

ISSN Print: 2664-844X
 ISSN Online: 2664-8458
 Impact Factor: RJIF 5.6
 IJAFA 2022; 4(2): 145-149
www.agriculturaljournals.com
 Received: 18-09-2022
 Accepted: 20-10-2022

Arjun Lal Prajapat
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Rani Saxena
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Rameshwar Lal Mandeewal
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Mahesh Sharma
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Manoj Kumhar
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Corresponding Author:
Arjun Lal Prajapat
 Sri Karan Narendra
 Agriculture University,
 Jobner, Rajasthan, India

Response of wheat cultivars on physiological attributes to irrigation scheduling under different sowing windows

Arjun Lal Prajapat, Rani Saxena, Rameshwar Lal Mandeewal, Mahesh Sharma and Manoj Kumhar

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2022.v4.i2b.114>

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted under loamy sand soil during two consecutive *Rabi* seasons of 2016-17 and 2017-18 at Research Farm, Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Durgapura, Jobner. The experiment comprises four irrigation scheduling treatments (Irrigation at 0.6 Etc, 0.8 Etc, 1.0 Etc and 1.2 Etc), three cultivars (Raj 4120, Raj 4079 and Raj 4238) and three dates of sowing (15th November, 30th November and 15th December) assigned, respectively to main plot, sub plot and sub-sub plots were replicated three times in split plot design. Results of experiment showed that the irrigation applied at 1.2 Etc significantly influenced and recorded maximum value for the relative water content, membrane stability index and Chlorophyll content. Further results show that cultivar Raj 4079 recorded highest value for the same. By date of sowing maximum value of physiological attributes obtained with crop sown on 15th November.

Keywords: Wheat, chlorophyll content, membrane stability index, relative water content

1. Introduction

Wheat is the most important cereal crop, it's stable diet for more than one third of the world population and contributes more calories and protein to the world diet than any other cereal crop (Abd-El-Haleem *et al.*, 2009) ^[1]. Water is the most severe stress and the main cause of significant losses in growth and productivity of crop plants (Ludlow and Muchow, 1990) ^[9]. Water stress induces significant alterations in plant physiology and biochemistry. Some plants have a set of physiological adaptations that allow them to tolerate water stress conditions. The degree of adaptations to the decrease of water potential caused by drought may vary considerably among species (Save *et al.*, 1995) ^[20]. Plant response to water stress include morphological and biochemical changes and later as water stress become more severe to functional damage and loss of plant parts (Sangtarash, 2010) ^[19]. Researchers linked various physiological responses of plant to drought with their tolerance mechanisms, such as: pigment content and stability and high relative water content (Clarke and McCaig, 1982) ^[4]. Drought tolerant wheat species can be characterized by growth response, changes in water relations of tissues exposed to low water potential, stomatal conductance, ion accumulation and changes in the fluorescence induction parameters under water stress (Blum, 1988). In recent years, the screening of plant fluorescence signatures is developing as a specific tool which could be applied to detect the functioning and health status of plants (Lichtenthaler *et al.*, 1999; Samson *et al.*, 2000) ^[8, 18]. The ability of plants to maintain membrane integrity under drought is what determines tolerance towards drought stress (Vieira Da Silva *et al.*, 1974). Membrane stability is a widely used criterion to assess crop drought tolerance (Premachandra and Shimada, 1988) ^[13]. Understanding of physiological mechanisms that enable plants to adapt to water deficit and maintain growth and productivity during stress period could help in screening and selection of tolerant genotypes and using these traits in breeding programs (Zaharieva *et al.*, 2001) ^[25]. The main objective of this study was to determine the effect of water stress- imposed by planting different wheat cultivars in different dates of sowing on various physiological parameters and yield to find out the best and most simple tool which could be used for screening wheat varieties for drought tolerance.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Relative water content (%)

Relative water content (RWC) of fresh flag leaves were measured by the method given by Barrs and Weatherly, 1962. Leaf segments (1 cm²) were initially weighed and floated over the distilled water for 4 hours and turgid weight was recorded. Dry weight was obtained after drying the leaf segments at 80 °C for 48 hours. The RWC was calculated as

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

2.2 Membrane stability index

The membrane stability index (MSI) was determined as per method prescribed by (Sairam, 1994) [17]. Leaf samples of 200 mg were placed in test tube filled with 25 ml double distilled water and kept in water bath at 45°C for 30 minutes. Then cooled at room temperature and electrical conductivity was recorded by conductivity meter (C₁).

Subsequently the another plant samples of 200 mg with 25 ml distilled water was placed on boiling water bath at 100°C for 10 minutes and after cooling, electrical conductivity was recorded (C₂). The MSI was calculated as

$$\text{MSI} = \left(1 - \frac{C_1}{C_2}\right) \times 100$$

2.3 Chlorophyll content

Chlorophyll content was worked out at 40 and 80 DAS. Hiscox and Israelstem (1979) demonstrated that the absorption spectrum (600-680nm) for chlorophyll extracted in DMSO was virtually identical to that for extracted in 90 per cent acetone. Accordingly chlorophyll was extracted in DMSO and transmittance was recorded with spectrophotometer at 645 and 663 nm. Arnon's equation (1949) was used to work out chlorophyll content as here under

$$\text{Chlorophyll "a" (mg g}^{-1} \text{ fresh weight of leaves)} = \frac{(12.7 \times A_{663}) - (2.69 \times A_{645})}{1000} \times \frac{\text{Volume of DMSO}}{\text{Weight of leaf sample}}$$

$$\text{Chlorophyll "b" (mg g}^{-1} \text{ fresh weight of leaves)} = \frac{(22.9 \times A_{645}) - (4.65 \times A_{663})}{1000} \times \frac{\text{Volume of DMSO}}{\text{Weight of leaf sample}}$$

Total chlorophyll content was worked out by adding chlorophyll "a" and chlorophyll "b" as under:

$$\text{Total Chlorophyll (mg g}^{-1} \text{ fresh weight of leaves)} = \text{Chlorophyll}_a + \text{Chlorophyll}_b$$

3. Results and Discussion

Statistical analysis of data for relative water content showed that different levels of irrigation significantly influenced. The treatment I₄ (Irrigation at 1.2 ETc) proved superior over rest of the treatments in relation to RWC with the respect values (75.01 and 66.54%) at anthesis and 15 days after anthesis, respectively which remained at par with I₃ (Irrigation at 1.0 ETc) according to pooled analysis. With irrigation scheduling I₁ (Irrigation at 0.6 ETc) relative water content significantly decreased. According to (Rahman *et al.*, 2007), plants grown under water stress conditions decrease the intracellular water by increasing of osmotic compounds to absorb water from the soil powerfully. It seems there is a direct relationship between the soil moisture content and relative water content of leaf so that reduction in soil moisture and increasing water stress reduces relative water content of leaf. The results revealed that different levels of irrigation showed significant variation in the membrane stability index of wheat. The treatment I₄ (Irrigation at 1.2 ETc) proved superior over rest of the treatments and remained at par with I₃ (Irrigation at 1.0 ETc).

The most observable indirect effect of drought on plant performance reduces osmotic potential which resulted in reduced water availability of plants. These results are in agreement with Jaleel *et al.*, (2007) [6] in *Catharanthus roseus* and in *Brassica juncea*. Also, Rao *et al.*, (2012) [14] reported that, the membrane stability index of maize plants was significantly increased in response to the treatment with drought stress. Data (Table 1.) revealed that significantly

higher value (2.76 mg g⁻¹) of chlorophyll content was recorded under the treatment I₄ (Irrigation at 1.2 ETc) which proved superior over rest of the treatments and remained at par with I₃ (Irrigation at 1.0 ETc) with respective value (2.73 mg g⁻¹) on pooled data basis. This may be attributed to better root growth, resulting in higher water and nutrient uptake which resulted in increased chlorophyll content in leaves. Higher root density had a large influence on plant water status through its effect on water uptake from soil (Patidar and Mali, 2004) [12]. Highest chlorophyll content was observed in Raj 4079 (2.71%) and lowest in Raj 4120 (2.40%) at flag leaf stage. The leaf chlorophyll content decreased in Raj 4238 and Raj 4120 by 2.65 and 12.91% at flag leaf stage, respectively, as compared to Raj 4079, when averaged across all the genotypes taken for study this differential magnitude of decrease in chlorophyll content shows the presence of genetic variability for chlorophyll retention in these wheat genotypes. Ristic *et al.*, (2007) [16] also observed the genetic variability in chlorophyll content in wheat lines exposed to high temperature. Thus, the amount of chlorophyll in leaves might be crucial in realizing higher yield under high temperature stress. Membrane stability index declined significantly under high temperature stress in all the genotypes. The percent decline was least in Raj 4079 at (8.11%) at 15 DAA from anthesis, while Raj 4120 (16.57%) exhibited highest decline in MSI at 15 DAA from anthesis in pooled data analysis (Table 1.). It has been reported that stable cell membrane that remains functional during stress appears to control adaptation to high temperature (Gupta *et al.*, 2000) [5]. Sairam *et al.*, (2000) [17] reported that membrane disruption may alter water, ion and organic solute movement, as well as photosynthesis and respiration. In present investigation also, close link between membrane stability was observed in heat tolerant Raj 4079 and Raj 4238 cultivars. Leaf RWC is proposed as more important indicator of water status than other water potential parameters under drought stress conditions. During plant development, drought stress significantly reduced RWC

values (Siddique and Islam, 2000) [21]. Significant difference in RWC was observed between cultivar at various stages and our results showed reduction in RWC in all the three cultivars at all stages of growth and more reduction were recorded in drought susceptible cultivar Raj 4120 (Table 1.). This deviation in RWC may be attributed to differences in the ability of the cultivars to absorb more water from the soil and the ability to control water loss through the stomata. It may also be due to differences in the ability of the tested cultivars to accumulate and adjust osmotically to maintain tissue turgor and hence physiological activities. Highest RWC was recorded at anthesis stage and decreased gradually to 15 DAA and the highest RWC value observed in drought tolerant cultivars Raj 4079 (Table 1.). These finding are in agreement with (Mamnoui *et al.*, 2006) [10]. Chlorophyll, relative water content and membrane stability

index showed wide differences among crop sown on various dates (Table 1.). While comparing the planting windows, the suitable time of seed planting was 15th November with respect to chlorophyll content, membrane stability index and relative water contents. The relative water content controls the leaf tissue turgor pressure which ultimately maintains the activities of leaf resulting to high rate of photosynthesis. Similarly, high chlorophyll contents might also contribute to higher photosynthetic rate and significant positive correlation between chlorophyll content and photosynthesis rate was reported in earlier findings (Thomas *et al.*, 2005) [22]. Pande and Verma, (2011) [11] have also documented the adverse effects of delayed sowing and wide variations among sowing dates for chlorophyll content, relative water content and membrane stability index.

Table 1: Effect of irrigation scheduling, cultivars and varying sowing dates on physiological parameters of wheat

Treatment	RWC at anthesis stage	RWC at 15 DAA	MSI at anthesis stage	MSI at 15 DAA	Chlorophyll content at flag leaf stage
Irrigation scheduling					
I ₁ (Etc 0.6)	63.52	55.87	52.04	46.40	2.33
I ₂ (Etc 0.8)	69.90	61.68	58.08	50.02	2.54
I ₃ (Etc 1.0)	74.52	66.11	61.64	52.75	2.71
I ₄ (Etc 1.2)	75.01	66.54	62.49	53.01	2.76
S.Em±	0.60	0.49	0.38	0.41	0.03
CD(P= 0.05)	1.86	1.51	1.16	1.26	0.10
Cultivars					
V ₁ (Raj 4120)	68.45	60.72	56.50	46.67	2.40
V ₂ (Raj 4079)	72.23	63.81	59.91	52.76	2.71
V ₃ (Raj 4238)	71.53	63.12	59.28	52.21	2.64
S.Em±	0.28	0.30	0.24	0.35	0.02
CD(P= 0.05)	0.81	0.85	0.69	1.00	0.08
Date of sowing					
D ₁ (15 th NOV.)	73.97	67.31	62.02	53.48	2.73
D ₂ (30 th NOV.)	71.69	64.34	60.08	51.33	2.62
D ₃ (15 th DEC.)	66.56	56.00	53.59	46.83	2.40
S.Em±	0.28	0.26	0.27	0.27	0.02
CD(P= 0.05)	0.79	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.06




Fig 1: Effect of irrigation, cultivars and sowing dates on relative water content and membrane stability index of wheat




Fig 2: Effect of irrigation, cultivars and sowing dates on chlorophyll content at flag leaf stage of wheat)

4. Conclusions

Growth and photosynthesis are two of the most important processes abolished, partially or completely, by water stress (Kramer and Boyer, 1995) [7], and both of them are major cause of decreased crop yield. The best option for crop production, yield improvement, and yield stability under soil moisture deficient conditions is to develop drought tolerant crop varieties. A physiological approach would be the most attractive way to develop new varieties rapidly (Turner and Nicolas, 1987) [23]. Looking overall results, it is clear that these parameters could explain some of the mechanisms which indicate tolerance to drought; however, their relevance in describing the varieties variability is significant.

5. References

1. Abd-El-Haleem SHM, Reham MA, Mohamed SMS. Genetic Analysis and RAPD polymorphism in some Durum Wheat Genotypes. *Global Journal of Biotechnology & Biochemistry*. 2009;4:1-9.
2. Arnon DI. Copper enzymes in isolated chloroplast. Polyphenol oxidase in *Beta vulgaris*. *Plant Physiology*. 1949;24:1-15.
3. Blum A. *Plant breeding for stress environments*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press; c1988.
4. Clarke J, McCaig T. Evaluation of techniques for screening for drought resistance in wheat. *Journal of Crop Science*. 1982;22:503-506.
5. Gupta NK, Gupta S, Kumar A. Cytokinin application increases cell membrane and chlorophyll stability in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Cereal Research Communication*. 2000;28:287-291.
6. Jaleel CA, Manivannan P, Sankar B, Kumar AK, Gopi R, Somasundaram R, *et al*. Induction of drought stress tolerance by ketoconazole in *Catharanthus roseus* is mediated by enhanced antioxidant potentials and secondary metabolite accumulation. *Colloids Surf. B: Biointerfaces*. 2007;60:201-206.
7. Kramer PJ, Boyer JS. *Water relations of Plants and Soils*. Academic Press, San Diego; c1995.
8. Lichtenthaler H, Wenzel O, Buschmann C, Gitelson A. *Annals New York Academy of Sciences*, 1999, 271-285.
9. Ludlow MM, Muchow RC. A critical evolution of traits for improving crop yields in water-limited environments. *Advances in Agronomy*. 1990;43:107-153.
10. Mamnouie E, FotouhiGhazvini R, Esfahany M, Nakhoda B. The Effects of Water Deficit on Crop Yield and the Physiological Characteristics of Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) Varieties. *Journal of Agricultural Science & Technology*. 2006;8:211-219.
11. Pande P, Verma RS. Sowing date and varietal effects on chlorophyll content and photosynthetic rate of wheat. *Pantnagar Journal of Research*. 2011;9(1):8-11.
12. Patidar M, Mali AL. Effect of FYM, fertility levels and biofertilizers on growth, yield and quality of sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L). *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2004;49(2):117-120.
13. Premachandra GS, Shimada. Evaluation of polyethylene glycol test of measuring cell membrane stability as a drought tolerance test in wheat. *Journal of Agricultural Science*. 1988;110.
14. Rao SR, Qayyum A, Razzaq A, Ahmad M, Sher A. Role of foliar application of salicylic acid and L-tryptophan in drought tolerance of maize. *Journal of Animal and Plant Sciences*. 2012;22(3):768-772.
15. Rehman A, Ahmad INH, Hussain M, Khan MA, Farooq J, Ali MA. Screening wheat germplasm for heat tolerance at terminal growth stage. *Plant Omics Journal*, 2:9-19.
16. Ristic Z, Bukovnik U, Prasad PVV. Correlation between heat stability of thylakoid membranes and loss of chlorophyll in winter wheat under heat stress. *Crop Science*. 2007;47:2067-2073.
17. Sairam RK, Srivastava GC, Saxena DC. Increased antioxidant activity under elevated temperature: a mechanism of heat stress tolerance in wheat genotypes. *Biologia Plantarum*. 2000;43:245-251.
18. Samson G, Tremblay N, Dudelzak A, Babichenko S, Dextraze L, Wollring J. *Nutrient Stress of Corn Plants: Early Detection and Discrimination Using a Compact*

- Multiwavelength Fluorescent Lidar, EARSeL e-Proceed., Dresden; c2000.
19. Sangtarash MH. Responses of different wheat genotypes to drought stress applied at different growth stages. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2010, 13.
 20. Save R, Biel C, Domingo R, Ruiz-Sanchez MC, Torrecillas A. Some physiological and morphological characteristics of citrus plants for drought resistance. *Plant Science*. 1995;110:167-172.
 21. Siddique MRB, Hamid A, Islam MS. Drought stress effects on water relations of wheat. *Botanical Bulletin of Academia Sinica*. 2000;41:35-39.
 22. Thomas JA, Jaffrey AC, Atsuko K, David MK. Regulating the proton budget of higher plant photosynthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 2005;102:9709-9713.
 23. Turner NC, Nicolas ME. Drought resistance of wheat for light textured climate. In. J.P. Srivastava, E. Procceddu E. Acevedo and S.Varma (Eds), drought tolerance in winter cereals. John Willey and Sons. New York, 1987, 203-216.
 24. Vieira, da Silva J, Naylor AW, Kramer PJ. Some ultra-structural and enzymatic effects of drought stress in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) leaves. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1974;71:3243-324.
 25. Zaharieva M, Gaulin E, Havaux M, Acevedo E, Monneveux P. Drought and heat responses in the wild wheat relative *Aegilops geniculata* Roth. *Crop Science*. 2001, 41.