Vol.6 No. 1, 14-20 (2017)
*Received: February, 2017; Accepted: March, 2017*

# Physiological Studies in *Rabi* Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench)

**V.D. Salunke[1], A. G. Mundhe[2], R. R. Dhutmal[3] and S. N. Waghmare[4]**

1.Wheat and Maize Breeder, Wheat and Maize Research Unit, VNMKV, Parbhani.
2. Research Associate, Wheat and Maize Research Unit, VNMKV, Parbhani.
3.Asstt. Breeder, Sorghum Research Station, VNMKV, Parbhani.
4. P.G. Scholar Department of Agril.Botany, VNMKV, Parbhani.

Email: anil.gm143@gmail.com

## Abstract

*A field experiment in some selected rabigermplasm of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench) was conducted at the Sorghum Research Station, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani. The experimental material comprised twelve genotypes. Among the genotypes GP 1 significantly recorded highest plant height than all other genotypes whereas IS 6368 recorded lowest plant height at all the growth stages than all other genotypes. The mean leaf area increased up to 75 days thereafter leaves started senescence and reduced leaf area. The maximum leaf area was recorded by GP 1 at all growth stages than all other genotypes. The mean leaf dry weight was more in the genotype GP 1 increased rapidly upto 90 days and declined thereafter slowly. At all stages of observations GP 1 showed maximum stem dry weight relative to other genotypes. The genotype GP 1 recorded maximum panicle dry matter continuously increased up to harvest. The genotype GP 1 showed maximum total dry matter per plant throughout the period of crop growth than all other genotypes. The genotype GP 1 was late maturing and genotype IS 6368 was early maturing genotype. The relative water content was highest in GP 1 whereas it was minimum in genotypes IS 6368 at panicle emergence and 50% flowering. The genotype GP recorded the highest total chlorophyll content than all other genotypes. The mean chlorophyll stability index indicated significant differences among genotypes. The significantly lowest CSI was recorded by SPV 1411. Soil moisture content decreased gradually from sowing to harvesting. The genotype IS 5589 recorded significantly highest mean soil moisture at 0-30 cm depth and 30-60 cm depth at physiological maturity. The genotype IS 6368 recorded significantly lowest mean soil moisture content than all other genotypes at physiological maturity. The genotype GP 1 produced highest grain yield/plant among all other genotype. Several desirable yield determining factors an yield limiting factors in twelve sorghum genotypes have been identified.*

***Key words*** *:Rabi sorghum, drought tolerance, yield, RWC, CSI.*

## Introduction

The moisture stress is the chief limiting factor in sorghum production in our country. Understanding the physiological, biochemical and molecular mechanisms involved in imparting drought tolerance is most crucial for development of stress tolerant genotypes.Evolutions of drought tolerant genotypes and identifying drought tolerant genotypes amongst the existing ones which are better suited to the conditions prevailing in Maharashtra would be of great practical significance. Moisture stress at any stage of the crop growth reduces yield considerably. There exist genotypic differences with regard to their response to moisture stress resulting in different levels of yield reduction. Hence, it is important to isolate genotypes which are affected to a lesser degree by moisture stress. Such genotypes could be directly recommended for cultivation under rainfed conditions or used in a breeding programme, to combine such characters which high yields, with this view the present investigation was undertaken with an object to studythe germplasm lines for morpho-physiological traits for drought tolerance and to identify germplasm lines with drought adaptations traits.

## Material And Methods

A field experiment in some selected *rabi*germplasm of sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench)was conducted at the Sorghum Research Station, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani during *rabi* season 2006-07. The experimental material comprised twelve genotypes *viz*., GP 15, SPV 1411, Yashoda x SPV 655, GP 1, IS 21971, IS 6368, GP 31, IS 47579, S 35, PVR 453, IS 5589 and M 35-1 (check). These were grown in a randomized block design with three replications with 45 x15 cm spacing between and within rows. Total 15 observations *viz*. days to 50% flowering, days to physiological maturity, relative leaf water content at panicle initiation (%), relative water content at 50% flowering, total chlorophyll content (mg/g), chlorophyll stability index, plant height (cm), leaf area ($dm^{-2}$), leaf dry matter (g/plant), stem dry matter (g/plant), total dry matter (g/plant), 1000 grain weight (g), grain yield per plant (g), fodder yield ($qha^{-1}$) and harvest index (%)were recorded. The statistical analysis of data were carried out by analysis of variance method suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1967), standard error (SE) of the mean were worked out for each factor. Whenever, the results are significant critical difference (C.D.) at 5 per cent level of significance was worked out.

## Results and Discussion

Though plant height is basically a genetically controlled character, it is being influenced by environmental conditions and genotypes. The present study revealed significant differences in plant height (Table 1) among the genotypes at different growth stages and noticed that higher the plant height, higher the grain yield. The present study revealed significant differences in plant height among the genotypes at different growth stages.

The mean plant height increased rapidly from 30 DAS to 75 DAS and declined slowly later on. The genotype GP 1 (168.87 cm) recorded significantly the highest plant height. The data further indicated that the grain yield of GP 1 (28.37 q/ha) was the highest among the genotypes. These findings are supported by the work of many others[6].

Dry matter production is an important yield contributing character. By knowing the pattern in which it is produced and distributing in different plant parts would give a better understanding of the genotypes. The data presented in Table 1 give a quantitative picture of accumulation and partitioning of total dry matter among the plant parts throughout the growth of the crop.

The data on dry matter of leaves showed increasing trend upto 50 per cent flowering and decreased thereafter in all genotypes. At 50 per cent, flowering to at physiological maturity, there was decreased in the leaf dry matter in all the genotypes and it continued to show a lower distribution further due to senescence and leaf drying. These results are in agreement with the findings of earlier investigators[2] who noticed that the dry matter in leaves decreased from milk to ripening stage in proportion of accumulation of dry matter in ear, indicating active translocation of assimilates during grain filling. The genotypes GP 1 recorded the highest (21.05 g/plant) dry matter of leaves.

The data on mean dry matter of stem per plant revealed that there was continuous increase upto 50 per cent flowering and decreased further. The genotypes GP 1 showed the highest stem dry matter per plant, whereas IS 6368 shoed the lowest stem dry matter among the genotypes at most of the growth stages. During early growth phase larger portion of total dry matter was shared by leaves than the stem. The accumulation of dry matter continued in stem.

The data on panicle dry matter in Table 1 revealed that there was continuous increase in a panicle dry matter upto harvest. The data on mean panicle dry weight per plant showed significant differences among the genotypes. At physiological maturity, the genotype GP 1 recorded the highest (41.83g) and the genotypes IS 6368 recorded the lowest the (33.58g) panicle dry matter per plant, and this trend was noticed at most of the growth stages. Panicle dry matter showed significance with grain yield (at physiological maturity) due to higher number of grains and higher accumulation of food from source to sink[3].

The data on total dry matter (Table 1) revealed that genotypes differed significantly at all growth stages. It could be seen that the total dry matter accumulation was increase upto harvest continuously. Increase in dry matter accumulation was rapid upto 90 DAS and it is more food accumulation in plant parts and transferred towards sink.

The genotypes selected in the present study revealed significant differences in their phenology with GP 1 taking more days (132.67 days) for maturity, while IS 6368 having the lesser number of days (108.67days) required for maturity. Both had much differences in yield observed i.e.283 kh/ha, respectively. This could be due to increased light utilization by the canopy and more time for active photosynthesis to produce more dry matter. However, IS-6368 and M 35-1 (check) had few day early maturity thereby escaping the terminal stress being increased to later stages. It can be inferred that early and midlategenotypes escapes that drought probably due to reduced root resistance and increased stomatal resistance[10].

The data on relative leaf water content (Table 2) indicated that there were significant differences among genotypes. Relative leaf water content (RL WC) is an important parameter which indicated the ability of a plant to maintain high water in the leaves under moisture stress condition and can be used as index to determine drought tolerance of a genotypes. The genotypes GP 1 showed highest RL WC (83.00%).

The data regarding chlorophyll content and chlorophyll stability index is given in Table 2. The data indicated that the varietal differences were significant.Genotype GP 1 recorded the highest total chlorophyll (2.525 mg/g).Genotype SPV1411 (0.020) recorded minimum chlorophyll stability index. Mean chlorophyll content and chlorophyll stability index was less as water stress adversely affected plant metabolic processes[11].

The data on mean per cent soil moisture content (Table 3) revealed that genotypes differed for mean soil moisture content at all growth stages. Mean soil moisture content decreased gradually from sowing till harvest. Due to differential moisture extracting abilities of genotypes, the differences of genotypes, in soil moisture content at different soil depth at various growth stages are soon.

In the present investigation it can be observed that mean soil moisture was highest in 30-60 cm depth then 0-30 cm depth among the genotypes at various growth stages. The genotype GP 1 was superior in terms of grain yield indicating that importance of soil moisture at early growth period i.e. at sowing and panicle emergence. At 50% flowering and physiological maturity the high yielding genotypes GP1 had comparatively lower soil moisture content over low yielding genotypes.

Genotype GP1 at both depths indicating that high yielding genotypes extract more water from soil profile at later growth stages than low yielding genotypes[7].

The critical study of yield and yield contributing components revealed significant differences due to genotypes for these traits (Table 2). Thus the differences for grain yield among the genotypes were mainly because of variation in yield contributing characters. Since the yield of cereals is interplay of may yield contributing characters[4,5,8,9].

Genotypes GP1 recorded highest 1000 grain weight (35.78g), High grain yield in case of GP 1 (2837 kg/ha$^{-1}$) as compared with check M 35-1 (1620 kg/ha) and highest fodder yield i.e. 71.01 q/ha.

Grain yield is function of dry matter production and harvest index and higher harvest index invariably leads to higher grain yield. The increase in harvest index was more in GP 1 (28.54%) because of effective translocation of dry matter from vegetative parts to economic parts. The genotype GP 1 has given higher grain yield though, the partitioning was low, it may be due to higher total dry matter production and it higher harvest index. Secondly increased seed number might have increased the demand of food from the reproductive parts and thereby increased the harvest index[9].

## Table 1 Differences of sorghum genotypes for different growth parameters

| Genotype | Plant height (cm) | | | | | | Leaf area (dm$^{-2}$) | | | | | | Leaf dry matter (g/plant) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 30 DAS | 45 DAS | 60 DAS | 75 DAS | 90 DAS | At harvest | 30 DAS | 45 DAS | 60 DAS | 75 DAS | 90 DAS | At harvest | 30 DAS | 45 DAS | 60 DAS | 75 DAS | 90 DAS | At harvest |
| $V_1$-GP 15 | 19.00 | 31.83 | 69.16 | 113.83 | 155.83 | 161.73 | 4.11 | 11.67 | 21.12 | 40.05 | 31.72 | 10.59 | 1.15 | 3.43 | 6.40 | 17.30 | 22.46 | 17.63 |
| $V_2$-SPV 1411 | 18.50 | 28.33 | 73.50 | 105.00 | 158.67 | 164.07 | 3.64 | 11.75 | 19.10 | 37.86 | 28.62 | 7.83 | 1.18 | 3.06 | 5.20 | 17.35 | 19.80 | 10.23 |
| $V_3$-Yashoda x SPV 655 | 19.83 | 33.16 | 52.66 | 107.33 | 162.67 | 167.57 | 4.31 | 12.62 | 13.97 | 36.24 | 30.10 | 6.21 | 1.02 | 3.10 | 5.15 | 16.34 | 21.63 | 20.73 |
| $V_4$-GP 1 | 20.50 | 45.83 | 77.50 | 121.17 | 163.17 | 168.87 | 4.34 | 12.64 | 21.13 | 40.07 | 31.90 | 11.40 | 1.19 | 3.44 | 6.44 | 18.45 | 23.52 | 21.05 |
| $V_5$-IS 21971 | 13.16 | 26.33 | 56.50 | 73.66 | 140.17 | 152.20 | 3.17 | 12.19 | 17.48 | 29.70 | 22.41 | 8.10 | 0.37 | 1.58 | 5.16 | 15.18 | 18.13 | 11.30 |
| $V_6$ -IS 6368 | 8.75 | 19.16 | 44.33 | 68.00 | 96.16 | 99.86 | 3.10 | 6.88 | 13.40 | 29.12 | 21.48 | 5.55 | 0.31 | 1.20 | 4.02 | 14.15 | 16.05 | 10.02 |
| $V_7$ -IS 5589 | 20.33 | 24.83 | 52.33 | 84.66 | 142.67 | 148.67 | 3.84 | 8.84 | 13.50 | 34.42 | 24.23 | 5.61 | 0.62 | 2.44 | 5.14 | 14.61 | 16.86 | 19.13 |
| $V_8$-GP 31 | 19.50 | 31.50 | 67.00 | 100.67 | 162.50 | 166.77 | 3.91 | 12.48 | 20.42 | 36.04 | 25.24 | 6.14 | 0.81 | 3.00 | 5.26 | 16.02 | 21.43 | 14.73 |
| $V_9$-IS 47589 | 17.50 | 24.16 | 64.00 | 97.33 | 153.33 | 161.13 | 3.98 | 11.39 | 20.09 | 38.34 | 24.09 | 7.96 | 0.65 | 2.16 | 5.52 | 16.44 | 18.30 | 11.63 |
| $V_{10}$-S 35 | 18.00 | 20.00 | 57.33 | 96.00 | 113.67 | 116.93 | 3.24 | 12.15 | 19.25 | 38.13 | 21.87 | 6.00 | 0.32 | 1.25 | 5.93 | 16.47 | 20.41 | 7.80 |
| $V_{11}$-PVR 453 | 14.16 | 25.83 | 66.50 | 90.33 | 144.83 | 152.97 | 3.71 | 11.33 | 18.56 | 37.53 | 26.25 | 8.64 | 0.77 | 1.75 | 5.45 | 16.97 | 21.03 | 17.40 |
| $V_{12}$-M 35-1 | 15.16 | 28.33 | 61.66 | 76.66 | 144.00 | 151.10 | 3.91 | 7.96 | 13.90 | 29.16 | 21.53 | 6.68 | 0.52 | 2.30 | 5.06 | 15.08 | 19.86 | 14.96 |
| Mean | 17.03 | 28.27 | 61.87 | 94.55 | 144.81 | 150.99 | 3.89 | 10.91 | 17.68 | 35.56 | 25.78 | 7.59 | 0.73 | 2.39 | 5.39 | 16.46 | 20.12 | 14.69 |
| SE ± | 1.05 | 2.15 | 3.74 | 4.77 | 4.99 | 3.18 | 0.21 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.87 | 1.19 | 0.87 |
| CD at 5% | 3.36 | 6.31 | 10.95 | 13.98 | 14.63 | 9.31 | 0.62 | 1.28 | 1.85 | 2.78 | 2.25 | 0.91 | 0.34 | 0.36 | 0.97 | 2.55 | 3.49 | 2.55 |
| CV | | | | | | | 6.27 | 6.98 | 6.20 | 4.62 | 5.17 | 4.37 | | | | | | |

**Continued…..**

| Genotype | Stem dry matter (g/plant) | | | | | | Total dry matter (g/plant) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 30 DAS | 45 DAS | 60 DAS | 75 DAS | 90 DAS | At harvest | 30 DAS | 45 DAS | 60 DAS | 75 DAS | 90 DAS | At harvest |
| $V_1$-GP 15 | 0.55 | 2.40 | 16.50 | 40.31 | 42.50 | 44.42 | 1.70 | 5.82 | 20.91 | 56.61 | 85.80 | 101.13 |
| $V_2$-SPV 1411 | 0.45 | 2.10 | 15.06 | 34.13 | 35.50 | 36.67 | 1.63 | 5.15 | 20.25 | 51.31 | 74.55 | 85.05 |
| $V_3$-Yashoda x SPV 655 | 0.37 | 2.00 | 15.64 | 31.93 | 32.00 | 28.06 | 1.39 | 5.10 | 20.80 | 48.24 | 75.11 | 82.25 |
| $V_4$-GP 1 | 0.57 | 2.50 | 17.04 | 41.22 | 43.50 | 44.52 | 1.76 | 5.94 | 23.48 | 59.67 | 90.01 | 107.40 |
| $V_5$-IS 21971 | 0.17 | 1.01 | 14.16 | 33.02 | 35.16 | 35.38 | 0.54 | 2.57 | 19.30 | 47.18 | 73.24 | 81.78 |
| $V_6$ -IS 6368 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 12.06 | 30.64 | 31.96 | 28.01 | 0.35 | 2.20 | 16.08 | 45.25 | 67.16 | 71.71 |
| $V_7$ -IS 5589 | 0.27 | 1.22 | 12.50 | 33.84 | 35.50 | 30.31 | 0.90 | 2.66 | 17.66 | 48.01 | 75.26 | 87.12 |
| $V_8$-GP 31 | 0.35 | 2.03 | 14.80 | 32.24 | 33.50 | 31.28 | 1.16 | 5.00 | 20.27 | 48.24 | 74.64 | 84.62 |
| $V_9$-IS 47589 | 0.22 | 1.66 | 15.20 | 33.81 | 35.33 | 36.19 | 0.87 | 3.66 | 19.73 | 50.25 | 74.00 | 84.00 |
| $V_{10}$-S 35 | 0.05 | 1.01 | 15.90 | 36.39 | 37.83 | 44.20 | 0.42 | 4.24 | 20.83 | 52.86 | 82.33 | 89.20 |
| $V_{11}$-PVR 453 | 0.32 | 1.75 | 15.44 | 37.19 | 39.50 | 39.75 | 1.90 | 3.50 | 20.91 | 52.86 | 82.65 | 96.15 |
| $V_{12}$-M 35-1 | 0.20 | 1.20 | 14.10 | 35.81 | 37.83 | 32.32 | 0.72 | 3.50 | 19.15 | 50.85 | 75.50 | 84.05 |
| Mean | 0.29 | 1.65 | 14.95 | 35.10 | 36.67 | 35.93 | 1.04 | 3.94 | 20.19 | 50.80 | 77.64 | 88.00 |
| SE ± | 0.032 | 0.088 | 0.48 | 0.87 | 1.54 | 0.86 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.73 | 1.29 | 0.66 | 1.42 |
| CD at 5% | 0.094 | 0.25 | 1.41 | 2.56 | 4.53 | 2.53 | 0.44 | 0.67 | 2.16 | 3.80 | 1.95 | 4.18 |

## Table 2 Differences of sorghum genotypes for different morphological and physiological parameters

| Genotype | Days to 50% Flowering | Days to Physiological maturity | Relative leaf water content at panicle initiation (%) | Relative leaf water content at 50% Flowering | Total Chlorophyll content (mg/g) | Chlorophyll stability Index | **1000 grain wt.(g)** | **Grain yield per plant (g)** | **Fodder yield ($qha^{-1}$)** | **Harvest index (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $V_1$-GP 15 | 71.33 | 115.67 | 82.06 | 79.80 | 1.951 | 0.223 | 27.15 | 23.26 | 58.42 | 25.97 |
| $V_2$-SPV 1411 | 84.66 | 129.33 | 86.16 | 81.09 | 1.715 | 0.020 | 32.88 | 19.10 | 51.30 | 25.50 |
| $V_3$-Yashoda x SPV 655 | 71.00 | 111.00 | 81.12 | 78.21 | 1.956 | 0.324 | 34.16 | 19.23 | 47.67 | 26.02 |
| $V_4$-GP 1 | 89.00 | 132.67 | 87.47 | 83.53 | 2.525 | 0.223 | 35.78 | 25.13 | 71.01 | 28.54 |
| $V_5$-IS 21971 | 88.00 | 130.67 | 86.19 | 80.91 | 1.771 | 0.074 | 24.92 | 20.13 | 41.86 | 26.02 |
| $V_6$ -IS 6368 | 69.00 | 108.67 | 77.06 | 73.80 | 1.551 | 0.109 | 18.60 | 18.45 | 40.11 | 23.30 |
| $V_7$ -IS 5589 | 71.33 | 111.67 | 82.29 | 82.29 | 1.863 | 0.043 | 33.04 | 18.85 | 42.86 | 23.61 |
| $V_8$-GP 31 | 74.66 | 114.67 | 81.29 | 78.64 | 1.984 | 0.051 | 26.48 | 20.56 | 47.13 | 26.26 |
| $V_9$-IS 47589 | 73.66 | 129.00 | 79.80 | 76.54 | 2.142 | 0.194 | 25.94 | 19.19 | 46.70 | 26.30 |
| $V_{10}$-S 35 | 71.33 | 114.67 | 80.20 | 74.12 | 2.492 | 0.433 | 27.92 | 21.36 | 44.66 | 28.03 |
| $V_{11}$-PVR 453 | 75.66 | 117.00 | 82.33 | 78.85 | 2.372 | 0.112 | 29.66 | 19.89 | 61.32 | 23.40 |
| $V_{12}$-M 35-1 | 69.33 | 110.67 | 81.53 | 80.34 | 2.320 | 0.231 | 33.96 | 20.75 | 48.00 | 25.23 |
| Mean | 75.75 | 118.81 | 82.29 | 79.01 | 2.053 | 0.170 | 29.21 | 20.49 | 48.92 | 25.68 |
| SE ± | 2.30 | 3.40 | 1.53 | 1.07 | 0.118 | 0.0022 | 1.56 | 0.77 | 2.94 | 0.237 |
| CD at 5% | 6.80 | 9.97 | 4.49 | 3.13 | 0.345 | 0.0065 | 4.58 | 2.26 | 8.62 | 0.694 |

## Table 3 Differences of sorghum genotypes on mean soil moisture content (%)

| **Genotype** | **At 0-30 cm depth** | | | | **At 30-60 cm depth (%)** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **At sowing** | **Panicle initiation** | **50% Flowering** | **Physiological maturity** | **At sowing** | **Panicle initiation** | **50% Flowering** | **Physiological maturity** |
| $V_1$-GP 15 | 22.19 | 18.32 | 12.50 | 8.49 | 24.22 | 19.58 | 13.59 | 10.53 |
| $V_2$-SPV 1411 | 21.36 | 18.22 | 10.30 | 9.34 | 23.28 | 19.16 | 13.34 | 10.43 |
| $V_3$-Yashoda x SPV 655 | 21.19 | 19.16 | 10.20 | 10.37 | 22.20 | 20.20 | 11.26 | 10.72 |
| $V_4$-GP 1 | 21.54 | 16.29 | 7.25 | 7.15 | 23.40 | 18.37 | 8.49 | 8.55 |
| $V_5$-IS 21971 | 20.75 | 16.35 | 7.30 | 6.61 | 23.53 | 18.28 | 8.37 | 7.51 |
| $V_6$ -IS 6368 | 23.20 | 16.42 | 9.50 | 6.53 | 24.59 | 19.78 | 13.34 | 6.36 |
| $V_7$ -IS 5589 | 23.55 | 17.51 | 9.91 | 7.45 | 24.50 | 19.46 | 14.35 | 8.56 |
| $V_8$-GP 31 | 22.76 | 16.52 | 7.67 | 6.56 | 23.51 | 17.21 | 10.64 | 7.17 |
| $V_9$-IS 47589 | 21.53 | 19.69 | 12.35 | 11.62 | 23.49 | 21.43 | 14.62 | 13.45 |
| $V_{10}$-S 35 | 22.59 | 19.46 | 9.49 | 7.65 | 23.35 | 20.43 | 11.32 | 9.31 |
| $V_{11}$-PVR 453 | 21.43 | 19.15 | 10.58 | 8.41 | 24.33 | 19.27 | 12.27 | 9.43 |
| $V_{12}$-M 35-1 | 23.16 | 18.49 | 11.52 | 8.37 | 24.52 | 20.39 | 12.38 | 9.42 |
| Mean | 22.10 | 17.96 | 9.96 | 8.21 | 23.74 | 19.46 | 12.00 | 9.28 |
| SE ± | 2.19 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 0.85 | 2.48 | 1.41 | 1.14 | 0.77 |
| CD at 5% | NS | NS | NS | 2.51 | NS | NS | 3.34 | 2.25 |

**References**


1. Bulm, A. (1966). Effect of soil fertility and plant competition on grain sorghum panicle morphology and panicle weight components. *Agronomy Journal,* **59**:400-403.
2. Babu, A.R. and Reddy, R.R. (1971). Rate of dry matter production in different plant parts at various growth stages in sorghum. *Andhara Agriculture Journal* **18** (3):85-89.
3. Chodhari, S.D. and Mahajan, S.N. (1978). Effect of genotype differences in leaf area, height and flowering on yield components of sorghum. *Journal of Maharashtra Agriculture University* **3**(1):71-73.
4. Dabholkar, A. R., Telang, S.W. and Patil, K.C. (1970). Correlation in sorghum hybrids. Science and Culture, **36** (8): 476.
5. Dhoble, M.V. and Kale, U.V. (1988). Recovery and drought resistance in sorghum. *Journal of Maharashtra Agriculture University* **13**(2):118.
6. Kulkarni, L.P., Narayana, R. and Krishnasastry, K.S. (1991). Photosynthetic efficiency and transpiration in relation to leaf characters and productivity in sorghum genotypes. *Sorghum Newsletter.***24**:124-125.
7. Matthew A. A Jenks, Robert J. Joly, Edward N. A. John, D. A. and Patrick, J. R. (1994). Chemically induced cuticle mutation affecting epidermal conductance to water vapour and diseases susceptibility in *sorghum bicolor* (L.)Moench*; Plant physiology,* **105**:1239-1345.
8. Parvatikar, S.R. and Prasad, T.G. (1973). Physiological studies on sorghum. *Sorghum Newsletter.* **16**:89-91.
9. Singh, R.O. and Stoskopf, N.C. (1971). Harvest index in cereals. *Agronomy Journal,* **63**:224-226.
10. Verma, P.K. and Eastin, J.D. (1985).Genotypic differences of *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench in response to environmental stress. *Sorghum Newsletter.***28**:128-129.
11. Yadava, R.B.R., Ehatt, R.E. and Kattiyar, D.S. (1991). Physiological evaluation of fodder sorghum genotypes for drought tolerance. *Sorghum Newsletter.*32-39.