IJCRM
International Journal of Contemporary Research In Multidisciplinary

Research Article

Comparative Study of Photosynthetic Efficiency in C3 vs C4 Plants Under Climate Stress

Dr. Sachendra Bohra[1*], Chetan Kumar Jani[2]

[1] Principal, Shri Dhanrajji Shri Chandji Badamia College of Professional Studies, Varkana, Rajasthan, India

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, Shri Dhanrajji Shri Chandji Badamia College of Professional Studies, Varkana, Rajasthan, India

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sachendra Bohra*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15242247

Abstract

The ongoing effects of climate change, including rising temperatures, erratic precipitation, and frequent droughts, are increasingly threatening agricultural productivity worldwide. These environmental stressors have a direct impact on plant growth, photosynthesis, and crop yields. Therefore, understanding how different plant types cope with these stresses is crucial for ensuring global food security. This study compares the photosynthetic efficiency and resilience of C3 and C4 plants, using wheat (Triticum aestivum) as a representative C3 species and maize (Zea mays) as a C4 species. Both plant types were exposed to controlled heat and drought stress to evaluate their physiological responses. Various parameters such as net photosynthetic rate, stomatal conductance, chlorophyll content, relative water content (RWC), and biomass accumulation were assessed. The findings revealed that C4 plants, particularly maize, demonstrated significantly better tolerance to both heat and drought stress, maintaining more consistent photosynthetic activity and overall physiological function compared to C3 plants. Maize showed superior water retention, higher chlorophyll levels, and more efficient stomatal control under stress conditions. In contrast, wheat exhibited more substantial reductions in photosynthetic efficiency, chlorophyll content, and biomass. These results highlight the advantages of the C4 photosynthetic mechanism in improving plant resilience to climate-related stresses and underscore the potential benefits of integrating C4 traits into breeding programs. This research offers valuable insights into strategies for developing climate-resilient crops, crucial for sustaining agricultural production in a changing climate.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 27-02-2025
- **Accepted:** 25-03-2025
- **Published:** 18-04-2025
- **IJCRM:**4(2); 2025: 222-227

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Bohra S, Jani CK. Comparative study of photosynthetic efficiency in C3 vs C4 plants under climate stress. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2025;4(2):222-227.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: C3 Photosynthesis, C4 Photosynthesis, Climate Stress, Photosynthetic Efficiency, Heat Stress, Drought Tolerance, Crop Improvement

1. INTRODUCTION

Photosynthesis is the fundamental biological process through which green plants convert light energy into chemical energy, sustaining life on Earth. The two primary pathways of photosynthesis in higher plants are the C3 and C4 pathways. C3 photosynthesis, named for the three-carbon compound produced during the initial step of the Calvin cycle, is the most common pathway and is utilized by major crops such as rice, wheat, and soybeans. However, C3 photosynthesis is inefficient under high temperature and low water availability due to the increase in photorespiration—a process that consumes oxygen and releases carbon dioxide, reducing net carbon gain.

In contrast, C4 photosynthesis is an adaptation found in certain plants, such as maize and sorghum, where carbon dioxide is initially fixed into a four-carbon compound in mesophyll cells. This compound is then transported to bundle sheath cells, where the Calvin cycle occurs. This spatial separation of initial carbon fixation and the Calvin cycle significantly reduces photorespiration, particularly under high temperature and light intensity conditions. As a result, C4 plants tend to exhibit higher water use efficiency and photosynthetic performance in warm and arid environments.

Given the ongoing changes in global climate, particularly rising temperatures and increased frequency of drought events, it is imperative to understand how these two types of plants perform under such stresses. This study aims to compare the photosynthetic performance of wheat and maize under heat and drought stress to identify potential physiological advantages of C4 plants and inform future agricultural strategies.

2. OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of this study is to evaluate and compare the photosynthetic efficiency and overall stress tolerance of C3 and C4 plants, specifically wheat (Triticum aestivum) and maize (Zea mays), when exposed to heat and drought stress. The specific objectives of this research are as follows:

1. To assess the photosynthetic efficiency of wheat (C3) and maize (C4) under heat and drought stress: The first objective is to measure how these two plant species differ in their ability to carry out photosynthesis under stressful environmental conditions. This will involve monitoring net photosynthetic rate (A) and determining how each species adapts to reduced water availability and increased temperatures, thereby providing insight into the efficiency of carbon fixation in C3 and C4 pathways.

2. To evaluate key physiological responses, including chlorophyll content, stomatal conductance, and relative water content (RWC): This objective seeks to understand the broader physiological adaptations that help plants cope with climate stress. Chlorophyll content will be measured to assess plant health, while stomatal conductance and RWC will provide information on how water use is regulated. These factors are critical for understanding how well each plant type maintains hydration and photosynthesis under stress.

3. To investigate biomass accumulation as an indicator of growth performance under stress conditions: Biomass accumulation serves as a reliable indicator of overall plant health and productivity. This objective aims to compare the growth of both wheat and maize under heat and drought stress by measuring dry weight and assessing how stress impacts their ability to allocate energy and resources toward growth. This will help evaluate the potential yield reduction in each species.

4. To explore the potential for utilizing C4 traits in improving C3 crops for climate resilience: Finally, this objective aims to explore the possibility of incorporating the beneficial traits of C4 photosynthesis into C3 crops like wheat. Understanding the advantages of the C4 pathway under climate stress can help guide breeding strategies to enhance stress tolerance and water use efficiency in crops that are vital for global food security.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Plant Material and Growth Conditions

Certified seeds of wheat (Triticum aestivum) and maize (Zea mays) were sourced from a local agricultural research institute to ensure quality and uniformity in the experimental material. The seeds were germinated in plastic pots containing a sterilized soil mixture composed of loam soil, sand, and organic compost in a 2:1:1 ratio. This mixture ensured proper drainage, adequate nutrient content, and an optimal medium for plant growth. The pots were placed in a controlled greenhouse with a natural photoperiod ranging from 12 to 14 hours of light per day. The greenhouse maintained a relative humidity level of 60-70% and a consistent ambient temperature of 25°C. The plants were allowed to grow until they reached the 4-leaf stage, which typically takes about three to four weeks, depending on the species and environmental conditions. At this stage, the plants were deemed mature enough to be subjected to experimental treatments.

3.2 Experimental Design

A factorial experimental design was employed to investigate the responses of wheat and maize to different environmental stress factors. The design included three distinct treatment conditions and two plant species, resulting in a total of six experimental groups. The specific treatments were:

1. Control Condition: Plants were kept at a constant temperature of 25°C with adequate water, maintaining 100% field capacity, which allowed the plants to grow under optimal conditions.

2. Heat Stress Condition: The plants were exposed to a temperature of 38°C, representing a heat stress scenario. These plants were also well-watered to ensure that the only stress factor was the elevated temperature.

3. Drought Stress Condition: The plants were subjected to drought by withholding water for seven days, reducing the soil moisture content to approximately 35-40% of field capacity. This treatment mimicked water scarcity scenarios typical in regions facing prolonged drought conditions.

Each treatment group consisted of five replicates for each plant species, totaling 30 experimental units. To ensure uniformity, all plants were placed in a controlled environment where variables such as temperature, humidity, and light were maintained consistently throughout the study. Daily observations were made to monitor any signs of plant stress such as wilting, leaf discoloration, or stunted growth. Data collection occurred at the end of the stress exposure period, which was after 7 days of imposed stress.

3.3 Parameters Measured

Several physiological parameters were measured to assess the effects of heat and drought stress on the plants. This included net photosynthetic rate, stomatal conductance, chlorophyll content, relative water content (RWC), and biomass accumulation. The following outlines the methodology used for each parameter:

Net Photosynthetic Rate (A): The photosynthetic rate of the plants was measured using a LI-6400XT portable infrared gas analyzer (Licor, USA). This device allowed for accurate real-time measurements of photosynthesis by monitoring the carbon dioxide assimilation rate (A) under controlled conditions of light intensity, temperature, and atmospheric CO2 concentration. The data was collected during the mid-morning to ensure stable and comparable measurements across different experimental units.

Stomatal Conductance (gs): Stomatal conductance was measured simultaneously with the net photosynthetic rate using the LI-6400XT. This parameter provides an indication of how open the stomata are, which is crucial for understanding how efficiently plants regulate water loss and carbon dioxide intake under stress conditions.

Chlorophyll Content: The chlorophyll content in the leaves was measured using a SPAD-502 chlorophyll meter (Minolta, Japan). The SPAD meter estimates the chlorophyll concentration based on the light absorbance in the red and infrared wavelengths, providing a non-destructive and rapid means to assess the plant's photosynthetic capacity and health.

Relative Water Content (RWC): The RWC was calculated to estimate the water status of the plants. Leaf samples were collected, weighed immediately for fresh weight (FW), then immersed in distilled water for 4-6 hours to achieve full turgidity, and weighed again to obtain the turgid weight (TW). After drying the samples in an oven at 70°C for 48 hours, the dry weight (DW) was determined. The relative water content was calculated using the following formula:

$$\mathrm{RWC} = \left(\frac{\mathrm{FW} - \mathrm{DW}}{\mathrm{TW} - \mathrm{DW}}\right) \mathrm{X}\ 100$$

Biomass Accumulation: Biomass accumulation was used as an indicator of the overall growth and productivity of the plants under stress conditions. After the experimental period, plants were carefully harvested, and all above-ground biomass was separated. The plant material was then dried in an oven at 70°C for 48 hours until a constant dry weight was achieved. The final dry weight was recorded and used as a measure of the plant's growth performance and resilience to heat and drought stress.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data collected from all measurements were analyzed using statistical software (e.g., SPSS or R). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine the effects of plant species (wheat vs. maize), treatment conditions (control, heat stress, drought stress), and their interaction on the measured parameters. Post-hoc comparisons were conducted using Tukey's test to identify significant differences between treatment groups. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all tests.

4. RESULTS

4.1. The photosynthetic rate (A) in both wheat (Triticum aestivum) and maize (Zea mays) was significantly influenced by the imposed heat and drought stress conditions. Under optimal control conditions (25°C, well-watered), maize exhibited a higher photosynthetic rate (21.5 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1) compared to wheat, which had a rate of 18.7 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1. These values reflect the inherent differences in the photosynthetic capabilities of C3 and C4 plants, with maize's C4 pathway enabling more efficient carbon fixation under favorable conditions.

When exposed to heat stress (38°C), both plant species showed a decline in photosynthetic rates. Wheat exhibited a marked reduction, with its photosynthetic rate dropping to 10.1 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1, representing a 46% decrease from control conditions. In contrast, maize experienced a smaller decrease in photosynthetic activity, with its rate declining to 17.8 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1, a reduction of only 17%. This suggests that maize, with its C4 photosynthetic pathway, maintained greater photosynthetic efficiency and was better able to tolerate elevated temperatures compared to wheat.

Under drought stress, which involved withholding water for seven days, both species experienced further declines in photosynthetic rates. Wheat's photosynthetic rate decreased by 52%, falling to 8.9 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1, while maize showed a more modest decline of 26%, dropping to 15.9 µmol CO_2 m^2s^1. These results highlight maize's superior resilience to water scarcity, as its photosynthetic system appears to be better adapted to cope with both heat and drought stress, maintaining a higher level of photosynthetic activity than wheat under both stress conditions.

4.2. Stomatal Conductance Wheat's stomatal conductance fell by 40% under heat stress and 47% under drought. In contrast, maize showed a more moderate reduction (22% under heat, 30% under drought), indicating better stomatal regulation in C4 plants.

4.3. Chlorophyll Content SPAD values revealed a 28% decrease in chlorophyll in wheat under heat stress and a 35% decrease under drought. Maize showed only 12% and 18% reductions, respectively. This suggests that chlorophyll degradation was more severe in C3 plants.

4.4. Relative Water Content Wheat showed a significant drop in RWC under drought, decreasing from 82% in the control to 54% in stressed plants. Maize maintained an RWC of 74% under drought, reflecting its superior water retention capacity.

4.5. Biomass Accumulation Dry biomass in wheat was reduced by 48% under drought and 40% under heat stress. In maize, reductions were limited to 22% and 18% respectively. The cumulative impact of reduced photosynthesis, chlorophyll content, and water availability was more pronounced in C3 plants.

5. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis highlights several key differences in how C3 and C4 plants respond to climatic stress. The decline in photosynthetic efficiency in wheat under both heat and drought stress aligns with established knowledge of the vulnerabilities of the C3 pathway. High temperatures exacerbate photorespiration in C3 plants, reducing their net carbon gain. Additionally, drought-induced stomatal closure in wheat significantly limits CO2 uptake, further compounding photosynthetic decline.

In contrast, maize benefits from the C4 photosynthetic mechanism, which concentrates CO2 around Rubisco in bundle sheath cells, thereby suppressing photorespiration even under high temperatures. This allows maize to maintain relatively higher photosynthetic rates and water use efficiency. The stability of chlorophyll content and higher relative water content in maize further support its resilience.

The study reinforces findings from other research showing that C4 plants have evolved to be more efficient under hot, dry conditions. These adaptations include anatomical traits (e.g., Kranz anatomy), biochemical pathways (PEP carboxylase instead of Rubisco for initial CO2 fixation), and physiological strategies (e.g., stomatal regulation).

Given that the majority of global staple crops are C3 species, there is growing interest in transferring C4 traits to C3 crops. This includes research into engineering the C4 pathway into rice, which could dramatically improve its yield and stress tolerance. Additionally, selective breeding to improve water use efficiency and reduce photorespiration in C3 crops remains a key area of focus.

6. CONCLUSION

This study provides strong evidence that C4 plants, such as maize, exhibit superior performance compared to C3 plants like wheat under both heat and drought stress. The results indicate that C4 plants are better equipped to maintain efficient photosynthesis, conserve water, and produce more biomass when subjected to environmental stressors. These advantages make C4 plants particularly promising for future agricultural systems, especially in regions that are highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. The findings emphasize the potential benefits of C4 crops in the context of a warming climate. As temperatures rise and water scarcity becomes more widespread, crops like maize, which are able to optimize water usage and withstand higher temperatures, will be crucial for ensuring food production in less favorable environments. This highlights the need for increased efforts to cultivate more C4 crops in regions where heat and drought are becoming more frequent or severe.

Additionally, the study supports the ongoing exploration of incorporating C4-like traits into C3 crops through advanced breeding techniques or genetic engineering. By transferring key elements of the C4 photosynthetic pathway into traditionally C3 crops like wheat, it may be possible to enhance their resilience to climate stress, thereby improving crop yields in a changing climate. The integration of such traits into crop development could significantly improve agricultural productivity, ensuring food security for the growing global population.

As climate change continues to impact traditional farming practices, leveraging the knowledge gained from photosynthetic research and applying it to breeding programs will be essential. This approach will allow for the development of more resilient crops that can thrive under increasingly difficult environmental conditions, securing the global food supply in the face of climate uncertainty.

REFERENCES

1. Ainsworth EA, Long SP. What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO_2 enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and plant production to rising CO_2. New Phytologist. 2005;165(2):351–372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01224.x
2. Baker NR. Chlorophyll fluorescence: A probe of photosynthesis in vivo. Annual Review of Plant Biology. 2008;59:89–113. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.032607.092759
3. Bernacchi CJ, Morgan PB, Ort DR, Long SP. The growth of soybean under free air CO_2 enrichment (FACE) stimulates photosynthesis while decreasing in vivo Rubisco capacity. Planta. 2007;220(3):434–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-004-1369-4
4. Cousins AB, Baroli I, Badger MR, Ivakov A, Lea PJ, Leegood RC, *et al.* The role of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase during C_4 photosynthetic isotope exchange and its implications for C_4 photosynthesis evolution. Plant Physiology. 2007;145(3):1006–1017. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.107.103374
5. Dai Y, Shen Z, Liu Y, Wang L, Hannaway D, Lu H. Effects of shade treatments on the photosynthetic capacity, chlorophyll fluorescence, and chlorophyll content of two soybean cultivars. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2009;4(7):685–690.
6. Ehleringer JR, Cerling TE. C_3 and C_4 photosynthesis. Encyclopedia of Global Environmental Change. 2002;2:186–190.
7. Farquhar GV, von Caemmerer S, Berry JA. A biochemical model of photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation in leaves of C_3 species. Planta. 1980;149(1):78–90. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00386231
8. Ghannoum O. C_4 photosynthesis and water stress. Annals of Botany. 2009;103(4):635–644. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcn093
9. Hatch MD. C_4 photosynthesis: A unique blend of modified biochemistry, anatomy and ultrastructure. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Reviews on Bioenergetics.

1987;895(2):81–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4173(87)80009-5

10. Heckathorn SA, Coleman JS, Hallberg RL. The role of chloroplast small heat-shock proteins in protection of photosynthesis during heat stress. American Journal of Botany. 1998;85(8):1007–1017. https://doi.org/10.2307/2446345
11. Henderson SA, von Caemmerer S, Farquhar GD, Wade LJ. Short-term salinity tolerance in C_4 grasses is related to differences in leaf osmotic adjustment and photosynthetic capacity. Plant and Soil. 1998;205(1):1–13. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004301713644
12. Kumar A, Singh DP. Photosynthetic efficiency and water use efficiency of C_3 and C_4 plants: A comparative analysis. Journal of Environmental Biology. 2012;33(5):667–671.
13. Leakey ADB, Bernacchi CJ, Dohleman FG, Ort DR, Long SP. Will photosynthesis of maize (*Zea mays*) in the US Corn Belt increase in future [CO_2] rich atmospheres? An analysis of diurnal courses of CO_2 uptake under free-air concentration enrichment (FACE). Global Change Biology. 2004;10(6):951–962. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-8817.2003.00767.x
14. Long SP, Ainsworth EA, Rogers A, Ort DR. Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide: Plants FACE the future. Annual Review of Plant Biology. 2004;55:591–628. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.55.031903.141610
15. Makino A, Mae T. Photosynthesis and plant growth at elevated levels of CO_2. Plant and Cell Physiology. 1999;40(10):999–1006. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pcp.a029493
16. Matsuoka M, Furbank RT, Fukayama H, Miyao M. Molecular engineering of C_4 photosynthesis. Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology. 2001;52:297–314. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.52.1.297
17. Jane L. A comparative biochemical analysis of photosynthetic efficiency in C3 and C4 plants. Journal of Plant Biochemistry & Physiology. 2024;12(5):323. https://doi.org/10.35248/2329-9029.24.12.323
18. Karami S, Shiran B, Ravash R. A comprehensive analysis of transcriptomic data for comparison of plants with different photosynthetic pathways in response to drought stress. PLoS ONE. 2023;18(6):e0287761. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287761
19. Tahmasebi A, Niazi A. Comparison of transcriptional response of C3 and C4 plants to drought stress using meta-analysis and systems biology approach. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2021;12:668736. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.668736
20. Karami S, Shiran B, Ravash R. Molecular investigation of how drought stress affects chlorophyll metabolism and photosynthesis in leaves of C3 and C4 plant species: A transcriptome meta-analysis. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2024;15:11840503. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.11840503
21. Yin X, Struik PC. Improving photosynthetic efficiency in fluctuating light to enhance yield of C3 and C4 crops. Crop and Environment. 2024;3(4):184–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crope.2024.06.003
22. Ainsworth EA, *et al.* Similar photosynthetic but different yield responses of C3 and C4 crops to elevated O_3. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2024;121(4):e2313591120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2313591120
23. Yamori W, Hikosaka K, Way DA. Temperature response of photosynthesis in C3, C4, and CAM plants: Temperature acclimation and temperature adaptation. Photosynthesis Research. 2014;119(1–2):101–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11120-013-9874-6
24. Bellasio C, *et al.* Differential physiological and production responses of C3 and C4 crops to climate factor interactions. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2024;15:1345462. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1345462
25. Sage RF, Zhu XG. Exploiting the engine of C4 photosynthesis. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2011;62(9):2989–3000. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err179
26. Sage RF, Khoshravesh R. The activation state of Rubisco in C3 and C4 plants. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2016;67(10):3109–3119. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erw106
27. Sage RF, Monson RK, editors. C4 plant biology. San Diego: Academic Press; 1999.
28. Sage RF, Pearcy RW. The nitrogen use efficiency of C3 and C4 plants: I. Leaf nitrogen, growth, and biomass partitioning in *Chenopodium album* (L.) and *Amaranthus retroflexus* (L.). Plant Physiology. 1987;84(3):954–958. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.84.3.954
29. Ghannoum O, *et al.* Photosynthetic responses of a C4 grass and a C3 grass to water stress. Plant Physiology. 2001;125(1):210–223. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.125.1.210
30. Long SP, et al. Food for thought: Lower-than-expected crop yield stimulation with rising CO_2 concentrations. Science. 2006;312(5782):1918–1921. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114722
31. Leakey ADB, *et al.* Elevated CO_2 effects on plant carbon, nitrogen, and water relations: Six important lessons from FACE. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2009;60(10):2859–2876. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp096
32. von Caemmerer S, Furbank RT. The C4 pathway: An efficient CO_2 pump. Photosynthesis Research. 2003;77(2–3):191–207. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025821629587
33. Edwards GE, Walker DA. C3, C4: Mechanisms, and cellular and environmental regulation, of photosynthesis. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications; 1983.
34. Hatch MD. C4 photosynthesis: A unique blend of modified biochemistry, anatomy and ultrastructure. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Reviews on Bioenergetics. 1987;895(2):81–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4173(87)80009-5
35. Ehleringer JR, Monson RK. Evolutionary and ecological aspects of photosynthetic pathway variation. Annual

Review of Ecology and Systematics. 1993;24(1):411–439. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.002211

About the Authors

Dr. Sachendra Bohra is the Principal of Shri Dhanrajji Shri Chandji Badamia College of Professional Studies, Varkana. With many years of academic and administrative experience, he has made significant contributions to higher education. Dr. Bohra has presented and published numerous research papers at international, national, and conference levels, reflecting his dedication to academic excellence. His innovative work and scholarly achievements have earned him the prestigious Young Scientist Award. A committed educator and researcher, Dr. Bohra continues to inspire students and colleagues through his leadership, vision, and passion for knowledge advancement in professional and academic spheres.

Chetan Kumar Jani is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Botany at Shri Dhanrajji Shri Chandji Badamia College of Professional Studies, Varkana. He is a dedicated educator and researcher with a strong commitment to academic excellence. Professor Jani has presented and published numerous research papers in reputed national and international journals, as well as at various conferences. His active participation in academic events reflects his enthusiasm for continuous learning and contribution to the field of botany. Through his subject expertise, research involvement, and engaging teaching methods, he continues to inspire and guide students in their academic journey.