Original Research Article

Evaluation of Maize Varieties at Seedling Stage under Drought Stress Based on Morpho-physiological and Biochemical Attributes

Abstract

A hydroponics pot experiment was driven to investigate the improvement of drought tolerance in six maize varieties (e.g. Gold Star, BHM 14, Paloan, Bharti 981, BHM 9, Pioneer) based on morpho-physiological and biochemical characteristics. Six Maize varieties were used as test crops and the experiment was laid out in a completely randomized design (RCBD) with three replications. Drought stress was imposed 14 days after sowing by using the PEG solution. The results revealed that BHM 14 possessed the longest root length (69.33 cm), higher shoot length (42.67 cm), longest total plant height (112.00 cm), highest fresh root weight (3.32 g), high leaf greenness was found in BHM 14 measured by SPAD meter in both top and lower leaves, high amount of proline whereas, Paloan produced shortest total plant height (78.50 cm), lowest fresh root weight (1.52 g), lowest proline after 42 days of sowing under stress condition. The maximal photochemical efficiency (Fv/Fm) appeared to measure photosynthesis whereas Pioneer was comparatively higher in stress conditions. The fresh weight of root and shoot was significantly least affected in stress conditions, whereas BHM 14 performed better in stress conditions. On the other hand, varieties had a significant difference in total dry matter of control condition and stress condition. Therefore, it is suggested that BHM 14 showed maximum drought tolerance in respect of growth and morpho-physiological changes under drought conditions.

Keywords: Biochemical, drought, maize, morpho-physical, stress, variety

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) occupies a key position as one of the most important cereals both for human and animal consumption. The crop is grown under various conditions in different parts of the world and its worldwide production is 785 million tons. It is important C4 plant from the poaceae family and is moderately sensitive to drought stress, wide intra specific genetic variation for drought resistance exists in maize (Mansour et al., 2005). Maize plants undergo a variety of adaptations at subcellular, cellular and organ levels to grow successfully under drought. Drought resistance is a complex phenomenon, maize plants manifest several adaptations such as stomata regulations, changes in hormonal balance, activation of antioxidant defense system, osmotic adjustment, maintenance of tissue water contents and various mechanisms of toxic symptoms under drought stress. Germination in *Zea mays* (*Z. mays* L.) decreases linearly with rising drought and drought stress creates internal stress in plants (Parvaiz and Satyawati, 2008). These stresses can be distinguished at several levels such as shoot, root and tissues (Tester and Davenport, 2003). Drought stress is an abiotic stress that can affects the plant growth and physiological and biochemical activities such as photosynthetic activity and chlorophyll content (Hajer et al., 2006; Saleh, 2012). Among the stages of the plant life cycle, seed germination and seedling emergence and establishment are key processes in the survival and growth of plants (Hadas, 2004). It is well established that drought stress has negative correlation with seed germination and vigor (Rehman et al., 1996). Seeds contribute as a vital component of world's diet. The embryos present in the seed act as a miniature plant and mode of dispersal and provide food reserve to the growing seedlings. Seed germination and early seedling growth are critical events for plant development (Kitajima and Fenner, 2000). Germination becomes visible by emergence of the structures surrounding the embryo by the radicle. Considering the importance and well adaptability, the average yield performance is very low compared to other developed

UNDER PEER REVIEW

countries due to different stresses. Among the various factors that limit total yield, drought stress is one of the serious environmental problems in Bangladesh, although the yield potential is promising. Crop plants are subjected to a variety of environmental stresses, many of which impair plant growth and development, decreasing crop plant yield (Seki et al., 2003; Farooq et al., 2009a, b, 2011). Drought is the single most damaging environmental stress, reducing crop yield more than any other environmental stress (Lambers et al., 2008). Drought can affect plant water metabolism and induce major morphological, physiological, and biochemical alterations (Torres-Ruiz et al., 2015). Drought stress inhibits plant growth by lowering the rate of photosynthesis (Kebbas et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2018). Stomatal (stomatal closure owing to decreasing CO_2), nonstomatal (decreased photosynthetic activity in mesophyll tissue), or both reasons could be the main causes of decreased photosynthesis (Ghotbi-Ravandi et al., 2014; Varone et al., 2012. Plants have evolved a variety of defense mechanisms to combat the oxidative damage induced by drought stress, including the over production of antioxidant molecules that prevent oxidative chain reactions from propagating (Caliskan et al., 2017).

The importance of antioxidant activities of phenolic compounds such as phenolic acids and flavonoids have been identified to be the most widespread substantial groups of plant secondary metabolites produced from the shikimate phenylpropanoid biosynthetic pathway (Quan et al., 2016). Many plants have a drought tolerance mechanism mediated by endogenous phenolic substances, but it varies by species, cultivars, plant tissues, and drought intensity (Gharibi et al., 2015; Al Hassan et al., 2015; Akula and Ravishankar, 2011; Weidner et al., 2009). To develop drought-tolerant cultivars for long-term crop production in the country's moisture deficit areas a fundamental research has been conducted in this area in order to generate high yielding genotypes suitable for drought stress, which must be analyzed

UNDER PEER REVIEW

morpho-physiologically in order to obtain high yielding genotypes. So, it is essential to screen suitable maize varieties that will grow and perform better under water stress condition.

Materials and Method

The Experiment was conducted at the Growth Chamber for Hydroponic Culture in Plant Physiology Laboratory, Department of Crop Botany, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh, Bangladesh during the period from March 2019 to September, 2019. The test crop under investigation was six varieties of maize (e.g. Gold Star, BHM 14, Paloan, Bharti 981, BHM 9 and Pioneer) were collected from the Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI), Joydevpur, Gazipur. The experiment was laid out in two factorial Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with three replications. There were two factors A: Six maize varieties and Factor B: Drought stress (0 and 10% PEG-6000).

Thus, the total number of pots were 36 ($6 \times 2 \times 3$) in hydroponic experiment. Tank size was 4L and each tank represents a single replication. The artificial light source was used in the experiment. High pressure sodium (HPS) light (400 Watt) was used for artificial lighting. About 200-250 µmol m^{-2} s^{1} light intensity was given for proper growth. The experiment was conducted in the growth room at 25°C with a photoperiod of 16 h. One-week-old seedlings were transferred to continuously aerated nutrient solution in 4-L Hydroponics tank on Styrofoam blocks with three holes and three plants per hole, supported with sponge. Before transplanting macro and micro nutrients were applied at recommended rates. Nutrients were added according to Hoagland's solution composition and the recommended dose used for the experiment ($Ca(NO_3)_2$:2.0 mM , K_2SO_4a : 1.0 mM , KH_2P0_4 :.2 mM $MgSO_4$: 0.5 mM , $CaCl_2$: 2.0 mM, H_3B0_4 : 1.0 µM, $MnSO_4$: 2.0 µM, $ZnSO_4$: 0.5 µM, $CuSO_4$: 0.3 mM and ($NH_4)_6Mo_70_4$: 0.01 µM along with treatments. (Pitann et al., 2009). The p^H of the solution was monitored daily and maintained around 5.5 by PHS-25 precision p^H/mv meter (Lida,

UNDER PEER REVIEW

shanghai, china). According to their growth 28 days old seedlings have been finalized for data collections. Parameters of the experiment measured were Shoot length, Root length, Number of leaves per plant, Leaf area, shoot fresh weight, shoot dry weight, root fresh weight, root dry weight, maximum photochemical efficiency of Photosystem-II (F_v/F_m), relative greenness, proline content, total plant height, total fresh weight, root shoot ratio, total dry weight, photosynthesis, transpiration, stomatal conductance, water use efficiency**.** The data in respect of growth were statistically analyzed to find out the statistical significance of the experimental results. The means for all the treatments were calculated and the analyses of variance for all the characters were performed by F test. The significance of difference between the pairs of means was separated by LSD test at 5% and 1% levels of probability by using MSTAT-C package program.

Results and Discussion

Root length

The effects of drought in case of root length of Maize varieties differ significantly (Table 1). In control condition, the longest root length (76.50 cm) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Gold star (75.33 cm) and the shortest root length (54.67 cm) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (55.00 cm). The table showed that, root length was decreased in each variety with the increasing drought level. In 10% PEG, the longest root length (69.33 cm) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by Gold Star (59.67 cm) and the shortest root length (43.00 cm) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (51.00 cm). Turk and Hall (1980), reported that root length of maize may be inhibited due to increasing salinity levels.

Shoot length

UNDER PEER REVIEW

The effects of drought on shoot length of Maize varieties differ significantly (Table 1). In control condition, the longest shoot length (78.33 cm) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Paloan (61.33 cm) and the shortest shoot length (45.00 cm) was achieved from BHM 9 followed by Pioneer (48.67 cm). The table showed that, shoot length was decreased in each variety with the increasing drought level. In 10% drought level, the longest shoot length (42.67 cm) was recorded from the variety Pioneer followed by BHM 14 (40.33 cm) and the shortest shoot length (32.67 cm) was achieved from Bharti 981 followed by BHM 9 (35.00cm). Plant biomass especially shoot length was affected due to higher salinity level (Pressland et al., 1982).

Plant Height

The effects of drought on plant height of Maize varieties differ significantly (Table 1). In control condition, the longest plant height (154.83 cm) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Gold star (131.6 cm) and the shortest plant height (108.7 cm) was achieved from Pioneer followed by Bharti 981 (109.3 cm). The table showed that, plant height was decreased in each variety with the increasing drought level. In 10% drought level, the longest plant height (112.00 cm) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Pioneer (114.00 cm) and the shortest plant height (78.50 cm) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (83.67 cm). Pressland et al., 1982 reported that drought induced growth inhibition in maize has long been reported for plant height.

Shoot fresh weight

Six Maize varieties showed different magnitude of reductions in the shoot fresh weight due to drought stress. Significant variation was observed among the varieties weight due to and treatment (Table 1). In control condition, the maximum shoot fresh weight (11.17g) as recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (11.01 g) and the minimum shoot

UNDER PEER REVIEW

fresh weight (4.61 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (5.66 g). The graph showed that, shoot fresh weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum shoot fresh weight (10.83 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (8.20 g) and the minimum shoot fresh weight (4.05 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (4.06 g). Shoot biomass is declined due to to increase of salinity (Patel et al., 1983)

Table 1. Effect of variety and treatment on morphological characteristics

Variety x treatment	Root Length	Shoot Length	Plant Height	Shoot Fresh Weight	Root Fresh Weight	Total Fresh Weight
Gold Star (Control)	75.33a	56.27bc	131.6b	8.17b	2.57b	10.74d
Gold Star (10% PEG)	55.00c	38.67efg	93.67fg	7.01c	2.10d	9.11e
BHM 14 (Control)	76.50a	78.33a	154.83a	11.01a	3.44a	14.45a
BHM 14 (10% PEG)	69.33ab	42.67efg	112ef	8.20b	3.32a	11.52c
Paloan (Control)	54.67c	61.33b	116.0cd	4.61e	1.77f	6.38gh
Paloan (10% PEG)	43.00d	35.50fg	78.50h	4.05e	1.52g	5.57i
Bharti 981 (Control)	55.00c	54.33bcd	109.3cde	7.75b	2.32c	10.07d
Bharti 981 (10% PEG)	51.00cd	32.67g	83.67gh	4.65e	1.95e	6.60g
BHM 9 (Control)	74.00a	45.00def	119.0c	11.17a	3.37a	14.54a
BHM 9 (10% PEG)	59.67bc	35.00fg	94.67def	10.83a	2.50b	13.34b
Pioneer (Control)	60.00bc	48.67cde	108.7cde	5.66d	2.36c	8.02f
Pioneer (10% PEG)	58.67bc	40.33efg	99.00def	4.17e	1.51g	5.67hi
Level of sign.	*	**	**	**	**	**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

In a column, figures with same letter (s) or without letter do not differ significantly whereas figures with dissimilar letter differ significantly (as per DMRT). ** =Significant at 1% level of probability, * =Significant at 5% level of probability

Root fresh weight

Six Maize varieties showed different magnitude of reductions in the root fresh weight due to drought stress. Significant variation was observed among the varieties weight due to and treatment (Table 1). In control condition, the maximum root fresh weight (3.43 g) as recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by BHM 9 (3.37 g) and minimum the root fresh weight (1.77 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (2.32 g). The graph showed that, root fresh weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10% drought level, the maximum root fresh weight (3.32 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by BHM 9 (2.50 g) and the minimum root fresh weight (1.51g) was achieved from Pioneer followed by Paloan (1.52 g). Root fresh weight decreased with the increment of drought stress (Liu et al., 2015).

Total fresh weight

Six Maize varieties showed different magnitude of reductions in the total fresh weight due to drought stress. Significant variation was observed among the varieties weight due to and treatment (Table 1). In control condition, the maximum total fresh weight (14.54 g) as recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (14.45 g) and the minimum total fresh weight (6.38 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (8.02 g). The graph showed that, total fresh weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum total fresh weight (13.34 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (11.52 g) and the minimum total fresh weight (5.57 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (5.67 g). Total biomass of maize plant decreased under the stress condition either natural or artificially imposed water scarcity (Liu et al., 2015).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Relative greenness (SPAD)

The effects of drought on relative greenness of varieties differ significantly (Table 2). In control condition, the maximum relative greenness (29.77) as recorded from the variety Gold Star followed by BHM 9 (28.43) and the minimum relative greenness (22.30) was achieved from Bharti 981 followed by Paloan (23.23). The table showed that, relative greenness was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10% drought level, the maximum relative greenness (27.70) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Gold Star (21.33) and the minimum relative greenness (17.57) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (19.33). Leaf greenness as measured by SPAD unit has been found less affected in all tested maize varieties due to water deficits. Dark green plants with reduced shoot biomass without toxicity symptoms in the foliage represent the typical phenotypic trait for the first phase of drought stress (Schubert, 2011).

Table 2. Effects of variety and treatment on physiological and morphological characteristics

Variety x treatment	SPAD VALUE	F_V/F_M	LEAF AREA
Gold Star (Control)	29.77a	0.787a	76.51e
Gold Star (10% PEG)	21.33ef	0.730e	68.68f
BHM 14 (Control)	28.10ab	0.773ab	102.4c
BHM 14 (10% PEG)	27.70b	0.746cde	73.66e
Paloan (Control)	23.23d	0.750cd	30.00j
Paloan (10% PEG)	17.57h	0.750cd	28.28j
Bharti 981 (Control)	22.30de	0.753c	59.05h
Bharti 981 (10% PEG)	19.33g	0.733de	49.53i

UNDER PEER REVIEW

BHM 9 (Control)	28.43ab	0.760bc	148.1a
BHM 9 (10% PEG)	20.03fg	0.750cd	122.3b
Pioneer (Control)	27.33b	0.763bc	93.53d
Pioneer (10% PEG)	25.40c	0.756bc	63.34g
Level of sign.	**	**	**

In a column, figures with same letter (s) or without letter do not differ significantly whereas figures with dissimilar letter differ significantly (as per DMRT). ** =Significant at 1% level of probability

Photochemical efficiency of PS-II (Fv/Fm)

The effects of drought on photochemical efficiency of PS-II of varieties differ significantly (Table 2). In control condition, the maximum photochemical efficiency of PS-II (0.787) as recorded from the variety Gold Star followed by BHM 14 (0.773) and minimum photochemical efficiency of PS-II (0.750) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (0.753). The table showed that, photochemical efficiency of PS-II was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10% drought level, the maximum photochemical efficiency of PS-II (0.756) was recorded from the variety Pioneer followed by BHM 9 (0.750) and the minimum photochemical efficiency of PS-II (0.730) was achieved from Gold Star followed by Bharti 981 (0.733). While working with the maize, (Niu et al., 2012) reported that both short and long term effects of drought on (F_v/F_m) ratios were not significant. Our results indicate that the drought at first phase (osmotic effect) may not be severe enough to cause potential damages in PS-II to make any significant difference in the (F_v/F_m) ratios among the tested six maize varieties.

Leaf area

The effects of drought on leaf area of Maize varieties differ significantly (Table 2). In control condition, the maximum leaf area (148.10 cm^2) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (102.40 cm^2) and the minimum leaf area (30.00 cm^2) was achieved

UNDER PEER REVIEW

from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (59.05 cm^2). The graph showed that leaf area was decreased in each variety with the increasing drought level. In 10% drought level, the maximum leaf area (122.30 cm^2) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (73.66 cm^2) and the minimum leaf area (28.28 cm^2) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (49.53 cm^2). Drought stress highly reduced the leaf area, which is due to accelerated leaf senescence caused by drought stress (Ali et al., 2011).

Shoot dry weight

The effects of drought on shoot dry weight of varieties differ significantly (Table 3). In control condition, the maximum shoot dry weight (0.91 g) as recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (0.73 g) and the minimum the shoot dry weight (0.34 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (0.44 g). The graph showed that, root dry weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum root fresh weight (0.73 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (0.69 g) and the minimum shoot dry weight (0.30 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (0.35 g). Shoot fresh and dry weights in maize and soybean plants also significantly reduced when exposed to drought due to reduced shoot growth, increased senescence and switching over of the plant growth from shoot growth towards root growth (Humayun et al., 2010).

Root dry weight

The effects of drought on root dry weight of varieties differ significantly (Table 3). In control condition, the maximum root dry weight (0.21 g) as recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Gold Star (0.14 g) and minimum the root dry weight (0.07 g) was achieved from Pioneer followed by BHM 9 (0.106 g). The graph showed that, root fresh weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10% drought level, the

UNDER PEER REVIEW

maximum root fresh weight (0.12 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Bharti 981 (0.103 g) and the minimum root fresh weight (0.029 g) was achieved from Pioneer followed by Paloan (0.073 g). Arjunan et al., (1992) also stated that the weight/plant, was reduced in high water deficits condition. Therefore, the present result hypothesized that with the increasing of drought level root dry weight might be decreased.

Table 3. Combined effects of variety and treatment on shoot dry weight, root dry weight, total dry weight and root shoot ratio

Variety x treatment	SDW	RDW	TDW	RSR
Gold Star (Control)	0.736b	0.143b	0.880c	0.196def
Gold Star (10% PEG)	0.530c	0.097def	0.627e	0.180def
BHM 14 (Control)	0.733b	0.210a	0.943b	0.286ab
BHM 14 (10% PEG)	0.686b	0.116bcd	0.803d	0.170ef
Paloan (Control)	0.343ef	0.106cde	0.450g	0.313a
Paloan (10% PEG)	0.300f	0.073f	0.373h	0.236bcd
Bharti 981 (Control)	0.470d	0.130bc	0.600e	0.273ab
Bharti 981 (10% PEG)	0.380e	0.103cdef	0.483fg	0.260abc
BHM 9 (Control)	0.906a	0.210a	1.117a	0.233bcd
BHM 9 (10% PEG)	0.733b	0.106cde	0.840cd	0.147f
Pioneer (Control)	0.440d	0.093def	0.533f	0.210cde
Pioneer (10% PEG)	0.353ef	0.076ef	0.430g	0.213cde
$LSD_{0.05}$	0.053	0.029	0.053	0.053
SE(±)	0.014	0.0091	0.0159	0.020
Level of sign.	**	**	**	*
CV (%)	**4.33**	**12.94**	**4.10**	**15.48**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

In a column, figures with same letter (s) or without letter do not differ significantly whereas figures with dissimilar letter differ significantly (as per DMRT). ** =Significant at 1% level of probability, * =Significant at 5% level of probability

Total dry weight

The effects of drought on total dry weight of varieties differ significantly (Table 3). In control condition, the maximum total dry weight (1.12 g) as recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (0.94 g) and minimum the total dry weight (0.451 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (0.53 g). The graph showed that, total dry weight was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum total dry weight (0.84 g) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (0.80 g) and the minimum total dry weight (0. *et al.*, (199237 g) was achieved from Paloan followed by Pioneer (0.43 g). Arjunan) reported that total dry weight of maize reduced under drought condition to normal condition.

Root shoot ratio

The effects of drought on root shoot ratio of varieties differ significantly (Table 3). In control condition, the maximum root shoot ratio (0.313) as recorded from the variety Paloan followed by BHM 14 (0.286) and minimum root shoot ratio (0.196) was achieved from Gold Star followed by Pioneer (0.210). The table showed that, root shoot ratio was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10% drought level, the maximum root shoot ratio (0.260) was recorded from the variety Bharti 981 followed by Paloan (0.24) and the minimum root shoot ratio (0.15) was achieved from BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (0.17). According to Liu et al., (2015) the root shoot ratio of two maize cultivars become decreased due to higher level of drought condition.

Photosynthesis (A)

UNDER PEER REVIEW

The effects of drought on photosynthesis of varieties differ significantly (Table 4). In control condition, the maximum photosynthesis (11.62 µmolm-2s-1) as recorded from the variety Pioneer followed by Gold Star (10.47 µmolm-2s-1) and the minimum photosynthesis (8.55 µmolm-2s-1) was achieved from Paloan followed by BHM 14 (9.09 µmolm-2s-1). The graph showed that, photosynthesis was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum photosynthesis (10.23 µmolm-2s-1) was recorded from the variety Pioneer followed by Gold Star (9.88 µmolm-2s-1) and the minimum photosynthesis (8.23 µmolm-2s-1) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (8.55 µmolm-2s-1). The rate of photosynthesis reduced due to lower chlorophyll concentration in maize under water stressed conditions (Anjum et al., 2011)

Transpiration

The effects of drought on transpiration of varieties differ significantly (Table 4). In control condition, the maximum transpiration (1.346 mmolm-2s-1) as recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by Pioneer (1.343 mmolm-2s-1) and minimum transpiration (1.02 mmolm-2s-1) was achieved from BHM 14 followed by Paloan (1.11 mmolm-2s-1). The graph showed that, transpiration was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum transpiration (1.22 mmolm-2s-1) was recorded from the variety BHM 9 followed by Pioneer (1.18 mmolm-2s-1) and the minimum transpiration (0.66 mmolm-2s-1) was achieved from Paloan followed by Gold Star (0.78 mmolm-2s-1). Higher level of drought stress reduces water transpiration rate in maize quickly (Ephrath et al., 1991)

Stomatal conductance (gs)

The effects of drought on stomatal conductance of varieties differ significantly (Table 4). In control condition, the maximum stomatal conductance (0.08 molm-2s-1) as recorded from the variety Gold Star followed by BHM 14 (0.053 molm-2s-1) and the minimum stomatal

UNDER PEER REVIEW

conductance (0.036 molm-2s-1) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (0.036 molm-2s-1). The graph showed that, stomatal conductance was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum stomatal conductance (0.046 molm-2s-1) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Pioneer (0.046 molm-2s-1) and the minimum stomatal conductance (0.026 molm-2s-1) was achieved from Paloan followed by Bharti 981 (0.026 molm-2s-1). Anjum et al., (2011) revealed that gaseous exchange was substantially declined in maize cultivars under water stressed conditions.

Water use efficiency

The effects of drought on water use efficiency of varieties differ significantly (Table 4). In control condition, the maximum water use efficiency (8.94 µm-1) as recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by Bharti 981 (8.75 µm-1) and minimum water use efficiency (7.25 µm-1) was achieved from BHM 9 followed by Paloan (7.70 µm-1). The graph showed that, water use efficiency was decreased in each variety with the increasing Drought level. In 10 % drought level, the maximum water use efficiency (12.69 µm-1) was recorded from the variety Gold Star followed by Paloan (12.42 µm-1) and the minimum water use efficiency (7.722 µm-1) was achieved from BHM 9 followed by BHM 14 (8.65 µm-1). Hasan et al., (2017) reported that water use efficiency reduced in maize and sorghum due to higher level of drought stress.

Table 4. Combined effects of variety and treatment on physiological traits of maize under drought condition

Variety x treatment	SPAD Value	A	GS	E	WUE	No of Leaf	Proline conc
Gold Star (Control)	29.77a	10.47b	0.0800a	1.273b	8.23de	6.33a	5.35d
Gold Star (10% PEG)	21.33ef	9.88d	0.0333de	0.7800f	12.69a	4.67f	5.36d

UNDER PEER REVIEW

BHM 14 (Control)	28.10ab	9.09f	0.0533b	1.020e	8.94c	5.33d	5.43d
BHM 14 (10% PEG)	27.70b	8.75g	0.0466bc	0.990e	8.85c	4.67f	7.99b
Paloan (Control)	23.23d	8.55h	0.0366cde	1.110d	7.70ef	5.33d	7.95b
Paloan (10% PEG)	17.57h	8.23i	0.0266e	0.663g	12.42a	4.67f	8.02b
Bharti 981 (Control)	22.30de	9.77d	0.0366cde	1.117d	8.75cd	5.67c	5.99c
Bharti 981 (10% PEG)	19.33g	8.55h	0.0266e	0.823f	10.39b	4.00g	6.15c
BHM 9 (Control)	28.43ab	9.76d	0.0433bcd	1.347a	7.25f	6.00b	6.14c
BHM 9 (10% PEG)	20.03fg	9.42e	0.0400cd	1.220c	7.72ef	4.67f	8.86a
Pioneer (Control)	27.33b	11.62a	0.0533b	1.343a	8.65cd	5.67c	8.87a
Pioneer (10% PEG)	25.40c	10.23c	0.0466bc	1.180c	8.67cd	5.00e	8.92a
$LSD_{0.05}$	1.74	0.169	0.005	0.053	0.533	0.226	0.22
SE(±)	0.59	0.057	0.0038	0.017	0.182	0.078	0.07
Level of sign.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
CV (%)	**4.28**	**1.04**	**15.29**	**2.76**	**3.44**	**2.62**	**1.82**

In a column, figures with same letter (s) or without letter do not differ significantly whereas figures with dissimilar letter differ significantly (as per DMRT). ** =Significant at 1% level of probability, * =Significant at 5% level of probability

Number of leaves per plant

Six Maize varieties showed different magnitude of reductions in the number of leaves due to drought. Significant variation was observed among the varieties and treatment (Table 4). In control condition, the maximum number of leaves (6.33) was recorded from the variety Gold Star followed by BHM 9 (6) and minimum number of leaves (5.33) was achieved from BHM 14 followed by Paloan (5.33). The graph showed that, number of leaves was decreased in each variety with the increasing drought. In 10% drought level, the maximum number of leaves (5) was recorded from the variety Pioneer followed by BHM 9 (4.66) and the minimum number of leaves (4) was achieved from Bharti 981 followed by Paloan (4.66). Hu

UNDER PEER REVIEW

et al., (2007) reported that number of leaves per plant reduced due to increment of drought level in maize at seedling stage.

Proline content

Six Maize varieties showed wide magnitude of changes in the proline content due to drought. Significant variation was observed among the varieties and treatment (Table 4). In control condition, the highest proline content (8.75 mg/100g FW) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by pioneer (7.32 mg/100g FW) and the lowest proline content (4.90 mg/100g FW) was achieved from Paloan followed by Gold strar (5.35 mg/100g FW). The table showed that, the proline content was increased in each variety with the increasing drought level. In 10% drought level, the highest proline content (10.87 mg/100g FW) was recorded from the variety BHM 14 followed by BHM 9 (8.86 mg/100g FW) and the lowest proline content (6.15 mg/100g FW) was achieved from Paloan followed by Gold star (6.363 mg/100g FW). A similar trend was endorsed by Munns and Tester (2008). This increment of proline concentration was occurred by plants might be due to maintaining osmotic pressure in the cell (Munns and Tester, 2008).

Conclusion

It can be concluded that drought stress significantly responded to different parameters. Shoot length, the number of leaves, leaf area, root length, root, shoot weight, and relative greenness were decreased by using PEG. Based on the experimental results, the PEG concentration at 10% showed a tremendous negative effect on the growth and morpho-physiological changes of maize seedlings and among the varieties, BHM 14 had the highest tolerance to drought in respect of growth and morpho-physiological attributes.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

References

Akula R, Ravishankar GA. Influence of abiotic stress signals on secondary metabolites in plants. Plant signaling & behavior. 2011;6(11):1720-1731.

Ali Q, Haider MZ, Shahid S, Aslam N, Shehzad F, Naseem J, Ashraf R, Hussain, SM. Role of amino acids in improving abiotic stress tolerance to plants. In Plant tolerance to environmental stress. 2019;175-204. CRC Press.

Anjum SA, Farooq M, Wang LC, Xue LL, Wang SG, Wang L, Zhang S, Chen M. Gas exchange and chlorophyll synthesis of maize cultivars are enhanced by exogenously-applied glycinebetaine under drought conditions. Plant, Soil and Environment. 2011;57(7):326-331.

Caliskan O, Radusiene J, Temizel KE, Staunis Z, Cirak C, Kurt D, Odabas MS. The effects of salt and drought stress on phenolic accumulation in greenhouse-grown *Hypericum pruinatum*. Italian Journal of Agronomy. 2017;12(3).

Ephrath JE, Hesketh JD. The effects of drought stress on leaf elongation, photosynthetic and transpiration rates in maize (*Zea mays* L.) leaves. Photosynthetica (Praha). 1991;25(4):607-619.

Farooq M. Hussain M, Wahid A, Siddique KHM. Drought stress in plants: an overview. Plant responses to drought stress: From morphological to molecular features. 2012;1-33.

Gharibi S, Tabatabaei BES, Saeidi G, Talebi M, Matkowski A. The effect of drought stress on polyphenolic compounds and expression of flavonoid biosynthesis related genes in *Achillea pachycephala* Rech. f. Phytochemistry. 2019;162:90-98.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Ghotbi- Ravandi AA, Shahbazi M, Shariati M, Mulo P. Effects of mild and severe drought stress on photosynthetic efficiency in tolerant and susceptible barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) genotypes. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science. 2014;200(6):403-415.

Girard O, Billaut F, Christian RJ, Bradley PS, Bishop DJ. Exercise-related sensations contribute to decrease power during repeated cycle sprints with limited influence on neural drive. European journal of applied physiology. 2017;117：2171-2179.

Hadas A, Kautsky L, Goek M, Kara EE. Rates of decomposition of plant residues and available nitrogen in soil, related to residue composition through simulation of carbon and nitrogen turnover. Soil biology and biochemistry. 2004;36(2):255-266.

Hasan MK, Cheng Y, Kanwar MK, Chu XY, Ahammed GJ, Qi ZY. Responses of plant proteins to heavy metal stress—a review. Frontiers in plant science, 2017;8:1492.

Hu S, Ding Y, Zhu C. Sensitivity and responses of chloroplasts to heat stress in plants. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2020;11:375.

Kebbas S, Lutts S, Aid F. Effect of drought stress on the photosynthesis of Acacia tortilis subsp. raddiana at the young seedling stage. Photosynthetica. 2015;53(2):288-298.

Kitajima K, Fenner M. Ecology of seedling regeneration. In Seeds: the ecology of regeneration in plant communities. Wallingford UK: CABI publishing. 2000;331-359.

Lambers H, Raven JA, Shaver GR, Smith SE. Plant nutrient-acquisition strategies change with soil age. Trends in ecology & evolution. 2008;23(2):95-103.

Liu Y, He C. Regulation of plant reactive oxygen species (ROS) in stress responses: learning from AtRBOHD. Plant Cell Rep. 2016;35:995-1007.

UNDER REVIEW

Mansour MMF, Salama KHA, Ali FZM, Abou Hadid AF. Cell and plant responses to NaCl in *Zea mays* L. cultivars differing in salt tolerance. Gen. Appl. Plant Physiol. 2005;31(1-2):29-41.

Niu L, Liao W. Hydrogen peroxide signaling in plant development and abiotic responses: crosstalk with nitric oxide and calcium. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2016;7:230.

Parvaiz A, Satyawati, S. Salt stress and phyto-biochemical responses of plants-a review. Plant soil and environment. 2008;54(3):89.

Patel NR, Mehta AN, Shekh AM. Canopy temperature and water stress quantificaiton in rainfed pigeonpea (*Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millsp.). Agricultural and Forest Meteorology. 2001;109(3):223-232.

Pitann B, Schubert S, Mühling KH. Decline in leaf growth under salt stress is due to an inhibition of H^+- pumping activity and increase in apoplastic pH of maize leaves. Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science. 2009;172(4):535-543.

Quan X, Qian Q, Ye Z, Zeng J, Han Z, Zhang G. Metabolic analysis of two contrasting wild barley genotypes grown hydroponically reveals adaptive strategies in response to low nitrogen stress. Journal of plant physiology. 2016;206:59-67.

Rehman K, Saunders WP, Foye RH, Sharkey SW. Calcium ion diffusion from calcium hydroxide- containing materials in endodontically- treated teeth: An in vitro study. International Endodontic Journal. 1996;29(4):271-279.

Saleh B. Salt stress alters physiological indicators in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). Soil & environment. 2012;31(2).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Schubert S. Salt resistance of crop plants: physiological characterization of a multigenic trait. The molecular and physiological basis of nutrient use efficiency in crops. 2011;443-455.

Tester M, Davenport R. Na+ tolerance and Na+ transport in higher plants. Annals of botany. 2003;91(5):503-27.

Torres-Ruiz JM, Diaz-Espejo A, Perez-Martin A, Hernandez-Santana V. Role of hydraulic and chemical signals in leaves, stems and roots in the stomatal behaviour of olive trees under water stress and recovery conditions. Tree Physiology. 2015;35(4):415-424.

Turk KJ, Hall AE. Drought adaptation of cowpea, Influence of drought on water use, and relations with growth and seed yield. Agronomy Journal. 1980;72(3):434-439.

Varone L, Ribas-Carbo M, Cardona C, Gallé A, Medrano H, Gratani L, Flexas J. Stomatal and non-stomatal limitations to photosynthesis in seedlings and saplings of Mediterranean species pre-conditioned and aged in nurseries: Different response to water stress. Environmental and Experimental Botany. 2012;75:235-247.

Weidner S, Karolak M, Karamac M, Kosinska A, Amarowicz R. Phenolic compounds and properties of antioxidants in grapevine roots (*Vitis vinifera* L.) under drought stress followed by recovery. Acta Societatis Botanicorum Poloniae. 2009;78(2):97-103.

UNDER PEER REVIEW