



Correlation Studies in Relation to Micro-Climate in Summer Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L).

KEYWORDS

Photosynthesis, CO₂ Conc., LUE, APAR, *Arachis hypogaea* L**D. D. Dudhade**

Department of Agronomy, Post Graduate Institute, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri.

A. D. Tumbare

Department of Agronomy, Post Graduate Institute, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri.

R. R. Hasure

Department of Agronomy, Post Graduate Institute, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri.

ABSTRACT

The dry pod yield was positively and highly significant correlated with all the characters under study during the year 2009 and 2010, except APAR during the year 2009. The LUE was positively and highly significantly correlated with all the growth and yield contributing characters under study during both the years indicating its importance in development of growth and yield attributes and ultimately dry pod yield.

Introduction

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) is a world prospective oilseed crop grown in almost all the tropical and sub-tropical countries. Yield is a complex character, which is influenced by micro-meteorological and physiological parameters. The equally dependent of these characters will influence kernel yield either directly or indirectly. Correlation coefficient study is used for the relationship of micro-meteorological and physiological parameters. Hence in the present investigation, such correlation study was carried out in summer groundnut under different irrigation regimes and sowing dates.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth Rahuri, (M.S.) in summer seasons of 2009 and 2010. The experimental plot had medium black soil low in available nitrogen 222 kg ha⁻¹, medium in available phosphorus 21.7 kg ha⁻¹, and high in available potash 313 kg ha⁻¹ with slight alkaline in reaction (pH 8.2). The experiment was conducted in Strip Design with three replications, comprising four irrigation regimes viz; i) 0.6 PE (Micro sprinkler) ii) 0.8 PE (Micro sprinkler) iii) 1.0 PE (Micro sprinkler) iv) 1.0 IW :CPE (Surface irrigation) and three sowing dates viz; i) 7th MW (12-18 February) ii) 9th MW (26 February- 4 March) iii) 11th MW (12-18 March). The Broad Bed Furrows were prepared by using a tractor drawn ridger. Each experimental unit was with gross plot size of 6.00 m x 3.00 m and net plot size of 5.60 m x 1.80

m. The groundnut variety TAG-24 was sown as per treatments during both the years. The spacing of the crop was 30 cm x 7.5 cm row per bed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The dry pod yield was positively and highly significantly correlated with all growth attributing characters and micro-meteorological parameters during both the years except APAR during the year 2009. The LUE was positively and highly significantly correlated with plant height, no. of branches plant⁻¹, no. of leaves plant⁻¹, leaf area dry matter and no. of pods plant⁻¹ during both the years except APAR during the year 2009, indicating its importance in development of growth and yield attributes. Important yield attributes viz; number of pods plant⁻¹, shelling percentage and test weight were positively and highly significantly correlated with all the growth attributes, micro meteorological and physiological parameters during both the years indicating that these were influenced by micro-metrological and physiological parameters.

The important characters viz; leaf area and dry matter plant⁻¹ were showed positive and highly significantly correlation with other growth attributes, physiological and micrometeorological parameters as well as dry pod and haulm yield during both the years indicating that their important role in higher biological productivity. Similar results were reported by Sumathi *et al.*, (2007), Mane *et al.*, (2008) and Parameshwarappa *et al.*, (2008).

Table 1. Correlation studies between growth and yield parameters with micro-meteorological and physiological parameters during 2009 at harvest.

	Dry Pod Yield	Plant height	Branches	Leaves	Leaf area	DM	P _n	CO ₂	APAR	LUE	GDD	Pods Plant ⁻¹	Shelling %	Test Wt.	Haulm yield
Yield															
Plant height	0.932**														
Branches	0.869**	0.913**													
Leaves	0.928**	0.878**	0.863**												
Leaf area	0.909**	0.869**	0.807**	0.971**											
DM	0.811**	0.786**	0.685*	0.845**	0.931**										
P _n	0.798**	0.846**	0.743**	0.815**	0.890**	0.891**									

CO ₂	0.850**	0.787**	0.651*	0.859**	0.944**	0.946**	0.886**										
APAR	0.479	NS	NS	NS	0.614*	0.715**	0.686*	0.663*									
LUE	0.742**	0.719**	0.697*	0.783**	0.831**	0.809**	0.671*	0.793**	NS								
GDD	0.791**	0.887**	0.923**	0.829**	0.793**	0.646*	0.807**	0.613*	NS	0.646*							
Pods plant ⁻¹	0.890**	0.909**	0.912**	0.940**	0.891**	0.741**	0.825**	0.734**	NS	0.730**	0.947**						
Shelling%	0.867**	0.891**	0.841**	0.911**	0.951**	0.917**	0.960**	0.886**	0.592*	0.792**	0.877**	0.908**					
Test Wt.	0.880**	0.864**	0.720**	0.850**	0.932**	0.917**	0.954**	0.960**	0.612*	0.773**	0.746**	0.811**	0.940**				
Haulm yield	0.992**	0.929**	0.846**	0.923**	0.927**	0.868**	0.844**	0.892**	NS	0.758**	0.773**	0.873**	0.899**	0.917**			

* Significant at 5 % level

** Significant at 1 % level

Table 2. Correlation studies between growth and yield parameters with micro-meteorological and physiological parameters during 2010 at harvest.

	Dry Pod Yield	Plant height	Branches	Leaves	Leaf area	DM	P _n	CO ₂	APAR	LUE	GDD	Pods Plant ⁻¹	Shelling %	Test Wt.	Haulm yield
Yield															
Plant height	0.898**														
Branches	0.745**	0.819**													
Leaves	0.812**	0.688*	0.676*												
Leaf area	0.948**	0.852**	0.720**	0.848**											
DM	0.871**	0.799**	0.654*	0.736**	0.967**										
P _n	0.835**	0.803**	0.735**	0.735**	0.926**	0.964**									
CO ₂	0.930**	0.838**	0.626*	0.795**	0.979**	0.948**	0.895**								
APAR	0.859**	0.792**	0.648*	0.728**	0.963**	0.999**	0.964**	0.948**							
LUE	0.913**	0.808**	0.673*	0.789**	0.976**	0.979**	0.940**	0.937**	0.971**						
GDD	0.614*	0.753**	0.925**	0.597*	0.666*	0.674*	0.793**	NS	0.672*	0.666*					
Pods plant ⁻¹	0.864**	0.854**	0.917**	0.889**	0.861**	0.778**	0.841**	0.784**	0.770**	0.820**	0.866**				
Shelling%	0.932**	0.873**	0.856**	0.845**	0.966**	0.928**	0.924**	0.902**	0.920**	0.954**	0.803**	0.934**			
Test Wt.	0.916**	0.864**	0.719**	0.756**	0.952**	0.932**	0.939**	0.965**	0.934**	0.911**	0.691*	0.837**	0.910**		
Haulm yield	0.983**	0.860**	0.674*	0.789**	0.969**	0.918**	0.856**	0.954**	0.907**	0.955**	0.574 ^{NS}	0.816**	0.932**	0.920**	

* Significant at 5 % level

** Significant at 1 % level

REFERENCE

Mane, P. S., Lad, D. B. and Jagtap, P. K. 2008. Correlation and Path coefficient analysis in summer bunch groundnut. J. Maharashtra agric. Univ. 33 (2):174-176. | Parameshwarappa, K. G., Mahabasari, T. A. and Lingaraja, B. S. (2008). Analysis of correlation and path effect among yield attributing traits in two crosses of large seeded groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) J. Oilseeds Res. 25: 4-7. | Sumathi, P. and Muralidharan, V.(2007). Character association and path coefficient analysis in confectionery type groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) Madras agric. J. 94 (1-6): 105-110. |