

Original Research Article
Lead Selection Traits Relationship in Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.): Is Grain Yield Still Key?

ABSTRACT



A study was set to highlight the relationships and contributions of yield and yield-related traits to the choice of a superior cowpea variety. Five cowpea varieties, Sampea-7 (IAR 48), Sampea-8 (IAR 452-1), Sampea-10 (IAR 499-35), Sampea-11 (IAR 288) and Sampea-12 (IAR 391), were evaluated in the field under normal growing conditions in the 2011-2012 growing season at the University of Calabar Teaching and Research Farm. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications did show significant ($p = 0.05$) varietal differences for days to 50% flowering (50% FLW), days to 75% maturity (75% MTY), number of pods per plant (NPP), seed size (SDS), total plant biomass (TOB) and grain yield (GRY). The number of branches (NBR), pod length (PDL) and harvest index (HI) were not significantly different. The GRY had a positive correlation with all other yield-related traits except for the flowering traits and breeding for the former traits will be an indirect way to select for high grain yields. However, based on the weighted combined contributions of all the traits, the superiority of the varieties followed an order different from their average grain yield order: Sampea-12<Sampea-10<Sampea-7<Sampea-8<Sampea-11. Apparently, this re-ordered result confirmed that the choice of a high performing cowpea variety could not primarily be viewed as a function of high grain yield, but a collective contribution of all other yield-related traits. These findings suggest that placing huge emphasis only on the economic yields (in this case, grain yields) as the main selection index could fault the breeding and evaluation of superior cowpea varieties.

Keywords: breeding, correlation, grain yield, ranking, superior performance

28 INTRODUCTION

29 Cowpea is an important crop in the tropics and sub-tropics [1][2] and breeding work with
 30 various objectives still continue [3]. In cowpea, other pulses and cereals, numerous key traits
 31 have been suggested, but the emphasis has always been on more grain yield [4][5][6] which,
 32 in itself is lacking in explaining the overall performance of the different cowpea genotypes.
 33 Additionally, yield is a complex trait resulting from several interacting physiological activities.
 34 This fact further informs the breeder of the need to pursue operative and effective ways of
 35 selecting superior genotypes in a breeding program. The choice of parent plants in crop
 36 improvement therefore becomes an apparently challenging decision-making task [7] and
 37 where numerous characters are presented for consideration; there is that utmost need to
 38 keenly consider the expected contributions of each character to the final decision about the
 39 parent plant and the expected performance and outcomes of the new plant type. Breeders
 40 have relied on a range of statistical measures to aid the choice process to become more
 41 competent and real for crop yield assessment. However, the foundation of yield traits as a
 42 basis for selecting for yield has not proven useful because of the existence of offsetting
 43 negative correlations where a decrease in one component will produce an increase in
 44 another. Understanding such interrelationships will provide interesting insights into the
 45 selection of desirable crop varieties. This study was set to highlight the relationships and the
 46 individual contributions of lead yield and yield-related characters in the selection of cowpea
 47 varieties with overall superior performance.

48 MATERIAL AND METHODS

49 Five varieties of cowpea obtained from the Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR), Samaru,
 50 Zaria were used for the studies. These varieties were Sampea-7 (IAR 48), Sampea-8 (IAR
 51 452-1), Sampea-10 (IAR 499-35), Sampea-11 (IAR 288) and Sampea-12 (IAR 391). The
 52 experimental site was the Teaching and Research Farm, University of Calabar, Calabar,
 53 Nigeria. Calabar is located at about 39m above the sea level and experiences a bimodal
 54 rainfall distribution with an average annual rainfall ranged from 3, 000mm to 3, 500mm. The

55 annual ambient temperature and relative humidity are 27 – 35°C and 75-85% respectively.
 56 The cowpea varieties were evaluated in the field during the 2011-2012 growing season. The
 57 experimental plot was manually cleared and ridged. The ridges measured 8m long and 1.4m
 58 high. The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design in three blocks
 59 (replications). Two viable seeds of each of the cowpea varieties were sown to the depth of
 60 2cm in the ridges at a planting distance of 75cm x 20cm. Each experimental plot had two
 61 rows and eight plant stands. Manual weeding was done initially at two weeks after sowing
 62 and later when necessary. Pesticides and fertilizer were appropriately applied as
 63 recommended. The yield and yield-related data collected were viz,

64 Days to 50% flowering – this was observed as the duration (in days) from the date of sowing
 65 to when 50% of the plant population bear at least an open flower.

66 Days to 75% maturity - the number of days from planting till 75% of the plants in the plot
 67 turned yellow, with abscission of the older leaves and lowest pods on the stem.

68 Five plants were sampled from each plot for the following characters: average number of
 69 branches and pods, pod length (cm) measured using a meter rule and seed size (mm)
 70 measured vertically with the aid of a Vernier calliper, grain yield and the aboveground total
 71 biomass (expressed in kg ha⁻¹) weights were taken with a weighing balance. The harvest
 72 index was expressed as a percentage of the economic yield over the total biomass
 73 (biological yield) [8]. GenStat Software [9] was used for the analysis of variance (ANOVA),
 74 bivariate correlation (Pearson's coefficient, r) and overall performance ranking (Kendall's
 75 Coefficient of Concordance, W). Fisher's post-ANOVA test [10] was done and the significant
 76 means were separated using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) [11].

77 RESULTS

78 With the use of a randomized complete block design in the study, the variability within each
 79 block was less than the variability of the entire sample except for days to 75% maturity (75%
 80 MTY) (p = 0.05) (Table 1). The analysis of variance revealed that the cowpea varieties

81 differed significantly in terms of seed size (SDS) ($p = 0.001$) the number of pods per plant
 82 (NPP) ($p = 0.05$), total biomass (TOB) ($p = 0.05$), days to 50% flowering (50% FLW) ($p =$
 83 0.01), 75% MTY ($p = 0.01$) and grain yield (GRY) ($p = 0.01$) (Table 2). The signal-to-noise
 84 ratios for NPP, pod length (PDL) and harvest index (HI) of the cowpea varieties were not
 85 significantly different. The magnitudes of the coefficient of variation (CV) ranged from 2.62%
 86 to 26.46% between the nine characters investigated. The only statistically significant
 87 bivariate Pearson correlation coefficient was between GRY and NPP ($r = 0.950$, $p = 0.013$)
 88 (Table 3). However, for the non-significant correlations, mostly characters with $r \geq 0.50$ were
 89 highlighted in discussing the existing relationships. Ranking based on Kendall's Coefficient
 90 of Concordance, W, showed the overall performance of the cowpea varieties following the
 91 order (Table 4): Sampea-12 < Sampea-10 < Sampea-7 < Sampea-8 < Sampea-11.

92

93 DISCUSSION

94 The variability within each block (replicate) was expected to be less than the variability of the
 95 entire sample for an efficient estimate of the varietal effect. The estimate of the varietal effect
 96 within each replicate (i.e. block) was less efficient than estimates across the entire plot for all
 97 the observations except for 75% MTY (Table 1). This implied that blocking failed to improve
 98 the precision of the experiment and a completely randomized design would have still
 99 explained the same overall estimates of the varietal differences among the cowpea varieties
 100 only in the absence of other experimental limitations [12]. The experimental CV was below
 101 10% for 50% FLW, 75% MTY, SDS, GRY and HI. High variations in the number of branches
 102 per plant (NBR), TOB, NPP and PDL were described by the quantitative nature of these
 103 characters. The 50% FLW, NPP and GRY have been identified as important characters in
 104 cowpea selection and breeding [13]. This study also showed that cowpea varieties
 105 significantly differed for these characters alongside 75% MTY, SDS and TOB (Table 2).
 106 Earliness in cowpea is an important polygenic agronomic trait [14] and an important
 107 component for crop adaptation in the semi-arid tropics where cowpea is also grown. 50%
 108 FLW ranged from 41 days to 57 days with an overall mean of 47.33 ± 1.84 days. These
 109 results were in consonance with previous reports [15][16]. The erect and white seeded
 110 Sampea-8 and Sampea-10 were significantly different ($p = 0.05$) in 50% FLW. Sampea-7
 111 (erect and brown seeded), Sampea-11 (spreading and white seeded) and Sampea-12
 112 (spreading and brown seeded) were the early maturing cowpea varieties which were also
 113 below the overall mean 50% FLW (47.33 ± 1.84). Early flowering has a direct relationship with
 114 photoperiodic groupings in cowpea. Cowpea varieties with less than 45 days to 50% FLW
 115 were grouped as day neutrals above which they are photoperiodic sensitive [17]. These
 116 groupings were found to have a direct influence on days to maturity in cowpea. Sampea-11
 117 was significantly different ($p = 0.05$) from Sampea-7 and Sampea-12. Sampea-8 and
 118 Sampea-10 varieties mature in 19 days and 20 days, respectively, after the earliest maturing
 119 variety, Sampea-12 (59.0 days). The NPP ranged from 8.0 in Sampea-10 to 17.0 in
 120 Sampea-11; these varieties had the highest NBR. There was no significant difference

121 between Sample-11 and Sampea-7 in terms of NPP. Sampea-10 differed significantly ($p =$
 122 0.05) from Sampea-11 but not statistically different from Sampea-7, Sampea-8 and Sampea-
 123 12. The mean PDL was 9.4 ± 1.44 cm and Sampea-11 with the highest NPP recorded the
 124 highest PDL (12.0 cm) as well. The combination of fewer NBR, NPP and shorter PDL
 125 encourages an effective partitioning of photosynthetic assimilates [18][19] which supports
 126 the development of larger seeds in cowpea. The mean seed size was 7.59 ± 0.1 mm.
 127 Sampea-10 had the least NPP and PDL but with the largest SDS (9.06 mm) that was
 128 significantly different ($p = 0.05$) from other varieties. Seed size in cowpea is a desirable
 129 characteristic that positively influences starch contents useful in industrial production of
 130 cowpea flour [20]. Though the mean number of seeds from each of the varieties was not
 131 considered in the study, PDL and NPP generally affect the total number of seeds in a pod-
 132 bearing plant (peas, beans or lentils) and can serve as important indices for breeding for
 133 high number of seeds in cowpea. Longer healthy pods are expected to contain more seeds
 134 than shorter pods. It was reported that selecting for higher GRY is an indirect way of
 135 selecting for NPP [21]. Higher NPP corresponded with higher TOB which, varied greatly and
 136 significantly ($p = 0.05$) among the cowpea varieties ranging from $3,046.8 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ (Sampea-
 137 11) to $2,579.2 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ (Sampea-8). Improved GRY is an important selection index in cowpea
 138 [22]. The highest and lowest GRYs were obtained from Sampea-11 ($1,304.1 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) and
 139 Sampea-12 ($1,069.0 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$), respectively. Sampea-8 ($1,082.7 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) and Sampea-10
 140 ($1,078.4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) were not significantly different. Sampea-7 had the second highest GRY
 141 ($1,136.7 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) and this was significantly different ($p = 0.05$) from the rest of the varieties.
 142 Slightly different GRYs, ($1,792.47 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) [23] and ($1,392 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$) [15], have previously
 143 been reported. There was no significant varietal difference for HI though the trend
 144 corresponded to the GRY. Sampea-11 (42.80%) and Sampea-8 (41.98%) were above the
 145 overall mean HI (40.35%) of the cowpea varieties. Their efficiencies in converting over 40%
 146 of total photosynthetic assimilates to economic yield (expressed as HI) further highlighted
 147 their superior biological and seed yielding abilities. Both Sampea-11 and Sampea-8 mature
 148 after 71 days and 79 days in the field, respectively. This agreed with [24] who reported high

149 photosynthetic efficiencies for medium to late maturing cowpea varieties. Understanding
 150 these efficiencies will be helpful in the selection of cowpea varieties with improved genetic
 151 potentials. The duration in attaining 50% flowering correlated with 75% MTY ($r = 0.847$, $p =$
 152 0.070), NBR ($r = 0.573$, $p = 0.313$) and SDS ($r = 0.530$, $p = 0.358$) (Table 4). The PDL ($r = -$
 153 0.563 , $p = 0.323$) and TOB ($r = -0.743$, $p = 0.151$) had strong negative correlations with 75%
 154 MTY. Late flowering cowpea varieties tend to produce numerous and longer branches,
 155 mature late and yield high amounts of fodder due to photosensitive differences [25].
 156 Generally, crop varieties with shorter vegetative growth phase do have the inherent potential
 157 of reduced biomass accumulation at the expense of their reproductive growth [26]. The
 158 length of reproductive period has strong influences on photosensitivity [27] and grain yield
 159 [28] in cowpea. It was however observed that NPP ($r = 0.724$, $p = 0.166$) related to a high
 160 TOB in the early maturing cowpea varieties evaluated. Also, the longer it took the cowpea
 161 varieties to mature in the field the bigger the SDS ($r = 0.639$, $p = 0.246$) and SDS was
 162 inversely associated with PDL ($r = -0.712$, $p = 0.178$) implying that cowpea varieties with
 163 shorter pod would generally possess larger seeds. Findings from this study revealed that
 164 GRY had a very strong and significant positive correlation ($r = 0.950$, $p = 0.013$) with NPP.
 165 This strongly confirmed that cowpea varieties with a higher number of pods will always have
 166 higher grain yields. The correlations between PDL ($r = 0.597$, $p = 0.072$) and TOB ($r = 0.845$,
 167 $p = 0.072$) with GRY will provide additional useful explanations to grain yield variations in
 168 cowpea. Overall, GRY positively correlated with all the traits with the exception of the
 169 flowering traits as previously reported [22]. The overall performance of the cowpea varieties
 170 was then assessed based on the weighted judgments of all the yield and yield-related
 171 characters. The NBR, 50% FLW, NPP, SDS, TOB and HI were the top traits that jointly
 172 contributed to the ranking of Sampea-11 and Sampea-8 as the best performing varieties.
 173 Based on the highest contributions of each of the characters to the overall performance of
 174 the cowpea varieties (Table 4), the choice of contrasting parents with any of these
 175 characters (with the highest rank, 5) for cowpea improvement through hybridization can be
 176 easily made. Taken together, these findings do support, with strong recommendations [29],

177 the need to always consider the existing interrelationships between yield and yield-related
178 traits [30][15] in cowpea selection, breeding and performance assessments.

179

180 **CONCLUSIONS**

181 The results were able to highlight the striking relationships and contributions of lead
182 agronomic characters useful in the selection, breeding and evaluation of promising high-
183 yielding cowpea varieties. This study has shown that placing extreme emphasis on grain
184 yield alone is not a sufficient basis for cowpea selection as generally reported in numerous
185 studies. To gain a finer resolution of these results finding, it is suggested that these
186 characters are investigated in future studies over a variety of growing environments with
187 more cowpea varieties and could as well be extended to other important pod-bearing
188 leguminous crop species.

189



REFERENCES

- 190 [1] Ehlers, J.D. and A. E. Hall. 1997. Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp.). Field Crop Res.
191 53(1-3):187-204. doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(97)00031-2
192
- 193 [2] Singh, B.B., J. D. Ehlers, B. Sharma and F. R. F. Filho. 2000. Recent progress in cowpea
194 breeding, In: C. A. Fatokun, A. Tarawali, B. B. Singh, P. M. Kormawa and M. Tamò,
195 (Eds.), Challenges and opportunities for enhancing sustainable cowpea production,
196 proceedings of the world cowpea conference III. International Institute of Tropical
197 Agriculture (IITA), Ibadan, Nigeria. pp 22–40.
- 198 [3] Boukar, O., R. Bhattacharjee, C. Fatokun, P.L. Kumar and B. Gueye. 2013. Cowpea, In:
199 S. Mohar, H. D. Upadhyaya and I. S. Bisht, (Eds.), Genetic and genomic resources of
200 grain legume improvement, Elsevier, Oxford. pp 137-156.
- 201 [4] Sinha, S.K. 1977. Food legumes: distribution, adaptability and biology of yield. Food and
202 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- 203 [5] Ucar, Y., A. Kadayifci, H.İ. Yilmaz, G. İ.Tuyulu and N. Yardimci. 2009. The effect of deficit
204 irrigation on the grain yield of dry bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) in semi arid regions.
205 Span. J. Agric. Res. 7(2):474-485.
- 206 [6] Iwo, G. and E. E. Obok, E. 2010. Agronomic performance and estimate of genetic
207 variability of upland rice genotypes on acid soil of Cross River State. Global J. Agric.
208 Sci. 9 (1): 1-7. doi: 10.4314%2Fgjass.v9i1.62779
- 209 [7] Acquaah, G. 2007. Principles of plant genetics and breeding. Blackwell Publishing,
210 Malden, USA.
- 211 [8] Donald, C.M. and J. Hamblin. 1976. The biological yield and harvest index of cereals as
212 agronomic and plant breeding criteria. AdvAgron 28:361-405. doi:10.1016/s0065-
213 2113(08)60559-3
- 214 [9] Payne, R.W., D. A. Murray, S. A. Harding, D. B. Baird and D. M. Soutar. 2009. GenStat
215 for windows. Hemel Hempstead: VSN International.
- 216 [10] Fisher, R.A. 1960. The design of experiments. Hafner Press, New York.
- 217 [11] Gomez, K.A. and A. A. Gomez. 1984. Statistical procedures in agricultural research.
218 John Wiley & Sons Inc., United States.
- 219 [12] Cochran, W.G. and G. M. Cox. 1992. Experimental designs. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
220 United States.
- 221 [13] Manggoel, W. and M. I. Uguru. 2012. Evidence of maternal effect on the inheritance of
222 flowering time in cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.). Int. J. Plant Breed. Genet.
223 6(1):1-16. doi:10.3923/ijpb.2012.1.16
- 224 [14] Adeyanju, A. O. and Ishiyaku, M. F. 2007. Genetic study of earliness in cowpea (*Vigna*
225 *unguiculata* L. Walp) under screen house condition. Int. J. Plant Breed. Genet. 1 (1),
226 34-37.
- 227 [15] Oyekanmi, A.A. and O. S. Sangodoyin. 2007. Evaluation of advanced lines of cowpea
228 (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp) for agronomic traits and grain yield in the transition
229 zone of Nigeria. Asian J. Plant Sci. 6(1):163-167. doi:10.3923/ajps.2007.163.167

- 230 [16] Udensi, O., E. A. Edu, E. V. Ikpeme, J. K. Ebiwgai and D. E. Ekpe. 2012. Biometrical
231 evaluation and yield performance assessment of cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.)
232 Walp] landraces grown under lowland tropical conditions. Int. J. Plant Breed. Genet.
233 6(1):47-53. doi:10.3923/ijpb.2012.47.53.
- 234 [17] Singh, C. 2003. Modern techniques of raising field crops. Oxford and IBH Publishing,
235 New Delhi, India.
- 236 [18] Brakke, M.P. and F. P. Gardner. 1987. Juvenile growth in pigeonpea, soybean, and
237 cowpea in relation to seed and seedling characteristics. Crop Sci. 27(2):311.
238 doi:10.2135/cropsci1987.0011183X002700020038x
- 239 [19] Gifford, R.M. and L. T. Evans. 1981. Photosynthesis, carbon partitioning, and yield.
240 Annu. Rev. Plant Phys. 32:485-509. doi:10.1146/annurev.pp.32.060181.002413
- 241 [20] Adeboye, O.C. and V. Singh. 2008. Physico-chemical properties of the flours and
242 starches of two cowpea varieties (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp). Innov. Food Sci.
243 Emerg. 9(1):92-100. doi:10.1016/j.ifset.2007.06.003
- 244 [21] Souza, C. L., A. A. Lopes, R. L. F. Gomes, M. Rocha and E. M. Silva. 2007. Variability
245 and correlations in cowpea populations for green-grain production. Crop Breed. Appl.
246 Biot. 7:262-269.
- 247 [22] Oladejo, A.S., R. O. Akinwale and I. O. Obisesan. 2011. Interrelationships between
248 grain yield and other physiological traits of cowpea cultivars. Afr. Crop Sci. J.
249 19(3):189-200.
- 250 [23] Aliyu, H. and M.F. Ishiyaku. 2013. Field evaluation of cowpea genotypes for drought
251 tolerance and striga resistance in the dry savanna of the North-West Nigeria. Int. J.
252 Plant Breed. Genet. 7(1):47-56. doi:10.3923/ijpb.2013.47.56
- 253 [24] Fagwalawa, L.D. 2005. Agrophysiological characterization of some early, medium
254 and late maturing varieties of cowpea under sole and intercropping systems. Kano:
255 Bayero University. [PhD thesis].
- 256 [25] Umar, M.L., M. G. Sanusi and F. D. Lawan. 2010. Relationships between some
257 quantitative characters in selected cowpea germplasm [(*Vigna unguiculata* L. (Walp))
258 Not. Sci. Biol. 2(1):125-128.
- 259 [26] Simmonds, N.W. 1979. Principles of crop improvement. Longmans, New York, USA.
- 260 [27] Mukhtar, F.B. and B. B. Singh. 2006. Influence of photoperiod and Gibberellic acid
261 (GA₃) on the growth and flowering of Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L) Walp). J.
262 Food Agric. Environ. 4(2):201-203.
- 263 [28] Hall, A.E. 1999. Cowpea, In: D. Smith and C. Hamel, (Eds.), Crop Yield, Springer,
264 Berlin, Germany. pp 355-373.
- 265 [29] Ranalli, P. and J. I. Cubero. 1997. Bases for genetic improvement of grain legumes.
266 Field Crop Res. 53(1-3):69-82. doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(97)00023-3.
- 267 [30] Nwofia, G.E., M. Nwanebu and C. U. Agbo. 2012. Variability and inter-relationships
268 between yield and associated traits in cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp as
269 influenced by plant populations. World J. Agric. Sci. 8(4):396-402.
270 doi:10.5829/idosi.wjas.2012.8.4.1669.

Table 1: Analysis of variance

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	MSS								
		50% FLW	75% MTY	NBR	NPP	PDL	SDS	TOB	GRY	HI
Block Effect	2	1.07 ^{ns}	46.67*	0.21 ^{ns}	14.60 ^{ns}	0.80 ^{ns}	0.03 ^{ns}	354.26 ^{ns}	0.19 ^{ns}	2.68 ^{ns}
Varietal Effect	4	139.83**	259.9**	0.63 ^{ns}	32.23*	12.9 ^{ns}	5.43***	891.21*	291.70**	10.85 ^{ns}
Residual Effect	8	10.23	8.5	0.38	7.41	6.3	0.04	222.91	20.93	13.47

MSS – mean sums of square; 50% FLW – days to 50% flowering; 75% MTY – days to 75% maturity; NPP – number of pods per plant; PDL – pod length (cm); SDS – seed size (mm); NBR – number of branches per plant; TOB – total biomass (g); GRY – grain yield (kg ha⁻¹); HI – harvest index; ns – non-significant; *, **, *** - significant at the 95%, 99%, >99% confidence level, respectively.

Table 2: Mean yield and yield-related characters in cowpea (2011-2012)

Variety	Growth habit	Seed coat colour	Days to 50% flowering	Days to 75% maturity	Number of branches per plant	Number of pods per plant	Pod length (cm)	Seed size (mm)	Total biomass (kg ha ⁻¹)	Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (%)
Sampea-7	Erect	Brown	44.0	61.0	4.53	12.0	8.0	8.23	2,893.5	1,136.7	39.28
Sampea-8	Erect	White	57.0	78.0	5.40	11.0	9.0	7.69	2,579.2	1,082.7	41.98
Sampea-10	Erect	White	52.0	79.0	4.26	8.0	7.0	9.06	2,759.6	1,078.4	39.08
Sampea-11	Spreading	White	43.0	71.0	4.80	17.0	12.0	7.58	3,046.8	1,304.1	42.80
Sampea-12	Spreading	Brown	41.0	59.0	4.33	9.7	11.0	5.43	2,768.7	1,069.0	38.61
<i>Mean</i>			<i>47.33</i>	<i>69.73</i>	<i>4.66</i>	<i>11.60</i>	<i>9.4</i>	<i>7.59</i>	<i>2,809.6</i>	<i>1,134.2</i>	<i>40.35</i>
<i>±SEM</i>			<i>1.84</i>	<i>1.68</i>	<i>1.73</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>1.44</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>8.62</i>	<i>2.64</i>	<i>1.85</i>
<i>LSD (0.05)</i>			<i>6.02</i>	<i>5.48</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>5.11</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>0.37</i>	<i>79.5</i>	<i>8.61</i>	<i>ns</i>
<i>CV %</i>			<i>6.75</i>	<i>4.18</i>	<i>13.20</i>	<i>23.46</i>	<i>26.59</i>	<i>2.62</i>	<i>15.03</i>	<i>4.03</i>	<i>7.90</i>

SEM – standard error of mean; LSD – least significant difference; CV – coefficient of variation; ns – non-significant at the 95% confidence level.

282 **Table 3: The bivariate correlation matrix of yield and yield-related characters in cowpea (2011-2012)**

Character	Days to 75% maturity	Number of branches per plant	Number of pods per plant	Pod length (cm)	Seed size (mm)	Total biomass (kg ha ⁻¹)	Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (%)
Days to 50% flowering	0.847 (0.070)	0.573 (0.313)	-0.381 (0.527)	-0.563 (0.323)	0.530 (0.358)	-0.743 (0.151)	-0.406 (0.498)	0.267 (0.664)
Days to 75% maturity	-	0.422 (0.479)	-0.115 (0.853)	-0.352 (0.561)	0.639 (0.246)	-0.365 (0.546)	-0.014 (0.983)	0.464 (0.432)
Number of branches per plant		-	0.371 (0.539)	0.178 (0.774)	0.046 (0.942)	-0.358 (0.554)	0.160 (0.797)	0.789 (0.112)
Number of pods per plant			-	0.685 (0.202)	-0.057 (0.927)	0.724 (0.166)	0.950* (0.013)	0.762 (0.134)
Pod length (cm)				-	-0.712 (0.178)	0.449 (0.449)	0.597 (0.288)	0.475 (0.419)
Seed size (mm)					-	0.046 (0.941)	0.101 (0.872)	0.131 (0.833)
Total biomass (kg ha ⁻¹)						-	0.845 (0.072)	0.190 (0.760)
Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)							-	0.686 (0.201)

283 Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) above 0.500 are in **bold typefaces**; *r is significant at the 95% confidence level; p-value in parenthesis.

284

285

286 **Table 4: Overall performance ranking of cowpea varieties based on selected yield and yield-related characters**

Variety	Days to 50% flowering	Days to 75% maturity	Number of branches per plant	Number of pods per plant	Pod length (cm)	Seed size (mm)	Total biomass (kg ha ⁻¹)	Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (%)	*Mean
Sampea-7	3	2	4	3	3	4	2	4	4	3.2 (3rd)
Sampea-8	5	4	3	4	5	3	3	3	1	3.4 (2nd)
Sampea-10	4	5	2	2	1	1	1	5	2	2.6 (4th)
Sampea-11	2	3	5	5	4	5	5	2	5	4.0 (1st)
Sampea-12	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	1	3	1.8 (5th)

287 Character weighted contribution: 1 – lowest, 5 – highest; Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, W = 0.294. *Performance rank in parenthesis.