

Original Research Article

Standardization of spacing and fertilizer levels for growth, yield and flower quality of French marigold (*Tagetespatula* L.)

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to investigate the standardization of spacing and fertilizer requirements on growth and flower quality of French Marigold (*Tagetespatula* L.). The experiment aimed to identify the most effective treatment combination for enhancing farmer profitability and yield. The treatments consisted of three fertilizer levels (F1:225:60:60 NPK kg per ha, F2: 168.75:45:45 kg NPK kg per ha, F3:112.5:30:30 NPK kg per ha), three spacing levels (S1: 30 cm x 30 cm, S2: 45 cm x 30 cm and S2: 45 cm x 45 cm) tested in factorial randomized block design with three replications. The plant height increased with decrease in spacing level and increase in fertilizer levels. The interaction of S1F1 (30 x 30 cm: 225:60:60 NPK kg/ ha) recorded higher plant height, plant spread, number of primary and secondary branches. Flower production was significantly influenced by spacing at 45 x 30 cm, and fertilizer level at 225:60:60 NPK kg/ ha. The treatment combination of S1F6 (45 x 30 cm: 250:75:150 kg/ ha) produced more flower yield per ha (18.20 t/ha). It was on par with S1F5 i.e 17.64 t/ha. Increasing levels of spacing and nutrition increased the duration of flowering, flower diameter, flower weight, shelf life of flower on plant and seed yield significantly. Duration of flowering, flower diameter, flower weight, shelf life of flower on plant yield proved superior with 45 x 45 cm spacing and fertilizer level at 225:60:60 NPK kg/ ha

Keywords: French marigold, plant spacing, NPK levels, flower yield, flower quality, flower shelf life

INTRODUCTION

The marigold is a year-round commercial flower cultivated primarily for loose flower production, contributing significantly to its prominence in the domestic flower market. The diverse agroclimatic zones offer numerous natural advantages, including ample sunlight, optimal temperatures, and soil characteristics conducive to healthy plant growth. These zones are particularly promising for the cultivation of various marigold genotypes due to their unique climates and rich biodiversity. Marigold oil, known for its distinct aroma, serves as an effective repellent against flies (Priyambada *et al.*, 2015). Additionally, marigolds are recognized for their insect-repellent properties, reducing insect and nematode activity when grown in fields, which subsequently benefits subsequent crops. The cultivation of marigolds also provides economic opportunities, thereby partially alleviating unemployment issues in both public and private sectors.

The genus *Tagetes* comprises 33 species, but only two are cultivated commercially: *Tagetes erecta* L., known as the African marigold, and *Tagetes patula* L., known as the French marigold. Due to their diverse blossom heights and colors, these species are utilized in landscape architecture and for loose flower supply (Serrato-Cruz *et al.*, 2000).

French marigolds are particularly valuable in landscaping for their vibrant colors, ranging from deep orange and red to bright yellow, and their natural insect-repellent properties, which enhance the health and vitality of neighboring plants. Their compact size and abundant blooming make them ideal for creating striking borders, filling gaps in garden beds, and adding pops of color to container gardens (Choudhary *et al.*, 2014). In addition to their aesthetic appeal, French marigolds repel harmful insects and attract beneficial pollinators, contributing to an ecologically balanced environment.

Nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) fertilizers are essential for optimal crop production, each serving distinct functions that collectively enhance plant growth and yield. Nitrogen is crucial for photosynthesis and protein synthesis, promoting vigorous vegetative growth and vibrant green foliage. Phosphorus is vital for energy transfer, root development, and the formation of flowers and seeds, ensuring robust early plant development and successful reproduction. Potassium regulates water and nutrient movement, strengthens stems, and enhances resistance to diseases and environmental stress, contributing to overall plant health and quality (Bansal *et al.*, 1995). Together, these macronutrients support balanced nutrition, leading to higher crop yields and improved quality, making them fundamental components of agricultural productivity. Therefore, enhancing soil fertility through the judicious application of NPK fertilizers can substantially increase flower yield. Spacing also plays a critical role in achieving healthy vegetative growth and producing high-quality flowers. Wider spacing enhances the photosynthetic area and reduces nutrient competition, whereas closer spacing increases flower yield but can negatively affect vegetative growth. The interaction between fertilizers and plant spacing can significantly influence the growth and flowering behavior of marigold plants. Keeping this in view an experiment was carried out to study the effect of plant spacing and fertilizers levels on the productivity, nutrient accumulation (N and P) and K use efficiencies in French marigold.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was laid out in the field during 2021-2022 by following recommended package of practices for spacing and fertilization (Anonymous, 2018).

List 1 : Nutrients used in the study

Type of application	Source of nutrients	Nutrient content
Soil application	Urea	46% N

	SSP	16% P ₂ O ₅
	MOP	60% K ₂ O

Crop : French marigold

Genotype :UHSFm 10

Design: Factorial RCBD

Treatments: 09

Replications: 03

Plot size: 3 x 4 m

Number of factors: Two

List 2 :Treatment details

The details of treatments are given below:

Factor 1: Spacing	Factor 2: Fertilizer levels
S ₁ : 30 x 30 cm	F ₁ : 100% RDF(225:60:60 NPKkg/ha)
S ₂ : 45 x 30 cm	F ₂ : 75% RDF(168.75:45:45 kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
S ₃ : 45 x 45 cm	F ₃ : 50% RDF (112.5:30:30 kg NPK ha ⁻¹)

The treatment combinations are as follows:

T₁: S₁F₁ (30 x 30 cm + 100% RDF 225:60:60 NPK kg/ha)

T₂: S₁F₂ (30 x 30 cm + 75% RDF NPK kg/ha)

T₃: S₁F₃ (30 x 30 cm + 50% RDF NPK kg/ha)

T₄: S₂F₁ (45 x 30 cm + 100% RDF 225:60:60 NPK kg/ha)

T₅: S₂F₂ (45 x 30 cm + 75% RDF NPK kg/ha)

T₆: S₂F₃ (45 x 30 cm + 50% RDF 187.5:100:75 NPK kg/ha)

T₇: S₃F₁ (45 x 45 cm + 100% RDF 225:60:60 NPK kg/ha)

T₈: S₃F₂ (45 x 45 cm + 75% RDF NPK kg/ha)

T₉: S₃F₃ (45 x 45cm + 50% RDF 187.5:100:75 NPK kg/ha)

Seeds were sown in pro-trays, and one month later, the seedlings were transplanted into the main field with three spacing levels: S1 (30 cm x 30 cm), S2 (45 cm x 30 cm), and S3 (45 cm

x 45 cm) according to the treatment plan. The experimental plots were enriched with well-decomposed FYM, half of the nitrogen dose, and the full doses of phosphorus and potassium as a basal application. The remaining half of the nitrogen dose was applied 30 days after transplanting. All cultural practices were performed uniformly.

Available nitrogen in the soil was determined using the alkaline permanganate method outlined by Subbiah and Asija (1956). Available phosphorus was estimated by the colorimetric method outlined by Olsen et al. (1954), and available potassium was extracted with neutral normal ammonium acetate and quantified using a flame photometer, as suggested by Stanford and English (1963), expressed in kg per hectare. Data on various growth and yield parameters were recorded from five tagged plants and analyzed statistically.

Growth parameters

Plant height (cm)

Plant height was measured from the base to the tip of the main stem for all five tagged plants in each plot using a meter scale. The average plant height was then calculated in centimeters.

Plant spread (cm)

Plant spread was assessed from East-West and North-South directions by using a measuring scale and the mean plant spread was worked out for both East-West and North-South direction of plant spread.

Number of primary branches

Every branch which emerged from the main stem of the plant were counted manually and recorded. The observations were noted down from all the five tagged plants and then the mean number of primary branches were counted.

Number of secondary branches

The branches which were developed from primary branches were manually counted and then the average number of secondary branches were calculated by observing all five tagged plants in the plot.

Flowering parameters

Days to first flowering

Days taken for the first flower opening was recorded from each plot by counting the days from the date of transplanting to the opening of first flower.

Days to 50 per cent flowering

The number of days taken for 50 per cent flowering was recorded from each plot by counting the days from the date of transplanting till the 50 per cent of plants flowered.

Duration of flowering (days)

Number of days taken from the first flowering to the last flowering in a plant was recorded as the total duration of flowering in each plot.

Yield parameters

Number of flowers per plant

The number of flowers per plant was counted from the five tagged plants from each replication till the final harvest and average was calculated.

Flower yield (g/plant)

After recording the number of flowers per plant, all the flowers were weighed separately at every harvest from each plant till the final harvest and the average flower yield per plant was calculated and expressed in grams per plant.

Flower yield (kg/plot)

Flower yield per plot was worked out by totaling the weight of flowers per plot, recorded and expressed in kilograms.

Quality characters

Flower diameter (mm)

Diameter of the flower was measured at the point of maximum breadth at full bloom stage, this was measured by vernier caliper and average diameter was expressed in millimeter.

Shelf life (days)

Fully opened flowers were harvested from each plot and kept in paper plates in laboratory condition. Number of days was counted until the flowers lost their marketable quality.

Individual flower weight (g)

After recording the number of flowers per plant, the weight of individual flower was recorded in grams from the tagged plants and averages were worked out for individual flower weight.

Statistical analysis:

The recorded data were statistically analyzed (ANOVA analysis) using the software OPSTAT, (developed at O.P. Sheoran, Computer Section, CCS HAU, Hisar, India). Sources of variation were fertilizer treatments. Mean comparisons were performed using LSD test to determine whether the difference between the variables were significant at $P < 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Growth parameters

Significant treatment differences were observed for plant height, plant spread, and number of branches due to varying levels of spacing and fertilizer application (Table 1).

At 90 days after transplanting (DAT), except for plant height, plant spread in both directions (E-W and N-S) was highest in S3 (45 × 45 cm spacing) at 32.95 cm and 29.68 cm, respectively, which was significantly greater than S2 (28.20 cm and 26.44 cm) and S1 (18.13 cm and 18.02 cm). Similarly, the number of primary and secondary branches was highest in S3 (14.03 and 29.79), significantly exceeding S2 (12.37 and 23.87). Plant height was highest in S1 at 40.71 cm (Table 1).

Regarding fertilizer doses, at 90 days after transplanting (DAT), maximum plant height (39.10 cm), plant spread in both directions (E-W: 32.03 cm, N-S: 30.01 cm), and number of primary and secondary branches (13.67 and 29.07) were recorded with F1, while the minimum values were observed with F3.

In terms of interactions, the combination of wider spacing with higher fertilizer dose (S3F1) showed plant spread in both directions (E-W: 34.93 cm, N-S: 31.74 cm) and a higher number of primary (14.80) and secondary branches (31.10).

Among the treatment combinations, maximum plant height (18.52 cm, 32.85 cm, and 43.82 cm) was recorded in S1F1 (30 × 30 cm + 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) at 30, 60, and 90 DAT, respectively. The minimum plant height (13.60 cm, 20.19 cm, and 30.29 cm) was observed in S3F3 (45 × 45 cm + 50% RDF) at all stages.

The increase in plant height at closer spacing may be attributed to intense competition among plants for light, which encourages the elongation of the main stem. Additionally, crowded conditions can lead plants to grow vertically due to the shading effects cast by neighboring plants. Nain et al. (2017) also reported maximum plant height at a closer spacing of 30 × 30 cm in marigold. These findings align with the results of Chauhan et al. (2014), Meena et al. (2015) in African marigold, and Sonara et al. (2023) in marigold.

Regarding branches per plant and plant spread, the treatment combination S3F1 (45 × 45 cm, 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) produced the highest values (26.10 and 29.85 cm), on par with S3F2 (45 × 30 cm, 168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha). The minimum values (21.31 and 24.95 cm) were observed in the S1F3 (30 × 30 cm, 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha) combination (Table 2). This suggests that a closer spacing of 30 × 30 cm combined with enhanced nutrition resulted in the tallest French marigold plants. Conversely, a wider spacing of 45 × 45 cm with higher nutrition positively impacted all other growth parameters except for plant height.

Yield parameters


Table 3 presents the data on flower yield, highlighting the effects of spacing, fertilizer, and their interactions. Spacing significantly influenced the number of flowers per plant. The maximum number of flowers per plant (129.63) was recorded with 45 × 45 cm spacing (S3), followed by 118.72 with S2 (45 × 30 cm) spacing, and the minimum (109.87) with S1 (30 × 30

cm) spacing. Among the fertilizer treatments, the highest number of flowers per plant (142.08) was recorded with F1 (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha), followed by 116.43 with F2 (168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha), and the lowest (99.70) with F3 (112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha). In terms of interactions, the maximum number of flowers per plant (164.10) was recorded with the S3F1 (45 × 45 cm, 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) combination, while the minimum (93.60) was observed with the S1F3 (30 × 30 cm, 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha) combination.

Similarly, the maximum flower yield per plant (300.70 g) and per plot (24.68 kg) was recorded with S3 (45 × 45 cm) spacing, which was on par with S2 (45 × 30 cm) at 289.90 g/plant. The minimum flower yield per plant (273.65 g) was recorded with S1 (30 × 30 cm) spacing.

The highest flower yield per plant (316.03 g) and per plot (18.39 kg) was recorded in F1 (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha), followed by F2 (168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha) with 302.63 g/plant, and the lowest yield was in F3 (112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha) with 245.59 g/plant. The treatment combination S3F1 (45 × 45 cm, 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) resulted in the maximum flower yield per plant (323.84 g) and per plot (27.05 kg), followed by S3F2 (45 × 45 cm, 168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha) with 302.63 g/plant and 25.81 kg/plot. The lowest yield was observed in the S1F3 (30 × 30 cm, 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha) treatment combination.

Flower production in French marigold was significantly influenced by increasing spacing levels (Fig. 1). The number of flowers increased gradually as spacing increased from 30 × 30 cm to 45 × 45 cm, and a similar trend was observed for flower yield (g/plant). The maximum yield per plant at wider spacing might be due to the higher number of branches per plant, which leads to a greater number of flowers and increased flower yield per plant. Divyashree et al. (2016) also reported higher yield and a maximum number of flowers at wider spacing (60 × 60 cm) in gaillardia. Similar results were found by Hugar (1997) in gaillardia, Sharma et al. (2009) in marigold, Dorajeerao et al. (2012b) in annual chrysanthemum, Kour et al. (2012) in marigold, and Duggani et al. (2023) in gomphrena.



S1 = 30 × 30 cm

S2 = 45 × 30 cm

S3 = 45 × 45 cm

F1 = 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha

F2 = 168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha

F3 = 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha

Fig. 1: Yield parameters as influenced by different levels of spacing and fertilizers in French marigold

Quality parameters

The maximum individual flower weight was recorded at 1.06 g with S3 spacing (45 × 45 cm), followed by 1.00 g with S2 spacing (45 × 30 cm), while the minimum individual flower weight of 0.94 g was observed with S1 spacing (30 × 30 cm) (Table 4). Among the NPK levels, the highest individual flower weight was 1.09 g in F1 (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha), followed by 0.99 g in F2 (168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha), and the lowest was 0.91 g in F3 (112.5:30:35 kg NPK/ha).

Among the different spacing treatments, 45 × 45 cm (S3) produced flowers with the highest diameter (4.35 cm), followed by S2 (45 × 30 cm) with 4.09 cm, while the smallest flower diameter (3.86 cm) was observed in S1 (30 × 30 cm). Varied NPK levels also had a significant influence on flower diameter. The maximum diameter (4.27 cm) was recorded in F1 (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha), followed by 4.13 cm in F2 (168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha), and the minimum (3.90 cm) in F3 (112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha). The largest flower diameter (4.52 cm) was observed in the treatment combination S3F1 (45 × 45 cm, 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha). However, this was statistically similar (4.34 cm) to the S3F2 combination (45 × 45 cm, 168.75:45:45 kg NPK/ha), while the smallest diameter (3.61 cm) was recorded in the S1F3 combination (30 × 30 cm, 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha).

The maximum shelf life of the flowers (3.58 days) was observed with S3 spacing (45 × 45 cm), followed by S2 spacing (45 × 30 cm) with 3.33 days, and the minimum shelf life (2.63 days) was recorded with S1 spacing (30 × 30 cm). Similarly, the longest shelf life (3.53 days) was noted at the highest level of NPK (F1: 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha), followed by F2 (168.75:45:74 kg NPK/ha) with 3.25 days, and the shortest shelf life (2.77 days) was recorded with F3 (112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha). The treatment combination S3F4 (45 × 45 cm, 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) resulted in the maximum shelf life (3.95 days) of the flowers, followed by S3F2 (45 × 45 cm, 187.5:100:75 kg NPK/ha) with 3.75 days, and the shortest shelf life (2.77 days) was observed in the S1F3 (30 × 30 cm, 112.5:30:30 kg NPK/ha) combination.

Spacing plays a crucial role in producing quality flowers by ensuring adequate aeration and light during the flowering period. Dugganiet *al.* (2023) also found that all quality traits were highest with a wider spacing of 60 cm x 30 cm in gomphrena. This is primarily due to better nutrient availability and reduced competition between plants, resulting in larger and heavier flowers. The application of NPK may have enhanced photosynthesis by increasing the source size (number of branches and leaf size), thus providing more photosynthates to developing

flowers and leading to greater cell division and expansion in flower tissues. Similar findings were reported by Hugar (1997) in gaillardia, Chaudhary *et al.* (2008) in annual chrysanthemum, and Munikrishnappa (2011) in China aster.

Available nutrient in soil

A considerable disparity in nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium concentration was observed. S3 (45 × 45 cm) had the greatest accessible nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium levels (185.87, 49.87, and 262.82 kg ha⁻¹, respectively). S1 (30 × 30 cm) had the lowest nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium availability (180.58, 43.97, and 241.97 kg ha⁻¹, respectively).

However, the available soil NPK was found maximum (184.41, 47.15 and 255.79kg ha⁻¹) in treatment F₁ (225:60:60 N, P₂O₅, K₂O kg ha⁻¹). The results are in conformity with the findings of Mohanty *et al.* (2000) in tuberose Samantaray *et al.* (1999) in marigold. Among the interaction effect, S3F₁ (45 cm × 45 cm: 225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) showed maximum available soil NPK.

The current study found that varied amounts of NPK had a substantial effect on nutrient availability in soil, with greater levels of NPK having the highest accessible soil NPK (225:60:60 kg/ha). The soil's increased availability of nitrogen as well as the external application of fertilisers with higher nitrogen and potassium contents and their preferred absorption may be the cause of this. Phosphorus and potassium's synergistic impact may also be the cause of the linear increase in nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium concentration up to F₁. The outcomes agree with those of Hugar and Nalawadi (1999) with gaillardia, Karuppaiah and Krishna (2005) regarding marigold, Airadevi (2012) and Sanaset *al.* (2018) regarding *Chrysanthemum coronarium*.

Conclusion

Based on the study findings, it can be inferred that utilizing a closer spacing of 30 × 30 cm combined with a higher dosage of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) was advantageous for achieving maximum flower yield per hectare. This spacing and nutrient combination likely facilitated optimal plant density and nutrient availability, thereby promoting higher flower production.

Conversely, employing a wider spacing of 45 × 45 cm alongside the same nutrient application (225:60:60 kg NPK/ha) was found to be optimal for promoting robust vegetative growth and ensuring superior quality of flowers. The wider spacing provided ample room for plant expansion and reduced competition for resources among plants, while the enhanced nutrient supply supported vigorous vegetative development and the production of high-quality flowers.

In conclusion, the choice between closer and wider spacing with specific nutrient levels should be guided by the desired outcome: closer spacing for maximizing flower yield per hectare and wider spacing for promoting strong vegetative growth and superior flower quality.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

References

1. Airadevi. Integrated nutrient management studies in annual chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum coronarium* L.) *Bioinfolet*. 2012: 9:430-434.

2. Anonymous, 2018, SamagraTotagarikaKaipidi (in kannada). *Uni. Hort. Sci.*, Bagalkot, Karnataka, India
3. Bansal G. L., Rana M. C. and Upadhyay R. G., 1995, Response of grain amaranth (*Amaranthhypochondriacus*) to plant density. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 65(11): 818- 820.
4. Chaudhary V., Tripathi V. K., Pandey U. N. and Sharma V. K., 2008, Effect of spacing and nitrogen levels on growth, flowering and yield of gaillardia. *J. Asian Hort.*, 5(1): 20-25
5. Chauhan, P., Gupta, Y. C., Dhamin, S. R. and Gupta, R. K., 2014, Effect of planting dates and spacing on growth and flowering of African marigold cv. PusaNarangiGainda. *Ann. Hort.*, 7(2): 119-122.
6. Choudhary, M., Beniwal, B. S. & Kumari, A. (2014). Evaluation of marigold genotypes under semi-arid conditions of Haryana. *Annals of Horticulture*. 7(1), 30- 35.
7. Divyashree M. S., Munikrishnappa P. M., Seetharamu G. K., Anilkumar S., Ramegowda G. K. and Basavarj G., 2016, Standardization of spacing and NPK levels for growth, yield and quality of gaillardia (*Gaillardia pulchella*Foug.) under eastren dry zone condition. *M.Sc. (Hort.) Thesis*, Uni. Horti. Sci., Bagalkot, Karnataka, India.
8. Dorajeerao A. V., Mokashi A. N., Patil V. S., Venugopal C. K., Lingaraju S. and Koti R. V., 2012b, Effect of plant spacing on yield and quality of garland chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum coronarium* L.). *Karnataka J. Agri. Sci.*, 25(2): 229-231.
9. Duggani S. M., Shirol A. M., Kulkarni B. S. and Krishnamurthy G. H., 2023, Standardization of spacing and fertilizer for high yield, quality and nutrient status in bachelor's button CV. AGS-5. *Pharm. Innov.*,12(5): 905-909.
10. Hugar A. H. 1997, Influence of spacing, nitrogen and growth regulators on growth, flower yield and seed yield of gaillardia (*Gaillardia pulchella* var. Pitch Fouger). *M.Sc. (Hort.) Thesis*, Uni. Agri. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka, India.
11. Hugar A. H. and Nalawadi U. G., 1999, Studies on influence of spacing and nitrogen levels on growth and yield parameters in gaillardia (*Gaillardia pulchella* var. Pitch Fouger). *Karnataka J. Agri. Sci.*, 129(1-4): 137-141.
12. Jackson M. L., 1973, Soil Chemical Analysis, Pub. prentice hall of Indian Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
13. Karuppaiah P. and Krishna G., 2005, Response of spacings and nitrogen levels on growth, flowering and yield characters of French marigold (*Tagetespatula* L.). *J. Ornam. Hort.*, 8(2): 96-99.
14. Kour R., Sanjay K., Munish S. and Sharma A., 2012, Effect of spacing and pinching on flower production in marigold cv. PusaNarangiGianda in mid hills of Jammu and Kashmir state. *The Asian J. Hort.*, 7(2): 307-309.
15. Meena Y., Sirohi H., Tomar B. and Kumar S., 2015. Effect of planting time, spacing and pinching on growth and seed yield traits in African marigold (*Tageteserecta*) cv. PusaNarangiGainda. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 85(6):797-801.

16. Munikrishnappa P. M., 2011, Standardisation of production technology in China aster *Callistephuschinesis* L. Nees under transitional tract of Northern Karnataka. *Ph.D. (Hort.) Thesis*, Uni. Agri. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka, India.
17. Olsen, Sterling Robertson. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with neutral normal ammonium acetate. US Department of Agriculture, No. 939. 1954.
18. Priyambada S., Alok K., Vinod K., Swadhinta K., Kuldip S., Madhuri G and Sohan S. (2015). Chemistry and biology of industrial crop *Tagetes Species*: areview. *J. Essent. Oil Res.*, 28(1): 1–14.
19. Samantaray D., Mohanty C. R. and Beliera T. K., 1999, Effect of planting time and spacing on growth and flowers yield of marigold (*Tagetes erecta* L.) cv. African Yellow. *Indian J. Hort.*, 56: 382-385.
20. Sanas K., Diltla B. S. and Singh S., 2018, Effect of mulch, N and K application on soil chemical properties under chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum coronarium* L.) cultivation. *Int. J. Chem. Stu.*, 6(3): 3441-3445.
21. Serrato-Cruz M. A., Hernandez-Radriguez M., Savidan Y. and Barcenas Ortega N. M., 2000, DNA content and ploid level in *Tagetes* spp. Using flow upometry. *Agrociencia*, 34: 729-734.
22. Sonara V. M., Nandre B. M., Pawar Y., Wankhade V. R., Patel D. and Kumari K., 2023. Growth and flowering of African marigold (*Tagetes erecta* L.) as influenced by spacing and pinching. *Pharm. Innov.*, 12(12): 2753-2756.
23. Srivastava S. K., Singh H. K. and Srivastava A. K., 2002, Effect of spacing and pinching on growth and flowering of PusaNaringaGainda (*Tagetes erecta* L.). *Indian J. Agri. Sci.*, 72(1): 611-612.
24. Subbiah B. V. and Asija G. L., 1956, A rapid procedure for estimation of available nitrogen in soil, *Curr. Sci.*, 25: 259-260.
25. The Stanford Quad, Stanford University, Book, 1963, 70.

26. Sharma D, Partap M, Warghat AR, Bhargava B. Hydroponic cultivation enhances the morpho-physiological traits and quality flower production in three cultivars (marigold scarlet red, marigold orange, and marigold yellow) of French marigold (*Tagetespatula* L.). *ScientiaHorticulturae*. 2024 Mar 1;327:112803.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1. Effect of spacing and varied levels of NPK on plant height (cm) and plant spread (cm) in French marigold

	Plant Height (cm)				Plant Spread E-W (cm)				Plant Spread N-S (cm)			
	90 DAT				90 DAT				90 DAT			
	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean
S₁	43.82	41.16	37.16	40.71	29.42	27.72	25.68	27.61	28.63	26.64	24.95	26.74
S₂	40.12	38.42	35.50	38.01	31.73	30.35	27.70	29.95	29.67	27.72	26.61	28.00
S₃	33.36	31.67	30.29	31.77	34.93	32.82	31.11	32.95	31.74	29.58	27.73	29.68
Mean	39.10	37.08	34.32		32.03	30.30	28.19		30.01	27.98	26.43	
	S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%	
Spacing (S)	1.05		3.14		0.89		2.69		0.77		2.32	
Fertilizer (F)	1.05		3.14		0.89		2.69		0.77		2.32	
S×F	1.81		5.43		1.55		4.65		1.34		4.02	

DAT-Days after transplanting, NS- Non-significant, F=NPK levels, S=Spacing, Sx F = Spacing x NPK levels

F₁-225 :60:60 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₂-168.75:45:45 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₃-112.5:30:30 kg NPK ha⁻¹

S₁ - 30 X 30 cm

S₂ - 45 X 30 cm

S₃ - 45 X 45

Table 2. Effect of spacing and varied levels of NPK on number of branches in French marigold

	Number of primary branches				Number of secondary branches			
	90 DAT				90 DAT			
	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean
S₁	12.50	11.70	11.20	11.80	26.70	25.30	24.90	25.64
S₂	13.70	12.90	12.10	12.90	29.30	28.00	26.20	27.86
S₃	14.80	13.90	13.40	14.03	31.10	30.06	28.20	29.79
Mean	13.67	12.83	12.23		29.07	27.79	26.43	
	S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%	
Spacing (S)	0.36		1.07		0.68		2.05	
Fertilizer(F)	0.36		1.07		0.68		2.05	
S×F	0.62		NS		1.18		3.54	

DAT-Days after transplanting, NS- Non-significant, F=NPK levels, S=Spacing, SxF = Spacing x NPK levels

F₁-225 :60:60 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₂-168.75:45:45 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₃-112.5:30:30 kg NPK ha⁻¹

S₁ - 30 X 30 cm

S₂ - 45 X 30 cm

S₃ - 45 X 45

Table 3. Effect of spacing and NPK levels on number of flowers/ plant and flower yield per plant (g) in French marigold

Spacing/ Fertilizer	Number of flowers/plant				Yield per plant(g/plant)				Yield per plot(kg/plant)			
	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean
S ₁	123.10	112.90	93.60	109.87	308.10	281.55	231.30	273.65	10.78	9.55	7.87	9.40
S ₂	139.50	116.80	100.30	118.72	315.99	306.78	246.92	289.90	17.35	16.21	13.36	15.64
S ₃	164.10	119.60	105.20	129.63	323.84	319.56	258.54	300.70	27.05	25.81	21.18	24.68
Mean	142.08	116.43	99.70		316.03	302.63	245.59		18.39	17.19	14.14	
	S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%	
Spacing (S)	3.51		10.55		6.44		19.35		0.54		1.63	
Fertilizer(F)	3.51		10.55		6.44		19.35		0.54		1.63	
S×F	6.01		18.06		11.17		33.49		0.93		2.81	

DAT-Days after transplanting, NS- Non-significant, F=NPK levels, S=Spacing, SxF = Spacing x NPK levels

F₁-225 :60:60 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₂-168.75:45:45 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₃-112.5:30:30 kg NPK ha⁻¹

S₁ - 30 X 30 cm

S₂ - 45 X 30 cm

S₃ - 45 X 45 cm

Table 4. Effect of spacing and NPK levels on quality parameters in French marigold

Spacing/ Fertilizer	Individual flowers weight (g)				Flower diameter(cm)				Shelf life(days)			
	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	Mean
S ₁	1.03	0.93	0.85	0.94	4.02	3.95	3.61	3.86	2.85	2.75	2.30	2.63
S ₂	1.09	0.99	0.91	1.00	4.27	4.11	3.89	4.09	3.80	3.25	2.95	3.33
S ₃	1.15	1.05	0.98	1.06	4.52	4.34	4.19	4.35	3.95	3.75	3.05	3.58
Mean	1.09	0.99	0.91		4.27	4.13	3.90		3.53	3.25	2.77	
	S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%		S. Em.±		CD at 5%	
Spacing (S)	0.02		0.08		0.11		0.37		0.08		0.27	
Fertilizer(F)	0.02		0.08		0.11		0.37		0.08		0.27	
S×F	0.04		0.14		0.19		0.58		0.16		0.47	

DAT-Days after transplanting, NS- Non-significant, F=NPK levels, S=Spacing, SxF = Spacing x NPK levels

F₁-225 :60:60 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₂-168.75:45:45 kg NPK ha⁻¹ F₃-112.5:30:30 kg NPK ha⁻¹

S₁ - 30 X 30 cm

S₂ - 45 X 30 cm

S₃ - 45 X 45 cm

UNDER PEER REVIEW