# SOME ASPECTS OF PHYSIOLOGY OF SALT TOLERANCE IN WHEAT (TRITICUM AESTIVUM L.)

R.H. Qureshi, M. Aslam, G. Mustafa & J. Akhtar Department of Soil Science, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad

Physiological parameters conferring salt tolerance in wheat were studied in two sets of experiment. Selected and non-selected population of LU 26S and LYP 73 were tested in set-I at EC of 0, 10 and 20 dS m<sup>-1</sup> while LU 26S (selected and non-selected) in set-II at 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. There was significant reduction in tillering fresh shoot and root weights, grain and straw yields in non-selected compared to selected populations of both the cultivars under saline conditions. Glume, rachis and seed of selected LU 26S, maintained lower concentrations of Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>+2</sup> and CF but higher concentrations of K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>+2</sup> and K<sup>+</sup>/Na<sup>+</sup> compared to its non-selected population. The best correlation of grain yield was found with number of tillers, shoot and root dry weights and ionic concentrations in glumes. For salt tolerance studies, analysis of glume was found more representative than rachis and leaf cell sap.

#### INTRODUCTION

Wheat is cultivated on an area of about 7 million hectares with grain production of about 13 million tonnes (Bajwa et al., 1983). However, within the area of irrigated wheat production it is estimated that about 1.2 million hectares are affected due to salinity/sodicity causing annual loss of 2-3 million tonnes of grain (Qayyum and Malik, 1988). This alarming situation warrants the need to develop wiseat cultivar which could produce substantial yield under such adverse conditions. It is, therefore, necessary to investigate the salt tolerance potential of wheat cultivars as some lines of Triticum aestivum L. possess varying tolerance to salinity in a much better way than the others (Qureshi et al., 1990). The present study deals with the comparison of selected vs non-selected population of two wheat cultivars LU 26S and LYP 73 for their ability to tolerate salinity.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two solution culture experiments (set I and II) were conducted in the net house, Department of Soil Science, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad to ascertain the differences for various physiological parameters conferring salt tolerance in selected and non-selected populations of two wheat cultivars (LU 26S and LYP 73). Selected and non-selected populations of both the cultivars (LU 26S and LYP 73) were tested in set-I at EC 0, 10 and 20 dS m-1 whereas in set-II LU 26S (selected and non-selected) was grown at EC 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. The experiment was laid out in completely randomized design with four repeats. The experimental set up and the techniques used were almost similar to those of Qureshi et al. (1990). Fully expanded leaves from each set were sampled before harvesting for analyses of different ions from the sap. In set-I crop was harvested after 35 days of growth period

Table I. Effect of salinity on growth characteristics and plant composition of four wheat varieties/lines (LU 26S and LYP 73)

		Numbe	Number of tillers plant	nt 1		Na + CC	concentration (m mol kg 1)	m mol kg 1)	Í
Variety	Variety x Selection		EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )				EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )	1)	***************************************
		Control	10	20	Mean	Control	10	70	Mean
S92 H 1	Selected	4.90a	2.40e	1.80f	3.00A	3.94e	47.27de	205.21c	85.47B
	Non-selected	3.80c	1.90f	0.80g	2.20C	4.76e	66.85d	258.04b	110.08AB
1 YP 73	Selected	5.30a	3.30d	0.90g	3.20A	4.41e	40.35de	292.11ab	112.29AB
Mean	Non-selected	4.50b 4.70A	2.60e 2.60B	0.80g 1.10C	2.60B	5.34e 4.61C	73.00d 56.87B	307.83a 265.95A	128.72A
		Shoot fi	Shoot fresh weight (g P-1)	P-1)	S. COLLEGE	K <sup>+</sup> cor	K + concentration (m mol kg.1)	1 mol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	
111265	Selected	14.04a	3.92f	1.45h	6.47A	270.06a	221.25cd	190.26efg	227.18A
)   	Non-selected	11.31c	3.58f	1.10hi	5.33C	258.44cde	215.96cde	179.50fgh	217.97A
LYP 73	Selected	13.145	4.46e	0.92i	6.17B	261,40ab	234.47bc	167.17gh	221.01A
	Non-selected	10.74d	2.91g	0.70	4.78D	235.89bc	203.08def	160.37h	199.78B
Mean		12.31A	3.72B	1.04C		256,45A	218.69B	174.33C	
		Root fr	Root fresh weight (gP-1)	-1)		Cl' con	Cl concentration (m mol kg-1)	mol kg-1)	
LU 26S	Selected	5.43a	2.97£	0.99h	3.13A	32.50g	85.00f	168.00d	95.17C
	Non-selected	4.26c	2.78f	0.62i	2.55C	33.50g	93.00ef	208.00c	111.50B
I.YP 73	Selected	4.67b	3.37e	0.88h	2.97B	35.50g	75.75f	238.00h	116.42B
Mean	Non-selected	3.70d 4.52A	1.91g 2.76B	0.53i 0.76C	2.05D	40.00g 35.38C	112.50e 91.56B	265.00a 219.75A	139.17A
Means f	Means followed by same		letter(s) are statistically similar (P=0.05)	imilar (P=0.	05)				

whereas in set-II, it was harvested at maturity and data on grain and straw yield and number of tillers were recorded. Various plant parts (glume, rachis and seed) were separated and digested by HNO<sub>3</sub>. Inorganic ions (Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>++</sup> and Mg<sup>++</sup>) were determined by flame emission in a PFPI flame photometer and Pye Unicam Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer. Chloride was determined by using Corning chloride analyser-925. The data collected were analysed statistically according to methods described by Steel and Torrie (1980).

by different workers (Bernal et al., 1974; Rauf et al., 1978; Rashid, 1986).

Shoot and root fresh weights decreased with increasing salinity, and significant differences were observed between selected and non-selected populations of both the cultivars. In general, at low salinity level LYP 73 (selected) performed better than LU 26S (selected), however, at high salinity later proved superior to LYP 73 (selected and non-selected). Shannon (1978), and Kingsbury and Epstein (1986) reported that selected lines showed remarkable perfor-

Table 2. Effect of salinity on K+: Na+ of true wheat varieties/lines

(Average	of	4	rei	ocal	Sì
(		•			,,

Voziata	~	Selection	EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )					
Variety	X	Selection	Control	10	20	Mean		
		Selected	68.00	4.68	0.93	2.65		
LU 26S		Non-selected	54.20	3.23	0.69	1.98		
		Selected	59.27	5.81	0.57	1.96		
LYP 73		Non-selected	44.17	2.78	0.52	1.55		
Mean			55.26	0.384	0.65	K. W. A.		

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect on growth: Generally, greater number of tillers ensure good crop stand and ultimately better yield. A significant interaction among wheat varieties LU 26S and LYP 73 (selected and non-selected population) as well as salinity levels has been observed (Table 1). Though tillering capacity was adversely affected under saline conditions, yet LYP 73 was superior to LU 26S in this respect up to EC of 10 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, however, LU 26S showed sharp improvement over LYP 73 as well as its own normal material at 20 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. Similar results have been reported

mance under highly adverse conditions.

Effect on plant composition: Concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> increased sharply in the leaf sap (Table 1) with an increase in salinity. Selected population of LU 26S and LYP 73 had lower concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> compared to their non-selected counterparts. However, these differences for Na<sup>+</sup> accumulation were non-significant under control and at EC level of 10 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. The ability of the selected population of LU 26S to retain less Na<sup>+</sup> in its tissues was outrightly improved at EC level of 20 dS m<sup>-1</sup> indicating that salt tolerance level was much improved in case of selected population of LU 26S. Similar results were reported by Greenway and

Table 3. Effect of salinity on different physical parameters and ionic composition of selected and non-selected materials of LU 26S wheat at EC 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>

Character	Unit	ι	LU 26S		
Ond deter	Oill	Selected	Non-selected		
Number of tillers	P-1	3.10 a	1.50 b		
Shoot oven dry weight	g P <sup>-1</sup>	4.54 a	2.82 b		
Root oven dry weight	g P-1	0.60 a	0.37 b		
Straw yield	g P-1	2,75 a	1.60 a		
Grain yield	g P-1	1.79 a	1.22 b		

## Ionic composition in cell sap

Sodium	m mol kg-1	277.53 b	434.62 a
Potassium	"	220.20 a	159.26 a
Chloride	II.	265.44 b	381.62 a
Calcium	11	11.91 a	5.95 b
Magnesium	ii	20.96 a	23.72 a
Potassium/Sodium	=	0.81 a	0.38 b

Correlation between grain yield and yield components of LU 26S wheat at EC of 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>

Characters	Unit	Regression constant (a)	Regression coefficient (b)	Correlation coefficient (r)	Significance
Number of tillers	P-1	0.75	0.32	+ 0.80	*
Shoot oven dry weight	g P <sup>-1</sup>	0.53	0.26	+ 0.77	*
Root oven dry weight	g P-1	0.54	2.0	+ 0.74	*
Straw yield	g P-1	0.96	0.25	+ 0.56	NS
Shoot/Root ratio	-	0.47	0.13	+ 0.21	NS

<sup>\* =</sup> Significant at P = 0.05

NS = Non-significant

Means followed by same letter(s) in each row are statistically similar at P = 0.05

Munns (1980). Concentration of Cl in the leaf sap followed the same pattern as that of Na<sup>+</sup> and the selected population of both the cultivars had shown good discriminative ability for these ions. Similar results were re-

ported by Able and Mackenzie (1964), Ahmad and Muhammed (1969).

Potassium concentration in selected LU 26S was better over the normal material of LYP 73 at low and high salinity levels.

This could be due to the efficient exclusion of Na<sup>+</sup> and Cl<sup>-</sup> reaching the shoot and maintenance of K<sup>+</sup> status by efficient absorption or selective exclusion of Na<sup>+</sup> by cortical cells in the vacuole, therefore, maintaining high K<sup>+</sup> concentration in cytoplasm which helped in better protein synthesis (Wyn Jones, 1985).

vars compared to their normal population under all the conditions. A careful scrutiny of Table 2 shows that there is a strong exclusion of Na<sup>+</sup> and Cl<sup>-</sup> in the selected population of LU 26S and LYP 73 under saline environment. This ability was much pronounced in LU 26S and it appeared that this selected material could be developed into a

Table 4. Effect of salinity on ionic composition in different parts of spike of LU 26S wheat at EC 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>

Classita		Unit	LU	26S
Character		Ont	Selected	Non-selected
<u></u>	Glume	m mol g <sup>-1</sup>	0.46	0.91*
Sodium	Rachis	"	0.86	1.71 <sup>NS</sup>
	Seed	u	0.07	0.15*
	Glume	m mol g-l	0.57	0.36*
Potassium	Rachis	"	0.48	0.32*
	Seed	11	0.19	$0.18^{NS}$
	Glume	m mol-1	15.50	21.75*
Chloride	Rachis	19	5.50	$6.00^{NS}$
	Seed	11	0.38	0.75 <sup>NS</sup>
	Glume	m mol g-l	0.08	0.05*
Calcium	Rachis	11	0.07	$0.05^{NS}$
	Seed	11	0.03	0.01*
	Glume	m mol g-1	0.06	0.08 <sup>NS</sup>
Magnesium	Rachis	n B	0.03	0.02*
Magnesium	Seed	71	0.07	0.09*
	Glume	m mol g-1	1.27	0.40*
K+/Na+	Rachis	II .	0.57	0.19*
ACTUAL STATE OF THE STATE OF TH	Seed	II;	2.60	1.38*

<sup>=</sup> Significant at P = 0.05

K<sup>+</sup>/Na<sup>+</sup> ratio (Table 2) was found far better in the selected population of the cultinew promising salt tolerant cultivar in future.

<sup>·</sup> NS = Non-significant

Table 5. Grain yield vs inorganic ions in different parts of LU 26S wheat at 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>

Character		Unit	Regression constant (a)	Regression coefficient (b)	Correlation coefficient (r)
*	Glume	m mol g-1	2.34	- 1,21	- 0.87**
a v	Rachis	н	2.37	- 0.66	- 0.88**
Sodium	Seed	II.	2.05	- 4.92	- 0.73*
	Leaf sap	m mol kg <sup>-1</sup>	2.60	- 0.00	- 0.81*
	Glume	m mol g-1	0.34	2,47	+ 0.84**
	Rachis	11	0.55	2.36	+ 0.74*
Potassium	Seed	31	1.22	1.55	$+ 0.08^{NS}$
	Leaf sap	m mol kg <sup>-1</sup>	2.72	- 0.00	- 0.56 <sup>NS</sup>
	Glume	m mol g-1	2.85	- 72.01	- 0.85**
Chloride	Rachis		2.09	- 100.22	- 0.43 <sup>NS</sup>
	Seed	**	1.60	- 165.45	-0.23 <sup>NS</sup>
	Leaf sap	m mol kg-1	2.72	- 0.00	- 0.79*
	Glume	m mol g-l	0.68	13,29	+ 0.63 <sup>NS</sup>
Calcium	Rachis	71	0.42	17.66	$+ 0.60^{NS}$
	Seed	ũ	1.00	26,64	+ 0.61 <sup>NS</sup>
	Leaf sap	m mot kg-l	0.71	0.08	+ 0.81*
	Glume	m mol g-1	3,23	- 25.50	- 0.82**
Magnesium	Rachis	11	0.81	29.25	$+ 0.60^{NS}$
	Seed	11	2.85	- 16.53	- 0.62 <sup>NS</sup>
	Leaf sap	m mol kg <sup>-1</sup>	1.73	- 0.01	- 0.09 <sup>NS</sup>
	Glume	m mol g-1	0.93	0.68	+ 0.89**
	Rachis	11	1.00	1.31	+ 0.81**
$K_+/Na_+$	Seed	11	0.79	0.35	+ 0.79*
	Leaf sap	m mol kg-1	0.93	0.97	+ 0.76*

<sup>\* =</sup> Significant at P = 0.05

NS = Non-significant

Grain yield and yield components: All the yield components i.e., number of tillers, shoot and root dry weights and grain yield except straw yield improved significantly in

the case of selected as compared to non-selected population of LU 26S (Table 3) at EC 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. Correlation between the grain yield and, number of tillers, root and shoot

<sup>\*\* =</sup> Highly significant at P = 0.01

dry weights was found positive and significant but non-significant with straw yield and shoot/root ratio. Similar results were reported by Asseed et al. (1975).

lonic variation in different parts of plant: lonic composition of the flag leaf sap showed significant differences for Na+, Ca+2, K+ and Cl<sup>+</sup> concentrations as well as K<sup>+</sup>/Na<sup>+</sup> ratio between the two populations of LU 26S. Selected population of LU 26S had much lower concentration of Na+ and Cl while better Ca+2, K+ and K+/Na+ in its flag leaf (Table 3). Further detailed analyses for the concentration of various ions (Na+, K+, Ca+2, Mg+2, K+/Na+ ratio and Cl') at 15 dS m-1 in different parts of spike (glume, rachis and seed) clearly showed the differences between selected and non-selected population (Table 4). All the parts of spike of selected population of LU 26S maintained lower concentrations of Na+ and Cl while higher concentrations of K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>+2</sup> and K+/Na+ ratio. The glume analysis was found more representative as compared to flag leaf cell sap and rachis (Table 4 and 5). Significant differences between selected and non-selected population of LU 26S clucidated the better ability of selected material to exclude Na+ and CI, furthermore, this mechanism was much pronounced in glumes. Perhaps this ability of glume made the selected population of LU 26S more tolerant against salinity.

#### CONCLUSIONS

In order to screen material for salt tolerance (with regard to maturity) one may prefer to analyse glume over flag leaf. However, later too had good correlation with salt tolerance.

### REFERENCES

- Able, G.H. and A.J. Mackenzie. 1964. Salt tolerance of soybean varieties (Glycine max L.) during germination and later growth. Crop Sci. 4: 157-161.
- Ahmad, M. and S. Muhammed. 1969. Salt tolerance of some adopted and imported soybean varieties. Pak. J. Agric. Sci. 6: 152-162.
- Asseed, M., F.A. Sorour and M.A. El-Sharkawy. 1975. Response of growth and yield of short straw wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) to salinized water and Cycocel. Libyan J. Agri. 4: 65-68.
- Bajwa, M.A., M.S. Oari and A.G. Asi. 1983. Wheat production recommendations for 1983-1984. Zari Digest (Wheat Number). 17: 7-28.
- Bernal, C.T., F.T. Bingham and J. Oertli. 1974. Salt tolerance of Mexican Wheat-II. Relation to variable sodium chloride and length of growing season. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc. 38: 777-780.
- Greenway, H. and R. Munns, 1980. Mechanism of salt tolerance in nonhalophytes. Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol, 31: 149-190.
- Hoagland, D.R. and D.I. Arnon, 1950. The water culture method for growing plants without soil. Calif. Agri. Expt. Stn. Circ. No. 347, 39 P.
- Kingsbury, R.W. and E. Epstein. 1986. Salt sensitivity in wheat. Plant Physiol. 80: 651-654.
- Qayyum, M.A. and M.D. Malik. 1988. Farm production losses in salt affected soils. pp 356-364. In Proc. Managing Soil Resources. Ist Natl. Congr. Soil Sci. Lahore, Oct. 6-8, 1985.

- Qureshi, R.H., A. Rashid and N. Ahmad. 1990. A procedure for quick screening of wheat cultivars for salt tolerance. pp. 315-324. In: Bassam et al. (Eds.), Genetic Aspects of Plant Mineral Nutrition. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.
- Rashid, A. 1986. Mechanism of salt-tolerance in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Ph.D. Thesis, Dept. Soil Sci. Univ. of Agri. Faisalabad, Pakistan.
- Rauf, A., Q. Javed, S. Muhammed and W. Muhammad. 1978. Salt tolerance studies on wheat seeds collected from salt affected areas. pp. 215-221. In Proc. Workshop/Seminar on Membrane Biophysics and Salt Tolerance in Plants. Univ. of Agri., Faisalabad, Pakistan.

- Shannon, M.C. 1978. Testing salt tolerance variability among tall wheat lines. Agron. J. 70: 719-722.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1980. Principles and Procedures of Statistics, McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc., New York.
- Wyn Jones, R.G. 1985. Salt tolerance in plants, Chemistry in Britain. pp. 454-459.