

**FEB - FRESENIUS ENVIRONMENTAL BULLETIN**

Founded jointly by F. Korte and F. Coulston

Production by PSP - Vimy Str. 1e, 85354 Freising, Germany in  
cooperation with PRT-Parlar Research & Technology

Vimy Str 1e, 85354 Freising

Copyright© by PSP and PRT, Vimy Str. 1e, 85354 Freising, Germany

All rights are reserved, especially the right to translate into foreign language or other processes - or convert to a machine language, especially for data processing equipment - without written permission of the publisher. The rights of reproduction by lecture, radio and television transmission, magnetic sound recording or similar means are also reserved.

**Printed in Germany-ISSN 1018-4619**

**FEB-EDITORIAL BOARD****CHIEF EDITOR:**

**Prof. Dr. Dr. H. Parlar**  
Parlar Research & Technology-PRT  
Vimy Str.1e  
85354 Freising, Germany

**MANAGING EDITOR:**

**Dr. P. Parlar**  
Parlar Research & Technology  
PRT, Vimy Str.1e  
85354 Freising, Germany

---

**CO-EDITORS:****Environmental Spectroscopy**

**Prof. Dr. A. Piccolo**  
Universita di Napoli "Frederico II"  
Dipto. Di Scienze Chimica Agrarie  
Via Universita 100, 80055 Portici, Italy

**Environmental Biology**

**Prof. Dr. G. Schuurmann**  
UFZ-Umweltzentrum  
Sektion Chemische Ökotoxikologie  
Leipzig-Halle GmbH,  
Permoserstr.15, 04318  
04318 Leipzig, Germany

**Prof. Dr. I. Holoubek**  
Recetox-Tocoen  
Kamenice126/3, 62500 Brno, Czech Republic

**Prof. Dr. M. Hakki Alma**

Igdir Universitesi  
76000, Igdir, Turkey

**Environmental Analytical Chemistry**

**Prof. Dr. M. Bahadir**  
Lehrstuhl für Ökologische Chemie  
und Umweltanalytik  
TU Braunschweig  
Lehrstuhl für Ökologische Chemie  
Hagenring 30, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany

**Dr. D. Kotzias**

Via Germania29  
21027 Barza(Va), Italy

---

**Advisory Board**

**K. Bester, K. Fischer, R. Kallenborn**  
**DCG. Muir, R. Niessner, W. Vetter,**  
**A. Reichlmayr-Lais, D. Steinberg,**  
**J. P. Lay, J. Burhenne, L. O. Ruzo**

**Environmental Management**

**Dr. K. I. Nikolaou**  
Env. Protection of Thessaloniki  
OMPEPT-54636 Thessaloniki  
Greece

**Environmental Toxicology**

**Prof. Dr. H. Greim**  
Senatkommission – DFG / TUM  
85350 Freising, Germany

**Environmental Proteomic**

**Dr. A. Fanous**  
Halal Control GmbH  
Stahlstraße 44  
D-65428 Rüsselsheim, Germany

**Environmental Education**

**Prof. Dr. C. Bayat**  
Yeni Yüzyil Üniversitesi  
34010 Zeytinburnu, Istanbul, Turkey

**Environmental Medicine**

**Prof. Dr. I. Tumen**  
Bandirma 17 Eylül Üniversitesi  
10200 Bandirma, Turkey

---

**Marketing Manager**

**Cansu Ekici, MSc. of B.A.**  
PRT-Research and Technology  
Vimy Str 1e  
85354 Freising, Germany  
**E-Mail: [parlar@wzw.tum.de](mailto:parlar@wzw.tum.de)**  
**[parlar@prt-parlar.de](mailto:parlar@prt-parlar.de)**  
**Phone: +49/8161887988**



**Fresenius Environmental Bulletin is abstracted/indexed in:**

**Biology & Environmental Sciences, BIOSIS, CAB International, Cambridge Scientific abstracts, Chemical Abstracts, Current Awareness, Current Contents/Agriculture, CSA Civil Engineering Abstracts, CSA Mechanical & Transportation Engineering, IBIDS database, Information Ventures, NISC, Research Alert, Science Citation Index (SCI), Scisearch, Selected Water Resources Abstracts**

---

## CONTENTS

### ORIGINAL PAPERS

BIOINDICATIVE OPERATION OF POLLUTANTS FROM MINE TAILINGS IN THE KISNICA MINE AND FLY ASH FROM THE THERMAL POWER PLANT OBILIC ON VEGETABLE PLANTS	2615
<b>Milica Stankovic-Popic, Radmila Trajkovic, Ljubomir Sunic, Zoran S Ilic</b>	
COMPETITION FOR CONSERVATION: OBSERVATION OF 1 <sup>ST</sup> PRUSSIAN CARP <i>CARASSIUS GIBELIO</i> (BLOCH, 1782) CATCHING COMPETITION IN GOKPINAR DAM POND (DENIZLI/TURKEY)	2626
<b>Esat Tarik Topkara, Bahar Bayhan, Hulya Saygi</b>	
VISUAL IMPACT OF WIND TURBINES ON LANDSCAPE QUALITY – A CASE STUDY	2632
<b>Marta Lisiak, Klaudia Borowiak, Jolanta Kanclerz, Anna Adamska, Ewelina Janicka, Anna Budka, Anna Libront</b>	
EVALUATING THE WORK ENVIRONMENT IN TURKISH FURNITURE INDUSTRY FROM THE POINT OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY	2639
<b>Devrim Karademir, Kucuk Huseyin Koc</b>	
SOME METALS AND ANTI-BROWNING AGENTS EFFECTS ON POLYPHENOL OXIDASE FROM PRINCESS TREE LEAVES	2646
<b>Gulnur Arabaci, Cengiz Cesko, Ayse Usluoglu</b>	
AN INTEGRATED FUZZY MULTI CRITERIA DECISION MAKING METHOD FOR SUSTAINABLE (GREEN) PACKAGING MATERIALS SELECTION: AN APPLICATION IN TURKEY	2653
<b>Bahadir Gulsun, Pinar Mic</b>	
INVESTIGATION OF PROSPECTIVE SCIENCE TEACHERS' OPINIONS AND SENSITIVITY TOWARDS ENVIRONMENT	2662
<b>Ebru Ezberci Cevik, Mehmet Altan Kurnaz</b>	
MONTHLY VARIATION OF PHARMACEUTICALLY VALUABLE ALKALOIDS, GALANTHAMINE AND LYCORINE, IN SUMMER SNOWFLAKE ( <i>LEUCOJUM AESTIVUM</i> L.)	2670
<b>Mustafa Arslan, Arzu Birinci Yildirim, Erva Ozkan, Fatma Betul Oktelik, Arzu Ucar Turker</b>	
NEW OR LESS KNOWN SPECIES OF MICROFUNGI FOR TURKEY	2678
<b>Makbule Erdogdu</b>	
EFFECTS OF MEDITERRANEAN CUTTLEFISH ( <i>SEPIA OFFICINALIS</i> ) BONE AS AN ALTERNATIVE CALCIUM SOURCE ON EGG PRODUCTION, EGG QUALITY AND SOME BLOOD PARAMETERS IN LAYING QUAILS	2683
<b>Kadir Emre Bugdayci, M Numan Oguz, Fatma Karakas Oguz, Isa Can Uyguralp, Ilker Yusuf Akinci</b>	
EFFECTS OF DIMETHYL SULFOXIDE (DMSO) AND THAWING RATES ON SPERM MOTILITY FOR CRYOPRESERVATION OF SPERM IN GILTHEAD SEABREAM ( <i>SPARUS AURATA</i> )	2691
<b>Serhat Engin, Sahin Saka, Kursat Firat</b>	
<i>IN VITRO</i> APPROACHES FOR SHORTENING GENERATION CYCLES AND FASTER BREEDING OF LOW $\beta$ -N-OXALYL-L- $\alpha$ , $\beta$ -DIAMINOPROPIONIC ACID CONTENT OF GRASS PEA ( <i>LATHYRUS SATIVUS</i> L.)	2698
<b>Surendra Barpete, Priyanka Gupta, Khalid Mahmood Khawar, Sebahattin Ozcan, Shiv Kumar</b>	
STUDY ON PARTIAL DISCHARGE SIGNAL DENOISING OF TRANSFORMER	2707
<b>Yanyan Zheng, Yongli Zhu</b>	
SHELF LIFE OF FARMED SEA BASS ( <i>DICENTRARCHUS LABRAX</i> , L. 1758) TREATED WITH <i>BACILLUS SUBTILIS</i> (KUEN 1593) UNDER COLD STORAGE	2711
<b>Eylem Ezgi Fadiloglu</b>	
INHIBITORY AND SYNERGISTIC EFFECT OF NOVEL COMBINED ACTIVE SUBSTANCES OF FUNGICIDES AGAINST SELECTED PLANT PATHOGENS	2719
<b>Piotr Iwaniuk, Bozena Lozowicka</b>	
MODELING OF NEAR-FIELD DILUTION OF BRINE DISCHARGES: A CASE STUDY IN SAMSUN BAY	2725
<b>Asu Inan, Lale Balas</b>	

FABRICATED AgBr/rGO/g-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> HYBRID PHOTOCATALYST FOR ENHANCED PHOTOCATALYTIC DEGRADATION OF TETRACYCLINE <b>Zhiguang Yang, Xiaoming Shi, Peng Peng, Yueyun Yang, Yunlin Li</b>	2732
INVESTIGATION OF WASTE FOUNDRY SAND AND SEWAGE SLUDGE REUSE AS LANDFILL CAP LAYER MATERIAL <b>Gulgun Dede, Ayse Bengu Sunbul, Mirac Gedikli</b>	2739
INTERDEPENDENCE OF CYTOTOXIC ACTIVITIES OF BIOACTIVE COMPONENTS IN BLACK SEED ( <i>NIGELLA SATIVA</i> L.) ESSENTIAL OIL AND INTRACELLULAR ZINC LEVELS <b>Olcay Boyacioglu</b>	2746
POLLUTION ASSESSMENT AND SOURCE APPROXIMATION OF HEAVY METALS IN THE SOIL ALONG A MAIN ROAD WITH HIGH DENSITY OF TRAFFIC <b>Han Sun, Linhua Sun, Yu Li, Xiaojun Gao, Zixiang Zhao</b>	2752
ASSESSMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS TO NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA <b>Ljubica Duskov, Dejan Filipovic, Vladimir Djurdjevic</b>	2758
DETERMINATION OF SOME QUALITY PROPERTIES OF ENSEILED FORAGE TURNIP ( <i>BRASSICA RAPA</i> L.) WITH DIFFERENT ADDITIVES <b>Ilkay Cetin, Asuman Arslan Duru</b>	2766
THE EFFECT OF KNIFE TYPE ON CUTTING CHARACTERISTICS OF COTTON STALK <b>Resat Esgici</b>	2772
ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC PROGRAMMING FOR ESTIMATING RAINFALL-RUNOFF HYDROLOGICAL EVENTS <b>Muhammet Omer Dis, Mehmet Unsal, Ayse Ece Yagci</b>	2778
DETERMINATION OF ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE AND CRISPR 2.1 LOCI OF <i>ESCHERICHIA COLI</i> ISOLATED FROM SEYHAN INLAND LAKE ADANA, TURKEY <b>Anil Delik, Esra Sunduz Yigittekin, Fatima Masume Uslu, Sadik Dincer</b>	2784
ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSIS OF GREEN TOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS BASED ON MATHEMATICAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS METHOD <b>Ting Zheng</b>	2792
DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDES IN FARMER HAIRS FOR THE BIOMONITORING OF EXPOSURE IN CUKUROVA REGION, TURKEY <b>Nebile Daglioglu, Pinar Efeoglu Ozseker, Nigar Yarpuz Bozdogan, Evsen Guzel</b>	2802
DETERMINATION OF NUT PROPERTIES AND CHEMICAL COMPOSITIONS OF WALNUT ( <i>JUGLANS REGIA</i> L.) GENOTYPES GROWN IN WALNUT-FRUIT FORESTS OF KYRGYZSTAN <b>Umran Erturk, Ali Osman Solak, Sevil Yucel, Kaliypa Saliyeva, Zeki Severoglu, Ibrahim Ilker Ozyigit, Bakit Borkoyev</b>	2809
NATURAL OCCURRENCE OF AFLATOXIN B <sub>1</sub> IN DRY FRUITS OF GILGIT-BALTISTAN, PAKISTAN <b>Shamsher Ali, Azhar Ali, Ali Sartaj, Maher Ali, Ali Amjad</b>	2818
MAPPING VEGETATION OF WETLAND BASED UPON AN OBJECT-ORIENTED CLASSIFICATION WITH HIGH RESOLUTION ORTHOPHOTOS <b>Fulsen Ozen</b>	2823
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CONVENTIONAL COAGULATION AND SLUDGE RECYCLING ENHANCED COAGULATION FOR LOW-TURBIDITY SOURCE WATER: THE EFFECT AND APPLICABILITY <b>Zipai Li, Lei Fang, Yan Zhang, Yunxia Miao</b>	2834
YIELD AND QUALITY TRAITS OF SOME SILAGE MAIZE CULTIVARS <b>Hakan Kir</b>	2843
STUDY ON GREEN SAFETY PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGY IN MODERN COAL MINES <b>Lianchun Zhou, Jinshan Zhang</b>	2850
TIME-DEPENDENT CHANGES OF HEPATIC ENZYME ACTIVITIES AND THYROID HORMONES IN <i>CARASSIUS AURATUS</i> EXPOSED TO 2,2',4,4'-TETRABROMODIPHENYL ETHER (BDE 47) <b>Mengnan Shen, Jie Cheng, Shixiang Gao, Na Li, Hai Lu</b>	2858
URBAN INTRINSIC PROCESS AND ITS APPLICATION IN SPATIAL DATABASE UNDER DIFFERENT RAIN CONDITIONS BASED ON GIS <b>Tianhe Yin, Qiting Huang, Zelin Qin, Chao Wang</b>	2869



STUDY ON RURAL INTELLIGENT PLANNING COOPERATIVE PLATFORM <b>Liquan Wang, Linjun Jin</b>	2879
THE NUMERICAL SIMULATION RESEARCH OF HIGH PRESSURE MIST SPRAY BASED ON MULTIPHASE FLOW THEORY <b>Lin Yang, Shaocheng Ge, Zhihui Huang, Deji Jing, Xi Chen</b>	2886
EFFECTS OF SOWING DATE AND NITROGEN APPLICATION RATE ON WHEAT YIELD AND YIELD COMPONENT FACTOR IN JIANGHUAI PLAIN <b>Chengfang He, Hongjie Zhu, Xiangqiang Kong, Xiaoming Yan</b>	2891
PLASTICITY IN BEHAVIOR OF TURKISH MALTING BARLEY CULTIVARS UNDER SEMI-ARID AND CONTINENTAL CLIMATIC CONDITIONS <b>Abdulveli Sirat, Bilge Bahar</b>	2897
RISK ASSESSMENT OF TORRENTIAL RAIN AND FLOOD DISASTER IN DATONG RIVER BASIN BASED ON FLOOD AREA MODEL <b>Haitao Wang, Shuwen Zhang, Xuedong Li, Bin Wang</b>	2908
SOME MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS, DISTRIBUTION AND POPULATION DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEST <i>SYNANTHEDON VESPIFORMIS</i> L. (LEPIDOPTERA: SESIIDAE) IN CHESTNUT AREAS, TURKEY <b>Cevdet Kaplan</b>	2917
STUDY ON THE SEQUENCE DIVISION AND RESERVOIR OF MIDDLE PERMIAN IN CENTRAL SICHUAN BASIN, CHINA <b>Jingying Wang, Ying Guo, Bin Ni, Guangying Ren, Xiaofei Shang, Yong Yang</b>	2925
IDENTIFICATION OF THE LATE TRIASSIC CHANG 6 <sub>3</sub> PERIOD SLOPE BELT IN THE CENTRAL ORDOS BASIN AND OIL AND GAS GEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE <b>Jianbo Liao, Aihua Xi, Zhiyong Li, Jing Deng, Huaqing Liu, Xiangbo Li, Wanyan Rong</b>	2932
QUANTITATIVE PREDICTION OF ORGANIC COMPONENTS IN SHALE OIL RESERVOIRS USING AN IMPROVED $\Delta \log R$ METHOD <b>Yinhao Dong</b>	2942
THE INVESTIGATION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF USING RED CALIFORNIA EARTHWORM ( <i>EISENIA FETIDA</i> ) MEAL AS AN ALTERNATIVE PROTEIN SOURCE IN RAINBOW TROUT ( <i>ONCORHYNCHUS MYKISS</i> ) DIET <b>Huriye Ariman Karabulut, Zeynep Bayraktar, Ilker Zeki Kurtoglu, Turan Yuksek</b>	2951
A STUDY ON DIESEL PARTICULATE FILTER STAGED LINEAR SOOT LOADING ESTIMATION BASED ON PRESSURE DROP <b>Jinchi Dai, Hailong Pang, Yan Yu, Jianguo Bu, Xinyun Zi</b>	2960
EXOGENOUS ROOTING AGENT (GGR-6) ALLEVIATES HARMFUL EFFECT OF DROUGHT STRESS ON SEEDLINGS OF PERENNIAL RYEGRASS <b>Jinyang Qi, Siddique Muhammad, Jingyao Tian, Jixiang Lin, Jinghong Wang</b>	2969
STUDY ON ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR AND DRUG-RESISTANT GENE EMISSION CHARACTERISTICS OF $\beta$ -LACTAM ANTIBIOTICS IN DRUG PRODUCTION PROCESS <b>Jingqiong Xiao, Xiuqin Wang, Liming Zheng, Dandan Ma</b>	2975
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON DAMAGE CHARACTERISTICS OF DIRT BAND BY SHAPED CHARGE BLASTING IN COAL SEAM <b>Yangbo Pan</b>	2982
PROPERTIES EVALUATION AND APPLICATION OF A NOVEL DRILLING FLUID WITH STRONG PLUGGING AND INHIBITION PERFORMANCE <b>Jianghong Jia, Zhongwen Song, Xiaoming Zhang</b>	2993
AFLATOXIN M <sub>1</sub> CONCENTRATION IN MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS FROM AYDIN PROVINCE, TURKEY <b>Selda Bulca</b>	3003
MULTIVARIATE ASSESSMENT OF WATER CHEMISTRY AND METALS IN A RIVER IMPACTED BY TANNING INDUSTRY <b>Usman Atique, Sonia Iqbal, Noor Khan, Bainazir Qazi, Aqeel Javeed, Khalid Mahmood Anjum, Muhammad Sultan Haider, Tanveer Ali Khan, Sajid Mahmood, Shahid Sherzada</b>	3013
EFFECT OF WATER CONSUMPTION CHARACTERISTICS ON WATER PRODUCTION FUNCTION OF SOYBEAN IN COLD BLACK SOIL AREA <b>Yanyu Lin, Shujuan Yi, Mengxue Wang, Mingyao Wang, Xiaolei He, Xu Zhou</b>	3026
EFFECT OF FOLIAR APPLICATION OF IRON (Fe) AND MOLIBDENUM (Mo) ON YIELD, PROTEIN AND NODULATION IN SOYBEAN UNDER AGRO CLIMATIC CONDITIONS OF SANLIURFA <b>Erdal Erbil, Ali Beyhan Ucak, Timucin Tas, Mehmet Karakus, Cemil Yetkin</b>	3033



SEDIMENTARY FACIES MODEL IN THE SOUTHWESTERN PART OF THE Qaidam Basin, China <b>Bing Hao, Xinyuan Ma, Qingfeng Zhang, Jianhua Zhong, Ningliang Sun</b>	3040
VEGAN VS. MEAT: CATEGORIZATION OF PLATE WASTE IN RESTAURANTS <b>Neven Voca, Eda Puntaric, Jona Suric, Dunja Kunjko</b>	3048
DETERMINATION OF Dioxins/Furans in Human Gallbladder Stones and Gallbladder Tissues as Indicator for Environmental Contaminations <b>Sharif Arar, Samer Awaideh, Mohammed H Kailani, Mahmoud Alawi</b>	3056
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON RESISTIVITY CHARACTERISTICS OF PURPLE SOIL IN DRYING SHRINKAGE PROCESS IN THREE GORGES RESERVOIR AREA, CHINA <b>Zhengcheng Wang, Xin Tang, Haitao Mao, Jiwei Shen, Tingqiang Zhou</b>	3072
A NOVEL NON-UNIFORM CLUSTERING ALGORITHM FOR WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS BASED ON ECOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS <b>Yan Li</b>	3084
GEOLOGICAL MODELING AND STABILITY ANALYSIS OF HORIZONTAL WALL IN TYPICAL SHALE GAS BLOCKS-TAKING WEI 202 BLOCK FOR EXAMPLE <b>Qihua Ran</b>	3091
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOPELESSNESS AND SELF-ESTEEM OF PREGNANT WOMEN: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN SOUTH EASTERN TURKEY <b>Ilknur Yesilcinar, Derya Yanik, Sahide Akbulut</b>	3102
IMPACT OF DYNAMIC FAULT DAMAGE TO CAPROCK ON OIL AND GAS RECOVERY OF TIGHT SANDSTONE <b>Yu Zhu</b>	3110
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FRIENDLY MODIFIED CELLULOSE AS RHEOLOGY MODIFIER IN CLAY-FREE WATER-BASED DRILLING FLUIDS <b>Junyi Liu</b>	3118
COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF BIODIVERSITY IN SOUTHERN GUIZHOU PROVINCE, CHINA <b>Lulu Liu, Quanqin Shao</b>	3126
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON THE FLOW CHARACTERISTICS OF JET IMPINGEMENT IN MICRO-SCALE ENVIRONMENT <b>Jie Zheng, Yarong Zhang, Yihua Dou</b>	3134
A NOVEL CONCURRENT RISK IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS METHOD FOR EQUIPMENT FAILURE BY COMBINING PETRI NET REASONING AND AN EXTENDED FMEA USING FOR SAFE OIL AND GAS STORAGE AND TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENT <b>Meng Zhang, Wei Liang, Weijun Li, Yanfen Yang</b>	3144
RESEARCH ON A NOVEL LASER DETECTION METHOD FOR CASING DAMAGE OF CNG GAS STORAGE WELL AND FIELD TRIAL <b>Liansheng Qin, Jian Du, Shiyong Cao, Han Liu</b>	3154
RESEARCH ON THE PREDICTION OF DIRECTIONAL WELL SAFE DENSITY WINDOW AND THE INFLUENCES OF FORMATION PARAMETERS <b>Peng Huang, Zhiqiang Huang</b>	3166
INFLUENCE OF DISPLACEMENT VELOCITY ON THE EFFECT OF THE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY OF BINARY COMPOSITE FLOODING IN LONG CORE <b>Yuting Pan, Zhiquan Zhang</b>	3173
ANALYSIS ON THE INFLUENCING FACTORS OF MODERN FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT IN RECLAMATION AREA BASED ON ECOLOGICAL SECURITY--TAKING HEILONGJIANG PROVINCE AS AN EXAMPLE <b>Wanjing Dong, Dapeng Jiang, Hongbo Li, Yingli Huang</b>	3184
IMPACT FORCE CALCULATION OF CHAIN DRIVE AND MODEL ANALYSIS OF FLEXIBLE GRAPHITE SHEET BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF NOISE REDUCTION AND ENERGY SAVING <b>Wei Jiang, Wei Li, Congwang Bao</b>	3193



STUDY ON WATERFLOODING MODEL OF FRACTURED GLUTENITE RESERVOIR - TAKING THE LOWER WUERHE FORMATION IN THE EIGHTH AREA OF KARAMAY OILFIELD AS AN EXAMPLE <b>Yangzhi Shi, Weifeng Li, Xiaojing Wang, Jie Zhang</b>	3201
MICROPORE STRUCTURE CHARACTERISTICS OF TIGHT OIL RESERVOIRS IN THE YANCHANG FORMATION IN THE ORDOS BASIN, CHINA <b>Tianjin Zhang, Gang Zhang, Lushe Zhang</b>	3212
DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A NOVEL ENVIRONMENTAL FRIENDLY CHATBOT BASED ON VSM AND RASPBERRY PI WITH ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION KNOWLEDGE <b>Linyan Ouyang, Xi Luo, Linsheng Xiong</b>	3223
NITROGEN REMOVAL IN DITCH WETLAND SYSTEMS: EFFECTS OF HYDRAULIC RETENTION TIME (HRT) AND SPATIAL CONFIGURATION <b>Wenjing Wang, Zifang Chi, Ying Yin</b>	3230
PRACTICES OF COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT OF THE JORDANIAN GULF OF AQABA BY MAPPING SPATIAL CONVERGENCE OF SEAFRONT HUMAN ACTIVITIES AND THEIR POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT <b>Ala'aldin Alrowwad, Ali Al Sawalmih, Riyad Manasrah, Mohammed Rasheed, Maysoon Kteifan, Aiman Soleiman, Zeinab Arabeyyat, Ahmad M. Al-Saad, Samantha Barnett</b>	3240
OCCURRENCE OF UNCONVENTIONAL NATURAL GAS IN COAL-BEARING STRATA IN ORDOS BASIN, CHINA <b>Zhanjun Chen, Yidong Yuan, Xiulan Zhu, Yanni Liu</b>	3254
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON OPTIMAL CO <sub>2</sub> FLOODING PRESSURE BEFORE AND AFTER FRACTURING IN HEAVY OIL RESERVOIRS <b>Le Qu, Tiantai Li, Rongjun Zhang, Zhipeng Miao, Hui Gao, Qing Guo</b>	3261
ACCURATE PREDICTION OF EXTERNAL CORROSION RATE OF BURIED PIPELINE BASED ON KPCA-MABC-SVR MODEL USING IN OIL AND GAS GATHERING AND TRANSPORTING SYSTEM <b>Hui Xu, Shipeng Wang, Min Yan, Zhixiu Liu, Rongrong Xie</b>	3269
<i>EFFECTS OF SALICYLIC ACID APPLICATION ON WRKY GENE IN PEPPER (CAPSICUM ANNUUM L.) SEEDLING</i> <b>Mohammed Ahmed Ahmed, Muhemet Zeki Karipcin, Fikret Yasar</b>	3279
MODELING AND COMPUTER SIMULATION OF DRAINAGE, EVAPORATION, AND RUNOFF (DEAR) FROM BARE SOILS <b>Mehmet Aydin, Baran Aydin, Veysel Polat</b>	3287
<b>NOTICE</b>	
LANDSCAPE DESIGN OF THE URBAN BUS STATION BASED ON THE URBAN CHARACTERISTICS AND ECOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT OF SMART CITY, CHINA <b>Chunyan Li</b>	3300
STUDY ON NEW ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION LAW AND CONSTRUCTION STRATEGY OF ECOLOGICAL COMPENSATION SYSTEM <b>Qingpo Wei</b>	3308



# PLASTICITY IN BEHAVIOR OF TURKISH MALTING BARLEY CULTIVARS UNDER SEMI-ARID AND CONTINENTAL CLIMATIC CONDITIONS

Abdulveli Sirat<sup>1</sup>, Bilge Bahar<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Gumushane University, Siran Mustafa Beyaz Vocational School, TR 29700, Gumushane, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Gumushane University, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, TR 29100, Gumushane, Turkey

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to select stable cultivars in terms of desired agronomic or quality criteria from among 15 two rowed barley cultivars that may remain stable in varying year conditions during 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. Furthermore, relationships among these traits were investigated. Some agronomical and quality traits of barley were affected by years and cultivars. Yield, yield components and some quality parameters were affected by the cultivars. Also, days to ripening was affected by years, cultivars, and year  $\times$  cultivar interaction. Crude protein content (CPC) was significantly positive correlated with ASH during both seasons. Starch ratio (SR) showed significantly negative correlations with ASH and CPC during both seasons. ADF and NDF had significant positive strong correlation with one another and ASH during both years while they showed significant negative correlations with SR. The results show that technological properties are not affected by the interaction of cultivar  $\times$  year; therefore, these stable cultivars can be readily used in malt or feed technology if their technological features are considered. For example, cv. Ünver contained low ratios of ash, CPC, oil, soluble fiber and high SR in the malt industry; cv. Hasat which includes the opposite technological properties of cv. Ünver, was found to be suitable for use in feed technology.

## KEYWORDS:

Feed, malting barley, quality traits, yield, yield components

## INTRODUCTION

Barley is an old crop that has been cultivated from *H. vulgare ssp. spontaneum* in the Fertile Crescent of the Middle East for more than 10000 years ago [1]. The barley is generally used for malting and as animal feed. It has fourth place after corn (1.1 billion tons), wheat (749.5 million tons) and rice (741 million tons) with the production of 141.2 million tons in world trade. Barley is grown over an area of

46.9 million ha with grain yield of 3011 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [2]. Barley is used as a food stuff in many parts of the World including the Middle East, North Africa, Northern and Eastern Europe, and Asia since long time ago. Now, two-thirds of the barley produced in the world is used in feed and one-third is used for brewing and malting; rest of the barley is used as human food [3]. Considering the health benefits of barley, its direct use in foods is comparatively low. It is helpful source of  $\beta$ -glucans for reduction of blood cholesterol [4]. It also has low glycemic index [5] with substantial amounts of antioxidant tocopherols and tocotrienols [6]. Technologic and nutritive performance of the  $\beta$ -glucans of barley increase further due to rheological characteristics of barley. Thus, they are consumed by mixing with other cereals to make bread, muffins, pasta, noodles, salad sauces, beverages, soups, reduced-fat dairy and meat products [7]. Apart from these, the protein contents are as higher as in animal meat. Bertholdsson [8] has reported that most of malting markets require near 11.5 percent of protein in barley grain. On the other hand, protein concentration of the barley grain may occasionally exceed these limit in malting barley due to the favorable nitrogen [9], drought [10], and high temperature together with water stress [11].

Yield and yield components are very important selection criteria in barley. Throughout the world, shrinkage of cultivation areas and rapid population growth have been the primary goal for improving grain yield of cereal crops including barley in breeding programs [12] for stable yield increases in barley [13]. Considerable evolutions in various physiological characteristics were observed in terms of grain yield for genetic gain in the last century [14]. There is need to breed high-yielding cultivars for more grains per unit area [15]. It has been reported that the increase in the number of grain in the unit area is due to the rise of spike numbers per square meter and the grain numbers per spike and not due to clear improvement in the weight of one thousand barley grains [16]. Therefore there is need to gain more information about correlation between genetic gains in grain yield and agronomical traits like heading date, spike length, plant height, hectoliter weight, and thousand grain weight [17]. Baumer et al. [18] has pronounced the advantages of the semi-dwarf barley

cultivars to obtain high yield and quality. Klein-knecht et al. [19] has reported effects of the influences of the genotypic and cultivar × environment interactions on variations in the agronomic traits of barley, and has emphasised the importance of optimization of field and laboratory assays. In a study, grain yield and other agronomical traits were significantly affected by cultivars, years, and cultivar × year interactions [17]. Again, Madic et al. [20] found cultivar × year interactions for plant height and grain yield and observed effects of year changes in years on the number of spikes per square meter and grain numbers per spike. These days greenhouse effects are source great variations on climate change is with adverse effects on cereals including barley grain yields [21]. Therefore, breeding of barley cultivars showing stable behaviour in face of greenhouse effects based adverse year conditions is desired.

The study aimed to quantify the behaviour of some agronomically important traits like grain yield and effective components on the grain yield of two-rowed winter barley cultivars under the semi-arid and continental climatic conditions of Gumushane Province of the Eastern Black Sea Region in Turkey.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Characteristics of the Trial Soils.** Research was conducted at the farmers field of Siran county of the Gumushane province of Turkey, during 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 (at the Latitudes of 40° 11' N, the Longitudes of 41° 85' E, and the altitude of 1409

m asl). In the first season (2014-2015), soil was slightly alkaline (pH 7.77) and clay loamy. It was also medium lime (12.43 % CaCO<sub>3</sub>), mild salty (0.18 %), poor for phosphorus (41.8 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup>), rich for favorable potassium (1323 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>), and fine for organic matter (3.32 %). In the second season (2015-2016), soil was clayey, mild alkaline (pH 7.61), mild limy (3.33 % CaCO<sub>3</sub>), medium salty (0.37 %), medium for phosphorus (80.8 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup>), with sufficient amount of potassium (1266 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>), and poor organic matter (1.68 %) (Table 1).

**Climatic Conditions of the Trial Sites.** The climatic data of the trial sites were obtained from the Turkey General Directorate of Meteorology, Gümüşhane Meteorology Regional Directorate. The long term average (1950 to 2016) and 2014 to 2016 meteorological data or Siran county of Gümüşhane Province is given in Table 2. The table, showed that the annual total precipitation in the first year (2014-2015) and 2<sup>nd</sup> year (2015-2016) was 419.8 mm and 429.1 mm in the same order. The precipitation values of the second season between April and July, which corresponded to the period of stem elongation to grain filling, were higher compared to these values in the first year. Growth seasons' temperature means were close to each other, relative moisture values of the second season were lower than the first year values.

**Plant Materials.** Fifteen (15) two rowed Turkish barley cultivars were used as material in the research. The names, release years, and origins of these cultivars are given in the Table 3.

**TABLE 1**  
Physical and chemical properties of the trial soils.\*

Years	Saturation (%)	Total salt (%)	pH	CaCO <sub>3</sub> (%)	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	K <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Organic matter (%)
2014-2015	57.0	0.18	7.77	12.43	4.18	132.3	3.32
2015-2016	73.0	0.37	7.61	3.33	8.08	126.6	1.68

\*Soil analysis was performed at the Laboratories of Soil Science Department, Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University Turkey.

**TABLE 2**  
The climate values for long term (1950 to 2016) average and 2014 to 2016 in Gumushane Province\*

Months	Average temperatures (°C)			Total precipitation (mm)			Relative humidity (%)		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Long term	2014-2015	2015-2016	Long term	2014-2015	2015-2016	Long term
October	14.4	14.2	13.8	61.4	45.2	34.3	64.6	55.8	54.0
November	7.2	7.6	7.0	51.6	42.3	45.2	64.5	52.4	48.7
December	6.2	-0.6	-1.3	14.2	408	45.7	63.0	64.9	66.3
January	0.8	-0.8	0.0	55.5	36.6	47.8	62.0	61.6	59.9
February	3.3	5.7	4.6	34.4	32.8	33.4	59.5	52.4	54.3
March	7.3	7.3	7.3	67.4	43.8	64.2	55.9	50.9	50.6
April	9.6	14.1	12.0	46.8	60.4	47.2	57.4	40.1	44.6
May	15.9	16.3	16.0	45.3	68.0	95.8	55.1	50.7	50.2
June	20.5	20.7	20.5	40.4	46.8	69.1	60.6	50.7	51.5
July	24.5	23.7	24.1	2.8	12.4	5.8	48.8	43.8	41.4
Total/Mean	10.97	10.82	10.40	419.8	429.1	488.5	59.14	52.33	52.15

\*Meteorological data was obtained from the Regional Directorate of Meteorology at Gumushane, Turkey.

**TABLE 3**  
**The names, release years, and origins of the cultivars in the research.**

Cultivar	Release Year	Origin
Larende	2006	Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute (Konya)
Beyşehir-98	1998	Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute (Konya)
Konevi-98	1998	Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute (Konya)
Karatay-94	1996	Bahri Dagdas International Agricultural Research Institute (Konya)
Fahrettinbey	2004	Blacksea Agricultural Research Institute (Samsun)
Bolayır	2007	Trakya Agricultural Research Institute (Edirne)
Sladoran	1998	Trakya Agricultural Research Institute (Edirne)
Harman	2011	Trakya Agricultural Research Institute (Edirne)
Hasat	2014	Trakya Agricultural Research Institute (Edirne)
İnce-04	2004	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)
Çıldır-02	2002	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)
Kalaycı-97	1997	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)
Bilgi-91	1991	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)
Özdemir-2005	2005	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)
Ünver	2013	Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute (Eskişehir)

**Field Experimental Setup and Studied Traits.** This research was conducted using randomized block design with three replications. The first sowing was carried out on 22.10.2014 and the second sowing was done on 04.11.2015 using seed sowing machine using 500 seeds m<sup>-2</sup>, the plot dimensions consisted of 5 m × 1.2 m, and the space between plots was 35 cm. In the trials, nitrogen and phosphorus was applied at the rate of 100 and 60 kg/ha respectively; such that whole of the phosphorus and the half of the nitrogen were applied at the time of sowing. Rest of the nitrogen was applied at the sapling stage. The weeds were removed by hand or by hoeing without use of any herbicides. Each plot consisted of an area of 4m<sup>2</sup> and an area 0.5 m was left before first and last rows in each plot. The harvesting was done with sickle on 13.07.2015 for the first year and on 16.07.2016 for the second year.

Measurement of agronomic parameters like days to heading (d), days to ripening (d), plant height (cm), spike number per m<sup>2</sup>, spike length (cm), grains number per spike, spike yield (g), harvest index (%), grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), thousand grains weight (g), and test weight (kg hl<sup>-1</sup>) were made following [22]. Other quality parameters like dry matter (%), ash content (%), crude protein content (%), starch ratio (%), ADF (acid detergent fiber, %), NDF (neutral detergent fiber, %), and FAT (oil content, %) were detected by NIT System Infracore 1241 Grain Analyzer (Foss, Hillerod, Denmark).

**Statistical Evaluations.** The variance analysis of the data obtained from the study was made using the statistical package program JMP 7.0.2 according to the randomized block design with the combined years. The significance level of differences in variation sources was examined by F test with this program. The statistical significance of the differences between the means was determined according to the LSD test. Correlations between the characters were also determined using the same statistical software.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Year combined variance analysis results and mean values for days to heading (DH), days to ripening (DR) and plant height (PH) are given in Table 4. The table, shows significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) differences among cultivars and differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) between years with no interaction between years and cultivars for days to heading. Days to heading remained 141.7 days during 2015-16 growth season that was 2.2 days longer than 2014-15 growth season with 139.5 days to heading. Whereas, the mean days to head for all cultivars remained 140.6 days. The days to heading for cultivars ranged 137.4 to 143 days. Cultivars Bolayır (137.4 days) and Hasat (137.7 days) showed the minimum DH values while Çıldır-02 showed a maximum value (143.0 days) for days to head. The results are in confirmation to the Rahal-Bouziane et al [23], who reported that DH showed significant variations for cultivars in their both years of growth and among cultivars. This study also confirms that each cultivar behaved variably irrespective of the effect of year and showed significant differences among them for DH. DH showed positive significant correlations at two growth seasons with DR, PH, GN (grain number per spike), SY (spike yield), and GY (grain yield), while it was significantly positive correlated with SL (spike length), TGW (thousand grain weight), and SR (starch ratio) during the first season only. This shows plasticity in behaviour of cultivars as affected by the climatic changes. DH was found to have negative significant correlation with ASH (ash content) during the first season (Table 10). Janfrozadh and Fard [24] found similar correlations with DH that was positively significantly correlated with DR, GY, GN, and PH. Rahal-Bouziane et al. [23] showed that positive significant correlations of DH with PH, SL, TGW, and DR similarly to our study. On the other hand, they reported the negative significant correlation between DH and GN.

**TABLE 4**  
**Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on the days to heading, days to ripening and plant height of 15 Turkish barley cultivars cultivars.**

Cultivars	Days to heading (days)			Days to ripening (days)			Plant height (cm)		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	141.3	144.0	142.7 ab <sup>§</sup>	186.0 g-k	196.5 a	191.3 a	103.80	107.30	105.55 bcd
Beyşehir-98	140.7	144.3	142.5 ab	185.7 g-k	194.0 abc	189.8 abc	106.13	111.50	108.82 b
Konevi-98	140.0	145.0	142.5 ab	185.0 i-l	195.7 ab	190.3 ab	100.33	105.87	103.10 de
Karatay-94	140.7	142.0	141.3 abc	185.7 g-k	192.0 cde	188.8 b-e	111.53	114.97	113.25 a
Fahrettinbey	140.7	140.3	140.5 cde	185.7 g-k	189.0 efg	187.3 def	99.73	107.23	103.48 cde
Bolayır	136.3	138.5	137.4 f	181.3 m	185.3 h-k	183.3 h	90.00	96.00	93.00 g
Sladoran	138.3	139.0	138.7 ef	183.3 klm	185.7 g-k	184.5 gh	93.00	92.07	92.54 g
Harman	138.0	140.3	139.2 def	183.0 klm	189.7 def	186.3 fg	100.20	102.70	101.45 ef
Hasat	136.7	138.7	137.7 f	181.7 lm	187.3 f-j	184.5 gh	96.93	100.53	98.73 f
İnce-04	140.0	141.7	140.8 bcd	185.0 i-l	190.0 def	187.5 c-f	103.33	104.33	103.83 cde
Çıldır-02	141.0	145.0	143.0 a	186.0 g-k	193.0 bcd	189.5 a-d	105.40	107.60	106.50 bc
Kalaycı-97	139.7	143.7	141.7 abc	184.7 j-m	190.3 def	187.5 c-f	106.00	106.27	106.14 bcd
Bilgi-91	138.0	140.3	139.2 def	183.0 klm	188.7 e-h	185.8 fg	100.93	102.60	101.77 ef
Özdemir-2005	140.7	142.7	141.7 abc	185.7 g-k	192.0 cde	188.8 b-e	103.13	104.10	103.62 cde
Ünver	140.0	140.7	140.3 cde	185.0 i-l	188.3 f-i	186.7 efg	103.67	105.13	104.40 cde
Mean	139.5 b	141.7 a	140.6	184.5 b	190.5 a	187.5	101.61 b	104.55 a	103.08
CV (%)	1.15			1.09			2.84		
	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	
Year (Y)	47.272**	0.919	87.847**	1.794	7.856*	2.909			
Cultivar (C)	7.764**	1.859	7.672**	2.372	20.095**	3.387			
Y × C	1.198	NS	2.091*	3.355	0.975	NS			

<sup>§</sup>The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

Days to ripening (DR) showed significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) interaction between years and cultivars. Days to ripening also showed significant differences among cultivars ( $p < 0.01$ ) and between years ( $p < 0.01$ ) in terms of days to ripening (Table 4). Accordingly, the second year (190.5 days) DR values were six days longer than the first year (184.5 days). The cultivars showed a range of 183.3 - 191.3 days in terms of DR. The minimum ripening periods was observed for cv. Bolayır (183.3 d), Sladoran (184.5 d), and Hasat (184.5 d). Whereas, the maximum DR were taken by the cv. Larende (191.3 d) and Konevi-98 (190.3 d). When the Y×G interactions were taken it was found that cv. Fahrettinbey, Sladoran and Ünver were in the same group during both growing years (2014-15 and 2015-16) and therefore these cultivars were not affected by year effects. Whereas, the other cultivars appeared in different groups during two years; so, these cultivars are differently affected by the year. DR was significantly positive correlated with PH, SY, and GY during two years, while it showed significant positive correlation with SL, GN, TGW and SR during the first year (Table 10). Janfrozadh and Fard [24] observed positive correlations of DR with DH, GY, PH, and GN in agreement to this study. Contrarily, a significant negative correlation was noted between DR and ASH during the first year (Table 10). Rahal-Bouziane et al. [23] reported a positive significant correlation between DR and DH, PH, SL, TGW, and negative significant correlation with GN.

Years and cultivars showed no interaction in terms of plant height PH (Table 4). However, significant differences were noted among cultivars ( $p < 0.01$ ) and between years ( $p < 0.05$ ) in terms of plant height (Table 4). Thus, mean PH value in 2015-16 year (104.55 cm) was longer than 2014-15 year (101.61 cm). Cultivars showed changes between 92.54 cm (cv. Sladoran) - 113.25 cm (cv. Karatay-94) in plant height. Madic et al. [20] reported that plant height was affected by the year conditions (years) and the interaction of cultivar × year in contradiction to this study that shows a non significant interaction for this trait. Miroslavjevic et al. [25] stressed the effects of cultivars and years on the plant height that ranged 97.4 - 105.0 cm for 19 winter malting barley cultivars. PH was significantly positive correlated with SY and TGW during both growth years. It showed significant positive correlation with SR during the first year. PH was significantly positive correlated with SL and GN during the second year. There was a significant negative correlation between PH and ASH (Table 10). Rahal-Bouziane et al. [23] has reported a positive significant correlation of PH with DH, DR, TGW, and SL and negative significant correlation with GN. Similarly, Janfrozadh and Fard [24] showed positive significant correlations between PH and GY, GN, DH, DR.

Significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for induction of number of spikes per m<sup>2</sup> (SN) (Table 5). The minimum SN were noted in cv. Bolayır (367.5) even though the maximum SN

were noted in cv. Larende (568.6). No significant differences were noted between years for SN with value of year (488.9 d and 481.4 d during the first and second years respectively. Madic et al. [20] reported that SN was affected by the years, but not af-

ected by the cultivars and cultivar  $\times$  year interaction. SN showed significant positive correlations with GN, SY, HI (harvest index), GY, and TGW during both growth years in our study (Table 10). Laidig et al. [26] found that SN was negatively significant correlated with GN, TW, and crude protein contents.

**TABLE 5**  
Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on the spike number per m<sup>2</sup>, spike length and grains number per spike of 15 Turkish barley cultivars.

Cultivars	Spike number per m <sup>2</sup>			Spike length (cm)			Grains number per spike		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	572.0	565.1	568.6 a	7.98	8.32	8.15 ab	20.89	20.80	20.85 c-f
Beyşehir-98	487.6	493.7	490.7 ef	7.40	7.04	7.22 def	21.83	22.17	22.00 bc
Konevi-98	512.8	529.8	521.3 cd	7.58	7.24	7.41 def	22.06	22.39	22.23 b
Karatay-94	412.2	416.5	414.4 hi	7.94	8.21	8.08 abc	21.33	22.08	21.71 bcd
Fahrettinbey	470.2	472.5	471.4 f	7.68	8.52	8.10 abc	20.19	20.12	20.16 f
Bolayır	363.6	371.5	367.5 j	6.18	6.82	6.50 gh	17.83	18.06	17.95 g
Sladoran	495.7	502.0	498.8 de	5.90	6.15	6.03 h	20.22	19.62	19.92 f
Harman	425.0	449.5	437.2 gh	5.71	6.28	6.00 h	19.66	19.93	19.80 f
Hasat	546.4	530.2	538.3 bc	7.39	7.99	7.69 bcd	20.17	20.52	20.35 f
İnce-04	490.7	502.8	496.8 e	8.31	8.38	8.35 a	21.83	21.47	21.65 b-e
Çıldır-02	499.7	514.4	507.0 de	8.13	8.08	8.11 abc	20.89	20.43	20.66 def
Kalaycı-97	560.4	549.9	555.2 ab	5.94	5.80	5.87 h	19.69	20.55	20.12 f
Bilgi-91	416.8	462.9	439.9 g	6.67	7.23	6.95 efg	18.45	18.34	18.40 g
Özdemir-2005	405.8	416.0	410.9 i	6.64	6.92	6.78 fg	20.11	20.81	20.46 ef
Ünver	561.8	556.2	559.0 ab	7.58	7.45	7.52 cde	24.00	24.61	24.31 a
<b>Mean</b>	<b>481.4</b>	<b>488.9</b>	<b>485.1</b>	<b>7.14 b</b>	<b>7.36 a</b>	<b>7.25</b>	<b>20.61</b>	<b>20.79</b>	<b>20.70</b>
<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>4.37</b>			<b>7.59</b>			<b>4.98</b>	
	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>
<b>Year (Y)</b>	1.744		NS	13.115*		0.173	0.170		NS
<b>Cultivar (C)</b>	48.762**		24.527	14.783**		0.632	13.696**		1.194
<b>Y <math>\times</math> C</b>	0.774		NS	0.703		NS	0.287		NS

§ The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

**TABLE 6**  
Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on spike yield, harvest index and grain yield of 15 Turkish barley cultivars.

Cultivars	Spike yield (g)			Harvest index (%)			Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	1.31	1.32	1.32 bcd	36.67	38.17	37.42 ab	6298	6447	6372 b
Beyşehir-98	1.38	1.42	1.40 ab	34.67	35.17	34.92 de	6046	6043	6044 cd
Konevi-98	1.21	1.24	1.23 cde	35.00	35.17	35.09 cde	5763	5895	5829 de
Karatay-94	1.33	1.36	1.35 bc	33.67	34.83	34.25 de	4845	4963	4904 gh
Fahrettinbey	0.96	0.99	0.98 gh	35.33	38.67	37.00 ab	5051	5257	5154 g
Bolayır	0.73	0.79	0.76 i	30.00	33.67	31.84 f	4194	4076	4135 i
Sladoran	0.99	1.02	1.01 g	36.00	38.67	37.34 ab	5540	5556	5548 f
Harman	1.03	0.95	0.99 g	33.33	33.83	33.58 ef	4989	5054	5022 g
Hasat	0.96	0.98	0.97 gh	36.67	37.17	36.92 abc	6011	6000	6006 cd
İnce-04	1.26	1.16	1.21 de	38.33	38.50	38.42 a	5565	5520	5542 f
Çıldır-02	1.30	1.03	1.17 ef	36.67	37.83	37.25 ab	5736	5713	5725 ef
Kalaycı-97	1.20	1.17	1.19 ef	37.00	38.50	37.75 ab	6300	6106	6203 bc
Bilgi-91	0.83	0.87	0.85 hi	34.33	35.00	34.67 de	4820	4961	4890 gh
Özdemir-2005	1.10	1.03	1.07 fg	36.67	37.67	37.17 ab	4709	4711	4710 h
Ünver	1.45	1.53	1.49 a	34.67	37.33	36.00 bcd	6761	6778	6769 a
<b>Mean</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>35.27</b>	<b>36.68</b>	<b>35.97</b>	<b>5509</b>	<b>5539</b>	<b>5524</b>
<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>9.74</b>			<b>4.56</b>			<b>4.23</b>	
	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>	<b>F value</b>		<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>
<b>Year (Y)</b>	0.096		NS	5.061		NS	0.212		NS
<b>Cultivar (C)</b>	21.334**		0.128	7.553**		1.899	55.997**		270.28
<b>Y <math>\times</math> C</b>	0.972		NS	0.731		NS	0.317		NS

§ The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

Statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) differences were noted among cultivars for spike length. Significant differences were also noted between years in terms of spike length. No interaction was noted between cultivars and years for this trait (Table 5). SL value of the second year (7.36 cm) was longer compared to the first year's value (7.14 cm). SL values ranged 5.87 to 8.35 cm among the cultivars used in the study. So, the minimum values were noted for the cv. Kalaycı-97 (5.87 cm), Harman (6.00 cm), and Sladoran (6.03 cm) and the the longest SL values were noted for the cultivars İnce (8.35 cm) and Larende (8.15 cm). During the first year, SL was significantly positive correlated with GN and SY while it was significantly negative correlated with CPC (crude protein content) (Table 10). Contrarily, Rahal-Bouziane et al. [23] noted a negative significant correlation between SL and GN. They also observed positive significant relationships of SL with PH, TGW, DH, and DR.

Grain number per spike (GN) showed significant variations among cultivars ( $p < 0.01$ ) (Table 5). The highest GN value was noted for cv. Ünver (25.32) and the lowest GN values were noted for cv. Bolayır (17.95) and Bilgi-91 (18.40). Contrarily, Madic et al. [20] noted significant effect of the interaction of cultivar  $\times$  years. At both growth years, GN showed significant positive associations with SY, GY, and TGW (Table 10). Janfrozadh and Fard [24] found positive correlation between GN and GY and noted negative correlation between GN and TGW. At the first year, GN was significantly positive correlated with HI and SR. It was significantly negative correlated with ASH and CPC (Table 10). The findings in this study showed partial differences with Laidig et al. [26] who reported that numbers of kernels per spike showed negative significant correlations with TGW. They also emphasized the GN's non-significant relations by test weight (TW), crude protein content (CPC) of kernel, and kernel extract ratio that is an indicator of the starch ratio (SR).

Spike yield (SY), which expresses grains weight per spike, showed statistically differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) among the cultivars. No statistical difference was noted between years and no significant interaction was noted between years and cultivars (Table 6). The cv. Ünver (1.49 g) and cv. Beyşehir-98 (1.40 g) had the highest SY; and cv. Bolayır (0.76 g) and cv. Bilgi-91 (0.85 g) had the lowest SY values. SY was significantly positively correlated with GY and TGW during two growth years. It showed significantly positive correlation with HI and SR during the first year. SY showed significantly negative correlations with ASH and CPC (Table 10).

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for Harvest index (HI) and these values ranged 31.84% in cv. Bolayır to 38.42% in cv. İnce-04 (Table 6). HI showed significantly positive correlation with GY during the growth years. It was significantly negative correlated

with CPC during first year. It was significantly positively correlated with DM during the second year (Table 10).

Statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) differences were found among cultivars for grain yield (GY) values (Table 6). Contrarily, Petkovski et al. [27] noted significant interaction between years and year  $\times$  cultivars. The highest GY was noted from cv. Ünver (6769 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The lowest GY was noted from cv. Bolayır (4135 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in this study. In the study of Ben Naceur et al. [28], a high variation was observed among barley genotypes with similar precipitation regime, but they obtained lower yield values ranging from 1943 to 4805 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. In contradiction, Laidig et al. [26] reported low variation for cultivars and cultivar  $\times$  year. However, they emphasized that all variation sources (cultivars, years, and their interaction) were statistically significant for grain yield. Miroslavljevic et al. [25] also showed strong effects of these variation sources on the grain yield. GY showed significantly positive correlations with DH, DR, SN, GN, SY, TGW, and HI during growth years while it was significantly negative associated with FAT during the second year (Table 10). Janfrozadh and Fard [24] found positive significant correlations between GY and DH, DR, GN, PH. Also, Laidig et al. [26] found positive significant phenotypic correlations between GY and SN and TGW while GY was significantly and negatively correlated with TW and CPC (crude protein content).

Statistically significant differences were noted among cultivars ( $p < 0.01$ ) and between years ( $p < 0.05$ ) for thousand grain weight (TGW). No interaction was noted for the years  $\times$  cultivars interaction (Table 7). In this way, TGW of the second growth year (2015-16) with 43.80 g was greater than the first year (2014-15) with value of 43.00 g. However, strong Y $\times$ G interaction on the TGW has been noted by other researchers [25,29]. The TGW values of the cultivars for mean years ranged 39.77 g - 48.61 g. The highest TGW values were noted from the cv. Ünver (48.61 g) and cv. Larende (47.74 g) while the lowest values were noted from the cv. Harman (39.77 g), İnce-04 (40.78 g), Hasat (40.85 g), and Bolayır (41.02 g). Miroslavljevic et al. [25] noted lower values of 35.8 to 43.5 g. Similar results were noted by [30,29,26]. TGW was significantly positively correlated with PH, SN, GN, SY, and GY during both years while it showed significantly positive correlations with DH and DR during the first year (Table 10). Similar findings related to correlations were noted between TGW and DR, DH, PH, and SL by [23]. Laidig et al. [26] also found positive significant correlation of TGW with GY and SN in similarly to these findings. However, they noted negative significant correlation of TGW with GN, TW and CPC. Some researchers also found negative significant correlations between TGW and GN [24, 26].

**TABLE 7**  
**Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on thousand grains weight, test weight and dry matter of 15 Turkish barley cultivars.**

Cultivars	Thousand grains weight (g)			Test weight (kg hl <sup>-1</sup> )			Dry matter (%)		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	46.93	48.55	47.74 a	71.30	69.66	70.48 abc	90.03	90.14	90.09 ab
Beşşehir-98	44.50	45.22	44.86 bc	69.98	69.69	69.84 cd	90.00	89.89	89.95 abc
Konevi-98	42.83	43.86	43.35 cd	70.20	70.82	70.51 abc	90.09	89.99	90.04 ab
Karatay-94	45.57	45.44	45.51 b	70.47	70.77	70.62 abc	89.91	89.97	89.94 abc
Fahrettinbey	41.93	43.93	42.93 d	70.56	71.33	70.95 b	89.92	89.96	89.94 abc
Bolayır	40.40	41.63	41.02 ef	69.82	70.36	70.09 a-d	89.87	89.72	89.80 c
Sladoran	41.47	42.65	42.06 de	69.80	70.10	69.95 bcd	89.96	89.82	89.89 bc
Harman	39.53	40.00	39.77 f	70.82	71.21	71.02 a	90.03	89.73	89.88 bc
Hasat	40.67	41.02	40.85 ef	69.53	70.28	69.91 cd	90.29	89.96	90.13 a
İnce-04	41.17	40.38	40.78 ef	70.42	69.84	70.13 a-d	89.89	89.62	89.76 c
Çıldır-02	42.13	43.82	42.98 d	69.96	70.35	70.16 a-d	89.86	90.03	89.95 abc
Kalaycı-97	45.30	44.37	44.84 bc	70.54	71.28	70.91 ab	90.21	89.93	90.07 ab
Bilgi-91	43.10	43.48	43.29 cd	69.40	69.09	69.25 d	89.98	89.80	89.89 bc
Özdemir-2005	42.03	42.90	42.47 de	70.15	70.53	70.34 abc	89.91	90.00	89.96 abc
Ünver	47.47	49.74	48.61 a	70.85	70.94	70.90 ab	89.74	89.91	89.83 c
Mean	43.00 b	43.80 a	43.40	70.25	70.42	70.34	89.98	89.90	89.94
CV (%)	3.71			1.12			0.21		
	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	
Year (Y)	9.589*	0.512		0.550	NS		3.329	NS	
Cultivar (C)	14.961**	0.713		2.110*	0.979		2.030*	0.212	
Y × C	0.512	NS		0.866	NS		1.340	NS	

§ The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

Significantly differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were noted among cultivars for test weight (TW); TW ranged 69.25 to 71.02 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> among cultivars with cultivars Bilgi-91 and Harman respectively (Table 7). These ranges of cultivars for TW were 68.4 to 72.2 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> in the study of [31]. Miroslavljevic et al. [25] observed the effects of cultivars, years, and their interaction on the test weight which changed from 73.4 to 76.6 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> for the barley cultivars. TW showed significantly negative correlation with NDF during second year (Table 10). Campbell et al. [32] presented negative strong correlations of TW with ADF and NDF. They also revealed the positive significant correlation between TW and starch ratio (SR). Laidig et al. [26] found weak negative correlation between TW and GY while they reported the weak negative correlations of TW with SN and TGW. Also, they noted moderate positive correlation between TW and CPC.

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were noted among cultivars for dry matter (DM). They ranged 89.76% with cv. İnce-04 to 90.13% with cv. Hasat (Table 7). Our data were the range of Campbell et al. [32] who noted a range of 89.31 to 93.97% DM. During both years, DM was significantly positive correlated with ASH and CPC while it was significantly negatively correlated with SR. It showed significantly positive correlation with NDF during the first year (Table 10).

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for ash content (ASH) (Table 8). The lowest ASH value was noted from cv. Ünver (1.825%) and the highest value was noted

from the cv. Hasat (2.237%). During both years, ASH was significantly positive correlated with CPC, ADF, and NDF while it was significantly negatively correlated with SR (Table 10).

As seen in the Table 8, all variation sources (years, cultivars, and Y×G interaction) did not show statistically significant differences for crude protein content (CPC). Nonetheless, the CPC values among cultivars ranged 11.76% to 13.44%. Similar results were found by Przulj et al. [30]. Contrarily, Bertholdsson [8], See et al. [33] and Miroslavljevic et al. [25] recommended < 11.5% protein ratio if the cultivars are meant for malting. The findings in this study showed all cultivars had values above the threshold level. Therefore, these cultivars seem suitable for use as forage in terms of protein. Thus, Miroslavljevic et al. [25] found average grain protein content values of 11.3%. Also, the grain protein contents (11.9% as average of malting cultivars) of Fox et al. [31] were similar to these researchers who showed lower CPC values. Significantly negative correlation between CPC and SR was found at both years in our study (Table 10). Laidig et al. [26] evaluated the extract content (EC) instead of SR, and so they found negative moderate significant relation between CPC and EC. They also found very strong correlations between CPC and grain yield. Although the CPC did not have a correlations with grain yield in our study, it showed negative significant correlations with some yield components such as spike length, grain numbers per spike, spike yield, and harvest index.

**TABLE 8**  
Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on ash content, crude protein content and starch ratio of 15 Turkish barley cultivars.

Cultivars	Ash content (%)			Crude protein content (%)			Starch ratio (%)		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	2.066	2.190	2.128 ab	12.54	13.24	12.89	57.93	55.45	56.69 de
Beyşehir-98	2.076	2.060	2.068 bc	12.36	11.99	12.18	57.38	57.62	57.50 de
Konevi-98	1.980	2.056	2.018 b-e	11.64	12.69	12.17	57.55	58.00	57.78 cde
Karatay-94	2.010	2.106	2.058 bcd	12.10	12.28	12.19	58.84	57.04	57.94 b-e
Fahrettinbey	2.053	2.040	2.047 b-e	12.79	12.85	12.82	57.55	57.71	57.63 cde
Bolayır	2.233	2.073	2.153 ab	13.92	12.72	13.32	55.06	57.97	56.52 e
Sladoran	2.170	2.086	2.128 ab	12.81	11.60	12.21	56.35	58.47	57.41 de
Harman	2.026	1.943	1.985 cde	13.12	12.62	12.87	57.80	59.61	58.71 a-d
Hasat	2.273	2.200	2.237 a	13.03	12.58	12.81	53.03	54.47	53.75 f
İnce-04	1.900	1.940	1.920 def	11.87	12.33	12.10	59.82	60.26	60.04 ab
Çıldır-02	1.883	1.943	1.913 ef	12.56	11.79	12.17	59.70	59.54	59.62 abc
Kalaycı-97	1.983	2.056	2.020 b-e	13.54	13.33	13.44	57.60	58.09	57.85 cde
Bilgi-91	1.830	2.070	1.950 c-f	12.47	13.09	12.78	60.13	56.47	58.30 b-e
Özdemir-2005	1.930	2.156	2.043 b-e	12.15	11.36	11.76	58.99	57.66	58.33 b-e
Ünver	1.810	1.840	1.825 f	11.74	12.15	11.95	60.73	60.64	60.69 a
Mean	2.015	2.051	2.033	12.58	12.44	12.51	57.90	57.93	57.92
CV (%)		6.05			7.56			3.15	
	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	
Year (Y)	0.029	NS		0.157	NS		0.001	NS	
Cultivar (C)	5.105**	0.138		1.736	NS		4.819**	2.109	
Y × C	1.223	NS		0.823	NS		1.408	NS	

§ The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

**TABLE 9**  
Effects of sowing years (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) on ADF, NDF and FAT of 15 Turkish barley cultivars.

Cultivars	ADF (%)			NDF (%)			FAT (%)		
	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean	2014-2015	2015-2016	Mean
Larende	7.52	8.36	7.94 ab	22.50	24.53	23.52 a	1.86	1.62	1.74 ef
Beyşehir-98	7.63	7.94	7.79 abc	22.68	23.29	22.99 abc	1.88	1.79	1.84 cde
Konevi-98	7.03	7.82	7.43 b-f	21.58	22.62	22.10 c-f	1.97	2.06	2.02 a
Karatay-94	7.12	6.80	6.96 d-h	22.11	22.58	22.35 b-e	1.77	1.87	1.82 cde
Fahrettinbey	6.59	6.42	6.51 gh	21.03	20.63	20.83 h	1.84	1.96	1.90 abc
Bolayır	6.98	7.08	7.03 c-g	22.08	21.74	21.91 d-g	1.99	2.00	2.00 ab
Sladoran	7.05	7.91	7.48 a-e	22.01	22.61	22.31 b-e	1.62	1.73	1.67 fg
Harman	6.08	6.38	6.23 h	20.86	21.33	21.10 fgh	1.61	1.57	1.59 g
Hasat	8.02	8.52	8.27 a	23.00	23.56	23.28 ab	1.88	1.87	1.88 bcd
İnce-04	7.02	6.29	6.66 fgh	21.70	20.99	21.35 e-h	1.85	1.75	1.80 c-f
Çıldır-02	6.85	7.58	7.22 b-g	21.75	22.69	22.22 cde	1.76	1.76	1.76 def
Kalaycı-97	6.54	6.89	6.71 e-h	22.00	22.47	22.24 cde	1.84	1.80	1.82 cde
Bilgi-91	5.98	7.33	6.66 f-h	20.87	22.81	21.84 d-h	1.88	1.85	1.87 b-e
Özdemir-2005	7.10	8.14	7.62 a-d	21.90	23.47	22.69 a-d	1.78	1.96	1.87 b-e
Ünver	6.36	6.94	6.65 fgh	20.53	21.28	20.91 gh	1.78	1.81	1.79 c-f
Mean	6.92 b	7.36 a	7.14	21.77 b	22.44 a	22.11	1.82	1.83	1.82
CV (%)		9.65			3.99			6.55	
	F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		F value	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	
Year (Y)	13.811*	0.325		20.006*	0.414		0.029	NS	
Cultivar (C)	4.451**	0.797		5.188**	1.019		5.105**	0.138	
Y × C	0.960	NS		1.205	NS		1.223	NS	

§ The same letters in a single column are not statistically different using LSD test at 0.05 level of significance.

\*, \*\* significant at probability levels of 0.05 and 0.01, respectively; CV, coefficient of variation; LSD, least significance difference; NS, non significant.

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for starch ratio (SR) and SR values changed from 53.75% in cv. Hasat to 60.69% in cv. Ünver (Table 8). Campbell et al. [32] presented lower data that ranged 48.11 to 64.84%, but the mean values among six cultivars used in their study was 58.17%. [31] presented the average SR

values (56.9 to 58.8%) for malting barleys. For SR, of both years and the Y×G interaction were not statistically different. This situation has showed that SR was not effected by year in other word years or growth year (Table 8). Campbell et al. [32] presented the medium variance (30.2%) of cultivar × year for





starch ratio of barley. SR showed significantly negative correlation with NDF during both years, while it was significantly negative correlated with ADF during the first year (Table 10). Campbell et al. [32] found medium strong negative correlations SR versus ADF plus NDF. But these correlations were very strong in our study, especially for the first year.

Statistically significant differences were noted among cultivars ( $p < 0.01$ ) and between years ( $p < 0.05$ ) for ADF (Table 9). ADF value was the highest (7.36%) during 2015-16 and the lowest (6.92%) in 2014-2015 growth year. When the cultivars was evaluated to find differences among cultivars, it was observed that ADF values ranged 6.23% for cv. Harman to 8.27% for cv. Hasat. These findings were higher than the results of some researchers [32, 34, 31]. During both growth years, there were significantly positive correlations between ADF and NDF (Table 10). Similarly, Campbell et al. [32] also emphasise high correlation between ADF and NDF.

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for NDF values. Statistically different ( $p < 0.05$ ) NDF values were also

noted between years (Table 9). Campbell et al. [32] noted interaction of cultivar  $\times$  year for ADF and NDF which these traits were similar to each other for the variance of interaction. NDF values was higher in the second growth year (22.44%) than the first year (21.77%). The mean NDF values of the cultivars ranged 20.83% in cv. Fahrettinbey to 23.52% in cv. Larende. However, Campbell et al. [32] noted lower range (13.50% to 16.40%) for NDF among barley cultivars.

Statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) were noted among cultivars for FAT (Table 9). Campbell et al. [32] emphasized high interaction of cultivar  $\times$  year with 75.9% variance. FAT content ranged 1.59% (cv. Harman) to 2.02% (cv. Konevi-98) in the study (Table 9). Some researchers have presented close results for this trait [32,35]. Bravi et al. [35] has also stressed the importance of low lipid content of barley grains because of their high capability to malting and friability.

**TABLE 10**  
**Correlations among the traits of 15 cultivars of two rowed barley.**

Traits	DR	PH	SN	SL	GN	SY	HI	GY	TGW	TW	DM	ASH	CPC	SR	ADF	NDF	FAT
DH <sup>§</sup>	.99**	.64**	.34	.41**	.39**	.58**	.26	.38*	.41**	.27	-.15	-.46**	-.14	.49**	-.17	-.12	-.05
	.83**	.51**	.29	.06	.32**	.40**	.03	.32*	.26	-.02	.29	-.04	.00	.00	.06	.16	.10
DR		.64**	.32	.39**	.38**	.56**	.27	.36*	.40**	.25	-.15	-.46**	-.13	.49**	-.18	-.13	-.06
		.55**	.23	.21	.28	.41**	.02	.31*	.29	.03	.49**	.20	.17	-.22	.12	.30*	-.04
PH			.20	.34	.24	.57**	.20	.27	.48**	.20	-.01	-.30*	-.19	.31*	-.06	-.00	.00
			.13	.40**	.43**	.54**	-.09	.25	.36*	.09	.21	-.09	.06	.01	-.12	.08	-.08
SN				.23	.39**	.42**	.48**	.93**	.44**	.13	.23	-.11	-.12	.04	.10	.03	.04
				.11	.43**	.46**	.41**	.92**	.39**	-.05	.14	-.18	.05	.08	.25	.20	-.28
SL					.52**	.58**	.23	.29	.20	.08	-.22	-.18	-.35*	.18	.18	.08	.19
					.19	.20	.16	.15	.21	-.15	.19	.06	.06	-.18	-.01	.03	.01
GN						.80**	.30*	.54**	.35*	.16	-.24	-.31*	-.38*	.35*	.09	-.06	-.02
						.79**	.06	.60**	.45**	.07	.17	-.22	-.12	.21	-.02	-.03	.02
SY							.32*	.60**	.52**	.23	-.11	-.36*	-.32*	.37*	.11	.08	-.13
							.12	.65**	.60**	.03	.29	-.10	-.04	.12	.04	.04	-.04
HI								.41**	.20	-.03	.11	-.16	-.31*	.16	.22	.16	-.11
								.37*	.09	.13	.31*	.23	.13	-.18	.08	.02	-.03
GY									.50**	.17	.15	-.16	-.13	.11	.06	.02	.03
									.57**	-.02	.28	-.12	.06	.01	.21	.20	-.31*
TGW										.10	-.09	-.18	-.28	.25	.10	.06	.15
										-.04	.27	-.04	-.07	-.06	.17	.24	-.13
TW											.16	-.06	.04	.04	-.07	-.12	-.20
											.07	-.16	.01	.17	-.19	-.30*	.09
DM												.35*	.41**	-.51**	.23	.44**	.02
												.40**	.33*	-.38*	.08	.16	.08
ASH													.36*	-.91**	.58**	.61**	.27
													.44**	-.88**	.30*	.50**	.19
CPC														-.39**	-.27	.12	.05
														-.58**	-.26	.04	-.07
SR															-.55**	-.61**	-.19
															-.26	-.54**	-.03
ADF																.84**	.16
																.81**	.02
NDF																	.11
																	-.24

<sup>§</sup>: In the same line, upper values show the first year (2014-2015) while the below values refer to the second year (2015-2016). \*, \*\* indicate significance at the 0.05 and 0.01 probability levels, respectively. DH: days to heading, DR: days to ripening, PH: plant height, SN: spike number per square meter, SL: spike length, GN: grain number per spike, SY: spike yield, HI: harvest index, GY: grain yield, TGW: thousand grain weight, TW: test weight, DM: dry matter, ASH: ash content, CPC: crude protein content, SR: starch ratio, ADF: acid detergent fiber, NDF: neutral detergent fiber, FAT: oil content.

## CONCLUSION

Statistically significant differences were observed among the cultivars for all evaluated traits except CPC. This evidence will play an important role in the proper use of the cultivars in barley malting or feed technology. What is more gratifying is that characteristics excluding DR are unaffected by cultivar × year interaction. This means that cultivars will remain stable in the face of changing year conditions. This is an important technological feature, as these features must not be affected by the year too much. The correlation between technological characteristics and yield components, for example, the significant positive relationships of SR with GN and SY are important in terms of grain yield and malt technology. In the study, SR had strong negative correlation with CPC. It was reconfirmed that low protein high starch-containing cultivars are more important in the malt industry.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Prof. Dr. Khalid Mahmood Khawar for his supports in the revising the English.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Badr, A., Muller, K., Schafer-Pregl, R., El Rabey, H., Effgen, S. (2000) On the origin and domestication history of barley (*Hordeum vulgare*). *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 17, 499-510.
- [2] FAO (2016) Crops. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC>, (Accessed September 03, 2018).
- [3] Newman, C.W., Newman, R.K. (2006) A brief history of barley foods. *Cereal Foods World*. 51, 4-7.
- [4] Behall, K.M., Scholfield, D.J., Hallfrisch, J. (2004) Diets containing barley significantly reduce lipids in mildly hypercholesterolemic men and women. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 80, 1185-1193.
- [5] Cavallero, A., Empilli, S., Brighenti, F., Stanco, A.M. (2002) High (1/3, 1/4)-β-glucan barley fractions in bread making and their effects on human glucemic response. *Journal of Cereal Science*. 36, 59-66.
- [6] Qureshi, A.A., Qureshi, N., Wright, J.J.K., Shen, Z., Kramer, G. (1991) Lowering of serum cholesterol in hypercholesterolemic humans by tocotrienols (palmvitee). *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 53, 1021-1026.
- [7] Lazaridou, A., Biliaderis, C.G. (2007) Molecular aspects of cereal β-glucan functionality: physical properties, technological applications and physiological effects. *Journal of Cereal Science*. 46, 101-118.
- [8] Bertholdsson, N.O. (1999) Characterization of malting barley cultivars with more or less stable grain content under varying environmental conditions. *European Journal of Agronomy*. 10(1), 1-8.
- [9] Eagles, H.A., Bedggood, A.G., Panozzo, J.F., Martin, P.J. (1995) Cultivar and environmental effects on malting quality in barley. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*. 46, 831-844.
- [10] Birch, C.J., Fukai, S., Broad, I.J. (1997) Estimation of responses of yield and grain protein concentration of malting barley to nitrogen fertilizer using plant nitrogen uptake. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*. 48, 635-648.
- [11] Savin, R.S., Nicolas, M.E. (1996) Effects of short periods of drought and high temperature on grain growth and starch accumulation of two malting barley cultivars. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology*. 23, 201-210.
- [12] Araus, J.L., Slafer, G.A., Royo, C., Serret, M.D. (2008) Breeding for yield potential and stress adaptation in cereals. *Critical Reviews in Plant Science*. 27, 377-412.
- [13] Peltonen-Sainio, P., Jauhiainen, L., Laurila, I.P. (2009) Cereal yield trends in northern European conditions: changes in yield potential and its realisation. *Field Crops Research*. 110, 85-90.
- [14] Lillemo, M., Reitan, L., Bjornstad, C. (2010) Increasing impact of plant breeding on barley yields in central Norway from 1946 to 2008. *Plant Breeding*. 129, 484-490.
- [15] Abeledo, L.G., Calderini, D.F., Slafer, G.A. (2008) Nitrogen economy in old and modern malting barleys. *Field Crops Research*. 106, 171-178.
- [16] Mladenov, N., Hristov, N., Kondic-Spika, A., Djuric, V., Jevtic, R., Mladenov, V. (2011) Breeding progress in grain yield of winter wheat cultivars grown at different nitrogen levels in semiarid conditions. *Breeding Science*. 61(3), 260-268.
- [17] Mirosavljevic, M., Momcilovic, V., Przulj, N., Hristov, N., Acin, V. (2016) The variation of agronomic traits associated with breeding progress in winter barley cultivars. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*. 103(3), 267-272.
- [18] Baumer, M., Hartl, L., Cais, R. (2004) Yield progress for malting barley. *Getreide Magazin*. 9, 158-163 (in German).
- [19] Kleinknecht, K., Möhring, J., Laidig, F., Meyer, U., Piepho, H.P. (2016) A simulation-based approach for evaluating the efficiency of multienvironment trial designs. *Crop Science*. 56, 2237-2250.



- [20] Madic, M., Paunovic, A.S., Knezevic, D., Zecevic, V. (2009) Grain yield and yield components of two-row winter barley cultivars and lines. *Acta Agriculturae Serbica*. 14(27), 17-22.
- [21] Olesen, J.E., Trnka, M., Kersebaum, K.C., Skjelvag, A.O., Seguin, B. (2011) Impacts and adaptation of European crop production systems to climate change. *European Journal of Agronomy*. 34, 96-112.
- [22] Bell, M.A., Fischer, R.A. (1994) Guide to Plant and Crop Sampling: Measurements and Observations for Agronomic and Physiological Research in Small Grain Cereals. Wheat Special Report No:32. CIMMYT, Mexico.
- [23] Rahal-Bouziiane, H., Alane, F., Abdelguerfi, A. (2015) Forage quality, forage dry matter yield, grain protein and agronomic traits of traditional barley genotypes (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) from rural areas in Algeria. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. 27(9), 182.
- [24] Janfrozadh, N. and Fard, A.N. (2014) Investigation of late- year drought stress effects on eco-physiological traits and grain yield in barley lines using different statistical methods. *International Journal of Biosciences*. 5(1), 339-344.
- [25] Mirosavljevic, M., Przulj, N., Momcilovic, V., Acin, V., Jockovic, B. (2015) Relationship between grain yield and agronomic traits in winter barley. *Ratarstvo i povrtarstvo*. 52(2), 74-79.
- [26] Laidig, F., Piepho, H.P., Rentel, D., Drobek, T., Meyer, U. (2017) Breeding progress, genotypic and environmental variation and correlation of quality traits in malting barley in German official variety trials between 1983 and 2015. *Theoretical Applied Genetics*. 130, 2411-2429.
- [27] Petkovski, N., Mihajlov, L., Ruzdik, N.M. (2018) Genetic and environmental effect on the grain yield of spring barley cultivars cultivated in the Republic of Macedonia. *Journal of Agriculture and Plant Sciences*. 16(1), 97-102.
- [28] Ben Naceur, A., Cheikh-M'hamed, H., Abdelly, C., Ben Naceur, M. (2018) Screening of North African barley genotypes for drought tolerance based on yields using tolerance indices under water deficit conditions. *Turkish Journal of Field Crops*. 23(2), 135-145.
- [29] Dekic, V., Popovic, V., Brankovic, S., Terzic, D., Duric, N. (2017) Grain yield and yield components of winter barley. *Agriculture and Forestry*. 63(1), 179-185.
- [30] Przulj, N., Momcilovic, V., Simic, J., Mirosavljevic, M. (2014) Effect of growing year and variety on quality of spring two-rowed barley. *Genetika*. 46(1), 59-73.
- [31] Fox, G., Kelly, A., Bowman, J., Inkerman, A., Poulsen, D., Henry, R. (2009) Is malting barley better feed for cattle than feed barley? *Journal of the Institute of Brewing*. 115(2), 95-104.
- [32] Campbell, L.D., Boila, R.J., Stothers, S.C. (1995) Variation in the chemical composition and test weight of barley and wheat grain grown at selected locations throughout Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*. 75(2), 239-246.
- [33] See, D., Kanazin, V., Kephart, K., Blake, T. (2002) Mapping genes controlling variation in barley grain protein concentration. *Crop Science*. 42, 680-685.
- [34] Grove, A.V., Pas, J.H., Pas, C.W.H. (2003) Chemical composition and ruminal fermentability of barley grain, hulls, and straw as affected by planting date, irrigation level, and variety. *The Professional Animal Scientist*. 19, 273-280.
- [35] Bravi, E., Marconi, O., Perretti, G., Fantozzi, P. (2012) Influence of barley variety and malting process on lipid content of malt. *Food Chemistry*. 135(3), 1112-1117.

---

**Received:** 11.10.2019

**Accepted:** 26.01.2020

---

#### CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

**Bilge Bahar**

Gumushane University,  
Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences,  
Department of Food Engineering,  
29100, Gumushane – Turkey

e-mail: bilgebahar@gmail.com