



Enumeration of Genetic Parameters and Genetic Diversity of Morpho-Physiological Traits in CIMMYT Bread Wheat Accessions [*Triticum aestivum* (L.) em. Thell]

Aavula Naveen ^{a*}, V. K. Mishra ^a, B. Sinha ^a, A. Sree Harika ^a, Patel Supriya ^b and M. B. Reddy ^a

^a Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, 221005, India.

^b Rani Lakshmbai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh, 284003, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Authors VKM and BS planned and designed and reviewed the research work. Author AN recorded, compiled the data and prepared the manuscript. Authors ASH, PS and MBR did data analysis and reviewed the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2023/v13i102696

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/101641>

Original Research Article

Received: 03/06/2023

Accepted: 07/08/2023

Published: 19/08/2023

ABSTRACT

Fifty genotypes of CIMMYT bread wheat were evaluated at Agricultural Research Farm, BHU, Varanasi during 2019-2020. The analysis of variance revealed significant differences among genotypes for all traits. High Phenotypic coefficient of variation was recorded compared to the genotypic coefficient of variation. However, high genotypic coefficients of variation were found particularly for: grain yield per plot (8.71), harvest index (9.22), test weight (8.9), normalized difference vegetative index (9.59) and chlorophyll content (9.79), suggesting that these traits are

*Corresponding author: E-mail: aavulanaveenyadav1997@gmail.com;

having ample genetic potential for selection amongst genotypes, in breeding programs. The highest broad sense heritability manifested for harvest index (91.61%); remaining traits showed moderate estimates of heritability. Low to moderate genetic advance as percent mean was estimated for all the traits studied. This suggests the existence of variability for agronomic traits in the studied wheat genotypes which, should be exploited during future breeding programmes. Fifty genotypes were divided into six non-overlapping distinct clusters using tocher's method based on Euclidean distances. Thirty-one genotypes were classified in the first cluster accounting 62% of total genotypes followed by 15 genotypes categorized in the second cluster. The remaining four clusters have one genotype each. Divergence and cluster mean show that, crossings between genotypes of clusters (II, III), and VI could lead to recovery of good transgressive segregants for maximum heterosis in wheat varietal improvement.

Keywords: PCV; GCV; heritability; genetic advance as percent mean; genetic diversity; genetic variability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* (L.) em. Thell; $2n = 6x = 42$) is one of the most important cereals of the world, belonging to the Poaceae family. It, accounts for one-sixth of all agricultural land [1]. Wheat is cultivated on about 220.83 mha with an annual yield of about 769.31 million tonnes [2]. It is anticipated that by 2050, demand for wheat will have expanded by 50%, from current levels. There is no way to expand the area under production [3]. The only remaining option therefore, is to boost productivity by developing better high yielding wheat varieties and better, management of crop production.

The Global Wheat Program of the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT), is one of the most important public sources of nutritious, high-yielding, disease- and climate-resilient wheat varieties for Africa, Asia, and Latin America. CIMMYT is therefore, a central pillar for more resilient agri-food systems in the above said continents countries [4]. CIMMYT breeding lines can be traced in the pedigree of varieties sown on over 60 mha, around the world [2].

Grain yield is a highly complex polygenic trait that is influenced by many component traits and the environment [5]. Increasing yield through direct selection is difficult thus, component traits should be considered while selecting to increase yield. Understanding the genetic makeup of various yield traits, is crucial for this purpose [5]. Variability can be additionally partitioned into phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) which, further aids in the selection of potential genotypes from amongst the available germplasm. The coefficient of variation simply

reveals the level of variability existing for traits, but it provided no information on the heritable portion of that existing variability [6]. In order to analyse the relative contributions of genetic and non-genetic components to the overall phenotypic variance in a population, it is important to consider both, heritability, and genetic variability. Genetic advance is the estimation of expected gain resulting from selection pressure on the breeding material. High heritability associated with high genetic advance for different yield components has a better scope for selecting high-yielding genotypes [7]. Hence heritability and genetic advance are critical selection parameters.

Crop genetic diversity provides an opportunity to develop varieties that are widely adapted to a specific environment [8]. In order to address changing end-user demands, increase productivity and adaptability to unpredictable climate change are desirable in a crop. Crop genetic diversity is regarded as a source of novel alleles for crop development [9]. The greater the genetic separation between parents, the more is the possibility to produce heterosis in progeny [10]. Therefore, the present investigation was carried out to achieve information on various genetic parameters and genetic diversity existing in important morpho-physiological traits in CIMMYT bread wheat accessions.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Plant Materials and Phenotypic Evaluations

Material used for the experiment was sown during *Rabi* season 2019-20 at the Agriculture Research Farm, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, consisting of 49 diverse genotypes of

bread wheat collected from CIMMYT, Mexico along with local check variety DBW 187 (Supplementary Table 1). The material was sown in randomized block design (RBD) with 2 replications by maintaining inter-plot gap of 50 cm and within each replication, genotypes were sown in 6 rows of 5 m length with an inter-row spacing of 20 cm and plant to plant spacing of 5 cm. Recommended agronomic practices and plant protection measures were followed to raise a healthy crop. Weather conditions during the crop season are given in Supplementary Fig. 1.

The observations were recorded on thirteen traits like germination percentage (GNP), days to 50% flowering (DTFF), days to maturity (DTM), chlorophyll content (CFC), normalized difference vegetative index (NDVI), canopy temperature (CNTP) in °C, plant height (PTH) in cm, spike length (SKL) in cm, tillers per square metre (TPSM), test weight (TWT) in grams, biological yield per plot (BYPP) in kg, grain yield per plot (GYPP) in kg, harvest index (HI) in %. With a Minolta SPAD-502 Chlorophyll metre, CFC was measured at the heading and anthesis phases, while CNTP was measured from the vegetative stage to dough stages using, a hand-held infrared thermometer.

2.2 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (Panse and Sukhatme [11] model) were carried out using INDOSTAT software. GCV and PCV were calculated as per the standard formula suggested by Searle [12]. The formula provided by Allard [13] was used to calculate genetic advance as percentage of mean (GAM) and broad sense heritability (h^2_b). Mahalanobis [14] D^2 statistic was used to measure the genetic divergence among 50 genotypes.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Phenotypic Evaluation

ANOVA showed significant differences among the genotypes indicating presence of sufficient variability in the germplasm for the studied traits suggesting, ample scope for further improvement (Table 1). Similar results were also reported by Arya et al., [15], and Upadhyay et al., [16].

The range and mean value of all the traits have been provided in Supplementary Table 2. TPSM showed a wider variation of 61(ACC-12) to 103 (ACC-30) with a mean value of 85. The lowest

and highest value of GNP was observed in ACC-29 (78%) and ACC-47 (110%) respectively with a mean value of 92%. The lowest and highest values for DTFF were observed in ACC-47 (70 days) and ACC-46 (88 days) respectively with an average value of 78 days. The lowest and highest values of CNTP were observed in ACC-42 (22.13°C) and ACC-27 (32.74°C) respectively, with a population mean of 25.36°C. The lowest and highest values of NDVI recorded in ACC-22 (46.09) and ACC-37 (82.14) respectively with an average value of 62.49. DTM exhibited a range from 103 (ACC-10) to 138 days (ACC-32,33) with a mean value of 117 days. CFC ranged from 34.67(ACC-23) to 56.25(ACC-17) with a mean of 42.99. For PTH lowest and highest values were recorded in ACC-18 (82.7 cm) and ACC-38 (117.1 cm) respectively with an average of 98.8 cm. SKL ranged from 9.4(ACC-9,11,31) to 14.9cm (ACC-14.9) with a mean of 11.34 cm. BYPP ranged from 6.85(ACC-18) to 11.66kg (ACC-32, ACC-33) with a population mean of 8.58 kg. GYPP ranged from 1.71(ACC-41) to 3.57kg (ACC-36) with a population mean of 2.72 kg. TWT ranged from 28.65 (ACC-41) to 55.03 g (ACC-6) with a population mean of 44.22 g. HI ranged from 24.41(ACC-41) to 39.11%(ACC-36) with a population mean of 32.19%. GYPP ranged from 1.71(ACC-41) to 3.57kg (ACC-36) with a population mean of 2.74.

3.2 Genotypic and Phenotypic Variability

The study revealed that, PCV were higher than their corresponding GCV for all the traits among the genotypes (Fig. 1). This indicates that, characters were influenced by the environment. Selection based on phenotype alone, can be effective for the traits where variation between PCV and GCV were less, means such traits are less influenced by the environment. These findings are in agreement with a previous study in wheat [16].

Low values of GCV were observed for all different traits as follows; for CFC (9.79), NDVI (9.59), HI (9.22), TWT (8.9), GYP (8.71), TPSM (8.073), BYPP (7.795), SKL (6.945), CNTP (5.88), DTM (5.79), GNP (4.04), DTFF (4.026) suggesting that there is a little scope for direct selection. Hence increasing variability through hybridization, mutation or through special techniques is needed for selection to be carried out in these traits. Moderate PCV values were observed for TWT (15.58), GYPP (15.27), BYPP (13.64), NDVI (13.16) while, lower values were recorded for GNP (6.42), DTFF (7.05) among the

traits. A wide difference between GCV and PCV was observed for TWT (6.689), GYPP (6.566), SKL (5.234), and BYPP (5.847) respectively, indicating the influence of environment on these traits. However, the least difference was observed in HI (0.413), GNP (2.38), and CFC (2.98) indicating that, these traits have a high heritable genetic variation and are less influenced by the environment. The current results are in agreement with previous studies in wheat [15,16].

3.3 Heritability and Genetic Advance

Estimates of heritability and GAM are presented in Supplementary Table 2. The highest value of heritability was revealed by HI (91.61), while all remaining traits showed moderate estimates of heritability. Heritability estimations aid plant breeders in choosing superior genotypes from a variety of genetic groups. Similar results were also observed in previous studies [17-19]. The highest GAM was recorded for HI (18.19) and lowest for GNP (5.25). Similar findings have also been reported by previous studies [16,17,20,21].

A character with high heritability does not necessarily also have high genetic advance [22]. A character may be assessed more precisely when heritability and genetic advance are investigated together, [23]. Consequently, Heritability estimates and GAM are typically more useful in finding gene action that is involved in the expression of different polygenic traits along with, estimating the gain. High heritability coupled with moderate GAM was observed for HI

(91.61 and 18.19) while moderate heritability with moderate GAM was recorded for NDVI (53.13 and 14.40), TPSM (42.93 and 10.89), CFC (58.76 and 15.47), TWT (32.59 and 10.46), and GYPP (32.51 and 10.23). Remaining traits exhibited moderate heritability coupled with, low GAM. Estimates of heritability, genetic advance, PCV, GCV for all the traits are displayed in Fig. 1.

3.4 Genetic Divergence (D²) Analysis

One effective method of determining genetic divergence is D² analysis [14]. To calculate the relative contribution of each component trait to the overall divergence and to measure the degree of differentiation at the intra- and inter-cluster levels, D² statistics is useful. Fifty genotypes were divided into six non-overlapping distinct clusters using Tocher's method based on, Euclidean distances so that, the genotypes within each cluster had lower D² values than the genotypes between the clusters (Fig. 2). Similar findings have been reported by earlier studies through Tocher's method for genotypes clustering (Tsegaye et al., 2014) [15,24,25]. Table 2 shows the percent contribution of each trait towards total genetic divergence. The more a trait contributes to diversity, the more times it ranked first. The traits like GYPP ranked a greater number of times (196) in first position and showed the highest percent contribution (15.65%) towards total genetic divergence followed by, TWT (13.55), and PTH (13.34). Lowest percent contribution was reported by the trait CNTP (0.24) followed by, DTFF (1.71).

Table 1. Analysis of variance for 13 morpho-physiological traits in 50 bread wheat accessions

Sl.No.	Source	Mean Sum of Squares (MSS)		
		Replication	Treatment	Error
	Degrees of freedom	1	49	49
1	GNP	4.0760	48.499**	20.953
2	DTFF	11.4580	39.868**	20.3
3	CNTP	6.6820	9.11*	4.656
4	NDVI	0.8850	103.58**	31.696
5	DTM	128.6180	188.278**	85.935
6	CFC	22.5630	47.931**	12.449
7	TPSM	0.3270	155.782**	62.202
8	PTH	13.3740	100.39*	51.31
9	SKL	0.6270	2.526**	1.286
10	BYPP	0.0180	1.817**	0.923
11	TWT	14.3110	63.024**	32.037
12	HI	1.610	18.455**	0.807
13	GYPP	0.0010	0.231**	0.118

* Significant at P = 0.05, ** Significant at P = 0.01

Where, GNP- Germination Percentage; DTFF- Days to 50 % Flowering; DTM- Days to Maturity; CFC- Chlorophyll Content; NDVI- Normalized Difference Vegetative Index; CNTP- Canopy Temperature; PTH- Plant Height (cm); SKL- Spike Length(cm); TPSM- Tillers Per Square Metre; TWT- Test Weight (g); BYPP- Biological Yield Per Plot (Kg); GYPP- Grain Yield Per Plot (Kg); HI- Harvest Index (%)




Fig. 1. Graphical representation of genetic parameters of variation (GCV, PCV, genetic advance (5%), genetic advance as percent of mean (5%), h²_b for 13 traits among 50 bread wheat accessions

*Abbreviations: GCV-Genotypic coefficient of variation, PCV-phenotypic coefficient of variation, h²_b-Broad Sense heritability

Table 2. Percent contribution of each trait towards total genetic divergence

Sl. No.	Source	Contribution (%)	Times ranked 1 st
1	GNP	4.24	53
2	DTFF	1.71	21
3	CNTP	0.24	3
4	NDVI	8.5	106
5	DTM	6.54	82
6	CFC	4.98	62
7	TPSM	2.38	30
8	PTH	13.34	167
9	SKL	9.62	120
10	BYPP	6.9	86
11	TWT	13.55	169
12	HI	12.35	154
13	GYPP	15.65	196

Cluster I had the most genotypes (31), followed by cluster II (15), while clusters III, IV, V, VI had just one genotype each (Table 3). Even though a particular cluster was produced, the genotypes within it were obtained from various locations. The genotype clustering pattern showed that, the genotypes acquired from the same location did not make up a single cluster. This shows that genetic and geographic diversity are not always related. Similar results were also reported by an earlier study [16].

In the current study, intra-cluster distances were lower than inter-cluster distances indicating the presence of a high degree of genetic diversity (Fig. 3). Cluster II recorded the largest intra-

cluster distance (553.67), followed by cluster I (500.53). While clusters III, IV, V and VI had only one genotype, no intra-cluster distance was thus, found (Table 4). It may therefore be concluded that, genotypes inside a cluster with a high degree of divergence would offer more suitable breeding materials for crop improvement [26].

The inter-cluster distance values ranged from 553.13 to 1908.08 (Table 4). Cluster II and VI had the largest inter-cluster distance (1908.08), followed by cluster II and III (1774.78). The genotypes found in these clusters had a wide range of genetic diversity and might be employed in a wheat hybridization programme to recover better transgressive segregants, aiding the




Fig. 2. Dendrogram of 50 bread wheat accessions for 13 traits

Table 3. Clustering of 50 bread wheat accessions by Tocher’s optimization method

Cluster group	No. of genotypes	List of genotypes
1 Cluster	31	ACC-32, ACC-33, ACC-50, ACC-26, ACC-40, ACC-44, ACC-49, ACC-35, ACC-34, ACC-4, ACC-9, ACC-8, ACC-15, ACC-31, ACC-13, ACC-36, ACC-23, ACC-39, ACC-27, ACC-45, ACC-14, ACC-42, ACC-43, ACC-46, ACC-48, ACC-24, ACC-1, ACC-30, ACC-19, ACC-28 & ACC-3
2 Cluster	15	ACC-2, ACC-5, ACC-16, ACC-21, ACC-7, ACC-25, ACC-20, ACC-18, ACC-12, ACC-6, ACC-17, ACC-11, ACC-22, ACC-10 & ACC-29
3 Cluster	1	ACC-38
4 Cluster	1	ACC-41
5 Cluster	1	ACC-37
6 Cluster	1	ACC-47

Table 4. Average intra cluster (diagonal) – inter cluster distances

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5	Cluster 6
Cluster 1	500.53	970.94	796.76	814.50	862.76	1100.85
Cluster 2	970.94	553.67	1774.78	1463.05	1180.62	1908.08
Cluster 3	796.76	1774.78	0.00	1557.04	553.13	895.55
Cluster 4	814.50	1463.05	1557.04	0.00	1228.44	1474.54
Cluster 5	862.76	1180.62	553.13	1228.44	0.00	1083.11
Cluster 6	1100.85	1908.08	895.55	1474.54	1083.11	0.00




Fig. 3. Cluster diagram of 50 bread wheat accessions using Tocher method

Table 5. Cluster means for 13 morpho -physiological traits in 50 bread wheat accessions

	GNP	DTFF	CNTP	NDVI	DTM	CFC	TPSM	PTH	SKL	BYPP	TWT	HI	GYPP
Cluster 1	91.48	78.97	25.28	62.20	128.48	42.61	87.39	100.39	11.59	8.89	42.69	31.69	2.79
Cluster 2	91.15	74.64	25.44	59.50	111.76	43.32	77.71	94.78	10.88	7.90	48.42	33.79	2.65
Cluster 3	93.09	83.09	24.54	76.45	133.02	38.44	89.91	117.12	12.55	9.10	44.79	30.29	2.70
Cluster 4	88.13	79.13	27.57	66.96	133.02	44.71	86.41	84.53	10.42	7.16	28.65	24.41	1.71
Cluster 5	88.14	84.22	26.05	82.14	116.83	46.97	88.41	105.35	10.96	9.72	42.19	32.95	3.20
Cluster 6	110.75	70.65	24.53	78.35	133.01	48.47	96.92	100.83	10.42	8.90	45.76	32.48	2.89

production of high yielding varieties. The smallest inter-cluster distances were found between clusters III and V (553.13), demonstrating a close association between these clusters and indicating that, they would not lead to satisfying outcomes [27,28].

The cluster means of all studied traits are presented in Table 5 above. The differences between the clusters for each trait were

revealed by the values of the cluster means for those traits. GNP cluster mean values ranged from 88.13 (cluster IV) to 110.75 (cluster VI). Cluster means of DTFF varied from 70.65 (cluster II) to 84.22 cm (cluster V). For CNTP cluster means ranged from 24.53 (cluster VI) to 27.57 (cluster IV). For NDVI cluster means ranged from 59.50 (cluster II) to 82.14 (cluster V). DTM cluster mean values ranged from 111.76 (cluster II) to 133.02 (cluster III and IV).

CFC cluster mean values ranged from 38.44 (cluster III) to 48.47 (cluster VI). TPSM cluster mean values ranged from 77.71 (cluster II) to 96.92 (cluster VI). For PTH cluster means ranged from 84.53 (cluster IV) to 117.12 (cluster III). For SKL cluster means ranged from 10.42 (cluster IV and VI) to 12.55 (cluster III). For BYPP cluster means ranged from 7.16 (cluster IV) to 9.72 (cluster V). Cluster means of TWT varied from 28.65 (cluster IV) to 48.42 (cluster II). Cluster means of HI varied from 24.41 (cluster IV) to 33.79 (cluster II). GYPP Cluster means varied from 1.71 (cluster IV) to 3.20 (cluster I). The highest mean value for DTM and the lowest for GYPP were observed among all clusters. Results on divergence and cluster mean reveal that, crossings between genotypes of clusters II, III, and VI could lead to achievement of maximum heterosis and recovery of better transgressive segregants; for wheat improvement [15].

4. CONCLUSION

Wide range of variability for most of the traits were observed among the germplasm accessions evaluated, indicating a considerable scope for the selection of desired genotypes that contribute directly or indirectly towards crop improvement. High heritability with high genetic advance was recorded for grain yield per plot, representing the contribution of on additive gene effect and the probability of improving the traits, by selection. It is possible to determine the type of gene action involved in the manifestation of various polygenic traits as well as, estimate the genetic advance, under selection, by using the derived heritability estimates and genetic advance. Divergence and cluster mean show that genotype crosses among clusters II, III, and VI may lead to higher heterosis and, recovery of best transgressive segregants for the development of better wheat varieties/hybrids.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Aavula Naveen extremely thankful to the department of genetics and plant breeding, faculty of agriculture, Banaras Hindu University for infrastructural support and, CYMMIT for providing material for the research.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Kumar S. (Ed.). The role of bioinformatics in agriculture (1st ed.). Apple Academic Press; 2014.
Available: <https://doi.org/10.1201/b16568>
2. Giraldo P, Benavente E, Manzano-Agugliaro F, Gimenez E. Worldwide research trends on wheat and barley: A bibliometric comparative analysis. *Agronomy*. 2019;9(7):352.
Available: <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy9070352>
3. CIMMYT; 2022.
Available: <https://www.cimmyt.org/work/wheat-research/>
4. Dreisigacker S, Crossa J, Pérez-Rodríguez P, Montesinos-López OA, Rosyara U, Juliana P, Mondal S, Crespo-Herrera L, Govindan V, Singh RP, Braun HJ. Implementation of genomic selection in the CIMMYT global wheat program, findings from the past 10 years. *Crop Breeding, Genetics and Genomics*. 2021;3(2).
5. Kumari M, Kumar M, Singh V, Kumar SV, Rathi M. Trait association and morphological diversity in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) genotypes. *Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding*. 2017;8(2):534-540.
6. Nzuve F, Githiri S, Mukunya DM, Gethi J. Genetic variability and correlation studies of grain yield and related agronomic traits in maize. *Journal of Agricultural Science*. 2014;6(9):166.
7. Thapa RS, Sharma PK, Pratap D, Singh T, Kumar A. Assessment of genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) genotypes under normal and heat stress environment. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2019;53(1):51-56.
8. Govindaraj M, Vetriventhan M, Srinivasan M. Importance of genetic diversity assessment in crop plants and its recent advances: An overview of its analytical perspectives. *Genetics Research International*. 2015:431-487.
9. Tester M, Langridge P. Breeding technologies to increase crop production in a changing world. *Science*. 2010;327(5967):818-822.
10. Joshi AB, Dhawan NL. Genetic improvement in yield with special reference to self-fertilizing crops. *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding*. 1966;26A: 101-113.

11. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi; 1969.
12. Searle SR. Phenotypic, genotypic and environmental correlations. Biometrics. 1961;17:474-480.
13. Allard RW. Principles of plant breeding. John Wiley and Sons. Inc, New York; 1960.
14. Mahalanobis PC. On the generalized distance in statistics. National Institute of Science of India; 1936.
15. Arya VK, Singh V, Kumar L, Kumar R, Kumar P, Chand P. Genetic variability and diversity analysis for yield and its components in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Indian Journal of Agricultural Research. 2017;51(2):128- 134.
16. Upadhyay P, Krishna S, Thakur P, Agrawal N, Yadav P, Prasad LC, Mishra VK. Identification of genetic variability and diversity in selected wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) germplasm under three different dates of sowing. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2020;9(2):82-86.
17. Mohsin T, Khan N, Naqvi FN. Heritability, phenotypic correlation and path coefficient studies for some agronomic characters in synthetic elite lines of wheat. Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment. 2009;7 (3-4):278-282.
18. Bayisa T, Tefera H, Letta T. Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance among bread wheat genotypes at South-Eastern Ethiopia. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. 2020;9(4):128.
19. Bhanu AN, Arun B, Mishra VK. Genetic variability, heritability and correlation study of physiological and yield traits in relation to heat tolerance in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research. 2018;2 (1):2112-2116.
20. Roy A, Kumar A, Singh A, Mandi A, Barman M. Analysis of genetic diversity and correlation studies on grain yield and its component characters in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. em Thell) genotypes. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(5):341-345.
21. Yadav N, Dashora A, Choudhary U, Dave M, Rathore J. Assessment of genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) Genotypes, The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(9):528-530.
22. Johnson HW, Robinson HF, Comstock RE. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans 1. Agronomy Journal. 1955;47(7):314-318.
23. Dudley JW, Moll RH. Interpretation and use of estimates of heritability and genetic variances in plant breeding 1. Crop Science. 1969;9(3):257-262.
24. Kumar B, Singh CM, Jaiswal KK. Genetic variability, association and diversity studies in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). The Bioscan. 2013;8(1):143-147.
25. Devesh P, Moitra PK, Shukla RS, Pandey S. Genetic diversity and principal component analyses for yield, yield components and quality traits of advanced lines of wheat. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2019;8(3):4834-4839.
26. Dobariya KL, Ribadia KH, Padhar PR, Ponkia HP. Analysis of genetic divergence in some synthetic lines of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Advances in Plant Sciences. 2006;19(1):221-225.
27. Santosh JP, Jaiswal AS, Gahatyari NC. Genetic diversity analysis in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. em Thell.) for yield and physiological traits. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8(2):3059-3068.
28. Singh G, Kumar R. Genetic diversity for yield and yield traits in wheat. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(5):2062-2066.

© 2023 Naveen et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/101641>