

RESEARCH ARTICLE

(Open Access)

Evaluation of drought resistance of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) cultivars using agronomic characteristics and drought tolerance indicesMOHSEN SAEIDI¹, MAJID ABDOLI^{2,3*}, MANDANA AZHAND⁴, MARYAM KHAS-AMIRI⁴¹Assistant Prof., Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, Campus of Agriculture and Natural Recourse, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran.²Ph.D. Student in Crop Physiology, Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, Faculty of Agriculture, Maragheh University, Maragheh, Iran.³Young Researchers and Elite Club, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran.⁴Former M.Sc. Student in Agronomy, Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, Campus of Agriculture and Natural Recourse, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran.**Abstract:**

In order to determine the performance of barley under drought stress conditions and screening quantitative indices of drought tolerance, twelve barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) cultivars were tested in a split-plot arranged in a randomized complete blocks design with three replications under irrigated and post-anthesis water deficiency conditions. This study was carried out in the field research of campus of agriculture and natural resources, Razi university, Kermanshah state in the west of Iran during 2010-2011. The results showed that post anthesis water deficiency caused 22, 18.3, 5.9, 5.5 and 21.9 percent reduction in grain yield, biomass, thousand grain weight, number of grain per spike and number of spike per m² in average respectively, but had no significant effect on harvest index. Mean comparisons showed that Nosrat cultivar with 838 g m⁻² and Afzal cultivar with 392 g m⁻², respectively had the highest and the lowest grain yield under non-stress condition. Under water stress environment Nosrat and Karoun cultivars with 696 and 656 g m⁻² and also, Aras and Sahra cultivars with 322 and 327 g m⁻², respectively had the highest and the lowest grain yield. The estimates of stress tolerance attributes indicated that the identification of drought-tolerant genotypes based on a single criterion was contradictory. For example, according to STI, GMP and MP cultivars Nosrat, Karoun and Sararud were the most, whereas Aras and Afzal cultivars the least relative tolerant genotypes. As to YI cultivars Nosrat, Karoun and Sararud were the most and Aras, Sahra and Afzal the least relative tolerant genotypes. According to YSI, SSPI, RDI and ATI indices selected the Sararud and Zarjo cultivars as the most relatively tolerant genotypes. DI selected the cultivars Sararud, Nosrat and Karoun as the best, while the cultivars Sahra, Aras and Reiham as the the worst relatively tolerant genotypes. Grain yield in stress condition was significantly and positively correlated with MP, GMP, STI, Harm, YI and DI. Also, grain yield in non-stress condition was significantly and positively correlated with MP, GMP, STI, Harm, YI, DI and ATI indicating that these criteria were more effective in identifying high yielding cultivars under different moisture conditions.

Keywords: Barley, Water deficiency, Agronomic characteristics, Drought tolerance indices.

Abbreviations: Grain Yield (Y), Biomass (B), Harvest Index (HI), Thousand Grain Weight (TKW), Number of Grain per Spike (NGPS), Number of Spike per m² (NSPM), Potential Yield (Yp), Stress Yield (Ys), Stress Susceptibility Index (SSI), Stress Tolerance Index (STI), Geometric Mean Productivity (GMP), Tolerance (TOL), Mean Productivity (MP), Relative Drought Index (RDI), Yield Index (YI), Yield Stability Index (YSI), Drought Resistance Index (DI), Abiotic Tolerance Index (ATI) and Stress Susceptibility Percentage Index (SSPI).

1. Introduction

Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) is grown as a commercial crop in one hundred countries and is one of the most important cereal crops in the world. Barley assumes the fourth position in total cereal production in the world after wheat, rice and maize [13]. Among all the factors limiting barley productivity, drought

remains the single most important factor affecting the world security and sustainability in agricultural production.

Drought, the most important factor limiting considered for crops successful production in world wide. This problem, combined with physical and environmental factors that trigger stress in plants and reduce growth. Water stress caused by delay, weaken

and/or lack of seedling establishment. Thus, conditions prepare for epidemic diseases, plant pests attack, physiological and biochemical changes. Even in cases of minor, injured and ultimately with reduction growth, damages yield [1]. So that, drought stress is the most significant environmental factor to impact on growth and yield of crops and it affects 40 to 60% of the world's agricultural lands [8].

To evaluate response of plant genotypes to drought stress, some selection indices has been proposed based on a mathematical relation between stress and optimum conditions [9, 17]. Drought indices which provide a measure of drought based on loss of yield under drought condition in comparison to normal condition have been used for screening drought tolerant genotypes [31]. These indices are either based on drought resistance or susceptibility of genotypes [17]. Drought resistance is defined by Hall [24] as the relative yield of genotype compared to other genotypes subjected to the same drought stress [24]. Drought susceptibility of a genotype is often measured as a function of the reduction in yield under drought stress [5].

Breeding for drought resistance is complicated by the lack of fast, reproducible screening techniques and the inability to routinely create defined and repeatable water stress conditions when a large amount of genotypes can be evaluated efficiently [41]. Achieving a genetic increase in yield under these environments has been recognized to be a difficult challenge for plant breeders while progress in grain yield has been much higher in favourable environments [42]. Thus, drought indices which provide a measure of drought based on yield loss under drought condition in comparison to normal condition have been used for screening drought-tolerant genotypes [31].

Rosielle and Hamblin [43] defined stress tolerance (TOL) as the differences in yield between the stress and non-stress environments and mean productivity (MP) as the average yield under stress and non-stress environments. Fischer and Maurer [18] proposed a stress susceptibility index (SSI) of the cultivars. Fernandez [17] defined a new advanced index (STI), which can be used to identify genotypes that produce high yield under both stress and non-stress conditions. Other yield based estimates of drought resistance are geometric mean (GM), MP and TOL. The Geometric mean is often used by breeders interested in relative performance since drought stress can vary in severity in field environment over years [41].

Fischer and Wood [19] introduced another index as relative drought index (RDI). Bidinger *et al.* [4] suggested drought response index (DRI) with its positive values indicating stress tolerance. Other yield based estimates of drought resistance are yield index (YI) [20] and yield stability index (YSI) [7].

Yield stability index (YSI) also was computed and suggested by Bouslama and Schapaugh [7]. This parameter is calculated for a given genotype using grain yield under stressed relative to its grain yield under non-stressed conditions. The genotypes with high YSI is expected to have high yield under stressed and low yield under non-stressed conditions [32]. In present study, drought tolerance in twelve genotypes of barley was investigated under post-anthesis drought stress conditions based on drought tolerance indices.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Plant material and treatments

This research carried out during 2010-2011 in the field research of campus of agriculture and natural resources, Razi university, Kermanshah state in the west of Iran (34° 20' N latitude, 47° 20' E longitude, elevation 1351 m above sea level) in the moderate-cold and semi arid zone. The soil was a clay loam (36.1% clay, 30.7% silt) and the experiment was laid out in a split-plot arranged in a randomized complete blocks design with three replications. Two levels of moisture regimes (includes: irrigation in all stages of plant growth normally and post anthesis water deficiency with withholding of irrigation) as the main-plot and different improved cultivars (includes: Aras, Afzal, Jonub, Reihan, Zarjo, Sararud, Sahra, Fajr-30, Karoun, Gorgan-4, Makuei and Nosrat) as sub-plot were considered. Date of anthesis was determined from middle rows in each plot when 50% of the spikes had extruded anthers [12]. Seeds were sown at a density of 400 seeds m⁻² on 12th October. Humidity and moderate temperatures during the crop season is presented in Table 1.

2.2. Grain yield and some agronomic traits

Grain yield, biomass and number of spike per m² for each cultivar were measured by harvesting 1 m² of the central part of each plot at crop maturity. Harvest index was measured by dividing grain yield to biomass production. In order to measuring grain yield components such as: number of grain per spike and thousand grain weight, 10 plants randomly selected and measurements were performed.

Table 1. Minimum, maximum and mean of temperature and relative humidity also precipitation in the Kermanshah region in the west of Iran during 2010-2011.

Month	Temperature (C°)			Precipitation (mm)	Relative Humidity (%)		
	Min	Max	Mean		Min	Max	Mean
Oct.	10.6	30.3	20.4	1	13.2	46.4	29.8
Nov.	4.5	21.9	13.2	31	22.8	66.8	44.8
Dec.	-1.5	16.8	7.7	24	26.5	62.4	44.5
Jan.	-2.2	9.6	3.7	50	47.1	91.0	69.1
Feb.	-2.7	8.0	2.7	65	52.1	94.2	73.2
Mar.	0.6	15.4	8	21	28.1	82.0	55
Apr.	4.5	20.1	12.3	47	24.6	78.8	51.7
May.	9.5	23.6	16.5	128	33.6	87.4	60.5
Jun.	12.8	33.8	23.3	0	11.3	51.1	31.2
Jul.	17.1	38.5	27.8	0	6.6	32.1	19.4
Aug	18.1	39.5	28.8	0	6	27.7	16.9
Sep	13.8	34.6	24.2	0	7.8	32.0	19.9

Table 2. Drought tolerance indices.

Index	Formula	Reference
Stress Susceptibility Index	$SSI = [1 - (Y_s / Y_p)] / SI$	Fischer and Maurer [18]
Stress Index	$SI = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{Y}_s}{\bar{Y}_p} \right)$	
Stress Tolerance	$TOL = Y_p - Y_s$	Rosielle and Hamblin [43]
Mean Productivity	$MP = \frac{Y_s + Y_p}{2}$	Rosielle and Hamblin [43]
Geometric Mean Productivity	$GMP = \sqrt{Y_s \times Y_p}$	Fernandez [17]
Stress Tolerance Index	$STI = \frac{Y_p}{\bar{Y}_p} \times \frac{Y_s}{\bar{Y}_s} \times \frac{\bar{Y}_s}{Y_p} = \frac{Y_p \times Y_s}{(\bar{Y}_p)^2}$	Fernandez [17]
Harmonic Mean	$HARM = \frac{2(Y_p \times Y_s)}{Y_p + Y_s}$	Kristin <i>et al.</i> [27]
Relative Drought Index	$RDI = \frac{(Y_s \times Y_p)}{(\bar{Y}_s + \bar{Y}_p)}$	Fischer and Wood [19]
Yield Index	$YI = \frac{Y_s}{\bar{Y}_p}$	Lin <i>et al.</i> [29]
Yield Stability Index	$YSI = \frac{Y_s}{Y_p}$	Bousslama and Schapaugh [7]
Drought Resistance Index	$DI = \frac{Y_s \times (Y_p \times Y_s)}{(\bar{Y}_s)}$	Lan [28]
Abiotic Tolerance Index	$ATI = \left[\frac{(Y_p - Y_s)}{(\bar{Y}_p / \bar{Y}_s)} \right] \times \sqrt{Y_p \times Y_s}$	Moosavi <i>et al.</i> [34]
Stress Susceptibility Percentage Index	$SSPI = \frac{(Y_p - Y_s)}{2(\bar{Y}_p)} \times 100$	Moosavi <i>et al.</i> [34]

Y_p and Y_s : Grain yield of each genotype under non-stress and stress conditions, respectively.

\bar{Y}_p and \bar{Y}_s : Mean grain yield of all genotypes under non-stress and stress conditions, respectively.

2.3. Drought resistance indices

In order to estimate the sensitivity and tolerance indices in post anthesis water stress in different improved wheat cultivars, the relationships that

proposed by Fischer and Maurer [18], Rosielle and Hamblin [43], Fernandez [17], Kristin *et al.* [27], Lin *et al.* [29], Lan [28], Moosavi *et al.* [34], Fischer and Wood [19] and Bousslama and Schapaugh [7] were used. These indices are included (Table 2).

2.4. Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using MSTATC and SAS softwares. Mean comparisons were also performed using LSD at 5% level.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Effects of post-anthesis water deficiency on agronomic traits

The results obtained from mean comparison analysis of grain yield and its components are shown in Table 2. showed that post anthesis water deficiency stress caused 22, 18.3, 5.9, 5.5 and 21.9% reduction in grain yield, biomass, thousand grain weight, number of grain per spike and number of spike per m² in average respectively, but had no significant effect on harvest index. The averages of grain yield, biological weight (dry matter weight) and thousand grain weight of different cultivars in well watered condition were 613 g m⁻², 1660 g m⁻² and 41.1 g respectively, while under water deficiency stress these values significantly reduced to 478 g m⁻², 1356 g m⁻² and 38.7 g. Gupta *et al.* [22] evaluated two spring wheat cultivars, Kalyansona and C-306, for yield and yield attributes and noted that water stress caused significant reduction in plant height, leaf area, number of grain per spike, test weight and yield.

The results showed that there were significant differences among genotypes in respect to grain yield under non-stress condition. Also, significant differences were observed among genotypes under stress condition (Table 3). These results demonstrate high diversity among genotypes that enable us to select genotypes under non-stress and stress environments. Grain yield of main spike of wheat genotypes is significantly affected due to severe water stress. Mean comparisons showed that Nosrat cultivar with 838 g m⁻² and Afzal cultivar with 392 g m⁻², respectively had the highest and the lowest grain yield under non-stress condition (Table 3). Under water stress environment Nosrat and Karoun cultivars with 696 and 656 g m⁻² and also, Aras and Sahra cultivars with 322 and 327 g m⁻², respectively had the highest and the lowest grain yield. Blum and Pnuel [6] reported that the final grain yield and its associated traits of bread wheat were significantly decreased due to water stress. Reduction in grain weight of wheat was also reported by various other researchers [1, 2, 36]. Kar *et al.* [25] observed that under water deficit condition, supplemental irrigation during reproductive phases had a significant effect on increasing seed yield. Water stress at

flowering negatively influenced the formation of grain, seed size, resulting in lower final grain yield.

At normal irrigation, comparison of means among all genotypes under study showed significant differences with each other. The highest (48.8 and 48 g) thousand grain weight was noted in Sararud and Gorgan-4 cultivars and lowest (36.3 g) was in Fajr-30 (Table 3). Post-anthesis water stress reduced thousand grain weight of all genotypes. In term of the thousand grain weight under water stress condition, Sararud cultivar had the highest (44.5 g) and Fajr-30 cultivar had the lowest values (33.7 g). The results of this conform to the findings of Karim *et al.* [26] and Baque *et al.* [3] who reported that water stress reduced grain yield by reducing productive tillers per plant, fertile spikelet per plant, number of grains per plant and individual grain weight.

Water stress at anthesis caused significant effect on yield traits and cultivars also showed significant variability for grain spike⁻¹, grain yield per plant, biological weight (dry matter weight) and harvest index. In term of the harvest index under well water condition, Nosrat and Fajr-30 cultivars had the highest (42.1%) and Afzal cultivar had the lowest values (25.3%). But, under post anthesis water deficiency stress Sararud and Fajr-30 cultivars had the highest (42.3 and 41.4%, respectively) and Aras cultivar lowest (27.7%) values (Table 3).

Mean comparisons showed that Karoun cultivar with 2230 g m⁻² and also, Aras and Reihan cultivars (1350 and 1380 g m⁻²), respectively had the highest and the lowest biological yield under well water condition (Table 3). Under water stress environment Karoun cultivar with 1880 g m⁻² and Sahra cultivar with 1020 g m⁻², respectively had the highest and the lowest biological yields.

It can be seen from the data in Table 3. that significant differences were found among cultivars in terms of the number of grain per spike and number of spike per m². In term of the number of grain per spike under well water condition, Karoun and Makuei cultivars had the highest (45.8 and 43.2 grain spike⁻¹) and Sararud cultivar had the lowest values (18.9 grain spike⁻¹). Under post anthesis water deficiency stress Karoun and Makuei cultivars had the highest (41.5 and 41.4 grain spike⁻¹, respectively) and Sararud cultivar lowest (18.6 grain spike⁻¹) values (Table 3). Edward and Wright [11] in their studies also reported that the yield components like grain number and grain size were decreased under pre-anthesis drought stress treatment in wheat. Water stress at various stages specially before anthesis can reduce number of heads and number of kernels per ear [10, 23].

In term of the number of spike per m^2 under non-stress condition, Sararud and Gorgan-4 cultivars had the highest (701 and 686 spike m^{-2} , respectively) and Sahra cultivar had the lowest values (383 spike m^{-2}). Under post anthesis water deficiency stress Sararud and Sahra cultivars had the highest (607 spike m^{-2}) and lowest (262 spike m^{-2}) values. The effects of water stresses during various growth stages on various morphological traits such as tillers, number of spike per m^2 , number of grain per spike, thousand grain weight, spike weight and grain weight per spike, have also been reported in wheat by several researchers [37, 39, 42].

In well water and water deficiency conditions a correlation was found between grain yield and the biomass, harvest index and number of spike per m^2 (Table 6). Also, in well water and water stress conditions a negative correlation was found between thousand grain weight and the number of grain per spike (Table 6). The findings of the current study are consistent with those of Moral *et al.* [35] who found that also negative correlation between these two traits. They concluded that this negative correlation is related to compensation effect of yield components on each other. In this situation, by increasing the number of grain per spike, plants can not fill all of them and then this is caused shrinking of grains and finally caused weight loss of the grains.

3.2. Assessment of drought resistance indices

Data concerning yield (Y_p and Y_s) and indices are given in Table 4. The estimates of stress tolerance attributes (Table 4) indicated that the identification of drought-tolerant genotypes based on a single criterion was contradictory. For example, according to STI, GMP and MP cultivars Nosrat, Karoun and Sararud were the most, whereas Aras and Afzal cultivars the least relative tolerant genotypes. For TOL and SSI the desirable drought tolerant genotypes were Sararud, Afzal and Zarjo. As to YI cultivars Nosrat, Karoun and Sararud were the most and Aras, Sahra and Afzal the least relative tolerant genotypes (Table 4). According to YSI, SSPI, RDI and ATI indices selected the Sararud and Zarjo cultivars as the most relatively tolerant genotypes. DI selected the Sararud, Nosrat and Karoun cultivars as the best, while the Sahra, Aras and Reihan cultivars as the the worst relatively tolerant genotypes. Majidi *et al.* [30] reported that GMP, STI and HM indices were similarly able to separate drought sensitive and tolerant genotypes of safflower in both mild and intense water stress environments. Talebi *et al.* [44] also reported that cultivars producing high yield in both drought and well watered conditions

can be identified by STI, GMP and MP values. Pireivatlou *et al.* [38] was also noted that STI can be a reliable index for selecting high yielding cultivars.

Yield in stress (Y_s) condition was significantly and positively correlated with MP, GMP, STI, Harm, YI and DI. Yield in non-stress (Y_p) condition was significantly and positively correlated with MP, GMP, STI, Harm, YI, DI and ATI indicating that these criteria were more effective in identifying high yielding cultivars under different moisture conditions (Table 5). Farshadfar *et al.* [15] reported that the results under both stress environments indicated positive and significant correlations between Y_p with TOL, MP, GMP, STI, YI, DI, K_1 STI, K_2 STI, ATI and SSPI selection indices. Also, Majidi *et al.* [30] reported that the results under both stress environments indicated positive and significant correlations between Y_p with TOL, MP, GMP, STI, SSI and HM selection indices. They reported that correlations between Y_s with GMP, STI, and HM indicated that selection based on these indices may increase yield in stress and non-stress conditions. Mollasadeghi [33] in a study evaluating 12 bread wheat genotypes concluded that the indices MP, GMP, STI and MSTI having the highest correlation with grain yield under normal irrigation and water stress conditions were introduced as superior indices.

Farshadfar *et al.* [16] believed that most appropriate index for selecting stress-tolerant cultivars is an index which has partly high correlation with grain yield under stress and non-stress conditions. The observed relations were consistent with those reported by Fernandez [17] in mungbean, Farshadfar and Sutka [14] in maize, Golabadi *et al.* [21] in durum wheat and Abdoli and Saeidi [1] in wheat.

Ramirez and Kelly [41] reported that selection based on a combination of both SSI and GM indices may provide a more desirable criterion for improving drought resistance in common beans. Guttieri *et al.* [23], using SSI criterion in spring wheat, suggested that more than 1 unit of SSI value may indicate above-average susceptibility for drought stress and less than one unit has below-average susceptibility. Golabadi *et al.* [21] found that STI, MP, and GMP are superior indices for selecting high yield durum wheat genotypes both under moisture stress and non-stress field environments. Pourdad [40] reported that STI was the best index to identify superior cultivated safflower genotypes in conditions both with and without drought stress.

Table 5. Mean comparisons of grain yield and some agronomic traits in different barley cultivars under post anthesis water deficiency.

Condition	Cultivars	Y (g m ⁻²)	†D (%)	B (g m ⁻²)	D (%)	HI (%)	D (%)	TKW (g)	D (%)	NGPS	D (%)	NSPM	D (%)
Well water	Aras	413±17		1350±30		30.6±0.4		38.0±0.5		23.3±1.1		593±46	
	Afzal	392±1		1550±0		25.3±0.1		39.4±3.5		36.6±1.4		427±12	
	Jonub	748±33		1870±130		40.0±0.1		38.2±1.3		41.7±3.6		628±31	
	Reihan	490±62		1380±20		35.5±3.9		39.3±2.5		37.9±1.8		435±30	
	Zarjo	548±42		1420±0		38.6±3.0		44.8±1.3		39.1±2.1		486±49	
	Sararud	659±59		1660±160		39.7±0.6		48.8±4.7		18.9±1.0		701±8	
	Sahra	473±10		1460±20		32.4±0.5		45.6±0.8		33.6±4.1		383±12	
	Fajr-30	611±3		1450±10		42.1±0.9		36.3±3.0		42.5±1.6		525±32	
	Karoun	778±7		2230±10		34.9±0.3		37.9±1.8		45.8±2.2		662±31	
	Gorgan-4	707±42		1850±30		38.2±1.6		48.0±3.1		22.7±1.0		686±17	
	Makuei	699±1		1710±230		40.9±3.1		38.7±0.8		43.2±1.2		586±39	
	Nosrat	838±13		1990±0		42.1±0.6		38.1±1.9		42.4±2.0		597±52	
Water deficiency	Aras	322±5	-22.1	1160±10	-14.1	27.7±0.2	-9.3	36.3±1.1	-4.4	23.0±1.0	-1.5	505±35	-14.8
	Afzal	339±37	-13.4	1100±30	-29.0	30.8±3.2	22.0	38.4±1.9	-2.6	35.9±4.5	-1.9	308±40	-27.9
	Jonub	489±79	-34.6	1340±140	-28.3	36.5±1.7	-8.8	37.4±1.1	-1.9	38.5±1.5	-7.6	450±10	-28.3
	Reihan	363±36	-25.8	1190±10	-13.8	30.5±2.3	-14.0	37.3±1.6	-4.9	35.4±2.4	-6.7	296±28	-32.0
	Zarjo	493±3	-9.9	1390±150	-2.1	35.5±2.9	-8.0	42.7±0.5	-4.8	39.0±0.2	-0.4	373±21	-23.3
	Sararud	630±40	-4.4	1490±10	-10.2	42.3±2.1	6.5	44.5±2.7	-8.8	18.6±1.4	-1.9	607±4	-13.5
	Sahra	327±27	-30.9	1020±100	-30.1	32.0±0.5	-1.1	43.8±0.8	-3.9	31.0±2.0	-7.9	262±6	-31.6
	Fajr-30	476±30	-22.0	1150±10	-20.7	41.4±1.7	-1.7	33.7±2.4	-7.2	40.9±0.1	-3.7	407±15	-22.5
	Karoun	656±24	-15.6	1880±30	-15.7	34.9±1.2	0.1	35.1±1.0	-7.4	41.5±0.5	-9.4	564±12	-14.8
	Gorgan-4	458±48	-35.2	1270±110	-31.4	36.1±1.3	-5.6	43.5±2.0	-9.3	21.3±0.5	-6.0	529±3	-22.9
	Makuei	489±25	-30.1	1430±50	-16.4	34.2±0.2	-16.4	35.0±0.6	-9.7	41.4±1.4	-4.2	423±3	-27.8
	Nosrat	696±27	-17.0	1850±0	-7.0	37.6±1.2	-10.7	36.4±1.2	-4.5	37.7±0.4	-11.2	516±8	-13.6
Well water		613 a		1660 a		36.9 a		41.1 a		35.6 a		559 a	
Water deficiency		478 b	-22.0	1356 b	-18.3	35.3 a	-4.5	38.7 b	-5.9	33.7 b	-5.5	437 b	-21.9
CV (%)		9.25		8.07		7.08		7.24		8.34		7.77	

Y: Grain Yield (g m⁻²), B: Biomass (g m⁻²), HI: Harvest Index (%), TKW: Thousand Grain Weight (g), NGPS: Number of Grain per Spike and NSPM: Number of Spike per m².

†D (%): Percentage decrease down control when water deficiency was applied at post anthesis.

Mean values followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to LSD (P < 0.05).

Data were means ± SE (n=3).

Table 4. Evaluation of barley cultivars based on drought tolerances (TOL, STI, SSI, GMP, MP, Harm, RDI, YI, YSI, DI, ATI and SSPI) indices.

Cultivars	Yp (g m ⁻²)	Ys (g m ⁻²)	SSI	STI	GMP	TOL	MP	Harm	RDI	YI	YSI	DI	ATI	SSPI
Aras	413.2	321.9	1.006	0.354	364.7	91.4	367.5	361.9	0.998	0.673	0.779	0.524	25994.4	7.5
Afzal	391.9	339.3	0.611	0.354	364.7	52.6	365.6	363.7	1.110	0.709	0.866	0.614	14971.6	4.3
Jonub	748.4	489.2	1.576	0.974	605.1	259.2	618.8	591.6	0.838	1.023	0.654	0.669	122345.1	21.1
Reihan	489.8	363.4	1.175	0.474	421.9	126.4	426.6	417.2	0.951	0.760	0.742	0.564	41616.6	10.3
Zarjo	547.7	493.2	0.452	0.719	519.7	54.4	520.4	519.0	1.154	1.031	0.901	0.929	22072.4	4.4
Sararud	658.9	630.0	0.200	1.105	644.3	28.9	644.4	644.1	1.225	1.317	0.956	1.259	14523.3	2.4
Sahra	472.9	326.8	1.407	0.411	393.1	146.2	399.9	386.5	0.885	0.683	0.691	0.472	44837.9	11.9
Fajr-30	610.8	476.2	1.003	0.774	539.3	134.6	543.5	535.2	0.999	0.996	0.780	0.776	56629.9	11.0
Karoun	777.7	656.1	0.712	1.358	714.3	121.7	716.9	711.7	1.081	1.372	0.844	1.157	67811.5	9.9
Gorgan-4	707.0	458.3	1.601	0.862	569.2	248.7	582.6	556.1	0.831	0.958	0.648	0.621	110443.1	20.3
Makuei	699.0	488.9	1.368	0.909	584.6	210.1	593.9	575.3	0.896	1.022	0.699	0.715	95843.6	17.1
Nosrat	838.3	695.9	0.773	1.552	763.8	142.4	767.1	760.5	1.064	1.455	0.830	1.208	84874.6	11.6
Mean	613.0	478.3	0.990	0.821	540.4	134.7	545.6	535.2	1.003	1.000	0.782	0.792	58497.0	11.0

Yp: Potential Yield, Ys: Stress Yield, SSI: Stress Susceptibility Index, STI: Stress Tolerance Index, GMP: Geometric Mean Productivity, TOL: Tolerance, MP: Mean Productivity, RDI: Relative Drought Index, YI: Yield Index, YSI: Yield Stability Index, DI: Drought Resistance Index, ATI: Abiotic Tolerance Index and SSPI: Stress Susceptibility Percentage Index.

Table 5. Correlation coefficient of barley cultivars grain yield in normal irrigation and water stress conditions to drought tolerance indices.

Yp	Ys	SSI	STI	GMP	TOL	MP	Harm	RDI	YI	YSI	DI	ATI	SSPI
Yp	1												
Ys	0.87**	1											
SSI	0.10	-0.41	1										
STI	0.94**	0.97**		1									
GMP	0.96**	0.97**	-0.17	0.99**	1								
TOL	0.50	-0.01	0.90**	0.20	0.24	1							
MP	0.97**	0.96**	-0.14	0.99**	1.00**	0.27	1						
Harm	0.95**	0.98**	-0.21	0.99**	1.00**	0.21	1.00**	1					
RDI	-0.10	0.41	-1.00**	0.20	0.17	-0.90**	0.14	0.21	1				
YI	0.87**	1.00**	-0.41	0.97**	0.97**	-0.01	0.96**	0.98**	0.41	1			
YSI	-0.10	0.41	-1.00**	0.20	0.17	-0.90**	0.14	0.20	1.00**	0.41	1		
DI	0.64*	0.94**	-0.69*	0.84**	0.83**	-0.34	0.81**	0.85**	0.69*	0.94**	1		
ATI	0.73**	0.29	0.73**	0.48	0.51	0.95**	0.54	0.48	-0.73**	0.29	-0.05	1	
SSPI	0.50	-0.01	0.90**	0.20	0.24	1.00**	0.27	0.21	-0.90**	-0.01	-0.34	0.95**	1

* and **: Significant at the 5 and 1 percent levels, respectively.

3.3. Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis using cluster analysis with UPGMA and based on drought tolerance criteria (Figure 1), the cultivars classified in three groups. Group 1 (drought tolerance) consisted of Karoun and Nosrat cultivars, group 2 (semi-resistance) included Zarjo, Fajr-30, Gorgan-4, Makuei, Jonub and Sararud

cultivars and group 3 (drought sensitive) discriminated Aras, Afzal, Sahra and Reihan cultivars. As group 1 and 3 showed maximum between group variance, therefore they are recommended for the genetic analysis using diallel or scaling test and QTLs mapping of drought tolerance indices.




Figure 1. Dendrogram resulted from cluster analysis based on drought tolerance indicators (GMP, MP, Harm, STI, YI and DI). Aras (G₁), Afzal (G₂), Jonub (G₃), Reihan (G₄), Zarjo (G₅), Sararud (G₆), Sahra (G₇), Fajr-30 (G₈), Karoun (G₉), Gorgan-4 (G₁₀), Makuei (G₁₁) and Nosrat (G₁₂).

Table 6. Correlation coefficients among grain yield and some agronomic traits in barley cultivars under post anthesis water deficiency.

Parameters	Condition	Y	B	HI	TKW	NGPS	NSPM
Y	Well water	1					
	Water deficiency	1					
B	Well water	0.85**	1				
	Water deficiency	0.92**	1				
HI	Well water	0.76**	0.30	1			
	Water deficiency	0.71*	0.38	1			
TKW	Well water	-0.06	-0.10	0.02	1		
	Water deficiency	-0.10	-0.23	0.12	1		
NGPS	Well water	0.32	0.30	0.22	-0.69*	1	
	Water deficiency	0.17	0.26	0.01	-0.64*	1	
NSPM	Well water	0.70*	0.64*	0.47	0.14	-0.29	1
	Water deficiency	0.71**	0.67*	0.48	-0.02	-0.37	1

Y: Grain Yield (g m⁻²), B: Biomass (g m⁻²), HI: Harvest Index (%), TKW: Thousand Grain Weight (g), NGPS: Number of Grain per Spike and NSPM: Number of Spike per m².

* and **: Significant at the 5 and 1 percent levels, respectively.

4. Conclusion

The newly evolved genotypes indicated some genetic improvement as they possess tolerance to water stress conditions and could produce high grain yield with less availability of water. Some cultivars have potential to produce better yield with less irrigation. This information will be helpful for wheat breeders in improving drought tolerance. The selected material will be utilised in hybridization programme to create new genetic variability. Also, based on this concept

which, whenever in terms of the MP, STI and GMP indices is superior, in both non-stress and stress treatments has higher grain yield, on this basis Nosrat, Karoun and Sararud cultivars is probably the best and its cultivation by farming in these situation with possibility of occurrence post anthesis water deficiency stress in addition to producing a higher grain yield than other cultivars also associated with a lower risk.

5. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank their colleagues in Agricultural and Natural Resource, University of Razi, Kermanshah, Iran.

6. References

1. Abdoli M, Saeidi M: **Using different indices for selection of resistant wheat cultivars to post anthesis water deficit in the west of Iran.** *Annals of Biological Research* 2012, **3**: 1322-1333.
2. Anjum SA, Wang LC, Farooq M, Hussain M, Xue LL, Zou CM: **Brassinolide application improves the drought tolerance in maize through modulation of enzymatic antioxidants and leaf gas exchange.** *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science* 2011, **197(3)**: 177-185.
3. Baque MDA, Karim MDA, Hamid A, Tetsush H: **Effects of fertilizer potassium on growth, yield and nutrient uptake of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under water stress conditions.** *South Pacific Stud* 2006, **27**: 25-35.
4. Bidinger FR, Mahalakshmi V, Rao GDP: **Assessment of drought resistance in millet Factors effecting yields under stress.** *Australian Journal of Agriculture Research* 1978, **38**: 37-48.
5. Blum A: **Plant breeding for stress environments.** CRC Press, Florida 1988, 212 pp.
6. Blum A, Pnuel Y: **Physiological attributes associated with drought resistance on wheat cultivars in a Mediterranean environment.** *Australian Journal of Agriculture Research* 1990, **41**: 799-810.
7. Bouslama M, Schapaugh WT: **Stress tolerance in soybean. Part 1. Evaluation of three screening techniques for heat and drought tolerance.** *Crop Science* 1984, **24**: 933-937.
8. Bray EA: **Molecular response to water deficit.** *Plant Physiology* 1993, 1035-1040.
9. Clarke JM, De-Pauw RM, Townley-Smith TM: **Evaluation of methods for quantification of drought tolerance in wheat.** *Crop Science* 1992, **32**: 728-732.
10. Dencic S, Kastori R, Kobiljski B, Duggan B: **Evaluation of grain yield and its components in wheat cultivars and landraces under near optimal and drought conditions.** *Euphytica* 2000, **113**: 43-52.
11. Edward D, Wright D: **The effects of winter water-logging and summer drought on the growth and yield of winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.).** *European Journal of Agronomy* 2008, **28**: 234-244.
12. Ehdaie B, Alloush GA, Madore MA, Waines JG: **Genotypic variation for stem reserves and mobilization in wheat: I I. Postanthesis changes in internode water-soluble carbohydrate.** *Crop Science* 2006 b, **46**: 2093-2103.
13. F.A.O: **Statistical database.** Available online: [Http// www. FAO. Org.](http://www.FAO.Org) 2004.
14. Farshadfar E, Sutka J: **Screening drought tolerance criteria in maize.** *Acta Agronomica Hungarica* 2002, **50(4)**: 411-416.
15. Farshadfar E, Jamshidi B, Aghaei M: **Biplot analysis of drought tolerance indicators in bread wheat landraces of Iran.** *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences* 2012, **4(5)**: 226-233.
16. Farshadfar E, Zamani M, Matlabi M, Emam-Jomei E: **Selection for drought resistance in chickpea lines.** *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences* 2001, **32(1)**: 65-77.
17. Fernandez GCJ: **Effective selection criteria for assessing stress tolerance.** In: *Proceedings of the international symposium on adaptation of vegetables and other food Crops in temperature and water stress.* (Eds): Kuo, C.G. Public Tainan Taiwan 1992, 257-270.
18. Fischer RA, Maurer R: **Drought resistance in spring wheat cultivars: I. Grain yield responses.** *Australian Journal of Agriculture Research* 1978, **29**: 897-912.
19. Fischer RA, Wood JT: **Drought resistance in spring wheat cultivars III Yield association with morpho-physiological traits.** *Australian Journal of Agriculture Research* 1979, **30**: 1001-1020.
20. Gavuzzi P, Rizza F, Palumbo M, Campalini RG, Ricciardi GL, Borghi B: **Evaluation of field and laboratory predictors of drought and heat tolerance in winter cereals.** *Canadian Journal of Plant Science* 1997, **77**: 523-531.
21. Golabadi M, Arzani A, Maibody SAM: **Assessment of drought tolerance in segregating populations in durum wheat.** *African Journal of Agriculture Research* 2006, **1**: 162-171.
22. Gupta NK, Gupta S, Kumar A: **Effect of water stress on physiological attributes and their relationship with growth and yield of wheat cultivars at different stages.** *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science* 2001, **186**: 55-62.
23. Guttieri MJ, Stark JC, Brien KO, Souza E: **Relative sensitivity of spring wheat grain yield**

- and quality parameters to moisture deficit. *Crop Science* 2001, **41**: 327-335.
24. Hall AE: **Is dehydration tolerance relevant to genotypic differences in leaf senescence and crop adaptation to dry environments?.** In: *Plant responses to cellular dehydration during environmental stress*. (Eds.): Close, T.J. and Bray, E.A. 1993, 1-10 pp.
 25. Kar G, Kumar A, Martha M: **Water use efficiency and crop coefficients of dry season oil seed crops.** *Agricultural Water Management* 2007, **87**: 73-82.
 26. Karim MA, Hamid A, Rahman S: **Grain growth and yield performance of wheat under subtropical conditions: II. Effect of water stress at reproductive stage.** *Cereal Research Communications* 2000, **28**: 101-107.
 27. Kristin AS, Senra RR, Perez FI, Enriquez BC, Gallegos JAA, Vallego PR, Wassimi N, Kelley JD: **Improving common bean performance under drought stress.** *Crop Science* 1997, **37**: 43-50.
 28. Lan J: **Comparison of evaluating methods for agronomic drought resistance in crops.** *Acta Agriculture Bor-occid Sinic* 1998, **7**: 85-87.
 29. Lin CS, Binns MR, Lefkovitch LP: **Stability analysis: where do we stand?.** *Crop Science* 1986, **26**: 894-900.
 30. Majidi M, Tavakoli V, Mirlohi A, Sabzalian MR: **Wild safflower species (*Carthamus oxyacanthus* Bieb.): A possible source of drought tolerance for arid environments.** *Australian Journal of Crop Science* 2011, **5(8)**: 1055-1063.
 31. Mitra J: **Genetics and genetic improvement of drought resistance in crop plants.** *Current Science* 2001, **80**: 758-762.
 32. Mohammadi R, Armion M, Kahrizi D, Amri A: **Efficiency of screening techniques for evaluating durum wheat genotypes under mild drought conditions.** *International Journal of Plant Production* 2010, **4(1)**: 1735-8043.
 33. Mollasadeghi V: **Effect of potassium humate on yield and yield components of wheat genotypes under end seasonal drought stress condition.** Thesis of M.Sc in plant breeding. Islamic Azad University, Ardabil branch. Iran. 2010.
 34. Moosavi SS, Yazdi-Samadi B, Naghavi MR, Zali AA, Dashti H, Pourshahbazi A: **Introduction of new indices to identify relative drought tolerance and resistance in wheat genotypes.** *Desert* 2008, **12**: 165-178.
 35. Moral GLF, Rharrabti Y, Villegas D, Royo C: **Evaluation of grain yield and its components in durum wheat under mediterranean conditions: an ontogenic approach.** *Journal of Agronomy* 2002, **95**: 266-274.
 36. Nasri M: **Interaction of nutrient elements and drought stress in cultivars of Brassica napus.** *The second international conference on integrated approaches to sustain and improve plant production under drought stress*. Rome, Italy, September 24-28. 2005, 109 pp.
 37. Noorka IR, Rehman SU, Haidry JR, Khaliq I, Tabassum S, Din GM: **Effect of water stress on physico-chemical properties of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.).** *Pakistan Journal of Botany* 2009, **41(6)**: 2917-2924.
 38. Pireivatlou AS, Masjedlou BD, Aliyev RT: **Evaluation of yield potential and stress adaptive trait in wheat genotypes under post anthesis drought stress conditions.** *African Journal of Agriculture Research* 2010, **5**: 2829-2836.
 39. Plaut Z, Butow BJ, Blumenthal CS, Wrigley CW: **Transport of dry matter into developing wheat kernels.** *Field Crops Research* 2004, **96**: 185-198.
 40. Pourdad SS: **Study of drought resistance indices in spring safflower.** *Acta Agronomica Hungarica* 2008, **56**: 203-212.
 41. Ramirez P, Kelly JD: **Traits related to drought resistance in common bean.** *Euphytica* 1998, **99**: 127-136.
 42. Richards RA, Condon AG, Rebetzke GJ: **Traits to improve yield in dry environments.** In: *Application of Physiology in Wheat Breeding*. (Eds): Reynolds, M.P. Ortiz Monasterio, J.I. and McNab, A. Mexico, CIMMYT. 2001, 88-100 pp.
 43. Rosielle AA, Hamblin J: **Theoretical aspects of selection for yield in stress and non-stress environments.** *Crop Science* 1981, **21(6)**: 943-946.
 44. Talebi R, Fayaz F, Naji AM: **Effective selection criteria for assessing drought stress tolerance in durum wheat (*Triticum durum* Desf.).** *General and Applied Plant Physiology* 2009, **35**: 64-74.