

Article

# Comparison of Different Multivariate Statistical Methods for Screening the Drought Tolerant Genotypes of Pearl Millet (*Pennisetum americanum* L.) and Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.)

Mohammadreza Negarestani <sup>1</sup>, Enayatollah Tohidi-Nejad <sup>1,2</sup>,\*, Gholamreze Khajoei-Nejad <sup>1,2</sup>, Babak Nakhoda <sup>3</sup> and Ghasem Mohammadi-Nejad <sup>1,2</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman P. O. Box 76169-133, Iran; negarestani@uk.ac.ir (M.N.); khajoei@uk.ac.ir (G.K.-N.); mohammadinejad@uk.ac.ir (G.M.-N.)
- <sup>2</sup> Research and Technology Institute of Plant Production (RTIPP), Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman P.C. 7616913439, Iran
- <sup>3</sup> Department of molecular physicology, Agricultural Biotechnology Research Institute of Iran, Agricultural Research Education and Extension Organization (AREEO), Karaj P. O. Box 19395-1113, Iran; b.nakhoda@abrii.ac.ir
- \* Correspondence: e\_tohidi@uk.ac.ir; Tel.: +98-9131-968-732; Fax: +98-3433-257-443

Received: 4 September 2019; Accepted: 11 October 2019; Published: 17 October 2019



**Abstract:** Drought is the main limiting factor of crops production in major regions of the world. Forage plants such as pearl millet and sorghum are drought tolerant and suitable for arid regions to grow. In this study, for selecting and introducing the best drought tolerant genotypes, seven pearl millet and five sorghum genotypes in three locations (Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir in Kerman Province) were studied with different climatic conditions. The experiments were conducted for three consecutive years of cultivation (2016, 2017, and 2018) under regularly irrigated conditions and the 100% (I<sub>100</sub>, full irrigation) plant water requirement and under water deficiency, (50%) plant water requirement (I<sub>50</sub>) in two randomized complete block designs in triplicate separately at each location. Eight drought tolerance/susceptibility indices were used. Multivariate factor analysis (FA) and stress tolerance score (STS) methods were employed to compare the most drought tolerant genotypes in each region. The STS method was more efficient and effective than the FA method for detecting the most drought tolerance indices and STS, the IP13150 and IP13151 genotypes of pearl millet and speed feed genotype of sorghum in Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir respectively, were introduced as the most drought tolerant genotypes for three consecutive years of cultivation.

**Keywords:** drought tolerance; factor analysis; pearl millet; sorghum; stress tolerance score; tolerance indices

# 1. Introduction

Drought stress is the most important factor limiting the growth of plants all over the world; hence, reduced growth due to drought stress is more than other environmental stresses significantly [1].

Pearl millet (*Pennisetum americanum* L.) and forage sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.) are adapted to hot arid climates [2] and drought stress, which are appropriate for regions with irrigation water shortage is the main cause of limitation in crop production [3,4]. Due to its low water requirement, low dependence on the soil type as well as high yield and quality of forage, pearl millet can be considered as a suitable strategy for feeding livestock [5]. Different mechanisms have been proposed for drought

tolerance in pearl millet and sorghum, including strategies against drought stress, improving drought tolerance, and premature plants. It is important to know how each genotype tolerates drought stress. Researches have revealed that millet can escape from the impacts of drought stress through early flowering and lack of synchronicity in tillers development [6,7].

Bruck et al. (2000) [8] reported the low crop harvest index in pearl millet due to drought stress. Different indexes have been reported for identifying the tolerance and response of cultivars to stress based on yield. Some researchers have suggested the tolerance (TOL) and the mean productivity (MP) indexes. High values of TOL indicate the relative sensitivity of genotypes to stress [9]. MP index is also defined as the total yield of a genotype under stress and non-stress conditions. The stress tolerance index (STI) is considered as a criterion for selecting drought tolerant cultivars; high values of STI indicate high tolerance and high yield potential [10].

Geometric mean productivity (GMP) is another index having more potential than MP for separation of cultivars [10]. The stress susceptibility index (SSI) is another selection index. Researchers believe that genotypes with lower SSI than unit tolerate drought more. Hence, reduction in their yield under drought conditions is less than the reduced average yield of total genotypes [11]. The yield stability index (YSI) assesses the yield of a cultivar under stress conditions compared to its yield under non-stress conditions and it can be a suitable index for identifying varieties tolerant of drought stress. Consequently, it is believed that cultivars with higher YSI have better yield under both conditions [12]. The yield index (YI) only categorizes the cultivars based on yield and under stress conditions, thus, it does not detect cultivars with high yield under both stress is associated with three factors, including yield potential, drought tolerance, and appropriate phenology. Drought tolerance is one of the traits controlled by many genes and it is one of the quantitative traits. The main problem is to identify a standard assessment test for selecting drought tolerant genotypes [15]. The aim of this study was selecting drought tolerant genotypes in regions with different climates using all drought tolerance/susceptibility indexes under stress and non-stress conditions simultaneously.

Ghollamin et al. (2010) [16] in a study stated that on durum wheat properties under drought stress and without drought stress 82.58% of its total yield variability was justified by factor analysis [16]. Abdulshahi et al. (2012) selected drought resistant genotypes from 40 different wheat genotypes using the STS method [17].

## 2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.1. Treatments

The treatments were performed to determine drought resistant genotypes, among the pearl millet cultivars including HHVBC, IP22269, HYB-1, HYB-2, ICMVO-O5222, IP13150, and IP13151 and different sorghum genotypes including S<sub>35</sub>, ICSV-112, SPEED FEED, ICSV-14001, and Pegah were selected in three regions almost different alternate in climate, including: Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir, whose geographical features and other characteristics are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Geographical characteristics of the study sites in different regions.

	Kerman	Jiroft	Bardsir
Above sea level	1756 m	680 m	2047 m
Longitude	30°29′	28°40′	29°55′
Latitude	57°6′	57°44′	56°34′
Average rainfall in 10 year	122.7 mm	180 mm	92.5 mm
Soil type	L-S	L	L-S
Growth season	20 June-31 October	20 March-2 August	30 April-11 September

Water treatments including 100% ( $I_{100}$ , full irrigation) plant water requirement and 50% plant water requirement ( $I_{50}$ ) were used respectively, as regularly irrigated and drought stress condition ( $I_{100}$ ,  $I_{50}$ ).

### 2.2. The Characteristics of Experimental Farms

The first field experiment site was conducted at the Research Farm in Faculty of Agriculture, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman and had a hot arid climate. The second field experiment site for the study was located in the Research Farm, Faculty of Agriculture, Islamic Azad University of Jiroft and had a hot arid climate. The third field experiment site located in the Research Farm of Agriculture Organization Office of Bardsir had a temperate semi-arid. The temperature range of the three regions is given in Figure 1. This experiment was conducted in the mentioned regions during the 2016, 2017, and 2018 crop years. The soil properties of the tested sites are also given in Table 2.



Figure 1. The temperature In Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir in three years.

	<b>N%</b>	P (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	K (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	pН	EC (dsm <sup>-1</sup> )	OC%	Fe (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Zn (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )
Kerman	0.4	9	470	7.5	4.2	1.2	8	1
Jiroft	0.5	11	440	7.5	4.6	1.1	6.2	1.2
Bardsir	0.3	8.8	460	7.5	4.1	1.4	6.8	0.8

Table 2. Soil properties of the study sites in Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir during the growing season.

## 2.3. The Stages of Implementation

At the first step, the studied farms were plowed and leveled using a land leveler so that the slope of the ground became almost nearly zero and the runoff problem was eliminated. Fifty kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of  $P_2O_5$  fertilizer and 70 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of urea fertilizer were added to the soils in three farms before implantation. In this experiment, two randomized complete block designs were used in each area (each with three replications). Each replicate consisted of 12 experimental units (plots) assigned to each genotype. Therefore, each randomized complete block design consisted of 36 experimental units and a total of 72 experimental units in total.

Each block design was irrigated with water treatment. The amount of irrigation water was determined by two separate weighing lysimeters embedded on the periphery of the farm (one for pearl millet and another for sorghum). The irrigation water was transferred to the test site through a poly vinyl chloride (PVC) pipe (75 mm) using an electric pump from the water source and the required water was given to each plot by a water volume meter. Table 3 shows the number of irrigation in the growing season and the amount of water consumed in each area.

	Plant	Cut	Number of Irrigation	Total Amount of Applied Water (m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Kerman				
I <sub>100</sub>				
	Pearl millet	2	15.28	6744.51
	Sorghum	2	15.28	7495.91
I <sub>50</sub>				
	Pearl millet	2	15.28	3372.26
	Sorghum	2	15.28	3747.95
Jiroft				
I <sub>100</sub>				
	Pearl millet	3	27.75	7726.8
	Sorghum	3	27.75	8731.28
I <sub>50</sub>				
	Pearl millet	3	27.75	3863.4
	Sorghum	3	27.75	4365.64
Bardsir				
I <sub>100</sub>				
	Pearl millet	2	15.28	6455.44
	Sorghum	2	15.28	7423.75
I <sub>50</sub>				
	Pearl millet	2	15.28	3227.72
	Sorghum	2	15.28	3711.72

**Table 3.** The number of cut and irrigation and amount of water consumed per plant and irrigation treatment in Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir.

Water treatments were applied when the plant was well established (four-leaf stage). Five lines were implanted in each experiment unit. Plants were cut from 10 cm height of soil surface for harvesting. After harvesting, the fresh forage was weighed. The growing season was considered 135 days from

planting date to final harvesting with the same period for all three years. In some areas, such as Jiroft with high temperatures, three crops were harvested (first crop: 72 days after planting, the second: 120 days, and the third: 135 days after planting), and in Kerman and Bardsir regions only two crops were harvested (first crop: 84 days after planting and the second crop: 135 days after planting).

## 2.4. Calculation of Drought Tolerance/Susceptibility Indices

 $I_{100}$  (full irrigation) and  $I_{50}$  treatments were considered as water treatments under regularly irrigated and water deficiency conditions. Fresh yield in regularly irrigated conditions was ( $Y_p$ ) and in water stress conditions, it was ( $Y_s$ ). The tolerance/susceptibility indices for each plant genotype were obtained using the following equations [16].

$$SSI = \frac{1 - \frac{Y_s}{Y_p}}{1 - \frac{\overline{Y}_s}{\overline{Y}_p}}.$$
(1)

where  $Y_s$  is the wet forage yield under water deficiency and  $Y_p$  is the wet forage yield under regularly irrigated condition,  $\overline{Y}_s$  and  $\overline{Y}_p$  are the mean yield (t ha<sup>-1</sup>) of all genotypes under water deficiency and regularly irrigated conditions, respectively.

$$MP = \frac{Y_s + Y_p}{2} \left( t \ ha^{-1} \right) \tag{2}$$

$$TOL = Y_P - Y_s(t \ ha^{-1}) \tag{3}$$

$$GMP = \sqrt{Y_P \times Y_s} (t \ ha^{-1}) \tag{4}$$

$$STI = \frac{Y_p + Y_s}{\left(\overline{Y}_p\right)^2} \tag{5}$$

$$YI = \frac{Y_s}{\overline{Y}_s} \tag{6}$$

$$YSI = \frac{Y_s}{Y_p} \tag{7}$$

 $\beta$  is the coefficient linear regression of yield of each genotype in each condition of the environmental index.

The new stress tolerance score (STS) method was used to apply these indices. This method is easier than the factor analysis (FA) method and could be applied to any number of genotypes, which is calculated by the following equation.

$$STS = MP + STI + GMP + YI + YSI - SSI - TOL - \beta$$
(9)

As it is deduced from the tolerance/susceptibility indices equations, high values are related to MP, STI and GMP, YI, and YSI indices and low values are related to SSI, Tol, and  $\beta$  indices, that are indicated higher resistance to drought stress. Therefore, MP, STI, GMP, YI, and YSI have a positive sign and coefficient, while SSI, Tol, and  $\beta$  have a negative coefficient [17]. Raw data cannot be used for calculating STS; hence, these indices must be first standardized and then used; the data are standardized using the following equation.

$$Z_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij} - X_i}{S_i},\tag{10}$$

where  $Z_{ij}$  is the standard score for *j*th genotype *i*th index.  $X_{ij}$  is the raw data of *j*th genotype in *i*th index, and  $S_i$  is the standard deviation of *i*th index.

#### 2.5. Statistical Analysis

ANOVA, simple correlation, and mean comparisons with LSD were performed by SAS 9.4 statistical software (SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC, USA). The FA was used by means of MINITAB 19 software (State College, PA, USA).

## 3. Results

The results of ANOVA are shown that  $Y_p$  and  $Y_s$  were significant in all indices at all three sites in the tested years. Comparison of means indicated that IP13151 and IP13150 genotypes of pearl millet in Kerman and Jiroft, respectively and the speed feed genotype of sorghum in the Bardsir area had the highest yield under stress and non-stress conditions. According to Tables 4–6, there was a significant positive correlation between the yields ( $Y_p$ ) and ( $Y_s$ ), so that in Kerman ( $r = 0.76^{**}$ ,  $r = 0.98^{**}$ , and  $r = 0.99^{**}$ ) and in Jiroft ( $r = 0.98^{**}$ ,  $r = 0.98^{**}$ , and  $r = 0.99^{**}$ ).

**Table 4.** Simple correlation coefficients between Y<sub>p</sub>, Y<sub>s</sub>, and drought tolerance/susceptibility indices of genotypes in Kerman in three years.

2016	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ys	0.76 **	1								
SSI	0.71 *	0.08	1							
MP	0.98 **	0.84 **	0.59	1						
TOL	0.97 **	-0.58 **	0.85 **	0.92 **	1					
STI	0.96 **	0.89 **	0.51	0.99 **	0.88 **	1				
GMP	0.96 **	0.90 **	0.50	0.99 **	0.87 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.76 **	0.99 **	0.09	0.85 **	0.59 *	0.89 **	0.90 **	1		
YSI	-0.68	-0.05	-0.99 **	-0.57	-0.83 **	-0.48	-0.47	-0.06	1	
β	-0.69 **	0.08	-0.97 **	-0.58 **	-0.82 **	-0.50 *	0.48	0.09	-0.97 *	1
2017	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ys	0.98 **	1								
SSI	-0.11	-0.26	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.84 **	1						
TOL	0.99 **	0.39	-0.82 **	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.85 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.85 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.98 **	0.99 **	-0.86 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	0.23 **	0.38 **	-0.78 **	0.80 **	0.78 **	0.81 **	0.80 **	0.81 **	1	
β	0.12	-0.03	0.48	-0.06	-0.01	-0.09	-0.07	-0.1	-0.41	1
2018	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ys	0.99 **	1								
SSI	-0.22 **	-0.29 **	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.23 **	1						
TOL	0.99 **	-0.43 *	-0.18	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.25	0.99 **	0.99 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.25	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.29	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	-0.08 **	-0.01 **	-0.76 **	-0.06	0.11	0.06	-0.04	-0.009	1	
β	0.16	0.08	-0.87 **	0.14	0.20	0.12	0.12	0.08	-0.8 **	1

Significant at the \* 0.05 and \*\* 0.01 probability level.

2016	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	YI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ys	0.98 **	1								
SSI	0.008	-0.18	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.98 **	-0.03	1						
TOL	0.99 **	0.35	0.10	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.08	0.99 **	0.97 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.08	0.99 **	0.98 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.98 **	0.99 **	-0.17	0.98 **	0.95 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	-0.09	0.09	-0.97 **	-0.04	-0.18	0.006	0.003	0.09	1	
β	0.96 **	-0.91 **	0.19	0.96 **	0.98 **	0.93 **	0.94 **	0.91 **	-0.27	1
2017	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β
Yp	ĺ									
Ýs	0.98 **	1								
SSI	0.02	-0.15	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.98 **	-0.01	1						
TOL	0.99 **	-0.96 **	0.11	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.07	0.99 **	0.97 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.06	0.99 **	0.98 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.98 **	0.99 **	-0.15	0.98 **	0.96 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	-0.20	-0.02	-0.94 **	-0.16	-0.26	-0.11	-0.11	-0.03	1	
β	0.96 **	-0.92 **	0.20	0.96 **	0.98 **	0.93 **	0.95 **	0.92 **	-0.37	1
2018	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	YI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ys	0.99 **	1								
SSI	-0.13	-0.60	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.13	1						
TOL	0.99 **	-0.76 **	-0.11	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.11	0.99 **	0.99 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.14	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.16	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	-0.24	-0.19	-0.50 **	-0.22	-0.26	-0.19	-0.21	-0.19	1	
β	0.98 **	-0.97 **	-0.15	0.98 **	0.98 **	0.95 **	0.97 **	0.97 **	-0.39	1

**Table 5.** Simple correlation coefficients between  $Y_p$ ,  $Y_s$ , and drought tolerance/susceptibility indices of genotypes in Jiroft in three years.

Significant at the \*\* 0.01 probability level.

**Table 6.** Simple correlation coefficients between  $Y_p$ ,  $Y_s$ , and drought tolerance/susceptibility indices of genotypes in Bardsir in three years.

2016	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	YI	YSI	β
Yp	1									
Ýs	0.99 **	1								
SSI	0.25	0.13	1							
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.22	1						
TOL	0.99 **	-0.41 *	0.32	0.99 **	1					
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.17	0.99 **	0.98 **	1				
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.2	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1			
ΥI	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.13	0.99 **	0.97 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1		
YSI	-0.19	-0.08	-0.86	-0.16	-0.25	-0.1	-0.14	-0.07	1	
β	0.47	-0.35	0.95 **	0.44	0.63 **	0.38	0.41	0.35	-0.86	1
2017	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β
Yp	ĺ									
Ýs	0.99 **	1								

SSI	-0.52	-0.59	1								
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.54	1							
TOL	0.99 **	0.38	-0.47	0.99 **	1						
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.56	0.99 **	0.99 **	1					
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.56	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1				
ΥI	0.85 **	0.86 **	-0.6	0.85 **	0.84 **	0.85 **	0.86 **	1			
YSI	0.52	0.59	-1	0.54	0.47	0.56	0.56	0.60 *	1		
β	0.98 **	-0.96 **	-0.41	0.97 **	0.99 **	0.97 **	0.97 **	0.80 **	0.41	1	
2018	Yp	Ys	SSI	MP	TOL	STI	GMP	ΥI	YSI	β	
Yp	1										
Ýs	0.99 **	1									
SSI	-0.46	-0.41	1								
MP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.45	1							
TOL	0.98 **	-0.48 *	-0.48	0.99 **	1						
STI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.43	0.99 **	0.99 **	1					
GMP	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.43	0.99 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1				
ΥI	0.99 **	0.99 **	-0.41	0.99 **	0.98 **	0.99 **	0.99 **	1			
YSI	-0.19	-0.11	0.23	-0.17	-0.24	-0.16	-0.15	-0.1	1		
β	0.26	-0.16	-0.57	0.24	0.32	0.22	0.21	0.16	-0.8	1	
											-

Table 6. Cont.

Significant at the \* 0.05 and \*\* 0.01 probability level.

This correlation implies that by using normal conditions it could perform a direct selection for stress conditions, and this role indicates the yield potential under drought stress conditions [18]. However, Si-o-seh Mardeh et al. (2006) [19] reported a negative correlation between yields in stress and non-stress conditions, which was inconsistent with the results of the present study. Eight drought tolerance/susceptibility indices (SSI, MP, TOI, GMP, STI, YI, YSI, and  $\beta$ ) were used for selecting the favorable genotypes with acceptable yield in different climatic conditions.

According to the Tables 4–6, four indices MP, GMP, STI, and YI had positive and strong correlations with  $Y_p$  and  $Y_s$ . This was also reported by Ilker et al. (2011) [20] that high-yielding genotypes could be assessed by MP, GMP, and STI indices under stress and non-stress conditions; while Jafari (2009) [21] introduced the STI index for this selection. According to the results of the present study, MP, GMP, STI, and YI were the most appropriate and effective indices. On the other hand, three indices of SSI, TOL, and  $\beta$  correlated negatively with yield under stress conditions.

According to Table 7, the first two factors were calculated using the FA method with varimax rotation in 2016, 2017, and 2018, and there was a high factor loading among MP, TOL, GMP, and YI in Kerman, Bardsir, and Jiroft regarding the first factor (FA1) for every three years. These indices had positive coefficients for FA1. There was a high factor loading between the SSI and YSI indices for the second factor (FA2) with a positive coefficient. However, these two indices had negative coefficients in Jiroft and Bardsir in the second year. However, FA1 and FA2 were considered as drought tolerant factors. Higher FA1 + FA2 score shows higher drought tolerance and lower genotypic susceptibility scores indicate the susceptibility to drought.

Kerman		2016			2017			2018	
	Factor	loading		Factor	loading		Factor l	oading	
Index	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.
SSI	-0.293	0.955	0.996	-0.164	0.986	0.997	-0.054	0.998	0.99
MP	0.960	-0.276	1	0.999	-0.038	1	0.999	0.012	1
TOL	0.992	-0.123	0.996	0.991	0.121	1	0.992	0.117	0.999
STI	0.952	-0.301	0.998	0.992	-0.101	0.994	0.997	-0.026	0.998
GMP	0.946	-0.321	1	0.995	-0.093	1	0.999	-0.026	1
YI	0.918	-0.394	0.997	0.981	-0.191	1	0.994	-0.101	1
YSI	0.290	0.956	0.996	0.167	0.985	0.997	0.054	0.998	0.997
В	-0.221	0.974	0.97	0.152	0.987	0.995	0.095	0.994	0.998
%Var	0.517	0.477	0.994	0.71	0.287	0.998	0.574	0.424	0.998
Jiroft		2016			2017			2018	
	Factor	loading		Factor	loading		Factor 1	oading	
Index	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.
SSI	-0.207	-0.977	0.948	0.044	0.998	1	0.230	0.931	1
MP	0.918	0.395	0.998	0.999	0.039	1	0.998	-0.056	1
TOL	0.984	0.174	0.992	0.985	0.170	0.999	0.994	-0.095	1
STI	0.853	0.512	0.992	0.995	-0.019	0.991	0.993	-0.045	0.989
GMP	0.888	0.458	0.999	0.999	-0.007	1	0.999	-0.041	1
YI	0.824	0.564	1	0.994	-0.101	1	0.999	-0.012	1
YSI	0.207	0.977	0.976	-0.046	-0.998	1	0.102	0.960	1
В	0.990	-0.040	0.979	0.955	0.257	0.979	0.976	-0.103	0.973
%Var	0.543	0.442	0.986	0.733	0.263	0.996	0.742	0.253	0.995
Bardsir		2016			2017			2018	
	Factor	loading		Factor 1	loading		Factor 1	oading	
Index	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.	FA1	FA2	Com.
SSI	0.085	0.996	1	-0.275	-0.956	0.998	-0.418	0.658	1
MP	0.985	0.167	1	0.949	0.307	0.991	0.992	-0.010	1
TOL	0.963	0.267	1	0.971	0.227	0.972	0.980	-0.185	0.999
STI	0.992	0.118	0.998	0.935	0.343	1	0.995	-0.061	0.998
GMP	0.989	0.140	1	0.941	0.331	1	0.995	-0.080	0.981
YI	0.996	0.076	0.997	0.798	0.428	0.968	0.998	-0.029	1
YSI	-0.082	0.996	0.996	0.261	-0.960	0.947	0.161	0.966	0.997
В	0.312	0.949	0.97	0.981	0.144	1	0.126	0.971	0.998
%Var	0.621	0.378	0.994	0.669	0.308	1	0.63	0.369	0.369

**Table 7.** Factor analysis (FA) for drought tolerance/susceptibility indices of genotypes in Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir in three years.

Note: Com. = Communality.

# 4. Discussion

The strong and positive correlation among MP, GMP, STI, and YI indices were shown that they could produce identical results. Selections based on these indices resulted in genotypes with high yield.

In contrast, there was a strong and negative correlation between  $\beta$  and TOL indices with Y<sub>s</sub> (Tables 4–6). Hence, according to Fernandez (1992) [10], low-yield potential genotypes can be selected based on TOL under non-stress conditions and high-yield potential genotypes can be selected under stress conditions. Thus, the idea of selection based on STI, MP, GMP, and YI was employed to select favorable low-yield potential genotypes.

In this study, the IP13151 and TP13150 pearl millet genotypes and speed feed sorghum genotype (with the highest yield under stress conditions) were introduced as the most drought tolerant genotypes in Kerman, Jiroft, and Bardsir in the tested years, respectively (Table 8). Comparison of this result with the result of multivariate statistical methods that can be used the indices simultaneously, such as FA and STS methods are given in this table.

Kerman												
2016 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	$Y_s$ (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	67.69	27.32	1.29	47.51	40.37	0.27	43	0.75	0.4	2.2	3.21	-1.92
IP22269	78.86	34.51	1.21	56.69	44.35	0.4	52.15	0.95	0.44	2.07	0.26	-0.43
HYB-1	84.86	36.14	1.24	60.5	48.72	0.45	55.36	1	0.43	2.14	-0.02	1.59
HYB-2	90.92	37.16	1.28	64.04	53.76	0.5	58.12	1.02	0.41	2.24	-0.37	2.23
IP13150	99.65	39.8	1.3	69.73	59.85	0.59	62.98	1.1	0.4	2.17	-0.52	4.34
ICM-05222	82.81	33.12	1.3	57.97	49.69	0.41	52.37	0.91	0.4	2.27	1.22	-1.19
IP13151	99.96	40.8	1.28	70.38	59.16	0.61	63.86	1.13	0.41	2.27	-0.89	4.6
S35	71.34	36.18	1.06	53.76	35.16	0.38	50.76	1	0.51	1.76	3.89	-3.88
ICS-112	68.7	35.34	1.03	52.02	33.36	0.36	49.16	0.97	0.53	1.72	7.71	-6.35
SPEEDFEED	92.92	37.68	1.29	65.3	55.24	0.52	59.17	1.04	0.41	2.1	-0.27	3.01
ICS-14001	81.75	36.95	1.18	59.35	44.8	0.45	54.95	1.02	0.45	2.01	-0.35	1.39
PEGAH	66.02	33.86	1.05	49.94	32.16	0.33	47.28	0.93	0.51	1.73	-2.43	0.52
LSD	2.07	3	0.09	3.68	6.56	0.05	3.38	0.08	0.05	0.21		
2017 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	85.54	27.54	1.04	56.28	58.53	0.29	48.07	0.92	0.32	2.92	0.82	-6.31
IP22269	93.34	30.33	1.03	62.84	65	0.36	53.77	1.03	0.32	2.92	0.37	-3.49
HYB-1	96.46	31.56	1.02	56.44	64.89	0.38	55.17	1.07	0.33	2.84	-1.44	1.14
HYB-2	103.44	33.77	1.02	60.23	69.68	0.43	59.1	1.15	0.33	2.86	-1.28	2.99
IP13150	111.74	37.03	1.01	65.1	74.71	0.51	64.32	1.26	0.33	2.83	-2.28	5.95
ICM-05222	97.52	30.57	1.04	55.08	66.95	0.37	54.6	1.04	0.31	2.97	1.3	-0.62
IP13151	115.71	38.22	1.03	65.08	77.5	0.55	66.5	1.3	0.33	2.85	-2.05	8.72
S35	72.41	22.58	1.04	48.01	49.83	0.2	40.42	0.77	0.31	2.91	1.61	-3.17
ICS-112	74.63	22.32	1.06	46.43	52.31	0.21	40.81	0.76	0.3	2.04	4.2	-4.12
SPEEDFEED	94.24	31.6	1.01	61.71	62.64	0.37	54.27	1.08	0.34	2.77	-3.06	5.19
ICS-14001	83.62	27.84	1.01	54.58	55.79	0.29	48.25	0.95	0.33	2.76	-2.59	-0.15
PEGAH	63.34	21.38	1	43.76	41.97	0.17	36.8	0.73	0.34	2.64	-3.50	-1.28
LSD	6.01	3.02	0.09	3.55	6.32	0.05	3.32	0.08	0.05	0.2		

**Table 8.** Mean yield in regularly irrigated  $(Y_p)$  and water deficiency  $(Y_s)$  conditions and drought tolerance/susceptibility indices for genotypes in three years.

Table 8. Cont.

2018 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	84.5	26.63	1.01	55.57	57.87	0.27	47.44	0.93	0.32	3.09	-1.15	-0.68
IP22269	94.24	29.84	1	62.04	64.4	0.34	53.02	1.04	0.32	3.08	-1.51	1.71
HYB-1	96.03	30.31	1.01	63.17	65.72	0.35	53.95	1.06	0.32	3.09	-1.26	1.67
HYB-2	102.84	32.04	1.01	67.44	70.8	0.4	57.4	1.12	0.31	3.14	-0.35	1.39
IP13150	111.56	36.32	1.01	73.94	75.25	0.49	63.65	1.27	0.33	3.01	-0.64	4.6
ICM-05222	97.19	30.29	1.01	63.74	66.91	0.36	54.25	1.06	0.31	3.14	-0.38	0.3
IP13151	113.77	36.02	1	74.9	77.75	0.5	64.01	1.26	0.32	3.1	-2.11	6.53
S35	71.98	22.04	1.02	47.01	49.95	0.19	39.82	0.77	0.31	3.17	0.86	-6.29
ICS-112	73.95	22.69	1.02	48.32	51.26	0.2	40.96	0.79	0.31	3.16	0.66	-5.65
SPEEDFEED	95.02	30.32	1	62.67	64.7	0.35	53.67	1.06	0.32	3.06	-2.03	2.78
ICS-14001	83.18	26.61	1	54.9	56.58	0.27	47.04	0.93	0.32	3.04	-2.20	0.85
PEGAH	63.07	20.28	1	41.68	42.78	0.15	35.76	0.71	0.32	3	-2.62	-1.98
LSD	6.35	3.09	0.09	3.79	6.51	0.06	3.5	0.08	0.05	0.21		
Jiroft												
2016 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	85.69	25.31	1.02	55.5	60.38	0.26	46.57	0.72	0.3	1.46	-4.99	-2.92
IP22269	95.66	27.74	1.03	61.7	67.92	0.32	51.51	0.79	0.29	1.7	-1.59	-2.92
HYB-1	96.72	29.09	1.01	62.91	67.63	0.34	53.04	0.83	0.3	1.65	0.75	-1.06
HYB-2	103.1	32.91	0.99	68.01	70.19	0.41	58.23	0.94	0.32	1.66	6.95	2.73
IP13150	109.98	38.46	0.94	74.22	71.52	0.51	65.01	1.09	0.35	1.6	15.96	8.86
ICM-05222	97.57	28.35	1.03	62.96	69.22	0.33	52.59	0.81	0.29	1.73	-0.66	-2.65
IP13151	116.52	37.8	0.98	77.16	78.72	0.53	66.36	1.07	0.32	1.8	14.39	5.45
S35	70.82	21.2	1.02	46.01	49.62	0.18	38.74	0.6	0.3	1.01	-10.64	-3.17
ICS-112	73.84	21.41	1.03	47.63	52.43	0.19	39.76	0.61	0.29	1.16	-10.75	-4.39
SPEEDFEED	94.35	31.02	0.97	62.69	63.33	0.35	54.1	0.88	0.33	1.47	4.51	3.21
ICS-14001	83.66	25.47	1.01	54.57	58.18	0.26	46.16	0.72	0.3	1.38	-4.36	-1.66
PEGAH	63.5	19.75	1	41.63	43.75	0.15	35.4	0.56	0.31	0.76	-11.91	-1.82

Table 8. Cont.

2017 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	85.71	26.02	1.03	55.87	59.69	0.27	47.23	0.89	0.3	1.42	1.64	-4.03
IP22269	95.68	30.09	1.01	62.89	65.59	0.35	53.65	1.03	0.31	1.57	0.53	-0.74
HYB-1	96.75	31.6	0.99	64.17	65.15	0.37	55.29	1.08	0.33	1.52	-0.67	1.68
HYB-2	103.14	33.01	1	68.07	70.13	0.41	58.35	1.12	0.32	1.65	0	1.4
IP13150	117.18	37.29	1	77.24	79.9	0.53	66.1	1.27	0.32	1.84	0.18	3.36
ICM-05222	97.77	30.12	1.02	63.95	67.65	0.35	54.27	1.03	0.31	1.63	1.2	-1.70
IP13151	108.58	35.25	0.99	71.92	73.34	0.46	61.96	1.2	0.32	1.7	-0.47	3.21
S35	72.35	22.98	1	47.67	49.37	0.2	40.75	0.78	0.32	1.03	0.05	-2.65
ICS-112	73.93	22.85	1.02	48.39	51.08	0.21	41.09	0.78	0.31	1.09	1.17	-4.27
SPEEDFEED	94.35	31.57	0.98	62.96	62.41	0.36	54.58	1.08	0.33	1.45	-1.48	2.86
ICS-14001	83.66	28.18	0.98	55.92	55.48	0.28	48.55	0.96	0.34	1.24	-1.67	1.69
PEGAH	63.62	21.4	0.98	42.51	42.22	0.16	36.89	0.73	0.34	0.7	-1.63	-0.52
LSD	8.31	1.95	0.08	5.07	6.58	0.04	3.99	0.06	0.02	0.25		
2018 Genotype	$Y_p$ (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	$Y_{s}$ (t	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t $ha^{-1}$ )	STI	GMP (t $h_{2}^{-1}$ )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 +	STS
eenergy	IIa )	lla )			nu )		na )				FA2	
ННУВС	85.32	26.57	1	55.95	58.74	0.28	47.62	0.76	0.31	1.38	-0.73	-1.15
HHVBC IP22269	85.32 95.28	26.57 30.09	1 1	55.95 62.69	58.74 65.19	0.28 0.35	47.62 53.55	0.76 0.86	0.31 0.32	1.38 1.55	-0.73 0.56	-1.15 1.54
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1	85.32 95.28 96.1	26.57 30.09 30.26	1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18	58.74 65.19 65.84	0.28 0.35 0.35	47.62 53.55 53.93	0.76 0.86 0.87	0.31 0.32 0.31	1.38 1.55 1.57	-0.73 0.56 0.3	-1.15 1.54 1.37
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11	1 1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79	0.28 0.35 0.35 0.4	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48	0.76 0.86 0.87 0.92	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31	1.38 1.55 1.57 1.69	-0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55	-1.15 1.54 1.37 1.48
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31	1 1 1 1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74	0.28 0.35 0.35 0.4 0.53	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08	0.76 0.86 0.87 0.92 1.07	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32	1.38 1.55 1.57 1.69 1.84	-0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81	-1.15 1.54 1.37 1.48 4.9
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48	0.28 0.35 0.35 0.4 0.53 0.36	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55	0.76 0.86 0.87 0.92 1.07 0.87	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31	1.38 1.55 1.57 1.69 1.84 1.62	-0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81 -0.99	-1.15 1.54 1.37 1.48 4.9 0.26
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14 74.7	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24	0.28 0.35 0.35 0.4 0.53 0.36 0.49	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63	0.76 0.86 0.87 0.92 1.07 0.87 1.02	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31	1.38 1.55 1.57 1.69 1.84 1.62 1.83	FA2           -0.73           0.56           0.3           -0.55           -0.81           -0.99           -0.40	-1.15 1.54 1.37 1.48 4.9 0.26 3.43
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151 S35	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81 71.13	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58 22.5	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14 74.7 46.81	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24 48.63	0.28 0.35 0.35 0.4 0.53 0.36 0.49 0.2	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63 40	$\begin{array}{c} 0.76 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.87 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.64 \end{array}$	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32	1.38 1.55 1.57 1.69 1.84 1.62 1.83 0.97	FA2 -0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81 -0.99 -0.40 0.9	$ \begin{array}{r} -1.15 \\ 1.54 \\ 1.37 \\ 1.48 \\ 4.9 \\ 0.26 \\ 3.43 \\ -0.98 \\ \end{array} $
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151 S35 ICS-112	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81 71.13 74.02	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58 22.5 22.96	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1.01	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14 74.7 46.81 48.49	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24 48.63 51.05	$\begin{array}{c} 0.28\\ 0.35\\ 0.35\\ 0.4\\ 0.53\\ 0.36\\ 0.49\\ 0.2\\ 0.21\\ \end{array}$	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63 40 41.23	$\begin{array}{c} 0.76 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.87 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.64 \\ 0.66 \end{array}$	0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31	$     1.38 \\     1.55 \\     1.57 \\     1.69 \\     1.84 \\     1.62 \\     1.83 \\     0.97 \\     1.09  $	FA2 -0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81 -0.99 -0.40 0.9 1.07	$\begin{array}{r} -1.15 \\ 1.54 \\ 1.37 \\ 1.48 \\ 4.9 \\ 0.26 \\ 3.43 \\ -0.98 \\ -2.71 \end{array}$
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151 S35 ICS-112 SPEEDFEED	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81 71.13 74.02 94.03	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58 22.5 22.96 30.15	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1.01 0.99	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14 74.7 46.81 48.49 62.09	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24 48.63 51.05 63.88	$\begin{array}{c} 0.28\\ 0.35\\ 0.35\\ 0.4\\ 0.53\\ 0.36\\ 0.49\\ 0.2\\ 0.21\\ 0.34\end{array}$	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63 40 41.23 53.24	$\begin{array}{c} 0.76 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.87 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.64 \\ 0.66 \\ 0.86 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.38\\ 1.55\\ 1.57\\ 1.69\\ 1.84\\ 1.62\\ 1.83\\ 0.97\\ 1.09\\ 1.51\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{FA2} \\ \hline -0.73 \\ 0.56 \\ 0.3 \\ -0.55 \\ -0.81 \\ -0.99 \\ -0.40 \\ 0.9 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.09 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} -1.15 \\ 1.54 \\ 1.37 \\ 1.48 \\ 4.9 \\ 0.26 \\ 3.43 \\ -0.98 \\ -2.71 \\ 2.87 \end{array}$
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151 S35 ICS-112 SPEEDFEED ICS-14001	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81 71.13 74.02 94.03 83.33	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58 22.5 22.96 30.15 26.5	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 0.99\\ 0.99 \end{array} $	55.95 62.69 63.18 67.5 77.18 64.14 74.7 46.81 48.49 62.09 54.92	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24 48.63 51.05 63.88 56.83	$\begin{array}{c} 0.28\\ 0.35\\ 0.35\\ 0.4\\ 0.53\\ 0.36\\ 0.49\\ 0.2\\ 0.21\\ 0.34\\ 0.27\\ \end{array}$	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63 40 41.23 53.24 46.99	$\begin{array}{c} 0.76 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.87 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.64 \\ 0.66 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.76 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.32 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.38 \\ 1.55 \\ 1.57 \\ 1.69 \\ 1.84 \\ 1.62 \\ 1.83 \\ 0.97 \\ 1.09 \\ 1.51 \\ 1.31 \end{array}$	FA2 -0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81 -0.99 -0.40 0.9 1.07 0.09 -1.18	$\begin{array}{r} -1.15\\ 1.54\\ 1.37\\ 1.48\\ 4.9\\ 0.26\\ 3.43\\ -0.98\\ -2.71\\ 2.87\\ 0.57\end{array}$
HHVBC IP22269 HYB-1 HYB-2 IP13150 ICM-05222 IP13151 S35 ICS-112 SPEEDFEED ICS-14001 PEGAH	85.32 95.28 96.1 102.9 117.05 97.88 113.81 71.13 74.02 94.03 83.33 63.37	26.57 30.09 30.26 32.11 36.31 30.4 35.58 22.5 22.96 30.15 26.5 20	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1.01\\ 0.99\\ 0.99\\ 1\\ \end{array} $	55.95 $62.69$ $63.18$ $67.5$ $77.18$ $64.14$ $74.7$ $46.81$ $48.49$ $62.09$ $54.92$ $41.69$	58.74 65.19 65.84 70.79 79.74 67.48 78.24 48.63 51.05 63.88 56.83 43.37	$\begin{array}{c} 0.28\\ 0.35\\ 0.35\\ 0.4\\ 0.53\\ 0.36\\ 0.49\\ 0.2\\ 0.21\\ 0.34\\ 0.27\\ 0.15\\ \end{array}$	47.62 53.55 53.93 57.48 66.08 54.55 63.63 40 41.23 53.24 46.99 35.6	$\begin{array}{c} 0.76 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.87 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.07 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.64 \\ 0.66 \\ 0.86 \\ 0.76 \\ 0.57 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.32 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.38\\ 1.55\\ 1.57\\ 1.69\\ 1.84\\ 1.62\\ 1.83\\ 0.97\\ 1.09\\ 1.51\\ 1.31\\ 0.74\end{array}$	FA2 -0.73 0.56 0.3 -0.55 -0.81 -0.99 -0.40 0.9 1.07 0.09 -1.18 0.49	$\begin{array}{r} -1.15\\ 1.54\\ 1.37\\ 1.48\\ 4.9\\ 0.26\\ 3.43\\ -0.98\\ -2.71\\ 2.87\\ 0.57\\ -2.05\end{array}$

Bardsir

2016 Genotype

HHVBC

IP22269

HYB-1 HYB-2

IP13150

ICM-05222

IP13151

S35

ICS-112 SPEEDFEED

ICS-14001

PEGAH

LSD

2017 Genotype

HHVBC

IP22269

HYB-1

HYB-2

IP13150

ICM-05222

IP13151

S35

ICS-112

ICS-14001

PEGAH

LSD

SPEEDFEED

95.49

81.22

95.99

76.94

77.62

97.4

82.77

68.17

4.48

35.51

30.01

35.76

28.54

28.78

36.6

30.09

24.79

1.92

1

1

1

1

1

0.99

1.01

1.01

0.02

65.5

55.61

65.87

52.74

53.2

67

56.43

46.48

3.07

59.98

51.21

60.23

48.41

48.84

60.8

52.68

43.38

3.1

0.48

0.35

0.49

0.31

0.32

0.51

0.36

0.24

2.07

				]	Fable 8. Con	<i>t</i> .					
Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
75.69	27.15	1.01	51.42	48.54	0.29	45.33	0.89	0.36	2.69	0.26	-4.00
79.21	28.54	1	53.88	50.67	0.32	47.55	0.94	0.36	2.68	-0.07	-2.24
81.75	29.56	1	55.66	52.18	0.34	49.16	0.97	0.36	2.67	-0.33	-0.89
92.49	32.89	1.01	62.69	59.6	0.43	55.16	1.08	0.36	2.73	0.9	-0.36
95.67	34.37	1.01	65.02	61.3	0.47	57.34	1.13	0.36	2.71	0.14	2.39
81.4	29.18	1.01	55.29	52.22	0.34	48.73	0.96	0.36	2.7	0.32	-2.44
96.02	34.76	1	65.39	61.26	0.48	57.77	1.14	0.36	2.68	-0.40	3.79
77.13	28.83	0.98	52.98	48.3	0.32	47.15	0.95	0.37	2.58	-2.71	3
77.81	28.15	1	52.98	49.65	0.31	46.8	0.93	0.36	2.67	-0.37	-1.98
97.33	35.81	0.99	66.57	61.51	0.5	59.03	1.18	0.37	2.64	-1.60	6.95
82.7	30.37	0.99	56.53	52.33	0.36	50.11	1	0.37	2.63	-1.44	1.89
67.89	25.05	0.99	46.47	42.85	0.24	41.24	0.82	0.37	2.6	-1.78	-1.79
4.39	2.1	0.02	3.19	2.58	0.04	3.01	0.08	0.01	0.07		
Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
75.68	27.46	1.01	51.57	48.22	0.3	45.58	0.75	0.36	1.27	-2.25	-2.66
79.08	28.79	1.01	53.94	50.3	0.33	47.71	0.56	0.36	1.33	-1.86	-3.35
81.57	29.65	1.01	55.61	51.92	0.35	49.18	0.81	0.36	1.37	-2.05	-1.76
92.32	33.49	1.01	62.91	58.83	0.44	55.6	0.91	0.36	1.54	-2.36	-0.27

58.23

49.37

58.59

46.86

47.27

59.71

49.9

41.1

2.81

0.97

0.82

0.97

0.78

0.78

1

0.82

0.68

0.19

0.37

0.37

0.37

0.37

0.37

0.38

0.36

0.36

0.01

1.54

1.35

1.54

1.26

1.28

1.55

1.39

1.1

0.09

0.6

-0.17

0.82

0.28

0.26

1.84

-2.02

-2.01

2.68

-0.36

2.95

-0.56

-0.54

4.07

-1.54

-3.20

Table 8. Cont.

2018 Genotype	Y <sub>p</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Y <sub>s</sub> (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	SSI	MP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	TOL (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	STI	GMP (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	YI	YSI	β	FA1 + FA2	STS
HHVBC	75.67	26.47	1	51.07	49.2	0.29	44.75	0.9	0.35	2.76	-1.51	-0.98
IP22269	79.07	27.36	1.01	53.22	51.72	0.31	46.51	0.93	0.35	2.79	-2.84	-0.80
HYB-1	81.56	27.96	1.01	54.76	53.61	0.33	47.75	0.95	0.34	2.82	-3.97	-2.39
HYB-2	91.94	32.44	1	62.19	59.5	0.43	54.62	1.1	0.35	2.75	-1.18	4.38
IP13150	95.11	33.59	1	64.35	61.52	0.46	56.52	1.14	0.35	2.75	-1.18	5.51
ICM-05222	80.87	28.28	1	54.57	52.59	0.33	47.82	0.96	0.35	2.76	-1.70	-1.02
IP13151	94.47	33.48	0.99	64.88	61.83	0.46	57.04	1.15	0.35	2.74	-0.78	5.08
S35	76.7	27.38	0.99	52.04	49.31	0.3	45.83	0.93	0.36	2.7	0.78	0.64
ICS-112	78.11	27.85	0.99	52.98	50.25	0.31	46.64	0.95	0.36	2.71	0.57	0.26
SPEEDFEED	98	34.4	0.8	66.2	63.6	0.48	58.07	1.17	0.35	2.77	-1.95	5.74
ICS-14001	83.25	29.51	0.99	56.38	53.75	0.35	49.56	1	0.35	2.73	-0.36	1.91
PEGAH	68.05	24.11	0.99	46.08	43.95	0.23	40.5	0.82	0.35	2.71	0.41	-4.01
LSD	4.78	1.91	0.01	3.3	3.07	0.04	2.98	0.06	0.01	0.07		

Based on the first two factors (FA1 + FA2), for example, in Kerman, in the three consecutive crop years, the ICSV-112 genotype with a score of 7.71 in the first year, and a score of 4.20 in the second year was the most resistant genotype, respectively. However, in the third year, the highest FA score was for S35 genotype of pearl millet with the value of 0.86, which was contradictory to previous result, which introduced the IP13151 genotype as the highest potential yield. In Jiroft, genotypes IP13150 (15.96), HHVBC (1.64), and ICSV-112 (1.07) were also, respectively, introduced based on FA rankings. This result was contradictory to the previous result. HYB-2 (0.90), speed feed (1.84), and S35 (0.78) genotypes were also introduced as the drought tolerant genotypes in Bardsir for three consecutive years, respectively.

The other statistical multivariate method that can use all the indices simultaneously, is the STS method; it is very easy to use and is calculated according to Equation (9). It is observed from the STS result (Table 8), in Kerman, that the STS scores were 4.60, 8.72, and 6.53 for the IP13151 genotype in the three consecutive crop years, respectively, that was introduced similar to results previously obtained based on the indices. Furthermore, in Jiroft, the obtained STS results of IP13150 genotype, with the sores 8.86, 3.36, and 4.90, respectively, were presented as the genotype with an acceptable yield in these climatic conditions under drought stress conditions. In Bardsir, the highest STS scores were related to the speed feed genotype of sorghum that were 6.95, 4.07, and 5.74, respectively. STS biplot graphs indicating the resistant genotypes in each region and year are presented in Figure 2.



Figure 2. Bi-plot based on the stress tolerance score (STS) in genotypes pearl millet and sorghum in three years. (a) 2016, (b) 2017, and (c) 2018.

#### 5. Conclusions

The multivariate statistics such as FA and STS that simultaneously applies all drought tolerance/susceptibility indices can be helpful for selecting drought tolerant genotypes. The multivariate STS method is a simpler, more understandable, and more efficient method than the FA method. Contrary to the FA method, STS could be employed to select and introduce the most tolerant and susceptible genotype even with a small number of genotypes. FA is a complex method and it usually leads to errors in selecting genotypes with a small number of genotypes. In this study, it was tried to select the most tolerant genotype to drought stress using STS in different climatic conditions and the results were compared with the results of the FA.

Finally, based on the new stress tolerance score (STS) method, the best genotype was identified, hence this method can be recommended to use by other researchers.

**Author Contributions:** Collected the data and wrote the first draft of manuscript, M.N.; Planned, supervised the project and reviewed the final manuscript, E.T.-N. and G.K.-N.; Provided the plant materials, selected the experimental locations and genetic consultant, B.N.; Conduct data analysis, G.M.-N.

**Acknowledgments:** We appreciate the support of Research and Technology Institute of Plant Production (RTIPP), Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran. Special thanks to Sonia Aghighi for editing the paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### References

- 1. Blum, A. Drought resistance-is it really a complex trait? Funct. Plant Biol. 2011, 38, 753–757. [CrossRef]
- 2. Yadav, O.; Bhatnagar, S. Evaluation of indices for identification of pearl millet cultivars adapted to stress and non-stress conditions. *Field Crop. Res.* **2001**, *70*, 201–208. [CrossRef]
- 3. Zegada-Lizarazu, W.; Iijima, M. Deep root water uptake ability and water use efficiency of pearl millet in comparison to other millet species. *Plant Prod. Sci.* 2005, *8*, 454–460. [CrossRef]
- 4. Diouf, O.; Brou, Y. Response of pearl millet to nitrogen as affected by water deficit. *Agronomie* **2004**, *24*, 77–84. [CrossRef]
- 5. Gholamhoseini, M.; Aghaalikhani, M.; Malakouti, M. Effect of natural zeolite and nitrogen rates on canola forage quality and quantity. *J. Sci. Technol. Agric. Nat. Resour.* **2008**, *12*, 537–548.
- Bidinger, F.; Mahalakshmi, V.; Rao, G.D.P. Assessment of drought resistance in pearl millet (*Pennisetum americanum* (L.) Leeke). II. Estimation of genotype response to stress. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* 1987, 38, 49–59. [CrossRef]
- 7. Mahalakshmi, V.; Bidinger, F. Water deficit during panicle development in pearl millet: Yield compensation by tillers. *J. Agric. Sci.* **1986**, *106*, 113–119. [CrossRef]
- 8. Bruck, H.; Payne, V.; Sattelmacher, B. Effects of phosphorus and water supply on yield, transpirational water-use efficiency, and carbon isotope discrimination of pearl millet. *Crop Sci.* 2000, 40, 120–125. [CrossRef]
- 9. Rosielle, A.; Hamblin, J. Theoretical aspects of selection for yield in stress and non-stress environment 1. *Crop Sci.* **1981**, *21*, 943–946. [CrossRef]
- 10. Fernandez, G.C. Effective selection criteria for assessing plant stress tolerance. In Proceedings of the International Symposium on Adaptation of Vegetables and other Food Crops in Temperature and Water Stress, Shanhua, Taiwan, 13–16 August 1992.
- 11. Fischer, R.; Maurer, R. Drought resistance in spring wheat cultivars. I. Grain yield responses. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* **1978**, *29*, 897–912. [CrossRef]
- 12. Bouslama, M.; Schapaugh, W.T. Evaluation of three screening techniques for heat and drought tolerance. *Crop Sci.* **1984**, *24*, 933–937. [CrossRef]
- Gavuzzi, P.; Rizza, F.; Palumbo, M.; Campanile, R.G.; Ricciardi, G.L.; Borghi, B. Evaluation of field and laboratory predictors of drought and heat tolerance in winter cereals. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 1997, 77, 523–531. [CrossRef]
- Ouk, M.; Basnayake, J.; Tsubo, M.; Fukai, S.; Fischer, K.S.; Cooper, M.; Nesbitt, H. Use of drought response index for identification of drought tolerant genotypes in rainfed lowland rice. *Field Crop. Res.* 2006, 99, 48–58. [CrossRef]

- Hao, Z.F.; Li, X.H.; Su, Z.J.; Xie, C.X.; Li, M.S.; Liang, X.L.; Weng, J.F.; Zhang, D.G.; Li, L.; Zhang, S.H. A proposed selection criterion for drought resistance across multiple environments in maize. *Breed. Sci.* 2011, 61, 101–108. [CrossRef]
- 16. Gholamin, R.; Zaeifizadeh, M.; Khayatnzhad, M. Factoranalysis for performance and other characteristics in durum wheat under drought stress and without stress. *Middle East J. Sci. Res.* **2010**, *6*, 599–603.
- Abdolshahi, R.; Safarian, A.; Nazari, M.; Pourseyedi, S.; Mohamadi-Nejad, G. Screening drought-tolerant genotypes in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) using different multivariate methods. *Arch. Agron. Soil Sci.* 2013, 59, 685–704. [CrossRef]
- 18. Dadbakhsh, A.; Yazdan-Sepas, A. Evaluation of drought tolerance indices for screening bread wheat genotypes in end-season drought stress conditions. *Adv. Environ. Biol.* **2011**, *5*, 1040–1045.
- 19. Mardeh, A.S.S.; Ahmadi, A.; Poustini, K.; Mohammadi, V. Evaluation of drought resistance indices under various environmental conditions. *Field Crop. Res.* **2006**, *98*, 222–229. [CrossRef]
- 20. Lker, E.; Tatar, Ö.; Tonk, F.A.; Tosun, M. Determination of tolerance level of some wheat genotypes to post-anthesis drought. *Turk. J. Field Crop.* **2011**, *16*, 59–63.
- 21. Jafari, A.; Paknejad, F.; Jami, A.-A. Evaluation of selection indices for drought tolerance of corn (*Zea mays* L.) hybrids. *Int. J. Plant Prod.* **2012**, *3*, 33–38.



© 2019 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).