

## **Original Research Article**

# **Response of foliar feeding of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilis on Fruit quality of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Langra**

### **ABSTRACT**

A study was conducted during the season of 2022-23 at the fruit research station in Imalia, which is affiliated with the Department of Horticulture at the JNKVV in Jabalpur. The objective of the study was to evaluate the positive effect of foliar sprays containing NAA, Urea, Nano-urea, and Biofertilis on the fruit quality of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Langra. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block design in three replications and all the treatments were replicated thrice by using single tree as a unit. Each treatment was carried out one tree for each replication. At the full bloom and pea stage, the spraying of three different concentrations of NAA (20 ppm, 30 ppm, and 40 ppm), Urea (2%, 3%, and 4%), Nano-urea (0.2%, 0.3%, and 0.4%) and Biofertilis (5 ml/litre, 10 ml/litre, and 15 ml/litre) was compared with the control, which consisted of no spraying. According to the findings of the experiment, applying a foliar spray containing 40 ppm of NAA resulted in a significant improvement in the quality parameter, as measured by a maximum TSS value of 22.22 °Brix, a maximum TSS: acid ratio of 117.13, maximum ascorbic acid content of 26.70 mg/100g, a minimum acidity content of 0.19%, and reducing sugars of 6.74% and total sugars of 17. During the course of the evaluation, it performed at the same level as T<sub>3</sub> (NAA 30 ppm), T<sub>2</sub> (NAA 20 ppm), and T<sub>7</sub> (Urea 4%).

*Keywords: NAA, urea, Nano-urea, TSS, physicochemical quality, Mango, Langra, Ascorbic acid*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) belonging to genus *Mangifera*, one of the 73 genera of the family Anacardiaceae, in order Sapindales, is among the most important tropical fruits of the world. It is also called as "King of the fruits" in India due to its historical and religious importance, attractive aroma, and capitative taste (Dutta *et al.*, 2013). Mangoes are well established commodity of international trade because of their high quality (Iqbal *et al.*, 2012). It occupies relatively the same position in the tropics as is enjoyed by the apple in temperate America or in Europe (Akter, 2013).

India's mango crop has significant cultural, socio-economic, and religious importance since ancient times, making it the most important crop in the country. The mango fruit has a substantial nutritional profile and exhibits a significant dietary worth. The inclusion of [this particular food item] may serve a significant function in achieving dietary equilibrium for individuals. One mango has the potential to fulfil up to 40 percent of the recommended daily intake of dietary fibre, which is known to be effective in preventing heart disease, cancer, and high cholesterol levels. India is the foremost global producer of mangoes, with a remarkable 111 nations engaging in mango cultivation. Currently, there are around 1200 distinct cultivars of mango, yet only a select handful has significant economic value due to their widespread acceptance. The present area under Mango in India is 2339 thousand hectares with a production of 20336 thousand MT, productivity 15.3 MT/ha. In Madhya Pradesh area under Mango is 42.11 thousand hectares with a production of 526.23 thousand Tonnes. (NHB, 2021-22). In Madhya Pradesh, it is grown in all districts and commercially cultivated in Hosangabad, Betul,

Rewa, Satna and Bhopal. Generally, quality parameters are genetically controlled. Exposure of fruit tree to adverse climatic conditions may alter the quality parameters of fruit like colour, flavour, TSS, Acidity, Sugars etc. up to a certain level. PGRs like NAA and Cytokinins are more prone to the retention of fruit i.e. minimizing fruit drop by increasing auxin level and had less or non-significant role in improving quality like TSS, Sugars, Acidity, etc. Similar results were observed by Pujari *et al.* (2016) in Alphonso mango. NAA improve the size and quality of fruits in mango and other crops (Raj and Brahmachari, 2004).

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present experiment was conducted at the Fruit Research Station, Imalia, Department of Horticulture, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur (M.P.) during the year 2022-23 on 23 years old mango plants cv. Langra with spacing at 12 × 12 m. The different concentrations of NAA @ 20ppm, 30ppm and 40ppm; Urea @ 2%, 3% and 4%; Nano-urea @ 0.2%, 0.3% and 0.4%; Biofertilis @ 5ml, 10ml and 15 ml/ lit spray along with control at full bloom and pea stage. The experiment was planned out in randomized block design and each treatment was replicated three times. The quality parameters were estimated after harvesting of fruit. Langra mango is harvested at mid-June to mid-July. Experiment

A hand Refractometer was used for the determination of TSS. Before usage, the hand refractometer was set to zero with pure water. According to a method described by Ranganna (1991), the titratable acidity of the samples was determined by titrating against 0.1N sodium hydroxide solution while using phenolphthalein as an indicator. The TSS and acidity ratio of fruit was calculated by dividing the TSS by acidity.

$$\text{TSS: Acidity ratio} = \frac{\text{Average value of TSS}}{\text{Average value of Acidity}}$$

Ascorbic acid was estimated as per assay method given by Ranganna (1991). The ascorbic acid content of a sample was calculated by using the following formula.

$$\text{Ascorbic acid (mg/100g)} = \frac{\text{Titrated value} \times \text{dye factor} \times \text{volume made up}}{\text{Aliquot extract taken} \times \text{weight of sample}} \times 100$$

The sugars content of the sample was determined by the procedure as described by Ranganna (1991) by using following formula:

$$\text{Non reducing sugar (\%)} = \text{Total sugar (\%)} - \text{Reducing sugar (\%)} \times 0.95$$

$$\text{Reducing sugar (\%)} = \frac{0.25}{\text{Burette reading}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Total sugar (\%)} = \frac{1.25}{\text{Burette reading}} \times 100$$

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilis on TSS (<sup>o</sup>Brix), acidity (%) and ascorbic acid (mg/100g).

Data shown in table 1 that the maximum total soluble solids (22.22 <sup>o</sup>Brix) was recorded with T<sub>4</sub> (NAA 40ppm) which was statistically at par with T<sub>3</sub> (NAA 30ppm), T<sub>2</sub> (NAA 30ppm) and T<sub>7</sub> (Urea 4%) having 22.20<sup>o</sup>Brix, 22.15<sup>o</sup>Brix and 21.80 <sup>o</sup>Brix, respectively. Whereas the minimum total soluble solids (20.10 <sup>o</sup>Brix) were recorded with control (T<sub>1</sub>). The increase in TSS content of fruits might be due to the application of NAA might have increased α-amylase activity and thus there was conversion of starch into sugars and hence improved total soluble solids content and enhanced solubilization of insoluble starch and pectin present in the cell wall and middle lamella. These results were also accordance with

previous findings of Bal and Randhawa (2007), Ghosh (2016), Singh *et al.* (2011) Venu and Radhevputra (2018) in mango.

Data shown in table 1 revealed that the minimum acidity (0.19%) was recorded with T<sub>4</sub> (NAA 40ppm) which is statistically at par with T<sub>3</sub> (NAA 30ppm) and T<sub>7</sub> (Urea 4%) having 0.20% and 0.20%, respectively and the maximum acidity percent (0.25%) was recorded with T<sub>1</sub> (control). The acidity percentage decreased might be due to increase in TSS and sugars of the fruits harvested from the treated trees which might be due to an increase in translocation of photosynthates (carbohydrates) and more metabolic conversion of acids to sugars by the reverse reaction of glycolytic pathway which is utilized in various physiological activities. The present study is supported with findings of Gupta and Brahmachari (2004) in mango. Titratable acidity was similar to the previous result of Maurya *et al.* (2020) and Mahajan *et al.* (2022), in Papaya. The TSS Acidity ratio was also maximum with NAA @ 40ppm (117.13) these results harmony with Venu and Radhevputra (2018) in mango.

As presented in table 1 maximum ascorbic acid (26.70 mg/100g) was recorded under T<sub>4</sub> (NAA 40ppm) which was significantly at par with T<sub>7</sub> (Urea 4%) and T<sub>3</sub> (NAA 30ppm) having 26.50 and 26.36 mg/100g, respectively and the minimum ascorbic acid (19.83 mg/100g) was found with T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The elevation in the concentration of ascorbic acid could possibly be attributed to the continuous production of glucose-6-phosphate throughout the maturation and progression of fruits, which is believed to serve as the precursor for vitamin C (Bhati and Yadav, 2003). Previous studies conducted by Sharma *et al.* (1990) and Sukhla (2002) have similarly shown that the application of NAA 40ppm to the leaves of mango cv. Langra resulted in the highest levels of ascorbic acid. These findings are consistent with the research conducted by Gattass *et al.* (2015) and Yadav *et al.* (2021) in the field. They also align with the results obtained in the current investigation.

**Table 1. Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilisol on fruit quality TSS (° Brix), acidity (%), TSS-acidity ratio and ascorbic acid (mg/100g)**

Notation	Treatment	TSS (° Brix)	Acidity (%)	Ascorbic acid (mg/100g)	TSS: Acidity ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	Control (Water)	20.10 <sup>e</sup>	0.25 <sup>b</sup>	19.83 <sup>d</sup>	81.51 <sup>j</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	NAA @ 20 ppm	22.15 <sup>a</sup>	0.21 <sup>ab</sup>	25.61 <sup>ab</sup>	105.48 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	NAA @ 30 ppm	22.20 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>ab</sup>	26.36 <sup>a</sup>	111.18 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	NAA @ 40 ppm	22.22 <sup>a</sup>	0.19 <sup>a</sup>	26.70 <sup>a</sup>	117.13 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Urea @ 2%	20.67 <sup>cd</sup>	0.22 <sup>ab</sup>	22.83 <sup>c</sup>	94.06 <sup>ef</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Urea @ 3 %	21.53 <sup>b</sup>	0.21 <sup>ab</sup>	24.65 <sup>b</sup>	102.62 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Urea @ 4%	21.80 <sup>ab</sup>	0.20 <sup>ab</sup>	26.50 <sup>a</sup>	107.29 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.2%	20.32 <sup>de</sup>	0.23 <sup>ab</sup>	21.23 <sup>cd</sup>	88.33 <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.3%	20.53 <sup>cde</sup>	0.23 <sup>ab</sup>	22.77 <sup>c</sup>	89.39 <sup>gh</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.4%	20.80 <sup>c</sup>	0.22 <sup>ab</sup>	22.17 <sup>c</sup>	94.67 <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 0.5%	20.23 <sup>de</sup>	0.24 <sup>ab</sup>	19.90 <sup>d</sup>	85.54 <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>12</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 1%	20.33 <sup>de</sup>	0.23 <sup>ab</sup>	20.20 <sup>d</sup>	89.72 <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>13</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 1.5%	20.50 <sup>cde</sup>	0.22 <sup>ab</sup>	20.27 <sup>d</sup>	91.80 <sup>f</sup>
	SE(m)±	0.14	0.004	0.17	1.97
	C. D. (p=0.05)	0.42	0.013	0.50	5.75
	C.V (%)	1.19	3.53	1.29	3.52




Fig. 1. Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilis on TSS (° Brix)




Fig. 3.2 Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilis on acidity (%)




Fig: 3 Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilisol on Ascorbic acid (mg/100g)


### 3.2 Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilisol on total sugar, reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar (%).

Maximum reducing sugar (6.74%), total sugar (17.63%) and minimum non-reducing sugar (9.25%) was recorded with the treatment T<sub>4</sub> (NAA at 40ppm) and presented in table 2. The surge in overall sugar levels may be linked to the presence of NAA, which potentially enhances the conversion of starch and other polysaccharides into soluble forms of sugar, hence promoting an increase in sugar content. The sugar content may be elevated as a result of the breakdown of polysaccharides into monosaccharides via metabolic processes, the conversion of organic acids into sugars, and the reduction of moisture, leading to an overall rise in total soluble solids. The findings align with previous studies conducted by Haidry *et al.* (1997) and Shrivastava and Jain (2006) in the case of cv. Langra, Narayanswamy *et al.* (2019) in the context of Pomegranate cv. Bhagwa, and Tripathi *et al.* (2022) in the case of ber.

Table 2. Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilisol on total sugar (%), reducing and non-reducing sugar (%).

Notation	Treatment	Reducing sugar (%)	Non-reducing sugar (%)	Total sugar (%)
T <sub>1</sub>	Control (Water)	5.88 <sup>g</sup>	10.90 <sup>g</sup>	15.23 <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	NAA @ 20 ppm	6.68 <sup>a</sup>	9.33 <sup>b</sup>	17.41 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	NAA @ 30 ppm	6.70 <sup>a</sup>	9.30 <sup>ab</sup>	17.49 <sup>ab</sup>

T <sub>4</sub>	NAA @ 40 ppm	6.74 <sup>a</sup>	9.25 <sup>a</sup>	17.63 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Urea @ 2%	6.57 <sup>b</sup>	10.23 <sup>d</sup>	16.77 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Urea @ 3 %	6.58 <sup>b</sup>	9.62 <sup>c</sup>	17.24 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Urea @ 4%	6.65 <sup>ab</sup>	9.34 <sup>ab</sup>	17.53 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.2%	6.42 <sup>c</sup>	10.27 <sup>d</sup>	16.52 <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.3%	6.38 <sup>c</sup>	10.30 <sup>d</sup>	16.61 <sup>de</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Nano urea @ 0.4%	6.11 <sup>d</sup>	10.60 <sup>e</sup>	15.70 <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 0.5%	6.10 <sup>de</sup>	10.82 <sup>e</sup>	15.63 <sup>fg</sup>
T <sub>12</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 1%	6.02 <sup>ef</sup>	10.79 <sup>f</sup>	15.46 <sup>gh</sup>
T <sub>13</sub>	Biofertilisol @ 1.5%	6.00 <sup>f</sup>	10.87 <sup>fg</sup>	15.43 <sup>h</sup>
	SE(m)±	0.03	0.03	0.06
	C. D. (p=0.05)	0.09	0.09	0.18
	C.V (%)	0.82	0.52	0.65



**Fig: 4** Effect of NAA, Urea, Nano-urea and Biofertilisol on total sugar (%), reducing and non-reducing sugar (%).

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of experiment conducted, it is found that treatment T<sub>4</sub> (NAA 40 ppm) performed superior over other treatment in all quality parameters i.e. TSS, Acidity (%), TSS: Acidity ratio, Total sugar, reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar percentage. Whereas treatment T<sub>3</sub> (NAA 30ppm) was also perform best in all aspects of the research.

## REFERENCES

- Akter A. Fruit development and quality changes of mango varieties at different growth stage. Thesis M.Sc. submitted to Bangladesh Agriculture University, Mymensingh. 2013; p 84.
- Anonymous. Indian Horticulture Database. 2021-22: <http://nhb.gov.in>
- Bal JS, Randhawa JS. Effect of NAA on fruit drop and quality of ber. Journal of Horticultural Sciences. 2007; 36(3-4), 231-232.
- Bayarri S, Calvo C, Costell E, Durán L. 2001: Influence of color perception of sweetness and fruit flavor of fruit drinks. Food Science & Technology International. 2001; 7:399–404.
- Bhati BS, Yadav PK. Effect of foliar application of urea and NAA on the quality of ber (*Zizyphus mauritiana* Lamk.) cv. Gola. Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences. 2003;32:32-33.
- Dutta SK, Shrivastav M, Chaudhary R, Lal K, Patil P, Singh SK, *et al.* Low temperature storage of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) pollen. Scientia Horticulture.2013;161:193-197.
- Gattass HR, Essa AA, Marzouk HA, El- Nawam SM. Effect of Application of Some Growth Regulators and CaCl<sub>2</sub> on Fruit Drop, Yield and Fruit Quality of Keitt Mango Trees. Assiut Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2015;49(1):79-95.
- Ghosh SN. Effect of plant growth regulators on fruit retention and physiochemical properties of mango cv. Amrapali grown in laterite soil at close spacing. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2016;12(3):83-85.
- Gupta RK, Brahmachari VS. Effect of foliar application of urea, potassium nitrate and NAA on fruit retention, yield and quality of mango cv. Bombai. Orissa Journal of Horticulture.2004;32(2):7-9.
- Haidery GA, Jalal-Ud-Din B, Ghaffoor A, Munir M. Effect of naphthalene acetic acid (NAA) on the fruit drop, yield and quality of mango (*Mangifera indica* L) cultivar Langra. Scientific Khyber (Pakistan).1997;10(1):13-20.
- Iqbal M, Niamatullah M, Hussain H, Munir M, Khan I, Khan MQ. Performance of selected parameters of mango cultivars in Muzaffargarh district (Punjab), Pakistan Sarhad Journal of Agricultural Science. 2012;28(3),395-398.
- Mahajan S, Rana DK, Hema, Raj L. Effect of different concentration of nutrient and PGRs on physico-chemical quality and yield of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Amrapalli under valley conditions of Garhwal hill. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(5):2194-2197.

- Maurya PK, Tripathi VK, Gupta S. Effect of pre-harvest application of GA<sub>3</sub>, Naphthalene acetic acid and borax on fruit drop, yield and quality of Mango cv. Amrapali. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2020;9(6):2123-2127.
- Narayanswamy P, Anawal VV, Ekabote SD. Effects of plant growth regulators on flowering, fruit set and yield of "Bhagwa" of pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.). Acta Horticulture. 2019;(1254),129–134.
- Pujari KH, Malshe AV, Shedje MS, Zagade VV, Lawande KE. Effect of CPPU (Forchlorfenuron) on fruit retention and postharvest quality of Alphonso mango. Acta Horticulture. 2016;1120. DOI 10.17660/ActaHortic.2016.1120.5.
- Raj KG, Brahmachari VS. Effect of foliar application of urea, potassium nitrate and NAA on fruit retention, yield and quality of mango. Orissa Journal of Horticulture. 2004;32(2):7-9.
- Ranganna S. Handbook of analysis and quality control for fruits and vegetable products. Second Ed. Tata Mc Graw Hill, Publication. 1991; Company Ltd., New Delhi, India.
- Sharma TR, Nair PK, Nema MK. Influence of foliar sprays of Urea, KNO<sub>3</sub> and NAA on chemical composition of mango cv. Langra. Punjab Horticultural Journal. 1990;30(1-4):53-56.
- Shrivastava DK, Jain DK. Effect of urea and GA<sub>3</sub> on physiochemical properties of mango cv. Langra during on year. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2006;19(3):754-756.
- Singh VK, Singh PK, Singh AK. Effect of different plant growth regulators on fruit yield of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. Pusa Dwarf. New Agriculturist. 2011;22(1):31-33.
- Sukhla AK. Effect of plant growth regulators, NAA and 2,4-D on control of fruit drop in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv Langra and Dashehari. M.Sc (Ag) thesis submitted to IGKV, Raipur. 2002.
- Tripathi SK, Gangwar V, Kumar D, Pratap R, Pal O, Chouhan NK, *et al.* Influence of Foliar Application of NAA, GA<sub>3</sub> and Zinc Sulphate on Fruiting and Yield Attributes of Ber (*Zizyphus mauritiana* Lamk Biological Forum – An International Journal. 2022;14(4):83-87.
- Venu A and Radevputra MV. Effect of polyamines and NAA application on quality and shelf life of mango cv. Kesar. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7(5):2906-2911.
- Yadav S, Singh JP, Gupta S, Yadav JS. A Study on Foliar Feeding of GA<sub>3</sub> and NAA on Fruit Drop, Retention, Yield and Quality of Ber Fruit (*Zizyphus mauritiana* Lamk.) cv. Banarasi Karaka. Biological Forum – An International Journal. 2021;13(3): 608-612