

Trends in Phytochemical Research (TPR)

Journal Homepage: http://tpr.iau-shahrood.ac.ir

Original Research Article



Genotype×environment interaction, rhizome yield stability and selection for region specific stable genotypes in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.)

Raj Kishori Lal $^{\bowtie}$, Sougata Sarkar and Mohammad Zaim

CSIR-Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, P.O. CIMAP, Lucknow - UP 226015, India

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was carried out to determine the stability over years among seventeen genetic stocks of turmeric assembled from different localities in India for high and stable rhizomes yield. The observed differences among genetic stocks, years and g×e interactions were highly significant for rhizome yield. The stable genetic stocks were selected on the basis of stability parameters, high mean, regression coefficient (bi) around unity and mean square deviations from regression (s²di) near zero. The environmental indices for rhizome yield also indicated clear effects over the year's, i.e. 1.85 in year I followed by 9.95 in year II; -6.31 in year III and -5.29 in the year IV. The largest AMMI1 gain of the grand mean occurs over years for picking stable genotypes/clones. Further partitioning of genotypes on the basis of AMMI and Eberhart and Russell (1966) model, the clones/genotypes T-8, T-12 and T-13 were highly stable; T-11 and T-14 adapted to the average stable in low yielding environment/year and T-9 and T-17 genotypes/clones with below average stable suitable for high yielding environment were recommended for commercialization.

© 2017 Islamic Azad University, Shahrood Branch Press, All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Turmeric (Curcuma longa L.) is a subtropical/ tropical perennial medicinal plant belonging to family 'Zingiberaceae'. It is mainly valued as a spice in food and a natural dye or clothing. This plant is also important as a potential source of new drugs for a variety of diseases (Lekshmi et al., 2014; Alvarez et al., 2016; Dyab et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016; Park et al., 2017; Saccol et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2017). Its importance in medicine started with an endeavour in which the dried rhizome of the plant was a rich source of phenolic compounds, identified as curcuminoids, particularly curcumin or diferuloyl methane. Some of the biological and therapeutic activities attributed to curcumin were anti-inflammatory, antioxidant and anti-carcinogenic, wound healing, and antiviral properties (Joe et al., 2004; Elvira and Maribel, 2014; Mishra et al., 2015). Turmeric is traditionally used in Indian and Ayurvedic and Unani system of medicine as stomachic, carminative, blood purifier, vermicide and antiseptic. Wound healing antiseptic property of turmeric

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 05 June 2017 Revised: 03 July 2017 Accepted: 10 July 2017 ePublished: 12 July 2017

KEYWORDS

Anti-carcinogenic *Curcumin* Multiplicative interaction Stable clones Turmeric

is well known to Indians since long years ago. Curcumin is the main biologically active phytochemical compound of turmeric with wide range of therapeutic effects (Gomathy et al., 2014). In recent years, pharmacological properties and actions of curcumin have been widely researched and its beneficial effects have been well established. Turmeric is a clonally propagated by its underground rhizomes. Though vegetative propagation is the usual means of reproduction, several studies have shown the existence of spontaneous genetic variation in this species (Mishra et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2016; Shakeri et al., 2017; Tanvir et al., 2017; Uchio et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017). The intra-specific variation may be due to the long-term cultivation and targeted selection of desirable genotypes in turmeric, which in turn may have adaptive value to the crop (Elvira and Maribel, 2014).

Basically, the region specific stable clones/genotypes over years strategy focuses on responses of all genotypes/ clones over years which help for the recommendation of stable genotypes/clones for commercial cultivation. The stable and reliable genotype is the one capable of



expressing continuously high yield over the years. High yield stability usually refers to a genotype's ability to perform consistently over years (Annicchiarico, 2002; Lal, 2014, 2015). Many biometrical, univariate and multivariate methods used to assess stability among different crops (Eberhart and Russell, 1966; Akçura et al., 2005; Lal, 2012, 2014) among which the most widely used are the regression coefficient (Finlay and Wilkinson, 1963), the environmental variance, the Shukla's stability variance (Shukla, 1972) and Wricke's ecovalence (Wrike, 1962), etc. The concept of yield stability and reliability with high yield in genotypes has been demonstrated by some researchers (Eskridge, 1990; Kang and Pham, 1991) in the different crops.

The basic information on wide adaptability and stability over years in turmeric is lacking. Studies on stability by genotype×environment interaction (g×e) using AMMI and model are very meager in turmeric crop (Mishra et al., 2015). In other words, there is not any record on stability and reliability of turmeric using AMMI as well as Eberhart and Russell stability model (Eberhart and Russell, 1966). Therefore, the objective of present investigation was to determine their stability and reliability over years for the selection of stable genotypes/ clones in turmeric crop.

2. Experimental

2.1. Sampling areas of 17 genotypes of turmeric

Seventeen genotypes (T-1 to T-17) of turmeric (Curcuma longa L.) belonging to family 'Zingiberaceae' representing fifteen states of India (Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Rajasthan, Haryana, Bihar, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Delhi, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and Meghalaya) constituted the material for the present investigation (see Table 1 and Fig. 1). They were evaluated at the Research Farm of CSIR-Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, P.O. CIMAP, Lucknow, U.P. 226 015 (India).- in the four consecutive years: 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 in Northern Indian plain's environments using a completely randomized block design (RCBD) with three replications. The experimental location at the institute research farm was located at 26.5° N latitude and 80.50° E longitude, and 120 m above the mean sea level. The climate is semiarid /subtropical in nature. The plants were planted in 30×50 cm rows to row/ plants to plant distance with plot size=30 m². The normal intercultural operations, irrigations, and fertilizers (100 N, 50 kg P₂O₅, and 50 kg K₂O per hectare) provided in the all experiments over the years. Plants were uprooted at maturity stage as an annual crop.

2.2. Extraction of essential oils

Fresh rhizomes were sliced and washed with water and then subjected to water distillation. Hydro distillation of the rhizomes of each accession was



Fig. 1. Morphological variability in genetic stocks of *Curcuma longa* plants.

performed in Clevenger's apparatus (Clevenger, 1928) for the extraction of essential oil content.

2.3. Analysis of essential oils

Gas chromatography and mass spectroscopic (GC-MS) analyses were performed using a Variance CP3800 instrument. For mass spectrometry (MS), CPC18CB fused silica column 30×0.32 mm $\times 1$ µm cell thickness were used, oven temperature was 60 to 220 °C at the rate of 3 °C per min, 220 °C. Injected temperature 280 °C, detected temperature 290 °C, split ratio 1:30, and hydrogen as a carrier 1 mL/min.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Stability parameter calculations were performed for rhizome yield (kg/plot) only using MATMODEL version 3.0 programme mode: fitting AMMI Model software (Gauch, 2007) and with stability model of Eberhart and Russell (Eberhart and Russell, 1966) using statistical software version 0.3 based on Singh and Chaudhary (Singh and Chaudhary, 1979) and Panse and Sukhatme (Panse and Sukhatme, 1967) available at the Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding of CSIR-CIMAP, Lucknow U.P. PIN -226 015, India.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Estimation of genetic variability

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results indicated that there were highly significant differences (P<0.01) for rhizome yield among the seventeen clones/ genotypes of turmeric (Table 1, 2). This clearly accounted for the existence of substantial genetic variability among clones/genotypes of turmeric grown in four years. The genotype×environments/ years interaction was also highly significant. Such significant genotype×environment/years reveal the high differential response of the genotypes to change in years/environments (Table 2). The pooled mean rhizome yield over years ranged from 8.73-



| | , | | | Mean | Anotana IS | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| No. | denotypes/ clones | Codes | Places/Origin in India | Rhizome yield (kg/plot) | JII CONTENT (%) | α-terpionolene | ar-turmerone (| x-turmerone | ß-turmerone (| Curcumine in oil | Gingiberene |
| | T-1 | TUR-2 | Udaipur, Rajasthan | 68.87 | 0.32 | 12.882 | 28.790 | 13.616 | 18.043 | 3.26 | 0.288 |
| 2 | T-2 | TUR-11 | Indaur, Madhya Pradesh | 86.48 | 0.16 | 8.069 | 29.735 | 14.389 | 17.461 | 0.1579 | 2.64 |
| e | T-3 | AMT-3 | CSIR-CIMAP,Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 49.93 | 0.17 | 18.563 | 21.868 | 11.131 | 16.146 | , | 0.224 |
| 4 | T-4 | TUR-12 | Haldwani, Uttarakhand | 53.18 | 0.22 | 6.158 | 30.201 | 14.599 | 17.768 | 0.123 | 2.68 |
| 5 | T-5 | TUR-8 | Kozhikode, Kerala | 51.22 | 0.20 | 10.958 | 23.659 | 13.264 | 20.068 | 2.456 | 1.81 |
| 9 | T-6 | TUR-1UNK | Muzaffarpur, Bihar | 11.50 | 0.21 | 16.537 | 25.924 | 12.931 | 15.884 | , | 2.102 |
| 7 | T-7 | AM-2 | Jorhat, Assam | 09.54 | 0.15 | 5.279 | 27.767 | 14.730 | 15.460 | 8.0266 | 0.19 |
| 8 | T -8 | TUR-5 | Chennai, Andhra Pradesh | 92.95 | 0.13 | 10.130 | 27.580 | 13.428 | 19.486 | , | 0.190 |
| 6 | 1 -9 | TUR-13 | Phagawara, Punjab | 92.59 | 0.20 | 8.946 | 35.996 | 13.339 | 7.341 | , | 4.25 |
| 10 | T-10 | TUR-8 | Junagarh, Gujarat | 92.87 | 0.20 | 10.958 | 23.659 | 13.264 | 20.068 | 2.456 | 1.81 |
| 7 | T-11 | TUR-6 | Puri, Odessa | 89.67 | 0.22 | 9.060 | 29.668 | 14.549 | 17.250 | , | 2.38 |
| 12 | T-12 | TUR-10 | Krishnanagar, West Bengal | 94.11 | 0.25 | 12.261 | 28.570 | 13.726 | 16.678 | 0.4556 | 2.875 |
| 13 | T-13 | TUR-4 | Bangalore, Karnataka | 93.84 | 0.23 | 13.379 | 28.388 | 13.176 | 17.521 | , | 2.179 |
| 14 | T-14 | TUR-3 | Renukot, Uttar Pradesh | 92.15 | 0.17 | 18.563 | 21.868 | 11.131 | 16.146 | ı | 0.224 |
| 15 | T-15 | ST-1 (UNK) | Palampur, Himachal Pradesh | 59.38 | 0.21 | 16.537 | 25.924 | 12.931 | 15.884 | · | 2.102 |
| 16 | T-16 | ST-2 (4) | Shilang, Meghalaya | 08.73 | 0.23 | 13.379 | 28.388 | 13.176 | 17.521 | , | 2.179 |
| 17 | T-17 | ST3 (9) | Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir | 137.09 | 0.19 | 9.120 | 28.874 | 13.817 | 20.541 | 0.1881 | 0.286 |
| Total | 17 | Range | 1 | 08.73-137.09 | 0.13-0.32 | 0.946-18.563 | Traces-41.220 | 11.131-14.730 | 7.341-20.541 | Traces-8.027 | Traces-4.25 |

Genotypes/clones, identification codes, Botanical names and oil compositions of *Curcuma longa* genotypes/ clones.

137.09 kg/plot; oil content in rhizomes=0.13- 0.32%, respectively. The genotype/clone T-17 was the highest rhizome yielder=137.09 kg/plot followed by clone T-12=94.11 and T-13=93.84 kg/plot, respectively. The lowest rhizome yielder clone was T-16=8.733 kg/plot. For oil content clone/genotype T-1=0.32% was the highest followed by T-12=0.25%; T-13 and T-16=0.23%, respectively. On the other hand, the oil composition of the rhizomes the α -terpionolene ranged from 0.946-18.563%. The best clones for α -terpionolene were T-14=18.653% followed by T-15=16.537; T-13 and T-16=13.379%. The range between other chemical constituents were arturmerone=traces-35.996;α-turmerone=11.131-14.730; β-turmerone=7.341-20.541; curcumine in oil=trace-8.02 and gingiberene=trace-4.25 in percent in order (Table 1). The mean rhizome yield of clones/genotypes across the years/environments ranged from in year/ environment I (4.4. to 20.833, mean 11.700 kg/plot); in year/environment II 6.833-330.933, mean 139.192 kg/plot; in year/environment III 2.233-171.367, mean 72.173 kg/plot and in year/environment IV 2.700-205.267, mean 55.545 kg/plot, respectively (Tables 4-11 and Fig. 2). The genotypic rank differences and IPCA (Interaction Principal Components Axes) axis 1 scores for AMMI model over years were expressed the highly influences of genotype×environment interactions (g×e) (Table 3, Fig. 3, 4).



Fig. 2. Mata model version 3.0 Mega-environments for AMMI 1 Model, cultivars, switch points, including hypothetical winners in *Curcuma longa*.

3.2. Selection of stable genotypes

Selection of stable genotypes for rhizomes yield in turmeric along with the genotype×environment interaction are among important issues for plant breeders, who want to select stable clones across diverse environments. The careful perusal of results indicated that the AMMI I and AMMI F selected the



Fig. 3. Year /environment wise AMMI values in Curcuma longa for rhizome yield.

Pooled analysis of variance and deviations for rhizome yield in Curcuma longa.

| Sources of variations | d.f. | Sum of squares | Mean sum of squares |
|------------------------------|------|----------------|---------------------|
| Treatments | 16 | 396.37 | 24.77** |
| Years | 3 | 8475.80 | 2825.27**++ |
| Replications × Years | 8 | 93.81 | 11.73** |
| Treatments × Years | 48 | 2846.61 | 29.30** |
| Years + (Treatments × Years) | 51 | 3774.14 | 74.00**++ |
| Years (Lin.) | 1 | 2825.27 | 2825.27**++ |
| Treatments × Years (Lin.) | 16 | 371.51 | 23.22** |
| Pooled deviation | 34 | 577.36 | 16.98 |
| Pooled error | 136 | 250.04 | 1.84 |

**-p<0.01; ++- p<0.01 pooled deviation

same winners in the two environments, i.e. 50% and also picked different winners in other two years 50%. The average loss from selecting AMMI1 winners = 8.958 and 12.86% of the grand mean. The AMMI1 ranking



Fig. 4. Enviromental indices for rhizome yield in Curcuma longa.

was more to be trusted the average gain for selecting AMMI1 winners, i.e. 19.49 and 56.69% of the grand mean. The largest AMMI1 gain of 125.94 or 180.81 of the grand mean occurs in year I where AMMIF picked genotype T-16 but AMMI 1 picked genotype T-17 instead of other genotype. The environmental means and IPCA axis 1 scores for model AMMI1 are presented in the (Table 3). In the interaction the sum of square noise can be estimated as genotype×environment interaction, degree of freedom, error and mean sum of square. This value was=1294052.16 exceeded the genotype×environment interaction (g×e), sum of squares. The genotype×environment interaction (g×e), sum of square indicated about the pattern of genotype×environment interaction. The genotype and environment typical bias values for seventeen genotypes were 170.06. On the other hand, the typical bias for the seventeen genotypes was 97.58 that falls within limit and is useful for selection.



Environmental means and IPCA Axis 1 Scores for model AMMI I in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Environments | Means | Count | Index | Environments | Means | Count | Index | Environments | Score | Index | Name | Score |
|-----|-------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------------------------|---------|-------|--------------------------|---------|
| 1 | ENV. I (years 2010-11) | 11.700 | 17 | 2 | ENV. II (years 2011-12) | 139.192 | 17 | 1 | ENV. I (years 2010-11) | -1.877 | 2 | ENV. II (years 2011-12) | 16.358 |
| 2 | ENV. II (years 2011-12) | 139.192 | 17 | 3 | ENV.III (years 2012-13) | 72.173 | 17 | 2 | ENV. II (years 2011-12) | 16.358 | 1 | ENV.I (years 2010-11 | -1.877 |
| 3 | ENV.III (years 2012-13) | 72.173 | 17 | 4 | ENV. IV (years 2013-14) | 55.545 | 17 | 3 | ENV.III (years 2012-13) | -3.719 | 3 | ENV. III (years 2012-13) | -3.719 |
| 4 | ENV.IV (years 2013-14) | 55.545 | 17 | 1 | ENV. I (years 2010-11) | 11.700 | 17 | 4 | ENV.IV (years 2013-14) | -10.762 | 4 | ENV.IV (years 2013-14) | -10.762 |

Grand Mean = 69.652 rhizome yield Kg/plot; AMMI = Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions; ENV = year

Table 4

Genotype IPCA axis 1 Scores for model and means for AMMI I in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Genotypes/clones | Mean | Count | Index | Name | Mean | Count | Score | Index | Genotypes/clones | Score |
|-----|------------------|--------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|--------|
| 1 | T-1 | 68.87 | 4 | 17 | T-17 | 137.09 | 4 | 6.722 | 2 | T-2 | 9.879 |
| 2 | T-2 | 86.48 | 4 | 12 | T-12 | 94.11 | 4 | 9.879 | 1 | T-1 | 6.722 |
| 3 | T-3 | 49.93 | 4 | 13 | T-13 | 93.84 | 4 | 3.869 | 4 | T-4 | 3.960 |
| 4 | T-4 | 53.18 | 4 | 8 | T -8 | 92.95 | 4 | 3.960 | 3 | T-3 | 3.869 |
| 5 | T-5 | 51.22 | 4 | 10 | T-10 | 92.87 | 4 | -4.340 | 10 | T-10 | 2.673 |
| 6 | T-6 | 11.50 | 4 | 9 | T -9 | 92.59 | 4 | -2.688 | 9 | Т-9 | 2.491 |
| 7 | T-7 | 9.54 | 4 | 14 | T-14 | 92.15 | 4 | -2.997 | 8 | T -8 | 2.479 |
| 8 | T -8 | 92.95 | 4 | 11 | T-11 | 89.67 | 4 | 2.479 | 11 | T-11 | 2.033 |
| 9 | T -9 | 92.59 | 4 | 2 | T-2 | 86.48 | 4 | 2.491 | 14 | T-14 | -0.564 |
| 10 | T-10 | 92.87 | 4 | 1 | T-1 | 68.87 | 4 | 2.673 | 13 | T-13 | -0.571 |
| 11 | T-11 | 89.67 | 4 | 15 | T-15 | 59.38 | 4 | 2.033 | 17 | T-17 | -2.211 |
| 12 | T-12 | 94.11 | 4 | 4 | T-4 | 53.18 | 4 | -8.590 | 6 | T-6 | -2.688 |
| 13 | T-13 | 93.84 | 4 | 5 | T-5 | 51.22 | 4 | -0.571 | 7 | T-7 | -2.997 |
| 14 | T-14 | 92.15 | 4 | 3 | T-3 | 49.93 | 4 | -0.564 | 16 | T-16 | -3.402 |
| 15 | T-15 | 59.38 | 4 | 6 | T-6 | 11.50 | 4 | -8.843 | 5 | T-5 | -4.340 |
| 16 | T-16 | 8.73 | 4 | 7 | T-7 | 9.54 | 4 | -3.402 | 12 | T-12 | -8.590 |
| 17 | T-17 | 137.09 | 4 | 16 | T-16 | 8.73 | 4 | -2.110 | 15 | T-15 | -8.843 |

Grand mean = 69.65 rhizomes yield Kg/plot; AMMI = Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions

The performance of genotypes for stability may be taken as important main effects of yield trials over the years. The AMMI model reduces the effects of genotype×environment interaction (g×e) in a very accurate and refined manner which helps for selecting suitable genotypes. After critical perusal of year wise AMMI values of the four years, it was clearly depicted that genotype T-17, followed by T-11 and T-12 T-13, T-14, T-8 and T-9 were found stable with comparisons to other genotypes (Fig. 3). The fresh rhizome yield of these clones were T-17=137.09, T-11 (89.67) and T-12 =94.11 T-13=93.84, T-14=92.15, T-8=92.95 and T-9=92.59 kg/plot in orders. The similar findings also reported by number of researchers using the AMMI model for broader information and interpretations on stability in the same and different crops (Lin et al., 1986; Purchase, 1997; Leeuvner, 2005; Prasad et al., 2007; Mishra et al., 2015; Lal et al., 2017).

3.3. Stability parameter applications in evaluation and further partitioning of genotypes of turmeric for selection

Nevertheless, there are remarkable achievements

and inconsistencies observed among seventeen genetic stocks of turmeric in stability for rhizomes yield. To further confirm the results of AMMI analysis.

Table 5

Stability parameters for rhizome yield in Curcuma longa.

| Treatments | Treatment means (X) | regression coefficient (bi) | mean square deviation from linear regression (s ² d) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| T-1 | 68.87 | 1.11** | -0.87* |
| T-2 | 86.48 | 1.63** | 34.04** |
| T-3 | 49.93 | 0.85* | -0.49 |
| T-4 | 53.18 | 1.12** | -0.29 |
| T-5 | 51.22 | 1.13** | 1.80** |
| T-6 | 11.50 | 1.27** | 3.86** |
| T-7 | 9.54 | 0.87* | 1.69** |
| T -8 | 92.95 | 1.13** | -1.09** |
| T -9 | 92.59 | 1.08** | 33.32** |
| T-10 | 92.87 | 1.30** | 27.72** |
| T-11 | 89.67 | 0.45 | -1.00** |
| T-12 | 94.11 | 1.42** | 4.70** |
| T-13 | 93.84 | 1.01** | -1.00** |
| T-14 | 92.15 | 0.99** | -1.47** |
| T-15 | 59.38 | 0.17 | 46.90** |
| T-16 | 8.73 | 0.38 | 88.25** |
| T-17 | 137.09 | 1.10** | 24.92** |
| Population mean | 69.652 | - | - |
| SE (Population mean) ± | 2.38 | - | - |
| bi (SE) ± | | 0.32 | - |

*, **-P<0.05 and P<0.01



Genotypes mean for environment/year I in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Genotypes | Count | Data | AMMI 1 | Residual | Rank | Index | Genotype name | Data | Index | Genotype name | AMMI 1 |
|-----|-----------|-------|--------|---------|----------|------|-------|------------------|--------|-------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | T-1 | 4 | 11.433 | -1.704 | 13.138 | 1 | 16 | T-16 | 20.833 | 17 | T-17 | 83.100 |
| 2 | T-2 | 4 | 7.433 | 9.977 | -2.544 | 2 | 17 | T-17 | 20.300 | 12 | T-12 | 52.282 |
| 3 | T-3 | 4 | 9.500 | -15.282 | 27.782 | 3 | 15 | T-15 | 18.033 | 13 | T-13 | 36.961 |
| 4 | T-4 | 4 | 14.333 | -12.203 | 26.537 | 4 | 4 | T-4 | 14.333 | 14 | T-14 | 35.256 |
| 5 | T-5 | 4 | 11.667 | 1.412 | 10.255 | 5 | 13 | T-13 | 13.033 | 8 | T -8 | 30.343 |
| 6 | T-6 | 4 | 11.100 | -41.406 | 52.506 | 6 | 5 | T-5 | 11.667 | 9 | Т-9 | 29.963 |
| 7 | T-7 | 4 | 11.267 | -42.785 | 54.052 | 7 | 1 | T-1 | 11.433 | 10 | T-10 | 29.897 |
| 8 | T -8 | 4 | 10.833 | 30.343 | -19.510 | 8 | 14 | T-14 | 11.400 | 11 | T-11 | 27.897 |
| 9 | T -9 | 4 | 4.433 | 29.963 | -25.530 | 9 | 7 | T-7 | 11.267 | 15 | T-15 | 18.032 |
| 10 | T-10 | 4 | 5.433 | 29.897 | -24.463 | 10 | 6 | T-6 | 11.100 | 2 | T-2 | 9.977 |
| 11 | T-11 | 4 | 7.433 | 27.897 | -20.464 | 11 | 8 | T -8 | 10.833 | 5 | T-5 | 1.412 |
| 12 | T-12 | 4 | 10.433 | 52.282 | -41.849 | 12 | 12 | T-12 | 10.433 | 1 | T-1 | -1.704 |
| 13 | T-13 | 4 | 13.033 | 36.961 | -21.927 | 13 | 3 | T-3 | 9.500 | 4 | T-4 | -12.203 |
| 14 | T-14 | 4 | 11.400 | 35.256 | -23.856 | 14 | 2 | T-2 | 7.433 | 3 | T-3 | -15.281 |
| 15 | T-15 | 4 | 18.033 | 18.032 | 0.001 | 15 | 11 | T-11 | 7.433 | 6 | T-6 | -41.406 |
| 16 | T-16 | 4 | 20.833 | -42.841 | 63.674 | 16 | 10 | T-10 | 5.433 | 7 | T-7 | -42.785 |
| 17 | T-17 | 4 | 20.300 | 83.100 | -62.800 | 17 | 9 | T -9 | 4.433 | 16 | T-16 | -42.840 |

Environments I and Mean = 11.700, AMMI (Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions) gain = 125.941

Table 7

Genotypes mean for environment/year II in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Genotypes | Count | Data | AMMI 1 | Residual | Rank | Index | Genotype name | Data | Index | Genotype name | AMMI 1 |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|---------|----------|------|-------|------------------|---------|-------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | T-1 | 4 | 255.667 | 248.359 | 6.807 | 1 | 2 | T-2 | 330.933 | 2 | T-2 | 317.613 |
| 2 | T-2 | 4 | 330.933 | 317.614 | 13.319 | 2 | 1 | T-1 | 255.167 | 1 | T-1 | 248.360 |
| 3 | T-3 | 4 | 183.467 | 182.757 | 0.709 | 3 | 10 | T-10 | 192.100 | 10 | T-10 | 206.129 |
| 4 | T-4 | 4 | 188.600 | 187.502 | 1.099 | 4 | 9 | T-9 | 189.633 | 8 | T-8 | 203.047 |
| 5 | T-5 | 4 | 20.600 | 49.759 | -29.159 | 5 | 4 | T-4 | 188.600 | 9 | T-9 | 202.880 |
| 6 | T-6 | 4 | 25.200 | 37.064 | -11.864 | 6 | 8 | T-8 | 187.733 | 11 | T-11 | 192.467 |
| 7 | T-7 | 4 | 17.800 | 30.061 | -12.261 | 7 | 13 | T-13 | 186.600 | 4 | T-4 | 187.502 |
| 8 | T -8 | 4 | 187.733 | 203.047 | -15.313 | 8 | 17 | T-17 | 186.533 | 3 | T-3 | 182.757 |
| 9 | T -9 | 4 | 189.633 | 202.880 | -13.246 | 9 | 14 | T-14 | 184.767 | 17 | T-17 | 172.116 |
| 10 | T-10 | 4 | 192.100 | 206.128 | -14.029 | 10 | 3 | T-3 | 183.467 | 13 | T-13 | 154.044 |
| 11 | T-11 | 4 | 177.200 | 192.467 | -15.67 | 11 | 11 | T-11 | 177.200 | 14 | T-14 | 152.464 |
| 12 | T-12 | 4 | 26.100 | 23.129 | 2.971 | 12 | 12 | T-12 | 26.100 | 5 | T-5 | 49.759 |
| 13 | T-13 | 4 | 186.600 | 154.045 | 32.555 | 13 | 6 | T-6 | 25.100 | 6 | T-6 | 37.064 |
| 14 | T-14 | 4 | 184.767 | 152.464 | 32.302 | 14 | 5 | T-5 | 20.600 | 7 | T-7 | 30.061 |
| 15 | T-15 | 4 | 7.000 | -15.737 | 22.737 | 15 | 7 | T-7 | 17.800 | 12 | T-12 | 23.129 |
| 16 | T-16 | 4 | 6.833 | 22.612 | -15.779 | 16 | 15 | T-15 | 7.000 | 16 | T-16 | 22.612 |
| 17 | T-17 | 4 | 186.533 | 172.116 | 14.417 | 17 | 16 | T-16 | 6.833 | 15 | T-15 | -15.737 |

Environments II and Mean = 139.192, AMMI (Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions) gain = 0.00001

Table 8

Genotypes mean for environment/year III in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Genotypes | Count | Data | AMMI 1 | Residual | Rank | Index | Genotype name | Data | Index | Genotype name | AMMI 1 |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|---------|----------|------|-------|------------------|---------|-------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | T-1 | 4 | 3.600 | 46.387 | -42.787 | 1 | 17 | T-17 | 171.167 | 17 | T-17 | 147.459 |
| 2 | T-2 | 4 | 4.167 | 52.253 | -48.086 | 2 | 10 | T-10 | 170.333 | 12 | T-12 | 128.578 |
| 3 | T-3 | 4 | 4.067 | 38.065 | -33.998 | 3 | 12 | T-12 | 169.933 | 13 | T-13 | 98.485 |
| 4 | T-4 | 4 | 3.267 | 40.975 | -37.708 | 4 | 8 | T -8 | 169.833 | 14 | T-14 | 96.768 |
| 5 | T-5 | 4 | 169.23 | 69.879 | 99.354* | 5 | 5 | T-5 | 169.233 | 15 | T-15 | 94.795 |
| 6 | T-6 | 4 | 3.467 | 24.019 | -20.552 | 6 | 11 | T-11 | 169.233 | 8 | T -8 | 86.249 |
| 7 | T-7 | 4 | 2.233 | 23.208 | -20.974 | 7 | 9 | Т-9 | 169.067 | 9 | Т-9 | 85.847 |
| 8 | T -8 | 4 | 169.833 | 86.249 | 83.585 | 8 | 15 | T-15 | 7.233 | 10 | T-10 | 85.446 |
| 9 | Т-9 | 4 | 169.067 | 85.847 | 83.219 | 9 | 16 | T-16 | 4.333 | 11 | T-11 | 84.624 |
| 10 | T-10 | 4 | 170.333 | 85.446 | 84.887 | 10 | 2 | T-2 | 4.167 | 5 | T-5 | 69.879 |
| 11 | T-11 | 4 | 169.233 | 84.624 | 84.609 | 11 | 3 | T-3 | 4.017 | 2 | T-2 | 52.253 |
| 12 | T-12 | 4 | 169.933 | 128.578 | 41.355 | 12 | 1 | T-1 | 3.600 | 1 | T-1 | 46.387 |
| 13 | T-13 | 4 | 3.300 | 98.485 | -95.185* | 13 | 6 | T-6 | 3.467 | 4 | T-4 | 40.975 |
| 14 | T-14 | 4 | 2.467 | 96.768 | -94.301* | 14 | 13 | T-13 | 3.300 | 3 | T-3 | 38.065 |
| 15 | T-15 | 4 | 7.233 | 94.795 | -87.561 | 15 | 4 | T-4 | 3.267 | 6 | T-6 | 24.019 |
| 16 | T-16 | 4 | 4.333 | 23.899 | -19.565 | 16 | 14 | T-14 | 2.467 | 16 | T-16 | 23.899 |
| 17 | T-17 | 4 | 171.367 | 147.459 | 23.707 | 17 | 7 | T-7 | 2.233 | 7 | T-7 | 23.208 |

Environments III and Mean = 72.173, AMMI (Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions) gain = 0.00001: Large residuals exceeding this by a factor of 1.960, 2.576, or 3.291 are marked with *, **, or *** respectively. Assuming normality, 5%, 1%, and 0.1% of the residuals exceed these limits.



Genotypes mean for environment/year IV in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Genotypes | Count | Data | AMMI 1 | Residual | Rank | Index | Genotype name | Data | Index | Genotype name | AMMI 1 |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|---------|----------|------|-------|------------------|---------|-------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | T-1 | 4 | 5.267 | -17.576 | 22.842 | 1 | 15 | T-15 | 205.267 | 12 | T-12 | 172.444 |
| 2 | T-2 | 4 | 3.367 | -33.943 | 37.309 | 2 | 13 | T-13 | 172.433 | 17 | T-17 | 145.691 |
| 3 | T-3 | 4 | 2.700 | -5.806 | 8.506 | 3 | 17 | T-17 | 170.367 | 15 | T-15 | 140.443 |
| 4 | T-4 | 4 | 6.533 | -3.539 | 10.073 | 4 | 12 | T-12 | 169.967 | 13 | T-13 | 85.877 |
| 5 | T-5 | 4 | 3.367 | 83.817 | -80.449 | 5 | 14 | T-14 | 169.966 | 14 | T-14 | 84.112 |
| 6 | T-6 | 4 | 6.233 | 26.323 | -20.089 | 6 | 9 | T-6 | 7.233 | 5 | T-5 | 83.817 |
| 7 | T-7 | 4 | 6.867 | 27.684 | -20.817 | 7 | 7 | T-7 | 6.867 | 11 | T-11 | 53.678 |
| 8 | T -8 | 4 | 3.400 | 52.162 | -48.762 | 8 | 4 | T-4 | 6.533 | 8 | T -8 | 52.162 |
| 9 | Т-9 | 4 | 7.233 | 51.677 | -44.444 | 9 | 6 | T -9 | 6.233 | 9 | Т-9 | 51.677 |
| 10 | T-10 | 4 | 3.600 | 49.996 | -46.396 | 10 | 1 | T-1 | 5.267 | 10 | T-10 | 49.996 |
| 11 | T-11 | 4 | 4.800 | 53.678 | -48.878 | 11 | 11 | T-11 | 4.800 | 16 | T-16 | 31.229 |
| 12 | T-12 | 4 | 169.967 | 172.444 | -2.477 | 12 | 10 | T-10 | 3.600 | 7 | T-7 | 27.684 |
| 13 | T-13 | 4 | 172.433 | 85.877 | 86.557 | 13 | 8 | T -8 | 3.400 | 6 | T-6 | 26.323 |
| 14 | T-14 | 4 | 169.967 | 84.111 | 85.855 | 14 | 5 | T-5 | 3.367 | 4 | T-4 | -3.539 |
| 15 | T-15 | 4 | 205.267 | 140.443 | 64.823 | 15 | 2 | T-2 | 3.666 | 3 | T-3 | -5.806 |
| 16 | T-16 | 4 | 2.900 | 31.229 | -28.329 | 16 | 16 | T-16 | 2.900 | 1 | T-1 | -17.576 |
| 17 | T-17 | 4 | 170.367 | 145.691 | 24.676 | 17 | 3 | T-3 | 2.700 | 2 | T-2 | -33.943 |

Environments IV and Mean = 55.545, AMMI (Additive Main Effects and Multiplicative Interactions) gain = 32.001

Table 10

Values for assessing the significance of mean separations in the data estimates and typical bias in Curcuma longa.

| No. | Estimates | Scope | Count | First order | Typical bias | Genotypes | Years/environments |
|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Genotype and environment | Gen with one Env | 17 | 1.794 | 170.060 | 17 | 3 |
| 2 | Environment and genotype | Env within one Gen | 4 | 1.029 | 97.582 | 17 | 3 |
| 3 | Treatments | All treatments | 68 | 2.367 | 224.339 | - | - |
| 4 | Details of estimates | Unweighted grand mean without imputed data | With 136 df the root error mean square | With 3 replications the standard of treatment means | Coefficient of variation of treatment means | Standard error of difference between two treatment means | With 136 df t .05 of 1.978 giving LSD .05 |
| 5 | Data estimates % of GM | 69.652 | 164.193 | 94.797 | 136.100 % of GM | 134.06 | 265.118 |
| 6 | Environmental indices | 1.85 | 9.75 | -6.31 | -5.29 | | |

Gen = Genotypes; Env = Environment/years; GM = Grand mean

The Eberhart and Russell (1966) model was also applied. In this model, the stable genotypes were selected based on high mean yield ("X), regression coefficient (bi) around unity and mean square deviations from regression (s²di) near zero. Genotypes with high mean performance, regression coefficient approaching 1.0 and low deviation mean square were considered to be an average stable genotype, which could be expected to perform uniformity over variable environments/years. However, high mean yield, regression coefficient less than unity would indicate a genotype to have above average stability specifically adapted to low yielding environments/ years and a coefficient greater than unity represents that a genotype with below average stability suitable for high yielding environments/years.

Evaluation of the obtained results and further partitioning of clones /genotypes of turmeric on the basis of Eberhart and Russell (1966) model, for individual parameters of stability (X⁻, bi and s²d) the genotypes T-17 produced the highest rhizome yield (137.09 kg/plot) followed by T-13 (93.84 kg/plot) and T-8 (92.95 kg/plot (Table 5). The regression coefficient (bi) of these genotypes was above unity (bi>1.00) with low deviation from regression (s²d) indicated

their responsiveness to favorable environments/ years. The clones/genotypes T-8 and T-13 were the high stable; the clone T-11 and T-14 were found average stable due to high mean rhizome yield (X⁻), regression coefficient (bi) less than unity would indicate a clone/genotype to have an average stability specially, adapted low yielding environments/years. The genotypes/clones T-9 and T-17 showed high rhizome yield mean value (X⁻), regression coefficient (bi) greater than unity would indicate a clone/genotype below average stability to high yielding environments/ years. The average chemical constituents in these selected clones/genotypes are presented in the (Table 1). On the other hand, genotype/clone like T-1 (68.87 kg/plot) gave mean rhizome yield below the overall mean rhizome yield (69.652 kg/plot). The regression coefficient of this genotype was bi>1.00 unity but the s²d not found fit for selection. The genotype/ clone T-14 had regression coefficient (bi) close to unity (bi=1.0) with a mean rhizome yield 92.15 kg/plot and low s²d value was found suitable for selection (Table 5). The rest of others genotypes showed high deviation from regression and not fit for selection as stable clones. The environmental indices for rhizome yield also indicated clear effects over the year's, i.e.



| lable 11 | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Interval, maximum, | count and histogram | n for AMMI I residu | als in <i>Curcuma longa</i> . |

| Interval | Maximum | Count | Histogram |
|----------|----------|-------|-----------|
| 1 | 4.96769 | 6 | ****** |
| 2 | 9.93539 | 2 | ****** |
| 3 | 14.90308 | 9 | ****** |
| 4 | 19.87078 | 5 | ****** |
| 5 | 24.83847 | 13 | ******* |
| 6 | 29.80617 | 4 | ****** |
| 7 | 34.77386 | 3 | ****** |
| 8 | 39.74156 | 2 | ****** |
| 9 | 44.70925 | 4 | ****** |
| 10 | 49.67694 | 4 | ****** |
| 11 | 54.64464 | 2 | ****** |
| 12 | 59.61233 | 0 | |
| 13 | 64.58003 | 2 | ****** |
| 14 | 69.54772 | 1 | **** |
| 15 | 74.51542 | 0 | |
| 16 | 79.48311 | 0 | |
| 17 | 84.45080 | 3 | ******* |
| 18 | 89.41850 | 5 | ****** |
| 19 | 94.38619 | 1 | **** |
| 20 | 99.35389 | 2 | ***** |

1.85 in year I followed by 9.95 in year II; -6.31 in year III and -5.29 in the year IV, respectively (Fig. 4). The above findings are in agreement with other reports (Annicchiarico, 2002; Lal et al., 2000; 2004; Akçura et al., 2005; Leeuvner, 2005; Lal, 2008, 2012, 2014). In nut shell, the data indicated from both model that the clones/genotypes T-8, T-12 and T-13 were highly stable; T-11 and T-14 adapted to the average stable in low yielding environment/year and T-9 and T-17 genotypes/clones with below average stable suitable for high yielding environment identified for commercial cultivation in large areas.

4. Concluding remarks

In the final tally, on the basis of AMMI analysis and Eberhart and Russell (1966) model, based on individual parameters of stability (X⁻, bi and s²d), the stable genotypes were selected based on high mean yield (⁻X), regression coefficient (bi) around unity and mean square deviations from regression (s²d_i) near zero. Genotypes with high mean performance, regression coefficient approaching 1.0 and low deviation mean square were considered to be an average stable genotype, which could be expected to perform uniformity over variable environments/years. The genotypes, T-8 (92.95 kg/plot), T-12 (94.11 kg/ plot), T-13 (93.84 kg/plot), T-11 (89.67 kg/plot), T-14 (92.15 kg/plot), T-9 (92.59 kg/plot) and T-17 (137.09 kg/plot) were selected as the most stable ones for high rhizome yield. Therefore, these seven genotypes/ clones were recommended for further commercial cultivation.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement

The authors express their sincere gratitude to Director, CSIR-CIMAP, India for keen interest and providing facilities for the experiments. This work was supported by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, India Emeritus Scientist Scheme (CSIR Sanction No. 21(1020)/16/EMR-II dated-18-11-2016).

References

Akçura, M., Kaya, Y., Taner, S., 2005. Genotype×environmental interactions and phenotypic stability analysis for grain yield of Durum wheat in the Central Anatolian region. Turk. J. Agric. For. 29(5), 369-375.

Alvarez, N.M., Ortiz, A.A., Martinez, O.C., 2016. *In vitro* antibacterial activity of *Curcuma longa* (Zingiberaceae) against nosocomial bacteria in Monteria, Colombia. Rev. Biol. Trop. 64(3), 1201-1208.

Annicchiarico, P., 2002. Genotype×environmental interactions; Challenges and Opportunities for Plant Breeding and Cultivar Recommendations. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper. 174, FAO, Rome.

Clevenger, J.F., 1928. Apparatus for determination of volatile oil. J. Pharm. Sci. 17(4), 345-349.

Dyab, A.K., Yones, D.A., Ibraheim, Z.Z., Hassan, T.M., 2016. Anti-giardial therapeutic potential of dichloromethane extracts of *Zingiber officinale* and *Curcuma longa in vitro* and *in vivo*. Parasitol. Res. 115(7), 2637-2645.

Eberhart, S.A., Russell, W.A., 1966. Stability parameters for comparing varieties. Crop Sci. 6(1), 36-40.

Elvira, A.C., Maribel, L.D., 2014. Genotypic diversity of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) accessions in mindanao, philippines on the basis of curcumin content. J. Biodiv. Environ. Sci. 5(4), 593-600.

Eskridge, KM., 1990. Selection of stable cultivars using a safety-first rule. Crop Sci. 30(2), 369-374.

Finlay, K.W., Wilkinson, G.N., 1963. The analysis of adaptation in a plant-breeding programme. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 14(6), 742-754.

Gauch, H.G., 2007. MATAMODEL Version 3.0: Open Source Software for AMMI and Related Analyses, Crop and Soil Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.

Gomathy, V., Anbazhagan, M., Arumugam K., 2014. *In vitro* propagation of *Curcuma longa* (Turmeric). Int. J. Res. Plant Sci. 4(1), 30-33.

Joe, B., Vijaykumar, M., Lokesh, B.R., 2004. Biological properties of curcumin-cellular and molecular mechanisms of action. Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr. 44(2), 97-111.

Kang, M.S., Pham, H.N., 1991. Simultaneous selection for yielding of stable crop genotypes. Agron. J. 83(1), 161-165.

Kim, D.W., Lee, S.M., Woo, H.S., Park, J.Y., Ko, B.S., Heo, J.D., Ryu, Y.B., Lee, W.S., 2016. Chemical constituents and anti-inflammatory activity of the aerial parts of *Curcuma longa*. J. Funct. Food. 26, 485-493.

Lal, R.K., 2008. Stability and genotypes×environment interactions in fennel. J. Herbs Spices Med. Plants 13(3), 47-54.

Lal, R.K., 2012. On genetic diversity in germplasm of vetiver (*Vetiveria zizanioides* L. Nash). Ind. Crops Prod. 43, 93-98.

Lal, R.K., 2014. Breeding for new chemotypes with stable high essential oil yield in *Ocimum*. Ind. Crops Prod. 59, 41-49.

Lal, R.K., 2015. Quantification of adaptability and stability among genotypes/cultivars for root yield in Ashwagandha (*Withania somnifera* L.). Ind. Crops Prod. 77, 648-657.

Lal, R.K., Khanuja, S.P.S., Agnihotri, A.K., Shasany, A.K., Naqvi, A.A., Dwivedi, S., Misra, H.O., Dhawan, O.P., Kalara, A., Singh, A., Bahl, J.R., Singh. S., Patra, D.D., Agarwal, S., Darokar, M.P., Gupta, M.L., Chandra, R., 2004. An early, short duration, high essential oil, methyl chavicol, and linalool yielding variety of Indian Basil (*Ocimum basilcum*) CIM-Saumya. J. Med. Aromat. Plants Sci. 26, 77-78.

Lal, R.K., Sharma, J.R., Sharma, S., 2000. Variability and stability pattern for some economic traits in chamomile *Chamomilla recutita*. J. Med. Aromat. Plants Sci. 22(2-3), 219-222.

Lal, R.K., Singh, S., Gupta, P., Dhawan, S.S., Sarkar, S., Verma, R.K., 2017. Quantification of ursolic acid, correlations and contribution by other traits towards accumulation of ursolic acid in six *Ocimum* species. Trends Phytochem. Res. 1(1), 39-46.

Leeuvner, D.V., 2005. Genotypes×environment interactions for sun flower hybrids in South Africa, M.Sc. Thesis, University of Pretoia, Pretoria.

Lekshmi, P.C., Arimboor, R., Nisha, V.M., Menon, A.N.,

Raghu, K.G., 2014. *In vitro* antidiabetic and inhibitory potential of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L) rhizome against cellular and LDL oxidation and angiotensin converting enzyme. J. Food Sci. Technol.-Mysore 51(12), 3910-3917.

Lin, C.S., Binns, M.R., Lefkovitch, L.P., 1986. Stability analysis: Where do we stand? Crop Sci. 26(5), 894-900.

Mishra, R., Gupta, A.K., Lal, R.K., Jhang, T., Banerjee, N., 2015. Genetic variability, analysis of genetic parameters, character associations and contribution for agronomical traits in turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). Ind. Crops Prod. 76, 204-208.

Panse, V.G., Sukhatme, P.V., 1967. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. Second Ed. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi.

Park, S.I., Lee, E.H., Kim, S.R., Jang, Y.P., 2017. Antiapoptotic effects of *Curcuma longa* L. extract and its curcuminoids against blue light-induced cytotoxicity in A2E-laden human retinal pigment epithelial cells. J. Pharm. Pharmacol. 69(3), 334-340.

Prasad, A., Lal, R.K., Chattopadhyay, A., Yadav, V.K., Yadav, A., 2007. Response of basil species to soil sodicity stress. Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Anal. 38(19-20), 2705-2715.

Purchase, J.L., 1997. Parametric analysis to describe genotype×environment interaction and yield stability in winter wheat. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Free State, Bloemfontein.

Saccol, E.M.H., Toni, C., Pes, T.S., Ourique, G.M., Gressler, L.T., Silva, L.V.F., Mourao, R.H.V., Oliveira, R.B., Baldisserotto, B., Pavanato, M.A., 2017. Anaesthetic and antioxidant effects of *Myrcia sylvatica* (G. Mey.) DC. and *Curcuma longa* L. essential oils on tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*). Aquac. Res. 48(5), 2012-2031.

Shakeri, F., Soukhtanloo, M., Boskabady, M.H., 2017. The effect of hydro-ethanolic extract of *Curcuma longa* rhizome and curcumin on total and differential WBC and serum oxidant, antioxidant biomarkers in rat model of asthma. Iran. J. Basic Med. Sci. 20(2), 155-165.

Singh, R.K., Chaudhary, B.D., 1979. Variance and covariance analysis. Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis. Kalyani Publisher, New Delhi (India), Chapter 3, 39-69.

Shukla, G.K., 1972. Some statistical aspects of partitioning genotypes-environmental components of variability. Heredity. 29(2), 237-245.

Tanvir, E.M., Hossen, M.S., Hossain, M.F., Afroz, R., Gan, S.H., Khalil, M.I., Karim, N., 2017. Antioxidant properties of popular turmeric (*Curcuma longa*) varieties from Bangladesh. J. Food Qual., 8.

Uchio, R., Higashi, Y., Kohama, Y., Kawasaki, K., Hirao, T., Muroyama, K., Murosaki, S., 2017. A hot water extract of turmeric (*Curcuma longa*) suppresses acute ethanol-induced liver injury in mice by inhibiting hepatic oxidative stress and inflammatory cytokine production. J. Nutr. Sci. 6, e3.

Wang, Y.D., Li, J.H., Guo, J.Q., Wang, Q.Y., Zhu, S.G., Gao, S.Y., Yang, C., Wei, M., Pan, X.D., Zhu, W., Ding, D.M., Gao, R.P., Zhang, W., Wang, J.Y., Zang, L.Q., 2017. Cytotoxic and antitumor effects of Curzerene from *Curcuma longa*. Planta Med. 83(1-2), 23-29.

Wricke, G., 1962. über eine method zur Erfassuny der ökologischen Streubreite in Feldversuchen. Z. Pflanzenzüchtg



47, 92-96.

Zhou, Y.Q., Wang, C.M., Wang, R.B., Lin, L.G., Yin, Z.Q., Hu, H., Yang, Q., Zhang, Q.W., 2017. Preparative separation of

four sesquiterpenoids from *Curcuma longa* by high-speed counter-current chromatography. Sep. Sci. Technol. 52(3), 497-503.