

36 grounds to search for an alternative source for ethanol production, as traditional source of
37 ethanol is unable to meet the existing and future demand. Eventually, sweet sorghum emerged
38 as a potential alternate raw material for fuel-grade ethanol production. because of its shorter
39 growing period (about four month), and low water requirement (8,000 cu m) for raising two
40 crops, unlike sugarcane which has a growing period of 12 to 18 months and a water
41 requirement of 36,000 cu m per crop and its cultivation cost is also four times lower than that
42 of sugarcane, therefore there is increased interest in the utilization of sweet sorghum for
43 ethanol production in recent years. In this regard, genetic enhancement of sweet sorghum for
44 increased stalk yield, sugar yield and its associated traits is very critical to make more
45 remunerative to the farmers and the industry (Murray et al., 2009). The juice yield in sweet
46 sorghum is a complex quantitative trait and the expression of which depends upon its
47 component traits and environment. Thus selection may not be useful for such characters;
48 however efficiency of selection under such circumstances could be improved by taking into
49 consideration simultaneously the phenotypic values of a number of plant attributes which are
50 correlated with the genotypic values (high heritability) of the characters under consideration.
51 Estimates of correlations alone may be often misleading due to mutual cancellation of
52 component traits. So, it becomes necessary to study path coefficient analysis, which takes in
53 to account the casual relationship in addition to degree of relationship (Mahajan et. al., 2011).
54 The path coefficient analysis initially suggested by (Wright 1921) and described by Dewey
55 and Lu (1959) allows partitioning of correlation coefficient in direct and indirect effects
56 followed by assessing the cause effect relations and contribution of each component character
57 to juice yield. Considering the future needs an experiment was under taken to evaluate the
58 character association and path analysis between green stalk yield and its contributing
59 characters.

60 2. Materials and Methods

61 Thirty genotypes of sweet sorghum collected from Indian Institute of Millet Research along
62 with three checks PVK 400, SSV 84 and CSH 22 SS were used as experimental material for
63 the present study. All the genotypes were evaluated in randomized block design with two
64 replication. Two rows of each genotype was sown with a distance of 60 cm between two rows
65 and 15 cm between plant to plant and all recommended agronomical practices were followed
66 to grow healthy crop. Observations were recorded on randomly selected five plants from each
67 entry from each replication for eleven characters days to 50 per cent flowering, days to
68 maturity, plant height (cm), stem girth (cm), internode length (cm), total fresh biomass
69 (g/plant), millable cane weight(g/plant), grain yield(g/plant), brix at physiological maturity,
70 juice extraction percentage (%) and juice yield (ml/plant).

71 2.1 Statistical analysis

72 The mean values of all traits under consideration were used for statistical analysis. The mean
73 data for different characters was statistically analysed by the statistical procedure provided by
74 Panse and Sukhatme, (1961). Covariance analysis between all pairs of characters under study
75 was carried out as per the analysis of variance and covariance as declared by Singh and
76 Chowdary (1979). The appropriate variances and co-variances were used to calculate
77 phenotypic and genotypic correlation (Johnson et al. 1955). The estimates of direct and
78 indirect contribution of various characteristics to seed yield were calculated through path
79 coefficient analysis as suggested by Wright (1921) and elaborated by Dewey and Lu (1959).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Correlation coefficients among different juice yield traits

The correlation coefficients among juice yield and its component traits at genotypic and phenotypic level tabulated in Table 1 revealed highly significant positive association between juice yield with Total Fresh Biomass ($G=0.8916$, $P=0.8862$), Millable cane weight ($G=0.9018$, $P=0.8938$), Juice extraction percentage ($G=0.7171$, $P=0.6950$), Stem girth ($G=0.6907$, $P=0.6860$), days to maturity ($G=0.2565$, $P=0.2512$), plant height ($G=0.2943$, $P=0.2866$) and internode length ($G=0.2528$, $P=0.2463$). This indicated that emphasis should be given for selection of plant type comprising traits such as high biomass, more cane weight, tallness with more number of internodes and thick stem as well as high juice extraction percentage to increase juice yield in sweet sorghum. Kavya *et al.*, (2020) reported positive significant contribution of Juice yield for ethanol yield at both genotypic and phenotypic level. Juice yield directly contributes to the ethanol yield and simultaneous improvement could be possible because of positive association. Iraddi *et al.* (2014) and Kachapur *et al.* (2009) observed similar results for of juice yield. Grain yield exhibited negative but non significant corelation with juice yield indicating. Reddy *et al.* 2012 also reported that both sweet sorghum hybrids and varieties had higher stalk sugar yields (50 and 89 %) and lower grain yields (25 and 2 %).

3.2 Path analysis

Days to maturity and plant height had shown significant positive association with stem girth, millable cane weight and total fresh biomass at both genotypic and phynotypic level. signifying high biomass can be achieved in late maturing tall genotypes. Similar results were reported by Iraddi *et al.* (2014) for days to maturity, plant height, stem girth and total fresh biomass. Plant height had also showed significantly positive corelation with stem girth and internode length at both the levels. Bangarwa *et al.* (1985) reported similar results for stem girth and plant height. Furthermore stem girth and internode length exhibited positive significant association with millable cane weight, total fresh biomass at both the levels while stem girth further showed positive association with total soluble sugar indicating thick stem accumulates more sugars. Millable cane weight showed significant and positive association with juice extraction percentage, non reducing sugar and total sugar percentage and non reducing sugar with total sugar percentage. While non reducing and reducing sugars were found negatively correlated. Justice *et al.* 2018 obserevd negative relationship between juice extractability and non-reducing, plant height and total sugar and between reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar. Sucrose (non-reducing sugar) is the predominant stalk sugar in sweet sorghum and is converted to reducing sugars (glucose and fructose) by invertase, thus a negative relationship is likely to be observed between reducing and non-reducing sugar. Brix was positively correlated with total sugar and non-reducing sugar. The results on association of sugar yield with its attributing traits indicated importance of these characters in improving juice yield. As these traits had direct correlation with juice yield improvement in these traits automatically improve sugar yield. Hence, the above correlated traits can be effectively utilized in formulating indirect selection schemes.

3.3 Correlation between juice yield and its component-characters

The correlation between yield and its component-character is often miss-leading, since it is affected by the inter- relationship among the component traits. Direct

124 effect of any component **trait** on juice yield gives an idea about reliability of indirect selection
125 to be made through that character to bring about improvement in juice yield. Hence results on
126 direct and indirect path coefficient is presented in Table 2. Millable cane weight, juice
127 extraction percentage, days to 50% flowering, stem girth, internodal length, brix at
128 physiological maturity, total fresh biomass and non reducing sugar had shown positive direct
129 effect on juice yield. **Both** correlation and the direct effect are high and positive for these
130 traits hence, correlation explains its true relationship and selection for these character will be
131 effective. Days to maturity, plant height, grain yield per plant and brix at 50 % flowering
132 exhibited negative direct effect on juice yield however these traits had positive correlation
133 with juice yield except for grain yield indicating indirect causal factor are to be considered
134 simultaneously for selection. Similar results were reported by Iraddi *et al.* (2014) for stalk
135 yield and total biomass.

136 Stem girth, internode length, millable cane weight, fresh biomass, had
137 positive direct effect on juice yield via indirect positive effect of almost all the traits.
138 so indirect selection through these traits would be rewarding for juice yield
139 improvement.

140 While plant height and grain yield had exhibited indirect negative effect on juice
141 yield via stem girth, internode length, total fresh biomass, millable cane weight, brix
142 at 50% flowering and brix at physiological maturity. **Kalpande *et al.* (2014)** also
143 observed negative indirect effect on cane yield via total fresh biomass and days to
144 maturity. However positive correlation between these traits and juice yield indicate
145 that direct selection for such traits should be practiced to reduce the undesirable
146 indirect effects.

147 Reducing and Non reducing sugar had positive direct effect on juice
148 yield while it was positively correlated with juice yield. Total soluble sugar had
149 negative direct effect on juice yield while it was positively correlated with juice yield.
150 The residual effect determines how best the causal factors account for variability of
151 the dependent factor. moderate value of residual effect indicates that beside the
152 character studied there are some other attributes which contributes for juice yield.

153 **4. Conclusion**

154 Hence on the basis of the results it can be concluded that due importance should be
155 given to characters viz. stem girth, internode length, total fresh biomass, millable cane
156 weight, juice extraction percentage for improving the juice yield in sweet sorghum.
157 selection for the character will be effective for these traits due to its true relationship
158 confirmed through significant positive correlation and direct effect on juice yield.

159 **Conference disclaimer:**

160 Some part of this manuscript was previously presented in the conference: 3rd International
161 Conference IAAHAS-2023 "Innovative Approaches in Agriculture, Horticulture & Allied Sciences" on
162 March 29-31, 2023 in SGT University , Gurugram, India. Web Link of the proceeding:
163 [https://wikifarmer.com/event/iaahas-2023-innovative-approaches-in-agriculture-horticulture-allied-](https://wikifarmer.com/event/iaahas-2023-innovative-approaches-in-agriculture-horticulture-allied-sciences/)
164 [sciences/](https://wikifarmer.com/event/iaahas-2023-innovative-approaches-in-agriculture-horticulture-allied-sciences/)

165

166 **References**

- 167 Bangarwa, K.S., Grewal, R.P.S. and Lodhi, G.P. 1985. Genetics of sweetness in sorghum .
168 *Sorghum Newsletters*, 28:75.
- 169 Dewey, D.R. and K.H. Lu, (1959). A correlation and path coefficient analysis of components
170 of crested wheatgrass seed production. *Agron. J.*,51: 515-518.
- 171 Iraddi Vermana, Reddy Dayakar T., Umakant, A. V. and Narasimhulu R. 2014. Correlation
172 and path analysis studies for juice yield and its associated traits
173 in sweet sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L. Moench)] *Bionfolet*, **11**(2A):358-361.
- 174 Johnson, H.W., Robinson H.F. and Comstock R.E. 1955. Genotypic and Phenotypic
175 correlation in soybean and their implications in selection. *Agron. J.*, **47**:477-482.
- 176 Justice K. Rono¹ , Erick K. Cheruiyot² , Jacktone O. Othira¹ & Virginia W. Njuguna². 2018.
177 Cane Yield and Juice Volume Determine Ethanol Yield in Sweet Sorghum (*Sorghum*
178 *bicolor* L. Moench). *International Journal of Applied Science*; Vol. 1, No. 2; 2018
- 179 Kachapur, R.M., Salimath, P.M., 2009. Genetic studies on correlation and character
180 association in sweet sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Monech) *Green- Farming*, **2**(6):
181 343-346
- 182 Kalpande H. V., Chavan S. K., More A.W., Patil V. S. and Unche P.B. 2014. Character
183 association, genetic variability and component analysis in sweet sorghum [*Sorghum*
184 *bicolor* (L. Moench)]. *Journal of Crop and Weed*, 10(2):108-110.
- 185 Kavya P., Satyanarayana Rao V., Vijayalakshmi B., Sreekanth B., Radhakrishna Y. and
186 Nafeez Umar S.K. (2020). Correlation and path coefficient analysis in sorghum
187 [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Monech] for ethanol yield. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and*
188 *Phytochemistry* 2020; 9(2): 2407-2410
- 189 Mahajan R.C., Wadikar P.B., Pole S.P., Dhuppe M.V. (2011). Variability, correlation and path
190 analysis studies in sorghum. *Res. J. of Agri. Sciences*, 2(1): 101-103.
- 191 Murray S.C., Rooney W.L., Hamblin M.T., Mitchell S.E. and Stephen Kresovich. 2009.
192 Sweet Sorghum Genetic Diversity and Association Mapping for Brix and Height. *The*
193 *Plant Genome*, 2: 48-62.
- 194 Panse V.G. and Sukhatme P.V. 1961. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. Indian
195 council of agricultural research. New Delhi, , 381.
- 196 Reddy BVS., Ramesh S., Ashok kumar A., Wani S.P., Ortiz R., Ceballos H. and Sreedevi T.K.
197 2008. Biofuel crops research for energy security and rural development in developing
198 countries. *Bioenergy Research*, 1: 248-258
- 199 Reddy BVS., Sanjana P., Reddy A.R., Sadananda, E., Dinakaran A., Ashok Kumar. 2012.
200 Post^{rainy} season sorghum: Constraints and breeding approaches. *Journal of SAT*
201 *Agricultural Research* 10. [http://ejournal .icrisat.org/ Volume10/Sorghum_](http://ejournal.icrisat.org/Volume10/Sorghum_Millets/Postrainy.pdf)
202 [Millets/Postrainy.pdf](http://ejournal.icrisat.org/Volume10/Sorghum_Millets/Postrainy.pdf).

203 Singh RK, Chaudhary BD. 1979. Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis.
204 Biometrical Methods in Quantitative Genetic Analysis.

205 Wright, S. (1921). Systems of Mating. Genetics,6: 111-178

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1: Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficient for Juice yield with its attributing traits studied in sweet sorghum.

	Days to 50% flowering (g)	Days to Maturity (g)	Plant height (cm)	Stem girth (cm)	Internode length (cm)	Total Fresh Biomass (g/plant)	Millable cane weight (g/plant)	Grain yield (g/plant)	Brix at 50% flowering	Brix at physiological maturity	Juice Extraction %	Reducing sugar (%)	Non Reducing Sugar (%)	Total Soluble Sugar (%)	Juice Yield(ml/plant)
Days to 50% flowering (g)	1.0000	0.975**	0.0253	0.2594*	-0.1093	0.2573*	0.2403	-0.0886	0.0355	-0.0681	0.0479	0.0055	0.0558	0.0574	0.2216
(p)	1.000	0.935**	0.0199	0.2536*	-0.1234	0.2451*	0.2255	-0.0831	0.0095	-0.0747	0.0622	0.0128	0.0481	0.0515	0.2190
Days to Maturity (g)		1.0000	0.0049	0.2582*	-0.0824	0.2788*	0.2709*	0.1500	0.0686	-0.0341	0.0981	0.1164	0.0245	0.0524	0.2565*
		1.0000	0.0122	0.2529*	-0.0961	0.2696*	0.2611*	-0.1411	0.0517	-0.0373	0.1001	0.0985	0.0303	0.0551	0.2512*
Plant height(cm) (g)			1.0000	0.399**	0.6260**	0.4064**	0.3495**	0.0687	0.0627	0.1884	0.0228	0.0801	-0.0687	-0.0500	0.2943*
			1.0000	0.392**	0.6028**	0.3955**	0.3373**	0.0634	0.0678	0.1872	0.0202	0.0796	-0.0610	-0.0414	0.2866*
Stem girth(cm) (g)				1.0000	0.2426*	0.8734**	0.8819**	0.2124	0.1364	0.0583	0.0440	0.0891	0.2313	0.2537 *	0.6907**
				1.0000	0.2395	0.8674**	0.8713**	0.2098	0.1316	0.0523	0.0359	0.0881	0.2346	0.2579*	0.6860**
Internode length(cm) (g)					1.0000	0.2509*	0.2576*	0.2338	0.1761	0.1561	0.1199	0.1360	0.0050	0.0374	0.2528*
					1.0000	0.2440*	0.2514*	0.2236	0.1816	0.1514	0.1050	0.1174	0.0088	0.0383	0.2463*
Total Fresh Biomass (g) (g/plant)						1.0000	0.9823**	0.1097	0.0792	0.1065	0.363**	0.0431	0.1889	0.2002	0.8916**
						1.0000	0.9776**	0.1082	0.0705	0.1036	0.330**	0.0346	0.1879	0.1975	0.8862**
Millable cane weight(g/plant) (g)							1.0000	0.0916	0.0771	0.0520	0.368**	0.0190	0.2797*	0.2857*	0.9018**
							1.0000	0.0940	0.0680	0.0518	0.324**	0.0161	0.2725*	0.2779*	0.8938**
Grain yield (g/plant) (g)								1.0000	0.1238	0.0630	-0.1350	0.2267	0.1700	0.2250	-0.0036
								1.0000	0.1072	0.0610	-0.1350	0.2134	0.1613	0.2156	-0.0020
Brix at 50%flowering (g)									1.0000	0.6496**	0.0670	0.0720	0.0690	0.0866	0.1086
									1.0000	0.6088**	0.0491	0.0861	0.0731	0.0950	0.0963
Brix at physiological maturity (g)										1.0000	0.1073	0.2370	-0.2336	-0.1783	0.1256
										1.0000	0.1017	0.2227	-0.2367	-0.1821	0.1234
Juice Extraction% (g)											1.0000	-0.0072	0.0354	0.0339	0.7171**
											1.0000	-0.0175	0.0301	0.0259	0.6950**
Reducing Sugar (%) (g)												1.0000	-0.1408	0.0970	0.0215
												1.0000	-0.1446	0.1053	0.0178
Non Reducing Sugar (%) (g)													1.0000	0.9717**	0.2298
													1.0000	0.9688**	0.2242
Total Soluble Sugar(%) (g)														1.0000	0.2362
														1.0000	0.2298
Juice Yield (ml/plant) (g)															1.0000
															1.0000

**,* Significant at 1% and 5% level respectively.

Table 2: Direct and indirect effect (genotypic) of fourteen components on juice yield in sweet sorghum.

Genotypes	Days to 50% flowering	Days to Maturity	Plant height (cm)	Stem girth (cm)	Internode length (cm)	Total Fresh Biomass (g/plant)	Millable cane weight (g/plant)	Grain yield(g/plant)	Brix at 50% flowering	Brix at physiological maturity	Juice Extraction %	Reducing sugar (%)	Non Reducing Sugar(%)	Total Soluble Sugar (%)	Correlation coefficient (r) with Juice Yield
Days to 50% flowering	0.3636	0.3544	0.0092	0.0943	-0.397	0.0935	0.0874	-0.0322	0.0129	-0.0247	0.0174	0.0020	0.0203	0.209	0.2216
Days to Maturity	-0.3473	-0.3563	-0.0017	-0.0920	0.0293	-0.0993	-0.0965	0.0534	-0.0245	0.0122	-0.0349	-0.0415	-0.0087	-0.0187	0.2565
Plant height(cm)	-0.0005	-0.001	-0.0192	-0.0077	-0.0120	-0.0078	-0.0067	-0.0013	-0.0012	-0.0036	-0.0004	-0.0015	0.0013	0.0010	0.2943
Stem girth (cm)	0.0329	0.0327	0.0506	0.1268	0.0308	0.1107	0.1118	0.0269	0.0173	0.0074	0.0056	0.0113	0.0293	0.0322	0.6907
Internode length(cm)	-0.0035	-0.0027	0.0202	0.0078	0.0323	0.0081	0.0083	0.0075	0.0057	0.0050	0.0039	0.0044	0.0002	0.0012	0.2528
Total Fresh Biomass (g/plant)	0.0192	0.0208	0.0303	0.0651	0.0187	0.0745	0.0732	0.0082	0.0059	0.0079	0.0270	0.0032	0.0141	0.0149	0.8916
Millable cane weight(g/plant)	0.1296	0.1461	0.1885	0.4757	0.1389	0.5299	0.5394	0.0494	0.0416	0.0281	0.1983	0.0103	0.1509	0.1541	0.9018
Grain yield(g/plant)	0.0061	0.0103	-0.0047	-0.0145	-0.0160	-0.0075	-0.0063	-0.0684	-0.0085	-0.0043	0.0092	-0.0155	-0.0116	-0.0154	0.0036
Brix at 50%flowering	-0.0004	-0.0008	-0.0008	-0.0017	-0.0021	-0.0010	-0.0009	-0.0015	-0.0121	-0.0079	-0.0008	-0.0009	-0.0008	-0.0011	0.1086
Brix at physiological maturity	-0.0035	-0.0017	0.0096	0.0030	0.0080	0.0054	0.0027	0.0032	0.0331	0.0510	0.0055	0.0121	-0.0119	-0.0091	0.1256
Juice Extraction%	0.0233	0.0476	0.0110	0.0213	0.0582	0.1761	0.1785	-0.0655	0.0325	0.021	0.4854	-0.0035	0.0172	0.0164	0.7171
Reducing Sugar (%)	0.0004	0.0083	0.0057	0.0064	0.0097	0.0031	0.0014	0.0162	0.0051	0.0169	-0.0005	0.0714	-0.0101	0.0069	0.0215
Non Reducing Sugar (%)	0.0079	0.0035	-0.0098	0.0329	0.0007	0.0269	0.0398	0.0242	0.0098	-0.0332	0.0050	-0.0200	0.1423	0.1383	0.2298
Total Soluble Sugar (%)	-0.0061	-0.0055	0.0053	-0.0268	-0.0039	-0.0211	-0.0302	-0.0237	-0.0091	0.0188	-0.0036	-0.0102	-0.1026	-0.1055	0.2362

Residual effect =0.071