International Journal of Plant & Soil Science

34(23): 1462-1474, 2022; Article no.IJPSS.93909
ISSN: 2320-7035

Genotype × Environment Interaction and Stability Analysis for Grain Yield and Yield Related Traits in Little Millet (*Panicum sumatrense* L.)

G. J. Dela [a*], Harshal E. Patil [b], U. N. Patel [a], R. G. Zala [c] and Purnima Ray [a]

[a] N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, Gujarat, India.
[b] Hill Millet Research Station, Navsari Agricultural University, Waghai (The Dangs), Gujarat, India.
[c] College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, Gujarat, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i232564

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93909

Original Research Article

Received 19 September 2022
Accepted 23 November 2022
Published 28 November 2022

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to evaluate Genotype × Environment interaction and stability analysis for grain yield, its components in 50 little millet genotypes under three environments *i.e.* Waghai, Vanarasi and Navsari locations (Gujarat, India) in year *Kharif*-2020. Stability analysis revealed that G x E interaction was significantly differed for all the characters except calcium content (mg/100g) and ash content (mg/100g) indicated that different genotypes reacted differently to different environmental conditions. Estimates of environmental indices indicated that Waghai location was favourable for most of the yield contributing characters along with quality parameters followed by Navsari and Vanarasi. The results of present study revealed that none of the genotypes exhibited average stability for all the characters. Among the genotypes, WV 262, WV 258, WV 256, WV 293 and WV 273 were found average stable over environments for grain yield per plant with one or more yield contributing characters and quality parameters. So, these genotypes may be used in further breeding programme in little millet.

Keywords: Little millet; stability; genotype × environment interaction; grain yield.

**Corresponding author: E-mail: harshalpatil@nau.in;*

1. INTRODUCTION

Little millet is one of the coarse cereals consumed in the form of rice. It is self-pollinated crop with a chromosome number of 2n=4x=36. Little millet belongs to the family Poaceae, sub-family Panicoideae and the tribe Paniceae [1]. Little millet's inflorescence is a panicle, contracted or thyrsiform and 15-45 cm long and 1-5 cm in wide [2]. The spikelet is persistent and 2-3.5 mm long. Panicle branches are scabrous and drooping at the time of maturity. Spikelets were produced on unequal pedicels but solitary at the end of the branches. Each spikelet consisted of two-minute flowers. The lower one is sterile; the upper one is fertile or bisexual without rachilla extension [3]. The lateral vein is absent in lower glume and its apex is acute. The upper glume is ovate and without keel but larger than lower glume [4]. The flowering progressed from the top to the bottom of the panicle. The anthesis occurred between 9.30 to 10.30 a.m. [5]. The glumes open for a short while and self-pollination is the rule. The whole process of the anthesis is very rapid and is completed within 2-5 min.

Little millet (*Panicum sumatrense* L.) is grown in India under various agro-ecological situations and commonly known as *samai, samo, moraio, vari and kutki*. Little millet is an important crop grown in the tribal belt of Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Odisha and Andhra Pradesh in India. In India, little millet having 1.42 lakh tones of production. In Gujarat, little millet is cultivated in an area of 10,634 hectares with 9,526 tonnes of production having the productivity of 896 kg/ha [6]. The area under this crop is mainly concentrated in the districts of Dangs, Valsad and Narmada of South Gujarat and Panchmahal of middle Gujarat.

Little millet is better as comparable to other cereals in terms of fiber, fat, carbohydrates, protein, calcium, iron and rich in phytochemicals included phenolic acids, flavonoids, tannins and phytate. Therefore, it could address nutritional sensitive agriculture, which aimed at nutritional enhancement to combat the present scenario of micronutrient malnutrition. Little millet is known for its drought tolerance and considered as one of the least waters demanding crop. Crop improvement work carried out so far in this crop has thrown some success. In the recent past some improved cultivars were developed but have limited yield potential. The potentiality of little millet has not been exploited in India and the yield levels were very low there by indicated a greater scope for exploitation of little millet under Indian condition.

Phenotype is defined as a linear function of Genotype (G), Environment (E) and G x E interaction effects. Relative importance of main and interaction effects might vary from genotype to genotype [7-9]. The study of G x E interaction served as a guide for various environmental niches. It is possible to identify genotypes with stability for high yield, through the stability for yield and yield component characters.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted during *Kharif*-2020 having 50 diverse little millet genotypes collected from NBPGR, New Delhi, *viz*., WV 254, WV 255, WV 256, WV 257, WV 258, WV 259, WV 260, WV 261, WV 262, WV 263, WV 264, WV 265, WV 266, WV 267, WV 268, WV 269, WV 270, WV 271, WV 272, WV 273, WV 274, WV 275, WV 276, WV 277, WV 278, WV 279, WV 280, WV 281, WV 282, WV 283, WV 284, WV 285, WV 286, WV 287, WV 288, WV 289, WV 290, WV 291, WV 292, WV 293, WV 294, WV 295, WV 296, WV 297, WV 298, WV 299, WV 300, WV 301, WV 302 and WV 303 were evaluated in randomized block design at Hill Millet Research Station, Navsari Agricultural University, Waghai, Gujarat, India; Niger Research Station, Navsari Agricultural University, Vanarasi, Gujarat, India and College Farm, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, Gujarat, India during *Kharif*-2020. The seedlings were planted at 22.5 x 10 cm^2 spacing. All recommended practices were followed and timely plant protection measures were taken to avoid damage through insect-pests and diseases.

The observations on five randomly selected plants were recorded for different characters *viz*., days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, plant height (cm), productive tillers per plant, panicle length (cm), spikes per panicle, 1000 grain weight (g), grain yield per plant (g), fodder yield per plant (g), harvest index (%) and hulling (%). Estimation of stability parameters evaluated by the Eberhart and Russell [7] model.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of variance for stability (Table 1) revealed that, the differences among the genotypes and environments were also significant for all the traits when tested against pooled deviation as well as pooled error. The environments + (genotypes x environments) interaction was observed to be significant for all traits when tested either against pooled deviation or pooled error. Further partitioning of environments + (genotypes x environments) component of variation revealed that the environments (linear) components of variation as well as genotypes x environments (linear) component were observed to be significant for all the characters under study. The G x E interaction was significant for all characters. The variance due to pooled deviation was found significant for days to 50% flowering, productive tillers per plant, spikes per panicle, hulling (%). Highly significant differences among genotypes, environments and G x E interaction were reported by Fentie et al. [10], Sood et al. [11], Ataei and Reza [12] and Kandel et al. [13].

The environmental indices computed for the seventeen characters studied were presented in Table 1 indicating both the favourable and unfavourable environments for all the component characters. Estimates of environmental indices indicated that Waghai location was favourable for most of the yield contributing characters along with quality parameters followed by Navsari and Vanarasi. It was also realized that among all the characters, leaf area (cm^2) was the most vulnerable to environmental fluctuations.

The estimation of mean and stability parameter for the different yield and yield related traits in little millet given in Tables 3, 4 and 5. The genotypes with lower mean performance and non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0) were tested for the significance of regression coefficient from unity, five genotypes *viz.*, WV 265, WV 270, WV 276, WV 292 and WV 267 for days to 50% flowering; six genotypes *viz.*, WV 265, WV 270, WV 287, WV 276, WV 292 and WV 267for days to maturity and seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 265, WV 287, WV 283, WV 276 WV 292, WV 279 and WV 255for plant height (cm) showed a regression coefficient nearly equal to unity (b_i=1), which demonstrated good general adaptation of character under various environments.

The seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 275, WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280 for days to 50% flowering; seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 275, WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280for days to maturity and six genotypes *viz.*, WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280for plant height (cm)which had a lower mean value, regression coefficients below unity (b_i<1) and non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0) was considered as only adapted to poor environment.

While seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 283, WV 266, WV 279, WV 285, WV 257, WV 294 and WV 269 for days to 50% flowering; seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 283, WV 266, WV 279, WV 285, WV 257, WV 294 and WV 269 days to maturity and seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 270, WV 285, WV 266, WV 294, WV 269, WV 257 and WV 273 for plant height (cm)were regarded as specifically adapted to a favourable environment because they had a lower mean value, a regression coefficient above unity (b_i>1)and a non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0).

Nagaraja et al. [14] reported that the genotype HR374 showed greater variation for days to 50 per cent flowering. Patel et al. [15] reported the G × E interaction was significant for days to 50% flowering.

Table 1. Estimation of environment index (Ij) for various characters under different environments in little millet

Sr. No.	Characters	Environmental index		
		Waghai (E_1)	Vanarasi (E_2)	Navsari (E_3)
1.	Days to 50% flowering	6.53	-1.81	-4.71
2.	Days to maturity	6.51	-1.79	-4.71
3.	Plant height (cm)	6.78	-1.47	-5.31
4.	Productive tillers per plant	0.64	-0.18	-0.46
5.	Panicle length (cm)	2.59	-0.69	-1.90
6.	Spikes per panicle	0.64	-0.18	-0.47
7.	1000 Grain weight (g)	0.05	-0.01	-0.04
8.	Grain yield per plant (g)	0.62	-0.08	-0.55
9	Fodder yield per plant (g)	0.93	-0.18	-0.75
10.	Harvest index (%)	0.44	0.03	-0.47

Patil [16] reported the genotypes *viz.*, RPSP 742, EC 138375 and RPSP 732 were early maturing with average stability of genotype. Kandel et al. [17] reported the significant genotypes and genotypes and their interaction were observed for day to maturity.

Patel et al. [15] reported that the G × E interaction was significant for plant height. Kandel et al. [17] reported significant genotypes and genotypes and their interaction for plant height along with genotype CO4656 which had mean yield that was higher than the overall mean (0.429 t/ha) with parameter of response (b_i)=1.16 and parameter of stability (S^2di)=0.05.

When genotypes with higher mean performance and non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0) were tested for the significance of regression coefficient from unity,four genotypes *viz.*, WV 274, WV 289, WV 286 and WV 296 for productive tillers per plant; ten genotypes *viz.*, WV 274, WV 258, WV 289, WV 272, WV 288, WV 286, WV 293, WV 259, WV 282 and WV 296 for panicle length (cm); ten genotypes *viz.*, WV 274, WV 258, WV 289, WV 272, WV 288, WV 286, WV 293, WV 282, WV 259 and WV 296for spikes per panicle; three genotypes *viz.*, WV 272, WV 262 and WV 293for 1000 grain weight (g); six genotypes *viz.*, WV 262, WV 258, WV 256, WV 293, WV 294 and WV 273for grain yield per plant (g); eight genotypes *viz.*, WV 257, WV 288, WV 269, WV 293, WV 260, WV 273, WV 282 and WV 259for fodder yield per plant (g); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 291, WV 301 and WV 273for harvest index (%); ten genotypes *viz.*, WV 256, WV 291, WV 263, WV 286, WV 288, WV 299, WV 293, WV 259, WV 282 and WV 296 for hulling (%); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 289, WV 286 and WV 302for chlorophyll content (mg/100g fresh weight); eight genotypes *viz.*, WV 289, WV 272, WV 288, WV 286, WV 263, WV 303, WV 296 and WV 282for leaf area (cm^2); one genotype WV 286for protein content (%); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 263, WV 286 and WV 303for crude fiber (%); none of genotype for mineral matter (mg/100g) and three genotypes *viz.*, WV 263, WV 287 and WV 303for iron content (mg/100g)showed a regression coefficient nearly equal to unity (b_i=1), which demonstrated good general adaptation of character under various environments.

Genotype WV 263 for productive tillers per plant; two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 263 for panicle length (cm); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 263for spikes per panicle; two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 263for 1000 grain weight (g); four genotypes *viz.*, WV 302, WV 303, WV 301 and WV 272for grain yield per plant (g); five genotypes *viz.*, WV 303, WV 301, WV 258, WV 272 and WV 262for fodder yield per plant (g); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 302, WV 303 and WV 254for harvest index (%); one genotype WV 303for hulling (%); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 297, WV 265 and WV 263 for chlorophyll content (mg/100g fresh weight); one genotype WV 297 for leaf area (cm^2); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 273 for protein content (%); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 302 for crude fiber (%); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 297 and WV 303 for mineral matter (mg/100g) and one genotype WV 274 for iron content (mg/100g) which had a higher mean value, regression coefficients below unity (b_i<1) and non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0) was considered as only adapted to poor environment.

While four genotypes *viz.*, WV 256, WV 260, WV 291 and WV 273 for productive tillers per plant; four genotypes *viz.*, WV 256, WV 260, WV 291 and WV 273 for panicle length (cm); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 256, WV 260 and WV 273 for spikes per panicle; six genotypes *viz.*, WV 296, WV 288, WV 295, WV 259, WV 282 and WV 257 for 1000 grain weight (g); four genotypes *viz.*, WV 259, WV 288, WV 269 and WV 296 for grain yield per plant (g); one genotype WV 296 for fodder yield per plant (g); seven genotypes *viz.*, WV 258, WV 259, WV 294, WV 288, WV 293, WV 269 and WV 296 for harvest index (%); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 260 and WV 273for hulling (%); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 288, WV 294 and WV 260for chlorophyll content (mg/100g fresh weight); five genotypes *viz.*, WV 256, WV 260, WV 294, WV 273 and WV 291for leaf area (cm^2); three genotypes *viz.*, WV 263, WV 256 and WV 260 for protein content (%); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 256 and WV 260for crude fiber (%); two genotypes *viz.*, WV 286 and WV 256for mineral matter (mg/100g) and one genotype WV 286 for iron content (mg/100g)were regarded as specifically adapted to a favourable environment because they had a higher mean value, a regression coefficient above unity (b_i>1), and a non-significant deviation from regression (S^2d_i=0).

Patel et al. [15] noted significant G × E interaction for number of effective tillers per plant. Madhavilatha et al. [18] reported among the tested genotypes that PR-1041 recorded average stability for number of productive tillers per plant indicated the wide adoptability of this genotype for number of productive tillers per plant.

Table 2. Analysis of variance for stability parameters with regards to grain yield and its component characters in little millet

Source of variation	Df	Days to 50% flowering	Days to maturity	Plant height (cm)	Productive tillers per plant	Panicle length (cm)	Spikes per panicle	1000 grain weight (g)	Grain yield per plant (g)	Fodder yield per plant (g)	Harvest index (%)
Genotype (G)	49	67.90***	68.57***	81.02***	0.68***	10.95***	0.69***	0.01***	6.01***	9.03***	6.90***
Environment (E)	2	1702.52***	1694.20***	1908.77***	16.52***	270.03***	16.58***	0.10***	17.29***	36.63***	10.30***
Env. + (Gen. x Env.)	100	53.12***	53.14***	61.01***	0.52***	8.47***	0.52***	0.004***	0.73***	1.28***	1.02**
G x E	98	19.46*	19.65*	23.30*	0.19*	3.13*	0.19*	0.002**	0.39**	0.56*	0.83*
Environment (Linear)	1	3405.05***	3388.41***	3817.55***	33.04***	540.06***	33.17***	0.21***	34.59***	73.27***	20.61***
G x E (Linear)	49	26.81**	27.31**	33.49***	0.27**	4.33**	0.27**	0.003***	0.61***	0.78**	1.14**
Pooled deviation	50	11.86***	11.75	12.85	0.12***	1.90	0.12**	0.001	0.18	0.33	0.51
Pooled error	294	5.38	11.83	27.21	0.04	2.26	0.07	0.004	0.16	0.97	1.94

Table 3. Estimation of mean and stability parameter for days to 50% flowering, days to maturity, Plant Height and Productive tillers per plant in little millet

Sr.	Genotypes	Days to 50% flowering						Days to maturity						Plant height (cm)					Productive tillers per plant					
No.		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i	Mean	b_i			S^2d_i	
1	WV 254	68.67	0.56	**	+	-2.41		108.67	0.57	**	+	-8.89		163.67	0.56	**	+	-23.74	4.49	0.54	*	+	-0.008	
2	WV 255	70	0.78			15.46		110	0.78			9.15		158.33	2.09	**		7.86	4.6	0.78			0.207	*
3	WV 256	75.67	1.55	**	++	-4.19		115.67	1.55	**	++	-10.58		170.67	1.45	**	+	-24.47	5.18	1.55	**	++	-0.026	
4	WV 257	72.33	1.62	**	++	-5.13		112.33	1.62	**	++	-11.54		163.67	2.26	**	+	-7.56	4.87	1.53	**	++	-0.036	
5	WV 258	75.33	1.49	**		15.93	*	115.33	1.49	**		9.75		170	1.41	*		-4.36	5.15	1.48	**		0.159	*
6	WV 259	85	1.65	**		9.1		125	1.66	**		2.4		180	1.56	**		-19.79	6.11	1.72	**		0.143	*
7	WV 260	76	1.81	**	++	-4.55		116	1.81	**	++	-10.93		171	1.68	**	++	-22.94	5.2	1.84	**	++	-0.034	
8	WV 261	84.33	0.8			55.27	**	124.33	0.81			48.57	*	179.33	0.79			27.88	6.04	0.8			0.614	***
9	WV 262	78.33	1.05			28.37	*	118.33	1.05			21.68		173.33	1.03			0.15	5.42	1.07			0.273	**
10	WV 263	78.67	0.64	**	++	-4.98		118.67	0.65	**	++	-11.41		174	0.57	**	+	-23.7	5.49	0.68	**	++	-0.039	
11	WV 264	68.67	0.64	**	++	-4.98		108.67	0.65	**	++	-11.41		163.67	0.57	**	++	-26.41	4.49	0.68	**	++	-0.039	
12	WV 265	74	0.7	**		-0.51		114	0.7	**		-6.9		169	0.63	**		-23.03	5	0.67	**		-0.007	
13	WV 266	71.33	1.33	**	++	-5.37		111.33	1.33	**	++	-11.83		164.33	1.53	**	+	-23.87	4.75	1.32	**	++	-0.04	
14	WV 267	71	0.82	*		4.83		111	0.82	*		-1.52		166	0.69			-15.23	4.73	0.83	*		0.059	
15	WV 268	82.33	0.1			18.59	*	122.33	0.1			12.12		177.33	0.11			-5.6	5.84	0.08			0.181	*
16	WV 269	73.67	2.12	**	++	-0.06		113.67	2.13	**	++	-6.31		168.33	2.03	**	++	-17.7	4.98	2.13	**	++	0.016	
17	WV 270	73	1.28	**		-2.58		113	1.28	**		-9.11		166.67	1.47	**	+	-23.22	4.84	1.33	**		-0.013	
18	WV 271	67.67	-0.01		++	3.28		107	-0.2		++	-0.59		160.33	0.2			4.62	4.27	-0.19		+	0.103	
19	WV 272	76.33	1.33	*		19.58	*	116.33	1.33	*		13.4		171.33	1.21			5.29	5.22	1.37	*		0.183	*
20	WV 273	75	2.26	**	++	-4.08		115	2.27	**	++	-10.43		168	2.54	**	++	-26.39	5.11	2.27	**	++	-0.026	
21	WV 274	75	0.83	**		-1.76		115	0.83	**		-8.27		170	0.82	**		-24.54	5.11	0.83	**		0.008	
22	WV 275	66	-0.17	**	++	-5.24		106	-0.17	**	++	-11.69		160	-0.06		++	-26.05	4.13	-0.11	**	++	-0.04	
23	WV 276	71.33	1.12	**		-2.67		111.33	1.13	**		-9.04		166.67	1.01	**		-18.92	4.76	1.04	**		0.004	

Sr.	Genotypes	Days to 50% flowering						Days to maturity						Plant height (cm)						Productive tillers per plant					
No.		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i	
24	WV 277	74.33	-0.06			15.01		114.33	-0.06			8.57		169.33	-0.02		+	-8.95		5.04	-0.04			0.157	*
25	WV 278	67.33	0.51	*	+	-2.14		107.33	0.51	*	+	-8.55		162	0.53	**	++	-24.89		4.33	0.58	**	++	-0.027	
26	WV 279	71	1.48	**	+	-2.58		111	1.48	**	+	-8.93		166	1.41	**		-21.98		4.73	1.5	**	+	-0.015	
27	WV 280	70.67	0.81	**	++	-5.32		110.67	0.81	**	++	-11.76		165.67	0.7	**	++	-26.94		4.69	0.7	*		0.043	
28	WV 281	69.33	0.43	**	++	-5.07		109.33	0.43	**	++	-11.53		164.33	0.44	**	++	-27.16		4.55	0.4	**	++	-0.037	
29	WV 282	84.67	1.55	**		10.69		124.67	1.56	**		3.99		179.67	1.51	**		-20.3		6.09	1.54	**		0.132	*
30	WV 283	72.67	1.26	**	++	-5.15		112.67	1.26	**	++	-11.58		168	1.15	**		-26.56		4.89	1.29	**	++	-0.036	
31	WV 284	77	1.12			35.49	**	117	1.12			28.76		172	1.1			6.15		5.29	1.1			0.384	**
32	WV 285	73.33	1.54	**	+	-1.95		113.33	1.54	**	+	-8.51		168.33	1.48	**	++	-26.98		4.93	1.5	**	+	-0.008	
33	WV 286	78.33	1	**		-4.95		118.33	1	**		-11.37		173.33	0.93	**		-26.35		5.42	0.98	**		-0.038	
34	WV 287	73	1.68	**		19.84	*	113	1.69	**		13.72		168.33	1.54	*		1.8		4.87	1.7	*		0.25	**
35	WV 288	77.67	1.72	**		13.88		118	1.66	**		2.4		172.67	1.68	**		-15.88		5.36	1.77	**		0.178	*
36	WV 289	75.67	1.05	**		-0.4		115	1.2	**		-10.65		170.67	0.98	**		-19.4		5.18	1.1	**		0.009	
37	WV 290	74.33	0.46			63	***	114.33	0.46			56.7	*	169.67	0.35			48.14		5.04	0.41			0.617	***
38	WV 291	74.67	2.12	**	++	-0.06		114.67	2.13	**	++	-6.31		169.67	1.99	**	+	-13.41		5.09	2.18	**	++	-0.001	
39	WV 292	71	1.03	**		-3.29		111	1.03	**		-9.68		166.33	0.9	**		-22.83		4.71	1.02	**		-0.016	
40	WV 293	83	1.36	*		14.11		123	1.37	*		7.42		178	1.34	**		-12.38		5.89	1.35	*		0.166	*
41	WV 294	74.33	2.07	**	++	-4.84		114.33	2.08	**	++	-11.23		169	2.01	**	++	-26.13		5.04	2.08	**	++	-0.034	
42	WV 295	69.67	0.68			13.65		109.67	0.68			7.32		164.67	0.63			-8.95		4.58	0.74			0.114	
43	WV 296	87	1.32	**		3.89		127	1.32	**		-2.72		182	1.27	**		-22.97		6.31	1.36	**		0.026	
44	WV 297	76.33	-0.03		++	-4.76		116.33	-0.03		++	-11.21		171.67	-0.12	**	++	-27.1		5.27	-0.08		++	-0.037	
45	WV 298	79.33	0.93			40.84	**	119.33	0.93			34.14	*	174	0.78			14.28		5.47	0.92			0.367	**
46	WV 299	76.67	0.03		++	-4.76		116.67	0.03		++	-11.21		171.67	-0.03		++	-26.41		5.29	0.04		++	-0.03	
47	WV 300	72.67	0.68			13.65		112.67	0.68			7.32		168	0.54			-8.85		4.87	0.7			0.146	*
48	WV 301	73.67	0.23			11.71		113.67	0.23			5.3		168.67	0.18			-9.16		4.98	0.21			0.146	*
49	WV 302	72.33	0.22		++	-3.96		112.33	0.22		++	-10.4		167.33	0.14		++	-25.92		4.84	0.21		++	-0.032	
50	WV 303	73	0.5	**	++	-4.08		113	0.5	**	++	-10.55		168	0.46	**	++	-27.03		4.91	0.49	**	++	-0.02	
	General mean	**74.65**						**114.63**						**169.29**						**5.07**					
	±SEb_i		**0.42**						**0.4**						**0.4**						**0.43**				

Where, b_i and S^2d_i were regression coefficient and deviation from regression, respectively
** and ** significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 0$*
+ and ++ significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 1$

Table 4. Estimation of mean and stability parameter for panicle length (cm), spikes per panicle 1000 grain weight (g) and grain yield per plant (g)in little millet

Sr. No.	Genotypes	Panicle length (cm)						Spikes per panicle						1000 Grain weight (g)					Grain yield per plant (g)					
		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i		Mean	b_i			S^2d_i	Mean	b_i			S^2d_i	
1	WV 254	29.45	0.54	**	+	-1.8		6.18	0.6	**	+	-0.04		1.96	1.37	**	++	-0.004	7.84	0.45	**	++	-0.15	
2	WV 255	29.97	0.76			1.01		6.29	0.75			0.13		2.01	1.89	**		-0.002	7.29	0.76	**		-0.13	
3	WV 256	32.21	1.52	**	++	-2.06		6.87	1.53	**	++	-0.06		2.1	1.71			0.003	10.23	0.87	**		-0.14	
4	WV 257	30.97	1.63	**	++	-2.2		6.53	1.64	**	++	-0.07		2.16	2.4	**	++	-0.003	8.74	0.95	**		-0.08	
5	WV 258	32.11	1.46	*		1.37		6.84	1.54	**		0.15		2.17	0.65			-0.003	9.95	1.01	**		-0.16	
6	WV 259	35.81	1.63	**		-0.12		7.8	1.67	**		0.07		2.21	1.73	**	++	-0.004	12.3	1.46	**	++	-0.14	
7	WV 260	32.44	1.82	**	++	-2.05		6.89	1.82	**	++	-0.07		2.1	1.59	**	+	-0.004	10.14	0.22			0.3	
8	WV 261	35.76	0.82			6.93	*	7.73	0.76			0.51	**	2.24	0.18			0.001	10.66	0.34			1.14	**
9	WV 262	33.36	1.06			3.01		7.15	1.07			0.23	*	2.15	0.86	**		-0.004	9.23	1.08	**		-0.16	
10	WV 263	33.61	0.55	**	++	-1.98		7.2	0.58	**	++	-0.06		2.15	0.62	**	++	-0.004	8.65	1.63	**	++	-0.13	
11	WV 264	29.37	0.74	**	++	-2.26		6.18	0.63	**	++	-0.06		2.07	0.34			-0.003	8.09	0.87	**	+	-0.16	
12	WV 265	31.64	0.7	*		-1.37		6.69	0.73	**		-0.03		2.05	-0.27		+	-0.002	8.13	0.25		+	-0.07	
13	WV 266	30.56	1.34	**	++	-2.27		6.42	1.32	**	++	-0.07		2.07	1.55	**	+	-0.003	8.47	0.5			0.01	
14	WV 267	30.37	0.81	*		-0.64		6.4	0.83	*		0.03		2.05	1.22	**		-0.003	8.03	-0.35			0.61	*
15	WV 268	34.94	0.13			1.55		7.53	0.06			0.2		2.14	1.08			-0.001	10.22	-1.05		++	0.19	
16	WV 269	31.5	2.13	**	++	-1.31		6.67	2.11	**	++	-0.03		2.09	1.53	**	++	-0.004	10.08	1.96	**	+	-0.04	
17	WV 270	31.01	1.36	**	++	-2.12		6.53	1.39	**	+	-0.05		2.08	1.47	**		-0.004	8.36	1.2	**		-0.1	
18	WV 271	28.71	-0.09		+	0.28		5.98	-0.14		+	0.11		2.05	-0.87	*	++	-0.003	7.66	0.69	**	++	-0.16	
19	WV 272	32.56	1.33	*		2.08		6.93	1.3	*		0.15		2.12	1.94	**		-0.002	9.8	0.54	*	+	-0.12	
20	WV 273	32.02	2.28	**	++	-1.98		6.8	2.25	**	++	-0.06		2.1	2.8	**	+	-0.001	11.15	0.95	**		-0.13	
21	WV 274	32.03	0.83	**		-1.78		6.8	0.78	**		-0.04		2.25	0.19			-0.003	8.04	1.38	**	+	-0.14	
22	WV 275	28.23	-0.08		++	-2.24		5.84	-0.09		++	-0.06		2.01	-0.08		++	-0.003	7.52	1.09	**		-0.13	
23	WV 276	30.69	1.06	**		-1.28		6.49	1.03	**		-0.02		2.07	0.6	**	+	-0.004	7.61	1			0.19	
24	WV 277	31.75	-0.04			1		6.75	-0.09			0.14		2.09	-0.36			-0.001	8.49	1.6	**	++	-0.16	
25	WV 278	28.87	0.55	**	++	-2.1		6	0.58	**	++	-0.06		2.03	0.36			-0.002	7.14	0.67	**	++	-0.16	
26	WV 279	30.41	1.47	**	+	-1.69		6.4	1.5	**	+	-0.04		2.06	1.98	**	+	-0.003	8.45	1.3	**		-0.01	
27	WV 280	30.25	0.81	**	++	-2.25		6.38	0.85	**	++	-0.07		2.05	1.22	**	++	-0.004	7.42	0.68	**	++	-0.16	
28	WV 281	29.72	0.41	**	++	-2.24		6.24	0.46	**	++	-0.07		2.04	0.66	*		-0.003	7.16	0.63	**	++	-0.16	
29	WV 282	35.88	1.56	**		0.1		7.78	1.61	**		0.08		2.2	1.89	**	++	-0.004	11.25	1.93			0.92	**
30	WV 283	31.05	1.27	**	++	-2.24		6.58	1.27	**	++	-0.07		2.08	1.42	**		-0.003	8.37	1.32	**		-0.12	
31	WV 284	32.72	1.15			4.59		7.02	1.1			0.34	*	2.16	0.43			-0.003	8.46	2.38	*		0.45	
32	WV 285	31.34	1.56	**	++	-1.78		6.62	1.57	**	++	-0.05		2.1	1.23	**		-0.003	8.03	2.28	**		0.15	
33	WV 286	33.31	1.01	**		-2.18		7.15	0.98	**		-0.07		2.16	1.07			-0.001	8.56	2.32	**		0.16	
34	WV 287	31.21	1.7	**		2.2		6.62	1.67	**		0.18		2.11	2.02	**		-0.002	8.58	2.58	**	++	-0.1	
35	WV 288	33.07	1.76	**		0.62		7.07	1.7	**		0.15		2.15	1.67	**	++	-0.004	10.01	1.84	**	+	-0.08	
36	WV 289	32.24	1.08	**		-1.53		6.87	1.08	**		-0.04		2.13	0.6			-0.003	8.55	1.59	**		-0.07	
37	WV 290	31.76	0.43			8.9	*	6.73	0.46			0.62	**	2.04	1.95	**	++	-0.004	8.08	0.54			0.18	

Sr. No.	**Genotypes**	**Panicle length (cm)**						**Spikes per panicle**						**1000 Grain weight (g)**					**Grain yield per plant (g)**					
		Mean	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**		**Mean**	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**		**Mean**	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**	**Mean**	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**	
38	WV 291	31.89	2.12	**	++	-1.2		6.76	2.17	**	++	-0.02		2.23	0.03		+	-0.003	10.52	2.08			0.89	*
39	WV 292	30.42	1.05	**		-1.9		6.42	1.06	**		-0.05		2.11	2.18	**	+	-0.002	7.28	0.87	**		-0.15	
40	WV 293	35.21	1.39	**		0.44		7.58	1.42	**		0.11		2.18	1.68	**		-0.003	10.53	2.13	**		0.13	
41	WV 294	31.78	2.07	**	++	-2.12		6.75	2.12	**	++	-0.07		2.1	2.55	**	++	-0.003	10.71	1.11	*		0.04	
42	WV 295	30.54	0.57	**	++	-2.24		6.27	0.69			0.12		2.12	1.67	**	++	-0.004	7.56	0.89	**		-0.15	
43	WV 296	36.82	1.32	**		-0.93		8	1.34	**		0.02		2.23	1.54	**	++	-0.004	10.97	3.57	**	++	-0.08	
44	WV 297	32.6	-0.07	*	++	-2.26		7.02	-0.16	*	++	-0.07		2.13	-0.38	*	++	-0.004	8.23	0.23	**	++	-0.16	
45	WV 298	33.65	0.84			6.58	*	7.22	0.83			0.49	**	2.19	-0.15		++	-0.003	9.24	1.11			0.19	
46	WV 299	32.67	0.03		++	-2.17		7.02	-0.08		++	-0.05		2.11	0.35	**	++	-0.004	8.07	0	**	+	-0.16	
47	WV 300	31.05	0.69			0.56		6.6	0.69			0.12		2.11	-0.09			0.005	7.79	0.86	**		-0.15	
48	WV 301	31.51	0.19			0.62		6.69	0.25			0.09		2.1	-0.01			-0.002	10.97	0.52	**	++	-0.16	
49	WV 302	30.91	0.23		++	-2.07		6.55	0.23		++	-0.05		2.09	0.19		++	-0.003	10.9	-1.98	**	++	-0.16	
50	WV 303	31.22	0.5	**	++	-2.07		6.62	0.51	**	++	-0.06		2.16	-0.22		++	-0.004	12.51	-0.83	**	++	-0.15	
General mean		**31.86**						**6.77**						**2.11**					**9.04**					
$\pm SEb_i$			**0.42**						**0.43**						**0.53**					**0.51**				

Where, b_i and S^2d_i were regression coefficient and deviation from regression, respectively.
** and ** significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 0$*
+ and ++ significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 1$

Table 5. Estimation of mean and stability parameter for fodder yield per plant (g) and harvest index (%) in little millet

Sr. No.	Genotypes	Fodder yield per plant (g)					Harvest index (%)				
		Mean	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**	**Mean**	**b_i**			**S^2d_i**
1	WV 254	16.76	0.85	*		-0.82	31.96	-0.58	**	++	-1.93
2	WV 255	16.76	1.36	*		-0.43	30.36	-0.18			-1.54
3	WV 256	18.57	2.46	**	+	-0.22	35.65	-2.43			1.53
4	WV 257	19.54	0.91	**		-0.94	30.97	1.26			-1.69
5	WV 258	20.59	0.61	**	++	-0.96	32.58	1.61	**	++	-1.93
6	WV 259	22.60	0.74	**		-0.92	35.29	1.86	**	++	-1.92
7	WV 260	21.01	0.78	**		-0.91	32.56	-0.57			-0.11
8	WV 261	21.22	0.61			-0.81	33.53	0.58			2.49
9	WV 262	19.90	0.83	**	++	-0.97	31.65	1.75	**	++	-1.93
10	WV 263	19.19	1.23	**	++	-0.97	30.97	2.59	**		-1.58
11	WV 264	18.16	1.13	**		-0.91	30.79	0.52			-1.62
12	WV 265	18.68	0.22			-0.71	30.41	0.33			-1.87
13	WV 266	18.72	0.70			-0.37	31.21	0.23		++	-1.92
14	WV 267	18.36	-0.02			2.03	30.39	-0.76		++	-1.87
15	WV 268	20.69	-0.48		++	-0.80	33.05	-2.03		+	-0.96
16	WV 269	20.66	1.16	**		-0.76	32.78	3.27	**	++	-1.92
17	WV 270	18.85	0.97	**		-0.94	30.73	1.62			-1.60
18	WV 271	17.47	0.76	**		-0.94	30.51	0.84	**		-1.93
19	WV 272	20.46	0.65	**	++	-0.96	32.42	0.36			-1.55
20	WV 273	21.61	0.82	**		-0.96	34.07	0.79	*		-1.87
21	WV 274	18.07	1.38	**	++	-0.95	30.81	1.55	*		-1.75
22	WV 275	17.38	1.78	**		-0.48	30.27	-0.30		++	-1.91
23	WV 276	17.35	1.43			0.46	30.56	0.44	**	++	-1.93
24	WV 277	18.92	1.34	**		-0.81	31.04	2.15	**	++	-1.86
25	WV 278	16.35	0.85	**	++	-0.97	30.44	0.52	**	+	-1.92
26	WV 279	18.83	1.25			-0.25	30.87	1.49	**	++	-1.93
27	WV 280	16.75	1.03	**		-0.97	30.66	-0.13		++	-1.93
28	WV 281	16.46	0.58	*		-0.90	30.36	0.93			-1.77
29	WV 282	21.94	1.22	**		-0.84	33.85	2.11			1.32
30	WV 283	18.78	1.22	**		-0.69	30.84	1.66	**	+	-1.90
31	WV 284	18.56	2.49			2.13	31.29	2.28	**	++	-1.93
32	WV 285	17.91	2.29	**	++	-0.84	30.89	2.60			-0.61
33	WV 286	18.98	1.94	**	++	-0.91	31.02	3.02			-0.35
34	WV 287	18.86	2.27	**	++	-0.85	31.18	3.01			-0.89
35	WV 288	20.56	1.10	**		-0.97	32.72	2.89	**	+	-1.63
36	WV 289	19.08	1.27	**	+	-0.95	30.94	2.43			-1.21
37	WV 290	17.62	1.54	*		-0.23	31.52	-1.55	**	++	-1.88
38	WV 291	21.11	1.17			-0.23	33.18	3.70	*		-0.83
39	WV 292	16.90	1.40	**	++	-0.97	30.13	-0.17		++	-1.93
40	WV 293	20.87	1.23	*		-0.49	33.50	3.10	**	++	-1.71
41	WV 294	21.22	0.53			-0.76	33.53	1.97	**	+	-1.85
42	WV 295	17.51	1.48	**		-0.82	30.17	0.11			-1.81
43	WV 296	21.29	2.54	**	++	-0.50	33.94	4.59	**	++	-1.81
44	WV 297	18.42	-0.12	**	++	-0.97	30.90	1.00	**		-1.88
45	WV 298	20.01	0.58			-0.68	31.63	2.40	*		-1.37
46	WV 299	18.66	-0.18		++	-0.96	30.25	0.40			-1.88
47	WV 300	17.66	0.77	**		-0.90	30.70	1.04			-1.51
48	WV 301	21.38	0.31	**	++	-0.98	34.04	0.89	**		-1.91
49	WV 302	21.82	-0.36		++	-0.62	33.24	-4.29	**	++	-0.85
50	WV 303	22.95	-0.61	**	++	-0.94	35.32	-0.91	**	++	-1.93
	General mean	**19.24**					**31.83**				
	±SEb_i		**0.48**					**1.11**			

Where, b_i and S^2d_i were regression coefficient and deviation from regression, respectively
** and ** significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 0$*
+ and ++ significant at 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively when Ho: $b_i = 1$

Table 6. Classification of genotypes by number-wise based on their adaptation in different environments in little millet

Sl. No.	Characters	Number of genotypes suitable for		
		Average stability and wide/ general adaptability	**Stable and adapted to poor environment**	**Stable and adapted to better environment**
1	Days to 50% flowering	5	7	7
2	Days to maturity	6	7	7
3	Plant height (cm)	7	6	7
4	Productive tillers per plant	4	1	4
5	Panicle length (cm)	10	2	4
6	Spikes per panicle	10	2	3
7	1000 grain weight (g)	3	2	6
8	Grain yield per plant (g)	6	4	4
9	Fodder yield per plant (g)	8	5	1
10	Harvest index (%)	3	3	7

Jawale et al. [19] reported the genotypes showing better performance under favourable environment were DPI 20114, DPI 20132, L 48, MR 34, DM 4, DM 7, GPU 58 and VR 847 for length of finger. Chavan et al. [20] evaluated genotypes which were showing better performance under favourable performance were PEH-1201, VL-149 and NDS-1 for length of finger. Chavan et al. [20] evaluated genotypes which were showing better performance under favourable environment were GE-1680, Kanika Reddy, IVT-25, Nagli Dapoli-1 for number of fingers per ear indicated wider adoptability of these genotypes under all environments.

Patel et al. [15] found out significant G × E interaction for grain yield per plant. Kandel et al. [13] reported that the genotype CO-4656 had mean yield which was higher than the overall mean (0.429 t/ha), parameter of response (b)=1.16 and parameter of stability (S2di)=0.05. Madhavilatha et al. [18] reported average stability for grain yield was found in VR 990 which revealed the wide adaptability of the genotype across different locations. Kandel et al. [13] studied genotypes *viz.*, GE-0382, KLE-216, NE-94 and KLE-559 that were found environmentally sensitive producing higher grain yield throughout the environments.

Shanthakumar and Lohithaswa [21] reported that the genotype PPR-2614 was also found stable for fodder yield per plant with higher mean value. Ataei and Reza [12] found out environment, genotype and interaction effects that were accounted for 76.38, 6.97 and 8.92 percent of the total forage yield variation, respectively.

Patel et al. [15] reported significant G × E interaction for harvest index when tested against pooled error. Patel et al. [15] reported significant G × E interaction for leaf area when tested against pooled error. Chavan et al. [20] recorded average stability for protein content (%) for genotypes *viz.*,GE-1680, Kanika Reddy, IVT-25, NagliDapoli 1 which indicated wider adoptability of these genotypes under all environments.

Chavan et al. [20] found out general stability for iron content (mg/100g) in the genotypes *viz.*, MR-6, PEH-1201 and IVT-11. Saritha et al. [22] noted that the genotypes *viz.*, VR-1034, GPU-71, DHWFM 11-3, OUAT-2 and JWM-1 were consistently stable across the environments whereas VR-936, GE-728, GE-6834-1, WFM-10, KMR-344, DHWFM 2-3 and GPU-67 were poorly adapted across the environments for their grain iron content. The genotypes studied in the present investigation have been classified on the basis of their stability performance and were presented in table 6. In general, the numbers of genotypes identified for average stability and wide/general adaptability were higher as compared to stable and adapted to poor environment or stable and adapted to better environment. And in Table 7 classification of genotypes by name-wise based on their adaptation in different environments in little millet.

Table 7. Classification of genotypes by name-wise based on their adaptation in different environments in little millet

Sr. No	Characters	Name of genotypes suitable for		
		Average stability and wide/ general adaptability	**Stable and adapted to poor environment**	**Stable and adapted to better environment**
1	Days to 50% flowering	WV 265, WV 270, WV 276, WV 292 and WV 267	WV 275, WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280	WV 283, WV 266, WV 279, WV 285, WV 257, WV 294 and WV 269
2	Days to maturity	WV 265, WV 270, WV 287, WV 276, WV 292 and WV 267	WV 275, WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280	WV 283, WV 266, WV 279, WV 285, WV 257, WV 294 and WV 269
3	Plant height (cm)	WV 265, WV 287, WV 283, WV 276 WV 292, WV 279 and WV 255	WV 281, WV 303, WV 278, WV 254, WV 264 and WV 280	WV 270, WV 285, WV 266, WV 294, WV 269, WV 257 and WV 273
4	Productive tillers per plant	WV 274, WV 289, WV 286 and WV 296	WV 263	WV 256, WV 260, WV 291 and WV 273
5	Panicle length (cm)	WV 274, WV 258, WV 289, WV 272, WV 288, WV 286, WV 293, WV 259, WV 282 and WV 296	WV 297 and WV 263	WV 256, WV 260, WV 291 and WV 273
6	Spikes per panicle	WV 274, WV 258, WV 289, WV 272, WV 288, WV 286, WV 293, WV 282, WV 259 and WV 296	WV 297 and WV 263	WV 256, WV 260 and WV 273
7	1000 grain weight (g)	WV 272, WV 262 and WV 293	WV 297 and WV 263	WV 296, WV 288, WV 295, WV 259, WV 282 and WV 257
8	Grain yield per plant (g)	WV 262, WV 258, WV 256, WV 293, WV 294 and WV 273	WV 302, WV 303, WV 301 and WV 272	WV 259, WV 288, WV 269 and WV 296
9	Fodder yield per plant (g)	WV 257, WV 288, WV 269, WV 293, WV 260, WV 273, WV 282 and WV 259	WV 303, WV 301, WV 258, WV 272 and WV 262	WV 296
10	Harvest index (%)	WV 291, WV 301 and WV 273	WV 302, WV 303 and WV 254	WV 258, WV 259, WV 294, WV 288, WV 293, WV 269 and WV 296

4. CONCLUSION

From the preceding discussion and overall picture of stability of genotypes to overall character, it could be concluded that, genotypes *viz.*, WV 262, WV 258, WV 256, WV 293 and WV 273 were found to be average stable over environments for grain yield per plant with one or more yield contributing characters. As WV 294 was found to be stable over environment for grain yield per plant but with none of the yield contributing characters. Hence, it was suggested that in order to identify stable genotypes, actual testing under variable environments including favourable and unfavourable would be advantageous. During selection, the attention should be paid to the phenotypic stability of characters directly related to grain yield per plant in little millet.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Rachie KO. The millets: Importance, utilization and outlook, ICRISAT publication, Hyderabad, India; 1975.
2. Seetharam A, Gowda J, Halaswamy JH. Small millets-nucleus and breeder seed production manual. Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India. 2003;54-67.
3. Sundararaj DP, Thulasidas G. Botany of field crops. Macmillan Publisher, India. 1976;509.
4. Nanda JS, Agarwal PK. Botany of field crops. Kalyani Publisher, India. 2008;381.
5. Jayaraman N, Suresh S, Nirmala A, Ganeshan NM. Genetic enhancement and breeding strategies in small millets. National Seminar on Small Millets, Coimbatore, India. 1997;19-21.
6. Anonymous. Annual progress report, Project coordinating unit, AICRP on small millets, GKVK (Bangalore); 2021.
7. Eberhart SA, Rusell WA. Stability parameters for comparing varieties. Crop Science. 1966;6(1):36-40.
8. Finlay KW, Wilkinson GN. The analysis of adaption in plant breeding programme. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research. 1963;14:742-754.
9. Perkins JM, Jinks JL. Environmental and genotype environmental components of variability in multiple lines and crosses. Heredity. 1968;23:339-356.
10. Fentie M, Assefa A, Belete K. AMMI anlaysis of yield performance and stability of finger millet genotypes in different environments. World Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2013;9(3):231-237.
11. Sood S, Patro TSSK, Karad S, Sao A. Graphical analysis of genotype by environment interaction of finger millet grain yield in India. Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding. 2018;9(1):82-89.
12. Ataei R, Reza MS. Multi-environment evaluation of foxtail millet (*Setaria italica* (L.) Beauv.) advanced lined for forage yield stability. Genetika. 2020;52(3):835-850.
13. Kandel M, Dhami NB, Rijal TR, Shrestha J. Yield stability and test location representativeness in foxtail millet (*Setaria italica* (L.) Beauv.) genotypes. Genetics and Biodiversity Journal. 2020; 4(2):74-83.
14. Nagaraja MS, Halagundegowda GR, Meenakshi HK. Application of regression model to identify stable finger millet genotypes. The Bioscan. 2015;9(3&4):721-724.
15. Patel JM, Patel MS, Patel HN, Soni NV, Prajapati NN. Stability analysis in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2019;7(4):2371-2375.
16. Patil HE. Stability analysis for grain yield in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). International Journal of Agricultural Science. 2007;3(1):84-86.
17. Kandel M, Kandel BP, Ghimire MS, Bastola A, Runiyar PB. Stability analysis of finger millet genotypes across diverse hilly and mountainous environments in Nepal. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2022;7(6):363-372.
18. Madhavilatha L, Rao MS, Kumar MH, Anuradha N, Kumar S, Priya MS. Stability analysis for grain yield attributing traits in finger millet. The Andhra Agricultural Journal. 2020;67:18-22.
19. Jawale LN, Bhave SG, Jadhav RA, Deosarkar DB, Choudhary AK. Stability analysis in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). Journal of Genetics, Genomics and Plant Breeding. 2017; 1(2):14-19.
20. Chavan BR, Jawale LN, Dhutmal RR, Kalambe AS. Stability analysis for yield and yield contributing traits in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). Journal

of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2018;7(5):296-300.
21. Shanthakumar G, Lohithaswa HC. Genotype environment interaction studies for yield and its component traits in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). Proceedings of third national seminar on millets research and development- Future policy options in India. 2004;2:20-22.
22. Saritha HS, Ravishankar P, Sunitha NC. Stability of grain nutrient concentrations in white finger millet. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7(11):2786-2801.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93909