Correlation and Path Coefficient Analysis in Some Varieties of Phaseolus (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.)

Esraa Abd. Al-huseein Jasim¹, Kamal Benyamin Esho²

^{1, 2}Department of Horticulture and Landscape Design, College of Agriculture and Forestry, Mosul University, Iraq

Keywords: Correlation, Path Analysis, Phaseolus, yield, Dry seed

1. Introduction

The common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) is a diploid (2n= 2x = 22) and predominantly self-crossing species although 3% or more out crossing rate has also been observed (Ibarra -Perez et al., 1997). It is an herbaceous plant that grown around the world for food as fresh (green pods) and dry seeds. Over a period of 7000 years common bean evolved from a wild plant into one of the main crops legumes, the domestrication of wild bean occurred the regions of Middle America and the Andes of South America independently (Kapland and Lynch, 1999). It is the most important food fabacea in the world (Ciat, 2001), dry common bean also called field bean, French bean, kidney bean common bean etc. is one of the most important fabacea crops in the world. The phaseolus plant given that most protein consumed by the poor is from plant sources, being protein rich, it play an especially significant role in the human diet (Yoseph et al., 2014). It has high levels of minerals mainly iron and zinc (Carvslho, et al., 2012). Use of genetic resources as old as the history of agriculture, hundreds of plants have been bred over many hundreds of years and thousands varieties have been developed by natural and artificial selection (Sari et al. 2008, Zarei et al. 2012). The large spectrum genetic variability in segregating populations depends on the level of genetic diversity among genotypes offer better scope for selection, A successful breeding programmed in common bean would need information on the nature and degree of genetic divergence in the available stock for choosing the right and best parents for further improvement. Genetic diversity can be evaluated with morphological traits, seed protein, isozymes and DNA markers conventionally (Vidyakar, et al., 2017).

Seed yield is affected by genotype and environmental factors because it is a quantative traits, therefore, generally,

seed yield has a low heritability. Using as selection criteria of traits direct relationship with seed yield increase the success of selection in plant breeding. Correlation analysis describes merely the mutual relationship among different pairs of traits without providing the nature of cause and effect relationship of each trait. Hence, the path analysis was also performed to determine the direct and indirect contribution of each trait to seed yield (Berhe et al., 1998). Breeder who needs to specify the basics of selection should determine the impact factors and the degree of relationships among yield components (Torun and Koycu, 1999). Many previous researches indicated that the seed yield was positively associated with number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, and seed yield per plant (Halvecioglu and Sehirali, 2001; Peksen and Gulumser, 2005; Karasu and Oz, 2010; Lobato et al., 2014 ; Alemu et al. 2017 and Bagheri et al. 2017). Esho (2019) indicated that there were higher positive significant genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients between total dry seeds yield with the plant height, seeds weight per plot seed diameter and 100-seeds weight.

The aim of this study was to study the correlation among seed yield and its components and to determine direct and indirect effects of certain yield components on seed yield.

2. Materials and Methods

This experiment was carried out during spring season 2019 at the field vegetable experiments of department of horticulture and landscape design, college of agriculture and forestry, Mosul University to study the Correlation And Path coefficient analysis in Common Bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). The experiments materials consisted of 12 genotypes of common bean (table 1).

DOI: 10.21275/SR20812140529

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN: 2319-7064 ResearchGate Impact Factor (2018): 0.28 | SJIF (2019): 7.583

	· · · ·	β γ					
S.No.	Genotype	Source					
1	Iranian	From local marker (Sulaimania), Kurdistan Irac					
2	Iranian	From local marker (Sulaimania), Kurdistan Irac					
3	Brinco	From local marker Mosul, (Turkish)					
4	Strick	From local marker Mosul, (Netherlands)					
5	line 3 K.M. Ph -22	Esho 2019					
6	Bar-245	3ar-245 From local marker Erbil Kurdistan Irac .(French)					
7	American	From local marker (Erbil), Kurdistan Iraq					
8	Brs- Pitango	From local marker (Erbil), Kurdistan Iraq (Iranian)					
9	Line 5 K.M. Ph. 28	Esho 2019 . College of Agri. & Fors. Mosul University					
10	Line 6 K,M Ph. 33	Esho 2019, College of Agri. & Fors. Mosul University					
11	Line 8 K.MPh 31	Esho 2019, College of Agri. & Fors. Mosul University					
12	Line 4 K.M Ph. 35	Esho 2019, College of Agri. & Fors. Mosul University					

Table 1: List of phaseolus genotypes used in the experiment

The seeds of the genotypes were sowing at 15/3/2019 in rows of 1.5 m length and 30 cm with an approximate plant

Phenotypic correlation (m)	Phenotypic covariance of traits x and y
richotypic conclation (ip)	$\sqrt{(5^2 \operatorname{ph} \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x} 5^2 \operatorname{ph} \mathbf{y})}$
Genetunic correlation (rg)=	Genotypic covariance of traits x and y
Genotypic contenation (ig)-	$\sqrt{(\mathbf{b}^2 \mathbf{g} \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x} \mathbf{b}^2 \mathbf{g} \mathbf{y})}$

where, $\sigma 2phY = phenotypic$ variance for character Y, $\sigma 2ph$ X = phenotypic variance for character X, $\sigma 2g$ X = genotypic variance for character X and $\sigma 2g$ Y = genotypic variance for character Y.

Based on genotypic correlation, path coefficient which refers to the direct and indirect effects of the yield attributing traits (independent character) on green pod yield (dependent character) was calculated following the method given by (Dewey and Lu 1959) as follows:

rij = Pij + Σ rikpkj, where, rij = mutual association between the independent character (i) and dependent character (j) as measured by the genotypic correlation coefficients, Pij = direct effects of the independent character (i) on the dependent variable (j) as measured by the genotypic path coefficients, and Σ rikpkj = summation of components of indirect effects of a given independent character (i) on a given dependent character (j) via all other independent traits (k). The residual effect, which determines how best the causal factors account for the variability of the dependent factor, yield, was obtained using the formula:

 $1=p2R + \Sigma$ pijrij, where, p2R is the residual effect and Σ pijrij is summation of the product of direct effect of any variable and its correlation coefficient with yield.

3. Results and Discussion

Table (2) showed the analysis of variance for 13 characters in genotypes of phaseolus during growing spring season 2019. indicated highly significant (P < 0.05) difference between 12 genotypes for all traits which were plant height, number of branches per plant, green pod length, green diameter pod, pod weight, number of seeds per pod, seed

length, seed diameter, weight of 1000 seeds, seeds yield per plot, seed yield per plant and total seeds kg per hectare . Many research reported in there studied, there was significant differences between genotypes of phaseolus in vegetative growth trait and for yield and yield components. (Santalla *et al.*, 2004 ; Yoseph *et al.*, 2014 ; Darkwa *et al.*, 2016 ; Alemu *et al.*, 2017 ; Bagheri *et al.*, 2017; Esho, 2019)

method described by Crus (2013).

to plant distance of 15 cm (20 plants per plot). Using randomized complete block design (R.C.B.D.) with three replicate for each genotype possesses 12 plots. All other necessary cultural such as fertilizing, weeding and cultivation were applied to all plots uniformly. The data were recorded for the traits. Vais: plant height (cm), number of branches per plant, number of pods per plant, length and diameter of pod (cm) number of seeds per pod, length and diameter of seed (cm), 1000 seeds weight (gm), seeds weight per plats (gm), seeds yield per plant (gm) and total seeds yield per hectares.(ton). All the agronomic data were recorded and being subjected to analysis using the SAS statistical software (SAS, 2007). Phenotypic and genotypic correlation between seeds yield and yield related traits were estimated using the method described by Miller et al. (1958). For the analysis of direct and indirect effects over seeds yield it was carried out path analysis among traits, with estimates obtained by means of regression equations, where triats are previously standardized, by using the

Table (3) showed the phenotype coefficient correlation among the 12 traits in common bean genotypes. plant height had negative and highly significant (P < 0.01) correlation with seeds yield plant, 1000 seeds weight, seed diameter, pod weight, green diameter pod and number of pod per plant. The number of branches per plant had negative and highly significant (P< 0.05) correlation with seeds yield per plot, weight of 1000 seeds; seed diameter and seed length. The number of pod per plant had positive significant correlation with seeds yield plant and was negative significant correlation among seeds yield per plant, number of seeds per pod and with green pod length. In table 3 there was a positive high significant correlation between green pod length and number of seeds per pod, and it has a negative coefficient correlation with most characters. Green diameter pod had positive significant coefficient correlation with total dry seeds yield per donum, seeds yield per plot, weight of 1000 seeds, seed diameter, and pod weight, and it has negative correlation with number of seeds per pod . The pod weight had a positive coefficient correlation with total seeds yield per donum . Also the table showed a positive high coefficient correlation between seed diameter and total dry seeds yield per donum, seeds yield per plant and with weight 1000 seeds . Weight of 1000 seeds had negative and highly coefficient correlation with total dry seeds yield per donum, seeds yield per plant and seeds yield per plot.

Volume 9 Issue 8, August 2020 www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Table (4) showed the genotypic correlation between the yield and yield component in common bean, from the table the plant height had had positive and highly significant correlation with most traits excepted with green pod length which was a negative coefficient correlation. Number of branches per plant gave a negative high significant correlation with most traits. The same result for the number of pods per plant and green length of pod. The trait green diameter of pod had a positive significant correlation with total dry seeds yield per donum, seeds yield per plant, seeds yield per plot, weight of 1000 seeds, seed diameter and with pod weight. Pod weight gave a high positive significant coefficient correlation with total dry yield per donum, weight of 1000 seeds and seed diameter. The number of seed per pod exhibited a negative significant correlation with all

traits under the study. Seed length was correlation with seed diameter significantly and positive. Seed diameter had a positive high significant correlation with most traits. Weight of 1000 seeds had positive high significant correlation with total dry seed yield per donum, seeds yield per plant and seeds yield per plot. A lot of genotypic correlation coefficient characters were significant than corresponding phenotypic correlation (table 3) values, this indicates that the traits are inherited. The importance of genotypic and phenotypic correlation and its use has been selection by a number of researchers Cabral *et al.*, 2011; Onder *et al.*, 2013; Negahi *et al.*, 2014; Ejara *et al.*, 2017; Bagheri et al., 2017; Alemu *et al.*, 2017 and Esho, 2019), recorded the same result for the phenotype coefficient correlation between the traits yield and it's component of phaseolus.

Table 2: ANOVA analysis for traits in phaseolus genotypes during growing spring season 2019

S,O. V.	d.f		Mean square											
		Plant			Green									
		height	No. of	No. of	Pod	Green	Pod	No. of	Seed	Seed	Weight of	Seeds	Seeds	Total dry
		(cm)	branches/	pods	length	diameter	weight	seeds/	length	diameter	1000 seeds	yield /plot	yield	seeds
			plant	/plant	(cm	pod (cm)	(g)	pod	(cm)	(cm)	(g)	(g)	/plant (g)	(kg/donum)
Block	2	49.568	0.031	3.420	0.173	0.001	0.001	0.083	0.002	0.001	1020.528	5385.028	3.070	6875.33
Genotypes	11	720.835**	0.924**	22.819**	5.209**	0.035**	0.019**	2.242**	0.005**	0.035**	10428.331**	19292.998	48.152**	26577.443**
												**		
Error	22	15.898	0.132	1.987	0.109	0.002	0.001	0.144	0.001	0.001	465.740	810.119	1.986	997.801
Total	53													

Table 3: The genotypic correlation between the traits in phaseolus genotypes during growing spring season 2019

		Green	Green	1 '	1 '	i '	1 1	· '	1	Seeds	Total dry	1	
No. of	No. of	Pod	diameter	Pod	No. of	Seed	Seed	Weight	Seeds	yield /	seeds	1	
branch/	pods	length	pod	weight	seeds/	length	diameter	of 1000	yield /	plant	(kg/	1	
plant	/plant	(cm	(cm)	(g)	pod	(cm)	(cm)	seeds (g)	plot (g)	(g)	donum)	The traits	
-0.023	0.281*	-0.775**	0.784**	0.638**	-0.783**	-0.190	0.685**	0.447**	-0.070	0.584**	0.078	Plant height (cm)	rg
	0.086	0.173	0.231*	-0.124	-0.094	-0.794**	-0.345**	-0.239*	-0.218*	-0.007	-0.413 **	No. of branches/plant	rg
			l l	, I	· · · ·			1	-				
		-0.272**	-0.108	-0.053	-0.007	0.063	-0.020	0.011	0.509**	0.372**	-0.462**	No. of pods /plant	rg
	-		-0.556**	-0.193	0.747**	0.088	-0.904**	-0.749**	-0.022	-0.785**	-0.258*	Green Pod length (cm	rg
		-		, I	· · · ·			1				Green diameter pod	
			I	0.655**	-0.561**	-0.196	0.524**	0.508**	0.285*	0.254*	0.300*	(cm)	rg
			-		-0.463**	-0.146	0.349**	0.338*	0.068	0.163**	0.614**	Pod weight (g)	rg
				-		0.208*	-0.801**	-0.718**	-0.032	-0.771	-0.407**	No. of seeds/pod	rg
							0.204*	0.012	-0.092	0.130	-0.051	Seed length (cm)	rg
								0.788**	-0.045	0.745**	0.552**	Seed diameter (cm)	rg
							-					Weight of 1000 seeds	
								ł	0.277*	0.589*	0.818**	(g)	rg
								-		-0.202*	0.435**	Seeds yield /plot (g)	rg
											0.205*	Seeds vield /plant (g)	rg

Table 4: The phenotypic correlation between the traits in phaseolus genotypes during growing spring season 2019

		· r · ·	· / I · · · ·				1	0	2 I	00	01	0	
No.of branches/ plant	No. of pods /plant	Green Pod length (cm	Green diameter pod (cm)	Pod weight (g)	No. of seeds/ pod	Seed length (cm)	Seed diameter (cm)	Weight of 1000 seeds (g)	Seeds yield /plot (g)	Seeds yield/ plant (g)	Total dry seeds (kg/ donum)	The traits	
-0.030	0.242*	-0.732**	0.716**	0.606**	-0.706**	-0.096	0.672**	0.434**	-0.079	0.541**	0.090	Plant height (cm)	rp
	0.093	0.177	0.067	-0.112	0.000	-0.444**	-0.258*	-0.213*	-0.244*	0.028	-0.183	No. of branches/plant	rp
		-0.201*	0.014	-0.070	-0.056	-0.046	0.016	0.054	-0.462**	0.268*	-0.156	No. of pods /plant	rp
			-0.521**	-0.206*	0.660**	-0.036	-0.828**	-0.706**	-0.039	-0.725**	-0.219*	Green Pod length (cm	rp
				0.594**	-0.514**	-0.125	0.481**	0.492**	0.252*	0.188	0.227*	Green diameter pod (cm)	rp
					-0.414**	-0.019	0.310*	0.308**	0.080	0.175	0.384**	Pod weight (g)	rp
						0.175	-0.692**	-0.618**	0.007	-0.617**	-0.304**	No. of seeds/pod	rp
							0.107	0.033	0.025	0.065	0.014	Seed length (cm)	rp

Volume 9 Issue 8, August 2020

<u>www.ijsr.net</u>

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN: 2319-7064 ResearchGate Impact Factor (2018): 0.28 | SJIF (2019): 7.583

0.745**	-0.074	0.662**	0.379**	Seed diameter (cm)	rp
	0.230*	0 520**	0 574**	Weight of 1000	
	0.230	0.529	0.574	seeds (g)	rp
		0.202*	0 150	Seeds yield /plot	
		-0.202	0.139	(g)	rp
			0.112	Seeds yield /plant	
			0.112	(g)	rp

Table (5) showed the path coefficient analysis for the traits in phaseolus genotypes during growing season 2019, total dry seed yield per donum had exerted the highest positive direct effect on green diameter pod, pod weight, seed diameter, weight of 1000 seeds, seeds yield per pod and seeds yield per plant . According to the result for the study total dry seeds per donum was mostly affected by this traits and negatively affected by number of branches per plant, number of pods per plant, green pod length, number of seeds per pod, and seed length . Similarly, the most effective factors in common bean were determined as plant height, green diameter, pod weight, seed diameter, weight of 1000 seeds and seeds yield per pod and per plant .For the plant height and green pod length and number of seeds per pod it was observed higher values in the direct effect (0.3683 and 0.3722 respectively . Positive direct effects were observed for number of pods per plant and seeds yield per plot (0.4282) . Green pod length had a direct effects for plant height (0.4894), green diameter pod (0.3513), seed diameter

(0.5713), weight of 1000 seeds (0.4729) and seeds yield per plant (0.4957). For the pod weight, it was observed direct effects of the plant height (0.6158), green diameter pod (0.6323), pod weight (0.9649), seed diameter (0.3364) and weight 1000 seeds (0.3261). Berhe et al., 1998; Onder et al., 2013; Doner et al., 2013; Alemu et al., 2017, Studying the direct effects of components traits over seeds yield in phaseolus . Evidencing that direct effects for this crop are expressive predictors of genetic and phonetic correlation, enabling selection for the dry seeds yield among its primary components, and this result allowed inferring that genotypes with high seeds yield may be obtained from the direct selection of genotypes with high number of pods per plant, seeds yield per plot and plant and 1000 seeds weight. In a similar research, Peksen and Gulumser (2005) ; Karasu and Oz (2010) ; indicated that seed weight had highest direct effect on seed yield among number of seeds per pod, seeds per plant and plot.

Table 5: The path coefficient analysis for trait in phaseolus genotypes during growing spring season 2019

Seeds								Green				
yield/	Seeds	Weight of	Seed	Seed	No. of	Pod	Green	Pod	No. of	No. of	Plant	
plant	yield /	1000 seeds	diameter	length	seeds/	weight	diameter	length	pods	branches/	height	
(g)	plot (g)	(g)	(cm)	(cm)	pod	(g)	pod (cm)	(cm)	/plant	plant	(cm)	The traits
-0.2777	0.0335	-0.2127	-0.3255	0.0904	0.3722	-0.3034	-0.3726	0.3683	-0.1334	0.0111	-0.4754	Plant height (cm)
0.0018	0.0552	0.0605	0.0873	0.2010	0.0239	0.0314	-0.0584	-0.0438	-0.0218	-0.2532	0.0059	No. of branches/plant
-0.3128	0.4282	-0.0091	0.0166	-0.0534	0.0060	0.0443	0.0910	0.2291	-0.8419	-0.0724	-0.2362	No. of pods /plant
0.4957	0.0137	0.4729	0.5713	-0.0556	-0.4720	0.1221	0.3513	-0.6318	0.1719	-0.1094	0.4894	Green Pod length (cm
-0.0641	-0.0720	-0.1282	-0.1323	0.0494	0.1415	-0.1654	-0.2523	0.1403	0.0273	-0.0582	-0.1977	Green diameter pod (cm)
0.1572	0.0652	0.3261	0.3364	-0.1406	-0.4471	0.9649	0.6323	-0.1864	-0.0507	-0.1196	0.6158	Pod weight (g)
-0.5016	-0.0210	-0.4671	-0.5212	0.1350	0.6503	-0.3014	-0.3647	0.4859	-0.0046	-0.0614	-0.5091	No. of seeds/pod
-0.0310	0.0218	-0.0029	-0.0486	-0.2380	-0.0494	0.0347	0.0466	-0.0210	-0.0151	0.1890	0.0453	Seed length (cm)
-0.5774	0.0349	-0.6105	-0.7745	-0.1582	0.6207	-0.2700	-0.4062	0.7003	0.0152	0.2670	-0.5303	Seed diameter (cm)
0.6685	0.3138	1.1347	0.8944	0.0136	-0.8151	0.3835	0.5766	-0.8495	0.0123	-0.2712	0.5077	Weight of 1000 seeds (g)
0.0648	-0.3208	-0.0887	0.0144	0.0294	0.0104	-0.0217	-0.0916	0.0069	0.1632	0.0699	0.0226	Seeds yield /plot (g)
0.5817	-0.1174	0.3427	0.4336	0.0758	-0.4486	0.0948	0.1478	-0.4564	0.2161	-0.0041	0.3398	Seeds yield /plant (g)
0.2051	0.4349	0.8176	0.5518	-0.0512	-0.4073	0.6137	0.2998	-0.2580	-0.4615	-0.4125	0.0776	Total dry seeds (kg/donum)

4. Conclusion

From the our resulted we conclusion that all genotypes were significant for all traits, the genotype, phenotype were significant positive correlation coefficient of the total yield per unite area with the yield component, the path coefficient analysis was positive direct effect observed for plant height with weight of 1000 seeds, seeds yield per plant, pod weight.

5. Acknowledgement

The authors are very grateful to the University of Mosul /College of Agriculture and Forestry for their provided facilities, which helped to improve the quality of this work

References

- Alemu, Y.; S. Alamirew and L. Dessalegn (2017). Correlation and path analysis of green pod yield and its componenets in snap bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) genotypes .Inter. Jour. of Res. in Agric. and Forestry . 4(1): 30-36.
- [2] Bagheri, M.; D. Kahrizi and A. Zebarjadi (2017). Study on genetic variation and morpho-phenolgic traits in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) .Biharean Biologist, Oradea Romania, 11(1): 43-47.
- [3] Berhe, A.; G. Bejiga and D. Mekonnen (1998). Association of some characters with seed yield in local varieties of faba bean .African Crop Science Jpurnal, 6(2): 197-204.
- [4] Cabral, P.D.S., T.C.B. Soares, A.B.P. Lima, Y.J.B. Soares and J.A. Silva. (2011). Path analysis of grain

Volume 9 Issue 8, August 2020

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

yield of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and its components. Revista Ciencia Agronomica. 42: 132-138.

- [5] Carvalho, L.M.J ; M. M. Correa ; E. J. Pereira ; M. R. Nutti ;J.L.V. Carvalho ; E.M.G. Ribeiro and S.C. Freitas (2012). Iron and zinc retention in common beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) after home cooking .Food Nutr Res. 56: 1-6.
- [6] Ciat, (2001). Annual report, Strategies developed for management of diseases and pests in bean based cropping systems. (Output 3) Genetic resistance to disease. CIAT. Cali. Colombia.
- [7] Cruz, C. D. (2013) . Genes . A software package for analysis in experimental statistics and quantitative genetics .Acta Scientarum . v.35, n.3, p.271-276, Available from :http:// periodicos .uem . br/ojs/index. Php/ ActaSciAgron/article/view/ 21251. Accessed Aug .01, 2016 . doi. 10.4025/actasciagron .v35i3.21251.
- [8] Darkwa, K. ; D. Ambachew ; H. Mohammed ; A. Asfaw and M. W. Blair (2016) . Evaluation of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) genotypes for grought stress adaptation in Ethiopia. The Crop Journal, ScienceDirect, 4: 367-376.
- [9] Dewey, D.R. and Lu, K.H. 1959. A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components of crested wheat grass kernel production. *J. Agronomy*. 51: 515-518.
- [10] Doner, M.; A. Kahraman and F. Ceyhan (2013). Correlation and path analysis for yield and yield components in common bean genotypes (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). Ratar.Povrt., 50(2): 14-19
- [11] Esho, K. B. (2019). Study the genetic parameters in phaseolus. International Journal of Advances in Science Engineering and Technology .7(1): 25-30.
- [12] Ejara, E.; W. Mohammed and B. Amsalu (2017). Correlations and path coefficient analysis of yield and yield related traits in common bean genotypes (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) at Abaya and Yabello, southern Ethiopia. International Journal of plant Breeding and Crop Science, 4(2): 215-224.
- [13] Helvacioglu, A. I. and S. Seherali (2001). The effect of different nitrogen fertilizers and doses on yield and yield components of dwarf beans (Phaseolus vulgaris L. var. nanus Dekapr.) National 4th Field Crops Congress, 17-21 September, 2001 Cereals and Edible Legumes, 1:391-396 .Tekirdag, Turkey.
- [14] Ibarra –Perez F; B. Ehdaie and G. Waines (1997). Estimation of out crossing rate in common bean .Crop Science . 37: 60-65.
- [15] Kaplan, L. and T.F. Lynch (1999) . Phaseolus (Fabaceae) in archaeology :ASM radiocarbon dates and their significance for pre-colombian agriculture .Econ. Bot., 53: 261-272.
- [16] Karasu, A. and M. Oz (2010). A study on coefficient analysis and association between agronomical characters in dry bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).
 Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science, 16(2): 203-211.
- [17] Lobato, A. K. Da S.; M. C. G. Vidigal; P. S. V. Filho ;V.M. Da S. Ramos; J. P. Poletine and C. A. De B. Andrade (2014). Genetic parameters of grain production and its components in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) under drought stress. Australian Journal of Crop Science. 8(8): 1152-1159.

- [18] Miller, P. A.; J. C. Williams; H. F. Robinson and R. E. Comstock (1958). Estimate of genotypic and environmental variances and co-variance in upland cotton and the implication selection .Agronomy Journal, 50 : 126-131.
- [19] Negahi, A.; M. R. Bihamta; Z. Negahi and M. Alidoust (2014).Evaluation of genetic variation of some agronomical and morphological traits in Iranian and exotic common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) . Agricultural communication, 2(3): 22-26.
- [20] Onder, M.; A. Kahraman and E. Ceyhan (2013). Correlation and path analysis for yield and yield components in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) Ratar Povrt, 50(2): 14-19.
- [21] Pekson, E. and A. Gulumser (2005). Relationship between seed yield and yield components and path analysis in some common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) genotypes . Ondokuz Mayis University .Journal of Agriculture Faculty .20(3): 82-87.
- [22] Santalla, M.; M. C. M. Sevillano; A. B. Monteagudo and A. M. De Ron (2004). Genetic diversity of Argentinean common bean and its evolution during domestication. Euphytica, 135: 75-87.
- [23] Sari, N ; A. Tan ; R. Yanmaz ; H. Yetisir ; A. Balkaya ; I. Solmaz and L. Aykas (2008). General status of cucrbit genetic resources in Turkey. Proceedings of the 9th EUCARPIA Meeting on Genetics and Breeding of Cucurbitaceae INRA . Avignon, France: pp: 21-32.
- [24] SAS (2007). Statistical Analysis Systems SAS/STAT user's guide Version 9.1 Cary NC. SAS Institute Inc. USA.
- [25] Torun, M. and C. Koycu (1999). Misur bitkisinde verimi ile bazi verim unsurlan arasindaki iliskilerin saptanmast, Tr. Journal of Agriculture and Forestry, 23: 1021-1027.
- [26] Vidyakar, V.; G.M Lal; M. K. Singh and A. Kumar (2017). Study on genetic diversity in French bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, SPI: 184-187.
- [27] Yoseph, T.; G .Gashaw; W. Shiferaw; T. Simon and E. Mekonnen (2014). Evaluation of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) varieties, for yield and yield components. Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare. 4(17): 22-25.
- [28]Zarei B.; D. Kahrizi; A. P. Aboughadereh and A. Sadeghi (2012). Correlation and path coefficient analysis for determining interrelationships among grain yield and related characters in corn hybrids (Zea mays L). International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences, 4(20): 1519-1522.

DOI: 10.21275/SR20812140529