Correlation, regression and path-coefficient analysis of physiological parameters associated with berry ripening in grape (Vitis vinifera)

M P GIRIDHARAN¹ and P C JINDAL²

Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi 110 012

Received: 6 February 1995

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during 1990–93 to study genetic variability, correlation and direct and indirect effects of physiological parameters associated with crop duration in 15 genetically diverse genotypes of grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.). The genotypes showed significant difference for total duration of crop (from pruning to berry ripening), leaf area, leaf-area duration, shoot length, number of leaves at 75 days after pruning, leaf-expansion rate, chlorophyll content and stomatal density. It indicated that the magnitude of variability for all the parameters was very high. Shoot length at 75 days after pruning and leaf-area duration were found the most important physiological characters, contributing to the variation in duration of crop growth. Heritability and genetic advance were high for shoot length at 75 days after pruning.

Breeding for early maturity is one of the main objectives of crop improvement in countries, where grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.) is mainly grown for table purpose (Olmo 1980). It assumes prime importance in north India, where the period available between spring and monsoon being short for berry ripening, and rain during ripening causes extensive damage to the crop. Recently physiological parameters are being used as markers for early evaluation of hybrid progenies (Majumder and Sharma 1990). Information on the genetic basis of such characters associated with earlyberry maturity in grape helps the breeders in selecting parental genotypes for hybridization to evolve early-maturing cultivars as well as to screen the hybrid progenies in seedling stage for early-berry maturity (Jindal 1990). Therefore the present study was undertaken to evaluate genetic variability and to determine correlation and direct and indirect effects of physiological parameters associated with crop duration in grape.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifteen genetically diverse cultivars of grape (trained on head system) were grown during 1990–1993 at New Delhi. The genotypes included 10 cultivars, viz 'Julesky Muscat', 'Pearl of Csaba', 'Beauty Scedless', 'New Perlette', 'Madelein Angevine', 'Gold', 'Pusa Seedless', 'Hur', 'Fakhri' and 'Tas', and 5 hybrids, viz 'Baunqui Abyad' x 'Beauty Seedless 71-50', 'Hur' x 'Beauty Seedless 70-56', 'Hur' x 'Beauty Scedless 76-64',

¹Assistant Professor (Horticulture), Regional Agricultural Research Station, Kerala Agricultural University, Pilicode 671 353

²Senior Scientist, Division of Fruits and Horticultural Technology

'Hur' x 'Cardinal 76-1' and 'Madelein Angevine' x 'Rubired 76-2'. All the plants were pruned uniformly on the same date every year, retaining 12 canes/plant. Observations were recorded on 3 random plants on total duration of crop growth (from pruning to berry ripening), leaf area, leaf-area duration, shoot length and number of leaves at 75 days after pruning (the minimum number of days required from pruning to flowering), leaf expansion rate, chlorophyll content and stomatal density. Correlation, regression and pathcoefficient analysis were carried out as per the procedure of Robinson et al. (1951), Gomez and Gomez (1984) and Dewey and Lu (1959) respectively. The heritability and genetic advance of the parameters which contributed significantly to the variation in duration of crop growth were also worked out (Allard 1960).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The genotypes showed significant difference for all the characters studied, indicating high magnitude of variability for all the characters (Table 1). The duration of crop growth (from pruning to ripening) ranged from 129.67 days ('Julesky Muscat') to 176.00 days ('Tas').

Shoot length and number of leaves/shoot recorded at 75 days after pruning varied from 5.0 cm ('Hur') to 72.49 cm ('Pearl of Csaba') and 3.97 ('Hur') to 31.93 ('Pearl of Csaba') respectively. The shoot length at 75 days after pruning showed very high negative correlation (r = -0.879) with total duration of crop growth (Table 2). It indicated that early-bud burst helped the early-ripening genotypes to attain sufficient shoot growth before flowering, whereas late-maturing cultivars showed the less shoot at 75 days after pruning also showed similar trend (r = 0.858). However,

the leaves/shoot at the time of flowering did not show significant correlation with the duration of crop growth. It indicates that the leaves/shoot in the early stages before flowering are more important for early maturity than the leaves at flowering stage. At the time of flowering the leaf production per shoot might have passed the optimum level of 13 matured leaves/shoot, as reported earlier by Kingston and Epenhuijesen (1989), leaving the character non-significant. Though the leaves/shoot at the time of flowering was not significantly correlated with duration of crop growth, leaf area/shoot at flowering showed significant correlation. This may be due to the variation in leaf size among the genotypes, stage of maturity of leaves and the parasitic nature of young leaves for metabolites and their competition with young berries, causing delay in berry development (Martinez 1982).

Leaf-area duration, leaf-expansion rate and chlorophyll content also had significant correlation with duration of crop growth.

Data on leaf production and leaf area indicated that early development of leaf area is essential for early ripening of berries. The result confirms the findings of Schrader (1932) and Hamilton (1953). Step-wise regression analysis of physiological characters with duration of crop growth as dependent variable indicated that leaf-chlorophyll content, leaf-area duration and shoot length at 75 days after pruning regressed significantly with duration of crop growth. Shoot length at 75 days after pruning, followed by leaf-area duration were found most important characters contributing to the variation in duration of crop growth. The regression analysis showed that the leaves/shoot at 75 days after pruning contributed only 0.95% of the variation to duration of the crop growth, though it was significantly correlated. This may be due to the nullification of its positive direct effect on duration of crop growth by the negative in-

Genotype Shoot Leaves/ length Leaves/ shoot at Leaf at -Julesky Muscar' 70.07 27.11 31.77 1273 2028. 'Pearl of Csaba' 70.07 21.22 50.55 2188. 640. 'Pearl of Csaba' 70.07 21.22 50.55 2188. 640. 'New Perlette' 31.03 9.00 40.13 3 640. 65.00 21.22 50.55 2188. 'New Perlette' 14.27 4.00 11.33 1 649. 733 2 6.73 4 211. 'Mendelein Angevine' x 14.27 4.00 11.33 1 649. 733 2 6.73 4 211. 'Nemdelein Angevine' x 12.39 5.33 2 6.73 2 324. 1 649.	<u>а</u> щ	Leaf-area L duration/ shoot Le shoot v w 84 888.09 (127 785.60 (163 953.60 (114 607.70 (114 607.70 (114 607.70	expa	14.	Leaf chlorophyll (mø/************************************	Stomatal density	Total
y Muscat' 70.07 27.11 31.77 1 if Caba' 72.49 31.93 37.33 2 'Secdless' 65.00 21.22 50.55 2 erlette' 31.03 9.00 40.13 3 erlette' 15.80 7.33 23.72 1 lein Angevine' 14.27 4.00 11.33 1 lein Angevine' 14.27 4.00 11.33 1 ired 76-2' 20.10 5.33 26.73 4 it Abyad' x 20.10 5.33 26.73 4 it Abyad' x 1.50' 12.39 5.33 26.73 4 it Abyad' x 1.50' 12.39 5.33 26.73 4 it Abyad' x 20.10 20.20 2 edless' 70.56' 7.56'			0.13 0.18 0.18			(no./mm²)	duration of crop growth (days)
f Csaba' 72.49 31.93 37.33 'Seedless' 65.00 21.22 50.55 erlette' 31.03 9.00 40.13 ein Angevine' x 15.80 7.33 23.72 ein Angevine' x 14.27 4.00 11.33 ien Angevine' x 14.27 4.00 11.33 ired 76-2' 14.27 4.00 11.33 ired 76-2' 14.27 4.00 11.33 ired 76-2' 19.10 5.33 26.73 ired 76-2' 19.15 8.87 34.83 ired 76-2' 19.15 8.87 34.83 ired 76-2' 19.15 8.87 34.83 ired 76-1' 15.30 8.83 36.00 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.83 36.00 'Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.83 36.00 eolless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 eolless' <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>0.18</td><td>0.24</td><td>3.22</td><td>169-00</td><td>129.67</td></t<>			0.18	0.24	3.22	169-00	129.67
Secdless* 65.00 21.22 50.55 erlette* 31.03 9.00 40.13 ein Angevine* X 15.80 7.33 23.72 dein Angevine* X 14.27 4.00 11.33 ried 76-2* 14.27 4.00 11.33 ried 76-2* 14.27 4.00 11.33 ried 76-2* 12.39 5.33 26.73 riv Seedless 71-50* 13.15 8.87 34.83 'Bauuty Seedless 70-56* 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 76-64* 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1* 15.30 8.83 36.00 sedless* 23.00 10.33 23.50 endless* 7.64* 7.65 23.17			0.18	0.26	3.29	207.67	133.33
erlette [*] 31.03 9.00 40.13 ein Angevine [*] X 15.80 7.33 23.72 lefin Angevine [*] X 14.27 4.00 11.33 ired 76-2 [*] 14.27 4.00 11.33 ird Angad [*] X 20.10 5.33 26.73 in Abyad [*] X 20.10 5.33 26.73 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.83 35.90 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.83 25.50 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.50' 19.15 8.83 25.50' 19.15 8.85' 19.50' 19.15 8.85' 19.50'				0.27	3.36	190.00	146.67
ein Angevine* 15.80 7.33 23.72 dein Angevine* 14.27 4.00 11.33 tired 76-2* 14.27 4.00 11.33 ui Abyad* 20.10 5.33 26.73 tity Seedless 71-50* 12.39 5.33 26.73 ity Seedless 71-56* 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 70-56* 19.15 8.87 7.17 24.17 'Beauty Seedless 76-64* 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1* 15.30 8.83 36.00 ecdless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 ecdless' 7.65 23.00 10.33 23.50			570	0.33	3.11	183.67	153.33
lefin Angevine' x 14.27 4.00 11.33 ired 76-2' 20.10 5.33 26.73 ir Abyad' x 20.10 5.33 26.73 ir Seedless 71-50' 12.39 5.33 25.20 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 76-64' 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1' 15.30 8.83 36.00 eedless' 23.00 10.33 23.50			0.20	0.36	3.03	269.67	154.67
ui Abyad' x 20.10 5.33 26.73 try Seedless 71-50' 12.39 5.33 26.73 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 76-64' 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1' 15.30 8.83 36.00 colless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 colless' 7.65 23.00 10.33 23.50	1 649.13 192	192 357.40 (0.26	0.33	2.65	210.67	166.67
12.39 5.33 25.20 'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 76-64' 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1' 15.30 8.83 36.00 eodless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 eodless' 7.63 5.39 29.17	4 211.20 371	371 727 <u>.</u> 50	0.27	0.36	3.15	173.00	156.33
'Beauty Seedless 70-56' 19.15 8.87 34.83 'Beauty Seedless 76-64' 17.87 7.17 24.17 'Cardinal 76-1' 15.30 8.83 36.00 colless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 eddless' 7.63 5.39 29.17	2 324 24 311	311 300.00	0.40	0.47	3.12	257.00	162.70
Beaulty Secdiess 76-64* 17.87 7.17 24.17 *Cardinal 76-1* 15.30 8.83 36.00 *condiess* 23.00 10.33 23.50 *colless* 7.63 5.39 29.17	2 964.93 250	250 878.80 (0.17	0.23	3.19	211.33	155.33
Cardinal 76-1 15.30 8.83 36.00 sedless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 7.63 5.39 29.17	2412.52 29(290 278.00	0.25	0.36	3.26	192.67	161.67
edless' 23.00 10.33 23.50 7.63 5.39 29.17	2 241.31 228	228 077.20	0.18	0.19	3.15	187.33	155.67
7.63 5.39 29.17	2 725.66 261	261 356.40 (0.19	0.28	2.52	175.33	162.00
	3 831.24 472	473 751.30 (0.36	0.50	2.86	204.67	175.33
'Hur ² 5.00 3.97 32.18 3.71.	3 771.05 314	314512.40 (0.22	0.25	2.97	218.33	174.33
'Tas' . 6.80 5.17 42.67 2.988.	2 988.83 413	413 956.90 (0.32	0.36	2.79	219.33	176.00
$CD \{P=0.01\}$ 7.5 3.5 2.83 479.	479.94 24	24 406.78 (0.02	0.03	0.16	9.66	2.20

GIRIDHARAN AND JINDAL

[Vol 65, No. 12

December 1995]	CORRELATION, REGRESSION AND PATH-COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS IN GRAPE
	Louis and the second se

Character	Correlation c	oefficient (r)	Adjusted	Contribution	Contribution
	Phenotypic	Genotypic	r ²	of character to r ²	to variation in duration of crop growth (%)
Shoot length at 75 days*	0.879	0.913	0.7719	0,7719	77.19
Leaves/shoot at 75 days*	0.858	0.891	0,7816	0.0095	0.95
Leaf-area duration	0.792	0.802	0.8545	0.0729	7.29
Leaf-expansion rate (length-wise)	0,657	0.677	0.8553	0,0008	0.08
Leaf chlorophyll	0.587	0.643	0.8848	0.0295	2.95
Leaf area/shoot at flowering	0.507	0.537	0.8870	0.0022	0.22
Leaf-expansion rate (width-wise)	0.472	0.494	0.8910	0.0040	0.40
Stomatal density	0.302	0.307	0.9061	0.0151	1.51
Leaves/shoot at flowering	0.182	0,191			
Table value	0.393				

Table 2	Correlation and regression analysis of physiological characters with duration of crop growth as dependent
	variable in grape

^{*}Days after pruning

 Table 3
 Direct and indirect effects of physiological characters on duration of crop growth at genotypic level in grape genotypes

Character	Leaf area/shoc at flower ing		Leaves/ shoot at 75 days	Shoot length at 75 days [*]	Stomata density	l Leaf- expan- sìon rate [†]	Leaf- expan- sion rate ⁴⁴	Leaf chloro- phyll	Genotypic correl- ation with growth duration
Leaf area/shoot at flowering	0.686		2.619	3.398	0.302	0.562	0.181	0.047	0.537
Leaf-area duration	0.542	2.437	3,493	4.936	0.012	1.012	0.380	0.127	0.802
Leaves/shoot at 75 days*	- 0.342	1,622	5.249	6.964	0.457	0.789	0,307	0.182	0.891
Shoot length at 75 days	-0.327	1.690	5.134	7.119	0.562	0.776	0.279	0,202	0.913
Stomatal density	0.144	0.020	-1.672	2.787	1.435	0,540	0.276	0.026	0.307
Leal-expansion rate [†]	0.294	1.878	3.152	4.206	0.590	1.313	0.591	0.105	0.677
Leaf-expansion rate Ψ	0.189	(.412	2.453	3,002	0,603	1.182	0.656	0.088	0.494
Leaf chlorophyll	0.090	0.859	2,654	3.984	0.102	0.384	0,161	0.360	-0,643
Residual mean			0,473						

^{*}Days after pruning; [†]length-wise, ^Ψwidth-wise

Character	Coefficient of	of variation	Heritability	Genetic advance (GA)	GA (% of mean)
	Phenotypic	Genotypic	(broad sense)		
Shoot length at 75 days	88,801	87.074	0.961	46.42	175.90
Leaf-area duration	43.791	43,398	0.982	57.70	0.01
Leaf chlorophyll	8.407	7.761	0.852	0.44	14.76
Crop-growth duration	8.081	8.639	0.990	27.90	17.70

 Table 4
 Coefficient of variation, heritability and genetic advance of characters correlated with crop-growth duration of grape

Days after pruning

direct effect through shoot length at 75 days after pruning (Table 3).

The leaf area/shoot at flowering stage showed strong direct positive effect on total duration of crop growth. Shoot length at 75 days after pruning had strong negative direct effect on total duration of crop growth; but it had indirect positive effect through leaves/ shoot at 75 days after pruning. Leaf-area duration had a direct effect of ---2.437 and it acted indirectly through leaf number at 75 days after pruning. The residual effect (0.473), associated with the value of standard partial regression coefficient, indicated the contribution of certain other characters.

Genotypic correlation coefficients were higher than phenotypic ones for all the characters (Table 2). There was association between various characters studied and the phenotypic expression of correlation was reduced under the influence of environment. The genotypic coefficient of variation was the highest for shoot length at 75 days after pruning, followed by leaf-area duration (Table 4). Genotypic coefficient of variation together with heritability estimates would give the estimates of genetic advance to be expected from the selection. In our study shoot length at 75 days after pruning and leaf-area duration showed high heritability, which are helpful in making selection of superjor genotype on the basis of phenotypic expression of quantitative traits. The shoot length at 75 days after pruning showed high heritability which as well as high genetic advance (as % of mean) indicating that most of the variation in the character is additive in nature.

It was concluded that shoot length at 75 days after pruning was the most suitable character for selection of early-ripening genotypes.

REFERENCES

- Allard R W. 1960. Principles of Plant Breeding, 485 pp. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Dewey D R and Lu K H. 1959. Correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheatgrass seed production. Agronomy Journal 51:515-8.
- Gomez K A and Gomez A A. 1984. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research, pp 411-20, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Hamilton J. 1953. The effect of cluster thinning on maturity and yield of grapes. Proceedings of American Society for Horticultural Science 62: 231-4.
- Jindal P C. 1990. Grape. (in) Fruits Tropical and Subtropical, pp 186-251. Bose TK and Mitra SK (Eds). Naya Prokash, Calcutta.
- Kingston C M and Epenhuijesen C W. 1989. Influence of leaf area on fruit development and quality of Italia glass house table grapes. American Journal of Englogy and Viticulture 40: 130-4.

December 1995] CORRELATION, REGRESSION AND PATH-COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS IN GRAPE

- Majumder P K and Sharma D K. 1990. Mango. (in) Fridis. Tropical and Subtropical. pp 1–62. Naya Prokash, Calcutta.
- Martinez D T F. 1982. A method of defining the parasiticzine at the aplical part of *Vitis vinifera* L. shoot. *Vitis* 21 (3): 217-22.
- Mohanakumaran N, Krishnamurthi S and Rao V N M. 1964. Influence of leaf area on the yield and quality of some varieties of grapes. South Indian Horticulture 12 (2): 29–43.
- Olmo H P. 1980. Selecting and breeding new grape varieties. *California Agriculture* **34** (7): 23-24.
- Robinson H F, Comstock R E and Harvey P H. 1951. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation in corn and their implication in selection. Agronomy Journal 43: 282-7.
- Schrader A L. 1932. Effect of defoliation on the fruiting of concord grape shoots. *Proceedings of American Society for Horticultural Science* 29: 317.