Annals of Plant and Soil Research 25(3): 466-472 (2023) https://doi.org/10.47815/apsr.2023.10293

# Influence on flower, fruit, yield and quality of custard apple (*annonas squamosa* I.) by drip fertigation

# PRIYA B.<sup>1</sup>, KURUBAR A.R.<sup>2</sup>, ASHOK H.<sup>3</sup>, RAMESH G.<sup>4</sup>, UDAYKUMAR N.<sup>5</sup>, UMESH M.R.<sup>6</sup> AND RAJKUMAR R.H.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>Department of Horticulture, U.A.S., Raichur, Karnataka, India, 584104

Received: March, 2023: Revised accepted, June, 2023

### ABSTRACT

A study was conducted during 2019 to 2020 and 2020 to 2021 to find out the effect of drip fertigation on flower, fruit yield and quality of custard apple (Annonas squamosa L.) Cv. Balanagar. The experiment was laid out in factorial randomized block design with eight treatment combinations which included four levels of fertigation (100, 75, 50% and surface application) and two sources of fertilizers, which included water soluble fertilizers and solid fertilizers with four replication. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium (NPK) content of solid and water soluble fertilizers were applied through fertigation as well as soil application to test various attributes of 5-years-old custard apple cv. Balanagar. The investigation indicated that 100% RDF (recommend dose of fertilizers) with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_1S_2$ ) resulted in maximum number of flowers per branch (53.15), number of flowers per plant (305.69), days from flowering to fruit set (8.21days), number of fruits per plant (84.55), average fruit weight (184.93g) fruit yield per plant (13.03 kg), Non reducing sugar (3.54 %), Reducing sugar (16.65 %), total sugar (20.22%), TSS/acid ratio (84.35%), Shelf life (7.50 days). However, surface application of 100% RDF with solid fertilizers ( $F_4S_1$ ) resulted in minimum flower, fruit, yield and quality attributes in custard apple

Key words: Custard apple, fertigation, source of fertilizers, yield, quality

## INTRODUCTION

Custard apple (Annona squamosa L.) belongs to family Annonaceae and is one of the finest fruits gifted to India by tropical America. It is commonly found in India and is cultivated an area of 38,000 ha with production of 3, 20,000 MT (Anonymous 2018). Custard apple, popularly known as Sitaphal is grown mainly in the States Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Tamil Nadu, of Madhya Pradesh and grows wild in Deccan plateau and some parts of central India. Custard apple is generally classified as semi wild fruit by virtue of its spontaneous spread in forests, wastelands and other uncultivated places. It is hardy, tolerant to drought, salinity and saline irrigation water to certain extent. It grows very well even on a shallow soil. It also sheds off leaves during stress period to minimize the moisture loss from plant tissues through transpiration and thus a most appropriate fruit crop for rain fed region. Custard apple is known by varied names as Sitaphal, Sugar apple and Shariffa. It is considered as one of the delicious and nutritionally valuable fruits meant for table purpose. Fruits have an edible, soft, granular, juicy and sugary pulp with mild flavour and with slight acidity. Fruits are considered for their medicinal value besides their general use in ice cream, confectionery, certain milk products and in making preserves such as jam, jelly and other products. It is considered as beneficial for cardiac disease, diabetes, hyperthyroidism and cancer. It contains about 28-55% of edible portion consisting of 73.30% moisture, 1.60% protein, 0.30% fat, 0.70% mineral matter, 23.90% carbohydrates, 0.20% calcium, 0.40% phosphorus, 1.0% iron, 12.4-18.15% sugar and 0.26-0.65% acidity with caloric value of 105 KCal/100g.

Custard apple gives better response to fertilizer application in respect to yield and quality of fruits. But, the low productivity of custard apple may be due to less adoption of improved crop management technology in respect of planting system, nutrition, plant protection and irrigation etc. Among several other factors affecting the productivity of fruit trees, as custard apple trees removes large nutrients from soil, amount of balance fertilization seems to be an important factor governing the productivity of custard apple trees. Nutrition of fruit tree is an important part of orchard management practices. Nutrients have

Email id: priyabyadagi84@gmail.com,<sup>5</sup>Department of Processing and Food Engineering, <sup>6</sup> Department of Agronomy, <sup>7</sup> Departmet of Soil and Water Engineering

certain specific role to play in the plant and their presence is must for a plant to complete its life cycle and to determine the fruitfulness and physico - chemical properties of the fruit.The fertilizers are becoming costly input day by day. Hence, it is felt necessary to study the efficient use of this input. This can be achieved by adopting efficient use of drip system of irrigation. The application of fertilizers through irrigation system is called "fertigation". It has become a common practice in modern irrigated agriculture. Increased yields, improvement in quality of the produce, irrigation and fertilizer use efficiencies and protection of the soil environment are some of the main characteristics of this method, which made it very popular throughout the world.

Fertilizer must supply and maintain an optimum level of nutrients within the root zone. For this new irrigation and fertilization techniques are required. Combined irrigation and fertilization is ideal for this purpose, with irrigation water acting as a vehicle for the nutrients required by crops. One of the major factors to promote modern fertigation is the development of micro irrigation systems, which include drips, jets and micro-sprinklers. Fertigation technology involves application of fertilizers with drip irrigation system at a slow and controlled rate to the root zone. A significant goal of fertilizer studies is to develop cultural practices by which crop nutrient requirements are satisfied through maximum uptake of nutrients from a minimum quantity of applied fertilizers. In general, injection of fertilizers into irrigation water gives a better crop response than either band or broadcast application. Fertigation gives flexibility of fertilization, which enables the specific nutritional requirements of the crop, to be met at different stages of its growth. The area under custard apple is increasing in India on commercial scale and no work has been done with respect to different levels of fertigation. Therefore, the present study was under taken to evaluate the fertigation system involving sources of fertilizers and various levels of fertilizers in comparison to farmers practice (soil application of RDF) on flower, fruit, yield and quality of custard apple.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiments were conducted at the Horticulture Garden, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Raichur, Karnataka, during 2019-20 and 2020-21 on uniform 5 year old custard apple *cv*. Balanagar which were spaced at 4.5  $\times$  4.5 m (494 plant ha<sup>-1</sup>). The region belongs to Agro-Climatic Zone-II (North-Eastern dry zone) of Karnataka. Raichur is located at 16.21° N. 77.35° E longitude and an altitude of 407 meters above mean sea level. The experimental site was clay loamy with pH of 7.0-7.3. The soil was fertile, with organic content (0.45 %), low available nitrogen (212.8 kg/ha), medium available phosphorous (27.1  $P_2O_5$ kg/ha) and potassium (237.7 K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha). There were 4 levels of fertigation, namely fertigation at 100% RDF ( $F_1$ ), fertigation at 75% RDF ( $F_2$ ), fertigation at 50% RDF ( $F_3$ ) and surface application at 100% RDF (F<sub>4</sub>) with two source of fertilizers were used in the experiment were, solid fertilizer  $(S_1)$  and water soluble fertilizer  $(S_2)$ along with eight treatment combinations. The experiment was laid out in factorial randomized block design with four replications and two plants were kept in each treatment. The recommended fertilizer dose of 250: 125:125 g NPK plant<sup>1</sup> vear<sup>-1</sup> was adopted for fertigation as well as soil application. The fertigation system was installed in the experimental orchard. The drip unit consisted of 63 and 40 mm PVC pipes, valves, venturi, a sand filter which was connected in series. The main PVC line was 63 mm in diameter to which a sub-main of 40 mm diameter was fixed. Lateral drip inline (16 mm LLDPE) were drawn from the sub mains parallel to the plant rows. One lateral was placed for one row of plants with two drippers at a discharge rate of four litres per hour. The water source for the drip system was from bore well near the experimental site. Well decomposed farmyard manure was applied at the rate of ten kg per plant at the time of basin preparation. The fertigation was given to custard apple plants as per treatments. Solid fertilizers like urea, di ammonium phosphate and muriate of potash were applied in the form of liquid fertilizers by soaking it in water for overnight and water soluble fertilizers like 19:19:19 along with urea were applied in five split doses at twenty days intervals after pruning. The observation on number of flowers per branch, number of flowers per plant, days from flowering to fruit set, number of fruits per plant, average fruit weight, fruit yield per plant, non reducing sugar, reducing sugar, total sugar, TSS/acid ratio, shelf life. The data obtained on various characters were subjected to Factorial RBD analysis and interpretation of the data was carried out in accordance to Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Flower, fruit and yield attributing parameters

Pooled data over two years indicates that flower parameters were non significantly influenced by different fertigation levels and source of fertilizers treatments (Table 1). Application of fertilizers through fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers  $(F_1S_2)$ was found maximum number of flowers per branch (53.15), number of flowers per plant (305.69). Application of 100 % RDF as water soluble fertilizers through fertigation produced high number of flowers. The total numbers of flowers were increased with increasing nitrogen levels. The present investigation is in line with findings of Verma and Bhattacharyya (2005) and Pandey et al. (2013). Better photo assimilates and hormonal balance would have improved the sink strength of trees treated with 100% RDF as water soluble fertilizers through fertigation acceleration of mega and microsporogenesis and differentiation of axillary buds into reproductive ones. The higher level of N, P and K resulted in flower production than lower levels (Suresh et al. 2018) in aonla. The two year pooled data on days from flowering to fruit set significantly influenced were by different fertigation levels and source of fertilizers Minimum days from treatments (Table 1). flowering to fruit set was observed in fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers (8.21 days) which was statistically at par with fertigation of 75% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_2S_2$ ), which registered a minimum days to fruit set(8.94 days). Maximum number of days from flowering to fruit set (15.66 Days) was observed under surface application of 100% RDF with solid fertilizers ( $F_4S_1$ ). The fewer days taken for flowering to fruit set might be due to regular and continuous availability of nutrients for longer period which helped to synthesis and deposition of photo-assimilates. This might led to induce better growth, fruit bud differentiation (FBD) and transfer of photo assimilates from source to sink increased flowering to fruit set (Agrawal et al., 2010, Jayakumar et al., 2010) in papaya.

Table 1: Flower attributing	parameters influenced b	v drip fertigation or	n custard apple Cv.	. Balanagar
		J - 1		

Tractment	No. flowers per branch			No. flo	wers pe	er plant	Days from flowering to fruit set (Days)			
rreatment	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	
$F_1S_1$ - Fertigation of 100 % RDF with solid fertilizers	41.11	61.11	51.11	285.05	302.87	293.96	12.46	12.06	12.26	
$F_1S_2$ - Fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers	42.75	63.55	53.15	296.43	314.96	305.69	8.34	8.08	8.21	
$F_2S_1$ - Fertigation of 75 % RDF with solid fertilizers $F_2S_2$ -Fertigation of 75 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers $F_3S_1$ -Fertigation of 50 % RDF with solid fertilizers	38.34	57.00	47.67	265.86	282.48	274.17	13.39	12.97	13.18	
	41.47	61.65	51.56	287.53	305.51	296.52	9.08	8.79	8.94	
	37.10	55.15	46.12	257.24	273.32	265.28	13.75	13.51	13.63	
F <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> -Fertigation of 50 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers	40.30	59.91	50.11	279.46	296.93	288.19	13.97	13.53	13.75	
F <sub>4</sub> S <sub>1</sub> -Surface application 100 % RDF with solid fertilizers	36.80	54.71	45.76	255.20	271.15	263.18	14.05	13.98	14.01	
F <sub>4</sub> S <sub>2</sub> -Surface application 100 % RDF with water soluble	39.10	58.13	48.62	271.16	288.11	279.64	15.91	15.41	15.66	
SEm± CD @ 5 %	1.89 NS	2.81 NS	2.35 NS	13.08 NS	13.90 NS	13.48 NS	0.22 0.64	0.21 0.62	0.21 0.63	

The observations on a number of fruits per plant, fruit weight and yield per plant were recorded for two years and presented in Table 2. Fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_1S_2$ ) had significantly resulted higher in the number of fruits (84.55), average fruit weight (184.93 g) fruit yield per plant (13.03 kg) which was statistically at par with fertigation of 75% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_2S_2$ ), which recorded number of fruits per plant (80.46), average fruit weight (177.53 g) fruit yield per plant (12.40 kg). However, lesser values were recorded for number of fruits (70.52), average fruit weight (155.59 g) and fruit yield per plant (10.87 kg) under surface application of 100% RDF with solid fertilizers ( $F_4S_1$ ). The yield were attributing characters significantly influenced by either application of 100 % and 75 % recommended dose of water soluble fertilizers through fertigation over the conventional method of soil application of 100% RDF. This might be due to the continuous supply of optimum dose of water-soluble fertilizers in available form through fertigation at critical stages of plant growth. This

might have resulted in higher uptake and better translocation of assimilates from source to sink, which in turn increased the yield attributes. More nutrient and moisture per plant, which is beneficial in improving all the morphological characters of fruits. Thus, photo assimilate production is higher, which allows the plants to express their potential by forming more racemes and in turns the yield attributing parameter. Raghupathi et al. (2002), who observed that significant increase in crop yield of banana with increased fertigation levels of N P K. Higher vields obtained under fertigation was also reported by Vijayakumar (2001) in mango and Haneef et al. (2014) in pomegranate who observed significant increase in crop vield with increasing fertigation levels. Similar results of increased average fruit weight, and plant yield increased with higher dose application of water soluble nutrient through fertigation. Similar finding are accordance with Shirgure and Shrivastav (2016) in mandarin Sandeep kumar et al. (2020) in citrus.

No fruits per plant			Average fruit			Fruit yield			
110.11				weight (g)			(kg plant⁻¹)		
2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	
72.74	81.29	77.01	154.52	181.45	167.97	9.98	13.76	11.87	
79.86	89.24	84.55	170.12	199.79	184.93	10.95	15.11	13.03	
72.43	82.51	76.69	156.30	183.56	169.90	9.93	13.70	11.82	
76.00	86.41	80.46	163.31	191.80	177.53	10.42	14.38	12.40	
69.71	80.24	73.81	149.81	175.94	162.85	9.56	13.19	11.38	
69.34	78.19	73.41	149.0	174.99	161.97	9.51	13.12	11.31	
66.61	74.43	70.52	143.13	168.10	155.59	9.14	12.60	10.87	
67.17	75.06	71.12	143.76	168.83	156.27	9.21	12.71	10.96	
4.05	4 50	4 40	0.07	4.05	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	
1.35 3.97	1.58 4.64	1.43 4.20	∠.87 8.43	4.95 9.91	3.12 9.17	0.19	0.26	0.22	
	No. fr 2019- 20 72.74 79.86 72.43 76.00 69.71 69.34 66.61 67.17 1.35 3.97	No. fruits per   2019- 20 2020- 21   72.74 81.29   79.86 89.24   72.43 82.51   76.00 86.41   69.71 80.24   69.34 78.19   66.61 74.43   67.17 75.06   1.35 1.58   3.97 4.64	No. fruits per plant   2019- 20 2020- 21 Pooled   72.74 81.29 77.01   79.86 89.24 84.55   72.43 82.51 76.69   76.00 86.41 80.46   69.71 80.24 73.81   66.61 74.43 70.52   67.17 75.06 71.12   1.35 1.58 1.43   3.97 4.64 4.20	No. fruits per plant Av w   2019- 20 2020- 21 Pooled 2019- 20   72.74 81.29 77.01 154.52   79.86 89.24 84.55 170.12   72.43 82.51 76.69 156.30   76.00 86.41 80.46 163.31   69.71 80.24 73.81 149.81   69.34 78.19 73.41 149.0   66.61 74.43 70.52 143.13   67.17 75.06 71.12 143.76   1.35 1.58 1.43 2.87   3.97 4.64 4.20 8.43	No. fruits per plantAverage fr weight (g $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ Pooled $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ $72.74$ $81.29$ $77.01$ $154.52$ $181.45$ $79.86$ $89.24$ $84.55$ $170.12$ $199.79$ $72.43$ $82.51$ $76.69$ $156.30$ $183.56$ $76.00$ $86.41$ $80.46$ $163.31$ $191.80$ $69.71$ $80.24$ $73.81$ $149.81$ $175.94$ $69.34$ $78.19$ $73.41$ $149.0$ $174.99$ $66.61$ $74.43$ $70.52$ $143.13$ $168.10$ $67.17$ $75.06$ $71.12$ $143.76$ $168.83$ $1.35$ $1.58$ $1.43$ $2.87$ $4.95$ $3.97$ $4.64$ $4.20$ $8.43$ $9.91$	No. fruits per plant Average fruit weight (g)   2019- 20 21 Pooled 2019- 20 2020- 21 Pooled   72.74 81.29 77.01 154.52 181.45 167.97   79.86 89.24 84.55 170.12 199.79 184.93   72.43 82.51 76.69 156.30 183.56 169.90   76.00 86.41 80.46 163.31 191.80 177.53   69.71 80.24 73.81 149.81 175.94 162.85   69.34 78.19 73.41 149.0 174.99 161.97   66.61 74.43 70.52 143.13 168.10 155.59   67.17 75.06 71.12 143.76 168.83 156.27   1.35 1.58 1.43 2.87 4.95 3.12   3.97 4.64 4.20 8.43 9.91 9.17	No. fruits per plantAverage fruit weight (g)F (f) $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ Pooled $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ Pooled $2019$ - $20$ $72.74$ $81.29$ $77.01$ $154.52$ $181.45$ $167.97$ $9.98$ $79.86$ $89.24$ $84.55$ $170.12$ $199.79$ $184.93$ $10.95$ $72.43$ $82.51$ $76.69$ $156.30$ $183.56$ $169.90$ $9.93$ $76.00$ $86.41$ $80.46$ $163.31$ $191.80$ $177.53$ $10.42$ $69.71$ $80.24$ $73.81$ $149.81$ $175.94$ $162.85$ $9.56$ $69.34$ $78.19$ $73.41$ $149.0$ $174.99$ $161.97$ $9.51$ $66.61$ $74.43$ $70.52$ $143.13$ $168.10$ $155.59$ $9.14$ $67.17$ $75.06$ $71.12$ $143.76$ $168.83$ $156.27$ $9.21$ $1.35$ $1.58$ $1.43$ $2.87$ $4.95$ $3.12$ $0.19$ $3.97$ $4.64$ $4.20$ $8.43$ $9.91$ $9.17$ $0.54$	No. fruits per plantAverage fruit weight (g)Fruit yie (kg plant) $2019$ - $20$ $210$ Pooled $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ Pooled $2019$ - $20$ $2020$ - $21$ $72.74$ $81.29$ $77.01$ $154.52$ $181.45$ $167.97$ $9.98$ $13.76$ $79.86$ $89.24$ $84.55$ $170.12$ $199.79$ $184.93$ $10.95$ $15.11$ $72.43$ $82.51$ $76.69$ $156.30$ $183.56$ $169.90$ $9.93$ $13.70$ $76.00$ $86.41$ $80.46$ $163.31$ $191.80$ $177.53$ $10.42$ $14.38$ $69.71$ $80.24$ $73.81$ $149.81$ $175.94$ $162.85$ $9.56$ $13.19$ $69.34$ $78.19$ $73.41$ $149.0$ $174.99$ $161.97$ $9.51$ $13.12$ $66.61$ $74.43$ $70.52$ $143.13$ $168.10$ $155.59$ $9.14$ $12.60$ $67.17$ $75.06$ $71.12$ $143.76$ $168.83$ $156.27$ $9.21$ $12.71$ $1.35$ $1.58$ $1.43$ $2.87$ $4.95$ $3.12$ $0.19$ $0.26$ $3.97$ $4.64$ $4.20$ $8.43$ $9.91$ $9.17$ $0.54$ $0.75$	

Table 2: Yield attributing parameters influenced by drip fertigation on custard apple Cv. Balanagar

#### **Quality parameters**

Pooled data over two years indicates that quality parameters were significantly influenced by different fertigation level and source of fertilizers treatments (Table 3). Significantly maximum non reducing sugar (3.54%), reducing sugar (16.65%), total sugar (20.22%) were observed in fertigation at 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_1S_2$ ) which was on par with

fertigation of 75% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_2S_2$ ) which recorded non reducing sugar (3.40%), reducing sugar (15.94%), total sugar (19.41%) while, minimum non reducing sugar (2.98%), reducing sugar (13.99%), total sugar (17.01%) was recorded in the surface application at 100% RDF with solid fertilizers. Drip irrigation at 100% level improved all quality components because drip irrigation provides a consistent moisture regime in the soil this might accelerate root growth and resulting in optimum availability of nutrient and proper translocation of food materials which accelerated the fruit growth and development, consequently improved the quality characters in the fruits. The increase in juice content might be because of more absorption of water and minerals from the soil resulting into increased juice content and total sugar (Nath *et al.*, 2002). Prasad and Mali (2000) found total sugar, reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar to be highest at optimum level of N in pomegranate cv. Jalore Seedless. Singh, (2013) also recorded sugar content to increase with N level. Dheware *et al.*, 2020 in mango also recorded the same phenomenon that optimum level of N increases the total sugar, reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar of the fruits.

Table 3 Quality attributing parameters influenced by drip fertigation on custard apple Cv. Balanagar

	Non reducing sugar			Reducing sugar			Total sugar		
Treatment	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled
$F_1S_1$ - Fertigation of 100 % RDF with solid fertilizers	3.07	3.36	3.25	15.02	15.22	15.12	18.30	18.45	18.58
$F_1S_2$ - Fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers	3.38	3.70	3.54	16.59	16.71	16.65	20.14	20.31	20.22
$F_2S_1$ - Fertigation of 75 % RDF with solid fertilizers	3.10	3.40	3.21	15.36	15.16	15.26	18.51	18.66	18.37
$F_2S_2$ -Fertigation of 75 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers	3.24	3.55	3.40	15.98	15.90	15.94	19.34	19.50	19.41
with solid fertilizers	2.97	3.26	3.12	14.57	14.59	14.58	17.74	17.89	17.81
with water soluble fertilizers	2.96	3.24	3.10	14.66	14.51	14.59	17.64	17.79	17.71
RDF with solid fertilizers	2.84	3.12	2.98	14.04	13.94	13.99	16.95	17.09	17.01
RDF with water soluble	2.85	3.13	2.99	14.15	14.05	14.10	17.02	17.16	17.09
SEm± CD @ 5 %	0.06 0.17	0.06 0.18	0.06 0.18	0.26 0.77	0.28 0.83	0.28 0.83	0.34 1.00	0.34 1.01	0.34 1.00

The data on TSS/acid ratio, shelf life of custard apple fruits as influenced by different fertigation levels and source of fertilizers are presented in table (Table 4). Significantly maximum TSS/acid ratio (90.01), shelf life (7.50 days) were observed in fertigation at 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers ( $F_1S_2$ ) which was on par with fertigation of 75% RDF with water soluble fertilizers  $(F_2S_2)$ which recorded TSS/acid ratio (86.41), shelf life (7.20 days) while, minimum TSS/acid ratio (70.96), shelf life (6.31 days) was recorded in the surface application at 100% RDF with solid fertilizers.

The TSS/ acid ratio exhibited maximum value with fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers. As the fruit maturity approaches in custard apple acidity decreases in proportion to TSS, which gives a fruit excellent sugar acid blend and is one of the most desirable characters of excellent fruit quality. These findings are in accordance with Neilsen *et al.* (2000) reported acidity to decrease and soluble solids to increase in response to higher N in 'Gala' apples. Same findings were also reported by Prasad and Mali (2000) who also found acidity to decrease with increasing N level in

	TSS/	acid rat	io (%)	Shelf life (Days)			
Treatment	2019- 20	2020- 21	Pooled	2019- 20	2020-21	Pooled	
F <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> - Fertigation of 100 % RDF with solid fertilizers	71.48	81.75	76.61	6.54	7.08	6.81	
F <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> - Fertigation of 100% RDF with water soluble fertilizers	78.70	90.01	84.35	7.20	7.80	7.50	
$F_2S_1$ - Fertigation of 75 % RDF with solid fertilizers	72.31	82.70	77.49	6.61	7.16	6.89	
$F_2S_2$ -Fertigation of 75 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers	75.55	86.41	80.97	6.91	7.49	7.20	
$F_3S_1$ -Fertigation of 50 % RDF with solid fertilizers	69.30	79.27	74.27	6.31	6.87	6.60	
$F_3S_2$ -Fertigation of 50 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers	68.93	78.84	73.87	6.30	6.83	6.57	
$F_4S_1$ -Surface application 100 % RDF with solid fertilizers	66.22	75.73	70.96	6.05	6.56	6.31	
$F_4S_2$ -Surface application 100 % RDF with water soluble fertilizers	66.51	76.06	71.28	6.08	6.59	6.33	
SEm±	1.33	1.52	1.42	0.12	0.13	0.13	
CD @ 5 %	3.90	4.46	4.10	0.36	0.39	0.37	

Table 4 Quality attributing parameters influenced by drip fertigation on custard apple Cv. Balanagar

pomegranate cv. Jalore Seedless. Another worker, Singh et al. (2006) also recorded higher TSS: acid ratio with higher doses of N level in pomegranate cv. Ganesh. Purendra Kumar et al., 2020 in guava recorded higher TSS: acid ratio with higher doses of N through fertigation. Fertigation of 100 % RDF has resulted in better nutrition which has produced more reserved food (carbohydrates) material in fruits. Hiah carbohydrate accumulation is responsible for increasing the shelf-life of fruit. It might be the attributing factor for the positive effects of

# REFERENCES

- Anonymous 2018. Annu. Rep. (2018-19). National Horticulture Board p 12.
- Agrawal, N., Panigrahi, H.K., Tiwari, S.P., Agrawal. R., Sharma, D. and Dikshit, S.N. (2010) Effect of fertigation through water-soluble fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of papaya (*Carica papaya L*). In: *National Seminar on Precision Farming in Horticulture* Pp: 507-510.
- Dheware, R.M., Nalage, N.A., Sawant, B.N., Haldavanekar, P.C., Raut, R. A., Munj, A.Y. and Sawant, S.N. (2020) Effect of fertigation on growth and yield of mango

nutrition in enhancing the shelf life of fruits. Extra photosynthates in plants reserved as carbohydrates which might have increased the C: N ratio of plant, high carbohydrates reserve favours the longer shelf life of fruits because the pre-harvest factor of a plant definitely affects their postharvest life. Singh and Bijimol (2012) also observed that the nitrogen is an essential constituent of various proteins and play an active part in various metabolic processes which might have some role in augmenting the shelf life of fruits.

cv. Alphonso under Konkan agro climatic condition. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* : **9**(3): 2001-2003.

- Haneef, M., Kaushik, R. A., Sarolia, D. K., Mordia A. and Dhakar M. (2014) Irrigation scheduling and fertigation in pomegranate cv. Bhagwa under high density planting system. *Indian Journal of Horticulture* **71**(1): 45-48.
- Jayakumar, P., Kumar, N. and Soorianatha sundaram, K. (2010) Fertigation studies on papaya (*Carica papaya* L.). South Indian Horticulture **49**: 71-75.

471

- Nath, V., Singh, R.S., Sharma, B.D. and Pareek, O.P. (2002) Shuskha Bagwanieinjal prabandh. *PhalPhool*, **22**, 11-14.
- Neilson, D., Neilsen, G. H and Hall, J. W. (2000) Fruit mineral concentration and quality of Gala apples as affected by rate and timing of fertigated nitrogen. *Acta Horticulture* **512**: 159-167.
- Pandey, A. K., Singh, A. K., Singh, S. K. and Kumar, A. (2013) Improving strawberry productivity and quality through drip irrigation and polythene mulch in Bihar. *Environment and Ecology* **30** (3A): 760-763.
- Prasad, R.N. and Mali, P.C. (2000) Effect of different levels of nitrogen on quality characters of pomegranate fruit cv. Jolore seedless. *Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences* **29**(3): 186-187.
- Purnendra Kumar, S. and Sahu, G.D. (2020) Response of different levels of fertigation and mulching on quality parameters of Guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) under ultra high density planting in Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Fauna and Biological Studies* **7**(3): 13-16
- Raghupathi, H.B., Srinivas, K. and Reddy, B.M.C. (2002) Concentration and distribution of secondary and micronutrients in banana under fertigation. *South Indian Horticulture* **50**(4-6): 291-300.
- Sandeep Kumar, V., Priyanka, K. and Kalpana, C. (2020) Irrigation scheduling and fertigation in citrus fruit crops. *Chemical Science* **9** (34), 418-424.

- Shirgure, P. S. and Srivastava, A. K. (2016) Optimizing the potassium dose of fertigation for Nagpur mandarin (*Citrus reticulata* Blanco.). *Agricultral Advances* **2**(8): 243-249.
- Singh, A. K. and Bijimol, G. (2012) Response of gladiolus cv. Pink Friendship flowering to spacing and nitrogen levels under low hills of Nagaland. *South Indian Horticulture* **50** (1-3): 136-139.
- Singh, P., Singh, A. K. and Sahu, K. (2006) Irrigation and fertigation of pomegranate cv. Ganesh in chattishgarh. *Indian Journal of Horticulture* **63**: 141-151.
- Singh D (2013) Effect of different levels of nitrogen through fertigation for growth and nutrient status of nectarine cv. Snow Queen. *M.Sc Thesis*, Dr YS Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan (HP) India.
- Suresh, P.M., Kumar, S., Swaminathan, V., Gurusamy, A. and Mahadevan, A. (2018) Effect of drip fertigation levels on fruit characters of Aonla (*Emblica officinalis* Gaertn.) cv. NA-7. *International Journal* of Chemical Studies **6**(4): 2524-2527.
- Verma, L.N. and Bhattacharyya, P. (2005) In: Production distribution and promotion of biofertilizers, fertilizers, organic manures. recyclable wastes and biofertilizers. FD Co. New Delhi. Pp.132-147.
- Vijayakumar, R.M. (2001) Studies on influence of months of sowing and growth regulation on annual mango (*Manjifera indica*.). Ph.D., thesis, Tamil Nadu Agri. Univ., Coimbatore.