Egypt. J. Plant Breed. 23(8):1769–1787(2019) MORPHOLOGICAL AND ANATOMICAL STUDIES ON SOME KENAF GENOTYPES IN RELATION TO YIELD G.H. EL-Shimy, Doaa I. Mahmoud and Maysa S. Abd AL-Sadek

Fiber Crops Res. Dep., field Crops Res. Inst., A.R.C., Giza

ABSTRACT

Four field experiments i.e., two in Giza Agric. Res. Stat. (clay loam soil) and two in Ismailia Agric. Res. Stat. (sandy soil), were carried out during 2018 and 2019 seasons to evaluate eleven kenaf genotypes in relation to yield, yield components, correlation and anatomical manifestation studies in stems. Results obtained Data indicated that either stalk or seed yield ad their components were significantly differed in both Giza and Ismailia experiments at the two studied seasons. The kenaf S.24 recorded maximum estimates, approximately, in all characters for the combined analysis across the two seasons in Giza and Ismailia locations. But the kenaf variety Tianung gave the lowest estimates in this case. Besides, correlation coefficient (r) values were highly significant and positive between total length and each of technical stem length, stalk yield/plant as well as per fad., fiber yield/plant as well as per fad., no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/faddan. Moreover, the r values were highly significantly positive between no. of capsules/plant and each of no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/faddan. In addition anatomical study for kenaf stems revealed that S.24 achieved highest estimates of total cross section area, cortex area, fiber area and xylem area. Meanwhile, the kenaf variety Giza 3 occupied second position. In addition, I.10 ranked third in this case. On the other hand, Tianung was also the latest genotype in major economic anatomical manifestations for both Giza and Ismailia experiments.

Key Words: Kenaf (Hibiscus cannabinus), Yield, Comparative, Correlation, Stem anatomy.

INTRODUCTION

Kenaf is a part of Malvaceae family. It has a various names such as mesta (Bengal, India), Polongi (Madras), deccan hemp (Bombay, India), ambali (Taiwan), teel (Egypt and Northern Africa), Java jute (Indonesia) and rama (West Africa) According to Dempsey (1975), LeMahieu *et al* (2003) and Hossan *et al* (2012).

The main uses of kenaf fibers have been rope, twine, coarse cloth, paper and animal bedding and feed. In addition to kenaf seed oil which used for cosmetics, industrial lubricants, bio – fuel production and linoleic acid (omega 6) (Charles 2002, Bitzer *et al* 2000 and Faruq *et al* 2013).

In recent time, kenaf crop take great attention to increase its productivity from fibers and seeds through release new varieties characterize by high yielding ability to cover the local requirements and to reduce the importation of jute fibers from foreign countries. Gauch and Zobel (1997) indicated that successful genotypes need to possess high performance for yield and other essential agronomics.

Therefore, the aim of the present investigation is to evaluate some kenaf genotypes concerning yield, yield components and relation to yield. Moreover, study the anatomy of kenaf stems at two locations. Giza (clay loam soil) and Ismailia (sandy soil).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Kenaf seeds of eleven genotypes i.e., Giza 3, Copa, Tianung, I.10, I.12, I.13, I.14, I.36, S.11, S.13 and S.24 were sown in Agricultural Research Center (A.R.C.), on 5th May 2018 and 3rd May 2019 in Giza location, in addition to 2^{nd} May 2018 and 4th May 2019 in Ismailia location. Each location carried out in the two successive seasons (2018 and 2019) statistical analysis of each location separately and for the same kenaf genotypes mentioned before, because the soil texture differed in the two sites (clay loam in Giza and sandy in Ismailia). The experimental design was a randomized complete block in four replications; The plot size was 3 meters long x 2 meters width (four ridges/plot). Kenaf genotypes seeds were sown in hills 20 cm apart within each ridge. The plants were thinned out to two plants/hill when seedling reached 15 cm height. Normal agricultural practices for kenaf production as recommended were followed Tables (1 and 2).

At harvest time, ten guarded plants were taken at random from each plot to estimate kenaf yield components. In addition, two plants were chosen from each plot at only second season concerning each location to study anatomical stem characters. Stalks, fiber and seed yields/faddan (fad. = $4200m^2$) were calculated on plot area basis.

Genotypes	Pedigree
Giza 3	Local cultivar Land race
Сора	Gregg X Doling
Tianung	Endora X Hibiscus sp.b
I. 10	Introduced from Nigeria
I. 12	Introduced from Nigeria
I.13	Introduced from Nigeria
I.14	Introduced from Nigeria
I.36	Introduced from Nigeria
S.11	Giza 3 X I.13
S . 13	S.16/63 x S.4/59/3
S.24	Giza 3 X I. 10

Table 1. Pedigree of the eleven kenaf genotypes.

experimental sites at Giza and Ismailia.	Ta	able	2.	Soil	physical	and c	hemical	analysis	upper	30	cm	of
				expe	rimental s	sites at G	iza and	Ismailia.				

Variables	2018	2019	2018	2019
Soil physical analysis	Gi	za	Isma	ilia
Coarse sand%	3.56	3.51	63.19	60.75
Fine sand%	17.04	17.12	35.14	36.29
Silt%	26.21	26.13	7.03	6.84
clay%	51.87	54.05	8.49	8.65
Soil type	clay	clay	Sandy	Sandy
	Chemic	al analysis		
pH value in 1:5	8.00	8.04	8.89	8.45
EC (mhos/cm)	3.81	3.87	0.13	0.15
Available N (ppm)	40.49	40.43	7.10	7.12
Available P (ppm)	6.25	6.22	2.14	2.16
Available K (ppm)	190	187	37.34	39.50
CO ₃ (meq/100g soil)	-	-	-	-
HCO ₃ (meq/100gsoil)	2.12	2.08	0.19	0.40
Cl (meq/100g soil)	9.14	9.12	0.25	0.34
SO ₄ (meq/100g soil)	11.34	11.28	0.12	0.17
Ca ⁺⁺ (meq/100g soil)	6.87	6.81	0.21	0.23
Mg ⁺⁺ (meq/100g soil)	4.40	4.44	0.14	0.21
Na ⁺⁺ (meq/100g soil)	11.02	11.07	0.20	0.32
K ⁺ (meq/100g soil)	49	47	0.14	0.16
Fe (meq/100g soil)	3.59	3.63	6.50	6.24

1. Yield and yield component characters

The following characters were recorded

Total length (m), technical stem length (m), fruiting zone length (m), stalk weight/plant (g), stalks yield/fad. (ton), fiber yield/plant (g), fiber yield/fad. (kg), number of capsules/plant, number of seeds/capsule, seed yield/plant (g) and seed yield/fad. (kg)

Statistical analysis

Analysis of variance was done according to Senedecor and Cochran (2014) and mean values were compared by least significant differences (L.S.D at 0.05). Homogeneity of the error was done according to Bartlett's test, by Snedecor *et al* (1989). Therefore, combined analysis was performed for each character across the two seasons in relation to each location as described by Le Clerg and Adams (1966).

Correlation coefficient study

The relationship among kenaf characters as average of the two seasons for each location were used to determine simple correlation coefficient values (r).

Anatomical study

At full maturity of kenaf plants when standing in the field, specimens had taken from the middle region of technical stem length, after killing (in killing solution) and fixing these samples for 36 hours by using formalin, Acetic acid and Alcohol (F.A.A. Solution). Paraffin wax method was used to obtain cross sections from kenaf stems, which microtomed at 25 microns by using sliding microtome. The slides were smeared with mayer albumen solution before mounting the ribbon of transverse sections which stained in 0.5% saffranin solution to make nucleus and lignified tissues with red colour. Moreover, these sections were stained after this with 1% light green dissolved in clove oil which gave the cytoplasm and cell wall green in colour.

Stem anatomical characters

Total cross section area (mm^2) , cortex area (mm^2) , fiber area (mm^2) , xylem area (mm^2) and pith area (mm^2) .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Yield and yield components Giza location:

Mean values of twelve kenaf characters for eleven genotypes in Giza location as the combined analysis across the two successive seasons of 2018 and 2019 are presented in Table (3).

Results obtained showed significant differences within each of the twelve characters concerning all the eleven kenaf genotypes. Data revealed that the kenaf Strain 24 ranked first in the most traits under study such as total length (3.84m), fruiting zone length (1.44 m), stalk weight/plant (188.98g), stalks yield/fad. (18.19 ton), fiber yield/plant (8.33g), fiber yield/fad. (699.300 kg), no. of capsules/plant (38.09), no. of seeds/capsule (18.34), no. of seeds/plant (697.62), seed yield/plant (16.81g) and seed yield/fad. (707.66 kg).

Genotypes	Total length	Technical stem length	Fruiting zone length	Stalk weight/plant	Stalk weight/fad.	Fiber yield/plant
	(111)	(m)	(m)	(g)	(ton)	(g)
Giza 3	3.27	2.30	0.97	172.05	17.04	7.60
сора	3.23	2.36	0.87	154.58	13.06	6.18
Tianung	3.02	2.34	0.68	147.63	12.49	5.75
I.10	3.41	2.45	0.96	158.90	13.40	6.67
I.12	3.15	2.15	1.00	139.48	11.72	5.78
I.13	3.30	2.59	0.71	152.51	12.82	6.32
I.14	3.17	2.33	0.84	150.96	12.70	6.19
I.36	2.87	1.93	0.94	140.45	11.79	5.85
S.11	3.07	2.29	0.78	146.55	12.32	5.92
S.13	3.22	2.17	1.05	159.11	13.39	6.57
S.24	3.84	2.40	1.44	188.98	18.19	8.33
General mean	3.23	2.30	0.93	155.56	13.27	6.47
C.V.%	7.71	7.52	22.21	9.26	12.45	12.61
L.S.D. 0.05	0.13	0.21	0.14	5.95	0.50	0.11
	Fiber	Number of	Number of	Number of	Seed	Seed
Genotypes	yield/fad.	cansules/nlant	seeds/	seeds/nlant	yield/plant	yield/fad.
	(kg)	capsuics/plant	capsule	seeus, prant	(g)	(kg)
Giza 3	636.30	32.96	15.13	502.11	12.28	517.99
сора	519.13	28.10	13.55	389.02	9.34	392.76
Tianung	481.74	19.28	13.46	256.61	6.17	260.80
I.10	556.50	29.38	11.38	334.63	8.10	342.39
I.12	485.09	18.74	13.03	244.73	5.91	249.08
I.13	529.68	33.47	13.20	414.93	10.85	455.70
I.14	520.80	38.31	13.13	502.54	12.05	508.27
I.36	494.70	32.10	11.96	384.96	9.24	388.87
S.11	497.28	33.64	11.01	370.06	8.92	376.92
S.13	551.45	33.10	16.40	543.28	13.13	552.30
S.24	699.30	38.09	18.34	697.62	16.81	707.66
General mean	542.91	30.65	13.69	421.59	10.25	432.07
C.V.%	12.54	21.23	15.94	31.33	31.28	32.18
L.S.D. 0.05	8.19	0.14	0.32	22.58	0.52	26.74

Table 3. Mean values of twelve kenaf characters for eleven genotypes inGiza location (combined analysis of 2018 and 2019 seasons).

Moreover, it ranked third in relation to the technical stem length (2.40 m). On the other hand, the kenaf variety Tianung was the lowest in fruiting zone length (0.68 m), fiber yield/plant (5.75 g) and fiber yield/fad. (481.74 kg).while I.12 was lowest in stalk weight/plant (139.48 g), stalk

yield/fad. (11.72 ton) and most of the economic seed traits. The introduced entry 36 was shorter in total length (2.87 m) and technical stem length (1.93 m). The remain kenaf genotypes take an intermediate position between the highest genotype (S. 24) and the lowest one (either Tianung, I.12 or I.36). The total length ranged from 2.87m for I.36 to 3.84 m (S.24), technical stem length ranged from 1.93 m (I.36) to 2.59 m (I.13), fruiting zone length ranged from 0.68 m (Tianung) to 1.44 m (S.24), stalk weight/plant ranged from 139.489 g (I.12) to 188.98 g (S.24), stalks yield/fad. ranged from 11.72 ton (I.12) to 17.04 ton (Giza 3), fiber yield/plant from 5.85 g (Tianung) to 8.33 g (S.24), fiber yield/fad. ranged from 18.74 kg (Tianung) to 699.30 kg(S.24), no. of capsules/ plant ranged from 18.74 (I.12) to 38.69 (S.24), no. of seeds/capsule which ranged from 11.01(S.11) to 18.34 (S.24), no. of seeds/plant ranged from 244.93 (I.12) to 697.62 (S.24), seed yield/plant ranged from 5.91g (I.12) to 16.81g (S.24) and finally the seed yield/fad. Which ranged from 249.08 kg (I.12) to 707.66 kg for S.24.

The general means which recorded in Giza location were 3.23 m, 2.30 m, 0.93 m, 155.56 g, 13.27 ton, 6.47 g, 542.91 kg, 30.65, 13.69, 421.59, 10.25 g and 432.07 kg for total length, technical stem length, fruiting zone length, stalk weight/plant, stalk yield/fad., fiber yield/plant, fiber yield/fad., no. of capsules/plant, no. of seeds/capsule, no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad., respectively. These results are consistent with those reported by Cheng (2004), Ogunkanmi *et al* (2010), Coetice *et al* (2013) and Faruq *et al* (2013). They reported high variation among kenaf genotypes.

The coefficient of variation (C.V.%) illustrated that the fruiting zone length, no. of capsules/plant, no. of seeds/capsule, no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. revealed high estimates. Besides, the three traits i.e., stalks yield/fad. fiber yield/plant and fiber yield/fad. showed very high coefficient of variation.

A- Ismailia location:

Mean values of the twelve kenaf characters for the eleven genotypes in Ismailia location for the combined analysis across the two successive seasons of 2018 and 2019 are presented in Table (4).

Genotypes Total length (m) Technical stem length (m) Fruiting zone length (m) Stalk weight/plant (m) Kalk weight/plant (m) Fiber yield/plant (m) Giza 3 2.52 1.23 1.29 136.57 11.47 5.61 copa 2.44 1.20 1.25 93.94 7.89 3.80 Tianung 2.39 1.15 1.24 86.31 7.25 3.32 1.10 2.45 1.32 1.13 143.51 12.15 5.81 1.12 2.84 1.94 0.90 88.87 7.47 3.56 1.13 2.45 1.22 1.23 82.95 6.97 3.35 1.14 2.53 1.49 1.04 105.28 8.84 4.29 1.36 2.39 1.11 1.28 104.98 8.82 4.35 S.11 2.54 1.26 1.27 128.33 10.54 5.14 S.3 2.85 1.62 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75							
Genotypes Horning (m) stem length (m) zone length (m) weight/plant (ton) weight/fad. (ton) (g) Giza 3 2.52 1.23 1.29 136.57 11.47 5.61 copa 2.44 1.20 1.25 93.94 7.89 3.30 Tianung 2.39 1.15 1.24 86.31 7.25 3.32 1.10 2.45 1.32 1.13 143.51 12.15 5.81 1.12 2.84 1.94 0.90 88.87 7.47 3.56 1.13 2.45 1.22 1.23 82.95 6.97 3.35 1.14 2.53 1.49 1.04 105.28 8.84 4.29 1.36 2.39 1.11 1.28 104.98 8.82 4.35 S.11 2.54 1.26 1.27 128.33 10.54 5.14 S.13 2.85 1.62 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75 C.V.% 8.07	Genotypes	Total length	Technical	Fruiting	Stalk	Stalk	Fiber
Giza 3(n)(n)(n)(g)(ton)(g)Giza 32.521.231.29136.5711.475.61copa2.441.201.2593.947.893.80Tianung2.391.151.2486.317.253.321.102.451.321.13143.5112.155.811.122.841.940.9088.877.473.561.132.451.221.2382.956.973.351.142.531.491.04105.288.844.291.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43LS.D. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of seeds/plantNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/fad. (kg)Seed yield/fad. (kg)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38Copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.56 <td>(m)</td> <td>stem length</td> <td>zone length</td> <td>weight/plant</td> <td>weight/fad.</td> <td>yield/plant</td>		(m)	stem length	zone length	weight/plant	weight/fad.	yield/plant
Giza 32.521.231.29136.5711.475.61copa2.441.201.2593.947.893.80Tianung2.391.151.2486.317.253.32I.102.451.321.13143.5112.155.81I.122.841.940.9088.877.473.56I.132.451.221.2382.956.973.35I.142.531.491.04105.288.844.29I.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43L.S.D. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsule/plantNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/fad.Seed yield/fad.Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38Copa35.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung28.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.05262.91 <td></td> <td>. ,</td> <td>(m)</td> <td>(m)</td> <td>(g)</td> <td>(ton)</td> <td>(g)</td>		. ,	(m)	(m)	(g)	(ton)	(g)
copa2.441.201.2593.947.893.80Tianung2.391.151.2486.317.253.32I.102.451.321.13143.5112.155.81I.122.841.940.9088.877.473.56I.132.451.221.2382.956.973.35I.142.531.141.04105.288.844.291.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43L.S.D. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsule/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of 	Giza 3	2.52	1.23	1.29	136.57	11.47	5.61
Tianung2.391.151.2486.317.253.32I.102.451.321.13143.5112.155.81I.122.841.940.9088.877.473.56I.132.451.221.2382.956.973.35I.142.531.491.04105.288.844.29I.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43LSD. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/plantNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/fad. (kg)246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.011.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.	copa	2.44	1.20	1.25	93.94	7.89	3.80
1.102.451.321.13143.5112.155.811.122.841.940.9088.877.473.561.132.451.221.2382.956.973.351.142.531.491.04105.288.844.291.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43LS.D.0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/fad. (g)240.38Giza 3470.0619.6911.09235.395.69240.38Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.021.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31256.261.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.701.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.321.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.701.363	Tianung	2.39	1.15	1.24	86.31	7.25	3.32
1.12 2.84 1.94 0.90 88.87 7.47 3.56 1.13 2.45 1.22 1.23 82.95 6.97 3.35 1.14 2.53 1.49 1.04 105.28 8.84 4.29 1.36 2.39 1.11 1.28 104.98 8.82 4.35 $S.11$ 2.54 1.26 1.27 128.33 10.54 5.14 $S.13$ 2.85 1.62 1.24 138.88 11.67 5.83 $S.24$ 2.98 1.28 1.70 162.08 13.52 7.03 General mean 2.58 1.35 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75 $C.V.%$ 8.07 18.23 15.93 23.55 23.43 25.43 $LSD.0.05$ 0.24 0.10 0.12 3.16 0.26 0.15 $Genotypes$ $Fiber$ yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsule/plant $seeds/$ capsule $seeds/$ $seed$ $seed$ $Giza$ 470.06 19.69 11.90 235.39 5.69 240.38 $copa$ 358.89 23.92 10.25 246.05 5.92 248.80 11.10 481.80 25.21 10.02 252.49 6.09 256.26 1.12 300.11 16.92 10.58 180.56 4.36 183.01 1.13 296.87 25.23 10.45 262.91 6.31 264.96 1.14 359.11 30.50 12.08 368	I.10	2.45	1.32	1.13	143.51	12.15	5.81
I.13 2.45 1.22 1.23 82.95 6.97 3.35 $I.14$ 2.53 1.49 1.04 105.28 8.84 4.29 $I.36$ 2.39 1.11 1.28 104.98 8.82 4.35 $S.11$ 2.54 1.26 1.27 128.33 10.54 5.14 $S.13$ 2.85 1.62 1.24 138.88 11.67 5.83 $S.24$ 2.98 1.28 1.70 162.08 13.52 7.03 General mean 2.58 1.35 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75 $C.V.%$ 8.07 18.23 15.93 23.55 23.43 25.43 $LS.D.0.05$ 0.24 0.10 0.12 3.16 0.26 0.15 GenotypesFiber yiel/fad.(kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/ (eg)Number of seeds/lant (g) 235.39 5.69 240.38 Copa 358.89 23.92 10.25 246.05 5.92 248.80 Tianung 283.58 16.67 9.85 165.56 4.01 168.02 $I.10$ 481.80 25.21 10.02 252.49 6.09 256.26 $I.12$ 300.11 16.92 10.58 180.56 4.36 183.01 $I.14$ 359.11 30.50 12.08 368.01 8.82 371.70 $I.36$ 364.09 28.13 10.37 292.82 7.06	I.12	2.84	1.94	0.90	88.87	7.47	3.56
I.142.531.491.04105.288.844.29I.362.391.111.28104.988.824.35S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43L.S.D. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsule/plantNumber of capsule/splantNumber of capsuleSeed yield/fad. (g)Seed yield/fad. (g)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38Copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61	I.13	2.45	1.22	1.23	82.95	6.97	3.35
I.36 2.39 $I.11$ $I.28$ $I04.98$ 8.82 4.35 S.11 2.54 $I.26$ $I.27$ $I28.33$ $I0.54$ 5.14 S.13 2.85 $I.62$ $I.24$ $I38.88$ $I1.67$ 5.83 S.24 2.98 $I.28$ $I.70$ $I62.08$ $I3.52$ 7.03 General mean 2.58 $I.35$ $I.23$ $I15.61$ 9.69 4.75 C.V.% 8.07 $I8.23$ $I5.93$ 23.55 23.43 25.43 L.S.D. 0.05 0.24 0.10 0.12 3.16 0.26 0.15 GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/ capsuleSeed yield/plant (g) (kg) Giza 3 470.06 19.69 11.90 235.39 5.69 240.38 copa 358.89 23.92 10.25 246.05 5.92 248.80 Tianung 283.58 16.67 9.85 165.56 4.01 168.02 I.10 481.80 25.21 10.02 252.49 6.09 256.26 I.12 300.11 16.92 10.58 180.56 4.36 183.01 I.13 296.87 25.23 10.45 262.91 6.31 264.96 I.14 359.11 30.50 12.08 368.01 8.82 371.70 I.36 364.09 28.13 10.37 292.82 7.06 296.32 S.11	I.14	2.53	1.49	1.04	105.28	8.84	4.29
S.112.541.261.27128.3310.545.14S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43L.S.D.0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/ capsuleSeedSeed yield/fad. (g)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.021.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.261.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.011.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.961.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.701.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.734	I.36	2.39	1.11	1.28	104.98	8.82	4.35
S.132.851.621.24138.8811.675.83S.242.981.281.70162.0813.527.03General mean2.581.351.23115.619.694.75C.V.%8.0718.2315.9323.5523.4325.43L.S.D. 0.050.240.100.123.160.260.15GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/plant (g)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65	S.11	2.54	1.26	1.27	128.33	10.54	5.14
S.24 2.98 1.28 1.70 162.08 13.52 7.03 General mean 2.58 1.35 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75 $C.V.%$ 8.07 18.23 15.93 23.55 23.43 25.43 $L.S.D.0.05$ 0.24 0.10 0.12 3.16 0.26 0.15 GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/plant (g)Giza 3 470.06 19.69 11.90 235.39 5.69 240.38 copa 358.89 23.92 10.25 246.05 5.92 248.80 Tianung 283.58 16.67 9.85 165.56 4.01 168.02 I.10 481.80 25.21 10.02 252.49 6.09 256.26 I.12 300.11 16.92 10.58 180.56 4.36 183.01 I.13 296.87 25.23 10.45 262.91 6.31 264.96 I.14 359.11 30.50 12.08 368.01 8.82 371.70 I.36 364.09 28.13 10.37 292.82 7.06 296.32 S.11 429.67 25.02 9.73 243.28 5.84 243.61 S.13 488.03 24.84 11.04 252.27 6.07 256.19 S.24 591.97 32.64 13.83 450.67 10.73 447.92 General mean <td>S.13</td> <td>2.85</td> <td>1.62</td> <td>1.24</td> <td>138.88</td> <td>11.67</td> <td>5.83</td>	S.13	2.85	1.62	1.24	138.88	11.67	5.83
General mean 2.58 1.35 1.23 115.61 9.69 4.75 C.V.% 8.07 18.23 15.93 23.55 23.43 25.43 L.S.D. 0.05 0.24 0.10 0.12 3.16 0.26 0.15 GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/plant (g)Giza 3 470.06 19.69 11.90 235.39 5.69 240.38 copa 358.89 23.92 10.25 246.05 5.92 248.80 Tianung 283.58 16.67 9.85 165.56 4.01 168.02 I.10 481.80 25.21 10.02 252.49 6.09 256.26 I.12 300.11 16.92 10.58 180.56 4.36 183.01 I.13 296.87 25.23 10.45 262.91 6.31 264.96 I.14 359.11 30.50 12.08 368.01 8.82 371.70 I.36 364.09 28.13 10.37 292.82 7.06 296.32 S.11 429.67 25.02 9.73 243.28 5.84 243.61 S.13 488.03 24.44 11.04 252.27 6.07 256.19 S.24 591.97 32.64 13.83 450.67 10.73 447.92 General mean 402.20 24.43 10.92 268.18 6.45 270.65 C.V.% <td>S.24</td> <td>2.98</td> <td>1.28</td> <td>1.70</td> <td>162.08</td> <td>13.52</td> <td>7.03</td>	S.24	2.98	1.28	1.70	162.08	13.52	7.03
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	General mean	2.58	1.35	1.23	115.61	9.69	4.75
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	C.V.%	8.07	18.23	15.93	23.55	23.43	25.43
GenotypesFiber yield/fad. (kg)Number of capsules/plantNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/ capsuleNumber of seeds/plantSeed yield/fad. (g)Seed yield/fad. (kg)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35	L.S.D. 0.05	0.24	0.10	0.12	3.16	0.26	0.15
GenotypesHote vield/fad. (kg)rumber of capsules/plantseeds/ capsulerumber of seeds/plantyield/plantyield/fad. (kg)Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35		Fiber	Number of	Number of	Number of	Seed	Seed
Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	Genotypes	vield/fad. (kg)	capsules/plant	seeds/	seeds/plant	yield/plant	yield/fad.
Giza 3470.0619.6911.90235.395.69240.38copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94		450.04	10.60	capsule	225.20	(g)	(kg)
copa358.8923.9210.25246.055.92248.80Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	Giza 3	470.06	19.69	11.90	235.39	5.69	240.38
Tianung283.5816.679.85165.564.01168.02I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	copa	358.89	23.92	10.25	246.05	5.92	248.80
I.10481.8025.2110.02252.496.09256.26I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	Tianung	283.58	16.67	9.85	165.56	4.01	168.02
I.12300.1116.9210.58180.564.36183.01I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	I.10	481.80	25.21	10.02	252.49	6.09	256.26
I.13296.8725.2310.45262.916.31264.96I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	I.12	300.11	16.92	10.58	180.56	4.36	183.01
I.14359.1130.5012.08368.018.82371.70I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	I.13	296.87	25.23	10.45	262.91	6.31	264.96
I.36364.0928.1310.37292.827.06296.32S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	I.14	359.11	30.50	12.08	368.01	8.82	371.70
S.11429.6725.029.73243.285.84243.61S.13488.0324.8411.04252.276.07256.19S.24591.9732.6413.83450.6710.73447.92General mean402.2024.4310.92268.186.45270.65C.V.%24.3420.8311.3130.0229.4829.35L.S.D. 0.0511.290.210.1113.660.1512.94	I.36	364.09	28.13	10.37	292.82	7.06	296.32
S.13 488.03 24.84 11.04 252.27 6.07 256.19 S.24 591.97 32.64 13.83 450.67 10.73 447.92 General mean 402.20 24.43 10.92 268.18 6.45 270.65 C.V.% 24.34 20.83 11.31 30.02 29.48 29.35 L.S.D. 0.05 11.29 0.21 0.11 13.66 0.15 12.94	S.11	429.67	25.02	9.73	243.28	5.84	243.61
S.24 591.97 32.64 13.83 450.67 10.73 447.92 General mean 402.20 24.43 10.92 268.18 6.45 270.65 C.V.% 24.34 20.83 11.31 30.02 29.48 29.35 L.S.D. 0.05 11.29 0.21 0.11 13.66 0.15 12.94	S.13	488.03	24.84	11.04	252.27	6.07	256.19
General mean 402.20 24.43 10.92 268.18 6.45 270.65 C.V.% 24.34 20.83 11.31 30.02 29.48 29.35 L.S.D. 0.05 11.29 0.21 0.11 13.66 0.15 12.94	S.24	591.97	32.64	13.83	450.67	10.73	447.92
C.V.% 24.34 20.83 11.31 30.02 29.48 29.35 L.S.D. 0.05 11.29 0.21 0.11 13.66 0.15 12.94	General mean	402.20	24.43	10.92	268.18	6.45	270.65
L.S.D. 0.05 11.29 0.21 0.11 13.66 0.15 12.94	C.V.%	24.34	20.83	11.31	30.02	29.48	29.35
	L.S.D. 0.05	11.29	0.21	0.11	13.66	0.15	12.94

Table 4. Mean values of the twelve kenaf characters for the eleven
genotypes in Ismailia location (combined analysis of 2018 and
2019 seasons).

Data obtained indicated that kenaf genotypes significantly differed in all studied characters. The strain 24 recorded also the maximum estimates of

all traits for exception with technical stem length (1.28 m) which was the fifth site as the descending order among kenaf genotypes. Moreover, this strain (S.24) was the highest and also adapted to both soil types i.e., clay loam in Giza location and sandy soil in Ismailia. The mean values achieved by S.24 were 2.98 m for total length, fruiting zone length (1.70 m), stalk weight/plant (162.08), stalk yield/fad. (13.52 ton), fiber yield/plant (7.03 g), fiber yield/fad. (591.97 kg), no. of capsules/plant (32.64), no. of seeds/capsule (13.83), no. of seeds/plant (450.67), seed yield/plant (10.73 g) and seed yield/fad (447.92 kg).

On the other hand, the kenaf variety Tianung recorded lowest estimates in the majority of economic traits such as total length (2.39 m), fiber yield/plant (3.32 g), fiber yield/fad. (296.87 kg), no. of capsules/plant (16.67), no. of seeds/capsule (9.85), no. of seeds/plant (165.56), seed yield/plant (4.01 g) and seed yield/fad. (168.020 kg). The remain nine kenaf genotypes were intermediate between the highest estimates which achieved by S.24 and the lowest one by Tianung in this case. The general means for all twelve kenaf characters were 2.58 m, 1.35 m, 1.23 m, 115.61, 9.69 ton, 4.75 g, 402.20 kg, 24.43, 10.92, 268.18, 6.45 g and 270.65 kg. for total length, technical stem length, fruiting zone length, stalk weight/plant, stalk yield/fad., fiber yield/plant, fiber yield/fad., no. of capsules/plant, no. of seeds/capsule, no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad., respectively. The estimates of C.V. % for the same arrangement characters mentioned before were 8.07, 18.23, 15.93, 23.55, 23.43, 25.43, 24.34, 20.83, 11.31, 30.02, 29.48 and 29.35 %, respectively. The coefficient of variation previously mentioned reported high values in all kenaf traits except with total length which appeared to be relatively low. Several investigators recorded genotypes differences such as Zahana and El-Refaie (2013), Adeniyan et al (2014), Faruq et al (2015), Kamalu et al (2016), Ryu et al (2017) and Akinrotimi and Okocha (2018).

It is worth noting that the general means for all the studied characters of Giza site (clay loam soil) surpass and were higher than the means of the Ismailia location (sandy soil) due to the deficiency of many nutrients in the latter location.

Correlation coefficient study

Estimates of correlation coefficient values (r) among 12 kenaf characters for the eleven genotypes are presented in Table (5).

Table 5. Estimates of correlation coefficient values (r) among 11characters for 11 kenaf genotypes.

	Total length (m)	Technical stem length (m)	Fruiting zone length (m)	stalk weight/ plant (g)	Stalk yield/fad. (ton)	Fiber yield/ plant (g)	Fiber yield/ fad. (kg)	Number of capsules/ plant	Number of seeds/ plant	Seed yield/ plant (g)	Seed yield/ fad. (kg)
Total length (m)	1										
Technical stem length (m)	0.794**	1									
Fruiting zone length (m)	-0.162	-0.643**	1								
stalk weight/ plant (g)	0.598**	0.687**	-0.411**	1							
Stalk yield/Fad. (ton)	0.525**	0.626**	-0.408**	0.883**	1						
Fiber yield / plant (g)	0.458**	0.592**	-0.429**	0.869**	0.901**	1					
Fiber yield / Fad. (kg)	0.460**	0.603**	- 0.442**	0.855**	0.829**	0.848**	1				
Number of capsules / plant	-0.013	-0.009	0.129*	0.005	0.115	0.104	0.015	1			
Number of seeds / plant	0.137	0.204*	0.406**	0.189*	0.262*	0.202*	0.191*	0.845**	1		
Seed yield /plant (g)	0.271*	0.312**	0.284*	0.181*	0.057	0.013	0.090	0.126*	0.175*	1	
Seed yield / Fad. (kg)	0.347**	0.547**	0.437**	0.636**	0.586**	0.654**	0.691**	0.911**	0.325**	0.449**	1

1777

Results obtained indicated that total length was highly significantly and positively correlated with each of technical stem length, stalk weight/plant as well as per fad., fiber yield/plant as well as per fad., no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. The interrelationships between technical stem length and each of stalk weight/plant, stalk yield/fad., fiber yield/plant, fiber yield/fad., seed yield/plant as well as per fad. recorded highly significant and positive for exception with no. of seeds/plant which was only positively significant. The r values between fruiting zone length and each of no. of capsules/plant, no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. revealed highly significant and positive. The correlation coefficient values between stalk weight/plant among stalk yield/fad., fiber yield/plant as well as per fad., and seed yield/fad. were highly significant and positive, while it was only significant and positive with both no. of seeds/plant and seed yield/plant. The association between stalk yield/fad. and each of fiber yield/plant, fiber yield/fad., no. of seeds/plant and seed yield/fad. recorded highly significant and positive values.

Fiber yield/plant was positive and highly significant with fiber yield/fad. and seed yield/fad, but only significant and positive with no. of seeds/plant. Meanwhile, the r values of fiber yield/fad. and each of no. of seeds/plant as well as per fad. appeared to be highly significant and positive, while it was only significant and positive with no. of seeds/plant. The association was highly significantly positive correlated between number of capsules/plant and no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. the r values were highly significant and positive between number of seeds/capsule and each of no. of seeds/plant, seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. the r values were highly significant affected significantly correlated and positive with the both seed traits i.e., seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad., in addition to also between seed yield/plant and seed yield/fad. Similar results were observed by Bahtoee *et al* (2012).

It can be concluded that the r results in this investigation promote principal knowledge to kenaf breeders about the possibility for selecting genotypes having either tallest plants or more technical stem length

characters for giving and obtaining great fiber yield. Moreover, the more number of capsules/plant give indication for high seed production. **Anatomical study**

Estimates of different tissue areas per cross section at the middle region of kenaf genotypes stems were sown in Giza location are presented in Table (6) and plate (1).

Genotypes	Total cross section area (mm) ²	Cortex area (mm) ²	Fiber area (mm) ²	Xylem area (mm) ²	Pith area (mm) ²
Giza 3	142.05	4.26	20.94	67.98	48.87
сора	115.40	3.85	17.11	46.61	47.83
Tianung	104.72	3.96	15.60	43.50	41.66
I.10	123.24	3.98	18.35	50.37	50.54
I.12	107.80	3.42	15.98	45.08	43.32
I.13	117.16	3.86	17.35	49.22	46.73
I.14	113.96	3.75	17.27	48.75	44.19
I.36	107.82	2.88	16.01	47.84	41.09
S.11	110.24	3.72	16.58	43.60	46.34
S.13	121.66	3.87	18.05	45.85	53.89
S.24	153.86	4.57	29.14	75.94	44.21
General mean	119.81	3.83	18.40	51.34	46.24
C.V.%	12.76	11.27	20.96	20.61	8.41
L.S.D. 0.05	3.10	0.24	0.51	1.46	2.01

Table 6. Mean values of different tissue areas per cross section (c.s.) atthe middle region of kenaf genotypes stems for Giza location.

Plate 1. Giza location.



Fig. 1. Sector magnified for The fiber region of kenaf S.24 from Giza location.



Fig. 2. Cross section of kenaf S.24 stem from Giza location (greatest fiber production).



Fig. 3. Sector magnified for the fiber region of kenaf I.14 from Giza location.



Fig. 4. Cross section of kenaf I.14 stem from Giza location (intermediate fiber production).



Fig. 5. Sector magnified for the fiber region of kenaf Tianung from Giza location.





Data obtained illustrated that the kenaf strain 24 achieved the highest estimates of all tissue areas per cross section (c.s.) with total c.s. area 153.86 mm², cortex area (4.57 mm²), fiber area (29.14 mm²) and xylem area (75.94 mm²). Meanwhile, the kenaf variety Giza 3 ranked second position in this case, by means that its measurements in the previous characters arrangement in addition to pith area were 142.05, 4.26, 20.94, 67.98 and 48.87 mm², respectively. Moreover, the introduced kenaf no.10 occupied the third site in all cross section tissue areas which mentioned before as descending order. On the other hand, the variety Tianung gave the lowest estimates in total c.s. area (104.72 mm²), fiber area (15.60 mm²) and xylem area (43.50 mm²). The remain kenaf genotypes ranked intermediate between the highest and the fewest ones.

Results obtained from Table (7) and plate (2) deals with the Ismailia experiment for the same anatomical traits. Data showed that the S. 24 ranked first and achieved also the maximum estimates in all stem tissues such as total cross section area (94.85 mm²), cortex area (3.86 mm²), fiber area (16.30 mm²), xylem area (57.80 mm²) and pith area (16.89 mm²). While Giza 3 was the second in all c.s. tissues except with fiber area which occupied the forth position, in addition to Introduction 10 was in the third site in relation to fiber area (12.64 mm²). The kenaf variety Tianung recorded the minimum estimates for total c.s. area (44.85 mm²), cortex area (1.82 mm²), fiber area (10.20 mm²) and xylem area (27.45 mm²).

Data obtained revealed that, the total cross section area ranged from 44.85 to 94.85 mm², cortex area from 1.82 to 3.86 mm², fiber area from 10.20 to 16.30 mm², xylem area from 27.45 to 57.80 mm² and pith area from 4.54 mm² for I.13 to 16.89 mm² for S. 24.

Isma	Ismallia location.								
Genotypes	Total cross section area (mm) ²	Cortex area (mm) ²	Fiber area (mm) ²	Xylem area (mm) ²	Pith area (mm) ²				
Giza 3	78.73	2.36	12.60	47.50	16.27				
copa	51.40	1.97	10.82	31.42	7.19				
Tianung	44.85	1.82	10.20	27.45	5.38				
I.10	77.64	2.30	12.64	46.78	15.92				
I.12	45.62	2.00	10.46	28.16	5.00				
I.13	46.20	2.18	10.28	29.20	4.54				
I.14	57.98	2.15	11.27	35.45	9.11				
I.36	58.90	2.30	11.78	36.04	8.78				
S.11	69.35	2.23	12.15	41.52	13.45				
S.13	77.92	2.96	12.90	46.80	15.26				
S.24	94.85	3.86	16.30	57.80	16.89				
General mean	63.95	2.38	11.95	38.92	10.71				
C.V.%	26.24	24.07	14.64	25.42	45.92				
L.S.D. 0.05	5.23	0.12	0.56	3.89	1.27				

Table 7. Mean values of different tissue areas per cross section (c.s.) at
the middle region of kenaf genotypes stems were sown in
Ismailia location.

1782

Plate 2. Ismailia location



Fig. 7. Sector magnified for the fiber region of kenaf S.24 from Ismailia location.



Fig. 9. Sector magnified for the fiber region of kenaf I.14 from Ismailia location.



Fig. 8. Cross section of kenaf S.24 stem from Ismailia location (great fiber production).



Fig. 10. Cross section of kenaf I.14 stem from Ismailia location (intermediate fiber production).



Fig. 11. Sector magnified for the fiber region of kenaf Tianung from Ismailia location.



Fig. 12. Cross section of kenaf Tianung stem from Ismailia Location (lowest fiber production).

The coefficient of variation (C.V.%) estimates were high in all the five anatomical manifestation characters under study concerning Giza and Ismailia locations. These results were in agreement with those obtained by Voulgaridis *et al* (2000), H`ng *et al* (2009) and Abdul Khalil *et al* (2010).

Generally, it is clear that the grand means of Giza location was higher than Ismailia one in either yield and yield components or in anatomical studied characters. Moreover, that the kenaf strain 24 achieved maximum estimates in both soil types clay loam in Giza and sandy in Ismailia which enable kenaf growers to extent cultivation in new reclamation lands.

REFERENCES

- **Abdul Khalil, H.P.S,A.F. IreanaYusra, A.H. Bhat and M. Jawaid (2010).** Cell wall ultrastructure, anatomy, lignin distribution, and chemical composition of Malaysian cultivated kenaf fiber. Indust. Crops & Products. 31: (1), 113-121.
- Adeniyan, O. N., O. A. Aluko, S. O. Olanipekun, J. O. Olasoji, J. A. Adetumbi, C. O. Alake and M. O. Adenekan (2014). Genotype x environment interaction and stability analysis in kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinusL.*) for growth and yield performances in southwest Nigeria.J. Agric. Sci., (6) 8: 28-34.
- Akinrotimi, C.A. and P.I. Okocha (2018). evaluations of genetic divergence in Kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L.)genotypes using Agro-morphological characteristics. Journal of Plant Sciences and Agricultural Research. 2: 2-12.
- Bahtoee, A., K. Zargar and E. Baniani (2012). An investigation on fiber production of different Kenaf. J. World App. Sci., 16 (1): 63-66.
- Bitzer, M.J., C.G. Cook and B.S. Baldwin (2000). The development of kenaf varieties in United States. In: Proceedings of the International Kenaf Symposium, pp: 91–94. Hiroshima, Japan.
- Charles, L. (2002). Trends in New Crops and New Use.ASHS Press, Alexandria, VA, USA.
- Cheng, Z. (2004). Kenaf research, products and applications in Japan. Plant Fiber sand Products 23: 16-24.
- Coetice, L.F., N.P. Mark and N.I. Babby (2013). Kenaf an important crop. J. Plant Sci., 20: 112-126.
- Dempsey, J. M. (1975). Fiber crops. The University Presses of Florida, Gainesville, USA.
- Faruq, G., M. A. Alamgir, M. M. Rahman, M. R. Motior, H. P. Zakaria, B. Marchalina and N. A. Mohamed (2013). Morphological charecterization of kenaf (*Hibiscus Cannabinus* L.) In Malaysian tropical environment using multivariate analysis. J. Anim. Plant Sci., 23(1): 60-67.
- Faruq, G., M.M. Rahman, H. Zabed and A. Latif (2015). Assessment of genetic variation in different kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus*) genotypes using morphoagronomic traits and RAPD markers. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, 17: 507–514.
- Gauch, H. G. and R. W. Zobel (1997). Identifying mega-environments and targeting genotypes. Crop Sci., 37(2): 311-326.
- H ng, P.S., B.N. Khor, N. Tadashi, A.S.N. Aini and M.T. Paridah (2009). Anatomical structures and fiber morphology of new kenaf varieties. Asian J. Sci. Res., 2: 161-166.
- Hossan, M., M.M. Hanafi, H. Jol and A.H. Hazandy (2012). Growth, yield and fiber morphology of kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L) growth on sundybirs soil as Influenced by different levels of Carbon. African J Biotech 10:10087-10094.
- Kamalu, O. J., J. G. Titus and U. E. Udensi (2016). Preliminary investigation of the adaptation of some kenaf (*Hibiscus Cannabinus* L.) genotypes in the coastal plain sand of Niger delta. J. Agric. & Ecol. Res. Inte., 9(4): 1-7.

- Le Clergé, P. and G. Adams (1966). Histoire etsociologie de l'église, Paris, The American Historical Review 73(1): 146–147.
- LeMahieu, P. J., E. S. Oplinger and D. H. Putnam (2003). Kenaf. Alternative Field Crops Manual. Retrieved from. <u>http://www.corn.agronomy</u>. wisc.edu/FISC/Alternatives/Kenaf.htm.
- Ogunkanmi, W.O, O.O. Okunowo, B.O. Oyelakin, O.O. Oboh and K.O. Adesina (2010). Assessment of genetic relationships between two species of Jute plants using phenotypic and RAPD markers. Int. J. Bot., 6: 107-111.
- Ryu, J., S. J. Kwon, D. G. Kim, M. K. Lee, J. M. Kim, Y.D. Jo, S. H. Kim, S. W. Jeong, K. Y. Kang, S. W. Kim, J.-B. Kim, S.-Y.Kang, S. W. Jeong and K. Y. Kang (2017). Morphological characteristics, chemical and genetic diversity of kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L.) genotypes. J. Plant Biotechnol, 44:416-430.
- Snedecor, George W. and Cochran, William G. (1989), Statistical Methods, Eighth Edition, Iowa State University Press
- Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran (2014). Statistical Method. 8th Edition, New Delhi :Wiley Blackwell.
- Voulgaridis, E., C. Passialis and A. Grigoriou (2000). Anatomical characteristics and properties of kenaf stem (*Hibiscus cannabinu*.L). IAWA J. 21: 435-442.
- Zahana, E.A. and M.M. El-Refaie (2013). Variability and covariability of agronomic characteristics in 14 kenaf genotypes.Egypt. J. Agric. Res. 91(2): 629 639.

دراسات مورفولوجية وتشريحية لبعض التراكيب الوراثية في التيل وعلاقتها بالمحصول

جمال الدين حسن الشيمي, دعاء إسماعيل محمود و مايسة سعيد عبد الصادق قسم بحوث محاصيل الالياف – معهد بحوث المحاصيل الحقلية – مركز البحوث الزراعية

أجريت أربعه تجارب حقليه: اثنتان منها أقيمت بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بالجيزة (تربة طينية جيرية) واثنان أيضا تم اجراؤهما بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بالإسماعيلية (تربة رملية) وذلك خلال الموسمين الزراعيين دراسة الحمات التشريحية في الساق. ويمكن تلخيص النتائج المحصول، مكونات المحصول، الارتباط بين الصفات، فروق معنوية في محصولي الساق. ويمكن تلخيص النتائج المتحصل عليها كما يلي: أشارت النتائج الي وجود فروق معنوية في محصولي السوق والبذور والصفات المكونة لهما في كلا من تجارب الجيزة والاسماعيلية وفي كلا الموسمين. حققت السلالة ٢٠ أعلي التقديرات في الغالبية العظمي من الصفات تحت الدراسة ومن التحليل التجميعي للموسمين. حققت السلالة ٢٠ أعلي التقديرات في الغالبية العظمي من الصفات تحت الدراسة ومن التحليل التجميعي للموسمين. معنوية في محصولي السوق والبذور والصفات المكونة لهما في كلا من تجارب الجيزة والاسماعيلية وفي كلا الموسمين. حققت السلالة ٢٠ أعلي التقديرات في الغالبية العظمي من الصفات تحت الدراسة ومن التحليل التجميعي للموسمين في تجارب الجيزة والاسماعيلية. لكن أعطي صنف التيل تياننج أقل التقديرات في هذه الحالة. السوق/الفدان، محصول الاليف/النبات كما للفدان، عدد البذور/للنبات، محصول البذرة/النبات، وزن البذرة/الفدان، محصول الاليف/النبات كما للفدان، عدد البذور/النبات، محصول البذرة/النبات، محصول البذرة/الفدان، محصول المناقر/الفدان. بالنسبة للدراسة التشريحية للساق: أشارت الناقح لتفوق البذرة/الفدان. وكانت قيم معامل الارتباط (ر) معنوية جدا وموجبة بين عدد الكبسولات/النبات وكل من عد تحقيق أعلي التقديرات في المساحة الكلية للقطاع العرضي، مساحة القشرة، مساحة الالياف، مساحة الخشب. في تحقيق أعلي التقديرات في المساحة الكلية للقطاع العرضي، مساحة القشرة، مساحة الالياف، مساحة الخشب. في المذور/النبات، محصول المركز الثاني ومستورد ١٠ أحتل المركز الثالث في هذة الحالية. المرز النتائج وكل من عد تحقيق أعلي التقديرات في المساحة الكلية للقطاع العرضي، مساحة القشرة، مساحة الالياف، مساحة الخشب. في المذور/النبات، محصول البذرة/الفدان. النسبة للدراسة التشريحية المركز الثالث في هذة الحالة. علي النقيض فقد أحتل

المجلة المصرية لتربية النبات ٢٣ (٨): ١٧٦٩ - ١٧٨٧ (٢٠١٩)