# Evaluation of Physiological Indices, Yield and its Components as Screening Techniques for Water Deficit Tolerance in Oilseed Rape Cultivars

B. Pasban Eslam<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Water deficit is an important factor limiting crop production worldwide. Drought stress can be managed by improving the availability of soil moisture conserved and selecting drought tolerant genotypes. Several physiological indices including stomatal conductance  $(K_1)$ , relative water content (RWC), leaf temperature  $(T_1)$  and crop temperature stability (CTS) along with yield, its components and seed glucosinolate content were measured in five oilseed rape genotypes of *Brassica napus* L. (Talayeh, Fornax, Okapi, Regent×Cobra and SLM046) under non-stress and water deficit conditions imposed from late flowering (80% flowering) to maturity in a loam soil at the Research Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources of East Azarbaijan, Iran (46°2'E, 37°58'N) over two successive years (2001-2003). According to the significant decrease of K<sub>1</sub> and RWC and significant increase of  $T_1$  caused by water deficit in both years, it seems that, these indices could reflect the drought effects occurring from late flowering in oilseed rape crops.  $K_1$  and  $T_1$  values also differed significantly among genotypes and therefore these indices could be used to screen oilseed rape genotypes for tolerance against late season drought. Water deficit significantly decreased the number of pods per plant and seed yield in Talayeh and Fornax. Significant positive correlation was observed between these traits during both years (r=0.88 and 0.89, respectively). It seems that when water deficit occurs from late flowering, decreased seed yield mainly via decreasing number of pods per plant is observed in oilseed rape. Okapi and SLM046 showed lower T<sub>1</sub> value (30.6 and 29.7°C, respectively), a higher  $K_1$  value (0.350 and 0.355 cm s<sup>-1</sup> respectively) and seed yield (5,241 and 5,245 Kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) under the water deficit condition. Okapi and SLM046 are therefore more suitable for cultivating in areas with late season water deficit stress.

Keywords: Leaf temperature, Oilseed rape, Relative water content, Seed yield, Water deficit.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Water deficit is a major limiting factor in crop production worldwide. In most cropping situations, soil moisture deficit builds up during the late phase of crop growth when many field crops are particularly sensitive. Oilseed rape is no exception to this (El Hafid *et al.*, 1998). The most critical time for water supply is during the flowering and seed filling stages (Richards and Thurling, 1978). Since yield and drought tolerance are controlled at

separate loci (Morgan, 1984), it may be identify and transfer the possible to physiological traits responsible for drought resistance high-yielding to and agronomically acceptable cultivars (Kumar 1998). Interspecific and Singh, and intraspecific variation were found in Brassica napus L. for the response to drought (Richards and Thurling, 1978; Rao Mendham, 1991) and and several physiological characters which may contribute to continued growth under water deficit stress have been identified. For

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Research Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources of East Azarbaijan, Tabriz, Islamic Republic Iran. e-mail: b\_ pasbaneslam@yahoo.com,

	Mean			Rainfall			Relative	
Te	mperature	(°C)		(mm)		H	Iumidity (	%)
2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
-	9.7	8.9	-	79.9	71.9	-	61.4	62.6
-	13.1	14.7	-	61.6	13.2	-	61.8	51.1
-	20.7	19.9	-	-	14.3	-	38.5	54.8
-	25.1	27.3	-	-	-	-	38.9	42.8
-	25.4	-	-	-	-	-	38.9	-
22.3	22.3	-	-	-	-	31.8	40.4	-
17.5	18.5	-	5.3	4.5	-	39.0	47.4	-
5.3	10.3	-	52.3	12.9	-	66.1	59.6	-
3.1	0.4	-	26.6	22.5	-	78.2	81.0	-
1.8	-1.5	-	11.6	7.8	-	71.6	77.9	-
-	1.4	-	0	14.6	-	74.0	77.3	-
6.9	4.1	-	32.4	39.8	-	61.0	65.8	-
	2001 - - 22.3 17.5 5.3 3.1 1.8 -	Temperature           2001         2002           -         9.7           -         13.1           -         20.7           -         25.1           -         25.4           22.3         22.3           17.5         18.5           5.3         10.3           3.1         0.4           1.8         -1.5           -         1.4	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Temperature (°C) \\ \hline 2001 & 2002 & 2003 \\ \hline 2003 & - 9.7 & 8.9 \\ \hline - 13.1 & 14.7 \\ \hline - 20.7 & 19.9 \\ \hline - 25.1 & 27.3 \\ \hline - 25.4 & - \\ 22.3 & 22.3 & - \\ 17.5 & 18.5 & - \\ 5.3 & 10.3 & - \\ 3.1 & 0.4 & - \\ 1.8 & -1.5 & - \\ \hline - 1.4 & - \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Temperature (°C)(mm)20012002200320012002-9.78.9-79.9-13.114.7-61.6-20.719.925.127.325.422.322.317.518.5-5.34.55.310.3-52.312.93.10.4-26.622.51.8-1.5-11.67.8-1.4-014.6	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

Table 1. Weather records for two growing seasons in Khosroshahr Station.

The values are related to experimental periods.

Table 2. Soil characteristic in the experimental field.

Soil depth	FC <sup>4</sup>	$^{'}(\%)$	WP	$^{b}(\%)$	AWC	$c^{c}(\%)$
(cm)	2001/02	2002/03	2001/02	2002/03	2001/02	2002/03
0-25	21.5	22.0	12.0	13	9.5	9.0
25-60	22.5	22.5	12.0	12.5	10.5	10.0
60-90	16.0	16.5	9.0	9.5	7.0	7.0
a <b>r</b> : 11	·. h	• • • • •	.1 1 1	• .		

<sup>*a*</sup> Field capacity; <sup>*b*</sup> Wilting point, <sup>*c*</sup> Available water capacity.

example, osmotic adjustment is considered to be an adaptive trait by which an increase in the solute content of cells can lead to maintenance of turgor and turgor-related processes at low water potentials (Kumar et al., 1984; Singh et al., 1990; Kumar and Elson, 1992; Kumar and Singh, 1998). As water deficit develops, stomata close progressively, transpiration decreases and canopy temperature rises. Kumar et al. (1984), Singh et al. (1985) and Kumar and Singh (1998)have reported close associations between osmotic adjustment and both stomatal conductance and canopy temperature in oilseed Brassica species. Singh et al. (1985) stated that transpirational cooling (canopy temperature minus air temperature) could effectively be used as a technique to screen Brassica genotypes for drought tolerance under a receding soil moisture condition. Pasban Eslam et al. (2000) reported that late season drought in oilseed rape, reduce crop temperature (differences stability between daily minimum and maximum air to crop

temperature) and they indicated significant positive correlation of crop temperature stability with stomatal conductance, water potential, relative water content and seed yield. They suggested that this index may be more accurate than leaf temperature. Kumar and Singh (1998) showed a significant correlation among seed yield with osmotic adjustment, transpirational cooling and stomatal conductance in oilseed Brassica species. Lehman et al. (1993) studying bentgrass clones suggested that relative water content would better predict maintained growth under increasing water deficit than the simple measure of leaf water pontential.

Richards and Thurling (1978) found that late season drought lead to abortion of more than 50 percent of the pods in *B. napus* L. and *B. rapa* L., however, the remaining pods had more and heavier seeds. Jensen *et al.* (1996) reported that water deficit stress occurring during both the vegetative growth and pod filling stages in oilseed rape, decreased number of seeds per m<sup>2</sup>, oil yield,

Downloaded from jast.modares.ac.ir on 2024-04-28

		$K_l a$	RWC <sup>b</sup>	$T_1^{c}$	$CTS^{d}$
Stress level	Genotype	(cr	$n s^{-1}$ )	("	°C)
2001-2002					
Non-stress	Talayeh	0.52	0.81	26.9	1.17
	Fornax	0.52	0.78	27.3	1.26
	Okapi	0.63	0.82	27.5	1.26
	Regent×Cobra	0.49	0.82	27.1	1.22
	SLM046	0.72	0.83	27.6	1.17
Stress	Talayeh	0.25	0.70	30.9	1.13
	Fornax	0.25	0.66	30.5	1.16
	Okapi	0.34	0.63	30.4	1.12
	Regent×Cobra	0.22	0.65	31.1	1.11
	SLM046	0.39	0.66	30.4	1.15
LSD(0.05) <sup>e</sup>		0.054	0.108	0.497	0.093
2002-2003					
Non-stress	Talayeh	0.56	0.87	26.5	1.16
	Fornax	0.53	0.84	27.3	1.26
	Okapi	0.73	0.89	27.0	1.25
	Regent×Cobra	0.50	0.86	26.8	1.23
	SLM046	0.62	0.88	27.2	1.18
Stress	Talayeh	0.27	0.72	31.7	1.15
	Fornax	0.24	0.82	30.8	1.40
	Okapi	0.36	0.83	30.7	1.14
	Regent×Cobra	0.24	0.79	30.8	1.12
	SLM046	0.32	0.79	29.0	1.24
LSD(0.05)		0.054	0.076	0.677	0.253

Table 3. Mean of traits measured on oilseed rape genotypes during 2001-2003.

<sup>*a*</sup> Stomatal conductance; <sup>*b*</sup> Relative water content; <sup>*c*</sup> Leaf temperature, <sup>*d*</sup> Crop temperature stability, <sup>*e*</sup> Least significant difference.

harvest index and seed yield. Irrigation after anthesis in oilseed rape increased the number of seeds per pod and harvest index and thus gave better seed yield (Rao and Mendham, 1991).

The glucosinolate content of seeds is an important quality attribute of oilseed rape, and it is increased by drought (Jensen *et al.*, 1996). Thus the correlation of seed glucosinolate with physiological indices may be useful to select for drought tolerance varieties having low seed glucosinolate under stress.

In spit of several reports about the drought stress effects on *B. Rapa* L. and *B. juncea* L. genotypes especially in temperate and warm areas, limited studies have reported on cold tolerant fall oilseed rape genotypes. Also late season drought is the main challenge against development of fall oilseed cultivation in cold areas of Iran. The objectives of this study were to evaluate the physiological indices in relation to the screening of cold tolerant oilseed rape genotypes for drought tolerance and to study yield and its component in *B. napus* L. genotypes under water deficit stress occurring during seed filling stage.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The experiment was carried out at the research farm of Research Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources of East Azarbaijan, Iran (46°2′E, 37°58′N) over two years (2001-2003). The prevailing weather characteristics during the growing season are summarized in Table 1. The experiment was factorial based on a randomized complete

block design with three replications. Five genotypes productive and suitable for cold areas of Iran -Talayeh, Fornax, Okapi, Regent×Cobra and SLM046- were evaluated under non-stress and water deficit conditions in a loam soil. Water stress was applied on MAD (mean allowable depletion). Plants were irrigated at 25 and 40 percent available soil water depletion in non-stress and stressed plots, respectively (Table 2). The stress was imposed from late flowering (80% flowering) to maturity. To prevent precipitation on stressed plots, polyethylene rain shelters were used during rainy periods (one time for 2 hours during the first year). The plot size was  $5 \times 2.1$  m seeds were sown at the bottom of furrows in a 30+60 cm system (one pair of rows in each furrow with 30 cm spacing, and 60 cm spacing between two paired rows) on 11 September. Plants were thinned to a spacing of 10 cm within rows, four weeks after sowing. Crop management practices were operated as needed during the growing season.

The youngest fully-expanded leaves were used for various measurements and the characteristics were measured five days from late flowering (26 May) until leaf senescence (20th and 26th June for stress and non-stress plots, respectively. Stomatal conductance (K<sub>1</sub>) was determined with an AP<sub>4</sub> prometer (Delta-T Devices, UK). Relative water content (RWC) was obtained by floating the leaf discs (3 discs from each leaf with a 20 mm diameter) on distilled water for 4 hours at 5°C under dim light. turgid weight (TW) The was then determined after floating, and the dry weight (DW) after the samples were dried for 24 hours at 80°C. Fresh weight (FW), TW and DW were used to calculate RWC as RWC= FW-DW/TW-DW (Jensen et al., 1996; Lazcano- Ferrat and Lovatt, 1999). A handheld infrared thermometer (Class 2, Testo, Germany) was used to measure leaf temperature  $(T_1)$ . For this characteristic ten measurements were taken on each plot and averaged for statistical analysis (Ray et al., 1998). We used the following relationship to determine crop temperature stability (CTS)

as CTS = Ta(max.) - Ta(min.)/Tc(max.)-Ta(max.)-Ta(min) and Tc(min.), where Tc(max.)–Tc(min.)are the differences between maximum and minimum air and crop leaf temperatures a during 24 hour period, respectively (Pasban Eslam et al., 2000). Measurements of  $K_1$ , RWC and  $T_1$ were made at 1,200 to 1,400 hours when Brassica species tend to show the greatest genetic variability in response to drought stress (Singh et al., 1990).

Finally, the seed yield, its components and the percentage of seed oil were measured. Also, seed glucosinolate content was determined by high performance liquid chromatography (Kaushik and Agnihotri, 1999).

Statistical evaluation of the data were performed using the MSTAT-C and SPSS software packages.

#### RESULTS

## Leaf Traits

Water deficit decreased  $K_1$  and RWC and increased  $T_1$  significantly in all genotypes over two years. However, stress significantly decreased CTS in the first year. Among the genotypes, Okapi and SLM046 showed higher amounts of  $K_1$  in both irrigation treatments and years. The lowest values of leaf temperature under a stress condition belonged to these genotypes in both years. SLM046 showed the lowest increase of  $T_1$ affected by drought. Differences among the genotypes for  $K_1$  and  $T_1$  were significant, but not for RWC (Table 3).

#### **Yield and Yield Components**

Water deficit imposed from late flowering to maturity significantly decreased the number of pods per plant and seed yield in Talayeh and Fornax in both years. Water deficit significantly decreased the 1,000seed weight, seed oil percentage and harvest index during 2001-2002. Genotypes were

Downloaded from jast.modares.ac.ir on 2024-04-28

significantly different in terms of the number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod and 1,000-seed weight in 2001-2002 and seed oil percentage in both years. Okapi and SLM046 emerged a higher number of pods per plant and seeds per pod in both irrigation treatments in 2001-2002 (Table 4). The highest number of pods per plant belonged to Fornax in both irrigation treatments in 2002-2003. In all water conditions and years, Regent×Cobra had the highest percentages of seed oil (Table 4). Okapi and SLM046, especially under water deficit, showed the highest seed yields among genotypes.

#### **Correlations between Traits**

Correlations between  $K_1$ , RWC and  $T_1$  in both years and between these traits and CTS in 2002-2003 were significant (Table 5). Seed yield was positively correlated with  $K_1$ and RWC and negatively With  $T_1$ . Seed glucosinolate content was negatively correlated with  $K_1$  and positively with  $T_1$  in 2001-2002. The correlation coefficient for the number of pods per plant with seed yield was both positive and significant (Table 5).

## DISCUSSION

Since K<sub>1</sub> and RWC were decreased and T<sub>1</sub> was increased significantly by water deficit stress in both years (Table 3), it seems that these indices could reflect the stress effects occurring from late flowering on the oilseed rape crop. K<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> significantly differed among genotypes (Table 3). Okapi and SLM046 had higher amounts of K<sub>1</sub> and lower amounts of T<sub>1</sub> under water stress during two years (Table 3). Both genotypes, especially under the water deficit condition, produced the highest seed yield (Table 4). Therefore  $K_1$  and  $T_1$  could be used to screen oilseed rape genotypes for tolerance against water deficit during the seed filling stage. The results showed a significant correlation between K<sub>1</sub>, RWC and T<sub>1</sub> in both years

(Table 5); Pasban Eslam et al. (2000) reported a similar correlation in B.napus L. and B.rape L. Since the correlation of seed yield with K<sub>1</sub> and RWC was positive and significant and its correlation with  $T_1$  was negative and significant (Table 5), it seems that screening the oilseed rape genotypes by these characteristics may give rise to higher yields under a drought stress environment. Kumar and Singh (1998) also reported a significant correlation of seed yield with osmotic adjustment, transpirational cooling and K<sub>1</sub> in oilseed Brassica species. In our study seed glucosinolate content was negatively correlated with K<sub>1</sub> and positively with  $T_1$  in 2001-2002 (Table 5). Thus, selection of oilseed rape genotypes by these indices, may also select for low seed glucosinolate under drought conditions. Singh et al. (1985) and Kumar and Singh (1998) suggested that transpirational cooling could be used to screen large numbers of germplasm lines of Brassica species for drought tolerance. Golestani Araghi and Assad (1998) reported that  $T_1$  and stomatal resistance are beneficial drought resistance indicators in wheat. It has been revealed more accurately that RWC predicts the growth maintained under increasing water deficit than the simple measure of water potential in Bentgrass (Lehman et al., 1993). El Hafid et al. (1998) indicated that stomatal resistance, RWC and greater osmotic adjustment are possible measures to determine the drought resistance of a spring durum wheat cultivar.

In the present study, water deficit during the seed filling period significantly decreased CTS only in first year (Table 3), and there were no significant differences among genotypes for CTS. However, Pasban Eslam *et al.* (2000) noted that CTS which reflects crop temperature stability under daily air temperature alterations, and higher stability of crop temperature under drought periods, could be an indicator of water absorption and the evaporative ability of a plant under stress condition. To obtain more

[ DOR: 20.1001.1.16807073.2009.11.4.4.9 ] [ Download

2001-2002       Talayeh       181.0         Non-stress       Talayeh       181.0         Formax       0kapi       191.3         Okapi       191.3       185.7         Okapi       191.3       185.7         Stress       Talayeh       191.3         Stress       Talayeh       193.3         Stress       Talayeh       161.3         Fornax       161.3       176.3         Regent×Cobra       175.3         Regent×Cobra       142.0         SLM046       176.7         LSD(0.05)       7.649         2002-2003       7.649         Non-stress       Talayeh       145.3         Regent×Cobra       176.7         SLM046       176.7         SLM046       168.3         SLM046       168.3         SLM046       168.3         SLM046       168.3         SLM046       168.3	29.0 29.0 31.3 30.3 27.0 27.0 27.0 27.0	3.73 3.61 3.63 3.63 3.41 3.41 3.11	39.5 40.1 40.3			(Juliu E
Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046	29.0 29.0 31.3 30.3 27.0 30.0 30.0	3.73 3.61 3.63 3.46 3.41 3.35 3.11	39.5 40.1 40.3			
Formax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Formax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Formax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Formax	29.0 31.3 30.3 30.3 29.7 30.0 30.0	3.61 3.23 3.46 3.41 3.35 3.11	40.1 40.3 7 2	0.30	5876	12.2
Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax	31.3 27.0 29.7 30.3 30.3 30.0 27.0	3.23 3.63 3.46 3.41 3.35 3.11	40.3 12 2	0.30	5578	14.3
Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh Fornax	27.0 30.3 29.7 30.0 30.0	3.63 3.46 3.41 3.35 3.11	<i>c c v</i>	0.29	5822	17.7
SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh	30.3 29.7 30.0 27.0	3.46 3.41 3.35 3.11	7.71	0.30	5105	15.1
Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Talayeh	29.7 27.0 27.0	3.41 3.35 3.11	40.1	0.27	6070	17.0
Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046	27.7 30.0 27.0	3.35 3.11	38.0	0.28	4670	11.1
Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046 Tolwo46	30.0 27.0	3.11	39.6	0.28	4168	15.7
Regent X Cobra SLM046 SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046	27.0		40.3	0.29	5371	21.1
SLM046 Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent X Cobra SLM046		3.54	40.4	0.27	4146	17.2
Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046	30.0	3.18	38.7	0.27	5832	15.5
Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046	1.554	0.269	1.506	0.054	1205.0	10.95
Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046						
tress Talayeh Fornax Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046 Toloveh						
Fornax Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046 Toloveb	28.7	4.25	44.6	0.31	5362	17.6
Okapi Regent×Cobra SLM046 Toloveb	30.3	4.32	45.3	0.30	5734	10.8
Regent×Cobra SLM046 Tolovab	33.3	3.90	46.1	0.36	5604	14.2
SLM046 Televeb	32.0	4.40	46.9	0.32	4976	13.6
Talorish	32.3	3.78	44.8	0.30	5570	12.3
I alaycii	30.7	4.48	43.4	0.29	3932	20.7
	32.0	4.26	45.0	0.29	4353	18.3
Okapi 99.0	33.3	3.96	45.8	0.30	5111	21.1
Regent X Cobra 100.7	28.7	4.15	45.9	0.28	4048	21.5
SLM046 99.3	32.7	4.26	45.7	0.29	4657	12.6
$LSD(0.05)^{a}$ 35.330	4.019	0.817	1.338	0.076	1038.0	9.355

–Pasban Eslam

_
6
$\overline{\mathbf{d}}$
÷
÷.
Ξ
9.
0
2
13
Ò
5
ŏ
16
•
Ξ.
01
ð
0
0
Ľ.
ō
Ă

$K_1^a$ I $0.87^{**}$ $0.68^{**}$ $0.68^{**}$ $0.01$ RWC <sup>b</sup> I         0.85^{**} $0.01$ $0.87^{**}$ $0.01$ RWC <sup>b</sup> I         0.85^{**} $0.89^{**}$ $0.01$ $0.75^{*}$ T <sub>1</sub> I         I $0.85^{**}$ $0.03^{**}$ $0.01$ T <sub>1</sub> I         I $0.85^{**}$ $0.03^{**}$ $0.01$ T <sub>1</sub> I         I $0.84^{**}$ $0.75^{*}$ $0.84^{**}$ $0.75^{*}$ CTS <sup>d</sup> I         I         I $0.84^{**}$ $0.75^{*}$ $0.90^{**}$ Number of pods/plant         I         I $0.84^{**}$ $0.77^{*}$ $0.00^{**}$ Number of seeds/pod         I         I $0.00^{**}$ $0.00^{**}$ $0.00^{**}$ Number of seeds/pod         I         I $0.00^{**}$ $0.00^{**}$ $0.00^{**}$ Number of seeds/pod         I         I         I $0.00^{**}$ $0.00^{**}$ Neight         I         I         I         I	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Trait	Trait (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(9)	(1)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(1)	K <sub>1</sub> <sup>a</sup>	I		0.87**	-0.88**	0.68*	0.88**	0.51	0.18	0.33	0.42	$0.84^{**}$	0.08
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			П		0.85**	-0.89**	-0.01	0.87 * *	0.22	-0.49	0.21	0.81 **	0.89**	-0.63*
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6	RWC <sup>b</sup>	Ι			-0.94**	0.75*	0.66*	0.23	0.52	0.37	0.54	0.61*	-0.28
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$			п			-0.84**	0.18	0.79**	0.23	-0.56	0.45	0.67*	0.86**	-0.54
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3	$T_1^{\circ}$	Ι				-0.80**	-0.71*	-0.15	-0.53	-0.50		-0.66*	0.16
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Π				-0.07	-0.82**	-0.03	0.22	-0.33		-0.83**	$0.76^{**}$
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(4)	CTS <sup>d</sup>	Ι					0.65*	0.20	0.26	0.40		0.46	-0.14
Number of pods/plant1 $0.71*$ $0.11$ $0.07$ $0.43$ $0.88**$ 110.01 $0.43$ $0.09$ $0.49$ $0.89**$ Number of seeds/pod1 $0.01$ $0.43$ $0.09$ $0.49$ $0.89**$ 10.00-seed1 $0.76$ $0.42$ $0.01$ $0.71*$ $0.71*$ 10.00-seed1 $0.00-seed$ $0.39$ $0.30$ $0.39$ $0.06$ Weight11 $0.01$ $0.71*$ $0.11$ $0.71*$ 111 $0.01$ $0.30$ $0.39$ $0.06$ Nurest11 $0.49$ $0.30$ $0.39$ $0.06$ Nurest11 $0.41$ $0.25$ $0.42$ $0.11$ 11 $0.41$ $0.38$ $0.36$ $0.38$ $0.50$ Nurest11 $0.49$ $0.11$ $0.49$ $0.11$ 11 $0.41$ $0.38$ $0.25$ $0.43$ $0.25$ 111 $0.41$ $0.18$ $0.43$ $0.28$ 11 $0.41$ $0.11$ $0.43$ $0.25$ 11 $0.41$ $0.11$ $0.43$ $0.26$ 11 $0.41$ $0.11$ $0.43$ $0.25$ 11 $0.41$ $0.11$ $0.43$ $0.26$ 11 $0.41$ $0.11$ $0.43$ $0.26$ 11 $0.11$ $0.11$ $0.11$ $0.11$ 11 $0.11$ $0.11$ $0.11$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			П					0.12	0.36	0.14	0.14		0.07	-0.40
II       -0.01       -0.43       0.09       0.49       0.89**         Number of seeds/pod       I       -0.56       -0.42       0.01       0.71*         Number of seeds/pod       I       -0.56       -0.42       0.01       0.71*         Neight       I       -0.56       -0.42       0.01       0.71*         Veight       I       -0.56       -0.42       0.01       0.71*         Veight       I       0.30       0.39       -0.06       0.01         Veight       I       0.30       0.39       -0.06       0.01         Oil content       I       0.43       0.31       0.41       0.26         Harvest       I       0.43       0.25       0.14       0.04       0.01         Index       II       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25         Index       II       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25         Index       II       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.25         Index       I       II       0.43       0.25       0.43       0.26         Index	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(2)	Number of pods/plant	I						0.71*	-0.11	0.07		0.88**	0.10
Number of seeds/pod         1         -0.56         -0.42         0.01         0.71*           II         II         -0.43         0.31         0.41         0.26           Weight         II         -0.43         0.31         0.41         0.26           Weight         II         -0.43         0.39         -0.06           Weight         II         -0.18         -0.39         -0.06           Oil content         I         0.30         0.39         -0.06           Marvest         I         0.18         -0.38         -0.36           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.1           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.41         0.60         -0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.43         0.25         -0.43         0.26	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1	Π						-0.01	-0.43	0.09		0.89**	-0.71*
II       -0.43       0.31       0.41       0.26         1000-seed       I       0.39       -0.06         Weight       I       -0.18       -0.38       -0.50         Weight       I       -0.18       -0.38       -0.50         Oll content       I       1       -0.43       0.01         Oll content       I       0       0.39       0.06         Harvest       I       0.49       0.01         Index       I       0.43       0.25         Index       II       0.43       0.26         Index       II <td< td=""><td><math display="block">\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</math></td><td>9</td><td>Number of seeds/pod</td><td>I</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-0.56</td><td>-0.42</td><td></td><td><math>0.71^{*}</math></td><td>0.18</td></td<>	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9	Number of seeds/pod	I							-0.56	-0.42		$0.71^{*}$	0.18
1000-seed         I         0.30         0.39         -0.06           Weight         I         0.18         -0.38         -0.50           With         I         0.49         0.1         0.49         0.01           Marvest         I         0.49         0.1         0.43         0.25           Harvest         I         0.43         0.25         0.43         0.25           Index         I         0.43         0.25         0.43         0.26           Index         I         0.44         0.26         0.44         0.26           Index         I         0.43         0.25         0.44         0.26           Seed yield         I         0.44         0.26         0.44         0.26           Index         I         0.44         0.44         0.44         0.44 <td>0.30 0.39 -0.06 -0.18 -0.38 -0.50 0.49 0.01 0.43 0.25 0.38 0.60</td> <td></td> <td>I</td> <td>П</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-0.43</td> <td>0.31</td> <td></td> <td>0.26</td> <td>-0.29</td>	0.30 0.39 -0.06 -0.18 -0.38 -0.50 0.49 0.01 0.43 0.25 0.38 0.60		I	П							-0.43	0.31		0.26	-0.29
Weight         II         -0.18         -0.38         -0.50           Oil content         I         0.49         0.01           II         II         0.49         0.01           Harvest         I         0.43         0.25           Index         I         0.43         0.25           Index         I         0.43         0.25           Index         I         0.43         0.25           Seed yield         I         0.43         0.38           Index         I         0.43         0.50           Glucosinolate         I         0.60         0.60	-0.18 -0.38 -0.50 0.49 0.01 0.43 0.25 0.38 0.60	E	1000-seed	Ι								0.30		-0.06	-0.60
Oil content         I         0.49         0.01           II         II         0.43         0.25           Harvest         I         0.43         0.25           Index         II         0.43         0.25           Seed yield         I         0.38           II         0.41         0.25           Glucosinolate         I         0.43           II         II         0.43	0.49 0.01 0.43 0.25 0.38 0.60		Weight	Π								-0.18		-0.50	0.11
II       0.43       0.25         Harvest       1       0.38         Index       II       0.38         Seed yield       1       0.50         II       II       0.60         Glucosinolate       1       1         II       II       1	0.43 0.25 0.38 0.60	8	Oil content	Ι										0.01	0.44
HarvestI0.38IndexII0.60Seed yieldI0.60IIII0.60GlucosinolateIIIIIIIII	0.60			П										0. 25	-0.26
IndexII0.60Seed yieldIClucosinolateIIIIIIIIIII	0.60	6	Harvest	Ι										0.38	-0.10
Seed yield I II Glucosinolate I II			Index	П										0.60	-0.32
П Г П		(10)	Seed yield	Ι											0.07
I II				П											-0.67*
П	II <ul> <li>* ** : Significant at 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively.</li> <li>Stomatal conductance; <sup>b</sup> Relative water content; <sup>c</sup> Leaf temperature, <sup>d</sup> Crop temperature stability.</li> </ul>	(11)	Glucosinolate	I											
	*, **: Significant at 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively. Stomatal conductance; <sup>b</sup> Relative water content; <sup>c</sup> Leaf temperature, <sup>d</sup> Crop temperature stability.			П											

JAST

reliable results, however, it is better to evaluate a large number of *B.napus* L. genotypes under stress conditions over several seasons.

Since water deficit significantly decreased the number of pods per plant and seed yield (Table 4), and there was a significantly positive correlation among these traits (Table 5), it seems that occurring water deficit from late flowering, decreases seed yield mainly via decreasing the number of pods per plant in oilseed rape. Limitation of carbohydrate supplies to pods can lead to pod abortion in oilseed rape during the late flowering and pod filling stages (Habekotte, 1993). Drought occurring at flowering stage, significantly increases the rate of pod abortion, thus decreasing final seed yield in soybean (Liu et al., 2003; 2004). Elias and Copelan (2001) reported that weather conditions, especially precipitation, affected both the initiation of pod formation and the duration between pod formation and maturity in oilseed rape. Richards and Thurling (1978) indicated that late season drought could lead to abortion of more than 50 percent of pods in *B. napus* L. and *B.* rapa L., however remaining pods had more and heavier seeds. Results showed that water deficit significantly decreased the 1,000seed weight, seed oil percentage and harvest index during 2001-2002 (Table 4). Jensen et al. (1996) revealed that water deficit stress occurring during both vegetative growth and pod filling stages in oilseed rape, decreased the number of seeds per  $m^2$ , oil yield, harvest index and seed yield. Findings about the adverse effects of drought on 1,000-seed weight, harvest index and seed oil percent in oilseed rape are reported (Richards and Thurling, 1978). It seems that when the plant growth stage that is confronted with drought, the stress level and its duration are usually main factors affecting the those characteristics. Water deficit stress increased seed glucosinolate (Table 4), but the amounts were always below acceptable levels (20µ mol g<sup>-1</sup>) in terms of European Union Standards for marketing oilseed rape (Jensen et al., 1996).

Among the genotypes Okapi and SLM046 had higher and lower values of  $K_1$  (in both irrigation patterns) and  $T_1$  under stress conditions, respectively (Table 3). These genotypes demonstrated higher amounts of pod per plant and seeds per pod in both irrigation conditions in 2001-2002 (Table 4). Finally Okapi and SLM046, especially under water deficit, had the highest seed yield (Table 4). Therefore among the studied genotypes, Okapi and SLM046 are more suitable to cultivation in areas with late season water deficit.

This study demonstrated the need for a further assessment of water deficit tolerance mechanisms in oilseed rape with clear drought cycles and measurements at specific stages of crop growth, using a suitable range of genotypes. An economically viable oilseed rape line to extend the crop rotation in dryer cropping areas appears possible, given the wide genotypic variation available.

## REFERENCES

- 1. Bar-Tsur, A. and Rudich, J. 1987. Osmotic Adjustment of Cotton to Moderate Potassium- Chloride Stress and Subsequent Water Stress during Early Stages of Development. *Agron. J.*, **79:** 166-171.
- 2. El Hafid, R., Smith, D. H., Karrou, M. and Samir, K. 1998. Physiological Responses of Spring Durum Wheat Cultivars to Earlyseason Drought in a Mediterranean Environment. *Ann. Bot.*, **54**: 537-541.
- Elias, S. G. and Copeland, L. O. 2001. Physiological and Harvest Maturity of Canola in Relation to Seed Quality. *Agron. J.*, 93: 1054-1058.
- 4. Golestani-Araghi, S. and Assad, M. T. 1998. Evaluation of Four Screening Techniques for Drought Resistance and Their Relationship to Yield in Wheat. *Euphytica*, **103:** 293-299.
- Habekotté, B. 1993. Quantitative Analysis of Pod Formation, Seed Set and Seed Filling in Winter Oilseed Rape (*Brassica napus* L.) under Field Conditions. *Field Crops Res.*, 35: 21-33.
- Jensen, C. R., Mogensen, V. O., Mortensen, G., Fieldsedn, J. K., Milford, G. F. J., Andersen, M. N. and Thage, J. H. 1996.

Downloaded from jast.modares.ac.ir on 2024-04-28

Seed Glucosinolate, Oil and Protein Contents of Field-grown Rape (*Brassica napus* L.) Affected by Soil Drying and Evaporative Demand. *Field Crops Res.*, **47**: 93-105.

- Kaushik, N. and Agnihotri, A. 1999. High-Performance Liquid Chromatographic Method for Separation and Quantification of Intact Glucosinolates. *Chromatographia*, 49: 281-284.
- 8. Kumar, A. and Singh, D. P. 1998. Use of Physiological Indices as a Screening Technique for Drought Tolerance in Oilseed *Brassica* Species. *Ann. Bot*, **81:** 413-420.
- 9. Kumar, A. and Elston, J. 1992. Genotypic Differences in Leaf Water Relations Between *Brassica Juncea* and *B. napus. Ann. Bot.*, **70:** 3-9.
- Kumar, A., Singh, D. P. and Singh, P. 1987. Genotypic Variation in the Response of *Brassica* Species to Water Deficit. *J. Agric. Sci. Camb.*, 109: 615-618.
- Kumar, A., Singh, P., Singh, D. P., Singh, H. and Sharma, H. C. 1984. Differences in Osmoregulation in *Brassica Species*. *Ann. Bot.*, 54: 537-541.
- Lazcano-Ferrat, I. and Lovatt, C. J. 1999. Relationship between Relative Water Content, Nitrogen Pools and Growth of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. and *P. acutifolius* A. Gray during Water Deficit. *Crop Sci.*, **39**: 467-475.
- Lehman, V. G., Engelke, M. C. and White, R. H. 1993. Leaf Water Potential and Relative Water Content Variation in Creeping Bentgrass Clones. *Crop Sci.*, 33: 1350-1353.
- Liu, F., Andersen, M. N. and Jensen, C. R. 2003. Loss of Pod Set Caused by Drought Stress in Associated With Water Status and ABA Content of Reproductive Structures in Soybean. *Fun. Plant Biol.*, **30**: 271-280.
- Liu, F., Jensen, C. R. and Andersen, M. N. 2004. Drought Stress Effect on Carbohydrate Concentration in Soybean Leaves and Pod During Early Reproductive Development: Its Implication in Altering Pod Set. *Field Crops Res.*, 86: 1-13.
- Mendham, N. J., Shipway, P. A. and Scott, R. K. 1981. The Effects of Delayed Sowing and Weather on Growth, Development and Yield of Winter Oilseed Rape (*Brassica* napus). J. Agric. Sci. Camb., 96: 389-415.

- 17. Morgan, J. M. 1984. Osmoregulation and Water Stress in Higher Plants. *Ann. Rev. plant physiol.*, **35:** 299-319.
- Nelson, R. L. and Schweitzer, L. E. 1988. Evaluating Soybean Germplasm for Specific Leaf Weight. *Crop Sci.*, 28: 647-649.
- Pasban Eslam, B., Shakiba, M. R., Neyshaboury, M. R., Mogaddam, M. and Ahmadi, M. R. 2000. Evaluation of Physiological Indices as a Screening Technique for Drought Resistance in Oilseed Rape. *Pak. Acad. Sci. J.*, **37:** 143-152.
- Rao, M. S. S. and Mendham, N. J. 1991. Soil-Plant-Water Relation of Oilseed Rape (*Brassica napus* and *B. campestris*). J. Agric. Sci. Camb, 117: 197-205.
- Ray, I. M., Townsend, M. S. and Henning, J. A.1998. Variation for Yield, Water-Use Efficiency, and Canopy Morphology among Nine Alfalfa Germplasms. *Crop Sci.*, 38: 1386-1390.
- 22. Richards, R. A. and Thurling, N. 1978. Variation between and Within Species of Rapessed (*B. campestris* and *Brassica napus*), in Response to Drought Stress. I. Sensitivity at Different Stages of Development. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.*, 29: 469-177.
- Rudich, J., Rendon-Phblete, E., Stevens, M. A. and Ambri, A. I. 1981. Use of Leaf Water Potential to Determine Water Stress in Field-Grown Tomato Plants. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., 106: 732-736.
- 24. Shimshi, D. and Livne, A. 1967. The Estimation of the Osmotic Potential of Plant Sap by Refractometry and Conductometry: A Field Method. *Ann. Bot.*, **31:** 505-511.
- 25. Singh, D. P., Chaudhary, B. D., Singh, P., Sharmma, H. C. and Karwastra, S. P. S. 1990. Drought Tolerance in Oilseed Brassica and Chickpea. Hisar, India, Directorate of Research. Haryana Agricultural University.
- Singh, D. P., Singh, P., Kumar, A. and Sharma, H. C. 1985. Transpirational Cooling as a Screening Technique for Drought Tolerance in Oilseed Brassicas. *Ann. Bot.*, 56: 815-820.
- Wright, P. R., Morgan, J. M. and Jessop, R. S. 1996. Comparative Adaptation of Canola (*Brassica napus*) and Indian Mustard (*B. juncea*) to Soil Water Deficits: Plant Water Relations and Growth. *Field Crops Res.*, 49: 51-64.

## ارزیابی شاخص های فیزیولوژیک، عملکرد و اجزای عملکرد به عنوان تکنیک گزینش برای تحمل به خشکی در ینج رقم کلزا

ب. ياسبان اسلام

چکندہ

کمبود آب مهم ترین عامل محدود کننده تولید گیاهان زراعی در سطح جهان می باشد . بـه وسیله توسعه دسترسـی بـه رطوبت خاک و گزینش ژنوتیپ های متحمل، می توان تنش خشکی را مدیریت نمود . در این تحقیق شاخص های فیزیولوژیک متعددی شامل هدایت روزنه ای ( K<sub>1</sub> )، مقدار آب نسبی ( RWC ) ، دمای برگ ( T<sub>1</sub> ) و پایداری دمای گیاه زراعی ( CTS ) و نیز عملکرد دانه، اجزای عملکرد و مقدار گلوکوزینولات دانه بر روی ۵ ژنوتیپ کلزا از Brassica napus L. (طلایه، فورناکس، اکایی، ریجنت × کبرا و اس ال ام ۰۴۶) تحت شرایط بدون تنش و تنش خشکی اعمال شده از اواخر گل دهی (۸۰٪ گل دهی ) تا رسیدگی دانه، مورد ارزیابی قرار گرفتند . آزمایش در مرکز تحقیقات کشاورزی و منابع طبيعي آذربايجان شرقي، ايران ( ۴۶ درجه و ۲ دقيقه شرقي، ۳۷ درجه و ۵۸ دقيقه شمالي) در طبي دو سال (۱۳۸۲–۱۳۸۰) در یک خاک لوم به اجرا در آمد . در هر دو سال آزمایش، خشکی باعث کاهش معنی دار K<sub>1</sub> و RWC و افزایش معنی دار T1 گردید . بنابراین به نظر می رسد که شاخص های مذکور بتوانند اثرات تنش خشکی رخ داده از اواخر دوره گل دهی بر روی گیاهان کلزا را منعکس نمایند . همچنین با توجه به وجود اختلاف معنی دار مقادیر K<sub>1</sub> و T<sub>1</sub> در بین ژنوتیپ های کلزا، به نظر می رسد بتوان از این شاخص ها در گزینش ارقام متحمل به خشکی اواخر فصل استفاده نمود . تنش خشکی تعداد خورجین در بوته و عملکرد دانه را به طور معنی داری کاهش داد .بین این خصوصیات در طبی هـر دو سـال آزمایش همبستگی مثبت و معنی داری دیده شد ( به ترتیب r برابر است با ۸۸/۰ و ۰/۸۹ ) . بـه نظر مـی رسـد وقـوع تـنش خشکی از اواخر گل دهی کلزا، عملکرد دانه را به ویژه از طریق کاهش تعداد خورجین در بوته، دچار افت می کند .تحت شرایط تنش کمبود آب، اکاپی و اس ال ام ۰۴۶ مقادیر پایین تر دمای برگ ( به ترتیب ۳۰/۶ و ۲۹/۷ درجه سانتی گراد ) و مقادیر بالاتر K<sub>1</sub> ( به ترتیب ۳۵۰، و ۳۵۵، سانتی متر بر ثانیه ) و عملکرد دانه ( به ترتیب ۵۲۴۱ و ۵۲۴۵ کیلوگرم در هکتار ) را نشان دادند . در نهایت چنین نتیجه گیری می گردد که اکایی و اس ال ام ۴۴ از شایستگی بیشتری برای کشت در مناطقي با تنش خشكي اواخر فصل برخوردارند .