# **Genetics of post-flowering drought tolerance traits in post-rainy sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]**

**J. V. Patil1,2 , Sujay Rakshit2,\* and K. B. Khot<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Mahatma Phule Krishi Viswa Vidyalaya, Rahuri 413 722 Maharashtra; <sup>2</sup>Directorate of Sorghum Research, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad 500 030

(Received: January 2012; Revised: November 2012; Accepted: December 2012)

### **Abstract**

**Post-rainy sorghum (Sorghum bicolor L. Moench) is mostly cultivated under receding soil moisture leading to postflowering moisture stress. Gene effects governing six moisture stress tolerance attributing traits were studied in nine generations of a cross between drought susceptible parent, SPV 1587 and drought tolerant parent, Phule Maulee under natural receding soil moisture regime during winter season of 2006-07 under randomized block design with three replications. Phule Maulee recorded higher relative leaf water content, chlorophyll stability index and grain yield per plant. Stomata frequencies were less on both surfaces in the drought tolerant parent. Heterosis and preponderance of duplicate epistasis (particularly dominance × dominance) were recorded for all the traits. This suggested the potential for hybrid breeding for drought tolerance in sorghum. Transgressive segregants were recorded for all the traits. Presence of significant dominance x dominance epistatic interactions suggests that selection for drought tolerance should be avoided in early generations and practiced in the advanced generations.**

**Key words :** Genetics, gene effects, drought tolerance, epistasis, sorghum

## **Introduction**

Sorghum (Sorghum bicolor L. Moench) is the fifth most important grain crop in the world after wheat, maize, rice and barley. It is predominantly cultivated in semiarid tropics (SAT) and its grain is main food source in many developing countries. Besides food, it is also used for animal feed, fuel, syrup, alcoholic beverages and ethanol. Sorghum is grown both during the rainy as well as post-rainy seasons in India, mostly as rain

fed crop. In India, this crop is cultivated in 8.33 m ha, of which 3.66 m ha is cultivated during rainy season and remaining during post-rainy season with a total annual production of 7.39 m t. Though the productivity of post-rainy sorghum (784 kg/ha) is lower than the rainy season sorghum (10.23 kg/ha), the produce is predominantly consumed as food, while the rainy season sorghum grain is utilized mainly for non-food purposes.

Among various abiotic stresses affecting field crops, moisture stress assumes great importance across the world, which has become more relevant particularly under changing climatic scenario [1]. As sorghum is predominantly cultivated as rain fed crop, it suffers from moisture stress. Particularly, the postrainy sorghum is grown under receding moisture condition leading to post-flowering drought in major parts of India. Though generally sorghum is a drought tolerant crop as compared to other field crops, drought stress at pre- or post-flowering stage significantly decreases grain yield [2]. For pre-flowering drought tolerance leaf photosynthetic rates, greater canopy temperature depression, improved panicle exertion and increased pollen viability play an important role [3]. Rooting depth, stay-greenness, increased seed filling rate, longer seed filling duration among others contribute towards post-flowering drought tolerance [4].

Genetic enhancement for drought tolerance has a special significance particularly for post-rainy sorghum improvement. Genetic diversity among the germplasm plays a very important role in any breeding program. Genetic diversity in sorghum has been

\*Corresponding author's e-mail: rakshit@sorghum.res.in

Published by Indian Society of Genetics & Plant Breeding, F2, First Floor, NASC Complex, PB#11312, IARI, New Delhi 110 012 Online management by indianjournals.com

evaluated using both morphological and molecular markers or in combination [5]. However, studies on diversity for physiological traits related to biotic stresses are scanty. In recent past Mutava et al. [2] made a comprehensive study on the diversity in grain sorghum for physiological traits with reference to moisture stress. They have reported wide variability for physiological and yield traits, like chlorophyll content, leaf temperature, grain numbers and grain weight per panicle etc., which were more stable among caudatum accessions under stress conditions as compared to other races. Knowledge on the genetics of drought tolerance traits is of paramount importance in designing the breeding methods with enhanced selection effectiveness.

Generation mean analysis (GMA) has been employed by several researchers to study genetic effects affecting various trait expressions in many crops including sorghum [6-9]. It is relatively simple and reliable tool, in which first order statistics are used for estimating the genetic effects. Gene actions involved in inheritance of yield and other traits have been studied in sorghum using GMA, which identified complex inheritance of the traits involving higher order gene interactions [10, 11]. Though post-flowering drought is one of the major production constraint across SAT, genetics of traits attributing to drought tolerance is lacking in sorghum. The present work was carried out with an objective to study the genetics of various traits attributing to drought tolerance in sorghum under rain fed conditions using GMA.

### **Materials and methods**

#### **Experimental material**

In the current investigation, a drought susceptible line, SPV 1587, and a drought tolerant variety, Phule Maulee were used. SPV 1587 is a derivative from a cross between RSLG 117 and IS 2312, while Phule Maulee is a selection from local land race of Maharastra, India. In subsequent text SPV 1587 and Phule Maulee will be referred to as  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively. The parents were crossed during the post-rainy season, 2004-05 to obtain F $_{\rm 1}$ . The F $_{\rm 1}$  were selfed as well as backcrossed to  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  during post rainy season, 2005-2006 to obtain  $\mathsf{F}_2$  and backcrosses (B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub>), respectively. During 2006 rainy season the  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$  and  $\mathsf F_2$  were selfed to generate  $\mathsf B_1\mathsf F_2$ ,  $\mathsf B_2\mathsf F_2$  and  $\mathsf F_3$ progenies. All the populations were evaluated together during post-rainy season, 2006-07 in randomized block design with three replications. Non-segregating

generations, viz.,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $F_1$  were grown in single row of 4.5 m length in each replication, whereas segregating generations, *viz*.,  $F_2$ ,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $B_1F_2$  and  $\mathsf{B}_2\mathsf{F}_2$  were grown in six rows with row length of 4.5 m accommodating about 30 plants per row. Recommended crop management practices were followed for good plant stand evaluation for post flowering drought tolerance were carried out under rainfed conditions in the experimental field of Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth at Rahuri, India.

#### **Observations recorded**

To study the moisture regime of the experimental plots, soil moisture levels at every plot representing different generations across all the three replications were recorded at 15 and 30 cm depth at 30 days interval starting from sowing to harvesting. Gravimetric method was carried out to determine soil moisture content. Observations on important drought tolerant traits such as relative leaf water content (RLWC), chlorophyll stability index (CSI), stomatal frequencies at adaxial and abaxial surface (no./mm<sup>2</sup>), panicle length (cm) and grain yield per plant (g) were recorded. RLWC was determined according to the modified method of Barrs and Weatherly [12] at 50% flowering stage and was expressed in percent. The CSI was computed using the methodology proposed by Arnon [13] at soft dough stage. Observations were recorded on ten competitive randomly selected plants from each replication totaling to 30 plants in non-segregating generations (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub> and  $F_1$ ) and 25 plants per replication adding up to 75 plants in segregating generations ( $\mathsf{F}_2$ ,  $\mathsf{F}_3$ ,  $\mathsf{B}_1$ ,  $\mathsf{B}_2$ ,  $\mathsf{B}_1\mathsf{F}_2$ , and  $B_2F_2$ ).

# **Statistical analysis**

To test the significance of treatment differences among the parents and their generations the data for all the characters were analyzed using randomized block design. The mean values for each generation were computed for all the traits. Adequacy of additive dominance model was tested by scaling tests of Mather [14] and joint scaling test of Cavalli [15]. Parameters of generation means (m: mean, d: additive, h: dominance, i: additive x additive, i: additive x dominance, l: dominance x dominance) were calculated as described elsewhere [16].

#### **Results and discussion**

In the present investigation, nine sorghum populations were evaluated under receding soil moisture during post-rainy season to estimate the genetics of six drought tolerance attributing traits using GMA. The mean gravimetric soil moisture content at 15 and 30 cm depth at 30 days interval from sowing date till harvest over all generations are presented in Table 1. Significant differences in terms of soil moisture content at both the depths were recorded at all the growth stages. Adequate soil moisture (~25%) was available at the time of sowing leading to satisfactory germination and initial growth. The difference in soil moisture at the time of sowing till 30 days after sowing (DAS) was very less due to rainfall at regular intervals during the period. The mean soil moisture contents at the time of sowing (27.88% at 15 cm and 24.35% at 30 cm), 30 DAS (23.54% at 15 cm and 21.41% at 30 cm) and 60 DAS (18.53% at 15 cm and 15.81% at 30 cm) were sufficient to support optimum crop growth. However, the depleted moisture levels (8.03% and 9.02 % at harvesting at 15 and 30 cm depth, respectively) indicated that crop experienced severe moisture stress. In crops like sorghum and maize roots are mostly concentrated in the upper layer of soil (0-30 cm) [17] and moisture content at this region was just near to the permanent wilting point at physiological maturity and at that stage crop experienced severe drought.

Analysis of variance indicated highly significant differences for all the six traits under study. The mean performances of nine populations,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_1F_2$  and  $B_2F_2$  for various traits are presented in Table 2. Results on scaling tests and joint scaling tests, and best fit model for various traits are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Accordingly, the

character-wise findings on various genetic components are discussed below:

## **Relative leaf water content (RLWC)**

RLWC is one of the important physiological factors related to moisture stress [18]. The drought susceptible parent,  $P_1$  had lower RLWC (73.66  $\pm$  0.44) compared to the resistant parent (78.91  $\pm$  0.52). Higher RLWC in resistant parent indicated its moisture stress tolerance. The  $F_1$  showed significantly higher RLWC, indicating heterosis for the trait. All subsequent generations showed inbreeding depression for the trait with  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  mean being closer to their respective recurrent parent. Significance of A, B and C scaling tests and joint scaling test suggested presence of nonallelic interactions for RLWC inheritance. Predominance of additive [d] and dominance x dominance [l] type of gene actions were found governing RLWC, with [*I*] type contributing towards desirable direction.

## **Chlorophyll stability index (CSI)**

Like RLWC, higher CSI also plays important role in drought tolerance [19]. CSI was higher in  $\mathsf{P}_2$  and the  $F_1$  showed partial dominance for higher CSI content (Table 2). Stability of chlorophyll corresponds to better performance of the genotypes under stress conditions. Inbreeding depression was significant in all the subsequent generations. All the four scaling tests as well as joint scaling test were significant. This indicated that simple additive-dominance model was not effective for CSI content inheritance. Prevalence of





Generation	<b>RLWC</b>	<b>CSI</b>	Ad St freq	Ab St freq	PL (cm)	PGY(g)	
$P_1$	$73.66 \pm 0.44$	$0.312 \pm 0.00$	$130.67 \pm 1.13$	$148.90 \pm 1.48$	$30.24 \pm 0.24$	$66.51 \pm 0.97$	
P <sub>2</sub>	$78.91 \pm 0.52$	$0.341 \pm 0.00$	$120.13 \pm 1.82$	$131.23 \pm 1.70$	$29.54 \pm 0.21$	$70.42 \pm 0.96$	
F <sub>1</sub>	$80.18 \pm 0.55$	$0.332 \pm 0.00$	$131.07 \pm 1.32$	$144.50 \pm 2.17$	$31.40 \pm 0.26$	$75.39 \pm 1.07$	
F <sub>2</sub>	$76.99 \pm 0.40$	$0.329 \pm 0.00$	$132.47 \pm 0.89$	$150.92 \pm 1.30$	$30.52 \pm 0.14$	$70.94 \pm 0.63$	
	$(-3.98)$	$(-0.90)$	(1.07)	(4.44)	$(-2.80)$	$(-5.90)$	
$B_1$	$75.46 \pm 0.28$	$0.317 \pm 0.00$	$136.25 \pm 1.81$	$154.03 \pm 0.93$	$29.27 \pm 0.15$	$65.51 \pm 0.78$	
	$(-5.89)$	$(-4.52)$	(3.95)	(6.60)	$(-6.78)$	$(-13.11)$	
B <sub>2</sub>	$77.05 \pm 0.32$	$0.311 \pm 0.00$	$130.97 \pm 0.70$	$151.03 \pm 1.01$	$29.26 \pm 0.16$	$66.15 \pm 0.60$	
	$(-3.90)$	$(-6.33)$	$(-0.08)$	(4.52)	$(-6.82)$	$(-12.26)$	
$F_3$	$74.86 \pm 0.38$	$0.29 \pm 0.00$	$133.11 \pm 0.89$	$156.72 \pm 0.97$	$29.07 \pm 0.13$	$60.94 \pm 0.84$	
	$(-6.64)$	$(-13.55)$	(1.56)	(8.46)	$(-7.42)$	$(-19.17)$	
$B_1F_2$	$73.47 \pm 0.40$	$0.309 \pm 0.00$	$132.48 \pm 0.69$	$152.51 \pm 1.16$	$27.61 \pm 0.16$	$58.96 \pm 0.78$	
	$(-8.37)$	$(-6.93)$	(1.08)	(5.54)	$(-12.07)$	$(-21.79)$	
$B_2F_2$	$69.51 \pm 0.34$	$0.298 \pm 0.00$	$136.07 \pm 0.85$	$153.65 \pm 0.91$	$27.14 \pm 0.15$	$56.33 \pm 0.64$	
	$(-13.31)$	$(-10.24)$	(3.81)	(6.33)	$(-13.57)$	$(-25.28)$	

**Table 2.** Mean performances of different generations of SPV1587 x Phule Maulee cross for various traits associated with drought tolerance in sorghum

RLWC: Relative leaf water content; CSI: Chlorophyll stability index; Ad St freq: Adaxian stomatal frequency; Ab St freq: Abaxian stomatal frequency PL: Panicle length; PGY: Plant grain yield; Values in parenthesis indicate the inbreeding depression

dominance gene action and all the three epistatic interactions with additive  $x$  additive  $[i]$  and dominance x dominance [l] towards desirable direction was observed. As difference between the parents for the trait was less (0.031) none of the effects were very high. The [h] and [l] components possessed opposite sign, indicating presence of duplicate epistasis.

### **Stomata frequency**

Stomata frequencies play a very vital role in leaf water potential balance of plant [20]. Stomata frequencies were lower in both adaxial and abaxial surfaces in drought tolerant parent (P<sub>2</sub>). Lower stomata density in turn helps the genotypes to prevent water losses, thus contributing towards drought tolerance [20, 21]. Abaxial stomata frequency showed dominance for higher stomata number, while adaxial frequency expressed

co-dominance. Interestingly, in none of the advanced generations stomata number showed inbreeding depression. Significant scaling and joint scaling tests clearly indicated prevalence of non-additive interactions governing stomata number inheritance. Additive [d] and dominance [h] gene actions increased stomata number, while dominance x dominance [/] interaction contributed towards reducing the stomata number inheritance. For abaxial stomata number inheritance in addition to  $[1]$  type of interaction additive x additive [i] was also effective. The [i] type interaction effect acted in undesirable direction as it leads to increase in stomata number. For stomata count inheritance again duplicate epistatic interactions were recorded. [*I*] type gene interaction was towards desirable direction as it reduces the number.

Scaling test	<b>RLWC</b>	CSI	Ad St freq	Ab St freq	PL (cm)	PGY(g)
A	$-2.92**$	$-0.019**$	$10.77**$	$14.65**$	$-3.10**$	$-11.41**$
B	$-4.78**$	$-0.034**$	$10.74**$	$19.92**$	$-2.42**$	$-14.04**$
C	$-4.97*$	$0.015**$	$16.93**$	$21.54**$	$-2.49**$	$-7.22*$
D	1.46	$0.022**$	$-7.29**$	$-6.21*$	$2.51**$	$9.12**$
$\chi^2$ joint scaling	$312.25**$	$201.31**$	$28.06**$	$12.37**$	295.79**	$301.53**$

**Table 3.** Estimation of scaling test for detecting non-allelic interactions for eight characters of sorghum



# **Panicle length**

Panicle length though is not directly associated with drought tolerance, its length may influence the grain yield. In our study the drought susceptible parent, SPV 1587 had marginally higher panicle length as compared to the tolerant parent, Phule Maulee. In fact, under well watered situation the susceptible parent had longer panicle than the resistant one (data not shown). The  $F_1$  showed longer panicle length than either of the parents. Advanced generations recorded inbreeding depression ranging from – 2.8% to –13.57%. Scaling test and joint scaling test results indicated presence of non-allelic interactions governing panicle length inheritance. Additive  $[d]$ , dominance  $[h]$ , additive x additive  $[i]$  and dominance x dominance [l] interactions were found to be significant for inheritance of panicle length inheritance. However, out of these [d] and [I] acted in favourable direction. [d] and [h] gene action was observed to act on opposite direction. Duplicate epistasis found to be effective to govern this trait inheritance as well.

# **Grain yield per plant**

Whatever may be the anatomical and/or physiological differences between genotypes, drought tolerance is ultimately reflected in terms of grain yield under stress condition [22].  $\mathsf{P}_2$  recorded higher plant yield as against P<sub>1</sub>, under moisture stress. Significant better parent heterosis was recorded in  $\mathsf{F}_1$ , while advanced generations recorded inbreeding depression ranging from –5.9% to –25.28%. Like other traits both scaling tests indicated existence of non-allelic interaction governing grain yield inheritance with both additive and dominance gene actions towards undesirable direction along with [i] type of interaction. [j] and [l] type of interactions influenced plant grain yield inheritance in favourable direction. Duplicate type of epistatic interactions governed the trait inheritance.

Heterosis over better parent was recorded for majority of the traits except CSI and abaxial stomatal count (Table 2). Thus, the hybrid performed better under drought situation. Inbreeding depression was high for all the traits except for stomata frequencies on both surfaces. This may be attributed to the fact that additive  $[d]$ , dominance  $[h]$  and additive x additive [i] interactions for stomata number inheritance act on opposite direction to that of dominance x dominance interactions  $\llbracket \mathcal{N} \rrbracket$  and upon inbreeding they may cancel effects of each other leading to no inbreeding depression.

To the best of our knowledge, there are no studies on inheritance of drought tolerance traits in sorghum using generation means. We have observed that epistatic interactions, predominantly duplicate epistasis, were effective for all the traits. Existence of duplicate epistatic effects governing water stress tolerance related traits has been reported in wheat [23]. Dominance x dominance [*I*] interactions were the most common and favoured interaction for all the traits. Ahmadi et al. [24] suggested importance of [l] type of interaction over other epistatic effects in governing drought related traits in wheat. However, Rao and Singh [25] observed combination of duplicate and complementary epistatic interaction governing drought related traits in maize. Kumar and Sharma [26] reported

under water stress. However, they found that both additive-dominance model and digenic epistatic model were predominantly ineffective to explain the variation for most of the traits related to drought tolerance. Most of the reports suggested preponderance of epistatic interactions governing drought tolerance. However, additive-dominance gene action governing drought tolerance in wheat has been reported by Golabadi et al. [27].

Generation mean analysis assumes unidirectional distribution of genes between two parents [28]. However, detection of epistatic interactions contradicts this assumption. We have observed overlapping distribution in backcross generations, which is indicative of existence of epistatic interaction [7]. Such interactions make the partitioning of genetic variance in the segregating generations into additive or dominance components extremely biased. As we have observed mostly [/] type interactions towards favourable direction, conclusion derived from the study will not be biased. Preponderance of epistatic interactions (particularly dominance x dominance interactions) for all the drought tolerance related traits suggests the potential for hybrid breeding for drought tolerance in sorghum. However, till now hybrids have not been able to make much dent during post-rainy sorghum. This is mainly due to consumer preferences for grain types. In this regard, hybrid breeding for moisture stress tolerance may be practiced but while selecting materials care will have to be taken on grain traits as well. Among the parents in our study, Phule Maulee is a well accepted post-rainy sorghum variety, while SPV 1587 also has adapted well post rainy season conditions. The hybrid between them has higher yield under depleting moisture regime. However, it needs to be tested on wider scale to decide its superiority. Lines derived from these potentially be identified as drought tolerant. In majority of cases the additive effect was low or towards unfavourable directions. Hence, derivation of superior lines from such crosses may not be feasible. However, as we recorded transgressive segregants for majority of traits, it is likely that the parents retained different alleles for the traits. Therefore, superior lines may be derived upon advancing the generations letting new combination of alleles to arise. Predominant epistatic effects may retard the selection process in the earlier generations. Hence, as suggested by Audilakshmi et al. [7] in presence of high epistatic interactions selection for drought tolerance should be avoided in early generations and practiced in later generations.

It must be kept in mind that gene effects, as estimated in our study are often cross specific. Hence, similar study needs to be extended on more crosses involving different resistant and tolerant lines.

#### **Acknowledgement**

We acknowledge the comments of Dr. K. N. Ganapathy for improvement of the manuscript.

#### **References**

- 1. **Araus J. L., Slafer G. A., Reynolds M. P. and Royo C.** 2002. Plant breeding and water relations in C3 cereals: what should we breed for? Ann. Bot. (London), **89**: 925-940.
- 2. **Mutava R. N., Prasad P. V. V., Tuinstra M. R., Kofoid K. D. and Yu J.** 2011. Characterization of sorghum genotypes for traits related to drought tolerance. Field Crops Res, **123**: 10-18.
- 3. **Lawlor D. W. and Cornic G.** 2002. Photosynthetic carbon assimilation and associated metabolism in relation to water deficits in higher plants. Plant Cell Environ, **25**: 275-294.
- 4. **Harris K., Subudhi P. K., Borrell A., Jordan D., Rosenow D., Nguyen H., Klein P., Klein R. and Mullet J.** 2007. Sorghum stay-green QTL individually reduce post-flowering drought-induced leaf senescence. Journal of Exp Botany., **58**: 327-338.
- 5. **Rakshit S., Gomashe S. S., Ganapathy K. N., Elangovan M., Ratnavathi C. V., Seetharama N., Patil J. V.** 2011. Morphological and molecular diversity reveal wide variability among sorghum Maldandi landraces from south India. J. Plant Biochem. Biotechnol., **21**: 145-156.
- 6. **Audilakshmi S., Stenhouse J. W. and Reddy T. P.** 2000. Genetic analysis of grain mould resistance in coloured sorghum genotypes. Euphytica, **116**: 95- 103.
- 7. **Audilakshmi S., Mall A. K., Swarnalatha M. and Seetharama N.** 2010. Inheritance of sugar concentration in stalk (brix), sucrose content, stalk and juice yield in sorghum. Biomass Bioenergy, **34**: 813-820.
- 8. **Aruna C. and Audilakshmi S.** 2004. Genetic architecture of grain hardness - a durable resistance mechanism for grain moulds in sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. Indian J Genet., **64**: 35-38.
- 9. **Audilakshmi S. and Aruna C.** 2005. Genetic analysis of physical grain quality characters in sorghum. J. Agri. Sci., **143**: 267-273.
- 10. **Kaul S., Rafiq S. M., Umakanth A. V., Madhusudan R. and Rana B. S.** 2005. Genetic analysis of grain yield and test weight in sorghum. Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities, **30**: 118-120.
- 11. **Ved Narain, Singh, P. K., Kumar N, and Singh V. S.** 2007. Gene effects for grain yield and related traits in sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]. Indian J Genet, **67**: 34-36.
- 12. **Barrs H. D. and Weatherly P. E.** 1962. Areexamination of the relative turgidity technique of estimating water deficit in leaves. Aust. J. Biol. Sci., **15**: 413-427.
- 13. **Arnon D. J.** 1949. Copper enzymes in isolated chloroplast, polyphenol oxidase in Beta vulgaris. Plant Physiol, **24**: 1-15.
- 14. **Mather K.** 1949. Biometrical genetics. Dover Pub. Inc., New York.
- 15. **Cavalli L. L.** 1952. Analysis of linkage in quantitative inheritance, E. C. Rieve and C. H. Waddington (ed.), HMSO, London. pp. 135-144.
- 16. **Santosh H. B., Sekhar J. C., Rakshit S., Gadag R. N. and Dass S.** 2012. Detection of epistatic interaction for susceptibility towards pink borer (Sesamia inferens Walker) in maize (Zea mays L.). Indian J. Genet., **72**: 284-289.
- 17. **Maiti R.** 1996. Sorghum Science. Oxford & IBH Pub., New Delhi.
- 18. **Hund A., Ruta N. and Liedgens M.** 2009. Rooting depth and water use efficiency of tropical maize inbred lines, differing in drought tolerance. Plant and Soil, **318**: 311-325.
- 19. **Kumari M., Dass S., Vimala Y. and Arora P.** 2004. Physiological parameters governing drought tolerance in maize. Ind. J. Plant Physiol., **9**: 203-207.
- 20. **Kadam G. N., Gadakh S. R. and Awari V. R.** 2001. Physiological analysis of rabi sorghum genotypes for shallow soil. Annals of Plant Physiology, **15**: 16-20.
- 21. **Nirmal S. V. and Patil J. V.** 2008. A new drought tolerant genotype of rabi sorghum - SPV 1546 (Phule Chitra). Annals of Plant Physiology, **22**: 165-168.
- 22. **Assefa Y., Staggenborg S. A. and Prasad V. P. V.** 2010. Grain sorghum water requirement and responses to drought stress: a review. Crop Management. 2010. November, CM-2010-1109-01- RV.
- 23. **Trinadhkumar G., Tomar S. M. S. and Vinod Bhanwar Singh.** 2008. Genetics of morphophysiological traits and seedling survivability in wheat (Triticum aestivum) under moisture stress conditions. Indian J. agric. Sci., **78**: 82-86.
- 24. **Ahmadi J., Orang S. F., Zali A. A., Yazdi-Samadi B., Ghannadha M. R. and Taleei A. R.** 2007. Study of yield and its components inheritance in wheat under drought and irrigated conditions. Journal of Science and Technology of Agriculture and Natural Resources, **11**: 201-214.
- 25. **Rao M. S. and Singh R. D.** 2006. Genetic studies on plant, maturity and physiological characters of maize (Zea mays L.) under rainfed and irrigated conditions. Plant breeding in post genomics era. Proceedings of Second National Plant Breeding Congress, Coimbatore, India, 1-3 March, 2006. 2006. 153-159.
- 26. **Kumar A. and Sharma S. C.** 2007. Genetics of excised-leaf water loss and relative water content in bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Cereal Res. Commun., **35**: 43-52.
- 27. **Golabadi M., Arzani A. and Maibody S. A. M. M.** 2008. Genetic analysis of some morphological traits in durum wheat by generation mean analysis under normal and drought stress conditions. Seed and Plant, 24: Pe99-Pe116.
- 28. **Shashikumar K. T., Pitchaimuthu M. and Rawal R. D.** 2010. Generation mean analysis of resistance to downy mildew in adult muskmelon plant. Euphytica, **173**: 121-127.