

# 1      **Interrelationship patterns among cane yield attributes and physiological** 2      **traits in sugarcane under normal and water stress conditions**

## 5      **ABSTRACT**

6      Differential pattern of association assessed in sugarcane under two water regimes  
7      revealed that cane yield had highly significant positive correlation with stalk length, stalk  
8      diameter and single cane weight under both the environments. Physiological traits like  
9      relative water content at 60 days after planting had a positive correlation with stalk length  
10     under both the environments whereas, it was positively correlated with stalk diameter (0.46)  
11     and single cane weight (0.45) under water stressed environment. Path analysis revealed that  
12     number of tillers at 240 days had maximum positive direct effect on cane yield followed by  
13     RWC at 60 days, stalk length, RWC at 120 days, number of shoots at 120 days and single  
14     cane weight. Stalk length, stalk diameter, MNC, number of tillers at 240 days were found  
15     important for cane yield improvement, and low number of stomata, chlorophyll, SLW and  
16     RWC at 120 days are associated with stress tolerance.

17     **Key Words:** Sugarcane, physiological traits, correlation, path analysis, water stress

## 18     **INTRODUCTION**

19     Sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp. complex) is widely grown in both tropics and sub tropics  
20     as a source of energy providing food and fuel. In India, sugar industry being the second  
21     largest agro-based industry next to textile. Abiotic stresses are the main causes of major crops  
22     productivity losses that cause negative impacts on crop adaptation and productivity. With the  
23     increases in climate change, soil water deficit is one of the biggest challenges for crop  
24     productivity. In the face of a global scarcity of water resources and the increased salinization  
25     of soil and water, water-deficit and salinity are widespread in many regions of world, and are  
26     expected to cause serious problem of more than 50% of all arable lands by the year 2050  
27     (Vinocur and Altman 2005). In present scenario, drought figures as the most significant  
28     stress and is considered an extremely important factor when it comes of losses in the  
29     productivity of sugarcane. Projections show an increase in intense rain events and at the same  
30     time reduction in the number of rain days that leads to increased risk of drought (Trenberth  
31     2011). Further, scarcity of fresh water is affecting the productivity and profitability of

sugarcane growers and millers in India. Due to glycophytic nature of sugarcane, drought conditions interfere with sugar production by affecting growth rate, yield of the cane, juices of lower sucrose contents, purity, higher acidity and the sucrose content of the stalk (Cardozo and Sentelhas 2013). Thus drought may reduce sugarcane yield up to 50% or even more. Sugarcane drought tolerant varieties have the ability to reduce transpiration losses and these varieties maintain a fairly adequate absorption of water from the soil. Efforts should be intensified to identify/evolve agronomic and physiological traits, which could lead to adaptation to different conditions or be correlated to drought tolerance and that could be used for breeding and development of new varieties (Domaingue 1995). The tillering and grand growth stages (sugarcane formative phase) have been identified as the critical water demanding period (Ramesh 2000) because during this stage 70-80% of cane yield is produced (Singh and Rao 1987). Photosynthetic responses and water relations to water deficit stress during this growth stage could therefore be useful in identifying drought tolerant genotypes. So, there is an urgent need to identify sugarcane varieties adapted to moisture stress in order to sustain sugarcane production and sugar recovery in the country. Genetic improvement in cane yield may be achieved by targeting traits closely associated with cane yield. Knowledge of interrelationship among the various characters and their direct and indirect effects is considered to be important in devising proper selection strategies in sugarcane breeding for water stress conditions. So, to identify the different crop parameters responsible for the higher productivity and growth under water stress conditions, the present study was planned to assess interrelation patterns of different agro-morphological and physiological traits with cane yield (t/ha) under normal irrigated ( $E_1$ ) and water stressed ( $E_2$ ) conditions.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The experimental plant material consisted of 30 diverse sugarcane genotypes comprising nine commercial varieties (Co238, CoJ88, CoS8436, CoPb91, CoPb92, CoPb93, Co118, CoJ85 and CoJ64), twelve local elite Clones (CoPb13181, CoPb10181, CoPb13182, CoPb11214, CoPb11211, CoPb12181, CoPb12182, CoPb14212, CoPb14211, CoPb12212 and L818/07), five new introductions (KV2012-1, KV2012-2, KV2012-3, KV2012-4 and KV2012-5) and four ISH clones viz. ISH148, ISH159, ISH135 and ISH07 were planted under subtropical conditions of India during 2016-17 in randomized complete block design having a plot size of  $21.6 \text{ m}^2$  with two replications. Seed setts of each genotype at the rate of 12 buds per running meter were planted. Data from different clones were recorded for various

growth and cane yield parameters viz. germination (%) , cane yield (t/ha), number of shoots at 120 days (000/ha), number of millable canes at maturity (000/ha), cane length (cm), cane diameter (cm), single cane weight (kg), no. of tillers at 240 days (000/ha) and physiological parameters viz. relative water content (RWC) at 60 and 120 days (%), total chlorophyll content (mg/l), stomatal frequency (no.) and specific leaf weight (g) under normal (E<sub>1</sub>) and water stress (E<sub>2</sub>) environments. Cane yield (t/ha) was recorded from final harvested crop, number of millable canes were counted at maturity of crop per plot and converted in to NMC (000/ha). Other cane characters were recorded as per standard procedures from five randomly selected canes taken from each genotype in each replication in both the environments to measure cane length and diameter. Physiological traits namely relative water content (RWC) (%) at 60 and 120 DAP (as per Turner, 1981), chlorophyll a (mg/l), chlorophyll b (mg/l), total chlorophyll (mg/l) as suggested by Hiscox and Israelstam (1979), stomatal frequency (no.), specific leaf weight (g) following standard procedures under both the environments as follow:

#### **Relative water content (%)**

Fresh leaves were collected from five randomly selected plants from each clone in each replication in early morning hours and brought to lab. 10g leaf discs (fresh weight) from each genotype from each plot were submerged in distilled water in test tubes till saturation. After 6 hrs the leaf discs were removed from test tubes. Surface water of the discs was blotted off without putting any pressure and then they were weighed to obtain saturated weight. After drying the discs at 70°C for 72 hr their dry weight was determined. From these data RWC was calculated as:

$$RLWC (\%) = \frac{\text{Fresh weight} - \text{Dry weight}}{\text{Saturated weight} - \text{Dry weight}} \times 100$$

#### **Chlorophyll content (mg/l)**

Chlorophyll content was estimated by following dimethyl sulphoxide (DMSO) method and readings were taken using spectrophotometer. Five leaves were collected from five randomly selected seven month old plants from each clone in each replication in early morning hours and brought to lab. 0.1 g of leaf tissue of each sugarcane clone were cut in smaller pieces and placed in test tubes containing 10 ml of solvent (DMSO). Test tubes were incubated in a water bath at 60-65°C for an hour. From preliminary studies this time was judged satisfactory for the full decolourization of tissues. Cooling at room temperature was followed for 30 min, filtration and absorption measured at 665 nm and 648 nm by being the

final stages. Blank determination was carried out with DMSO. Absorption measurement was carried out with a spectrophotometer. The absorbance of the blank sample was subtracted from the absorbance readings of each sample before calculations.

### Calculations:

Chlorophyll concentration (a, b and total) was calculated as mg /g fresh weight by the following formulae (Barnes et al., 1992) and expressed as mg/l.

$$\text{Chlorophyll a (mg/g F.W)} = (14.85 A_{665} - 5.14 A_{648})$$

$$\text{Chlorophyll b (mg/g F.W)} = (25.48 A_{665} - 7.36 A_{648})$$

$$\text{Total chlorophyll (mg/g F.W)} = (7.49 A_{665} + 20.34 A_{648}) \quad \backslash$$

Where:  $A_{665}$  = absorption value at 665 nm,  $A_{648}$  = absorption value at 648 nm.

### Stomatal frequency (no.)

Leaves from five randomly selected plants of a clone from each replication were taken and brought to lab. The leaf membrane from the lower side of each leaf was peeled off by applying thinner on it followed by removal of leaf membrane by using cello tape. The cello tape containing the leaf membrane was placed on a glass slide and observed under compound microscope. Stomatal frequency was calculated by counting the number of stomata per microscopic field of the compound microscope. The mean of four microscopic fields considered as stomatal frequency of the genotype under study in both the environments and expressed as number of stomata per microscopic field.

### Specific leaf weight (SLW) (g)

For this all the leaves of a genotype from each plot at 120 days after planting were counted in field and carried to lab where they were kept in oven at 50°C for 24 hours. The dry weight of oven dried leaves was taken and specific leaf weight (SLW) was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Specific leaf weight (g)} = \text{Dry weight of leaves per plant (g)} / \text{Total no. of leaves per plant}$$

## 123 Statistical analysis

124 The mean values of all the traits from each genotype in each replication were used for  
 125 analysis of variance as per Fisher (1935) carried out with CPCS1 software (Cheema and  
 126 Singh 1990). However, phenotypic and genotypic correlation coefficients of different traits  
 127 with cane yield were worked out by the formulae suggested by Al-Jibouri et al. (1958) and  
 128 path coefficient analysis was done following Dewane and Lu (1958) under normal ( $E_1$ ) and  
 129 water stress ( $E_2$ ) environments using MVM software (Singh 1993) and interpretations were  
 130 made accordingly.

## 131 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

132 From correlation matrix of cane yield, its components and physiological traits at  
 133 phenotypic and genotypic levels (Table 1) in both the environments, it was evident that  
 134 genotypic correlation coefficients, in general under both the environments, were higher in  
 135 magnitude than the corresponding phenotypic correlations. This indicated that there was an  
 136 inherent association among various characters under study, which was depressed due to  
 137 environmental influence and ultimately resulted in low phenotypic expression of the  
 138 correlation. Khan et al. (2012) also reported lower estimates of phenotypic correlation  
 139 indicated that these relationships were affected by environment at phenotypic level.

140 At Phenotypic level, under normal ( $E_1$ ) and water stress ( $E_2$ ) environments cane yield  
 141 had significant and positive association with stalk length (0.254, 0.378), stalk diameter  
 142 (0.329, 0.373), single cane weight (0.301, 0.541) and chlorophyll content (0.202, 0.413).  
 143 Kumar et al. (2001) reported close association of cane yield with number of tillers, number of  
 144 millable canes per plot, germination per cent, length of internodes and single cane weight  
 145 under moisture deficient conditions. Sanghera et al. (2015) also reported that cane yield was  
 146 significantly and positively correlated with NMC at 10 months, stalk length, single cane  
 147 weight, stalk diameter and germination percentage at 45 days under irrigated conditions.  
 148 Similarly, cane yield was found significantly and positively associated with stalk length  
 149 (0.558 and 0.463), stalk diameter (0.565 and 0.488), single cane weight (0.512 and 0.652) and  
 150 chlorophyll content, (0.289 and 0.757) at genotypic level, normal ( $E_1$ ) and water stress ( $E_2$ )  
 151 environments, respectively. However, it had negative significant correlation with number of  
 152 stomata (-0.556) under water stress ( $E_2$ ) environment. These results are in agreement with  
 153 earlier studies (Thippeswamy et al. 2003, Tyagi et al. 2012, Sanghera et al. 2015) who found

positive and highly significant genotypic associations of cane yield with single cane weight, number of millable cane per plot and germination percent.

Interrelations among cane yield components revealed that at phenotypic level, stalk length was positively correlated with number of tillers at 240 days (0.339) and number of millable canes (0.429) and at genotypic level it was positively correlated with germination percent (0.398), number of shoots at 120 DAP (0.348), number of tillers at 240 DAP (0.416) and number of millable canes (0.568) under water stress ( $E_2$ ) environment. The stalk diameter was positively correlated with stalk length under normal ( $E_1$ ) environment but was negatively correlated with germination percent, number of shoots at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days and number of millable canes at maturity under water stress environment ( $E_2$ ) at genotypic level. Earlier correlation study for characters under normal and drought conditions by Hemaprabha *et al* (2013) also reported significant association for NMC, cane length and internode length confirming the importance of quantifying NMC, cane length and single cane weight as important parameters to be considered in drought screening. Germination in percentage was highly significant positively correlated with number of shoots at 240 days in thousand per hectare under both the environment at both phenotypic as well as genotypic level. Similarly, number of millable canes was highly positively associated with germination in percentage, number of shoots at 120 days in thousand per hectare and number of tillers at 240 days in thousand per hectare under both the environments at both phenotypic and genotypic level. Results shown by Tena *et al.* (2016) indicated that cane yield had a strong positive and highly significant correlation with millable cane number, single cane weight, stalk height and sugar yield.

Physiological traits showed differential pattern of associations with cane yield component traits in this study. Relative water content (RWC) at 60 days after planting had a positive correlation with stalk length (0.332 and 0.553) under both  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  environments, respectively whereas it was positively correlated with stalk diameter (0.463) and single cane weight (0.447) under water stress ( $E_2$ ) environment at phenotypic level. At genotypic level RWC had positive significant correlation with stalk length and single cane weight under both the environments but it was negative and significantly correlated with number of shoots at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days and number of millable canes under normal water ( $E_1$ ) conditions and positive significantly correlated with these characters under water stress ( $E_2$ ) conditions.

At phenotypic level, under  $E_2$  environment total chlorophyll content had significant positive correlation with stalk length, stalk diameter and single cane weight while at genotypic level it was significant and positively correlated with germination percentage, number of shoots at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days, number of millable canes at maturity, stalk length, stalk diameter, single cane weight and RWC at 60 and 120 days after planting. Under  $E_1$  conditions, it had significant positive correlation with stalk length and negative significant correlation with RWC at 60 days after planting. Similar results were exposed by Silva et al. (2007) who found positive significant correlation among total chlorophyll content and RWC under water stress conditions.

Number of stomata was significant and negatively correlated with stalk length, stalk diameter and single cane weight under both water stress ( $E_2$ ) and normal ( $E_1$ ) conditions at phenotypic and genotypic levels. At phenotypic level, specific leaf weight had significant positive correlation with stalk length (0.395), single cane weight (0.385), single cane weight (0.385) and RWC at 60 days after planting (0.349) under water stressed ( $E_2$ ) conditions and at genotypic level it had significant positive correlation with number of millable canes, stalk length, stalk diameter, single cane weight RWC at 60 and 120 days after planting and total chlorophyll content under same environment. On the basis of correlation studies, stalk length, stalk diameter, number of millable canes and number of tillers at 240 days were identified as important traits which can be selected for cane yield improvement under both the environments. While the number of stomata, chlorophyll content, specific leaf weight and RWC at 60 and 120 days are identified as important physiological traits for cane yield under water stress ( $E_2$ ) environment.

Path analysis is useful in finding out direct and indirect causes of associations and allows a precise perception of specific forces acting to produce a given correlation. The relative importance of each causal factor also becomes evident. In present investigation, the direct and indirect effects of different traits on cane yield at phenotypic and genotypic levels were worked out both under normal ( $E_1$ ) and water stressed ( $E_2$ ) conditions (Table 2 & 3). A perusal of direct and indirect effects at phenotypic level delineate that under normal ( $E_1$ ) conditions, number of millable canes exhibited highest positive direct effect (0.669) on cane yield followed by stalk diameter (0.329), number of stomata (0.128), RWC at 60 days (0.065), specific leaf weight (0.026) and stalk length (Table 2). The character with negative direct effects on cane yield were number of shoots at 120 days, germination percentage, RWC at 60 days and chlorophyll content. However, under water stressed ( $E_2$ )

conditions number of tillers at 240 days had maximum positive (0.445) direct effect on cane yield followed by single cane weight (0.337), total chlorophyll (0.288) and specific leaf weight (0.042). These results were similar to as reported by Singh *et al* (2005), Mali *et al* (2010), Sanghera *et al* (2014a) and Tena *et al* (2016). Similarly, direct and indirect effects at genotypic level (Table 3) revealed that under normal ( $E_1$ ) conditions, number of millable canes (7.487) exhibited highest positive direct effect on cane yield followed by stalk diameter (3.189), number of stomata (1.217), RWC at 120 days (0.445), specific leaf weight (0.423) and stalk length (0.356). The character with negative direct effects on cane yield were number of tillers at 240 days, number of shoots at 120 days, germination percentage, RWC at 60 days and chlorophyll content. However, under water stressed ( $E_2$ ) conditions number of tillers at 120 days (3.177) had maximum positive direct effect on cane yield followed by relative water content at 60 days (1.930), stalk length (1.741), RWC at 120 days (1.525), number of shoots (0.768) and single cane weight (0.453). The above results are in accordance with the earlier studies of Das *et al* (2007) and Khan *et al* (2012). Among indirect effects, germination percentage had positive indirect effect via NMC, chlorophyll content and specific leaf weight under both  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  environments and via number of tillers at 240 days, single cane weight, stalk length and number of stomata under water stress ( $E_2$ ) conditions. However, this trait exhibited negative indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days, stalk diameter, single cane weight, RWC at 60 and 120 days and number of stomata under normal ( $E_1$ ) conditions, while under water stress conditions ( $E_2$ ) this trait exhibited negative indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days and RWC at 60 and 120 days. Single cane weight had positive indirect effect on cane yield via stalk diameter and negative indirect effect via NMC under normal water conditions whereas it had negative indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days and positive indirect effect via stalk length under water stressed conditions. The results were similar to earlier reported by Sanghera *et al* (2015), Kumar and Singh (2005) and Madhavi *et al* (1990) for cane yield and component traits under irrigated conditions.

Among indirect effects, germination percentage had positive indirect effects on cane yield via NMC, single cane weight, chlorophyll content under  $E_1$  and via number of tillers at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days, stalk length and RWC at 60 days after planting under  $E_2$  environment. Number of shoots at 120 days had positive indirect effect via NMC, SCW and chlorophyll content and had negative effects via number of tillers at 240 days and stalk diameter under normal water conditions whereas under water stressed conditions it had

positive indirect effect via number of tillers at 240 days, SCW, stalk length, RWC at 60 and 120 days and number of stomata and negative indirect effect via germination percentage, NMC, stalk diameter and chlorophyll content. The genotypic correlation coefficients indicated that NMC, stalk weight, and stalk height had significant and positive association with cane yield as well as sugar yield (Rishipal *et al* 1998 and Thippeswamy *et al* 2003) so these traits have high direct and indirect effects. Stalk length had negative indirect effect via NMC, chlorophyll content under both the environments however; it had positive indirect effect via number of tillers at 240 days and number of shoots at 120 days. Singh *et al* (2005) reported that two characters namely NMC and single cane weight showed significant positive direct contribution towards cane yield. Under both the environments, stalk diameter had positive indirect effect via stalk length, number of shoots at 120 days and number of tillers at 240 days however, under water stress ( $E_2$ ) conditions, it had positive indirect effect on cane yield via single cane weight, RWC at 60 and 120 days and number of stomata. Under  $E_2$  environment SCW and RWC at 60 and 120 days had negative indirect effect on cane yield via germination percentage and positive indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days, number of tillers at 240 days, stalk length and number of stomata. Sanghera *et al* (2015) partitioned association into their direct and indirect effects and reported that high positive indirect effects are exerted by growth characters like number of shoots 240 days, number millable canes, single cane weight and stalk diameter. In case of physiological traits under water stress ( $E_2$ ) environment, RWC at 60 and 120 days after planting had negative direct effect but it shows positive indirect effect on cane yield via single cane weight and number of tillers at 240 days. The chlorophyll content had negative indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days and positive direct effect via single cane weight. The number of stomata had negative direct effect on yield but it had positive indirect effect via number of shoots at 120 days. The chlorophyll content had negative indirect effect via number of tillers at 240 days and positive indirect effect via stalk diameter and number of millable canes. Similar results have been reported (Silva *et al.* 2014) under water stress conditions. The residual (unexplained) variation in path analysis signified that unexplained and unaccounted variation left among the genotypes could be explained by including some more agro-physiological traits. Present study conclude that stalk length, stalk diameter, number of millable canes, number of tillers at 240 days are important for cane yield improvement and low number of stomata, high chlorophyll content, specific leaf weight and RWC at 120 days are physiological traits associated with stress tolerance and could be used as selection criteria for cane yield improvement under water stress ( $E_2$ ) conditions.

286 **References**

- 287 Al- Jibouri HA, Millar PA and Robinson HF (1958) Genotypic and environmental variances  
288 and co-variance in an upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. **Agronomy**  
289 **Journal 50**: 633-637.
- 290 Barnes JD, Balaguer L, Manrique E, Elvira S and Davison A W (1992) A reappraisal of the  
291 use of DMSO for the extraction and determination of chlorophylls a and b in lichens  
292 and higher plants. **Envir Exp Bot 32**:85-100.
- 293 Cardozo NP and Sentelhas PC (2013) Climatic effects on sugarcane ripening under the  
294 influence of cultivars and crop age. **Sci. agric. 70(6)**: 449-456.
- 295 Cheema HS and Singh B (1990) A user's manual to CPCS- 1. A computer programme  
296 package for the analysis of commonly used experimental designs, PAU, Ludhiana.
- 297 Das R, Ghoshal SK, Ray BR and Mazumdar D (2007) Study of correlation and path analysis  
298 in relation to cane and sugar yield of sugarcane. **Sugar Tech 9**: 293-299.
- 299 Domaingue R (1995) Family and varietal adaptation of sugarcane to dry conditions and  
300 relevance to selection procedures. **Proc Congress of Intern So Sugarcane Technol**  
301 **21**: 418–435.
- 302 Fisher RA (1935) The design of experiments. **Oliver and Boyd, Edinburg.**
- 303 Hemaprabha G, Swapna S, Lavanya DL, Sajitha B and Venkataramana S (2013) Evaluation  
304 of drought tolerance potential of elite genotypes and progenies of sugarcane  
305 (*Saccharum* sp. hybrids). **Sugar Tech. 15**: 9–16.
- 306 Hiscox JD and Israelstam GF (1979) A method for the extraction of chlorophyll from leaf  
307 tissue without maceration. **Canadian journal of Botany 57**: 1332-1334.
- 308 Khan IA, Bibi S, Yasmin S, Khatri A, Seema N and Abro SA (2012) Correlation studies of  
309 agronomic traits for higher sugar yield in sugarcane. **Pak. J. Bot 44(3)**: 969-971.
- 310 Kumar N and Singh JRP (2005) Path analysis in sugarcane under different environmental  
311 conditions. **Indian Sugar 55**: 57-60.
- 312 Kumar S, Singh PK, Singh J and Kumar S (2001) Genetic variability, heritability, genetic  
313 advance and correlations in sugarcane under moisture deficit condition. **Indian**  
314 **Journal of Sugarcane Technology 16**: 32-35.
- 315 Madhavi D, Reddy CR and Rao KSN (1990) Inter-relationship of component traits of cane  
316 and sugar yields. **Sugarcane (Autumn 1990)**: 34-36.
- 317 Mali SC, Patel A, Patel DU and Patel CL (2010) Variability, correlation, path analysis and  
318 genetic divergence in sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp.) **Research on Crops 11**: 497-504.
- 319 Ramesh P (2000) Effect of different levels of drought during the formative phase on growth  
320 parameters and its relationship with dry matter accumulation in sugarcane. **J. Agron**  
321 **Crop Sci. 185**: 83-89.
- 322 Rishipal BS, Chaudhari AS, Mehta AS and Kadian SP (1998) Studies on characters  
323 interrelationship in clonal generation of sugarcane (*Saccharum* complex hybrids).  
324 **Indian Sugar 47**: 907-911.
- 325 Sanghera GS, Tyagi V, Kumar R and Thind KS (2014) Genetic variability for cane yield,  
326 earliness and quality traits in sugarcane under subtropical region of India.  
327 **International journal of current research. 6 (8)**: 7763-7765.

- 328 Sanghera GS, Tyagi V, Kumar R, Thind KS and Sharma B (2015) Genetic variability,  
329 association and their dissection through path analysis for cane yield and its component  
330 traits in early maturing sugarcane clones. **Journal of Science 5 (1):** 28-34.
- 331 Silva MD, Jifon JL, Silva JAGD and Santos CMD (2014) Relationships between  
332 physiological traits and productivity of sugarcane in response to water deficit. **The**  
333 **Journal of Agricultural Science 152 (1):** 104-118
- 334 Singh B (1993) A users' manual to MVM. A computer programs package for the analysis of  
335 commonly used multivariate methods, PAU, Ludhiana.
- 336 Singh RK, Singh SP and Singh SB (2005) Correlation and path analysis in sugarcane ratoon.  
337 **Sugar Tech. 7:** 176-178.
- 338 Singh S and Rao PNG (1987) Varietal differences in growth characteristics in sugarcane. **J.**  
339 **Agri. Sci. 108:** 245-247.
- 340 Sreekumar K, Jessy Kuriakose M, Mathew T, Alexander D. and Santhakumari S (1994)  
341 Variability, heritability and correlation studies on yield and quality characters of  
342 sugarcane. **Indian Sugar 44:** 243-249.
- 343 Tena E, Mekbib F and Ayana A (2016) Correlation and path coefficient analyses in  
344 sugarcane genotypes of Ethiopia. **American Journal of Plant Sciences 7:** 1490-1497
- 345 Thippeswamy S, Kajjidoni ST, Salimath PM and Goud JV (2003) Correlation and path  
346 analysis for cane yield, juice quality and their component traits in sugarcane. **Sugar**  
347 **Tech 5:** 65-72.
- 348 Trenberth KE (2011) Changes in precipitation with climate change. **Clim. Res. 47:** 123-138.
- 349 Turner NC (1981) Techniques and experimental approaches for the measurement of plant  
350 water status. **Plant Soil 58:** 339-361.
- 351 Tyagi VK, Sharma S and Bhardwaj SB (2012) Pattern of association among cane yield, sugar  
352 yield and their components in sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.). **J. Agric. Res.**  
353 **50:** 29-38.
- 354 Vinocur B and Altman A (2005) Recent advances in engineering plant tolerance to abiotic  
355 stress: achievements and limitations. **Curr. Opin. Biotech. 16:** 123-132.

356  
357**Table 1: Genotypic and Phenotypic correlation coefficients among different morpho-physiological traits of sugarcane under normal (E<sub>1</sub>) and water stress (E<sub>2</sub>) environments.**

| Traits            | Env.           | Germination | No. of shoots | No. of tillers | NMC       | Stalk length | Stalk diameter | SCW       | RWC 60 days | RWC 120 days | Chlorophyll | No. of stomata | Specific leaf wt | Cane yield (t/ha) |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Germination       | E <sub>1</sub> |             | 0.5420**      | 0.6043**       | 0.5804**  | -0.0842      | -0.2610*       | -0.2041   | -0.0951     | 0.0629       | -0.0702     | 0.2716*        | -0.4140**        | 0.245             |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> |             | 0.8519**      | 0.8165**       | 0.9911**  | 0.3984**     | 0.067          | 0.2201    | 0.4425**    | 0.5929**     | 0.3492**    | -0.1618        | 0.1442           | 0.1015            |
| No. of shoots     | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.5412**    |               | 0.9857**       | 0.9597**  | -0.0255      | -0.5602**      | -0.3724** | -0.6595**   | 0.0276       | -0.0913     | 0.0745         | -0.1844          | 0.1445            |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.6198**    |               | 0.9125**       | 0.9325**  | 0.3481**     | 0.0591         | 0.3489**  | 0.4373**    | 0.3323**     | 0.4290**    | -0.0642        | 0.3243*          | 0.1828            |
| No. of tillers    | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.5569**    | 0.9403**      |                | 0.9639**  | -0.0269      | -0.4857**      | -0.4808** | -0.6525**   | -0.0328      | -0.1972     | -0.04          | -0.2870*         | 0.2674*           |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.6733**    | 0.8987**      |                | 0.9532**  | 0.4169**     | 0.0489         | 0.3166    | 0.4862**    | 0.5261**     | 0.5518**    | -0.0673        | 0.2452           | 0.1993            |
| NMC               | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.4694**    | 0.8806**      | 0.9308**       |           | -0.0511      | -0.6104**      | -0.4652** | -0.7544**   | 0.0685       | -0.0682     | -0.0132        | -0.2365          | 0.2513            |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.5093**    | 0.7748**      | 0.7433**       |           | 0.5685**     | 0.1358         | 0.3670**  | 0.4761**    | 0.5052**     | 0.8384**    | -0.2644*       | 0.4197**         | 0.3289*           |
| Stalk length      | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.1002      | 0.1336        | 0.1828         | 0.1154*   |              | 0.3583**       | 0.5082**  | 0.5809**    | -0.0042      | 0.3695**    | -0.3537**      | 0.4166**         | 0.5584**          |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.2151      | 0.4329        | 0.3395**       | 0.4293**  |              | 0.7442**       | 0.7595**  | 0.9321**    | 0.6470**     | 0.9522**    | -0.4460**      | 0.5867**         | 0.4630**          |
| Stalk diameter    | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.1186     | -0.4043       | -0.2870*       | -0.3486** | 0.2942**     |                | 0.4912**  | 0.2528      | -0.2654*     | 0.2045      | -0.4129**      | -0.0016          | 0.5657**          |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.0336      | 0.0262        | 0.026          | 0.0937    | 0.5146**     |                | 0.8832**  | 0.8868**    | 0.7395**     | 0.8694**    | -0.5714**      | 0.4280**         | 0.4887**          |
| SCW               | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.194      | -0.1548       | -0.1535        | -0.1731   | 0.4606**     | 0.5611**       |           | 0.3726**    | -0.0935      | 0.24        | -0.0673        | 0.3222*          | 0.5128**          |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.1118      | 0.2478        | 0.2364         | 0.2914*   | 0.5677**     | 0.6066**       |           | 0.8879**    | 0.8750**     | 0.9107**    | -0.4210**      | 0.5249**         | 0.6523**          |
| RWC 60 days       | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.0089     | -0.1426       | -0.135         | -0.1471   | 0.3315**     | 0.1844         | 0.213     |             | -0.135       | -0.3376**   | 0.3297*        | 0.9567**         | -0.0311           |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.0393      | 0.2458        | 0.1528         | 0.2754*   | 0.5532**     | 0.4634**       | 0.4475**  |             | 0.8669**     | 0.9054**    | -0.3030*       | 0.8300**         | 0.0719            |
| RWC 120 days      | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.0882      | 0.0232        | 0.0415         | 0.1088    | -0.0175      | -0.0058        | 0.0417    | -0.0159     |              | 0.008       | -0.2810**      | -0.1667          | -0.1473           |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.1576      | 0.2725*       | 0.1282         | 0.4665**  | 0.4369**     | 0.2555*        | 0.3781**  | 0.4106**    |              | 0.9178**    | -0.5062**      | 0.6646**         | 0.248             |
| Chlorophyll       | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.0396      | 0.1169        | 0.069          | 0.0887    | 0.1127       | 0.1126         | 0.2157    | 0.0467      | 0.0342       |             | -0.1503        | 0.2282           | 0.2897*           |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.208       | 0.3066*       | 0.1441         | 0.3202*   | 0.6022**     | 0.4154**       | 0.4770**  | 0.2853*     | 0.4434**     |             | -0.6168**      | 0.6512**         | 0.7572**          |
| No. of stomata    | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.1352      | 0.115         | 0.0361         | 0.0048    | -0.1032      | -0.2519        | 0.0184    | 0.1306      | -0.099       | -0.0897     |                | 0.127            | -0.1804           |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.1461     | -0.0443       | -0.1192        | -0.2033   | -0.3501**    | -0.3948**      | -0.3481** | -0.0587     | -0.1596      | -0.2609*    |                | -0.2819*         | -0.5563**         |
| Specific leaf wt  | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.077      | -0.0415       | -0.047         | -0.0591   | 0.1753       | 0.1622         | 0.3001*   | 0.2146      | 0.0567       | 0.0146      | 0.1596         |                  | 0.1148            |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.1514      | 0.1755        | 0.1458         | 0.1958    | 0.3952**     | 0.3046*        | 0.3852**  | 0.3495**    | 0.1606       | 0.2416      | -0.1495        |                  | 0.2996*           |
| Cane yield (t/ha) | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.1568      | 0.1594        | 0.2229         | 0.2509    | 0.2543*      | 0.3290*        | 0.3014*   | 0.1008      | -0.0997      | 0.2022      | -0.184         | 0.782            |                   |
|                   | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.0785      | 0.1476        | 0.2072         | 0.2286    | 0.3781**     | 0.3734**       | 0.5411**  | 0.0966      | 0.1377       | 0.4130**    | -0.4479**      | 0.2256           |                   |

358 **Critical value of 'r' at 5%=0.2541 and at 1%=0.3301, above diagonal Genotypic correlation coefficients**

359 Table 2: Estimates of direct and indirect effects of different agro-physiological traits of sugarcane genotypes on cane yield (t/ha) at phenotypic level under normal (E<sub>1</sub>)  
360 and water stressed (E<sub>2</sub>) environments.

| Traits                              | Env.           | Germination (%) | No. of shoots at 120days (000/ha) | No. of tillers at 240 days (000/ha) | NMC at maturity (000/ha) | Stalk length (cm) | Stalk diameter (cm) | SCW (kg)     | RWC at 60 DAP (%) | RWC at 120 DAP (%) | Total Chlorophyll (mg/l) | Stomatal frequency (no.) | Specific leaf wt (g) | Correlation with cane yield (t/ha) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Germination (%)                     | E <sub>1</sub> | <b>0.096</b>    | -0.026                            | -0.153                              | 0.314                    | 0.0004            | -0.039              | -0.003       | -0.0006           | -0.016             | 0.003                    | -0.017                   | 0.002                | 0.1568                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | <b>-0.164</b>   | -0.222                            | 0.299                               | 0.040                    | 0.006             | 0.0001              | 0.042        | -0.006            | -0.014             | 0.059                    | 0.031                    | 0.006                | 0.0785                             |
| No. of shoots at 120days (000/ha)   | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.052           | <b>-0.048</b>                     | -0.258                              | 0.589                    | 0.0006            | -0.133              | -0.023       | -0.009            | -0.004             | 0.009                    | -0.014                   | -0.001               | 0.1594                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.102          | <b>-0.359</b>                     | 0.400                               | 0.061                    | 0.012             | 0.0001              | 0.093        | -0.038            | -0.025             | 0.088                    | 0.009                    | 0.007                | 0.1476                             |
| No. of tillers at 240 days (000/ha) | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.053           | -0.045                            | <b>-0.274</b>                       | 0.622                    | 0.0008            | -0.094              | -0.023       | -0.008            | -0.007             | 0.005                    | -0.004                   | -0.001               | 0.2229                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.110          | -0.323                            | <b>0.445</b>                        | 0.058                    | 0.009             | 0.0001              | 0.089        | -0.023            | -0.012             | 0.041                    | 0.026                    | 0.006                | 0.2072                             |
| NMC at maturity (000/ha)            | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.045           | -0.042                            | -0.255                              | <b>0.669</b>             | 0.005             | -0.114              | -0.026       | -0.009            | -0.020             | 0.007                    | -0.0006                  | -0.001               | 0.2509                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.083          | -0.278                            | 0.331                               | <b>0.079</b>             | 0.012             | 0.0003              | 0.110        | -0.043            | -0.043             | 0.092                    | 0.044                    | 0.008                | 0.2286                             |
| Stalk length (cm)                   | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.009           | -0.006                            | -0.050                              | 0.077                    | <b>0.004</b>      | 0.096               | 0.070        | 0.021             | 0.003              | 0.009                    | 0.013                    | 0.004                | 0.2543                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.035          | -0.155                            | 0.151                               | 0.033                    | <b>0.029</b>      | 0.014               | 0.214        | -0.086            | -0.041             | 0.173                    | 0.076                    | 0.017                | 0.3781                             |
| Stalk diameter (cm)                 | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.011          | 0.019                             | 0.078                               | -0.233                   | 0.001             | <b>0.329</b>        | 0.085        | 0.012             | 0.001              | 0.009                    | 0.032                    | 0.004                | 0.3290                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.005          | -0.009                            | 0.011                               | 0.007                    | 0.015             | <b>0.002</b>        | 0.229        | -0.072            | -0.024             | 0.119                    | 0.086                    | 0.013                | 0.3734                             |
| SCW (kg)                            | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.001          | 0.007                             | 0.042                               | -0.115                   | 0.002             | 0.184               | <b>0.153</b> | 0.014             | -0.007             | 0.018                    | -0.002                   | 0.007                | 0.3014                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.018          | -0.089                            | 0.105                               | 0.023                    | 0.016             | 0.001               | <b>0.377</b> | -0.069            | -0.035             | 0.137                    | 0.076                    | 0.016                | 0.5411                             |
| RWC at 60 DAP (%)                   | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.0009         | 0.006                             | 0.037                               | -0.098                   | 0.001             | 0.060               | 0.032        | <b>0.065</b>      | 0.003              | 0.003                    | -0.016                   | 0.005                | 0.1008                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.006          | -0.088                            | 0.068                               | 0.021                    | 0.016             | 0.001               | 0.168        | <b>-0.156</b>     | 0.038              | 0.082                    | 0.012                    | 0.015                | 0.0966                             |
| RWC at 120 DAP (%)                  | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.008           | -0.001                            | -0.011                              | 0.072                    | -0.0001           | -0.001              | 0.006        | -0.001            | <b>-0.189</b>      | 0.002                    | 0.012                    | 0.001                | -0.0997                            |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.026          | -0.098                            | 0.057                               | 0.036                    | 0.012             | 0.0007              | 0.142        | -0.064            | <b>-0.093</b>      | 0.127                    | 0.034                    | 0.006                | 0.1377                             |
| Total Chlorophyll (mg/l)            | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.003           | -0.005                            | -0.019                              | 0.059                    | 0.0005            | 0.037               | 0.033        | 0.003             | -0.006             | <b>0.084</b>             | 0.011                    | 0.0004               | 0.2022                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.034           | -0.110                            | 0.064                               | 0.025                    | 0.017             | 0.001               | 0.180        | -0.044            | -0.041             | <b>0.288</b>             | 0.057                    | 0.010                | 0.4130                             |
| Stomatal frequency (no.)            | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.013           | -0.005                            | -0.009                              | 0.003                    | -0.0004           | -0.082              | 0.002        | 0.008             | 0.018              | -0.007                   | <b>0.128</b>             | 0.004                | 0.1840                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.024           | 0.015                             | -0.053                              | -0.016                   | -0.010            | -0.011              | -0.131       | 0.009             | 0.015              | -0.075                   | <b>-0.218</b>            | -0.006               | -0.4479                            |
| Specific leaf wt (g)                | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.007          | 0.002                             | 0.012                               | -0.039                   | 0.0008            | 0.053               | 0.045        | 0.014             | -0.010             | 0.001                    | -0.020                   | <b>0.026</b>         | 0.782                              |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.024          | -0.063                            | 0.065                               | 0.015                    | 0.011             | 0.0008              | 0.145        | -0.054            | -0.015             | 0.069                    | 0.032                    | <b>0.042</b>         | 0.2256                             |

361 Unexplained variation at phenotypic level under E<sub>1</sub> = 0.14      Unexplained variation at phenotypic level under E<sub>2</sub> = 0.16

362  
363

**Table 3: Estimates of direct and indirect effects of different agro-physiological traits of sugarcane genotypes on cane yield (t/ha) at genotypic level under normal (E<sub>1</sub>) and water stressed (E<sub>2</sub>) environments.**

| Traits                              | Env.           | Germination (%) | No. of shoots at 120days (000/ha) | No. of tillers at 240 days (000/ha) | NMC at maturity (000/ha) | Stalk length (cm) | Stalk diameter (cm) | SCW (kg)      | RWC at 60 DAP (%) | RWC at 120 DAP (%) | Total Chlorophyll (mg/l) | Stomatal frequency (no.) | Specific leaf wt (g) | Correlation with cane yield (t/ha) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Germination (%)                     | E <sub>1</sub> | <b>-0.286</b>   | -0.178                            | -3.055                              | 4.345                    | -0.030            | -0.832              | 0.020         | 0.010             | 0.028              | 0.067                    | 0.330                    | -0.175               | 0.2450                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | <b>-2.607</b>   | 0.654                             | 2.594                               | -2.302                   | 0.693             | -0.166              | 0.099         | 0.854             | 0.904              | -0.781                   | 0.353                    | -0.194               | 0.1015                             |
| No. of shoots at 120days (000/ha)   | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.155          | <b>-0.329</b>                     | -4.983                              | 7.185                    | -0.009            | -1.786              | 0.038         | 0.072             | 0.012              | 0.087                    | 0.090                    | -0.078               | 0.1445                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -2.221          | <b>0.768</b>                      | 3.437                               | -2.512                   | 0.606             | -0.146              | 0.158         | 0.844             | 0.506              | -0.960                   | 0.140                    | -0.4373              | 0.1828                             |
| No. of tillers at 240 days (000/ha) | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.173          | -0.324                            | <b>-5.055</b>                       | 7.254                    | -0.009            | -1.549              | 0.049         | 0.071             | -0.014             | 0.189                    | -0.048                   | -0.121               | 0.2674                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -2.129          | 0.831                             | <b>3.177</b>                        | -2.750                   | 0.725             | -0.121              | 0.143         | 0.938             | 0.802              | -1.235                   | 0.147                    | -0.330               | 0.1993                             |
| NMC at maturity (000/ha)            | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.166          | -0.316                            | -4.898                              | <b>7.487</b>             | -0.018            | -1.947              | 0.047         | 0.082             | 0.030              | 0.065                    | -0.016                   | -0.100               | 0.2513                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -2.584          | 0.831                             | 3.762                               | <b>2.322</b>             | 0.989             | -0.337              | 0.166         | 0.919             | 0.770              | -1.877                   | 0.577                    | 0.565                | 0.3289                             |
| Stalk length (cm)                   | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.024           | 0.008                             | 0.135                               | -0.382                   | <b>0.356</b>      | 1.143               | -0.052        | -0.063            | -0.001             | -0.354                   | -0.430                   | 0.176                | 0.5584                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -1.039          | 0.267                             | 1.324                               | -1.320                   | <b>1.741</b>      | -1.847              | 0.344         | 1.954             | 0.986              | -2.131                   | 0.974                    | -0.791               | 0.4630                             |
| Stalk diameter (cm)                 | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.074           | 0.184                             | 2.455                               | -4.570                   | 0.127             | <b>3.189</b>        | -0.050        | -0.027            | -0.118             | -0.196                   | -0.502                   | -0.0007              | 0.5657                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.174          | 0.045                             | 0.155                               | -0.315                   | 1.295             | <b>2.482</b>        | 0.400         | 1.711             | 1.128              | -1.946                   | 1.248                    | -0.577               | 0.4887                             |
| SCW (kg)                            | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.058           | 0.122                             | 2.430                               | -3.483                   | 0.181             | 1.567               | <b>-0.102</b> | -0.040            | -0.041             | -0.230                   | -0.082                   | 0.136                | 0.5128                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.573          | 0.268                             | 1.005                               | -0.852                   | 1.322             | -2.192              | <b>0.453</b>  | 1.714             | 1.334              | -2.039                   | 0.919                    | -0.707               | 0.6523                             |
| RWC at 60 DAP (%)                   | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.027           | 0.217                             | 3.298                               | -5.648                   | 0.206             | 0.806               | -0.038        | <b>-0.109</b>     | -0.060             | 0.324                    | 0.401                    | 0.548                | -0.0311                            |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -1.154          | 0.336                             | 1.544                               | -1.105                   | 1.762             | -2.201              | 0.402         | <b>1.930</b>      | 1.322              | -2.308                   | 0.661                    | -1.119               | 0.0719                             |
| RWC at 120 DAP (%)                  | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.018          | -0.009                            | 0.165                               | 0.512                    | -0.001            | -0.846              | 0.009         | 0.014             | <b>0.445</b>       | -0.007                   | 0.342                    | -0.070               | -0.1473                            |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -1.546          | 0.255                             | 1.671                               | -1.173                   | 1.126             | -1.836              | 0.397         | 1.673             | <b>1.525</b>       | -2.054                   | 1.105                    | -0.896               | 0.2480                             |
| Total Chlorophyll(mg/l)             | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.020           | 0.030                             | 0.997                               | -0.510                   | 0.131             | 0.653               | -0.024        | 0.036             | 0.003              | <b>-0.960</b>            | -0.183                   | 0.096                | 0.2897                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.910          | 0.329                             | 1.753                               | -1.947                   | 1.657             | -2.158              | 0.413         | 1.989             | 1.399              | <b>-2.239</b>            | 1.347                    | -0.878               | 0.7572                             |
| Stomatal frequency (no.)            | E <sub>1</sub> | -0.077          | -0.024                            | 0.202                               | -0.098                   | -0.125            | -1.317              | 0.006         | -0.036            | -0.125             | 0.144                    | <b>1.217</b>             | 0.058                | -0.1804                            |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | 0.421           | -0.049                            | 0.213                               | 0.614                    | -0.776            | 1.418               | -0.191        | 0.584             | -0.772             | 1.381                    | <b>-2.184</b>            | 0.380                | -0.5563                            |
| Specific leaf wt(g)                 | E <sub>1</sub> | 0.118           | 0.060                             | 1.451                               | -1.770                   | 0.148             | -0.005              | -0.032        | -0.140            | -0.074             | -0.219                   | 0.154                    | <b>0.423</b>         | 0.1148                             |
|                                     | E <sub>2</sub> | -0.376          | 0.249                             | 0.779                               | -0.974                   | 1.021             | -1.062              | 0.238         | 1.602             | 1.013              | -1.458                   | 0.615                    | <b>-1.348</b>        | 0.2996                             |

364  
365  
366

Unexplained variation at genotypic level under E<sub>1</sub> = - 0.16

Unexplained variation at genotypic level under E<sub>2</sub> =0.20