infestation in sugarcane fields of middle Egypt. Arab Journal of Plant Protection 16:60-65.

**Reynolds HT, Anderson LD** and **Andres LA.** 1959. Cultural and chemical control of the lesser corn stalk borer in Southern California. Journal of Economic Entomology 52:63–66.

**Sharma HC, Nwanze KF** and **Subramanian V.** 1997. Mechanisms of resistance to insects and their usefulness in sorghum improvement. Pages 81–100 *in* Plant Resistance to Insects in Sorghum (Sharma HC, Faujdar Singh and Nwanze KF, eds.). ICRISAT, Patancheru 502324, Andhra Pradesh, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.

# Agronomic Characteristics of Different Cytoplasmic Male-Sterility Systems and their Reaction to Sorghum Shoot Fly, *Atherigona soccata*

MK Dhillon, HC Sharma<sup>\*</sup> and Belum VS Reddy (ICRISAT, Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India) \*Corresponding author: h.sharma@cgiar.org

## Introduction

The discovery of cytoplasmic male-sterility (*milo* cytoplasm) led to commercial exploitation of hybrid vigor in sorghum (Stephens and Holland 1954). Several CMS systems have been identified in sorghum for diversifying hybrid production. However, only the  $A_1$  CMS system has been deployed for producing sorghum hybrids worldwide, with the exception of  $A_2$  CMS-based hybrids in China (Shan et al. 2000). The use of a single source of male-sterility ( $A_1$  cytoplasm) has narrowed the genetic base of sorghum hybrids. As a result, there is considerable risk of insect pest and disease outbreaks in cultivars based on a single source of male-sterility (Sharma et al. 2004).

Sorghum is damaged by over 150 species of insect pests, of which shoot fly *Atherigona soccata* (Rondani) is important in Asia, Africa, and Mediterranean Europe. Plant resistance is an important component for the management of this pest, and efforts are being made at ICRISAT to transfer resistance genes into male-sterile lines. Since there is considerable risk of single MS system-based hybrids becoming vulnerable to this major pest, it is important to determine the agronomic desirability and the reaction of different CMS systems to sorghum shoot fly, *A. soccata*.

**Plant material.** The experimental material consisted of six isonuclear lines in six cytoplasmic backgrounds ( $A_{1,}$ ,  $A_{2,}$ ,  $A_{3,}$ ,  $A_{4}G_{1,}$ ,  $A_{4}M$ , and  $A_{4}V_{z}M$ ), and six maintainer (B) lines. The test material was evaluated during the 2002 and 2003 rainy, and 2003 postrainy seasons. Each entry was planted in 4 row plots of 2 m row length, and the rows were 75 cm apart. There were three replications in a randomized complete block design. One week after seedling emergence, thinning was done to maintain a spacing of 10 cm between plants. Normal agronomic practices were followed for raising the crop. At the milk stage, the panicles were covered with nylon bags to avoid damage from birds.

**Observations.** Data were recorded on numbers of plants with shoot fly deadhearts in the central two rows at 14 days after seedling emergence, and expressed as percentage of plants with deadhearts. Data were also recorded on days to 50% flowering, plant height, and agronomic desirability. Plant height was recorded at maturity. Agronomic desirability was evaluated at crop maturity on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = good productive potential and ability to withstand insect damage, 5 = poor productive potential and prone to insect damage). The data was analyzed using factorial analysis. The significance of differences between the treatment means was tested using least significant differences (LSD) at P 0.05.

## **Results and Discussion**

There were significant differences among the CMS lines for all the traits under study (Tables 1 to 4). The mean squares due to genotype x CMS systems for plant height, agronomic desirability and shoot fly infestation were nonsignificant (Tables 2, 3, and 4). The isonuclear lines in A<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>2</sub>, and A<sub>2</sub> cytoplasmic backgrounds flowered 1-2 days earlier than in other CMS backgrounds. Similar results have earlier been reported by Quinby (1970). The  $A_AG_1$  and  $A_AVzM$  cytoplasms flowered one-day later than the B-lines. These results are in conformity with those of Nagur and Menon (1974). The isonuclear lines in A<sub>2</sub> cytoplasmic background (except in case of ICSA 26 and ICSA 38) were shorter than in other cytoplasmic backgrounds, but the differences among the CMS systems were nonsignificant (Table 2). Similar observations have been reported by Williams-Alanis and Rodriguez-Herrera (1994). Pederson and Toy (1997) observed similar pattern for plant height in A<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>2</sub>, and A<sub>3</sub> cytoplasms. The

differences in agronomic score of different CMS systems were nonsignificant (Table 3). Ross and Kofoid (1979) reported comparable agronomic performance and grain yield in different CMS systems. However, Gangakishan and Borikar (1989) and Wang et al. (1990) observed that the hybrids based on *Maldandi* ( $A_4M$ ) cytoplasm are bold and yield better than those on *milo* cytoplasm. Shoot fly deadhearts in different CMS systems varied from 69.9 to 88.7% (Table 4). The male sterile lines showed more deadhearts [77.1 ( $A_4M$ ) to 81.0% ( $A_4G_1$ )] compared to the maintainer lines (74.4%) (Table 4). Among the cytoplasms tested,  $A_4M$  suffered lower deadheart incidence than the other CMS systems. Therefore, it can be exploited for producing shoot fly-resistant hybrids in future (Dhillon et al. 2005).

### Conclusion

Isogenic lines in  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ , and  $A_3$  cytoplasmic backgrounds flowered two days earlier than the other CMS and maintainer lines. The male-sterile lines in  $A_4G_1$  and  $A_4VzM$  CMS backgrounds flowered one day later than the maintainer lines. The  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $A_3$ , and  $A_4VzM$  CMS lines were comparable in height, but shorter than  $A_4M$ and  $A_4G_1$  CMS and B-lines. The differences in agronomic

Table 1. Days to 50% flowering of different cytoplasmic male-sterile (A) and maintainer (B) lines of sorghum (ICRISAT, Patancheru, India).

Genotypes	Days to 50% flowering								
	A	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	$A_4G_1$	A <sub>4</sub> M	A <sub>4</sub> VzM	В	Mean	
ICSA 11	71.3	67.0	69.1	72.3	75.1	75.7	74.6	73.2	
ICSA 17	71.3	73.0	73.3	71.7	69.7	73.6	70.7	71.4	
ICSA 26	75.2	79.5	77.6	79.2	77.7	78.5	75.3	76.6	
ICSA 38	72.7	77.2	68.6	76.6	75.6	76.6	80.6	77.6	
ICSA 88001	74.7	76.0	73.6	77.7	79.6	76.7	76.9	76.6	
ICSA 88004	78.7	75.7	77.6	80.6	78.1	79.0	76.0	77.1	
Mean	74.0	74.7	73.3	76.3	75.9	76.7	75.7		
For comparing	SE±		LSD				F-test		
Cytoplasm (C)	0.63		0.83				0.002		
Genotypes (G)	0.58		0.89				< 0.001		
CxG	1.54		2.18				0.004		

Table 2. Plant height at maturity in different cytoplasmic male-sterile (A) and maintainer (B) lines of sorghum (ICRISAT, Patancheru, India).

	Plant height (cm)							
Genotypes	A	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	$A_4G_1$	A <sub>4</sub> M	A <sub>4</sub> VzM	В	Mean
ICSA 11	101.1	98.6	99.2	105.8	102.8	98.9	100.5	100.8
ICSA 17	88.3	80.0	88.6	94.4	91.1	93.1	86.9	88.1
ICSA 26	102.2	111.7	108.1	99.4	103.1	103.9	110.0	107.4
ICSA 38	104.7	103.1	103.3	101.7	103.1	101.7	109.2	106.1
ICSA 88001	125.0	122.5	122.5	123.3	129.2	126.9	123.3	124.1
ICSA 88004	110.0	108.3	109.2	119.7	112.8	109.2	113.9	112.7
Mean	105.2	104.0	105.2	107.4	107.0	105.6	107.3	
For comparing	SE±		LSD			F-test		
Cytoplasm (C)	1.68		NS			0.737		
Genotypes (G)	1.56		4.34			< 0.001		
C x G	4.12		NS			0.748		

Genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 5); Cytoplasms (P = 0.05; df = 6); Cytoplasms x genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 30); Error (P = 0.05; df = 205). NS = Nonsignificant.

Genotypes	Agronomic score <sup>a</sup>								
	A	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	$A_4G_1$	$A_4M$	A <sub>4</sub> VzM	В	Mean	
ICSA 11	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.4	3.3	
ICSA 17	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.4	
ICSA 26	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	
ICSA 38	3.2	3.5	3.5	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.2	
ICSA 88001	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.1	
ICSA 88004	2.8	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9	
Mean	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.2		
For comparing	SE±	LSD			F-test				
Cytoplasm (C)	0.10	NS			0.253				
Genotypes (G)	0.10	0.26			< 0.001				
CxG	0.24	NS			0.995				

Table 3. Agronomic desirability of different cytoplasmic male-sterile (A) and maintainer (B) lines of sorghum (ICRISAT, Patancheru, India).

Genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 5); Cytoplasms (P = 0.05; df = 6); Cytoplasms x genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 30); Error (P = 0.05; df = 205). <sup>a</sup> = Agronomic score (1 = good, and 5 = poor). NS = Nonsignificant.

# Table 4. Evaluation of different CMS systems of sorghum for susceptibility to shoot fly, *Atherigona soccata* (ICRISAT, Patancheru, India).

Genotypes	Deadhearts (%) 14 DAE								
	A	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	$A_4G_1$	A <sub>4</sub> M	A <sub>4</sub> VzM	B-line	Mean	
ICSA 11	81.1	88.7	83.0	85.0	78.7	77.8	82.3	82.4	
ICSA 17	84.0	73.9	74.0	81.0	77.1	78.3	80.7	79.4	
ICSA 26	78.7	74.1	81.7	82.0	72.9	80.2	69.9	74.1	
ICSA 38	78.8	84.7	81.2	81.1	81.7	81.2	71.9	76.7	
ICSA 88001	78.2	78.1	79.1	76.4	75.4	81.2	70.6	74.4	
ICSA 88004	77.1	74.0	77.4	80.7	76.9	78.1	71.1	74.2	
Mean	79.6	78.9	79.4	81.0	77.1	79.5	74.4		
For comparing	SE±	SE±		LSD			F-test		
Cytoplasm (C)	1.3	1.33		3.71			0.016		
Genotypes (G)	1.2	1.23		3.43			0.005		
C x G	3.2	6		NS			0.314		

DAE = Days after seedling emergence. Genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 5); Cytoplasms (P = 0.05; df = 6); Cytoplasms x genotypes (P = 0.05; df = 30); Error (P = 0.05; df = 328). NS = Nonsignificant.

desirability of different CMS systems were nonsignificant. The  $A_4$ M (*Maldandi*) cytoplasm was less susceptible to sorghum shoot fly, *A. soccata*, and can be exploited for producing sorghum hybrids with less susceptibility to sorghum shoot fly.

## References

**Dhillon MK, Sharma HC, Reddy BVS, Ram Singh, Naresh JS** and **Kai Z.** 2005. Relative susceptibility of different malesterile cytoplasms in sorghum to shoot fly, *Atherigona soccata*. Euphytica (in press). **Gangakishan A** and **Borikar ST.** 1989. Comparative performance of *Maldandi* V/S *Milo* cytoplasm in sorghum. Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities 14:192–195.

**Nagur T** and **Menon PM.** 1974. Characterization of different male-sterility inducing cytoplasms in sorghum. Sorghum Newsletter 17:18.

**Pedersen JF** and **Toy JJ.** 1997. Forage yield, quality, and fertility of sorghum x sudangrass hybrids in  $A_1$  and  $A_3$  cytoplasm. Crop Science 37:1973–1975.

**Quinby JR.** 1970. Effect of male-sterility inducing cytoplasm in sorghum hybrids. Crop Science 10:614.

**Shan LQ, Ai PJ, Yiu LT** and **Yao ZF.** 2000. New grain sorghum cytoplasmic male-sterile line  $A_2V_4A$  and  $F_1$  hybrid Jinza No. 12 for Northwest China. International Sorghum and Millets Newsletter 41:31–32.

Sharma HC, Dhillon MK, Naresh JS, Ram Singh, Pampapathy G and Reddy BVS. 2004. Influence of cytoplasmic male-sterility on the expression of resistance to insects in sorghum. Page 6 *in* New Directions for a Diverse Planet. Proceedings, Fourth International Crop Science Congress, 25 Sept–2 Oct 2004, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia (Fisher T, Turner N, Angus J, McIntyre L, Robertson M, Borrell A and Lloyd D, eds.). Australia: Brisbane, Queensland. http:// www.cropscience.org.au.

**Stephens JC** and **Holland RF.** 1954. Cytoplasmic male sterility for sorghum seed production. Agronomy Journal 46:20–23.

**Ross WM** and **Kofoid KD.** 1979. Effect of non-*milo* cytoplasms on the agronomic performance of sorghum. Crop Science 19:267–270.

**Wang FD, Zhang SP** and **Yang LG.** 1990. Evaluation of  $A_2$  male-sterile lines in sorghum. II. Combining ability analysis for main agronomic characters. Acta Agronomica Sinica 16:242–251.

**Williams-Alanis H** and **Rodriguez-Herrera R.** 1994. Comparative performance of sorghums in  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  cytoplasms. II. Yield and agronomic characteristics. Cereal Research Communications 22:301–307.

# Morphology of Sorghum Grain in Relation to Resistance to Maize Weevil

MW Pendleton<sup>1,\*</sup>, S Vitha<sup>1</sup>, EA Ellis<sup>1</sup>, FM Chitio<sup>2</sup> and BB Pendleton<sup>2</sup> (1. Microscopy and Imaging Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2257, USA; 2. Division of Agriculture, West Texas A&M University, PO Box 60998, Canyon, TX 79016-0001, USA)

\*Corresponding author: bpendleton@mail.wtamu.edu

### Introduction

The maize weevil (*Sitophilus zeamais*) is one of the most destructive insect pests of stored grain, including sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench] (Teetes et al. 1981, Teetes and Pendleton 2000). This weevil is abundant in warm, humid regions of the world. Maize weevils infest developing kernels in the field and storage. A female chews a cavity to deposit an egg in a kernel. The larva develops inside and damages the kernel.

Use of sorghum cultivars that resist damage in the field and in storage is an alternative to the use of insecticide. Chitio (2004) evaluated resistance to maize weevils in grain of 20 genotypes of sorghum. The goal of this research was to relate morphology of the sorghums to resistance to maize weevil.

#### **Materials and Methods**

Chitio (2004) measured grain weight, size, hardness, and protein content and evaluated resistance to maize weevils of 20 genotypes of sorghum (ATx623, ATx631, ATx635, B1, CE151, Kuyuma, Macia, Malisor84-7-167, Malisor84-7-476, RTx430-5362, RTx430-5451, Segaolane, SC630-11E11, Sima, SRN39, Sureno, Tegemeo, Tx2737, Tx2882, and Tx2911). One gram of grain of each genotype was weighed and the number of grains per gram counted to detemine the weight of an individual grain. This was repeated five times for each genotype. A Vernier caliper was used to measure the length, width, and height in millimeters of each of five grains of each genotype.

The density method was used to determine hardness of four 25-g samples of grain of each genotype. The grain was weighed and dried for 24 hours at 89°C in an oven. Each sample of grain was weighed again and put with 70 ml of water into a 100-ml glass graduated cylinder. The amount of water displaced by the weight of the grain was used as the volume of the grain. The dry weight of the grain was divided by the volume of the grain to determine the density of the grain in g ml<sup>-1</sup>. The nitrogen content of grain of each genotype was determined by using a LECO model CN-2000 Carbon/Protein/Nitrogen Elemental Analyzer and converted to the amount of protein.

Five grams of sorghum grain were infested with three female and two male newly emerged maize weevils per each of 10 vials of the 20 genotypes of sorghum. Vials of each sorghum genotype were evaluated every 3 weeks for 105 days. Each day, each grain in the 10 vials of one kind of sorghum was evaluated for damage, numbers of live and dead weevil adults were counted, and the grain in each vial was weighed. A scale of 1–5 was used to score damage, where 1 = no evidence of damage; 2 = some feeding on the surface, involving 1–25% or one shallow hole in a kernel; 3 = two tunnels, causing 26–50% damage to a kernel; 4 = 51–75% damage or more than two holes in a kernel; 5 = 76–100% damage and many tunnels in a kernel.

For microscopic observation, grains of the sorghums were split, exposed to osmium vapor, and coated with gold-palladium. The cross-section of seed coat was observed by using a JEOL JSM 6400 at 15 KeV, 12-mm working distance, and 500-2000x magnifications. Pieces of seed coat were dried, fixed, and embedded in epoxy resin and sectioned for observation by using a Zeiss Axiophot compound light microscope at 100-600x magnifications.