

*Triticum aestivum* L.

|            |        |      |              |
|------------|--------|------|--------------|
| **         | *      | **   | **           |
| /          | /      | /    | **           |
|            | /      |      | *            |
|            | /      | /    | **           |
| /          | /      |      |              |
|            |        |      | 2009-2008    |
|            | . 99   |      |              |
| 30 20 10 0 |        | /    | 150 100 50 0 |
|            | ( ) 48 |      | (4×4×3)      |
|            | . 0.05 |      |              |
| /          | 150    |      |              |
|            | /      | 1000 | /            |

## Role of Proline acid in mitigating the adverse effects of sodium chloride on Yield components of wheat plant. *Triticum aestivum* L.

Abbas J.H.AL- Saedi\*\* , Abdel-Kareem H.Hassan\* & Amel Ghanim .M .

\*\*AL-Kazzaz

\*Dept. of Biology, College of Education Ibn Al- haitham , Univ. of Baghdad.

\*State Board for Agricultural Research, Ministry of Agriculture .

### Abstract

An experiment was conducted by using pots in greenhouse of the Department of Biology ,College of Education (Ibn Al\_ haitham ) University of Baghdad during the growing season of 2008-2009 .The experiment aimed to demonstrate the effect of increasing concentrations of both Sodium chloride and proline acid and their interaction on some yield components of wheat cv.Ibaa99.

The experiment included four concentrations of Sodium Chloride 0,50,100and150 mM\L and four concentrations of proline acid 0,10,20and30 ppm. The experiment was designed as Completely Randomized Design (CRD)by three replicates(3×4×4)consisting 48 exp.units.Data were statistically analyzed to find out the least significal differences (LSD) between treatment at 0.05 level .Results indicated that increasing of Sodium Chloride concentration form 0 to 150 mM\L caused significant decreases in yield components (biological yield, Spike length,number of spikelets\spike,number of grains\spike,weight of 1000 grain and grains yield/pot. The treatment with proline acid indicated significant increases in all averages of yield components.

Results of interactions for both factors indicated that foliar application of proline acid counteracted the adverse effects of high concentrations of Sodium chloride o f yield components of the plant.

*Triticum aestivum* L.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4) (5)

1000

4H و 3H

(6)

(7)

1000

(11)

Proline acid

(8)

)

Super oxide

(9)

dismutase

(10)

-1

-2

/ /

2009-2008

(1)

(11)

(1)

| - . . ) |      |       | - . . )<br>( | pH   | - . . | (- ) |     |     |
|---------|------|-------|--------------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| K       | P    | N     |              |      |       |      |     |     |
| 111.60  | 5.80 | 47.20 | 7.10         | 7.40 | 1.90  | 188  | 511 | 301 |

|                                     |                                 |                    |        |           |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------|-----------|
| 2                                   |                                 |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 | 7                  | 30     |           |
| ( CRD) Completely Randomized Design |                                 |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 | -:                 |        | 4× 4      |
|                                     | /                               | 150 و 100 و 50 و 0 |        | -1        |
|                                     | -:                              |                    | 1      |           |
|                                     |                                 | ×                  |        |           |
| -----                               |                                 |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 | 30 و 20 و 10 و 0   |        | -2        |
|                                     |                                 | 1000               | (1)    |           |
|                                     |                                 |                    | (1)    |           |
| . 48                                |                                 |                    |        | -3        |
| / 0 .70                             | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> ) |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 | / 0.35             | (46%N) |           |
|                                     |                                 | 43                 |        | / 0.35    |
| 16                                  | 2008/11/23                      | 99                 | *      |           |
|                                     |                                 |                    | % 50   |           |
|                                     | 14                              | 11                 |        |           |
|                                     | 2009/1/11                       | 4 -3               | ( )    |           |
|                                     |                                 |                    |        |           |
| 53                                  |                                 |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 |                    |        | 2009/1/14 |
| 14                                  |                                 |                    |        |           |
| 2009/1/28                           |                                 |                    |        |           |
|                                     |                                 |                    | (1)    |           |



شكل (1) يوضح تصميم التجربة ونبات الحنطة النامي .

\*

146

-:

2009/4/19

|  |            |    |
|--|------------|----|
|  | .( )       | -1 |
|  | ( + )      |    |
|  | .( )       | -2 |
|  | /          | -3 |
|  | /          | -4 |
|  | .( ) 1000  | -5 |
|  | .( ) / ( ) | -6 |

(12)

. 0 .05

(LSD) Least Significant Difference

-1

3.281 (2)

/ 150 % 33.21 8.87

30

%33.33 .7211 8.74

20

30

6.10 12.00 / 50

/ 150

% 96.7

(2)

|       | ( / )   |       |       |       | (PPm)  |
|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
|       | 150     | 100   | 50    | 0     |        |
| 8.79  | 6.10    | 8.25  | 9.10  | .7011 | 0      |
| .1511 | 9.59    | 0.591 | .4411 | 2.971 | 10     |
| .7911 | 9.99    | 1.311 | 11.95 | 3.911 | 20     |
| .7211 | 9.80    | 0.531 | 2.001 | 4.561 | 30     |
|       | 8.87    | 10.17 | .1211 | 3.281 |        |
|       | 0.062=  |       |       |       | LSD    |
|       | 0.062 = |       |       |       | (0.05) |
|       | 0.124 = |       |       |       |        |

(13)

.(10)

-2

(3)

% 30.58 .3711 6.381

/ 150

4.211 0.781  
30 % 32

4.371 20

30

8.25 18.95 /

/ 150

(3)

( )

|         | ( / ) |       |       |       | (PPm)         |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|
|         | 150   | 100   | 50    | 0     |               |
| 0.781   | 8.25  | 9.70  | .9011 | 3.251 | 0             |
| 3.461   | 2.401 | 2.801 | 3.101 | 5.551 | 10            |
| 4.371   | 2.881 | 3.301 | 3.551 | 7.751 | 20            |
| 4.211   | .9511 | 2.851 | 3.101 | 8.951 | 30            |
|         | .3711 | 2.161 | 2.911 | 6.381 |               |
| 0.120 = |       |       |       |       | LSD<br>(0.05) |
| 0.120 = |       |       |       |       |               |
| 0.241 = |       |       |       |       |               |

. / -3

%24.51 2.441 6.481 /

(4) / 150

/

5.641 .9411 / 20

/ % .31

/ 30

150 9.45 17.90 /  
 .%89.41 /  
 /

(4)

|         | ( / ) |       |       |       | (PPm)         |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|
|         | 150   | 100   | 50    | 0     |               |
| .9411   | 9.45  | .5011 | 2.501 | 4.301 | 0             |
| 4.781   | 3.001 | 4.201 | 5.201 | 6.701 | 10            |
| 5.641   | 4.001 | 5.201 | 6.351 | 7.001 | 20            |
| 5.531   | 3.301 | 4.601 | 6.301 | 7.901 | 30            |
|         | 2.441 | 3.881 | 5.091 | 16.48 |               |
| 0.315 = |       |       |       |       | LSD<br>(0,05) |
| 0.315 = |       |       |       |       |               |
| 0.629 = |       |       |       |       |               |

/ -4

/

(5)

% 23.45 24.61 32.15  
 / 150  
 / 20 30.25 25.03  
 %20.85

30 /

34.00 /

/

150

21.70

30 /

/

/ 150

/ 21.70

/ (5)

|         | ( / ) |       |       |       | (PPm)         |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|
|         | 150   | 100   | 50    | 0     |               |
| 25.03   | 21.70 | 24.55 | 25.30 | 28.55 | 0             |
| 28.11   | 24.10 | 27.65 | 28.10 | 32.60 | 10            |
| 30.25   | 26.80 | 29.25 | 31.50 | 33.46 | 20            |
| 29.45   | 25.85 | 27.20 | 30.75 | 34.00 | 30            |
|         | 24.61 | 27.16 | 28.91 | 32.15 |               |
| 0.691 = |       |       |       |       | LSD<br>(0,05) |
| 0.691 = |       |       |       |       |               |
| .3821 = |       |       |       |       |               |

/

/

1000 -5

31.26 / 1000 (6)

/ 150 19.93

20

% 20.28 26.51 22.04 1000

1000 1000

30

/ 150

1000

1000 (14)

1000

(6)

( ) 1000

|         | ( / ) |       |       |       | (PPm)         |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|
|         | 150   | 100   | 50    | 0     |               |
| 22.04   | 17.35 | 20.90 | 22.35 | 27.55 | 0             |
| 24.70   | 20.30 | 23.45 | 24.85 | 30.20 | 10            |
| 26.51   | 21.35 | 24.65 | 26.85 | 33.20 | 20            |
| 26.39   | 20.70 | 24.51 | 26.25 | 34.10 | 30            |
|         | 19.93 | 23.38 | 25.08 | 31.26 |               |
| 0.830 = |       |       |       |       | LSD<br>(0,05) |
| 0.830 = |       |       |       |       |               |
| =       |       |       |       |       |               |

-6

( ) / ( )

/ (7)

%38.77      2.59    4.23

/      150

/

20

.      3.60    3.00      /

30      /

4.55      /

/      150

.      2.10

(7)

/

|         | ( / ) |      |      |      | (PPm)         |
|---------|-------|------|------|------|---------------|
|         | 150   | 100  | 50   | 0    |               |
| 3.00    | 2.10  | 2.80 | 3.25 | 3.85 | 0             |
| 3.44    | 2.72  | 3.16 | 3.73 | 4.16 | 10            |
| 3.60    | 2.88  | 3.35 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 20            |
| 3.48    | 2.65  | 3.25 | 3.45 | 4.55 | 30            |
|         | 2.59  | 3.14 | 3.56 | 4.23 |               |
| 0.118 = |       |      |      |      | LSD<br>(0,05) |
| 0.118 = |       |      |      |      |               |
| 0.236 = |       |      |      |      |               |

/

(14)

20

99

/ 150 و 100

. (1987)

-1

2-Rausch,T.;Kirsch,M.;Low,R.;Lehr,A.;Viereck,R. and Zhigang,A.(1996). Salt stress responses of higher plants. The role of proton pumps and Na<sup>+</sup>/H<sup>+</sup> antiporters .Plant Physiol.,148:425-433.

3-Sionit, N.; Teare,I.D.and Kramer,P.J. (1980). Effect of repeat application of water stress on water status and growth of wheat. Plant Physiol., 50:11-15 .

. (1998) -4

. *Triticum aestivum* L.

. (2001) -5

.96-89:(2)32

. (2005) -6

7-Khan,M.J.(2007) . Physiological and biochemical mechanisms of salinity tolerance in different wheat genotypes. Thesis of Ph. D. N. W. F. P. , Agricultural University , Peshawar , Pakistan.

8-Ashraf,M. and Foolad,M.R.(2007).Role of glycinebetaine and proline in improving plant abiotic stress resistance.Envirn.Exp.Bot. ,59:206-216.

- 9-Tan,J.; Zhao,H.; Hong, J.;Han,Y.;Li,H. and Zhao, W.(2008). Effects of exogenous nitric oxide on photosynthesis, antioxidant capacity and proline accumulation in wheat seedlings subjected to osmotic stress . World J.Agric .
- 10-Fattahi Neisiani, F. ; Modarres Sanavy , S. A. M. ;Ghanati, 1Sci.,4(3);307-313. F. and Dolatabadian,A.(2009).Effect of foliar application of pyridoxine on antioxidant enzyme activity,proline accumulation and lipid peroxidation of maize *Zea mays* L., under water deficit. Nat.Bot. Hort.Agrobot.Cluj. , 37(1):116-121 .
- 11-Page,A. L. ; Miller,R. H. and Kenney, D. R. (1982). Method of Soil Analysis. 2<sup>nd</sup>(ed),Agron.9, Publisher , Madiason , Wisconsin.
- 12-Little, T. M. and Hills, F. J. (1978). Agricultural Experimentation Design and 1 Analysis.John Wiley and Sons,New York.
- . (2000) -13

- 14 -Levitt, J. (1980). Responses of plants to environmental Stresses . Vol 2, Acad.Press,New York.