Stress Tolerance Indices and Performance of Elite Wheat Genotypes under Normal and Heat Stress Conditions in the Western Region of Nepal

MUKTI RAM POUDEL*, RADHAKRISHNA BHANDARI, SHIVALAL NYAUPANE AND MADHAV PRASAD NEUPANE¹

Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Paklihawa Campus, Nepal, 32900 *(e-mail: muktipoudel8@gmail.com; Mobile: +977 98570 29723)

(Received: June 10, 2023; Accepted: July 22, 2023)

ABSTRACT

Heat stress has been one of the major abiotic stresses in South Asian regions. Heat stress reduces yield by influencing physiological processes and yield related traits. To evaluate heat stress tolerance of 20 elite wheat lines comprising 18 genotypes and two commercial checks viz., Bhrikuti and Gautam, the field experiment was conducted for three continuous wheat growing seasons of 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 in the western region of Nepal at Paklihawa Campus under normal and heat stress conditions using an alpha lattice design having two replications and five blocks. The genotypic evaluation was done with nine stress tolerance indices (STIs). The ANOVA of the AMMI model revealed that yield performance was significant across tested environments and genotypes. The combined ANOVA showed that days to booting (DTB), days to heading (DTH), plant height (Ph), spike length (SL), spike weight (SW), spikelets per spike (SPS), grains per spike (GPS) and grain yield (GY) were significantly reduced by 14, 15, 8.6, 4, 14, 4, 7 and 34%, respectively under heat stress condition as compared to normal condition. For three years, BL 4919 and Bhrikuti were the highest yielding wheat genotypes under normal and heat stress conditions with mean GY of 4860.8 and 3415.41 kg/ha, respectively. Principal component analysis (PCA) performed across STIs extracted; Modified stress tolerance indices (MSTI2) and stress tolerance indices (STI). From MSTI2, Bhrikuti (1.39) and NL 1350 (1.16) were identified as high yielding stable genotypes and from STI, Bhrikuti (0.87) and BL 4919 (0.86) were identified as heat-tolerant genotypes. Selection based on MSTI2 and STI would be helpful to identify high-yielding stable and stress-tolerant genotypes under heat stress conditions, respectively.

Key words: Wheat, stress tolerance, irrigated, drought, heat stress

INTRODUCTION

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is the most important cereal crop in the world (Bhandari *et al.*, 2021). It is the major staple crop of 35% of the global population and provides about 32.5% of the total calorie and 31.9% total protein in the diet (Poudel *et al.*, 2021). Wheat shares 19.13% of the total cereal cropping area of Nepal (MOALD, 2020). The productivity of wheat in Nepal is 2.99 t/ha which is lower compared to India and China (FAOSTAT, 2022). One of the major reasons behind poor productivity in Nepal is heat stress. About 25% of the total wheat growing area of Nepal falls under heat stress where the average productivity is around 1.79-2 t/ha (Regmi *et* *al.*, 2021). Wheat suffers from heat stress when the temperature exceeds 25° C. Since the optimum temperature for growth, anthesis and ripening is 16-22, 12-22 and 21-25°C, respectively. The rise in temperature and heat stress would have concerns about the overall production and productivity of wheat (Khan *et al.*, 2020).

Climate change and temperature rise have been major threats to cereal production in the world (Kamrani *et al.*, 2017; Djanaguiraman *et al.*, 2020). In Nepal, a mean annual rise of 0.0539 °C per year has been reported (Paudel *et al.*, 2020). Globally, wheat yield reduces by about 6-10% which reaches up to 46% if the high temperature coincides with the reproductive stage of wheat (Poudel *et al.*,

¹Department of Agronomy, Agriculture and Forestry University, Rampur, Nepal, 44200.

2020). The rice-wheat cropping pattern of Nepal and residual moisture after rice harvest shifts the sowing of wheat up to December last which leads the reproductive stage of wheat to coincide with terminal heat stress in March-April. The productivity of wheat is reduced by 8-46% due to terminal heat stress. IPCC had forecasted the grain yield of wheat will further aggravate in the future and the yield is predicted to reduce on an average by 44-47% in south Asia by 2050 (Lesk *et al.*, 2016; Abhinandan *et al.*, 2018) due to climate change and lack of water for irrigation.

The productivity of wheat must be increased to eradicate the existing hunger and malnutrition in the world. In Nepal, about 16.67% of people are under malnutrition (MOF, 2022). The long-term sustainable plans for Nepal; the agriculture development strategy (ADS) and sustainable development goals (SDGs) aim at achieving food security, ending hunger and improving nutrition in the long run which can be fulfilled by the increment in the production and productivity of wheat (ADS, 2015). Increasing the yield of wheat by increasing the total cropping area is almost impossible. In 1961, about 1.36 billion hectares of land were cultivated for 3.5 billion people around the world. After half a century, the population became doubled (7 billion) but the area under cultivation increased only by 12-13% (FAOSTAT, 2022). Thus, identification of climate-resilient heat stress tolerant genotypes of wheat would play a significant role in achieving the goals of ADS and SDGs that makes heat-stress wheat breeding very crucial for the future food and nutritional security of the world.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted at Bhairahawa, Western region of Nepal under three wheat growing seasons 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 under normal and heat stress environments comprising six wheat growing environments. Twenty elite wheat lines including 15 Nepal lines (NL), three Bhairahawa lines (BL) and two commercial checks viz., Bhrikuti and Gautam were used in the evaluation.

The experiment was carried out in alpha lattice design, replicated twice with five blocks for both normal and heat stress conditions. Each genotype was sown on a net plot size of 10 m^2 having the dimension of 4 x 2.5 m. The inter block and inter replication spaces were maintained by one meter. The normal environment was created by sowing the genotypes in the third week of November (25th November) and the heat stress condition was created by sowing the genotypes one month later (25th December) so that the flowering and reproductive stage of wheat coincide with the hot wave that had blown at the February-March in the western region of Nepal.

Phenological data days to booting (DTB) and days to heading (DTH); growth data plant height (Ph), spike length (SL), spike weight (SW) and yield attributing data, spikelets per spike (SPS) and number of grains per spike (NGPS) were collected. The yield of the wheat genotype under both normal and heat stressed environments was taken from two quadrants of 1 m² and averaged to get the mean yield.

The average yield and variation in the yield among the genotypes under stressed and nonstressed conditions were described through mean productivity (MP) and tolerance index (TOL), respectively (Table 1). The stress susceptibility index (SSI) measured the yield stability that seeks the change in both potential and actual yield in both the environments. SSI value of more than one above average susceptibility of the genotypes and vice versa was true. Geometric mean productivity (GMP) determined the relative performance of the genotypes since the severity of the stress varied from environment to environment. The stability of the genotypes was described through yield susceptibility index (YSI). The high-yielding and stresstolerant genotypes were evaluated through stress tolerance indices (STI). MSTI1 was used to determine the yield potential of the genotypes under less stressed conditions, whereas MSTI2 identified genotypes having stable and high yields at stressed conditions. Data entry and processing were done on Microsoft Excel- 2016. Descriptive statistics, combined analysis of variance (ANOVA) across genotypes, environments, year, correlation, and principal component analysis (PCA) were performed on IBM SPSS statistics v.26.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The combined analysis of variance (ANOVA)

S

Formula

No	. indices	
1.	Tolerance index (TOL)	(Ypi – Ysi)
2.	Mean productivity (MP)	$\left(\frac{\mathrm{Ypi}+\mathrm{Ysi}}{2}\right)$
3.	Geometrical mean productivity (GMP)	$\left(\sqrt{\text{Ypi}*\text{Ysi}}\right)$
4.	Yield stability index (YSI)	$\left(\frac{\mathrm{Ysi}}{\mathrm{Ypi}}\right)$
5.	Relative efficiency index (REI)	$\left[\left(\frac{Ysi}{Ys}\right)*\left(\frac{Ypi}{Yp}\right)\right]$
6.	Stress tolerance index (STI)	$\left(\frac{\mathrm{Ypi}*\mathrm{Ysi}}{\mathrm{Yp}^2}\right)$
7.	Modified stress toleranc index 1 (MSTI 1)	$ = \left[\left(\frac{Ypi^2}{Yp^2} \right) * STI \right] $
8.	Modified stress toleranc index 2 (MSTI 2)	$ = \left[\left(\frac{Ysi^2}{Ys^2} \right) * STI \right] $
9.	Stress susceptibility index (SSI)	$\left[\left(1-\frac{Ysi}{Ypi}\right)/\left(1-\frac{Ys}{Yp}\right)\right]$

Table 1. Stress tolerance indices (STIs)

Stress tolerance

revealed that there was a significant difference in yield and yield-attributing characteristics of wheat across normal and heat stress conditions (Table 2). DTB, DTH, Ph, SL, SW, SPS, NGPS, and GY were reduced by 14, 15, 8.6, 4, 14, 4, 7, and 34%, respectively, under heat stress conditions as compared to normal condition (Table 2).

The ANOVA of the AMMI model showed that there was a highly significant difference in

yield across combined normal and combined heat stress conditions (Table 3). Environment and genotypes explained 85.68 and 9.44% variation in the yield suggesting the direct effect of the environment on the yield of wheat (Table 3).

BL 4919 was the high yielder ($4860.83\pm$ 1231.89) followed by NL 1346 ($4568.58\pm$ 641.92 kg/ha) under combined normal conditions, whereas Bhrikuti was the highest yielding genotype ($3415.41\pm$ 209.56) followed by NL 1350 ($3251.17\pm$ 715.02 kg/ha) under combined heat stress condition (Table 4).

The combined ANOVA across the environments revealed that there was a highly significant difference in grain yield (GY) among genotypes under normal and heat stress conditions. Grain yield was reduced by 47.59 ± 14 , 20.77 ± 6.61 and $30.06\pm13.96\%$ in 2019, 2020 and 2021, respectively, under heat stressed conditions (Table 4). Moreover, wheat genotypes were found to have an average yield reduction of $33.84\pm8.19\%$ over three years due to heat stress conditions.

The lower productivity of wheat under heat stress conditions was due to its effect on physiological, biological and biochemical processes. Heat stress induces reactive oxygen species (ROS) that cause changes in the membrane stability, lipid peroxidation, protein oxidation and damage to nucleic acids. Heat stress causes the deactivation of RUBISCO enzyme as a result decreases the photosynthetic capacity and helps in the reduction of assimilate translocation. The disruption of biosynthetic pathways results in premature leaf senescence and decreases in chlorophyll content which ultimately decreases the yield. The molecular basis of heat stress wheat has developed different tolerance mechanisms to avoid heat stress induced injury and damage. Heat shock proteins (HSPs) were produced in heat stressed

 Table 2. Per cent reduction of yield attributing characters under heat stress conditions as compared to normal conditions

	Days to booting (DTB)	Days to heading (DTH)	Plant height (Ph)	Spike length (SL)	Spike weight (SW)	Spikelets/ spike (SPS)	No. of grains/spike (NGPS)	Grain yield (GY) (kg/ha)
Normal	79	85	93.6	10.3	22	17.5	43	4081
Heat stress (HS)	68	72	85.6	8.8	18	16.7	40	2693
% Reduction	14	15	8.6	4	14	4	7	34
F-Value	***	***	***	**	***	***	**	***

, *Denote level of significance at 1 and 0.1%, respectively.

	SS	%	Porcenac	DF	MS	F	Prob. F
E	1.15E+08	85.68604	85.68604	1	1.15E+08	284.9588	0
G	12689335	9.44909	95.13513	19	667859.7	1.6539	0.0469
Ε×G	6533106	4.86487	100	19	343847.7	0.85151	0.64329
PC 1	6542088	100	100	19	344320.4	1.16575	0.29506
PC 2	0	0	100	17	0	0	1
Residuals	80761929	0	0	200	403809.6	NA	NA

Table 3. ANOVA of AMMI model

E-Environment; G-Genotype; SS-Sum of square; DF-Degree of freedom; MS-Mean square; F-F-value; PROB F-P-value and PC-Principal component.

environment that maintains correct protein folding, refolding and synthesis and it also degrades the protein aggregate (Raza, 2020). The anti-oxidative defense system detoxified the accumulated ROS through various enzymatic and non-enzymatic antioxidants. Heat tolerance in wheat was governed by some traits such as stay green (SG), chlorophyll fluorescence and canopy temperature (Khan *et al.*, 2020).

High yielding and high yield potential genotypes could be identified using MP, GMP and STI (Ali and El-sadek, 2016; Bennani *et al.*, 2017; Poudel *et al.*, 2021). Kamrani *et al.* (2017) and Poudel *et al.* (2021) identified high yield potential and heat tolerant genotypes using MP, GMP and STI. BL 4919 was found to have maximum MP followed by Bhrikuti, BL 4407 and BL 4669. Bhrikuti had maximum GMP and STI followed by BL 4919. Higher MP, GMP and STI denoted higher yield and higher yield potential (Kamrani *et al.*, 2017; Poudel *et al.*, 2021).

A stable genotype can be selected using TOL, YSI and REI (Bennani et al., 2016). Higher TOL indicates lower yield under stressed conditions and vice versa is true (Kamrani et al., 2017; Puri et al., 2020). A YSI value closer to 1 indicates the stability of the genotype. The value of REI above 1 indicates a highly efficient genotype across both the environment and vice versa. The lowest TOL was found for Bhrikuti followed by NL 1420 (Table 5). So, Bhrikuti and NL 1420 were identified as heat tolerant genotypes. The highest TOL was found for NL 1346 followed by NL 1412 which can be identified as heat susceptible genotypes. Similarly, Bhrikuti was found to have a maximum YSI (0.809) followed by NL 1350 (0.794). Hence, Bhrikuti and NL 1350 were identified as stable genotypes across three wheat growing seasons. Similarly, from the YSI value, NL

1412 (0.507) followed by NL 1346 (0.551) were the most heat stress susceptible genotypes under heat stress conditions.

Genotypes performing well in both the environments were selected by using SSI. SSI above 1 represents above average susceptibility, whereas below 1 represents below average susceptibility. Genotypes with the least SSI were heat tolerant genotypes, whereas genotypes with the highest SSI were heat susceptible genotypes. Bhrikuti had least SSI (0.56) followed by NL 1350 (0.61). These genotypes were heat tolerant. Bhrikuti, BL 4407, BL 4669, Gautam, NL 1350, NL 1369, NL 1376, NL 1413 and NL 1420 were the belowaverage susceptible genotypes, whereas NL 1346 and NL 1386 were found to have maximum SSI values and identified as the most heat stress susceptible genotypes.

BL 4919 was found to have maximum MSTI1. It also had the highest yield under a normal environment and still has a chance to improve yield under stressed conditions. Whereas MSTI2 identified genotypes having both stable and high yield under stressed conditions (Kamrani *et al.*, 2017; Puri *et al.*, 2020). Based on MSTI2, Bhrikuti was the highest yielding stable genotype under heat stress conditions followed by NL 1350.

MP, GMP, REI, STI and MSTI1 were highly significantly positively correlated with Yp and Ys which showed these were yield potential indices (Table 6). These indices would help to identify high yielding genotypes under both the conditions. Since, MP, GMP and MSTI1 were affected by the yield at both the conditions, it would be misleading to coin genotypes as high yielding under both conditions despite they are yield potential genotypes. So, MP, GMP and MSTI1 were suitable indices for the selection of genotypes under normal conditions. The correlation between GMP and STI with Ys was highly

2021-22	fean %			18.4	31.6	25.8	38.1	24.6	34.5	43.2	20.6	36.2	29.0	31.1	39.8	33.6	42.4	37.5	36.4	47.4	31.3	33.7	20.7	32.8	7.9	24.0	NS
at growing years 2019-20, 2020-21 and	Combined N heat stress		GY±STD	3415.4±209.56	2958.2 ± 157.09	3102.5 ± 495.65	2946.5 ± 420.64	2896.167 ± 366.82	2761.167 ± 36.3	2515.167 ± 513.26	3251.167 ± 715.02	2647.667 ± 142.26	2854.5 ± 714.61	2742.667 ± 624.49	2360.667 ± 493.25	2418 ± 758.23	2256.16 ± 779.23	2400 ± 413.85	2617.66 ± 7353.98	2052.667 ± 1129.4	2632±268.89	2354.66 ± 7607.43	2691.833 ± 178.52	2693.74 ± 468.92	343.39	12.75	NS
	Combined normal GY±STD		GY±STD	4221.25 ± 340.89	4375.683± 472.49	4216.417± 371.16	4860.833±1231.89	3852.917±133	4315.417 ± 811.54	4568.58 ± 641.93	4095.8 ± 269.88	4170.167 ± 471.47	3996.583±390.55	4069.167 ± 450.17	3978.95 ± 438.07	3700.5 ± 238.31	4041.833 ± 510.33	3910.317 ± 426.79	4238.833 ± 773.52	4047.633 ± 640.91	3887.817 ± 471.04	3577.883 ± 237.68	3511.8 ± 932.37	4081.92 ± 512.70	317.84	7.79	NS
ons of wl	% eduction	% eduction		4.5	21.3	41.4	45.3	14.7	27.3	51.5	2.5	39.8	16.7	23.5	44.8	23.1	35.9	39.1	41.6	44.0	30.7	34.0	19.3	30.1	14.0	46.5	NS
ess conditi	2021-22 	HS		3656.7	3113.1	2702.5	3420	3158.5	2798.5	2448.5	4075	2661.5	3659.5	3134.5	2445.5	2776.5	2694	2531	2840.5	2594	2820	2510.5	2554	2929.72	460.86	15.73	NS
nd heat stre		Normal		3828.25	3957.05	4612.75	6254	3704.75	3848.75	5046.75	4181.4	4417.5	4393.75	4097.5	4427.35	3611.5	4202.5	4155.45	4866	4634.9	4069.45	3805.15	3164.4	4263.96	647.43	15.18	NS
normal a		%	eduction	25.4	30.8	12.1	28.4	21.6	28.2	20.3	23.9	31.1	27.8	14.8	21.0	16.7	21.7	20.0	16.9	16.5	17.9	13.9	6.2	20.8	6.6	31.8	NS
pes under		HS	R	3310.5	2962.5	3657	2803.5	3053	2759	3058.5	2886.5	2499	2609	3071	2806	2930.5	2718	2732.5	2803	2809.5	2752	2869	2628	2885.9	259.5	8.99	NS
teat genoty	020-21	Normal		4437	4282	4159.5	3915.5	3892	3845	3839	3793.5	3626.5	3613	3605.5	3552	3519.5	3470.5	3417.5	3374.5	3364	3353	3331	2803	3659.68	375.7	10.27	*
0 elite wh	2	%	eduction	25.5	42.7	24.0	40.7	37.5	48.1	57.7	35.3	37.7	42.4	55.1	53.7	61.0	69.5	53.4	50.6	81.8	45.2	53.2	36.7	47.6	14.0	29.4	NS
can grain yield (GY) of 20	20	HS	R	3279	2799	2948	2616	2477	2726	2038.5	2792	2782.5	2295	2022.5	1830.5	1547	1356.5	1936.5	2209.5	754.5	2324	1684.5	2893.5	2265.6	627.22	27.68	***
	nt 2019-	Normal		4398.5	4888	3877	4413	3962	5252.5	4820	4312.5	4466.5	3983	4504.5	3957.5	3970.5	4452.5	4158	4476	4144	4241	3597.5	4568	4322.13	390.2	9.03	NS
	.eatme	Τ,	-	T,	, °	, T	С	T ₆	$\mathbf{T}_{_{7}}$	Ľ		\mathbf{T}_{10}	Т ₁	\mathbf{T}_{12}	1 T	T_{14}	Т 15	T_{16}	T_{17}	\mathbf{T}_{18}	T_{19}	T_{20}	2	,			
Table 4. N	T	Genotypes	4	Bhrikuti	BL 4407	BL 4669	BL 4919	Gautam	NL 1179	NL 1346	NL 1350	NL 1368	NL 1369	NL 1376	NL 1381	NL 1384	NL 1386	NL 1387	NL 1404	NL 1412	NL 1413	NL 1417	NL 1420	Mean	STD	CV	F-value

HS-Heat stress, GY-Grain yield and STD-Standard deviation.

Poudel, Bhandari, Nyaupane and Neupane

Treatment	Normal	Heat stress	TOL	MP	GMP	YSI	REI	STI	MSTI1	MSTI2	SSI	% YL
	(Yp)	(Ys)										
T,	4221.25	3415.4	805.85	3818.33	3797.01	0.809	1.31	0.87	0.93	1.39	0.56	19.09
T ₂	4375.68	2958.2	1417.48	3666.94	3597.8	0.676	1.18	0.78	0.89	0.94	0.95	32.39
T ₃	4216.42	3102.5	1113.92	3659.46	3616.83	0.736	1.19	0.79	0.84	1.04	0.78	26.42
T_4°	4860.83	2946.5	1914.33	3903.67	3784.5	0.606	1.3	0.86	1.22	1.03	1.16	39.38
T ₅	3852.92	2896.17	956.75	3374.54	3340.46	0.752	1.01	0.67	0.6	0.77	0.73	24.83
T ₆	4315.42	2761.17	1554.25	3538.29	3451.9	0.64	1.08	0.72	0.8	0.75	1.06	36.02
T ₇	4568.58	2515.17	2053.42	3541.88	3389.8	0.551	1.05	0.69	0.86	0.6	1.32	44.95
T ₈	4095.8	3251.17	844.63	3673.48	3649.13	0.794	1.21	0.8	0.8	1.16	0.61	20.62
Τ _ο	4170.17	2647.67	1522.5	3408.92	3322.83	0.635	1	0.66	0.69	0.64	1.07	36.51
T_10	3996.58	2854.5	1142.08	3425.54	3377.61	0.714	1.04	0.68	0.66	0.77	0.84	28.58
T ₁₁	4069.17	2742.67	1326.5	3405.92	3340.71	0.674	1.01	0.67	0.67	0.69	0.96	32.6
T ₁₂	3978.95	2360.67	1618.28	3169.81	3064.8	0.593	0.85	0.56	0.54	0.43	1.2	40.67
T ₁₃	3700.5	2418	1282.5	3059.25	2991.29	0.653	0.81	0.54	0.44	0.43	1.02	34.66
T ₁₄	4041.83	2256.17	1785.67	3149	3019.78	0.558	0.83	0.55	0.54	0.38	1.3	44.18
T ₁₅	3910.32	2400	1510.32	3155.16	3063.46	0.614	0.85	0.56	0.52	0.45	1.14	38.62
T ₁₆	4238.83	2617.67	1621.17	3428.25	3331.04	0.618	1.01	0.67	0.72	0.63	1.12	38.25
T ₁₇	4047.63	2052.67	1994.97	3050.15	2882.44	0.507	0.76	0.5	0.49	0.29	1.45	49.29
T ₁₈	3887.82	2632	1255.82	3259.91	3198.86	0.677	0.93	0.61	0.56	0.59	0.95	32.3
T ₁₉	3577.88	2354.67	1223.22	2966.28	2902.54	0.658	0.77	0.51	0.39	0.39	1.01	34.19
T ₂₀	3511.8	2691.83	819.97	3101.82	3074.6	0.767	0.86	0.57	0.42	0.57	0.69	23.35
20	4081.92	2693.74	1388.18	3387.83	3309.87	0.66	1	0.66	0.68	0.7	1	33.84
	Treatment T_{1}^{1} T_{2}^{2} T_{3}^{3} T_{4}^{4} T_{5}^{5} T_{6}^{6} T_{7} T_{8}^{8} T_{9}^{7} T_{10}^{11} T_{12}^{12} T_{13}^{13} T_{14}^{14} T_{15}^{15} T_{16}^{16} T_{17}^{17} T_{18}^{18} T_{19}^{19} T_{20}^{20}	$\begin{array}{c c} \mbox{Treatment} & \mbox{Normal} \\ \mbox{(Yp)} \\ \hline T_1 & 4221.25 \\ T_2 & 4375.68 \\ T_3 & 4216.42 \\ T_4 & 4860.83 \\ T_5 & 3852.92 \\ T_6 & 4315.42 \\ T_7 & 4568.58 \\ T_8 & 4095.8 \\ T_9 & 4170.17 \\ T_{10} & 3996.58 \\ T_9 & 4170.17 \\ T_{10} & 3996.58 \\ T_{11} & 4069.17 \\ T_{12} & 3978.95 \\ T_{13} & 3700.5 \\ T_{14} & 4041.83 \\ T_{15} & 3910.32 \\ T_{16} & 4238.83 \\ T_{16} & 4238.83 \\ T_{17} & 4047.63 \\ T_{18} & 3887.82 \\ T_{19} & 3577.88 \\ T_{20} & 3511.8 \\ $4081.92 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Treatment Normal (Yp) Heat stress (Ys) TOL (Ys) MP GMP YSI REI STI T 4221.25 3415.4 805.85 3818.33 3797.01 0.809 1.31 0.87 T 2 4375.68 2958.2 1417.48 3666.94 3597.8 0.676 1.18 0.78 T 3 4216.42 3102.5 1113.92 3659.46 3616.83 0.736 1.19 0.79 T 4860.83 2946.5 1914.33 3903.67 3784.5 0.606 1.3 0.86 T 5 3852.92 2896.17 956.75 3374.54 3340.46 0.752 1.01 0.67 T 6 4315.42 2761.17 1554.25 3538.29 3451.9 0.64 1.08 0.72 T 4568.58 2515.17 2053.42 3541.88 3649.13 0.794 1.21 0.8 T 79 4170.17 2647.67 1522.5 <	Treatment Normal (Yp) Heat stress (Ys) TOL (Ys) MP GMP YSI REI STI MST11 T1 2 4221.25 3415.4 805.85 3818.33 3797.01 0.809 1.31 0.87 0.93 T2 3 4216.42 3102.5 1113.92 3659.46 3616.83 0.736 1.19 0.79 0.84 T4 4 4860.83 2946.5 1914.33 3903.67 3784.5 0.606 1.3 0.86 1.22 T5 5 3852.92 2896.17 956.75 3374.54 3340.46 0.752 1.01 0.67 0.66 T6 4315.42 2761.17 1554.25 3538.29 3451.9 0.64 1.08 0.72 0.88 T8 7 4056.85 2515.17 2053.42 3541.88 3389.8 0.551 1.05 0.69 0.86 T8 4 4095.8 3251.17 844.63 3673.48 3649.13 0.794 1.21 0.8 0.66 T10	Treatment Normal (Yp) Heat stress (Ys) TOL (Ys) MP GMP YSI REI STI MSTI1 MST12 T_1 4221.25 3415.4 805.85 3818.33 3797.01 0.809 1.31 0.87 0.93 1.39 T_2 4375.68 2958.2 1417.48 3666.94 3597.8 0.676 1.18 0.78 0.89 0.94 T_4 4860.83 2946.5 1914.33 3903.67 3784.5 0.606 1.3 0.86 1.22 1.03 T_5 3852.92 2896.17 956.75 3374.54 340.46 0.752 1.01 0.67 0.66 0.77 T_6 4315.42 2761.17 1554.25 3538.29 3451.9 0.644 1.08 0.72 0.8 0.67 T_6 4315.42 2761.17 1524.5 3538.29 3421.9 0.641 1.08 0.72 0.8 0.66 T_8 4095.8 3251.17 844.63	Treatment Normal Heat stress (Yp) TOL (Ys) MP GMP YSI REI STI MSTI1 MSTI2 SSI T1 2 4375.68 2958.2 1417.48 3666.94 3597.8 0.676 1.18 0.78 0.93 1.39 0.56 T2 4 4375.68 2958.2 1417.48 3666.94 3597.8 0.676 1.18 0.78 0.89 0.94 0.95 T3 4 4216.42 3102.5 1113.92 3659.46 3616.83 0.736 1.19 0.79 0.84 1.04 0.78 T5 3852.92 2896.17 956.75 3374.54 3340.46 0.72 1.01 0.67 0.66 0.77 0.73 T6 4315.42 2761.17 1554.25 3538.29 3451.9 0.64 1.08 0.72 0.8 0.75 1.06 T6 4 4170.17 264.767 1522.5 3408.92 3322.83 0.635 1 0.66 0.69 0.64 1.07

Table 5. Stress tolerance indices of wheat genotypes under normal (Yp) and heat stress (Ys) conditions.

Yp-Yield under normal conditions, Ys-Yield under heat stress conditions, TOL-Tolerance index, MP-Mean productivity, GMP-Geometrical mean productivity, YSI-Yield stability index, REI-Relative efficiency index, STI-Stress tolerance index, MST11-Modified stress tolerance index 1, MST12-Modified stress tolerance index 2, SSI-Stress susceptibility index and MSY-Mean stable yield.

Table 6. Correlation among Yp, Ys and 10 stress tolerance indices

	Yp	Ys	TOL	MP	GMP	YSI	REI	STI	MSTI1	MSTI2	SSI	% Yield loss
Yp	1											
Ýs	0.339	1										
TOL	0.529*	-0.619**	1									
MP	0.802**	0.834**	-0.082	1								
GMP	0.709**	0.903**	-0.223	0.990**	1							
YSI	-0.27	0.812**	-0.958**	0.357	0.485*	1						
REI	0.710**	0.902**	-0.221	0.989**	0.999**	0.484*	1					
STI	0.710**	0.902**	-0.221	0.989**	0.999**	0.484*	1.000**	1				
MSTI1	0.916**	0.668**	0.162	0.962**	0.918**	0.121	0.921**	0.921**	1			
MSTI2	0.486*	0.974**	-0.473*	0.904**	0.948**	0.691**	0.953**	0.953**	0.776**	1		
SSI	0.27	-0.812**	0.958**	-0.357*	-0.485*	-1.000**	-0.484*	-0.484*	-0.121	-0.691	1	
% Yield	0.27	-0.812**	0.958**	-0.357	-0.485*	-1.000**	-0.484*	-0.484	-0.121	-0.691	1.000**	1
loss												

significant than MP. So, a genotype with higher GMP indicates higher yield at stressed conditions and denotes stress tolerance.

TOL and SSI were strongly negatively correlated with Ys, hence these indices can be used as heat stress tolerance indices. A highly significant positive correlation was seen between YSI and Ys indicating selection based on YSI would help to identify heat stress tolerant genotype. There was no significant correlation between Yp and Ys, which showed that the performance of the genotypes was independent of environment. MSTI2 would help to identify genotypes with higher and stable yields under both the conditions as it was strongly positively correlated with Ys than YSI (Bennani *et al.*, 2016).

PC1 and PC2 described 73.27 and 26.38% of the total variation in the indices, respectively (Fig. 1). Two components were extracted from the principal component analysis (PCA), Modified stress tolerance indices (MSTI2) and Stress tolerance indices (STI).

From MSTI2, Bhrikuti (1.39) followed by NL 1350 (1.16) were identified as the higher and stable yielding across both the conditions, whereas, from STI Bhrikuti (0.87) followed by BL 4919 (0.86) were identified as heat stress



Fig. 1. Principal component analysis (PCA).

tolerant genotypes (Table 5). Bhrikuti and NL 1350 were identified as high-yielding stable genotypes across both the conditions for profitable cultivation. Furthermore, PC1 has described more of the variation in GY compared to PC2. Selection based on MSTI2 compared to STI would be more accurate. Hence, Bhrikuti was identified as the ideal genotype for cultivation under heat-stressed conditions (MSTI2 = 1.39), whereas BL 4919 (MSTI1 = 1.22) was identified as the highest yield potential genotype which has good performance under normal conditions.

CONCLUSION

Heat stress has been a serious problem in wheat cultivation in the world. The terminal heat stress at the time of the reproductive stage reduces the yield by reducing the grain-filling period and altering the physiology of the plant. To identify the heat-tolerant genotype of wheat under heat-stress environments, an evaluation of 20 elite wheat genotypes was done for three continuous wheat growing seasons with nine stress tolerance indices (STIs). DTB, DTH, Ph, SL, SW, SPS, NGPS and GY were reduced by 14, 15, 8.6, 4, 14, 4, 7 and 34%, respectively, under combined heat

stressed conditions as compared to normal condition. BL 4919 was found to be a high yielder (4860.83±1231.89) followed by NL 1346 (4568.58±641.92 kg/ha) under normal conditions over three years, whereas Bhrikuti was found to be a high-yielding genotype (3415.41±209.56 kg/ha) followed by NL 1350 (3251.17 ±715.02) under heat stress condition. The principal component analysis (PCA) extracted two indices; Modified stress tolerance indices (MSTI2) and Stress tolerance indices (STI). Bhrikuti and NL 1350 were identified as high-yielding stable genotypes across both the conditions over three years for profitable cultivation. Hence, MSTI2 and STI can be used to identify high vielding stable genotypes and stress tolerant genotypes under heat stress conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the National Wheat Research Program (NWRP) for providing the genetic materials, the Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science (IAAS), Paklihawa Campus for providing the field for the experiment and the University Grants Commission (UGC), Bhaktapur, Nepal for the research grant (FRG-78/79-AgandF-02) for the financial support to conduct experiment.

REFERENCES

- Abhinandan, K., Skori, L., Stanic, M., Hickerson, N. M. N., Jamshed, M. and Samuel, M. A. (2018). Abiotic stress signalling in wheat-An inclusive overview of hormonal interactions during abiotic stress responses in wheat. Fron. Plant Sci. 9: 01-25. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018. 00734.
- ADS (2015). Agriculture Development Strategy 2015 to 2035. *Min. Agric. Develop. Nepal* 20-198.
- Ali, M. B. and El-sadek, A. N. (2016). Evaluation of drought tolerance indices for wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under irrigated and rainfed conditions. Comm. Biom. Crop Sci. 11: 77-89.
- Bennani, S., Nsarellah, N., Birouk, A., Ouabbou, H. and Tadesse, W. (2016). Effective selection criteria for screening drought tolerant and high yielding bread wheat genotypes. Univ. J. Agric. Res. 4: 134-142. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujar.2016.040404.
- Bennani, S., Nsarellah, N., Jlibene, M., Tadesse, W., Birouk, A. and Ouabbou, H. (2017). Efficiency of drought tolerance indices under different stress severities for bread wheat selection. Aust. J. Crop Sci. 11: 395-405. https://doi.org/10.21475/ajcs. 17.11.04.pne272.
- Bhandari, R., Gnawali, S., Nyaupane, S., Kharel, S., Poudel, M. and Panth, P. (2021). Effect of drought and irrigated environmental condition on yield and yield attributing characteristic of bread wheat–A review. *Rev. Food Agric.* 2: 59-62. https://doi.org/ 10.26480/rfna.02.2021.59.62.
- Djanaguiraman, M., Narayanan, S., Erdayani, E. and Prasad, P. V. V. (2020). Effects of high temperature stress during anthesis and grain filling periods on photosynthesis, lipids and grain yield in wheat. BMC Plant Biol. 20: 01-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/ S12870-020-02479-0/FIGURES/5.
- FAOSTAT (2022). FAOSTAT. http://www.fao.org/ faostat/en/#data/QC.
- Kamrani, M., Hoseini, Y. and Ebadollahi, A. (2017). Evaluation for heat stress tolerance in durum wheat genotypes using stress tolerance indices. Arch. Agr. Soil Sci. 64: 38-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/03650340. 2017.1326104.
- Khan, A., Ahmad, M., Ahmed, M. and Iftikhar Hussain, M. (2020). Rising atmospheric

temperature impact on wheat and thermotolerance strategies. *Plants (Basel, Switzerland)* **10**: 01-24. *https://doi.org/ 10.3390/PLANTS10010043.*

- Lesk, C., Rowhani, P. and Ramankutty, N. (2016). Influence of extreme weather disasters on global crop production. *Nature* **529**: 84-87. *https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16467.*
- MOALD (2020). Statistical Information in Nepalese Agriculture. Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock 290. https://nepalindata.com/ resource/statistical-information-nepaleseagriculture-207374-201617/.
- MOF (2022). Economic Survey 2020-21. Government of Nepal Ministry of Finance. / articles/heatstress-effects-and-tolerance-in-wheat-areview-53182.html.
- Paudel, B., Zhang, Y., Yan, J., Rai, R., Li, L., Wu, X., Chapagain, P. S. and Khanal, N. R. (2020). Farmers' understanding of climate change in Nepal Himalayas: Important determinants and implications for developing adaptation strategies. *Climatic Change* **158**: 485-502. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10584-019-02607-2.
- Poudel, M. R., Ghimire, S., Prasad, P., Dhakal, K. H., Thapa, D. B. and Poudel, H. K. (2020). Evaluation of wheat genotypes under irrigated, heat stress and drought conditions. J. Biol. Today's World 9: 212. https://doi.org/10.35248/2322-3308.20.9. 212.
- Poudel, P. B., Poudel, M. R. and Puri, R. R. (2021). Evaluation of heat stress tolerance in spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) genotypes using stress tolerance indices in western region of Nepal. J. Agric. Food Res. 5: 100179. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jafr.2021.100179.
- Puri, R. R., Tripathi, S., Bhattarai, R., Dangi, S. R. and Pandey, D. (2020). Wheat variety improvement for climate resilience. Asian J. Res. Agric. Fores. 6: 21-27. https:// doi.org/10.9734/AJRAF/2020/V6I230101.
- Raza, A. (2020). Wheat Production in Changing Environments. Springer Singapore. https:// doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6883-7.
- Regmi, D., Poudel, M. R., Bishwas, K. C. and Poudel, P. B. (2021). Yield stability of different elite wheat lines under drought and irrigated environments using AMMI and GGE biplots. Int. J. Appl. Sci. Biotech. 9: 098-106. https://doi.org/10.3126/ ijasbt.v9i2.38018.