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#### Abstract

Creation of variability through induced mutation is cardinal in genotype selection. However, the stability of the mutants in the subsequent generations is of utmost importance for improvement. This current research was aimed at evaluating the performance of pigeon pea landraces following amiprophos methyl (APM) treatment. Thirty seeds each of two varieties of pigeon pea (brown "Fiofio", white "Fiofio") were soaked in $0,4,6$ and 8 ppm amiprophos methyl (APM) for 48 hours. After the first growing season (2010/2011), mutant seeds were harvested and replanted in the next growing season (2011/2012). The result from the parental generation showed that the brown "Fiofio" variety grew taller $(286.1 \pm 1.63 \mathrm{~cm})$, produced more branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $18.25 \pm 0.25$ ), had broader leaf area plant ${ }^{-1}\left(86.12 \pm 2.29 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$ and increased petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}(4.58 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{~cm})$ while the white "Fiofio" produced more leaves plant ${ }^{1}$ ( $337.5 \pm 1.04$ ) and seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $452.5 \pm 1.04$ ). Plants raised from the $M$, mutant seeds of white "Fiofio" variety produced more pods plant-1 (267.8士1.93pods) and had increased seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $1344 \pm$ seeds) with increased weight of 100 -seeds ( $18.12 \pm 0.11 \mathrm{~g}$ ). However, plants raised from brown "Fiofio" produced more number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ (2865 $\pm 2.73$ ), had taller plants ( $255.2 \pm 1.77 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) with increased days to $50 \%$ flowering and maturity (196; 180 days, respectively). The treatment also caused high phenotypic and genotypic variances; especially in the $M_{1}$ generation. Explicitly, there were obvious positive significant effects of APM treatment on pigeon pea, especially the white variety at 4 ppm . M , generation progenies performed better than their parental counterparts in yield traits, including seed yield. The implication is that $M$, seeds can be advanced to $M_{2}$ generation where genetic blueprint will be released through segregation.
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# Otimização técnica de indução de mutação para a melhoria de características agronômicas em guandu [Cajanus cajan (L.) Millsp.] Landraces 

## Resumo

A criação de variabilidade através de mutação induzida é cardeal em seleção de genótipos. No entanto, a estabilidade dos mutantes nas gerações subsequentes é de extrema importância para a melhoria. Esta pesquisa teve como objetivo principal avaliar o desempenho de cultivares de guandu, tratamentos com amiprophos metil (APM). Trinta sementes cada uma das duas variedades de guandu (marrom "Fiofio", branco "Fiofio") foram embebidas em 0, 4, 6 e 8 ppm amiprophos metil (APM) por 48 horas. Após a primeira estação de crescimento (2010/2011), sementes mutantes foram colhidas e replantadas na safra seguinte (2011/2012). O resultado da geração dos pais mostrou que a variedade marrom "Fiofio" cresceu mais alto ( $286,1 \pm 1,63$ centímetros), produzido mais ramos planta- ${ }^{-1}(18,25 \pm 0,25)$, teve mais amplo de área foliar da planta ${ }^{-1}(86,12 \pm 2.29 \mathrm{~cm} 2)$ e aumento pecíolo comprimento planta-1 ( $4,58 \pm 0,23$ centímetros), enquanto o branco "Fiofio" produziu mais folhas planta-1 $(337,5 \pm 1,04)$ e rendimento de sementes de plantas ${ }^{-1}(452,5 \pm 1,04)$. Plantas levantadas a partir da M1 sementes mutantes de branco "Fiofio" variedade produziu mais vagens planta ${ }^{-1}$ ( $267,8 \pm 1.93$ pods) e aumentou o rendimento de grãos da planta ${ }^{-1}$ ( 1.344 sementes $\pm$ ) com o aumento do peso de 100 sementes ( $18,12 \pm 0,11 \mathrm{~g}$ ). No entanto, as plantas criadas a partir de marrom "Fiofio" produziu o maior número de folhas planta ${ }^{-1}$ ( $2,865 \pm 2,73$ ), tinha plantas mais altas ( $255,2 \pm 1,77$ centímetros) com o aumento dias a $50 \%$ de floração e maturação (196; 180 dias, respectivamente). O tratamento também causou alta fenotípica e variância genotípica; especialmente na geração M1. Explicitamente, não houve efeitos significativos positivos óbvios de tratamento APM em guandu, especialmente a variedade branca a 4 ppm. Progênies geração M1 desempenho melhor do que os seus homólogos dos pais em caracteres de produção, incluindo a produção de sementes. A implicação é que as sementes M1 pode ser avançado para geração M2 onde código genético será lançado pela segregação.
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## Introduction

For sustainable food security in the sub-Saharan African countries, particularly Nigeria, the need for crop development and improvement, especially landraces should not be over-emphasized. Mutation induction on crop plants has been reported to create variability, which is a prerequisite for crop improvement (Mahandjiev et al., 2001; Ciftci et al., 2006; Boureima et al., 2009; Udensi et al., 2012d; 2013).

Different authors have reported the use of different mutagenic agents for the improvement of specific crops and highlighted significant effects (Xiuzher, 1994; Rabie et al., 1996; Stoeva \& Bieneva, 2001; Ciftci et al., 2006; Khan \& AlQurainy, 2009; Brisibe et al., 2011; Udensi et al., 2012c, d). Several researchers have reported polyploidy induction following mutagenic treatments and have affirmed to improve agronomic traits in crops (Takamura \& Miyajima et al., 1986; Yamaguchi, 1989; Solo'veva, 1990; Keeler \& Davis, 1999; Carvalho et al., 1999; Brisibe et al., 2011; Udensi et al., 2011c; 2013,).

Amiprophos methyl (APM) is an example of a phosphoroamidates herbicide, which has been used intensively in agriculture. This notwithstanding, it has been reported to effect shoot and root elongation and development severely, causing both shoots and roots to be stunted with a characteristic swollen tip (Anthony \& Hussey, 1999). APM action is by binding to the a,b-tubulin dimer site, thus inhibiting microtubule polymerization. This however, prevents the formation of chromatic fuses and induces separation of the metaphasic chromosomes (Blume et al., 2003).

Legumes have been reported to have high nutritive values, especially protein with balanced amino acids profile (Tharanathan \& Mahadevamma, 2003; De Almeida Costa et al., 2006; Udensi et al., 2011b). Specifically, pigeon pea [Cajanus cajan (L.) Millsp] landraces with high adaptive potential to environmental stresses (Joshi et al., 2009) is one of the legumes that concerted efforts should be geared towards improving given that worsening climatic conditions in the globe demands crops that have the intrinsic capacity to withstand these precarious situations (Udensi et al., 2011a; 2012a,
b).

Worthy of note is the fact that inducing mutation that will lead to improve agronomical traits is one thing and it is yet another for the introgression of economic traits from parentals to the mutants in the subsequent generations to be favourable. It thus implies that the stability of these traits is very cardinal to successful mutagenesis. This current research is aimed that evaluating the performance of pigeon pea landraces following amiprophos methyl (APM) treatment and thereafter assess the stability of the $M_{1}$ mutants. Efforts were also made to compare the variability between the parents and $M_{1}$ mutants. This will aid in ascertaining the impact of APM in pigeon pea improvement.

## Material and methods

Experiment 1: Studies on the parental generation
Seeds of two varieties of pigeon pea (brown "Fiofio", white "Fiofio") were obtained from the germplasm collection of Dr. Udensi, O. Ugorji at the University of Calabar, Nigeria. Thirty seeds were soaked in 50 ml of each of the APM concentration, $0,4,6$ and 8 ppm for 48 hours bringing the final volume to $60 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$. Eight beds were made with a spacing of 2 meters between beds. The treated seeds were then sown on a plot of land measuring $12 \times 12$ meters using randomized complete block design in a $2 \times 4$ factorial layout with 10 replications. Three seeds per variety were sown in a hole of 4 cm deep according to the method of (Center for New Crops and Plants Products, 2002). A spacing of $20 \times 75 \mathrm{~cm}$ was maintained between stands. This experiment was carried out in the University of Calabar Experimental Farm, Calabar, Nigeria, during the 2010-2011 growing season.

Experiment 2: Studies on the $M_{1}$ mutants
During the 2011/2012 growing season, $M_{1}$ seeds were obtained from experiment 1 and sown according to the methods of (Center for New Crops and Plants Products, 2002) while data were collected according to the method of Udensi et al. (2012a).

## Data collection and analysis

After one month of planting in the two
experiments, percentage germination and days to seedling emergence were estimated. Other morphological traits such as plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$, leaf area plant ${ }^{-1}$, internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$, petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$, days to $50 \%$ flowering, number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of pods plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length, number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$, days to $50 \%$ maturity, seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$, and 100 -seed weight were also recorded at 6 months. For the estimation of the leaf area, the leaves were laid on a $1-\mathrm{cm}$ grid (graph paper) and their outlines were traced. The numbers of square centimeters were calculated, including the partial square and multiplied by $0.1 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$. However, all partial squares that are less than half covered were excluded. The seed yield per plant was estimated by multiplying the average number of seeds per pod per plant and the average number of pod per plant (Udensi et al., 2012a). They were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW), version 18.0. Genetic estimates such as phenotypic ( $\delta^{2} p$ ) and genotypic variances $\left(\delta^{2} \mathrm{~g}\right)$ were done by the method of (Uguru, 1998),

## Results

Morphological and yield traits of parental generation of pigeon pea after amiprophos methyl (APM) treatment

Seeds of pigeon pea parental lines were exposed to amiprophos methyl and interesting observations were made. There were significant effects ( $P<0.05$ ) of APM treatment on the morphological and yield traits of the two varieties evaluated, which were concentrationdependent. It showed that plants derived from 4 and 8 ppm soaked seeds of brown Fiofio grew taller (286.1 $\pm 1.63 ; 276.5 \pm 2.20$ ); produced broader leaves (86.12 $\pm 2.29 ; 84.99 \pm 1.87$ ) and enhanced the number of branches ( $18.25 \pm 0.25$ ). Though the plants derived from white Fiofio seeds produced more pods plant ${ }^{-1}$ (91.75 $\pm 1.25$ ), number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $337.5 \pm 1.04$ ) and seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ (452.5 $\pm 1.04$ ), generally, brown variety performed better, especially on morphological traits (Table 1). Varietal and concentration means separation revealed also that brown "Fiofio" variety grew taller $(270.44 \mathrm{~cm})$, produced more branches
plant ${ }^{-1}$ (17.31), had broader leaf area plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $83.37 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ ) and increased petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ $(6.83 \mathrm{~cm})$ while the white "Fiofio" produced more leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $\sim 310$ ). Additionally, the germination percentage (~98 days) increased including the days to $50 \%$ flowering ( 183 days) for the brown variety while days to $50 \%$ maturity increased for white variety ( $\sim 198$ days) (Table 2).

The differentials observed in the variety notwithstanding, the concentration of APM used had a dose-dependent effect on the morphological traits. It revealed that increasing APM concentration caused increase in the height of the plant, leaf area, number of leaves and number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$. Specially, seeds exposed to 4 ppm APM produced more flowers, pod number and gave the highest seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ though it reduced days to $50 \%$ flowering and maturity, the trend was consistent (Table 3).

Morphological and yield traits of $M_{1}$ generation of pigeon pea after amiprophos methyl (APM) treatment
$M_{1}$ seeds were planted to assess their performances; it was observed that there were remarkable improvements in most traits, the variety notwithstanding. Plants raised from seeds of white Fiofio soaked in 4 ppm APM produced more flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ (531.4 $\pm 1.53$ ), pod plan ${ }^{\text {t-1 }}$ ( $267.8 \pm 1.93$ ) and seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ (1344.0 $\pm 2.48$ ). Other trait such as number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length competed favourably with plants raised from brown Fiofio at the same concentration 4 ppm . Separating the means based on varietal and concentration showed that plants raised from the $M_{1}$ seeds of white "Fiofio" variety produced more pods plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $\sim 157$ pods) and had increase seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( 777 seeds) with increased weight of 100 -seeds (17.32g). However, plants raised from brown "Fiofio" produced more number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( $\sim 2716$ ), had taller plants $(230.6 \mathrm{~cm})$ with increased days to $50 \%$ flowering and maturity (184; 176 days, respectively). Though there were no trend followed concerning APM effect on the evaluated traits, result revealed a dosedependent effect. It was observed that there was stability of traits that were hitherto positively affected by 4 ppm APM treatment such as increased number of leaves (2568), number of
flowers（494），number of pods（192）and seed $50 \%$ flowering though it reduced with increasing yield plant ${ }^{-1}$（946）（Figure 1）．The lengths of the mutagen concentration（Tables 4 \＆5）． petiole and internode increased with the days to
Table 1．Effect of amiprophos methyl on yield and yield－related traits in pigeon pea parental generation

| Morphological／ yield traits | Brown fiofio |  |  |  | White Fiofio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Concentration of amiprophos methyl used（ppm） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Days to seedling emergence | $4.8 \pm 0.21 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.6 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.25 \pm 0.22 \mathrm{~b}$ | $5.53 \pm 0.43 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.75 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.0 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.65 \pm 0.28 \mathrm{ab}$ | $5.2 \pm 0.31 \mathrm{ab}$ |
| \％Seed germination | $85.3 \pm 1.1 \mathrm{c}$ | $99.98 \pm 0.2 a$ | $99.99 \pm 0.3^{\text {a }}$ | $94.5 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{~b}$ | $89.75 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{c}$ | $88.50 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{c}$ | $88.5 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{c}$ | $95.8 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 254．7 $\pm 2.3 \mathrm{bc}$ | $286.1 \pm 1.63 a$ | $264.5 \pm 2.10 \mathrm{~b}$ | $276.5 \pm 2.20 a$ | $231.1 \pm 1.75 d$ | 237．0¹．4d | $249.6 \pm 1.12 \mathrm{C}$ | $250.2 \pm 1.56 \mathrm{C}$ |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 284さ1．47e | $264.0 \pm 0.05 f$ | $282.75 \pm 0.085 \mathrm{e}$ | $318.75 \pm 2.14 b$ | $314 \pm 1.58 \mathrm{c}$ | $337.5 \pm 1.04 a$ | 305．5さ2．06d | $283.5 \pm 0.65 \mathrm{e}$ |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $16.5 \pm 0.65 \mathrm{~b}$ | $18.25 \pm 0,25 a$ | $16.0 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{~b}$ | $18.5 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{a}$ | 14．5 $\ddagger 1.13 \mathrm{c}$ | $10.75 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{e}$ | $12.75 \pm 0.48 \mathrm{~d}$ | $14.51 \pm 0.29 \mathrm{C}$ |
| Leaf area plant | $84.94 \pm 1.12 \mathrm{a}$ | $86.115 \pm 2.29 a$ | $77.44 \pm 1.68 \mathrm{~b}$ | $84.99 \pm 1.87 a$ | $55.06 \pm 1.00 \mathrm{e}$ | $57.41 \pm 1.14 e$ | 61．13 $\pm 1.07 \mathrm{~d}$ | $67.10 \pm 1.41 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Internode length | $7.55 \pm 1.06 a$ | $6.175 \pm 0.72 \mathrm{ab}$ | $5.0 \pm 0.83 \mathrm{bc}$ | $5.15 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{bc}$ | $5.625 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{bc}$ | $4.45 \pm 0.26 \mathrm{c}$ | $5.2 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{bc}$ | 4．45 $\pm 0.09 \mathrm{C}$ |
| Petiole length | $4.45 \pm 0.27 a$ | $4.58 \pm 0.23 a$ | $3.65 \pm 0.18 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.75 \pm 0.15 a$ | $3.0 \pm 0.04 \mathrm{c}$ | $2.93 \pm 0.11 \mathrm{c}$ | $3.75 \pm 0.21 \mathrm{~b}$ | $3.75 \pm 0.32 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Days to 50\％flowering | $178.3 \pm 1.75 \mathrm{~b}$ | 195．50 $\pm 1.96 a$ | $167.0 \pm 1.78 \mathrm{c}$ | 191．75 $\pm 1.31 \mathrm{a}$ | $162.5 \pm 1.04 \mathrm{~cd}$ | 163．75 $\pm 1.25 \mathrm{c}$ | 158．0土2．04d | $152.0 \pm 2.17 e$ |
| Number of flowers | $84.75 \pm 1.11 d$ | 112．75 $\pm 0.85 \mathrm{c}$ | 173．75 $\pm 1.38 \mathrm{a}$ | $85.25 \pm 1.11 d$ | $132.5 \pm 1.32 \mathrm{~b}$ | $122.8 \pm 0.85 \mathrm{bc}$ | $66.5 \pm 1.04 \mathrm{e}$ | $116.8 \pm 0.85 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Days to 50\％ maturity | 182．5 $\pm 1.19 \mathrm{~d}$ | 189．5 $\pm 1.04 \mathrm{bc}$ | 183．5 $\pm 1.53 \mathrm{~d}$ | 183．5 $\pm 1.19$ d | $203.25 \pm 0.85 a$ | $205.25 \pm 0.85^{\text {a }}$ | 189 $\ddagger 1.63 \mathrm{c}$ | 192．5さ0．63b |
| Pod length | $6.13 \pm 0.14 a$ | $6.0 \pm 0.08 a$ | $6.2 \pm 0.15 a$ | $7.65 \pm 0.65 a$ | $6.35 \pm 0.65 a$ | $6.075 \pm 0.09 a$ | 5．53さ0．13a | $5.023 \pm 0.37 a$ |
| Number of pod per plant | $69.25 \pm 2.06 \mathrm{c}$ | $67.5 \pm 1.85 \mathrm{c}$ | $90.25 \pm 0.63 a$ | $51.25 \pm 1.11 \mathrm{~d}$ | $77.75 \pm 1.75$ b | $91.75 \pm 1.25 a$ | $44.00 \pm 1.68 \mathrm{e}$ | 78．25 $\ddagger 1.65 b$ |
| Number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ | $4.75 \pm 0.25 a$ | $5.25 \pm 0.25 a$ | $4.5 \pm 0.65 a$ | $6 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{a}$ | $5.0 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.75 \pm 0.48 \mathrm{a}$ | $5.25 \pm 0.23 a$ | $5.1 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $335.3 \pm 2.25 \mathrm{c}$ | $342.5 \pm 5.20 \mathrm{c}$ | $415 \pm 20.62 b$ | 289 $\pm 13.53 d$ | $387.5 \pm 6.61 \mathrm{~b}$ | $452.5 \pm 1.04 a$ | $222.5 \pm 3.23 \mathrm{e}$ | 394．0さ1．96b |
| 100 seed weight | $13.4 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{abc}$ | $15.11 \pm 0.39$ a | $11.96 \pm 0.84 \mathrm{c}$ | $14.22 \pm 0.63 \mathrm{ab}$ | $12.27 \pm 0.91 \mathrm{bc}$ | $12.11 \pm 0.76 \mathrm{c}$ | 11．9さ0．10c | $12.5 \pm 0.68 \mathrm{bc}$ |

Table 2．Effect of amiprophos methyl on yield and yield－related traits in pigeon pea $M$ ，generation

| $\underset{\text { traits }}{\text { Morphological／yield }}$ | Brown fiofio |  |  |  | White fiofio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Concentration of amiprophos methyl used（ppm） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Days to seedling emergence | 4．5＋0．29b | 4．0さ0b | $4.25 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{~b}$ | $5.73 \pm 0.63 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.25 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.0 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{~b}$ | 4．75 $\pm 0.48 \mathrm{ab}$ | $5.0 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{lab}$ |
| \％Seed germination | $60.0 \pm 0.04 a$ | $52.0 \pm 0.82 a$ | $48.1 \pm 0.69 a$ | $32.0 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{ab}$ | $44.2 \pm 0.04 \mathrm{a}$ | $28.3 \pm 0.89 \mathrm{~b}$ | $28.4 \pm 0.89 \mathrm{~b}$ | $24.5 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{1}$ | $244.6 \pm 1.57 \mathrm{~b}$ | 255．2土1．77a | 210．0 $\pm 1.70 \mathrm{dd}$ | $212.6 \pm 1.50 \mathrm{~d}$ | $230.0 \pm 1.1 \mathrm{c}$ | 214．8 $\pm 1.77 \mathrm{~d}$ | 234．8さ1．77c | 198．6t1．44e |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ Numbers of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ Internode length | 2846．4 11.39 a | 2565．2土1．3b | 2865．4 $\pm 2.73 \mathrm{a}$ | 2587．8土1．7b | $2134 \pm 4.2 \mathrm{c}$ | 2570．4土2．3b | 2002．8さ1．4d | 1686．6さ2．7e |
|  | $24.0 \pm 1.73 \mathrm{ab}$ | 21．8さ2．18ab | 21．0さ0．2b | 26．8さ1．28a | $25.4 \pm 2.04 \mathrm{ab}$ | $20.4 \pm 1.78 \mathrm{~b}$ | 22．2 $\ddagger 1.53 \mathrm{ab}$ | 22．0さ1．92ab |
|  | $7.22 \pm 064$ | $10.0 \pm 0.17 a$ | $7.7 \pm 0.34 \mathrm{~b}$ | $7.38 \pm 0.15 \mathrm{~b}$ | $8.68 \pm 1.00 \mathrm{ab}$ | $7.78 \pm 0.60 \mathrm{~b}$ | $7.72 \pm 0.44 \mathrm{~b}$ | $5.50 \pm 0.39 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Petiole length | $5.38 \pm 0.36 \mathrm{~cd}$ | $8.46 \pm 0.17 \mathrm{a}$ | $6.78 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{bc}$ | 5．94 $\pm 0.32 \mathrm{~cd}$ | $4.88 \pm 0.27 \mathrm{~d}$ | 7．84 $\pm 0.94 \mathrm{ab}$ | $5.04 \pm 0.52 \mathrm{~d}$ | 8．24 $\pm 1.08 \mathrm{ab}$ |
| Days to $50 \%$ flowering Number of flowers plant ${ }^{1}$ | $178.5 \pm 1.55 \mathrm{~b}$ | 195．5さ1．55a | $167.5 \pm 1.55 \mathrm{c}$ | 192．25 $\pm 0.2 \mathrm{a}$ | $163.5 \pm 1.04 \mathrm{c}$ | 164．5士1．55c | 159 $\pm 1.87 \mathrm{~d}$ | 153．25 2.2 e |
|  | $339 \pm 0.59 \mathrm{c}$ | 456．8さ1．13b | 326 $\pm 2.71 \mathrm{c}$ | $212.6 \pm 2.89 \mathrm{e}$ | $313.6 \pm 4.2 \mathrm{~cd}$ | 531．477．53a | 328．8さ4．12c | 281．2＋1．37d |
| Days to $50 \%$ maturity | 179 $\pm 4.83 \mathrm{a}$ | 179．8さ2．22a | $175.6 \pm 4.47 a$ | $171.4 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{a}$ | $153 \pm 1.64 \mathrm{~b}$ | $155 \pm 0.84 \mathrm{~b}$ | 166 $\pm 2.93 \mathrm{a}$ | 171．8さ1．11a |
| Pod length | $6.9 \pm 0.06 \mathrm{~b}$ | $7.86 \pm 0.09 a$ | $7.48 \pm 0.21 \mathrm{a}$ | $7.46 \pm 0.20 \mathrm{a}$ | $7.44 \pm 0.22 \mathrm{a}$ | $6.86 \pm 0.16 \mathrm{~b}$ | $6.94 \pm 0.19 \mathrm{~b}$ | $5.9 \pm 10,13 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Numbers of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ | $4.4 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{~b}$ | $5.2 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.0 \pm 0.32 \mathrm{c}$ | $5.1 \pm 0.32 \mathrm{a}$ | $3.4 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{c}$ | $5.1 \pm 0.32^{\text {a }}$ | $4.8 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.4 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Number of pods plant ${ }^{1}$ | $52 \pm 2.81 \mathrm{f}$ | 142．4土1．3c | 104土1．06d | $78.6 \pm 2.79 \mathrm{e}$ | $29.8 \pm 1.66 \mathrm{~g}$ | 267．8さ1．93a | $242.4 \pm 3.61 \mathrm{~b}$ | $86.6 \pm .162 \mathrm{e}$ |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{1}$ | $260 \pm 9.35 \mathrm{e}$ | $648.8 \pm 3.2 \mathrm{c}$ | $441.6 \pm 1.9 \mathrm{~d}$ | $398 \pm 16.56 \mathrm{~d}$ | 98．4土2．25f | $1344 \pm 7.48^{\circ}$ | 1244土2．5b | $421.6 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{~d}$ |
| 100－seed weight | $15.3 \pm 1.14 \mathrm{a}$ | 10．74土0．28d | $10.82 \pm 0.19 \mathrm{~d}$ | 12．54土0．20c | 17．22 $\pm 0.27 \mathrm{a}$ | 18．12 $\pm 0.11 \mathrm{a}$ | $16.9 \pm 0.43 \mathrm{a}$ | $17.3 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{a}$ |

Table 3. Varietal mean separation of yield and yield related morphological traits of parental lines that were treated with AMP

| Morphological traits | Brown "Fiofio" | White "Fiofio" |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days to seedling emergence (days) | $4.38 \pm 0.18 \mathrm{a}$ | 4.37 $\pm 0.13 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Percentage seed germination (\%) | $97.69 \pm 1.96 a$ | $91.75 \pm 1.28 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $270.44 \pm 1.45 \mathrm{a}$ | $241.96 \pm 2.23 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Numbers of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $287.56 \pm 2.12 \mathrm{~b}$ | $310.13 \pm 0.59$ a |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $17.31 \pm 0.35 a$ | $13.13 \pm 0.43 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Leaf area plant ${ }^{1}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$ | $83.37 \pm 1.19 a$ | $60.17 \pm 1.29 b$ |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{\text {( }}$ (cm) | $5.97 \pm 0.40 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.95 \pm 0.16 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $6.83 \pm 2.48 \mathrm{a}$ | $3.36 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Days to $50 \%$ Flowering (days) | $183.00 \pm 2.34 \mathrm{a}$ | $159.13 \pm 1.39 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 114.13 $\pm 1.89 \mathrm{a}$ | $109.63 \pm 3.02 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Number of pods plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $69.56 \pm 1.31 \mathrm{a}$ | $72.94 \pm 1.24 a$ |
| Pod length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $6.49 \pm 0.24 a$ | $6.01 \pm 0.19 a$ |
| Number of seed pod ${ }^{-1}$ | $5.13 \pm 0.24 a$ | $5.00 \pm 0.18 a$ |
| Days to 50\% Maturity (days) | 184.75 $\pm 0.91 \mathrm{~b}$ | 197.5土1.84a |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $345.44 \pm 4.32 \mathrm{a}$ | $364.13 \pm 2.36 \mathrm{a}$ |
| 100-seed weight (g) | $13.67 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{a}$ | $12.2 \pm 0.35 a$ |
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Figure 1. Concentration effect on seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ in the parental $\left(P_{1}\right)$ and first mutant generations $\left(M_{1}\right)$

Table 4. Varietal means separation of yield and yield related morphological traits obtained from $M_{1}$, generation

| Morphological traits | Brown | White |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage seed germination (days) | $48.0 \pm 0.30^{\text {a }}$ | $31.0 \pm 0.70^{\text {b }}$ |
| Days to seedling emergence (\%) | $4.63 \pm 0.24 a$ | $4.50 \pm 0.18 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $230.60 \pm 4.58{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $219.55 \pm 3.34^{\text {b }}$ |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $2716.2 \pm 37.2^{\text {a }}$ | $2098.45 \pm 2.8^{\text {b }}$ |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $23.4 \pm 0.99$ a | $22.5 \pm 0.94^{\text {a }}$ |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $8.08 \pm 0.312^{\text {a }}$ | $7.42 \pm 0.40 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $6.64 \pm 0.29$ a | $6.5 \pm 0.50^{\text {a }}$ |
| Days to 50\% flowering (days) | $183.5 \pm 2.94 a$ | $160.06 \pm 1.38 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $333.62 \pm 0.30^{\text {a }}$ | $363.75 \pm 22.76^{\text {a }}$ |
| Days to 50\% maturity (days) | $176.45 \pm 1.78{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $161.45 \pm 1.97^{\text {b }}$ |
| Number of pod plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $94.25 \pm 0.56{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $156.65 \pm 3.32^{\text {a }}$ |
| Pod length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $7.43 \pm 0.11^{\text {a }}$ | $6.79 \pm 0.15^{\text {a }}$ |
| Number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ | $4.65 \pm 0.17^{\text {a }}$ | $4.40 \pm 0.18^{\text {a }}$ |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $437.1 \pm 0.38{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $777.0 \pm 1.22^{a}$ |
| 100 -seed weight (g) | $12.67 \pm 0.63^{\text {b }}$ | $17.32 \pm 0.18^{a}$ |

Table 5. Mean separation of yield and yield-related morphological traits of $M_{1}$ generation in respect to treatments

| Morphological traits | Concentrations of amiprophos methyl (ppm) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Control | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Percentage seed germination (days) | 52.0 $\pm 0.23 \mathrm{a}$ | $40.0 \pm 0.54{ }^{\text {ab }}$ | $38.0 \pm 0.52^{\text {b }}$ | $28.0 \pm 0.25^{\text {c }}$ |
| Days to seedling emergence (\%) | $4.38 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{ab}$ | $4.00 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{~b}$ | $4.5 \pm 0.19 \mathrm{ab}$ | $5.38 \pm 0.27 a$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $237.3 \pm 2.67^{\text {a }}$ | $235.0 \pm 0.84^{\text {a }}$ | $222.4 \pm 4.29{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $205.6 \pm 2.53^{\text {c }}$ |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $2490.2 \pm 0.79{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $2567.8 \pm 0.31^{\text {a }}$ | $2434.1 \pm 3.78^{\text {c }}$ | $2137.2 \pm 0.02^{\text {d }}$ |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $24.7 \pm 1.28{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $21.1 \pm 1.35^{\circ}$ | $21.6 \pm 1.20^{\circ}$ | $24.4 \pm 1.35^{\text {a }}$ |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $7.95 \pm 0.61^{\text {ab }}$ | $8.89 \pm 0.47$ a | $7.71 \pm 0.27^{\text {ab }}$ | $6.44 \pm 0.37 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $5.13 \pm 0.22^{\text {c }}$ | $8.15 \pm 0.46^{\text {a }}$ | $5.91 \pm 0.39 \mathrm{bc}$ | $7.09 \pm 0.65^{\text {ab }}$ |
| Days to 50\% flowering (days) | $171.0 \pm 2.96 \mathrm{~b}$ | $180.0 \pm 2.34 a$ | $163.38 \pm 2.02 \mathrm{c}$ | $172.72 \pm 1.45 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $326.3 \pm 0.15^{\text {b }}$ | $494.1 \pm 3.95^{\text {a }}$ | $327.4 \pm 2.21^{\text {b }}$ | $246.9 \pm 2.13^{\text {c }}$ |
| Days to 50\% maturity (days) | $166.0 \pm 4.96^{\text {a }}$ | $167.4 \pm 4.28^{\text {a }}$ | $170.8 \pm 2.98{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $171.6 \pm 0.56^{\text {a }}$ |
| Number of pods plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $40.9 \pm 4.01^{\circ}$ | $192.4 \pm 1.77^{\circ}$ | $185.9 \pm 0.38^{\text {a }}$ | $78.6 \pm 1.96{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Pod length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $7.17 \pm 0.14^{\text {bc }}$ | $7.33 \pm 0.18^{\text {ab }}$ | $7.21 \pm 0.16^{\text {ab }}$ | $6.68 \pm 0.28 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Number of seeds $\mathrm{pod}^{-1}$ | $9.00 \pm 0.23{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5.1 \pm 0.18^{\text {b }}$ | $4.4 \pm 0.22^{\text {c }}$ | $4.7 \pm 0.21^{\text {bc }}$ |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $179.2 \pm 0.73^{\text {c }}$ | $946.4 \pm 0.18^{\text {a }}$ | $892.8 \pm 0.63^{\text {a }}$ | $409.8 \pm 4.11^{\text {b }}$ |
| 100-seed weight (g) | $16.23 \pm 0.64^{\text {a }}$ | $14.41 \pm 1.14^{c}$ | $13.86 \pm 0.04^{\text {d }}$ | $14.92 \pm 0.80^{\text {b }}$ |

Phenotypic, genotypic environmental variances for the parental generations and $M_{1}$ were computed. It showed that the phenotypic variances for most traits were higher than the genotypic and environmental variances. Our result revealed that plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of leaves, leaf area, number of pod plant ${ }^{-1}$, days to $50 \%$ flowering and maturity, seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ had high genotypic and phenotypic variances. Generally, the phenotypic variances were higher than genotypic variances, the variety and mutagenic concentration notwithstanding. $M_{1}$ generation progenies showed higher phenotypic and genotypic variances for number of leaves, number of flowers, days to maturity, number of
pod plant ${ }^{-1}$, 100 -seed weight and seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ than the parental generation. On the other hand, parental generation recorded higher phenotypic and genotypic variations for plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ and days to flowering when compared with the $M_{1}$ generation counterpart (Tables 6 \& 7).

Comparing phenotypic, genotypic and environmental variances in parental and $M_{1}$ generations after APM treatment

In $M_{1}$ generation progenies, phenotypic and genotypic variances for number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ were 766553.503 and 762399.28 (varietal effect) and 74193.3184 and 70039.0954 (treatment effect) while in parental generation,

Table 6. Phenotypic, genotypic and environmental variations in yield and yield-related traits obtained from parental lines that were treated with AMP

| Morphological traits | Varietal effect |  |  | Treatment effect |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vg | Vp | Ve | Vg | Vp | Ve |
| Days to seedling emergence (days) | -0.3463 | 1.0717 | 1.418 | -0.2205 | 1.1975 | 2206.1975 |
| Percentage seed germination (\%) | 69.683 | 72.985 | 3.302 | 54.683 | 57.985 | 3.302 |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | 6473.310 | 6526.491 | 53.181 | 636.659 | 689.84 | 53.181 |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 1015.765 | 1025.235 | 9.47 | 170.223 | 179.693 | 9.47 |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 34.90 | 35.577 | 0.677 | 1.797 | 2.474 | 0.677 |
| Leaf area plant ${ }^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$ | 1042.05 | 1051.178 | 9.128 | 16.11 | 25.238 | 9.128 |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | 5.0678 | 6.157 | 1.0892 | 0.693 | 1.782 | 1.089 |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | 2.359 | 2.463 | 0.104 | 0.241 | 0.345 | 0.104 |
| Days to 50\% flowering (days) | 1137.074 | 1148.904 | 11.83 | 92.89 | 104.72 | 11.83 |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 132.34 | 203.74 | 71.4 | 170.13 | 187.526 | 17.396 |
| Days to 50\% maturity (days) | 323.765 | 329.205 | 5.44 | 49.078 | 54.518 | 5.44 |
| Number of pod plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 20.349 | 30.078 | 9.729 | 87.213 | 96.942 | 9.729 |
| Pod length (cm) | 0.350 | 0.849 | 0.499 | 0.255 | 0.755 | 0.5 |
| Number of seeds $\mathrm{pod}^{-1}$ | -0.0468 | 0.6203 | 0.6671 | 0.009925 | 0.6769 | 0.666975 |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 2700.441 | 3073.805 | 373.364 | 2135.334 | 2508.698 | 373.364 |
| $100-$ seed weight ( g ) | 3.736 | 5.657 | 1.921 | 0.618 | 2.539 | 1.921 |

Table 7. Phenotypic, genotypic and environmental variations in yield and yield-related traits in $M_{1}$ generation of pigeon pea

| Morphological traits | Varietal effect |  |  | Treatment effect |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vg | Vp | Ve | Vg | Vp | Ve |
| Percentage seed germination (\%) | 559 | 654 | 95 | 175 | 270 | 95 |
| Days to seedling emergence (days) | -0.094 | 0.625 | 0.715 | 0.552 | 3.208 | 2.656 |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | 244.15 | 254.289 | 10.139 | 420.1795 | 433.009 | 12.8295 |
| Number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 762399.28 | 766553.503 | 4154.223 | 70039.0954 | 74193.3184 | 4154.223 |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$ | -1.722 | 14.99 | 16.712 | 3.598 | 20.308 | 16.71 |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | 0.5699 | 2.0109 | 1.441 | 1.75 | 3.191 | 1.441 |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | -0.2978 | 1.3872 | 1.685 | 3.1804 | 4.8654 | 1.685 |
| Days to $50 \%$ flowering (days) | 1096.088 | 1106.266 | 10.178 | 6.713 | 16.891 | 10.178 |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 1117.67 | 1854.545 | 736.875 | 20185.52 | 20922.395 | 736.875 |
| Days to 50\% maturity (days) | 507.23 | 547.09 | 39.86 | 13.49 | 53.35 | 39.86 |
| Pod length plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | 0.79 | 0.93 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.29 | 0.14 |
| Number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.35 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.35 |
| Number of pods plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 7759.67 | 7900.08 | 140.41 | 11386.08 | 11526.78 | 140.7 |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | 229866.83 | 235852.78 | 5985.95 | 33.67 | 125.65 | 91.98 |
| 100-seed weight ( g ) | 43.24 | 43.71 | 0.47 | 4.85 | 5.31 | 0.46 |

the variances were 1025.235 and 1015.765 (varietal effect) and 179.693 and 170.223 (treatment effect). For seed yield, the variances were 235852.78; 229866.83 (varietal effect) and 125.65; 33.67 (treatment effect) in $M_{1}$ generation while parental generation had 3073.805; 2700.441 (varietal effect) with higher variances in treatment effect (2508.698; 2135.334). In all the traits, the environmental variances were the lowest.

## Discussion

The essence of mutation breeding is to produce superior genotypes. However, it is very possible that mutation could cause enhancement in morphological traits and seed yield in the parental generation,but transfer of these modified genes into subsequent generation may be futile. It thus suggests that trait stability is fundamental in successful mutagenesis. It should be understood that it is at the point of trait stability that superior lines will be selected for mass production and possible commercialization. An interesting scenario played out in this current report. Results from the parental generation showed trait improvement as regards plant height, number of flowers, number of pods and seed yield though days to $50 \%$ flowering and maturity increased when seeds were exposed to 4 ppm APM. Udensi et al. (2011c) reported polyploidy inducing capacity of APM on pigeon pea varieties. This notwithstanding, the type of polyploidy induced is very cardinal inasmuch as it will determine the separation pattern of the chromatids to the poles. Udensi \& Ntui (2013) observed that when the induced polyploidy is a mixoploid, it could either be a diploid+triploid $(2 n+3 n)$ or diploid+tetraploid $(2 n+4 n)$ and if tilts towards the former, there is every likelihood of aborted process as affirmed by Meng \& Finn (2002) that fertility is often poor if the hybrid is triploid, pentaploid,or an aneuploid with a chromosome number less than hexaploid. This is a confirmation of the position of Udensi et al. (2011c) on induction of possible tetraploid at this concentration. This might be the underlying factor responsible for the excellent morphological performances in our current report.

It could also be observed that there was
a reduction of days it took white "Fiofio" variety to flower ( $\sim 160$ days) as against brown "Fiofio" variety ( 183 days) while days to $50 \%$ maturity was increased in white ( $\sim 198$ days) but reduced in brown variety ( $\sim 185$ days). This discrepancy did not affect the yield in the parental generation. Obviously, it would be wise to assert that plants that first reached anthesis should also be the first to mature. However, most times it does not present itself as such. Though the mechanism underlying the phenomenon is presently unknown, it will be right to assume that the variety to reach anthesis first does not necessarily imply that the variety will mature first (Udensi et al., 2012a, b). When the $M_{1}$ seeds were planted for releasing the genetic variability through segregation and also to assess if the traits seemingly improved in the parental generation were stabilized, it was observe that number of leaves, number of flowers, number of pods, pod length, number of seeds pod-1 and seed yield were enhanced drastically, which could indicate traits stability in the $M$, generation. When the parental generation was assessed, pod length and number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ were not significantly improved, APM concentration notwithstanding. However, in the $M_{1}$ generation, these two traits were significantly improved at 4 ppm APM. This is informative as the mutagenic effect on these traits manifested on the $M_{1}$ generation. The yield improvement observed in the $M_{1}$ generation might be linked to the integral contributions of other yield related traits such as number of leaves, leaf area, number of flowers, which had influenced pod production that culminates to increase seed yield (Udensi et al., 2011a, 2012a, b). Udensi \& Ntui (2013) reported colchicine induced mutation leading to production of tetraploid (4n) and mixoploid $(2 n+4 n)$ in pigeon pea while Brisibe et al. (2011) reported same for oryzalin in Egusi melon. It is most probabl that though Udensi et al. (2011c) reported polyploidy induction at other concentration of APM other than 4 ppm, the polyploidy may have been triploid (3n) or diploidtriploid $(2 n+3 n)$, which might not be favourable for fertility This might answer why they may not have performed well morphologically.

Expectedly, increase in leaf number with broader leaf area should increase plant height,
producing more branches, leading to increase seed yield (Udensi et al., 2011a, 2012a, b,). It should be realized that production of more flowers is not a prerequisite for higher pod production. On one hand, some flowers produced may not develop into pods and on the other, since yield is polygenic in inheritance; productivity is usually linked covalently to other factors. It therefore suggest that selecting superior pigeon pea genotypes, a plant breeder should select genotypes with good biomass yield, increased number of branches, flowers, pod length, etc., and not only on yield.

There were high and wide phenotypic and genotypic variances in some morphological traits, especially those traits that are seemingly concerned with yield in this present study. This was also reported by Tyagi et al. (2000); Sarsamkar et al. (2008); Idahosa et al. (2010); Udensi et al. (2011a; 2012a). Genotypic and phenotypic variances for most traits were higher in the $M_{1}$ generations than the parental generation, which is in conformity with earlier reports of Rohman et al. (2003) and Shamin (2012) in mungbean; Makeen et al. (2007) in Vigna radiate; Farshader \& Farshader (2008) and Wani et al. (2012) in Cicer arientinum; Geeta \& Manish (2011) in soybean Generally, PV was higher than GV in almost all the traits, which according to Udensi et al. (201 la 2012a) is an indication that pigeon pea yield improvement will be done majorly through either varietal and/or treatment-based phenotypic selection of traits. Selection of important agronomic traits in pigeon pea and indeed other crops revolves on the extent of genetic variability and obviously the degree to which the traits are inherited (Udensi et al., 2012a). Undoubtedly, improving traits with very small genetic control relative to environmental influences will be difficult (Ragsdale \& Smith, 2003).

Further improvement and subsequent commercialization of any crop variety is a function of the extent of stability of traits after series of generations of mutation breeding (trials of mutant generations). It is therefore important to compare the performance of the parental and $M_{1}$ generations as to ascertain possible introgression of genes for releasing the genetic blueprint through segregation in the subsequent
generations and their stability. From our current report, it is very clear that since plant height, number of leaves, number of flowers, number of pods, number of seeds pod ${ }^{-1}$ and seed yield recorded high variances, it does suggest that additive genes were strong and traits might be tilting stability in $M_{1}$ generation, which will be seen as the segregate in the $M_{2}$ and other generations.

Since seed yield is of utmost importance in pigeon pea breeding, it does therefore suggest that all breeding technique should be geared towards improving yield if food security will be a reality in the Sub-Saharan African countries. In the parental generation, APM treatment did not significantly affect yield but in the $M$, generation, white "Fiofio" variety produced more flowers plant $^{-1}(531.4 \pm 1.53)$, pod plan ${ }^{\text {t-1 }}(267.8 \pm 1.93)$ and seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ (1344.0 $\pm 2.48$ ), especially for the 4 ppm soaked seeds. Other trait such as number of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$, number of branches plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length competed favourably with plants raised from brown Fiofio at the same concentration. This was also reported by Udensi et al. (2012d) when they irradiated pigeon pea seeds with gamma rays. Additionally, though plants raised from seeds soaked in 4 ppm APM produced 398 seeds in parental generation, the production increased exponentially in the $M_{1}$ generation to 947 seeds (from means separation tables 5 \& 8). Undoubtedly, treating pigeon pea with seeds with APM comparing the parental and $M$, generations giving the phenotypic and genotypic variances has induced positive significant variability, which are worth monitoring (Mahandjiev et al., 2001; Ciftci et al., 2006; Boureima et al., 2009).

## Conclusions

Explicitly, there were obvious positive significant effects of APM treatment on pigeon pea, especially the white fiofio variety at 4 ppm . $M_{1}$ generation progenies performed better than their parental counterparts in yield traits, including seed yield, which could indicate success in mutagenesis at least in $M_{1}$. The treatment also caused high phenotypic and genotypic variances; especially in the $M_{1}$ generation. The implication is that $M_{1}$ seeds can be advanced to $M_{2}$ generation where genetic blueprint will be released through segregation.

Table 8. Mean separation of yield and yield related morphological traits of parental lines treated with AMP in respect to the treatments

| Morphological traits | Concentration of amiprophos methyl used (ppm) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Control | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Days to seedling emergence (days) | $4.38 \pm 0.26 a$ | $4.38 \pm 0.83 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.00 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.63 \pm 0.26 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Percentage seed germination (\%) | $99.98 \pm 1.01 \mathrm{a}$ | $95.25 \pm 2.62 \mathrm{~b}$ | $96.00 \pm 2.76 \mathrm{~b}$ | $87.5 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Plant height plant ${ }^{-1}$ ( cm ) | $242.85 \pm 2.21 \mathrm{~d}$ | $261.55 \pm 2.34^{\text {b }}$ | $257.05 \pm 0.67 \mathrm{c}$ | $263.35 \pm 0.34 a$ |
| Numbers of leaves plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $310.75 \pm 1.14 \mathrm{a}$ | $289.38 \pm 1.86 \mathrm{~d}$ | $294.13 \pm 2.44 \mathrm{c}$ | 301.13 $\pm 0.91 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Number of branches plant ${ }^{1}$ | $15.5 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{ab}$ | $14.50 \pm 1.43 \mathrm{c}$ | $14.38 \pm 2.45 \mathrm{c}$ | 16.5 $\pm 0.80 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Leaf area plant ${ }^{1}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$ | $69.99 \pm 0.56 \mathrm{a}$ | $71.7 \pm 1.55 \mathrm{a}$ | $69.29 \pm 3.22 \mathrm{a}$ | $72.67 \pm 0.45 a$ |
| Internode length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $6.63 \pm 0.61 \mathrm{a}$ | $5.31 \pm 0.48 \mathrm{~b}^{\text {c }}$ | $5.10 \pm 0.21 \mathrm{bc}$ | $4.8 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Petiole length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $3.73 \pm 0.30 \mathrm{bc}^{\text {c }}$ | $3.75 \pm 0.33 \mathrm{bc}$ | $3.70 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{c}$ | $4.25 \pm 0.25 a$ |
| Days to 50\% flowering (days) | $170.38 \pm 3.12 \mathrm{~b}$ | $179.38 \pm 2.21 \mathrm{a}$ | 162.5土2.11c | 172.0 00.99 ab |
| Number of flowers plant ${ }^{1}$ | $108.63 \pm 3.21 \mathrm{bc}$ | $117.7 \pm 1.79 \mathrm{~b}$ | 120.125 $\pm 0.21 \mathrm{a}$ | $101.0 \pm 0.99 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Days to $50 \%$ maturity (days) | $192.88 \pm 3.98 \mathrm{~b}$ | $197.38 \pm 3.01$ a | 186.25+1.47c | $188 \pm 1.81 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Number of pods plant ${ }^{1}$ | $73.5 \pm 2.04^{\text {b }}$ | $79.63 \pm 0.45 a$ | $67.13 \pm 2.11 \mathrm{c}$ | $64.75 \pm 2.01 \mathrm{c}$ |
| Pod length plant ${ }^{-1}$ (cm) | $6.34 \pm 0.31^{\text {a }}$ | $6.0 \pm 0.34 \mathrm{a}$ | $5.86 \pm 0.16 \mathrm{a}$ | $6.86 \pm 0.44 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Number of seed pod ${ }^{-1}$ | $4.88 \pm 0.23{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5.0 \pm 0.21 \mathrm{a}$ | $4.88 \pm 0.35 a$ | $5.53 \pm 0.26 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Seed yield plant ${ }^{-1}$ | $361.38 \pm 1.87^{\text {b }}$ | $397.5 \pm 0.78$ a | $318.75 \pm 3.221 \mathrm{c}$ | $341.5 \pm 0.56 \mathrm{bc}$ |
| 100-seed weight (g) | $12.82 \pm 0.525^{\circ}$ | $13.60 \pm 0.52 \mathrm{a}$ | $11.95 \pm 0.39$ a | $13.38 \pm 0.53 a$ |
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