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#### Abstract

SUMMARY

The present study on variability and character association in fodder oat was carried out at Research cum Instructional Farm, IGKV, Department of Genetics \& Plant Breeding, Raipur during Rabi, 2019-20. An experiment was conducted with 294 germplasm accession belonging to ten different Avena species with six check varieties of oat (Avena sp. L.) in augmented design. Nineteen quantitative traits were studied for the assessment of genetic variability. Sufficient variation was exhibited by most of the traits studied. The highest values for GCV and PCV was green fodder yield, number of tillers per plant and number of leaves per plant. High heritability and coupled with high genetic advance were found in number of leaves per plant and green fodder yield per plant. Most of the traits studied had skewness value ranged from ( -0.5 to 0.5 ) are normally distributed except for days to $50 \%$ flowering, number of tillers per plant, number of leaves of per plant, leaf dry weight per plant, leaf: stem ratio and days to maturity. Negative kurtosis (Platykurtic) viz., leaf length, culm diameter, number of leaves per plant, seed yield per plant, dry matter weight and 1000 seed weight.
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Oat (Avena sativa L.) is a multipurpose cereal crop grown in rabi season in many parts of the world. In India, it is used as green fodder, hay and silage for animals. It has excellent growth habit, quick recovery after cutting and provides good quality herbage. Furthermore, the demand for oat for human consumption has increased, particularly because of the demonstrated dietary benefits of oat whole-grain products. Green fodder production for animals to provide balanced nutrition (Phogat et al., 2021). Oat is considered to be a nutritious source of protein, carbohydrate, fibre, vitamins, and minerals as well as of compounds with beneficial effects on health. Assessment of the genetic variability can be achieved using morphological measurements and phenotypic characterization. Very good information on sources of germplasm, various descriptors, data on various morphological traits and characterization of oat germplasm on the basis of morphological traits has been well documented (Choubey et al., 2005). The genotypic correlation between yield and yield attributing characters as well as path coefficient analysis are important in breeding programme. For selection programme, it is essential to have thorough knowledge about the mutual relationship among the yield and its component characters which are positively
correlated. When a greater number of variables is considered, the association becomes more and more complex. Under such situations path coefficients would be more useful for calculating direct and indirect associations with yield. Therefore, the present study was undertaken in fodder oat to gather information on different parameters of genetic variability and association of component traits with fodder yield.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was carried out during Rabi, 2019 at Research cum instructional farm, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, IGKV, Raipur Chhattisgarh. A total of 294 genotypes procured from NBPGR, Delhi is presented in (Table 2) was evaluated under field condition using augmented design. The observations were recorded for 19 oat traits viz., days to $50 \%$ flowering, plant height ( cm ), number of leaves per plant, flag leaf length (cm), flag leaf width $(\mathrm{cm})$, leaf length $(\mathrm{cm})$, leaf width $(\mathrm{cm})$, culm diameter ( cm ), number of nodes on the main culm, number of tillers per plant, peduncle length ( cm ), green) fodder yield (g), dry matter yield per plant (g), leaf dry weight per plant (g), stem dry weight per plant (g), leaf: stem ratio, days to maturity, seed yield

TABLE 1
Descriptor of Avena sativa L. (Oat)

| S. No. | Characteristic | Class | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Plant Vigour | Poor Good | 1 |
|  |  | Very Good | 2 |
|  |  |  | 3 |
|  | Growth Habit | Erect | 1 |
|  |  | Semi-prostate | 2 |
|  |  | Prostate | 3 |
|  |  | Other (specify) | 9 |
| 10. | Leaf Colour | Green | 1 |
|  |  | Dark Green | 2 |
|  |  | Other (specify) | 9 |
|  | Leaf Sheath pubescence | Absent Present | 0 |
|  |  |  | 1 |
|  | Flag leaf attitude | Erect | 1 |
|  |  | Drooping | 2 |
|  |  | Semi-drooping | 9 |
| 13. | Stem Solidness | Hollow | 1 |
|  |  | Semi Solid | 2 |
|  |  | Solid | 3 |
|  | Culm diameter (cm) | Quantitative |  |
| 15. | Number of nodes on the main culm | Quantitative |  |
|  | Number of tillers per plant | Quantitative |  |
|  | Peduncle length (cm) | Quantitative |  |
|  | Green fodder yield per plant (kg or g) | Quantitative |  |
|  | Dry matter yield per plant (kg or g) | Quantitative |  |
|  | Leaf dry weight per plant (g) | Quantitative |  |
|  | Stem dry weight per plant (g) | Quantitative |  |
|  | Leaf: stem ratio | Quantitative |  |
|  | Days to maturity | Quantitative |  |
| 25. | Panicle Attitude | Compact | 1 |
|  |  | Semi-compact | 2 |
|  |  | Lateral | 3 |
|  |  | Equilateral | 4 |
|  |  | Other (specify) | 9 |
|  | Awn per spikelet | Absent | 0 |
|  |  | One | 1 |
|  |  | Two | 2 |
| 27. | Primary Floret Pubescence | Absent | 0 |
|  |  | Present | 1 |
|  | Spikelet | Shattering | 1 |
|  | shattering | Non-shattering | 2 |
| 29. | Hullness | Absent | 0 |
|  |  | Present | 10 |
|  | Seed yield per plant (g) | Quantitative |  |
|  | 1000 seed weight (g) | Quantitative |  |
| 32. | Seed colour | White | 1 |
|  |  | Yellow | 2 |
|  |  | Grey | 3 |
|  |  | Black | 4 |
|  |  | Other (specify) | 9 |
|  | Biotic Stress susceptibility | Very Low | 1 |
|  |  | Low | 3 |
|  |  | Intermediate | 5 |
|  |  | High | 7 |
|  |  | Very High | 9 |

per plant (g) and 1000 seed weight (g) were studied which is received from Indian Grassland and Fodder Research Institute, Jhansi are presented in (Table 1). The descriptive statistics were worked out. The estimates of variability parameters were worked out according to the method suggested by Lush (1940). Phenotypic and genotypic coefficients of variation were calculated based on the method advocated by Burton (1952). Heritability in broad sense was estimated (Allard, 1960) and expressed in percentage. Genetic advance as per cent of mean was estimated by the method suggested by Johnson et al. (1955).

Correlation coefficients between green fodder yield and its component traits were used for this analysis. By keeping green fodder yield as a dependent variable and the other traits as independent variables, simultaneous equations, which expressed the basic relationship between path coefficients, were solved to estimate the direct and indirect effects.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## Analysis of variance

Analysis of variance was carried out for 19 characters. There is considerable amount of variability present among the genotype studied are presented in the Table Analysis of variance revealed that most of studied were found significant at $1 \%$ and $5 \%$ level of significance. Trait like plant height, flag leaf length, flag leaf width, leaf length, leaf width, culm diameter, number of nodes per plant, peduncle length, green fodder yield and seed yield per plant were significant at $1 \%$ level of significance are observed in (Table-3). The above investigation pressed indicated better opportunity for a breeder to select a genotype for these traits.

## MEAN, RANGE AND CV

Descriptive statistical analysis of the recorded characters like mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation and coefficient of variation (CV) for green fodder yield and different quantitative traits are shown in the (Table 4). Days to $50 \%$ flowering showed a range of 66 to 103 with a mean of 81.29 . The accession EC0130646 was found to be very early. all quantitative characters exhibited variability evident by high CV observed in most of the traits studied. The high CV observed among morphological characters which include leaf dry weight per plant (gm) (44.58\%) followed by L:S ratio ( $41.83 \%$ ), green fodder yield (gm) (34.57\%), seed yield per plant (gm) (24.11\%), number of tillers per plant ( $23.55 \%$ ), dry matter yield per plant (gm) ( $23.14 \%$ ), stem dry weight per plant (gm) ( $22.8 \%$ ), number of leaves per plant ( $21.5 \%$ ) is a clear indication of a high level of variability.

## Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variation

The estimates of phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV), genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), heritability in broad sense ( $\mathrm{h}^{2}, \mathrm{BS}$ ) and genetic
TABLE 2
List of genotypes of oat used in the study

| S. Botanical name No. | Accession | Country Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | Botanical name | Accession | Country Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | Botanical name | Accession | Country Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Avena sativa | EC0108120 | ARGENTINA | 43. | Avena sativa | EC0841794 | SWEDEN | 85. | Avena sativa | EC0108648 | AUSTRALIA |
| 2. Avena sativa | EC0108122 | ARGENTINA | 44. | Avena sativa | EC0841793 | SWEDEN | 86. | Avena sterilis | EC0130450 | CANADA |
| 3. Avena sativa | EC0108124 | ARGENTINA | 45. | Avena sativa | EC0841791 | SWEDEN | 87. | Avena sativa | EC0178760 | CANADA |
| 4. Avena sativa | EC0108125 | ARGENTINA | 46. | Avena sativa | EC0841790 | SWEDEN | 88. | Avena sativa | EC0176071 | CANADA |
| 5. Avena sativa | EC0108126 | ARGENTINA | 47. | Avena sativa | EC0841789 | SWEDEN | 89. | Avena sativa | EC0109263 | CANADA |
| 6. Avena sativa | EC0246122 | BRAZIL | 48. | Avena sativa | EC0841788 | SWEDEN | 90. | Avena sativa | EC0109243 | CANADA |
| 7. Avena sativa | EC0246131 | BRAZIL | 49. | Avena sativa | EC0841787 | SWEDEN | 91. | Avena sativa | EC0109104 | CANADA |
| 8. Avena sativa | EC0246132 | BRAZIL | 50. | Avena sativa | EC0841785 | SWEDEN | 92. | Avena sativa | EC0092887 | CANADA |
| 9. Avena sativa | EC0246134 | BRAZIL | 51. | Avena sativa | EC0006715 | SWEDEN | 93. | Avena sativa | EC0043840 | CANADA |
| 10. Avena sativa | EC0246144 | BRAZIL | 52. | Avena sativa | EC0013354 | SWEDEN | 94. | Avena sativa | EC0112034 | CANADA |
| 11. Avena sativa | EC0246145 | BRAZIL | 53. | Avena sativa | EC0013351 | SWEDEN | 95. | Avena sativa | EC0109262 | CANADA |
| 12. Avena sterilis | EC0062320 | NORWAY | 54. | Avena sativa | EC0004721 | FRANCE | 96. | Avena sativa | EC0178759 | CANADA |
| 13. Avena sativa | EC0057332 | FINLAND | 55. | Avena sativa | EC0003230 | CYPRUS | 97 | Avena sativa | EC0178761 | CANADA |
| 14. Avena sativa | EC0057333 | FINLAND | 56. | Avena sativa | EC0007815 | YUGOSLAVIA | 98. | Avena sativa | EC0140899 | CANADA |
| 15. Avena sativa | EC0099174 | PORTUGAL | 57. | Avena byzantina | IC0282934 | UTTARAKHAND | 99. | Avena sativa | EC0117407 | AUSTRALIA |
| 16. Avena byzantina | EC0099164 | PORTUGAL | 58. | Avena sativa | EC0246149 | BRAZIL | 100. | Avena sativa | EC0117404 | AUSTRALIA |
| 17 Avena byzantina | EC0099163 | PORTUGAL | 59. | Avena sativa | EC0246148 | BRAZIL | 101. | Avena sativa | EC0114246 | AUSTRALIA |
| 18. Avena sativa | EC0099178 | PORTUGAL | 60. | Avena sativa | EC0246150 | BRAZIL | 102. | Avena sativa | EC0108657 | AUSTRALIA |
| 19. Avena sativa | EC0099175 | PORTUGAL | 61. | Avena sterilis | EC0013183 | CANADA | 103. | Avena sativa | EC0055192 | AUSTRALIA |
| 20. Avena sativa | EC0099170 | PORTUGAL | 62. | Avena sativa | EC0109261 | CANADA | 104. | Avena sativa | EC0004453 | AUSTRALIA |
| 21. Avena byzantina | EC0099161 | PORTUGAL | 63. | Avena sativa | EC0113921 | AUSTRALIA | 105. | Avena sativa | EC0004456 | AUSTRALIA |
| 22. Avena sativa | EC0007814 | YUGOSLAVIA | 64. | Avena byzantina | EC0015550 | GERMANY | 106. | Avena sativa | EC0007662 | AUSTRALIA |
| 23. Avena sativa | EC0054834 | ISRAEL | 65. | Avena byzantina | EC0108724 | ISRAEL | 107. | Avena sativa | EC0008370 | AUSTRALIA |
| 24. Avena sativa | EC0095143 | CHILE | 66. | Avena byzantina | EC0099165 | PORTUGAL | 108. | Avena sativa | EC0061704 | UK |
| 25. Avena sativa | EC0096459 | NEW ZEALAND | 67. | Avena sativa | EC0054937 | NEW ZEALAND | 109. | Avena sativa | EC0108588 | UK |
| 26. Avena sativa | EC0112078 | ECUADOR | 68. | Avena sterilis | EC0013594 | AUSTRALIA | 110. | Avena sativa | EC0108601 | UK |
| 27. Avena sativa | EC0112079 | ECUADOR | 69. | Avena sativa | EC0004438 | AUSTRALIA | 111. | Avena sativa | EC0108604 | UK |
| 28. Avena sativa | EC0157669 | JAPAN | 70. | Avena sativa | EC0008367 | AUSTRALIA | 112. | Avena sativa | EC0108602 | UK |
| 29. Avena sativa | EC0030247 | RUSSIA | 71. | Avena sativa | EC0008369 | AUSTRALIA | 113. | Avena sativa | EC0107538 | AUSTRALIA |
| 30. Avena sativa | EC0030244 | RUSSIA | 72. | Avena sativa | EC0086444 | AUSTRALIA | 114. | Avena sativa | EC0107536 | AUSTRALIA |
| 31. Avena sativa | EC0159072 | FINLAND | 73. | Avena sativa | EC0056175 | AUSTRALIA | 115. | Avena sativa | EC0107534 | AUSTRALIA |
| 32. Avena sativa | EC0159073 | FINLAND | 74. | Avena sativa | EC0057341 | AUSTRALIA | 116. | Avena sativa | EC0160165 | AUSTRALIA |
| 33. Avena sativa | EC0159069 | FINLAND | 75. | Avena sativa | EC0055197 | AUSTRALIA | 117. | Avena sativa | EC0029050 | AUSTRALIA |
| 34. Avena sativa | EC0067153 | SWEDEN | 76. | Avena sativa | EC0107533 | AUSTRALIA | 118. | Avena sativa | EC0102653 | AUSTRALIA |
| 35. Avena sativa | EC0028808 | SWEDEN | 77. | Avena sativa | EC0103929 | AUSTRALIA | 119. | Avena sativa | EC0102652 | AUSTRALIA |
| 36. Avena sativa | EC0028814 | SWEDEN | 78. | Avena sativa | EC0102649 | AUSTRALIA | 120. | Avena sativa | EC0019711 | AUSTRALIA |
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Source: Procured from NBPGR (National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources).
advance as per cent of mean (GA) are presented in (Table 5). Highest estimated GCV and PCV was observed for number of leaves per plant, number of tillers per plant and green fodder yield per plant. Number of leaves per plant showed range of 9.80 to 78.17 with mean 38.63 . The accession EC0095144 was found to be more no. of leaves. Number of tillers per plant showed range of 2.60 to 16 with mean 7.7. The accession EC0099165 was found to be more tillers. Green fodder yield per plant showed range of 32.20 to 229 with mean 92.79. The accession EC0004721 was found to be more green fodder. So, by selecting these traits would provide a good scope for crop improvement, Chakraborty et al. 2014 and Chouhan and Singh, 2019 also found high GCV and PCV for seed yield per plant.

## Heritability and genetic advance

The success in any breeding programme depends on the spectrum of genetic variability present in the germplasm. A survey of genetic variability is essentially the first step in crop improvement and plant breeding is an exercise in the management of variability
(Hutchinson, 1958). Heritability indicates the accuracy with which a genotype can be identified by its phenotypic performance. High heritability combined with high genetic advance in the indication of additive gene action and selection based on this would be more effective. High heritability and high genetic advance were found in number of leaves per plant and green fodder yield per plant. Sangwan et. al. (2012) observed high heritability with high genetic advance for tillers per plant and green fodder yield.

## SKEWNESS AND KURTOSIS

The magnitude and frequency of such variants might be more in one or the other direction or be equal in both directions. A comparison of the distribution parameters like skewness and kurtosis would give a clearer picture of the extent of variability induced in the traits. Skewness and kurtosis indicate relative mean performance and nature of distribution of traits. If value ranges from -0.5 to 0.5 then the data is normally distributed i.e., symmetrical. Kurtosis indicates the peak ness or flatness of a tail of a curve. If the value is near $(?=3)$ then the data is normally distributed

TABLE 3
Analysis of variance for green fodder yield and its attributing traits in oat (Avena sativa sp.)

| Source of variation | Degree <br> of freedom | Days to\% <br> 50 <br> flowering | Plant <br> height | Flag leaf length | Flag leaf width | Leaf <br> length | Leaf <br> width | Culm <br> diameter | No. of nodes/ plant | No. of tillers/ plant | No. of leaves/ plant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Block (ignoring treatments | 5 | 400 ** | 230.95** 1 | 123.577** | 0.31** | 160.98** | 0.16** | * 0.155** | 0.653* | 104.58** | 7,550.64** |
| Treatments (eliminating blocks) | 293 | 62.04 * | 111.24** | 23.4* | 0.06** | 38.1** | 0.03 | 0.007 | 0.364 | 4.575 | 107.444 |
| Blocks (eliminating treatments) | 5 | 7.985 | 16.78 | 20.67 0.0.0 | 0.053** | 13.95 | 0.07* | 0.023** | 0.053 | 3.695 | 49.273 |
| Treatment (ignoring blocks) | 293 | 68.73** | 114.89** | 25.15* 0 | 0.064** | 40.61** | 0.04 | 0.009 | 0.374 | 6.29* | 235.45** |
| Checks | 5 | 34.911 | 927.92** | 82.62** 0 | 0.392** | 71.73** | 0.27** | * 0.03** | 1.116** | 1.972 | 35.54 |
| Varieties | 287 | 69.55** | 88.62** | 24.237* | 0.06** | 39.01** | 0.03 | 0.009 | 0.314 | 6.19* | 232.22** |
| C vs V | 1 | 1.784 | 3,590.72** | 0.654 | 0.075 | 344.84** | 0.032 | - 0.011 | 13.869** | 57.32** | 2,162.11** |
| Varieties+Checks vs Varieties | 288 | 62.511* | 97.06** | 22.37* | 0.054** | 37.52** | 0.029 | 0.006 | 0.351 | 4.62 | 108.693 |
| Error323 | 30.136 | 30.285 | 12.233 | 0.024 | 16.846 | 0.022 | 0.006 | - 0.217 | 3.186 | 66.332 |  |
| Source of variation | Degree <br> of freedom | Peduncle length | Green <br> fodder yield/plant | Leafdry weight/ plant | Stem <br> dry weig <br> plant |  |  | eaf: stem ratio | Days to maturity | Seed <br> yield/ <br> plant | $\begin{aligned} & 1000 \text {-seed } \\ & \text { weight } \end{aligned}$ |
| Block (ignoring treatments | 5 | 97.49** | 7,503.87** | 203.14** | * 22.666 | 6347.27 | 27** 0 | 0.489** | 160.77** | 274.45** | 384.01** |
| Treatments (eliminating blocks) | 293 | 15.62* | 676.905 | 2.164 | 14.084 | 417.3 |  | 0.013 | 3.748 | 29.051 | 74.796 |
| Blocks (eliminating treatments) | 5 | 12.15 | 2,193.20 | 15.049 | 25.084 | 464.8 |  | 0.016 | 12.72** | 25.553 | 121.25* |
| Treatment (ignoring blocks) | 293 | 17.08* | 767.531 | 5.374 | 14.043 | 322.1 | 142 | 0.021 | 6.27* | 33.298 | 79.28* |
| Checks | 5 | 95.3** | 7,413.06** | - 6.06 | 23.029 | 927.9 | 956 | 0.016 | 1.783 | 208.87** | 51.983 |
| Varieties | 287 | 15.36* | 645.209 | 5.38 | 13.93 | 22.11 | 114 | 0.021 | 6.37* | 30.176 | 79.94* |
| C vs V | 1 | 119.62** | 2,646.38 | 0.348 | 1.352 |  | 18 | 0.001 | 0.395 | 51.611 | 25.88 |
| Varieties+Checks vs Varieties | 288 | 14.24* | 559.958 | 2.097 | 13.929 | 917.1 | . 138 | 0.013 | 3.782 | 25.929 | 75.192 |
| Error | 25 | 7.798 | 1,047.20 | 6.162 | 17.756 | 630.9 | 918 | 0.02 | 2.89 | 19.524 | 44.903 |

[^0]TABLE 4
Genetic variability parameters for forage yield and its contributing traits in oat (Avena sativa Sp .)

| S. <br> No. | Character | Maximum | Minimum | Grand mean | S.D. | S.E. | CV (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | DF50\%T | 103.00 | 66.00 | 81.29 | 8.06 | 0.47 | 10.16 |
| 2. | PH | 147.03 | 86.74 | 115.34 | 9.72 | 0.57 | 4.73 |
| 3. | FLL | 43.48 | 13.64 | 27.06 | 4.85 | 0.28 | 12.93 |
| 4. | FLW | 2.52 | 0.74 | 1.70 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 9.09 |
| 5. | LL | 59.32 | 26.48 | 43.93 | 6.3 | 0.37 | 9.28 |
| 6. | LW | 2.98 | 1.34 | 1.97 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 7.52 |
| 7. | CD | 0.81 | 0.33 | 0.58 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 13.05 |
| 8. | NN/P | 6.60 | 3.20 | 4.77 | 0.58 | 0.03 | 9.66 |
| 9. | NT/P | 16.00 | 2.60 | 7.70 | 2.23 | 0.13 | 23.55 |
| 10. | NL | 78.17 | 9.80 | 38.63 | 15.97 | 0.93 | 21.5 |
| 11. | PL | 46.94 | 22.48 | 30.76 | 3.88 | 0.23 | 9.03 |
| 12. | GFY | 229.00 | 32.20 | 92.79 | 24.8 | 1.45 | 34.57 |
| 13. | LDW | 16.00 | 2.00 | 5.56 | 1.62 | 0.09 | 44.58 |
| 14. | SDW | 30.40 | 7.60 | 18.47 | 3.96 | 0.23 | 22.8 |
| 15. | DMY | 41.60 | 10.40 | 24.01 | 4.21 | 0.25 | 23.14 |
| 16. | L:S | 1.03 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 41.83 |
| 17. | DTM | 102.00 | 87.00 | 92.19 | 2.1 | 0.12 | 1.84 |
| 18. | SY | 32.00 | 2.4 | 18.21 | 5.12 | 0.3 | 24.11 |
| 19. | 1000 SW | 70.00 | 11 | 37.80 | 9.14 | 0.53 | 17.77 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DT } 50 \% \text { F = Days to } 50 \% \text { flowering } \\ & \text { PH }(\mathrm{cm})=\text { Plant height } \\ & \text { FL }(\mathrm{cm})=\text { Flag leaf length } \\ & \text { FW }(\mathrm{cm})=\text { Flag leaf width } \end{aligned}$ |  | LL (cm) = Leaf length |  | NT/P = No. of tillers per plant |  | DMY (g) = Dry | ld per plant |
|  |  | LW (cm) = Leaf width |  | NL/P = No. of leaves per plant |  | LDW (g) = Leaf | t per plant |
|  |  | $\mathrm{CD}(\mathrm{~cm})=\text { Culm diameter }$ |  | PL (cm) = Peduncle length |  | $\text { SDW }(\mathrm{g})=\text { Stem }$ | ht per plant |
|  |  | $\mathrm{NN} / \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{No}$. of nodes on the main culm |  | GFY (g) = Green fodder yield |  | L:S = leaf: stem |  |

DTM = Days to maturity
SY $(\mathrm{g})=$ Seed yield per plant
1000 SW $(\mathrm{g})=1000$ seed weight
TABLE 5
Genetic variability parameters for forage yield and its contributing traits in oat (Avena sativa Sp.)

| S. | Character | GCV (\%) | PCV (\%) | H2 (bs) \% | G A | GA (as \% of mean) | Skewness | Kurtosis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | DF50\%F | 7.72 | 10.26 | 56.67 | 9.75 | 11.99 | 1.22 ** | 4.0 ** |
| 2 | PH | 6.62 | 8.16 | 65.82 | 12.78 | 11.08 | 0.1 | 3.7 * |
| 3 | FLL | 12.8 | 18.19 | 49.53 | 5.03 | 18.59 | 0.08 | 3.6* |
| 4 | FLW | 10.9 | 14.21 | 58.87 | 0.29 | 17.25 | 0.17 | 4.1 ** |
| 5 | LL | 10.72 | 14.22 | 56.81 | 7.32 | 16.66 | -0.09 | 2.8 |
| 6 | LW | 4.88 | 8.96 | 29.68 | 0.11 | 5.48 | 0.28 | 5.5 ** |
| 7 | CD | 9.62 | 16.24 | 35.06 | 0.07 | 11.75 | 0.06 | 2.8 |
| 8 | NN/P | 6.53 | 11.76 | 30.84 | 0.36 | 7.48 | 0.41 ** | 3.6 |
| 9 | NT/P | 22.52 | 32.32 | 48.56 | 2.49 | 32.38 | 0.74 ** | 3.6 |
| 10 | NL | 33.34 | 39.44 | 71.43 | 22.46 | 58.13 | 0.8 ** | 2.6 |
| 11 | PL | 8.94 | 12.74 | 49.21 | 3.98 | 12.93 | 0.53 ** | 3.9* |
| 12 | GFY | 21.60 | 27.38 | 62.30 | 32.44 | 34.96 | 0.33 * | 3.8 * |
| 13 | LDW | 15.88 | 41.72 | 14.50 | 69.28 | 12.46 | 1.62 ** | 9.7 ** |
| 14 | SDW | 10.6 | 20.21 | 27.49 | 2.11 | 11.42 | -0.14 | 2.6 |
| 15 | DMY | 12.36 | 19.58 | 39.85 | 3.86 | 16.08 | -0.04 | 3.3 |
| 16 | L:S | 11.42 | 43.42 | 6.92 | 0.02 | 6.2 | 1.08 ** | 4.9 ** |
| 17 | DTM | 2.02 | 2.74 | 54.65 | 2.85 | 3.09 | 1.38 ** | 7.2 ** |
| 18 | SY | 17.92 | 30.16 | 35.3 | 4 | 21.97 | -0.21 | 3.6 |
| 19 | 1000 SW | 15.66 | 23.65 | 43.83 | 8.08 | 21.39 | 0.35 * | 3.2 |

DT $50 \%$ F = Days to $50 \%$ floweri
PH $(\mathrm{cm})=$ Plant height
FL $(\mathrm{cm})=$ Flag leaf length
FW $(\mathrm{cm})=$ Flag leaf width
DTM = Days to maturity
SY $(\mathrm{g})=$ Seed yield per plant
1000 SW $(\mathrm{g})=1000$ seed weight

TABLE 6
Correlation analysis for green forage yield and its contributing traits in oat (Avena sativa Sp.)

|  | PH | FL | FW | LL | LW | CD | NN | NT | NL | PL | LDW | SDW | DMW | L:S | DTM | SY | 1000SW | GFY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DT50\% | -0.02 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.02 | -0.13 | -0.16 | 0.08 | 0.033 | 0.066 | 0.029 | 0.192 | -0.093 | 0.17 | 0.06 |
| F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PH |  | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.40 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.28 | -0.09 | -0.12 | 0.37 | -0.05 | 0.024 | -0.004 | -0.009 | -0.130 | 0.100 | -0.04 | 0.27 |
| FL |  |  | 0.24 | 0.54 | 0.10 | 0.20 | -0.11 | -0.03 | -0.20 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.016 | -0.002 | 0.152 | 0.28 | 0.23 |
| FW |  |  |  | 0.20 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.06 | -0.04 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.044 | 0.053 | 0.025 | 0.117 | 0.034 | 0.04 | 0.24 |
| LL |  |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.22 | 0.04 | -0.16 | -0.20 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.027 | 0.063 | 0.075 | -0.026 | 0.035 | 0.12 | 0.18 |
| LW |  |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.032 | 0.03 | 0.019 | 0.101 | -0.09 | 0.08 | 0.004 |
| CD |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | -0.01 | -0.18 | 0.17 | 0.12 | -0.002 | 0.058 | 0.126 | 0.242 | -0.04 | 0.09 | 0.01 |
| NN/P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.12 | -0.10 | 0.03 | 0.09 | -0.042 | 0.014 | 0.108 | 0.051 | -0.11 | -0.19 | 0.07 |
| NT/P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.29 | -0.03 | -0.24 | 0.004 | -0.114 | -0.223 | 0.258 | 0.151 | 0.10 | 0.04 |
| NL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.137 | -0.28 | -0.103 | -0.223 | -0.166 | -0.090 | 0.029 | -0.17 | -0.107 |
| PL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.21 | -0.131 | -0.206 | -0.076 | -0.189 | 0.113 | -0.10 | 0.085 |
| LDW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.162 | 0.622 | 0.757 | 0.311 | -0.349 | 0.022 | 0.24 |
| SDW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.873 | -0.403 | 0.004 | -0.009 | 0.135 | 0.072 |
| DMY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.054 | 0.156 | -0.178 | 0.119 | 0.177 |
| L:S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.276 | -0.279 | -0.06 | 0.083 |
| DTM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.094 | 0.066 | 0.097 |
| SY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.210 | 0.027 |
| 1000 SW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| DT $50 \% \mathrm{~F}=$ Days to $50 \%$ flow <br> PH (cm) = Plant height <br> FL $(\mathrm{cm})=$ Flag leaf length <br> FW (cm) = Flag leaf width |  |  |  | ring | LL (cm) = Leaf length |  |  |  |  |  | NT/P = No. of tillers per plant |  |  |  | DMY (g) = Dry matter yield per plant |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | LW (cm) = Leaf width N |  |  |  |  |  | NL/P $=$ No. of leaves per plant |  |  |  | LDW (g) = Leaf dry weight per plant |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{CD}(\mathrm{cm})=$ Culm diameter $\quad \mathrm{P}$ |  |  |  |  |  | PL (cm) $=$ Peduncle length $\quad$ S |  |  |  | SDW (g)= Stem dry weight per plant |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{NN} / \mathrm{P}=$ No. of nodes on the main culm |  |  |  |  |  | GFY (g) = Green fodder yield L |  |  |  | L:S = leaf: stem ratio |  |  |  |

DTM = Days to maturity
SY $(\mathrm{g})=$ Seed yield per plant
1000 SW $(\mathrm{g})=1000$ seed weight
(mesokurtic). Kurtosis $(?<3)$ indicates the flatness of the curve i.e., platykurtic and if it is $(?>3)$ then it indicates the peak ness of a curve i.e., leptokurtic (Misra et al. 2008). Positive skewness i.e., longer tailed to the right shows dominant and complementary gene action where negative skewness i.e., longer tailed to the left is associated with dominant and duplicate gene action (Pooni et al. 1977). Leptokurtic (positive kurtosis) indicates that traits are governed by fever number of genes and platykurtic (negative kurtosis) shows that traits are governed by large number of genes (Kapur et al. 1981).

In the present study most of the trait showed almost normal distribution (i.e., skewness estimated not significantly different from -0.5 to 0.5 and kurtosis is 3 respectively) (Table-5). On the other hand, most of the traits had distribution pattern showing deviation from normality i.e., showed significant skewness trait like days to $50 \%$ flowering, number of tillers per plant, number of leaves of per plant, leaf dry weight per plant, leaf: stem ratio and days to maturity.

Similarly, most of the trait showed leptokurtic distribution pattern (i.e., Kurtosis estimates significantly more than 3.0 ) and Leaf length, culm diameter, number of leaves per plant, stem dry weight per plant, dry matter weight and 1000 seed weight exhibited negative kurtosis (platykurtic). Kar et al.
(2019) observed leptokurtic for seed yield per plant in sesame.

## CORRELATION AND PATH ANALYSIS

Relationship between various morphological traits and green fodder yield was also worked out and presented in (Table 6). It is clear from the table that high positive correlation for green fodder yield was shown by leaf dry weight per plant, dry matter yield per plant, stem dry weight per plant and leaf width.

Correlation coefficients were not enough to determine traits as selection criteria in our study. In agriculture, path analyses have been used by plant breeders to assist in identifying traits that are useful as selection criteria to improve crop yield (Dewey \& Lu, 1959; Milligan et al. 1990). Path analysis was conducted to determine direct and indirect effect of traits on oat yield, and the results from path analysis are given in (Table 7). dry matter weight was followed by plant height, flag leaf width, flag leaf length, number of tillers per plant, peduncle length, days to maturity, seed yield per plant, number of leaves per plant, 1000 seed weight and days to $50 \%$ flowering showed significant positive correlation as well as positive direct effect on dependent character green fodder yield.
TABLE 7
Path matrix for green forage yield in oats (Avena sativa L.)

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { D T } \\ 50 \% \text { F } \end{gathered}$ | P H | FL | FW | LL | LW | CD | NN | N T | NL | PL | LDW | SDW | DMW | L:S | DTM | SY | 1000 | $r^{2}$ with SW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DT 50\% F | 0.025 | -0.004 | 0.010 | 0.013 | 0.000 | -0.005 | -0.010 | -0.005 | 0.001 | -0.005 | -0.010 | -0.032 | -0.080 | 0.169 | -0.019 | 0.009 | -0.004 | 0.005 | 0.06 |
| PH | 0.000 | 0.271 | 0.030 | 0.026 | -0.012 | -0.002 | -0.003 | -0.012 | -0.006 | -0.005 | 0.023 | 0.020 | -0.057 | -0.011 | 0.006 | -0.006 | 0.004 | -0.001 | 0.27 |
| FL | 0.002 | 0.065 | 0.125 | 0.057 | -0.016 | -0.011 | -0.013 | 0.005 | -0.002 | -0.008 | 0.011 | -0.005 | -0.014 | 0.031 | -0.011 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0.008 | 0.23 |
| FW | 0.001 | 0.029 | 0.030 | 0.240 | -0.006 | -0.057 | -0.014 | -0.007 | 0.004 | -0.002 | 0.010 | -0.014 | -0.105 | 0.135 | -0.017 | 0.006 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.24 |
| LL | 0.000 | 0.108 | 0.067 | 0.048 | -0.030 | -0.015 | -0.015 | -0.002 | -0.011 | -0.008 | 0.019 | -0.034 | -0.064 | 0.162 | -0.050 | -0.001 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.18 |
| LW | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.012 | 0.118 | -0.004 | -0.117 | -0.022 | 0.003 | 0.002 | 0.006 | 0.014 | -0.003 | -0.076 | 0.076 | -0.013 | 0.005 | -0.004 | 0.002 | 0.004 |
| CD | 0.004 | 0.011 | 0.024 | 0.048 | -0.007 | -0.037 | -0.069 | -0.002 | -0.001 | -0.007 | 0.010 | -0.048 | 0.004 | 0.150 | -0.085 | 0.012 | -0.002 | 0.003 | 0.01 |
| NN/P | 0.003 | 0.075 | -0.013 | 0.039 | -0.001 | 0.007 | -0.004 | -0.044 | -0.008 | -0.004 | 0.002 | -0.037 | 0.099 | 0.035 | -0.073 | 0.002 | -0.005 | -0.005 | 0.07 |
| NT/P | 0.001 | -0.024 | -0.003 | 0.015 | 0.005 | -0.004 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.068 | 0.012 | -0.002 | 0.097 | -0.009 | -0.292 | 0.150 | 0.012 | 0.007 | 0.003 | 0.04 |
| NL | -0.003 | -0.032 | -0.025 | -0.009 | 0.006 | -0.018 | 0.013 | 0.004 | 0.020 | 0.040 | 0.009 | 0.114 | 0.244 | -0.571 | 0.112 | -0.004 | 0.001 | -0.005 | -0.107 |
| PL | -0.004 | 0.100 | 0.021 | 0.039 | -0.009 | -0.026 | -0.011 | -0.001 | -0.002 | 0.005 | 0.062 | 0.083 | 0.312 | -0.528 | 0.051 | -0.009 | 0.005 | -0.003 | 0.085 |
| LDW | 0.002 | -0.014 | 0.002 | 0.008 | -0.003 | -0.001 | -0.008 | -0.004 | -0.016 | -0.011 | -0.013 | -0.400 | -0.385 | 1.592 | -0.509 | 0.015 | -0.016 | 0.001 | 0.24 |
| SDW | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.001 | 0.011 | -0.001 | -0.004 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.000 | -0.004 | -0.008 | -0.065 | -2.378 | 2.236 | 0.271 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.072 |
| DMW | 0.002 | -0.001 | 0.001 | 0.013 | -0.002 | -0.003 | -0.004 | -0.001 | -0.008 | -0.009 | -0.013 | -0.249 | -2.076 | 2.560 | -0.036 | 0.007 | -0.008 | 0.003 | 0.177 |
| L:S | 0.001 | -0.002 | 0.002 | 0.006 | -0.002 | -0.002 | -0.009 | -0.005 | -0.015 | -0.007 | -0.005 | -0.303 | 0.959 | 0.138 | -0.672 | 0.013 | -0.013 | -0.002 | 0.083 |
| DTM | 0.005 | -0.035 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.001 | -0.012 | -0.017 | -0.002 | 0.017 | -0.004 | -0.012 | -0.124 | -0.009 | 0.401 | -0.186 | 0.047 | -0.004 | 0.002 | 0.097 |
| SY | -0.002 | 0.027 | 0.019 | 0.008 | -0.001 | 0.010 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.007 | 0.140 | 0.022 | -0.456 | 0.187 | -0.004 | 0.045 | 0.006 | 0.027 |
| 1000 SW | 0.004 | -0.011 | 0.035 | 0.009 | -0.004 | -0.009 | -0.006 | 0.008 | 0.007 | -0.007 | -0.006 | -0.009 | -0.321 | 0.306 | 0.043 | 0.003 | 0.009 | 0.029 | 0.08 |

$\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{NT} / \mathrm{P}=\text { No. of tillers per plant } & \text { DMY }(\mathrm{g})=\text { Dry matter yield per plant } & \text { DTM }=\text { Days to maturity } \\ \text { NL/P }=\text { No. of leaves per plant } & \text { LDW }(\mathrm{g})=\text { Leaf dry weight per plant } & \text { SY }(\mathrm{g})=\text { Seed yield per pla }\end{array}$
SDW $(\mathrm{g})=$ Stem dry weight per plant 1000 SW $(\mathrm{g})=1000$ seed weight L:S = leaf: stem ratio
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