

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**A STUDY OF SEED VIGOUR TEST METHODOLOGY  
VARIABLES**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirement  
for the Degree of Master of Applied Science in  
Seed Technology at Massey University  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand

TAO ZHANG

1998

## ABSTRACT

Further research of some variables and procedures for promising seed vigour tests, such as the conductivity, Accelerated Ageing (AA) and Controlled Deterioration (CD) tests, is needed for their wider application and standardisation. Experiments to determine the effects of fungicide and insecticide seed treatments, and breaking hard seed using concentrated sulphuric acid ( $H_2SO_4$ ) and mechanical scarification on results of the conductivity and AA tests; determining tolerances for the conductivity test; and a comparison of the efficiency of two methods of raising seed moisture content (SMC), i.e., the water added method (WAM) and the filter paper method (FPM) for the CD test; were carried out using a number of seed species and methodology according to the procedures recommended by the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) and its Vigour Test Committee.

At the recommended application rate, protectant and systemic fungicide seed treatments had little effect on seed conductivity of the large seeded legumes garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.), soybean (*Glycine max.* (L.) Merrill), French bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and broad bean (*Vicia faba* L.), and the cereals maize, sweet corn (*Zea mays* L.) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) both immediately after treatment and after two months storage. However, at double the application rate, systemic fungicide seed treatments significantly increased conductivity, but not necessarily for all the species, cultivars and chemicals used. Seed treated at the recommended fungicide application rate can be directly tested for conductivity without removal of the chemicals. Seed treatment chemicals, particularly insecticides, tended to increase conductivity of the small seeded legume white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.). However, the reliability of the conductivity test for small seeded legumes needs further investigation as the method currently recommended produced variable results. There was no clear trend for the effects of seed treatment chemicals on AA test results because different chemicals, particularly systemic ones, had different phytotoxicity, even at the recommended rate. However, when comparing the vigour of seed lots treated with the same fungicide or insecticide at a similar application rate, the seed lots can be directly AA tested. The effects of the chemicals on seeds are modified by their phytotoxicity, and their

beneficial effects that are determined by chemical application rate, physical condition of the seed lot, vigour status of the seed lot, fungal infection and storage time.

The tolerances for differences between the highest and lowest conductivity result among four replicates of a seed lot for garden pea cv. Bolero were calculated as 4.77 and 5.56 $\mu$ S/cm/g at the 5 and 1% significance level respectively. The present tolerance of 5 $\mu$ S/cm/g recommended by the Vigour Test Committee of ISTA is appropriate for pea and other large seeded legumes. However it may be not suitable for cereals and small seeded legumes because of large differences in conductivity value among them.

Both the WAM and the FPM provided a SMC for large seeded species of garden pea and maize very near the desired SMC for the CD test. Variability was small, and ranking of seed lot vigour did not differ between the two methods of raising SMC. The WAM provided a reasonably acceptable SMC in terms of mean and variance for the small seeded species onion (*Allium cepa* L.) and swede (*Brassica napus* var. *napobrassica* L.), but was very dependent on the accurate operation of the micro-pipette and improvement of SMC determination methodology after the CD test. Therefore the WAM, after further refinement, will be able to be used for the CD test, superseding the FPM.

Artificial deterioration conditions i.e., high temperature of 40<sup>0</sup>C for 48h and 45<sup>0</sup>C for 24h at near 20% SMC induced high seed dormancy in swede seed lots of cultivars received from the United Kingdom and New Zealand, but the extent varied with cultivar and initial SMC. Pre-chilling and 20-30<sup>0</sup>C germination temperature broke the dormancy. Caution should be used when swede and its close species e.g., rape (*Brassica napus* L.) and other *Brassica* spp. are artificial ageing tested.

H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> treatment had little negative effect on germination of white clover and lotus (*Lotus uliginosus* Schk.), but significantly increased conductivity and reduced AA germination because of seed coat degradation and fungal invasion.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the following people and organisations.

Firstly, I am indebted to Associate Professor John G. Hampton, my chief supervisor and chairperson of the Vigour Test Committee of the International Seed Testing Association, for his farsighted guidance and supervision, criticism and comments on the experiments and thesis writing, and his patience in reading, editing and correcting my English. I have learned a lot about what a scientist should be from him.

I would like thank Professor Murray J. Hill, my co-supervisor and director of the Seed Technology Centre, especially for his moral help and care during my study. His sense of humour relieved the burden of study.

I also acknowledge the technical help and support from the other Seed Technology Centre staff, namely Mrs Karen A. Hill, senior tutor; Mrs Ruth Morrison, senior seed analyst; Mr. Craig R. McGill, technician; and Mr. Robert C. Southward, technician. Their assistance is truly appreciated.

I appreciate the help from Dr. Ian Gordon, who provided the computer programme for normal distribution for the analysis of the tolerance data.

I am grateful to the Education Committee of the People's Republic of China for the nomination, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand for providing the scholarship, and the Seed Administrative Headquarters of Shandong Province for the help during my study in New Zealand.

Finally, thanks to my wife, Lixia Yu, and my daughter, Yu (Mary) Zhang, for their company and support, and also to my mother for her care and concern for me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Abstract</b>	ii
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	iv
<b>List of Tables</b>	ix
<b>List of Figure</b>	xiii
<b>List of Plates</b>	xiii
<b>List of Appendices</b>	xiv
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	5
<b>2.1 Seed quality</b>	5
2.1.1 Seed structure	5
2.1.2 Seed quality	5
<b>2.2 Seed testing</b>	6
2.2.1 Germination test	6
2.2.1.1 Definition	6
2.2.1.2 Limitations	7
<b>2.3 Seed vigour</b>	8
2.3.1 Definition of seed vigour	8
2.3.2 Factors affecting seed vigour	10
2.3.2.1 Genetics	10
2.3.2.2 Seed deterioration	11
2.3.2.3 Pathogens	12
<b>2.4 Seed vigour testing</b>	13
2.4.1 Requirements of seed vigour tests	14
2.4.2 Development and future of vigour testing	14
<b>2.5 Recommended vigour tests</b>	16
2.5.1 Electrical conductivity test	16
2.5.1.2 SMC effects	18

2.5.1.3 Seed treatment effects	20
2.5.1.4 Limitations	20
2.5.1.5 Tolerances for seed vigour tests	22
2.5.2 Accelerated ageing test	24
2.5.2.1 Current status	24
2.5.2.2 SMC effects	24
2.5.2.3 Seed treatment effects	26
2.5.2.4 Micro-organism effects	26
2.5.2.5 Comparison of natural and artificial ageing of seeds	27
2.5.3 Controlled deterioration test	28
2.5.3.1 Current status	28
2.5.3.2 Comparison of the CD and AA tests	28
2.5.3.3 Methods of raising SMC	30
<b>2.6 Seed treatment</b>	30
2.6.1 Protectant and systemic chemicals and their mechanisms	31
2.6.2 The effects of seed treatment	33
2.6.2.1 Beneficial effects	33
2.6.2.2 Seed treatment phytotoxicity	34
2.6.3 Effect and problems in seed testing	35
<b>2.7 Dormancy and hardseededness</b>	35
2.7.1 Dormancy	35
2.7.2 Hardseededness	36
2.7.2.1 Methods for breaking hardseededness	37
2.7.2.2 The problems in seed testing	40
<b>CHAPTER 3 MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	40
<b>3.1 General</b>	40
3.1.1 Seed sources	40
3.1.2 Seed sampling	40
3.1.3 Standard germination	40
3.1.4 Seed moisture content	40
3.1.5 Thousand seed weight	41

<b>3.2 Conductivity testing</b>	41
3.2.1 Standard method	41
3.2.2 Achieving the desired SMC	42
3.2.3 Presence of hard seed	44
3.2.4 Effect of seed treatment	44
3.2.4.1 Laboratory treated seeds	44
3.2.4.2 Commercially treated seed lots	46
3.2.5 Determining tolerances for conductivity testing	46
<b>3.3 Accelerated Ageing testing</b>	47
<b>3.4 Controlled Deterioration testing</b>	49
3.4.1 Raising SMC	49
3.4.1.1 Filter paper method	49
3.4.1.2 Water added method	49
3.4.2 Temperature and time	50
3.4.3 Dormancy study of swede cv. Doon Major	51
<b>3.5 Effect of hardseededness on vigour test results</b>	51
3.5.1 Breaking hardseededness using sulphuric acid and sandpaper	51
3.5.1.1 Sulphuric acid treatment	51
3.5.1.2 Sandpaper treatment	52
3.5.2 Germination and vigour (conductivity and AA) testing	52
<b>3.6 Statistical analysis</b>	52
<b>CHAPTER 4 RESULTS OF CONDUCTIVITY TESTING</b>	53
<b>4.1 Initial seed quality</b>	53
<b>4.2 Effects of seed treatment on conductivity testing</b>	53
4.2.1 Large seeded legumes	53
4.2.2 Cereal	56
4.2.3 Small seeded legumes	59
<b>4.3 Determining tolerances for conductivity testing</b>	62



<b>CHAPTER 5 EFFECTS OF SEED TREATMENT ON AA TESTING</b>	63
5.1 Large seeded legumes	63
5.2 Cereal	67
<b>CHAPTER 6 RESULTS OF CD TESTING WITH A COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS OF RAISING SMC, AND SWEDE DORMANCY</b>	68
6.1 Small seeded species-onion and swede	68
6.2 Large seed species-pea and maize	73
<b>CHAPTER 7 EFFECTS OF HARDSEEDEDNESS BREAKING BY H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> AND SANDPAPER ON VIGOUR TEST RESULTS</b>	75
<b>CHAPTER 8 DISCUSSION</b>	77
8.1 Seed treatment effect on conductivity	77
8.1.1 Large seeded legumes	77
8.1.2 Cereal	80
8.1.3 Small seeded legumes	81
8.2 Tolerances	82
8.3 Seed treatment effect on AA testing	83
8.4 CD testing- a comparison of two methods of raising SMC	85
8.5 Induced dormancy of swede in CD testing	87
8.6 Effects of methods of hard seed breaking on vigour testing	90
<b>CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSIONS</b>	92
<b>REFERENCES</b>	94
<b>APPENDICES</b>	113

## List of Tables

	Page
Table 2.1: Germination and emergence percentages of crimson clover seed lots in various conditions and treatments	8
Table 2.2: Correlation of responses of crimson clover seed under various conditions with field emergence and viability after 5 months storage	8
Table 2.3: The effect of initial SMC on conductivity test results	18
Table 3.1: Species and seed lots used in the experiments	41
Table 3.2: Recommended chemical application rate	45
Table 3.3: Variables for the AA test using an inner chamber	47
Table 4.1: Quality of seed lots employed in all the experiments	53
Table 4.2: Effect of fungicide seed treatment at the recommended (R) and double the recommended (D) application rates on conductivity for two seed lots of pea cv. Pania	54
Table 4.3: Effect of fungicide seed treatment at the recommended (R) and double the recommended (D) application rates on conductivity for one seed lot each of soybean, broad bean and French bean	54
Table 4.4: Conductivity of the solutions of the chemicals used for large seeded legume seed treatment	54
Table 4.5: Effects of seed treatment of soybean with systemic and protectant fungicides at the recommended application rate on conductivity and germination immediately after treatment (I) and after two months storage (T)	55
Table 4.6: Effect of commercial pea seed treatment on conductivity	56
Table 4.7: Effect of fungicide seed treatment at the recommended (R) and double the recommended (D) rates on the conductivity of two maize seed lots	57
Table 4.8: Effects of fungicide seed treatment at the recommended (R) and double recommended (D) application rates on the conductivity and germination of two sweet corn seed lots	58

Table 4.9: Effect of fungicide seed treatment of wheat cv. Otane at the recommended application rate (R) and double that rate (D) on conductivity and germination.	57
Table 4.10: Effect of fungicide seed treatment at the recommended application rate on sweet corn cv. Jubilee conductivity and germination immediately after treatment (I) and after two months storage (T)	59
Table 4.11: Conductivity of the solutions of the chemicals used for maize, sweet corn and wheat seed treatment	59
Table 4.12: Effects of insecticide and fungicide seed treatments at the recommended application rates on the conductivity of white clover cv. Huia using 50 seeds	60
Table 4.13: Effects of insecticide and fungicide seed treatment at the recommended (R) and double recommended (D) application rates on the conductivity and germination of three white clover seed lots using 0.3g seeds	61
Table 5.1: Effects of seed treatment with systemic and protectant fungicides at the recommended application rate (R) and double that rate (D) on germination, vigour and SMC after ageing for seed lot 1 of pea cv. Pania	64
Table 5.2: Effects of seed treatment with systemic and protectant fungicides at the recommended application rate (R) and double that rate (D) on germination, vigour and SMC after ageing for seed lot 2 of pea cv. Pania	65
Table 5.3: Effect of fungicide seed treatment of soybean at the recommended application rate (R) and double that rate (D) on germination before and after accelerated ageing	66
Table 5.4: Effects of seed treatment of maize cv. CF96005 with systemic and protectant chemicals at the recommended application rate (R) and double that rate (D) on germination and vigour	67
Table 6.1: SMC of onion and swede seed lots before the CD test	68

Table 6.2: SMC achieved in CD testing of onion seed lots using two methods of raising SMC	68
Table 6.3: SMC achieved in CD testing of swede seed lots using two methods of raising SMC	69
Table 6.4: Post-CD germination percentage of onion seed lots treated at 20 <sup>0</sup> C using the top of paper germination method after ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C for 24 h following two methods of raising SMC (run 1)	69
Table 6.5: Post-CD germination percentage of onion seed lots treated at 20 <sup>0</sup> C using the top of paper germination method after ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C for 24 h following two methods of raising SMC (run 2)	70
Table 6.6: Post-CD germination percentage of onion seed lots at 20 <sup>0</sup> C using the between paper germination method after ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C for 24 h following two methods of raising SMC (run 3)	70
Table 6.7: Induced dormancy percentage of swede seed lots after ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C for 24 h following two methods of raising SMC and germinating at 20 <sup>0</sup> C	71
Table 6.8: Induced dormancy percentage of swede seed lots after ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C for 24 h following two methods of raising SMC and germinating at 20-30 <sup>0</sup> C	71
Table 6.9: Comparison of induced dormancy percentage of swede cv. Doon Major seed lots 1-4 after CD ageing at 45 <sup>0</sup> C 24h at four different moisture content and control germinated at 20 <sup>0</sup> C	72
Table 6.10: SMC achieved in CD testing of seed lots 1, 2 and 3 (stored at 5, 20, 25 <sup>0</sup> C for six months, respectively) of garden pea cv. Bolero following two methods of raising SMC	73
Table 6.11: Comparison of the efficiency of two methods for raising SMC for the CD test for seed lots 1, 2 and 3 (stored at 5, 20, 25 <sup>0</sup> C for six months, respectively) of garden pea cv. Bolero	73
Table 6.12: Comparison of the efficiency of two methods of raising SMC and their effect on post CD germination for seed lot 1 of pea cv. Pania	74

Table 6.13: Comparison of the efficiency of two methods of raising SMC of maize cv. CF96003 and CF96005 and their effect on post CD germination	74
Table 7.1: Effect of H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> and sandpaper treatment on white clover cv. Sustain hard seed breaking, germination and vigour test results	76
Table 7.2: Effects of H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> and sandpaper treatment on lotus cv. Maku hard seed breaking, germination and vigour test results	76

## List of Figure

	Page
Figure 4.1: Observed and expected frequency distribution of conductivity value range among 100 tests of four replicates of pea cv. Bolero	63

## List of Plates

Plate 3.1: CDM83 conductivity meter (Radiometer, Copenhagen)	43
Plate 3.2: The flasks covered with laboratory sealing film to prevent contamination and evaporation in the conductivity test	43
Plate 3.3: The Series Five Contherm incubator used as the outer ageing chamber in the AA and CD tests	48
Plate 3.4: Scarifier lined with sandpaper (P150 grade) for mechanical scarification of hard seed	48

## List of Appendices

	Page
Appendix 1: Quality data of nine commercially treated seed lots of garden pea	112
Appendix 2-1: Frequency of conductivity ranges for 100 tests using four replicates of garden pea cv. Bolero	112
Appendix 2-2: Distribution of the conductivity ranges from 100 tests using four replicates of garden pea cv. Bolero	113
Appendix 3-1: Control germination and post CD germination of swede seed lots excluding dormant seeds	113
Appendix 3-2: Accumulated final germination and post CD germination of swede seed lots including normal seedlings produced before and after a chilling treatment at 5 <sup>0</sup> C for three days	113
Appendix 3-3: Effect of pre-chilling at 5 <sup>0</sup> C for 3 days after the CD ageing but prior to germination on dormancy of five swede seed lots germinated at 20-30 <sup>0</sup> C	114
Appendix 4-1: Dormancy (%) of swede cv. Doon Major seed lots 1-4 (with SMC 7.0, 8.5, 9.9 and 11.5% respectively) as revealed by standard germination and post CD germination test	114
Appendix 4-2: Accumulated final germination and post CD germination of swede cv. Doon Major seed lots 1-4 (with SMC 7.0, 8.5, 9.9 and 11.5% respectively) including normal seedlings produced before and after a chilling treatment at 5 <sup>0</sup> C for three days	114

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

*Is it not reasonable to expect that the condition of storage or age, which has proved fatal to one-third of the seed, has left its degenerating influence upon many of the remaining seeds? In other words, the vigour of the 62% which germinated, has been impaired.*

-----W. L. Goss (1933)

A seed quality test must be repeatable and reliable. The laboratory germination test, which indicates the potential of a seed lot to produce normal seedlings under optimum conditions, is an important and standardised test for seed quality (ISTA 1996). However, for seed lots with a high germination percentage, a germination test may fail to detect differences among seed lots in field planting value and storage ability (e.g., Helmer *et al.* 1962; Wang & Hampton 1991), because it cannot detect difference in seed vigour. Differences in seed vigour exist among high germination seed lots (Delouche & Baskin 1973) and may determine the potential performance of the seed lot under realistic field and storage conditions. In this situation, a more sensitive indicator of seed quality, i.e., seed vigour testing, is required.

Although many vigour tests have been developed (AOSA 1983; Anonymous 1988; Hampton & TeKrony 1995), no test has yet been standardised and therefore accepted as a part of the International Seed Testing Association Rules (ISTA 1996), because of some inconsistencies in results. This was attributed to extraneous sources of variables and unclear assumptions behind each test (Hampton & Coolbear 1990), although many of them have been eliminated (e.g. McDonald 1977; Tao 1978a; Loeffler *et al.* 1988; Tomes *et al.* 1988; Hampton *et al.* 1992a, 1992b).

The basic requirements of a vigour test are that it should be a more sensitive index of seed performance than the germination test, and provide a consistent ranking of seed lots in terms of their potential performance (Isely 1958; McDonald 1980b; Powell & Matthews 1981; Perry 1984b). The conductivity test and artificial ageing tests, (i.e. Accelerated Ageing (AA) and Controlled Deterioration (CD) tests) have shown



promise in meeting the basic requirements of a vigour test and are able to reasonably consistently predict seed lot potential performance (Hampton & Coolbear 1990; Hampton & TeKrony 1995).

Seed treatments, such as fungicides and insecticides, are extensively used in the seed industry to enhance seed performance by preventing fungi and insect attacks. Both protectant and systemic products are available. Much research on the mechanisms (e.g., Lyr 1995) and effects of chemical seed treatment on seed germination, seedling growth rate and emergence have been reported (e.g. Van Toai *et al.* 1986; Lewis *et al.* 1991; Saraswathi *et al.* 1995), but little is known as to what effects they may have on vigour testing. A few reports concluded that protectant fungicides, such as seed treatment with *captan* and *thiram*, and the systemic fungicide *carboxin* had no effects on soybean (*Glycine max.* (L.) Merrill) conductivity (McDonald & Wilson 1979; Loeffler *et al.* 1988; Eua-umpon 1991), but conductivity was reduced after long storage (Van Toai *et al.* 1986; Saraswathi *et al.* 1995). AA germination of soybean seeds treated with *carboxin* and *thiram* after six months storage was higher than that of the control because the fungicide delayed and reduced the invasion of fungi during storage and AA testing (Van Toai *et al.* 1986). However, the effects of systemic chemical seed treatments other than *carboxin* on electrical conductivity and AA tests have not been reported, and therefore, there are no guidelines in the vigour test procedures (Hampton & TeKrony 1995).

The reliability of seed test results is measured by tolerances. The amount of allowable deviation from a standard or the allowable difference between test results is called a tolerance. These tolerances were obtained by comparing the observed results with the calculated distribution of results assuming random sampling variation only (Justice 1972; Thomson 1979; Bould 1986). For the conductivity test, tolerances of less than 4 or 5  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}/\text{g}$  between two replicates for readings in excess of 30  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}/\text{g}$  were suggested (Matthews & Powell 1981, 1987). Hampton & TeKrony (1995) proposed no more than 5  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}/\text{g}$  differences among four replicates. However, these tolerances are based on the actual variation found in tests, rather than on theoretical calculation (Hampton, pers. comm.).

The CD test is considered to have an advantage over the AA test in that the control of seed moisture is more accurate, and thus deterioration is controlled more readily (Matthews 1980). It can consistently predict seed field emergence (Matthews 1980; Powell & Matthews 1981), and storage ability (Powell & Matthews 1984a, 1984b) in small-seeded vegetable species, and also emergence of some larger seed species- e.g. garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) (Bustamante *et al.* 1984). However, raising seed moisture content using the filter paper method (Matthews 1980), and the high relative humidity method for large seeds, such as pea (Don *et al.* 1984; Bustamante *et al.* 1984) or maize (*Zea mays* L.) (Bruggink 1989), requires frequent weighing and is time and labour consuming, particular for large seeded species. The high RH method is considered impractical because it takes a few days to achieve the desired SMC (Powell 1995). The water added method is an easier way (Wang & Hampton 1991) and was reliable and repeatable in red clover (*Trifolium pratense* L.) (Wang & Hampton 1991) and mungbean (*Phaseolus mungo* L.) (Hampton *et al.* 1992a). However large variance was also reported in French bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) (Hampton *et al.* 1992a). In rape (*Brassica napus* L.) seed, the method resulted in bigger variance than the filter paper method because of inexpert use of micro-pipette and evaporation of water drops when sealing bags (Powell 1995). Which method of raising SMC to the desired level for the CD test is more accurate is still to be determined.

Hard seed in small-seeded legumes is common, and has ecological and economic significance. However, it causes problem in seedling establishment and seed testing. Hard seed breaking methods, such as sulphuric acid ( $H_2SO_4$ ) and mechanical scarification, which are appropriate for small seed lots and large seed lots respectively (Hare & Rolston 1985), can effectively break hard seed and not affect viability and germination if used at suitable concentrations, duration and speeds of the machines (Brant *et al.* 1971; Viado 1989; Fu *et al.* 1996). Seed vigour is a more sensitive parameter of seed quality. However, the effect of hard seed breaking method on seed vigour testing has scarcely been reported.

The objectives of this research, therefore, were:

- 1) To determine the effects of protectant but especially, some systemic fungicide and insecticide seed treatments on conductivity and AA testing using a variety of species;
- 2) To determine the tolerance for conductivity test results among four replicates of a seed lot using garden pea;
- 3) To compare the advantages and disadvantages of two methods (filter paper and water added methods) of raising seed moisture content (SMC) in the CD test using both large, i.e., garden pea, maize and small i.e., onion (*Allium cepa* L.), swede (*Brassica napus* var. *napobrassica* L.) seeded species, and to investigate the possibility of superseding the former with the latter method, thus widening the use of the CD test;
- 4) To determine the effects of H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and sandpaper methods of breaking hard seed on conductivity and AA testing of the small seeded legumes white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.) and lotus (*Lotus uliginosus* Schk.).