Genotypic and Phenotypic Variability and Correlation Studies in Ridge Gourd (*Luffa acutangula* L. Ruxb.)

L. B. Thulasiram [a++*], S. A. Ranpise [b#], S. A. Anarase [c†], D. B. Kshirsagar [b‡] and Swati Shinde [d†]

[a] *Department of Horticulture, Post Graduate Institute, MPKV, Rahuri, Maharashtra, India.*
[b] *Department of Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri, Maharashtra, India.*
[c] *Department of Agriculture Botany, Punyashlok Ahilyadevi Holkar College of Agriculture, Halgaon, Maharashtra, India.*
[d] *Department of Statistics, MPKV, Rahuri, Maharashtra, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The research was conducted AICRP on Vegetable crops, Department of Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri, Dist. Ahmednagar (M.S.) in RBD along with two replications evaluated that summer-2022. In F_3 progenies in Cross-III P_6 x P_8 (Saloni-5 x NRG-9) with two parents ridge gourd. In eighteen characters studied that variability and broad sense heritability (bs) with genetic advance over mean and correlation studied that, the high GCV and high PCV observed for the number of branches/vine, fruit yield/vine, fruit yield/plot and fruit yield/ha reported that highest variability

---

[++] *Ph.D Scholar;*
[#] *Head;*
[†] *Assistant Professor;*
[‡] *Associate Professor;*
Corresponding author: E-mail: tulasiherty@gmail.com;

indicated characters for further improvement and the highest broad sense heritability (bs) along with the highest genetic advance over mean were observed in number of branches/vine, number of nodes which first male flower appeared, number of picking, weight of fruit, number of fruits/vine, fruit yield/vine, fruit yield/plot and fruit yield/ha. The fruit yield (q/ha) in F_3 generation at genotypical and phenotypical of fruit yield indicated that highly significant positively correlated with number of branches/vine, length of vine, number of pickings, days to last pickings, diameter of fruit except genotypic level, weight of fruits and number of fruits/vine, in these characters was governed by additively gene action, the least influences by the environment effects indicating that better chance for the improve through the selections.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant cucurbitaceous vegetable crops is the ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula* L. Ruxb.), which is widely cultivated in tropical and subtropical areas of the world. With a 2n=26 chromosomal number, it is a member of the Cucurbitaceae family and is commonly grown in India throughout the *kharif* and summer months. With good nutritional content and large yield potentials, ridge gourd's tender fruits are a well-known and popular culinary vegetable in India [1].

Understanding the method of inheritance of such a complicated quantitative character is crucial for devising efficient selection processes in order to improve yield and its related qualities. Yield is a complex character that is heavily influenced by the genotype-environment interaction. Highest broad sense heritability combined with the highest genetic advance over mean, reported that the of additively gene action, although highly heritability with lowest genetic advances reported that the epistasis, dominant gene action [2]. In Highest heritability combined with the highest genetic advances is usually greater useful in prediction achieve under selections than heritability estimation alone [3]. In genotypical and phenotypical coefficient of variations, heritability and genetically advances enable the breeders to studied that genetic variability and potential in progenies. Since many economic traits are quantitative in nature and heavily influenced by the environment, it will be helpful to divide the overall variability into its heritable and non-heritable components to determine whether selection is superior. Breeding progress is governed by the nature of genetic and non-genetic variations.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted AICRP on Vegetable crops, Department of Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri, Dist. Ahmednagar (M.S.) in RBD along with two replications evaluated that summer-2022. F_3 generation of five progenies in the cross III P_6 x P_8 (Saloni-5 x NRG-9). The observations taken growth, flowering, fruit, yield characters were indicated that on F_3 progenies and with two parents. The data was taken from all the plants for eighteen characters *viz.*, number of branches/vine, length of vine (m), days to appearances of first male flower, days to appearances of first female flower, number of nodes at which first male flower appear and number of nodes at which first female flower appear, days to 50 percent flowering, sex ratio, days to first pickings, number of picking, days to last picking, length of fruit (cm), diameter of fruit (cm), weight of fruit (g), number of fruits/vine, fruit yield/vine (kg), fruit yield/plot (kg) and fruit yield/ha. The Genotypical and phenotypical coefficient of variations was evaluated as formula indicated by Burton and De Vane [4].

2.1 Estimations of Component of Variations

In phenotypical and genotypical variance was indicated by respectively mean squared values [5].

i. Environmental variance ($\sigma^2 e$) = MSe
ii. Genotypic variance ($\sigma^2 g$) = MSg-MSe/r
iii. Phenotypic variance ($\sigma^2 p$) = ($\sigma^2 g$)+ ($\sigma^2 e$)

Where,

MSg is genotypic mean sum of square
MSe is an error mean sum of square
R is number of replications

2.2 Estimations Coefficient of Variation

In genotypical and phenotypical coefficient of variations was regarded that by Burton and De Vane [4].

i. Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV)

$$PCV\ (\%) = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma 2p}}{X} x\ 100$$

Where,

σ²p = Phenotypic variance
X̄ = General mean of character

ii. Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV)

$$GCV\ (\%) = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma 2g}}{X} x\ 100$$

2.3 Estimations of the Heritability (Percentage)

The heritability is defined as ratio of genotypical to phenotypical variance. The percentages of heritability in a broad sense was calculated for a variety of characters, as shown below (Lush, 1949).

$$h2\ (b.s.) = \frac{\sigma 2g}{\sigma 2p} x\ 100$$

Where,

σ²g = Genotypic variance
σ²p = Phenotypic variance

Genetic advances expressed as over mean were evaluated by the following formula.

$$\text{Genetic advance as over mean (GAM)} = \frac{GA}{X} x\ 100$$

2.4 Estimations of Correlation Coefficient

The genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficient were estimated for the pooled data were derived by the following formula in order to explore the relationship between various features.

$$rg = \frac{Co-variance\ XY\ (G)}{\sqrt{Variance\ X\ (G)\ x\ Variance\ Y\ (G)}}$$

$$rph = \frac{Co-variance\ XY\ (PH)}{\sqrt{Variance\ X\ (PH)\ x\ Variance\ Y\ (PH)}}$$

The Heritability and expected genetic advances was indicated as per formula regards by Johnson et al., [5] and correlation coefficient were comparing with the statistical table value of correlation coefficients at 1% and 5% level of significances [6].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results revealed that variability, heritability and genetic advance in studied that. The phenotypical coefficient of variation (PCV) were greater than the respective genotypical coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits of cross denoted that environment factors influenced their expressions to little degree. Wider differences between the PCV, GCV indicated that the greater role of their environment factors although, narrow differences between the GCV and PCV reported that these traits are less influences by the environment condition. Similarly was noted by Panda et al. [7] and Kannan and Rajamanickam [8] and Gautham and Balamohan [9] in ridge gourd and Deepa et al. [10] in cucumber and Maurya et al. [11] and Alekar [12] in bitter gourd.

The highest values of GCV and PCV was showed in number of branches/vine, sex ratio, number of fruits/ vine, fruit yield/vine, fruit yield /plot and fruit yield/ha indicated that the highest variability for these traits which is useful that advance improvements Similarly reported that Kannan and Rajamanickam [8] and Gautham and Balamohan [9] of ridge gourd and Deepa et al. [10] of Cucumber. The moderately GCV, PCV values were showed for traits number of nodes at which first male flower appear, number of picking, length of fruit, weight of fruit similarly noted that Singh et al. [13], Amit Kumar Bhargava et al. [14], Ananthan and Krishnamoorthy [15] of ridge gourd. In bitter gourd Yadagiri et al. [16] that suggested considerable variability in the population. Variability exists in the population, some allowed for further selection. although, lowest GCV, PCV for these days to appearance of first male flower, days to appearance of first female flower, days to 50 % flowering, days to 1ˢᵗ picking, number of picking, days to last pickings were showed. The indicated that less chance for improvements of their characters due to lowest magnitudes of the variability. Similarly was indicated that Kanimozhi et al. [17] in wax gourd.

The estimates of highest heritability (bs) was showed for yield and yield related factors, similarly noted by Doddamani et al. [18] of Cucumber, in ridge gourd Kannan and Rajamanickam [8]. Highest heritability along with the highest genetic advance over mean were showed for the number of branches/vine, sex ratio, number of picking, length of fruit, weight of fruit, number of fruits/vine, fruit yield/vine,

Table 1. Mean performance, ranges, GCV, PCV, ECV, heritability (bs), genetic advances over mean and genetic advance of two parents along F$_3$ population of cross-III Saloni-5 x NRG-9

Sr. No	Character	Mean 2 Parents	Mean F$_3$ progeny	Range	GCV (%)	PCV (%)	ECV (%)	h^2 bs (%)	GA	GAM (%)
1	No. of branches /vine	4.10	6.34	3.30-7.00	22.83	23.00	2.74	98.60	2.66	46.70
2	Length of vine (m)	3.69	3.92	3.59-4.09	4.43	5.10	2.52	75.50	0.30	7.94
3	Days to appearances first male flower	42.50	39.98	39.30-42.80	3.10	3.20	0.78	93.90	2.52	6.19
4	Days to appearance first female flower	47.05	45.22	44.20-47.20	2.28	2.44	0.85	87.80	2.02	4.41
5	Node no. at which first male flower appeared	3.85	3.22	2.80-3.90	10.53	11.45	4.50	84.60	0.67	19.95
6	Node no. at which first female flower appeared	15.10	12.68	12.10-15.20	9.62	9.83	2.02	95.80	2.59	19.40
7	Days to 50% flowering	54.35	51.84	51.00-54.60	2.68	2.76	0.64	94.60	2.82	5.38
8	Sex ratio	25.30	17.28	16.06-26.58	21.16	21.4	3.18	97.80	8.43	43.10
9	Days to first picking	57.65	54.91	53.90-57.90	2.67	2.70	0.44	97.30	3.02	5.43
10	No. of pickings	12.41	18.38	12.05-19.23	17.86	17.90	3.79	99.61	6.10	36.70
11	Days to last picking	96.85	111.92	95.90-114.20	7.03	7.05	0.75	99.30	15.50	14.42
12	Length of fruit (cm)	21.65	25.20	21.00-29.40	12.84	13.44	3.98	91.20	6.11	25.26
13	Diameter of fruit (cm)	1.92	2.12	1.91-2.15	4.73	5.12	1.98	85.10	0.18	8.98
14	Weight of fruit (g)	112.45	142.42	108.10-156.40	13.75	13.8	1.13	99.30	37.80	28.24
15	No. of fruits per vine	13.50	25.24	12.90-28.10	28.41	28.48	1.95	99.50	12.78	58.39
16	Fruit yield per vine (kg)	1.52	3.62	1.39-4.39	39.28	39.38	2.81	99.50	2.44	80.72
17	Fruit yield /plot (kg)	7.61	18.12	6.95-21.98	39.33	39.42	2.75	99.50	12.21	80.82
18	Fruit yield (q/ha)	101.40	241.62	92.63-293.02	39.32	39.42	2.75	99.50	162.90	80.82

Table 2. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficient for yield and yield contributing characters in F$_3$ generations of cross-3 P$_6$ X P$_8$

		No. of branches per vine	Length of vine (m)	Days to appearan first male	Days to appearan first female	Node no. at Which first male	Node no. at which first female	Days to 50% flowering	Sex ratio	Days to first picking	No. of picking	Days to last picking	Length of fruit (cm)	Diameter of fruit (cm)	Weight of fruit (g)	No. of fruits per vine	Fruit yield q/ha
No. of branches	G	1.000	0.749*	-0.827**	-0.696**	-0.948**	-0.838**	-0.758**	-0.757**	-0.753**	0.826**	0.818**	0.223	0.915**	0.683**	0.805**	0.769**
per vine	P	1.000	0.653*	-0.800**	-0.680**	-0.870**	-0.811**	-0.742**	-0.743**	-0.743**	0.819**	0.818**	0.240	0.817**	0.675**	0.801**	0.764**
Length of vine	G		1.000	-0.788**	-0.411	-0.708**	-0.520	-0.462	-0.781**	-0.497	0.580*	0.681**	0.370	0.644*	0.866**	0.883**	0.913**
(m)	P		1.000	-0.580*	-0.280	-0.688**	-0.404	-0.488	-0.697**	-0.382	0.458	0.576*	0.396	0.499	0.749**	0.785**	0.806**
Days to appearance first male flower appeared	G			1.000	0.806**	0.975**	0.920**	0.895**	0.975**	0.876**	-0.952**	-0.961**	-0.566*	-0.998**	-0.861**	-0.960**	-0.919**
	P			1.000	0.759**	0.824**	0.897**	0.809**	0.931**	0.844**	-0.944**	-0.936**	-0.502	-0.905**	-0.836**	-0.927**	-0.889**
Days to appearance first female flower appeared	G				1.000	0.836**	0.813**	1.023**	0.766**	1.011**	-0.754**	-0.675**	-0.094	-0.986**	-0.771**	-0.740**	-0.735**
	P				1.000	0.723**	0.736**	0.944**	0.693**	0.969**	-0.729**	-0.667**	-0.118	-0.790**	-0.708**	-0.694**	-0.686**
Node no. at Which first male flower appeared	G					1.000	0.898**	0.873**	0.853**	0.889**	-0.884**	-0.8345	-0.202	-0.985**	-0.865**	-0.885**	-0.887**
	P					1.000	0.798**	0.851**	0.749**	0.773**	-0.793**	-0.772**	-0.209	-0.785**	-0.773**	-0.816**	-0.813**

		No. of branches per vine	Length of vine (m)	Days to appearan first male	Days to appearan first female	Node no. at Which first male	Node no. at which first female	Days to 50% flowering	Sex ratio	Days to first picking	No. of picking	Days to last picking	Length of fruit (cm)	Diameter of fruit (cm)	Weight of fruit (g)	No. of fruits per vine	Fruit yield q/ha
Node no. at Which female flower appeared	G						1.000	0.823**	0.784**	0.846**	-0.912**	-0.865**	-0.565*	-1.029**	-0.603*	-0.763**	-0.687**
	P						1.000	0.755**	0.744	0.801**	-0.891**	-0.844**	-0.518	-0.893**	-0.583*	-0.736**	-0.662**
Days to 50% flowering	G							1.000	0.821**	1.016**	-0.815**	-0.750**	-0.104	-0.961**	-0.854**	-0.817**	-0.823**
	P							1.000	0.794**	0.967**	-0.775**	-0.729**	-0.138	-0.847**	-0.822**	-0.803**	-0.805**
Sex ratio	G								1.000	0.825**	-0.913**	-0.959**	-0.512	-0.900**	-0.911**	-0.988**	-0.959**
	P								1.000	0.808**	-0.889**	-0.930**	-0.492	-0.852**	-0.908**	-0.981**	-0.954**
Days to first picking	G									1.000	-0.827**	-0.775**	-0.206	-0.971**	-0.805**	-0.810**	-0.796**
	P									1.000	-0.815**	-0.762**	-0.188	-0.793**	-0.797**	-0.784**	
No. of pickings	G										1.000	0.983**	0.471	0.961**	0.719**	0.867**	0.799**
	P										1.000	0.977**	0.439	0.882**	0.715**	0.858**	0.791**
Days to last picking	G											1.000	0.542	0.955**	0.7607	0.9181	0.851**
	P											1.000	0.532	0.840**	0.745**	0.908**	0.841**
Length of fruit (cm)	G												1.000	0.531	0.2459	0.4589	0.361
	P												1.000	0.411	0.231	0.447	0.351
Diameter of fruit (cm)	G													1.000	0.7761	0.9001	0.841
	P													1.000	0.739**	0.837**	0.790**
Weight of fruit (g)	G														1.000	0.9447	0.981**
	P														1.000	0.942**	0.980**
No. of fruits per vine	G															1.0000	0.987**
	P															1.000	0.987**

*, ** Significant at 5 % and 1 % level respectively

fruit yield/plot and fruit yield/ha, indicated there traits was less influences by environment conditions and controlled by the additively gene actions, and greater chance for the improvements direct the selections. Similarly showed that in bottle gourd Sharma and Sengupta [19], Gautham and Balamohan [9] in ridge gourd. Although, these traits are number of nodes at which first male flower appeared, number of nodes at which first female flower appeared and days to picking revealed that highest heritability along with the moderated genetic advance over mean, and the highest heritability along with lowest genetic advance over mean were showed for length of vine, days to appearances of first male flower, days to appearances first of female flower, days to 50 % flowering and days to first pickings. The reported that, present to a certain extent of non-additively gene effects and not effective through the selection. Similarly showed that in bitter gourd noted Pathak et al. [20] and Maurya et al. [11].

The correlation studies reported that the character fruit yield in F_3 generation at both genotypical and phenotypical, the fruit yield noted that high significant positively correlation with the number of branches/vine, length of vine, number of picking, days to last picking, diameter of fruit except genotypic level, weight of fruits and number of fruits/vine. Similar findings reported by Mali [21] in musk melon, in bottle gourd Sharma and Sengupta [19] and Chandramouli et al. [22]. Whereas, significant negatively correlation were observed that days to appearances of first male flower, days to appearances of first female flower, nodes number of at which first male flower appear, node number of at which first female flower appear, days to 50 % flowering, sex ratio and days to first pickings.

4. CONCLUSION

In highest genotypic coefficient of variations (GCV) and the high phenotypic coefficient of variations (PCV) was showed that number of branches/vine, sex ratio, number of fruits/vine, fruit yield/vine, fruit yield/plot and fruit yield/ha, which revealed that widely ranges of variations and the selective based on these traits provides grater scope for the selection. In highest heritability along with the highest genetic advance over mean were showed that number of branches/ vine, sex ratio, number of picking, length of fruits, weight of fruits, number of fruits/vine, fruit yield/ vine, fruit yield /plot and fruit yield/ha, reported that were less influences by

environment conditions and controlled by additively gene actions, and greater amount scope for selection. The character fruit yield in F_3 generation at combined with genotypical and phenotypical the fruit yield noted high significant positively correlation with the number of branches/vine, length of vine, number of pickings, days to last pickings, diameter of fruit except genotypic level, weight of fruits and number of fruits /vine.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Seshadri VS. Cucurbits vegetable crops in India, Ed. Bose TK, and Som MG. Noya Prakash, Culcutta, India. 1986:91-164.
2. Panse VG, Khargonkar SS. Genetics of quantitative characters in relation to plant breeding. Indian Journal Genetics. 1957;17:318-327.
3. Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Fatokun CA. Genetic advance in pea (*Pisium sativum* L.). Madras Agric. 1955;67:387-390.
4. Burton GW, De Vane EH. Estimating heritability in tall fescus (*Festuce arundinaceae* L.) from replicated clonal material. Agron. J. 1953;45:478-481.
5. Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Comstock RW. Estimation of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans. Agron. J. 1955a;47:314-318.
6. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. Statistical methods, 6th Edn., Oxford and IBH, Publ. Co. Bombay; 1967.
7. Panda M, Reddy Mohanty A, Sarkar S, Sahu GC, Tripathy P, Das S, Patnaik A. Variability studies for ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula (L.) Roxb.*). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(4):1716-1719.
8. Kannan A, Rajamanickam C. Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis of F_5 generation of ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula* (L.) Roxb.) for yield and quality. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8(11):1153-1164.
9. Gautham SP, Balamohan TN. Genetic variability studies in F_2 and F_3 generations of ridge gourd for yield and yield components [(*Luffa acutangula* L.) Roxb]. Annals of Plant Sciences. 2018;7(8):2385-2390.

10. Deepa SK, Hadimani HP, Hanchinamani CN, et al. Estimation of genetic variability in cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L). International Journal of Chem. Study. 2018;6(6):115-118.

11. Maurya SK, Ram HH, Singh OK. Standrad heterosis for fruit yield and its components in bottle gourd (*Lagenaria siceraria* (Mol.) Standl.). Annals of Horticulture. 2009;2: 72- 76.

12. Alekar AN, Shinde KG, Khamkar MB. Studies on genetic variability, heritability, genetic advance and correlation in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). Int. J. Chemical Studies. 2019;7(3):1155-1159.

13. Singh RP, Mohan J, Dharmendra S. Studies on genetic variability and heritability in ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula* L.). Agricultural Science Digest. 2002; 22(4):279-280.

14. Amit Kumar Bhargava, Singh VB, Pradeep Kumar, Rakesh Kumar Meena. Efficiency of selection based on genetic variability in ridge gourd [*Luffa acutangula* L. (Roxb.)]. Journal of Pharmacognisy and Phytochem. 2017;6(4):1651-1655.

15. Ananthan, M, Krishnamoorthy V. Genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula* (Roxb) L.). International Journal Current Microbiology Applied Science. 2017;6(6):3022-3026.

16. 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.

17. Kanimozhi RG, Mohammed YS, Ramesh K, Kanthaswamy V, Thirumeni S. Genetic analysis in segregating generation of wax gourd. International Journal of Vegetable Science. 2015;21(3):281-296.

18. Doddamani M, Satish SD, Nishani S, Dileepkumar A, Masuthi SGK, Tataga MH. Assessment of genetic variability in local collections of cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) genotypes for productivity traits. International Journal of Genetics. 2018;8(1):01-05.

19. Sharma A, Sengupta SK. Evaluation of genetic variability in bottle gourd (*Lagenaria siceraria* (molina) standl.) genotypes. Veg. Sci. 2012;39(1):83-85.

20. Pathak M, Manpreet, Kanchan P. Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis in bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.). International Journal Advance Research. 2014;2(8):179-184.

21. Mali MD. Genetic studies in F_3 and F_4 generations of musk melon (*Cucumis melo* L.). Ph. D. Thesis submitted to Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, MS., India; 2015.

22. Chandramouli B, Reddy RVSK, Ravindra Babu M, Jyothi KU, Umakrishna K, Paratpara M. Genetic variability studies for yield and yield attributing traits in F_2 generation of bottle gourd (*Lagenaria siceraria* (Mol.) Standl.). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(5):1484-1488.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/99554