### Horticultural Communication

Biosci. Biotech. Res. Comm. 10(1): 22-27 (2017)



## Correlation analysis of musk melon, *Cucumis melo* genotypes grown under different water regimes in greenhouse

Sheshnath Mishra<sup>1</sup>, Chetna Chugh<sup>2</sup>, A. K. Sharma<sup>3</sup> and Vishwanath Sharma<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Division of Vegetable Science, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi-110012 <sup>3</sup>Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, College of Agriculture, Swami Keshwanand Rajasthan Agricultural University (SKRAU), Bikaner-334006 <sup>4</sup>Division of Seed Science and Technology, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi-110012

#### ABSTRACT

Drought is most important abiotic stress factor responsible for greater yield loss than any other single stress condition in India. Water greatly influences the yield and quality of vegetables and thereby drastically reduces productivity including muskmelon. So, correlation study among 40 genotypes of muskmelon was done under different water regimes. The genotypes were sown in polythene bags in four replications for study root and shoot traits. Stress was imposed after germination of seeds by different levels of irrigation per day (50 ml, 25 ml and 0 ml) till 35 days old seedlings. The traits like root fresh weight with root dry weight (0.868\*\* and 0.824\*\*, 0.907\*\* and 0.790\*\* 0.896\*\* and 0.837\*\*), root shoot ratio by weight (0.719\*\* and 0.643\*\*, 0.659\*\* and 0.602\*\*, 0.577\*\* and 0.468\*\*) and root length (0.937\*\* and 0.863\*\*, 0.870\*\* and 0.759\*\*, 0.798\*\* and 0.678\*\*) ; root dry weight with root shoot ratio by weight (0.907\*\* and 0.869\*\*, 0.869\*\* and 0.846\*\*, 0.755\*\* and 0.664\*\*) and root length (0.844\*\* and 0.792\*\*, 0.903\*\* and 0.741\*\*, 0.760\*\* and 0.640\*\*); root shoot ratio by weight with root length (0.671\*\* and 0.585\*\*, 0.745\*\* and 0.607\*\*, 0.500\*\* and 0.343\*\*) were positive and significantly correlated with each other at both genotypic and phenotypic level under normal and water stress conditions. Hence selection of anyone of these traits enhances the performances of other traits.

**KEY WORDS:** MUSKMELON, GENOTYPES, GERMINATION, CORRELATION

#### ARTICLE INFORMATION:

\*Corresponding Author: chetnachugh@gmail.com Received 31<sup>st</sup> Jan, 2017 Accepted after revision 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 BBRC Print ISSN: 0974-6455 Online ISSN: 2321-4007 CODEN: USA BBRCBA Thomson Reuters ISI ESC and Crossref Indexed Journal NAAS Journal Score 2017: 4.31 Cosmos IF : 4.006 © A Society of Science and Nature Publication, 2017. All rights reserved. Online Contents Available at: http://www.bbrc.in/

# 22

#### INTRODUCTION

Unpredictable drought is the single most important factor affecting world food security and the catalyst of the great famines of the past (Gale M., 2003). More than 80 percent of farmers in India are small and marginal (< 1 ha of land) thus having less capacity to cope with climate change impacts on agriculture, particularly who are mainly dependent on high return crops like vegetables (FAO, 2010). Due to succulent nature, water stress affects productivity and quality of vegetables including melons which will aggravate in changing climate scenario (AVRDC, 1990). Although, yield under drought stress is the primary trait for selection in breeding programmes. But, more emphasis has been diverted in recent days to improve several physiological traits through selection which confer drought tolerance without much compromising with yield reduction. Plant growth is one of the most drought-sensitive physiological processes due to the reduction in turgor pressure (Taiz and Zeiger, 2006). Root length of plants under imposed water stress registered high significant increases in root length above those of plants normal irrigated (Keshavagi et al., 2006; Abdalla and El-Khoshiban, 2007; Songsri et al., 2008) and be deeper under drought conditions than irrigated environment (Basal et al., 2003; Kamara et al., 2003; Rizza et al., 2004 and Hufstetler et al., 2007). Increasing the severity and duration of drought caused decline in shoot length (Cabello et al., 2009; Mirabad et al., 2013 and Pandey et al., 2016).

The root/shoot length ratio is adaptive mechanism in response to water deficit; it is considered an important indicator for the ability of a genotype to tolerate drought stress. Root/shoot ratio increased under water stress condition to facilitate water absorption (Lambers et al., 1998). An idea on the extent of association between traits conferring drought resistance will be much helpful to decide upon the traits to be given importance in selection for drought tolerance. A positive association between traits warrants the simultaneous improvement of both the traits while restricting selection to any one of the associated traits. By understanding the correlation between morphological traits such as root length, shoot length, root/shoot ratio), we can reach more efficiently for indirect selection of plants in relation to drought at early seedling stage (Riaz et al. 2013).

Hence, the present study was carried out to find association between traits like root length, shoot length, root shoot ratio by length, root shoot ratio by weight both in water stress and non-stress situations.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Forty genotypes of musk melon (*Cucumis melo*), procured from National Agriculture Innovation Project

Table 1. List of muskmelon genotypes used for

| present investigation |                |       |             |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| S. N.                 | Genotype       | S. N. | Genotype    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                     | ArkaJeeth      | 21    | IIHR-RM-652 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2                     | DurgapuraMadhu | 22    | IIHR-RM-653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3                     | EC-564755      | 23    | IIHR-RM-655 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4                     | IIHR-GPW-12    | 24    | IIHR-RM-659 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5                     | IIHR-GPW-15    | 25    | IIHR-RM-660 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6                     | GYNO           | 26    | IIHR-RM-662 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7                     | Hara Madhu     | 27    | IIHR-RM-663 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8                     | MM-06-662      | 28    | IIHR-RM-671 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9                     | MG-5           | 29    | IIHR-RM-673 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10                    | MS-1           | 30    | IIHR-RM-675 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11                    | Punjab-Sunehri | 31    | IIHR-RM-680 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12                    | PusaMadhuras   | 32    | IIHR-RM-681 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13                    | IIHR-RM-43     | 33    | IIHR-RM-699 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14                    | IIHR-RM-190    | 34    | IIHR-RM-708 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15                    | IIHR-RM-352    | 35    | IIHR-RM-712 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16                    | IIHR-RM-387    | 36    | IIHR-RM-716 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17                    | IIHR-RM-604    | 37    | IIHR-RM-718 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18                    | IIHR-RM-616-1  | 38    | IIHR-RM-719 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19                    | IIHR-RM-619    | 39    | IIHR-RM-720 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20                    | IIHR-RM-624    | 40    | EC-564754   |  |  |  |  |  |

ICAR, were used for the present investigation. The genotypes were evaluated under three moisture regimes in a randomized complete block design with four replications in Greenhouse at Bio-technology centre, SKRAU, Bikaner (Table 1). All the accessions were sown in perforated polythene bags of 110 cm length x 20 cm diameter dimension in four replications at 30°C temperature for studying root and shoot traits. At initial stage, no stress was imposed till germination of seeds. Stress was created by different levels of irrigation per day (50 ml, 25 ml and 0 ml) in different sets after germination of seeds and imposed till 35 days old seedlings. After 35 days, the bottoms of polythene bags were cut opened and the sandy soil present in the polythene bags were washed without disturbing the root system. Then observations were recorded for root length (cm), shoot length (cm), root fresh weight (gm), shoot fresh weight (gm), root dry weight (gm) and shoot dry weight (gm). Root length was measured from root collar to the tip of main root. For measurement of root dry weight, roots of plants sampled at maturity were cut from the stem, dried moisture free in a hot air oven at 80°C for 48 hours (till attaining constant weight). Shoot dry weight was measured after drying in oven at 80°c for 48 hours. The Root shoot ratio by weight was worked out as follows: Root shoot Ratio = Root dry weight (in gm)/Shoot dry weight (in gm). Root shoot ratio by length was worked out as follows: Root shoot ratio by length = Root length (in gm)/Shoot length (in gm).

Statistical analysis: Analysis of variance and the expectations of mean squares were estimated according to Gomez and Gomez (1984). Differences between means were tested using the least significant difference (L.S.D.) test according Waller and Duncan (1969) at the 1 % and 5% level of probability. Correlation coefficients between any two characters were analysed as described by Al-Jibouri *et al.* (1958).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

A correlation study provides information to the breeder about importance of any trait. The estimates of genotypic correlation coefficient, in general, were higher in magnitude than phenotypic correlation coefficient for most of the characters under normal and water stress

conditions. This indicates that there was high genetic relationship between the traits under study and environment has not much influencing in regarding their actual association. Similar finding have been reported by Singh and Chaudhary, (2007).

The traits like root fresh weight with root dry weight (0.868\*\* and 0.824\*\*, 0.907\*\* and 0.790\*\* 0.896\*\* and 0.837\*\*), root shoot ratio by weight (0.719\*\* and 0.643\*\*, 0.659\*\* and 0.602\*\*, 0.577\*\* and 0.468\*\*) and root length (0.937\*\* and 0.863\*\*, 0.870\*\* and 0.759\*\*, 0.798\*\* and 0.678\*\*) ; root dry weight with root shoot ratio by weight (0.907\*\* and 0.869\*\*, 0.869\*\* and 0.846\*\*, 0.755\*\* and 0.664\*\*) and root length (0.844\*\* and 0.792\*\*, 0.903\*\* and 0.741\*\*, 0.760\*\* and 0.640\*\*); root shoot ratio by weight with root length (0.671\*\* and 0.585\*\*, 0.745\*\* and 0.607\*\*, 0.500\*\* and 0.343\*\*) were positive and significantly correlated with each other at both genotypic and phenotypic level under normal and water stress conditions (Table 2, 3, 4).

| Table 2. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients among eight characters in muskmelons genotypes under 50 ml (non-stress or 100% water) condition |                              |        |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        |                         |                                    |
|--|------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| S. No.   | Characters                   | Levels | Root Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot<br>Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Root Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | RDW/<br>SDW | Root<br>Length<br>(cm) | Shoot<br>Length<br>(cm) | Root<br>Length/<br>Shoot<br>length |
| 1  | Root fresh<br>weight (gm)    | G      | 1.000                        | 0.230                            | 0.868**                    | 0.458**                     | 0.719**     | 0.937**                | 0.366*                  | 0.0009                             |
|  |                              | Р      | 1.000                        | 0.248                            | 0.824**                    | 0.382*                      | 0.643**     | 0.863**                | 0.356*                  | -0.003                             |
| 2  | Shoot fresh<br>weight (gm)   | G      |                              | 1.000                            | 0.272                      | -0.106                      | 0.304       | 0.315                  | 0.261                   | -0.136                             |
|  |                              | Р      |                              | 1.000                            | 0.240                      | -0.017                      | 0.228       | 0.272                  | 0.256                   | -0.142                             |
| 3  | Root dry<br>weight (gm)      | G      |                              |                                  | 1.000                      | 0.340*                      | 0.907**     | 0.844**                | 0.375*                  | -0.054                             |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  | 1.000                      | 0.274                       | 0.869**     | 0.792**                | 0.330*                  | -0.020                             |
| 4  | Shoot dry<br>weight (gm)     | G      |                              |                                  |                            | 1.000                       | -0.072      | 0.476**                | -0.099                  | 0.230                              |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  |                            | 1.000                       | -0.214      | 0.392*                 | -0.056                  | 0.169                              |
| 5  | RDW/SDW                      | G      |                              |                                  |                            |                             | 1.000       | 0.671**                | 0.457**                 | -0.176                             |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  |                            |                             | 1.000       | 0.585**                | 0.364*                  | -0.113                             |
| 6  | Root length<br>(cm)          | G      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             | 1.000                  | 0.268                   | 0.111                              |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             | 1.000                  | 0.247                   | 0.156                              |
| 7  | Shoot<br>length (cm)         | G      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        | 1.000                   | -0.900**                           |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        | 1.000                   | -0.886**                           |
| 8  | Root length/<br>shoot length | G      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
|  |                              | Р      |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
| **Significant at 1% (P= 0.01) level of significance, *Significant at 5% (P=0.05) level of significance   |                              |        |                              |                                  |                            |                             |             |                        |                         |                                    |

| Table 3. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients among eight characters in muskmelonsgenotypes under 25 ml (50% water or S1) stress condition |                              |        |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        |                         |                                    |
|---|------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| S. No.  | Characters                   | Levels | Root<br>Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot<br>Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Root<br>Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot<br>Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | RDW/<br>SDW | Root<br>Length<br>(cm) | Shoot<br>Length<br>(cm) | Root<br>Length/<br>Shoot<br>length |
| 1   | Root fresh<br>weight (gm)    | G      | 1.000                           | 0.363*                           | 0.907**                       | 0.207                          | 0.659**     | 0.870**                | 0.582**                 | 0.368*                             |
|   |                              | Р      | 1.000                           | 0.212                            | 0.790**                       | 0.138                          | 0.602**     | 0.759**                | 0.470**                 | -0.250                             |
| 2   | Shoot fresh<br>weight (gm)   | G      |                                 | 1.000                            | 0.188                         | 0.406*                         | -0.039      | 0.296                  | 0.269                   | -0.218                             |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 | 1.000                            | 0.181                         | 0.339*                         | -0.028      | 0.187                  | 0.242                   | -0.208                             |
| 3   | Root dry<br>weight (gm)      | G      |                                 |                                  | 1.000                         | -0.013                         | 0.869**     | 0.903**                | 0.501**                 | -0.218                             |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  | 1.000                         | 0.004                          | 0.846**     | 0.741**                | 0.490**                 | -0.262                             |
| 4   | Shoot dry<br>weight (gm)     | G      |                                 |                                  |                               | 1.000                          | -0.474**    | 0.111                  | -0.086                  | 0.143                              |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  |                               | 1.000                          | -0.487**    | 0.111                  | -0.053                  | 0.112                              |
| 5   | RDW/SDW                      | G      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                | 1.000       | 0.745**                | 0.449**                 | -0.269                             |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                | 1.000       | 0.607**                | 0.422**                 | -0.253                             |
| 6   | Root length<br>(cm)          | G      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             | 1.000                  | 0.339*                  | -0.056                             |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             | 1.000                  | 0.258                   | 0.053                              |
| 7   | Shoot length<br>(cm)         | G      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        | 1.000                   | -0.937**                           |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        | 1.000                   | -0.924**                           |
| 8   | Root length/<br>shoot length | G      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
|   |                              | Р      |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
| ** Significant at 1% (P= 0.01) level of significance, * Significant at 5% (P=0.05) level of significance  |                              |        |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |             |                        |                         |                                    |

Hence selection of anyone of these traits enhances the performances of other traits. Thus, indicating the need for scope of selection (Sandu and Kang, 1998). Natarajan, (1992) also reported that yield was positively and significantly correlated with root length and root dry weight in tomato. Similar results were also reported by Viera et al. (1995); Dias et al. (2002); Ahsan et al. (2010) and Riaz et al. (2013). Whereas characters namely root fresh weight, root dry weight and root shoot ratio by weight were significant and positive correlated with shoot length under non-stress (50 ml water per day) and 50% water stress condition (25 ml water per day) respectively. Riaz et al. (2013) also reported similar observations. Subburamu et al. (1998) also concluded that yield was significantly and positively correlated with shoot length. Root fresh weight was significantly and positively correlated with shoot fresh weight in 50% water stress condition. Ahsan *et al.* (2010) also reported significant and positive correlation between root fresh weight and shoot fresh weight under water stress conditions. Different response of traits under different environments for correlation may be due to different response of genotypes under different environments.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The characters like root fresh weight with root dry weight, root shoot ratio by weight and root length ; root dry weight with root shoot ratio by weight and root length; root dry weight with root length were positive and significantly correlated with each other in all the water regime conditions. Hence selection of anyone of these traits enhances the performance of other traits.

| Table 4. Genotypic and phenotypic correlation coefficients among eight characters in muskmelons genotypes under 0 ml (0% water or S2) stress condition |                              |                |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      |                        |                         |                                    |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| S. No.   | Characters                   | Levels         | Root<br>Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot<br>Fresh<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Root<br>Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | Shoot<br>Dry<br>Weight<br>(gm) | RDW/<br>SDW          | Root<br>Length<br>(cm) | Shoot<br>Length<br>(cm) | Root<br>Length/<br>Shoot<br>length |
| 1  | Root fresh<br>weight (gm)    | G              | 1.000                           | -0.293                           | 0.896**                       | -0.021                         | 0.577**              | 0.798**                | 0.220                   | 0.066                              |
|  |                              | Р              | 1.000                           | -0.268                           | 0.837**                       | -0.003                         | 0.468**              | 0.678**                | 0.187                   | 0.066                              |
| 2  | Shoot fresh<br>weight (gm)   | G              |                                 | 1.000                            | -0.337*                       | 0.227                          | -0.370*              | -0.086                 | -0.062                  | 0.029                              |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 | 1.000                            | -0.313                        | 0.206                          | -0.334*              | -0.059                 | -0.045                  | 0.023                              |
| 3  | Root dry<br>weight (gm)      | G              |                                 |                                  | 1.000                         | -0.099                         | 0.755**              | 0.760**                | 0.208                   | 0.0004                             |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  | 1.000                         | -0.062                         | 0.664**              | 0.640**                | 0.194                   | 0.009                              |
| 4  | Shoot dry<br>weight (gm)     | G              |                                 |                                  |                               | 1.000                          | -0.683**             | 0.035                  | -0.058                  | 0.140                              |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  |                               | 1.000                          | -0.702**             | 0.060                  | -0.006                  | 0.074                              |
| 5  | RDW/SDW                      | G              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                | 1.000                | 0.500**                | 0.215                   | -0.119                             |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                | 1.000                | 0.343**                | 0.155                   | -0.078                             |
| 6  | Root length<br>(cm)          | G              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      | 1.000                  | 0.299                   | 0.036                              |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      | 1.000                  | 0.220                   | 0.162                              |
| 7  | Shoot length<br>(cm)         | G              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      |                        | 1.000                   | -0.897**                           |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      |                        | 1.000                   | -0.864**                           |
| 8  | Root length/<br>shoot length | G              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
|  |                              | Р              |                                 |                                  |                               |                                |                      |                        |                         | 1.000                              |
| **Signific   | ant at 1% (P= 0.01)          | level of signi | ficance,                        |                                  | *Signific                     | ant at 5% (P=                  | -<br>=0.05) level of | significance           | 2                       |                                    |

#### REFERENCES

Abdalla, M.M. and El-Khoshiban N.H. (2007). The influence of water stress on growth, relative water content, photosynthetic pigments, some metabolic and hormonal contents of two (Triticium aestivum L.) cultivars. Journal of Applied Science Research Vol. 3: Pages 2062-2074.

Ahsan M., Hussain M.M., Farooq A., Khaliq I., Farooq J., Ali Q. and Kashif M. (2010): Physio-genetic behaviour of maize seedlings at water deficit condition. Cercetări Agronomiceîn Moldova, Vol.14: Pages 146-148.

Al-Jibouri H. A, Miller P. A. and Robinson H. F. (1958) Genotypic and environmental variances and co variances in an upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. Agronomy Journal Vol. 50: Pages 663-667.

AVRDC (1990) Vegetable Production Training Manual. Asian Vegetable Research and Training Center. Shanhua, Tainan, 447 pp.

Basal, H., Bebeli P., Smith C. W. and Thaxton P. (2003) Root growth parameters of converted races of upland cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) and two BC2F2 populations. Crop Science Vol. 43: Pages 1983–1988. Gale M. 2003. Applications of molecular biology and genomics to genetic enhancement of crop tolerance to abiotic stresses – a discussion document. Interim Science Council Secretariat, FAO. Consultative group on international agricultural research

Cabello M.J., Castellanos M.T., Romojaro F., Martinez-Madrid C. and Ribas F. (2009) Yield and quality of melon grown under different irrigation and nitrogen rates. Agricultural Water Management Vol. 96: Pages 866-874.

Dias R., De C.S., Pico B., Espinos A. and Nuez F. (2002) Modifying root structure of cultivated muskmelon to improve vine decline resistance. Horticulture Science Vol. 37: Pages 1092-1097

FAO (2010) Asia and Pacific Commission on Agricultural Statistics, Agenda Item 10, pp14.

Gomez K. A. and Gomez A. A. (1984) Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley and sons, Inc. London, UK (2nd ed. pp. 13-175.

Hufstetler V.E., Boerma R., Carter T. E. J. and Earl H. J. H. (2007) Genotypic variation for three physiological traits affecting drought tolerance in soybean. Crop Science Vol. 47: Pages 25-35 Kamara, A.Y., Menkir A., Babu-Apraku B. and Ibikunle O. (2003) The influence of drought stress on growth, yield and yield components of stressed maize genotypes. Journal of Agriculture Sciences Vol. 141: Pages 43-50.

Kashavagi J., Krishnamurthy L., Crouch J. H., Serraj R. (2006) Variability of root trait density and its contributions to seed yield in chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) under terminal drought stress. Field Crop Research Vol. 95: Pages 171-181.

Lambers, H., Chapin F. S. and Pons T. (1998) Plant Physiological Ecology. Springer-Verlag., New York.

Mirabad A.A., Lotfi M. And Roozban M.R. (2013) Impact of water -deficit stress on growth, yield and sugar content of cantaloupe (Cucumis melo L.). International Journal of Agricultural and Crop Sciences Vol. 5, No. 22: Pages 2778-2782

Natarajan S. (1992) Genetic variability and association of leaf area, root length and root dry weight: shoot dry weight ratio in tomato under moisture stress. Madras Agricultural Journal Vol. 79: Pages 271-276.

Pandey S., Ansari W.A., Atri N., Singh B., Gupta S. and Bhat K.V. (2016) Standardization of screening technique and evaluation of muskmelon genotypes for drought tolerance. Plant Genetic Resources: Pages 1-8.

Riaz M., Farooq J., Sakhawat G., Mahmood A., Sadiq M.A. and Yaseen M. (2013) Genotypic variability for root/shoot parameters under water stress in some advanced lines of cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.). Genetics and Molecular Research Vol. 12, No.1: Pages 552-561.

Rizza, F; F. W. Badeck; L. Cattivelli and O. Lidestri (2004) Use of a water stress index to identify barley genotypes adapted to

rainfed and irrigated conditions. Crop Science, Vol. 44: Pages 2127–2137.

Sandu S. K. and Kang G. S. (1998) Genetic analysis in germplasm of andigena potato (Solanum tuberosum subspecies Adigena). Crop Improvement Vol. 252: Pages 181-185.

Schuzendubel, A., Nikolova P., Rudolf C. and Polle A. (2002) Cadmium and H2O2-induced oxidative stress in populous X. canescens roots. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry Vol. 40: Pages 577-584.

Singh G.P. and Chaudhary H.B. (2007) Stability of wheat genotypes for yield and moisture stress tolerance traits. Indian Journal of Genetics Vol. 67: Pages 145-148.

Songsri P., Jogloy S., Vorasoot N., Akkasaeng C., Patanothoi A. and Holbbrook C.C. (2008) Root distribution of drought resistance peanut genotypes in response to drought. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science Vol. 194: Pages 92-103.

Subburamu K., Jayapragasam M. and Thandapani V. (1998) Heterosis for seed and seedling characters in tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.). Seed Research Vol. 26: Pages 187-190.

Taiz, L. and E. Zeiger (2006). Plant Physiology, 4th Ed., Sinauer Associates Inc. Publishers, Massachusetts.

Vieira R.M., Bourland F.M. and Watson C.E.J.R. (1995) Relationship and inheritance of selected seedling vigour parameters in cotton. Proceeding Beltwide cotton conference, San Antonia,TX. ,U.S.A., January 4-7,. Memphis ,U.S.A. National Cotton Council, 1: 507-510.

Waller, R. A. and Duncan D. B. A. (1969) A Bayes rule for the symmetric multiple comparison problems. Journal of the American Statistical Association Vol. 64: Pages 1484-1504.