

## Estimation of Genetic Parameters for some Morphological Traits among Newly Selected Nigerian Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* Linn.) Genotypes

\*Daudu O.A.Y<sup>1</sup>., Falusi, O.A<sup>1</sup>., Gana, S.A<sup>2</sup>., Abubakar, A<sup>1</sup>.,  
Dangana, M.C<sup>1</sup>., Yahaya, S.A<sup>3</sup>. and Gado<sup>4</sup>, A.A

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State

<sup>2</sup>Department of Crop Science, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State

<sup>3</sup>Nigerian Institute for Oil Palm Research, Jigawa Station, Jigawa State

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Federal College of Education, Kontagora, Niger State

\*Corresponding Author: dauduoladipupoyusuf@yahoo.com/+2348062202142

### Abstract

In order to assess some genetic parameters among newly selected Nigerian Roselle (*Hibiscussabdariffa* Linn.) genotypes; the roselle genotypes were evaluated for their morphological and yield attributes at the Department of Biological Sciences experimental garden, Federal University of Technology, Minna during 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 growing seasons, using a Complete Randomized Block Design (CRBD) with four replicates. The morphological parameters were investigated using standard procedures. The results on the morphometric parameters showed significant difference ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) for most of the parameters studied. The present study also revealed that some of the morphological parameters were influenced by environmental factors, such parameters are not suitable for selection. Moreover, higher estimates for genotypic variances than environmental variances for plant height at flowering, number of seeds per capsule, number of branches per plant and number of fruits per plant, indicate good characters for selection and improvement of the crop. The highest genetic advance as percentage of mean (129.80%) was obtained for number of branches per plant at 50% flowering; whereas, stem circumference at harvest had the lowest (6.36%). In addition, high values of broad sense heritability estimates ( $\geq 60\%$ ) was high for plant height at 6 week after thinning, plant height at 50% budding and flowering, number of branches at 50% flowering and number of seeds per capsule. Therefore, combination of high heritability estimates with genetic advance in the selection program is important for selection of the crop in the future. Emphasis should be made on those agro-morphological parameters that show greater genetic importance for selection and improvement of the crop in Nigeria.

**Keywords:** Genotypic variance, environmental variance, heritability, selection, improvement

### Introduction

Vegetable Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* var. *sabdariffa* L.) belongs to the family Malvaceae. It is known by different synonyms and vernacular names, such as Roselle, Sorrel, Red sorrel and Mesta (Parkouda *et al.*, 2008). There are three common varieties of Roselle grown in Nigeria. Two of these varieties have red calyces ('Isapa Pupa': Yoruba; 'Zobo': Hausa), and the other one has green calyces

('Isapa': Yoruba; 'Yakuwa': Hausa) (Udom *et al.*, 2001; Falusi *et al.*, 2014). Roselle is a tetraploid ( $2n=4x=72$ ) whose chromosomes are related to the diploid ( $2n=2x=36$ ) *Hibiscus cannabinus* L. (McClean, 1973). It is probably a native of Asia (India to Malaysia) to tropical Africa (Gomez-Leyva *et al.*, 2008). Being a tropical plant species, Roselle can be found in almost all tropical countries, such as Malaysia, South East Asia, Indonesia, Thailand and



Philippines (Rao, 1996).

The calyces are rich in acid and pectin; analysis of calyces has shown the presence of crude protein and minerals such as iron, phosphorus, calcium, manganese, aluminium, magnesium, calcium, sodium, and potassium (Gautam, 2004; Atta *et al.*, 2011). Amin *et al.* (2008), stated that the fruit of roselle contains more Ascorbic acid (Vitamin C) than *Ribesnigrum* L (Black currant) and nine times more than Citrus (*Citrus sinensis* L.). Roselle is associated with traditional medicine and is reported to be used as treatment for several diseases such as hypertension and urinary tract infections (Diane *et al.*, 2010).

The success of any program geared towards improving any crop plant depends on the genetic variability, genetic advance and characters associated with the plant yield; these information are lacking on this particular crop in Nigeria. Genetic improvement of any crop plant is greatly dependent on the importance of several genetic parameters such as phenotypic and genotypic coefficient of variation (PCV and GCV), broad sense heritability and genetic gain; on which the breeding methods are formulated for further improvement (Rajib and Jagatpati, 2011) of any crop. Analysis of genetic variability reveals its presence and is of utmost importance as it provides the basis for effective selection (Rajib and Jagatpati, 2011). The different genotypic components of variance and heritability are important in determining selection efficiency (Omoigui *et al.*, 2006). The genetic variance of any quantitative trait is made up of additive (heritable) variance and non-additive (dominance and epistasis) variance (Mohamed *et al.*, 2012). It becomes very necessary therefore, to partition the observed phenotypic variability into its non-heritable and heritable components (Mohamed *et al.*, 2012). This is because selection of favourable genotypes for certain trait depends on the amount of variability existing in the material under study. It is on this background that this research is aimed at evaluating the nature of genetic variability, heritability and genetic

advancement of some quantitative characters among some selected Nigerian Roselle genotypes.

### Materials and Methods

The morphological parameters were investigated using standard procedures after the techniques of Akinyele and Osekita (2006); Hegazi and Hamideldin (2010). The number of leaves per plant (NL) at maturity were determined by counting the number of leaves attached to the plants. The height of the shoot of the plants at two weeks interval up to maturity was measured in centimetres (cm) using a metre rule. For each of the morphological parameters mentioned above, mean values per plant were determined for the Roselle accessions. The yields from the different accessions of Roselle were determined using the following indices: number of fruits per plant (NF), number of seeds per capsule (NSC), and weight of fruit (WF). For NSC and WF, ten fruits each were selected at random for all the accessions and the values were recorded for further statistical analysis.

NF were determined by counting the total number of fruits or pods a plant produced at the completion of the life cycle. NSC were determined by opening up the capsules and counting the number of viable seeds which were determined by their relative large size and firmness. WF were determined by measuring the pods on a weighing balance, mean values of yield parameters per fruit or plant were determined for the Roselle plants.

### Genetic Parameters Estimates

Broad Sense Heritability ( $h^2$ ) was estimated according to Falconer (1989) using:

$$h^2 = \frac{\sigma^2_g}{\sigma^2_{ph}} \quad (\text{equation 1})$$

Where  $\sigma^2_g$  is the genotypic variance;  $\sigma^2_{ph}$  is the phenotypic variance. Phenotypic and Genotypic variances were obtained from the analysis of variance table using equations 2 and 3 as follows:

$$\sigma^2_g = \frac{MS1 - MS2}{rXs} \quad 2$$

$$\sigma^2_{ph} = \frac{MS1}{rXs} \quad 3$$

(Where r: replication, s: season, MS1: Mean square for cultivar, MS2: Mean square for cultivar X season).

The mean values were used for genetic analyses to determine Genotypic Coefficient of Variation (GCV) and Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation (PCV), using equation 4 and 5 as follows:

$$GCV(\%) = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Genotypic Variance}}}{\text{Grand Mean}} \quad 4$$

$$PCV(\%) = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Phenotypic Variance}}}{\text{Grand Mean}} \quad 5$$

Genetic advance (GA) was calculated with the method suggested by Singh and Chaundry (1985) using equation 6 as follows:

$$GA = k. \sigma_{ph}. h^2 \quad 6$$

Where K: constant = 2.06 at 5% selection intensity,  $\sigma_{ph}$ : square root of phenotypic variance,  $h^2$ : Heritability  
GA as percentage of mean (GAM) =  
(GA/Grand Mean) X 100 7

## Results

Genotypic Variance, Phenotypic Variance, Environmental Variance, Broad Sense Heritability, Genotypic Coefficient of Variation (GCV), Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation (PCV) and Genetic advance for seven characters are presented in Table 1. The results revealed considerable phenotypic and genotypic variances among the various accessions for the characters under consideration. The results revealed inconsistency in the environmental and genotypic variances. In some of the characters studied, the genotypic variance was quite higher than the environmental variances (Plant height at 6 weeks after thinning, Plant height at 50 % flower bud formation and Plant height at flowering).

In addition, Genotypic Variance (GV)

was higher than Environmental Variance (EV) for number of seeds per capsules (Table 1). However, the influence of the environmental factors on the expression of other characters as indicated by the magnitude of the EV was quite evident. This indicates that a large proportion of the Phenotypic Variance (PV) was caused by environmental influences for those characters. Consequently, such characters do not possess promising genetic variability; so, selection for them might not be efficient and successes might be very low. But for where the GV is higher than EV, such character is suitable for selection and successes are expected to be high.

The highest GV (905.51) was for number of leaves per plant at maturity, this is followed by plant height at harvest (433.33), then number of branches at flowering. The least GV (0.44) was recorded for stem circumference at harvest. Phenotypic variance (PV) was also highest in number of leaves per plant at maturity (2300.44), followed by plant height at maturity (1579.67), then plant height at flowering (251.75), and followed by number of fruits per plant (229.37); then the lowest PV (3.30) was found in stem circumference at harvest (Table 1). Genotypic Coefficient of Variation (GCV) was highest for number of branches at flowering (65.17 %) followed by number of fruit per plant (43.43 %), then followed by plant height at six weeks after thinning (27.47 %). This was followed by plant height at flowering (27.22 %), then number of branches per at four weeks after thinning (25.70 %), then weight of fruit (23.20 %); the least GCV (8.61 %) was found in stem circumference at harvest.

The highest PCV (74.30 %) was for number of fruit per plant, followed by number of fruit per plant, then followed by number of branches per plant at flowering (67.74 %). Generally, moderately high PCV were recorded for all the other traits studied (Table 1). Genotypic coefficient of variation, which is the real indicator of the extent of genetic variability in a population, was high for all the characters, except stem circumference at

harvest. For all the tested character, higher PCV than GCV values were obtained. The highest Broad sense heritability ( $h^2$ ) (93.00 %) was recorded number of branches at flowering with an expected genetic advance over percentage of mean (GAM) of 129.80 %. This was followed by number of seeds per capsule (71.00 %) with an expected GAM of 36.24%; followed by plant height at six weeks after thinning and plant height at flowering (66 % each) with expected respective GAM values of 46.05 % and 45.52 %. Weight of fruit also showed moderately high heritability (47 %) with GAM value of 31.90 %. Stem circumference at harvest produced the lowest heritability value (13.00 %) and a corresponding lowest GAM value (6.36 %) (Table 1).

### Discussion

In an attempt to determine the extent to which variation in yield components are responsible for variations in yield among various Roselle accessions, it should be noted that total variability depends on heritable and non-heritable components. In this study, the twenty Roselle accessions exhibited significant differences for most of the traits investigated. The observed variations among these genotypes can be attributed to both environmental and genetic factors; Similar results had been reported by Elsadig *et al.* (2013); Jalal and Ahmad (2012). Ibrahim and Hussein (2006), also detected significant differences among genotypes for plant height, number of branches per plant and weight of sepals. The change in the overall mean for these characters was recorded for the interaction of the genotypes with the environment. This shows that the observed variation among genotypes in these traits could be attributed to environmental causes as well as the interaction with the genetic makeup of the accessions.

The estimates of phenotypic variances were higher in values than their corresponding genotypic variance and environmental variance for all the characters evaluated; this agrees with the work of Jonah *et al.* (2013).

The results obtained for estimates of genotypic variances being lower than the environmental variances for some characters were in line with the work of Elsadig *et al.* (2013) on *Hibiscussabdariffa* and Mostopha *et al.* (2002) on *H. cannabinus*. An exception to this on number of seeds per capsule and plant height at flowering is in contrary with the work of Elsadig *et al.* (2013) and Mostopha *et al.* (2002); but in line with the work of Mohamed *et al.* (2012) on tomato. This differences could be attributed to the lesser effect of the environmental factors on these characters; similar conclusions have been drawn by Elsadig *et al.* (2013).

Most of the traits examined in this study showed a wide range of genetic variability among the evaluated accessions (Vijah and Manohar, 1990). The variations obtained among the genotypic coefficient of variation for most of the characters shows that the genetic advances for selection of a character depends on the amount of genetic variability of such characters. Similar inferences have been drawn by Wong and Baker (1986); Elsadig *et al.* (2013).

High values of heritability estimates recorded for most of the traits indicate that these traits possessed wide range of genetic variability and their improvement could be achieved with mass selection (Elsadig *et al.*, 2013; Mostofa *et al.*, 2002). High heritability coupled with high genetic advance (GA) for number of fruit per plant, number of branches at flowering, plant height at different stages, weight of fruit and number of seeds per capsule is an indication of additive gene effects on such traits (Mostofa *et al.*, 2002). The high heritability indicates that this character is highly genetically controlled and less affected by environment (Abou El-Nasr *et al.*, 2014). Jalal and Ahmad (2012), emphasized the importance of heritability and genetic advance as selection parameters. High values of GA are indication of additive gene action while low GA values are indication of non-additive gene action (Singh and Narayanan, 1993). Genotypic coefficient of variation, which is the real indicator of the

extent of genetic variability in a population, was high for all the characters, except stem circumference at harvest. Similar results were obtained by Pradeepkumar and Tewari (1999).

However, the association of the genetic advance and heritability does not follow similar trend or pattern as observed between genotypic coefficient of variation and genetic advance; increased heritability value does not always lead to a corresponding increase in genetic advance. Similar results were obtained by Gasim and Khidir (1998); Elsadig *et al.* (2013). In this present study, characters like plant height, number of branches per plant and number of seeds per capsule have strong genetic component and therefore high heritability; similar conclusion had been made by Sadras *et al.*, (2013).

For some of the traits that were observed in this study, like plant height, number of branches per plant, number of fruits, these

characters should be selected for the improvement of the crop. This is because many scientists have reported highly significant correlations among some of these parameters. Ibrahim and Hussein (2006), reported a highly significant correlation between number of branches and number of fruits per plant as well as plant height and number of branches per plant at genotypic level in *H. sabdariffa*. Ottai *et al.* (2003), also made similar assertion.

In conclusion, wide genetic variability was observed among the Roselle accessions; this variability could be exploited in different breeding program of the crop. There was no definite pattern between genetic coefficient of variation and heritability as well as genetic advance. Therefore, combination of heritability estimates with genetic advance in the selection program is important.

**Table 1:** Estimation of some components of genetic parameters for some agro-metrical characters among the 20 Roselle accessions

| Characters  | Grand mean | Genotypic variance ( $\sigma^2_g$ ) | Phenotypic variance ( $\sigma^2_P$ ) | Environmental variance ( $e^2$ ) | Broad sense heritability ( $h^2$ )/% | Genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV)/% | Phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV)/% | Genetic advance (GA) | GA as a % of Mean |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| Plant Height at 4 weeks after thinning (cm)               | 12.32      | 3.47                                | 16.77                                | 13.31                            | 21.00                                | 15.12                                      | 33.24                                       | 1.77                 | 14.37             |
| Plant Height at 6 weeks after thinning (cm)               | 18.61      | 26.13                               | 39.72                                | 13.60                            | 66.00                                | 27.47                                      | 33.87                                       | 8.57                 | 46.05             |
| Plant Height at 8 weeks after thinning (cm)               | 25.96      | 26.75                               | 60.44                                | 33.69                            | 44.00                                | 19.92                                      | 29.94                                       | 7.05                 | 27.16             |
| Plant Height at 50 % flower bud formation (cm)            | 35.41      | 68.82                               | 114.19                               | 45.37                            | 60.00                                | 23.43                                      | 30.18                                       | 13.21                | 37.31             |
| Plant Height at 50% flowering (cm)                        | 47.41      | 166.57                              | 251.82                               | 85.25                            | 66.00                                | 27.22                                      | 33.47                                       | 21.58                | 45.52             |
| Plant Height at harvest (cm)                              | 185.78     | 433.33                              | 1579.67                              | 1146.34                          | 27.00                                | 11.20                                      | 21.39                                       | 22.11                | 11.90             |
| Number of branches per plant at 4 weeks after thinning    | 6.14       | 2.49                                | 5.95                                 | 3.46                             | 42.00                                | 25.70                                      | 39.71                                       | 2.11                 | 34.36             |
| Number of branches per plant at 6 weeks after thinning    | 10.34      | 1.58                                | 5.69                                 | 4.12                             | 28.00                                | 12.14                                      | 23.07                                       | 1.38                 | 13.35             |
| Number of branches per plant at 8 weeks after thinning    | 13.32      | 3.98                                | 9.63                                 | 5.65                             | 41.00                                | 14.98                                      | 23.31                                       | 2.62                 | 19.67             |
| Number of branches per plant at 50 % flower bud formation | 19.27      | 8.62                                | 22.69                                | 14.08                            | 38.00                                | 15.23                                      | 24.72                                       | 2.73                 | 14.17             |
| Number of branches per plant at 50% flowering             | 23.42      | 233.00                              | 251.75                               | 18.75                            | 93.00                                | 65.17                                      | 67.74                                       | 30.40                | 129.80            |
| Number of leaves per plant at maturity                    | 144.11     | 905.51                              | 2300.44                              | 1394.93                          | 39.00                                | 20.88                                      | 33.28                                       | 38.53                | 26.74             |
| Number of fruits per plant                                | 20.38      | 78.35                               | 229.37                               | 151.02                           | 34.00                                | 43.43                                      | 74.30                                       | 10.61                | 52.06             |
| Weight of fruit (g)                                       | 6.99       | 2.63                                | 5.59                                 | 2.96                             | 47.00                                | 23.20                                      | 33.83                                       | 2.23                 | 31.90             |
| Number of seeds per capsule                               | 29.69      | 38.41                               | 54.01                                | 15.60                            | 71.00                                | 20.87                                      | 24.75                                       | 10.76                | 36.24             |
| Stem circumference at harvest                             | 7.706      | 0.44                                | 3.30                                 | 2.86                             | 13.00                                | 8.61                                       | 23.59                                       | 0.49                 | 6.36              |

## References

- Abou El-Nasr, T.H.S., El-Enany, A.M. and Ibrahim, M.M. (2014). Genetic Parameters Evaluation among Some Selected Lines of Sudanese Roselle Variety in Egypt, Using Morpho-agronomic Traits and ISSR Markers. *Middle East Journal of Applied Sciences*, 4(2): 181-190.
- Akinyele, B. O., and Osekita, O. S. (2006). Correlation and path coefficient analyses of seed yield attributes in okra [*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench]. *African Journal of Biotechnology* 5(14), 1330-1336.
- Amin, I., Emmy, H. K. F., and Halimatul-Saadiah, M. N. (2008). Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L) Seeds- Nutritional Composition, Protein Quality and Health Benefits. *Food*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Atta, S., Seyni, H. H., Bakasso, Y., Sarr, B., Lona, I., and Saadou, M. (2011). Yield character variability in Roselle, (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L). *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 6(6), 1371-1377.
- Diane, L. McKay, C. Y., Oliver, C., Edward, S., and Jeffrey, B. B. (2010). *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. Tea (Tisane) Lowers Blood Pressure in Prehypertensive and Mildly Hypertensive Adults 1-4. *The Journal of Nutrition*, 298-303.
- Elsadig, B. I., Abdel Wahab, H. A., Elshiek, A. I., and Ahmed, M. E. (2013). Variability in some Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) Genotypes for Yield and its Attributes. *International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry*, 3(7), 261-266.
- Falconer, D. S. (1989). *Introduction to quantitative genetics*. (3rd Edn) Logman House, Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex, England: Longman Scientific and Technical, pp. 438.
- Falusi, O. A., Dangana, M. C., Daudu, O. A. Y., Oluwajobi, A. O., Abejide, D. R., and Abubakar, A. (2014). Evaluation of some Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) germplasm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Biotechnology and Food Science*, 2(1), 117-121.
- Gasim, S. M., and Khidir, M. O. (1998). Genetic variability of some characters in Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* var. *sabdariffa* L.). *University of Khartoum Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 6(1), 22-33.
- Gautum, R. D. (2004). Sorrel-A lesser known source of medicinal soft drink and food in India. *National Product Radiance*, 3(5), 338-342.
- Gomez-Leyva, J. F., Acosta, L. A. M., Muraira, I. G. L., Espino, H. S., Ramirez-Cervantes, F., and Andrade-Gonzalez, I. (2008). Multiple shoot regeneration of Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) from a shoot apex system. *International Journal of Botany*, 4(3), 326-330.
- Hegazi, A. Z., and Hamildeldin, N. (2010). The effect of gamma irradiation on enhancement of growth and seed yield of okra [*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench] and associated molecular changes. *Journal of Horticulture and Forestry*, 2(3), 38-51.
- Ibrahim, M. M., and Hussein, R. M. (2006). Variability, heritability and genetic advance in some genotypes of Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.). *World Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2, 340-345.
- Jalal, A. A., and Ahmad, H. A. (2012). Genetic Variation, Heritability, Phenotypic Correlation Studies for Yield Components in Promising Barley Genotypes. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 4(3), 193-210.
- Jonah, P. M., Aliyu, B., Jibung, B., and Abimiku, O. E. (2013). Phenotypic and Genotypic Variance and Heritability Estimates in Bambara Groundnut (*Vigna subterranea* (L) Verdc) in Mubi, Adamawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of IT, Engineering and Applied Sciences Research*, 2(2), 66-71.
- Mclean K. (1973). Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.), or karkade, as cultivated edible plants. AG. S. SUD/70/543, Project Working Paper, FAO, Rome.
- Mohamed, S. M., Ali, E. E., and Mohamed, T. Y. (2012). Study of Heritability and Genetic Variability among Different Plant and Fruit Characters of Tomato

- (*Solanum lycopersicon* L.). *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 1(2) 55-58.
- Mostofa, M. R., Islam, M. R., Morshed Alam, A. T. M., Mahbub Ali, S. M., and Moll, M. A. F. (2002). Genetic Variability, Heritability and Correlation studies in Kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L.). *Online Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2(6), 422-424.
- Omoigui, L., Ishiyaku, M., Kamana, A., Alab, S., and Mohammed, S. (2006). Genetic variability and heritability studies of some reproductive traits in Cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp]. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 5, 1191-1195.
- Ottai, M. E. S., Abdel-Moniem, A. S. H., and El-Mergawi, R. A. (2003). Effect of variety and location on growth and yield components of Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) and its infestation with the spiny bollworm *Earias insulana* (Boisd). *Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection*, 37, 215-231.
- Parkouda C, Diawara B and Ouoba LII. 2008. Technology and physicochemical characteristics of Bikalga, alkaline fermented seeds of *Hibiscus sabdariffa*. *Afr J Biotechnol*, 7(7):916-922.
- Pradeepkumar, T., and Tewari, R. N. (1999). Studies on genetic variability for processing characters in tomato. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 56, 332-336.
- Rajib, R., and Jagatpati, T. (2011). Evaluation of Genetic parameters for agro-metrical characters in Carnation genotypes. *African Crop Science Journal*, 19, 183-188
- Rao, P. U. (1996). Nutrient Composition and Biological evaluation of Mesta (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L) seeds. *Plants Food for Human Nutrition*, 49, 27-34.
- Sadras, V. O., Rebetzke, G. J., and Edmeades, G.O. (2013). The phenotype and the components of crop traits. *Field Crops Research*, 154, 255-259.
- Singh, P., and Narayanan, S.S. (1993). *Biometrical techniques in plant breeding*. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, 83 pp.
- Singh, R. K., and Chaudhary, B. D. (1985). *Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Analysis*. New Delhi: Kalayani Publishers, 318 pp.
- Udom, O., Igwe, C. C., and Osinowo, F. A. (2001). Comparison of the Anthocyanin content of two varieties of Red Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) from Nigeria. *Nigeria Food Journal*, 19, 101-105.
- Vijay, O.P., and Manohar, M.S. (1990). Studies on genetic variability, correlation and path analysis in okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* L. (Moench)). *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 47, 97-103.
- Wong, L. S. L., and Baker, R. J. (1986). Selection to maturity in spring wheat. *Crop Science*, 26, 1171-1175.