

## Effect of different seed priming treatments on seed quality components of Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.)

### Abstract

The effects of different seed priming treatments, namely tap water, KNO<sub>3</sub> 2.5%, Thiourea 1000 ppm, CaCl<sub>2</sub> 2%, NaCl<sub>2</sub> 2%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> 1% and Salicylic acid 100 ppm solutions, on yield attributes, seed yield and economic returns of Barley cv. K-1055 and K-409 in Factorial Completely Randomized Block Design with four replications were investigated during 2022-23 and 2023-24 at the laboratory of Department of Seed Science and Technology, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. Analysis of variance revealed that the all recorded seed quality parameters were significantly affected by various seed priming treatments. Priming with KNO<sub>3</sub> @ 2.5 % showed maximum 1000 seed weight, standard germination %, seedling length, seedling root length, seedling shoot length, seedling dry weight, seed vigour index-I and- seed vigour index-II.

Key words:- Barley, Priming, KNO<sub>3</sub>, Seed quality

### Introduction

Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) is a versatile cereal grain worldwide, ranking fourth in acreage and production after wheat, rice and maize (USDA 2023). Barley belongs to the grass family Poaceae, tribe Triticeae and genus *Hordeum*, comprising nearly 350 species. Out of which *Hordeum* consists of about 32 species including the wild and cultivated one. Barley is a diploid with 2n=14 chromosomes.

The production of barley worldwide was estimated at around 142.22 million metric tons. Globally, the top barley-producing countries are Russia, Australia, Canada and United Kingdom. Russia shares 13% of the world's total barley production with an area of 9 million hectares and production of 19.03 million metric tons. Australia shares 8% of world's total barley production with the area 3.2 million hectares and production of 11.5 million metric tons. Seed quality plays a significant role in determining the productivity and sustainability of agricultural practices. The quality of seeds can greatly affect the overall success of a crop. High-quality seeds are essential for ensuring a healthy and vigorous crop that is able to give better growth and yield. Seeds that are of poor quality may lead to low germination rates, weak plants, and reduced yields.

High-quality seeds are crucial for effective seed production. Seed priming techniques, such as hydropriming, osmo-priming, thermo-priming, halo-priming, magnetic-priming, and nano-priming, can enhance germination and establishment in various crops like maize, wheat, rice, and canola (Basra et al., 2005). This age-old method improves germination and seedling emergence, resulting in better stand establishment and yield (Dutta, 2018).

Priming offers several advantages, including rapid and uniform germination, increased nutrient uptake, relief from phytochrome-induced photo- and thermo-dormancy, expanded germination temperature range, improved water use efficiency, and synchronous crop maturity. By reducing imbibitions time (Brocklehurst et al., 2008) and promoting metabolite production and pre-germinative enzyme activation (Hussain et al., 2016), seed

metric tons. Canada shares 6% of world's total barley production with an area of 2.7 million hectares and production of 9.6 million metric tons (USDA 2023).

Barley is used as a source of fermentable material for beer and certain distilled beverages and as a component of various health foods. Barley grains are commonly made into malt in a traditional and ancient method of preparation. In general, barley is mainly classified as six-rowed and two-rowed barleys based on arrangement of kernels. Seed is an important component and the quality seed plays a crucial role in agricultural production as well as in the national economy. Seed deterioration starts once the seed attains physiological maturity in the field. Seed deterioration will lead to some of physiological changes like drop of germinability, decrease in mean germination time and loss of vigour. priming ensures uniform germination and enhances crop establishment.

Seed priming has also been investigated as a presowing or mid-storage treatment for seed batches that have lost vigour due to insufficient storage conditions (Pan and Basu, 1985; Singh et al., 2001). Various studies have been carried out on seed priming and have shown positive results over non-primed seeds, though the methods are not widely used. The behaviour of seed with different priming treatments depends on various physiological and biochemical factors. There is ample scope for investigating mechanism involved behind the beneficial and adverse effect impacts of seed priming on seed quality.

### Material and Methods

The experiment was carried out to determine the effect of various seed priming treatments on Barley seed quality parameters, during 2022-23 and 2023-24 at the laboratory of Department of seed science and Technology, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, U.P. The experiment comprised of two Barley cultivars viz. cv. K-409 (V<sub>1</sub>) and K-1055 (V<sub>2</sub>). Both varieties were primed with control (T<sub>0</sub>), tap water (T<sub>1</sub>), KNO<sub>3</sub> 2.5% (T<sub>2</sub>), Thiourea 1000 ppm (T<sub>3</sub>), CaCl<sub>2</sub> 2% (T<sub>4</sub>), NaCl<sub>2</sub> 2% (T<sub>5</sub>), ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% (T<sub>6</sub>), KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> 1% (T<sub>7</sub>), Salicylic

Comment [D1]: Why seed yield? Rewrite this sentence

Comment [D2]: Arrange sentences

Comment [D4]: New reference???

Comment [D5]: Add some support to your particular treatments

Comment [D3]: Replace by new reference

acid 100 ppm( $T_0$ ) solutions. For test weight of seed 1000 seeds in four replications were counted manually from seed lot of each treatment and weight in (g) up to two decimal places with the help of the digital balance. Germination test was carried out by following the procedure outlined by ISTA rules. Four replications of 100 seeds each for every treatment were uniformly placed on moist germination paper and rolled with butter paper to prevent moisture evaporation during test period. Samples were placed in plastic tray in stand upright position and these trays were shifted to seed germinator maintained at  $20 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  temperature and  $90 \pm 3$  per cent relative humidity. The sample was allowed to germinate for the prescribed period. Germination percentage was recorded on 8<sup>th</sup> days by counting normal seedlings. On 8<sup>th</sup> day of germination, ten seedlings were selected randomly from each replication and seedling length, seedling root length and seedling shoot length was measured in cm and averaged. Randomly taken ten normal seedlings which were used for recording the seedling measurement were kept in beakers and dried for 24 hours in a hot air oven maintained at  $100^\circ\text{C}$  temperature. These dried seedlings were removed and cooled in a desiccator for 30 minutes. Then the weight was recorded and express in grams. The seedling vigour index-I was calculated by multiplying the per cent seed germination and total seedling length (cm) of all treatments separately. The seedling vigour index-II was determined by multiplying seed germination percentage and seedling dry weight (g). Formula suggested by **Abdul Baki and Anderson (1973)** as below.

Vigour Index-I = Germination Percentage x Seedling Length (cm)

Vigour index-II = Germination Percentage x Seedling dry weight (g)

### Results and Discussion

The data presented in table-1 to table- 8 revealed that both varieties of Barley when treated with various seed priming treatments showed significant effects on seed quality parameters.

Variety K-1055 exhibited significantly greater 1000 seed weight (42.71 g), standard germination % (92.33 %), seedling length (23.74 cm), seedling root length (10.20 cm), seedling shoot length (13.54 cm), seedling dry weight (0.229 g), seed vigour index-I (2194.87 cm), seed vigour index-II (21.20 cm) as compared to variety K-409 that may be due to differential response of

variety. Similar results have been reported by **Afzal et al. (2006)**, **Bakht et al. (2011)**, and **Siddique and Bose (2015)**.

Pooled data of priming treatments also presented in Table-1 to table-8 revealed that among the priming treatments, priming with  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $T_2$ ) was significantly superior in terms of 1000 seed weight (43.85 g), standard germination % (95.31 %), seedling length (25.88 cm), seedling root length (11.09 cm), seedling shoot length (14.79 cm), seedling dry weight (0.239 g), seed vigour index-I (2466.52 cm), seed vigour index-II (22.82 cm) followed by priming with thiourea @ 1000 ppm ( $T_3$ ) while all the seed quality characters were minimum in control ( $T_0$ ). These results are in conformity with **Ali et al. (2020)**, **El Tayeb (2006)**, **Naz and Shagufta (2021)**, **Khokhar et al. (2016)**.

Table-1 to table-8 revealed that the interaction of barley varieties with priming treatments showed significant improvement in 1000 seed weight, seedling length, seedling root length, seedling shoot length on pooled data basis of both years, maximum 1000 seed weight (44.46 g) was recorded in variety K-1055 with priming treatment  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $V_2 \times T_2$ ) followed by variety K-1055 with priming treatment thiourea @ 1000 ppm. Maximum seedling length (26.13 cm), seedling root length (11.23 cm), seedling shoot length (14.90 cm) was recorded in variety K-1055 with priming treatment  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $V_2 \times T_2$ ) followed by variety K-409 with priming treatment  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $V_1 \times T_2$ ). In terms of standard germination percentage, seedling dry weight, seed vigour index-I and seed vigour index-II the interaction of barley varieties with priming treatments were showed non significant improvement. However, maximum standard germination percentage (95.75 %), seedling dry weight (0.241g), seed vigour index-I (2502.38) and seed vigour index-II (23.04) were recorded in variety K-1055 with priming treatment  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $V_2 \times T_2$ ) followed by variety K-409 with priming treatment  $\text{KNO}_3$  @ 2.5 % ( $V_1 \times T_2$ ). All the recorded seed quality parameters found minimum in variety K-409 without priming ( $V_1 \times T_0$ ). Findings are in conformity with the results of **MoradiDezfuliet al. (2008)**, **Jalal et al. (2014)**, **Murungu (2011)**.

**Comment [D7]:** Explain each table with results in detail respectively. Elaborate results

**Comment [D8]:** Why using 1000 seed repeatedly

**Comment [D6]:** Too lengthy. It should be short but clear

**Comment [D9]:** Add atleast one new reference after 2018

**Comment [D10]:**

Table 1- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on 1000 seed weight (g) in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	40.12	41.02	40.57	40.78	41.21	40.99	40.45	41.12	40.78
T <sub>1</sub>	40.80	41.47	41.14	41.12	41.69	41.41	40.96	41.58	41.27

T <sub>2</sub>	43.11	44.05	43.58	43.37	44.87	44.12	43.24	44.46	43.85
T <sub>3</sub>	42.51	43.80	43.16	42.58	44.27	43.72	42.54	44.03	43.28
T <sub>4</sub>	41.74	42.24	41.99	41.87	42.64	42.26	41.81	42.44	42.12
T <sub>5</sub>	41.15	41.72	41.43	41.26	42.23	41.74	41.20	41.97	41.59
T <sub>6</sub>	42.34	43.18	42.76	42.67	43.46	43.06	42.50	43.32	42.91
T <sub>7</sub>	42.19	42.28	42.23	42.14	42.61	42.37	42.16	42.44	42.30
T <sub>8</sub>	41.95	42.64	42.29	42.46	42.87	42.66	42.20	42.75	42.48
Mean	41.77	42.49	42.13	42.03	42.94	42.48	41.90	42.71	42.30
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.04	0.08		0.006	0.012		0.024	0.048	
T	0.09	0.18		0.013	0.026		0.051	0.103	
V×T	0.13	0.25		0.018	0.037		0.072	0.145	
CV(%)	2.29			2.31			2.30		

Table 2- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on standard germination% in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	70.38 (88.75)	70.84 (89.25)	70.61 (89.00)	70.83 (89.25)	71.79 (90.25)	71.31 (89.75)	70.60 (89.00)	71.31 (89.75)	70.95 (89.38)
T <sub>1</sub>	71.08 (89.50)	71.89 (90.25)	71.44 (89.88)	71.30 (89.75)	72.26 (90.75)	71.78 (90.25)	71.19 (89.63)	72.02 (90.50)	71.60 (90.06)
T <sub>2</sub>	76.41 (94.50)	77.42 (95.25)	76.92 (94.88)	77.39 (95.25)	78.82 (96.25)	95.75 (95.75)	76.90 (94.88)	78.12 (95.75)	77.51 (95.31)
T <sub>3</sub>	75.52 (93.75)	76.12 (94.25)	75.82 (94.00)	76.10 (94.25)	77.39 (95.25)	76.74 (94.75)	75.81 (94.00)	76.75 (94.75)	76.28 (94.38)
T <sub>4</sub>	72.02 (90.50)	72.78 (91.25)	72.40 (90.88)	72.77 (91.25)	73.28 (91.75)	73.02 (91.50)	72.39 (90.88)	73.03 (91.50)	72.71 (91.19)
T <sub>5</sub>	71.54 (90.00)	72.04 (90.25)	71.79 (90.25)	72.02 (90.50)	72.78 (91.25)	72.40 (90.88)	71.78 (90.25)	72.41 (90.88)	72.09 (90.56)
T <sub>6</sub>	73.81 (92.25)	74.91 (93.25)	74.36 (92.75)	74.35 (92.75)	74.91 (93.25)	74.63 (93.00)	74.08 (92.50)	74.91 (93.25)	74.94 (92.88)
T <sub>7</sub>	72.28 (90.75)	73.28 (91.75)	72.78 (91.25)	73.28 (91.75)	73.81 (92.25)	73.54 (92.00)	72.78 (91.25)	73.54 (92.00)	73.16 (91.63)
T <sub>8</sub>	72.77 (91.25)	74.08 (92.50)	73.42 (91.88)	73.81 (92.25)	74.35 (92.75)	74.08 (92.50)	73.29 (91.75)	74.21 (92.63)	73.75 (92.19)
Mean	72.87 (91.25)	73.70 (92.03)	73.28 (91.64)	73.54 (91.89)	74.38 (92.64)	73.95 (92.26)	73.20 (91.57)	74.04 (92.33)	73.62 (91.95)
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.21	0.42		0.14	0.29		0.17	0.35	
T	0.45	0.90		0.31	0.62		0.38	0.76	
V×T	0.63	NS		0.44	NS		0.53	NS	
CV(%)	2.11			2.16			2.14		

(The data presented in parentheses indicate transformed back values)

Table 3- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on seedling length (cm) in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	20.87	21.52	21.19	21.20	21.92	21.56	21.04	21.72	21.38

T <sub>1</sub>	21.69	22.11	21.90	22.28	22.64	22.46	21.99	22.37	22.18
T <sub>2</sub>	25.25	25.82	25.53	25.99	26.45	26.22	25.62	26.13	25.88
T <sub>3</sub>	24.07	24.72	24.40	24.94	25.56	25.25	24.51	25.14	24.82
T <sub>4</sub>	22.27	23.06	22.66	22.90	23.62	23.26	22.58	23.34	22.96
T <sub>5</sub>	21.87	22.36	22.11	22.50	23.02	22.76	22.18	22.69	22.44
T <sub>6</sub>	23.69	24.24	23.96	24.50	25.06	24.78	24.10	24.65	24.37
T <sub>7</sub>	22.65	23.39	23.02	23.56	23.84	23.70	23.11	23.61	23.36
T <sub>8</sub>	23.05	23.65	23.35	24.11	24.38	24.24	23.58	24.01	23.80
Mean	22.82	23.43	23.12	23.55	24.05	23.80	23.19	23.74	23.46
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.011	0.022		0.006	0.013		0.009	0.018	
T	0.023	0.047		0.014	0.027		0.019	0.037	
V×T	0.03	0.066		0.019	0.039		0.026	0.053	
CV(%)	5.85			6.18			6.02		

Table 4- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on seedling root length (cm) in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	8.55	9.01	8.78	8.73	9.16	8.94	8.64	9.08	8.86
T <sub>1</sub>	9.12	9.37	9.24	9.56	9.67	9.61	9.34	9.52	9.43
T <sub>2</sub>	10.69	10.98	10.83	11.21	11.48	11.35	10.95	11.23	11.09
T <sub>3</sub>	10.16	10.60	10.38	10.83	11.14	10.98	10.50	10.87	10.68
T <sub>4</sub>	9.42	9.89	9.66	9.78	10.24	10.01	9.60	10.07	9.83
T <sub>5</sub>	9.27	9.64	9.45	9.63	9.87	9.75	9.45	9.76	9.60
T <sub>6</sub>	10.09	10.39	10.24	10.64	10.89	10.77	10.37	10.64	10.50
T <sub>7</sub>	9.62	10.11	9.86	10.14	10.35	10.24	9.88	10.23	10.05
T <sub>8</sub>	9.83	10.23	10.03	10.46	10.61	10.54	10.14	10.42	10.28
Mean	9.64	10.02	9.83	10.11	10.38	10.24	9.87	10.20	10.04
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.008	0.016		0.008	0.016		0.008	0.016	
T	0.017	0.035		0.017	0.035		0.017	0.035	
V×T	0.025	0.049		0.025	0.049		0.025	0.049	
CV(%)	6.36			7.32			6.84		

Table 5- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on seedling shoot length (cm) in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	12.32	12.51	12.41	12.47	12.76	12.61	12.39	12.63	12.51
T <sub>1</sub>	12.57	12.74	12.65	12.73	12.97	12.85	12.65	12.85	12.75
T <sub>2</sub>	14.56	14.84	14.70	14.78	14.97	14.87	14.67	14.90	14.79
T <sub>3</sub>	13.91	14.12	14.01	14.11	14.43	14.27	14.01	14.27	14.14
T <sub>4</sub>	12.85	13.17	13.01	13.12	13.38	13.25	12.98	13.28	13.13
T <sub>5</sub>	12.61	12.72	12.66	12.87	13.15	13.01	12.74	12.93	12.83
T <sub>6</sub>	13.61	13.85	13.73	13.86	14.17	14.01	13.73	14.01	13.87
T <sub>7</sub>	13.04	13.28	13.16	13.42	13.49	13.45	13.23	13.38	13.30
T <sub>8</sub>	13.23	13.42	13.32	13.64	13.77	13.70	13.43	13.59	13.51
Mean	13.19	13.40	13.29	13.44	13.67	13.56	13.31	13.54	13.43
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.003	0.006		0.003	0.006		0.003	0.006	
T	0.007	0.014		0.006	0.013		0.007	0.014	
V×T	0.010	0.019		0.009	0.018		0.010	0.019	
CV(%)	5.56			5.39			5.48		

Table 6- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on seedling dry weight (g) in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	0.216	0.218	0.217	0.217	0.219	0.218	0.216	0.219	0.218
T <sub>1</sub>	0.219	0.221	0.220	0.221	0.222	0.222	0.220	0.221	0.221
T <sub>2</sub>	0.238	0.240	0.239	0.239	0.241	0.240	0.238	0.241	0.239
T <sub>3</sub>	0.235	0.237	0.236	0.237	0.239	0.238	0.236	0.238	0.237
T <sub>4</sub>	0.224	0.225	0.225	0.225	0.226	0.226	0.225	0.226	0.225
T <sub>5</sub>	0.222	0.223	0.222	0.223	0.225	0.224	0.223	0.224	0.223
T <sub>6</sub>	0.231	0.233	0.232	0.234	0.236	0.235	0.232	0.234	0.233
T <sub>7</sub>	0.226	0.229	0.228	0.228	0.231	0.229	0.227	0.230	0.228
T <sub>8</sub>	0.229	0.231	0.230	0.231	0.234	0.232	0.230	0.233	0.231
Mean	0.227	0.229	0.228	0.228	0.230	0.229	0.227	0.229	0.228
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.001	0.001		0.001	0.001		0.001	0.001	
T	0.002	0.003		0.001	0.002		0.002	0.003	
V×T	0.002	NS		0.002	NS		0.002	NS	
CV(%)	3.24			3.27			3.26		

Table 7- Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on vigour index-I in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	1852.06	1920.11	1886.09	1892.46	1977.79	1935.12	1872.26	1948.95	1910.60
T <sub>1</sub>	1940.78	1995.03	1967.90	1999.68	2054.15	2026.91	1970.23	2024.59	1997.41
T <sub>2</sub>	2385.94	2458.95	2422.44	2475.37	2545.82	2510.59	2430.65	2502.38	2466.52
T <sub>3</sub>	2255.97	2329.94	2292.95	2350.62	2434.76	2392.69	2303.29	2382.35	2342.82
T <sub>4</sub>	2015.18	2104.68	2059.93	2089.17	2167.39	2128.28	2052.17	2136.04	2094.10
T <sub>5</sub>	1968.26	2022.77	1995.51	2036.05	2100.29	2068.17	2002.15	2061.53	2031.84
T <sub>6</sub>	2185.08	2259.76	2222.42	2272.63	2336.80	2304.71	2228.85	2298.28	2263.57
T <sub>7</sub>	2055.53	2146.42	2100.98	2161.13	2204.66	2182.90	2108.33	2175.54	2141.94
T <sub>8</sub>	2103.37	2187.26	2145.32	2223.55	2261.08	2242.32	2163.46	2224.17	2193.82
Mean	2084.68	2158.32	2121.50	2166.74	2231.41	2199.08	2125.71	2194.87	2160.29
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	11.94	24.05		7.64	15.370		9.79	19.71	
T	25.34	51.02		16.22	32.610		20.78	41.81	
V×T	35.83	NS		22.94	NS		29.38	NS	
CV(%)	7.98			8.34			8.16		

Table 8-Effect of priming treatments for 6 hours on vigour index-II in Barley varieties K-409 and K-1055

Treatments	2022-23			2023-24			Pooled		
	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean	V <sub>1</sub>	V <sub>2</sub>	Mean
T <sub>0</sub>	19.15	19.48	19.31	19.34	19.79	19.57	19.25	19.63	19.44
T <sub>1</sub>	19.58	19.92	19.75	19.84	20.15	19.99	19.71	20.04	19.87
T <sub>2</sub>	22.47	22.89	22.68	22.74	23.20	22.97	22.60	23.04	22.82
T <sub>3</sub>	22.01	22.36	22.19	22.29	22.74	22.52	22.15	22.55	22.35
T <sub>4</sub>	20.25	20.55	20.40	20.55	20.71	20.63	20.40	20.63	20.52
T <sub>5</sub>	20.00	20.13	20.07	20.16	20.51	20.33	20.08	20.32	20.20
T <sub>6</sub>	21.33	21.73	21.53	21.66	21.98	21.82	21.50	21.86	21.68
T <sub>7</sub>	20.51	21.03	20.77	20.90	21.34	21.12	20.70	21.19	20.95
T <sub>8</sub>	20.85	21.39	21.12	21.27	21.68	21.47	21.06	21.54	21.30
Mean	20.68	21.05	20.87	20.97	21.34	21.16	20.83	21.20	21.01
Factors	SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%		SE(d)	CD 5%	
V	0.011	0.23		0.084	0.17		0.048	0.20	
T	0.24	0.51		0.17	0.36		0.20	0.43	
V×T	0.35	NS		0.25	NS		0.30	NS	
CV(%)	5.36			5.41			5.39		

Comment [D11]: All results in same format. Use some data for graphs, some for pictorial representation while some for tabular format

## Conclusion

The study led us to conclude that the seed priming with KNO<sub>3</sub> at a concentration of 2.5 % for a duration of 6 hours significantly enhances the seed quality parameters of Barley. Among the assessed varieties, variety K-1055 performed better, indicating its potential for practical utility at the farmer level.

## References

Abdul-Baki, AA and JD Anderson. 1973. Vigour determination in soybean by multiple criteria. *Crop Science* 13:630-633.

Afzal, S., Basra, M.A., Amhad, N., Cheema, M.A., Haq, M.A., Kazmi, M. H and Ifrani, S. (2006). Enhancement of antioxidant defence system induced by hormonal priming. *Cereal Research and communications*, 39 (3):334-342

Ali, L. G., Nulit, R., Ibrahim, M. H., & Yien, C. Y. S. (2020). Enhancement of germination and early seedling growth of rice (*Oryza sativa*) var. FARO44 by seed priming under normal and drought stressed conditions. *Journal of plant nutrition*, 43(11), 1579-1593.

Bakht, J., Shafi, M., Jamal, Y., & Sher, H. (2011). Response of maize (*Zea mays* L.) to seed priming with NaCl and salinity stress. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research*, 9(1), 252-261.

Basra SMA, R Farooq, Tabassam and N Ahmad. 2005. Physiological and biochemical aspects of presowing seed treatments in fine rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Seed Science and Technology* 33:623-628

Brocklehurst, PA and J Dearman. 2008. Interaction between seed priming treatments and nine seed lots of carrots. II. Seedling emergence and plant growth. *Annals of Applied Biology* 102:583-593

Dutta P. 2018. Seed priming: New Vistas and Contemporary Perspectives: In: Rakshit A., Singh H. (editors). *Advances in Seed Priming*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 3-22

El-Tayeb, M. A. (2006). Differential response of sugar beet and barley genotypes to salt stress: growth, osmotic adjustment, and photosynthesis. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Soil & Plant Science*, 293-300.

Hussain S, F Khan, HA Hussain, L Nile. 2016. Physiological and biochemical mechanism of seed priming-

induced chilling tolerance in rice cultivars. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 7:116-120

Jalal, J., Razieh, K., & Edris, K. (2014). Improving of barley seedling growth by seed priming under water deficit stress. *Journal of Stress Physiology & Biochemistry*, 10(2), 125-134.

Khokhar, A., Singh, S., Kumar, V., Sharma, S., Bawa, S., Singh, S., ... & Singh, M. (2016). Seed Priming and foliar spray seed priming and foliar spray of thiourea for y of thiourea for improving growth and productivity of rainfed wheat in kandi region of punjandi region of punjandi region of Punjab.

MoradiDezfuli P., Sharif-zadeh F. and Jann Mohammadi M. (2008). Influence of priming techniques on seed germination behavior of maize inbred lines (*Zea mays* L.). *ARP Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science*. 3(3): 22-25

Murungu, F. S. (2011). Effects of seed priming and water potential on seed germination and emergence of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) varieties in laboratory assays and in the field. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 10(21): 4365-4371

Naz, S. and S. Perveen. (2021). Response of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L. var. Galaxy-2013) to pre-sowing seed treatment with thiourea under drought stress. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 53(4): 1209-1217.

Pan D and RN Basu. 1985. Mid-storage and presowing seed treatments for lettuce and carrot. *Scientia Horticulturae* 25(1): 11-19.

Siddique, A. and Bose, B. (2015). Effect of Seed Invigoration with Nitrate Salts on Morpho-Physiological and Growth Parameters of Wheat Crop Sown in Different Dates in its Cropping Season. *Vegetos-An International Journal of Plant Research*, 28(1), 76-85.

Comment [D12]: Improve dissection by adding other treatment results and then recommendations for KNO<sub>3</sub> treatment

Comment [D13]: Arrange references

**Singh G, SS Gill and KK Sandhu. 2001.** Storage of primed seeds of muskmelon (*Cucumis melo* L.). *Seed Research* **29**(2): 235-237.

**STA. 2019.** Informational rules for seed testing. International Seed Testing Association. Zurich, Switzerland.

**USDA Barley Production Foreign Agricultural Service**  
<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://fas.usda.gov/data/production/commodity/0430000&ved=2ahUKEwiJl8HQ4bWFAxUV7jgGHcXPA08QFnoECA4QBQ&usq=AOvVaw3engcjmo160gDcNqql0jMj>

Field Code Changed

UNDER PEER REVIEW