SURCHUMS

GRAIN-GRASS AGRONOMY: OPTIMEM PLAN' FORWLATION FOR YIELD TESTING N.SEETHARAMA

Since the grain-grass plant type is substantially different from normal sorghum grown almost everywhere, there is great need to have more information on all agrandomic aspects. Because of their early maturity, tillering habit and narrow leaves, population density trial was conducted in order to recommend the optimum population for grain yield testing of promising breeding material.

Material and Methods

Following three grain grasses representing the range of difference between normal and typical grain-grass sorghum and one hybrid check were planted:

- 1. uc 50. resembles cypical grain-grass
- 2. GC 230: intermediate between 1 & 3
- 3. GO 430: intermediate between grain grass and normal sorghum
- 4. CSH-6: normal duration hybrid sorghum

The experiment was sown on 29 June, 1976 in flat black soil (BT5 area) with 4 replications employing split plot design. Genotypes formed main plots and 7 population densities formed sub-plots (Table 1), with the population ranging from 10-200 plants/ \mathbf{m}^2 . The rationale for using such high densities was that, the grassy sorghum resembling wheat, might produce as many as 200 heads/ \mathbf{m}^2 .

SMIC ICRISAT LIBRARY

^{*} Paper presented in the INTERNATIONAL SOROHUM NOR (SHOP held during harch 6-12, 1977

Row to row distance was constant (20 cm) for all levels of populations and plot size was 3 \times 2 m. Fertilizer rate was same as we apply for normal sorghum (60 N, 60 P at planting, and additional top dressing with 40 N in the form of urea).

Central 8 rows covering 2 m row length (= 3.2 m²) were harvested. From this area 10 plants were removed separately for simplified growth analysis.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the summarized results from , split plot analysis of several variables.

- 1. <u>Plant Density</u>: Though the initial stand was perfect up to 8-10 leaf stage, in dense population, death of plants started from that stage up to flowering of main shoot, in case of grain grasses, and up to final leaf stage in CSH6. Table I shows the plant population initially planted and after thinning as well as final stand (plant) count. Bused on final stand count only 4 distinct plant populations were present (Range: 99,800 727,500 plants/ha).
- 2. <u>Grain Yield</u>: Grain yield significantly increased with increase in plant density and there was no genotype x density interactions (Table 3). Table 2 shows the yield of grain grasses as well as checks. Note that in case of GC 50, the yield is not significantly different at different densities, because of its

ability to tiller profusely and produce more seeds/panicle under lowest population density. 6C 230, has only two yield classes, with grain yield increasing rapidly from the lowest population to next and remaining almost constant. 6C 430 which resembles CSH6 most amongst grain grasses, has 3 yield classes just as CSH6. In both these genotypes yield increases from 99,800 plants/ha to 623,200 plants/ha and then after almost remaining constant. Note that even at very high populations, the yield did not go down, since the plant stand itself levelled off at denser populations.

- 3. Fodder yield: Interestingly the fresh fodder yield was fairly constant among the entries, though weak interaction between entries and populations was noticed. The grain grasses were much less leafier than CSH6 and their stems were slender (though slightly shorter); since they also had more shoots per unit area, there is a possibility of grain grasses making better fodder.
- 4. Physiology of Grain Yield: Though the hybrid check was found slightly superior to grain grasses in almost all physiological parameters studied, grain grasses did show higher grain/leaf ratio, thus probably indicating their higher photosynthetic efficiency. If this high efficiency is maintained even under stress conditions, they can be expected to be very useful under dry conditions.

Conclusions: (1) The experimental grain grass varieties of different morphologies, showed that the optimum population for yield testing must be around 500,000/ha.

(2) Since the grain-grass plant type is plastic to great extent, the geometry of planting may not greatly influence the yield. Though this trial was conducted in 20 cm rows on flat land, when doubling the row spacing (but compled with high intra-row spacing as well) may be adopted in routine yield trials of breeding material. In our existing 75 cm row system paired rows with 18-19 plants/m row length seem to be more practical.

N. SEETHARAMA Cereal Physiology

'Table 1: 'Plant densities at planting and thinning and at narvest"

o)ulation	Plant/in ² at planting, also at thinning)	Intra-row spacing (cm)	firal stand count/m²	
P ₁	10	',1)	9.98 a**	
P _?	40	12.5	47.31 b	
P ₃	70	7.1	62.32 c	
P4	110	1.5	69.36 d	
P ₅	140	3.6	68.27 c d	
P ₆	170	2.9	70.51 d	
P7	230	2.5	72.75 4	

¹⁾ F value for replications, genetype and interactions were not significant (see Table 2).

^{2,} L.S.D. for the means at .05 probability level is 6.97

^{** 1)} Treatment means within columns with similar letters are not significantly different at 0.05 level according to Duncan's multiple range test

²⁾ Difference between P_3 & P_4 is very small

(able 2: Split plot analysis for different variables: Γ-ratios

	Genoty de	r matio bensily	Interaction	(1, (%)
1 Dlant/m-	1.91	83.23**	0.73	17 }
Arain vield (ig/ha)	Munt 1	J. 1744	1.02	'4.5
2. Days to sor Howering,	18.50	G. 9	·0.30	1.0
4. Crain filling days	3 21	0.30	0.0	2.4
5 Stover weight (fresh field wright)	1.91	1.93	1.33*	17.2
b. Loaf dry weight as 3 of botal dry veight/plant	j.;(*	1/	2.184	31.0
7 Flant height	39. 25	3.24 **	1.01	3.n
o. Neads/pilant	11." *	52.3*	10.34*	27.2
leads/m²	36.3/°*	26.47 **	1.11	.7
I. Harvest index (%)	1.63+	1.14	1.07	3.04
. Crain/leaf ratio	5.35*	0.59	1.34	1: 0
Grads/plant	6.0.	140.041	1.61	,
`. leds/m²	3.37	10 79##	0.31	,, 1
. Sicul size gm/1000 seeds	316.571	7 ,8*	1.9	(,^
13. 02. 1	133.95**	1.10*	1.07	J
16. Dry weight of plant	1")~"	57.07k#	4.6	27. 7
'. Pasonal productivity rate kg/ha/day	6.45*	5.65**	1.07	19.7
Seasonal crop growth rate kg/ha/day	7.76	17.64**	1.37	17.9
<pre>iq. Head filling rate kg grain/ha/day in GS3</pre>	12.07.	6.7/1**	1.07	19.3
Degrees of freedom:		/ 70		
Treatment Source x Error Source	3 4 9	5 x 72	18 x 72	
F value 5%	3.97 6.99	7.23 3 07	1.75	

7 ble 3. Table of means for tipe to flower, tays in CS3 (units filling), har vest index, grain-leaf ratio

	Pays to flower	Grain filling da/s	Harvost Index ()	inco (leaf ratio regram/gr leaf in/ reight
G C 50	41.6	30.1	30.3	3 97
230	44.6	31.7	?h.;	31 .
440	47.6	31.4	31.2	39)
CSH6	57	33.0	28.4	270
LSD (5%)	0.7	1.9	4.2	13)

Thile 4 Means for grain yield, plant height, head,/n2, heads/plant, seed number plant and seed size

* ** **	Population	Grain vield ka/ha •	Plant herent (cn)	Ear hgals/ m	lar heals/ plant	Seci No / plint	ciclisting gr/11)) seeds
S(·)	1	17	; (<i>]</i>	, ,	1,	1
	3 4	1311 1925	11) 150	17) 11)	1.,	119 113	1.9
	5 6 7	1667 2177 2301	153 113 150	170 135 1 20	13	50 / 126 644	17 17 9 11.3
'lean	entre til filmen en med en street separatingen separatings.	1376	737	_1117	- 17	17825	12 "
GC 230	P1 2 3 1 5 6 7	1054 1393 2102 23 1 1917 2102 2151	134 143 138 148 133 137 137	17 72 96 97 117 113	4.7 1.5 1.6 1.7	177 611 562 376 112 431	12.1 12.1 12.5 12.0 13.6
'ran			ַ יונד	77		- 711	11.5
SC 430	P1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1717 2772 2777 2733 2511 2772 2640	147 159 1 2 115 153 143	37 93 91 93 107 113 122	3.3 2.1 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7	1568 7-4 7-1 7-1 632 779 642	1, 0 11.7 11.2 12.1 11.6 12.1 10.9
Mear		72(*)	וייו	272	2.7	- 165	7.77
CS 15	P1 2 3 4 5 6	2f 21 3°2 f 357° 34 ,5 3153 3799 3235	17 126 136 133 138 139 179	11 47 50 66 65 61 63	1 1 1.0 1 1 0.9** 0.9 2 9	1566 716 579 509 491 512 145	17 / 13.0 19.6 19.1 20.0 20.1
Man		3343	184	54	1.0	613	19.0
Overall Mean	level for means	11. J	23(à d		
a) 'Inthin e		685 774	9 12	26 27	7.8 9.7	- 294 314	1.1 1.4

In CSH6 at higher populations stand count excluded counts of ear heads/unit area. A few plants reached final leaf stage, but no earhead was found emerging.