

# Morpho-physiological traits and yield quality for cassava genotypes planted under drought during canopy establishment (#116450)

1

Second revision

## Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **4 Sep 2025** for the benefit of the authors .



### Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for guidance.



### Author notes

Have you read the author notes on the [guidance page](#)?



### Raw data check

Review the raw data.



### Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

All review materials are strictly confidential. Uploading the manuscript to third-party tools such as Large Language Models is not allowed.

If this article is published your review will be made public. You can choose whether to sign your review. If uploading a PDF please remove any identifiable information (if you want to remain anonymous).

## Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

- 1 Tracked changes manuscript(s)
- 1 Rebuttal letter(s)
- 4 Figure file(s)
- 7 Table file(s)
- 1 Raw data file(s)




# Structure and Criteria

---

## Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

- 1. Basic Reporting
  - 2. Study design
  - 3. Validity of the findings
  - 4. General Comments
  - 5. Confidential notes to the editor
- 
- You can also annotate the review pdf and upload it as part of your review (optional).

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

## Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

Article types: Research and AI Application

### BASIC REPORTING

Include the appropriate criteria template based on the type variable  
Clear and unambiguous, professional English used throughout.

The article must be written in English and must use clear, unambiguous, technically correct text. The article must conform to professional standards of courtesy and expression.

Literature references, sufficient field background/context provided.

The article should include sufficient introduction and background to demonstrate how the work fits into the broader field of knowledge. Relevant prior literature should be appropriately referenced.

Professional article structure, figures, tables. Raw data shared.

The structure of the article should conform to an acceptable format of 'standard sections' (see our Instructions for Authors for our suggested format). Significant departures in structure should be made only if they significantly improve clarity or conform to a discipline-specific custom.

Figures should be relevant to the content of the article, of sufficient resolution, and appropriately described and labeled.

All appropriate raw data have been made available in accordance with our Data Sharing policy.

Self-contained with relevant results to hypotheses.

The submission should be 'self-contained,' should represent an appropriate 'unit of publication', and should include all results relevant to the hypothesis.

Coherent bodies of work should not be inappropriately subdivided merely to increase publication count.

## **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

Original primary research within [Aims and Scope](#) of the journal.

Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how research fills an identified knowledge gap.

The submission should clearly define the research question, which must be relevant and meaningful. The knowledge gap being investigated should be identified, and statements should be made as to how the study contributes to filling that gap.

Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.

The investigation must have been conducted rigorously and to a high technical standard. The research must have been conducted in conformity with the prevailing ethical standards in the field.

Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

Methods should be described with sufficient information to be reproducible by another investigator.

## **VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS**

Impact and novelty not assessed. Meaningful replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.

Decisions are not made based on any subjective determination of impact, degree of advance, novelty or being of interest to only a niche audience. We will also consider studies with null findings. Replication studies will be considered provided the rationale for the replication, and how it adds value to the literature, is clearly described. Please note that studies that are redundant or derivative of existing work will not be considered. Examples of "acceptable" replication may include software validation and verification, i.e. comparisons of performance, efficiency, accuracy or computational resource usage.

All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.

The data on which the conclusions are based must be provided or made available in an acceptable discipline-specific repository. The data should be robust, statistically sound, and controlled.

Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

The conclusions should be appropriately stated, should be connected to the original question investigated, and should be limited to those supported by the results. In particular, claims of a causative relationship should be supported by a well-controlled experimental intervention. Correlation is not causation.



The best reviewers use these techniques

## Tip

## Example

**Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources**

*Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.*

**Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript**

*Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).*

**Comment on language and grammar issues**

*The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult. I suggest you have a colleague who is proficient in English and familiar with the subject matter review your manuscript, or contact a professional editing service.*

**Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points**

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

**Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions**

*I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC*

**Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript**

*I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.*

# Morpho-physiological traits and yield quality for cassava genotypes planted under drought during canopy establishment

Passamon Ittipong<sup>1</sup>, Poramate Banterng<sup>Corresp., 1, 2</sup>, Nimitr Vorasoot<sup>1</sup>, Sanun Jogloy<sup>1, 2</sup>, Piyada Theerakulpisut<sup>3</sup>, Kochaphan Vongcharoen<sup>4</sup>, Supranee Santanoo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Plant Breeding Research Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Science, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Science and Health Technology, Kalasin University, Kalasin, Thailand

Corresponding Author: Poramate Banterng  
Email address: bporam@kku.ac.th

Growth analysis provides better insight into the adaptability of cassava genotypes grown under drought conditions during canopy establishment and full irrigation . This study is intended to determine the growth rate and starch yield of different cassava genotypes grown under irrigation and drought treatments during canopy establishment. The experiment was conducted in two growing seasons at Khon Kaen University, Thailand, from August 2021 to August 2022 (2021/2022) and from August 2022 to August 2023 (2022/2023) using six cassava genotypes. A 2 x 6 split-plot design with four replications was used. The main plots were full irrigation and drought conditions during canopy establishment (90 to 150 days after planting (DAP)) , and the cassava genotypes were assigned as subplots. The results showed that drought treatment from 90 to 150 DAP reduced soil moisture and relative water contents (RWC), stem growth rate (SGR), storage root growth rate (SRGR), and crop growth rate (CGR). Re-watering after a drought supported cassava's growth rate, resulting in desirable yield and biomass at final harvest. The Rayong 72 and CMR38-125-77 produced significantly higher storage root dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield than the other tested genotypes. Growing under drought treatment, the best performance in storage root dry weight with statistical significance for both years was recorded for CMR38-125-77 (11.2 and 11.4 t ha<sup>-1</sup> for the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons, respectively) , and this was associated with a high crop growth rate (CGR, 12.3 g m<sup>-2</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> for the 2021/2022 growing season ) and relative growth rate (RGR, 1.11 x 10<sup>-2</sup> g g<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> for the 2022/2023 growing season ) during 180 to 360 DAP. These favorable cassava genotypes should be utilized for future plant breeding programs and cultivation to achieve the desired productivity in the growing

areas with drought during canopy establishment.

Running title: Performance of cassava under drought conditions during canopy establishment

**Morpho-physiological traits and yield quality for cassava genotypes planted under drought during canopy establishment**

Passamon Ittipong<sup>a</sup>, Poramate Banterng<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Nimitr Vorasoot<sup>a</sup>, Sanun Jogloy<sup>a,b</sup>, Piyada Theerakulpisut<sup>c</sup>, Kochaphan Vongcharoen<sup>d</sup> and Supranee Santanoo<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, 40002, Thailand

<sup>b</sup>Plant Breeding Research Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Faculty of Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, 40002, Thailand

<sup>c</sup>Faculty of Science, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, 40002, Thailand

<sup>d</sup>Faculty of Science and Health Technology, Kalasin University, Kalasin, 46230, Thailand

\*Corresponding author :bporam@kku.ac.th

**ABSTRACT**

Growth analysis provides better insight into the adaptability of cassava genotypes grown under drought conditions during canopy establishment and full irrigation. This study is intended to determine the growth rate and starch yield of different cassava genotypes grown under irrigation and drought treatments during canopy establishment. The experiment was conducted in two growing seasons at Khon Kaen University, Thailand, from August 2021 to August 2022 (2021/2022) and from August 2022 to August 2023 (2022/2023) using six cassava genotypes. A 2 x 6 split-plot design with four replications was used. The main plots were full irrigation and drought conditions during canopy establishment (90 to 150 days after planting (DAP)), and the

cassava genotypes were assigned as subplots. The results showed that drought treatment from 90 to 150 DAP reduced soil moisture and relative water contents (RWC), stem growth rate (SGR), storage root growth rate (SRGR), and crop growth rate (CGR). Re-watering after a drought supported cassava's growth rate, resulting in desirable yield and biomass at final harvest. The Rayong 72 and CMR38-125-77 produced significantly higher storage root dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield than the other tested genotypes. Growing under drought treatment, the best performance in storage root dry weight with statistical significance for both years was recorded for CMR38-125-77 (11.2 and 11.4 t ha<sup>-1</sup> for the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons, respectively), and this was associated with a high crop growth rate (CGR, 12.3 g m<sup>-2</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> for the 2021/2022 growing season) and relative growth rate (RGR, 1.11 x 10<sup>-2</sup> g g<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> for the 2022/2023 growing season) during 180 to 360 DAP. These favorable cassava genotypes should be utilized for future plant breeding programs and cultivation to achieve the desired productivity in the growing areas with drought during canopy establishment.

**Keywords:** drought, growth rate, irrigation, starch yield

## 1. Introduction

Cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) is extensively cultivated in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and it plays a vital role in food, animal feed, and bioethanol production (Bayata, 2019; Ferguson et al., 2019). In 2022, Thailand was a major cassava producer, with an output of 35.10 million tons, the harvested area was 1.67 million hectares, and the average yield was 21.44 tons per hectare (Office of Agricultural Economics, 2023). However, the average yield in Thailand was lower than the yield potential of 75 tons per hectare (Boonseng, 2011; Kongsil et al., 2024).



The major cassava growing area in Thailand is in the Northeast, characterized by sandy soils with poor soil fertility, low soil water holding capacity, and unpredictable rainfall. Cassava in this region is typically cultivated in two seasons: the main rainy and the late rainy seasons (Polthanee, 2018). For growing cassava in the late rainy season, storage root yield can be affected by drought during the early growth phase, specifically the canopy establishment, and it causes a decrease in yield by approximately 32 to 60 percent (Palanivel & Shah, 2021). There are several options for increasing cassava yields in drought-prone areas. These include the application of supplemental irrigation and the selection of suitable cassava genotypes. Recommending drought-adaptive cassava genotypes is a strategy to help farmers achieve high productivity with low investment.

Determinations of the agronomic traits, physiological traits, and starch content of cassava genotypes have been done for different water regimes. Photosynthesis, growth, productivity, and nutrient use efficiency among cassava genotypes under rain-fed conditions were documented by El-Sharkawy & De Tafur (2010). In arid and semi-arid lands, different cassava genotypes were evaluated under drought and irrigated conditions in agro-climatic zone five (ACZ-V) (Orek et al., 2020). Wongnoi et al. (2020) studied the performance of different cassava genotypes in upland in a dry environment during the high storage root accumulation stage. Various cassava genotypes grown under different irrigation levels (100%, 60%, and 20% crop water requirement (ET crop)) during the early growth phase were reported (Ruangyos et al., 2024). Mahakosee et al. (2019) reported a Rayong 9 cassava genotype grown under rain-fed and irrigated conditions. Growth and yield of cassava genotypes grown under rain-fed upper paddy field conditions were assessed (Sawatraksa et al., 2018 and 2019). These studies did not cover the performances of

some cassava genotypes for drought conditions during the canopy establishment and under full irrigation.

Photosynthesis, carbohydrate partitioning, growth, and yield were studied in different cassava genotypes under full irrigation and early drought conditions (Santanoo et al., 2024). However, this report was only based on a single experiment, necessitating further research for more robust conclusions. In addition, morpho-physiological traits and yield quality based on growth analysis for cassava offer valuable insights into crop growth habits, aiding in the selection of suitable cassava varieties for various environments (Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017; Phoncharoen et al., 2019a; Sawatraksa et al., 2019; Ruangyos et al., 2024). The information on growth analysis can help design suitable cassava genotypes for the dry period during the early growth phase and provide appropriate water management practices. Growth analysis for cassava on the basis of crop growth rate (CGR), stem growth rate (SGR), leaf growth rate (LGR), storage root growth rate (SRGR), and relative growth rate (RGR) for different cassava genotypes can support a better understanding of cassava adaptability in different growing environments. Previous studies mentioned growth analysis for cassava growing under different nitrogen fertilizer applications (Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017), various environments (Sawatraksa et al., 2019), and different planting dates (Phoncharoen et al., 2019a). However, an investigation on the performance of different cassava genotypes in terms of growth rate under non-irrigation (drought conditions) during the canopy establishment and under full irrigation is still necessary for a tropical savanna climate (Aw). This study is designed to determine the growth rate and starch yield of different cassava genotypes grown under irrigation and drought during canopy establishment.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Experimental detail

This experiment was conducted under field conditions from August 2021 to August 2022 (2021/2022) and from August 2022 to August 2023 (2022/2023) at the Field Crop Research Station of Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand (16°28' N, 102°48' E, 200 m a.s.l.). The soil type for the experimental field was Yasothon Series (Yt: Oxic Paleustults). The experiment was a 2 x 6 split-plot design with four replications (main plot factor = water regime, subplot factor = genotype). Two water regimes, including drought conditions in the dry season and full irrigation, were assigned as main plots. Six cassava genotypes, Kasetsart 50, Rayong 9, Rayong 72, CMR38-125-77, CMR 35-91-63, and CM523-7, were assigned as subplots. The cassava genotypes were selected for high environmental adaptability (Kasetsart 50), high yield and high starch content (Rayong 9 and CMR38-125-77), high yield and drought tolerance (Rayong 72), high yield (CMR35-91-63), and low yield and drought tolerance (CM523-7).

Land preparation and tillage were conducted, and soil ridges were created with a 1 m distance between the ridges. The plot size was 7 x 10 m. Cassava stem cuttings of 20 cm from healthy 12-month-old plants were planted at 1 x 1 m spacing after soaking for 15 minutes in thiamethoxam [3-(2-chloro-thiazol-5-ylmethyl)-5-methyl-(1,3,5)-oxadia-zinan-4-ylidene-N-nitroamine, 25% water-dispersible granules] to prevent pest infestation. The stakes were inserted vertically to a depth of 14 cm into the soil ridges. Manual weed control was conducted between 30 to 90 days after planting (DAP). At 30 DAP, chemical fertilizer was applied according to the nutrient requirements for cassava as suggested by Howeler (2002) and the soil characteristics that were identified before planting. Chemical fertilizer (N-P-K) formula of 15-7-18 was applied at a rate of 312.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at 60 DAP (Department of Agriculture, 2008). Before planting, soil at 0-30 cm and

30-60 cm depths were sampled to assess physical and chemical properties (Table 1). The soil texture at the Field Crop Research Station of Khon Kaen University was a sandy loam; the values for soil pH ranged from 6.3 to 6.8, total nitrogen varied from 0.2 to 0.3 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, available phosphorus was between 8.0 to 36.8 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, and exchangeable potassium varied from 13.6 to 54.7 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. The soil chemical analysis indicated low total nitrogen and exchangeable potassium. From 30 to 90 days after planting (DAP), full irrigation based on a mini-sprinkler system was applied to all experimental plots under both irrigation and drought conditions. In the dry season (90 to 150 DAP), drought treatment was imposed by withholding irrigation, and supplementary irrigation was applied back for the recovery period from 151 to 360 DAP. For the plots that received full irrigation, the plants were irrigated throughout the crop duration. Irrigation was conducted based on the amount of crop water requirement (ET<sub>crop</sub>) that was calculated as described by Doorenbos & Pruitt (1992):

$$ET_{crop} = ET_o \times K_c \quad (1)$$

where ET<sub>crop</sub> is the crop requirement (mm day<sup>-1</sup>), ET<sub>o</sub> is the evapotranspiration of a reference plant under specified conditions calculated by the pan evaporation method, and K<sub>c</sub> is the crop water requirement coefficient that varies as a function of the growth stage. The K<sub>c</sub> value for cassava was provided by the FAO, but it is inappropriate for the cassava growing conditions. The K<sub>c</sub> value for FAO was calculated using a crop duration of 210 days. However, the crop duration of the cassava was 330 days. Therefore, we decided to use the K<sub>c</sub> of sugarcane, which has a crop duration that covers 330 days (Doorenbos et al., 1986). In addition, the period for yield formation for cassava is also similar to sugarcane. The amount of water for irrigation was then calculated.

## 2.2. Data collection

Soil moisture content was monitored by sampling at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 DAP for depths of 0-30 cm and 30-60 cm. The soil samples were oven-dried at 105°C for 72 h or until weights were constant, and the moisture percentage was calculated. Soil moisture was determined by the gravimetric method described by Shukla et al. (2014) as shown below (2):

$$\text{Soil moisture content (\%)} = \frac{\text{Soil wet weight (g)} - \text{Soil dry weight (g)}}{\text{Soil dry weight (g)}} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

The relative water content (RWC) values were recorded at 180, 210, 240, 270, and 360 DAP. Measurements were taken from the second or third fully expanded leaves on the top of the main stem of two plants from each plot. The sampling occurred between 9:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. Leaf discs, each measuring 1 cm<sup>2</sup>, were collected from 10 leaves per plot. Leaf fresh weight was determined in the laboratory and then soaked in distilled water for 24 hours, after which it was weighed to obtain the turgid weight. Sampled leaves were oven-dried at 80 °C until constant weight, then weighed. RWC was calculated by following Kramar:

$$\text{RWC (\%)} = \frac{\text{Field weight (g)} - \text{Dry weight (g)}}{\text{Turgid weight (g)} - \text{Dry weight (g)}} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

Crop data was collected from two plants of each plot at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 DAP. The plants were separated into leaves, stems, storage roots, and fibrous roots. All plant parts were subsampled (about 10% of the total fresh weight of each organ). A subsample of fresh leaves was then used to measure leaf area by using a leaf area meter (LI-3100, LI-COR, Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA). Subsamples were oven-dried at 80 °C to achieve a constant dry weight. The harvest index (HI) was calculated as the ratio of the dry weight of storage roots to the total dry weight of the crop. Calculations of CGR during 90 to 120 DAP, 120 to 150 DAP, 150 to 180 DAP, and 180 to 360 DAP were performed based on the function below (Sawatraksa et al., 2019) (3):

$$\text{CGR (g m}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}\text{)} = \left(\frac{1}{G}\right) \times \left(\frac{DW_2 - DW_1}{T_2 - T_1}\right) \quad (4)$$

where  $G$  is sample area ( $m^2$ ) and  $DW_1$  and  $DW_2$  are crop dry weight (g) at the times  $T_1$  and  $T_2$

(d). The equation for CGR was applied to calculate LGR, SGR, and SRGR.

Relative growth rate (RGR) was calculated using the following equation (Sawatraksa et al., 2019) (4):

$$RGR (g g^{-1} d^{-1}) = \frac{\ln(DW_2) - \ln(DW_1)}{T_2 - T_1} \quad (5)$$

where  $DW_1$  and  $DW_2$  are crop dry weight (g) at the times  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  (d).

### 2.3. Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed for all crop traits by following a model for split-plot design (Gomez & Gomez, 1984) and by using the statistix10 program (Statistix10, 2013).

Mean comparisons were conducted for the least significant difference test (LSD) at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Weather conditions

The weather data shows that the drought treatment that was applied from November to January coincided with the low rainfall period for both the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons (Figure 1), which is generally observed for most of the years in Thailand. This period was recognized for its cooler and drier conditions, characterized by lower temperatures and reduced rainfall compared to other times.

### 3.2. Soil moisture content

The information on soil moisture content during growing seasons was shown in Figure 2, indicating that the values of soil moisture content for full irrigation treatment for the 2021/2022

growing season were close to field capacity (FC) values for both soil depths (Figure 2a). On the other hand, the values of soil moisture content for drought treatment during 120 to 150 DAP (during canopy establishment) for both soil depths were lower than FC values (Figure 2b), and the value of soil moisture content at a depth of 30 cm for 150 DAP was close to the permanent wilting point (PWP). Similar results were found for the 2022/2023 growing season (Figure 2c, d).

### 3.3. Relative water content under different water regimes

The relative water content value (RWC) indicates the water content in a leaf at the time of sampling relative to its maximum water-holding capacity. The results revealed the different responses of six cassava genotypes in two water regimes. In comparison between water treatments, the drought treatment exhibited lower RWC values than the irrigated treatment during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons (Figure 3).

Based on the effect of the drought treatment during 90 to 150 DAP, Kasetsart 50, CMR38-125-77, and CM523-7 for 2021/2022 growing season and Rayong 9, Rayong 72, CMR38-125-77, and CM523-7 for 2022/2023 growing season, showed the highest RWC values at 120 DAP (Figure 4). For 150 DAP, it marks the peak of a dry period, as evidenced by the very low soil moisture content (Figure 2). The highest RWC values were observed from CMR35-91-63 for 2021/2022 growing season and Kasetsart 50 and CMR35-91-63 for 2022/2023 growing season.

### 3.4. Evaluation of growth rates

In terms of growth rate for the 2021/2022 growing season, the results indicated the different responses of six cassava genotypes in two water regimes (Table

2). The drought treatment during 90 to 150 DAP provided higher LGR and SGR than the irrigation treatment, but not SRGR. Comparing growth rates from 90 to 150 DAP among different cassava genotypes, Rayong 72 had the highest value of LGR, while CMR38-125-77 exhibited SGR and SRGR that were higher than those of the other genotypes. After the drought during the early growth phase, full irrigation was applied to all experimental plots, resulting in higher LGR and SRGR (from 180 to 360 DAP) for the drought treatment compared to the irrigation treatment. Among different cassava genotypes, the highest growth rate values from 150 to 180 DAP were observed for CMR35-91-63 in terms of LGR and SGR, and for Rayong 72 based on SRGR. Kasetsart 50 displayed higher LGR, SGR, and SRGR values from 180 to 360 DAP compared to the other genotypes.

For CGR and RGR for the 2021/2022 growing season, different effects of two water regimes on six cassava genotypes were found, as indicated by an interaction between water treatment and genotype, except for RGR for 90 to 150 DAP (Table 3). CGR and RGR during the periods of 90 to 150 were not different between the two water regimes, but it was not the same for CGR during 150 to 180 and 180 to 360 DAP and RGR from 150 to 360. CMR38-125-77 exhibited the highest CGR values for all ranges: 90 to 150, 150 to 180, and 180 to 360 DAP, compared to the other tested genotypes. Rayong 9 and CMR35-91-63 had a greater value of RGR for 150 to 360 than the other genotypes.

### 3.5. Performances of cassava at final harvest

According to the final harvest data for the 2021/2022 growing season (Table 4), the interaction between water regime and genotype for storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, HI, and starch yield indicated the various responses of six cassava



genotypes in two water regimes. The drought treatment produced more storage root fresh weight, total dry weight, HI, and starch contents than the irrigation treatment. Comparing among genotypes, Rayong 72 and CMR38-125-77 performed well for almost all traits, except for total dry weight.

Based on the growth rate for the 2022/2023 growing season, the results showed an interaction between water regimes and cassava genotype (Table 5). During 90 to 150 DAP, the drought treatment gave higher LGR and SRGR values than the irrigation treatment. Among the tested genotypes, the highest growth rate values were observed for CMR38-125-77 regarding LGR, Rayong 72 and CM523-7 for SGR, and Rayong 72 for SRGR. During the late growth phase, all experimental plots received full irrigation. This led to drought treatment having a higher LGR during 180 to 360 DAP and SRGR from 150 to 360 DAP compared to the irrigation treatment. Comparing among genotypes, the highest LGR values were recorded for CMR35-91-63 during 150 to 180 DAP and Rayong 72 from 180 to 360 DAP. For SGR, Kasetsart 50, CMR38-125-77, and CMR35-91-63 had the highest values for 150 to 180 DAP, and CMR35-91-63 for 180 to 360 DAP. The highest SRGR for the ranges of 150 to 180 and 180 to 360 DAP was identified from CMR35-91-63.

Regarding CGR and RGR for the 2022/2023 growing season, the interaction between water regime and genotype indicated the response variation of six cassava genotypes to different water regimes (Table 6). Among water regimes, irrigation treatment gave higher CGR from 90 to 150 and 150 to 180 DAP, but not for 180 to 360 DAP. A greater value of RGR from 150 to 360 DAP was recorded for the drought treatment. In comparison between cassava genotypes, CMR35-91-63 showed the highest CGR from 90 to 150 and from 150 to 180 DAP, and Rayong

9 recorded the highest CGR from 180 to 360 DAP. Rayong 72 and CM523-7 demonstrated the highest RGR for 150 to 360.

In the final harvest data for the 2022/2023 growing season (Table 7), the responses of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes were different for all crop traits. The drought treatment produced higher storage root dry weight, total crop dry weight, HI, and starch yield than the irrigation treatment. CMR38-125-77 is a desirable genotype for almost all crop traits, except for storage root fresh weight.

#### 4. Discussion

This study focused on the growth analysis of different cassava genotypes under drought conditions during the canopy establishment and full irrigation. The findings can help select suitable cassava genotypes for dry periods during early growth and develop effective water management practices. The soil moisture content and RWC were used to explain water status in soil and crops, respectively, during the growing season. The RWC is a measure of the water status within the plant tissue (specifically the leaves), reflecting the water deficit experienced by the plant. Low rainfall decreased soil moisture contents and led to a low value of RWC (Figures 1, 2, and 3). The relationship between RWC and soil moisture content was established, leading to the use of RWC values to identify suitable cassava genotypes across various water regimes in Thailand (Ruangyos et al., 2024; Sawatraksa et al., 2018; Wongnoi et al., 2020). The genotype with high RWC value during the dry periods serves as a mechanism for drought resistance, resulting from either enhanced osmotic regulation or reduced elasticity of tissue cell walls (Ritchie et al., 1990). As indicated by high RWC values (Figure 4) during the peak of the dry period (150 DAP) for both growing seasons (Figure 2), CMR35-91-63 would be classified as a

genotype with a good balance of the water content between leaves and water shortage conditions during the early growth phase.

The result revealed that even though cassava faces drought conditions during its early growth phase, some tested genotypes can still produce desirable results at final harvest if there is supplementary irrigation or rainfall in the later growth phase. The dry period from 90 to 150 DAP in this study, therefore, did not decrease the final yield for some tested genotypes, and ultimately produced slightly higher average values of biomass and yield compared to the irrigation treatment (Tables 4 and 7). Cassava is a remarkably drought-resistant crop that can thrive with minimal water during its growth period (El-Sharkawy, 1993; El-Sharkawy et al., 2012; Howeler, 2002; Howeler et al., 2013; Sawatraksa et al., 2018). Santanoo et al. (2024) conducted a single-year experiment on the photosynthetic performance and growth of different cassava genotypes grown under the dry period during the early growth phase and irrigation treatment. They found that net photosynthesis rate (Pn), petiole, root dry weight, leaf, stem, and storage root dry weight were reduced after 60 days of the dry period. After 30 days of re-watering, Pn fully recovered, leading to a significantly higher dry weight at 12 months after planting for the drought treatment than the irrigation treatment. Mahakosee et al. (2019) planted cassava genotype cv. Rayong 9 under drought and irrigated conditions in Thailand. They found that the drought treatment with a planting date during the early growth phase, which had a dry period, produced higher storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, and total crop dry weight than the irrigation treatment.

The study on growth rate during different growing periods, along with crop dry weights at the final harvest, offers valuable insights into growth habits and enhances the understanding of adaptability. The drought treatment displayed slightly higher values of LGR from 90 to 150 DAP

when compared to the irrigation treatment (Tables 2 and 5). This is due to efficient leaf production under water-limited conditions in certain cassava genotypes, such as Rayong 72, CMR35-91-63, and CMR38-125-77, whose leaves continue to grow well despite water shortages. However, a better growth rate of the stem and storage root for the irrigation treatment led to a higher CGR from 90 to 150 DAP compared to the drought treatment (Tables 3 and 6). The results of this study indicate that although cassava experiences low water availability during the early growth phase, it is capable of recovering well when water is supplied again during the storage root development phase. This is evidenced by the high RGR and CGR between 150 and 360 DAP (after re-watering) in the drought treatment, which led to greater storage root fresh weight, total dry weight, HI, and starch yield compared to the full irrigation treatment throughout the entire crop duration (Tables 4 and 7). CGR in the late growth period was identified as a physiological determinant of storage root dry weight for cassava grown under different nitrogen applications (Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017) and various environments (Phoncharoen et al., 2019a).

Based on the average performance among cassava genotypes, this study highlighted that Rayong 72 (Table 4) and CMR38-125-77 (Tables 4 and 7) excelled in storage root dry weight, HI, and starch yield. The performance of these two cassava genotypes is associated with the growth rates of plant organs. For example, in the 2021/2022 growing season, Rayong 72 exhibited high LGR from 90 to 150 DAP (Table 2). Enhanced leaf growth during canopy establishment enables the plant to produce more photosynthates, resulting in greater storage root accumulation (El-Sharkawy, 1993; El-Sharkawy et al., 2012; Santanoo et al., 2024). Meanwhile, CMR38-125-77 demonstrated high SGR and SRGR during the 90 to 150 DAP range. To determine the relationship between the final harvest data and CGR, however, high values of

CGR for CMR38-125-77 during the 2021/2022 growing season are associated with high storage root dry weight, HI, and starch yield (Tables 3, 4, 6, and 7). A previous report has shown that not only does a higher CGR during the formation of storage roots support greater growth and yield, but also that a high LGR during storage root formation and a strong SRGR in the early growth phase are essential factors for enhancing cassava production (Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017). Phoncharoen et al. (2019a) reported that CGR and SRGR during 300-360 DAP and LGR during 60-120 and 300-360 DAP were the components for the physiological determinants of storage root dry weights for cassava genotypes grown under different planting dates. A report by Sawatraksa et al., 2019 on cassava grown in various environments also highlighted that specific growth rates, such as SGR, SRGR, and CGR, significantly correlated with total biomass and storage root dry weight.

A comparison among the combination of six genotypes and two different water regimes showed that CMR38-125-77 under drought treatments performed well in terms of storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, and starch yield for both the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons as compared to the other genotypes (Tables 4 and 7). This final harvest data of CMR38-125-77 under drought treatment related to high CGR during 180 to 360 DAP in the 2021/2022 growing season (Table 3) and a large value of RGR from 150 to 360 DAP in the 2022/2023 growing season (Table 6). This suggests that the high productivity of cassava can be attributed to either the rapid accumulation of biomass over a specified period (CGR) (Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017) or the plant's strong ability to recover after experiencing drought stress (RGR) (Awal & Ikeda, 2002; Abid et al., 2016; Ruangyos et al., 2024; Vandegeer et al., 2013).

A study about growth analysis of different cassava genotypes grown under different planting dates by Phoncharoen et al. (2019a, 2019b) reported that CMR 38-125-77 is likely to be an optimal genotype relative to total crop dry weight and storage root dry weight at final harvest for almost all growing dates. The previous study has also recorded the desirable performance in chlorophyll fluorescence of a CMR 38-125-77 genotype grown after rice harvesting and under rain-fed upper paddy field conditions (Sawatraksa et al., 2018). Wongnoi et al. (2020) have mentioned the desirable physiology, growth, and yield characteristics of a genotype CMR 38-125-77 grown in upland fields under a dry environment during the maximum storage root accumulation phase. A study by Ruangyos et al. (2023) regarding the evaluation of the physiological performance of different cassava genotypes grown under different irrigation levels also found that a CMR 38-125-77 had a high net photosynthesis rate compared to other genotypes.

The drought is generally observed in Thailand, where it is predominantly characterized by a tropical savanna climate (Aw). Growing cassava with a late rainy season planting date leads to the chance of the crop experiencing drought during the early growth. This study demonstrated the impact of drought during the early growth phase on growth and storage root yield for different cassava genotypes. For some cassava genotypes, however, the positive effect of drought during the early growth phase indicates drought resilience. These genotypes can be useful material for future breeding programs and cultivation under drought conditions during the early growth phase. There is another growing season of cassava in Thailand. For the early rainy season planting date, the drought can occur during the period of peak storage root accumulation. This is also important for breeders and farmers to pay keen attention to cassava. Additional research regarding drought for this growing period might help overcome this situation. In

addition, the length of drought is also a crucial factor influencing these two growth phases of cassava, and this effect varies year to year due to climate change. The finding can also be applied to other regions with similar weather conditions.

Selection of the superior cassava genotypes under different growing conditions based on only final yield is inefficient, and analysis of morpho-physiological traits can provide useful information (Phoncharoen et al., 2019a; Phuntupan & Banterng, 2017; Sawatraksa et al., 2019). This study offers a better understanding of how particular cassava genotypes perform under drought during canopy establishment, and it could support prescient decision-making in identifying suitable genotypes within a given environment. This finding reinforces the critical role of water management in cassava cultivation and emphasizes the necessity of selecting genotypes with robust performance under both stress and recovery conditions. Further physiological characterization and molecular analysis of top-performing genotypes could provide insights into adaptive mechanisms and support targeted breeding for climate-resilient cassava production systems.

## 5. Conclusions

The drought treatment during the canopy establishment decreased soil moisture contents, RWC, SGR, SRGR, and CGR (from 90 to 150 DAP). Re-watering after the drought period could enhance the growth rate of cassava and produce a higher final yield and biomass than irrigation treatments. The preferred genotypes for storage root dry weight, HI, and starch yield were Rayong 72 and CMR38-125-77 for the 2021/2022 growing season, and CMR38-125-77 for the 2022/2023 growing season. In addition, the best performance in the storage root yield was CMR38-125-77 grown under drought treatment, and this was related to high CGR during 180 to

360 DAP in the 2021/2022 growing season and high RGR from 150 to 360 DAP in the 2022/2023 growing season. The identified cassava genotypes from this study are valuable material for future plant breeding and cultivation, aiming to enhance productivity in areas experiencing dry conditions during canopy establishment. Additional study on the impact of drought during the key growth stage, particularly the period of peak storage root accumulation for cassava, is also a crucial issue.

## Acknowledgments

We utilized an artificial intelligence (AI) tool to edit our manuscript.

## Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## ORCID

Passamon Ittipong. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9988-6087>

Poramate Banterng. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3535-8718>

Sanun Jogloy. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7455-4514>

Nimitr Vorasoot. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4164-8148>

Piyada Theerakulpisut. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5495-2953>

Kochaphan Vongcharoen. <https://orcid.org/0000-002-0057-5045>

Supranee Santanoo. <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0267-1510>

## References



- 413 **Abid M, Tian Z, Ata-Ul-Karim ST, Wang F, Liu Y, Zahoor R, Jiang D, Dai T. 2016.**  
414       Adaptation to and recovery from drought stress at vegetative stages in wheat (*Triticum*  
415       *aestivum*) cultivars. *Functional Plant Biology* **43**:1159–1169 DOI: 10.1071/FP16150.
- 416 **Awal MA, Ikeda T. 2002.** Recovery strategy following the imposition of episodic soil moisture  
417       deficit in stands of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*  
418       **188**:185–192 DOI: 10.1046/j.1439-037X.2002.00558.x.
- 419 **Bayata A. 2019.** Review on nutritional value of cassava for use as a staple food. *Science Journal*  
420       *of Analytical Chemistry* **7**:83–91 DOI: 10.11648/j.sjac.20190704.12.
- 421 **Boonseng O. 2011.** New innovation for cassava cultivation. *Available at*  
422       <https://tapiocathai.org/Articles/Year54/Innovation.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2025).
- 423 **Department of Agriculture. 2008.** *Good agricultural practices for cassava*. Bangkok:  
424       National bureau of agricultural commodity and food standards ministry of agriculture and  
425       cooperatives.
- 426 **Doorenbos J, Kassam AH, Bentvelsen CLM, Brabscheid V, Plusje JMCA, Smith M,**  
427       **Uittenbogaard GO, Van Der Wal HK. 1986.** *Yield response to water*. Rome: Food and  
428       Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- 429 **Doorenbos J, Pruitt WO. 1992.** *Crop water requirements*. Rome: Food and Agriculture  
430       Organization of the United Nations.
- 431 **El-Sharkawy MA. 1993.** Drought–tolerant cassava for Africa, Asia and Latin America: Breeding  
432       projects work to stabilize productivity without increasing pressures on limited natural  
433       resources. *BioScience* **43**:441–451 DOI: 10.2307/1311903.
- 434 **El-Sharkawy MA, De Tafur SM. 2010.** Comparative photosynthesis, growth, productivity, and  
435       nutrient use efficiency among tall– and short–stemmed rain–fed cassava cultivars.  
436       *Photosynthetica* **48**:173–188 DOI: 10.1007/s11099-010-0023-6.
- 437 **El-Sharkawy MA, De Tafur SM, Lopez Y. 2012.** Eco-physiological research for breeding  
438       improved cassava cultivars in favorable and stressful environments in tropical/subtropical  
439       bio-systems. *Environmental Research Journal* **6**:143–212 DOI: 10.13140/2.1.1823.0409.
- 440 **Ferguson ME, Shah T, Kulakow P, Ceballos H. 2019.** A global overview of cassava genetic  
441       diversity. *PLOS ONE* **14**:1–16 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0224763.
- 442 **Gomez KA, Gomez AA. 1984.** *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*. New York: John  
443       Wiley and Sons.

- 444 **Howeler RH. 2002.** Cassava mineral nutrition and fertilization. In: Hillocks RJ, Thresh JM,  
445 Bellotti AC, eds. *Cassava: Biology, production and utilization*. Oxen: CABI Publishing,  
446 115–147.
- 447 **Howeler RH, Litaladio N, Thomas G. 2013.** *Save and Grow: Cassava—A guide to sustainable*  
448 *production intensification*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United  
449 Nations.
- 450 **Kramar PJ. 1980.** Drought, stress and the origin of adaptation. In: Turner NC, Kramar PJ, eds.  
451 *Adaptation of plant to water and high temperature stress*. New York: John Wiley and  
452 Sons, 207–230.
- 453 **Kongsil P, Ceballos H, Siriwan W, Vuttipongchaikij S, Kittipadakul P, Phumichai C,**  
454 **Wannarat W, Kositratana W, Vichukit V, Sarobol E, Rojanaridpiched C. 2024.**  
455 Cassava breeding and cultivation challenges in Thailand: Past, present, and future  
456 perspectives. *Plants* 13:1–29 DOI:10.3390/plants13141899.
- 457 **Mahakosee S, Jogloy S, Vorasoot N, Theerakulpisut P, Banterng P, Kesmala T, Holbrook C,**  
458 **Kvien C. 2019.** Seasonal variations in canopy size and yield of Rayong 9 cassava genotype  
459 under rainfed and irrigated conditions. *Agronomy* 9:1–20 DOI: 10.3390/agronomy9070362.
- 460 **Office of Agricultural Economics. 2023.** *Agricultural statistics of Thailand 2022*. Bangkok:  
461 Office of Agricultural Economics.
- 462 **Orek C, Gruissem W, Ferguson M, Vanderschuren H. 2020.** Morpho-physiological and  
463 molecular evaluation of drought tolerance in cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz). *Field*  
464 *Crops Research* 255:107861 DOI: 10.1016/j.fcr.2020.107861.
- 465 **Palanivel H, Shah S. 2021.** Unlocking the inherent potential of plant genetic resources: Food  
466 security and climate adaptation strategy in Fiji and the Pacific. *Environment, Development*  
467 *and Sustainability* 23:14264–14323 DOI: 10.1007/s10668-021-01273-8.
- 468 **Phoncharoen P, Banterng P, Vorasoot N, Jogloy S, Theerakulpisut P, Hoogenboom G. 2019a.**  
469 Growth rates and yields of cassava at different planting dates in a tropical savanna climate.  
470 *Scientia Agricola* 76:376–388 DOI: 10.1590/1678-992X-2017-0413.
- 471 **Phoncharoen P, Banterng P, Vorasoot N, Jogloy S, Theerakulpisut P, Hoogenboom G.**  
472 **2019b.** The impact of seasonal environments in a tropical savanna climate on forking, leaf  
473 area index, and biomass of cassava genotypes. *Agronomy* 9:19 DOI:  
474 10.3390/agronomy9010019.

- 475 **Phuntupan K, Banterng P. 2017.** Physiological determinants of storage root yield in three  
476 cassava genotypes under different nitrogen supply. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*  
477 **155**:978–992 DOI: 10.1017/S0021859617000053.
- 478 **Polthanee A. 2018.** Cassava as an insurance crop in a changing climate: The changing role and  
479 potential applications of cassava for smallholder farmers in Northeastern Thailand. *Forest*  
480 *and Society* **2**:121–137 DOI: 10.24259/fs.v2i2.4275.
- 481 **Ritchie SW, Nguyen HT, Holaday AS. 1990.** Leaf water content and gas exchange parameters  
482 of two wheat genotypes differing in drought resistance. *Crop Science* **30**:105–111 DOI:  
483 10.2135/cropsci1990.0011183X003000010025x.
- 484 **Ruangyos C, Banterng P, Vorasoot N, Jogloy S, Theerakulpisut P, Vongcharoen K,**  
485 **Hoogenboom G. 2024.** Variation in biomass of cassava genotypes grown under different  
486 irrigation levels during the early growth phase. *Crop Science* **64**:482–495 DOI:  
487 10.1002/csc2.21127.
- 488 **Santanoo S, Ittipong P, Banterng P, Vorasoot N, Jogloy N, Vongcharoen K, Theerakulpisut**  
489 **P. 2024.** Photosynthetic performance, carbohydrate partitioning, growth, and yield among  
490 cassava genotypes under full Irrigation and early drought treatment in a tropical savanna  
491 climate. *Plants* **13**:2049 DOI: 10.3390/plants13152049.
- 492 **Sawatraksa N, Banterng P, Jogloy S, Vorasoot N, Hoogenboom G. 2018.** Chlorophyll  
493 fluorescence and biomass of four cassava genotypes grown under rain-fed upper paddy field  
494 conditions in the tropics. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science* **204**:554–565 DOI:  
495 10.1111/jac.12285.
- 496 **Sawatraksa N, Banterng P, Jogloy S, Vorasoot N, Hoogenboom G. 2019.** Cassava growth  
497 analysis of production during the off-season of paddy rice. *Crop Science* **59**:1–12 DOI:  
498 10.2135/cropsci2018.07.0435.
- 499 **Shukla A, Panchal H, Mishra M, Patel PR, Srivastava HS, Patel P, Shukla AK. 2014.** Soil  
500 moisture estimation using gravimetric technique and FDR probe technique: A comparative  
501 analysis. *American International Journal of Research in Formal, Applied and Natural*  
502 *Sciences* **8**:89–92. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279848435>.
- 503 **Statistix10. 2013.** Statistix10: Analytical software user’s manual. Available at  
504 <https://www.statistix.com/> (accessed 16 October 2020).

**Vandegeer R, Rebecca E, Bain M, Roslyn M, Timothy R. 2013.** Drought adversely affects tuber development and nutritional quality of the staple crop cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz). *Functional Plant Biology* **40**:195–200 DOI: 10.1071/FP12179.

**Wongnoi S, Banterng P, Vorasoot N, Jogloy S, Theerakulpisut P. 2020.** Physiology, growth and yield of different cassava genotypes planted in upland with dry environment during high storage root accumulation stage. *Agronomy* **10**:576–593 DOI: 10.3390/agronomy10040576.

**Table 1**(on next page)

Physical and chemical properties of the soil for depths of 0-30 and 30-60 cm.

Each data point indicates the average value for for depths of 0-30 and 30-60 cm.

1 **Table 1:**  
2 **Physical and chemical properties of the soil for depths of 0-30 and 30-60 cm.**

Soil property	2021/2022		2022/2023	
	0–30 cm	30–60 cm	0–30 cm	30–60 cm
Physical property				
Texture class	Sandy loam	Sandy loam	Sandy loam	Loamy sand
Sand (%)	75.0	71.0	82.9	67.9
Silt (%)	18.0	17.0	11.8	18.1
Clay (%)	7.0	12.1	5.4	14.1
Chemical property				
pH (1:1 H <sub>2</sub> O)	6.4	6.3	6.4	6.8
Cation exchange capacity (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	3.3	3.6	2.9	4.3
Electrical conductivity (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Organic matter (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	4.3	2.9	2.9	1.9
Total nitrogen (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
Available phosphorus (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	36.8	27.8	27.5	8.0
Exchangeable potassium (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	54.7	21.3	13.6	18.2

3

# **Table 2**(on next page)

Means for leaf growth rate (LGR), stem growth rate (SGR), and storage root growth rate (SRGR) during 90–150, 150–180, and 180–360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2021/2022 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2021/2022 growing season.

**Table 2:**  
**Means for leaf growth rate (LGR), stem growth rate (SGR), and storage root growth rate (SRGR) during 90–150, 150–180, and 180–360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2021/2022 growing season.**

Treatment	LGR (g $\text{m}^{-2}$ day $^{-1}$ )			SGR (g $\text{m}^{-2}$ day $^{-1}$ )			SRGR (g $\text{m}^{-2}$ day $^{-1}$ )		
	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP
Water treatment (W)									
Drought (W1)	0.18A	0.59B	2.90A	3.0A	6.0B	2.0	8.6B	11.7	11.1A
Irrigation (W2)	0.13B	0.91A	1.11B	2.2B	8.4A	2.0	11.6A	12.0	4.9B
F-test	*	*	**	**	**	NS	**	NS	**
C.V. (%)	29.53	16.74	28.14	15.29	2.94	20.85	7.92	8.97	21.45
Genotype (G)									
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	0.07E	0.72B	3.06A	2.5B	8.0B	3.2A	7.1E	12.5B	10.7A
Rayong 9 (G2)	0.08E	0.63B	2.30B	2.5B	6.0D	1.3C	8.8D	11.6B	10.0A
Rayong 72 (G3)	0.26A	0.54B	1.59C	2.0C	5.0E	1.3C	10.0C	15.5A	5.8C
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	0.17C	0.69B	2.10B	3.2A	6.7C	1.6C	15.4A	9.8C	4.7C
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	0.21B	1.29A	1.50C	2.6B	12.2A	2.1B	6.5E	9.8C	7.3B
CM523-7 (G6)	0.14D	0.65B	1.51C	2.7B	5.6D	2.5B	12.8B	12.0B	9.56
F-test	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
G x W									
W1 x G1	0.04E	0.55B-E	4.70A	3.5B	6.8D	3.7A	5.8E	7.0GH	14.5A
W1 x G2	0.13D	0.64B-E	3.03C	3.1BC	7.1CD	0.3E	7.2DE	8.2FG	12.2B
W1 x G3	0.32A	0.30E	2.34D	1.1FG	4.9E	1.1CD	12.2B	19.9A	9.3C
W1 x G4	0.15CD	0.87BC	4.05B	3.4B	4.9E	0.8DE	13.1B	13.6BC	4.8EF
W1 x G5	0.30A	0.80BC	1.75E	4.3A	7.7C	3.6A	5.8E	12.4CD	13.1AB
W1 x G6	0.16B-D	0.38DE	1.50EF	2.8CD	4.8E	2.8B	7.3D	9.3EF	12.5AB
W2 x G1	0.11D	0.89B	1.41EF	1.6EF	9.1B	2.8B	8.4D	18.0A	7.0C-E
W2 x G2	0.04E	0.63B-E	1.57E	1.9E	4.9E	2.3B	10.4C	15.0B	7.8CD
W2 x G3	0.20B	0.78B-D	0.84F	2.9B-D	5.1E	1.6C	7.7D	11.0DE	2.2G
W2 x G4	0.20BC	0.51C-E	0.15G	3.1BC	8.4B	2.5B	17.7A	5.9H	4.5F
W2 x G5	0.12D	1.77A	1.19EF	1.0G	16.8A	0.7DE	7.2DE	7.2GH	1.5G
W2 x G6	0.11D	0.92B	1.51E	2.5D	6.4D	2.2B	18.2A	14.7B	6.6D-F
F-test	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	14.74	11.87	19.87	13.13	7.51	21.69	9.95	10.43	18.50

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). NS, \*, \*\* = non-significant, significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  and significant at  $p \leq 0.01$  level, respectively.



# **Table 3**(on next page)

Means for crop growth rate (CGR) and relative growth rate (RGR) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2021/2022 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2021/2022 growing season.

**Table 3:**  
**Means for crop growth rate (CGR) and relative growth rate (RGR) of six cassava genotypes**  
**under two water treatments in the 2021/2022 growing season.**

Treatment	CGR (g m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )			RGR x 10 <sup>-2</sup> (g g <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )	
	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–360 DAP
Water treatment (W)					
Drought (W1)	14.7	18.1B	9.1A	2.2	0.49A
Irrigation (W2)	15.3	40.6A	3.6B	2.7	0.39B
F-test	NS	**	**	NS	*
C.V. (%)	5.25	6.75	13.04	30.60	16.77
Genotype (G)					
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	11.4D	32.4AB	6.4B	2.0B	0.41B
Rayong 9 (G2)	17.8B	18.0D	8.1A	2.8A	0.62A
Rayong 72 (G3)	18.4B	28.4C	5.6BC	2.6A	0.28D
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	19.7A	32.6AB	8.5A	2.4AB	0.34C
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	13.0C	35.3A	5.1BC	2.1B	0.64A
CM523-7 (G6)	9.6E	29.5BC	4.5C	2.8A	0.34C
F-test	**	**	**	**	**
G x W					
W1 x G1	10.1E	39.2B	5.8E-G	2.0	0.45C
W1 x G2	10.6E	2.8G	11.1AB	2.6	0.94A
W1 x G3	24.4A	28.0D	8.1CD	2.6	0.26FG
W1 x G4	17.2C	5.5G	12.3A	1.6	0.43CD
W1 x G5	12.4D	14.0F	9.6BC	2.2	0.62B
W1 x G6	13.3D	19.2E	7.8C-E	2.2	0.25FG
W2 x G1	12.7D	25.6D	6.9D-F	2.1	0.36DE
W2 x G2	25.0A	33.3C	5.2F-H	3.0	0.31EF
W2 x G3	12.3D	28.7CD	3.2HI	2.6	0.31EF
W2 x G4	22.1B	59.7A	4.6GH	3.2	0.24G
W2 x G5	13.5D	56.7A	0.7J	2.1	0.67B
W2 x G6	5.8F	39.8B	1.1IJ	3.4	0.42CD
F-test	**	**	**	NS	**
C.V. (%)	6.35	11.15	11.12 <sup>AB</sup>	18.35	8.82

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). NS, \*, \*\* = non-significant, significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  and significant at  $p \leq 0.01$  level, respectively.

# **Table 4**(on next page)

Means for storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield at 360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in 2021/2022 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2021/2022 growing season.

**Table 4:**  
**Means for storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield at 360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in 2021/2022 growing season.**

Treatment	Storage root fresh weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Storage root dry weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total dry weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	HI	Starch yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Water treatment (W)					
Drought (W1)	26.1A	9.7	12.8A	0.77A	250.2A
Irrigation (W2)	23.8B	8.2	11.9B	0.68B	192.0B
F-test	*	NS	*	**	**
C.V. (%)	9.13	19.72	7.04	2.36	9.52
Genotype (G)					
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	23.6B	8.9BC	13.4A	0.67D	249.0A
Rayong 9 (G2)	23.2B	8.5C	11.3C	0.71C	212.8B
Rayong 72 (G3)	25.7AB	10.0A	12.7B	0.80A	252.3A
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	25.9AB	9.7AB	12.5B	0.78AB	260.8A
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	23.7B	8.3C	11.1C	0.75B	223.5B
CM523-7 (G6)	27.4A	8.3C	13.1AB	0.64E	128.0C
F-test	*	**	**	**	**
G x W					
W1 x G1	24.4B-D	9.8B	13.9BC	0.73D	296.7A
W1 x G2	26.3A-C	9.8B	11.1EF	0.83A	254.5B
W1 x G3	25.7A-C	9.9B	12.7D	0.81A	285.6A
W1 x G4	29.2A	11.2A	15.1A	0.76B-D	309.7A
W1 x G5	24.6B-D	8.9BC	11.9DE	0.76B-D	218.8C
W1 x G6	26.4A-C	8.6B-D	11.9DE	0.73D	135.8E
W2 x G1	22.8CD	8.1CD	12.9CD	0.61E	201.3C
W2 x G2	20.2D	7.2D	11.4E	0.59EF	171.1D
W2 x G3	25.8A-C	10.0AB	12.7D	0.79A-C	219.1C
W2 x G4	22.6CD	8.2CD	9.9G	0.80AB	211.9C
W2 x G5	22.8CD	7.7CD	10.2FG	0.75CD	228.2BC
W2 x G6	28.3AB	8.0CD	14.4AB	0.56F	120.3E
F-test	*	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	11.73	8.85	5.46	4.09	8.92

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). NS, \*, \*\* = non-significant, significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  and significant at  $p \leq 0.01$  level, respectively.

# **Table 5**(on next page)

Means for leaf growth rate (LGR), stem growth rate (SGR), and storage root growth rate (SRGR) during 90–150, 150–180, and 180–360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2022/2023 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2022/2023 growing season.

**Table 5:**  
**Means for leaf growth rate (LGR), stem growth rate (SGR), and storage root growth rate (SRGR) during 90–150, 150–180, and 180–360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water regimes in the 2022/2023 growing season.**

Treatment	LGR (g m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )			SGR (g m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )			SRGR (g m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )		
	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP
Water treatment (W)									
Drought (W1)	1.01A	0.32B	0.21A	0.3B	2.5B	0.4B	1.6A	4.4A	2.8B
Irrigation (W2)	0.95B	0.73A	0.13B	0.6A	7.0A	0.5A	1.1B	2.6B	3.6A
F-test	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	5.08	17.51	11.01	24.50	24.45	8.48	10.53	20.12	15.39
Genotype (G)									
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	1.32B	0.50B	0.07D	0.2D	6.9A	0.4C	0.8E	4.4B	2.1D
Rayong 9 (G2)	0.64E	0.30C	0.21AB	0.3C	1.7D	0.6B	0.6E	2.2D	2.3CD
Rayong 72 (G3)	0.79D	0.33C	0.23A	0.8A	2.7C	0.6B	2.5A	3.7C	1.3E
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	1.63A	0.60B	0.16C	0.5B	6.6A	0.2D	2.1B	2.1D	3.6B
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	0.99C	0.95A	0.15C	0.3C	6.7A	0.7A	1.0D	6.3A	7.0A
CM523-7 (G6)	0.52F	0.49B	0.19B	0.7A	4.0B	0.2D	1.3C	2.1D	2.7C
F-test	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
G x W									
W1 x G1	2.02B	0.18E	0.06EF	0.2DE	3.0E	0.3E	1.2D	6.0BC	1.6F
W1 x G2	0.24G	0.45C	0.26C	0.2DE	1.0FG	0.7C	0.6FG	3.3D	1.5F
W1 x G3	0.14G	0.19E	0.43A	0.1G	0.1G	0.9B	4.5A	6.5B	0.4G
W1 x G4	2.74A	0.27DE	0.04FG	0.5C	4.5CD	0.1G	1.2D	1.3F	4.0C
W1 x G5	0.50EF	0.43CD	0.14D	0.1G	3.5DE	0.4E	0.8EF	7.6A	7.5A
W1 x G6	0.45F	0.43CD	0.32B	0.7B	2.9E	0.2F	1.6C	1.6EF	1.6F
W2 x G1	0.63E	0.81B	0.08E	0.1G	10.8A	0.5D	0.4G	2.8D	2.6DE
W2 x G2	1.04D	0.16E	0.16D	0.3D	2.4EF	0.5D	0.7E-G	1.2F	3.1CD
W2 x G3	1.43C	0.47C	0.02G	1.4A	5.4C	0.3E	0.4G	0.9F	2.1EF
W2 x G4	0.50EF	0.93B	0.28C	0.5C	8.7B	0.3E	3.0B	2.8D	3.3CD
W2 x G5	1.49C	1.47A	0.16D	0.4C	9.8A	1.1A	1.3CD	5.0C	6.4B
W2 x G6	0.59EF	0.54C	0.07EF	0.8B	5.2C	0.3E	1.0DE	2.6DE	3.8C
F-test	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	11.57	21.29	10.46	16.48	14.75	7.83	12.77	15.22	14.53

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). \*\* = significant at  $p \leq 0.01$  level, respectively.

# **Table 6**(on next page)

Means for crop growth rate (CGR) and relative growth rate (RGR) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.

**Table 6:**  
**Means for crop growth rate (CGR) and relative growth rate (RGR) of six cassava genotypes**  
**under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.**

Treatment	CGR (g m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )			RGR x 10 <sup>-2</sup> (g g <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> )	
	90–150 DAP	150–180 DAP	180–360 DAP	90–150 DAP	150–360 DAP
Water treatment (W)					
Drought (W1)	1.7B	31.0B	7.2A	0.58	0.87A
Irrigation (W2)	2.8A	38.3A	2.6B	0.62	0.66B
F-test	**	**	**	NS	**
C.V. (%)	7.42	0.50	3.43	7.74	11.13
Genotype (G)					
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	1.0E	28.6C	5.2C	0.49C	0.78B
Rayong 9 (G2)	1.7D	21.0D	7.1A	0.12E	0.77BC
Rayong 72 (G3)	1.0E	17.0E	6.5B	0.35D	0.89A
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	3.6B	42.0B	3.5D	0.48C	0.71C
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	4.4A	71.7A	0.7E	1.41A	0.57D
CM523-7 (G6)	2.1C	27.6C	6.3B	0.74B	0.87A
F-test	**	**	**	**	**
G x W					
W1 x G1	0.8F	18.2G	8.3C	0.72D	0.81C-E
W1 x G2	0.2G	19.0G	9.5B	0.04H	0.83B-D
W1 x G3	0.4G	10.3H	12.0A	0.18G	0.71F
W1 x G4	3.7B	40.3D	5.2E	0.73D	1.11A
W1 x G5	2.7D	75.1A	0.7G	0.85C	0.85BC
W1 x G6	2.5D	23.0F	7.3D	0.96B	0.90B
W2 x G1	1.1F	39.0D	2.2F	0.25F	0.72D-F
W2 x G2	3.1C	22.9F	4.6E	0.20FG	0.73D-F
W2 x G3	1.5E	23.7F	1.0G	0.51E	0.72EF
W2 x G4	3.4C	43.7C	1.8F	0.23FG	0.66F
W2 x G5	6.1A	68.3B	0.7G	1.98A	0.28G
W2 x G6	1.7E	32.2E	5.2E	0.52E	0.83BC
F-test	**	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	8.77	3.46	10.34	6.65	7.76

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). NS, \*\* = non-significant and significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ , respectively.



# **Table 7** (on next page)

Means for storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield at 360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.

Each data point indicates the average performance of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.

**Table 7:**  
**Means for storage root fresh weight, storage root dry weight, total dry weight, harvest index (HI), and starch yield at 360 days after planting (DAP) of six cassava genotypes under two water treatments in the 2022/2023 growing season.**



Treatment	Storage root fresh weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Storage root dry weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total dry weight (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	HI	Starch yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Water treatment (W)					
Drought (W1)	26.3A	9.8A	13.3A	0.76A	265.2A
Irrigation (W2)	24.1B	6.9B	10.2B	0.68B	176.6B
F-test	**	**	**	*	**
C.V. (%)	2.88	7.14	6.24	8.57	5.63
Genotype (G)					
Kasetsart 50 (G1)	22.9D	8.6BC	11.7B	0.78A	249.9A
Rayong 9 (G2)	20.9E	8.0C	11.7B	0.71BC	213.7B
Rayong 72 (G3)	30.1A	6.9D	10.1C	0.65D	198.0C
CMR38-125-77 (G4)	25.9C	9.7A	12.9A	0.75AB	245.1A
CMR35-91-63 (G5)	23.4D	8.7B	12.3AB	0.70C	210.8B
CM523-7 (G6)	27.9B	8.4BC	11.7B	0.72BC	207.8EC
F-test	**	**	**	**	**
G x W					
W1 x G1	21.8D	9.6BC	12.8BC	0.80A	309.0A
W1 x G2	24.3C	9.2CD	13.4B	0.76AB	247.0C
W1 x G3	29.6A	10.3B	13.4B	0.77AB	280.6B
W1 x G4	30.4A	11.4A	14.9A	0.77AB	296.8A
W1 x G5	25.8B	9.6BC	13.3B	0.73BC	259.7C
W1 x G6	25.9B	8.7DE	11.9CD	0.73BC	198.0E
W2 x G1	24.1C	7.6FG	10.6EF	0.75AB	190.8EF
W2 x G2	17.5E	6.7G	10.0F	0.67C	180.3F
W2 x G3	30.5A	3.5H	6.8G	0.53D	115.4H
W2 x G4	21.5D	7.9EF	10.9D-F	0.72BC	193.5EF
W2 x G5	21.0D	7.7F	11.4DE	0.67C	161.8G
W2 x G6	29.8A	8.1EF	11.4DE	0.71BC	217.5D
F-test	**	**	**	**	**
C.V. (%)	3.41	7.41	6.61	5.65	4.66

*Note:* Different letters in the same column represent significant differences (least significant difference test). \*, \*\* = significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  and significant at  $p \leq 0.01$  level, respectively.

# Figure 1

Weather data at the Field Crop Research Station of Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand for the experiment from August 2021 to August 2022 and from August 2022 to August 2023. (A) 2021/2022 and (B) 2022/2023.


Weather data at the Field Crop Research Station of Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand.



# Figure 2

Soil moisture content of rainfed treatment (drought treatment) and irrigation treatment. (A) soil depth 0–30 cm in 2021/2022. (B) 30–60 cm in 2021/2022. (C) 0–30 cm in 2022/2023. (D) 30–60 cm in 2022/2023.


Soil moisture content of rainfed treatment (drought treatment) and irrigation treatment.



# Figure 3

Relative water content (%) at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 days after planting (DAP) for drought and irrigation treatment. (A) during 2021/2022 and (B) 2022/2023. Different letters in the same days after planting represent significant differences.

Relative water content (%) at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 days after planting (DAP) for drought and irrigation treatment.



# Figure 4

Relative water content (%) at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 days after planting (DAP) for six cassava genotypes. (A) during 2021/2022 and (B) 2022/2023. Different letters in the same days after planting represent significant differences.

Relative water content (%) at 90, 120, 150, 180, and 360 days after planting (DAP) for six cassava genotypes.

