SCREENING OF COTTON VARIETIES AGAINST SALINITY I. AT GERMINATION STAGE

Nazir Ahmad, R. H. Qureshi, R. D. Khan & A. Ghani*

ARSTRACT

Relative salt tolerance of 14 cotton varieties at germination stage was studied in sand culture under laboratory conditions. Increasing salinity levels decreased and delayed the germination of all the varieties tested. Varieties (in descending order) NIAB-78, AUH-37, AU-59, AU-14, NIAB-82, Express and MNH-93 were relatively salt tolerant while varieties Ravi, D-9, LH-61, B-557, LH-72, LH-62 and AC-134 were salt sensitive ones.

INTRODUCTION

Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum) is a major textile fibre crop commercially grown in Pakistan. It not only supports a massive local industry but also earns huge amount of foreign exchange. However, cotton production per unit area is low as compared to international standards. An analysis of causes responsible for the low yield of cotton reveals that soil salinity is the most serious constraint in cotton production.

Cotton is a moderately salt tolerant crop (U.S. Salinity Lab. Staff, 1954) but its tolerance varies at different stages of growth, germination generally being the most sensitive stage. Under increased salinity, germination is decreased and seedling emergence is delayed (Mehta and Desai 1958; Latif and Khan, 1976). Varietal differences in cotton at germination under sline conditions have also been reported (Abul-Nass and Omran, 1974). Cultivation of salt sensitive cotton varieties often results in failure of the crop under saline conditions. It is therefore, essential to screen the available cotton varieties for their salt tolerance. This paper presents results of the study on the comparative salt tolerance of different cotton varieties at germination stage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Salt tolerance of 14 cotton varieties (Table 1) at germination stage was

Cotton Varieties

tested under laboratory conditions using plastic coated metal trays (45x30x5 cm) field with sand upto 4 cm deep. Three salinity levels i. e., EC 10 20 and 30 mmhos/cm, were prepared with NaCl while distilled water served as control. Ten seeds of each variety were sown at each salinity level. Trays were covered with black polythene sheets to minimize salinity variations due to evaporation loss. Daily germination counts were recorded for two weeks. At the end of the experiment the average height and dry weight of seedlings of each variety were recorded. Relative sals tolerance of different varieties was determined by calculating EC value that was expected to cause 50 per cent reduction in dry matter yield of each variety. The following equation described by Mass and Hoffman (1977) was used for this purposa:

$$Y = 100 - B (EC - A)$$

where,

Y = Relative yield

B = The per cent yield decrease per unit salinity increase

A = Salinity threshold in mmhos/cm

The values of B were determined by using average regression coefficient between yield and EC values.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of Salinity on Germination

At low level of EC 10 mmhos/cm, the germination was not affected to a great extent (Table 1). At EC 20 mmhos/cm, Ravi and D—9 varieties were the most sensitive followed by AU—14, B—557. However, the germination was adversely affected at EC of 30 mmhos/cm. At this salinity level, varieties Ravi, D—9, B—557, LH—61, LH—62, LH—72 and AC—134 were sensitive with no germination of seeds followed by Express, MNH—93, AUH—37 and AU—14 which gave 11, 14, 14 and 22 per cent germination as compared to their respective controls. At the same EC level, NIAB—78 gave the highest germination (40%) followed by AU—59 and NIAB—82 both with 30 per cent germination compared to control. As the salinity level increased, the rate of germination was also decreased in all the varieties.

Ef.cet of salt levels on garmination, seedling height and seedling dry weight of different cotton varieties Table !

EC* 10 EC 20 EC 30 EC 30 <t< th=""><th>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</th><th></th><th></th><th>Commercial (% of control)</th><th>control)</th><th>Seedling height (% of control)</th><th>eight (% o</th><th>f control)</th><th>Scedling dry weight (% of control)</th><th>y weight (</th><th>to %.</th><th>contri</th></t<>	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Commercial (% of control)	control)	Seedling height (% of control)	eight (% o	f control)	Scedling dry weight (% of control)	y weight (to %.	contri
78 80 40 102 52 30 88 64 22 80 70 30 97 50 28 92 58 90 60 30 103 55 32 92 58 89 78 0 93 45 0 93 51 100 33 0 87 30 0 97 52 89 67 0 98 52 22 94 56 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 41 89 11 0 94 33 0 93 41 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 56 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 54 88 38 0 97 92 99 54 100 71 14	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			EC 20	EC 30	EC 10	EC 20	EC 30	EC 10	EC 20		EC 30
82 80 70 30 97 50 28 92 58 1 80 60 30 103 55 32 92 58 1 80 60 30 103 55 32 92 61 4 89 78 0 93 45 0 93 51 4 89 67 0 98 45 0 97 52 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 41 89 11 0 94 33 0 93 41 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 43 67 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 54 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 54 7 100 71 14 98 51 22	22 80 70 30 97 50 28 92 58 58 59 58 59 58 59 58 59 58 59 58 59 58 59 59 58 59 59 58 59 59 58 59 59 58 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59 59	NIAB-78	80	80	30	102	52	30	88	6.4		
90 60 30 103 55 32 92 89 78 0 93 45 0 93 100 33 0 87 30 0 97 89 67 0 98 45 0 94 67 11 98 52 22 94 89 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 5 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 5 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 5 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 6	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SIAB-82	80	7.0	02	0.7	1 6	000	CO O	# O		0+
89 78 93 45 92 100 33 0 93 45 0 93 100 33 0 87 30 0 97 89 67 0 98 45 0 94 67 11 0 94 33 0 94 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 67 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 67 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 67 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 89 67 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 89 67 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 <td< td=""><td>H - 61 89 78 0 93 45 92 92 92 92 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95</td><td>17 - 50</td><td>00</td><td>000</td><td>2 4</td><td>* **</td><td>00</td><td>23</td><td>26</td><td>98</td><td></td><td>29</td></td<>	H - 61 89 78 0 93 45 92 92 92 92 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95	17 - 50	00	000	2 4	* **	00	23	26	98		29
89 78 0 93 45 0 93 100 33 0 87 30 0 97 89 67 0 98 45 0 94 67 11 98 52 22 94 89 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 8	H − 61 89 78 0 93 45 0 93 −−557 100 33 0 87 30 0 97 C−−134 89 67 0 98 45 0 104 XFPTess 78 56 11 98 52 22 94 avi 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 avi 67 11 0 94 33 0 97 U−-14 89 33 22 102 53 0 97 H−72 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 H−62 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 5 7H−37 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 8 3H−37 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 99		8	09	30	103	55	3.2	95	61		41
100 33 0 87 30 0 97 89 67 0 98 45 0 104 78 56 11 98 52 22 94 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 8	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.H - 61	68	78	0	93	45	0	03	1		
89 67 0 98 45 0 104 7S 56 11 98 52 22 94 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 5 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 8	CI34 89 67 0 98 45 0 104 xFress 78 56 11 98 52 22 94 avi 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 -9 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 U14 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 H72 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 H62 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 NH93 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 *- EC in mmhos/om. *- EC in mmhos/om. *- *- *- *- *-	-557	100 >	33	0	87	30	0	87	62		> 0
78 56 11 98 52 22 94 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 6	xFress 78 56 1: 98 52 22 94 avi 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 -9 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 0 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 H 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 H 63 38 0 97 47 0 92 MH 98 31 22 99 92 MH 98 48 22 100 $*$ $=$ $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{C}$ in mmhos/om.	.C134	68	49	0	86	54	0	104	4 90		
67 11 0 94 33 0 93 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	avi 67 11 0 94 33 0 93 -9 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 U-14 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 H-72 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 H-62 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 NH-93 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 (XILESE	78	56	11	86	52	22	+6	2 20		90
89 11 0 95 30 0 97 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 96 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	-9 89 11 0 95 30 0 97 U-14 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 H-72 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 H-62 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 NH-93 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 7H-37 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 * - EC in mmhos/cm.	avi	67	-11	0	94	33	0	83	2 4		000
89 33 22 102 53 25 103 67 67 0 97 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	U—14 89 33 22 102 53 25 103 H—72 67 67 67 47 0 92 H—62 88 38 0 97 47 0 92 NH—93 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 3H—37 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 $* = \mathbb{E} \mathbb{C} \text{ in mmhos/cm}.$	6	68	11	0	95	30	0	97	4.5		> <
67 67 67 7 47 0 92 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 96 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	H—72 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 692 H—62 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 NH—93 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 * = EC in mmhos/cm. * * * * * * * *	U14	68	33	29	102	53	95	103	e e		> (
88 38 0 97 52 0 92 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	H—62 88 38 0 97 52 0 92 NH—93 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$ $\frac{32}{100}$	H-72	67	67	0	26	1-4	0	600	80 1		42
100 71 14 98 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	NH_93 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 JH_37 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 * EC in mmhos/cm.	H-62	88	36	<	-	10	10	72	90		0
100 71 14 98 51 22 99 100 71 14 98 48 22 100	$JH = 37$ 100 71 14 98 51 22 99 $JH = 37$ 100 71 14 98 48 22 100 $* = \mathbb{E} \text{C in mmhos/cm}$.	NII 02	100	000	0	97	52	0	9.5	54		0
100 71 14 98 48 22 100	# = EC in mmhos/cm.	11 0 L	100	T.	14	98	51	22	66	55		41
	* = EC in mmhos/cm.	OH-3/	100	7.1	14	86	48	22	100	62		41

Cotton Varieties

Effect of Salinity on Seedling Height

There was no decrease in seedling height of all the cotton varieties at EC 10 mmhos/cm as compared to their respective controls (Table 1). The medium salinity level (EC 20 mmhos/cm) reduced the plant height by about 50% but a remarkable decrease was recorded at maximum salinity, i. e., 30 EC mmhos/cm. Minimum decrease in plant height was recorded in variety AU—59 followed by NIAB—78 and NIAB—82 with seedling height of 32, 30 and 28 per cent, respectively. The higher salinity level greatly decreased the height as compared to that of control. The results are in agreement with those of Ayers (1952), Latif and Khan (1976) and Randhawa (1981).

Effect of Salinity on Dry Matter Yield of Seedling

At low salinity there was not much reduction in dry matter yield of all the cotton varieties as compared to their respective controls (Table 1). The decrease in dry matter yield of secoling at medium salinity level (EC 20 mmhos/cm) was relatively small (50-60%) except in Ravi and D-9 which gave 41 and 44 per cent dry matter of their respective controls. Among varieties which germinated at EC 30 mmhos/cm the minimum decrease in dry matter yield was recorded in variety AU-14 followed by AU-59, NIAB-78, AUH-37, MNH-93, NIAB-82. The probable cause of this reduction could be retarded seeding growth at higher salinity level. The vegetative growth could be retarded due to toxic effect of added salts or physiological scarcity of water with the increase in solute suction of saline media.

The calculation of relative salt tolerance of different cotton varieties at germ nation (Table 2) showed that NIA - -78 was the most salt tolerant as the calculated EC value for 50% reduction in yield was the highest (25.5 mmhos/cm) in this case, followed by AUH-37, AU-59, AU-14, NIAB-82, Express and MNH-93 which showed 50% reduction at EC 25.0 25.0 24.2, 23.2, 23.1 and 19.0, respectively. Against the same amount of reduction in yield, variety Ravi showed the lowest EC followed by D-9, LH-61, B-557, LH-72, LH-62 and AC-134, which were considered as salt sensitive ones.

Pak. J. Agri. Sci., Vol. 20 (3-4), 1983

Table 2. Relative salt tolerance of different cotton varieties

Varieties	Expected EC for 50% reduction in dry matter yield	Merit at 50% reduction
NIAB-78	25.5	Soft level - I n/E-
NIAB-82	23.2	5
AU - 59	25.0	2
LH - 61	16.5	12
B-557	16 8	11
AC-134	17.5	8
Express	23.0	6
Ravi	15.9	14
D-9	un you de marsuffe 16.0	13
ÁU – 14	24.2	4
LH 72	17.0	10
LH 62	17.0	9
MNH-93	19.0	hard to be 17 may
AUH - 37	25.0	9 Tarring Total 3 1 4 2

REFERENCES

- Abul-Nass, A.A. and M.S. Omran. 1974. Salt tolerance of seventeen cotton varieties during germination and early seedling development. Zoitchrift for Acker-und Pflanzenbua, 140 (3): 229-236 (Soil & Fert., 38 (12): 6379, 1975).
- Ayers, A.D. 1952. Seed germination as affected by soil moisture and salinity.

 Agron. J. 44: 82-84.
 - Hasoon, E., I. Kahana and A. Poljakoff Mayler. 1972. Effect of Ci- and SO₄ = types of salinity on growth and on osmotic adaptation of pea seedlings. Plant and Soil; 36: 449-459
- Latif, A. and M.A. Khan. 1976. Effect of soil salinity on cotton (Gossypium

Cotton Varieties

- hirsulum) at different stages of growth. The Pak. Cottons, 20 (2): 91-104.
- Mehta, B.V. and R.S. Desai. 1958. Effect of soil salinity of germination of some seeds. Indian J. Soil & Water Conser. 6: 168-176.
- Mass, E.V. and G.J. Hoffman. 1977. Crop salt tolerance current assessment.

 J. Irrigation Drainage Div. ASCE, 103: 115-134.
- Randhawa, Z. A. 1981: Effect of salinity on growth and leaf ion content of cotton. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ., of Agri., Faisalabad.
- U.S. Salinity Lab. Staff. 1954. Diagnosis and Improvement of Saline and Alkali Soil. U.S.D.A. Handbook 60.