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#### Abstract

The present study was conducted on eleven urban tree species i.e, Acacia nilotica L., Alstonia scholaris R. Br., Cassia fistula L., Conocarpus erectus L., Dalbergia sissoo Roxb., Eucalyptus citriodora Hook., Melia azedarach L., Mimusops elengi L., Pongamia pinnata L., Putranjiva roxburghii Wall. and Syzygium cumini L. The anatomical studies were carried out on one and a half year old saplings of these species, which were planted in Botanic Garden Government College University Lahore. Stomata and xylem anatomy was carried out using light microscope. The results showed that the size of stomata ranged from 5.50 to $11.93 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, the maximum size was found in Mimusops elengi and the minimum was found in in Cassia fistula. The number of stomata ranged from 22.5 to 212, maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris and minimum in Mimusops elengi. The size of stem xylem vessel ranged from 12.21 to $25.52 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, maximum was found in Cassia fistula and minimum in Mimusops elengi. The number of stem xylem vessel ranged from 8.75 to 45.5 , maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris and minimum in Acacia nilotica. The size of root xylem vessel ranged from 18.07 to $80.61 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, maximum was found in Dalbergia sisso and minmum in Mimusops elengi. The number of root xylem vessel was ranged from 3 to 14, maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris and minimum in Dalbergia sisso. The theoretical hydraulic conductivity (ki) for stem ranged from $1.37 \times 10^{-}$ ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Kg}_{\mu \mathrm{m}} \mathrm{m}^{-1} \mathrm{Mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ to $6.01 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{Kg}_{\mu \mathrm{m}} \mathrm{Mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, maximum in Acacia nilotica and minimum in Cassia fistula. The theoretical hydraulic conductivity value for root xylem vessel ranged from $1.01 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{Kg}_{\mathrm{mm}} \mathrm{mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{Mps}^{-1}$ to $6.69 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{m} \mathrm{m}^{-1} \mathrm{Mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, maximum in Acacia nilotica and minimum in Syzygium cumini. It is concluded that species with maximum ki value consumed more water and on the basis of water conduction per xylem vessels and the species with small ki conduct less water per xylem vessel. Such data can be useful to plan the plantation for the urban ecosystems.


## Introduction

The morphological and anatomical features of different species determine the performance and productivity (Wright et al., 2004; Sack et al., 2013). Functions of leaves in the ecosystem play fundamental roles as they control the exchange of carbon and water (Wright et al., 2004; Reich, 2014). Under the different environmental conditions variations in the anatomical components and plant trait have been observed which lead to affect the performance of plants (Witkowski \& Lamont, 1991). Species of stressful environment or long life spam might have low maximum rate of photosynthesis and low concentration of nutrients. The survival of plants is limited by environmental stress factors at different global levels. All levels of organizations in the plants are effect by water stress. Opening of stomata causes the diffusion of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in leaves, as photosynthetic rate is positively linked with stomatal conductance (Farquhar \& Sharkey, 1982). Structurally safe xylem is characterized by thick walls which are narrow, hence resistant to cavitation but with potentially slow the gain of photosynthetic carbon (Hubbard et al., 1999; Hacke \& Sperry 2001).

Environment where evaporation is high and water supply is limited, the species with hydraulically safe xylem tend to dominate. In leaves, rate of gas exchange coordinated with water stress causes leaf venation system to change its hydraulic efficiency. Structures of the stomata along with its functional properties are also changed under stress conditions (Aasamaa \& Sober, 2001). Changes that occur during drought conditions are irreversible. Stomatal size and density are determined by water status and stomatal density linked with parameter of gas exchange (Xu \& Zhou, 2008). Leaves expand more than other anatomical structures during non-stress conditions. When water is limited stomatal pattern and hydraulic traits consume water in such way that their survival would be possible. With the passage of time requirements of plants vary depending on ontogenetic stage as well as local environment and regional environment (Poorter \& Kitajima, 2007; Wimmer, 2002).

The study of functional characteristics helps to understand the effect of environment (Baraloto et al., 2010). Relationship of coordination of leaf, stem, and root are related to the growth of plants and their
survival (Reich et al., 2003; Cavender-Bares et al., 2004). Such environment where growth of trees is determined by the availability of water, the size of xylem vessels, their arrangement and frequency can play a major role (Tyree \& Zimmermann, 2002). In plants water moving through xylem path is influenced by diameter and frequency of xylem vessels (Sperry, 2003).

Need of woody species varies for support, water transport and storage. Capacity of growth in woody plant is constrained by xylem hydraulics. Plant growth is also related to stem traits. As age of the tree progresses, growth is limited by a factor called hydraulic resistance. Mechanical support is provided by dense wood and resulting in slow growth rate. In woody species fine roots determine the stem length and branches (McCully, 1999; Draye, 200). The ability of perennial plants to draw upon stored nutrient reserves reduces the need for high nutrient uptake rates to occur simultaneously with new leaf production. In fact, root and leaf production are frequently asynchronous (Wells \& Eissenstat, 2000).

Root traits are less dependent and less supportive when sources are deficient. They get nutrients from the soil independently (Eissenstat, 1992; Brundrett, 2002; Menge et al., 2008; Comas et al., 2014). Previous increase in growth of species is observes under functional traits (Schnitzer and Bongers 2011). An economic spectrum develops which describes the leaves amount for fine roots (Wahl and Ryser, 2000; Reich et al., 2003; Lavorel et al., 2007). Root traits belong to particular group rapidly use the belowground resources as a result poor structural development and lead to excessive turnover of root (Eissentat \& Yanai 1997; Eissentat et al., 2000; Cranie et al., 2003). Among plant groups functional character of leaf and roots are liked with one another. It is the trait of leaf to provide poor substitution for function of root. For understanding of plant strategies of resources, it is important to observe belowground and aboveground traits (Eissenstat 1992).

Whole functioning of the plant is linked with vascular system because it has functional properties and developmental coordination of hydraulic traits and photosynthesis (Brodribb, 2009; Beerling \& Franks, 2010). When plant under water stress, different changes take place at different level in whole plant which balance the initial negative effect of water (Boyer, 1982; Chaves et al., 2003; Flexas et al., 2006). Changes take place due to water stress is because all the functions in the plants are related with each other (Heckenberger et al., 1998; Niinemets and sack, 2006). Cell expansion and growth of plant is inhibited by low
availability of the water (Hsiao and $\mathrm{Xu}, 2000$ ). Leaves which adapt themselves in stress conditions, they develop small size leaves as compared to normal leaves growing in normal conditions. Cytological structure of leaves also may change (Karamanos et al., 1982; Chaves et al., 2003; Kramer \& Boyer 1995).

Photosynthesis and gas exchange negatively change with water stress. When water stress applied for short period it is observe that it only effects are functional consequences but in natural environment water stress occur after many days and weeks (Flexas et al., 2006).

Growth and aboveground biomass accumulation follow a common pattern as tree size increases, with productivity peaking when leaf area reaches its maximum and then declining as tree age and size increase (Ryan \& Waring, 1992). Age- and size-related declines in forest productivity are major considerations in setting the rotational age of commercial forests, and relate to issues of carbon storage, since changes in forest structure can influence large-scale biomass accumulation. Despite the ecological and practical significance of the growth and aboveground biomass accumulation follow a common pattern as tree size increases, with productivity peaking when leaf area reaches its maximum and then declining as tree age and size increase (Ryan \& Waring, 1992). Age and sizerelated declines in forest productivity are major considerations in setting the rotational age of commercial forests, and relate to issues of carbon storage, since changes in forest structure can influence large-scale biomass accumulation.

When amount of water in the soil is gradually low various functions of the trees are affected (Hsiao \& Xu 2000). Leaf, root and stem show different response in drought conditions because they are sensitive to drought conditions, growth of tree is affected in arid as well as in humid climate. During stress conditions chemical and hydraulic signals exist between roots and shoots develop communication. Drought, change the physiological conditions of the tree but cell extension is more sensitive process. An individual tree can bear the drought conditions but leaf canopy area, growth rate and reproductive success, all of these related through a number of anatomical and physiological processes (Boyer 1982; Chaves et al., 2003). The objectives of present study were to; 1) investigate the vessel and stomatal anatomy and their comparison across the species 2) to understand the tradeoff between the anatomical traits.

The objectives of present study were to; 1) investigate the vessel and stomatal anatomy and their
comparison across the species 2) to understand the tradeoff between the anatomical traits.

## Materials and Methods

Study site: This study was carried out at Botanical Garden Government College University, Lahore situated at Mall road. Annual temperature of Botanical Garden is $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, mean annual temperature in summer is $36^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and annual mean temperature in winter is $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Range of annual precipitation is $250-500 \mathrm{~mm}$ (Khan, 1996).

Plant species and sample collection: Eleven tree species belonging to seven families were studied (Table 3.1). These plant species were one and half year old and planted in experimental plot of Botanical Garden. Four replicates of each specie used for the anatomical study. Samples were collected in the zipper bags and labeled. Leaves were selected for study of stomata while branch and root samples were collected for the study of xylem. For these foliar and branch anatomical investigations, for individual trees of each species were selected and for each tree 5-6 leaves and 3-5 branches of equal size were selected.

Study of stomata: Impression method was used for the study of stomatal numbers (Zhao et al., 2017). Before microscopic study of leaves, dust particles were removed carefully with the help of camel hair brush. Randomly selected leaves of four replicates placed on the smooth surface then applied nail polish varnish on the abaxial surface of leaves. After 3 minutes, nail polish was removed with the help of tweezers. Mounted the layer of nail polish on the glass slide and added a drop of water with the help of dropper and placed cover slip carefully and observed the glass slide under 40X power of the light microscope.

Section cutting for study of xylem vessels: Randomly selected bra etnches and fine roots of each species were used. Selected branches and roots of each replicates were washed. Peel-off the epidermis of the branch. Sections were prepared by free hand-sectioning of roots and branches. Free-hand sectioning was done by using blade. Sections were placed in the petri plate with some water. To observe the section, it was mounted on the glass slide. Added a drop of water and placed a cover slip on it. Placed glass slide under 40X of light microscope for observation.

Photography: Images of stomata and vessels of roots and branches were taken with the help of cell phone camera. Stomatal density was estimated by counting the total number of stomata. Stomatal length was calculated by using image J and 10 randomly selected stomata were
used for measurement for each image of stomata and vessel. Size of vessels and stomata was estimated by using image J (Fan et al., 2011).

Data Analysis: The data was analyzed using Sigma Plot version 14.5. The mean values of studied traits were compared across species using t-test.
Theoretical hydraulic conductance of xylem vessel: Theoretical hydraulic conductance of vessel was calculated (Fan et al., 2011).

| Sr. no. | Species name | Species code | Family |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Acacia nilotica L. | An | Fabaceae |
| 2 | Alstonia scholaris R.Br. | As | Apocynaceae |
| 3 | Cassia fistula L. | Cf | Fabaceae |
| 4 | Conocarpus erectus L. | Ce | Combretaceae |
| 5 | Dalbergia sisso Roxb. | Ds | Fabaceae |
| 6 | Eucalyptus citriodora Hook. | Ec | Myrtaceae |
| 7 | Melia azedarach L . | Ma | Meliaceae |
| 8 | Mimusops elengi L . | Me | Sapotaceae |
| 9 | Pongamia pinnata L . | Pp | Fabaceae |
| 10 | Putranjiva roxburghii Wall. | Pr | Euporbiaceaea |
| 11 | Syzygium cumini L. | Sc | Myrtaceae |

## Results

Stem vessel size across the species studied: The stem vessel size ranged from $12.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ to $25.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, the maximum was found in Cassia fistula while the lowest in Mimusops elengi. The individual species mean values are shown in figure 1 and the mean comparison across species are shown in Table 2.


Fig. 1. Stem vessel size across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 3.1.

It was found that Acacia nilotica showed the significant difference of vessel size with Melia azedarach and Eucalyptus citriodora, while no significant differences were found for Acacai nilotica with the rest of species. Alstonia scholaris showed significant difference with Dalbergia sisso, and Melia azedarch. While Cassia fistula showed significant
difference with Melia azedarach only. Conocarpus erectus showed the significant difference with Dalbergia sisso and Melia azedarach. Melia azedarch showed significant difference with Mimusops elengi. Mimusops elengi showed significant difference with pongamia pinnata, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodora

Table 2. Differences of stem vessels size across the species studied.

| Species names | As | An | Cf | Ce | Ds | Ma | Me | Pp | Pr | Sc | Ec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 18.784 \\ & 0.057 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 25.526 \\ & 0.358 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 19.089 \\ & 0.069 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 24.134 \\ & 0.290 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 19.422 \\ & 0.101 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 21.999 \\ 12.219 \\ <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 21.030 \\ & 0.670 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 16.983 \\ & 0.071 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.999 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.134 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 21.999 \\ & 17.412 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 7} \end{aligned}$ |
| As | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 25.526 \\ & 0.112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 19.089 \\ & \\ & 0.745 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 24.134 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 19.422 \\ & \\ & 0.551 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 12.219 \\ & \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.784 \\ 21.030 \\ 0.322 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 16.983 \\ & \\ & 0.425 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.617 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.784 \\ & 17.412 \\ & 0.194 \end{aligned}$ |
| Cf | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 25.526 \\ & 19.089 \\ & \\ & 0.135 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25.526 \\ & 24.134 \\ & \\ & 0.710 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.526 \\ & 19.422 \\ & 0.149 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25.526 \\ & 12.219 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25.526 \\ & 21.030 \\ & 0.278 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.526 \\ & 16.983 \\ & 0.070 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.526 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.150 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25.526 \\ & 17.412 \\ & 0.082 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ce | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 24.134 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 19.422 \\ & 0.703 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 12.219 \\ & \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 21.030 \\ & 0.374 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 16.983 \\ & 0.350 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.763 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.089 \\ & 17.412 \\ & 0.0620 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ds | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 24.134 \\ & 19.422 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 4 0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24.134 \\ & 12.219 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.134 \\ & 21.030 \\ & 0.237 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.134 \\ & 16.983 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24.134 \\ & 19.443 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 4 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24.134 \\ & 17.412 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \end{aligned}$ |
| Ma | ----- | --- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 19.422 \\ & 12.219 \\ & \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 19.422 \\ & 21.030 \\ & 0.460 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 19.422 \\ & 16.983 \\ & 0.294 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.422 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.987 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.422 \\ & 17.412 \\ & 0.062 \end{aligned}$ |
| Me | ----- | ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 12.219 \\ & 21.030 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.219 \\ & 16.983 \\ & 0.081 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.219 \\ & 19.443 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.219 \\ & 17.412 \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ |
| Pp | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 21.030 \\ & 16.983 \\ & \\ & 0.175 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.030 \\ & 19.443 \\ & 0.484 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.030 \\ & 17.412 \\ & 0.142 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pr | ----- | -- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | --- | ----- | 16.983 | 16.983 |



Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $p<0.05$.

Stem vessel number across the species studied: The stem vessel number ranged from 8.75 to 45.5 , the maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris while the lowest in Acacia nilotica. The individual species mean value mean are shown in figure 2 and the comparison across species are shown in Table 3


Fig. 2. Stem vessel number across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 1.

It was found that Acacia nilotia showed the significant difference with Alstonia scholaris, Conocarpus erectus, Melia azedarach, Mimusops elengi, Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini.Alstonia scholaris showed the significant differences with Cassia fistula, Dalbergia sissio, Pongamia pinnata, Eucalyptus citriodora. Cassia fistula showed the significant differences with Conocarpus erectus, Melia azedarach, Mimusops elengi, Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini.Conocarpus erectus showed the significant differences with Dalbergia sissio, Pongamia pinnata.Dalbergia sissio showed the significant differences with Melia azedarach, Mimusops elengi, Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini, Eucalyptus citriodora. Melia azedarach showed the significant differences with Pongamia pinnata. Mimusops elengi showed the significant differences with Pongamia pinnata. Pongamia pinnata showed the significant differences with Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini, Eucalyptus citriodora

Table 2. Differences of stem vessel number across the species studied.

| Species <br> names | An | As | Cf | Ce | Ds | Ma | Me | Pp | Pr | Sc | Ec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.750 \\ & 45.500 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 8} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.750 \\ & 14.00 \\ & 0.275 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.750 \\ & \\ & 29.500 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 5 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.750 \\ & 14.750 \\ & 0.079 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.750 \\ & 31.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.750 \\ & 38.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.750 \\ & 10.000 \\ & 0.559 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.750 \\ & 40.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 4 5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.750 \\ & 29.500 \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.750 \\ & 25.50 \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ |
| As | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 14.00 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & 0.074 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 14.750 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 31.000 \\ & 0.087 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 38.000 \\ & 0.342 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 40.000 \\ & \\ & 0.641 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 29.500 \\ & 0.068 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.500 \\ & 25.5 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 3} \end{aligned}$ |
| Cf | ----- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.00 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.00 \\ & 14.750 \\ & 0.876 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.00 \\ & 31.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.00 \\ & 38.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.00 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \\ & 0.407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.00 \\ & 40.000 \\ & \\ & 0.063 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.00 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.00 \\ & 25.50 \\ & 0.066 \end{aligned}$ |


| Ce | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 14.750 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 31.000 \\ & 0.784 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 38.000 \\ & 0.199 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 40.000 \\ & 0.364 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & 1.000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 25.50 \\ & \\ & 0.444 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ds | ---- | ---- | --- | - | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 14.750 \\ & 31.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.750 \\ & 38.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.750 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \\ & 0.165 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.750 \\ & 40.000 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.750 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.750 \\ & 25.50 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 3} \end{aligned}$ |
| Ma | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 31.000 \\ & 38.000 \\ & 0.226 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.000 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 31.000 \\ & 40.000 \\ & \\ & 0.420 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.000 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & 0.688 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.000 \\ & 25.50 \\ & \\ & 0.227 \end{aligned}$ |
| Me | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 38.000 \\ & 10.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.000 \\ & 40.000 \\ & 0.855 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.000 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & 0.129 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.000 \\ & 25.50 \\ & 0.050 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pp | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | -- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 10.00 \\ & 40.00 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 4 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.000 \\ & 29.500 \\ & \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.00 \\ & 25.50 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \end{aligned}$ |
| Pr | ---- | --- | ---- | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 40.000 \\ & \\ & 29.500 \\ & 0.349 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.000 \\ & 25.50 \\ & 0.217 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sc | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 29.500 \\ & 25.50 \\ & 0.268 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ec | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |

Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $p<0.05$.
Root vessel size across the species studied: The root vessel size ranged from 18.07 um to 80.61 um, the maximum root vessel size was found in Dalbergia sisso while the lowest in Mimusops elengi. The individual species mean values are shown in figure 3 and the comparison across species are shown in Table 3.


Fig. 3. Root vessel size across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 1

It was found that Acacia nilotica showed significant differences with Alstonia scholaris, Melia azedarach. Alstonia scholaris showed significant differences with

Cassia fistula, Conocarpus erectus, Dalbergia sisso, Melia azedarach, Pongamia pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini. Cassia fistula showed significant differences with Dalbergia sisso, Melia azedarach. Conocarpus erectus showed significant differences with Melia azedarach, Syzygium cumini.

Dalbergia sisso showed significant differences with Mimusops eleng, Pongamia pinnata, Syzygium cumini. Melia azedarach showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi. Mimusops elengi Syzygium cumini

Table 4. Differences of root vessel size across the species studied.

| Species names | An | As | Cf | Ce | Ds | Ma | Me | Pp | Pr | Sc | Ec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An | -- | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 | 62.540 |
|  |  | 18.953 | 35.826 | 36.783 | 80.615 | 33.466 | 18.077 | 30.669 | 26.709 | 24.944 | 26.586 |
|  |  | 0.040 | 0.120 | 0.130 | 0.272 | 0.101 | 0.037 | 0.081 | 0.064 | 0.057 | 0.060 |
| As | ---- | --- | $\begin{aligned} & 18.953 \\ & 35.826 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 7} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 | 18.953 |
|  |  |  |  | 36.783 | 80.615 | 33.466 | 18.077 | 30.669 | 26.709 | 24.944 | 26.586 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.013 | 0.003 | 0.011 | 0.598 | 0.037 | 0.001 | 0.018 | 0.095 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cf | ----- | ---- | ---- | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 | 35.826 |
|  |  |  |  | 36.783 | 80.615 | 33.466 | 18.077 | 30.669 | 26.709 | 24.944 | 26.586 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.859 | 0.004 | 0.634 | 0.013 | 0.346 | 0.088 | 0.054 | 0.110 |
| Ce | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 80.615 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 33.466 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 18.077 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 30.669 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 26.709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 24.944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.783 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.005 | 0.496 | 0.009 | 0.261 | 0.062 | 0.037 | 0.079 |
| Ds | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 80.615 \\ & 33.466 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80.615 \\ & 18.077 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.615 \\ & 30.669 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80.615 \\ & 26.709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80.615 \\ & 24.944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80.615 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.002 |
| Ma | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 33.466 \\ & 18.077 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.466 \\ & 30.669 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.466 \\ & 26.709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.466 \\ & 24.944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.466 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.007 | 0.552 | 0.094 | 0.050 | 0.162 |
| Me | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 18.077 \\ & 30.669 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.077 \\ & 26.709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.077 \\ & 24.944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.077 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.027 | 0.002 | 0.013 | 0.071 |
| Pp | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 30.669 \\ & 26.709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.669 \\ & 24.944 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.669 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.335 | 0.196 | 0.417 |
| Pr | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | 26.709 | 26.709 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.944 | 26.586 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.370 | 0.973 |
| Sc | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |  | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 24.944 \\ & 26.586 \end{aligned}$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.666 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ec | ------ | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- |

Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $p<0.05$.

## Root vessel number across the species studied:

The root vessel number ranged from 3 to 14 , the maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris while the lowest in Dalbergia sisso. The individual species mean values are shown in figure 4.4 and the comparison across species are shown in Table 4.4


Fig. 4. Root vessel number across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 3.1.

It was found that Acacia nilotica showed significant differences with Alstonia scholaris and Melia azedarach.. Alstonia scholaris showed significant differences with Cassia fistula, Conocarpus erectus, Dalbergia sisso, Mimusops elengi, Pongamina pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii and Eucalyptus citriodora. Cassia fistula showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi. Dalbergia sisso showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi. Melia azedarach showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi. Mimusops elengi showed significant differences with Pongamia pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii.

Table 5. Differences of root vessel number across the species studied.

| Species names | An | As | Cf | Ce | Ds | Ma | Me | Pp | Pr | Sc | Ec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An | --- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.250 \\ & 14.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 4.500 \\ & 0.871 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.241 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 3.000 \\ & 0.252 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 4.750 \\ & 0.762 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 9.750 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 4.000 \\ & 0.862 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 5.500 \\ & 0.390 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.250 \\ & 13.000 \\ & 0.128 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.250 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.224 \end{aligned}$ |
| As | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 14.000 \\ & 4.500 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 8} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.000 \\ & 6.250 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.000 \\ & 3.000 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.000 \\ & 4.750 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.000 \\ & 9.750 \\ & \\ & 0.110 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.000 \\ & 4.000 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.000 \\ & 5.500 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14.000 \\ & 13.000 \\ & 0.839 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.000 \\ & 6.250 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 8} \end{aligned}$ |
| Cf | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.350 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 3.000 \\ & \\ & 0.304 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.500 \\ & 4.750 \\ & 0.893 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 9.750 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 4.000 \\ & 0.766 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 5.500 \\ & \\ & 0.551 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 13.000 \\ & 0.135 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.500 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.337 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ce | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 3.000 \\ & 0.075 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 4.750 \\ & 0.440 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 9.750 \\ & 0.066 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 4.000 \\ & 0.223 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6.250 \\ & 5.500 \\ & 0.661 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 13.000 \\ & 0.210 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.250 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ds | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 4.750 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 9.750 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 4.000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 5.500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 13.000 \end{aligned}$ | 3.000 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.280 | 0.002 | 0.437 | 0.091 | 0.098 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6.250 \\ & 0.065 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ma | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 4.750 \\ & 9.750 \\ & \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 4.750 \\ 4.000 \\ \\ 0.675 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 4.750 \\ 5.500 \\ \\ 0.671 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.750 \\ & 13.000 \\ & \\ & 0.144 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.750 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.429 \end{aligned}$ |
| Me | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | ---- | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 9.750 \\ 4.000 \\ \\ \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 9.750 \\ 5.500 \\ \\ \mathbf{0 . 0 2 1} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9.750 \\ & 13.000 \\ & \\ & 0.502 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9.750 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.057 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pp | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 4.000 \\ 5.500 \\ \\ 0.356 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.000 \\ & 13.000 \\ & \\ & 0.120 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.000 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.210 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pr | ----- | ----- | ---- | --- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5.500 \\ & 13.000 \\ & \\ & 0.173 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5.500 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.651 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sc | ----- | ----- | ---- | ----- | ----- | --- | --- | --- | ----- | ----- | $\begin{aligned} & 13.000 \\ & 6.250 \\ & 0.209 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ec | --- | --- | --- | ----- | --- | --- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | ---- |

Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $p<0.05$.
tomata size across species studied: Stomata size ranged from $5.50 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ to $11.93 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, the maximum was found in Mimusops elengi while the lowest in Cassia fistula. The individual species mean values are shown in figure 4.5 and the comparison across species are shown in Table 5.


Fig. 5: Stomata size across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 1.

It was found that Acacia nilotica showed significant differences with Melia azedarach,
pongamina pinnata, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodoa.

Alstonia scholaris showed significant differences with Conocarpus erectus, Melia azedarach and Syzygium cumini. Cassia fistula showed significant differences with Conocarpus erectus and Melia azedarach. Conocarpus erectus showed significant differences with Melia azedarach, Mimusops elengi, Pongamia pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii and Eucalyptus citriodora. Dalbergia sisso showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi, Pongamia pinnata, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodoa.,Melia azedarach showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi and Syzygium cumini. Mimusops elengi showed significant differences with Pongamia pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii and Eucalyptus citriodora Table 4.5 showing the differences of stomata size across the species studied. Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $\mathrm{p}<0.05$.

Pongamia pinnata showed significant differences with Syzygium cumini. Putranjiva roxburghii showed significant differences with Syzygium cumini.

Syzygium cumini showed significant differences with Eucalyptus citriodoa.
4.6 Stomata number across species studied: Stomata number ranged from 22.5 to 212 , the maximum was found in Alstonia scholaris while the lowest in Mimusops elengi. The individual species mean values are shown in figure 4.6 and comparison across species are shown in Table 4.6


Fig. 4.6 Stomata number across species studied. Species codes are listed in Table 3.1.

It was found that Acacia nilotica showed significant differences with Cassia fistula, Conocarpus erectus, Dalbergia sisso and Mimusops elengi. Cassia fistula showed significant differences with Melia azedarach, with Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodora. Conocarpus erectus showed significant differences with Melia azedarach, with Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodora. Dalbergia sisso showed significant differences with Putranjiva roxxburghii.

Table 4.6 Showing the differences of stomata number across the species studied.

| Species names | An | As | Cf | Ce | Ds | Ma | Me | Pp | Pr | Sc | Ec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An | -- | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 | 65.500 |
|  |  | 212.00 | 44.750 | 38.500 | 31.000 | 49.500 | 22.500 | 52.000 | 73.250 | 64.250 | 67.000 |
|  |  | 0.306 | 0.037 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.105 | 0.002 | 0.250 | 0.289 | 0.814 | 0.837 |
| As | ---- | --- | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 | 212.00 |
|  |  |  | 44.750 | 38.500 | 31.000 | 49.500 | 22.500 | 52.000 | 73.250 | 64.250 | 67.000 |
|  |  |  | 0.294 | 0.291 | 0.287 | 0.297 | 0.282 | 0.298 | 0.310 | 0.305 | 0.306 |
| Cf | ----- | ---- | ---- | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 | 44.750 |
|  |  |  |  | 38.500 | 31.000 | 49.500 | 22.500 | 52.000 | 73.250 | 64.250 | 67.000 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.422 | 0.132 | 0.617 | 0.032 | 0.533 | 0.011 | 0.045 | 0.031 |
| Ce | --- | --- | --- | --- | 38.500 | 38.500 | 38.500 | 38.500 | 38.500 | 38.500 | 38.500 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 31.000 | 49.500 | 22.500 | 52.000 | 73.250 | 64.250 | 67.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.290 | 0.218 | 0.022 | 0.242 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.005 |
| Ds | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 31.000 | 31.000 | 31.000 | 31.000 | 31.000 | 31.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.500 | 22.500 | 52.000 | 73.250 | 64.250 | 67.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.074 | 0.193 | 0.103 | <0.001 | 0.006 | 0.002 |
| Ma | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 49.500 | 49.500 | 49.500 | 49.500 | 49.500 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 22.500 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 2 5 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 52.000 \\ & 0.833 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 73.250 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 3 1 0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 64.250 \\ & 0.114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 67.000 \\ & 0.087 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Me | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 22.500 \\ & 52.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 4 6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.500 \\ & 76.250 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.500 \\ & 64.250 \\ & <\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.500 \\ & 67.000 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 2} \end{aligned}$ |
| Pp | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | $\begin{aligned} & 52.000 \\ & 73.250 \\ & 0.098 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.000 \\ & 64.250 \\ & 0.270 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.500 \\ & 67.000 \\ & 0.212 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pr | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | $\begin{aligned} & 73.250 \\ & 64.250 \\ & 0.146 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73.250 \\ & 67.000 \\ & 0.401 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sc | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---- | --- | --- | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 64.250 \\ & 67.000 \\ & 0.634 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ec | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Note: Bold number indicates the significant differences in the mean values $p<0.05$
roxburghii, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodora. Melia azedarach showed significant differences with Mimusops elengi and Putranjiva roxburghii. Mimusops elengi showed significant differences with Pongamia pinnata, Putranjiva roxburghii, Syzygium cumini and Eucalyptus citriodora.
4.7 Xylem theoratical hydraulic conductance (ki) for root and stem across species studied.


Fig 4.7 Species code and theoratical hydraulic conductance of root vessels $\left(\mathrm{Kg} \mu \mathrm{m}^{-1} \mathrm{Mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right.$ ). All values on Y -axis are with $10^{-11}$ power.


Fig 4.8 Species code and theoratical hydraulic conductance of stem vessels in $\left(\mathrm{Kg} \mu \mathrm{m}^{-1} \mathrm{Mpa}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$. All values on Y -axis are with $10^{-11}$ power.
4.8 Relationship of stem xylem vessel with root xylem vessel: A positive relationship ( $\mathrm{R} 2=0.41$ ) was found between stem vessel number and root vessel number as shown in figure 4.10


Fig 4.9: Relationship of stem xylem vessel with root xylem vessel. Each dot represents the individual specie.
4.9 Relationship of stem xylem vessel with root xylem vessel: A positive relationship ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.23$ ) was found between stem vessel number and root vessel number as shown in figure 4.11.


Fig 4.10 Showing linear relationship between stem vessel number and root vessel number.
4.9 Relationship between stem vessel number and root vessel number: A positive relationship $\left(R^{2}=0.48\right)$ was found between stem vessel number and root vessel number as shown in figure 4.11


Fig 4.11 Showing linear relationship between stem vessel number and root vessel number.

## Discussion

The study conducted on the 11 trees seedlings has provided some useful insights into the foliar, branch and
root anatomical features. The studied traits broadly reflect the hydraulic performance of species, which is reflected in terms of water supply through the xylem vessels from roots, to the stem xylem and finally at the leaf level (stomata) to release water and fix the carbon (Bussotti et al., 2018). These traits are also useful to understand the hydraulic safety and efficiency among the trees (Johnson et al., 2011; Meinzer et al., 2009). As the trees with large diameter of vessel potentially have large theoretical conductivity per xylem vessels, but such vessels are more susceptible to embolism, such species need to maintain the constant supply of water through the roots which can help to avoid the embolism and will be requiring moist habitat or may reduce the path length. In our study the species with larger vessel diameter are exhibiting the larger xylem hydraulic conductivity supporting the previous studies (Choat et al., 2008; Apgaua et al., 2015). Further, we found the positive relationships between the stem vessel size and root vessel size, indicating the balance among the development of organs both above ground and below ground. But this finding contradicting with Tyree and Zimmermann (2002), reporting the more vulnerability of root vessels to drought as compared to stem vessels due to significantly large diameter of root vessels than the stem vessels. The species with small vessels and having more parenchyma cells also have the adaptation to avoid the drought induced embolism by utilizing the starch to release sugars which can move into the vessels helping the transportation of water due to osmotic potential (Carlquist, 2001). Such arrangement of cells also help the species for the recovery of embolism.

It was found that in some species the root xylem was wider than the stem. The resistance to the conductivity of water in the xylem is determined by the size of xylem conduit, as the conductivity in the xylem is proportional to the fourth power of conduit radius. The increase in xylem area leads to the increase in xylem hydraulic conductance. The large difference in the species xylem hydraulic conductance is because of the differences in their xylem sizes and also the length of xylem conduit length, although the vessel length can be correlated with the xylem diameter (Alder et al., 1996; Kavanaugh et al., 1999; Martínez-Vilalta \& Pockman 2002). Such changes in xylem affect the efficiency of water transport. As the water absorbed by the deep roots have to be travelled from a long distance to reach the canopy leaves, than the water of shellow roots, the comparision of xyelm anatomy at the different intervals of water path length may reflect some insights on the species differences and their adaptations to transport water to the canopy. The differences in the xylem size at the deep roots, surface roots and at the stem will be necessory to create the gradient for conductuion of water.

The number of stomata and the size differed significantly across the stuudy species mainly because the species respond differently even under the similar climatic conditions. As each speceis have evolved with the specific morphological traits through time. The meteorological conditions have the influence on plants as they force to adjust foliar and xylem plant traits (Tian et al., 2016).

In our study the xylem hydraulic conductance was as: Acacia nilotica > Mimusops elengi > Pongamia pinnata > Delbergia sisso > Syzygium cumini > Melia azadarach > Cnocarpus erectus > Alstonia scholaris > Putranjiva roxburghii $>$ Eucalyptus citriodora $>$ Cassia fistula. It is important to note that the results reported
here for the xylem conductance and foliar anatomy are on the unit area basis, not on the whole tree xylem area or as some species can have low conductance but larger conducting area, and can have the high value of conduatance when compared with the whole tree basis.

## Conclusion:

The foliar, branch and root anatomical features can provide useful insights about the conductance of water in trees. Such kinds of traits provide approximate about the water conducting capacity and can help to plan the species for plantation in the specific areas.


Plate 3: Cassia fistula, A (Stem xylem vessels), C (stomata)

Plate 1: Acacia nilotia, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 2: Alstonia scholaris, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 4: Conocarpus erectus, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 5: Dalbergia sisso, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 6: Melia azedarach, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 7: Mimusops elengi, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels). C (stomata)


Plate 8: Pongamia pinnata, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 9: Putranjiva roxburghii, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 10: Syzygium cumini, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)


Plate 11: Eucalyptus citriodora, A (Stem xylem vessels), B (Root xylem vessels), C (stomata)
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