

Grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) - a potential leafy vegetable of eastern India

Kuldeep Tripathi

kdtripathi89@gmail.com

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

Shubha Kumari

ICAR-Research Complex for Eastern Region, Patna, Bihar

Ravi pamarthi

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

A Mukherjee

ICAR-Research Complex for Eastern Region, Patna, Bihar

Ramya KR

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

Rakesh Bhardwaj

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

RINKY RESMA PANDA

ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute

DP Semwal

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

KC Bhatt

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

P Viswakarma

Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK), Sitamarhi, Bihar

Raj Gautam

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

PK Singh

ICAR-National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources

Research Article

Keywords: Grasspea, exploration, collection, leaves, Garrett ranking, organoleptic

Posted Date: March 11th, 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4008498/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) locally known as “*Khesari*” was extensively cultivated in Eastern parts of India i.e. Eastern U.P, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal. This study focuses on the exploration, collection, and survey of grasspea as leafy vegetable with the aim of revitalizing traditional knowledge for practical applications. The data on collected grasspea samples (46 accessions) from five germplasm expedition missions were presented in the study. These were subjected to garret ranking and biochemical profiling along with organoleptic evaluation. The findings of the study elucidated that the preference of grasspea consumption in the descending order: leafy vegetable > pulse > fodder > by-products/ processed product. The nutritional profiling of leaves of selected accessions of grasspea were assessed for proximate parameters. This comprehensive study provides valuable insights into use and preferences associated with grasspea consumption in Eastern India, paving the way for practical applications and the revival of traditional knowledge.

Introduction

Green leafy vegetables have attracted global attention due to their significant role in promoting a healthy diet and offering various health benefits to humans. Vegetables are commonly referred to as “protective foods” in the human diet because of their diverse health advantages, stemming from their abundance in vitamins, essential fatty acids, minerals, amino acids, dietary fibre, and various essential bioactive compounds. Plants serve as primary sources of numerous bioactive compounds collectively known as phytochemicals, which are recognized as crucial for maintaining good health (Grusak et al. 1999; Dias, 2012). Phytochemicals can be broadly categorized as nutritional components, including essential fatty acids, proteins, vitamins, minerals, and phenolic compounds. Leafy vegetables stand out for their high mineral content, particularly iron and calcium, surpassing that of staple food grains. Their low caloric value makes them an ideal choice for weight management (Torres et al. 2014). Encouraging the consumption, cultivation, and potentially commercialization of these leafy vegetables is therefore recommended. Additionally, leafy vegetables are natural sources of folic acid, essential for the multiplication and maturation of red blood cells (Gopalan et al. 2004). The World Health Organization/Food and Agriculture Organization (WHO/FAO) published a report in 2003 recommending a minimum daily intake of 400g of fruits and vegetables (excluding potatoes and other starchy tubers) to prevent chronic diseases such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes, and obesity, as well as to address micronutrient deficiencies (Lee et al. 2016; Healthy diet factsheet, WHO, 2024). The dietary guidelines for Americans suggest five servings of vegetables per day, with one of those servings specifically emphasizing green leafy vegetables HHS/USDA, 2015 (Natesh et al. 2017). Incorporating these green leafy vegetables into daily diets may help fulfil the daily requirements of essential nutrients, particularly for individuals with marginal nutritional status. The nutritional composition varies among genera and species of different edible leafy vegetables. Currently, underutilized foods are gaining importance as a means to enhance per capita food availability (Gopalan et al. 2004; Edleman and Colt, 2016). In nature, numerous underutilized greens with promising nutritive value exist, and one such example is grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) as a source of green leafy vegetable. India, with its diverse natural surroundings, varying climates, and seasons, boasts a variety of leafy vegetable species. Commonly consumed leafy vegetables include spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*), amaranth (*Amaranthus gangeticus*, *A. viridis*), fenugreek (*Trigonella foenum graecum*), drumstick (*Moringa oleifera*), kangkong (*Ipomea aquatica*), mustard (*B. juncea* var. *rugosa*), jute (*Corchorus olitorius*), bathua/pigweed (*Chenopodium album*), among others. These greens are not only affordable and high-yielding but also integral to the local diet, often readily available. Grasspea is one of the oldest cultivated crops, with a long history of domestication (Smartt, 1984). The origin of the crop dates back to archaeological excavations in Turkey and Iraq (Jackson and Yunus, 1984; Lambein et al. 2019); oldest excavations in India of 2500 BC and 8000 BC in the Balkans (Kislev, 1989; Saraswat, 1980; Tripathi et al. 2021). Grasspea is cultivated in northern states of India especially in central and eastern regions for both as pulse and green leafy (Mehra et al. 1995). Grasspea is the climate smart crop used for both food and feed, requires minimal inputs, having ratooning capacity, used in conservation agriculture and also in pharmaceutical industries thereby act as an insurance crop to the marginal farmers (Ramya et al. 2022). It is considered as one of the profitable crops than *boro* or summer rice in West Bengal (Tripathi et al. 2022). The use of grasspea as a pulse has been well documented, its potential as a leafy vegetable has received less attention. The leaves of grasspea are a rich source of protein, vitamins, minerals and can be used as a fresh vegetable or as an ingredient in soups, stews, and other dishes. The young leaves and pre-flowering shoots of grasspea are consumed as leafy vegetable in Bangladesh (Arora et al. 1996). Usually, the tender young shoots of grasspea at pre-flowering stage sold as a green leafy vegetable in West Bengal (Tripathi et al. 2022). The straw and residual biomass from grasspea production can be used as animal feed, providing a valuable source of protein and energy for animals. The rolled and dried leaves of grasspea are also used as off-season vegetable due to its delicacy (Bharathi and Neupane (1989); Tripathi et al. 2022). This present study discusses the collection and documentation of grasspea about its leaves in addressing food, nutritional security and dietary diversity of the people of the eastern parts of India and aim to evaluate the nutritional value of grasspea and their potential impact on the preference of consumption over other green leafy vegetable.

Materials and methods

Study area and exploration

The exploration trips were planned and conducted in the eastern part of India i.e., Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal where grasspea is cultivated since longtime. The multi-crop explorations were undertaken in collaborative mode with crop-based institutes/ State Agricultural Universities (SAU's) / Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK's) during 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and collected around 46 accessions from Bihar (Nawada, Banka, Kaimur, Rohtas, Bhojpur, Buxar, Sitamarhi, Darbhanga and Saharsa) and West Bengal (Paschim Medinipur, Purba Medinipur, Murshidabad). The diversity distribution pattern, cultivation status and frequency of use were also surveyed through fields, local mandi/markets, kitchen gardens and backyards/homesteads. The passport data was collected which includes the details of state, district, village, latitude (N) and longitude (E). The number of accessions collected in different areas and years are given in the Table 1.

Table 1
List of explorations conducted for augmenting *Lathyrus* germplasm

S. no.	Year	Site of collection	No. of accessions collected	Institute involved
1	2020	East Medinipur, West Medinipur and Mushidabad (West Bengal)	21	(Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya) BCKV Mohanpur, West Bengal
2	2021	Nawada and Banka (Bihar)	04	KVK, Nawada, Banka, Bihar
3	2021	Saharsa (Bihar)	02	KVK, Saharsa, Bihar
4	2021	Bhojpur, Buxar, Kaimur and Rohtas (Bihar)	08	KVK, Rohtas, Kaimur
5	2022	Darbhanga, Madhubani and Sitamarhi (Bihar)	11	KVK, Jale, Darbhanga, Sitamarhi, Bihar

In order to know the diversity distribution pattern, DIVA-GIS software version 7.5 (www.diva-gis.org) was used to generate the potential distribution map (Hijmans et al. 2001). DIVA-GIS software version 7.5, freely downloadable software from www.diva-gis.org was used to generate the potential distribution map. Grasspea germplasm collection sites in the parts of Bihar and West Bengal states (red colour) in the present study and the regions where it has been collected already and conserved in ICAR-NBPGR national genebank (NGB) are given in the Fig. 1.

Garret ranking technique

Garret ranking technique was used to rank the preferences for grasspea consumption among local consumers. The Garret ranks were calculated using the appropriate formula, and the Garret value was then determined. The Garret tables and scores for each problem in the table were multiplied and added row-wise to obtain the total Garret score.

$$\text{Per cent position} = \frac{100(R_{ij} - 0.5)}{N_j}$$

Where R_{ij} represents the rank given to the i^{th} variable by the j^{th} respondent, and N_j is the number of variables ranked by the j^{th} respondent. The per cent positions were then converted into scores using the Garrett table provided by Garret and Woodworth (1969). The scores for each individual were then added for each factor, and the total and mean values were calculated. The factor with the highest mean value was considered the most important.

Biochemical profiling

The preliminary biochemical analysis was done for the selected accessions namely IC0634659, IC0634654, IC0634666, IC0634662, IC0634674, IC0634754 for proximate components along with β -ODAP estimation. The nutritional composition of the leaves were determined using the standard methods viz. moisture (AOAC 934.01), protein (AOAC 2001.11), total soluble sugar (Anthrone reagent method) and total dietary fibre by AOAC Official Method 985.29 and mineral estimation (Iron, Copper, Zinc, Calcium and Magnesium) by AAS (Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy) as per (AOAC) method 999.11 and β -ODAP (β -N-oxalyl-L- α,β -diaminopropionic acid) estimation by UPLC (Ultra-performance liquid chromatography) as per Fikre et al. (2008).

Results and Discussion

Grasspea leaves have the potential to play an important role in contributing to improved food security and sustainable agriculture in several ways. Grasspea leaves are a nutrient-dense vegetable that is high in protein, fibre, and essential vitamins and minerals. By including grasspea leaves in the diet, people can increase their intake of important nutrients, which can help to improve their health and wellbeing. Grasspea is a drought-tolerant crop that can be grown in areas with low rainfall and poor soil quality. The stems of this plant are four-angled (quadrangular) which are very thin, featuring winged edges. Leaves arranged in a pinnately opposite to each other and consist of two or three pairs of lanceolate leaflets, culminating in a single or branching tendril. These leaflets are sessile, whole, and wedge-shaped at the base, tapering to an acuminate point at the top. The stipules take on a triangular to oval shape with a basal appendage. Farmers commonly sell the tender leaves and branches of the grasspea in markets in India and Bangladesh (Ramya et al. 2022). By growing grasspea and utilizing leaves, farmers can produce a nutritious crop that is well-suited to the local growing conditions, without requiring extensive irrigation or fertilization. As a drought-tolerant crop, grasspea leaves can help to build resilience to climate change, which is causing more frequent and severe droughts in many parts of the world. By growing grasspea leaves, farmers can adapt to the changing climate and continue to produce food in challenging conditions. Growing grasspea leaves can provide an important source of income for farmers, especially in areas where other crops may not grow well. By diversifying their crops and selling grasspea leaves in local markets, farmers can improve their livelihoods and contribute to the local economy.

Exploration and collection

A total of about 144 accessions of grasspea from the eastern parts of India were conserved in the National Genebank, ICAR-NBPGR, New Delhi (accessed PGR portal, 2023). The diversity and distribution of these accessions across the areas of study and methods of use by the communities were also recorded. Geo-referenced maps were prepared using WGS84 datum and Everest projection systems (Semwal et al. 2018). The field view of grasspea in West Bengal (west Medinipur) and Bihar (Madhubani) are given in the Fig. 2

The passport data of 46 collected grasspea accessions were given in the Table 2. The variability in grasspea leaves is given in the Fig. 3. In general, they fetch a good income generation which fetches Rs.150–220/kg. Sometimes farmers sell their produce to local vendors in markets @ Rs. 80–90/kg to avoid the transport charges. During the survey, it was observed that local people also prefer mostly grasspea leaves than other seasonal leafy vegetables. Additionally,

leaves are used in some traditional medicine systems for their various health benefits. The comparative table of nutritional aspects of grasspea are also depicted in the Table 3.

Table.2. Grasspea germplasm collection sites from the eastern India

S. No.	Accession/ Collection no.	Village	Mandal	District	State Name	Lat	Long
1	648849	Sukhnar	Kawakol	Nawada	Bihar	24.660	85.340
2	DPS/PKK-22-46	Giddha	Belhar	Banka	Bihar	24.890	86.600
3	648858	Uprama	Rajoun	Banka	Bihar	24.990	86.960
4	648860	Kaitha	Rajoun	Banka	Bihar	25.060	86.950
5	DP/SC/21 – 20	Alipur	Ramgarh	Kaimur	Bihar	25.30	83.69
6	641907	Sadallapur	Ramgarh	Kaimur	Bihar	25.27	83.70
7	641908	Panjrawn	Nuaon	Kaimur	Bihar	25.38	83.78
8	641909	Mokar	Sasaram	Rohtas	Bihar	25.01	84.03
9	641913	Karmainikhurd	Dinara	Rohtas	Bihar	25.22	84.18
10	641918	Nathupur	Kudra	Kaimur	Bihar	25.07	83.75
11	DP/SC/21 – 18	Fatehpur	Itarhi	Bhojpur	Bihar	25.290	84.443
12	DP/SC/21–32	Dhansoi	Rajpur	Buxar	Bihar	25.488	84.010
13	IC0470973	Premnagar	Sitamarhi	Sitamarhi	Bihar	26.59	85.54
14	IC0470975	Basatpur	Sonbarsa	Sitamarhi	Bihar	26.65	85.66
15	IC0470976	Ramnagar	Bathana	Sitamarhi	Bihar	26.58	85.45
16	IC0470977	Piprarhi	Bajpatti	Sitamarhi	Bihar	26.56	85.64
17	IC0470978	Birakh	Sursand	Sitamarhi	Bihar	26.61	85.71
18	IC0470979	Sukhet	Jhanjharpur	Madhubani	Bihar	26.23	86.32
19	IC0470980	Berma	Lakhsaur	Madhubani	Bihar	26.26	86.32
20	IC0470981	Bullipatti	Jaynagar	Madhubani	Bihar	26.45	86.26
21	IC0470982	Samdhinia	Jale	Darbhanga	Bihar	25.96	86.23
22	IC0470983	Kortho	Ghanshyampur	Darbhanga	Bihar	26.03	86.34
23	IC0470984	Baika	Tardih	Darbhanga	Bihar	26.15	86.25
24	643774	Hempur	Nohatta	Saharsha	Bihar	26.02	86.49
25	643777	Barahsher	Satarkataiya	Saharsha	Bihar	25.99	86.55
26	634654	Baragrah	Debra	Paschim Medinipur	West Bengal	22.23	87.3400
27	KT/2020/16	Bhagwanpur	Debra	Paschim Medinipur	West Bengal	22.2900	87.3500
28	KT/2020/21	Radhakantapur	Debra	Paschim Medinipur	West Bengal	22.4500	87.3800
29	634655	Kamargeria	Naraingarh	Paschim Medinipur	West Bengal	22.6000	87.2300
30	634656	Horekhali	Sutahata	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	22.7000	88.9000
31	634657	Begunaberia	Sutahata	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	22.7000	88.9000
32	634658	Masuria	Mahishadal	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	22.9000	88.1000
33	634659	Chandipur	Mahishadal	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	22.8000	87.5900
34	634660	Subdi	Nandigram II	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.8800	87.5200
35	634661	Subdi	Nandigram II	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.8800	87.5200
36	634662	Sonachura	Nandigram I	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.7900	87.5800
37	634663	Soudkhali	Nandigram I	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.7900	87.5900
38	634664	Katkadevi Chak	Khejuri II	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.7500	87.5200
39	634665	Deshduttapur	Contai I	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.8200	87.4600
40	634666	Dholgada	Egra II	Purba Medinipur	West Bengal	21.9400	87.4000
41	634667	Galadaria	Jalangi	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.1100	88.4200
42	634669	Ahiran	Suti-I	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.3100	88.1000

S. No.	Accession/ Collection no.	Village	Mandal	District	State Name	Lat	Long
43	634670	Harua	Suti-I	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.3100	87.5900
44	634672	Kasim Nagar	Suti II	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.3700	87.5900
45	634673	Gohalbari	Farakka	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.4400	87.5400
46	634674	Jamalpur	Raninagar II	Murshidabad	West Bengal	24.2200	88.5400

Table.3. Comparative table of nutritional profile of grasspea with other leafy vegetables

Nutritional Parameters	Major Leafy Vegetables					
	Grasspea	Kangkong	Mustard	Jute	Amaranthus	Pigweed
Protein (%)	28.42	23.6–27.6 (Adedokun et al. 2019)	18.58–33.38 (Pant et al. 2020; Bhandari et al. 2021; Priyanka et al. 2021; Tiwari, 2023)	12.54 ± 0.10–16.26 ± 0.34 * (Ndlovu and Afolayan, 2008; IDRIS et al. 2009)	11.59–29.06 (Andini et al. 2013; Pathan et al. 2019)	27.84 ± 0.36–37.05 (Pathan et al. 2019; Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Fibre (TDF) (%)	20.41	5.40 ± 0.20 -17.67 ± 0.35% (Umar et al. 2007; Shariff et al. 2019)	3.20 (Paula Filho et al. 2018)	2.03 ± 0.1 * (Ndlovu and Afolayan, 2008)	14.04 ± 0.35* (Umar et al. 2011)	36.37 ± 2.34 (Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Moisture (%)	13.84	4.75 (Adedokun et al. 2019)	68 to 88# (Pant et al. 2020)	7.48 ± 1.36 (Traoré et al. 2017)	7.38 ± 3.84 (Traoré et al. 2017)	5.23 ± 0.17 (Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Ash (%)	8.81	10.83 ± 0.80 (Umar et al. 2007)	10.94–15.48 (Pant et al. 2020)	18.38 ± 0.32 (IDRIS et al. 2009)	16.43–21.05 ± 0.30 (Kachiguma et al. 2015; Umar et al. 2011)	2.1–20.0 (Pathan et al. 2019; Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Calcium (mg/100 g)	156.544	416.70 ± 5.77 (Umar et al. 2007)	123.25–240 (Paula Filho et al. 2018; Pant et al. 2020)	30.55 ± 0.05 to 1650 ± 0.83 (Zeghichi et al. 2003; IDRIS et al. 2009)	110.67–1483 (Umar et al. 2011; Kachiguma et al. 2015; Kambabazi et al. 2021)	147–1535.0 (Yadav et al. 2018; Pathan et al. 2019; Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Iron (mg/100 g)	52.101	210.30 ± 2.47 (Umar et al. 2007)	30.56–37.52 (Priyanka et al. 2021; Bhandari et al. 2021)	19.53 ± 0.09 to 55.9 ± 3.22 (Zeghichi et al. 2003; IDRIS et al. 2009)	19.82 to 419 ± 68.81 (Umar et al. 2011; Kachiguma et al. 2015; Kambabazi et al. 2021)	7.6 to 148 (Yadav et al. 2018; Pathan et al. 2019)
Copper (mg/100 g)	1.125	0.36 ± 0.01 (Umar et al. 2007)	45.2 to 48.9 (Kumar et al. 2017)	2.52 ± 0.02 to 22.5 ± 1.74 (Zeghichi et al. 2003; IDRIS et al. 2009)	2.87 ± 1.23 (Umar et al. 2011)	1.0–1.12 (Pathan et al. 2019)
Magnesium (mg/100 g)	295.589	301.64 ± 12.69 (Umar et al. 2019)	26.82 (Paula Filho et al. 2018)	76.69 ± 0.13 to 340 ± 1.11 (Zeghichi et al. 2003; IDRIS et al. 2009)	40.3.13 ± 34.27 to 462 (Umar et al. 2011; Kachiguma et al. 2015)	2.26 ± 0.23 to 902.0 (Pathan et al. 2019; Villacrés, et al. 2022)
Zinc (mg/100 g)	5.271	2.47 ± 0.27 (Umar et al. 2007)	5.73 to 5.83 (Bhandari et al. 2021; Priyanka et al. 2021)	4.71 ± 0.01 to 11.2 ± 0.57 (Zeghichi et al. 2003; IDRIS et al. 2009)	1.30 ± 0.70 to 1.76 (Umar et al. 2011; Kachiguma et al. 2015)	1.3 to 9.8 (Yadav et al. 2018; Pathan et al. 2019)
Note: # wet basis, * crude fibre/ protein						

Garrett ranking technique

The preference ranking for grasspea consumption by the farmers of Bihar and West Bengal was calculated by combining incomplete order of merit ranking, as suggested by Garrett et al. (1969). The respondents were asked to rank their grasspea preferences for uses like leafy vegetable, use as pulse, use as powder/pakora/other snacks item and use as fodder (Table 4). Grasspea cultivation is a source of income to smallholder farmers, where they can sell grasspea leaves in local markets or to processors who can pack and distribute them to wider markets. The findings of the study elucidated that the preference of grasspea consumption in the order are, in descending order: leafy vegetable > pulse > fodder > by-products. The more preference for grasspea as a leafy vegetable can be attributed to its high nutrition and other traditional uses. However, the lower preference for grasspea by-products suggests the need for more innovative ways to promote its utilization and create value addition.

Table 4
Preference ranking for grasspea consumption by the consumers of Eastern states of India (n = 50)

S.N.	Preferences	Garret Score	72	56	43	28	Total	Average	Rank
		Rank frequency	1	2	3	4			
1	Bihar								
A	Northern Bihar (n = 15)								
a	Leafy vegetable		7	7	0	1	924	61.6	I
b	Pulse		6	5	4	0	884	58.93	II
c	By-product (Powder/Pakoda/other snacks item)		0	2	7	6	581	38.73	IV
d	Fodder		2	1	4	8	596	39.73	III
B	Southern Bihar (n = 14)								
a	Leafy vegetable		13	1	0	0	992	70.85	I
b	Pulse		1	12	1	0	787	56.21	II
c	By-product (Powder/Pakoda/other snacks item)		0	1	0	13	420	30	IV
d	Fodder		0	1	12	1	600	42.85	III
2	West Bengal (n = 21)								
a	Leafy vegetable		7	13	1	0	1275	60.71	II
b	Pulse		10	8	3	0	1297	61.76	I
c	By-product (Powder/Pakoda/other snacks item)		0	0	1	20	603	28.71	IV
d	Fodder		4	0	16	1	1004	47.80	III
3	Pooled								
a	Leafy vegetable		27	21	1	1	3191	63.82	I
b	Pulse		17	25	8	0	2968	59.36	II
c	By-product (Powder/Pakoda/other snacks item)		0	3	8	39	1604	32.08	IV
d	Fodder		6	2	32	10	2200	44	III

Grasspea was predominantly favoured as a leafy vegetable in northern Bihar with a Garrett's ranking scores of 61.6 and 70.85 in southern Bihar and as a pulse in West Bengal with a ranking score of 61.76, which was very closely matched by its ranking as a leafy vegetable at 60.71. Notably, no significant difference in ranking was observed between the northern and southern regions of Bihar, despite their distinct agro ecological characteristics.

Organoleptic assessment and biochemical profiling

The leaves were harvested at 50–60 days after sowing, specifically during the pre-flowering stage, and were subsequently used for cooking and sensory evaluation. The assessment involves 20 participants, including individuals from diverse backgrounds such as scientists, students, project assistants, and daily wage labourers and the information was recorded through structured/ semi-structured questionnaire method. The consensus among this group was that the taste of khesari as leafy vegetable (*L. sativus*) was greatly preferred over other available saag during that season, including karamua (*Ipomea aquatica*), mustard leaves, patsan (*Corchorus olitorius*), amaranthus and bathua (*Chenopodium album*). The feedback and recommendations from the individuals under study further validated the suitability of Khesari saag as a green leafy vegetable. The sensory (organoleptic) assessment has confirmed that the knowledge regarding the utilization of leaves as *saag* and the preparation of dishes from them may have been passed down through generations within traditional culture by trial-and-error approach (Pandey et al. 2019). The preference for grasspea as a leafy vegetable is consistent with its high nutritional value, as it is a good source of protein, iron, and other essential nutrients (Bogale et al. 2015). The use of grasspea as a pulse is also popular due to its unique taste and versatility in various dishes (Sarker et al. 2018). The preliminary biochemical analysis of grasspea leaves showed the higher nutritional value of the crop and the values are given in the table 5. The nutritional profiling of grasspea for its leaves as follows: protein content ranged from 26.49 to 31.47%; sugar – 3.07 to 4.61%; phenols – 0.42 to 0.5%; TDF- 16.35 to 24.69%; Moisture – 11.90 to 15.60%; ash content- 7.38 to 11.31% and β -ODAP ranged from 0.034 mg/kg and the minerals values are given in the Table 4 which is expressed in mg/100g.

Table 4
Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) of proximate parameters of grasspea leaves

Acc. no	Protein (%)	Sugar (%)	Phenol (%)	TDF (%)	Moisture (%)	Ash (%)	Cu (mg/100g)	Fe (mg/100g)	Zn (mg/100g)	Ca (mg/100g)	Mg (mg/100g)
IC0634659	26.4900 ^a	3.0567 ^a	.4200 ^a	16.3500 ^a	11.9033 ^a	7.3767 ^a	0.98067 ^a	37.24767 ^a	3.89400 ^a	84.25067 ^a	252.557
IC0634654	27.2933 ^{ab}	3.3067 ^{ab}	.4267 ^a	17.4833 ^a	13.2700 ^{ab}	7.6700 ^a	1.08733 ^b	51.13900 ^b	4.87267 ^b	91.92800 ^b	253.167
IC0634666	27.5033 ^{ab}	3.5800 ^{bc}	.4733 ^a	17.4933 ^a	13.3600 ^{ab}	7.8433 ^a	1.10333 ^b	51.77600 ^b	5.05967 ^c	106.56700 ^c	291.169
IC0634662	28.3600 ^{ab}	4.0367 ^{cd}	.4900 ^a	23.2033 ^b	13.9167 ^{bc}	8.2167 ^a	1.11167 ^b	53.95667 ^{bc}	5.56033 ^d	173.32600 ^d	293.541
IC0634674	29.3933 ^b	4.2400 ^{de}	.4933 ^a	23.2233 ^b	15.0133 ^{bc}	10.4367 ^b	1.20600 ^c	56.21867 ^c	5.94867 ^e	223.78100 ^e	312.909
IC0634754	31.4700 ^c	4.6133 ^e	.5000 ^a	24.6867 ^b	15.6033 ^c	11.3100 ^b	1.26033 ^c	62.26933 ^d	6.28967 ^f	259.40933 ^f	370.188

Similarly, the parameters like sugar, zinc, calcium showed significant difference with each other and each fall into different groups. Parameters like TDF, moisture, ash, copper, iron and magnesium showed significant difference between the accessions and falls into a group of 2, 4, 2, 3, 5, 4 respectively. The phenol content doesn't show any significant difference with each other and all the accessions were grouped together in a single group. The biochemical analysis highlighted that grasspea leaves contain high amount of protein and other proximate components and of less β -ODAP in its leaves. However, β -ODAP need to be validated over the years and locations.

Conclusion

The research findings highlighted the widespread preference for grasspea as a green leafy vegetable in the Eastern states of India. The traditional use of grasspea as a leafy vegetable provide a foundation for the development of research, policies and strategies to promote grasspea cultivation and consumption, ultimately enhancing nutritional security. It also underscores the importance of understanding local preferences and the need to promote crop diversification to ensure food and nutrition security in the face of climate change and other challenges. The extensive studies are required to validate the greater number of accessions from national genebank for nutritional parameters in view of reported use as pulses, vegetables, confectionaries and fodder. The exploratory traits, cultivation technology, package of practices to be developed for this leafy vegetable. A high yielding grasspea with superior nutritional quality as green leafy vegetable can be a boon for farmers of eastern India. A smart value addition and processing technology, strengthening the linkage can also help in, promoting and upliftment of this crop.

Declarations

Conflict of interest

Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest on the content of the manuscript and study undertaken

Author Contribution

K.T. and K.S. wrote the main manuscript text; K.T., R.P. and P.V. conducted exploration; A.M. did Garret ranking; R.K. and R.B. did nutritional analysis; R.R. prepared figures; D.S. prepared map; K.B. and P.S. provided passport data of germplasm expeditions and K.T. and R.G. reviewed and did final editing. All authors reviewed the manuscript."

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the Director, ICAR-NBPGR, New Delhi for continued support and logistic facilities for the present study.

References

- Adedokun, M. A., Ogundiran, M. A., & Alatis, S. P. (2019). Preliminary assessment of water spinach (*Ipomoea aquatica*) and morning glory (*Ipomoea asarifolia*) leaves meals as non-conventional fish feed stuffs. *Int J Fish Aquat Stud*, 7(5), 446-450.
- Andini, R., Yoshida, S., & Ohsawa, R. (2013). Variation in protein content and amino acids in the leaves of grain, vegetable and weedy types of amaranths. *Agronomy*, 3(2), 391-403.
- AOAC G (2016) Official methods of analysis of AOAC International. Rockville, MD: AOAC International, ISBN: 978-0-935584-87-5
- Bhandari, D., Singh, A., & Ghosh, S. (2021). Nutraceuical Profile for Genetic Diversity Assessment in Leafy Mustard (*Brassica juncea* var. *rugosa*) Genotypes. *Indian Journal of Plant Genetic Resources*, 34(02), 295-300.
- Bharati M P & Neupane R K, *Lathyrus sativus* cultivation and screening of germplasm in Nepal, In: *The Grass Pea: Threat and Promise*, Proc of the International Network for the Improvement of *Lathyrus sativus* and the Eradication of Lathyrism (P. Spencer), (Third World Medical Research Foundation,

- New York), 1989, p. 159-167.
6. Bogale A, Shimelis H, Tadesse T, Silim S (2015) Genetic diversity and population structure of Ethiopian grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) accessions. BMC genetics, 16(1), 107
 7. Campbell, Clayton G (1997) Grass pea. *Lathyrus sativus* L. Promoting the conservation and use of underutilized and neglected crops. 18. Institute of Plant Genetics and Crop Plant Research, Gatersleben/International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, Rome, Italy
 8. Castorena Torres F, Ramos Parra PA, Hernández Méndez RV, Vargas García A, García Rivas G, et al. (2014) Natural folates from biofortified tomato and synthetic 5-methyl-tetrahydrofolate display equivalent bioavailability in a murine model. Plant Foods Hum Nutr 69(1): 57-64.
 9. Dias JS, Major classes of phytonutriceuticals in vegetables and health benefits: A review. Journal of Nutritional Therapeutics. 2012; 1(1):31-62.
 10. Edelman M, Colt M. Nutrient value of leaf vs. seed. Front Chem. 2016; 4:1-32.
 11. Fikadu A, Tsegay G, Negesse T (2020) Livestock feed resources and challenges in Ethiopia: A review. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 15(1), 1-12
 12. Fikre A, Korbu L, Kuo YH, Lambein F (2008) The contents of the neuro-excitatory amino acid β -ODAP (β -N-oxalyl-L- α , β -diaminopropionic acid), and other free and protein amino acids in the seeds of different genotypes of grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.). Food Chemistry. 110(2):422-7
 13. Garret HE, Woodworth RS (1969) Statistics in Psychology and Education. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd, 329
 14. Gopalan C, Sastri R, Balasubramanian SC. Nutritive value of Indian foods. National Institute of Nutrition, ICMR, Hyderabad, 2004, 52.
 15. Grusak MA, Della Penna D. Improving the nutrient composition of plants to enhance human nutrition and health. Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mol Biol. 1999; 50(1):133-161
 16. Hijmans, RJ, Guarino L, Cruz, M, Rojas E (2001) Computer tools for spatial analysis of plant genetic resources data: 1. DIVA-GIS. *Plant Genet. Resour. News Lett.* 127: 15-19
 17. <http://genebank.nbgr.ernet.in/SeedBank/Default.aspx> NGB Database (2023) Genebank Database, (accessed on 01st October, 2023)
 18. Idris S, Yisa J, Ndamitso MM (2009) Nutritional composition of *Corchorus olitorius* leaves 5 (2) (D.O.I: 10.4314/apra. v5i2.49827)
 19. Jackson MT, Yunus AG (1984) Variation in the grass pea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) and wild species. Euphytica. 33:549–59. doi: 10.1007/BF0002 1156
 20. Kachiguma, N. A., Mwase, W., Maliro, M., & Damaliphetsa, A. (2015). Chemical and mineral composition of amaranth (*Amaranthus* L.) species collected from central Malawi. Journal of Food Research, 4(4), 92.
 21. Kambabazi, M. R., Okoth, M. W., Ngala, S., Njue, L., & Vasanthakalam, H. (2021). Evaluation of nutrient content in red kidney beans, amaranth leaves, sweet potato roots and carrots cultivated in Rwanda. African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development, 21(4), 17801-17814.
 22. Kumar S, Gupta P, Barpete S, Choukri H, Maalouf F, Sarkar A (2020) "Grass pea": the beans and the peas, from orphan to mainstream crops. In: Pratap A, Gupta S, editors. Sawston: The Beans and the Peas, Woodhead Publishing p. 273–287
 23. Kumar, M., Kumar, V., Kumar, R., & Pratap, R. (2017). Correlation between soil nutrient and plant nutrient concentration in mustard. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 6(4), 751-754. (as a whole plant)
 24. Kumar, M., Kumar, V., Kumar, R., & Pratap, R. (2017). Correlation between soil nutrient and plant nutrient concentration in mustard. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 6(4), 751-754.
 25. Lambein F, Travella S, Kuo YH, Montagu MV, Heijde M (2019) Grass pea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.): orphan crop, nutraceutical or just plain food. Planta. 250:821–38. doi: 10.1007/s00425-018-03084-0
 26. Longvah T, Anantan I, Bhaskarachary K, Venkaiah K, Longvah T (2017) Indian food composition tables. Hyderabad: National Institute of Nutrition, Indian Council of Medical Research
 27. Mehra RB, Raju DB, Himabindu K (1995) Evaluation and Utilization of *Lathyrus sativus* collection in India. In; Arora, R.K, P.N. Mathur, K.W. Riley and Y. Adham, editors. *Lathyrus Genetic Resources on Asia: Proceedings of a Regional Workshop, 27-29 December 1995*, Indira Gandhi Agricultural University, Raipur, India. IPGRI Office for South Asia, New Delhi, India. 168p
 28. Mukherjee PK, Maity N, Nema NK, Sarkar BK (2012) Phytochemical and therapeutic potential of *Lathyrus sativus* L. Current drug discovery technologies, 9(3), 191-199
 29. Mukherjee A, Bahal R, Burman RR, Dubey SK, Jha GK (2012) Constraints in privatised agricultural technology delivery system of tata kisan sansar. Journal of Global Communication. 5(2):155-9
 30. Ndlovu, J., & Afolayan, A. J. (2008). Nutritional analysis of the South African wild vegetable *Corchorus olitorius* L. Asian J. Plant Sci, 7(6), 615-618.
 31. Palmer VS, Kaul AK, Spencer PS (1989) International Network for the Improvement of *Lathyrus sativus* and the Eradication of Lathyrism (INILSEL): A TWIMRF initiative. Pp. 219-223 in The Grass Pea: Threat and Promise. Proc. of the International Network for the Improvement of *Lathyrus sativus* and the Eradication of Lathyrism (P. Spencer, ed.). Third World Medical Research Foundation, New York
 32. Pant, U., Bhajan, R., Singh, A., Kulshrestha, K., Singh, A. K., & Punetha, H. (2020). Green leafy mustard: A healthy alternative. Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding, 11(01), 267-270.
 33. Pathan, S., Eivazi, F., Valliyodan, B., Paul, K., Ndunguru, G., & Clark, K. (2019). Nutritional composition of the green leaves of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.). Journal of Food Research, 8(6), 55-65.
 34. Paula Filho, G. X., Barreira, T. F., Santos, R. H., Priore, S. E., Della Lucia, C. M., & Pinheiro-Sant'Ana, H. M. (2018). Composição química, carotenoides, vitaminas e minerais em mostrada silvestre coletada em ambiente silvestre. Horticultura Brasileira, 36, 59-65.
 35. Priyanka, M. R., Singh, A., Rawat, S., & Bhardwaj, S. B. (2021). Estimation of nutritional potential in leafy mustard (*Brassica juncea* var. rugosa) germplasm: Chemical characterization. IJCS, 9(1), 2439-2444.

36. Ramya KR, Tripathi K, Pandey A, Barpete S, Gore PG, Raina AP, Khawar KM, Swain N, Sarker A (2022) Rediscovering the potential of multifaceted orphan legume Grasspea-a sustainable resource with high nutritional values. *Frontiers in Nutrition*. 23;8:826208
37. Sarker A, Islam MS, Rana MS, AliMS (2018) Nutritional and anti-nutritional properties of grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) grown in Bangladesh. *Journal of food science and technology*, 55(5), 1988-1997
38. Sarwar CDM, Malek MA, Sarker A, Hassan MS (1996) Genetic Resources of Grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) in Bangladesh. In; Arora, R.K, P.N. Mathur, K.W. Riley and Y.Adham, editors. *Lathyrus Genetic Resources on Asia: Proceedings of a Regional Workshop, 27-29 December 1995*, Indira Gandhi Agricultural University, Raipur, India. IPGRI Office for South Asia, New Delhi, India. 168p
39. Semwal DP, SP Ahlawat and K Pradheep (2018) Pigeonpea [*Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millsp.] and its wild spp. germplasm collection status, diversity distribution and trait-specific germplasm mapping using GIS tools in India. *Legume Res*. 41(5) 2018: 656-662
40. Shariff, A. H. M., Shapiai, N. A., Zakaria, M., Akanda, J. M. H., Noor, N. Q. I. M., Yusop, M. H. M., & Razali, U. H. M. (2019, September). Proximate compositions of Ipomea aquatic Forsk.(leaf, petiole and stem) from Lubok Bungor, Jeli, Kelantan. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2155, No. 1). AIP Publishing.
41. Shiferaw E, Pe ME, Porceddu E, Ponnaiah M (2012) Exploring the genetic diversity of Ethiopian grass pea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) using EST-SSR markers) *Mol Breeding*. 30:789–797 DOI 10.1007/s11032-011-9662-y
42. Singh IP, Chandel KPS (1995). *Lathyrus* germplasm resources at NBPGR, India: Introduction and Evaluation. In: Arora, R.K, P.N. Mathur, K.W. Riley and Y.Adham, editors. *Lathyrus Genetic Resources on Asia: Proceedings of a Regional Workshop, 27-29 December 1995*, Indira Gandhi Agricultural University, Raipur, India. IPGRI Office for South Asia, New Delhi, India. 168p
43. Smartt J. (1984) Evolution of grain legumes. I. Mediterranean pulses. *Experimental Agriculture*. 20(4):275-96
44. Tiwari, A. (2023). FORMULATION OF LITO WITH MUSTARD GREEN LEAVES (*Brassica juncea* L.) (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Nutrition & Dietetics Central Campus of Technology Institute of Science and Technology Tribhuvan University, Nepal. 2021).
45. Traoré, K., Parkouda, C., Savadogo, A., Ba/Hama, F., Kamga, R., & Traoré, Y. (2017). Effect of processing methods on the nutritional content of three traditional vegetables leaves: Amaranth, black nightshade and jute mallow. *Food Science & Nutrition*, 5(6), 1139-1144.
46. Tripathi K, Gore PG, Ramya KR, Sarker A (2022) Grass Pea an Inherent Abiotic Stress-Tolerant Legume: Current Status and Future Scope Under Changing Environment. In *Developing Climate Resilient Grain and Forage Legumes 2022* May 28 (pp. 125-139). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore
47. Tripathi K, R Sadhukhan, A Das, K Janab, DP Semwal, A Kumara, Ashutosh Sarker, SP Ahlawat (2022) Khesari (*Lathyrus sativus* L.), an ancient legume for future gain: An expedition collection from parts of West Bengal state of Eastern India. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge* Vol 21(2), April 2022, pp 395-403
48. Tripathi K, RK Pamarthi, R Gowthami, Padmavati G Gore, Gayacharan, Surendra Barpete, Neeta Singh, Ashutosh Sarker, Ashok Kumar (2021) Deciphering morpho-taxonomic variability in *Lathyrus* species. *Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour*. 34(2): 279–289 (DOI 10.5958/0976-1926.2021.00027.9)
49. Umar KJ, Hassan LG, Dangoggo SM, Ladan MJ (2007) Nutritional composition of water spinach (*Ipomoea aquatica* Forsk.) leaves. *Journal of Applied Sciences*. 7(6):803-809
50. Umar, K. J., Hassan, L. G., Dangoggo, S. M., Maigandi, S. A., & Sani, N. A. (2011). Nutritional and anti-nutritional profile of spiny amaranth (*Amaranthus viridis* Linn). *Studia Universitatis Vasile Goldis Seria Stiintele Vietii (Life Sciences Series)*, 21(4).
51. Villacrés, E., Quelal, M., Galarza, S., Iza, D., & Silva, E. (2022). Nutritional value and bioactive compounds of leaves and grains from quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.). *Plants*, 11(2), 213.
52. Villacrés, E., Quelal, M., Galarza, S., Iza, D., & Silva, E. (2022). Nutritional Value and Bioactive Compounds of Leaves and Grains from Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.). *Plants* 2022, 11, 213.
53. Yadav, R. K., Tomar, B. S., Pachauri, N., & Jain, V. (2018). Studies of nutritional properties and antioxidant potential in green leafy vegetables. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 2(1), 7-13.
54. Zeghichi, S., Kallithraka, S., & Simopoulos, A. P. (2003). Nutritional composition of molokhia (*Corchorus olitorius*) and stamnagathi (*Cichorium spinosum*). *Plants in human health and nutrition policy*, 91, 1-21.
55. Diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases: report of a Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation. WHO Technical Report Series, No. 916. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003
56. Healthy diet. Fact sheet number 394. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2024. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs394/en> (accessed Jan 26, 2024)
57. Natesh, H. N., Abbey, L., & Asiedu, S. K. (2017). An overview of nutritional and antinutritional factors in green leafy vegetables. *Horticult Int J*, 1(2), 00011.
58. Lee, A. (2016). Affordability of fruits and vegetables and dietary quality worldwide. *The Lancet Global Health*, 4(10), e664-e665.

Figures




Figure 1

Grasspea germplasm collection sites in the parts of Bihar and West Bengal states and conservation in NGB in the parts of Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal states of Eastern India



Figure 2

(a). Field view of grasspea in West Bengal (West Medinapur) and (b). Field view of grasspea in Bihar (Madhubani)



Figure 3

Variability in leaf shapes in the cultivated varieties of grasspea.