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#### Abstract

The investigation was conducted at Bakrajo in Sulaimani Province at two seasons (2011-2012 and 2012-2013) to select the best varieties for growth and yield characteristics of lentil that adapted to the environment of Sulaimani province. Eight lentil varieties were utilized in the study. The experiment was designed as a Randomized Complete Block Design (R.C.B.D) with three replications. Mean comparison was carried out by the least significant difference (L.S.D) at a significant level of $5 \%$. The result confirmed the interaction between average seasons and varieties on some growth and forage characteristics for the two seasons. Consequently, the highest value for the characters; plant height with 36.33 , days to $\% 50$ flowering with 118.33 , and days to maturity with 152 were realized by the varieties V.3, V.7, and V. 5 consecutively. The characters, number of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 3.33 for the variety V.1, first pod height with 15 for variety V.6, and variety V. 3 for no. of branch nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 36.677. In the 2012-2013 season, variety V. 5 gave the maximum value for plant height with 44 cm , days to $\% 50$ flowering with 121.66 days for the variety V.3, days to maturity with 161 days for the variety V.8, no. of branches with 19.33 for the variety V.5, and no. of bacterial nodules/plant for the variety V. 3 with 31.66 . Effect of the interaction between seasons and varieties on seed yield and its components for two seasons. The variety V. 2 produced the highest seed yield and some of its yield components for both seasons. The effect of seasons showed that in season 2011-2012 gave the maximum values for all characters of growth and seed yield components for lentil varieties except for no. of seeds/pod and no. of seeds/plant.
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## Introduction

Lentil (Lens culinaris Medik.) belonging to the family Fabaceae is considered an ancient, domesticated, economically important winter legume crop agriculturally cultivated worldwide as human food. Due to the short life of lentil, it is very suitable to be involved in the rotation system, especially with cereals, reducing the effect of weeds, diseases, and soil erosion (2).Pulse crop acres, particularly field peas and lentil, have been expanding in the Northern Plains states and Canadian States (5) Lentils are considered to be a good source of protein. This high protein content in lentils and other pulses makes them a significant food source for developing countries and low-income people (6). Lentil is richer in total soluble fiber than peas and chickpeas. Also, its content of dietary fiber is higher than beans and chickpeas. Like most legumes, lentil is a rich protein source between $20.6 \%$ and $31.4 \%$ proteins (8). Lentil Lens culinaris Medik., faba bean Vicia faba L. and chickpea Cicer arietinum L. provide a considerable portion of the people's diet in this region. For example, Rwanda bean supplies $65 \%$ of the national dietary protein, compared to $4 \%$ from animal protein, and $32 \%$ of the energy (7). The seeds of this plant are commonly used as an edible pulse. Lentils are nutritional valued for their high protein content of about $30 \%$ and a good source of vitamins and other nutrients (6). Lentil has become an important food legume crop in the farming and food systems of many countries globally. The straw is a valued animal feed. Its seed is a rich source of minerals, protein, and vitamins for human nutrition. It is capability carbon sequestration and in nitrogen get better soil
nutrient status (15). The crop is known to tolerate hard environmental conditions (8). It has received little research attention to improving quality and yield(13). Pulse crop acres, particularly field peas and lentil, have been expanding in the Northern Plains states and Canadian States (12). Lentil is known to have a tolerance for extreme environmental conditions such as drought and high temperature and can be grown in semiarid regions without irrigation(1).Lentil contributes significantly to soil fertility, having the capability of fixing the atmospheric nitrogen through a symbiotic relationship with nitrogen-fixing Rhizobium bacteria. Cool-season grain legumes are important protein-rich food crops of East Africa. Climate Lentils require a minimum of 350 mm rainfall a maximum of 550 mm ; in the higher rainfall areas with good drainage is essential; waterlogging will have a great effect on yields and disease spread (3). Lentil is very rich compared to cereals for higher protein content of $28 \%$. The straw also is a valued fodder containing a reasonable amount of minerals $2 \%$ (11). In this study, our objectives were to evaluate eight varieties of lentil under two growth seasons for growth and yield and select the more adaptable varieties to the Sulaimani province Iraqi Kurdistan region.

## Materials and Methods

## Field Experiment

For two winters growing seasons 20112012 and 2012-1013, eight lentil varieties, large seeds, were utilized in this investigation; Flip 2004-56L, Flip2005-2L, Flip2007-11L, Flip2007-12L, Flip200719L, Flip2007-29L, Flip 2007-30L, and local check denoted by (V.1-V.8)
respectively. They were obtained from the Agricultural Research Station of BakrajoSulaimani. The varieties were grown at Bakrajo. The experiment was laid out according to a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replications in both seasons. A line of 2 m length and 30 cm apart. Plots have consisted of four rows . The seed rate of $100 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ was applied for all varieties in November for both seasons. Also, an amount of $160 \mathrm{~kg} \cdot \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ DAP, $40 \mathrm{~kg} \cdot \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ urea fertilizer was applied during sowing. Mechanical weed control was applied to the experiment. Data were recorded from the whole plot for seed yield, biomass, and harvest index, while for other traits; the average value from ten plants in each plot was recorded. The measured traits included; plant height cm , days to $\% 50$ flowering, days to maturity, no. of branches per plant, first pod height cm , no. of pods per plant, no. of seed per plant, first pod length cm , no. of nodules, no. of seeds per pods, 100 seeds, seed yield kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$. Seed yield in kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ as a yield rate per hectare by tons, counted by converting the yield of plot area into a hectare. The average weight of the whole
plants for each plot converted to kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, and harvest index (HI), counted as the ratio of grain yield to biological yield (16).

Harvest Index (HI \%) =

$$
\frac{\text { Economic yield(seed yield) }}{\text { Biological yield }} \mathrm{X} 100
$$

All possible comparisons among the means would be carried out using the Least Significant Difference test LSD at a significant $5 \%$ level after showing their significance in the general test.

## Results and Discussions

Data from Table (1) presents the Means of eight lentil varieties' response in some growth characteristics for the season 20112012. Data was found to be significant Difference at $5 \%$ (LSD) for plant height, days to maturity, and no. of bacterial nodules/plant, but no significance for days to $\% 50$ flowering, no. of branches per plant, and no. of bacterial nodules/plant. The variety Flip 2004-56L gave maximum value for no. of branches per plant and first pod height with 3.33 and 14.33, respectively.

Table 1: Performance of means traits of eight lentil varieties in the growing season 20112012.

| varieties | Plant <br> height <br> (cm) | Days <br> to\% 50 <br> flowering | Days to <br> maturity | No. of <br> branches <br> .plant $^{-1}$ | First pod <br> height <br> (cm) | No. of <br> bacterial <br> nodules. <br> Plant $^{-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V.1 | 36.33 | 116.33 | 147.33 | 3.33 | 14.33 | $\mathbf{2 7 . 3 3 3}$ |
| V.2 | 40.66 | 117.00 | 147.66 | 3.00 | 13.66 | $\mathbf{2 8 . 3 3 3}$ |
| V.3 | 35.33 | 117.33 | 145.66 | 3.00 | 14.32 | $\mathbf{3 6 . 6 6 7}$ |
| V.4 | 37.66 | 116.66 | 144.33 | 2.63 | 13.60 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 6 6 7}$ |
| V.5 | 42.00 | 117.33 | 152.00 | 2.65 | 13.33 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 6 6 7}$ |
| V.6 | 36.33 | 116.32 | 148.00 | 3.00 | 14.00 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 6 6 7}$ |
| V.7 | 37.66 | 118.33 | 150.00 | 3.00 | 13.00 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0 0 0}$ |
| V.8 | 42.01 | 116.66 | 145.60 | 3.00 | 14.31 | $\mathbf{3 1 . 3 3 3}$ |
| LSD (5\%) | 3.80 | N.S | 5.073 | N.S | N.S | $\mathbf{1 2 . 1 2 4}$ |
| N.S |  |  |  |  |  |  |

N.S= Non signifiant

Variety V. 3 produced maximum value for no. of nodules/plant with 36.66 . Variety V. 4 recorded the minimum value for days to maturity and no. of branches/plant with
144.33 and 2.63 , respectively. Variety V. 5 maximum value for plant height 42.00 cm Variety V. 6 recorded the lowest value for days to $\% 50$ flowering with 116.32 .

Table 2: Differences between means eight lentil varieties in the yield and yield components in the growing season 2011-2012.

|  | No. of <br> Vod. <br> Varieties <br> Plant $^{-}$ | No. of <br> Seed. <br> Plant $^{-1}$ | No. <br> of <br> seed <br> $\mathbf{p o d}^{-\mathbf{1}}$ | Pod <br> length <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ <br> seed <br> weight <br> $(\mathbf{g m})$ | Seed <br> yield <br> kg.ha $^{-\mathbf{1}}$ | Biological <br> lield kg. <br> ha $^{\mathbf{- 1}}$ | Harvest <br> index\% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V.1 | 40.330 | 45.000 | 1.300 | 1.330 | 5.560 | 2635.050 | 6896.373 | $\mathbf{3 8 . 3}$ |
| V.2 | 38.000 | 47.330 | 1.600 | 1.560 | 6.160 | 2759.390 | 7049.723 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1}$ |
| V.3 | 44.330 | 33.330 | 1.600 | 1.260 | 5.900 | 2749.570 | 7842.650 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 0}$ |
| V.4 | 38.000 | 39.600 | 1.010 | 1.300 | 6.700 | 2662.350 | 7114.870 | $\mathbf{3 7 . 4}$ |
| V.5 | 38.000 | 40.000 | 1.000 | 1.230 | 6.400 | 2485.020 | 6852.420 | $\mathbf{3 6 . 2}$ |
| V.6 | 40.000 | 32.330 | 2.100 | 1.460 | 6.200 | 2474.830 | 6426.907 | $\mathbf{3 8 . 5}$ |
| V.7 | 32.000 | 34.660 | 2.000 | 1.500 | 6.330 | 2319.053 | 5618.603 | $\mathbf{4 1 . 2}$ |
| V.8 | 32.000 | 39.330 | 1.620 | 1.200 | 5.700 | 2571.490 | 6581.947 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 0}$ |
| LSD | 6.940 | 10.940 | N.S. | 0.260 | N.S. | 121.891 | 176.688 | N.S. |
| (5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

N.S.= Non signifiant

Data represent in Table (2) explain the performance of seed yield and its components of eight lentil varieties for season 2011-2012. It was noticed that the differences among varieties were significant at $5 \%$ (LSD) for no. of pod/plant, no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length, seed yield, and biological yield. But not significant for no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}, 100$ seed weight, and harvest index. Variety V. 1 gave maximum value for 100 seed weight with 5.56 gm . However, variety V. 2 recorded the highest value for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length, seed yield, and biological yield with $47.33 \mathrm{gm}, 1.56$, gm $2759.39 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$, and $7049.72 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$, respectively. Variety V. 3 produced the
highest value for no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, while the lowest value recorded in harvest index with $35 \%$. Variety V. 4 gave maximum value for 100 seed weight with 6.70 gm , while no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$ gave the minimum value of 1.01 . Variety V. 6 gave the highest value for no. of seed. pod $^{-1}$ with 2.10 . Variety V. 7 gave maximum value for the harvest index with 0.41 . While the minimum values for no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, seed yield, and biological yield with $32.00,34.66,2319.05 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$, and 5618.60 kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, respectively. The lowest value recorded for the characters; no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$ and pod length with 32.00 and 1.20 cm , respectively, this result in agreement with previous studies (4).

Table 3 Performance of means of traits of eight lentil varieties in the growing season 2012-2013.

| Varieties | Plant <br> height <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | Days to <br> $\mathbf{\% 5 0}$ <br> flowering | Days to <br> maturity | No. of <br> branches <br> plant $^{-\mathbf{1}}$ | First <br> pod <br> height <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | No. of <br> bacterial <br> nodules. <br> plant $^{\mathbf{1}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| V.1 | 37.330 | 117.660 | 158.330 | 3.030 | 17.000 | 26.333 |
| V.2 | 42.333 | 118.667 | 159.000 | 3.010 | 19.000 | 19.333 |
| V.3 | 38.660 | 121.660 | 158.00 | 3.030 | 17.333 | 31.667 |
| V.4 | 35.000 | 118.660 | 159.333 | 3.020 | 19.333 | 21.333 |
| V.5 | 44.000 | 120.660 | 157.667 | 4.000 | 17.000 | 25.000 |
| V.6 | 42.330 | 118.330 | 158.667 | 3.020 | 16.333 | 15.333 |
| V.7 | 36.000 | 117.330 | 157.33 | 3.030 | 18.333 | 14.000 |
| V.8 | 39.330 | 120.333 | 161.000 | 3.000 | 17.000 | 21.667 |
| LSD $(5 \%)$ | 6.375 | 2.129 | 1.921 | N.S. | 2.088 | N.S. |

N.S = Non signifiant

The results in Table(3) revealed significant differences between varieties in all characters except for no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-}$ 1 and no. of bacterial nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$. Variety V. 3 recorded maximum value for days to $\% 50$ flowering and no. of nodules . plant $^{-1}$ with 121.66 and 31.66 , respectively, but days to maturity showed a minimum value of 158 . Variety V. 4 produced the highest value for the first pod height with 19.33 cm and showed the lowest value for plant height with 35.000
cm . Variety V. 5 gave maximum value for plant height and no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 44 and 4 respectively, while variety V. 6 gave the lowest value for the first height with 16.333 cm , and variety V. 7 also recorded the lowest value for the first pod height and no. of nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 117.33 cm and 14.00 , respectively. Variety V. 8 recorded the highest value with 161.00 by the days to maturity, while no. of branch.plant ${ }^{-1}$ gave minimum value with 3.00 Table (3).

Table 4: performance of means of seed yield and its components of eight lentil varieties for season 2012-2013 average.

| varieties | No. of <br> pod. <br> Plant $^{-1}$ | No. of <br> Seed. <br> Plant $^{-1}$ | Pod <br> length <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | 100 seed <br> weight <br> $(\mathbf{g})$ | Seed <br> yield <br> kg/ha | Biological <br> yield <br> kg.ha $^{-1}$ | Harvest <br> index $\mathbf{~ \% ~}^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V.1 | 34 | 20.660 | 1.86 | 5.500 | 1253.55 | 5617.543 | 22.3 |
| V.2 | 46 | 25.660 | 1.66 | 6.160 | 1332.25 | 4628.337 | 28.6 |
| V.3 | 42 | 29.000 | 1.733 | 5.660 | 1264.44 | 5326.507 | 23.0 |
| V.4 | 50 | 28.660 | 1.400 | 6.160 | 1264.40 | 4552.450 | 27.7 |
| V.5 | 60 | 29.330 | 1.460 | 6.500 | 1157.11 | 5044.943 | 22.9 |
| V.6 | 36 | 26.000 | 1.500 | 5.830 | 1159.67 | 4949.333 | 23.4 |
| V. 7 | 28 | 31.660 | 1.566 | 6.200 | 1060.17 | 4502.863 | 23.5 |
| V.8 | 46 | 36.660 | 1.5667 | 5.166 | 1281.77 | 5496.490 | 23.3 |
| LSD | 6.63 | 9.219 | 0.24 | N.S. | 69.26 | 142.588 | 0.09 |
| (5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

N.S= Non signifiant

Table 4 displays the performance of means of seed yield and its components of eight lentil varieties for season 2012-2013 performance of means of seed yield and its components of eight lentil varieties for season 2012-2013. Indicated the significant difference between the treatment for most of the characters; however, no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-}$ ${ }^{1}$ and 100 seed weight were not significant. Variety V. 1 gave the highest value was 1.860 cm achieved by pod length, and the lowest value was $20.66,5617.54 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ and $22 \%$ for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, biological yield, and harvest index, respectively. At seasons 2011-2012, the variety V. 2 gave
maximum values for seed yield kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, biological yield, and harvest index with $1332.25,4628.33$, and $28.6 \%$ respectively, while exhibited the lowest value for pod length with 1.400 recorded by the variety V.4, which is similar to previous research result (9). Variety V. 5 recorded the highest value with 60 by no. of pod/plant. However, variety V. 7 produced the lowest value with 28 for no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$. Variety V. 8 gave a maximum value of 36.66 for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, while 100 seed weight recorded the lowest value with 5.16 gm . Which is similar to previous research result [14].

Table 5: means of some growth characters of eight lentil varieties for seasons 2011-2012

| varieties | Plant <br> height <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | Days <br> to\% \% 50 <br> flowering | Days <br> maturity | No. <br> branches <br> plant $^{-\mathbf{1}}$ | ofFirst <br> pod <br> height <br> (cm) | No. of <br> bacterial <br> nodules. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Plant $^{\mathbf{- 1}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 explains the means of some growth maturity recorded the minimum value of characters of eight lentil varieties for seasons 2011-2012. As the average of both seasons, the interaction effect between varieties and seasons was highly significant for all characters. Variety V. 1 showed the highest value for no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 3.16 , while the lowest value was recorded days to $\% 50$ flowering with 117 days. It was observed that the variety V. 2 gave the maximum value for plant height with 37.66 . Variety V. 3 produced maximum value for days to $\% 50$ flowering with 119.50 , while days to

Variety V. 4 showed the highest value for the first pod highest with 16.66 cm . In the 2012-2013 season, variety V. 5 produced maximum value for the character days to maturity reached 154.83 , while exhibited the lowest values for no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$ and first pod height was reached 3.33 cm and 15.50 , respectively. However, variety V. 6 recorded the lowest value for no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 3.00. In contrast, variety V. 7 gave the minimum value for the plant high and no. of bacterial
nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 32.500 and 16.00 , respectively.

Table 6 illustrates the average of traits of seed yield and its components of some lentil varieties for seasons 2012-2013. It was noticed that the differences among
varieties were significant for all traits studied; no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$, pod length (cm), 100 seed weight (gm), seed yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), biological yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), and harvest index.

Table 6: Average of some lentil varieties on seed yield and its components for seasons 2012-2013

| varieties | No. of pod. Plant ${ }^{-}$ 1 | No. of seed.plant ${ }^{-}$ 1 | No. of seed . .pod $^{-1}$ | Pod length (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100 \\ & \text { seed } \\ & \text { weight } \\ & (\mathrm{gm}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | seed <br> Yield <br> kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ | Biological yield Kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ | Harvest index \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V. 1 | 37.500 | 23.166 | 1.331 | 1.600 | 5.533 | 1944.300 | 6256.958 | 30.1 |
| V. 2 | 42.000 | 24.500 | 1.665 | 1.616 | 6.166 | 2045.820 | 5839.030 | 33.8 |
| V. 3 | 43.333 | 17.3330 | 1.664 | 1.500 | 5.783 | 2007.010 | 6584.578 | 29.7 |
| V. 4 | 44.333 | 20.500 | 1.167 | 1.350 | 6.433 | 1963.380 | 5833.660 | 32.5 |
| V. 5 | 49.000 | 20.666 | 1.500 | 1.350 | 6.450 | 1821.070 | 5948.681 | 29.5 |
| V. 6 | 38.333 | 16.833 | 1.663 | 1.483 | 6.016 | 1817.250 | 5688.120 | 30.9 |
| V. 7 | 30.000 | 17.833 | 1.833 | 1.533 | 6.366 | 1689.610 | 5060.733 | 32.3 |
| V. 8 | 39.000 | 20.333 | 1.333 | 1.383 | 5.433 | 1926.630 | 6039.218 | 31.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LSD } \\ & (5 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.080 | 0.092 | 0.0137 | 0.0029 | 0.010 | 1.177395 | 2.6464 | 29.3 |

The lowest value for no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$ and 100 seed weight recorded by the variety V. 1 reached 1.33 and 5.53 gm , respectively. Variety V. 2 produced the maximum value for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, seed yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), and harvest index with $24.50,2045.82$, and 0.33 , respectively. Variety V. 5 recorded the highest value for no. of pod/plant, 100 seed weight, and biological yield with $49.00,6.45 \mathrm{gm}$, and 5948.68 , respectively, whereas the lowest value for harvest index was 29.5 gm . Moreover, variety V. 6 and V. 7 provided the lowest value for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$, no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, seed yield,
and biological yield with $16.83,30.00$, $1.38,1689.61 \mathrm{Kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$, and $5060.73 \mathrm{Kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-}$ ${ }^{1}$, respectively, while pod length recorded the minimum value for no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$ with 1.83 .

Data represented in Table 7 Effect of the seasons on some growth and forage characters of eight lentil varieties for both seasons. Showed in that were found to affect all characters significantly for both seasons. Variety V. 3 produced the highest value for no. of bacterial nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 36.67 .

Table 7: Effect of the seasons on some growth and forage characters of eight lentil varieties for both seasons.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Seas } \\ \text { ons } \end{gathered}$ | varieti es | Plant height (cm) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days to } \\ \% 50 \\ \text { flowering } \end{gathered}$ | Days to maturity | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { No. of } \\ \text { branche } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { plant } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | First pod height (cm) | No. of bacterial nodules. plant ${ }^{-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ - \\ 2012 \end{gathered}$ | V. 1 | 31.333 | 116.333 | 147.333 | 3.333 | 14.100 | 23.733 |
|  | V. 2 | 33.000 | 117.000 | 147.666 | 3.000 | 14.310 | 28.333 |
|  | V. 3 | 36.333 | 117.333 | 145.666 | 3.010 | 14.120 | 36.677 |
|  | V. 4 | 33.000 | 116.66 | 144.333 | 2.666 | 14.020 | 24.646 |
|  | V. 5 | 30.666 | 117.333 | 152.000 | 2.636 | 14.200 | 20.636 |
|  | V. 6 | 29.000 | 116.323 | 148.000 | 3.020 | 15.000 | 21.616 |
|  | V. 7 | 29.010 | 118.333 | 150.000 | 3.011 | 14.220 | 18.000 |
|  | V. 8 | 26.333 | 116.66 | 145.666 | 3.000 | 14.014 | 31.323 |
|  | V. 1 | 37.333 | 117.666 | 158.333 | 3.030 | 17.000 | 26.333 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2012 \\ - \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | V. 2 | 42.333 | 118.666 | 159.000 | 3.666 | 19.000 | 19.313 |
|  | V. 3 | 38.666 | 121.666 | 158.000 | 3.343 | 17.333 | 31.666 |
|  | V. 4 | 35.000 | 118.666 | 159.333 | 3.313 | 19.333 | 21.333 |
|  | V. 5 | 44.000 | 120.666 | 157.666 | 4.000 | 17.000 | 25.000 |
|  | V. 6 | 42.333 | 118.333 | 158.666 | 3.000 | 16.313 | 15.334 |
|  | V. 7 | 36.000 | 117.333 | 157.333 | 3.333 | 18.333 | 14.000 |
|  | V. 8 | 39.333 | 120.333 | 161.000 | 3.000 | 17.000 | 21.666 |
| LSD (5\%) |  | LSD (5\%) | 0.040 | 0.064 | 0.0327 | 0.074 | 0.243 |

Regarding the varieties V.4, V.5, V.6, V.7, and V. 8 gave the lowest values for days to maturity, plant height, no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$, days to $\% 50$ flowering, and first pod height with 144.33 days, $29.00 \mathrm{~cm} 2.63,116.32$ days, and 14.014 cm , respectively, for the seasons 2011-2012. While days to $\% 50$ flowering gave maximum value with 121.66 recorded by the variety V.3. The characters of first pod
height, no. of branches, and days to maturity provided maximum value realized by m varieties V.4, V.5, V.6, and V. 8 with $19.33 \mathrm{~cm}, 44.00,4.00$, and 161.00 days, respectively, for seasons 2012-2013. It is concluded that this variation is due to differences in temperature degrees, which affected the lateness and earliness of plant development to reach this stage.

Table 8: Effect of the seasons on seed yield and its components characters of eight lentil varieties for both seasons.

| Seas ons | varietie $\mathbf{s}$ | No. of pods. Plant ${ }^{-1}$ | No. of seeds. Plant ${ }^{-}$ 1 | No. of seed .pod-1 | Pod length (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100 \\ & \text { seed } \\ & \text { weight } \\ & (\mathrm{g}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Seed yield kg .ha ${ }^{-1}$ | Biologic <br> al yield <br> Kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Harves } \\ & \mathbf{t} \\ & \text { index } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \\ & - \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | V. 1 | 40.333 | 45.000 | 1.333 | 1.333 | 5.566 | 2635.050 | 6896.373 | 38.2 |
|  | V. 2 | 38.000 | 47.333 | 1.676 | 1.566 | 6.166 | 2759.390 | 7049.723 | 39.1 |
|  | V. 3 | 44.333 | 42.666 | 1.656 | 1.266 | 5.900 | 2749.576 | 7842.650 | 35.0 |
|  | V. 4 | 38.000 | 39.666 | 1.333 | 1.300 | 6.700 | 2662.356 | 7114.870 | 37.4 |
|  | V. 5 | 38.000 | 40.000 | 1.635 | 1.230 | 6.400 | 2485.020 | 6852.420 | 36.1 |
|  | V. 6 | 40.000 | 32.333 | 1.334 | 1.466 | 6.212 | 2474.833 | 6426.906 | 38.4 |
|  | V. 7 | 28.000 | 34.666 | 1.666 | 1.500 | 6.533 | 2319.053 | 5618.603 | 41.2 |
|  | V. 8 | 32.000 | 39.33 | 1.027 | 1.200 | 5.700 | 2571.490 | 6581.946 | 39.0 |
|  | V. 1 | 34.666 | 49.666 | 1.323 | 1.866 | 5.500 | 1253.553 | 5617.543 | 22.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2012 \\ & - \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | V. 2 | 46.000 | 46.000 | 1.668 | 1.666 | 6.166 | 1332.256 | 4628.336 | 28.6 |
|  | V. 3 | 42.333 | 33.333 | 1.666 | 1.733 | 5.833 | 1264.440 | 5326.506 | 23.7 |
|  | V. 4 | 50.666 | 41.333 | 1.020 | 1.400 | 6.166 | 1264.403 | 4552.450 | 27.7 |
|  | V. 5 | 60.000 | 51.000 | 1.000 | 1.466 | 6.521 | 1157.113 | 5044.943 | 22.8 |
|  | V. 6 | 36.666 | 44.666 | 2.022 | 1.500 | 5.833 | 1159.673 | 4949.333 | 23.4 |
|  | V. 7 | 32.000 | 51.000 | 2.030 | 1.566 | 6.200 | 1060.173 | 4502.863 | 23.5 |
|  | V. 8 | 46.000 | 59.333 | 1.675 | 1.566 | 5.166 | 1281.773 | 5496.490 | 23.3 |
| LSD (5\%) |  | 0.1140 6 | 0.1897 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0194 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 0.019416 | 0.130 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.66508 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0009 | 374.2 |

Table 8 explains Effect of the seasons on seed yield and its components characters of eight lentil varieties for both seasons. At the average of two seasons of the interaction, the highest value for seed yield was $2759.39 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ recorded by the interaction between variety V. 2 and season 2011-2012. In addition, the maximum value for biological yield $\mathrm{kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ was 7842.65 recorded by the variety V. 3 and season 2011-2012. The highest value for pod length ( cm ) and 100 seed weight (gm) was 1.30 cm and 6.70 gm , respectively. In contrast, the lowest value for no. of seeds/plant with 32.33 recorded by the variety V. 6 and season 2011-2012. In addition, the lowest value for no. of pod. Plant ${ }^{-1}$ was 28.000 recorded by the interaction between variety V. 7 and season 2011-2012. The highest value for harvest
index was 0.41 produced by variety V. 7 and season 2011-2012. At season 20122013, no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$ recorded the maximum value with 60.00 by variety V. 5 and the season. Nevertheless, the lowest value for no. of seed/pod with 1.00 was recorded by the variety V. 5 and 2012-2013 season. The character no. of seed/pod with 2.03 was recorded by variety V.7. While minimum value for seed yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ) and biological yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ) were 1060.173 and 4502.86, respectively, shown by variety V. 7 and the 2012-2013 season. The highest value for no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$ with 2.03 was produced by the variety V. 7 and the 2012-2013 season. Variety V. 8 gave maximum value for no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 59.33 in the 2012-2013 season. In contrast, the lowest value for pod length and 100
seed weight with 1.56 and 5.16, respectively, was recorded by variety V.8.

Table 9 explains the effect of seasons on the growth of lentil varieties. Significant effects were found in both seasons for all characteristics. It is observed that the
second season realized more yielding than the first season in all characters, Plant height (cm), Days to \%50 flowering, Days to maturity, No. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$, First pod height (cm), No. of bacterial nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ by 26.67, 1.85, 15.76, $12.67,25.06$, and 19.46 , respectively.

Tables 9: Effect of averages of both seasons on growth characters of eight lentil varieties.

| Seasons | Plant <br> height <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | Days to \%50 <br> flowering | Days to <br> maturity | No. of <br> branches <br> plant $^{-1}$ | First pod <br> height <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | No. of <br> bacterial <br> nodules. <br> Plant $^{\mathbf{- 1}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 2 0 1 2}$ | 39.375 | 119.166 | 158.666 | 3.333 | 17.666 | 26.083 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 2 0 1 3}$ | 31.083 | 117.000 | 147.583 | 2.958 | 14.125 | 21.833 |
| LSD $(5 \%)$ | 0.036 | 0.022 | 0.034 | 0.006 | 0.014 | 0.053 |

The first season recorded a significant difference for plant height, days to $\% 50$ flowering, days to maturity, no. of
no. of bacterial nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 39.37 cm , 119.16 days, 158.66 , days $3.33 \mathrm{~cm}, 17.66 \mathrm{~cm}$, and 26.08 , respectively. branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$, first pod height ( cm ), and
Table-10: Effect of averages of both seasons on seed yield and its components of eight lentil varieties.

| Seasons | No. of <br> pods. <br> Plant $^{-1-}$ | No. of <br> seeds. <br> pod $^{-1}$ | No. of <br> seeds. <br> Plant $^{-1}$ | Pod <br> length <br> $(\mathbf{c m})$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ seed <br> weight(g) | Biological <br> yield <br> $\mathbf{k g h a}^{\prime}$ | Seed <br> yield <br> $\mathbf{k g . h a}^{-\mathbf{1}}$ | harvest <br> index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 -}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 43.041 | 1.500 | 38.958 | 1.595 | 6.145 | 6797.936 | 2582.096 | 0.380 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 -}$ | 37.8333 | 1.541 | 48.208 | 1.358 | 5.900 | 5014.808 | 1221.673 | 0.244 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ |  | 0.004216 | 0.05636 | 0.0190 | 0.0054 | 0.4090 | 1.6328 | 0.0003 |

Data represented in table 10 indicated effects for both seasons' on seed yield and its components of lentil varieties under study. In the first season, no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length ( cm ), 100 seed weight (gm), biological yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), seed yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), and harvest index with 43.04, $1.59 \mathrm{~cm}, \quad 6.145 \mathrm{gm}, \quad 6797.93 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$,
$2582.09 \mathrm{~kg} . \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$, and $38 \%$, respectively, were recorded highest values. However, no. of seed.pod ${ }^{-1}$ and no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$ produced the lowest value with 1.50 and 38.95 , respectively. In the second season, no. of seed/pod and no. of seed.plant ${ }^{-1}$ with 1.54 and 48.20 gave the maximum value. While no. of pod/plant, pod length (cm),

100 seed weight (gm), biological yield (kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$ ), seed yield kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, and harvest index with $37.833,1.35,5.90,5014.80$ kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, kg.ha ${ }^{-1} 1221.67$ kg.ha ${ }^{-1}$, and $24 \%$, respectively, gave the minimum values.

## Conclusions

Lentil is one of an important legume crop and plays a crucial role in human, animal feeding, and soil improvement.. It is a cool-season food legume playing a significant role in human and animal nutrition and soil fertility maintenance (10). The result of the current investigation indicated the significant differences among the varieties for most of the traits studied, we concluded that the first season 20112012 gave the maximum value for days $\% 50$ flowering, days to maturity, no. of branches.plant ${ }^{-1}$, first pod height ( cm ), and no. of bacterial nodules.plant ${ }^{-1}$ However, the second season realized the highest value for no. of pod.plant ${ }^{-1}$, pod length, 100 seed weight, biological yield, seed yield, and harvest index of lentil varieties compared to the first season. Depending on the study results, it can be recommended that the variability of variety performance was associated mainly with the climatic conditions and the genetic variation among varieties at each location. Thus, varieties should be carefully selected and released for corresponding regions depending mainly on seasonal weather conditions. Therefore, the Lentil variety V. 2 and variety V. 3 were selected. Moreover, the first season was better than the second one for planting lentil in the region attributed to climatic differences.
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## Appendix

## Appendix (1) Mean squares of variance Analysis of Lentil for some growth Characters

| S.O.V | d. <br> f | Plant height (cm) | Mean square |  |  |  | No. of bacteria 1 nodules Plant ${ }^{-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Days } \\ & \text { to } \% 50 \\ & \text { flowerin } \\ & \mathrm{g} \end{aligned}$ | Days to maturit y | No. of branche s .plant ${ }^{-1}$ | First pod height (cm) |  |
| Replications | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 1.3333 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | 1.08333 | 6.8125 | 0.14583 | $\begin{gathered} 1.2708 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55.270 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| Year | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 825.02 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 56.3333 | $\begin{gathered} 1474.0 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 1.6875 | $\begin{gathered} 150.52 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 216.75 |
| Varieties | 7 | $\begin{gathered} 26.758 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | 4.33333 | 5.7976 | 0.11607 | $\begin{gathered} 1.3779 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 183.65 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| Year*Varieties | 7 | $\begin{gathered} 33.449 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 4.14286 | $16.845$ | 0.40179 | $\begin{gathered} 2.5208 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30.416 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| Year*Replications\&Rando m | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 6.3333 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | 2.33333 | 5.6453 | 0.1875 | $\begin{gathered} 1.0208 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.687 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| Varieties*Replications [Year]\&Random | 28 | $\begin{gathered} 6.0238 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.97024 | 2.4910 | 0.64286 | $\begin{gathered} 0.7886 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.455 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |

## Appendix (2) Mean squares of variance Analysis lentil for seed yield and its components

## Mean squares

| S.O.V | d. $\mathrm{f}$ | No. of pod. Plant | No. <br> of <br> Seed. <br> Plant | No. of seed . .pod $^{-1}$ | Pod lengt h (cm) | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { seed } \\ \text { weig } \\ \text { ht } \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | Seed yield kg.ha- | $\begin{gathered} \text { Biologi } \\ \text { cal } \\ \text { yield } \\ \mathrm{kg} \cdot \mathrm{ha}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | Harv est index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Replications | 2 | 69.93 | 106.0 | 11.08 | 0.002 | 0.043 | 1809. | 7332.5 | 0.000 |
|  |  | 75 | 83 | 33 | 71 | 33 | 56 | 6 | 68 |
| Year | 1 | 325.5 | 1026. | 1698 | 0.676 | 0.725 | 2.227 | 3.8277 | 0.224 |
|  |  | 21 | 75 | 7.7 | 88 | 21 | 75 | 8 | 27 |
| Varieties | 7 | 191.4 | 109.1 | 45.21 | 0.068 | 0.972 | 8289 | 117846 | 0.001 |
|  |  | 73 | 9 | 13 | 07 | 35 | 9.2 | 3 | 5 |
| Year*Varieties | 7 | 160.8 | 79.03 | 41.59 | 0.056 | 0.085 | 8629. | 606944 | 0.001 |
|  |  | 54 | 57 | 23 | 87 | 68 | 89 | 606944 | 29 |
| Year*Replications\& Random | 2 | 2.770 | 15.25 | 14.25 | 0.004 | 0.143 | 31.99 | 802.99 | 0.000 |
|  |  | 83 |  | 0 | 38 | 33 | 59 | 8 | 44 |
| Varieties*Replicatio | 2 | 7.806 | 21.59 | 10.28 | 0.010 | 0.142 | 1663. | 8404.7 | 0.000 |
| ns [Year]\& Random | 8 | 55 | 52 | 57 | 68 | 86 | 51 | 3 | 5 |

