Effect on normal seedlings of different containers, genotypes and fungicidal trea...



Effect on normal seedlings of different containers, genotypes and fungicidal treatments during storage in rice

ABSTRACT

The experiments were conducted in the Laboratory to evaluate the effect of two containers (cotton bag and 700 gauge polythene bag), five genotypes of rice (CMS 58025 A, CMS 58025 B, KMR-3, IR-66 and Pant Dhan-11) and fungicidal treatments (Thiram, Thiram + Bavistin, Bavistin, Captan Vitavax, Chlorothalonil and Contaf on normal seedlings during storage (January to May) in rice. The packaging material cotton bags and 700 gauge polythene bags were found same for storage of seeds. In both containers, per cent normal seedlings were statistically at par in all the genotypes containing 12% moisture content. In all the genotypes there has been reduction in germination with the increase in storage period. The per cent normal seedlings were found maximum, after storage in restorer KMR-3 followed by IR-66 and variety Pant Dhan-11. In all the genotypes, different fungicides improved seed germination increased normal seedlings per cent. The individual effect of fungicides indicates that Thiram was most effective and yielded maximum percentage of normal seedling followed by Thiram + Bayistin. As per the cumulative effect is concern KMR-3 resulted more normal seedlings in both containers when treated with Thiram.

KEY WORDS: Normal Seedlings, Rice, Containers, Genotypes, Fungicidal treatments, Storage period

INTRODUCTION

Rice (Oryza sativa L) is one of the most important cereal crops for human consumption all over the world. In India, rice is grown on a very large area. For rice cultivation, the seed is a very important input. The rice seeds are required to be store for sowing in the next season after a time gap of six months or one year (Padhi et al. 2017). For the farmers and seed industry storage of seeds till the next sowing season is an important aspect. The deterioration on seed starts immediately after maturity in terms of reduction in seed germination, normal seedlings, viability and vigour. Stored seeds viability and vigour depends on the seed quality, genotypes, seed treatment, packing materials and storage conditions. For reducing the financial losses which is caused by due to non-selling of the seed in one season and have to store for the next season, the knowledge of storage of seed is very essential. There are many factors which affect the seed quality and cause deterioration during storage. Containers, genotypes and fungicidal treatment play a very important role during storage (Singh and Vishunavat 2019). The present investigation was carried out to find out the effect of containers, genotypes, fungicidal treatments and their combined effect on normal seedling during storage in rice.

Materials and Methods

The seeds of hybrid rice parents; CMS 58025 A, CMS 58025 B, IR- 66, KMR-3 and a variety Pant Dhan-11 were collected from the Crop Research Centre, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar (UK), India showing varying degree of infection of various diseases in rice under field conditions. The seed were sum dried to bring down the moisture to 12% before storage. The seeds treated @ 2 gm/kg seed with Thiram (T1); Thiram https://assignbuster.com/effect-on-normal-seedlings-of-different-containers-genotypes-and-fungicidal-treatments-during-storage-in-rice/

+ Bavistin (T2); Bavistin (T3); Captan (T4); Vitavax (T5), Chlorothalonil (T6); and Contaf (T8) as well untreated seeds of genotypes *viz.* CMS 58025 A, CMS 58025 B, IR- 66, KMR-3 and a variety Pant Dhan -11were divided into two lots and were stored in two types of containers viz. Cotton bags (C1) and Polythene bags of 700-gauge (C2) at room temperature for further studies. The observations were recorded at monthly intervals on normal seedlings.

Normal seedlings

A proportionate root and shoot length are considered to be normal seedlings.

Normal seedlings show continued development into a satisfactory plant with all their essential structures well developed.

Germination test

Germination test was conducted to take the observations on normal seedlings. The tests were carried out using "Towel Paper Method". Two Towel paper (L×B) were soaked in running water overnight. Four hundred seeds for each treatment were used in the replication for 100 seeds. Twenty five seeds per towel paper were seeded and rolled using butter paper at the top. These rolled towel papers were placed in an incubator at 20-30° C in inclined position for 14 days. After 14 days, germination counts were made for normal seedlings and results are statistically analyzed for presenting the data (ISTA 1996).

Results and Discussion

Table 1 indicates that with an increase in storage period there has been decrease in per cent normal seedlings in both types of containers C_1 and C_2 . Container C_1 retained more percentage of normal seedlings at different storage periods from January to May as compared to C_2 , although, these has not been significant difference in per cent normal seedlings in seeds stored in both of containers. The results are in accordance with Kaur et al. (1990) who also reported maximum germination retention in the seeds stored in 700 gauge polyline bags. Choudhury *et al.* (2011) also reported that rice seeds stored in polythene bags had higher seed germination. Padhi *et al.* observed that seeds of paddy stored in 700 gauge polythene bags maintained more germination percentage during storage.

Table 2 indicates that with an increase in storage period, the per cent normal seedlings decrease in all the genotypes. Maximum normal seedlings were recorded in genotype G4 in January (84. 74%) while the minimum per cent normal seedlings were recorded in G 2 (67. 92%) at same period of storage. The same trend has been observed as regard to per cent normal seedling further at different storage months, thus the maximum per cent normal seedlings were recorded in G4 followed by G3, G5 and G2, while minimum normal seedlings were recorded in G1. Kalavathi *et al.* (1989) evaluated A lines and their maintainer lines, restorers and their resultant F ₁ hybrids and reported that IR 150 R followed by IR 101-98/96-2R as good storer and IR 58025 A found a poor storer. Rapid decrease in seed germinability in CMS line during storage was also reported by Duan and Ma (1992). Chang (1993) also reported that viability and vigour of hybrid rice seeds decreased more rapidly as compared to common cultivars, during storage. Deshpande and

Mahadevappa (1994) reported germinability decrease in storage period while carrying out the storage studied with restorers of hybrid rice.

The maximum percentage of normal seedlings were recorded in T1 whereas the minimum normal seedlings were observed in T8 with the increase in storage period per cent normal seedling decreased irrespective of different seed treatments. At all the storage periods, treatments T1 and T2 proved to be the best and maintained maximum percentage of normal seedlings. Treatments T3, T4, T5, T6 and T7 also improved percentage normal seedlings during storage as compared to check but were inferior to T1 and T2 (Table 3). Asalmol and Zade (1994) studied the effect of pre-storage seed treatment with Thiram and found the fungicide effective against fast deterioration of seed quality. Sharma and Chahal (1996) concluded that Bavistin + Thiram effectively controlled the seed borne pathogens. Moon et al. (2011) reported that seeds treated with Thiram+ Bavistin had higher seed germination and seedling length. Jyoti et al. (2017) reported that seed stored with treatment of Thiram proved superior as it maintained good and maximum seedling length in rice during storage. Choudhury et al. (2011) observed that rice seeds treated with Thiram+ Bavistin had higher germination and seedlings length during storage. Padhi et al. (2017) concluded that rice seed treated with Thiram can maintain higher germinability for longer period.

Table 4 indicates that genotypes G3, G4 and G5 in C1 and C2 containers with treatments T1 and T2 retained maximum percentage of normal seedlings and proved to be the best at all the storage periods. Genotypes G1 and G2 in containers C1 and C2 with all treatments improved percentage of normal https://assignbuster.com/effect-on-normal-seedlings-of-different-containers-genotypes-and-fungicidal-treatments-during-storage-in-rice/

seedlings as compared to checks but gave minimum percentage of normal seedlings as compared to rest of the genotypes, containers and treatment combinations (Table 4).

Conclusion

The present study indicates that seed stored in cotton bags and 700 gauge polyline bags are statistically at par in relation to normal seedlings in all the genotypes. The maximum normal seedlings were maintained in KMR-3, while minimum were in CMS 58025 A and CMS 58025 B in all storage period. At all the storage periods, Thiram followed by Thiram+ Bavastin proved to be the best and maintained maximum percentage of normal seedlings.

Table 1: Effect of different containers on per cent normal seedlings at different storage period in rice

	Storag	C I CITO			
Containe	!				
rs	Januar	Februa	Marc	ائس مر ۸	Max
	у	ry	h	April Ma	
	77 62	75 47	73.	71.	69.
	//. 63	3 75. 47	75	13	68
C ₁	(62.	(60.			
	30)	74)	(59.	(57.	(56.
	30,	, ,,	53)	76)	81)
C ₂	79. 93	74. 97	73.	71.	68.
			22	82	85

Storage Period

Table 2: Effect of different genotypes on per cent normal seedlings at different storage period in rice

Storage Period

Genotyp

Table 3: Effect of different treatments on per cent normal seedlings at different storage period in rice

Storage Period

Treatme

nts	Januar	Februa	Marc	Apri	May
	у	ry	h	I	May
	01 72	70 40	77.	74.	72.
	81. 73 79. 40		80	47	40
T ₁	(65.	(63.			
	201	61)	(62.	(60.	(58.
	39)	01)	43)	15)	70)

T ₂	81. 27 (64. 86)		76. 67 (61. 43)	00 (60.	33 (58.
Т3	77. 93 (62. 37)		74.20(59.79)	27 (58.	07 (57.
Т 4	80. 73 (62. 90)		72.53(58.72)	07 (57.	93 (56.
T 5	(61.	74. 00 (59. 68)	72.53(58.64)	13 (57.	00 (56.
Т 6	(61.	74. 93 (60. 23)	73. 07 (58. 96)	12 (57.	47 (56.

T 7

https://assignbuster.com/effect-on-normal-seedlings-of-different-containers-genotypes-and-fungicidal-treatments-during-storage-in-rice/

76. 67 74. 73 72. 70. 68.

Table 4: Cumulative effect of containers, genotypes and fungicidal treatment on per cent normal seedling at different storage periods in rice

Storage Period $C \times G$ Januar Februa χТ March April May У ry 67. 64. 63. 77. 33 69. 33 67 67 33 C 1 G (58. (56. 1 T 1 (52. (54. (53. 96) 38) 95) 54) 74) 68. 66. 64. 74.67 64.33 C 1 G 00 67 67

			(52.	(51.	(51.
			74)	95)	56)
C ₁ G ₁ T ₈	(53. 93)	54) 64. 33 (56.	64.00(53.16)70.	62. 00 (51. 97) 60.	60.67(51.58)59.33
			80)	81)	39)
C ₁ G ₂ T ₂	71. 33 (56. 63)		68. 67 (55.	66.67(54.	00
			96)	74)	14)
C 1 G	67. 33 (55.	64. 67	62. 67		
2 T 3	15)		(52. 35)		
C ₁ G ₂ T ₄	65. 33 (53. 95)		62. 67		

			(52.	(51.	(50.
			36)	96)	78)
	68 67	67. 33	66.	64.	62.
C 1 G	00. 07	07. 33	67	00	67
2 T 5	(56.	(55.	(54.	(53.	(52.
	04)	16)	74)		
			,	,	.,
	70.00	66.00	62.	61.	61.
C 1 G	70. 00	66. 00	67	33	33
2 T 6	(56.	(54.	(52.	/ 51	/51
	82)	41)			
			36)	57)	5/)
			62.	60.	58.
C 1 G	66. 33	64. 67	67	63	67
2 T 7	(54.	(53.		<i>,</i>	
21/	94)	14)	(49.		
			99)	17)	99)
			58.	57.	53.
$C \cdot C$	65. 33	64. 00	67		33
C 1 G	(53.	(53.	0.7		33
2 T 8	35)		(51.	(49.	(48.
	•	·	95)	23)	06)
$C_{1}C_{2}$	86 67	86. 51	80	8 0	72
	80. 07	60. JI			
2 T 1	(69.	(69.	67	UU	UU
	19)	00)			

			9		
			(66.	(63.	(62.
			42)	96)	17)
C ₁ G	86. 67	87. 33	82. 67	79. 93	
3T ₂	(68. 17)		(67.	(63. 80)	(61.
C ₁ G ₃ T ₃	84. 67 (66. 02)		79.33(63.57)	(62.	00 (60.
C ₁ G ₃ T ₄	82. 07 (65. 45)		33 (62.	78. 66 (62. 50)	33 (60.
C ₁ G ₃ T ₅	84. 67 (67. 50)		80. 00 (63. 94)		67 (59.
C ₁ G ₃ T ₆	82. 67 (65. 40)			77. 33	

49)

02)

				(62. 71)	
C ₁ G 4 T 4	(67.	84. 00 (66. 50)	82. 00 (65.	80. 00 (63. 45)	76. 67 (61.
C ₁ G ₄ T ₅	83. 33 (65. 94)		67	77.33(61.59)	33 (60.
C 1 G 4 T 6	(65.	80. 67 (64. 04)	67 (64.	80.00(63.51)	33 (61.
C ₁ G ₄ T ₇	84. 00 (66. 67)		67 (64.	78. 67 (62. 71)	33 (60.
C ₁ G ₄ T ₈	78. 67 (62.	74. 00 (59.	73. 33		66. 67

70)

44)

			(59.	(57.	(54.
			04)	74)	78)
	84. 67	83. 00	82.	80.	77.
C_1G			67	00	33
5 T 1	(67.		(60.	(63.	(61.
	42)	34)	57)	55)	64)
	83 33	82. 00	79.	79.	75.
C ₁ G	03. 33	02. 00	33	00	33
5 T 2	(66.	(65.	(63.	(63.	(60.
	88)	46)	24)	10)	30)
	92 67	80. 67	80.	78.	76.
C ₁ G	02. 07	00.07	00	00	67
5 T 3	(65.	(64.	(63.	(62.	(61.
	55)	04)		08)	
			,	,	,
	64.00	02 67	81.	80.	78.
C ₁ G	64. 00	82. 67	33	00	00
5 T 4	(66.	(65.	(64.	(63	(62
	63)	45)		43)	
			<i>-</i>	7 <i>3)</i>	U-7)
C ₁ G	81. 33	77. 33	76.	75.	72.
5 T 5	(65.	(61	00	33	67
	52)				
	J-,	55,			

			(60.	(60.	(58.
			81)	40)	57)
C ₁ G ₅ T ₆	(65. 40)	43) 82. 00	77. 33 (61. 59) 80.	74. 67 (59. 78) 76.	73. 33 (58. 91) 75.
5 T 7	96)	04)	(63.	(61.	(60.
			60)	27)	34)
C ₁ G ₅ T ₈	(60.	72. 67 (58. 48)	73. 33 (58. 97)	33 (57.	33 (56.
C ₂ G ₁ T ₁	76. 00 (60. 78)		71.33(57.71)	67 (55.	67 (54.
	72. 00 (58. 09)		70. 00		

			(56.	(53.	(54.
			82)	56)	74)
C ₂ G ₁ T ₃	(51. 19)		67. 33 (55. 17) 58.	66.00(54.33)	62. 00 (51. 95)
C ₂ G	/ 51	(40	00	00	33
1 T 4	(51. 39)		(49. 63)		
C ₂ G ₁ T ₅	60. 67 (51. 39)		58.67(50.01)	33 (50.	00 (50.
C ₂ G ₁ T ₆	79. 33 (56. 45)	(55.	64.00(53.15)	67 (52.	33 (51.
	68. 00 (55. 61)		66. 00		

			(54.	(53.	(51.
			39)	57)	95)
	62. 00 6	0. 67	62.	61.	59.
C 2 (3		67	33	33
1 T 8			(52.	(51.	(50.
	95) 1	.7)	39)	59)	41)
	70. 67 6	8 67	66.	58.	55.
C 2 (0. 07	67	67	33
₂ T ₁	(57. (55.	(54.	(50.	(48.
	26) 9	7)	94)	00)	
			•	·	·
	70. 33 7	0 67	68.	66.	64.
C 2 (0. 07	67	67	67
2 T 2	(60. (57.	(56.	(54.	(53.
	25) 3	0)	04)		
			0 1,	00)	30,
	70 67 6	0 67	66.	64.	61.
C 2 (70. 67 6 3	8.67	67	00	33
2 T 3	(57. (56.	(54.	(53.	(51
	22) 1	0)	81)		
			01)	13)	ردد
C ₂ (64.006	2. 67	61.	60.	58.
2 T 4	(53. (55	33	00	67
	17) 3	(0)			

			9		
			(51.	(50.	(49.
			57)	78)	99)
C 2 G 2 T 5	(53. 24)	91) 65. 33	63.33(52.78)	62.67(52.36)64.	61.33(52.57)62.
2 T 6	76)		(53.	(53.	(52.
			94)	13)	34)
C ₂ G ₂ T ₇	67. 33 (55. 16)		00 (50.	57.33(49.26)	67 (48.
C 2 G 2 T 8	63. 33 (52. 74)		33 (49.	54.67(47.71)	67 (46.
C ₂ G ₃ T ₁	86. 00(68.17)		82. 67		

			(60.	(63.	(62.
			57)	99)	51)
	84. 00	81. 33	80.	79.	77.
C ₂ G ₃ T ₂	(66.		67	33	33
			(63.	(63.	(61.
	60)	50)		05)	
			,	,	- ,
	00 67		80.	77.	76.
C ₂ G ₃ T ₃	82.67		00	33	00
	(65.		(63	(61.	(60
	45)			66)	
			31)	00)	12)
			76.	75.	74.
C ₂ G	81. 33	79. 33	67	33	67
3 T 4		(62.	(61	(60	/ F.O
_	45)	97)		(60.	
			12)	24)	/3)
			80.	75.	75.
C ₂ G ₃ T ₅	83. 33	80. 67	00	33	33
	(66.				
	22)			(61.	
			51)	60)	25)
CaG		80. 00	70	7.4	7.4
3 T 6		(63.	00	67	00
		51)			

		9		
	(65.	(60.	(59.	(59.
	49)	04)	78)	38)
C ₂ G ₃ T ₇	81. 33 (64. 43)	00 (60.	76. 00 (60. 67)	33 (57.
C ₂ G ₃ T ₈	74. 67 (59. 83)	33 (58.	70. 67 (57. 22)	00 (56.
C ₂ G 4T ₁	91. 33 (73. 04)	33	86.67(68.33)	00 (66.
C 2 G 4 T 2	87. 33 (69. 34)	00 (65.	80.67(63.92)	67 (61.
C ₂ G 4T ₃	82. 00(65.42)	79. 33		

			(59.	(58.	(52.
			88)	08)	32)
C ₂ G ₅ T ₁	86 33	84. 67 (64.	83.	82.	76.
	(67.		87	67	00
			(66.	(64.	(60.
	55)	40)	92)		
			32)	30,	00,
C ₂ G		84. 00	83.	82.	79.
	86. 00		67	00	33
5 T 2	(68.	(66.	166	16.1	(62
5 1 2	14)	51)	(66.		
			40)	90)	97)
			78.	77.	74.
6 6	80. 67	80. 00	67	33	00
C ₂ G	(64.	(63.			
5 T 3	17)	66)	(62.	(61.	(59.
	·	·	64)	64)	37)
			90	77	76
C ₂ G ₅ T ₄	82. 67	80. 67	80.		
	(65.		00	33	67
	47)		(63.	(61.	(61.
	47)	32)	45)	57)	12)
		80. 67			
5 T 5	(65.	(63.	00	00	00
	55)	96)			

$$\begin{array}{c}
(62. \quad (60. \quad (58.)) \\
(64. \quad (64.) \\
(62. \quad (60.) \\
(63. \quad (64.) \\
(64. \quad (64.) \\
(62. \quad (62.) \\
(62. \quad (62.) \\
(62. \quad (58.) \\
(62. \quad (62.) \\
(62. \quad (62.) \\
(63. \quad (64.) \\
(63. \quad (61.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(60.) \\
(6$$

Each value in table is mean of three replications

Values in parenthesis are angular transformed value

 C_1 = Polythene bags

$C_2 = Cotton bags$

5%

 $G_1 = CMS 58025 A$

 $G_2 = CMS 58025 B$

 $G_3 = Restorer (IR-66)$

 $G_4 = Restorer (KMR-3)$

 $G_5 = Variety (Pant Dhan-11)$

 $T_1 = Thiram$

 $T_2 = Thiram + Bavastin$

 $T_3 = Bavistin$

 $T_4 = Captan$

 $T_5 = Vitavax$

 $T_6 = Chlorothalonil$

 $T_7 = Contaf$

 $T_8 = Check$

Reference:

- 1. Asalmol, M. N. and Zade, V. R. (1994). Effect of seed treatment on storability of seeds of different crops. *Seed Tech News*, . 24(4): 117.
- 2. Chang, L. B. (1993). Study of vigour of hybrid rice. *Acta Scienharum*Nalaraliyam Universitalis Hormmalis Hunanesis. 16(3): 34-38.

- 3. Choudhary MM, Rajanna, CM, da Silva, J. A. T. and Balkrishna (2011).

 Influence of packaging materials and seed treatments on physiological attribute during storage of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Seed Science and Technology*, 5(1), 15-20.
- Kalavathi, D; Karivara Tharaju, T. V. and Thiagrajan, C. P. (1994).
 Storage potentials of parential lines and hybrids in paddy. Seed Tech News, . 24(4) 15.
- 5. Deshpande, V. K. and Mahadevappa, M. (1994). Prediction of storability in parents of hybrid rice. *Seed Tech. News*, 24(4) 11.
- 6. Duan, X. M. and Ma, H. S. (1992). Effect of foliar spray of gibberllic acid on seed quality of hybrid rice. *Seed Tech. News.* 24(4): 11.
- 7. Kaur, J., Randhawa, H. S. and Sharma, H. L. (1990). Influence of moisture and containers on viability of paddy seed during storage under ambient conditions of Punjab. *Annals of Biology Ludhiana* . 6(2): 129-134.
- 8. Jyoti, Rai, P. K., Kumar, H. and Ali, A. (2017). Performance of different genotypes. Packing materials and seed treatments on seedling characters of rice (*Oryza sativa* L) during storage period, *J. Pharmacology & Photochemistry* 6(1): 283-286.
- 9. Padhi, S. K., Behera, S., Padhiary, A. K. and Nayak, B. (2017). Effect of seed coating materials on seed quality during storage of paddy, 6 (6): 1263-1279.
- 10. Sharma, R. C. and Chahal, H. S. (1996). Seed health studies on parental lines of hybrid rice. Seed Res., 24(2): 145-150.

11. Singh, R. and Vishunavat Karuna (2019). Influence of containers, genotypes, fungicides and combinations on seed rot in rice during storage. Internat. J. Plant Protec. , 12(1): 10-14.