   | 4.76   | 51.27   | 4.63    | 3.48    | 2.52    |
| 33 | IC 71825   | 5.10    | 35.53   | 4.64   | 51.98   | 4.27    | 4.46    | 2.68    |
| 34 | IC 89010   | 5.63    | 22.50   | 4.56   | 71.60   | 4.30    | 3.29    | 3.05    |
| 35 | IC 105588  | 5.60    | 24.53   | 4.41   | 59.79   | 3.80    | 6.06    | 2.61    |
| 36 | IC 121640  | 5.67    | 24.43   | 4.02   | 46.39   | 3.90    | 3.45    | 2.82    |
| 37 | IC 123030  | 5.43    | 23.57   | 3.96   | 52.96   | 3.87    | 3.75    | 3.01    |
| 38 | IC 123033  | 5.92    | 34.03   | 4.40   | 57.71   | 4.20    | 7.81    | 2.85    |
| 39 | IC 139331  | 6.43    | 32.33   | 4.23   | 61.17   | 4.50    | 8.09    | 3.34    |
| 40 | IC 139527  | 6.50    | 44.60   | 4.24   | 74.37   | 4.77    | 11.71   | 3.59    |
Table 3: Variability estimates for different traits in horse gram

| Parameters      | PRI_BRN | POD_PLT | POD_LT | PLT_HGT | SED_POD | YLD_PLT | SED_WGT |
|-----------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ECV             | 13.63   | 43.83   | 13.65  | 20.41   | 16.31   | 52.25   | 11.88   |
| GCV             | 5.45    | 21.65   | 1.64   | 11.92   | 2.28    | 46.18   | 7.97    |
| PCV             | 14.68   | 48.89   | 13.75  | 23.64   | 16.15   | 69.73   | 14.30   |
| $h^2$ (B S.)    | 0.13    | 0.19    | 0.01   | 0.25    | -0.02   | 0.43    | 0.31    |
| GA as % of Mean 5% | 4.17   | 19.75   | 0.40   | 12.39   | -0.66   | 63.00   | 9.15    |

PRI_BRN = Primary branches per plant; POD_PLT= Pods per plant; POD_LT= pod length (cm); PLT_HGT= Plant height (cm); SED_POD= Seeds per pod; YLD_PLT = Seed yield per plant (g); SED_WGT = 100 seed weight (g)
Table 4 Variability in qualitative traits among 66 horsegram accessions

| Descriptors        | Descriptor states | Frequency | Percent | SDI   |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Plant vigour       | Poor              | 2         | 3.03    | 0.501 |
|                    | Good              | 8         | 12.12   |       |
|                    | Very good         | 56        | 84.85   |       |
| Growth habit       | Bushy             | 1         | 1.52    | 0.078 |
|                    | Semi spreading    | 65        | 98.48   |       |
| Growth Pattern     | Determinate       | 26        | 39.39   | 0.670 |
|                    | Indeterminate     | 40        | 60.61   |       |
| Leaf surface       | Glabrous          | 45        | 68.18   | 0.625 |
|                    | Pubescent         | 21        | 31.82   |       |
| Stem colour        | Green             | 50        | 75.76   | 0.554 |
|                    | Purple            | 16        | 24.24   |       |
| Pod surface        | Glabrous          | 16        | 24.24   | 0.554 |
|                    | Pubescent         | 50        | 75.76   |       |

Table 5 Promising accessions identified for different traits in horse gram

| SN | Trait                              | Promising accessions                  |
|----|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1  | Primary branches per plant         | IC 277625, IC 277630, IC 145250        |
| 2  | Pods per plant                     | IC 53627, IC 26132, IC 9623            |
| 3  | Plant height (cm)                  | IC 277630, IC 277677, IC 277625        |
| 4  | Seed yield per plant (g)           | IC 341308, IC 145250, IC 22783         |
| 5  | 100 seed weight (g)                | IC 139527, IC 15735, IC 277677         |

Fig.1 Grouping of 66 horse gram accession on the basis of Euclidean distances
Whereas accessions from rest of the states were well distributed in cluster II exhibiting high diversity for the traits studied. The accessions from cluster I could be used for hybridization program with the accessions from cluster II in order to develop high yielding genotypes/varieties for overall yield enhancement (Fig. 1). Sunil et al., 2008 and Vishwanatha et al., 2016 also reported clustering of horse genotypes into different clusters and also reported important and distant accessions for utilization in horse gram crop improvement (Gupta et al., 2010). Promising accessions for different traits are reported (Table 5) and these can be used for improvement of the specific traits in horse gram.
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