

Original Research Article

Influence of NAA and Zinc sulphate on Fruiting behaviour and Quality of Litchi (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.) cv. Rose Scented

Abstract:

The current investigation was led to evaluate the effect of NAA and zinc sulphate to maintain fruiting behaviour and qualitative attributes of fruit in litchi cv. Rose scented. This experiment was done in 2022 and 2023 at the Horticulture Garden, Department of Fruit Science, C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur (U.P.). There were sixteen treatments including four levels of zinc sulphate (0, 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6 %), NAA (0, 25, 50 and 75 ppm) and their combinations imitated in Factorial- CRD. The foliar application of treatments was done on January 28 and March 16 of each year, prior to flowering and fruit setting at pea stage, respectively. This experiment showed that the treatment with NAA 50ppm and 0.4% zinc sulphate improved fruit set percent (63.40 and 62.73), fruit retention percent (30.76 and 31.36 %) and reduced fruit drop percent (69.23 and 68.63 %). The same treatment blend increased juice content of litchi fruit (63.63 and 64.22 percent) and also improved nutritional qualities of fruit like TSS (22.75 and 22.62 °Brix), total sugar (14.48 and 14.54 percent), ascorbic acid (41.22 and 41.64 mg/ 100g of pulp), organoleptic test (85.36 and 86.82) and minimum titratable acidity (0.473 and 0.421 percent) in litchi fruits.

Keywords: Litchi, NAA, ZnSO₄, fruiting behavior and quality attributes.

Introduction

Litchi (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.) is a very important subtropical evergreen fruit crop, belonging to the Sapindaceae family. Botanically, it is a nut type of fruit cultivated commercially to a limited extent in Bihar, Uttarakhand, Assam, West Bengal, Orissa, Tripura, and Himachal Pradesh. It is grown in sub- mountainous districts of Uttar Pradesh i.e., Saharanpur and Muzaffarnagar (Singh and Singh, 1954; Gautam *et al.*, 2021). Muzaffarpur of Bihar grows best quality litchi fruits. The litchi fruits also known as “Natural rasgulla” are considerably rich in the sugar. The sugar content of different varieties ranges from 6.74 to 18.86 percent. In addition to sugar, it contains 0.7% pectin, 0.3% minerals and 40-60 mg vitamin C per 100 g of pulp.

Litchi fruit is a delicious and luscious fruit with attractive red colour, sweet aroma and good taste (Hossain *et al.*, 2014). It is a sweet, dry fruit with white translucent juicy pulp and large seeds. The taste of fresh fruit pulp is musky. When dried, it has a sour taste and is very sweet. It is rich in carbohydrates, vitamins, and minerals such as magnesium, iron, calcium, copper, phosphorus, and potassium. It is processed into juice, wine, pickles, jam, jelly, ice cream, yogurt (Huang *et al.*, 2005; Nand *et al.*, 2023).

For years, plant growth regulators (PGRs) and micronutrients have consistently boosted economic returns in litchi production by influencing fruit behaviour and plant growth. Both micronutrients and PGRs positively impact lychee fruit yield and quality, enhancing flowering, fruit set, and retention. Optimal micronutrient concentrations stimulate plant growth, increase yield, and improve fruit quality. Foliar applications are essential for providing specific micronutrient requirements. Zinc plays a crucial role in plant metabolic activities, acting as a metal activator for enzymes and influencing RNA and ribosome content. Zinc deficiency adversely affects flowering, fruit size, growth, and quality. Auxin significantly affects respiration, photosynthesis, and osmotic pressure, leading to changes in fruit qualities. Recognizing the significance of zinc and NAA in litchi, this experiment was designed.

Material Methods

The litchi trees were about 30 years old but properly maintained at Horticulture Garden, Department of Fruit Science, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology Kanpur. Sixteen uniform plants of litchi 'cultivar Rose scented' were selected for the present investigations during 2022 and 2023. During the course of the investigation the whole orchard was kept under clean and uniform cultivation. Factorial Completely Randomized Design was used with three replications and sixteen treatments viz., four levels each of NAA (0, 25, 50 and 75 ppm) and zinc sulphate (0, 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6%) and their combination spraying of these were done twice i.e., before flowering (28 January) and at pea stage (16 March) during both the years. Three branches in uniform growth and vigour were selected on each tree.

Observations were recorded on various fruiting and quality parameters. The length and diameter were determined with the vernier callipers, fruit weight, pulp weight, seed weight and rind weight of fruit was determined with the help of electronic balance. The total sugars and titratable acidity contents were determined by the techniques as recommended by AOAC (1980).

Results and Discussion

Fruit Set (per panicle): Correlative influence of NAA and Zinc was found to be non-significant. Treatment of N_2Z_2 induced maximum (258.90 and 259.41) fruit set closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (256.33 and 257.40). The minimum (212.50 and 214.51) fruit set were presented with control (N_0Z_0) during both years of experimentation. The chemical significantly increased the fruit set as compared to control however, the highest fruit set was obtained with the application of 0.4 per cent zinc sulphate + 50 ppm NAA. It has been early reported that fruit set in pear can be promoted with application of plant bio-regulators like NAA in litchi. These results corroborate with the work of in litchi. The increases in number of inflorescence and fruit set with zinc application Saraswat *et al.* (2006), might be due to its effect on process of fertilization and hormonal metabolism, helpful in maintaining better nutritional status of tree which ultimately proved beneficial in improving fruit set.

Fruit Drop (%): Interactive influence of NAA and Zinc was found to be non-significant, treatment of N_2Z_2 resulted minimum (69.23 and 68.63 %) fruit drop closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (70.26 and 69.58%). The maximum (77.57 and 77.17 %) fruit drop were presented with control (N_0Z_0) during both the years of experiments. The chemical non-significantly reduced the fruit drop as compared to control however, the lowest fruit drop was obtained with the application of 0.4 per cent zinc sulphate + 50 ppm NAA. These outcomes also agree with the conclusions of Saraswat *et al.* (2006). In mature fruits, pre-harvest drop is caused by low auxin levels and a weakening and eventual fracturing of the middle lamella of the cell at or near the abscission layer. Therefore, the fruit is not affected by these alterations in the middle lamella when auxin is applied; this is probably because auxin inhibits the enzymes that make pectin soluble. Applying zinc sulphate foliarly at a reasonable dosage may aid to keep plants in a healthier nutritional state, which will ultimately improve fruit retention and prevent drop.

Fruit Retention (%): Correlative consequence of NAA and Zinc was found to be non-significant treatment of N_2Z_2 induced maximum (30.76 and 31.36 %) fruit count at maturity stage closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (29.74 and 30.47 %). The minimum (22.42 and 22.83%) fruit retention were recorded with control (N_0Z_0) during both the years. Zinc response was more positive which play an important role in translocation of carbohydrates, auxin synthesis and increased pollen viability and fertilization. Minimum fruit setting and fruit retention were recorded under control. Similar results were also observed in litchi under Saraswat *et al.* (2006), Chaudhary *et al.* (2018). Fruit retention increased and fruit drop was reduced with the usage of NAA.

Fruit quality:

Juice Content (%): In relation to different NAA and Zinc concentrations on initial juice are an expression the plants which was influenced by NAA and Zinc growth regulators over control. Interactive effect of NAA and Zinc was found non-significant under treatment of N_2Z_2 that induced maximum (63.63 and 64.22 %) juice content closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (62.57 and 63.64 %). The minimum (53.22 and 53.81 %) juice content were presented with control (N_0Z_0) during both the years of experiments. This increase may be ascribed to enhance synthesis of metabolites, increased absorption of water and mobilization of sugars and minerals in the expanded cells and intercellular space of mesocarp. These enhancements of above physiological activities are accelerated possibly due to growth promoter as well as nutrients also. Improvement in juice content with the use of NAA and $ZnSO_4$ has been observed. These results are in accordance with the reports of Nand *et al.* (2023) in litchi.

Total Soluble Solid Content ($^{\circ}$ Brix): Relative to different NAA and Zinc concentrations on initial TSS are an expression the plants which was influenced by NAA and Zinc over control. The associated consequence of NAA and Zinc was found to be non-significant treatment of N_2Z_2 induced maximum (22.75 and 22.62 $^{\circ}$ B) TSS closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (22.34 and 22.44 $^{\circ}$ B). The minimum TSS (18.32 and 18.24 $^{\circ}$ B) was presented with control (N_0Z_0) during both the years of experiments. The reason for increase in total soluble solids content of fruit may be due to fact that nutrients and plant growth regulators played important role on photosynthesis which ultimately led to the accumulation of carbohydrates and attributed to increase in T.S.S. of fruit. These results are in similar with the finding of $ZnSO_4$ and NAA may be attributed to the quick metabolic transformation of starch and pectin into soluble compounds and rapid translocation of sugars from leaves to developing fruits. The results with respect to quality are in accordance with the findings of Chaudhary *et al.* (2018), Sharma *et al.* (1987), Saraswat *et al.* (2006), Gupta *et al.* (2022) in litchi and Shukla *et al.*, Katiyar *et al.* (2008) in aonla. The process of photosynthesis and the mobilization of food material were greatly aided by NAA and zinc sprays. This resulted in the accumulation of quality constituents such as carbohydrates, which in turn promoted the quality attributes and the rapid metabolic conversion of starch and pectin into soluble compounds and the translocation of sugars from leaves to developing fruits (Brahamachari and Rani, 2001).

Total sugar content: In regard to various NAA and Zinc fixations on starting absolute sugar are an articulation the plants which was affected by NAA and Zinc development controllers over control. Treatment with N_2Z_2 (14.48 and 14.54 percent) was found to have a non-significant and greater effect on total sugar than treatment with N_2Z_3 (14.23 and 14.32

percent). During both of the years of the experiments, the control (N_0Z_0) was given the minimum total sugar (11.42 and 11.54 percent). Decline in acidity with foliar use of $ZnSO_4$ and NAA may be because of expansion in movement of carb and increment metabolic change from acidity to sugars. Singh *et al.*, (2017) in mango, Tiwari *et al.* (2017) in aonla, Shukla *et al.* (2011), Saraswat *et al.* (2006), Kaur (2017), Devaraja *et al.* (2019) in litchi reports are in line with these findings.

Titrateable Acidity: Different quantities of zinc and NAA at harvest time indicate how the plants were affected by these growth regulators, which had an impact on the plants' ability to titrate acidity. The combined effects of zinc and NAA were shown significant. At harvesting, N_2Z_2 considerably reduced the acidity to a minimum of (0.473 and 0.421 percent), closely followed by N_2Z_3 treatment (0.476 and 0.425 percent). The control group (N_0Z_0) was used to demonstrate the greatest acidity at harvest (0.628 and 0.617 percent) in both trial years. These results are consistent with the reports in Singh *et al.*, (2017) in mango, Litchi by Saraswat *et al.* (2006), and Megu *et al.* (2021) and Tripathi *et al.* (2011) in aonla. This indicates that juice acidity was inclined to be reduced by the high quantity of NAA present in the zinc sprays.

Ascorbic Acid: The results regarding the various sprays of NAA and Zinc on litchi trees showed ascorbic acid content as follows. Treatment with N_2Z_2 (41.22 and 41.64 percent) was found to have a non-significant effect on ascorbic acid than the treatment with N_2Z_3 (39.96 and 41.22 percent). During both of the years of the experimentation, the control (N_0Z_0) was given the minimum ascorbic acid (32.64 and 33.26 percent). Interactive effect of NAA and Zinc on the ascorbic acid content of litchi fruit might be due to the increase in synthesis of metabolites which can enhance the synthesis of ascorbic acid precursor. The reports of Saraswat *et al.* (2006), Devaraja *et al.* (2019), Megu *et al.* (2021) in litchi are in line with these findings.

Organoleptic Test (%): The organoleptic test is an evaluation of the fruit's taste and aroma, which was influenced by NAA and Zinc over control. Joint effect of NAA and Zinc was found to be non-significant treatment of N_2Z_2 induced significantly maximum (85.36 and 86.82%) organoleptic values closely followed by treatment N_2Z_3 (84.76 and 85.45%). The minimum values (71.23 and 72.31%) were recorded with control (N_0Z_0) during both the years of experiments. These findings are in accordance with the reports of Nand *et al.*, (2023) in litchi Devaraja *et al.*, (2019) in litchi.

CONCLUSION

Based on results acquired in the current experiment it could be presumed that the utilization of NAA and Zinc came out with improved fruiting and good quality of litchi crediting characters such as length, diameter and weight of fruit which at last expanded the yield per plant under combination of NAA 50ppm and Zinc 0.4%. This treatment likewise worked on wholesome characteristics of fruit like total sugars and decreased acidity and maintained sugar acid ratio in litchi. The application of plant bio-regulators (NAA) and micronutrients (ZnSO₄) plays a significant role in enhancing fruit yield and quality by reducing cracking and enhancing fruit set, retention, and quantity. because litchi is an important fruit crop in subtropical climates in India. That is the reason from here on out, more experimental researches can be done on different cultivars, alone or in the mix of both plant growth regulators and micro-nutrients on additional boundaries to normalize dosages well defined for the specific districts.

REFERENCES

- AOAC (1980). Official Methods of analysis, association of official analytical chemist, Washington, D.C. U.S.A.
- Chaudhary, M., Singh, D. P. Singh, J. P., & Mishra, K.K. (2018). "Effect of foliar application of PGRs and mineral nutrients on fruiting behaviour, growth and yield of Aonla CV. NA-7." *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(4): 2714-2718.
- Devaraja, R.; Hazarika, B.N. and Raghavan, M. (2019). Effect of micronutrients and plant growth regulators on yield and fruit quality of litchi (*Litchi chinensis* S.) cv. Muzaffarpur under foot hills of Arunachal Pradesh. *Progressive Horticulture*, 51(2): 161-165
- Gautam, S.; Singh, J.P.; Patel, S.K. and Yadav, S. (2021) Effect of NAA and Zinc on Fruiting Parameters, Marketable Yield and Quality of Litchi [*Litchi chinensis* (Gaertn.) Sonn.], *Biological Forum – An International Journal*, 13(3a): 144-148(2021).
- Gupta, A.; Tripathi, V.K. and Shukla, J.K. (2022). Influence of GA₃, Zinc and Boron on Fruit drop, Yield and Quality of Litchi (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.). In *Biological Forum-International Journal*, 2022;14: 1079-1083.
- Hossain, M. M., Hossain, M. S., & Islam, M. M. (2014). Fruit setting, cracking and quality of litchi as influenced by foliar spray of different nutrient solutions during fruit growth and development. *Journal of Agricultural Technology*, 10(3): 717-731.
- Huang, X. M., Wang, H. C., Li., Yuan, W., Lu, L., & Huang, H. B. (2005). An overview of calcium, S role in litchi fruit cracking. *Acta Horticulture*, 665: 231-240.

- Katiyar, P. N., Singh, J. P., & Singh, P. C. (2008). Effect of zinc sulphate, borax and calcium nitrate in flowering, fruiting, yield and quality of Litchi cv. Dehradun. *Journal of Rural and Agricultural Research*, 8(2): 49-51.
- Kaur, S. (2017). Effect of micronutrients and plant growth regulators on fruit set, fruit retention, yield and quality attributes in litchi cultivar Dehradun. *Chemical Science Review and Letters*, 6(22): 982-986.
- Megu, O.; Hazarika, B.N.; Wangchu, L.; Sarma, P.; Singh, A.K.; Debnath, P. and Angami, T. (2021). Effect of plant growth regulators and micronutrients on vegetative growth, flowering and yield attributes of Litchi (*Litchi chinensis* S.). *International Journal Plant Soil Science*, 33:176-181.
- Nand, V; Dwivedi, A.K. and Tripathi, V.K. (2023). Influence of GA₃ and ZnSO₄ on Fruiting, Yield and Quality Parameters of Litchi (*Litchi chinensis* S.) cv. Dehradun. *Journal of Experimental Agriculture International*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 20-30, 2023.
- Saraswat, N. K., Pandey, U. N., & Tripathi, V. K. (2006). Influence of NAA and Zinc sulphate on fruit drop, cracking, fruit size, yield and quality of litchi cv. Calcuttia. *Journal of Asian, Horticulture*, 2(4): 255- 259.
- Sharma, S. B., & Dhillon, B. S. (1987). Effect of zinc sulphate and growth regulators on fruit cracking in litchi. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 44(1-2): 57-59.
- Singh & Singh (1954). The litchi. Supt Printing and Stationery U.P. Allahabad.
- Singh, T.; Tripathi, V.K. and Tiwari, P. (2017). Influence of pre-harvest application of plant bio-regulators and micronutrients on fruit retention, yield and quality attributes of mango. *Progressive Research - An International Journal*, 12(4): 2640- 2644.
- Shukla, H.S.; Kumar V. and Tripathi, V.K. (2011). Effect of Gibberellic Acid and Boron on Development and Quality of Aonla Fruits 'Banarasi'. *Acta Horticulture*, 890:375-380.
- Tiwari, P.; Tripathi, V.K. and Singh, A. (2017). Effect of foliar application of plant bio-regulators and micronutrients on fruit retention, yield and quality attributes of aonla. *Progressive Research-An International Journal*, 12(4):2565-2568.
- Tripathi, V.K. and Shukla, H.S. 2011. Influence of calcium chloride and calcium nitrate on physico-chemical composition of aonla 'Banarasi'. *Acta Horticulturae*, 890: 371-374.
- Yadav, S., Shukla, H. S., & Ram, R. A. (2010). Studies on foliar application of NAA, GA₃, Boric acid and Ca (NO₃)₂ on fruit retention, growth, yield and quality of Aonla (*Emblca officinalis* Gaertn.) cv. Banarasi. *Horticulture Journal*, 23(2): 64-67.

Table no. 1: Effect of foliar sprays of NAA, Zinc and their interactions on fruits set, drop and retention.

| Parameter | Doses NAA ppm (A) | Zinc % (B) | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | | 2022 | | | | | 2023 | | | | |
| | | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A |
| Fruit Set percent | A ₀ Control | 54.343 | 54.827 | 55.070 | 55.480 | 54.930 | 54.743 | 55.117 | 56.590 | 56.900 | 55.838 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 55.597 | 56.047 | 56.640 | 56.787 | 56.268 | 56.967 | 57.717 | 58.240 | 58.323 | 57.812 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 60.730 | 61.537 | 63.407 | 62.730 | 62.101 | 61.970 | 62.177 | 63.507 | 62.430 | 62.521 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 57.793 | 58.270 | 59.650 | 60.373 | 59.022 | 59.183 | 61.070 | 61.030 | 61.323 | 60.652 |
| | Mean B | 57.116 | 57.670 | 58.692 | 58.843 | | 58.216 | 59.020 | 59.842 | 59.744 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 1.130 | 0.552 | 0.391 | | | 1.134 | 0.554 | 0.392 | | |
| B | 1.130 | 0.552 | 0.391 | | | 1.134 | 0.554 | 0.392 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 1.105 | 0.781 | | | NS | 1.108 | 0.784 | | | |
| Fruit Drop percent | A ₀ Control | 77.577 | 76.223 | 75.500 | 75.140 | 76.110 | 77.177 | 76.703 | 76.600 | 75.140 | 76.405 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 75.223 | 74.783 | 74.360 | 74.113 | 74.620 | 74.873 | 74.443 | 73.280 | 73.227 | 73.956 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 70.323 | 70.310 | 69.233 | 70.260 | 70.032 | 70.090 | 69.580 | 68.633 | 69.523 | 69.457 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 73.267 | 72.430 | 71.580 | 71.337 | 72.153 | 72.767 | 71.110 | 70.950 | 70.737 | 71.391 |
| | Mean B | 74.098 | 73.437 | 72.668 | 72.713 | | 73.727 | 72.959 | 72.366 | 72.157 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | | 1.136 | 0.555 | 0.392 | | |
| B | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | | 1.136 | 0.555 | 0.392 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 1.101 | 0.778 | | | NS | 1.110 | 0.785 | | | |
| Fruit Retention percent | A ₀ Control | 22.423 | 23.777 | 24.500 | 24.860 | 23.890 | 22.823 | 23.297 | 23.400 | 24.860 | 23.595 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 24.777 | 25.217 | 25.640 | 25.887 | 25.380 | 25.127 | 25.557 | 26.720 | 26.773 | 26.044 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 29.677 | 29.690 | 30.767 | 29.740 | 29.968 | 29.910 | 30.420 | 31.367 | 30.477 | 30.543 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 26.733 | 27.570 | 28.420 | 28.663 | 27.847 | 27.233 | 28.890 | 29.050 | 29.263 | 28.609 |
| | Mean B | 25.903 | 26.563 | 27.332 | 27.288 | | 26.273 | 27.041 | 27.634 | 27.843 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | | 1.136 | 0.555 | 0.392 | | |
| B | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | | 1.136 | 0.555 | 0.392 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 1.101 | 0.778 | | | NS | 1.110 | 0.785 | | | |

Table no. 2: Effect of foliar sprays of NAA, Zinc and their interactions on TSS, Total sugars and Titratable acidity.

| Parameter | Doses NAA ppm (A) | Zinc % (B) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | | 2022 | | | | | 2023 | | | | |
| | | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A |
| Total Soluble Solids (TSS) | A ₀ Control | 18.323 | 18.450 | 18.683 | 18.873 | 18.583 | 18.243 | 18.820 | 19.120 | 19.360 | 18.886 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 19.050 | 19.260 | 19.450 | 19.920 | 19.420 | 19.590 | 19.680 | 19.957 | 20.180 | 19.852 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 21.557 | 21.880 | 22.750 | 22.340 | 22.132 | 21.420 | 21.727 | 22.620 | 22.440 | 22.052 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 20.237 | 20.560 | 20.850 | 21.150 | 20.699 | 20.353 | 20.910 | 20.460 | 20.650 | 20.593 |
| | Mean B | 19.792 | 20.038 | 20.433 | 20.571 | | 19.902 | 20.284 | 20.539 | 20.658 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 0.504 | 0.246 | 0.174 | | | 0.493 | 0.241 | 0.170 | | |
| B | 0.504 | 0.246 | 0.174 | | | 0.493 | 0.241 | 0.170 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 0.493 | 0.348 | | | NS | 0.482 | 0.341 | | | |
| Total Sugars | A ₀ Control | 11.423 | 11.650 | 11.870 | 11.953 | 11.724 | 11.540 | 11.883 | 12.053 | 12.140 | 11.904 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 12.230 | 12.350 | 12.590 | 12.783 | 12.488 | 12.253 | 12.400 | 12.650 | 12.870 | 12.543 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 13.650 | 13.920 | 14.483 | 14.233 | 14.072 | 13.950 | 14.150 | 14.543 | 14.320 | 14.241 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 12.850 | 13.037 | 13.180 | 13.470 | 13.134 | 13.167 | 13.450 | 13.583 | 13.740 | 13.485 |
| | Mean B | 12.538 | 12.739 | 13.031 | 13.110 | | 12.728 | 12.971 | 13.208 | 13.268 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 0.278 | 0.136 | 0.096 | | | 0.280 | 0.137 | 0.097 | | |
| B | 0.278 | 0.136 | 0.096 | | | 0.280 | 0.137 | 0.097 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 0.272 | 0.192 | | | NS | 0.273 | 0.193 | | | |
| Titratable Acidity | A ₀ Control | 0.628 | 0.582 | 0.542 | 0.526 | 0.569 | 0.617 | 0.573 | 0.562 | 0.532 | 0.571 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 0.517 | 0.515 | 0.513 | 0.508 | 0.513 | 0.512 | 0.512 | 0.506 | 0.505 | 0.509 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 0.485 | 0.482 | 0.473 | 0.476 | 0.479 | 0.455 | 0.448 | 0.421 | 0.425 | 0.437 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 0.506 | 0.505 | 0.498 | 0.493 | 0.500 | 0.498 | 0.475 | 0.462 | 0.459 | 0.473 |
| | Mean B | 0.534 | 0.521 | 0.507 | 0.501 | | 0.520 | 0.502 | 0.488 | 0.480 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.004 | | | 0.010 | 0.005 | 0.003 | | |
| B | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.004 | | | 0.010 | 0.005 | 0.003 | | | |
| A X B | 0.025 | 0.012 | 0.009 | | | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.007 | | | |

Table no. 3: Effect of foliar sprays of NAA, Zinc and their interactions on Juice content, Ascorbic acid and Organoleptic test.

| Parameter | Doses NAA ppm (A) | Zinc % (B) | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | | 2022 | | | | | 2023 | | | | |
| | | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A | B ₀ Control | B ₁ 0.2 | B ₂ 0.4 | B ₃ 0.6 | Mean A |
| Juice Content | A ₀ Control | 53.223 | 53.827 | 54.300 | 54.960 | 54.078 | 53.813 | 54.367 | 55.073 | 55.260 | 54.628 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 55.397 | 56.137 | 57.060 | 57.073 | 56.417 | 55.477 | 56.537 | 57.000 | 56.990 | 56.501 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 60.780 | 61.597 | 63.637 | 62.570 | 62.146 | 61.720 | 62.447 | 64.227 | 63.640 | 63.008 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 57.693 | 58.450 | 58.850 | 59.283 | 58.569 | 58.617 | 58.960 | 59.890 | 60.683 | 59.538 |
| | Mean B | 56.773 | 57.503 | 58.462 | 58.472 | | 57.407 | 58.078 | 59.048 | 59.143 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 1.138 | 0.556 | 0.393 | | | 0.438 | 0.214 | 0.151 | | |
| B | 1.138 | 0.556 | 0.393 | | | 0.438 | 0.214 | 0.151 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 1.112 | 0.787 | | | NS | 0.428 | 0.303 | | | |
| Ascorbic Acid | A ₀ Control | 32.643 | 33.097 | 33.423 | 33.710 | 33.218 | 33.263 | 34.397 | 35.563 | 35.790 | 34.753 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 34.217 | 34.737 | 35.660 | 35.633 | 35.062 | 36.067 | 36.477 | 37.030 | 37.043 | 36.654 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 38.700 | 39.437 | 41.227 | 39.960 | 39.831 | 40.300 | 40.737 | 41.647 | 41.220 | 40.976 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 36.517 | 36.930 | 37.910 | 38.573 | 37.483 | 37.757 | 38.330 | 38.920 | 40.003 | 38.753 |
| | Mean B | 35.519 | 36.050 | 37.055 | 36.969 | | 36.847 | 37.485 | 38.290 | 38.514 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 0.439 | 0.215 | 0.152 | | | 0.438 | 0.214 | 0.151 | | |
| B | 0.439 | 0.215 | 0.152 | | | 0.438 | 0.214 | 0.151 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 0.429 | 0.303 | | | NS | 0.428 | 0.303 | | | |
| Organoleptic Test | A ₀ Control | 71.233 | 71.777 | 72.260 | 73.610 | 72.220 | 72.313 | 72.907 | 73.380 | 74.710 | 73.328 |
| | A ₁ 25 | 74.447 | 75.627 | 76.420 | 76.820 | 75.828 | 75.527 | 76.777 | 77.860 | 78.117 | 77.070 |
| | A ₂ 50 | 82.730 | 83.737 | 85.367 | 84.760 | 84.148 | 83.610 | 84.897 | 86.827 | 85.450 | 85.196 |
| | A ₃ 75 | 78.433 | 79.870 | 80.540 | 81.663 | 80.127 | 79.193 | 80.670 | 81.950 | 82.813 | 81.157 |
| | Mean B | 76.711 | 77.753 | 78.647 | 79.213 | | 77.661 | 78.813 | 80.004 | 80.273 | |
| | Factors | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | | CD at 5% | SE (d) ± | SE (m) ± | | |
| | A | 1.121 | 0.548 | 0.388 | | | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | |
| B | 1.121 | 0.548 | 0.388 | | | 1.126 | 0.550 | 0.389 | | | |
| A X B | NS | 1.096 | 0.775 | | | NS | 1.100 | 0.778 | | | |

UNDER PEER REVIEW