Legume Res., 37 (6) : 641-645, 2014

doi:10.5958/0976-0571.2014.00689.4

 $www.arccjournals.com\ /\ www.legumeresearch.in$

STABILITY ANALYSIS OF YIELD AND RELATED TRAITS IN CHICKPEA (*CICER ARIETINUM*L.)

Asha Yadav, L.S. Yadav and C.K. Yadav

Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar-125 004, India

Received: 13-11-2013

Accepted: 09-01-2014

ABSTRACT

A set of fifty genotypes of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.)were evaluated in three different environments during 2008-09 to determine the stability for seed yield plant height , number of branches per plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, biological yield, seed yield per plant, harvest index (%), 100 seed weight . Analysis of variance revealed significant differences among the genotypes for all the characters studied. Stability analysis showed that a major portion of genotype × environment (G × E) interaction was accompanied by linear component for number of branches per plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, biological yield, seed yield per plant and 100 seed weight, whereas, non-linear portion predominantly contributed towards plant height, number of branches per plant and harvest index. Environment two (E2) was observed to be best for most of the yield attributing traits. Considering all the parameters, genotypes H06-79, H04-31, HK05-151, HK06-162, HK06-170, HK06-171, HK-2, HK-3, H06-32 having bi> 1 and i = 0 found promising for favourable environment and genotypes H05-10, HK06-152, HK06-155 having bi= 1 and S²d_i = 0 across the environments.

Key words: Chickpea, G x E interaction, Phenotypic stability.

INTRODUCTION

Chickpea is an important winter season pulse crop in India and Asia and traditionally a low input crop grown in moisture stress environment of drought prone semi-and and tropical regions. Large number of important high yielding varieties of chickpea have been evolved, yield of these varieties are not stable over environments which is one of the reason for poor adaptation. The yield of this crop fluctuates greatly as genotypes respond differently due to variation in the environments of its cultivation. (Bahl, 1988; Singh and Jaiswal, 1990). Varietal adaptation to environmental fluctuation is important for stabilization of crop production, both over region and years. Therefore, there is an urgent need for genetically upgrading the yield potential along with stabilization of production. Thus, high productivity and stability are two most desirable features of any crop variety (Costa et al., 2004). Therefore, the present study was conducted to know the G x E

interaction of 50 genotypes of chickpea for seed yield and yield attributing traits.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifty genotypes of chickpea (Table 1) were evaluated at experimental farm area of Pulses Section, Department of Plant Breeding, Hisar and **Regional Research Station (CCS Haryana** Agricultural University), Bawal. The crop at Hisar was sown on two different dates (9-11-2008 and 10-12-2008) and normal sown in Bawal (11-11-2008) thus creating three environments in a randomized block design with three replications in each environment. For each genotype the plot size was 9.60 m² (4×2.40 sq. meter) with a spacing of 30 cm between rows and 10 cm within a row. All the recommended agronomic package of practices was followed to raise the crop. At maturity, data was recorded on different characters from five competitive randomly selected plants from each genotype per replication in each environment. The

^{*} Conesponding author's e-maik asha.agtarians@gmail.com

TABLE 1: Genotype's pedigree description

Genotype	Pedigree
H04-68	H91-35 × H82-2 (m)
H04-75	HC-5 × H91-36
H05-10	NARC 9006 × HC 5
H05-11	H 89-171 × HC 5
H05-24	(HC 5 × GNG 711) ×
1100 #1	$(PDG84-16 \times NARC 9006)$
H05-29	IPC94-19 × IPC 71
H06-07	H91–35 × E100 Y m
H06-11	PBG98-5 \times H92-67
H06-15	PBG98-5 \times H92-67
H06-18	H90-64 × H92-67
H06-30	H91-36 × H92-67
H06-32	H91-35 × HC 5
H06-41	H91-35 × HC 5
H06-52	H89-59 × HC 5
H06-55	CSG 8962 × HC 5
H06-56	GNG 711 × HC5
H06-63	H99-109 × HC 1
H06-70	HC 5 × E 100 Ym
H06-75	H92-67 × E 100 Ym
H06-79	Katila × BG 362
H06-80	(HC 1 × E 100 Ym) × H91-36
H04-31	$(ICCV 10 \times ICC 4958) \times ICC11320$
HC-5	H89-78 × H89-84
HC-1	F 61 × L 550
C-235	$P58 \times C 1234$
HC-3	L550 × E 100 Ym
H06.97	HC 1 × BGD 112
H06.98	$HC 1 \times V$ ijav
H06-135	$HC 1 \times PCD 84.16$
H06-136	HC 1 \times ICC 4958
H07-12	$C_{235} \times GL 94022$
H07-93	$HC 1 \times H80.84$
H07-23	$H96.51 \times GL 94022$
H07.86	$(HC 1 \times CL 94022) \times CL 94022$
H07.88	HC 1 \times ICCV 96029
H07.121	(HC 5 × ICCV 96030) × ICCV 96030
H07-169	$(CSG 8962 \times H92.67) \times GL 94022$
HK05.151	$HK 99.94 \times HK 1$
HK06.152	PG 95412 × HC 3
HK06.155	(HK 92.94 × HK 95.67) × HK 1
HK06.158	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06.159	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06.160	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06-162	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06.168	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06-169	HK 95.70 × HK 1
HK06.170	(HK 92.98 × HK 95.67) × HK 1
HK06.171	PG 95412 × HC 3
HK-2	$(H82.5 \times F100Vm) \vee Rkm$
нк-3	ICCV Z × Sumutato 77

mean of the five plants in each replication was used for statistical analysis of all the characters. The environments and genotypes were assumed to be fixed for Statistical analysis. The phenotypic stability of genotypes was estimated using the parameters developed by Eberhart and Russell (1966) model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There exists a great agro-climatic variation in the environments due to uneven rainfall and variation in soil texture. Such environmental variation play a significant role in genotype x environment interaction. Hence, there is an urgent need to obtain stable genotypes which could give high and uniform yield of gram.

The pooled analysis of variance revealed the existence of considerable amount of genetic variability among genotypes and environments (Table 2) for all the traits. The experimental results indicated that mean squares due to genotypes, environment and $G \times E$ interaction were highly significant for all the 11 traits, indicating that genotypes interacted significantly with varied environmental conditions. This showed the presence of $G \times E$ interaction for all the traits. The present findings of $G \times E$ interaction are in agreement with earlier workers, (Samad *et al.*, 1989; Rathore and Gupta, 1999; Chetia and Yaday, 2002; Rao and Rao, 2004; Shamma *et al.*, 2007; Abbas *et al.*, 2008; Yadav *et al.*, 2010, Choudhary and Haque, 2010).

With the availability of different analytical approaches, the most important conclusion which has emerged out from these studies is that bulk of $G \times E$ interaction is often a linear function of the environmental means, although both linear and non linear functions play an important role in building up of total genotype \times environment ($G \times E$) interaction. The linear component of genotype \times

Source of	D.E	Plant	Number of	Number	Number	Biological	Seed	Harvest	100 seed
variation		height	branches/	of pods/	of seeds	yield/	yield/	index	weight
		(cm)	plant	plant	per pod	plant(g)	plant	(%)	(g)
Genotype	49	222.13 ^{+ +}	2.24	334.63 ^{+ +}	2.07 ^{+ +}	77.39 ⁺	13.21 ⁺⁺	70.23	12.33 ^{+ +}
E+ G×E)	100	98.45 **	8.59 + +	271.87 ^{+ +}	0.07++	76.62 + +	9.09 + +	62.90 **	11.25 ++
Env.(L)	1	1331.81 ⁺⁺	662.88 ⁺ ⁺	13930.52 ++	1.51++	3486.92 ++	256.03 ++	689.20 ++	264.97 ^{+ +}
G × E (L)	49	66.42 **	1.46 **	1165.60 ^{**,+}	0.09 ^{**,++}	45.96 **	8.89^{**,++}	20.50 *	16.37** ,++
Pooled deviation	50	105.18 **	2.50 **	102.83 **	0.03	38.47**	4.34 ^{**}	91.94 **	1.15**
Pooled Error	294	5.81	0.68	33.79	0.02	8.49	0.96	15.14	1.49

TABLE 2: Stability analysis of variance for different characters studied (Eberhart & Russell, 1966)

= Significant mean square against pooled error at 5% and 1 % probability level respectively.

= Significant mean square against pooled deviation at 5% and 1 % probability level respectively.

*. **

+ + + +

Genotypes	Plan	rt height (a of bu	anches p	erplant	Na of	pods per l	lant	Na of	reeds per	pod	Biologica	al yield per p	kant (g)	Seedy	ield per 1	skant (g)	Harr	vest index	(%)	Seed	weight (;	
	Gen Mean	₽	S ^r d	Gen	b≑ 1	S ² d	Gen	1	S ² d	Gen Mean	1	p _z s	Gen	1	S ² d	Gen Mean	1	S ² d	Gen	₩ 1	S ² d	Gen Mean	 	S ² d
H04.68	072	3.457	3.663	13	1.152	0.222	51.8	1.698	1.294	1.6	0.278	1.190*	98.0	0173	0.721	83	0.238	1.55	31.7	1.014*	000	15.6	1.683	0.041
H04-75	84.2	1.842	0.531	3	0.618	0.074	72.8	-0.269	0.183	1.4	1145	0.073	37.5	1.270	0100	11.7	0.048	0.906	35.7	0.378	17.854	16.2	1.422*	0.000
H05-10	73.6	1.941	1.765	5.6	0.899	0.023	8	0.022	0.057	1.4	0830	0.953*	30.7	1.156	0.068	104	1.225	0.001	340	0.452	0.022	16.7	1.235	0.279
11-CUH		3060	6698		00CM		29.4	0.749.	1.390	4 v 7	8007	8,350 1,408		L. /4/ 0.969	02010	201	0.592	3.494*	878	0270	L./3/ 0134	15.3	1 200	806 U
H05-29	54.5	2.556	4.855	25	0.724	000	46.4	0.738	0.062	8	2.653	0.128	202	0000	0.085	11.1	0.244	1.713	391	1.542	0.063	15.7	0490	0.005
H06-07	81.4	4.001	1.480	6.2	0.695	0014	62.2	0.459*	0.000	1.5	1145	0.073	27.5	0.552	0.005	9.5	-0.051	0.225	347	0.482	1.753	164	1.634	0.042
H06-11	71.0	2.235	4.942	6.3	0.598	0.243	69.2	0.817	0.010	1.6	6.780	1.279	30.8	0.958	0.362	9.8	0.216	1.165	32.2	0.575	0.787	16.3	0.973	0.027
H06-15	72.8	1.703	4678	80	0.581	0.544	57.8	0.422	0.045	1.6	27855	5.758	29.6	0.754	0.007	8 6	-0.514	0.257	336	1.221	5.330	16.8	1.052	0.053
H06-18		4154	2.854	5.7	1.038	0.008	61.0	1.631	0.634	- ·	1.309	0.520	30.3	0.590	162.0	610	-0.106	0.171	31.0	0.540	22.22	15.6	1.478	0.115
HU6-30	199	0.906	0.957	9 C	0.965	u157	1917	1.505	Anz n	4		4234		1.322		29	1.200		31.2	0.583		14.5	1.271*	1000
H06-41	6.19	2.625	0.668	2 K	2003 2001	0.035	20.0	3210	1.960 1.960	- 1 - 1	1.145	1.0073 0.073	50.6	1341	0.398	4 X	1996.U	0 TU	3013 481	0.462	36.133	15.6	1.344	0.082
H06-52	67.8	1.611	11.057	6.9	1.618	0137	33	2112	0.044	12	1496	0.637	26.8	1.184	1.454	10.6	0.764	0.590	46.7	0.669	119.033*	14.3	1.505	0.038
H06-55	73.8	0.843	2.963	4.9	1.103*	0.007	3	0.938	0.054	1.8	1.362	0.821*	23.2	0.961	0.457	7.8	0.918	0.136	343	-1.033	4.678	15.1	1.613	0.644
H06-56	60.0	1.634	5.209	5.4	0.889	0.002	69.6	1.134	0.160	1.5	2301	0.766	242	0.555	0.626	84	0.413	0.126	36.1	1.910	2.345	17.4	0.835	0.232
H06-63	51.1	1.911	2.978	09	1.361	0.257	5 g	1.419	000	1.5	0.662	1.133	122	1.341		91	0.449	0.216	400	1.950	5.346	16.0	1.405	0.074
H06-70		2007	10.662	90	1.339		969	1.751		4.0		1.279	<u>.</u>	1.970		10.7	9820	1.028			222	15.9	0.376	
C/-00U	6.11	2610	0.015		0118 0 018	103	676	0.66U	0115 0115	4 1	20.00	9.467*	107 980	1 447			2.9.49		440		3.630	176	0.000.1	
H06-80	540	-0.769	0.051	3	0.584	0163	55.8	-0.148	0.208		2.139	2883	347	1.833	1.732	11.6	3.284	0.573	347	1.589	15.040	17.3	1.178	0.076
H0431	55.1	-2.833	1.460	6.4	1.205*	0000	53.8	1.792	1.168	1.7	1.013	0.028	27.8	0.841*	0.004	12.5	2.244	0.862	441	-1.796	1.402	13.8	0.778	0.103
HC-5	62.6	0.435	9.078	2.8	1.086	0121	54.5	0.076	0.073	1.2	0201	0.721*	281	0.595	0.122	9.2	0.331	0.363	330	0.283	0.058	17.0	1.063	0.189
HC-1	54.5	0.598	2.506	09	1.423	0.026	56.3	1.045*	000	8. 8. 9.	0.800	0.621*	22.7	0.876	0.003	80	0.140	0.00	36.7	1.544	2.282	142	1.737	0.208
C-235	200	-1.537	1.480		1.078	0.698	2000	-0.330	0.603	6.T	0.296	0.305	083	-1.056	0.016	86	-1.572	0.109	43.9	0.403	0.113	16.7	2092	0.485
HC-3 HAR 07	8.28 A A	0.599	1.029	0.0	2011.1	0.492	000 7 7		1.10 0 215	0 F	1151	0.965	314 912	2000	0110 672	15.4 6 2	3.919	97.1.X	2019	18210	0.506	12.6	0.230	
16-00H	26.8	1.183	11.175	92	1.070	1.274	38.3	0.940	0.491		1.270	0.252	27.2	0.659	0000	2 82 28	0.884	0.724	308	2.034	3.835	14.5	1.806	0.088
H06-135	66.8	-1.046	10.291	6.5	0.321	0.681	40.9	0.683*	0.000	1.2	744	0.002	20.5	1.434	0.018	6.8	0.532	0.145	35.8	3.861	0.897	16.2	1.497*	0.005
H06-136	50.9	1.450	0.222	6.9	0.700	0616	45.0	1.033	0.022	1.4	3000	0163	26.6	1.602	0.034	86	0.786	0.123	33.7	2.161	0.573	16.3	1.312	0.002
21-70H		0.583	0.489		0.302	6610	361	1.211*		2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 4 3 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		0.384	221	0.913			1.669	0.413	31.0	1.311	8.443 9.450	171	1.653	
H07-23		3489	1.581	0	1.388	0078	36.7	0.878	0.025	9	1.070	0.721	25.9	-0.176	2.911	80	0.530	0.334	347	2.345	10.093	14.8	1.065	0.074
H07-86	67.8	0.994	0.079	4.9	1.052	0.053	41.8	0.163	0.286	1.4	1.474	0.207	244	0.848	0.075	7.5	0.686	0.223	30.9	0.568	0.005	15.7	1.169	0.003
H07-88	60.8	1.047	0.047	5.1	0.636	0.007	41.3	0.457	0.868	1.2 2	;671*	0.034	23.9	1.061	1.362	83	0.262	3.905°	36.6	0.223	3.247	16.2	0.884	0.099
H07-121	57.6	-0.732	16.935	51	0.725	0.010	41.1	0.380	0.143	1.1	3.740	0442	20.9	1.088	0.642	7.8	0.808	0.529	394	3214	1.758	17.6	5.739	0.229
HU7-169			0.006		1.2007 1 AF7		40.6 7 0 7	1.305		2 0	1220 C	0770	1.22	1.109 1 516	1.060 0.015	12.0	1.928 9 5 62	ZAZAZ	7357 24 B	1.934	SES D	242	0.996	1 905
HK06-152	6.0	-1.042	0.870		1.539	0.036	53.5	1.355	0.026	19	2579	0.048	354	1.134	0.196	11.8	1.308	0.004	33.7	0.063	0106	27.5	0.757	0.157
HIK06-155	66.1	1.244	5.578	6.5	0.902	0.010	40.6	0.724	0.093	1	1,700	0.025	32.0	0.343	0.618	12.2	1.718	0.186	391	1.113	16.616	31.9	0.751	0.012
HIK06-158	50.1	2,085	2.011	6.9	1.167	0.013	37.4	1.191	0.096	1.1	LO74	0019	30.9	2177	0.628	11.2	2.051	0.431	36.8	2.024	0.037	33.6	0.855	0.364
HK06-159	62.2	2.611	6.609	6.2	0.713	0.018	35.2	0.980	0.340	1.2	1.196	0409	33.2	1.766	0.053	10.3	2,115	0,787	31.4	2.079	3.565	Ŕ	1.403	0.080
HK06-160	60.0	1.668	6.788	63	1.503	0013	39.2	1.209	0.223	1.3	2002	0.558	31.7	1.363	1.071	11.3	0.085	0.626	36.0	1.692	1.407	33.0	1.637	0.121
HK06-162		-1.214	1.833	6,9	1.188	0.021	47.6	1.591	0.159		018.1	1.350	34.8	1.681	1.079	126	8063	2.544	37.1	2,666	1096	28.5	2,084	0.337
HK06-169	30.5 30.5	1.508	6.783	3 3	1.759	0.080	443	1.394	1.036	3 6	67 C 37	1.350	341	0.279	1.360	11.5	1.151	7.877*	326	1.821	6104 6104	25.7	0.799	0.087
HK06-170	646	1.286	0.389	7.4	1.186	0000	57.3	2.483	0,751	1.1 (1939	000	38.3	1.941	0.035	13.9	2.808	0.031	36.5	1.110	2,646	281	1.235	1.215
H1K06-171	58.5	1.017	3400	61	1.246*	000	44.9	0.084	0.178	1.2	0.056	0.463	30.0	1.551	0.041	12.5	3.230	0.251	42.9	1.601	7.082	23.9	-2.385	0.016
	546	-0.176	0.114	5	1.207	0.026	49.1	1.931	0.193	1 1 2 1 2 1 1	0.405	0155	33.0	2021	0.126	12.0	2.608	0.315	36.7	1.325	2.063	22.7	1.345	1.135
HM-3	979	-0.434	ZINN	¥	1.1.76		45.0		R.1.1	2	.926	1.UZ0	4K ¹ 2	2190	T.3416	134	2.141	1044	34Z	Z.369	4,067	212	108%	CEON

TABLE 3: Stability parameters for different traits in chickpea

LEGUME RESEARCH

environment (G × E) interaction was significant for number of pods per plant, seeds per pod, 100-seed weight and seed yield per plant when tested against pooled deviation, indicating that major portion of interaction was linear in nature and prediction over environments was possible only for these traits. The linear component of genotype × environment (G × E) interaction was non significant against pooled deviation for remaining traits viz, plant height, number of branches per plant, biological yield per plant and harvest index which indicated that prediction for consistency in performance of the genotypes was not possible. However, relative magnitude of both these portions i.e., linear and non linear vary with the traits. In the present study the linear portion was higher in magnitude for all the traits except plant height, number of branches per plant and harvest index .This indicated the preponderance of linear portion for most of the economic traits and thus performance of the genotypes can be predicted across environments with greater reliability. Predominance of linear component of G × E interaction for different characters was also reported by Singh and Kumar; (1994); Popalghat et al., (1999); Sirohi et al., (2001), Rao and Rao, (2004); Verma et al., (2008) in chickpea.

The stability parameters i.e., mean (\bar{X}) , regression coefficient (bi) and deviation from regression (S²d) were estimated for each genotype separately for each trait. Both linear regression (bi) and deviation from regression (S²d) components of genotype × environment (G × E) interaction should be considered along with mean while judging the phenotypic stability of a genotype (Table 3).

An examination of two parameters viz, bi and S²d di for individual genotypes revealed that plant height and harvest index were observed to be the most stable traits for maximum number of genotypes followed by biological yield, number of pods per plant, seed yield per plant, number of branches, 100 seed weight and numberof seeds per pod. Predictable response among the genotypes was found to be largerfordays to maturity, whereas, plant height exhibited the lowest. Some workers, however; demonstrated that even for unpredictable traits, prediction could still be made when the stability parameters of individual genotypes were considered (Kapoor; 1972; Singh, 1981 and Sandhu, 1983; Choudhary and Haque ,2010). Similar conclusions could be drawn when the stability parameters of individual genotypes were considered in the present study.

Twenty genotypes showed un predictable response across the environments for number of seeds perpod, whereas, none of the genotype showed this type of response for number of branches per plant, number of pods perplant, biological yield and 100 seed weight. None of the genotypes had both predictable and non-predictable response across the environments.

The results indicated that genotypes showing high and stable seed yield also exhibited either high or above average response for a number of yield contributing traits. It can, therefore, be suggested that while making selection, attention should be paid to the phenotypic stability of the traits associated with seed yield and the genotypes having average response for different traits could be identified as stable genotypes across the environments.

The simultaneous assessment of three stability parameters viz, ($\overline{\chi}$), bi and S²d_p and mean revealed that genotypes H06-79, H04-31, HK05-151, HK06-162, HK06-170, HK06-171, HK-2, HK-3 for yield per plant; H05-11, H06-135, H07-12 for 100 seed weight; H06-07, H06-75, HK06-168, H07-88, H06-41 for seeds per pod; H05-11, H06-52, H06-18, H06-70 for number of pods per plant, H06-75 (Tall) for plant height; HK05-151, HK05-152, HK06-160, HK06-169, for biological yield; exhibited high mean performance, above average response and were observed to be stable too. Hence these genotypes could safely be termed as ideal for favourable environmental conditions.

The desirable genotypes having Xi> X, bi= 1.0 and S²d_i = 0, for average environments were H05-10, HK06-152, HK06-155 for seed yield perplant; H04-75, H06-30, H06-97, H06-136, H07-86, H07-169, HK06-155, HK06-159, for 100 seed weight; H06-97, HK06-170 for seeds perpod; H04-31, C-235, HK-3, for number of branches perplant; H06-63, HC-1, H07-169, H06-11, H06-07, H06-55, for number of pods per plant; H07-88, HK05-151, HK-3, H06-80 for plant height; H07-93, HC-5, HC-1, H06-07, H04-31, H06-15, H06-70, H06-75, H06-32, H06-63, H06-98, for biological yield; H04-68, H06-41, C-235, HC-3 for harvest index. These genotypes were observed to be stable and generally suitable across the environments.

For unfavourable environmental conditions the desirable genotypes were HC-3 foryield perplant; HC-3, H06-70, H05-29, HK-3, HK06-177 for 100 seed weight; H07-169, for plant height; H05-29 for seeds per pod ; HK06-171, C-235, HC-5, H06-79, H04-75, H05-10 for number of pods per plant; C-235, HC-3, H07-23, H06-97, H05-29 for biological yield. These genotypes were expected to perform better under poor environmental conditions.

Considering the seed yield and its contributing traits, genotype H05-10 was observed

to be stable for six traits, genotypes H06-79, HK06-170 for five traits, genotypes H06-32 and H06-41, HK06-171, HK06-155 for four traits as indicated by the high mean performance, average to above average response and non significant values. The performance of these genotypes could be predicted across the environments. Some other genotypes viz, H06-79 and H04-31 and HC-3 were also observed to be stable across the environments.

The genotypes included in the present study did not exhibit uniform stability and responsiveness pattern for the different traits. The stability and response appeared to be specific for individual traits of an individual genotype and not common for all the traits.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, G., Atta, B.M., Shah, T.M., Sadiq, M.S. and Haq, M.A. (2008). Stability analysis for seed yield in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.). *J. Agric. Res.* 46: 223-228.
- Bahl, PN.(1988). Pulse Crops, [Baldev, B., Ramanujain, S. and Jain, H.W. (Eds.)]. Oxford & IBH Publishing
- Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi pp 95-131..
- Chetia, S.K. and Yadav, R.K. (2002). Phenotypic stability of yield and its components in pea (*Pisum satiuum* L.). *Res. Crops* 3: 606-614
- Choudhary, R.N. and Haque, M.E (2010). Stability of yield and its components in chickpea (*Ciceratietinum* L.) for chhotanagarpurregion. *Legume Res* 33: 164-170
- Costa, J.M., Bollero, V.S. and Pandey, PL. (2004). Stability for grain yield of barley genotypes underrainfed conditions. Adv in Plant Sci. 12: 27-30.
- Eberhart, S.A. and Russell, W.A. (1966). Stability parameters for comparing varieties. Crop Sci 6: 35-40.

Kapoor; R.L. (1972). A study of adaptability and gene action of some quantitative characters in Bajra [Pennisetum typhoides(Burmp.)Sandh].Ph.Dthesis, HAU, Hisar.

- Popalghat, G.R., Patil, J.V., Deshmukh and Mhase, L.B. (1999). Stability for yield and its components in chickpea (*Ciceratietinum*L.). Legune Research 22: 254-258.
- Popalghat, G.R., Patil, J.V., Deslimukh, R.B. and Mhase, L.B. (2001). Genotype × Environment interaction for seed yield and seed quality parameters in chickpea. *Legume Res.* 24: 248-251.
- Rao, M. and Rao, Y. (2004). Stability analysis in chickpea (Ciceranietinum L.). Legume Res. 27: 235-242.
- Rathore, P and Gupta, V.P (1999). Effect of environmental measures on stability analysis in pea. Crop. Improv. 26: 226-231.
- Samad, M.A., Fautrier, A.D. and Mc Neil, D.L. (1989). Phenotypic stability of formation and abortion of reproductive organs and other yield factors in pea and their values for genetic improvement. *New Zealand Journal of Crop and Horti Sci* 17: 129-136.
- Sandhu, H.S. (1983). Studies on Genotype X Environment interaction in cotton. M.Sc. Thesis, HAU, Hisar
- Sharma, D.K., Billore, M., Singhal, H.C. and Katania, V.P (2007). Adaptation analysis for yield and its attributes in chickpea (*Cicerarietinum* L.). *Legume Res.* 30: 103-107.
- Singh, O. and Kumar; S. (1994). Phenotypic stability of yield and related characters in desi gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Indian J. Agric. Sci., 64: 815-820.
- Singh, R.P. and Jaiswal, H.K. (1990). Genetic improvement of Pulse crops, pp 147-164. Nizam, J., Khan, I.A. and Farook, S.A. (Eds.) *Premier Publishing House*, Hyderabad, A.P.
- Singh, P (1981). Phenotypic stability in upland cotton. Curr. Sci. 50(23):10-34.
- Sirohi, A., Singh, A., Panwar, K.S., Chauhan, K.C. (2001). Genotype x Environment interaction and phenotypic stability in gram (*Ciceratietinum* L.). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 71: 411-413.
- Verma, A.K., Singh, D., Kumar, J., Rizvi, A.Z., Andrews, M. and Yaday, S.S. (2008). Impact of genetic divergence on the expression of individual trait in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L), *American-Eurasian Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 2: 205-211.
- Yaday, S.S., Verma, A.K., Rizvi, A.H., Singh, D., Kumar, J. and Andrews, M. (2010). Impact of genotype × environment interactions on the relative performance of diverse groups of chickpea (*CiceratietinumL.*) cultivars. Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science. 56: 49-64.