Pak. J. Bot., 40(2): 627-635, 2008.

PATH COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS OF YIELD COMPONENT IN TOMATO (*LYCOPERSICON ESCULENTUM*)

HIDAYATULLAH*, SHAKEEL AHMAD JATOI, ABDUL GHAFOOR AND TARIQ MAHMOOD

National Agricultural Research Center, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Abstract

Thirty six tomato genotypes, including cultivar, were evaluated at National Agricultural Research Centre, Islamabad, during summer, 2002 and 2003 to estimate the nature and magnitude of genetic variability based on days to first harvest, number of pickings, plant height, number of fruit plant^{-1}, fruit weight plant^{-1}, fruit size, single fruit weight, number of locules, pericarp thickness, TSS, fruit pH, seeds fruit^{-1} and 1000 seed weight. A wide range of variation was observed among the characters studied which have a great interest for tomato breeders. Heritability for (broad sense) ranged from 51.8 to 99.8 % in 2002 and from 86.0 to 99.9 % in 2003. Single fruit weight gave the highest heritability during 2002, however, it was at maximum for days to first harvest during 2003. Fruit weight plant^{-1}showed high and positive genotypic and phenotypic correlation with number of picking and with number of fruits plant^{-1}, thus indicating that these traits were the most important yield components. On the basis of performance and keeping in view the selection criteria observed in the present study, 14 genotypes were identified for future testing under wide range of environments.

Introduction

Tomato (2n=24) belonging the family Solanaceae is an important vegetable crop of the world with a yield potential of up to 42.1 t/ha (Yamaguchi, 1983). It is grown all over Pakistan in different seasons according to their environments with main crop during spring season, whereas the autumn crop is being planted in the Soan Valley (Punjab) and Durgai (NWFP) where it yields from November till middle of December (Chaudhary *et al.,* 1995). Its cultivated area is 38,959 hectares and production is 4, 12,786 tones with per unit area yield 10.6 t ha^{-1} that is less than half of its potential yield (Anon., 2004; Ashraf & Ahmad, 2001).

Systematic study and evaluation of tomato germplasm is of great importance for current and future agronomic and genetic improvement of the crop. Furthermore, if an improvement programme is to be carried out, evaluation of germplasm is imperative, in order to understand the genetic background and the breeding value of the available germplasm (Agong *et al.,* 2000). Singh *et al.,* (2002) observed high genetic variation for plant height, number of days to fruit set, number of fruit clusters plant^{-1}, number of fruits plant^{-1}, fruit weight plant^{-1}and fruit yield plant^{-1}. Yield being a complex trait, it is difficult to exploit various yield contributing characters through the knowledge of correlation, therefore it is important to carry out other analysis including path coefficient that provides a clear indication for selection criterion (Mc Giffens *et al.,* 1994). The coefficients generated by path analysis measure the direct and the indirect influence of a variable upon another (Dewey & Lu, 1959). Present study was conducted to evaluate tomato germplasm received from various sources both exotic and local.

*E-mail: hidayatu_2003@yahoo.co.uk

Materials and Methods

The experimental material comprised of 36 genotypes including one check (Roma) and out of these 28 were exotic i.e., from North Korea (11), India (5), Bangladesh (3), Sri Lanka (2), Japan (1), Italy (1) and AVRDC, Taiwan (5). Seven genotypes were local, one each obtained from Punjab (Nagina) and Baluchistan (Sariab Long), whereas other 5 were collected from different parts of the country. Seeds were sown on third week of January and transplanting under field conditions at NARC (longitude 73° 08 east and latitude 33° 42 north with an altitude of 510 meters above sea level) during third week of March both the years in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications. Two rows of 3 meter for each genotype were planted with 75 cm inter row spacing, whereas plant distance were kept at 50 cm. All cultural practices were done according to the need of plant (Choudhury & Shahid, 2000). Data on days to first harvest, plant height, number and weight of fruits plant^{-1}, single fruit weight, fruit size and other fruit characteristics (TSS, pH, pericarp thickness, number of locules) and total yield were recorded from all the plants at approximately similar physiological maturity (bright red ripe).

Variance and covariance analyses were carried out along with phenotypic, genotypic and environmental correlations with the help of computer software following the techniques described by Singh & Chaudhry (1979). Heritability was estimated as a ratio between genotypic and phenotypic variability. Path analysis was also carried out to determine the relationship among the yield components (Dewey & Lu, 1959).

Results and Discussion

Analysis of variance for yield and its components presented in the Table 1 revealed significant differences among genotypes for all the characters during both the years. Similar observations have been reported by Shravan *et al.,* (2004) on 14 characters in tomato. Singh & Raj (2004) and Barman *et al.,* (1995) also had similar findings that **t**he genotypes showed significant differences for all the traits. The effect of year for various characters (days to first harvest, number of pickings, number of fruits plant^{-1}, fruit weight plant^{-1} and fruit size) indicated the influence of environmental changes over the years that was expected under field conditions in a crop like tomato. These differences were mainly attributed towards climatic data during two years (Table 2). Similarly genotypes-years interaction was significant for most of the characters which revealed that the evaluation experiments under field condition should be conducted over the years or locations to minimize errors (Goncalves *et al.,* 2003).

Mean data, range, genotypic and phenotypic coefficient of variation and heritability revealed high range for most of traits studied (Table 3). High heritability for days to first harvest, number of fruits plant^{-1}, single fruit weight and number of locules indicated less influence of environments within specific year that could be exploited through simple selection from this material to improve yield as suggested by Mohanty, (2003). Low to medium heritability for TSS and seeds fruit^{-1} suggested a careful selection from the material for enhancing the genetic portion of variation that can also be attained through addition of superior Germplasm (Johnson *et al.,* 1955).

Table 1. Analysis of variance for yield and its components of 36 genotypes of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*).

Characters	Years	Replication – year	Genotypes	Genotype – years	Error
Days to First harvest	23541.8**	250.6	116.6**	65.7**	0.1
No. of Pickings	394.7**	4.5	5.1**	3.7**	0.4
Plant height	232.3 NS	249.7	4608.0**	36.9 NS	38.7
Fruits per plant	3458.4**	22.6	1633.3**	149.2**	23.3
Fruit weight/ plant	1.3*	0.1	0.3**	0.03**	0.02
Fruit length	278.8*	29.1	799.9**	0.5NS	20.2
Fruit diameter	263.8*	22.5	715.7**	0.4 NS	18.5
Single fruit weight	62.6 NS	193.9	3028.7**	103.2**	5.02
No. of locules	0.2 NS	0.4	8.8**	0.1**	0.03
Pericarp thickness	0.03 NS	1.4	11.9**	0.1 NS	0.2
TSS	1.5 NS	1.4	1.9**	0.3**	0.1
PH	6.0 NS	1.6	11.6**	0.5*	0.3
Seeds/ fruit	48.7 NS	279.6	3691.5**	33.5 NS	131.2
1000 seed weight	0.6 NS	0.4	0.8**	0.02 NS	0.02

*****Significant at 1% level

**Significant at 5% level

The genotypic and phenotypic correlations among all the characters are presented in Table 4 and 5. In most of the cases genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients were of the same directions but the former were slightly higher in magnitude indicating low influence of environments that enhanced the acceptance of these findings (Shravan *et al.,* 2004; Nakawuka & Adipala, 1999). Out of total 91 combinations for correlation, 73 showed similarity during both years for genotypic association, whereas 79 combinations were similar for phenotypic correlations. Although year effects were observed for most of the characters for basic statistics but about two third combinations for correlation were of same magnitude over the years that enhanced the acceptance of the results. Due to high similarity in results for correlation at both genotypic and phenotypic levels, we discussed only genotypic correlations onward. Days to first harvest showed negative correlation with number of pickings that could be exploited for developing determinate cultivars which are not available at present, although these types of cultivars are more acceptable by growers. Number of pickings had positive correlation with fruit weight plant^{-1}and 1000 seed weight. Number of fruits plant^{-1} showed positive association with fruit weight plant^{-1} and seeds fruit^{-1}. Similar results were reported by Joshi *et al.,* (1998), Moya *et al.,* (1996), Singh *et al.,* (1997) and Das *et al.,* (1998). Number of fruits plant^{-1} had negative correlation with fruit size, single fruit weight as already mentioned by Mohanty (2002), whereas in our findings in addition it was also negative with number of locules and pericarp thickness. Fruit length had positive correlation with fruit diameter, single fruit weight, pericarp thickness and 1000 seed weight, whereas negative with seed fruit^{-1}.

Because of significant association of fruit weight plant^{-1} with other characters, genotypic correlations were partitioned into direct and indirect effects (Table 6). All the characters exhibited direct effect on fruit weight plant^{-1}, however, based on two years results, it was concluded that fruit diameter that exhibited the highest direct effect could be the selection criteria for improving fruit yield plant^{-1}, whereas other important characters (plant height, fruit length, single fruit weight, TSS and seeds per fruit) those exhibited negative direct effect are suggested to be exploited through high indirect effects. The undesirable negative association as of fruit length with other yield contributing traits could be broken through selective diallel mating or mutation to broaden the genetic base for selection to improve fruit yield (Arshad *et al*., 2005).

Overall 14 genotypes showed more fruit yield plant^{-1} as compared to control (Table 7). Maximum fruit yield plant^{-1} was recorded from 10584 acquired from North korea, through PGRP gene bank. Maximum number of fruits plant^{-1} was recorded in a variety Pant Bahar from India. However due to smaller fruit size of variety Pant Bahar it was at no.4 in fruit yield plant^{-1}. Pericarp thickness and average fruit weight were highest in Avinash-2 as compared to control. All the selected genotypes exhibited higher fruit yield along with other desirable traits, hence these are suggested to test under potential areas for identification of best cultivar for general cultivation.

Table 2. Monthly mean maximum/minimum air temperatures during crop growth period.

Months	Maximum (°C)		Minimum (°C)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003
March	26.9	23.0	9.5	9.6
April	32.6	30.9	15.1	14.2
May	39.1	35.0	19.7	16.8
June	38.4	38.8	23.2	22.2

Table 3. Genetic parameters for various quantitative characteristics in tomato grown at NARC during 2002-03.

Character	Year	Mean	Range	GCV	PCV	h^2 (BS)
Days to first harvest	2002	120.31 ± 0.215	114-128	3.84	3.85	99.4
	2003	141.19 ± 0.112	131-160	4.44	4.45	99.9
Number of pickings	2002	6.15 ± 0.403	3.33-7.67	16.69	20.19	68.4
	2003	3.44 ± 0.291	2-6	37.35	40.11	86.7
Plant height	2002	74.58 ± 5.013	42.33-134.33	37.15	38.93	91.1
	2003	72.51 ± 0.818	34-132	37.89	37.94	99.7
Number of fruits/plant	2002	24.97 ± 3.92	4.8-88.5	80.41	84.88	89.7
	2003	16.97 ± 0.384	1.8-45.1	78.07	78.17	99.7
Fruit weight/plant	2002	0.67 ± 0.072	0.14-1.41	37.95	42.24	80.7
	2003	0.52 ± 0.015	0.09-0.98	49.03	49.29	99.0
Fruit length	2002	45.22 ± 2.528	23.03-67.1	24.27	26.13	86.3
	2003	47.49 ± 2.654	24.17-70.47	24.27	26.13	86.3
Fruit diameter	2002	43.94 ± 2.423	23.17-65.3	23.61	25.47	85.9
	2003	46.15 ± 2.542	24.33-68.57	23.61	25.46	86.0
Single fruit weight	2002	41.26 ± 0.706	5.3-87.7	59.23	59.3	99.8
	2003	42.62 ± 0.614	7.7-88.3	50.04	50.11	99.8
Number of locules	2002	2.99 ± 0.14	2.0-6.2	40.07	40.88	96.1
	2003	3.05 ± 0.039	2.0-6.3	39.78	39.84	99.7
Pericarp thickness	2002	4.42 ± 0.399	2.33-7.13	31.04	34.76	79.8
	2003	4.44 ± 0.044	2.4-7.2	31.51	31.55	99.7
TSS	2002	5.23 ± 0.304	4.37-6.63	10.43	14.49	51.8
	2003	5.40 ± 0.026	4.1-6.5	10.53	10.56	99.4
Fruit Ph	2002	4.63 ± 0.439	2.1-9.73	29.85	34.07	76.8
	2003	4.97 ± 0.046	2.5-9.8	27.80	27.84	99.7
Seeds/fruit	2002	43.77 ± 9.227	2.23-108.37	53.65	64.90	68.3
	2003	43.00 ± 0.721	2.3-112.4	57.86	57.93	99.7
1000 seed weight	2002	2.14 ± 0.112	1.46-3.07	16.29	18.65	76.3
	2003	2.04 ± 0.013	1.11- 2.94	18.65	18.68	99.6

h^2 (BS) = heritability for broad sense

Table 4. Genotypic correlation coefficients for relations among yield components of tomato.

	Year	Days to first harvest	No. of pickings	Plant height	Fruits plant^{-1}	Fruit weight plant^{-1}	Fruit length	Fruit diameter	Single fruit weight	No. of locules	Pericarp thickness	Total soluble salts	Fruit pH	Seeds fruit^{-1}
No. of pickings	2002	-0.760**												
	2003	-0.710**												
Plant height	2002	0.310	-0.272											
	2003	0.360*	-0.156											
Fruits plant	2002	-0.051	0.063	0.136										
	2003	-0.129	0.140	0.011										
Fruit weight plant	2002	-0.459**	0.391*	-0.222	0.343*									
	2003	-0.457**	0.512**	-0.295	0.567**									
Fruit length	2002	-0.100	-0.127	-0.259	-0.710**	-0.008								
	2003	-0.187	0.303	-0.259	-0.621**	-0.010								
Fruit diameter	2002	0.070	-0.033	-0.040	-0.749**	-0.0817	0.516**							
	2003	0.112	-0.061	-0.065	-0.675**	-0.136	0.516**							
Single fruit weight	2002	0.084	-0.066	-0.116	-0.757**	-0.097	0.610**	0.921**						
	2003	0.029	-0.046	-0.152	-0.742**	-0.145	0.653**	0.916**						
No. of locules	2002	0.074	-0.021	-0.151	-0.429**	-0.172	0.184	0.684**	0.587**					
	2003	0.022	-0.123	-0.203	-0.336*	-0.096	0.198	0.640**	0.577**					
Pericarp thickness	2002	-0.326*	0.383*	-0.031	-0.402*	0.151	0.414*	0.464**	0.516**	0.063				
	2003	-0.059	0.167	0.021	-0.450**	-0.054	0.415*	0.510**	0.600**	0.122				
Total soluble salts	2002	0.384*	-0.169	0.0789	0.380*	-0.052	-0.233	-0.358*	-0.464**	-0.377*	-0.189			
	2003	0.221	-0.222	-0.193	0.052	0.035	-0.011	-0.083	-0.102	-0.062	-0.237			
Fruit pH	2002	0.229	-0.220	0.143	-0.031	-0.225	-0.074	-0.042	-0.109	0.062	-0.281	-0.139		
	2003	0.284	-0.224	0.036	0.019	-0.080	-0.032	0.056	-0.003	0.105	-0.127	0.126		
Seeds fruit	2002	-0.246	0.338*	-0.061	0.477**	0.119	-0.563**	-0.156	-0.207	0.002	0.135	-0.162	-0.100	
	2003	-0.151	0.174	-0.067	0.401*	0.089	-0.498**	-0.116	-0.259	0.035	0.173	-0.185	-0.046	
1000 seed weight	2002	-0.390*	0.368*	-0.480**	-0.143	0.295	0.356*	0.075	0.161	0.105	0.112	-0.278	0.045	0.098
	2003	-0.485**	0.481**	-0.488**	-0.030	0.207	0.337*	0.017	0.014	0.144	0.079	-0.088	-0.077	0.164

Table 5. Phenotypic correlation coefficients for relations among yield components of tomato.

	Year	Days to first harvest	No. of pickings	Plant height	Fruits plant^{-1}	Fruit weight plant^{-1}	Fruit length	Fruit diameter	Single fruit weight	No. of locules	Pericarp thickness	Total soluble salts	Fruit pH	Seeds fruit^{-1}
No. of pickings	2002	-0.625 **												
	2003	-0.660 **												
Plant height	2002	0.297	-0.188											
	2003	0.357 *	-0.148											
Fruits plant	2002	-0.054	0.094	0.121										
	2003	-0.129	0.130	0.011										
Fruit weight plant	2002	-0.417 *	0.394 *	-0.179	0.394 *									
	2003	-0.455 **	0.490**	-0.294	0.566 **									
Fruit length	2002	-0.085	-0.062	-0.225	-0.614 **	0.022								
	2003	-0.172	0.271	-0.237	-0.579 **	-0.010								
Fruit diameter	2002	0.067	0.027	-0.011	-0.646 **	-0.034	0.527 **							
	2003	0.105	-0.056	-0.062	-0.627 **	-0.129	0.527 **							
Single fruit weight	2002	0.084	-0.054	-0.109	-0.715 **	-0.085	0.571 **	0.856 **						
	2003	0.029	-0.041	-0.152	-0.742 **	-0.144	0.610 **	0.852 **						
No. of locules	2002	0.072	-0.012	-0.146	-0.402 *	-0.152	0.147	0.609 **	0.573 **					
	2003	0.021	-0.117	-0.203	-0.336 *	-0.096	0.186	0.599 **	0.577 **					
Pericarp thickness	2002	-0.297	0.299	-0.001	-0.333 *	0.127	0.334 *	0.396 *	0.460 **	0.049				
	2003	-0.058	0.159	0.020	-0.445 **	-0.053	0.386 *	0.471**	0.600 **	0.122				
Total soluble salts	2002	0.279	-0.060	0.054	0.244	0.006	-0.169	-0.264	-0.336 *	-0.264	-0.172			
	2003	0.220	-0.211	-0.194	0.053	0.035	-0.010	-0.074	-0.102	-0.062	-0.236			
Fruit pH	2002	0.202	-0.145	0.094	-0.006	-0.105	-0.054	-0.034	-0.094	0.059	-0.206	-0.002		
	2003	0.284	-0.210	0.036	0.019	-0.080	-0.031	0.053	-0.003	0.105	-0.127	0.126		
Seeds fruit	2002	-0.205	0.237	-0.055	0.387 *	0.127	-0.449 **	-0.127	-0.171	0.018	0.075	-0.054	-0.031	
	2003	-0.151	0.161	-0.067	0.401 *	0.088	-0.463 **	-0.108	-0.259	0.035	0.173	-0.185	-0.046	
1000 seed weight	2002	-0.354 *	0.255	-0.387 *	-0.113	0.248	0.250	0.058	0.137	0.098	0.114	-0.133	0.053	0.168
	2003	0.455 **	-0.487 **	-0.030	0.207	0.304	0.012	0.014	0.144	0.079	-0.088	-0.077	0.164	0.160

Table 6. Direct and indirect effects contributions of various characters to fruit weight per plant in tomato during 2002 and 03.

	Days to first harvest	No. of pickings	Plant height	Fruits plant^{-1}	Fruit length	Fruit diameter	Single fruit weight	No. of locules	Pericarp thickness	TSS	pH	Seeds per fruit	1000 seed weight	Fruit weight plant^{-1}
Days to first harvest	**0.02**	0.17	-0.02	0.004	0.03	0.01	-0.03	0.001	-0.08	-0.08	-0.03	0.05	-0.04	-0.46
	-0.11	-0.01	-0.04	-0.050	0.003	0.04	-0.01	-0.001	-0.004	-0.01	0.004	0.03	0.01	-0.46
Number of pickings	-0.01	**-0.22**	0.02	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.0002	0.10	0.04	0.03	-0.07	0.04	0.39
	0.08	**0.02**	0.02	0.05	-0.004	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.003	-0.04	-0.01	0.51
Plant height	0.01	0.06	**-0.07**	-0.010	0.07	-0.01	0.04	-0.001	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.05	-0.22
	-0.04	-0.002	**-0.11**	0.004	0.004	-0.02	0.03	0.01	0.002	0.01	0.001	0.01	0.01	-0.30
Fruits plant^{-1}	-0.001	-0.01	-0.01	**-0.09**	0.18	-0.12	0.29	-0.004	-0.10	-0.08	0.004	-0.10	-0.01	0.34
	0.01	0.002	-0.001	**0.38**	0.009	-0.25	0.17	0.01	-0.03	-0.002	0.0003	-0.08	0.001	0.57
Fruit length	-0.002	0.03	0.02	0.06	**-0.25**	0.08	-0.23	0.002	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.11	0.04	-0.01
	0.02	0.004	0.03	-0.23	**-0.01**	0.19	-0.15	-0.01	0.03	0.001	-0.001	0.10	-0.01	-0.01
Fruit diameter	0.001	0.01	0.003	0.06	-0.13	**0.16**	-0.35	0.01	0.12	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.01	-0.08
	-0.01	-0.001	0.01	-0.26	-0.01	**0.38**	-0.21	-0.02	0.04	0.004	0.001	0.02	-0.0003	-0.14
Single fruit weight	0.001	0.02	0.01	0.06	-0.16	0.15	**-0.38**	0.01	0.13	0.10	0.01	0.04	0.02	-0.10
	-0.003	-0.001	0.02	-0.28	-0.01	0.34	**-0.22**	-0.02	0.04	0.01	0.001	0.05	-0.0002	-0.15
Number of locules plant-1	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.05	0.11	-0.22	**0.01**	0.02	0.08	-0.01	-0.0004	0.01	-0.17
	-0.002	-0.002	0.02	-0.13	-0.003	0.24	-0.13	**-0.04**	0.01	0.003	0.002	-0.01	-0.002	-0.10
Pericarp thickness	-0.01	-0.09 0.002	0.002	0.03	-0.11	0.08	-0.20	0.001	**0.25**	0.04	0.04	-0.03	0.01	0.15
	0.01		-0.002	-0.17	-0.01	0.19	-0.13	-0.01	**0.07**	0.01	-0.002	-0.04	-0.001	-0.05
Total soluble salts	0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.06	-0.06	0.18	-0.003	-0.05	**-0.20**	0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.05
	-0.02	-0.003	0.02	0.02	0.0002	-0.03	0.02	0.002	-0.02	**-0.04**	0.002	0.04	0.001	0.04
Fruit pH	0.004	0.05	-0.01	0.003	0.02	-0.01	0.04	0.001	-0.07	0.03	**-0.13**	0.02	0.01	-0.23
	-0.03	-0.003	-0.004	0.01	0.0004	0.02	0.001	-0.004	-0.01	-0.01	**0.02**	0.01	0.001	-0.08
Seeds fruit-1	-0.004	-0.08	0.004	-0.04	0.14	-0.03	0.08	0	0.03	0.03	0.01	**-0.20**	0.01	0.12
	0.02	0.003	0.01	0.15	0.01	-0.04	0.06	-0.001	0.01	0.01	-0.001	**-0.21**	-0.003	0.09
1000 seed weight	-0.01	-0.08	0.033	0.01	-0.09	0.01	-0.06	0.001	0.03	0.06	-0.01	-0.02	**0.10**	0.30
	0.05	0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.005	0.01	-0.003	-0.01	0.01	0.004	-0.001	-0.03	**-0.02**	0.21

Table 7. Fruit yield and important yield contributing factors of better yielding genotypes and the check.

Genotypes	Source	Plant height	Number of fruit plant^{-1}	Fruit weight plant^{-1} (Kg)	Fruit size (length)	Fruit size (width)	S.F. wt: (grams)	Number.of locules	Pericarp thickness	TSS	Fruit pH
Roma	Pakistan	55.7	11.9	0.64	59.68	45.55	54.45	2.05	6.715	5.615	4.535
PAK 0010573	N. Korea	66.3	27.6	0.68	39.365	39.95	25.5	2.9	2.365	4.8	5.635
Feston	Itlay	54.7	13.2	0.695	50.435	49.13	53.35	2.2	3.515	5.885	4.915
BARI-4	Bangladesh	62.7	24.2	0.74	44.215	38.0	31.15	2.25	5.135	4.885	2.535
Punjab Chhuhara	India	64.0	20.6	0.745	65.3	42.335	37	2.685	5.185	5.435	3.835
PAK 0010290	Pakistan	55.7	31.1	0.745	46.065	33.8	24.7	2	3.865	5.7	3.45
PAK 0010592	N. Korea	69.3	40.1	0.755	42.52	32.57	19.2	2.185	3.865	5.985	4.2
Avinash-2	Srilanka	51.8	14.2	0.8	48.715	51.15	56.05	2.95	7.165	4.865	3.165
Pusa Ruby	India	72.0	25.6	0.845	35.42	50.15	33.15	4.55	4.515	4.85	2.75
PAK 0010576 (p)	N. Korea	116.8	10.4	0.86	49.515	66.935	82.55	3.165	5.915	4.98	4.485
Bari-5	Bangladesh	50.5	35.3	0.9	43.735	37.9	26.065	2.415	5.135	5.435	5.115
Pant bahar	India	87.5	44.6	0.915	31.5	39.65	20.85	3.585	4.25	5.35	6.985
CLN- 1767-238-zy	AVRDC, Line	44.3	42.0	0.98	43.1	34.68	23.6	2.335	3.835	6.135	3.885
Nozomi	Srilanka	56.8	27.0	1.035	62.935	37.7	38.45	2	3.95	4.75	6.315
PAK 0010584	N. Korea	116.0	35.3	1.195	41.315	44.93	35.5	2	4.965	5.4	4.335

References

Agong, S.G., S. Schittenhelm and W. Friedt. 2000. Genotypic variation of Kenyan tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* L.) germplasm. *Plant Genetic Resources Newsletter*, 123: 61-67.

Anonymous. 2004. *Area, production of fruit, vegetables and Condiments.* Fruit, vegetable and condiments statistics of Pakistan, 2003-2004. p. 11-12.

Arshad, M., A. Ghafoor and A.S. Qureshi. 2005. Inheritance of qualitative traits and their linkage in blackgram [*Vigna mungo* (L.) Hepper]. *Pak. J. Bot*., 37 (1): 41-46.

Ashraf, S.H. and S. Ahmad. 2001. *In vitro* control of *Alternaria solani*, the cause of early blight of tomato. *Online J. Biol. Sci.*, 1: 949-950.

Barman, D., C.K. Sharma, I.P. Singh and S. De. L.C. Sardana. 1995. Genetic variability in exotic lines of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) in off season. *Internat. J. Trop. Agric.*, 13: 265-268.

Chaudhary, M.F., K.M. Khokhar, M. Ashraf and T. Mehmood. 1995. Performance of six tomato hybrids/ cultivars under plastic tunnel during winter. *Sarhad J. Agric*., 11: 325-329.

Chaudhary, M.F. and R. Shahid. 2000. *Cultivation of Tomato* (Urdu). Vegetable Crops Research Programme, Horticulture Research institute, National Agricultural Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan, pp. 2-3.

Das, B., M.H. Hazarika and P.K. Das. 1998. Genetic variability and correlation in fruit characters of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). *Ann. Agric. Res*., 19(1): 77-80

Dewey, D.R. and K.H. Lu. 1959. A correlation and path-efficient analysis of components of crested wheatgrass seed production. *Agron. J.*, 51: 515-518.

Gonçalves, P.D.S., N. Bortoletto, A.L. M. Martins, R.B.D. Costa and P.B. Gallo. 2003. Genotype-environment interaction and phenotypic stability for girth growth and rubber yield of *Hevea* clones in São Paulo State, Brazil. *Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 26(4): 441-448. _____.

Joshi, A.K., K. Ashwani, B.K. Sharma and A. Kumar. 1998. Evaluation of tomato genotypes for horticultural characteristics. *Punjab Vegetable Grower*, 33: 21-22.

Johnson, W.H., H.F. Robinson and R.E. Comstock. 1955. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybean. *Agron. J.*, 47: 314-318.

McGiffen, M.E., D.J. Pantone and J.B. Masiunas. 1994. Path analysis of tomato yield components in relation to competition with black and eastern black nightshade. *J. of Amer. Soci. Hort. Sci.*, 119: 6-11.

Mohanty, B.K. 2002. Variability, heritability, correlation and path coefficient studies in tomato. *Haryana J. Hort. Sci.*, 31: 230-233.

Mohanty, B.K. 2003. Genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient studies in tomato. *In. J. Agric. Res.*, 37: 68-71.

Moya, C., M. Alvarez, M. Varela and M.E. Mesa. 1996. Estimates of genetic-statistical parameters in three different groups of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) varieties growing in organoponics. *Cultivos Tropicales*, 17: 67-71.

Nakawuka, C.K. and E. Adipala. 1999. A path coefficient analysis of some yield component in cowpea. *African crop Sci. Jour.*, 4: 327-331.

Shravan, K., T. Singh, B. Singh and J.P. Singh. 2004. Studies on heritability and genetic advance in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill). *Prog. Agric.*, 4: 76-77.

Singh, R.K. and B.D. Chaudhry. 1979. Biometrical methods in quantitative genetic analysis. *Kalyani Publ.*, New Delhi.

Singh, D.N., A. Sahu and A.K. Parida. 1997. Genetic variability and correlation studies in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). *Environ. and Ecol.*, 15: 117-121.

Singh, J.K., J.P. Singh, S.K. Jain, J. Aradhana and A. Joshi. 2002. Studies on genetic variability and its importance in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). *Prog. Hort.*, 34: 77-79.

Singh, A.K. and N. Raj. 2004. Variability studies in tomato under cold arid condition of Ladakh. *Hort. J.*, 17: 67-72.

Yamaguchi, M. 1983. World vegetables: *Principals, production and nutritive values. AVI Publishing Co.*, Westport, CT.

(Received for publication 5 August 2006)