

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.

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

*In the Name of Allah,  
the Compassionate, the Merciful,*

**INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SIZE GRADING AND THE PHYSIOLOGICAL  
FACTORS LIMITING THE GERMINATION OF SUGAR BEET FRUITS**

A thesis presented in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Agricultural Science in Plant Science  
(Seed Technology) at Massey University,  
Palmerston North,  
New Zealand

**Majid Dehghan Shoar**

**1992**

## INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SIZE GRADING AND THE PHYSIOLOGICAL FACTORS LIMITING THE GERMINATION OF SUGAR BEET FRUITS

Supervisors:     **Dr. P. Coolbear**  
                      **Dr. J.G. Hampton**

### ABSTRACT

The quality and quantity of the sugar produced from sugar beet is strongly dependent on optimizing plant spacing in the field. Poor germinability and, in particular, low plant establishment, has long been a problem in sugar beet production, particularly in precision drill sowing systems designed to omit thinning, which is a time consuming process with high labour costs. In addition to physical and environmental stresses accruing in the field during germination and seedling emergence, fruit size and the physiological characteristics of the fruit itself have also been considered as very important factors involved in poor plant establishment.

This experiment was carried out using samples of three lots of a diploid monogerm cultivar (9597) which was released in Iran in 1985 and continues to be produced by the Sugar Beet Seed Institute of Iran (S.B.S.I.). According to the germination capacity of ungraded fruit, these lots were categorized as medium (LOT A), low (LOT B) and high (LOT C) quality lots and were selected to determine whether there was any similarity in the relationships between fruit size and quality within different lots.

Despite there being a linear and highly significant correlation ( $r= 0.96^{***}$ ) between fruit diameter and germination as well as fruit diameter and plant establishment in the low quality lot, the nature of these relationships in the medium and high quality lots

were different in that the large fruits showed equal or lower germination and planting value than the medium fruit sizes. No apparent relationship was found between fruit thickness and germination performance of the seed lots. Although there was no significant correlation between the laboratory standard germination result for both thickness and diameter graded fruits and plant establishment of the high quality lot, highly significant correlations were found between the laboratory germination and plant establishment of the size grades of the medium and poor quality lots ( $r= 0.91$  and  $0.99$  for Lots A and B, respectively). This appeared to be a function of the variation in germination performance of the size grades and suggests that, although in poor and medium quality lots the germination percentage of the fruit can sometimes be used as an index of field performance, in high quality lots more emphasis should be placed on the vigour of the seed.

The results obtained via size grading of the seed lots used in this study illustrated that 60% of harvested fruits of each lot were either too small or too big to be used for the precision drill sowing system. Further, it was also found that 24% of the fruits within the suitable size grades were either seedless (seeds aborted) or contained under-developed seed. X-radiography of the size graded fruits of the medium quality lot (A) illustrated that, despite the fact that immaturity was mostly associated with the smallest fruits (where 64% of the fruits were immature), about 18% of the larger fruits (4-5mm diameter) also contained immature seed.

An important point to note is that 11-12 % of fruits with fully mature seed in the small and larger size grades did not germinate when incubated in optimal conditions. In contrast, only 3% of the fruits of the medium size grade did not germinate. This indicates that other germination limiting factors besides immaturity are involved and that they may vary between size grades. Because of its role in impeding radicle emergence and/or oxygen entrance into the seed cavity, cap tightness is known to be an

important germination limiting factor in sugar beet. Thus the tighter the seed cap, the lower the germination of the fruit. Direct measurement of the force required for cap movement indicated that cap removal in larger fruits required a greater force than in small fruits. These results were in a similar range to those found by Morris *et al.* (1985) via indirect estimates, suggesting that enzymatic action on cap loosening is unlikely to play an important role in cap removal and therefore the direct method used in this study may be useful for selection of progenies with a reasonably loose seed cap.

Chemical inhibitory substances in the fruit pericarp have been shown to be the other important factors inhibiting germination of the seed. As they are water soluble, germination improvement may be obtained following prewashing of the fruits. Despite significant germination improvement on pleated paper after prewashing of the fruits of the high quality lot (C), no improvement was obtained via prewashing the size grades of the medium and poor quality lots. However, a significant germination improvement was achieved when prewashed fruits of the medium seed quality lot were incubated on a wetter substrate in Petri-dishes. It was found that the pericarp base is the main entry route of oxygen to the seed cavity and removal of this resulted in a 29% increase in germination percentage of the thick fruit of lot A when incubated in Petri-dishes. This is attributed to shortening the path for oxygen transfer to the seed cavity. However, a similar improvement in germination was also obtained via prewashing the intact fruit and a synergistic improvement in germination (45% increase) was found as a result of prewashing plus pericarp base removal. This could be explained on the basis of increased oxygen uptake into the embryo via the removal of both chemical and physical barriers to oxygen entry to the seed cavity, but requires confirmation by further research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise be to Almighty Allah, the Lord of Universe, and peace be upon prophet Muhammad s.a.w. and his family.

My sincere thanks to Dr. Peter Coolbear for his supervision and guidance in conducting the experiments and preparation of this thesis.

Appreciation and thanks are extended to Dr. John G. Hampton my co-supervisor for his valuable guidance.

I would like to thank Professor Murray J.Hill, Director of the Seed Technology Centre, Massey University, for his guidance and particularly, parental care and the other members of staff of the Seed Technology Centre, Massey University, namely Mrs Karen A Hill, Mrs Dulcie C Humphrey, Mr Robert C Southward and Mr Craig R McGill for their valuable help in this study.

I am particularly grateful to the Sugar Beet Research Institute of Iran and the Scholarship Department of the Ministry of Culture and Higher Education of the Islamic Republic of Iran for awarding me the scholarship to undertake this study.

I am also indebted to the kind people of my country who actually paid for the study. May my services to my country be a repayment to them.

# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLE</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>LIST OF PLATES</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xix</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1    THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANT ESTABLISHMENT IN SUGAR BEET PRODUCTION	1
1.2    GERMINATION LIMITING FACTORS IN SUGAR BEET SEED	2
1.3    OBJECTIVE	4
 <b>CHAPTER 2 THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANT ESTABLISHMENT IN SUGAR BEET PRODUCTION</b>	 6
2.2    THE STRUCTURAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL FEATURES OF THE REPRODUCTIVE UNITS OF SUGAR BEET	9
2.2.1 <b>Flowering and seed development in sugar beet</b>	9
2.2.2 <b>Fruit structure</b>	10
2.3    THE EFFECT OF SIZE GRADING ON GERMINATION PERFORMANCE OF SUGAR BEET SEED	14
2.3.1 <b>Fruit and true seed size effects on germination</b>	16
2.3.2 <b>Fruit and true seed size effects on the rate of                     emergence and seedling size</b>	20
2.3.3 <b>The effect of fruit and true seed weight on                     plant establishment</b>	21

2.3.4	<b>Relationship between germination and plant establishment</b>	22
2.4	PHYSIOLOGICAL BASIS OF LOW GERMINABILITY IN SUGAR BEET SEED	23
2.4.1	Physical inhibition by the seed coat and seed cap on seed germination	23
2.4.2	The inhibitory effect of sugar beet fruit water soluble substances on germination of the seed	26
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1	RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FRUIT SIZE AND SEED QUALITY IN THREE LOTS OF MONOGERM SUGAR BEET SEED	28
3.1.1	Seed sample	28
3.1.2	The grading process	30
3.1.2.1	<i>Diameter Grading</i>	30
3.1.2.2	<i>Thickness Grading</i>	31
3.1.3	Thousand fruit weights of the size grades	32
3.1.4	Weight measurements of the true seed, seed cap and the seed coat of the size graded fruits	37
3.1.5	To determine germination performance of the size graded fruits	37
3.1.6	Seedling dry weight measurements	38
3.1.7	Median radicle emergence times and uniformity of germination of the size graded fruits	38
3.1.8	To investigate the potential performance of size graded fruits in field conditions	39
3.2	THE PHYSIOLOGICAL BASIS OF LOW GERMINATION CAPACITY IN MONOGERM SUGAR BEET SEED	43

3.2.1	<b>Relationships between stage of seed maturity and germination percentage in size graded fruits.</b>	43
3.2.2	<b>Assessment of the effect of water soluble chemical substances in the fruit on seed germination</b>	46
3.2.3	<b>To determine physical inhibitory effect of the cap via measuring the force required for the seed cap movement at the time of radicle emergence</b>	46
3.2.3.1	<i>Construction</i>	46
3.2.3.2	<i>Fruit preparation and the process of measuring the force required for cap movement</i>	47
3.2.4	<b>To investigate the physiological function of the pericarp base of the fruit</b>	50
3.2.4.1	<i>Relationship between the thickness of the pericarp base and germination performance</i>	50
3.2.4.2	<i>To assess whether the pericarp bases reduce the germination percentage via limiting water uptake or via the rate of oxygen uptake during germination</i>	51
3.2.5	<b>Data analysis of the experiments</b>	53
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>RESULTS</b>	54
4.1.1	<b>Fruit size and fruit weight relationships</b>	54
4.1.2	<b>Relationship between fruit size and true seed, seed cap and seed coat dry weights</b>	56
4.1.2.1	<i>Fruit diameter and fruit fraction relationships</i>	57
4.1.2.2	<i>Fruit thickness and fruit fraction relationships</i>	57
4.1.2.3	<i>Relationships between fruit size and germination performance</i>	62
4.1.3.1	<i>Fruit diameter and germination</i>	62
4.1.3.2	<i>Fruit thickness and germination performance</i>	62

4.1.4	<b>Seedling dry weight and fruit size</b>	67
4.1.5	<b>Median radicle emergence time and uniformity of germination of the size graded fruits</b>	67
4.1.6	<b>Interaction between size grades and germination substrate</b>	73
4.1.7	<b>Fruit size and plant establishment relationships</b>	76
4.1.8	<b>Relationship between fruit size and field seedling dry weight</b>	76
4.1.9	<b>Post emergence factors limiting plant establishment</b>	77
4.2	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	85
4.2.1	<b>Fruit size and fruit weight relationship</b>	85
4.2.2	<b>Relationships between fruit size and fruit fractions</b>	86
4.2.2.1	<i>Fruit size, pericarp and true seed size relationships</i>	86
4.2.2.2	<i>Fruit size and seed cap relationships</i>	87
4.2.3	<b>The relationships between fruit size, germination and plant establishment of monogerm sugar beet seed</b>	88
4.2.4	<b>Fruit size and the speed of radicle emergence</b>	90
4.2.5	<b>The relationships between fruit size and seedling dry weight</b>	91
4.2.6	<b>Post emergence limiting factors for sugar beet establishment</b>	93
4.2.7	<b>Seed germination and plant establishment relationships</b>	93

## CHAPTER 5

5.1	INTRODUCTION	95
5.2	RESULTS	96
5.2.1	<b>Relation between stage of maturity as determined by x-radiography and germination percentage in size graded fruits</b>	96
5.2.2	<b>Assessment of the effect of inhibitors in the fruits on seed germination</b>	101
5.2.2.1	<i>Germination performance of prewashed and unwashed fruit on pleated paper</i>	101
5.2.2.2	<i>Germination performance of prewashed and unwashed fruit in petri-dishes</i>	104
5.2.3	<b>Measurement of the force required for seed cap movement.</b>	104
5.2.4	<b>To investigate physiological functions of fruit pericarp bases on germination of sugar beet seed</b>	106
5.2.4.1	<i>Comparison between water uptake capacity of the thinnest and thickest grades up to 36 hours after incubation in petri-dishes</i>	107
5.2.4.2	<i>Effect of fruit orientation on the media on germination performance of the thinnest and thickest fruits</i>	107
5.3	DISCUSSION (GERMINATION LIMITING FACTORS IN SUGAR BEET)	114
5.3.1	<b>Seed maturity stage, seed size and germination relationships</b>	114
5.3.2	<b>The inhibitory function of the fruit pericarp on seed germination</b>	118
5.3.2.1	<i>Inhibitory effect of water soluble substances in the fruit pericarp on seed germination.</i>	118

	x	
5.3.2.2	<i>The inhibitory function of the seed cap on seed germination</i>	120
5.3.2.3	<i>The inhibitory function of the pericarp base on germination performance of sugar beet seed</i>	122
5.3.3	<b>The relative importance of the inhibitory factors limiting germination of different fruit sizes of sugar beet</b>	124
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION AND SCOPE OF FURTHER WORK</b>	129
6.1	<b>ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE RESEARCH</b>	129
6.1.1	<b>The relationship between fruit size, germination performance and plant establishment of monogerm sugar beet seed.</b>	129
6.1.2	<b>Germination limiting factors in sugar beet seed</b>	131
6.1.2.1	<i>Significance of seed maturity stage and true seed size on seed germination</i>	131
6.1.2.2	<i>Germination inhibitory factors in sugar beet fruit</i>	132
6.2	<b>LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SCOPE FOR FURTHER WORK</b>	135
6.2.1	<b>Limitations of the study</b>	135
6.2.2	<b>Scope for further work</b>	136
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>		139

## LIST OF TABLES

		<b>PAGE</b>
Table 3.1	Date of harvest, germination percentage, moisture content, thousand fruit weight and seedling dry weight of ungraded samples of the seed lots.	29
Table 3.2	The proportion of diameter graded fruits with 2.25-3.25mm of thickness within the ungraded samples of the seed lots.	33
Table 3.3	The proportion of thickness graded fruits with 3.5-5mm of diameter within the ungraded samples of the seed lots.	34
Table 3.4a	Moisture contents of the diameter graded fruits of the seed lots.	35
Table 3.4b	Moisture contents of the thickness graded fruits of the seed lots.	36
Table 4.1a	Median radicle emergence times and uniformity of germination of thickness graded fruits of the medium quality lot (A) incubated in petri-dishes at 15°C.	71
Table 4.1b	Median radicle emergence times and uniformity of germination of diameter graded fruits of the medium quality lot (A) incubated in petri-dishes at 15°C.	72
Table 4.2a	Comparison between germination performance of the thickness graded fruits in petri-dishes at 15°C and on pleated paper at 20°C.	74
Table 4.2b	Comparison between germination performance of the diameter graded fruits in the petri-dishes at 15°C and on pleated paper at 20°C.	75

Table 5.1	Comparison between germination percentage of prewashed (4 hours in running water, P.W.F.) and the control (Unwashed, U.W.F.) of an ungraded sample of each lot.	102
Table 5.2	Comparison between germination percentage of prewashed (4 hours in running water, P.W.F.) and the control (Unwashed, U.W.F.) thickness graded fruits of lot C.	103
Table 5.3	Germination percentage, uniformity and median radicle emergence times (T50) of washed and unwashed thickest graded fruit with or without the pericarp base removed.	109
Table 5.4	Comparison between the germination performance (median radicle emergence time, T50 or uniformity, T90-T10) of fruits of the thinnest and thickest grades of LOT A as affected by the orientation of the fruits on the germination medium.	111
Table 5.3.1	The proportion by weight of fruits in Lot A within each fruit diameter class and the proportion of immature fruits within each of the size grades.	116
Table 5.3.2	Percentage of mature fruit and percentage of mature ungerminated fruits in the small (3-4mm), medium 4-5mm) and large fruit size (5-5.5mm) of Lot A.	125
Table 5.3.3	The effect of pericarp base removal and prewashing the fruit on germination percentage of thick fruits of the medium quality seed lot (A).	128

## LIST OF FIGURES

		PAGE
<b>Figure 2.1</b>	A cross section of a sugar beet true seed comprising embryo, endosperm, perisperm, newcellus and seed coat. (Addapted from Mayer, A.M. and Poljakoff-Mayber. A. 1989.	13
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	The relationship between fruit diameter and 1000 fruit weight of the lots.	55
<b>Figure 4.2</b>	The relationship between fruit thickness and 1000 fruit weight of the lots.	56
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	Proportions of seed coat, seed cap and true seed or germplasm (GP) to total weight of diameter graded fruits.	58
<b>Figure 4.4</b>	The relationship between fruit diameter and 1000 true seed weight of each of the lots.	59
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	The relationship between fruit diameter and 1000 seed cap weight of each of the lots.	60
<b>Figure 4.6</b>	Proportions of seed coat, seed cap and true seed or germplasm (GP) to total weight of thickness graded fruits.	61
<b>Figure 4.7</b>	Germination percentage of diameter grades at 20°C.	63
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	The linear correlation between fruit diameter and germination percentage in the poor quality lot (LOT B).	64
<b>Figure 4.9</b>	The relationships between fruit diameter and germination percentage in LOT A and LOT C.	65

<b>Figure 4.10</b>	Germination percentage of thickness grades at 20°C.	66
<b>Figure 4.11</b>	Example of the relationship between true seed weight and seedling dry weight of the thickness graded fruits in the medium quality lot (LOT A).	68
<b>Figure 4.12</b>	Fruit diameter and 1000 seedling dry weight relationships of the lots.	69
<b>Figure 4.13</b>	Fruit thickness and seedling dry weight relationships in the seed lots.	70
<b>Figure 4.14</b>	The linear correlation between fruit diameter and plant establishment in the poor quality lot (LOT B).	78
<b>Figure 4.15</b>	The relationship between fruit diameter and plant establishment in the medium (A) and high quality lot (C).	79
<b>Figure 4.16</b>	Field establishment of the thickness graded fruits in the seed lots.	80
<b>Figure 4.17</b>	The correlation between laboratory germination and plant establishment of different size grades for each of the lots.	81
<b>Figure 4.18</b>	Shoot dry weights of seedlings 45 d after field sowing and fruit thickness relationships of the lots.	82
<b>Figure 4.19</b>	Shoot dry weights of seedlings 45 d after field sowing and fruit diameter relationships of the lots.	83
<b>Figure 5.1</b>	The correlation between fruit diameter and the percentage of empty or seedless fruits as determined by X-radiography.	97

<b>Figure 5.2</b>	The relationship between fruit diameter and percentage of under-developed seed as determined by X-radiography.	98
<b>Figure 5.3</b>	The correlation between fully mature seed, as determined by X-radiography, and percentage of germination.	99
<b>Figure 5.4</b>	The correlation between fruit diameter and percentage of abnormal seedlings in LotA.	100
<b>Figure 5.5</b>	The weight (Newtons) applied to remove the seed cap from the coat of biggest (5-5.5mm) and smallest (3-3.5mm) fruit of Lot A.	105
<b>Figure 5.6</b>	Increase in the fresh weight of the thinnest (-) and thickest fruit (O) of Lot A after different incubation times at 15°C.	110

## LIST OF PLATES

		PAGE
<b>Plate 2.1</b>	Morphological characteristics of a monogerm sugar beet fruit (Plate 2.1a) and also structure of the fruit comprising pericarp (P), True seed (T) and Seed cap (C) (Plate 2.1b).	12
<b>Plate 2.2</b>	The process of seed cap movement and radicle emergence in a monogerm sugar beet fruit which occurs due to the expansion of the true seed during the imbibition phase.	19
<b>Plate 3.1</b>	Labeling the emerged seedling in the field trial. This was carried out for monitoring the post emergence limiting factors of sugar beet plant establishment.	42
<b>Plate 3.2</b>	An example photograph of the X-rayed fruits. From this plate it can be illustrates the internal structure of fruits and shows whether the cup cavity is filled by the true seed or not.	45
<b>Plate 3.3</b>	Construction of the instrument used in this study for direct measurement of the seed cap tightness of sugar beet fruit.	48
<b>Plate 3.4</b>	The process of direct measurement of seed cap tightness of sugar beet fruit.	49
<b>Plate 4.1</b>	Maize Seedling Beetle ( <i>Clivina-rugithrox</i> ) which caused some plant establishment losses through cutting shoot of growing seedlings.	84
<b>Plate 5.1</b>	Scanning electron micrographs (X 25) of the thickest (3.25-3.5mm, A) and thinnest (2.25-2.4, B) fruits of Lot A. In this picture, the pericarp base (P), true seed or germplasm (g) and the seed coat (S) are shown.	108

- Plate 5.2** Scanning electron micrographs (X 53.75) of the pericarp base (P) of the thickest fruit of Lot A (3.25-3.5mm) comprised of many pores filled with irregularly shaped loosely packed cells. In this picture, a layer of lignified cells (L), testa (t), and germplasm (g) are shown. 112
- Plate 5.3** Scanning electron micrographs (X 537.5) of a layer of lignified cells in the pericarp base of the thickest fruit (3.25-3.5) LotA (A). Calcium (Ca) was the only metal element identified by Energy Dispersal X-ray Spectroscopy, apart from gold (Au) which was sprayed onto the specimen to obtain contrast (B). 113

## LIST OF APPENDICES

**Appendix 1** The formula used in this study for measurement of the median radicle emergence time (T50) and uniformity

**Appendix 2** Lay out of the field experiment using Randomized Block Design with six replications

**Appendix 3** Soil description of the field trial

**Appendix 4** Relative humidity from seed sowing to harvest time

**Appendix 5** Seed bed moisture content during seedling emergence and growth up to the harvest time

**Appendix 6** Seed bed temperature from seed sowing to harvest time

**Appendix 7** Maximum and minimum air temperature in the field from seed sowing to harvest time

## CHAPTER I

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANT ESTABLISHMENT IN SUGAR BEET PRODUCTION

Sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*), which was recognized as early as the 16th century as a plant with valuable properties (Thomas Theis 1971), is presently grown on over nine million hectares, mainly in the temperate regions of the Northern Hemisphere. The most important production areas are the former USSR with 3,526,000 ha., Europe 3,873,000 ha., Germany 418,000 ha. and USA 418,000 ha., (Durrant *et al.*, 1986).

Sugar beet is a biennial plant which accumulates a reserve food supply in the root during its first growing season to enable the plant to survive over the winter and produce flowering stems and seed, (correctly fruit) in the following year. In sugar beet, the term 'monogerm' is used when a cluster includes one fruit and 'multigerm' when more than one fruit makes a cluster. Normally sugar beet fruit are monocarpic; therefore, each fruit contains a single seed which is called a true seed or germplasm, comprising the embryo, food reserves (perisperm and cotyledons) and testa. The true seed lies horizontally in the cavity of a cup-shaped pericarp (commonly referred to as the seed coat rather than the fruit coat) and is covered by a removable cap (usually termed the seed cap) which is usually strongly attached to the pericarp.

Except when grown for seed production, the life cycle is usually interrupted by harvesting the root during the first season of growth when the sugar content is high. Besides being grown for sugar production, beet tops are used for animal feed, as is the pelleted mixture of pulp and molasses which remains after the sugar extraction process. In addition, this crop may be grown for ethanol production.

Usually the quality and the quantity of sugar produced from sugar beet is strongly dependent on the plant density and, in particular, optimizing the plant spacing. Normally 50-60 cm rows are prepared with inter- row distances of 15 - 20 cm (see section 2.1). Planting high vigour seed is an essential pre-requisite for obtaining suitable plant establishment. According to the literature (discussed in section 2.2), poor germinability and, in particular, low plant establishment, has long been a problem in sugar production, particularly in the precision drill system which has been designed to omit thinning, a time consuming process with high labour costs.

## **1.2 GERMINATION LIMITING FACTORS IN SUGAR BEET SEED**

Because of the plants, cross pollinating nature, indeterminate flowering habit, and also extensive intra- and inter-plant competition on the parent plant, every lot of sugar beet seed comprises a wide range of seed size and maturity grades and these may not be of equal value for sowing. Owing to these problems, the producers of commercial fruit have to reject large amounts of the seed bulk during processing to provide a good quality seed lot of a standard size to use in the precision drill system (2.25-3.25mm thickness, 3.25- 4.5mm diameter and more than 85 % germination under optimal conditions). Besides losing lots which are under and over standard grades, this grading

process is time consuming and also needs a high level of expertise. Thus this kind of seed is expensive to produce. Nevertheless, even after grading poor establishment still remains a problem for commercial sugar beet production.

There is some debate about the reason for poor seed germination. Snyder (1963), for example, showed that the presence of physico-chemical inhibitors in the seed coat of beet seed may delay the emergence and/or diminish final germination, while Grimwade *et al.* (1987) suggested that the presence of underdeveloped and shrivelled seed and seedless or empty fruits are the main causes of poor quality in beet seed. However, the interactions between these factors and involvement of others should also be taken into account in explaining low germination and, in particular, the poor stand establishment characteristic of the beet seed.

Although a lot of effort has been made to highlight the relative effects of the different factors involved, there is still argument in this area, no doubt because of the wide range of different variables and multiple interactions between them, and with the environmental conditions of the seed bed (see literature review). In addition, there are some aspects of seed performance which have not yet been investigated: for example, the effect of fruit thickness on germination and establishment, the rate of water and oxygen uptake in different sized fruits, and the effects of seed quality on seedling establishment after field emergence.

### **1.3 OBJECTIVE**

By building on previous research, this study was carried out with the following objectives:

- 1.3.1 To assess the effect of two different size grading methods (based on thickness and diameter grading) on fruit and true seed weight.**
- 1.3.2 To determine the relationship between size grades and percentage, speed, and uniformity of seedling emergence.**
- 1.3.3 To investigate the relationships between fruit size, true seed weight and the seedling dry weight.**
- 1.3.4 To investigate and determine the relative importance of the factors limiting germination, including inhibitory substances in the seed coat and the physical inhibitory functions of the seed coat and the cap.**
- 1.3.5 To evaluate whether the X-ray technique can be use as a reliable method for predicting the germinability of seed.**
- 1.3.6 To determine the relationship between standard germination results and plant establishment.**

**1.3.7 To define the relationships between the fruit diameter and thickness and plant establishment and seedling dry weight in the field.**

**1.3.8 To identify the factors which reduce plant establishment after emergence in the field under New Zealand conditions.**

To fulfil these objectives, two series of experiments were conducted in this study:

The first stage was designed to define the relationship between fruit size and true seed, seedling dry weight, seed cap and seed coat weight and to evaluate percentage and speed of seedling emergence in both optimal laboratory conditions and also in the field. In addition, factors which may reduce plant establishment after seedling emergence were also investigated. All these results are discussed in chapter four. The second set of experiments was designed to investigate the physiological basis of the germination performance of monogerm sugar beet seed including, the relationship between the stage of seed maturity as determined by X-radiography and germination percentage in size graded fruits, the assessment of the effects of physical and chemical inhibitors in the fruits on seed germination, and also to investigate the physiological properties fruit pericarp bases in relation to germination. The results of this set of experiments are presented and discussed in chapter five.