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#### Abstract

Yield is the complex trait that depends on various attributes. Therefore, the knowledge about the relationship of different attributes to yield is crucial for making efficient selection strategy. The grain yield per plant exhibited highly significant and positive association with biological yield per plant followed by panicle bearing tillers per plant, spikelets per panicle, grains per panicle, chlorophyll content in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ at both genotypic and phenotypic level. Highest positive direct effect on grain yield per plant was exerted by biological yield per plant and harvest-index in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ at both genotypic and phenotypic level. Therefore, biological yield per plant and harvest index should be utilized in making selection strategy for yield improvement in rice.
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## Introduction

Rice (Oryza sativa L.) is the most important staple food crop of the world. Asia is the leader in rice production accounting for about $90 \%$ of the world's production. India has the world's largest rice-growing area (45 million hectares) and ranks second in overall production ( 130.29 million tonnes) after China, with an average yield of $2895 \mathrm{~kg} /$ hectare (Anonymous 2021-22).

The knowledge of factors responsible for high yields has been rendered difficult since yield is a complex character that manifests through multiplicative interactions of other characters known as yield components (Grafius, 1959). For rational approach in breeding for higher yield, several workers emphasized use of component approach for successful breeding programme (Moll et al., 1962, Bhatt, 1970). Therefore, the identification of important yield contributing characters, out of numerous plant traits, is necessary because it would
be impossible and impractical to concentrate and work on improving many characters at a time. The correlation and path coefficient analysis help us in identification of important yield contributing characters.

Correlation is a statistical measure, which is used to find out the degree (strength) and direction of relationship between two or more variables or characters. The coefficient of correlation expresses association between two variables, but tells us nothing about the causal relations of variables, i.e., which variable is dependent and which is independent. Therefore, the study of path-coefficients is necessary. The concept of path analysis was developed by Wright (1921), but the technique was first used for plant selection by Dewey and Lu (1959). Pathcoefficient is simply a standardized partial regression
coefficient, which splits the correlation coefficient into the measures of direct and indirect effects. In other words, it measures the direct and indirect contribution of various independent characters on the dependent character like yield. It also estimates residual effects. Path analysis clearly indicates the relative importance of different yield components so that one may identify the most important yield components.

## Materials and Methods

This experiment was carried out at the Main Experimental Station of A.N.D. University of Agriculture \& Technology, Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj), Ayodhya (U.P.) India. The experimental material was based on a line $x$ tester set of 63 hybrids ( $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ 's) developed by crossing 21 lines (females) with 3 testers (males). An attempt was made to make a sixty three cross combinations during kharif season 2017 to generate $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ 's. The $63 \mathrm{~F}_{1}$ 's along with parents and two checks, Jaya and CSR 43 were evaluated to work out the correlation and path coefficient of their various attributes on grain yield under the sodic soil in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications during kharif 2018. Estimation of correlation coefficients was done as per Searle, 1961 and path-coefficient analysis was done as per Dewey and $\mathrm{Lu}, 1959$.

## Results and Discussion

The estimates of simple correlation coefficients at phenotypic and genotypic levels computed between eighteen characters under study are presented in Table 1 and 2, respectively. The phenotypic correlation coefficients and genotypic correlation coefficients for 18 traits were analyzed in the $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ of 63 cross combinations and their 24 parents. Differences in magnitude as well as in direction were observed for different traits.

However, both genotypic correlation coefficient and phenotypic correlation coefficient exhibited similar signs with few exceptions. In general, both positive and negative character associations were observed among different traits. Further, it was also observed that the estimates of genotypic correlation coefficient were higher than the corresponding phenotypic correlations.

The grain yield per plant exhibited highly significant and positive association with biological yield per plant $(0.9018,0.8798)$, followed by panicle bearing tillers per plant $(0.6410,0.6329)$, spikelets per panicle ( $0.6210,0.6166$ ), grains per panicle ( $0.6136,0.6096$ ), chlorophyll content ( $0.4976,0.4858$ ), panicle length ( $0.3741,0.3589$ ), plant height ( $0.3020,0.2978$ ), flag leaf area $\left(0.2755,0.2746\right.$ ) in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ at genotypic and phenotypic level respectively. Therefore, these characters emerged as most important associates of grain yield in rice. The strong positive association of grain yield with the characters mentioned above has also being reported in rice by earlier workers (Sarawgi et al., 1997, Chaudhary and Motiramani 2003, Qamar et al., 2005, Ramkrishnan et al., 2006, Zahid et al., 2006, Eradasappa et al., 2007b, Petchiammal and Kumar 2007, Kishor et al., 2007, Rahaman et al., 2011, Bhadru et al., 2011, Krishnamurthy and Kumar, 2012, Ahamed et al., 2014, Kumar et al,, 2018 and Shrivastav et al., 2020.

Biological yield per plant showed positive and highly significant correlation with grain yield per plant (0.8798), spikelets per panicle (0.6962), grains per panicle ( 0.6685 ), panicle bearing tillers per plant (0.5862), chlorophyll content (0.5068), panicle length (0.3942), plant height (0.2611), protein content (0.2506), flag leaf area (0.2278), leaf nitrogen $(0.2213)$, harvest index (0.1849), leaf temperature ( 0.1792 ) and amylose content ( 0.1677 ),
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in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. These similar result reported by those of Chaudhary and Motiramani, 2003; Ahamed et al., 2014; Kumar et al., 2018. Harvest index showed positive and highly significant correlation with grain yield per plant (0.6131), panicle bearing tillers per plant (0.3711), flag leaf area (0.2173), plant height (0.1897), biological yield per plant (0.1849), $\mathrm{L}: \mathrm{B}$ ratio $(0.1754)$, grains per panicle $(0.1618)$ and chlorophyll content (0.1605) in $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ s. These finding are accordance with the result of Ahamed et al., 2014; Kumar et al., 2018. Amylose content showed positive and highly significant correlation with 1000-grain weight ( 0.2856 ), spikelets per panicle (0.2408), chlorophyll content (0.2269), panicle bearing tillers per plant (0.2212), biological yield per plant (0.1677) and grains per panicle (0.1599) in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. But grain yield per plant $(0.1218)$ shows positive and significant correlation in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. Protein content showed positive and highly significant correlation with biological yield per plant (0.2506), plant height ( 0.2439 ), panicle length ( 0.2038 ) and grains per panicle ( 0.1748 ) in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. But grain yield per plant ( 0.1269 ) shows positive and significant correlation in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$. The estimates of correlation coefficients obtained in present study are broadly in conformity with previous reports in rice (Sarawgi et al., 1997, Chaudhary and Motiramani, 2003, Qamar et al., 2005, Zahid et al., 2006, Kishore et al., 2007, Rahman et al., 2011, Bhadru et al., 2011, Ahamed et al., 2014, Kumar et al., 2018 and Shrivastav et al., 2020.

Path coefficient analysis is a tool to partition the observed correlation coefficient into direct and indirect effects of yield components on grain yield. Path analysis provides more clear picture of character associations for formulating efficient selection strategy. Path coefficient analysis differs from simple correlation in that it points out the causes
and their relative importance, whereas, the later measures simply the mutual association ignoring the causation. The concept of path coefficient was developed by Wright S. (1921) and technique was first used for plant selection by Dewey and Lu (1959). Path analysis has emerged as a powerful and widely used technique for understanding the direct and indirect contributions of different characters to economic yield in crop plants so that the relative importance of various yield contributing characters can be assessed. The direct and indirect effects of seventeen characters on grain yield per plant estimated by path coefficient analysis using phenotypic and genotypic correlations is depicted in Table 3 and 4 respectively.

Highest positive direct effect on grain yield per plant was exerted by biological yield per plant (0.7908, 0.7756), followed by harvest-index ( $0.4598,0.4669$ ), amylose content ( $0.0270,0.0179$ ), $\mathrm{L}: \mathrm{B}$ ratio $(0.0203,0.0149)$ in $\mathrm{F}_{1} \mathrm{~s}$ at genotypic and phenotypic level respectively. Thus, biological yield per plant and harvest-index emerged as most important direct yield components on which emphasis should be given during simultaneous selection aimed at improving grain yield in rice. These characters have also been identified as major direct contributors towards grain yield by Sarawgi et al., (1997), Mishra and Verma (2002), Petchiammal and Kumar (2007), Kishore et al., (2007), Amahed et al., (2014), Kumar et al., (2018) and Shrivastav et al., (2020).

In the present study, path analysis identified biological yield per plant followed by harvest-index as most important direct as well as indirect yield contributing traits or components which merit due consideration at time of devising selection strategy aimed at developing high yielding varieties in rice.
Table 1 : Estimates of phenotypic correlation coefficients ( $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ s) between 18 characters in rice under sodic soil

| Characters | Days to $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ flowering | Chlorophyll content | $\begin{gathered} \text { Leaf } \\ \text { nitrogen } \end{gathered}$ | Leaf temperature | Flag leaf area ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ) | Plant <br> height <br> (cm) | Panicle bearing tillers/ plant | Panicle <br> length <br> (cm) | Spikelets/ panicle | Grains/ panicle | Spikelet fertility (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Biological } \\ \text { yield } / \\ \text { plant (g) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Harvest } \\ \text { index (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | L/B ratio | $\begin{gathered} \text { grain } \\ \text { weight (g) } \end{gathered}$ | Amylose content | Protein content (\%) | Grain yield/ <br> plant (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days to 50\% flowering | 1.0000 | -0.0890 | -0.0426 | -0.1428* | -0.1169 | -0.1332* | -0.2511** | -0.1200 | $-0.1163$ | -0.1586** | -0.1770** | -0.2185** | -0.2122** | 0.1243* | -0.1886** | 0.3199** | -0.0564 | -0.2665** |
| Chlorophyll content |  | 1.0000 | 0.4797** | -0.1013 | 0.0735 | 0.3982** | 0.4386** | 0.2136** | 0.3765** | 0.4122** | 0.2424** | 0.5068** | 0.1605** | 0.2001** | 0.1584** | 0.2269** | 0.1242* | 0.4858** |
| Leaf nitrogen |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.3626** | 0.1247* | 0.3799** | 0.2338** | 0.1577** | 0.2044** | 0.2512** | 0.2180** | 0.2213** | -0.0116 | 0.2293** | -0.0316 | $-0.0669$ | 0.1130 | 0.1683** |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Leaf tempera- } \\ \text { ture }\end{array}$ |  |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.0669 | $-0.2023 * *$ | 0.0002 | -0.1676** | 0.0018 | -0.0367 | -0.1158 | 0.1792** | 0.0723 | 0.1778** | 0.1067 | -0.0138 | 0.0042 | 0.1912** |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flag leaf area } \\ & \left(\mathrm{cm}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.4854** | 0.1429* | 0.1972** | 0.2649** | 0.2428** | 0.0588 | 0.2278** | 0.2173** | 0.3121** | 0.1774** | -0.1033 | 0.0147 | 0.2746** |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plant height } \\ & (\mathrm{cm}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1458* | 0.3185** | 0.2576** | 0.2362** | 0.0435 | 0.2611** | 0.1897** | 0.0245 | 0.1011 | -0.1463* | 0.2439** | 0.2978** |
| Panicle bearing tillers/ plant |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1392* | 0.5719** | 0.5393** | 0.0788 | 0.5862** | 0.3711** | 0.3527** | 0.1053 | 0.2212** | -0.1510* | 0.6329** |
| Panicle length (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.3438** | 0.3375** | 0.0302 | 0.3942** | 0.0931 | 0.2187** | -0.1311* | $-0.0504$ | 0.2038** | 0.3589** |
| Spikelets/ panicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.9452** | 0.1077 | 0.6962** | 0.1306* | 0.1405* | -0.0068 | 0.2408** | 0.1539* | 0.6166** |
| Grains/panicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.4179** | 0.6685** | 0.1618** | 0.2270** | -0.0736 | 0.1599** | 0.1748** | 0.6096** |
| Spikelet fertility (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1431* | 0.1386* | 0.2921** | -0.1151 | -0.1599** | 0.1225* | 0.1801** |
| Biological yield/plant (g) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1849** | 0.0809 | 0.1052 | 0.1677** | 0.2506** | 0.8798** |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harvest index } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1754** | 0.1368* | -0.0545 | $-0.1613^{* *}$ | 0.6131** |
| L/B ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.0826 | 0.0821 | 0.1024 | 0.1492* |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1000-grain } \\ & \text { weight (g) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.2856** | $-0.1437^{*}$ | 0.1543* |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amylose con- } \\ & \text { tent } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.1984** | 0.1218* |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Protein con- } \\ \text { tent (\%) } \end{array} \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1269* |

*, ** Significant at 5\% and 1\% probability levels, respectively

| Characters | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { to } \mathbf{5 0 \%} \\ \text { flowering } \end{gathered}$ | Chlorophyll content | Leaf nitrogen | Leaf temperature | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flag } \\ & \text { leaf } \\ & \text { area } \\ & \left(\mathrm{cm}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Plant height (cm) | Panicle bearing tillers/ plant | Panicle length (cm) | Spikelets/ panicle | Grains/ panicle | Spikelet fertility | Biological yield/ plant (g) | Harvest index (\%) | L/B ratio | 1000grain weight (g) | Amylose content | Protein content (\%) | Grain yield/ <br> plant (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days to 50\% <br> flowering | 1.0000 | -0.1260 | -0.0800 | -0.1867 | $-0.1431$ | -0.1751 | -0.3274* | -0.1611 | -0.1483 | -0.1976* | -0.2238* | $-0.2798 * *$ | $-0.2585 * *$ | 0.1517 | -0.2420* | 0.3953** | -0.0678 | -0.3278** |
| Chlorophyll content |  | 1.0000 | 0.5008** | -0.1101 | 0.0752 | 0.4143** | 0.4575** | 0.2438* | 0.3839** | 0.4256** | 0.2735** | 0.5244** | 0.1890 | 0.2073* | 0.1617 | 0.2329* | 0.1278 | 0.4976** |
| Leaf nitrogen |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.3831 | 0.1319 | 0.4009** | 0.2478* | 0.1836 | 0.2106* | 0.2710** | 0.2691** | 0.2264* | 0.0053 | 0.2537** | -0.0395 | -0.0702 | 0.1153 | 0.1755 |
| Leaf temperature |  |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.0710 | -0.2064* | -0.0034 | -0.1730 | 0.0012 | -0.0387 | -0.1254 | 0.1763 | 0.0982 | 0.1876 | 0.1091 | -0.0141 | 0.0051 | 0.1947* |
| Flag leaf area ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.4893** | 0.1446 | 0.2033* | 0.2660** | 0.2443* | 0.0624 | 0.2339* | 0.2351* | 0.3206** | 0.1831 | -0.1034 | 0.0149 | 0.2755** |
| Plant height (cm) |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1464 | 0.3225** | 0.2593** | 0.2397* | 0.0506 | 0.2697** | 0.2051* | 0.0232 | 0.1035 | -0.1473 | 0.2457* | 0.3020** |
| Panicle bearing tillers/plant |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1427 | 0.5790** | 0.5463** | 0.0825 | 0.6056** | 0.4087** | 0.3654** | 0.1053 | 0.2234* | -0.1544 | 0.6410** |
| Panicle <br> length (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.3565** | 0.3489** | 0.0279 | 0.4199** | 0.1075 | 0.2300* | -0.1442 | -0.0520 | 0.2097* | 0.3741** |
| Spikelets/ panicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.9507** | 0.1232 | 0.7129** | 0.1458 | 0.1459 | $-0.0073$ | 0.2413* | 0.1540 | 0.6210** |
| Grains/ panicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.4184** | 0.6866** | 0.1758 | 0.2315* | $-0.0760$ | 0.1604 | 0.1752 | 0.6136** |
| Spikelet <br> fertility (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1556 | 0.1492 | 0.3078** | -0.1214 | -0.1688 | 0.1287 | 0.1869* |
| Biological yield/plant (g) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.2659** | 0.0845 | 0.1051 | 0.1714 | 0.2601* | 0.9018** |
| Harvest <br> index (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1952* | 0.1593 | -0.0585 | -0.1781 | 0.6560** |
| L/B ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.0831 | 0.0839 | 0.1057 | 0.1525 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1000-grain } \\ & \text { weight (g) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.2920** | -0.1480 | 0.1569 |
| Amylose content |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | -0.1991* | 0.1222 |
| Protein content (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0000 | 0.1278 |

Table 3: Estimates of phenotypic direct and indirect $\left(F_{1} \mathbf{s}\right)$ effect of 17 characters on grain yield per plant in rice under sodic soil

| Characters | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { to } 50 \% \\ \text { flowering } \end{gathered}$ | Chlorophyll content | Leaf nitrogen | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Leaf } \\ \text { tem- } \\ \text { perature } \end{array}\right\|$ | Flag leaf area ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ) | Plant height (cm) | Panicle bearing tillers/ plant | Panicle length (cm) | Spikelets/ panicle | Grains/ panicle | Spikelet fertility (\%) | Biological yield/ plant (g) | Harvest index (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{B} \\ \text { ratio } \end{gathered}$ | 1000grain weight <br> (g) | Amylose content | Protein content (\%) | Grain yield/ plant (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days to 50\% flowering | 0.0043 | -0.0004 | -0.0002 | -0.0006 | -0.0005 | -0.0006 | -0.0011 | -0.0005 | -0.0005 | -0.0007 | -0.0008 | -0.0009 | -0.0009 | 0.0005 | -0.0008 | 0.0014 | -0.0002 | -0.2665 |
| Chlorophyll content | -0.0007 | 0.0084 | 0.0040 | -0.0009 | 0.0006 | 0.0033 | 0.0037 | 0.0018 | 0.0032 | 0.0035 | 0.0020 | 0.0043 | 0.0013 | 0.0017 | 0.0013 | 0.0019 | 0.0010 | 0.4858 |
| Leaf nitrogen | -0.0001 | 0.0011 | 0.0022 | -0.0008 | 0.0003 | 0.0008 | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | 0.0004 | 0.0005 | 0.0005 | 0.0005 | 0.0000 | 0.0005 | -0.0001 | -0.0001 | 0.0002 | 0.1683 |
| Leaf temperature | -0.0039 | -0.0028 | -0.0099 | 0.0274 | -0.0018 | $-0.0055$ | 0.0000 | -0.0046 | 0.0000 | -0.0010 | -0.0032 | 0.0049 | 0.0020 | 0.0049 | 0.0029 | -0.0004 | 0.0001 | 0.1912 |
| Flag leaf area ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ) | 0.0004 | -0.0003 | -0.0004 | 0.0002 | -0.0035 | -0.0017 | -0.0005 | -0.0007 | -0.0009 | -0.0009 | -0.0002 | -0.0008 | -0.0008 | 0.0011 | -0.0006 | 0.0004 | -0.0001 | 0.2746 |
| Plant height (cm) | -0.0011 | 0.0032 | 0.0031 | -0.0016 | 0.0039 | 0.0081 | 0.0012 | 0.0026 | 0.0021 | 0.0019 | 0.0004 | 0.0021 | 0.0015 | 0.0002 | 0.0008 | -0.0012 | 0.0020 | 0.2978 |
| Panicle bearing tillers/ plant | 0.0039 | -0.0069 | -0.0037 | 0.0000 | -0.0022 | -0.0023 | -0.0156 | -0.0022 | -0.0089 | -0.0084 | -0.0012 | -0.0092 | -0.0058 | 0.0055 | -0.0016 | -0.0035 | 0.0024 | 0.6329 |
| Panicle length (cm) | -0.0018 | 0.0031 | 0.0023 | -0.0024 | 0.0029 | 0.0046 | 0.0020 | 0.0146 | 0.0050 | 0.0049 | 0.0004 | 0.0058 | 0.0014 | 0.0032 | -0.0019 | -0.0007 | 0.0030 | 0.3589 |
| Spikelets/panicle | 0.0001 | -0.0002 | -0.0001 | 0.0000 | -0.0001 | -0.0001 | -0.0003 | -0.0002 | -0.0005 | -0.0005 | -0.0001 | -0.0003 | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | -0.0001 | -0.0001 | 0.6166 |
| Grains/panicle | -0.0015 | 0.0040 | 0.0024 | -0.0004 | 0.0023 | 0.0023 | 0.0052 | 0.0032 | 0.0091 | 0.0096 | 0.0040 | 0.0064 | 0.0016 | 0.0022 | -0.0007 | 0.0015 | 0.0017 | 0.6096 |
| Spikelet fertility (\%) | -0.0003 | 0.0004 | 0.0003 | -0.0002 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | 0.0007 | 0.0016 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0005 | -0.0002 | -0.0003 | 0.0002 | 0.1801 |
| Biological yield/plant (g) | -0.1694 | 0.3931 | 0.1716 | 0.1390 | 0.1767 | 0.2025 | 0.4547 | 0.3058 | 0.5400 | 0.5185 | 0.1110 | 0.7756 | 0.1434 | 0.0628 | 0.0816 | 0.1301 | 0.1944 | 0.8798 |
| Harvest index (\%) | -0.0991 | 0.0749 | $-0.0054$ | 0.0337 | 0.1015 | 0.0886 | 0.1733 | 0.0435 | 0.0610 | 0.0755 | 0.0647 | 0.0863 | 0.4669 | 0.0819 | 0.0639 | -0.0255 | -0.0753 | 0.6131 |
| L/B ratio | 0.0018 | 0.0030 | 0.0034 | -0.0026 | 0.0046 | -0.0004 | 0.0052 | -0.0033 | 0.0021 | 0.0034 | 0.0043 | 0.0012 | 0.0026 | 0.0149 | 0.0012 | 0.0012 | 0.0015 | 0.1492 |
| 1000-grain weight (g) | -0.0011 | 0.0009 | -0.0002 | 0.0006 | 0.0011 | 0.0006 | 0.0006 | -0.0008 | 0.0000 | -0.0004 | -0.0007 | 0.0006 | 0.0008 | 0.0005 | 0.0059 | 0.0017 | -0.0009 | 0.1543 |
| Amylose content | 0.0057 | 0.0041 | $-0.0012$ | -0.0002 | -0.0018 | $-0.0026$ | 0.0040 | -0.0009 | 0.0043 | 0.0029 | -0.0029 | 0.0030 | -0.0010 | 0.0015 | 0.0051 | 0.0179 | -0.0036 | 0.1218 |
| Protein content (\%) | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | -0.0001 | -0.0001 | 0.0005 | 0.1269 |

Table 4: Estimates of genotypic direct and indirect $\left(F_{1} s\right)$ effect of $\mathbf{1 7}$ characters on grain yield per plant in rice under sodic soil

| Characters | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { to } 50 \% \\ \text { flowering } \end{gathered}$ | Chlorophyll content | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Leaf } \\ \text { nitrogen } \end{array}$ | Leaf temperature | Flag leaf area ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ) | Plant height (cm) | Panicle bearing tillers/ plant | Panicle length (cm) | Spikelets/ panicle | Grains/ panicle | Spikelet fertility (\%) | Biological yield/plant (g) | Harvest index (\%) | $\underset{\text { ratio }}{\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{B}}$ | 1000- <br> grain <br> weight <br> (g) | Amylose content | Protein content (\%) | Grain yield/ <br> plant (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days to 50\% flowering | -0.0095 | 0.0012 | 0.0008 | 0.0018 | 0.0014 | 0.0017 | 0.0031 | 0.0015 | 0.0014 | 0.0019 | 0.0021 | 0.0027 | 0.0025 | 0.0014 | 0.0023 | -0.0038 | 0.0006 | $-0.3278$ |
| Chlorophyll content | -0.0003 | 0.0027 | 0.0014 | -0.0003 | 0.0002 | 0.0011 | 0.0012 | 0.0007 | 0.0010 | 0.0011 | 0.0007 | 0.0014 | 0.0005 | 0.0026 | 0.0004 | 0.0006 | 0.0003 | 0.4976 |
| Leaf nitrogen | -0.0004 | 0.0027 | 0.0053 | -0.0020 | 0.0007 | 0.0021 | 0.0013 | 0.0010 | 0.0011 | 0.0014 | 0.0014 | 0.0012 | 0.0000 | 0.0013 | -0.0002 | -0.0004 | 0.0006 | 0.1755 |
| Leaf temperature | -0.0026 | -0.0016 | -0.0054 | 0.0141 | -0.0010 | -0.0029 | 0.0000 | -0.0024 | 0.0000 | -0.0005 | -0.0018 | 0.0025 | 0.0014 | 0.0056 | 0.0015 | -0.0002 | 0.0001 | 0.1947 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flag leaf area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{c m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 0.0016 | -0.0009 | $-0.0015$ | 0.0008 | -0.0114 | -0.0056 | -0.0016 | $-0.0023$ | -0.0030 | -0.0028 | -0.0007 | -0.0027 | $-0.0027$ | 0.0036 | $-0.0021$ | 0.0012 | -0.0002 | 0.2755 |
| Plant height (cm) | -0.0015 | 0.0035 | 0.0033 | -0.0017 | 0.0041 | 0.0083 | 0.0012 | 0.0027 | 0.0022 | 0.0020 | 0.0004 | 0.0022 | 0.0017 | 0.0005 | 0.0009 | -0.0012 | 0.0020 | 0.3020 |
| Panicle bearing tillers/plant | 0.0145 | -0.0203 | -0.0110 | 0.0002 | -0.0064 | -0.0065 | -0.0443 | $-0.0063$ | -0.0257 | $-0.0242$ | $-0.0037$ | -0.0269 | -0.0181 | 0.0162 | $-0.0047$ | -0.0099 | 0.0068 | 0.6410 |
| Panicle length (cm) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0042 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.3741 |
| Spikelets/panicle | -0.0076 | 0.0196 | 0.0107 | 0.0001 | 0.0136 | 0.0132 | 0.0295 | 0.0182 | 0.0510 | 0.0484 | 0.0063 | 0.0363 | 0.0074 | 0.0074 | $-0.0004$ | 0.0123 | 0.0078 | 0.6210 |
| Grains/panicle | 0.0097 | -0.0209 | -0.0133 | 0.0019 | -0.0120 | -0.0118 | -0.0269 | -0.0172 | -0.0468 | -0.0492 | -0.0206 | -0.0338 | -0.0086 | 0.0114 | 0.0037 | -0.0079 | -0.0086 | 0.6136 |
| Spikelet fertility (\%) | -0.0027 | 0.0032 | 0.0032 | -0.0015 | 0.0007 | 0.0006 | 0.0010 | 0.0003 | 0.0015 | 0.0050 | 0.0119 | 0.0018 | 0.0018 | 0.0037 | -0.0014 | -0.0020 | 0.0015 | 0.1869 |
| Biological yield/ plant (g) | $-0.2212$ | 0.4147 | 0.1791 | 0.1394 | 0.1850 | 0.2133 | 0.4789 | 0.3321 | 0.5638 | 0.5430 | 0.1231 | 0.7908 | 0.2103 | 0.0668 | 0.0831 | 0.1356 | 0.2057 | 0.9018 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harvest index } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | -0.1189 | 0.0869 | 0.0024 | 0.0452 | 0.1081 | 0.0943 | 0.1880 | 0.0495 | 0.0670 | 0.0808 | 0.0686 | 0.1223 | 0.4598 | 0.0898 | 0.0733 | -0.0269 | -0.0819 | 0.6560 |
| L/B ratio | 0.0016 | 0.0021 | 0.0026 | 0.0019 | 0.0033 | 0.0008 | 0.0038 | 0.0024 | 0.0015 | 0.0024 | 0.0032 | 0.0009 | 0.0020 | 0.0203 | 0.0069 | 0.0019 | 0.0011 | 0.1555 |
| 1000-grain weight (g) | 0.0017 | -0.0012 | 0.0003 | -0.0008 | -0.0013 | -0.0007 | -0.0008 | 0.0010 | 0.0001 | 0.0005 | 0.0009 | -0.0008 | -0.0011 | 0.0006 | -0.0072 | -0.0021 | 0.0011 | 0.1569 |
| Amylose content | 0.0107 | 0.0063 | -0.0019 | -0.0004 | -0.0028 | -0.0040 | 0.0060 | -0.0014 | 0.0065 | 0.0043 | -0.0046 | 0.0046 | -0.0016 | 0.0023 | 0.0079 | 0.0270 | -0.0054 | 0.1222 |
| Protein content (\%) | 0.0003 | -0.0005 | -0.0005 | 0.0000 | -0.0001 | -0.0010 | 0.0006 | -0.0008 | -0.0006 | -0.0007 | -0.0005 | -0.0010 | 0.0007 | 0.0004 | 0.0006 | 0.0008 | -0.0039 | 0.1278 |

Residual factors $=0.03$, Bold figures indicate direct effects
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