

Effect of Seed Coating with Polymer, Fungicide and Insecticide on Seed Quality in Cotton During Storage*

Cotton is an important fiber crop, known as the 'king' of fiber and in recent times cotton called as the "White gold". Cotton belongs to Malvaceae family and is the most important commercial crop of India ranks first in both area and production. Cotton seed loses viability and vigour rapidly in storage as being the poor storer. The linted cotton seed hosts many pathogens and insect pests during storage and reduce the seed quality. To maintain the seed quality, it is advisable to delint the seed and protect from storage pathogens and insect pests by polymer coating, fungicide and insecticide treatments. Film coating is a new concept in which the plasticizer polymer forms a flexible film that adheres and protects fungicide and insecticide. Film coating technology is a sophisticated process of applying precise amount of active ingredients along with a liquid material directly on to the seed surface without obscuring its shape and total seed weight may increase up to 1 to 2 per cent. The film formulations consists of a mixture of polymer, plasticizer and colourants (Robani, 1994) that are commercially available as ready to use liquids or as dry powders (Ni., 1997). Seed coating provides an opportunity to package effective quantities of material such that they can improve the germination and seedling growth. Cotton is the common cultivated crop of India. Hence, an attempt was made to prolong the shelf life of the seeds through seed management practices for ambient storage conditions.

A laboratory experiment was conducted at National Seed Project, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad during 2004-05 to know the effect of polymer, fungicide and insecticide

on seed quality during storage. The freshly harvested seeds were taken and delinted with sulphuric acid @ 100 ml per kg of seeds for 10 minutes, the seeds were washed in running water and dried to nine per cent moisture content and then, imposed with following seed treatment combinations.

Seed coating with polymer @ 3.00g per kg of seed (T₁), 4.00g per kg of seed (T₂), 5.00 g per kg of seed (T₃), T₁ + Thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed (T₄), T₂ + Thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed (T₅), T₃ + Thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed (T₆), T₁ + Imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed (T₇), T₂ + Imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed (T₈), T₃ + Imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed (T₉), Thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed and Imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed (T₁₀) and untreated control (T₀). Two kilogram of freshly harvested certified cotton (AK-235) seeds was taken for each treatment. The treatment of fungicide and insecticide was given before polymer coating. Utmost care was taken during mixing to have uniformity in coating and the seeds were air dried under shade for 24h to bring back to its original moisture content. The experiment was designed as Completely Randomized Block Design with four replicates. Then the seeds were packed in cloth bag and stored in ambient conditions of Dharwad. The tri monthly observations on germination percentage (Anon.,1996), vigour index (Abdul-Baki and Anderson, 1973), electrical conductivity(Presley,1959) and field emergence were recorded. The statistical analysis was done as per the procedure described by Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

Table 1. Influence of seed coating with polymer, fungicide and insecticide on germination (%) and vigour index of cotton seeds during storage

Treatments	Months after storage							
	Germination percentage				Vigour index			
	0	3	6	9	0	3	6	9
T ₁	85.00 (67.21)*	81.20 (64.30)	75.00 (60.00)	68.91 (56.1)	2491	2145	1805	1530
T ₂	85.00 (67.21)	81.60 (64.59)	75.80 (60.52)	70.60 (57.15)	2473	2164	1882	1634
T ₃	85.00 (67.21)	81.90 (64.85)	76.90 (61.41)	71.30 (57.60)	2520	2237	1942	1679
T ₄	85.00 (67.21)	83.90 (66.39)	79.60 (63.15)	74.10 (59.40)	2457	2368	2109	1853
T ₅	85.00 (67.21)	84.10 (66.50)	80.10 (63.51)	74.90 (59.90)	2565	2376	2119	1896
T ₆	86.00 (68.03)	84.80 (67.05)	80.60 (63.87)	76.10 (60.70)	2560	2434	2199	1976
T ₇	85.00 (67.21)	82.80 (65.50)	77.90 (61.95)	72.52 (58.40)	2513	2283	2008	1762
T ₈	85.25 (67.42)	83.20 (65.80)	78.40 (62.31)	73.30 (58.80)	2444	2321	2040	1781
T ₉	85.00 (67.21)	83.50 (66.03)	79.10 (62.79)	73.60 (59.10)	2520	2351	2055	1808
T ₁₀	86.00 (67.21)	85.10 (67.29)	81.50 (64.52)	77.40 (61.40)	2570	2457	2271	2054
T ₀	85.00 (67.21)	79.00 (62.73)	67.00 (54.94)	52.00 (46.00)	2516	2039	1481	1023
Mean	85.20 (67.37)	82.83 (65.54)	77.41 (61.72)	71.34 (57.63)	2501	2284	1991	1727
S.Em ±	0.31	0.07	0.09	0.20	30.79	9.28	9.91	18.91
C.D at 5%	NS	0.206	0.255	0.582	NS	26.63	28.44	54.40

* - Values in the parenthesis are arcsine transformed values NS – Non-significant

* Part of M. Sc. (Agri) thesis submitted by the senior author to the University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad-580 005, India.

Table 2. Influence of seed coating with polymer, fungicide and insecticide on Electrical conductivity and Field emergence of cotton seeds during storage

Treatments	Months after storage							
	Electrical conductivity (dSm ⁻¹)				Field emergence (%)			
	0	3	6	9	0	3	6	9
T ₁	0.863	1.014	1.300	1.500	77.50 (61.34)*	71.00 (57.42)	64.00 (53.13)	57.00 (49.00)
T ₂	0.862	0.911	1.190	1.420	73.50 (61.32)	71.50 (57.73)	65.00 (54.33)	58.60 (49.97)
T ₃	0.860	0.977	1.100	1.400	77.50 (61.34)	72.00 (58.05)	66.65 (54.73)	59.70 (50.60)
T ₄	0.863	0.948	1.012	1.200	78.45 (62.34)	75.00 (60.00)	70.00 (56.79)	63.80 (53.00)
T ₅	0.860	0.933	0.985	1.100	79.00 (62.73)	75.50 (60.33)	70.80 (57.29)	65.50 (54.00)
T ₆	0.863	0.923	0.975	1.050	79.50 (62.34)	76.00 (60.67)	71.60 (57.80)	67.10 (55.00)
T ₇	0.857	0.981	1.080	1.345	77.50 (61.67)	73.00 (58.69)	67.00 (54.94)	60.71 (51.20)
T ₈	0.867	0.960	1.032	1.280	78.50 (62.38)	73.50 (59.02)	68.50 (55.86)	62.10 (52.00)
T ₉	0.875	0.959	1.025	1.230	78.00 (62.02)	74.20 (59.47)	69.20 (56.29)	63.10 (52.60)
T ₁₀	0.867	0.910	0.950	0.980	79.00 (62.73)	76.50 (61.07)	72.50 (58.37)	68.80 (56.00)
T ₀	0.858	1.103	1.400	1.600	76.90 (61.26)	69.00 (56.17)	57.00 (49.02)	44.80 (42.00)
Mean	0.864	0.972	1.094	1.280	78.12 (61.95)	73.38 (58.93)	67.48 (55.32)	60.95 (51.33)
S.Em ±	0.012	0.008	0.011	0.007	1.01	0.15	0.14	0.14
C.D at 5%	NS	0.022	0.031	0.020	NS	0.43	0.42	0.41

NS – Non-significant

The germination percentage gradually decreased (77.40) and it was above minimum seed certification standards (70%) at the end of nine months of storage. The treatment with coating chemicals recorded significantly higher germination upto nine months of storage as compared to control. Among the different treatment combinations, the seeds coated with thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed and imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed (T₁₀) recorded significantly higher germination (77.40%) followed by T₆ (seed coating with polymer @ 5.00 g per kg of seeds and thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds) as compared to control (52.00%) (Table 1). The decline in germination percentage with advance in storage period may be attributed to ageing effect, leading to depletion of food reserves and decline in synthetic activity of embryo apart from loss of viability and storage condition. Thiram acts as protective agent against seed deterioration due to fungal invasion and physiological ageing as a result of which the seed viability was maintained for comparatively longer period of time (Savitri *et al.*, 1994) and also phytotonic effect of imidacloprid maintained the seed viability for longer period (Jarande and Dethé, 1994). These findings are in agreement with results obtained by Hunje *et al.* (1990) in cowpea. The film formed around seed act as a physical barrier, which has been reported to reduce leaching of inhibitors from the seed coverings and may restrict oxygen diffusion to the embryo (Duan and Burris, 1997). The higher germination percentage can be seen in polycoated seeds, it is due to increase in the rate of imbibition where the fine particles in the coating act as moisture attracting material or perhaps to improve germination. Increase in storage period decreases in vigour index, seedling dry weight, root and shoot length (Table 2 and 3) was noticed irrespective of seed treatments.

Significantly higher vigour index and its parameters (germination and seedling length) was recorded in the seeds coated with thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed and imidacloprid @ 7.50 g pr kg of seed (T₁₀) followed by T₆ (seed coating with polymer @ 5.00 g per kg of seeds and thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds) as compared to control. The decrease in the vigour index, root length, shoot length and seedling dry weight may be due to natural ageing induced decline in germination, decrease in dry matter accumulation in seedlings and decrease in seedling length. Such findings were reported by Savitri *et al.* (1998) in groundnut. A number of water soluble compounds such as electrolytes, sugars, amino acids and organic acids are released in the water. The electrical conductivity of seed leachate indicate the membrane integrity and quality of seed and it is negatively correlated with seed quality. Significantly lower electrical conductivity was recorded in the seed coated with thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds and imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seeds (T₁₀) followed by T₆ (seed coating with polymer @ 5.00 g per kg of seeds and thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds) as compared to control at the end of nine months of storage (Table 2). This variation in electrical conductivity of seed leachate indicating increased membrane permeability and decrease in integrity of seedcoat and cellular membrane deterioration. Such findings were reported by Vasundhara and Bommegowda (1999) in groundnut. The polymer film formed around seed act as a physical barrier, which has been reported to reduce leaching of inhibitors from the seed coverings and may restrict oxygen diffusion to the embryo (Duan and Burris, 1997). Significantly higher field emergence recorded in T₁₀, seed coating with thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed and imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed followed

Effect of Seed Coating.

Table 3. Influence of seed coating with polymer, fungicide and insecticide on root length (cm), shoot length (cm) and dry weight of seedling (mg/seedlings) of cotton seeds during storage

Treatments	Root length			Shoot length			Dry weight of seedlings					
	0	3	6	9	0	3	6	9	0	3	6	9
T ₁	18.40	16.10	14.87	13.40	11.00	10.20	9.20	8.70	44.57	36.05	29.20	20.90
T ₂	18.40	16.30	15.47	14.20	10.90	10.30	9.33	8.95	44.70	37.82	30.00	22.10
T ₃	18.45	17.00	15.70	14.50	11.20	10.32	9.50	9.05	45.00	39.00	31.87	23.50
T ₄	18.45	17.70	16.60	15.60	11.07	10.52	9.90	9.40	45.00	43.15	36.00	28.00
T ₅	18.40	17.85	16.75	15.80	11.12	10.55	10.00	9.52	45.32	43.50	37.67	29.80
T ₆	18.55	18.10	17.07	16.20	11.22	10.60	10.20	9.77	45.22	44.70	39.17	31.00
T ₇	18.20	17.20	16.17	15.10	10.90	10.37	9.60	9.10	45.10	41.90	32.92	24.00
T ₈	18.20	17.40	16.30	15.25	11.12	10.50	9.72	9.16	44.65	42.00	33.50	25.10
T ₉	18.40	17.50	16.42	15.40	11.10	10.47	9.70	9.25	45.25	42.50	35.00	26.50
T ₁₀	18.85	18.27	17.47	16.56	11.05	10.75	10.40	9.98	45.22	44.65	41.20	34.50
T ₀	18.30	15.82	13.10	11.50	11.00	10.00	9.00	8.18	44.95	34.50	27.00	19.00
Mean	18.39	17.19	15.99	14.38	11.04	10.40	9.68	9.19	45.01	40.91	33.85	25.85
S.Em ±	0.289	0.059	0.05	0.157	0.11	0.06	0.04	0.10	0.40	0.31	0.28	0.21
C.D at 5%	NS	0.169	0.143	0.433	NS	0.19	0.12	0.29	NS	0.89	0.81	0.62

* - Values in the parenthesis are arcsine transformed values NS – Non-significant

by T₆ (seed coating with polymer @ 5.00 g per kg of seeds and thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds) as compared to control at the end of nine months of storage (Table 2). The decrease in field emergence may be due to age induced deteriorative changes in cell and cell organelles and germination capacity of seed under natural soil condition. These results are in conformity with Muthuraj et al. (2002), who have recorded higher in field emergence can be seen in polycoated seeds, due to increase in the rate of imbibition where the fine particles in the coating act as moisture attracting material which improves seed soil

interphase. Coating with hydrophilic polymer regulates the rate of water uptake, reduce imbibition damage and improve the emergence of soybean seeds (Hwang and Sung, 1991).

In conclusion, the higher germination percentage, field emergence, root length, shoot length, seedling vigour index, dry matter, lower lectrical conductivity were recorded in the seeds treated with thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seed and imidacloprid @ 7.50 g per kg of seed followed by seed coating with polymer @ 5.00 g per kg of seeds and thiram @ 1.50 g per kg of seeds.

Department of Seed Science & Technology
University of Agricultural Sciences,
Dharwad – 580 005, Karnataka, India

VIJAYKUMAR KUNKUR
RAVI HUNJE
N. K. BIRADAR PATIL
B. S. VYAKARNHAL

(Received : January, 2006)

References

ABDUL-BAKI, A. A. AND ANDERSON, J. D., 1973, Vigour determination in soybean by multiple criteria. *Crop Science*, **13** : 630-633

ANONYMOUS., 1996, International Rules for Seed Testing. *Seed Science and Technology*, **13** :299-355

DUAN, X. AND BURRIS, J. S., 1997, Film coating impairs leaching of germination inhibitors in sugarbeet seeds. *Crop Science*, **37** : 515–520.

HUNJE, R. V., KULKARNI, G. N., SHASHIDHARA, S. D. AND VYAKARANAHAL, B. S., 1990, Effect of insecticide and fungicide treatment on cowpea seed quality. *Seed Research*, **18** : 90 – 92.

HWANG, W. D. AND SUNG, F. J. M., 1991, Prevention of soaking injury in edible soybean seeds by ethyl cellulose coating, *Seed Science and Technology*, **19** : 269 – 278.

JARANDE, N. T. AND DETHE, M. D.,1994, Effective control of brinjal sucking pests by imidacloprid. *Plant Protection Bulletin*, **46** :43-44.

MUTHURAJ, R., KANT, K. AND KULSHRESTHA, 2002, Screening soybean cultivars for seed mycoflora and effect of thiram treatment there on. *Seed Research* **30** : 118 – 121.

NI, B. R., 1997, Seed coating, film coating and pelleting. In: *Seed Industry and Agricultural Development, Chinese Association of Agricultural sciences*, DOA, Ministry of Agriculture, Beijing, China agriculture press, pp. 737-747.

PANSE, V. G AND SUKHATME, P. V., 1967, *Statistical Methods for Agricultural Works*. ICAR, Publication, New Delhi, pp.100-116.

PRESLEY, J. T., 1958, Relations of protoplast permeability of cotton seed viability and predisposition of seedling disease. *Plant Disease Report*, **42**: 582.

ROBANI, H., 1994, Film coating horticultural seed. *Horticultural Technology*, **4**:104-105

SAVITRI, H., SUGUNAKAR REDDY, M. AND MURALIMOCHAN REDDY, 1998, Effect of seed treatment with fungicides and insecticides on seed borne fungi, storage pest, seed viability and seedling vigour in groundnut. *Seed Research*, **26** : 62 – 72.

VASUNDHARA, S. AND BOMMEGOWDA, A., 1999, Effect of fungicidal seed treatment on seed quality of groundnut seeds in storage. *Seed Research*, **27** : 223 – 224.