

Assessment of Genetic Variability and Heritability Analysis in Sugarcane Clones Obtained by FUZZ (True Seed) at Northern of Côte d'Ivoire

Abstract:

Sugarcane is the main sugar producing crop in Côte d'Ivoire. However, improvement of this crop through breeding is limited due to lack of genetic diversity. Therefore, genetic variability and diversity assessment are necessarily important for the sugarcane clones obtained by FUZZ (True Seed). Experiment was conducted with 47 sugarcane clone at Northern of Côte d'Ivoire (SUCAF CI), Ferkessédougou, during 2016-17, following RCBD. Data were collected on different growth and yield contributing characters. Number of stem on 3 meter exhibited high genotypic coefficient of variation and phenotypic coefficient of variation. High phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) were also recorded for %Flowering, Nber_stem/3m and stem_diameter but moderate PCVs were recorded for %Brix. Low PCVs was observed for stem_Height. Based on the characters studied the Nber_stem.3m, % Flowering and % Brix have a high heritability value estimate while stem_diameter and stem_height have low heritability. Nber_stem/3m showed negative and weakly significant correlation with stem_diameter, stem_height, and positive weakly correlation observed with %Brix). There was also positive and weakly correlation of stem_height with %Flowering and negative and weakly correlation are observed between % Brix with %Flowering. A positive value of r shows that the changes of two variables are in the same direction, i.e. high values of one variable are associated with high values of other and vice versa. Results indicate that the genotypes should be selected on the basis of number of stem on 3 meter, %Brix, stem diameter and %Flowering for future selection to get higher sugar yield.

Keywords: Sugarcane clone, genetic diversity, phenotypic diversity, heritability, SUCAF CI

I. Introduction

The world's sugarcane cropped area in 2014 was over 27 million ha with a total cane production of 1900 million tons, making the world's average cane 70 tons per ha (Burleigh Dodds, 2018). In the terms of cultivated area, sugarcane ranks the 7th place in the world, after wheat, maize, rice, soybean, barley and sorghum. Therefore, sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp.) contributes approximately 80% of the sugar to the world, greatly exceeding sugar beet as a source of sugar (Dahlquist, 2013). Today's commercial sugarcane cultivars are derived from hybridization between the species *Saccharum officinarum* ($2n = 80$) with high sugar content (SC) and the wild species *Saccharum spontaneum* ($2n=40-128$). The commercial cultivars have chromosome number of 100-130 with 70-80% of the chromosome derived from the *S. officinarum* species, 10-20% from *S. spontaneum* and 5-17% from a recombination of these two species (D'Hont, 2005; D'Hont et al., 1996; Piperidis et al., 2001).



39 The heterozygous and polyploidy natures of this crop have resulted in generation of greater
40 genetic variability. The information on the nature and the magnitude of variability present in the
41 genetic material is of prime importance for a breeder to initiate any effective selection program.
42 However, it most important sugar crop of tropical and subtropical countries for sugar
43 production.

44 Breeding for higher yield and quality traits requires basic information on the extent of genetic
45 variation in a population and its response to selection.

46 Generally the main objective of sugarcane breeding is to develop varieties capable of producing
47 high sugar yields per unit land area. To achieve this goal we need special varieties.

48 The improvement of modern cultivars could be achieved by identifying genes associated with
49 important agronomic traits, such as sucrose content. To facilitate the selection of different
50 cultivars for improved quality, it is necessary to evaluate existing germplasm and released
51 varieties of sugarcane.

52 Therefore, sustainability of sugarcane cultivation in this country is threatened. To sustain
53 sugarcane production and to improve the productivity, tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses,
54 nutrient management, and improved sugar recovery are of the major concerns. Development of
55 varieties is important consideration that would be highly productive and tolerant against biotic
56 and abiotic factors with the changing climate. Coefficients of variation with heritability as well as
57 genetic advance are very essential to improve any trait of sugarcane because this would help in
58 informing whether or not the desired objective can be achieved from the material (*Alam et al.,*
59 *2017*). Therefore, the objective of this study was to describe the nature and extent of genetic
60 variability and phenotypic and genotypic variability of sugarcane clones obtained by FUZZ at
61 northern of Côte d'Ivoire in some important traits.

62 II. Materials and Methods

63 a) Experimental area

64 The study was conducted at the Experimental Station of the Sugar Complex of Ferké 2 in
65 northern Côte d'Ivoire between 9°20' and 9°60' north latitude on the one hand, and, 5°22' and
66 5°40' west longitude, with an average altitude 325 m above sea level. The climate prevailing in
67 the study area is of dry tropical type with two seasons; one dry season, from November to April
68 and the other wet, from May to October. The rainfall pattern is unimodal and centered on the
69 months of August-September which accumulate nearly half of the average annual rainfall height
70 of about 1200 mm. To compensate for the water deficit of sugarcane, the water supply through
71 irrigation approaches on average 700 mm (*Péné et al., 2012*).

72 The vegetation of Ferké 2 is a Guinean savanna (or sub-Sudanese) of wooded type, with
73 variable levels containing small fragments of detached forests. The soils are predominantly
74 ferrallitic, with shallow topsoil (40 to 60 cm) limited by indurations.

75 b) Plant materials

76 New genotypes have been developed from bi-parental cross breeding of fuzz (true seed) of
77 Reunion origin at Reunion Island sugarcane breeding center (eRcane). The large number of

seedling clones was developed and year wise tested/screened under several selection stages in single plant, 1st stage, 2nd stage and 3rd stage. Sugarcane planting was done in November 2015, and qualitative and quantitative traits factors were measured during two separate seasons. The first season was November 2016, and coincided with 12-month-old plants. The second season was comprised of three successive time points, namely September 2017, and December 2017, and coincided with ratoon plants. The plan was to record data in the abovementioned time points in order to gain a detailed understanding of growth periods, and to assess the difference between them and, consequently, to recognize critical stages for gaining the optimum yield.

Their numbers were reduced at each stage and only promising clones were promoted to the next selection stage on the basis of better stem diameter (mm), number of Stem on 3 meters, stem height (m), flowering rate % and Brix (**Table 1**).

Table1: Descriptors used for characterizing for the 5 traits of studied

Traits	Description
Nber_stem/3m	Number of stem on 3 meters
Stem_height (m)	Stem height from ground level to the insertion of the top visible dewlap leaf (TVD)
Stem_diameter (mm)	Diameter of stem
Brix%	Brix is the total soluble solids in the aqueous solution from the stem as a percentage by weight (% w/w)
% Flowering	Flowering is the total apparent flowering

Forty-seven (47) genotypes used in this study were tested during 2 years (2015-16 and 2016-17) **Table 2**. All genotypes were planted compared with check commercial varieties SP70-1006.

Table2: All genotypes used in this study at 3rd stage of the selection scheme

Order	Genotypes	Pedigree	Order	Genotypes	Pedigree
1	RCI14/189	R 579 x R 97/0434	25	RCI13/153	R 579 x R 585
2	RCI14/188	R 96/2116 x Q 213	26	RCI13/151	R 96/2569 x R 585
3	RCI14/171	R 579 x R 585	27	RCI13/143	R 579 x BT 92/3586
4	RCI14/161	R 579 x R 585	28	RCI13/142	R 579 x BT 92/3586
5	RCI14/159	R 579 x R 585	29	RCI13/138	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043
6	RCI14/158	R 579 x R 585	30	RCI13/13	R 579 x BT 92/3586
7	RCI14/155	R 579 x R 585	31	RCI13/122	R 99/2162 x R 585
8	RCI14/147	R 96/2116 x Q 213	32	RCI13/121	R 579 x BT 92/3586
9	RCI14/14	R 96/2116 x Q 213	33	RCI13/118	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043
10	RCI14/131	R 579 x R 585	34	RCI13/1148	R 579 x BT 92/3586
11	RCI14/129	R 579 x R 585	35	RCI13/1135	R 96/2569 x R 585
12	RCI14/1139	R 579 x R 585	36	RCI13/1119	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043
13	RCI14/1137	R 579 x R 585	37	RCI13/110	R 99/2162 x R 585
14	RCI14/1127	R 96/2116 x Q 213	38	RCI12/19	R 93/0136 x N 27
15	RCI14/1109	R 579 x R 585	39	RCI12/15	R 93/0136 x N 27
16	RCI14/1107	R 579 x R 585	40	RCI12/1130	R 582 x R 570
17	RCI14/1102	R 579 x R 585	41	RCI11/169	R 92/6545 x R 93/6683

18	RCI14/11	NCo376 x N 27	42	RCI11/167	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885
19	RCI13/198	R 579 x R 585	43	RCI11/134	R 94/0142 x R 98/6092
20	RCI13/195	R 96/2569 x R 585	44	RCI11/114	R 89/2042 x R 97/2332
21	RCI13/194	R 582 x SP 70/1143	45	RCI11/112	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885
22	RCI13/187	R 579 x BT 92/3586	46	RCI11/1114	R 92/2401 x R 98/6092
23	RCI13/173	R 582 x R 01/6043	47	RCI13/16	R 92/2210 x R 91/2069
24	RCI13/17	R 579 x BT 92/3586			

c) Experimental design

The experimental design used at one-row screening stage was a randomized block with 2 replications comprising 47 genotypes were planted in November 2015, each being planted in single rows of 3 m long with 1.5 m of inter-row spacing. To avoid edge effects, the field trial was surrounded by a buffer zone 3 m wide and 30 m long planted with a commercial variety SP70-1006.

d) Data collection and analysis

Data were collected on different growth and yield contributing characters. Intercultural operations like weeding, earthen-up, mulching, and irrigation were done as per required schedule.

The collected data were analyzed by R version 3.5.1 statistical software for variability and diversity analysis. Analysis of variance was performed using the Plant Breeding Statistical Program (PLABSTAT (Version 2N)).

• Estimation of Genotypic and Phenotypic Variances

Genotypic and phenotypic variances were calculated using the following formula (Hill *et al.*, 1998; Johnson *et al.*, 1955): **Genotypic variance** (σ^2_g) = $\frac{GM - EM}{r}$

(1)

Where GMS is genotypic mean square, EMS is error mean square, r is number of replication, and **phenotypic variance is** (σ^2_p) = $\sigma^2_g + \sigma^2_e$.

(2)

• Estimation of Genotypic Coefficient of Variation (GCV) and Phenotypic Coefficient of Variation (PCV).

Phenotypic (PCV) and genotypic (GCV) coefficients of variation were evaluated according to the methods as follows (Johnson *et al.*, 1955; Singh *et al.*, 1985):

⇒ Genotypic coefficient of variation (**GCV**) = $(\sigma^2_g / \bar{X}) * 100$,

(3)

Where σ^2_g is genotypic variance and $\bar{X}$ is population mean.

⇒ Phenotypic coefficient of variation (**PCV**) = $(\sigma^2_p / \bar{X}) * 100$,

Where σ^2_p is phenotypic variance and $\bar{X}$ is population mean.

(4)

• **Estimation of Heritability**

Broad-sense heritability (h^2) for mean values was calculated using PABSTAT (Alam et al., 2017), following the formula described by:

$$\text{Heritability } (h^2_b) = (\sigma^2_g / \sigma^2_p) \cdot 100, \quad (5)$$

• **Estimation of Genetic Advance.**

Genetic advance (GA) was estimated accordance to the methods illustrated (Nair et al., 1998; Fehr et al., 1987):

$$\text{Genetic advance (GA)} = h^2_b \cdot K \cdot \sigma_p, \quad (6)$$

Where h^2_b is heritability in broad sense, $K=K$ is the selection differential value which is 2.06 at 5% selection intensity, and σ_p is phenotypic standard deviation.

• **Estimation of Correlation Coefficient.**

The genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients between growth and yield contributing character were calculated as follows:

$$\Rightarrow \text{Genotypic correlation, } r_g(xy) = \frac{\text{Cov}(g)_{1.2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2_g(1)\sigma^2_g(2)}} \quad (7)$$

$\text{Cov}(g)_{1.2}$ is genotypic covariance between the variables X and Y , $\sigma^2(g)^1$ is genotypic variance of the variable X_1 , and $\sigma^2(g)^2$ is genotypic variance of the variable X_2 .

$$\Rightarrow \text{Phenotypic correlation, } r_p(xy) = \frac{\text{Cov}(p)_{1.2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2_p(1)\sigma^2_p(2)}} \quad (8)$$

$\text{Cov}(p)_{1.2}$ is phenotypic covariance between the variables X and Y , $\sigma^2(p)^1$ is phenotypic variance of the variable X_1 , and $\sigma^2(p)^2$ is Phenotypic variance of the variable X_2 .

III. Results and Discussion

a. Descriptive statistics

Statistical parameters such as mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, coefficient of variation (CV %) for different traits in this study are shown in Table 3. Among morphological traits such as Nber_stem/3m with CV%=22.58, had a higher variation while stem_diameter (mm) and stem_height (m) with CV%=11.25, 9.63 respectively, had a minimum variation. Among a phonological trait the% Flowering with CV%=77.02, had a higher variation while the technological quality Brix% had CV%=9.43. In order to avoid possible bias due to the shape of the curves, the classification proposed by Costa et al., 2002 was also performed. However, the two methods showed similar classification of the CV values for each response variable (data not shown). This result is in accordance with previous reports by Costa et al., 2002 and Carvalho et al., 2003, who concluded that, when the variable is normally distributed, both methods are equivalent.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for all traits studied

Parameters	Mean	Variance	S.D	CV%	Mini	Maxi
Nber_Stem/3 meter	57.57	168.99	13	22.58	34	93.0
Stem_Height	2.88	0.07	0.27	9.63	2.24	3.58
Stem_diameter	24.69	7.71	2.77	11.25	18	31.66
Brix%	19.51	3.38	1.84	9.43	14.2	24.4
%Flowering	53.18	1677.62	40.95	77.02	0.0	100

b. Phenotypic Characterization & Trait Distributions

The average Nber_stem / 3m in the second season (2017) was 62.14, which was significantly ($p<0.001$) higher than the Nber_stem / 3 m the first year (53). The stem_height was significantly ($p<0.001$) higher for the first season than the second season 3.01 and 2.76 respectively. In the second season (2017), the genotypes of sugarcane was had a high Brix% than the first season (2016) 20.30 and 18.70 respectively. Contrary to these results, the average stem_diameter in the first season (2016) 24.14 mm was smaller than that of the second season (2017) 22.6 mm and this difference was significant ($p<0.05$) **Figure1**.




Figure 1: Mean estimated per years for all traits studied

c. Genetic and phenotypic coefficient variance components

The analysis of variance for all characters showed statistically highly significant ($p\leq 0.01$) among the genotypes (Table 4). Similar results were also found in case of number of millable canes, individual cane weight, cane height, and sucrose (**Chaudbary, 2001**). These results indicated that there were greater variations among the genotypes that might support the design of a breeding program for sugarcane improvement.

201 **Table 4:** Analysis of variances for 5 traits

Mean square (MS) and degree of freedom (DF) from ANOVA						
Sources	DF	Nber_Stem/3m	Stem_Height	Stem_diameter	Brix	%Flowering
Genotypes	46	258.15***	0.08***	9.92*	4.30**	2544.47**
Replication	1	2056.79**	1.36**	24.18*	59.74**	14911.05**
Error	46	42.61	0.047	5.30	1.35	529.35

202 As stated, the PCV (phenotypic coefficient of variation) and GCV (genotypic coefficient of
 203 variation) values are ranked as low, medium, and high with 0 to 10%, 10 to 20%, and >20%,
 204 respectively (*Shivasubramanian et al., 1973*) (Table 5). High GCV were recorded for
 205 Nber_stem/3m (187.20), % flowering (1894.62) and stem_diameter (9.36), Brix% (7.56) and
 206 stem_Height (0.17), exhibited low GCV. High phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) were
 207 also recorded for %Flowering (2890.02), Nber_stem/3m (261.21) and stem_diameter (30.82)
 208 but moderate PCVs were recorded for %Brix (14.48). Low PCVs are observed for stem_Height
 209 (2.60). High genotypic coefficient of variation and phenotypic coefficient of variation (187.20
 210 and 1894.62) and (261.21 and 2890.02) were found in Nber_stem/3m and %Flowering
 211 respectively. The estimated phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) was higher than genotypic
 212 coefficient of variation (GCV) for all the traits indicating greater environmental influence on
 213 these traits for total variation. High GCV and PCV indicated that selection may be effective
 214 based on these characters and their phenotypic expression would be good indication of the
 215 genotypic potential (*Singh et al., 1994*). Mean performance of different genotypes had wider
 216 variation in performance values for different traits (Table 5).

217 **Table 5:** Component for variances, heritability in broad sense (h^2_b), and genetic advance (GA)
 218 for 5 traits of sugarcane

Traits	Mean	σ_p	Msg	σ^2_g	σ^2_p	σ^2_e	Heritability (h^2_b)	GCV%	PCV%	GA	GA%
Nber_Stem/3m	57.57	13	258.15	101.77	129.07	42.61	71.67	187.20	261.21	19.19	33.34
Stem_Height	2.88	0.27	0.08	0.005	0.04	0.07	6.67	0.17	2.60	0.04	1.29
Stem_diameter	24.69	2.77	9.92	2.31	4.61	5.3	30.35	9.36	30.82	1.73	7.02
%Brix	19.51	1.84	4.3	1.475	2.15	1.35	52.21	7.56	14.48	1.98	10.14
%Flowering	53.18	40.95	2544.47	1007.56	127.23	529.35	65.56	1894.62	2890.02	55.30	103.99

219 **d. Heritability and Genetic Advance**

220 Heritability values are helpful in predicting the expected progress to be achieved through the
 221 process of selection; high heritability coupled with high genetic advance is an indicator of a
 222 greater proportion of the additive genetic variance and consequently a high genetic gain is
 223 expected from selection (*Singh and Rai, 1981*). The characters of Nber_stem/3m, %Brix and
 224 % Flowering showed high heritability, moderate heritability observed for stem_diameter and low
 225 heritability are observed for stem_height. Heritability values are categorized as low (0–30%),
 226 moderate (30–60%), and high (60% and above) (*Robinson et al., 1949*). In the current study,
 227 the heritability ranged from 6.67% to 71.67%, while genetic advance as a percentage of the
 228 mean showed a wider gain ranging from 1.29% to 103.99% (Table 5). Based on this measure,
 229 the traits under study have high heritability value estimate (71.67%; 65.56% and 652.21%)

obtained for Nber_stem.3m, % Flowering and %Brix respectively, and we are observed low heritability value estimated for (30.35% and 6.67%) stem_diameter and stem_height respectively. It indicates that simple selection based on phenotype for these traits might be effective method for sugarcane variety improvement selection program.

e. Correlation Coefficient

The phenotypic and genotypic correlations for all component characters are indicated in Table 6. Breeders always look for genetic variation among traits to select desirable types as some of these characters are highly correlated among themselves, so that the analysis of the relationship among these traits and their correlation with sugar yield is essential to establish selection criteria (Singh, 2000). Nber_stem/3m showed negative and weakly significant correlation with stem_diameter ($r=-0.26$, $p=0.024$), stem_height ($r=-0.23$, $p=0.009$), and positive weakly correlation observed with %Brix ($r=0.19$, $p=0.054$). There was also positive and weakly correlation of stem_height with %Flowering ($r=0.33$, $p<0.001$) and negative and weakly correlation are observed between % Brix with %Flowering ($r=-0.44$, $p<0.001$). A positive value of r shows that the changes of two variables are in the same direction, i.e. high values of one variable are associated with high values of other and vice versa.

Table 6: Correlation coefficient matrix among different 5 traits

Parameters		Nber_Stem/3 meter	Stem_Height	Stem_diameter	%Brix	%Flowering
Nber_Stem/3 meter	Pearson's r	—				
	p-value	—				
Stem_Height	Pearson's r	-0.23	—			
	p-value	0.024	—			
Stem_diameter	Pearson's r	-0.26	0.04	—		
	p-value	0.009	0.694	—		
%Brix	Pearson's r	0.19	-0.32	0.02	—	
	p-value	0.054	0.002	0.836	—	
%Flowering	Pearson's r	-0.074	0.33	0.05	-0.44	—
	p-value	0.476	< .001	0.611	< .001	—

f. Mean comparison

The clonal means for all agronomic traits considered in this study are shown in Table 7. In all the traits measured highly significant differences were observed among clones.

Nber_stem/3m. In all the sugarcane clones selected, RCI14/1109 (R579 x R585), RCI13/110 (R99/2162 x R585), RCI13/142 (R579 x BT92/3586), RCI13/16 (R 92/2210 x R 91/2069), RCI12/15 (R 93/0136 x N27) exhibited the highest number of stem on 3 meter while the selected clones RCI13/198 (R 579 x R 585), RCI14/171 (R 579 x R 585) represented the clones with low number of stem on 3 meter. **Stem_height.** Among the clone selected, RCI14/161(R 579 x R 585), RCI13/142 (R 579 x BT 92/3586), RCI11/169 (R 92/6545 x R 93/6683), RCI13/195 (R 96/2569 x R 585), RCI11/167 (R 94/6113 x R 93/6885) showed the longest cane stem.

259 **Stem_diameter.** Of the selected genotypes, RCI14/171 (R 579 x R 585), RCI11/114 (R
260 89/2042 x R 97/2332), RCI13/110 (R 99/2162 x R 585), RCI12/1130 (R 582 x R 570),
261 RCI13/118 (VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043) showed the largest stem diameter.

262 **%Brix.** Directly proportional to brix is percent pol or percent sucrose in the juice. The selected
263 clones which exhibited higher %Brix value RCI14/131 (R 579 x R 585), RCI13/153 (R 579 x R
264 585), RCI14/1109 (R 579 x R 585), RCI12/15 (R 93/0136 x N 27), RCI11/112 (R 94/6113 x R
265 93/6885), RCI13/122 (R 99/2162 x R 585) consistently gave the highest percent sucrose in the
266 juice. The low percentage brix were observed, RCI14/147 (R 96/2116 x Q 213), RCI14/1127 (R
267 96/2116 x Q 213), RCI14/188 (R 96/2116 x Q 213), RCI12/1130 (R 582 x R 570) and RCI14/14
268 (R 96/2116 x Q 213).

269

270

271

272

273

Table 7: Mean performances of sugarcane clone obtained by Fuzz for 5 traits

Genotypes	Pedigree	Nber_Stem/3 M	Stem_Height	Stem_diameter	%Brix	%Flowering
RCI13/110	R 99/2162 x R 585	77 ab	3.08 abcdefgh	28.83 abc	18.35 fghi	86.84 ab
RCI13/138	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043	60 defghij	2.91 abcdefghijklm	26.5 abcdefghi	19.89 bcdefg	90.76 ab
RCI13/173	R 582 x R 01/6043	52.5 hijkl	3.09 abcdefgh	27.16 abcde	18.73 efgh	96.29 a
RCI13/142	R 579 x BT 92/3586	77 ab	3.23 ab	23.33 defghijkl	19.54 bcdefg	61.72 abc
RCI14/1102	R 579 x R 585	73 abcd	3.10 abcdefg	25.66 abcdefghij	18.96 efgh	69.78 ab
RCI12/15	R 93/0136 x N 27	76 abc	2.66 hijklmn	26.66 abcdefgh	21.51 abcd	51.97 abcdef
RCI11/167	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885	41 lmn	3.12 abcde	26.25 abcdefghij	20.51 abcdef	75.13 ab
RCI13/16	R 92/2210 x R 91/2069	76.5 abc	3.05 abcdefghi	18.91 l	20.05 bcdefg	84.75 ab
RCI13/194	R 582 x SP 70/1143	75 abc	2.80 cdefghijklmn	25.66 abcdefghij	19.30 defg	83.98 ab
RCI13/195	R 96/2569 x R 585	57.5 efghijk	3.18 abcd	24.50 cdefghijk	18.61 efghi	87.69 ab
RCI13/1119	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043	54.50 ghijk	2.91 abcdefghijklm	27 abcdef	18.97 efgh	80.18 ab
RCI14/161	R 579 x R 585	54 ghijkl	3.28 a	25.83 abcdefghij	19.38 cdefg	52.34 abcdef
RCI14/189	R 579 x R 97/0434	45 klmn	3.11 abcdef	24.83 bcdefghijk	19.54 bcdefg	93.26 a
RCI11/112	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885	44.5 klmn	3.04 abcdefghij	25 abcdefghijk	21.5 abcd	74.09 ab
RCI13/17	R 579 x BT 92/3586	61 defghij	3.02 abcdefghijk	25.66 abcdefghij	18.79 efgh	58.69 abcd
RCI13/118	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043	44 klmn	2.77 defghijklmn	27.25 abcde	20.22 bcdefg	86.047 ab
RCI13/13	R 579 x BT 92/3586	53.50 hijkl	3.02 abcdefghijk	25.41 abcdefghijk	20.36 bcdefg	45.00 bcdefg
RCI12/19	R 93/0136 x N 27	69.50 bcdef	2.98 abcdefghijkl	22.66 efghijkl	20.67 abcde	15.24 cdefg
RCI14/11	NCo376 x N 27	67 bcdefg	2.83 bcdefghijklmn	22.50 fghijkl	20.02 bcdefg	83.12 ab
RCI14/171	R 579 x R 585	36.50 n	3.11 abcdef	29.50 a	20.48 abcdef	0.0 g
RCI11/114	R 89/2042 x R 97/2332	48 jklmn	3.01 abcdefghijkl	29.33 ab	18.15 ghij	83.67 ab
RCI11/134	R 94/0142 x R 98/6092	48.5 jklmn	2.97 abcdefghijkl	26.16 abcdefghij	18.91 efgh	86.53 ab
RCI14/158	R 579 x R 585	58.5 efghij	2.76 defghijklmn	26.50 abcdefghi	19.93 bcdefg	15.44 cdefg
RCI13/122	R 99/2162 x R 585	63.5 cdefghi	2.61 klmn	23.33 defghijkl	21.35 abcd	71.31 ab
RCI11/169	R 92/6545 x R 93/6683	54.50 ghijk	3.21 abc	23.16 defghijkl	18.74 efgh	70.89 ab
RCI14/1137	R 579 x R 585	56.50 fghijk	2.86 abcdefghijklmn	23.66 defghijk	20.86 abcde	5.00 fg
RCI14/147	R 96/2116 x Q 213	60.50 defghij	2.87 abcdefghijklmn	22.66 efghijkl	16.98 hij	93.83 a
RCI13/1148	R 579 x BT 92/3586	50.50 ijklm	3.06 abcdefghi	25 abcdefghijk	18.88 efgh	56.75 abcde

RCI14/1109	R 579 x R 585	83.5 a	2.69 efghijklmn	20.83 kl	21.65 abc	0.53 g
RCI13/151	R 96/2569 x R 585	65 bcdefgh	2.83 bcdefghijklmn	23 defghijkl	20.33 bcdefg	1.35 g
RCI14/1127	R 96/2116 x Q 213	76.5 abc	2.73 efghijklmn	22.33 ghijkl	16.89 hij	90.58 ab
RCI13/187	R 579 x BT 92/3586	55 ghijk	2.86 abcdefghijklmn	25.83 abcdefghij	18.81 efgh	14.75 cdefg
RCI13/153	R 579 x R 585	50 jklm	2.75 efghijklmn	22 ijkl	21.67 ab	73.39 ab
RCI11/1114	R 92/2401 x R 98/6092	59.5 efghij	2.69 fghijklmn	25.08 abcdefghijk	19.38 cdefg	20.17 cdefg
RCI12/1130	R 582 x R 570	51 ijklm	2.74 efghijklmn	27.5 abcd	16.4 ij	73.42 ab
RCI13/143	R 579 x BT 92/3586	60 defghij	2.67 ghijklmn	23.165 defghijkl	19.89 bcdefg	58.31 abcde
RCI14/1107	R 579 x R 585	49 jklmn	2.77 defghijklmn	23.66 defghijk	19.53 bcdefg	79.41 ab
RCI14/131	R 579 x R 585	49.5 jklmn	2.70 efghijklmn	24.33 cdefghijk	22.73 a	1.78 g
RCI14/188	R 96/2116 x Q 213	56 ghijk	2.82 bcdefghijklmn	21.83 jkl	16.76 hij	93.39 a
RCI14/1139	R 579 x R 585	48.5 jklmn	3 abcdefghijkl	22.83 efghijkl	19.93 bcdefg	11.11 efg
RCI14/129	R 579 x R 585	51.5 ijklm	2.48 n	24.83 bcdefghijk	20.76 abcde	7.40 fg
RCI13/198	R 579 x R 585	38.5 mn	2.93 abcdefghijkl	26.83 abcdefg	18.18 ghij	13.75 defg
RCI13/121	R 579 x BT 92/3586	70 bcde	2.61 jklmn	21.83 jkl	20.42 bcdefg	0.0 g
RCI14/14	R 96/2116 x Q 213	50.5 ijklm	2.59 lmn	24.33 cdefghijk	15.91 j	97.22 a
RCI14/155	R 579 x R 585	53.5 hijkl	2.49 mn	22.16 hijkl	20.87 abcde	2.5 g
RCI13/1135	R 96/2569 x R 585	50.5 ijklm	2.90 abcdefghijklmn	25.33 abcdefghijk	18.14 ghij	0.0 g
RCI14/159	R 579 x R 585	52 hijkl	2.64 ijklmn	24 defghijk	19.59 bcdefg	0.0 g
Mean		57.57	2.88	24.69	19.51	53.18
P>F		< 0.0001	0.001	0.011	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
LSD_{5%}		2.77	0.08	0.94	0.47	9.8

275

276

277

278

g. Divergence of genotypes

All the genotypes were clustered on the basis of agglomerative cluster analysis, where specifications were made based on cluster mean performance (Table 8) and grouping was made on average clustering method. Based on these two methods together the 47 genotypes were clustered into three groups named as cluster I, cluster II, and cluster III (Figure 2). Cluster I included 16 genotypes, cluster II included 12 genotypes and 19 genotype belonged to cluster I (Table 9).

Table 8: Cluster mean performance for all 5 traits

Traits	Cluster I	Cluster II	Cluster III
Nber_Stem/3 meter	54.09	43.9	62.5
Stem_Heig	3.04	2.96	2.91
Stem_diam	24.45	24.3	22.25
Brix	18.29	19.35	19.71
%Flowering	97.58	1.5	4.16




Figure 2: Dendrogram based on mean performance of variables among 47 sugarcane clones.

295 **Tables 9:** Clusters of 47 sugarcane clones based on all traits studied

Cluster I (16 genotypes)		Cluster II (12 genotypes)		Cluster III (19 genotypes)	
Genotypes	Pedigree	Genotypes	Pedigree	Genotypes	Pedigree
RCI14/158	R 579 x R 585	RCI13/173	R 582 x R 01/6043	RCI14/14	R 96/2116 x Q 213
RCI13/187	R 579 x BT 92/3586	RCI13/1119	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043	RCI14/147	R 96/2116 x Q 213
RCI14/1137	R 579 x R 585	RCI11/134	R 94/0142 x R 98/6092	RCI12/1130	R 582 x R 570
RCI14/155	R 579 x R 585	RCI11/114	R 89/2042 x R 97/2332	RCI14/188	R 96/2116 x Q 213
RCI14/129	R 579 x R 585	RCI13/1148	R 579 x BT 92/3586	RCI14/1127	R 96/2116 x Q 213
RCI14/131	R 579 x R 585	RCI13/17	R 579 x BT 92/3586	RCI11/167	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885
RCI13/198	R 579 x R 585	RCI11/112	R 94/6113 x R 93/6885	RCI14/11	NCo376 x N 27
RCI14/159	R 579 x R 585	RCI14/161	R 579 x R 585	RCI13/138	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043
RCI13/151	R 96/2569 x R 585	RCI14/189	R 579 x R 97/0434	RCI13/143	R 579 x BT 92/3586
RCI13/121	R 579 x BT 92/3586	RCI13/195	R 96/2569 x R 585	RCI13/118	VMC 93/282 x R 01/6043
RCI11/1114	R 92/2401 x R 98/6092	RCI13/13	R 579 x BT 92/3586	RCI14/1107	R 579 x R 585
RCI14/1109	R 579 x R 585	RCI11/169	R 92/6545 x R 93/6683	RCI13/153	R 579 x R 585
RCI12/19	R 93/0136 x N 27			RCI13/16	R 92/2210 x R 91/2069
RCI14/171	R 579 x R 585			RCI14/1102	R 579 x R 585
RCI14/1139	R 579 x R 585			RCI13/142	R 579 x BT 92/3586
RCI13/1135	R 96/2569 x R 585			RCI13/110	R 99/2162 x R 585
				RCI12/15	R 93/0136 x N 27
				RCI13/194	R 582 x SP 70/1143
				RCI13/122	R 99/2162 x R 585

296 IV. Conclusion

297 The study indicated that there is wide genetic variability among the tested sugarcane clones for
 298 all characters. Moreover, the results showed high GCV for Nber_stem/3m (187.20) and %
 299 flowering (1894.62), while stem_diameter (9.36), Brix% (7.56) and stem_Height (0.17) showed
 300 low GCV. High phenotypic coefficients of variation (PCV) was also recorded for %Flowering
 301 (2890.02), Nber_stem/3m (261.21) and stem_diameter (30.82) but moderate PCVs was
 302 recorded for %Brix (14.48). Low PCVs are observed for stem_Height (2.60). The 47 genotypes
 303 were clustered into three groups named as cluster I, cluster II, and cluster III. Cluster I included
 304 16 genotypes, cluster II included 12 genotypes and 19 genotype belonged to cluster I.
 305 However, selection of candidate sugarcane clones should also be performed considering those
 306 characters with high values of heritability because they magnify the genetic advance to
 307 progenies.

308 References

309 Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing Limited, 2018, <http://dx.doi.org/10.19103/AS.2017.0035.09>

312 **Dahlquist E.** 2013. Biomass as Energy Source: Resources, SyStalks and Application, CRC
 313 Press, Taylors & Francis, London.

D'Hont, A. 2005. Unraveling the genome structure of polyploids using FISH and GISH; examples of sugarcane and banana. *Cytogenet Genome Res.* 2005; **109** (1-3):27-33.

D'Hont A., Grivet, L., Feldmann, P., Rao, S., Berding, N. and Glaszmann, J.C. (1996). Characterisation of the double genome structure of modern sugarcane cultivars (*Saccharum* spp) by molecular cytogenetics. *Mol. Gen. Genet.* **250**: 405-413.

Piperidis, G., D'Hont, A. and Hogarth, D. M. 2001. Chromosome composite analysis of the various *Saccharum* interspecific hybrids by genomic in situ hybridization (GISH)', In: Proceedings of the International Society of Sugar Cane Technologist, volume **24**, pp. 556-559.

Alam, M. N., Ujjal Kumar Nath, Karim, K. M. R., Ahmed, M. M., Mitul, R. Y. 2017. Genetic Variability of Exotic Sugarcane Genotype. *Hindawi. Scientifica.* Volume 2017, Article ID 5202913, 9 pages <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/5202913>

Péné CB, Ouattara HM, Koulibaly GS. 2012. Late sugarcane performance as affected by soil water regime at the yield formation stage on commercial farms in northern Ivory Coast. *J. of life Sci.* Vol **6** (6), 644-651.

Bakhsh, A., Arshad, M. and Haqqan, A.M. (2006) Effect of Genotype × Environment Interaction on Relationship between Grain Yield and Its Components in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, **38**, 683-690.

Da Silva, F.F., Pereira, M.G., Ramos, H.C.C., Damasceno Jr., P.C., Pereira, N.S. and Ide, C.D. (2007) Genotypic Correlations of Morpho-Agronomic Traits in Papayas and Implications for Genetic Breeding. *Crop Breeding and Applied Biotechnology*, **7**, 345-352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12702/1984-7033.v07n04a03>.

"Utz HF: PLABSTAT (Version 2N). A computer program for the computation of variances and covariance's. Institute of Plant Breeding, Seed Science, and Population Genetics, University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, Germany," <http://www.uni-hohenheim.de/ipspwww/soft.html>, 2007.

J. Hill, H. C. Becker, and P. M. Tigerstedt, *Quantitative and Ecological Aspects of Plant Breeding*, Chapman & Hall, London, UK, 1998.

H. W. Johnson, H. F. Robinson, and R. E. Comstok, "Estimation of genetic and environmental variability in soybean," *Agronomy Journal*, vol. **47**, pp. 314–318, 1955.

R. K. Singh and B. D. Chaudhary, *Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis*, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, India, 1985.

N. V. Nair, R. Balakrishnan, and T. V. Sreenivasan, "Variability for quantitative traits in exotic hybrid germplasm of sugarcane," *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 459–464, 1998.

W. R. Fehr, *Principles of Cultivar Development*, vol. I, MacMillan, New York, NY, USA, 1987.

Costa NHAD, Seraphin JC, Zimmermann FJP. 2002. A new method of variation coefficient classification for upland rice crop. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira* 37, 243-249.

Carvalho CGP, Arias CAA, Toledo JFF, Almeida L, Kiihl RA, Oliveira MF, Hiromoto DM, Takeda C. 2003. Proposal to categorize coefficients of variation for yield and plant height in soybean. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira* 38, 187-193.

R. R. Chaudhary, "Genetic variability and heritability in sugarcane," *Nepal Agriculture Research Journal*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 56–59, 2001.

S. Shivasubramanian and M. Menon, "Heterosis and inbreeding depression in rice," *Madrash Agricultural Journal*, vol. 60, 1139 pages, 1973.

R. K. Singh, D. N. Singh, S. K. Singh, and H. N. Singh, "Genetic variability and correlation studies in foreign commercial hybrids of sugarcane," *Agricultural Science Digest*, vol. 14, pp. 103–107, 1994.

H. F. Robinson, R. E. Comstock, and P. H. Harvey, "Estimates of heritability and the degree of dominance in corn," *Agronomy Journal*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 353–359, 1949.

Singh, R.P., Rai, J.N., 1981. Note on the heritability and genetic advance in chilli. (*Capsicum annum* L. *Prog. Hortic.* 13, 89-92.

Yamamoto H, Fujimori T, Sato H, Ishikawa G, Kami K, Ohashi Y. 2014. Statistical hypothesis testing of factor loading in principal component analysis and its application to metabolite set enrichment analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* 15 (1), 1-9.

Lukibisi FB, Lanyasunya T. 2010. Using principal component analysis to analyze mineral composition data. Biennial Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, Scientific Conference on Socio Economics and Biometrics.