Effect of Plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.)

BY

# PRAVEEN KUMAR 99A73D

Thesis submitted to the Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University in the partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of:

# DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN VEGETABLE CROPS



# COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE CCS HARYANA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY HISAR – 125 004

2002



## <u>CERTIFICATE - I</u>

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "Effect of Plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.)" submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in the subject of Vegetable Crops of the CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, is a bonafide research work carried out by Praveen Kumar under my supervision and that no part of this dissertation has been submitted for any other degree.

The assistance and help received during the course of investigation have been fully acknowledged.

lat [Dr. Sewa Lall

MAJOR ADVISOR

## CERTIFICATE - II

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "Effect of Plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.*)" submitted by **Praveen Kumar** to the CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of **Ph.D.** in the subject of **Vegetable Crops**, has been approved by the Student's Advisory Committee after an oral examination on the same, in collaboration with an External Examiner.

Xey 2117

HEAD O TMENT

DEAN, POST-GRADUA

<u>Acknowledgment</u>

At the very outset, the author solicits the privilege to offer his deepest sense of gratitude and indebtedness to Dr. Sewa Lal, Professor, Department of Vegetable crops and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee whose officious guidance and constant encouragement only has made the whole process of investigation and preparation of this manuscript a reality.

The author, at the same time expresses his grateful appreciation to Dr. S.K. Arora, Professor and Head, Dept. of Vegetable crops for rendering his expertise evaluation, keen interest and kind help as often and whenever needed during the course of this investigation.

The author is highly obliged to Dr. J.L. Mangal Professor, Dept. of Vegetable crops Dr. S. Siddiqui, Associate Professor, Dept. of Horticulture, Dr. R.K. Rana, Professor, Dept. of Plant Breeding, for their valuable suggestions, enthusiastic interest and guidance as the members of the Advisory Committee, during the course of this academic persuit.

The author expresses his grateful appreciation to Dr. I.S. Hooda Professor, Dept. of Agronomy, for rendering his expertise evaluation, keen interest and kind help as often and whenever needed during the course of this investigation.

The author expresses his sincere thanks to all the friends Dharmoeer, Satish, Mukesh, Rajiv, Devraj, Satyapal, Kailash, Ashwani, Sanjeev, Kuldeep, Bhupender, Manoj, Hansraj, Omprakash, Krishan, Kamal, Ajneesh and Delvender for their constant encouragement and help during the whole period in Hisar.

My sincere thanks also goes to Sanjiv and Rajkumar for typing out the manuscript carefully.

Last but not least, the author offers his heartiest thanks to his adorable wife Neelam for her constant inspiration, countless and unpaid cooperation throughout the Ph.D. programme.

The author remains grateful to all his family members, Patori Devi, Fateh Singh, Roshani Devi and Manjeet Singh for their encouragement and valuable cooperation in each and every aspects throughout the period in Hisar.

The author expresses his sincere thanks to M/s Indian Organic Pood for providing the Pinical Assistance for testing the plant vitalizer

Date: 23 December, 2002

Kimes Praveen Kumar

Place: Hisar

# **CONTENTS**

| Chapter No. | Description            | Pages   |
|-------------|------------------------|---------|
| I           | Introduction           | 1-4     |
| II          | Review of Literature   | 5-26    |
| · III       | Materials and Methods  | 27-46   |
| IV          | Results                | 47-92   |
| v           | Discussion             | 93-106  |
| VI          | Summary and Conclusion | 106-110 |
|             | Bibliography           | i-xv    |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table<br>No. | Description  | Pages |
|--------------|--|-------|
| 1.           | Physico-chemical characteristic of the soil  | 29    |
| 2.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on plant height<br>(cm) at different stages of plant growth.   | 48    |
| 3.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on number of leaves and fresh weight of leaves per plant at 90 DAT.                                      | 50    |
| 4.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on branches/<br>plant and thickness of main stem at 90 DAT.  | 52    |
| 5.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on chlorophyll 'a'<br>and 'b' content of leaves at 65 DAT and dry<br>matter content of plant at harvest. | 54    |
| 6.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on mineral composition of tomato plant.  | 55    |
| 7.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on days to 50% flowering and days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis.                                | 58    |
| 8.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on number of fruits/cluster, number of fruits/plant and fruit size.                                      | 59    |
| 9.           | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on fruit yield per plant and fruit yield per hectare.  | 62    |
| 10.          | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on pulp, juice and seed contents.  | 64    |
| 11.          | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on TSS and Sugar content of tomato fruit.  | 65    |
| 12.          | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on quality of tomato fruit.  | 66    |
| 13.          | Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on tomato leaf curl virus plants/plot, and tomato fruit borer.   | 68    |

- Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 70 manures on plant height (cm) at different stages of plant growth.
- 15. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 72 manures on number of leaves and fresh weight of leaves per plant at 90 DAT.
- Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 74 manures on branches/plant and thickness of main stem.
- 17. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 76 manures on chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' content of leaves at 65 DAT and dry matter of plant at harvest.
- 18. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 78 manures on mineral composition of tomato plant.
- Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 80 manures on days to 50% flowering and days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis.
- 20. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 82 manures on number of fruits/cluster, number of fruits/plant and fruit size.
- 21. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 84 manures on fruit yield per plant and fruit yield per hectare.
- 22. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 87 manures on pulp, juice and seed contents.
- Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 88 manures on TSS and Sugar content of tomato fruit.
- 24. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 90 manures on quality of tomato fruit.
- 25. Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic 92 manures on tomato leaf curl virus plants/plot, and tomato fruit borer.

# **ABBREVIATIONS**

| Anon   | : | Anonymous                |
|--------|---|--------------------------|
| t      | : | Tonne                    |
| q      | : | Quintal                  |
| Kg     | : | Kilogram                 |
| cm     | : | Centimeter               |
| m      | : | Meter                    |
| DAT    | : | Days after transplanting |
| Ν      | : | Nitrogen                 |
| Р      | : | Phosphorus               |
| К      | : | Potassium                |
| et al. | : | And others               |
| ppm    | : | Parts per million        |
| RP     | : | Rock phosphate           |
| Na     | : | Sodium                   |
| Ca     | : | Calcium                  |
| Mg     | : | Magnesium                |
| FW     | : | Fresh weight             |
| DW     | : | Dry weight               |
| IAA    | : | Indole acetic acid       |
| DAP    | : | Diammonium phosphate     |

# CHAPTER - I

Introduction

Tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.) is one of the most important and popular vegetable used in every kitchen in many ways as salad, cooked, soup, juice, ketchup, paste and powder form. It is a rich source of vitamins particularly vitamin A, C and minerals. The soluble solids in tomatoes are predominantly sugars, which contribute to flavour. The free sugars, representing more than 60% of the solids in tomatoes, are mainly D-glucose and D-fructose. Glutamic acid, aspartic acid,  $\gamma$ -aminobutyric acid and glutamine comprise about 80% of the free amino acids and contribute to the taste of tomato fruit (Mcglasson, 1993 and Salunkhe et al., 1974). Tomato is the important source of potassium in human diet. Citric acid and malic acid are the organic acids that contribute to the typical taste of tomato fruit. It also contain tomatine, a glycosidic steroidal alkaloid. Tomato is rich in medicinal properties. Hot water extract of dried fruits has been used in the treatment of ulcers, wounds, hemorrhoids and burns (Caceres et al., 1987 and Ramirez et al., 1988). Tomato poultice has been used in the

treatment of edema during pregnancy. The fresh fruits are reported to be effective as digestive aids and in the treatment of Kidney and liver problems (Liebstein, 1927).

Tomato is grown all over the world in an area of 35,42,000 ha., with an estimated annual production of around 95,127,000 metric tonnes. In India tomato is grown on 4,56,500 ha land with an annual production of 74,26,800 metric tonnes and productivity of 16.3 tonnes/ha. In Haryana tomato is grown in about 9000 ha with production of 1,99,500 tonnes and productivity of 22.2 tonnes/ha (Anon., 2001). In the world it occupies the largest area after potato and sweet-potato, but tops the list of nutritious and processed vegetables (Chaudhary, 1967).

Tomato is a major feeder of nutrients and their average uptake of N, P, K were 3.82, 1.01 and 3.65 kg, respectively, per tonne fruit production (Cholakov, 1987). Therefore, supply and monitoring of nutrients are essential for high productivity. For high achievements, excess of chemical fertilizers and other chemicals are being applied in vegetable crops, which may be health hazardous for human beings. Kaushik and Kaushik (2001) reported that excessive use of nitrogenous fertilizers can enrich the surface water and even ground water with nitrates and can results in methaemoglobinemia and stomach cancer in humans. Anand Prakash *et al.* (2001) also reported that in the developed world, mineral fertilizer application has gone so high that it has shown its ill effects on the environment, like ground water pollution and eutrophication of surface water.

Excessive use of chemicals and artificial fertilizers also cause soil degradation and make the soil polluted. Kathpal and Arora (1988) recorded maximum vegetable contamination with BHC followed by DDT and endosulphan. Thus, organic farming has an important role to play in ensuring stability and sustainability of food production. Efforts are being made to increase and provide vegetables free from harmful effects of chemicals to consumers and the use of organic manures is a major step towards this effort. Organic materials such as FYM, green manure, poultry manure, crop residue etc. offer sustainable and ecologically sound alternative for meeting the nutrient requirement, particularly nitrogen. Fayad and Sweelam (1989) found that application of triple phosphate with cattle manure reduced nematode population and thus increased nutrient uptake and improve the tomato growth. Rumpel (1998) reported that after many years treatment, soil porosity and water retention increased significantly with FYM. Also, the organic carbon and humus content was over 2 times higher with FYM. The combination of FYM with mineral fertilizers did not increase total N content after crop harvest

3

compared to FYM alone. Lucarini et al. (1999) reported that organic tomatoes had a lower dietary fibre content and higher sugar and malic acid contents. There was no difference in total polyphenols between the organic and non-organic fruits, but single phenolic acids were lower in organic tomatoes. Different studies indicated considerable increase in vegetable production and quality improvement by using organic materials without any harmful effect on soil. The herbal (Acorin, Emodin, Serpentine etc.) extract containing some active components which may affect the nutrient mineralization in the soil and metobolism in plants. Consequently, growth and yield of plants are affected. Annupan supplied by M/s. Indian organic foods co, one such extract containing free sugar which affect the microbial activities in soil. Therefore, keeping in view the residual effect of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, it has been planned to study the effect of plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentun Mill) with the following objectives:

- 1. To evaluate the plant vitalizers for growth, yield and quality of tomato.
- To compare the plant vitalizers and organic manure in relation to tomato production.
- To study the plant protection capability of plant vitalizers against insects and diseases.

### CHAPTER – II

Review of Literature

At global level considerable progress has been made in the field of agricultural production. The success of green revolution in India was engineered by breeding high yielding varieties together with the use of fertilizers and pesticides in the best agroclimatic conditions. However, this narrow emphasis was so crucial to the success in productivity terms. It has largely ignored its effects on the soil health, environmental and socioeconomic diversity. Practically no work has been done under present day research methodology in comparison with VIRAKSHAYURVEDA. According to ayurveda every living thing is composed of five basic elements (PANCH MAHABUTAS) i.e. earth, water, air, fire and ether. In various combination of these elements affect three GUNAS i.e. SATVA, TAMA and RAJA and three DOSHA i.e. VATTA, PITTA and KAPHA are called vitia because they uphold or pollute the body. This being the natural rejuvenation of plant need details studies and first time an attempt has been made in this direction, hence forth, could not be supported with relevant documents. So, in future the agricultural scientists and farmers are going to face a big challenge of maintaining the productivity of lands at a sustainable level. Chaudhary and Sharma (1992) reported that out of 329 million ha total geographical area about 29 million ha has become subject to degradation due to explotive type of agriculture.

Sharma (1993) reported that use of chemical fertilizers in high amounts; parts of canal irrigated lands are facing the problems of development of sick soils containing high amount of salts. It has been estimated that 10.5% of the cultivated area is infested with this problem in Haryana.

#### Soil health and conditions

The various studies conducted on the effect of applied herbicides on the microflora and fauna in soil indicate that herbicides stimulates bacterial application of and algal population but reduces population the of fungi and actinomycetes (Malkomes, 1976). Sarwad (1985) reported that Thimet (phorate), Bavistin (carbendazine) and diuron at 10-100 ppm inhibited nitrification but soil dehydrogenase activity was stimulated by all pesticides. Drinkwater *et al.* (1995) reported that nitrogen mineralization potential, microbial and parasitoid abundance and diversity were higher in organic farms as compared to conventional farms and suggested that biological processes compensated for reductions in the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides.

The concept of soil, as a living system, is the centre of farming system as opposed to chemical farming. Soil must be "fed", in a way, that the activities of beneficial soil organisms, necessary for recycling the nutrients and producing humus, are not restricted (Bhawalkar, 1992). Studies conducted for several years at Hisar reveal that application of nitrogenous fertilizers alongwith continuous use of FYM improved the efficiency of fertilizers and other nutrients applied (Singh et al., 1994). It has also been reported that low grade economically cheap rock phosphate composted for about three months in a pit in the ratio of 1:4 (RP : Farm waste) could work as good as any phosphatic fertilizers (Singh et al., 1983 and Ruhal et al., 1991). Chaudhary et al. (1991) suggested that organic carbon content in unfertilized soil has gone down to about half of the initial

level. Similarly, added N through fertilizers also did not have beneficial effect on organic carbon but when FYM was used in every crop season, the organic carbon content increased to about double the initial level. Yadav et al. (2001) also reported that the nutrient content was more in organic manure treated soils than that of inorganic fertilizers treated soils. It was also observed that improvement in physical properties of soil was more in plots treated with organic manure alone or in combination with inorganic fertilizers than that of treated with inorganic fertilizers only. Nehra and Grewal (2001) noted that application of organic manures (FYM @ 15t/ha) increased the organic carbon content and available NPK in soil significantly whereas, soil pH and electrical conductivity did not change under the influence of organic manures as well as fertilizer levels.

Ramteke *et al.* (2001) reported that physico-chemical properties of soil such as bulk density and water holding capacity were significantly improved by FYM applied @ 5 t/ha and paddy straw @ 5 t/ha compared to PM @ 5 t/ha and control. Availability of nitrogen was significantly improved due to FYM and poultry manure. Kaushik and Kaushik (2001) reported that indiscriminate use of agro-chemicals affected the non-target soil organisms which are helpful in maintaining soil fertility. Fertilizers replenish the inorganic materials but not the organic matter and humus. Regular use of inorganic fertilizers resulted imbalances in soil eco-system. Pesticdies used for crop protection disturb the natural predator- prey relationships. Organic farming, is ecologically safe and sustainable method of farming. Organic matter produces humus, gets decomposed by soil microbes and releases NPK etc. necessary for plant growth. It also helps in maintaining the soils physical, chemical, and biological properties on long-term basis.  $\stackrel{}{\star}$ Angadi and Meli (2001) suggested that organic farming with FYM @ 10 t/ha or vermicompost @ 2.5t/ha in the long run can sustain productivity. Integrated use of vermicompost with organic and inorganic fertilizers further elevated the productivity with enhanced returns.

Geissler and Schmidt (1978) recommended peat, FYM and slurry to improve soil structure. Nazaryuk (1989) also reported that combined mineral and organic inputs are considered essential methods of significantly improving the nitrogen status of low fertility soils. Ranganna *et al.* (1991)

reported that BGSS (manure used for biogass generation) has a higher percentage composition of total N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O and organic carbon than FYM and has positive effect on soil health. Ahmed observed that composted coir pith (5-20 t/ha), (1993) incorporated into the soil one day before transplanting the tomato, generally improved soil condition (including strength  $(kg/cm^3)$  and bulk density) and moisture retention capacity compared with 10t FYM/ha. Rumpel (1998) also reported that soil density decreased while porosity and water retention increased significantly with FYM @ 40t/ha. Also the organic carbon content and humus content was over two times higher with FYM. The treatment combination of FYM and NPK (150:100:200 kg/ha) did not increase total N content after crop harvest compared to FYM alone.

#### Plant growth

An application of FYM @ 20t/ha, proper plant growth and development contribute a lot to crop productivity. FYM + NP at 60:60 kg/ha or NP at 120:60kg/ha resulted in good root growth of tomato (Ovchinnikova, 1972). Jose *et al.* (1988) noted the combinations of 50kg N as organic form showed increased dry matter content and higher uptake of N, P, K, Ca and Mg than the other treatments. Organic manure increased the available nitrogen in the soil (Spasov et al., 1977) and this ultimately leads to increased N uptake by the plant. Besides, the organic manure might have improved the development of root system for increased adsorption and uptake of N. The higher plant height (75.15cm) were recorded by the plants receiving 50 kg N as urea and 50 kg N as poultry manure. The improved growth of plants supplied with poultry manure and urea may be attributed to the increased N uptake and utilization. Poultry manure contained growth promoting substances which induced better plant growth. Enhanced plant growth with the application of poultry manure and inorganic fertilizers have been reported by (1981) in bhendi and Dhandpani (1982) Abusaleha in cauliflower. The efficacy of inorganic fertilizers is much pronounced when they are combined with organic manure (Fritz and Wonneberger, 1973). Application of triple phosphate as a source of phosphorus together with cattle manure increased the nutrient uptake and tomato growth reported by Fayad and Sweelam (1989). Application of inorganic fertilizers in the absence of FYM retarded formation of vegetative organs and subsequently reproductive organs (Cerna, 1980). FYM favourably

mass, dry weight, plant height affected vegetative and photosynthetic potential (Meena et al., 1990). Oikeh and Asiegbu (1993) reported that very high manure application (30t/ha) depressed growth, irrespective of the manure source. The potential fertilizer values of the organic manures were not fully reflected by early growth parameters as they were with NPK treatment, apparently due to slow release of the elements that were still bound in organic forms in the manures. The ultimate yield advantages associated with the organic manures compared with NPK fertilizer were ascribed to their probable effects on the supply of macro and micronutrient elements not present is NPK fertilizer. Gagnon and Berrouard (1994) reported that application of organic waste from the agri-food industry mixed with peat compost growing medium prior to transplanting of tomato, produced best growth, significantly by increasing shoot dry weight 57-83% compared with non-fertilized plants. Zeenat and Sharma (1994) found that application of fresh algae improved the vegetative growth (Plant height, leaf no., root biomass and shoot biomass) of tomato seedlings in pots when compared with DAP treatments.

In tomato crop, growth parameters were improved with recommended dose of NPK + FYM (Mallangouda et al., 1995). Treatments with 100% organic manure alone or in combination with ammonium nitrate resulted in taller plants than inorganic fertilizers alone (Youssef et al., 2001). Wang et al. (1996) reported that application of organic granular fertilizer composed of powdered poultry manure, NP & K fertilizers and micronutrients. (A formulation containing 88% powdered poultry manure, 4% urea, 4% KCl, 4% boron sulphate) was best for vegetative growth of tomato. Similar observations were reported by Kumaran et al. (1998) when applied organic and inorganic fertilizer in combination. Shelke et al. (1999) reported that the plant height, number of branches, leaves per plant and leaf area of brinjal were significantly increased due to the application of N through organic and inorganic combination. It was further observed that the highest available NPK content and their uptake by the brinjal plant were due to the application of 40% N through urea and 60% N through poultry manure (Nanthakumar and Veeraragavathatham, 1999).

## Flowering and fruiting behaviour

Early flowering and fruiting in tomato plants occurred whose seedlings had been pricked out into a 2:1 mixture of garden soil and FYM with added NPK and perlite. Compared to the control (2:1 mixture of garden soil and FYM) organic matter formation was accelerated in transplants pricked out into a 1:1 mixture of soil and FYM or into a 2:1 mixture with higher NPK and lower perlite contents (Petrov and Andreev, 1972). Watering the seedlings of tomato 12 hours before transplanting with 0.005% humus solution (from well rotted FYM) at 250 ml/pot under conditions of high mineral and low organic nutrition increased earliness in early cultivar by 9-13%, in medium cultivars by 12-15% and in late varieties by 23-30% (Stanchev, 1972).

Application of organic and biofertilizers along with inorganic NPK in brinjal resulted into early vigorous growth of <u>root</u> would have helped to synthesize more cytokinin by these plants. <u>Better stem girth</u> attained would have helped the translocation of these synthesized cytokinin when compared with the treatments which received the inorganic fertilizers alone. The increased nutrient availability from FYM, the organic phosphorus through phosphobacteria and IAA from azospirillum might have increased the various endogenous hormonal levels in the plant tissue, which were responsible for enhanced pollen germination and tube growth which ultimately increased the fruit set (Rajagopal and Rao, 1974).

The higher number of fruits per plant (13.0) were recorded by the plants receiving 50kg N as urea and 50kg N as poultry manure than the plants which received 100kg N through inorganic source (Jose et al., 1988). Early flowering has been noticed in the plants supplied with inorganic fertilizers as stated by Abusaleha (1981) in bhendi and Dhandpani (1982) in cauliflower. Gianquinto and Borin (1990) reported that tomato ripening was delayed when grown with N 200kg,  $P_2O_5$  100kg and  $K_2O$  280 kg/ha as compared to FYM 20 t/ha with N 100kg,  $P_2O_5$ 50kg and  $K_2O$  140 kg/ha. The recommended dose of fertilizer + farmyard manure recorded more number of fruits per plant (25.47) and the lowest in control (11.60). This was due to favourable influence of fertilizers on Chilli crop. (Mallanagouda et al., 1995).

Number of fruits of tomato per  $m^2$  was significantly increased by poultry manure when applied @ 1.5 t/ha (Argerich

X et al., 1998). NanthaKumar and Veeraragavathatham (1999) reported that number of flowers per plant in brinjal crop, which is one of the most vital attributes, was considerably increased due to the combined application of organic and biofertilziers along with inorganic NPK than the treatments which received the inorganic fertilizers alone. Jose (1984) noted an increase in both long and medium styled flowers (productive flowers) in the treatment with half of the dose as organic source and other half as inorganic source of fertilizers. The fruit set was also significantly improved in the same treatment. The higher fruit set may also be due to the higher percentage of productive flower in these elite treatments (Uma, 1984). The greater fruit weight was recorded in the crop fertilized with both organic and inorganic fertilizes, which might have been due to accelerated mobility of photosynthates from source to sink as influenced by growth hormone, released or synthesized due to the organic source of fertilizers (Susan, 1995).

#### Yield

Khvatov et al. (1973) also reported the best results in tomato from plots receiving combined mineral (full rate) and organic (half rate) fertilizers. Spasov et al. (1977) reported that

tomato growing third and fourth year after the last organic fertilizer application resulted in higher yields than the control. In tomato crop, total commercial yield was highest (68.6t/ha) from plots receiving poultry manure @ 500g/planting hole + NPK at 60:240:240 kg/ha (Almeida et al., 1981). Tomato vield was highest under organic soil treatment as compared to mineral soil 1984).<sup>‡</sup>Linardakis and treatments (Eggert and Kahrmann. Tsikalas (1984) reported that tomato plants in the plots receiving FYM gave the highest total and marketable yields, with NK fertilization having a lesser effect. Jose et al. (1988) reported that the highest yield (51.03t/ha) of brinjal was obtained from plants receiving 50 kg N/ha as poultry manure + 50 kg N/ha as urea. The control gave 20.9 t/ha, which is 143.23% less than the above said. Bagal et al. (1989) reported that application of FYM @ 20t/ha with NPK at 200:100:100 kg/ha produce the highest yield (309 q/ha) of tomato. Hilman and Suwandi (1989) found that the highest yield of tomato 2.16 kg/plant was obtained with sheep manure @ 36 t/ha. Prezotti et al. (1989) reported that application of poultry manure @ 10 t/ha appreciably increased the yield of tomato and augmented fruit size. Phosphorus was beneficial only in the absence of organic matter in the soil. Liming had no appreciable effect on yield. Silva and Vizzotto (1989) reported that the highest yield of tomato fruits (53 t/ha) was obtained with 103.5 kg N + 285.8 kg  $P_2O_5$  + 103.5 kg K<sub>2</sub>O + 20 t poultry manure/ha. Without poultry manure the yield declined to 46.2 t/ha. Application of inorganic fertilizer alone decreased fruit yield was due to retarded formation of vegetative organs and subsequently reproductive organs (Cerna, 1980). Annanurova et al. (1992) found that application of NPK alone increase yield per plant by 43.4% compared with untreated control and when supplemented with FYM @ 30 t/ha by 161.8%. Ahmed (1993) recorded highest tomato yield (19.01 t/ha) with FYM @ 10 t/ha followed by 20t coirpith/ha (16.97 t/ha) and were lowest in controls (11.23 t/ha) with no treatment. Oikeh and Asiegbu (1993) reported that very high manure application (30 t/ha) depressed the yield, irrespective of the manure source. The potential fertilizer values of the organic manures were not fully reflected by early growth parameters as they were with NPK treatment, apparently due to slow release of the elements that were still bound in organic forms in the manures. The ultimate yield advantage associated with the organic manures compared with NPK fertilizer were in

plant, ascribed to their probable effects on the soil physical characteristics. The highest fruit yield (20.9 g/ha FW and 5.7 g/ha DW). In tomato the percentage of yield affected by blossom end rot was lowest with the composted manure treatment given at the start of cultivation. Dried manure given at the start of the experiment gave significantly greater fresh weights than composted manure (Salmmen, 1997). Alexiev et al. (1997) reported that application of 200t FYM/ha increased tomato yields by 14.6% compared with application of only 50t FYM/ha. Kalembasa et al. (1998) reported that vermicompost and FYM increased the yield of lettuce and tomatoes in comparison to the unamended control. Except at the lowest rate, ammonium nitrate decreased the yield of lettuce and tomatoes. The form of N used had a significant effect only on tomato K, Mg and Ca contents. Kumaran et al. (1998) reported that results of an experiment showed that a combination of organic and inorganic fertilizers gave the best results in terms of yield Rumpel (1998) found that tomato and onion yields was significantly higher with combined fertilizer treatment (FYM (a) 40 t/ha + NPK 150:100:200 kg/ha) compared to FYM alone. Duraisamy et al. (1999) reported that fruit yield of tomato was higher when

supplied with organic fertilizer composted coir-pith (CCP) 12.5 t/ha or FYM 12.5 t/ha than those supplied with inorganic N. Among the organic fertilizers CCP resulted in the highest fruit vield (14.68 t/ha). NanthaKumar and Veeraragavathatham (1999) reported that a combined nutrition of organic manure through 12.5 t/ha of FYM, 2 kg each of azospirillum and phosphobacteria and 75 per cent of the recommended dose of inorganic (NPK 75:37.5:30 kg/ha) increased the yield parameters and yield in brinjal. The increased yield obtained in plants inoculated with azosprilliuum could be attributed to the effect of growth hormones like IAA, cytokinin produced by azospirillum (Fallick et al., 1989), Vitamin B12 (Sankaran, 1960), auxin (Naumova et al., 1962). Fugro (2000) reported that the treatment combination comprising organic manure in with NPK superimposed with alternate sprays of organic and chemical pesticides produced the maximum yield of green chilli (166 q/ha).

#### Fruit quality

Michalik *et al.* (1975) reported that FYM or mineral fertilizers had no appreciable effect on the juice, dry matter content and vitamin C content of tomatoes and capsicums.

Matev and Stanchev (1979) found strongest antagonism between K<sup>+</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup> which inhibited sugar, organic acid and vitamin C synthesis and reduced TSS percentage in the glasshouse tomatoes. Humus extracts from FYM reduced antagonism between  $Ca^{2+}$  and  $K^+$  and improved growth and fruit development. Blanc et al. (1983) reported that FYM reduced the tomato fruit number, nitrate and K contents of fruit calvces. Eggert and Kahrmann (1984) found that the concentration of reduced ascorbic acid was higher in tomatoes grown under the organic treatments. Patil and Bojappa (1984) reported that the highest level of nitrogen (150 kg/ha) recorded the highest percentage of total sugar (3.127) and reducing sugar (2.867). Verma et al. (1970) and Maher (1972) also observed an increase in reducing and total sugars with increase in nitrogen levels. As regards phosphorus, the increase in the level of applied phosphorus had no significant influence on the sugars content.

Piven *et al.* (1987) found that increasing nitrogen from 120 to 240 kg/ha reduce dry matter and sugar content in tomato. Bagal *et al.* (1989) reported that application of increasing rates of NPK fertilizes significantly increased the juice content and TSS The percentage moisture and nitrite contents

were not affected by fertilizer treatment. Acidity increased with increasing fertilizer application, upto rates of NPK 200 kg, 100kg and 100 kg/ha after which there were no further increase. Increasing rates of K resulted in an increase in lycopene content whereas, P had the opposite effect. Hasegawa (1989) found that sugar level of tomato fruits was highest with organic fertilizers and vitamin C content was highest with fossil shell fertilizer. Meier et al. (1989) reported that composted FYM gave the superior results of desirable nutrients (Vit. C and sugars) and undesirable constituents (nitrates) of tomato and improvement in organoleptic properties also occurred with the biogenic waste compost. Montagu and Goh (1990) reported that fruit colour in tomato increased significantly on application of blood and bone compost, Ammonium Sulphate and Potassium nitrate, where as compost showed no effect. Vitamin C content in fruits decreased when any one of the N fertilizes was applied. In an experiment, application of poultry manure and mineral fertilizer combination (equivalent to 140kg N + 140 kg  $P_2O_5$  + 100 kg  $K_2O/ha$ ) compared with non-fertilized control, showed improved fruit colour of processing tomatoes but reduced the acidity, acid content and soluble solids ratio. In processing tomatoes, the

best score of suitability for paste transformation were obtained with mixed fertilizer (33.3% poultry manure and 66.7% mineral fertilizer) and the plots receiving only mineral fertilizers produced fruits with less favourable values of pH and electrical conductivity compared with the poultry manure ones. Trpevski et al. (1992) found that application of 120 kg N with 40t FYM/ha showed non-significant effect on fruit N, dry matter, organic acid and vitamin C content. Lacatus et al. (1994) reported that the best quality tomatoes for processing was obtained with NPK @ 300, 150 and 75 kg/ha, respectively plus 20t FYM/ha. Kumaran et al. (1998) reported that quality parameters such as TSS, ascorbic acid and lycopene contents were comparatively higher in organically grown tomato plants. Duraisamy et al. (1999) found that TSS and acidity were not significantly affected by organic or inorganic fertilized treatment. Lucarini et al. (1999) noted that organic tomatoes had a lower dietary fiber content and higher sugar and malic acid contents. There was no difference in total polyphenols between the organic and nonorganic fruits but single phenolic acids were lower in organic tomatoes. NanthaKumar and Veeraragavathatham (1999)observed that combined application of 12.5t FYM/ha,

azospirillum and phosphobacteria (2kg each) + inorganic fertilizers at 75% of the recommended rate of N (75 kg/ha) P (37.5 kg/ha) and 100% of K (30kg/ha) increased the keeping quality, lowered the commulative physiological loss in weight, improved the general appearance and overall acceptance of the harvested fruits compared to the ones treated with inorganic fertilizers. Xu et al. (2000) reported that application of an organic fertilizer (bokashi) and poultry manure increased the photosynthesis. Concentrations of sugars and organic acids were higher in fruits of plants given bokashi, vitamin C content was higher in fruits from poultry manure and bokashi plots than in those from chemical fertilizer plots. Youssef et al. (2001) reported that tomato fruit dimensions were highest with organic manure alone. Organic manure (25%) + mineral fertilizers (75%) was the best treatment for TSS of fruits. Pimpini et al. (1992) reported that in processing tomatoes, the best scores of suitability for paste formation were obtained with mixed fertilizers (33.3% poultry manure and 66.7% mineral fertilizers.)

#### Insect and disease Incidence

Salmmen (1997) reported that percentage of yield affected by blossom-end rot was lowest with the composted manure treatment given at the start of cultivation. Fugro (2000) reported that the incidence of die-back in chilli was significantly higher in treatment comprising organic manure superimposed with organic pesticides than in those combined with inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides. In contrast, the incidence of leaf curl virus was comparatively higher in treatment comprising organic/inorganic fertilizers superimposed with chemical and organic pesticides than in the organic manure/pesticides treatments. The appropriate combination of both organic and inorganic fertilizers and pesticides is needed to manage the diseases to a satisfactory level.

Omori *et al.* (1972) reported that the incidence of blossom-end rot was increased in tomatoes by the use of heavy application of fresh cattle manure @ 10t/ha. Cucumbers and tomatoes were injured by the use of fresh chicken manure applied @ >5t/acre but 5-10 t/acre could be used for pimento, egg plant and Chinese cabbage without deleterious effect. Prezotti *et al.*, (1989) found that liming @ 1 t/ha or poultry manure @ 10t/ha markedly reduced the incidence of blossomend rot. Fayad and Sweelam (1989) reported that the addition of organic matter significantly reduced the nematode population,

owing to nematicidal effect of some compounds produced from the amendments. P fertilization significantly reduced the nematode population except basic slag when compared with the control, because basic slag had no effect on soil pH. These results are in agreement with those of Dowe and Decker (1975) and Badra et al. (1979). Maoreg (1984) reported that organic amendments reduced the population of Meloidogyne javanica due to the biological and chemical changes in the soil caused by the chemical decomposition of the added organic matter. It was concluded that if tomato is planted on soil infested with M. javanica application of triple phosphate as a source of P along with organic matter (cattle manure) may reduce the nematode population, thereby increasing the nutrient uptake and tomato growth. Wahundeniva (1991) reported that application of high rates of poultry manure (10t/ha) reduced the root-knot nematode population considerably in infested soil.
# CHAPTER – III

Materials And Methods

# **Experimental site**

The present investigation entitled "Effect of plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill)" was carried out at vegetable Research Farm of Department of vegetable crops, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar during the spring-summer season of 2001 and 2002.

The details of the materials used and methods applied in the experiment are mentioned below:

# Soil conditions

Random soil samples from the experimental field were drawn from ten places with the help of soil auger to the depth of 22cm before layout of the experiment, before second year of crop planting and after harvest. Each time all the samples taken from ten places were mixed thoroughly and a uniform sample was analysed for assessing the status of the soil. The physical and chemical compositions of soil samples are presented in Table 1.

# **Climatic conditions**

Hisar is situated at latitude 29°.10' North and longitude 75°.46' East at an altitude of 215.2 meters. It is a semi-arid climate with hot and dry desiccating winds accompanied by frequent dust storm in summer, severe cold during winter and humid-warm monsoon months. The mean maximum and minimum temperatures, therefore, show a wide range of fluctuation during summer and winter months. A maximum temperature around 48°C during summer and temperature upto freezing point accompnined by occurrence of frost in winter is common in this region. The average rainfall is around 400mm, most of which is received from south-west monsoon during July to September. A few showers of cyclonic rains also occur during December, January or late spring.

Since the growth, development, yield and quality of the crop is considerably influenced by the weather conditions, the record of the total weekly rainfall, maximum and minimum temperature and relative humidity (morning and evening) recorded during the period of experimentation at the agrometerological observatory of the meteorology Research Farm, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, are presented in Annexure – I and figure 1.

| Sr. No. | Particular                          | Values observed |
|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| А.      | Before layout of the experiment     |                 |
| 1.      | Soil texture                        | Sandy Loam      |
| 2.      | РН                                  | 8.4             |
| 3.      | Organic carbon                      | 0.39            |
| 4.      | Available nitrogen (kg/ha)          | 100.00          |
| 5.      | Available phosphorus (kg/ha)        | 25.00           |
| 6.      | Available potassium (kg/ha)         | 384.00          |
| 7.      | EC (dS/m)                           | 0.70            |
| В.      | Before transplating the second crop |                 |
| 1.      | Soil texture                        | Sandy loam      |
| 2.      | РН                                  | 8.3             |
| 3.      | Organic carbon                      | 0.44            |
| 4.      | Available nitrogen (kg/ha)          | 98.00           |
| 5.      | Available phosphorus (kg/ha)        | 23.00           |
| 6.      | Available potassium (kg/ha)         | 225.00          |
| 7.      | EC (dS/m)                           | 0.70            |
|         | After harvest of second crop        |                 |
| 1.      | Soil texture                        | Sandy loam      |
| 2.      | РН                                  | 8.2             |
| 3.      | Organic carbon                      | 0.54            |
| 4.      | Available nitrogen (kg/ha)          | 97.00           |
| 5.      | Available phosphorus (kg/ha)        | 22.00           |
| 6.      | Available potassium (kg/ha)         | 192.00          |
| 7.      | EC (dS/m)                           | 0.65            |

Table 1: Physico-chemical characteristics of the soil.

A persual of weekly meteorological data indicate that maximum and minimum temperature during crop growth seasons fluctuated between 15.1°C to 43.6°C and 1.0°C to 25.2°C in 2001, 46.6°C to 18.8°C and 1.32°C to 28.4°C in 2002, respectively. The total rainfall received during the crop season was 306.2mm and 20.2mm in 2001 and 2002, respectively.

### **EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUE:**

Experiment I: "Effect of plant vitalizers (Anupaam + Anupaan R) on tomato Cv. Hisar Arun".

# Treatments and layout plan

The experiment consisted of four doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R and four methods of application and one control was laidout in Randomized Block Design. There were seventeen treatment combinations and each treatment combination was replicated three times and allotted randomly. The plot size for each treatment was 3.0m x 3.0m. The details of the treatments layout is depicted in Fig. 2.





Min. Temp. (°C)

# CHIRH (%) Morn.



### LAYOUT PLAN (EXPT. NO. 1)

**FIG.** 2

# TREATMENTS

Plant vitalizer

Anupaan + Anupaan R

(A + AR)

- :(i) Suggested dose (225ml+225ml/acre)
- :(ii) 25% less than suggested dose (168.75ml + 168.75ml)
- :(iii) 25% more than suggested dose (281.25ml + 281.25ml)
- :(iv) 50% more than suggested dose (337.50ml + 337.50ml)

Treatment combination-17 given below:

| С                              | Control   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| $S_1$                          | Soil application of A + AR at suggested does                        |
| $S_2$                          | Soil application of A + AR at 25% less than suggested dose          |
| S <sub>3</sub>                 | Soil application of A + AR at 25% more than suggested dose          |
| S <sub>4</sub>                 | Soil application of A + AR at 50% more than suggested dose          |
| F <sub>1</sub>                 | Foliar application of A + AR at suggested does                      |
| $F_2$                          | Foliar application of A + AR at 25% less than suggested dose        |
| F <sub>3</sub>                 | Foliar application of A + AR at 25% more than suggested dose        |
| F4                             | Foliar application of A + AR at 50% more than suggested dose        |
| $S_1 + F_1$                    | Soil + Foliar application of A + AR at suggested dose               |
| $S_2 + F_2$                    | Soil + Foliar application of A + AR at 25% less than suggested dose |
| S <sub>3</sub> +F <sub>3</sub> | Soil + Foliar application of A + AR at 25% more than suggested dose |
| S4+F4                          | Soil + Foliar application of A + AR at 50% more than suggested dose |
| $D_1$                          | Root dipping in suggested dose of A + AR                            |
| $D_2$                          | Root dipping in 25% less than suggested dose of A + AR              |
| $D_3$                          | Root dipping in 25% more than suggested dose of A + AR              |
| D4                             | Root dipping in 50% more than suggested dose of A + AR              |

| Foliar spray          | : | 20, 30, 40 and 50 DAT                |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Method of application | : | Four (soil, foliar, root dipping and |
|                       |   | soil + foliar)                       |
| Design of Experiment  | • | RBD                                  |
| Replication           | : | Three                                |
| Variety               | Ξ | Hisar Arun                           |
| Plot size             | : | $3 \times 3 = 9 $ sq. m.             |
| Total plots           | : | 17 x 3 = 51                          |

### EXPERIMENT - II

"Comparative studies of plant vitalizers and organic manures on tomato Cv. Hisar Arun".

# Treatments and layout plan

The experiment consisting of four doses of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R), two organic manures (FYM and poultry manure) and one control was laid out in Randomized Block Design. There were 12 treatment combinations and each treatment combination was replicated three times and allotted randomly. The plot size for each treatment was 3.0m x 3.0m. The layout of the experiment presented in Fig. 3.



LAYOUT PLAN (EXPT. NO. 2)

# TREATMENTS

# Organic manures

| FYM            | :     | Farm Yard Manure, Suggested dose (14 T/acre) |
|----------------|-------|--|
| РМ             | :     | Poultry Manure, Suggested does (23.5 q/acre) |
| Doses of plant | vital | izes : Anupaan + Anupaan R (A + AR)          |
| Aı             | :     | suggested dose (225ml+225ml/acre)            |
| A <sub>2</sub> | :     | 25% less than suggested dose                 |
|                |       | (168.75ml+168.75ml/acre)                     |
| A <sub>3</sub> | :     | 25% more than suggested dose                 |
|                |       | (281.25ml+281.25ml/acre)                     |
| A4             | :     | 50% more than suggested dose                 |
|                |       | (337.50ml+337.50ml/acre)                     |
|                |       |  |

Method of Application : One-soil

Treatment combinations : 12 given below:

| С                   | Control '                                    |
|---------------------|--|
| FYM                 | Farm yard manure                             |
| PM                  | Poultry manure                               |
| A1                  | A + AR at suggested dose                     |
| $A_1$ +FYM          | A + AR at suggested dose + FYM               |
| A <sub>1</sub> +PM  | A + AR at suggested dose + PM                |
| A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | A + AR at 25% less than suggested dose + FYM |
| A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | A + AR at 25% less than suggested dose + PM  |
| A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | A + AR at 25% more than suggested dose + FYM |
| A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | A + AR at 25% more than suggested dose + PM  |
| A <sub>4</sub> +FYM | A + AR at 50% more than suggested dose + FYM |
| A <sub>4</sub> +PM  | A + AR at 50% more than suggested dose + PM  |

| Design of Experiment | : | RBD                              |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Replications         | : | Three                            |
| Variety              | : | Hisar Arun                       |
| Plot Size            | : | $3.0 \ge 3.0 = 9 \text{ sq. m.}$ |
| Total plots          | : | $12 \ge 3 = 36$                  |

# Land preparation

The experimental field was prepared by three ploughings followed by planking to achieve good tilth so that suitable seed beds can be prepared. The field was divided into different plots measuring 3.0m x 3.0m having 80cm irrigation channel and 70cm path in between.

# Nursery raising

The seeds of tomato variety Hisar Arun were sown in the well prepared nursery beds on December 3, 2000 for the first year crop and November 3, 2001 for the second year crop. After seed sowing nursery beds were irrigated daily with the help of watering cane till the seed germination. After that subsequent irrigations were done as and when required. Proper care was taken to protect the seedlings from frost and infestation of insects and diseases till seedlings become ready for transplanting.

# Application of organic manures and plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R)

The suggested quantity of each organic manure i.e. FYM and poultry manure was added in the allocated plots and mixed well before preparing the ridges. The suggested quantity of Anupaan + Anupaan R with respect to treatment was mixed in small quantity of soil and then mixed in the respective plots before ridges preparation. For root dipping treatments, required quantity of Anupaan + Anupaan R was mixed in 1 litre of water and tomato seedlings were dipped for ten minutes at the time of transplanting. For foliar application, required quantity of Anupaan + Anupaan R were mixed in 1 liter of water and then sprayed with baby spray pump in respective treatment at 20, 30, 40 and 50 DAT.

# Transplanting

The transplanting of seedlings was done on February 6, 2001 for the first year and January 4, 2002 for the second year crop. Seedlings ready for transplanting were taken from the nursery beds carefully without causing injury to their root and foliage system. Uniformly selected healthy seedlings were transplanted at 45 cm apart on the ridges, made 60 cm distance. Experimental field was irrigated immediately after transplanting.

# Irrigation and other cultural practices

The first irrigation was applied just after transplanting followed by second irrigation which was given five days after the first irrigation followed by gap filling. Subsequent irrigations were applied as and when required. Other cultural practices like hoeing, weeding, earthing up were carried out as and when required.

# Harvesting

The harvesting was done in four pickings when fruits were ready for harvest i.e. red ripe fruits. The first picking was done on May 11, 2001 for first year crop and on April 23, 2002 for the second year crop. After that subsequent pickings were done as and when fruits ready for harvest.

### Characters studied

The vegetative growth, flowering and fruiting behaviour of plant and yield and quality of tomato fruits were studied during the course of experimentation. Observations made on various parameters are as follows:

# A. GROWTH PARAMETERS

For recording data on vegetative growth characters, five plants were selected at random from each treatment and tagged. The average value was calculated from the total of the data recorded from five plants as sample to represent the population.

### Plant height

The height of plants was measured in centimeters from the base of the plant to apex of main shoot at 30, 60 and 90 days after transplanting.

# Leaves per plant

Number of leaves per plant was counted at 90 days after transplanting.

# **Branches** per plant

The number of primáry and secondary branches per plant were counted at 90 days after transplanting.

# Thickness of main stem

Randomly selected two plants were taken from each plot and their main stem thickness was measured with the help of vernier calliper.

# Weight of leaves

After cutting all the leave of two selected plants were weighed and their average weight was recorded.

# **B.** FLOWERING AND FRUITING BEHAVIOUR

# Days to 50% flowering

The number of days required from the date of transplanting to the flowering in 50 per cent plants under each treatment were recorded.

# Days to ripening from flower anthesis

The number of days required from the date of opening of first flower to ripening of first fruit under each treatment were recorded.

# Fruit per cluster

The number of fruits from five randomly selected cluster of five selected plants from each treatment were counted and average number of fruit per cluster was calculated.

# Fruit per plant

The total number of fruits from five selected plants on each picking were summed up and fruits per plant were calculated by dividing the total number of fruits by total number of plants.

### Fruit size

Randomly ten fruits were taken from five selected plants in each treatment and weighed. By dividing the total fruits weight by ten, average fruit weight was calculated.

# Fruit yield per plant

The weight of fruits from five selected plants in each treatment on each picking was recorded. Fruits yield per plant was calculated by dividing the total weight by five.

# Fruit yield per hectare

Fruit weight recorded from all the pickings was added to calculate that yield in kg per plot from which the yield q/ha was calculated.

# C. FRUIT QUALITY

# Pulp and juice content

One hundred gram 'of fruit from each treatment was crushed and juice extracted by squeezing through muslin cloth. The juice, pulp and seed content were separated. The juice was measured with the help of a measuring glass cylinder and was recorded in per cent of total fruit weight. Pulp content was also recorded in per cent of total fruit weight.

### Seed content

Seed content was calculated per 100g of fruit weight basis.

# Total soluble solids (TSS)

Total soluble solids were determined with the help of Erma Hand Refractometer and expressed as per cent TSS

# Acidity

Acid content of extracted juice was determined by titrating the fruit juice against N/10 NaOH using phenolphthalein as an indicator (A.O.A.C., 1975).

# Ascorbic acid

Ascorbic acid content in tomato fruits was determined by 2, 6-dichlorophenol indophenol titration method (A.O.A.C. 1975) and expressed in mg per 100g of fruit weight.

# Sugar content

Sugar was determined by the method expressed by Hulme and Narain (1931).

### D. PHYSIOLOGICAL STUDIES

# Chlorophyll (a & b) content of leaves

Photosynthetic pigment Chl 'a' and Chl 'b' were estimated according to the method of Hiscox and Irraelstom (1979) using Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO).

### Dry matter accumulation in plant

To determine dry matter production per plant, plants were cut close to the ground at harvest. The plant samples were first dried in sun light and then oven dried at 60°C till constant weight was obtained.

### Mineral composition of plant

Plant samples were dried in over at 60°C and than ground in grinder. Nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium contents were estimated by following methods.

- a) Nitrogen : Nessler's reagent method (Lindner, 1944)
- b) Phosphorus : Yellow colour method (Koenig and Johnson, 1942).
- c) Potassium : Flame photometer method (Jackson, 1967).

# E. INCIDENCE OF PEST AND DISEASES

# Tomato leaf curl virus (TLCV)

Plants infected with TLCV were counted per plot and converted into percentage.

# Tomato fruit borer

Fruits infected with tomato fruit borer were counted per plot and converted into percentage.

# Statistical analysis

The data recorded on various characteristics were analysed statistically by the method of variance in order to find out the significance and the result of each treatment as described by Panse and Sukhatme's (1967) method.

# Analysis of variance

| Source      | d.f.       | <b>S.S</b> . | M.S.   | F. cal     |
|-------------|------------|--------------|--------|------------|
| Replication | r-1        | SSr          | MSr    | MSr        |
| Treatment   | t-1        | $SS_t$       | $MS_t$ | MSe<br>MSt |
|             |            |              |        | MSe        |
| Error       | (r-1)(t-1) | $SS_e$       | $MS_e$ |            |
| Total       | rt-1       |              |        |            |

S.E. is the standard error of the difference of the treatment means which was calculated as follows:

S.Ed. = 
$$\frac{2EMs}{r}$$

In order to compare the means of different treatments, the critical difference (C.D.) was calculated by using the below mentioned formula.

C.D. = S.E. x t

Where,

| EMs | 3 = | Error mean sum of squares                          |
|-----|-----|--|
| n   | =   | Number of replication                              |
| t   | =   | Tabulated value of 't' at 5% level of significance |
|     |     | for error degree of freedom                        |

# Chapter - IV

Experimental Results

The results of the experiment have been explained with help of data recorded on various growth, yield attributing characters, yield and quality of fruits presented in various tables in this chapter.

EFFECT OF PLANT VITALIZERS (ANUPAAN + ANUPAAN R) ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN

### A. Growth studies

# 1. Plant height

The observations recorded on plant height at different stages of plant growth (30, 60 and 90 DAT) under the influence of different treatments presented in Table 2, did not show any significant response to different concentrations and methods of application of Anupaan + Anupaan R at various stages of plant growth during both the years. However, on the basis of mean value, the treatment  $S_4+F_4$  gave better results as compared to

| Sr.   | Treatments                      | 30   | DAT  |              | <b>60</b> )  | DAT  |              | 90   | DAT  |          |
|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|------|----------|
| #     | -                               | 2001 | 2002 | Mean         | 2001         | 2002 | Mean         | 2001 | 2002 | Mean     |
| 1     | Control                         | 17.1 | 16.5 | 16.8         | 25.5         | 26.7 | 26,1         | 36.3 | 32.9 | 34.6     |
| 2     | S1                              | 22.0 | 19.9 | 21.0         | 29.2         | 33.7 | 31.3         | 48.0 | 43.1 | 45.6     |
| 3     | S <sub>2</sub>                  | 21.4 | 17.7 | 19.5         | 29.1         | 26.7 | 27.9         | 38.3 | 39.0 | 38.6     |
| 4     | S <sub>3</sub>                  | 23.2 | 20.5 | 21.9         | 33.5         | 29.9 | 31.7         | 49.1 | 47.9 | 48.5     |
| 5     | S4                              | 24.5 | 20.7 | 22.6         | 36.4         | 32.7 | 34.6         | 49.9 | 48.1 | 49.0     |
| 6     | F1                              | 19.5 | 20.1 | 19.8         | 36.5         | 36.0 | 36.3         | 46.0 | 43.6 | 44.8     |
| 7     | $F_2$                           | 19.9 | 19.3 | 19.6         | 35.1         | 35.0 | 35.0         | 41.8 | 34.6 | 38.2     |
| 8     | F3                              | 20.5 | 20.8 | 20.7         | 36,1         | 35.0 | 35 <b>.6</b> | 44.9 | 44.7 | 44.8     |
| 9     | F4                              | 22.3 | 20.9 | 21. <b>6</b> | 41.0         | 36.9 | 39.0         | 48.9 | 52.4 | 50.7     |
| 10    | $S_1 + F_1$                     | 23.1 | 20.5 | 21.8         | 39.4         | 37.6 | 38.6         | 48.1 | 47.2 | 47.7     |
| 11    | $S_2 + F_2$                     | 20.3 | 19.1 | 19.7         | 32.7         | 35.3 | 34.0         | 45.0 | 43.9 | 44.4     |
| 12    | S <sub>3</sub> + F <sub>3</sub> | 26.1 | 23.2 | 24.6         | 42.1         | 38.7 | 40.4         | 46.7 | 48.7 | 47.7     |
| 13    | S4 + F4                         | 28.8 | 24.0 | 26.4         | , 42.2       | 42.5 | 42.4         | 56.2 | 53.5 | 55.1     |
| 14    | D <sub>1</sub>                  | 20.1 | 19.7 | 19.9         | 32.6         | 34.6 | 33.6         | 45.9 | 47.5 | 46.7     |
| 15    | $D_2$                           | 19,6 | 19.3 | 19.4         | 30.1         | 32.7 | 31.4         | 38.9 | 44.4 | 41.6     |
| 16    | $D_3$                           | 21.4 | 20.7 | 21.0         | 35. <b>7</b> | 35.1 | 35.4         | 48.1 | 50.5 | 49.3     |
| 17    | D₄                              | 22.2 | 21.7 | 22.0         | 36.7         | 37.7 | 37.2         | 49.1 | 51.6 | 50.3     |
| SE () | m)±                             | 3.1  | 1.5  |              | 4.9          | 2.1  |              | 6.6  | 3.0  | <u> </u> |
| C.D.  | at 5%                           | NS   | NS   |              | NS           | NS   |              | NS   | NS   |          |

Table 2:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on plant height (cm) at differentstages of plant growth.

other treatments and maximum plant height 26.4cm, 42.4cm and 55.1cm were noted at 30, 60 and 90 DAT, respectively under this treatment.

# 2. Leaves per plant (No.)

The leaves per plant were influenced significantly by different treatments of Anupaan+ Anupaan R in both the years (Table 3). The treatments  $S_3 +F_3$  and  $S_4 +F_4$  during both the years,  $F_4$  in first year and  $S_1 +F_1$  in second year were found significantly superior over control in increasing the number of leaves per plant but statistically at par with each other. The average value showed that the maximum number of leaves (71.7) were produced under treatment  $S_4 +F_4$ . The application of Anupaan + Anupaan R at 50% more than the suggested dose either applied in soil, foliar, root dipping or soil + foliar application was found beneficial as compared to other treatments in both the years.

# 3. Fresh weight of leaves per plant

The data pertaining to fresh weight of leaves per plant showed significant response to different treatments in both the years (Table 3). The treatments  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$  and  $S_3$  + $F_3$  during first year and treatments  $S_4$  and  $S_4$  + $F_4$  during both the years,

| Sr.<br># | Treatments                      | Leaves/plant (#) |      |      | Fres!<br>leaves, |              |          |
|----------|---------------------------------|------------------|------|------|------------------|--------------|----------|
|          |                                 | 2001             | 2002 | Mean | 2001             | 2002         | <br>Mean |
| 1        | Control                         | 40.7             | 38.0 | 39.3 | 42.0             | 48.0         | 45.0     |
| 2        | $S_1$                           | 41.8             | 45.3 | 43.6 | 58.7             | 67 <b>.7</b> | 63.2     |
| 3        | $S_2$                           | 41.3             | 44.0 | 42.7 | 48.3             | 64.7         | 56.5     |
| 4        | S <sub>3</sub>                  | 42.3             | 48.7 | 45.5 | 63.0             | 75.7         | 69.3     |
| 5        | S4                              | 47.7             | 51.3 | 49.5 | 66.7             | 80.0         | 73.3     |
| 6        | F <sub>1</sub>                  | 44.9             | 42.7 | 43.8 | 57.5             | 61.7         | 59.6     |
| 7        | F <sub>2</sub>                  | 42.3             | 39.3 | 40.8 | 46.7             | 56.0         | 51.3     |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub>                  | 51.0             | 43.3 | 47.2 | 67.5             | 63.3         | 65.4     |
| 9        | F4                              | 53.7             | 46.3 | 50.0 | 71.7             | 69.0         | 70.3     |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$                     | 50.3             | 53.3 | 51.8 | 60.0             | 65.0         | 62.5     |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$                     | 48.3             | 47.3 | 47.8 | 55.0             | 53.3         | 54.2     |
| 12       | S <sub>3</sub> + F <sub>3</sub> | 55.7             | 64.3 | 60.0 | 66.7             | 73.3         | 70.0     |
| 13       | S4 + F4                         | 69.0             | 74.3 | 71.7 | 76.7             | 91.7         | 84.2     |
| 14       | $D_1$                           | 41.0             | 36.7 | 38.8 | 53.7             | 45.0         | 49.3     |
| 15       | $D_2$                           | 40.8             | 33.0 | 36.9 | 46.7             | 39.0         | 42.8     |
| 16       | $D_3$                           | 45.7             | 41.7 | 43.7 | 56.0             | 51.7         | 53.8     |
| 17       | D₄                              | 47.0             | 42.3 | 44.7 | 60.0             | 56.3         | 58.2     |
| SE (:    | m)±                             | 7.8              | 4.9  |      | 7.8              | 8.2          |          |
| C.D.     | at 5%                           | 12.4             | 14.4 |      | 22.6             | 29.6         |          |

Table 3:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on number of leaves and fresh weightof leaves per plant at 90 DAT.

improved significantly the fresh weight of leaves per plant over control but all these treatments were statistically at par amongst each other. Perusal of mean reveal that  $S_4$  +F<sub>4</sub> treatment produced maximum fresh weight of leaves per plant (84.2g).

# 4. Branches per plant

The data regarding number of branches per plant presented in Table 4, indicate that all the treatments gave nonsignificant results with respect to number of branches per plant during both the years. However, on the basis of observed value highest number of branches per plant (7.8) was recorded in S<sub>4</sub>  $+F_4$  treatment.

# 5. Thickness of main stem

The effect of different treatments of Anupaan +Anupaan R on diameter of main stem are summarized in Table 4. The treatments  $S_3 +F_3$ ,  $S_4 +F_4$  during both the years and treatments  $S_4$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$  and  $D_4$  only during the second year showed significant higher diameter over control. The treatment  $S_3 +F_3$  and  $S_3 +F_4$  were statistically at par with each other during both the years but significantly superior to other treatments during second year. ON the basis of mean value, maximum diameter of

| Sr.<br># | Treatments     | 'reatments Branches/ Plant (#) |      |          | Diamete:<br>stem |      |                                       |
|----------|----------------|--------------------------------|------|----------|------------------|------|---------------------------------------|
|          | -              | 2001                           | 2002 | <br>Mean | 2001             | 2002 | Mean                                  |
| 1        | Control        | 5.4                            | 5.3  | 5.4      | 0.9              | 0.8  | 0.8                                   |
| 2        | <b>S</b> 1     | 6.8                            | 5.8  | б.З      | 1.2              | 1.1  | 1.2                                   |
| 3        | $S_2$          | 6.2                            | 5.4  | 5.8      | 1.2              | 1.1  | 1.1                                   |
| 4        | $S_3$          | 7.0                            | 5.7  | 6.4      | 1.3              | 1.1  | 1.2                                   |
| 5        | S4             | 8.0                            | 5.9  | 7.0      | 1.3              | 1.2  | 1.2                                   |
| 6        | $\mathbf{F}_1$ | 7.0                            | 6.1  | 6.5      | 1.1              | 1.1  | 1.1                                   |
| 7        | F <sub>2</sub> | 6.7                            | 6.0  | 6.3      | 1.0              | 1.0  | 1.0                                   |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub> | 7.2                            | 6.2  | 6.7      | 1.3              | 1.3  | 1.3                                   |
| 9        | F4             | 8,7                            | 6.3  | 7.5      | 1.3              | 1.3  | 1.3                                   |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$    | 7.7                            | 6.0  | 6.9      | 1.3              | 1.0  | 1.1                                   |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$    | 5.7                            | 5.7  | 5.7      | 1.2              | 0.9  | 1.1                                   |
| 12       | $S_3 + F_3$    | 9.0                            | 6.2  | 7.6      | 1.8              | 1.8  | 1.8                                   |
| 13       | S4 + F4        | 9.3                            | 6.3  | 7.8      | 2.0              | 1.8  | 1.9                                   |
| 14       | $D_1$          | 6,8                            | 6.1  | 6.5      | 1.3              | 1.1  | 1.2                                   |
| 15       | $D_2$          | 6.5                            | 5.6  | 6.1      | 1.0              | 1.0  | 1.0                                   |
| 16       | D <sub>3</sub> | 8,8                            | 6.2  | 7.5      | 1.2              | 1.1  | 1.2                                   |
| 17       | D₄             | 9.1                            | 6.2  | 7.7      | 1.3              | 1.3  | 1.3                                   |
| SE (1    | m)±            | 1.6                            | 0.5  | <u> </u> | 0.2              | 0.1  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| C.D.     | at 5%          | NS                             | NS   |          | 0.5              | 0.3  |                                       |

\_

Table 4:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on branches/plant and thickness ofmain stem at 90 DAT.

main stem (1.9cm) was recorded in  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment followed by  $S_3 + F_3$  treatment (1.8cm).

# **B.** Physiological studies

# 1. Chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' content of leaves

The analysis for chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' (Table 5) indicate that chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves were not affected significantly by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years.

# 2. Dry matter accumulation of plant

The dry matter accumulation of plant reveal that all the treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R showed significant response in improving the dry matter accumulation of plant over control during both the years. Whereas, these treatments were statistically at par during both the years. On the basis of data gathered in Table 5, highest production of dry matter (118.9g) per plant was noted in treatment  $S_4 + F_4$ .

# 3. Mineral Composition of plant

Nitrogen content of plant in the second year and phosphorus and potassium contents of plant during both the years were influenced significantly by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R (Table 6). The treatments  $S_4$ ,  $S_3$  + $F_3$ ,  $S_4$ 

| Sr. Treatments<br># |                | Chlorophyll 'a'<br>(mg/g) |      |      | Chlorophyll 'b'<br>(mg/g) |      |      | Dry matter/<br>Plant (g) |       |       |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------|------|---------------------------|------|------|--------------------------|-------|-------|
|                     |                | 2001                      | 2002 | Mean | 2001                      | 2002 | Mean | 2001                     | 2002  | Mean  |
| 1                   | Control        | 2.6                       | 2.5  | 2.5  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 47.7                     | 44.9  | 46.3  |
| 2                   | $S_1$          | 2.7                       | 2.7  | 2.7  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 100.4                    | 96.8  | 98.6  |
| 3                   | $S_2$          | 2.7                       | 2.7  | 2.7  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 92.2                     | 91,8  | 92.0  |
| 4                   | $S_3$          | 2.8                       | 2.8  | 2.8  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 105.1                    | 100.3 | 102.7 |
| 5                   | S4             | 2.8                       | 2.8  | 2.8  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 112.9                    | 107.8 | 110.4 |
| 6                   | $\mathbf{F}_1$ | 2.9                       | 3.0  | 2.9  | 1.4                       | 1,5  | 1.5  | 112.6                    | 110.5 | 111.6 |
| 7                   | $F_2$          | 2.9                       | 2.9  | 2.9  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 103.1                    | 103.0 | 103.0 |
| 8                   | F3             | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 114.2                    | 112.8 | 113.5 |
| 9                   | F4             | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 116.8                    | 114.5 | 115.6 |
| 10                  | $S_1 + F_1$    | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | 1,4                       | 1.5  | 1.4  | 107.7                    | 103.2 | 105.4 |
| 11                  | $S_2 + F_2$    | 2.9                       | 2.9  | 2.9  | 1.4                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 106.1                    | 101.1 | 103.6 |
| 12                  | $S_3 + F_3$    | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | <sup>′</sup> 1.5          | 1.5  | 1.5  | 120.2                    | 112.3 | 116.3 |
| 13                  | S4 + F4        | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 122.5                    | 115.8 | 118.9 |
| 14                  | $D_1$          | 2.9                       | 2.9  | 2.9  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 109.0                    | 104.0 | 106.5 |
| 15                  | $D_2$          | 2.9                       | 2.9  | 2.9  | 1.4                       | 1.4  | 1.4  | 107.1                    | 102.8 | 105.0 |
| 16                  | $D_3$          | 3.0                       | 2.9  | 3.0  | 1.4                       | 1,4  | 1.5  | 112.3                    | 110.9 | 111.6 |
| 17                  | D4             | 3.0                       | 3.0  | 3.0  | 1.5                       | 1.5  | 1.5  | 114,7                    | 113.2 | 113.9 |
| SE (                | m)±            | 0.4                       | 0.5  | `    | 0.2                       | 0.2  |      | 11.7                     | 8.9   |       |
| С.р.                | at 5%          | NS                        | NS   |      | NS                        | NS   |      | 33.9                     | 26.5  |       |

Table 5:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' content ofleaves at 65 DAT and dry matter content of plant at harvest.

-

| Table 6: | Effect of Anupaan + | Anupaan R on mineral | l composition of tomato |
|----------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|----------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|

plant.

| Sr.<br># | Treatments                      | N Content<br>(%) |       |                   | P Content<br>(%) |       | · · · · | K Content<br>(%) |       |       |
|----------|---------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------------------|------------------|-------|---------|------------------|-------|-------|
|          |                                 | 2001             | 2002  | Mean              | 2001             | 2002  | Mean    | 2001             | 2002  | Mean  |
| 1        | Control                         | 0.705            | 0.703 | 0.704             | 0.104            | 0.103 | 0.103   | 0.309            | 0.306 | 0.307 |
| 2        | $S_1$                           | 0.708            | 0.705 | 0.70 <del>6</del> | 0.106            | 0.104 | 0.105   | 0.316            | 0.312 | 0.314 |
| 3        | $S_2$                           | 0.705            | 0.700 | 0.702             | 0.105            | 0.103 | 0.104   | 0.313            | 0.310 | 0.311 |
| 4        | S <sub>3</sub>                  | 0.711            | 0.708 | 0.709             | 0.108            | 0.106 | 0.107   | 0.317            | 0.314 | 0.315 |
| 5        | S4                              | 0.715            | 0.711 | 0.713             | 0.112            | 0.110 | 0.111   | 0.319            | 0.317 | 0.318 |
| 6        | $F_1$                           | 0.706            | 0.703 | 0.704             | 0.107            | 0.105 | 0.106   | 0.314            | 0.315 | 0.314 |
| 7        | F <sub>2</sub>                  | 0.707            | 0.704 | 0.705             | 0.104            | 0.102 | 0.103   | 0.311            | 0.311 | 0.311 |
| 8        | F3                              | 0.711            | 0.708 | 0.709             | 0.114            | 0.112 | 0.113   | 0.319            | 0.315 | 0.317 |
| 9        | F4                              | 0.715            | 0.708 | 0.711             | 0.114            | 0.118 | 0.116   | 0.318            | 0.317 | 0.317 |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$                     | 0.707            | 0.705 | 0.706             | 0.114            | 0.112 | 0.113   | 0.318            | 0.318 | 0.318 |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$                     | 0.706            | 0.705 | 0.705             | 0.109            | 0.107 | 0.108   | 0.316            | 0.314 | 0.315 |
| 12       | S <sub>3</sub> + F <sub>3</sub> | 0.712            | 0.710 | 0.711             | 0.118            | 0.116 | 0.117   | 0.320            | 0.320 | 0.320 |
| 13       | $S_4 + F_4$                     | 0.715            | 0.711 | 0.713             | 0.117            | 0.123 | 0.120   | 0.317            | 0.324 | 0.320 |
| 14       | D1                              | 0.708            | 0.705 | 0.706             | 0.114            | 0.112 | 0.113   | 0.315            | 0.314 | 0.314 |
| 15       | $D_2$                           | 0.707            | 0.704 | 0.705             | 0.112            | 0.110 | 0.111   | 0.315            | 0.315 | 0.315 |
| 16       | D <sub>3</sub>                  | 0.712            | 0.709 | 0.710             | 0.119            | 0.116 | 0.117   | 0.319            | 0.318 | 0.318 |
| 17       | D4                              | 0.714            | 0.710 | 0.712             | 0.118            | 0.116 | 0.117   | 0.320            | 0.319 | 0.319 |
| SE (:    | m)±                             | 0.002            | 0.002 |                   | 0.003            | 0.002 |         | 0.002            | 0.002 |       |
| C.D.     | at 5%                           | NS               | 0.005 |                   | 0.008            | 0.005 |         | 0.006            | 0.006 |       |

+F4, D3 and D4 were found significant over control with respect to nitrogen content of plant but statistically at par during the second year. The maximum nitrogen content (0.713%) was noted in S4 and S4 +F4 treatments.

The phosphorus content of plant was improved significantly over control by the treatments  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $S_1 + F_1$ ,  $S_3 + F_3$ ,  $S_4+F_4$ ,  $D_1$ ,  $D_3$  and  $D_4$  during both the years whereas,  $S_4$  and  $D_2$  treatments showed significant results only during second year. In first year all the treatments were statistically at par but during second year the treatment  $F_4$ ,  $S_3 + F_3$ ,  $S_4 + F_4$ ,  $D_3$  and  $D_4$ . were significantly superior than other treatments. The average of two years showed phosphorus content (0.120%) under the treatment  $S_4 + F_4$ .

The Treatments  $S_3$ ,  $S_4$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $S_1 + F_1$ ,  $S_2 + F_2$ ,  $S_3 + F_3$ ,  $S_4 + F_4$ ,  $D_3$  and  $D_4$  showed significant results over control with respect to potassium content of plant during both the years. The treatment  $S_1$  during first year and  $F_1$ ,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  treatment during the second year also improved significantly for potassium content in plant over control. All these treatments were statistically at par during both the year except  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment

during second year only. Perusal of data showed maximum potassium content (0.320%) in  $S_3 + F_3$  and  $S_4 + F_4$  treatments.

# C. Flowering and fruiting behaviour

# 1. Days to 50% flowering

Days to 50% flowering was not significantly affected due to different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. However, on the basis of mean value, treatment  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  gave better results as compared to other treatments under which flowering took 41.3 days whereas, it was 47.3 days in control plot (Table 7).

### 2. Days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis

The number of days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis was not affected significantly by the variation in treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. However, on the basis of mean, lowest duration (46.2) were taken by  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment whereas, in case of control it ripened in 51.2 days (Table 7).

# 3. Fruit per cluster

The observations regarding number of fruits per cluster summarized in Table 8, reveal that all the treatments showed non-significant results with respect to fruits per cluster

| Sr.<br># | Treatments          | Days to 50%<br>flowering |                   |      | Days to fru<br>from flowe |      |      |
|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------|---------------------------|------|------|
|          | -                   | 2001                     | 2002              | Mean | 2001                      | 2002 | Mean |
| 1        | Control             | 46.0                     | 48,7              | 47.3 | 50.0                      | 52.3 | 51.2 |
| 2        | Sı                  | 42.7                     | 42.0              | 42.3 | 48.7                      | 47.1 | 47.9 |
| 3        | $S_2$               | 42.7                     | 43. <b>3</b>      | 43.0 | 47.3                      | 47.7 | 47.5 |
| 4        | S <sub>3</sub>      | 41.3                     | 43.7              | 42.5 | 4 <b>7</b> ,7             | 47.0 | 47.3 |
| 5        | S4                  | 42.3                     | 42.0              | 42.2 | 48.0                      | 47.7 | 47.8 |
| 6        | $F_1$               | 43.0                     | 41.7              | 42.3 | 49.3                      | 48.2 | 48.7 |
| 7        | $F_2$               | 42.7                     | 42.7              | 42.7 | 48.1                      | 47.3 | 47.7 |
| 8        | F3                  | 43.3                     | 43,3              | 43.3 | 49.7                      | 48.2 | 49.0 |
| 9        | F4                  | 43.7                     | 42.0              | 42.8 | 49.7                      | 49.3 | 49.5 |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$         | 43.3                     | 43.3              | 43.3 | 48.7                      | 48.0 | 48.3 |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$         | 42.3                     | 42.7              | 43.5 | 48.1                      | 49.7 | 48.9 |
| 12       | S3 + F3             | 42.7                     | 42.0              | 42.3 | 47.3                      | 47.7 | 47.5 |
| 13       | S4 + F4             | 41.7                     | 41.0 <sup>′</sup> | 41.3 | 46.4                      | 46.1 | 46.2 |
| 14       | $\mathbf{D}_1$      | 44.7                     | 41.3              | 43.0 | 50.7                      | 43.0 | 49.8 |
| 15       | $D_2$               | 43.7                     | 43.3              | 43.5 | 47.0                      | 48.7 | 47.8 |
| 16       | D <sub>3</sub>      | 44,3                     | 41.7              | 43.0 | 49.3                      | 50.0 | 49.7 |
| 17       | D4                  | 43.0                     | 43.7              | 43.3 | 49.7                      | 48.3 | 49.0 |
| SE (1    | m)±                 | 1.4                      | 1.0               |      | 1.5                       | 1.0  |      |
| C.D.     | C.D. at 5% NS NS NS |                          | NS                |      |                           |      |      |

Table 7:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on days to 50% flowering and days tofruit ripening from flower anthesis.

| Sr.<br># | Treatments     | Fruit/Cluster<br>(#) |      |                         | Fruit/Plant<br>(#) |      |                  | Fruit size (g) |              |      |
|----------|----------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|--------------------|------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------|
|          |                | 2001                 | 2002 | Mean                    | 2001               | 2002 | Mean             | 2001           | 2002         | Меал |
| 1        | Control        | 2.0                  | 2.3  | 2.2                     | 12.9               | 14.9 | 13.4             | 13.7           | 16.7         | 15.2 |
| 2        | $S_1$          | 2.3                  | 3.0  | 2.7                     | 22.8               | 20.8 | 21.8             | 15.7           | 17.6         | 16.7 |
| 3        | $S_2$          | 2.3                  | 2.3  | 2.3                     | 21.5               | 19.9 | 20.7             | 15.9           | 16. <b>1</b> | 16.0 |
| 4        | S <sub>3</sub> | 3.0                  | 3.0  | 3.0                     | 25.3               | 23.6 | 24.4             | 14.9           | 16.6         | 15.8 |
| 5        | S4             | 3.3                  | 3.3  | 3.3                     | 26.9               | 25.2 | 26.1             | 14.6           | 16.0         | 15.3 |
| 6        | $\mathbf{F}_1$ | 3.0                  | 3.0  | 3.0                     | 21.3               | 20.1 | 20.7             | 17.0           | 17.0         | 17.0 |
| 7        | F <sub>2</sub> | 2.3                  | 2.7  | 2.5                     | 20.6               | 19.4 | 20.0             | 13.0           | 17.0         | 17.0 |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub> | 3.0                  | 3.0  | 3.0                     | 27.4               | 26.4 | 26.9             | 14.3           | 14.1         | 14.2 |
| 9        | F4             | 3.3                  | 3.3  | 3.3                     | 28.8               | 26.8 | 27.8             | 14.9           | 15.3         | 15.1 |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$    | 3.0                  | 3.0  | 3.0                     | 29,4               | 27.1 | 28.2             | 14.5           | 15.0         | 14.8 |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$    | 2.0                  | 2.7  | 2.3                     | 27,5               | 25.6 | 26.5             | 15.1           | 15.5         | 15.3 |
| 12       | $S_3 + F_3$    | 3.0                  | 3.3  | 3.2                     | 33.6               | 28.7 | 31.2             | 1 <b>3.</b> 5  | 16.0         | 14.8 |
| 13       | S4 + F4        | 3.3                  | 3.7  | <b>3.5</b> <sup>′</sup> | 35.8               | 34.2 | 35.0             | 16.6           | 17.4         | 17.0 |
| 14       | D1             | 2.3                  | 3.0  | 2.7                     | 28.0               | 26.2 | 27.1             | 12.7           | 12.9         | 12.8 |
| 15       | $D_2$          | 2.3                  | 3.0  | 2.7                     | 22.6               | 21.1 | 21.8             | 15.0           | 15.0         | 15.0 |
| 16       | D <sub>3</sub> | 2.7                  | 3.3  | 3.0                     | 29.5               | 28.0 | 28.7             | 12.9           | 12.9         | 12.9 |
| 17       | D4             | 3.0                  | 3.7  | 3.3                     | 34,4               | 31.3 | 32. <del>9</del> | 11.6           | 12.2         | 11.9 |
| SE (     | m)±            | 0.5                  | 0.4  |                         | 3.4                | 3.3  |                  | 7.3            | 3.6          |      |
| C.D.     | at 5%          | NS                   | NS   |                         | 9.8                | 6.9  |                  | NS             | NS           |      |

Table 8:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on number of fruits/cluster, numberof fruits/plant and fruit size.

during both the years. However, with in the mean observations, maximum number of fruits per cluster (3.5) was recorded in  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment.

# 4. Fruits per plant

The data pertaining to number of fruits per plant presented in Table 8, indicate that all the treatments increased significantly the number of fruits per plant over control except  $S_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and  $D_2$  during both the years and  $S_1$  during second year. The highest number of fruits per plant (35.8) was recorded in  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment during first year which was significantly superior to  $S_1$  and  $S_3$  treatment and statistically at par with above mentioned other treatments. During second year maximum number of fruits per plant (34.2) was also recorded in  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment which was significantly superior to all the above said treatments except  $S'_3$  +  $F_3$ ,  $D_3$  and  $D_4$  treatments where these were statistically at par. On the basis of observed values, maximum number of fruits per plant (35.0) was counted under the treatment  $S_4 + F_4$ .

# 5. Fruit size

The fruit size was not affected significantly by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the

years. However, information in Table 8 indicate that largest fruit size (17.0g) were produced by  $S_4 + F_4$ ,  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  treatments.

# 6. Fruit yield per plant

The perusal of data in Table 9 on fruit yield per plant indicate that different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R affected significantly the fruit yield per plant. The treatments  $F_4$ ,  $S_1 + F_1$ ,  $S_3 + F_3$  and  $S_4 + F_4$  during both the years and the treatments  $S_3$ ,  $S_4$ ,  $F_3$ ,  $S_2 + F_2$ ,  $D_3$  and  $D_4$  during first year showed significant results over control. The maximum fruit yield per plant (0.49kg) was recorded with  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment during both the years. This treatment was significantly superior to all other treatments but at par with  $S_3 + F_3$  treatment.

# 7. Fruit yield per hectare

The data on fruit yield per hectare presented in Table 9, reveal that all the treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R significantly increased the fruit yield per hectare over control during both the years except  $S_2$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and  $D_2$  treatments during both the years and  $D_1$  treatment during the first year. Maximum fruit yield per hectare i.e. 17.0 t/ha and 16.4 t/ha was recorded with  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment during first and second year, respectively. The treatment  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  was found significantly superior to all

| Sr.<br>#   | Treatments     | Fruit yield | l (kg/plant) |      | Fruit yi | ield (t/ha) |      |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|------|----------|-------------|------|
|            |                | 2001        | 2002         | Mean | 2001     | 2002        | Mean |
| 1          | Control        | 0.31        | 0.32         | 0.31 | 10.2     | 10.5        | 10.3 |
| 2          | S <sub>1</sub> | 0.36        | 0.37         | 0.36 | 12.8     | 12.2        | 12.5 |
| 3          | S <sub>2</sub> | 0.34        | 0.32         | 0.33 | 11.4     | 10.7        | 11.0 |
| 4          | S <sub>3</sub> | 0.38        | 0.39         | 0.38 | 13.7     | 13.1        | 13.3 |
| 5          | S₄             | 0.39        | 0.40         | 0.40 | 14.2     | 13.4        | 13.7 |
| 6          | F1             | 0.36        | 0.34         | 0.35 | 12.0     | 11.4        | 11.7 |
| 7          | $F_2$          | 0.35        | 0.33         | 0.34 | 11.7     | 11.0        | 11.3 |
| 8          | F3             | 0.39        | 0.37         | 0.38 | 13.0     | 12.4        | 12.7 |
| 9          | F4             | 0.43        | 0.41         | 0.42 | 14.3     | 13.7        | 13.9 |
| 10         | $S_1 + F_1$    | 0.43        | 0.41         | 0.42 | 14.2     | 13.5        | 13.8 |
| 11         | $S_2 + F_2$    | 0.42        | 0.40         | 0.41 | 13.8     | 13.2        | 13.5 |
| 12         | $S_3 + F_3$    | 0.45        | 0.46         | 0.46 | 15.9     | 15.3        | 15.6 |
| 13         | S4 + F4        | 0.49        | 0.49         | 0.49 | 17.0     | 16.4        | 16.7 |
| 14         | $D_1$          | 0.36        | 0.34         | 0.35 | 11.9     | 12.0        | 11.9 |
| 15         | $D_2$          | 0.34        | 0.32         | 0.33 | 11.2     | 11.2        | 11.2 |
| 16         | $D_3$          | 0.38        | 0.36         | 0.37 | 12.7     | 12.7        | 12.6 |
| 17         | D4             | 0.40        | 0.38         | 0.39 | 13.3     | 13.2        | 13.2 |
| SE (m)±    |                | 0.02        | 0.02         |      | 0.7      | 0.5         |      |
| C.D. at 5% |                | 0.06        | 0.08         |      | 2.0      | 1.2         |      |

Table 9:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on fruit yield per plant and fruityield per hectare.
other treatments but statistically at par with  $S_3 + F_3$  treatment during both the years.

# D. Fruit quality

## 1. Pulp, juice and seed content

The observed values presented in Table 10 show that the pulp, juice and seed contents of tomato fruit were not influenced significantly by various treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years.

# 2. Total soluble solids and sugar content

The total soluble solids (TSS) and sugar content of tomato fruit were not affected significantly by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years (Table 11). However, on the basis of mean value, maximum TSS and sugar content (6.2% and 4.1%), respectively, of tomato fruit was recorded in  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment.

#### 3. Acidity

The influence of different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R on acidity was significant. Data summarized in Table 12 indicate that only  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment significantly increased the acid content of tomato fruit over control during both the years. Higher acidity (0.9%) was recorded in  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  treatment,



| Sr.<br># | Treatments                      | Pulp Content<br>(%) |      |      | Juice ( | Content<br>%) |      | Seed Content<br>(g/100g) |      |      |
|----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------|------|---------|---------------|------|--------------------------|------|------|
|          |                                 | 2001                | 2002 | Mean | 2001    | 2002          | Mean | 2001                     | 2002 | Mean |
| 1        | Control                         | 49.4                | 50.2 | 49.8 | 50.0    | 49.2          | 49.6 | 0.3                      | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| 2        | Si                              | 49.2                | 46.3 | 47.7 | 49.8    | 53.0          | 51.4 | 0.4                      | 0.2  | 0.3  |
| 3        | S <sub>2</sub>                  | 48.8                | 46.8 | 47.8 | 50.1    | 52.6          | 51.1 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 4        | $S_3$                           | 48.8                | 47.2 | 48.0 | 50.5    | 52.2          | 51.3 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 5        | S4                              | 50.8                | 51.9 | 51.4 | 48.0    | 47.0          | 47.5 | 0.4                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| б        | F <sub>1</sub>                  | 49.2                | 47.5 | 48.3 | 49.6    | 51.4          | 50.5 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 7        | $\mathbf{F}_2$                  | 48.2                | 49.2 | 48.7 | 50.9    | 49.8          | 50.4 | 0.3                      | 0.2  | 0.3  |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub>                  | 46.8                | 49.1 | 48.0 | 52.2    | 49.8          | 51.0 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 9        | F4                              | 47.7                | 48.7 | 48.2 | 51.5    | 50.5          | 51.0 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$                     | 50.0                | 49.0 | 49.5 | 49.0    | 50.0          | 49.5 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$                     | 47.1                | 46.1 | 46.6 | 51.7    | 52.7          | 52.2 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 12       | S <sub>3</sub> + F <sub>3</sub> | 51.5                | 47.5 | 49.5 | 47.7    | 51.6          | 49.7 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 13       | S4 + F4                         | 54.0                | 49.0 | 51.5 | 45.2    | 50.2          | 47.7 | 0.4                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 14       | D <sub>1</sub>                  | 46.5                | 48.1 | 47.3 | 52.5    | 50.8          | 51.6 | 0.3                      | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| 15       | $D_2$                           | 48.6                | 49.3 | 49.0 | 51.2    | 49.7          | 50.5 | 0.2                      | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| 16       | $D_3$                           | 49.8                | 48.2 | 49.0 | 49.3    | 51.0          | 50.2 | 0.2                      | 0.2  | 0.3  |
| 17       | D4                              | 48.7                | 50.0 | 49.3 | 50.6    | 49.2          | 49.9 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| SE (:    | m)±                             | 7.4                 | 3.6  | k    | 8.7     | 3.6           |      | 0.1                      | 0.1  |      |
| C.D.     | at 5%                           | NS                  | NS   |      | NS      | NS            |      | NS                       | NS   |      |

Table 10: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on pulp, juice and seed contents.

| Sr.<br># | Treatments     | T.S<br>(% | 5.S<br>) |      | Sugar (% | content<br>) |      |
|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|------|----------|--------------|------|
|          | _              | 2001      | 2002     | Mean | 2001     | 2002         | Mean |
| 1        | Control        | 4.0       | 4.3      | 4.2  | 2.6      | 2.5          | 2.6  |
| 2        | $S_1$          | 4.4       | 4.9      | 4.6  | 3.1      | 3.1          | 3.1  |
| 3        | $S_2$          | 3.7       | 4.5      | 4.1  | 3.0      | 3.0          | 3.0  |
| 4        | S <sub>3</sub> | 3.9       | 5.2      | 4.6  | 3.2      | 3.2          | 3.2  |
| 5        | S4             | 4.0       | 6.0      | 5.0  | 3.3      | 3.2          | 3.2  |
| 6        | $F_1$          | 4.5       | 4.9      | 4.7  | 3.3      | 3.2          | 3.2  |
| 7        | $F_2$          | 4.5       | 4.6      | 4.6  | 3.2      | 3.1          | 3.2  |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub> | 4.5       | 5.1      | 4.8  | 3.3      | 3.3          | 3.3  |
| 9        | F4             | 4.6       | 5.8      | 5.2  | 3.5      | 3.4          | 3.4  |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$    | 4.1       | 4.5      | 4.3  | 3.4      | 3.3          | 3.3  |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$    | 4.0       | 4.3      | 4.2  | 3.3      | 3.2          | 3.3  |
| 12       | $S_3 + F_3$    | 5.6       | 5.9      | 5.7  | 3.4      | 3.4          | 3.4  |
| 13       | S4 + F4        | 6.0       | 6.3      | 6.2  | 5.1      | 3.1          | 4.1  |
| 14       | D <sub>1</sub> | 4.3       | 4.5      | 4.4  | 3.1      | 3.1          | 3.1  |
| 15       | $D_2$          | 4.3       | 4.4      | 4.3  | 3.1      | 3.0          | 3.1  |
| 16       | $D_3$          | 4.6       | 5.2      | 4.9  | 3.1      | 3.1          | 3.1  |
| 17       | D4             | 4.9       | 5.5      | 5.2  | 3.2      | 3.2          | 3.2  |
| SE (     | m)±            | 0.4       | 0.3      |      | 0.3      | 0.2          |      |
| C.D.     | at 5%          | NS        | NS       |      | N.S.     | N.S.         |      |

 Table 11:
 Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on TSS and Sugar content of tomato

| Sr.<br># | Treatments                      | Aci<br>( | dity<br>%) |      | Ascort<br>(mg/10 | oic acid<br>Og fruit) |      |
|----------|---------------------------------|----------|------------|------|------------------|-----------------------|------|
|          | _                               | 2001     | 2002       | Mean | 2001             | 2002                  | Mean |
| 1        | Control                         | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 19.8             | 27.1                  | 23.4 |
| 2        | $S_1$                           | 0.5      | 0.6        | 0.5  | 23.4             | 26.7                  | 25.0 |
| 3        | $S_2$                           | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 23.7             | 25.9                  | 24.8 |
| 4        | $S_3$                           | 0.6      | 0.6        | 0.6  | 22.5             | 26.2                  | 24.4 |
| 5        | S4                              | 0.6      | 0,6        | 0.6  | 22.9             | 26.9                  | 24.9 |
| б        | F <sub>1</sub>                  | 0.6      | 0,5        | 0.5  | 24.5             | 25.8                  | 25.2 |
| 7        | F <sub>2</sub>                  | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 25.2             | 27.5                  | 26.4 |
| 8        | F <sub>3</sub>                  | 0.6      | 0.5        | 0.6  | 24.6             | 28.2                  | 26.4 |
| 9        | F4                              | 0.6      | 0.5        | 0.6  | 20.2             | 25.9                  | 23.0 |
| 10       | $S_1 + F_1$                     | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 24.1             | 28.7                  | 26.4 |
| 11       | $S_2 + F_2$                     | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 26.5             | 25.6                  | 26.1 |
| 12       | S <sub>3</sub> + F <sub>3</sub> | 0.7      | 0.6        | 0.6  | 23.6             | 26.5                  | 25.0 |
| 13       | S4 + F4                         | 0.9      | 0.9        | 0.9  | 24.4             | 27.3                  | 25.9 |
| 14       | D <sub>1</sub>                  | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 30.0             | 27.6                  | 28.8 |
| 15       | D <sub>2</sub>                  | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 23.0             | 25.7                  | 24.4 |
| 16       | D <sub>3</sub>                  | 0.5      | 0.5        | 0.5  | 24.9             | 24.1                  | 24.5 |
| 17       | D4                              | 0.6      | 0.6        | 0.6  | 25.2             | 28.4                  | 26.8 |
| SE (     | m)±                             | 0.1      | 0.1        |      | 6.4              | 1.9                   |      |
| C.D.     | . at 5%                         | 0.3      | 0.3        |      | NS               | NS                    |      |

Table 12: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on quality of tomato fruit.

which was significantly superior to all other treatments during both the years but statistically at par with  $S_3 + F_3$  treatment during first year.

# 4. Ascorbic Acid

The data regarding ascorbic acid of tomato fruit presented in Table 12 indicate that the ascorbic acid content of tomato fruit during both the years was not affected statistically by the application of Anupaan + Anupaan R. However, on the basis of observed value, treatment  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  maintained its superiority (28.8 mg/100 g fruit).

# E. Incidence of pest and diseases

# 1. Tomato leaf curl virus (TLCV)

The observations on tomato leaf curl virus affected plants per plot recorded in Table 13 indicate that all the treatments had non-significant effect on incidence of TLCV during both the years. However, the data indicate minimum infestation (1.7%) by TLCV under the treatment  $S_4$  +  $F_4$  as compared to other treatments.

# 2. Tomato fruit borer

The data pertaining to tomato fruit borer indicate that all the treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R significantly lowered

| Sr.<br>#   | Treatments     | TLCV pla<br>(% | nts /plot<br>6) |           | Tomato I<br>( | Fruit Borer<br>%) |      |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|------|
|            |                | 2001           | 2002            | Mean      | 2001          | 2002              | Mean |
| 1          | Control        | 6.7            | 6.7             | 6.7       | 39.2          | 39.9              | 39.6 |
| 2          | $S_1$          | 3.3            | 6.7             | 5.0       | 35.0          | 35.0              | 35.0 |
| 3          | $S_2$          | 6.7            | 3.3             | 5.0       | 38.3          | 36.8              | 37.5 |
| 4          | $S_3$          | 6.7            | 1.7             | 4.2       | 29.9          | 30.1              | 30.0 |
| 5          | S4             | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 20.6          | 25.1              | 22.8 |
| 6          | $\mathbf{F}_1$ | 3.3            | 3.3             | 3.3       | 27.9          | 26.2              | 27.1 |
| 7          | F <sub>2</sub> | 6.7            | 1.7             | 4.0       | 31.2          | 29.3              | 30.2 |
| 8          | F <sub>3</sub> | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 20.1          | 23.0              | 21.6 |
| 9          | F4             | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 17.0          | 17.8              | 17.4 |
| 10         | $S_1 + F_1$    | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 18.6          | 17.1              | 17.8 |
| 1 <b>1</b> | $S_2 + F_2$    | 3.3            | 3.3             | , 3.3     | 19.1          | 22.1              | 20.6 |
| 12         | S3 + F3        | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 18.6          | 17.0              | 17.8 |
| 13         | S4 + F4        | 1.7            | 1.7             | 1.7       | 13.2          | 13.0              | 13.1 |
| 14         | D <sub>1</sub> | 3.3            | .3.3            | 3.3       | 32.9          | 32.4              | 32.6 |
| 15         | $D_2$          | 6.7            | 3.3             | 5.0       | 34.7          | 34.1              | 34.4 |
| 16         | D <sub>3</sub> | 3.3            | 3.3             | 3.3       | 26.5          | 17.6              | 22.0 |
| 17         | D4             | 3.3            | 1.7             | 2.5       | 24.7          | 12.2              | 18.4 |
| SE (       | m)±            | 0.6            | 0.5             | . <u></u> | 2.8           | 3.1               |      |
| C.D.       | at 5%          | NS             | NS              |           | 7.2           | 8.3               |      |

Table 13: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R on tomato leaf curl virus plants/plot, and tomato fruit borer.

the tomato fruit borer attack as compared to control except,  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  treatments during both the years. The lowest number of affected fruits (13.2%) by tomato fruit borer was recorded under  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment during first year which was significantly superior to all the treatments except  $F_3$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $S_1 + F_1$ ,  $S_2 + F_2$  and  $S_3 + F_3$  treatments which were statistically at par. Whereas, in second year, minimum infection (12.2%) by tomato fruit borer was recorded in  $D_4$  treatment which was statistically at par with  $F_4$ ,  $S_1 + F_1$ ,  $S_3 + F_3$ ,  $S_4 + F_4$  and  $D_3$  treatments and significantly superior to rest of the treatments (Table 13).

# COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF PLANT VITALIZERS AND ORGANIC MANURES ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN

#### A. Growth studies

#### 1. Plant height

The plant height was not affected significantly by different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan +Anupaan R at various stages of plant growth (30, 60 and 90 DAT) during both the years. However, on average basis, the treatment A<sub>4</sub> + PM produced taller plants at all the stages of plant growth as compared to other treatments (Table 14).

| ST.<br># | Treatments         | 30   | DAT  |      | 60   | DAT  |              | 90 DAT |      |      |
|----------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|--------|------|------|
| -        |                    | 2001 | 2002 | Mean | 2001 | 2002 | Mean         | 2001   | 2002 | Mean |
| 1        | Control            | 18.2 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 26.3 | 24.6 | 25.5         | 36.3   | 33.3 | 34.8 |
| 2        | FYM                | 20.1 | 22.3 | 21.2 | 38.1 | 38.7 | 38.4         | 44.5   | 44.1 | 44.3 |
| 3        | РМ                 | 21.9 | 24.3 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 40.8 | 39.7         | 48.3   | 49.2 | 47.8 |
| 4        | A <sub>1</sub>     | 19.1 | 18.9 | 19.0 | 32.5 | 36.8 | 34.6         | 42.7   | 44.0 | 43.3 |
| 5        | Αι+ϜϒϺ             | 21.1 | 25.7 | 23.4 | 39.6 | 42.5 | 41.1         | 45.2   | 49.6 | 47.4 |
| 6        | A1+PM              | 23.5 | 27.5 | 25.5 | 43.3 | 43.6 | 43.5         | 48.3   | 54.8 | 51.6 |
| 7        | A2+FYM             | 20.3 | 24.6 | 22.5 | 39.3 | 39.5 | 39.4         | 41.3   | 46.0 | 43.6 |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM | 22.4 | 24.1 | 23.3 | 41.1 | 43.0 | 42.0         | 43.7   | 48.3 | 46.0 |
| 9        | A3+FYM             | 24.9 | 27.3 | 26.1 | 43.1 | 46.7 | 44.9         | 48.0   | 56.5 | 52.3 |
| 10       | A <sub>3</sub> +PM | 25,0 | 29.1 | 27.0 | 44.7 | 49.3 | 47.0         | 52.6   | 54.0 | 53.3 |
| 11       | A4+FYM             | 27.3 | 29.1 | 28.2 | 45.6 | 49.7 | 47.7         | 54.3   | 60.9 | 57.6 |
| 12       | A4+PM              | 30.1 | 33.2 | 31.7 | 48.9 | 50.8 | 49.8         | 61.4   | 68.7 | 65.1 |
| SE (1    | n)±                | 4.0  | 1.3  |      | 5.9  | 2.7  | <u>_,. ,</u> | 5.2    | 5.2  |      |
| C.D.     | at 5%              | N.S. | N.S. |      | N.S. | N.S. |              | N.S.   | N.S. |      |

Table 14:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on plant height<br/>(cm) at different stages of plant growth.

# 2. Leaves per plant

The data presented in Table 15 reveal that leaves per plant was significantly increased by all the treatments of organic manure and Anupaan + Anupaan R except PM,  $A_1$  + FYM and  $A_2$ + FYM during first year and FYM and  $A_1$  treatments during both the years. The maximum number of leaves per plant (75.3) was recorded under the treatment  $A_4$  + PM during first year which was significantly superior to FYM, PM  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  + FYM treatments and statistically at par with rest of the treatments. During second year the maximum number of leaves (84.0) per plant was recorded under  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was significantly superior to all the treatments but statistically at par with  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + FYM treatments.

# 3. Fresh weight of leaves per plant

The observations related to fresh weight of leaves per plant gathered in Table 15 indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R significantly increased the fresh weight of leaves per plant over control except FYM,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  + FYM during both the years. The highest fresh weight of leaves per plant i.e. 136.7g and 151.7g were recorded with  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + PM treatments during first year and

| Sr.<br># | Treatments          | Leaves/ | Plant (#) |               | Fresh<br>leaves/ | ı Wt. of<br>'plant (g) |          |
|----------|---------------------|---------|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|
|          | -                   | 2001    | 2002      | Mean          | 2001             | 2002                   | <br>Mean |
| 1        | Control             | 46.3    | 45,7      | 46.0          | 76.7             | 68.3                   | 72.5     |
| 2        | FYM                 | 54.0    | 55.7      | 54.8          | 96.7             | 98.3                   | 97.5     |
| 3        | РМ                  | 58.3    | 59.7      | 59.0          | 113.3            | 121.3                  | 117.3    |
| 4        | A <sub>1</sub>      | 51.7    | 49.0      | 50.3          | 88.7             | 83.3                   | 86.0     |
| 5        | A1+FYM              | 59.7    | 60.2      | 59.9          | 115.3            | 118.7                  | 117.0    |
| 6        | A1+PM               | 68.3    | 71.1      | 69.7          | 128.3            | 135.0                  | 131.7    |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 55.7    | 57.3      | 56.5          | 105.0            | 108.3                  | 106.7    |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 63.0    | 65.7      | 64.3          | 120.0            | 126.7                  | 123.3    |
| 9        | A3+FYM              | 64.3    | 67.3      | • <b>65.8</b> | 124.7            | 131.7                  | 128.2    |
| 10       | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 71.7    | 77.3      | 74.5          | 136.7            | 142.3                  | 139.5    |
| 11       | A₄+FYM              | 68.7    | 78.0      | 73.3          | 129.7            | 143.0                  | 136.3    |
| 12       | A <sub>4</sub> +PM  | 75.3    | 84.0      | 79.7          | 132.3            | 151.7                  | 142.0    |
| SE (:    | <b>m)</b> ±         | 5.3     | 3.6       | <u></u>       | 11.2             | 15.9                   | i        |
| C.D.     | at 5%               | 15.7    | 10.6      |               | 33.1             | 47.0                   |          |

Table 15: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on number of leaves and fresh weight of leaves per plant at 90 DAT.

second year, respectively. These treatments were significantly superior to FYM and  $A_1$  treatments and statistically at par with rest of the other treatments.

# 4. Branches per plant

Number of branches per plant did not show any significant response to different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. However,  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + PM treatment gave better results (1.7) as compared to other treatments (Table 16).

# 5. Thickness of main stem

The diameter of main significantly stem was influenced by different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R (Table 16). It was significantly increased under all the treatments over control during both the years except A<sub>1</sub> treatment during first year. The maximum diameter of main stem (2.0 and 1.7 cm) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment during first year and second year, respectively. A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment was statistically at par with  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + FYM treatments during first year and A<sub>4</sub> + FYM treatment during second year and significantly superior to rest of the treatments during the respective years (Table 16).

| <b>Sr.</b><br># | Treatments          | Branche<br>(† | s/ Plant<br><sup>‡</sup> ) |        | Diamete<br>sten | er of main<br>n (cm) |      |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|------|
|                 | -                   | 2001          | 2002                       | Mean   | 2001            | 2002                 | Mean |
| 1               | Control             | 7.1           | 6.7                        | 6.9    | 0.9             | 0.9                  | 0.9  |
| 2               | FYM                 | 8.1           | 8.4                        | 8.3    | 1.3             | 1.3                  | 1.3  |
| 3               | РМ                  | 8.8           | 8.7                        | 8.8    | 1.4             | 1.3                  | 1.4  |
| 4               | <b>A</b> 1          | 7.9           | 7.7                        | 7.8    | 1.2             | 1.2                  | 1.2  |
| 5               | A <sub>I</sub> +FYM | 9.5           | 9.1                        | 9.3    | 1.3             | 1.4                  | 1.4  |
| б               | A1+PM               | 10.4          | 10.1                       | 10.3   | 1.5             | 1.4                  | 1.4  |
| 7               | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 8.2           | 8.6                        | 8.4    | 1.3             | 1.3                  | 1.3  |
| 8               | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 9.3           | 9.4                        | 9.4    | 1.4             | 1.4                  | 1.4  |
| 9               | A3+FYM              | 10.5          | 10.7                       | , 10.6 | 1.7             | 1.5                  | 1.6  |
| 10              | A3+PM               | 12.1          | 11.5                       | 11.8   | 1.9             | 1.5                  | 1.7  |
| 11              | A4+FYM              | 11.3          | 11.6                       | 11.4   | 1.9             | 1.6                  | 1.7  |
| 12              | A4+PM               | 13.5          | 13.2                       | 13.4   | 2.0             | 1.7                  | 1.9  |
| SE (:           | m)±                 | 1.8           | 0.6                        |        | 0.2             | 0.1                  | ·    |
| C.D.            | at 5%               | N.S.          | N.S.                       |        | 0.3             | 0.2                  |      |

Table 16: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on branches/plant and thickness of main stem.

#### **B.** Physiological Studies

# 1. Chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves

The observations recorded on chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' indicate that chlorophyll ('a' and 'b') contents of leaves were not affected significantly by different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. However, on the basis of mean value, treatment  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + PM exhibit better colour ton as compared to other treatments (Table 17).

# 2. Dry matter accumulation of plant

The values of dry matter accumulation of plant (Table 17) indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R improved significantly the dry matter content of plant over control except FYM,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  + FYM treatments during first year and  $A_1$  treatment during second year. The maximum biomass per plant (142.1g) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment during first year which was significantly superior to FYM,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  + FYM treatments and statistically at par with rest of the treatments. During second year maximum dry matter production per plant (140.8g) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which is statistically at par with the treatments.

# Table 17: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves at 65 DAT and dry matter of plant at harvest.

| Sr.<br># | Treatments          | Chloro;<br>(m; | phyll 'a'<br>g/g) |      | Chloro<br>(m | phyll 'b'<br>g/g) |      | Dry n<br>/Plai | natter<br>nt (g) |       |
|----------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|------|--------------|-------------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|
|          |                     | 2001           | 2002              | Mean | 2001         | 2002              | Mean | 2001           | 2002             | Mean  |
| 1        | Control             | 2.5            | 2.5               | 2.5  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 86.8           | 95.6             | 91.2  |
| 2        | FYM                 | 2.6            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 109.1          | 119.8            | 114.5 |
| 3        | РМ                  | 2.7            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 118.6          | 126.5            | 122.6 |
| 4        | A <sub>t</sub>      | 2.6            | 2.6               | 2.6  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 101.4          | 114.9            | 108.2 |
| 5        | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 2.7            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 120.2          | 119.5            | 119.8 |
| 6        | A1+PM               | 2.7            | 2.8               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 128.2          | 119.4            | 123.8 |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 2.7            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 112.3          | 119.4            | 115.9 |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 2.7            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 121.0          | 131.3            | 126.1 |
| 9        | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | 2.7            | 2.7               | 2.7  | 1.4          | 1.4               | 1.4  | 128.6          | 123.7            | 126.1 |
| 10       | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 2.8            | 2.8               | 2.8  | 1.5          | 1.5               | 1.5  | 135.1          | 127.6            | 131.4 |
| 11       | A₄+FŸM              | 2.8            | 2.8               | 2.8  | 1.5          | 1.5               | 1.5  | 131.8          | 134.8            | 133.3 |
| 12       | A4+PM               | 2.9            | 3.0               | 3.0  | 1.5          | 1.5               | 1.5  | 142.1          | 140.8            | 141.4 |
| SE (:    | m)±                 | 0.4            | 0.3               |      | 0.2          | 0.3               |      | 9.1            | 6.7              |       |
| C.D.     | at 5%               | N.S.           | N.S.              |      | N.S.         | N.S.              |      | 26.9           | 19.9             |       |

PM,  $A_2 + PM$ ,  $A_3 + FYM$ ,  $A_3 + PM$  and  $A_4 + FYM$  and significantly superior to rest of the treatments.

## 3. Mineral composition of plant

The data regarding mineral composition of tomato plant tabulated in Table 18 reveal that nitrogen content of tomato plant did not show any significant response to different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the year. However, on the basis of mean value, maximum nitrogen content (0.729%) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment.

Phosphorus content in tomato plant showed significant response to various treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. All the treatments significantly contributed the phosphorus content of tomato plant over control except FYM,  $A_1$  and  $F_2$  + FYM during both the years and  $A_1$  + FYM during the second year. Maximum phosphorus (0.136% and 0.137%) accumulated in  $A_4$  + PM treatment during first and second year, respectively. The treatment  $A_4$  + PM was statistically at par with  $A_1$  + PM,  $A_2$  + PM,  $A_3$  + P.M and  $A_4$  + FYM during both the years but during second year A<sub>4</sub> + PM also statistically at par with PM treatment and

| Sr.<br># | Treatments          |       | ntent<br>6) |       | P Co1<br>(% | ntent<br>6) |       | K Content<br>(%) |       | _     |
|----------|---------------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
|          |                     | 2001  | 2002        | Mean  | 2001        | 2002        | Mean  | 2001             | 2002  | Меал  |
| 1        | Control             | 0.707 | 0.701       | 0.704 | 0.112       | 0.116       | 0.114 | 0.315            | 0.305 | 0.310 |
| 2        | FYM                 | 0.716 | 0.713       | 0.714 | 0.120       | 0.124       | 0.122 | 0.325            | 0.327 | 0.326 |
| 3        | РМ                  | 0.719 | 0.715       | 0.717 | 0.127       | 0.129       | 0.128 | 0.330            | 0.334 | 0.332 |
| 4        | A <sub>1</sub>      | 0.708 | 0.706       | 0.707 | 0.114       | 0.118       | 0.116 | 0.319            | 0.316 | 0.317 |
| 5        | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 0.718 | 0.715       | 0.716 | 0.122       | 0.125       | 0.123 | 0.326            | 0.328 | 0.327 |
| 6        | A1+ <b>PM</b>       | 0.721 | 0.717       | 0.719 | 0.132       | 0.133       | 0.132 | 0.331            | 0.333 | 0.332 |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 0.713 | 0.715       | 0.714 | 0.119       | 0.121       | 0.120 | 0.324            | 0.326 | 0.325 |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 0.718 | 0.715       | 0.716 | 0.128       | 0.130       | 0.129 | 0.328            | 0.329 | 0.328 |
| 9        | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | 0.723 | 0.716       | 0.719 | 0.123       | 0.127       | 0.125 | 0.329            | 0.331 | 0.330 |
| 10       | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 0.732 | 0.717       | 0.724 | 0.134       | 0.135       | 0.134 | 0.333            | 0.336 | 0.334 |
| 11       | A4+FYM              | 0.730 | 0.717       | 0.723 | 0.125       | 0.129       | 0.127 | 0.332            | 0.334 | 0.333 |
| 12       | A₄+PM               | 0.742 | 0.718       | 0.729 | 0.136       | 0.137       | 0.136 | 0.337            | 0.339 | 0.338 |
| SE (     | m)±                 | 0.009 | 0.004       |       | 0.003       | 0.003       |       | 0.007            | 0.005 |       |
| C.D.     | at 5%               | N.S.  | N.S.        |       | 0.008       | 0.009       |       | N.S.             | 0.014 |       |

Table 18: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on mineralcomposition of tomato plant.

significantly superior to rest of the treatments in respective years.

The potassium content of tomato plant was influenced significantly only during second year .All the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R improved potassium content of tomato plant over control except  $A_1$ treatment. Maximum potassium content (0.339%) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was significantly superior to  $A_1$ treatment and statistically at par with rest of the treatments (Table 18).

# C. Flowering and fruiting behaviour

# 1. Days to 50% flowering

The observations on days to 50% flowering presented in Table 19 reveal that days to 50% flowering was not affected significantly by different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years. However, on the basis of mean value, 50% plants flowered in 41.5 days after transplanting when treatments  $A_4$  + PM was applied whereas plants under control took 45.5 days to reach up to this stage of flowering.

| Sr.<br># | Treatments            | Days flow | to 50%<br>ering |      | Days to fru<br>from flowe | lit ripening<br>er anthesis |      |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
|          | -                     | 2001      | 2002            | Mean | 2001                      | 2002                        | Mean |
| 1        | Control               | 45.0      | 46.0            | 45.5 | 51.2                      | 52.7                        | 52.0 |
| 2        | FYM                   | 43.7      | 41.7            | 42.7 | 44.3                      | 50.7                        | 50.0 |
| 3        | РМ                    | 42.7      | 42.3            | 42.5 | 48.7                      | 49.3                        | 49.0 |
| 4        | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | 43.7      | 43.0            | 43.3 | 49.3                      | 50.7                        | 50.0 |
| 5        | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM   | 42.7      | 42.3            | 42.5 | 48.7                      | 49.7                        | 49.2 |
| 6        | A1+bW                 | 41.7      | 42.0            | 41.8 | 47.7                      | 47.7                        | 47.7 |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM   | 43.0      | 43.0            | 43.0 | 49.0                      | 49.3                        | 49.2 |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM    | 42.7      | 42.3            | 42.5 | 48.7                      | 49.3                        | 49.0 |
| 9        | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM   | 42.7      | 43.0            | 42.8 | 48.7                      | 47.3                        | 48.0 |
| 10       | A <sub>3</sub> +PM    | 43.0      | 43.3            | 43.2 | 47.3                      | 46.7                        | 47.0 |
| 11       | A₄+FYM                | 42.7      | 41.3            | 42.0 | 48.7                      | 47.3                        | 48.0 |
| 12       | A <sub>4</sub> +PM    | 41.3      | 41.7            | 41.5 | 47.3                      | 45.7                        | 46.5 |
|          | SE (m)±               | 0.8       | 1.0             |      | 1.2                       | 1.0                         |      |
|          | C.D. at 5%            | N.S.      | N.S.            |      | N.S.                      | N.S.                        |      |

Table 19:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on days to 50%flowering and days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis.

## 2. Days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis

The days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis did not show any significant response to different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years (Table 19). However, on the basis of average values, minimum days (46.5) were taken by  $A_4$  + PM treatment for fruit ripening from flower anthesis where as in case of control it was longest duration (52.0 days).

# 3. Fruits per cluster

The observations on number of fruits per cluster summarized in Table 20 reveal that all the treatments of organic manures, Anupaan + Anupaan R and their combinations gave non-significant results with respect to fruit per cluster during both the years. The application of A4 + PM treatment produced maximum number of fruits per cluster (4.3) in the year 2002 as compared to all other treatments.

# 4. Fruits per plant

The values recorded on number of fruits per plant indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R improved number of fruits per plant (Table 20). Significant increase in number of fruits per plant

| Sr.<br># | Treatments F        | Fruits/<br>( | /Cluster<br>#) |              | Fruits<br>(i | /Plant<br>#) |      | Fruit : | size (g) |              |
|----------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|---------|----------|--------------|
|          |                     | 2001         | 2002           | Меап         | 2001         | 2002         | Mean | 2001    | 2002     | Меал         |
| 1        | Control             | 2.3          | 2,3            | 2.3          | 14.8         | 11.0         | 13.4 | 22.1    | 29.0     | 25.5         |
| 2        | FYM                 | 3.0          | 3.0            | 3.0          | 18.2         | 17.2         | 17.7 | 23.8    | 25.5     | 24.6         |
| 3        | РМ                  | 3.3          | 3.0            | 3.2          | 20.4         | 19.4         | 19.9 | 22.6    | 24.1     | 23.4         |
| 4        | A <sub>1</sub>      | 3.0          | 2.7            | 3.3          | 23.8         | 22.6         | 23.2 | 14.5    | 17.1     | 15. <b>8</b> |
| 5        | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 3.3          | 3.3            | 3.3          | 21.1         | 29.4         | 25.2 | 23.2    | 16.8     | 20.0         |
| 6        | A1+PM               | 3.0          | 3.7            | 3.3          | 27.8         | 30.4         | 29.1 | 20.2    | 18.5     | 19.3         |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 3.0          | 3.0            | 3.0          | 16.2         | 15.4         | 15.8 | 28.5    | 26.3     | 27.4         |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 3.0          | 3.0            | 3.0          | 21,8         | 15.7         | 18.7 | 24.6    | 30.5     | 27.5         |
| 9        | A3+FYM              | 3.3          | 3.3            | <b>3.3</b> , | 20.6         | 19.3         | 19.9 | 25.4    | 26.9     | 26.1         |
| 10       | A3+PM               | 3.7          | 3.3            | 3.5          | 31.6         | 20.5         | 26.1 | 17.8    | 27.6     | 22.7         |
| 11       | A₄+FYM              | 3.3          | 3.7            | 3.5          | 27.1         | 20.1         | 23.6 | 19.5    | 24.7     | 22.1         |
| 12       | A4+PM               | 3.7          | 4.3            | 4.0          | 33.5         | 28.1         | 30.8 | 27.2    | 29.8     | 28.5         |
| SE (:    | m)±                 | 0.5          | 0.4            | <u> </u>     | 4.6          | 3.0          |      | 4.2     | 2.7      | <u></u>      |
| C.D.     | at 5%               | N.S.         | N.S.           |              | 7.2          | 9.0          |      | N.S.    | N.S.     |              |

Table 20:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on number offruits/cluster, number of fruits/plant and fruit size.

over control was recorded only under the treatments  $A_1$ ,  $A_1$  + PM,  $A_3$  + PM,  $A_4$  + PM and  $A_4$  + FYM during both the years and  $A_1$  + FYM during second year 2002. Highest number of fruits per plant (33.5) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was statistically at par with  $A_1$  + PM,  $A_3$  + PM and  $A_4$  + FYM and significant superior to rest of the treatments during the first year 2001. Whereas, in second year, maximum number of fruits per plant (30.4) was recorded in  $A_1$  + PM treatment which was statistically at par with  $A_1$ ,  $A_1$  + FYM and  $A_4$  + PM and significantly at par with  $A_1$ ,  $A_1$  + FYM and  $A_4$  + PM and significantly at par with  $A_1$ ,  $A_1$  + FYM and  $A_4$  + PM and significantly superior to rest of the treatments (Table 20).

#### 5. Fruit size

The data on fruit size presented in Table 20 indicate that fruit size was not affected significantly by various treatments of organic manures and Anupaan +Anupaan R during both the years. However, on the basis of average value of two years, heaviest fruit size (28.5g) was recoded with  $A_4$  + PM treatment.

# 6. Fruit yield per plant

The observations recorded (Table 21) on fruit yield per plant reveal that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R increased significantly the fruit yield per

| Sr.<br># | Treatments          | Fruit yield (kg/plant) |        |      | Fruit yi | ield (t/ha) |              |
|----------|---------------------|------------------------|--------|------|----------|-------------|--------------|
|          | -                   | 2001                   | 2002   | Mean | 2001     | 2002        | Mean         |
| 1        | Control             | 0.33                   | 0.35   | 0.34 | 12.1     | 11.5        | 11.8         |
| 2        | FYM                 | 0.43                   | 0.44   | 0.43 | 14.4     | 14.6        | 14.5         |
| 3        | РМ                  | 0.46                   | 0.47   | 0.47 | 15.4     | 15.6        | 15.5         |
| 4        | A <sub>1</sub>      | 0.35                   | 0.39   | 0.37 | 13.0     | 12.9        | 13.0         |
| 5        | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 0.49                   | 0.49   | 0.49 | 16.3     | 16.4        | 16.4         |
| 6        | A1+PM               | 0.56                   | 0.56   | 0.56 | 18.5     | 18.5        | 18.5         |
| 7        | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 0.46                   | 0.47   | 0.46 | 15.4     | 15.6        | 15.5         |
| 8        | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 0.54                   | 0.54   | 0.54 | 17.8     | 18.0        | 17.9         |
| 9        | A3+FYM              | 0.52                   | 0.52 , | 0.52 | 17.4     | 16.6        | 16. <b>9</b> |
| 10       | A3+PM               | 0.56                   | 0.57   | 0.56 | 18.8     | 18.7        | 18.7         |
| 11       | A4+FYM              | 0.53                   | 0.50   | 0.51 | 19.3     | 17.3        | 18.3         |
| 12       | A₄+PM               | 0.58                   | 0.06   | 0.57 | 20.1     | 18.9        | 19.5         |
| SE (1    | m)±                 | 0.03                   | 0.02   |      | 1.2      | 1.1         |              |
| C.D.     | at 5%               | 0.09                   | 0.09   |      | 3.5      | 2.9         |              |

Table 21:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on fruit yieldper plant and fruit yield per hectare.

plant over control during both the years except A<sub>2</sub> treatment during first year 2001 and A<sub>2</sub> and FYM treatments during the year 2002. In first year, maximum fruit yield per plant (0.58 kg) was recorded in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment which was significantly superior to FYM, PM, A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub> + FYM and statistically at par with rest of the treatments. In second year maximum fruit yield per plant (0.57kg) was recorded in A<sub>3</sub> + PM treatment which was significantly superior to FYM, PM, A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub> + FYM treatments and statistically at par with rest of the treatments.

#### 7. Fruit yield per hectare

The data regarding fruit yield per hectare presented in Table 21 reveal that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R increased significantly the fruit yield over control except A<sub>1</sub> treatment during both the years and FYM, PM and A<sub>1</sub> treatments during first year. Maximum fruit yield per hectare (20.1t) was recorded in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment which was significantly superior to FYM, PM, A<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>1</sub> + FYM and A<sub>2</sub> + FYM treatments and statistically at par with rest of the treatments. During second year, maximum fruit yield per hectare (18.9t) trend was maintained by A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment which was significantly superior to FYM, PM,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  + FYM treatments and statistically at par with rest of the treatments.

# D. Fruit quality

# 1. Pulp juice and seed content

The pulp, juice and seed contents of tomato fruit were not affected significantly by different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years (Table 22).

# 2. Total soluble solids and sugar contents

The observations recorded on total soluble solids (TSS) presented in Table 23 indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R improved significantly the TSS content of tomato fruit over control only during the year 2001. In the year 2002 application of different treatments did not show any significant result in TSS content. The maximum TSS of tomato fruit (6.1%) was recorded in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment which was significantly superior to A<sub>1</sub> treatment and statistically at par with rest of the treatments.

Sugar content of tomato fruit was significantly increased over control by all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R during both the years (Table 23).

| Sr. Treatments<br># |                     | Pulp Content<br>(%) |      |      | Juice Content<br>(%) |      |      | Seed Content<br>(g/100g) |      |      |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|----------------------|------|------|--------------------------|------|------|
|                     |                     | 2001                | 2002 | Mean | 2001                 | 2002 | Mean | 2001                     | 2002 | Mean |
| 1                   | Control             | 51.4                | 50.5 | 50.9 | 47.9                 | 48.7 | 48.3 | 0.3                      | 0.2  | 0.3  |
| 2                   | FYM                 | 51.6                | 50.2 | 50.9 | 47.8                 | 48.7 | 48.2 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 3                   | РМ                  | 52.8                | 52.9 | 52.9 | 46.1                 | 45.4 | 45.8 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 4                   | A1                  | 50.3                | 50.0 | 50.1 | 48.8                 | 48.8 | 48.8 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 5                   | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 50.4                | 52.0 | 51.2 | 48.6                 | 46.6 | 47.6 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 6                   | A <sub>1</sub> +PM  | 52.4                | 50.2 | 51.3 | 46.7                 | 48.8 | 47.7 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 7                   | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 50.9                | 51.7 | 51.3 | 48.3                 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 0.3                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 8                   | A2+PM               | 49.8                | 51.7 | 50.7 | 49.4                 | 47.1 | 48.2 | 0.4                      | 0.3  | 0.3  |
| 9                   | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | 51.2                | 52.9 | 52.0 | 47.7                 | 46.5 | 47.1 | 0.4                      | 0.3  | 0.4  |
| 10                  | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 52.9                | 52.5 | 52.7 | 46.0                 | 46.4 | 46.2 | 0.4                      | 0.4  | 0.4  |
| 11                  | A4+FYM              | 51.8                | 52.3 | 52.0 | 47.2                 | 46.9 | 47.0 | 0.4                      | 0.4  | 0.4  |
| 12                  | A4+PM               | 52.3                | 52.9 | 52.6 | 46.4                 | 46.1 | 46.2 | 0.4                      | 0.4  | 0.4  |
| SE (m)±             |                     | 5.0                 | 3.3  |      | 5.6                  | 3.4  |      | 0.2                      | 0.3  |      |
| C.D. at 5%          |                     | N.S.                | N.S. |      | N.S.                 | N.S. |      | NS                       | NS   |      |

# Table 22: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on pulp, juice and seed contents.

| Sr. #      | Treatments          | T.S.S<br>(%) |       |      | Sugar content (%) |      |      |
|------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|------|-------------------|------|------|
|            |                     | 2001         | 2002  | Mean | 2001              | 2002 | Mean |
| 1          | Control             | 3.0          | 4.8   | 3.9  | 2.5               | 2.5  | 2.5  |
| 2          | FYM                 | 5.4          | 5.2   | 5.3  | 4.0               | 4.0  | 4.0  |
| 3          | РМ                  | 5.5          | 5.5   | 5.5  | 4.1               | 4.1  | 4.1  |
| 4          | A <sub>1</sub>      | 4.8          | 4.9   | 4.8  | 3.9               | 4.0  | 3.9  |
| 5          | A1+FYM              | 5.4          | 5.4   | 5.4  | 4.2               | 4.2  | 4.2  |
| 6          | A <sub>1</sub> +PM  | 5.9          | 5.7   | 5.8  | 4.3               | 4.3  | 4.3  |
| 7          | A2+FYM              | 5.1          | 5.2   | 5.2  | 4.1               | 4.1  | 4.1  |
| 8          | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 5.2          | 5.2   | 5.2  | 4.1               | 4.2  | 4.1  |
| 9          | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | 5.3          | 5.5 ′ | 5.4  | 4.3               | 4.3  | 4.3  |
| 10         | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 5.8          | 5.4   | 5.6  | 4.4               | 4.4  | 4.4  |
| 11         | A4+FYM              | 5.5          | 5.9   | 5.7  | 4.3               | 4.4  | 4.4  |
| 12         | A4+PM               | 6.1          | 5.5   | 5.8  | 4.5               | 4.5  | 4.5  |
| SE (m)±    |                     | 0.4          | 0.5   |      | 0.2               | 0.3  |      |
| C.D. at 5% |                     | 1.3          | N.S.  |      | 0.9               | 0.9  |      |

# Table 23: Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on TSS and

Sugar content of tomato fruit.

Treatment  $A_4$  + PM followed the similar trend of superiority in both the years.

#### 3. Acidity

The data on the effect of different treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R on acidity presented in Table 24. It indicate that the treatments  $A_3$  + FYM,  $A_3$  + PM,  $A_4$  + PM during both the years and  $A_4$  + FYM during the years 2001 increased significantly the acidity content of tomato fruit over control. During the year 2001 maximum acidity content (1.6%) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was significantly superior to all the treatments. In second year highest level of acidity content (0.8%) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM and  $A_3$  + FYM treatments which were statistically at par with PM,  $A_1$  + FYM,  $A_1$  + PM and  $A_3$  + PM treatments and significantly superior to rest of the treatments.

## 4. Ascorbic acid

The observations on ascorbic acid content of tomato fruit indicate that all the treatments were non-significant for ascorbic acid content of tomato fruit during both the years (Table 24). However, on the basis of observed value, maximum ascorbic acid content (27.6 mg/100g fruit) was recorded under  $A_4$  + PM treatment.

| Sr.<br>#   | Treatments<br>_     | Acie<br>(% | dity<br>6) |                 | Ascorb<br>(mg/10 | <b></b> |           |
|------------|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|-----------|
|            |                     | 2001       | 2002       | Mean            | 2001             | 2002    | -<br>Меал |
| 1          | Control             | 0.5        | 0.4        | 0.5             | 18.6             | 23.1    | 20.8      |
| 2          | FYM                 | 0.6        | 0.5        | 0.6             | 19.4             | 25.5    | 22.5      |
| 3          | РМ                  | 0.8        | 0.6        | 0.6             | 20.5             | 26.6    | 23.5      |
| 4          | A1                  | 0.5        | 0.5        | 0.5             | 18.9             | 24.2    | 21.5      |
| 5          | A1+FYM              | 0.6        | 0.6        | 0.6             | 20.1             | 25.5    | 22.8      |
| 6          | A1+PM               | 0.8        | 0.6        | 0.7             | 21.7             | 24.5    | 23.1      |
| 7          | A <sub>2</sub> +FYM | 0.5        | 0.5        | 0.5             | 14.0             | 22.9    | 18.5      |
| 8          | A <sub>2</sub> +PM  | 0.8        | 0.5        | 0.6             | 15.3             | 24.3    | 19.9      |
| 9          | A3+FYM              | 0.9        | 0.8        | ,<br><b>0.8</b> | 22.2             | 26.3    | 24.5      |
| 10         | А <sub>3</sub> +РМ  | 1.1        | 0.7        | 0.9             | 22.8             | 24.1    | 23.5      |
| 11         | A₄+FYM              | 1.1        | 0.5        | 0.8             | 24.6             | 23.8    | 24.2      |
| 12         | A₄+PM               | 1.6        | 0.8        | 1.2             | 28.7             | 26.4    | 27.6      |
| SE (m)±    |                     | 0.2        | 0.1        | <u></u>         | 3.7              | 1.5     |           |
| C.D. at 5% |                     | 0.3        | 0.2        |                 | N.\$.            | N.S.    |           |

Table 24:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on quality oftomato fruit.

#### E. Incidence of pest and diseases

# 1. Tomato leaf curl viruses (TLCV)

The observations regarding TLCV affected plants presented in Table 25 indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R showed non-significant effect on TLCV infestation during both the years. However, on the basis of mean value recorded, lowest number of plants (1.7%) affected by TLCV in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment.

# 2. Tomato fruit borer

The infection of tomato fruit due to borer presented in Table 25 indicate that all the treatments of organic manures and Anupaan + Anupaan R reduced the tomato fruit borer incidence. The treatments  $A_1$ ,  $A_3$  + FYM,  $A_3$  + PM,  $A_4$  + PM and  $A_4$  + FYM lowered significantly the tomato fruit borer attack over control during both the years. Minimum tomato fruit borer attack (18.9%) was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was statistically at par with  $A_1$ ,  $A_1$  + PM,  $A_3$  + PM,  $A_3$  + FYM and  $A_4$  + FYM and significantly superior to rest of the treatments during first year. In the year 2002 lowest tomato fruit borer attack (17.4%) was observed in  $A_4$  + PM treatment which was statistically at par with  $A_1$ ,  $A_3$  + FYM,  $A_3$  + PM,  $A_4$  + FYM treatments and significantly superior to rest of the treatments.

| Sr.<br>#   | Treatments          | TLCV plants<br>/plot (%) |      |      | Tomato fruit Borer<br>(%) |      |      |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------|------|---------------------------|------|------|
|            |                     | 2001                     | 2002 | Mean | 2001                      | 2002 | Mean |
| 1          | Control             | 6.7                      | 5.0  | 5.8  | 55.1                      | 52.1 | 53.6 |
| 2          | FYM                 | 6.7                      | 3.3  | 5.0  | 46.0                      | 44.6 | 45.3 |
| 3          | РМ                  | 5.0                      | 3.3  | 4.2  | 39.3                      | 37.1 | 38.2 |
| 4          | A <sub>1</sub>      | 3.3                      | 1.7  | 2.5  | 29.8                      | 28.7 | 29.3 |
| 5          | A <sub>1</sub> +FYM | 5.0                      | 3.3  | 4.2  | 40.6                      | 38.4 | 39.5 |
| 6          | A <sub>1</sub> +PM  | 3.3                      | 1.7  | 2.5  | 36.9                      | 36.8 | 36.9 |
| 7          | A2+FYM              | 5.0                      | 3.3  | 4.2  | 44.8                      | 42.7 | 43.8 |
| 8          | A2+PM               | 5.0                      | 1.7  | 3.3  | 38.8                      | 37.1 | 37.9 |
| 9          | A <sub>3</sub> +FYM | 3.3                      | 1.7  | 2.5  | 28.2                      | 29.6 | 28.9 |
| 10         | A <sub>3</sub> +PM  | 5.0                      | 3.3  | 4.2  | 24.3                      | 22.7 | 23.5 |
| 11         | A4+FYM              | 3.3                      | 1.7  | 2.5  | 23.9                      | 21.9 | 22.9 |
| 12         | A4+PM               | 1.7                      | 1.7  | 1.7  | 18.9                      | 17.4 | 18.1 |
| SE (m)±    |                     | 0.2                      | 0.1  |      | 6.1                       | 5.2  |      |
| C.D. at 5% |                     | NS                       | NS   |      | 18.2                      | 15.3 |      |

# Table 25:Effect of Anupaan + Anupaan R and organic manures on tomato leafcurl virus plants/plot, and tomato fruit borer.

Discussion

The present investigations were carried out to evaluate the effect of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) and different organic manures on growth, flowering, yield and quality of tomato cv. Hisar Arun. The studies yielded some useful, interesting and encouraging results. The salient features of these findings are discussed in the following pages:

EFFECT OF PLANT VITALIZERS (ANUPAAN + ANUPAAN R) ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN.

# A. Growth studies

The growth parameters such as number and fresh weight of leaves per plant and diameter of main stem were influenced significantly by the application of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) whereas, the plant height and branches per plant did not respond significantly. It is clear from the findings that the application of Anupaan + Anupaan R @ 50 per cent more than suggested dose applied as soil + foliar feeding gave better results as compared to other treatments with respect to all the growth parameters. This might be due to growth promoting effects of Anupaan + Anupaan R which might have encouraged all physiological activities going on in the plants. The growth is a vital phenomenon. The protoplasm assimilates the products of digestion and cell enlarge and divides and the plant grows as a whole (Dutta, 1976). Similar results were obtained by Zeenat and Sharma (1994) on growth and biomass of tomato crop.

Chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves were improved by Anupaan + Anupaan R application but results were not significant. Dry matter accumulation of plant was increased significantly with different concentrations and methods of application of Anupaan + Anupaan R. The bio-fertilizers such as phosphate solubilizers increased the growth (Vishwanath, 2002), the Anupaan + Anupaan R was also acting in the same way and promoting growth parameters. Plants mineral composition (NPK) were also improved by these plant vitalizers. This indicate that the uptake of these nutrients by plant improved by application of plant vitalizers, there by showing improved plant growth (Tables 2-5) and ultimately productivity (Tables 8-9) of tomato crop increased.

## **B.** Flowering and fruiting behaviour

It is evident from the results that flowering and fruiting behaviour of the plant was influenced by the Anupaan + Anupaan R. There was early flowering and fruit ripening in plants receiving the higher doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R when applied in soil + foliar combination. These plant vitalizers also increased number of fruits per plant. The early flowering, heavy fruiting and early ripening of fruits in plants receiving plant vitalizers might be due to commencement of early reproductive phase in plants under the influential effects of Anupaan + Anupaan R. As number and fresh weights of leaves increased more photosynthates were assimilated and consequently, transferred to the storage organ i.e. ovary and as a result fruit developed early. These finding were supported by Petrov and Andreev (1972) and Stanchev (1972).

# C. Yield

Fruit yield per plant and per hectare were significantly increased by higher doses of these plant vitalizers when applied as soil + foliar. This is due to the promoting effects of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) on growth, flowering and fruiting behaviour of tomato plants and ultimately on fruit yield. It is interesting to note that the application of Anupaan + Anupaan R at 50% more than suggested dose either applied in soil, foliar, root dipping or soil + foliar was found beneficial as compared to other treatments. This might be due to accelerated, mobility of photosynthates from source to sink as influenced by harmones, released or synthesized due to organic sources. Similar findings were corroborated by Rajagopal and Rao (1974), Uma (1984) and Susan (1995).

#### D. Fruit quality

Anupaan + Anupaan R has no significant effect on total soluble solids and ascorbic acid contents but acidity was increased significantly only in the treatment  $S_4$  +  $A_4$  (50% more than suggested dose, soil + foliar application). Sugar content was also not improved significantly by Anupaan + Anupaan R. This indicate that the plant vitalizers applications have not affected much the fruit quality of tomato. Similarly Matev and Stanchev (1979) found the antagonism between K+ and Ca++ which inhibited in sugar, organic acid and vitamin C synthesis and reduced TSS in tomato crop.

# E. Incidence of pest and diseases

Tomato fruit borer attack was significantly lowered by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R. Higher doses of these plant vitalizers showed minimum incidence of tomato fruit borer. As it has been suggested by the manufacturer of these plant vitalizers that Anupaan R is an insect repellant and less attack of tomato fruit borer in plants receiving plant vitalizers is due to specific role of Anupaan R. Weerakkody *et al.* (2002) also reported good insect control when neem seed and garlic extracts were applied as insect repellant two and six weeks after planting of tomato crop, respectively.

Tomato leaf curl virus were not controlled significantly by these plant vitalizers. This indicate that Anupaan R did not keep away the viruses transmitting insects. Vishwanath (2002) reported that some of the biopesticides such as need seed kernel extract, tobacco extract, garlic extract etc. which do not harm the environment but effectively reduced the pest population.

It was interesting to note that the higher concentration of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) i.e. 50% more than suggested dose gave appreciable results applied either as soil, foliar, root dipping or soil + foliar. The soil + foliar application improved almost all the growth, yield attributing parameters and yield of tomato because Anupaan + Anupaan R may be more effective at higher concentration than suggested dose. Work done by Omori *et al.*, (1972) recorded similar information.

# COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF PLANT VITALIZERS AND ORGANIC MANURES ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN

## A. Growth studies:

The results clearly show that the growth parameter such as number and fresh weight of leaves per plant and diameter of main stem were improved with the addition of organic manures along with plant vitalizers application (Tables 15-16). Whereas the plant height and branches per plant were not affected significantly.

Better performance of the organic manures along with Anupaan + Anupaan R in comparison to their alone applications with respect to growth parameters may be because of the fact that addition of organic manures enhances the supply of macro and micronutrients to the plants, increase organic matter content of soil which in turn improves physical properties of soil. Among organic manures, an application of FYM @ 20t/ha,
proper plant growth and development contribute a lot to crop productivity. FYM + NP @ 60:60kg/ha resulted in good root growth of tomato (Ovchinnikova, 1972). Application of inorganic fertilizer in the absence of FYM retarded formation of vegetative organs and subsequently reproductive organs (Cerna, 1980). The poultry manure along with plant vitalizers showed more encouraging results as compared to FYM because it might be rich in nutrient contents than FYM. Spasov et al. (1977) reported that the improved growth of plants employed with poultry manure and urea may be attributed to the increased nitrogen uptake and utilization. Poultry manure contained growth promoting substances which induced better plant growth. Enhanced plant growth with the application of poultry manure and inorganic fertilizer have also been reported by Abusaleha (1981) in bhendi and Dhandpani (1982) in cauliflower.

Chlorphyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves were improved by organic manures along with Anupaan + Anupaan R but results were non-significant (Table 17). All the organic manures along with Anupaan + Anupaan R increased the dry matter accumulation of plant. The reason for higher dry matter accumulation in plant may be due to organic manures along with Anupaan + Anupaan R enhanced the supply of macro and micro-nutrients for the plants, which directly associated with physiological processes like photosynthesis which in turn responsible for more dry matter accumulation in plants. FYM favourabely affected vegetative dry weight mass, and photosynthetic potential (Meena et al., 1990). Jose et al. (1988) that combinations of 50kg N as organic form also reported showed increased dry matter content. Maximum nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium contents in tomato plant were recorded in poultry manures treatments applied along with Anupann + Anupaan R as compared to FYM treatments. This is because of the fact that poultry manure has higher NPK content than FYM. Spasov et al. (1977) reported that organic manure increased the available nitrogen in the soil and this ultimately leads to increased nitrogen uptake by the plant. Besides this, organic manure might have improved the root ramification causing increased absorption and uptake of nitrogen. Gagnon and Berrouard (1994) reported that application of organic waste from the agri-food industry mixed with peat compost growing medium prior to transplanting of tomato, produced best growth; significantly increasing shoot dry weight (57-83%) as compared with non-fertilized plant. Similar observations were reported by Kumaran *et al.* (1998) when applied organic and inorganic fertilizer in combination. It was further observed that the highest available N, P, K contents and their uptake by brinjal plant were due to the application of 40% N through urea and 60% N through poultry manure (Nanthakumar and Veeraragavathatham, 1999).

### **B.** Flowering and fruiting behaviour:

Early flowering and fruit ripening were noticed in the organic manures and Anupann + Anupaan R treatments in comparison with control. Similar findings by Gianquinto and Borin (1990) reported that tomato ripening was delayed when grown with N 200 kg,  $P_2O_5$  100kg and  $K_2O$  280 kg/ha as compared to FYM 20t/ha with N 100kg  $P_2O_5$  50kg and  $K_2O$  140kg/ha.

Stanchev (1972) reported that watering the seedlings of tomato 12 hours before transplanting with 0.005% humus solution (from well rotted FYM) @ 250ml/pot under conditions of high mineral and low organic nutrition, increased earliness in early cultivars by 9-13%, in medium cultivars by 12-15% and in late varieties by 23-30%. Early flowering has been noticed in the plants supplied with inorganic fertilizer as stated by Abusaleha (1981) in bhendi and Dhandpani (1982) in cauliflower.

Maximum fruit per cluster, per plant and fruit size were recorded under poultry manure along with Anupaan +Anupaan R treatments in comparison to control. Because the organic manures increased the availability of nutrients to the plants, for a long time and there was no loss in nutrients. Nanthakumar and Veeraragavathatam (1999) reported that number of flowers per plant in brinjal crop was considerably increased due to the combined application of organic and biofertilizers along with inorganic NPK than the treatment which received the inorganic fertilizers alone. Gianquinto and Borin (1990) reported that FYM @ 20t/ha with N 100kg, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> 50kg and K<sub>2</sub>O 100kg/ha produced more number of fruits per plant (25.4) and the lowest in control (11.60).

Rajagopal and Rao (1974) reported that application of organic and biofertilizers along with inorganic NPK in brinjal resulted into early vigorous growth of root which would have helped to synthesize more cytokinin by these plants. Better stem girth attained would have helped the translocation of these synthesized cytokinin when compared with the treatments which received the inorganic fertilizers alone. The increased nutrients availability from FYM might have increased the various endogenous harmonal levels in the plant tissue, which enhanced pollen germination and tube growth, ultimately increasing the fruit set.

### C. Yield:

Fruit yield per plant and per hectare was significantly increased by the organic manures viz. FYM and poultry manure along with Anupaan + Anupaan R. These findings are supported by Prezotti *et al.* (1989) and reported that application of poultry manure @ 10t/ha appreciably increased the yield of tomato and augmented fruit size. Annanurova *et al.* (1992) found that application of NPK alone increased yield per plant by 43.4% compared with untreated control and when supplemented with FYM @ 30t/ha by 161.8% Khvatov *et al.* (1973) also reported the best results in tomato from plots receiving combined mineral (full rate) and organic (half rate) fertilizers. Tomato yield was highest under organic soil treatment as compared to mineral soil treatment (Eggert and Kahrmann, 1984).

Silva and Vizzotto (1989) reported that the highest yield of tomato fruits (53t/ha) was obtained with recommended dose of NPK +20t poultry manure/ha. Without poultry manure the yield declined to 46.2t/ha. Cerna (1980) reported that application of inorganic fertilizer alone decreased fruit yields, was due to retarded formation of vegetative organ and subsequently reproductive organs.

### **D.** Fruit quality:

The sugar, total soluble solids and acidity of tomato fruit was increased by organic manures viz. FYM and poultry manure along with Anupaan + Anuapann R (Tables 23-24). Kumaran et al. (1998) also reported that quality parameters such as TSS, ascorbic acid and lycopene contents were comparatively higher in organically grown tomato plants. Meier et al. (1989) stated that composted FYM gave superior results of desirable nutrients (Vit C and Sugars). Montagu and Goh (1990) observed the best scores of suitability of tomato for paste formation were obtained with mixed fertilizer (33.3%), poultry manure and 66.7% mineral fertilizer). The plots receiving only mineral fertilizers produced fruits with less favourable values of pH and electrical conductivity compared with poultry manure ones. Eggert and Kahrmann (1984) found that the concentration of ascorbic acid was higher in tomatoes grown under the organic treatments. Meier et al. (1989) reported that composted FYM

gave improved improvement in organoleptic properties (Vit C and sugars levels) and undesirable constituents (nitrate) of tomato.

## E. Incidence of insect and diseases:

Tomato leaf curl virus and tomato fruit borer attack was lowered by the organic manures along with Anupaan + Anupaan R as compared to control. The plant vitalizer Anupaan R has showed its capability to reduce the attack of insect and disease similar to the previous experiment. The results were also reported by Fugro (2000) that the incidence of leaf curl virus in chilli was comparatively lower in organic manures/pesticides treatments than in treatments comprising organic/inorganic fertilizers superimposed with chemical and organic pesticides.

A perusal of findings of both experiments reveal that Anupaan + Anupaan R at higher concentration i.e. more than 50% of suggested dose as well as the same dose along with organic manures gave highly appreciable results with respect to growth and development of tomato crop ultimately leading to high productivity i.e. yield. It might be due to the higher concentration of Anupaan + Anupaan R along with the organic manure which effectively improved the all vital activities of plant. Wahundeniva (1991) worked on post management recorded the similar information.

Summary And Conclusion

The present investigation entitled "Effect of plant vitalizers and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill)" was carried out on of Department of Vegetable Crops, CCS farm Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar to study the effect of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) alone and in combination with organic manures (FYM and Poultry manure) on tomato cv. Hisar Arun. In the first experiment four doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R (168.75, 225.00, 281.25 and 337.50 ml/acre) were applied through soil, foliar, root dipping and soil + foliar methods. While in second experiment above said four doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R were applied through soil in combination with FYM and poultry manure, keeping control for comparison. The results of the investigation are summarized and concluded in the following pages:

## EFFECT OF PLANT VITALIZERS (ANUPAAN + ANUPAAN R) ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN.

- 1. The growth parameters such as number and fresh weight of leaves per plant and thickness of main stem in  $S_4 + F_4$ treatment were increased significantly over control during both the years. Plant height and branches per plant did not show significant impact.
- 2. Chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves were not increased significantly. The dry matter accumulation of plant was increased significantly by all the treatments during both the years and in the treatment  $S_4 + F_4$  dry matter accumulation increased by 61.1% over control. NPK content of tomato plant was significantly improved with the application of  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment during both the years.
- 3. Days to 50% flowering, fruit ripening from flower anthesis, fruits per cluster and its size were not influenced significantly due to various treatment in both the years.
- 4. Maximum number of fruits per plant and fruit yield per plant was recorded in  $S_4 + F_4$  treatment during both the years. The significant fruit yield per hectare was 38.3%

higher than control under the influence of this treatment.

- 5. Pulp, juice, seed content, total soluble solids, sugar and ascorbic acid were not affected significantly by the application of different treatments. Whereas, Acidity of tomato fruit was increased significantly by  $S_4 + F_4$ treatment during both the years.
- Tomato leaf curl virus was not controlled significantly but lowest fruit borer attack (1.7%) was recorded in S<sub>4</sub> + F<sub>4</sub> treatment.

# COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF PLANT VITALIZERS AND ORGANIC MANURES ON TOMATO CV. HISAR ARUN

- The growth parameters such as number and fresh weight of leaves per plant and thickness of main stem were influenced significantly over control by A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment during both the years. Plant height and branches per plant did not show significant improvement due to the exogenous application.
- 2. Chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' contents of leaves were found non-significant due to different treatments. Significant higher dry matter accumulation of plant was recorded in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment during both the years which was

35.5% more than control. As regard to mineral contents of plant, nitrogen content of plant did not vary but significantly more phosphorus was recorded in  $A_4$  + PM treatment during both the years. The potassium content during the second year followed the same trend that of phosphorus.

- Days to 50% flowering, fruit ripening from flower anthesis, fruits per cluster and its size were not improved significantly.
- 4. Statistically highest number of fruit per plant (30.8), fruit yield per plant (0.57kg) and per hectare (19.5t) were recorded with the application of  $A_4$  + PM treatment during both the years. Fruit yield per hectare was increased by 39.5% in comparison to control.
- 5. Pulp, juice, seed content and ascorbic acid content were found non-significant during both the years. Maximum total soluble solids and sugar content of tomato fruit was recorded in A<sub>4</sub> + PM treatment.
- 6. The lowest tomato leaf curl virus (1.7) was observed with
  A<sub>4</sub> + PM application. Similar trend for fruit borer attack
  (18.1%) was recorded in this treatment.

## CONCLUSION

Application of Anupaan + Anupaan R @ 50% more than the suggested had improved the growth and yield of tomato crops in both the years. The combination of organic source for nutrients supply system proved better as compared to alone application of either sources. Pest infection was significantly reduced due to the application of Anupaan + Anupaan R and Anupaan + Poultry manure in both the years.

Bibliography

- A.O.A.C. (1975). Official methods of analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D.C. pp: 15-16.
- Abusaleha. (1981). Studies on the effect of organic vs inorganic form of nitrogen on bhendi (Abelmoschus esculentus Moench). M.Sc. Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Coimbatore.
- Ahmed, S.R. (1993). Influence of composted coconut coirdust (coirpith) on soil physical properties, growth and yield of tomato. South Indian Hort. 41 (5): 264-269.
- Alexiev, N., Rankov, V. and Lazic, B. (1997). The effect of intensive organo-mineral fertilizers on the yield of tomatoes grown in plastic green house; and on biological soil activity. Proceedings of the first Balkan symposium on vegetables and potatoes, Belgrade. Yugosalavia. 462: 687-692.
- Almeida, D.L., Salek, R.C.. Ribeiro-M. and Oliveira-M.F. (1981). Effect of poultry manure and its association with fertilizer on tomato productivity in the Vassouras-RJ municipality. *Comunicado – Tecnico – Empresa – de – Pesquisa Agropecuria-do-Estado-do-Rio-de-Janeiro*. 71: 3.

- Anand Prakash, M., Dhanackar, P., Siva Kumar, S. and Sankar (2001). Organic farming: Reviving soil fertility and sustaining agricultural production. Int. Conf. Nature farming and Ecological balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 172-173.
- Angadi, V.V. and Meli, S.S. (2001). Organic farming in upland rice through vermitechnology. Int. Conf. Nature Farming and Eco. balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 184.
- Annanurova, M.R., Rozyeva, M., Tailakov, T. and Slavinskaya, L.P. (1992). Effect of fertilizers of some physiological processes and fruit quality in tomatoes. Seriya Biologicheskikh Nauk 3: 49-52.
- Anonymous (2001). Horticulture production year book 2001. National Horticulture Board, Gurgaon, Haryana, India pp: 55-131.
- Badra, T., Saleh, M.W. and Otecfa, B.A. (1979). Nematicidal activity and composition of some organic fertilizers and amendments. *Revue Nematologiez* **2** (1): 29-36.
- Bagal, S.D., Shaikh, G.A. and Adsule, R.N. (1989). Influence of different levels of N, P and K fertilizers on the protein, ascorbic acid, sugars and mineral contents of tomato. J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ. 14 (2): 153-155.
- Bagal, S.D., Shalkh, G.A. and Adsule, R.N. (1989). Influence of different levels of N, P and K fertilizer on the yield and

quality of tomato. J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ. 14 (2): 158-160.

- Bhawalkar, U.S. (1992). Proc. National Seminar on natural farming, Raj. College of Agric. Udaipur, India. 105-124.
- Blanc, D., Montarone, M. and Otto, C. (1983). The effect of fertilizers on the yield and quality of tomatoes and lettuce under glass. *Gartenbauwissenschaft*. **48**(1): 1-4.
- Caceres, A., Gram, L.M., Alvarde, S.R. and Torres, M.F. (1987). Screening of International activity of plants popularly used in quatemate for the treatment of dermatomucosal diseases. J. Ethnopharmacol. pp: 220-23.
- Cerna, K. (1980). Effect of FYM and graduated ratio of mineral nutrients on yield formation in Capsicum. Sbronik UVTIZ, Zahradnictive 7: 297-307.
- Chaudhary, A.L. and Sharma, H.C. (1992). Proc. National Seminar on natural farming, Raj. College of Agric. Udaipur, India. pp. 3-31.
- Chaudhary, B. (1967). Vegetables. Pub. National Book Trust, India, New Delhi.
- Chaudhary, M.L., Singh, J.P. and Narwal, R.P. (1991). J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci. 29: 81-84.
- Cholakov, D. (1987). Nitrogen phosphorus and potassium uptake by determinate tomato cultivars in late field production. *Rastenievdni-nanki* **25** (1): 72-76.

- Dhandpani, S. (1982). Studies on the effect of organic vs inorganic from of nitrogen on cauliflower (Brassica oleracea L. var. botrytis L.) M.Sc. Thesis. Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Coimbatore.
- Dowe, A. and Decker, H. (1975). On the influence of fertilization with organic substances on migratory root nematodes. Archiv für Pflanzenschutz **7**: 468-78.
- Drinkwater, L.E., Letourneau, D.K. Workneh, F., Bruggen, AHC, Van., Shennan, C. and Van-Bruggen, AHC. (1995)
  Fundamental differences between conventional and organic tomato agroecosystems in California. *Ecological Applications*. 5(4): 1098-1112.
- Duraisamy, R., Mani, A.K. and Balasubramaniam, P. (1999). Effect of fertilizer nitrogen, azospirillum and organics on yield and nutrition of rainfed tomato. South Indian Horticulture.47 (1-6): 234-235.
- Dutta, A.C. (1976). A class Book of Botany, pp: 286.
- Eggert, F.P. and Kahrmann, C.L. (1984). Response of three vegetable crops to organic and inorganic nutrient sources. American Society of Agronomy Special Publication. **46**: 97-109.
- Fallick, E., Sarig, S. and Okon, Y. (1989). Morphology and physiology of plant roots associated with Azospirrillum In: Azospirillum Plant Association CRC Press Boca Raton. pp. 77-86.

- Fayad, M.N. and Sweelam, M.E. (1989). Effect of phosphorous fertilization, organic matter and root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne Javanica*) infection on growth and nutrient content of tomato. *Indian J. Agril. Sci.* 59 (7): 455-458.
- Fritz, D. and C. Wonneberger, (1973). The significance of organic fertilization at proper mineral fertilization and irrigation. Acta Hort. 29: 203-236.
- Fugro, P.A. (2000). Role of organic pesticides and manures in management of some important chilli diseases. J. Mycology and Plant Pathology. 30 (1): 96-97.
- Gagnon, B. and Berrouard, S. (1994). Effect of several organic fertilizer, on growth of greenhouse tomato transplants. Canadian J. Plant Sci. 74 (1): 167-168.
- Geissler, T. and Schmidt, R. (1978). The complex factors influencing siol fertility in the greenhouse. Gartenbau. 25(2): 36-38.
- Gianquinto, G. and Borin, M. (1990). Effet of organic and mineral fertilizer application and soil type on the growth and yield of processing tomatoes. *Rivista di Agronomica*. 24(4): 339-348.
- Hasegawa, K. (1989). The use of fossil shell fertilizer and its efficiency (6). A comparison of fertilizer efficiency and the effect on quality in field tomatoes. Agriculture and Horticulture. 64(1): 68-72.

- Hilman, Y. and Suwandi. (1989). Effect of different kinds and rates of FYM on the tomato cultivar Gondol. Buletin Penelitian Hortikulfura. 18 (2): 33-43.
- Hiscox, J.D. and Irraelstom, G.F. (1979). A method for extraction of chlorophyll from leaf tissue without maceration. Can. J. Bot. 57: 1332-34.
- Hulme, A.C. and Narain, R. (1931). The ferricyanide method for the determination of reducing sugars. *Biochem. J.* 25: 1051-61.
- Jackson, M.L. (1967). Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
- Jose, D. (1984). Studies on the efficacy of organic vs inorganic form of nitrogen on brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) M.Sc. (Hort.) Thesis, A.C. & P.I. Madurai.
- Jose, D., Shanmugavelu, K.G. and Thamburaj, S. (1988). Studies on the efficacy of organic vs inorganic form of nitrogen in brinjal. *Indian J. Hort.* **45**(1-2): 100-103.
- Kalembasa, S., Deska, J. and Fiedorow, Z. (1998). The possibility of utilizing vermicomposts in the cultivation of lettuce and tomato. *Ekologiczne aspekty produkcji* ogrodniczej, Poznan, Poland. 27: 125-130.
- Kathpal, T.S. and Arora, S.K. (1988). Proc. Workshop on env. Poll. and its Mgt. HAU, Hisar.

- Kaushik, C.P. nad Kaushik, A. (2001), Agro-chemical usage visà-vis organic farming. Int. Conf. Nature farming and Eco. Balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 184.
- Khvatov, A.D., Khokhlov, V.I., Samoilenko, B.S. and Ermakov, V.V. (1973). The effect of organic, organic mineral and mineral fertilizers on the productivity of vegetable crops. Vestnik Sel'skokhozyaistvennoi Nauki Kazakhstana. 16(5): 22-26.
- Koenig, R.A. and Johnson, C.R. (1942). Colorimetric determination of P in biological materials. Ind. Eng. Chem. Anal. 14: 155-56.
- Kumaran, S.S., Natarajan, S. and Thamburaj, S. (1998). Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of tomato. South Indian Horticulture. 46 (3-6): 203-205.
- Lacatus, V., Botez, C., Chelu, M., Mhghis, R., Voican, V. and Bieche, B.J. (1994). The influence of organic and mineral fertilizers on tomato quality for processing. Fifth International symposum on the processing tomato. Sorrento, Italy. Acta Horticulture. **376**: 329-332.
- Liebstein, A.M. (1927). Therapentic effects of various food articles. Am. Med. pp: 33.
- Linardakis, D.K. and Tsikalas, P.E. (1984). Fertilization of protected tomato with N-K solutions. I. Effect on the yield. Proceedings of 3<sup>rd</sup> Conference on Protected Vegetables and Flowers.

- Lindner, R.C. (1944). Rapid analytical method for some of the more common inorganic constituents of plant tissues. *Plant Physiol.* **19**: 76-89.
- Lucarini, M., Carbonaro, M., Nicoli, S., Aguzzi, A. Cappelloni, M., Ruggeri, S., Lullo-G-di, Gambelli, L., Carnovale, B. and di-Lullo, G., (1999). Endogenous markers for organic versus conventional plant products. Agri. Food Quality II. 306-310.
- Maher, M.J. (1972). The effect of nitrogen concentration and amount of liquid feed on tomatoes grown in peat substrates. Acta. Hort. 26: 187-193.

Malkomes, H.P. (1976). Zbl. Bkt. 134: 573-586.

- Mallanagouda, B., Sulikeri, G.S., Murthy, B.G. and Prathibha, N.C. (1995). Performance of chilli (*Capsicum annoum*) under different intercropping systems and fertility levels. *Indian J.* Agronomy. **40**(2): 277-279.
- Mallanagouda, B., Sulikeri, G.S., Murthy, B.G., Prathibha, N.C. (1995). Effect of NPK, FYM and companion crops on growth, yield and yield components of chilli (*Capsicum annum L.*). Advances in Agriculture Research in India. 3: 58-69.
- Maoreg, M.F. (1984). The role of organic amendments on controlling nematode' Ph.D. thesis, Menoufia University, Egypt (unpublished).
- Matev, I. and Stanchev, L. (1979). Effect of Na+, K+, Ca2+ and Mg2+ imbalance on the development and biological value of

galsshouse tomatoes. Gradinarska I. Lozarska Nauka. **16**(1): 76-82.

- Mcglasson, B. (1993). Tomatoes, in Encylopedia of food science, food Technology and Nutrition C.R. Maerea, R.K. Robinson and M.J. Sandlers, eds) Academic Press, New York, pp. 45-79.
- Meena Nair, Peter, K.V. and Nair, M. (1990). Organic, inorganic fertilizers and their combinations on yield and storage life of hot chilli. Veg. Sci. 17(1): 7-10.
- Meier Ploeger, A., Duden, R. and Vogtmann, H. (1989) Quality of food plants grown with compost from biogenic waste. Agri. Ecosytem Environment. 27(1-4): 483-491.
- Michalik, H., Elkner, K. and Fajkowska, H. (1975). The effect of fertilization, crop rotation, harvest time and year of cultivation on the dry matter and vitamin C contents of tomato and capsicum fruits. *Biuletyn Warzywniczy*. **18**: 207-219.
- Montagu, K.D. and Goh, K. M. (1990). Effects of forms and rates or organic and inorganic nitrogen fertilizers on the yield and some quality indices of tomatoes (Lycopersicon esculentum Miller). New Zealand J. Crop and Hort. Sci. 18(1): 31-37.
- Nanthakumar, S. Veeragavathatham, D. (1999). Effect of integrated nutrient management on keeping quality of brinjal (Solanum melongena L.). South Indian Horticulture. 47(1-6): 81-85.

- Nanthakumar, S. Veeraragavathatham, D. (1999). Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and yield attribute of brinjal (Solanum melongena). cv. PLR I. South Indian Horticulture. 47(1-6): 42-48.
- Naumova, A.N., Mishustin, E. N. and Maxienko, V.M. (1962). On the nature of action of bacterial fertilizers. (Azotobactor and phosphobacteria) upon agricultural crops. Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR. 5: 709-717.
- Nazaryuk, V.M. (1989). The nitrogen balance of mineral fertilizers in cultivation of alluvail meadow soils. Izvortivs Sibirakogo Otdeleniva Akademn Nauk-SSSR Seriya, 3: 129-133.
- Nehra, A.S. and Grewal, K.S. (2001). Influence of integrated use of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on soil properties and yield of wheat. Int. Conf. Nature Farming and Eco. balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 155.
- Oikeh, S.O. and Asiegbu, J.E. (1993). Growth and yield responses of tomato to sources and rates of organic manures in ferralitic soils. *Bioresources Technology.* 45(1): 21-25.
- Omori, S., Sugimoto, M. and Ogura, I. (1972). Experiment on the application of fresh manure to vegetable crops. Bulletin of the Kanagawa Horticultural Experiment Station. **20**: 58-66.

- Ovchinnikova, G.P. (1972). The effect of fertilizers on root growth in irrigated tomatoes. *Trudy Kishinevskogo Selskokhozyaistvennogo Instituta.* **97**: 98-103.
- Panse, V.G. and Sukhatme, P.V. (1967). Statistical methods for agricultural workers. *I.C.A.R New Delhi* pp. 152-155.
- Patil, A.A. and Bojappa, K.M. (1984). Effect of cultivars and graded levels of nitrogen and phosphorus on quality attributes of tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.). II. Sugars, dry matter content and juice percentage. Mysore J. Agric. Sci. 18(4): 292-295.
- Petrov, H. and Andreev, A. (1972). The effect of different fertilizers-soil mixtures on the organogenic stages of tomato during the transplanting period. Nauchni-Trudove, Vissh Selskostopanski, Institue, "Vasii-Kolarov" 21 (2): 27-34.
- Pimpini, F., Giardini, L., Borin, M. and Gainquinto, G. (1992) Effect of poultry manure and mineral fertilizers on the quality of crops. J. Agric. Sci. 118(2): 215-221.
- Piven, P. Ya., Grishkevich, M.L., Karyagina, L.A., Mikhailovskaya, N.A. and Moroz, G.V. (1987). The influence of fertilizers on the productivity of vegetable crops in a rotation and on the biological activity of dernopodzolic soil. Agrokhimiya. 2: 49-53.
- Prezotti, L.C., Balbino, J.M. de. S., Mendes da Fonseca, E.E. and Ferreira, L.R. (1989). Effect of poultry manure, triple superphonshate and lime on productivity and the incidence

of blossoms end rot in the tomato cultivar Kada. Horticultura Brasileira. 7(2): 15-17.

- Rajagopal, A. and Rao, I.M. (1974). Changes in the endogenous level of auxins and gibberelline like substances in the shoot apices of nitrogen deficient tomato plant (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.) Aust. J. Bot., 22 (3): 429-435.
- Ramirez, V.R., Mostacero, L.J., Garcia, A.E., Mejia, C.F., Pelaez, P.F., Medina, C.P. and Miranda, C.H. (1988). Vegetables empleados en medicinal traditional nor Peruana, *Banco* Agrario Del Peru Nacl. Univ. Trajillo, Beru pp: 54.
- Ramteke, J.R., Patil, R.A., Bal, A.S. and Kanade, V.M. (2001). Judicious use of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients for sustaining productivity of Rice-Chilli cropping systems. Int. Conf. Nature Farming and Eco. balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 113.
- Ranganna, B., Pillegowda, S.M., Reddy, S.Y.S., Huliyarappa, H. and Krishnappa, A.M. (1991). Spent sludge an enriched manure. Current Research University of Agricultural Sciences Banglore. **20**(4): 66-67.
- Ruhal, D.S., Singh, C.P. and Singh, M. (1991). Crop Res. 4(9): 47-52.
- Rumpel, J. (1998). Effect of long term organic and mineral fertilisation on soil properties and development of tomato, carrot and onion. Ecological aspects of nutrition and alternatives for herbicides in horticulture. *Int. seminar, Warszawa, Poland.* 63-64.

- Salmmen, M.S. (1997). Growth and yield of tomato cultivated on a substrate with organic fertilizers. Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> International Congress on Soilless Culture. St. Helier, jersey, Channel Islands. 409-415.
- Salunkhe, D.K., Jadhav, S.R. and Yu, M.H. (1974). Quality and nutritional composition of tomato fruits as influenced by certain biochemical and physiological changes. Qual Plant 24: 85.
- Sankaran, A. (1960). Rhizosphere effects on soil microogranisms Ph.D. Thesis, P.G. School, IARI, New Delhi.
- Sarwad, I.M. (1985). Mysore J. Agri. Sci. 21:240.
- Sharma, H.C. (1993). Paper presented in XIV meeting of regional committee No. VI, CCS HAU, Hisar.
- Shelke, S.R., Adsule, R.N. and Amrutsagar, V.M. (1999). Nitrogen management through organic and inorganic in brinjal. J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ. 24: 297-298.
- Silva Junior, A.A. and Vizzotto, V.J. (1989). Fertilization of tomatoes and its residual effect. Agropecuaria Calarinense. 2(4): 37-40.
- Singh, C.P., Ruhal, D.S. and Singh, N. (1983). Agril. Wastes. 8:17-25.
- Singh, D.P., Katyal, S.K., Singh, K.R., Prakash J. and Hooda, I.S. (1994). Agronomy at CCS H.A.U. Activities and achievements: 2-5.

- Spasov, S.P., Rankov, V. and Kanazirska, V. (1977). Organic fertilizer application to early greenhouse tomatoes. Gradinarska I. Lozarska Nauka. 14(3): 53-60.
- Stanchev, L.B. (1972). The effect of humus substances on the earliness and yield of glasshouse tomatoes. Pochvoznanie I. Agrokhimiya. 7(1): 65-79.
- Susan, S.C. (1995). Effect of organic, inorganic and biofertilizer on growth, yield and quality of onion. M.Sc. (Hort.) Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric Univ.. Coimbatore.
- Trpevski, V. Demirovska, V., Stojcevska, L. and Ognenovski, V. (1992). The effect of different rates on nitrogen on the quality and yield of some tomato cultivars. Savremena Poljoprivreda. 40(1-2): 100-105.
- Uma J.K. 1984. Studies on the effect of triacontanol, 2, 4-D and boron on brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) cv. MDU 1. M.Sc., (Hort.) thesis, AC & RI. Madurai.
- Verma, A.N., Srivastava, D.C. and Sharma R.K. (1970). Effect of crea spray on growth and quality of tomato (Lycospersicon, esculentum Mill). Mysore J. Agric. Sci. 14: 107-109.
- Vishwanath, B.N. (2002). Organic input and supply in India with particular reference to biofertilizers and biopesticides. *Int. Conf. Vegetables* November 11-14, 2002 Banglore.
- Wahundeniva, I. (1991). Effect of poultry manure on root knot nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.) in tomato (Lycopersicon esculenium Mill). Tropical Agriculturist. 147: 143-153.

- Wang X., Wang F., Liao Z., Lingin Y. and Maopei (1996). Study on formula selection and rational application amount of organic-inorganic granular fertilizer for some veg. Sps. Acta Agricultural Shanghai. 12(1): 61-65.
- Weerakkody, W.A.P., Dris, R., Dharmasena, P.N.S. and Ranadewa, D.P. (2002). Organic tomato Cultivation in tropical greenhouses. Inf. Conf. Vegetables November 11-14, 2002 Banglore.
- Xu-H., Wang-R., Mridha-MAU, Xu-HL and Wang-R. (2000). Effects of organic fertilizers and a microbial inoculant on leaf photosynthesis and fruit yield and quality of tomato plants. J. Crop production 3 (1): 173-182.
- Yadav, M.K., Raj, M. and Yadav, R.P. (2001). Integrated nutrient management for maintaining soil health. Int. Conf. Nature Farming and Eco. balance, CCS HAU, Hisar, India, March 7-10, 2001 pp: 119.
- Youssef, A.M., El, Fouly, A.H.M., Youseef, M.S. and Mohamedien, S.A. (2001). Effect of using organic and chemical fertilizers in fertigation system on yield and fruit quality of tomato. *Egyptian J. Hort.* 28(1): 59-77.
- Zeenat R. and Sharma, V.K. (1994). Algae as biofertilzer for tomato plants. In Recent Advances in Physiology. 221-223.

| Std. Week | Max. Temp.<br>(°C) | Min. Temp.<br>(°C) | RH (%)<br>Morn. | RH (%)<br>Even. | Rainfall<br>(mm) |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 44        | 33.6               | 12                 | 75              | 25              | 0.0              |
| 45        | 32.8               | 10.6               | 72              | 22              | 0.0              |
| 46        | 29.8               | 8.1                | 77              | 25              | 0.0              |
| 47        | 27.6               | 8.7                | 86              | 37              | 0.0              |
| 48        | 24.5               | 4.1                | 85              | 26              | 0.0              |
| 49        | 25.9               | 2.9                | 81              | 21              | 0.0              |
| 50        | 24.6               | 3.4                | 87              | 28              | 0.0              |
| 51        | 24.4               | 3.3                | 89              | 28              | 0.0              |
| 52        | 23.2               | 3.4                | 89              | 43              | 0.0              |
| 1         | 15.1               | 6.1                | 96              | 79              | 15.0             |
| 2         | 15.9               | 1.0                | 96              | 65              | 0.0              |
| 3         | 17.7               | 1.2                | 95              | 53              | 0.0              |
| 4         | 21.1               | 2.1                | 94              | 33              | 0.0              |
| 5         | 22.6               | 2.8                | 89              | 29              | 0.0              |
| 6         | 23.4               | 2.0                | 88              | 29              | 0.0              |
| 7         | 25.3               | 7.5                | 83              | 39              | 0.0              |
| 8         | 27.0               | 10.0               | 88              | 27              | 9.2              |
| 9         | 25.2               | 5.5                | 92              | 27              | 0.0              |
| 10        | 29.3               | 6.1                | 84              | 21              | 0.0              |
| 11        | 30.3               | 11.1               | 78              | 32              | 0.0              |
| 12        | 30.9               | 11.1 ′             | 80              | 34              | 0.0              |
| 13        | 32.0               | 12.7               | 77              | 32              | 0.0              |
| 14        | 33.7               | 12.5               | 67              | 22              | 0.0              |
| 15        | 37.6               | 19.0               | 49              | 18              | 3.3              |
| 16        | 30.4               | 15.1               | 77              | 42              | 43.3             |
| 17        | 40.6               | 19.3               | 44              | 13              | 0.0              |
| 18        | 42.1               | 21.8               | 48              | 17              | 0.8              |
| 19        | 43.6               | 25.2               | 48              | 20              | 0.0              |
| 20        | 37.7               | 22.6               | 65              | 35              | 12.5             |
| 21        | 39.5               | 23.4               | 58              | 30              | 4.5              |
| 22        | 38.0               | 21.6               | 71              | 42              | 95.1             |
| 23        | 35.0               | 22.3               | 72              | 59              | 37.2             |
| 24        | 36.6               | 23.6               | 77              | 56              | 85.3             |

ANNEXURE - I Weekly weather data for Hisar during crop period - 2000-01\*

\* Source: Department of Agriculture Meteorology, CCS HAU, Hisar

### **ABSTRACT**

| Title of Thesis                      | : | Effect of plant vitalizers and organic manures<br>on growth, yield and quality of tomato<br>(Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.)       |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Name of the Degree Holder            | : | Praveen Kumar   |
| Admission No.                        | : | 99A73D  |
| Title of Degree                      | : | Doctor of Philosophy  |
| Name and Address of<br>Major-Advisor |   | <b>Dr. S. Lal (Professor)</b><br>Department of Vegetable Crops<br>CCS Haryana Agricultural University,<br>Hisar - 125 004 (India) |
| Degree awarding university           | : | CCS Haryana Agricultural University,<br>Hisar-125004 (INDIA)  |
| Year of award of degree              | : | 2002  |
| Major Subject                        | : | Vegetable Crops   |
| Total no. of page in thesis          | : | 113 + xvi   |
| Total no. of words in Abstract       | : | 300 Approximately   |

(An abstract of the dissertation submitted to the CCS Haryana agricultural University, Hisar for partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Vegetables Crops).

Field experiments were conducted on the research farm of the Department of Vegetable Crops, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar to study the effect of plant vitalizers (Anupaan + Anupaan R) and organic manures on growth, yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) Cv. Hisar Arun. In the first experiment, four doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R (168.75, 225.00, 281.25 and 337.50 Anupaan + Anupaan R (168.75, 225.00, 281.25 and 337.50 ml/acre) were added through four method of application viz. Soil, foliar, root dipping and soil + foliar, while in the second experiment, all the above said doses of Anupaan + Anupaan R in combination with organic manures viz. FYM and poultry manure were applied through soil application, keeping control for comparison.

All the growth parameters (number of leaves per plant, fresh weight of leaves per plant and diameter of main stem, dry matter per plant), yield parameters (number of fruit per plant, fruit yield per plant), quality parameters (sugar and Acidity), NPK content of tomato plant increased significantly whereas, plant height at 20, 60 and 90 DAT, branches per plant, chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' content of leaves, days to 50% flowering, days to fruit ripening from flower anthesis, fruit per cluster, fruit size, pulp, juice, seed content, TSS, Ascorbic acid, were not affected significantly.

The application of Anupaan + Anupaan R did not influence the infestation of tomato leaf curl virus but tomato fruit borer was significantly checked by different treatment of Anupaan + Anupaan R.

Fruit yield per hectare was improved significantly by different treatments of Anupaan + Anupaan R when blended with organic manure. The combination of  $A_4$  + PM treatment gave best results regarding the fruit yield of tomato.

