

STUDIES ON THE INTERACTION EFFECT OF PRUNING METHODS AND TRAINING SYSTEMS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF CUCUMBER (*CUCUMIS SATIVUS* L.) CV. MALINI GROWN UNDER PROTECTED CONDITIONS.

Comment [Ma1]: Please change the title.

ABSTRACT

Comment [Ma2]: Use the proper format for Abstract writing

Aim:To study the interaction effect of pruning methods and training systems on cucumber cv. Malini under protected conditions.

Study Design:The research plot was laid out in Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD).

Place and Duration of study:The experiment was conducted in green house at vegetable block, College of Horticulture, Mojerla. Duration of crops is 3 months.

Methodology:Research was carried out with 12 treatments and 3 replications

Results:Pruning methods and Training systems interaction was assessed for growth and yield characters of Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) Cv. Malini under protected conditions during rabi season. The treatments consists of four levels of pruning i.e., P₁ (Removal of flower buds up to 45cm), P₂ (Removal of flower buds up to 60cm), P₃ (Removal of flower buds up to 75cm), P₄ (No Pruning) and three levels of training systems viz., T₁ (Single head training system), T₂ (Umbrella training system), and T₃ (Low middle training system). Growth and yield characters were studied. Data collected was statistically analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and separation of means for significant effect was done by the use of Least Significant Difference (LSD) at 5% of probability. Among the interaction treatments maximum numbers of fruits per vine (25.33), yield per vine (6.97 kg), yield per hectare (154.90 t/ha), marketable yield (150.10 t/ha) were recorded in P₃T₁ followed by P₂T₁.

Comment [Ma3]: Add growth and yield as well

Comment [Ma4]: Life span

Conclusion:Single head training system with pruning up to 75cm (P₃T₁) was found to be the best treatment and the treatment P₂T₁ was found on par with it.

Keywords: *Cucumber, Pruning methods, Training systems, Marketable Yield.*

Comment [Ma5]: Add greenhouse as well

INTRODUCTION

Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) is one of the most important and popular vegetable crops grown extensively throughout the tropical and subtropical region of the world. It is a thermophilic and frost-susceptible horticultural crop usually cultivated in fields during spring-summer period (Bacci *et al.*, 2006) or in greenhouse in different seasons. Cucumber is a creeping vine, grows on trellises wrapping around supports with thin spiralling tendrils. The plant has large leaves, form a canopy over the fruit. The fruit is roughly cylindrical in shape, elongated with tapered ends and is used as salad, pickle and also as culinary vegetable. The fruits and seeds possess cooling properties and it is mostly referred as super food having no side effect (More TA, 2015).

India has emerged as the origin of the finest country for cucumber cultivation in various aspects. Cucumber is cultivated in an area of 1,04,000 hectare and produces 16,03,000 metric tonnes.

Comment [Ma6]: Mention the source

Production of cucumber under protected conditions emphasizes the need to maintain proper plant density to boost up the production per unit area by utilizing the applied nutrients in available space. Along with the plant density, maintaining the plant population is also one of the key factors for increasing the yields with good quality. For maintaining the plants pruning and training is done to cucumber plants. Moreover, cucumber crop exhibits overcrowding of vines within a short time due to its fast growth habit and this causes problems for performing various cultural operations. This problem can be overcome by following training and pruning which are the important operations to get the higher yield with better quality fruits.

Al - Obeid (2007) studied the effect of growth techniques (pruning method) on production of cucumber grown in greenhouses and stated that single stem method resulted in highest yield. Sanjeev *et al.* (2014) conducted an experiment on response of parthenocarpic cucumber to fertilizers and training systems under naturally ventilated polyhouse in sub tropical condition and reported that single stem training system recorded higher yield under naturally ventilated polyhouse.

Considering the above points an investigation was done to study the interaction effect of pruning and training systems on Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) Cv. Malini under protected conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was carried out in green house at vegetable block, College of Horticulture Mojerla, Sri Konda Laxman Telangana State Horticultural University during the Rabi season of 2016-17. The seeds of the cucumber crop were supplied by Seminis seeds. The experiment was laid out in FRBD with three replications on raised beds of size 21m having dimensions of 100 x 40 x 50 cm (width, height & distance between two beds). The experiment comprises of twelve treatments with four levels of pruning methods and three levels of training systems. As per the study the observations attributing to the growth and yield of the crop was recorded and subjected to statistical analysis were carried out in accordance to Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

METHODOLOGY FOLLOWED FOR THE EXPERIMENT

The plants were arranged on the beds as per the treatments which includes four levels of pruning viz. P₁ (Removal of flower buds up to 45cm), P₂ (Removal of flower buds up to 60cm), P₃ (Removal of flower buds up to 75cm) and P₄ (No Pruning) and three levels of training systems viz. T₁ (Single head training system), T₂ (Umbrella training system) and T₃ (Low middle training system).

Treatment details:

T₁: P₁T₁T₄: P₂T₁ T₇: P₃T₁ T₁₀: P₄T₁
 T₂: P₁T₂ T₅: P₂T₂ T₈: P₃T₂ T₁₁: P₄T₂
 T₃: P₁T₃ T₆: P₂T₃ T₉: P₃T₃ T₁₂: P₄T₃

Table 1. Interaction effect of pruning methods and training systems on vegetative traits of cucumber under protected conditions.

Treatment	Vine length at 30 DAS (cm)	Vine length at 60 DAS (cm)	Vine length at 90 DAS (cm)	Leaf area at 30 DAS (cm ²)	Leaf area at 60 DAS (cm ²)	Leaf area at 90 DAS (cm ²)	Days taken to first flowering	Days taken to 50% flowering
P ₁ T ₁	95.08	204.75	292.92	346.40	484.87	627.09	31.50	36.60

Comment [Ma7]: Explain

Comment [Ma8]: Change it as Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD)

Comment [Ma9]: Replicates

Comment [Ma10]: No need to add this sub topic since you mentioned as 'Materials and Methods' at first place.

Comment [Ma11]: attributes

Comment [Ma12]: What do you mean by 'DAS' here? Please interpret the terms

P ₁ T ₂	92.17	200.14	286.07	350.80	485.97	626.13	31.70	36.70
P ₁ T ₃	92.01	202.01	288.03	345.10	485.80	624.68	31.90	36.70
P ₂ T ₁	97.31	217.97	294.55	352.40	505.77	640.39	30.80	36.10
P ₂ T ₂	103.43	205.09	291.48	347.50	496.72	633.25	30.90	36.20
P ₂ T ₃	99.77	207.11	289.39	345.70	497.61	634.47	31.20	36.30
P ₃ T ₁	108.19	205.86	302.43	349.00	502.54	638.89	31.60	36.30
P ₃ T ₂	98.21	202.88	288.19	344.70	488.11	630.90	31.90	36.40
P ₃ T ₃	97.22	203.55	282.01	344.00	487.15	633.18	31.90	36.50
P ₄ T ₁	89.87	198.21	285.28	339.50	485.88	602.27	32.30	36.40
P ₄ T ₂	87.97	196.64	280.40	342.00	477.81	601.83	32.30	36.60
P ₄ T ₃	88.17	197.50	278.36	340.10	476.28	601.42	32.40	37.10
SEm ±	2.38	0.97	3.30	3.33	4.56	1.10	0.26	0.24
CD at 5 %	NS	S	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS

Table 2. Interaction effect of pruning methods and training systems on fruit and yield attributes of cucumber under protected conditions.

Treatment	Days taken to first harvest	Number of fruits per vine	Fruit length (cm)	Fruit diameter (cm)	Fruit weight (g)	Fruit yield per vine (Kg)	Fruit yield per plot (Kg)	Fruit yield per hectare (t/ha)	Marketable yield (t/ha)	Deformed fruits (%)
P ₁ T ₁	46.60	20.66	21.36	5.70	270.00	5.60	61.30	123.80	118.50	4.35
P ₁ T ₂	47.34	19.66	20.30	5.37	248.48	4.87	52.35	118.43	112.93	4.65
P ₁ T ₃	47.02	20.00	19.97	5.47	303.59	6.00	66.10	133.52	127.76	4.34
P ₂ T ₁	46.40	24.66	21.33	5.60	265.43	6.50	71.40	144.22	140.87	2.31
P ₂ T ₂	46.70	23.66	20.43	5.77	272.82	6.35	69.86	141.13	136.10	3.60
P ₂ T ₃	46.90	23.00	20.79	5.47	279.36	6.30	69.16	139.70	134.50	3.72
P ₃ T ₁	47.67	25.33	20.70	5.67	283.27	6.97	76.68	154.90	150.10	3.11
P ₃ T ₂	47.35	20.33	20.11	5.47	244.24	4.90	54.30	109.64	104.70	4.53
P ₃ T ₃	47.23	21.00	21.06	5.60	258.78	5.40	59.50	120.22	115.29	4.26
P ₄ T ₁	48.63	21.66	19.57	5.05	226.76	4.92	54.15	109.40	102.63	6.27
P ₄ T ₂	48.97	19.33	18.50	4.65	252.84	4.84	53.60	108.26	101.33	6.61
P ₄ T ₃	48.90	22.66	19.03	4.90	218.62	4.90	53.94	108.98	101.83	6.64
SEm ±	0.30	1.26	0.55	0.18	18.57	0.34	3.91	7.90	7.32	0.45
CD at 5 %	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	S	NS

RESULTS

The data of vegetative, flowering and fruiting traits were statistically analyzed to test their significance and results of these data have been presented in Table 1 and 2.

Comment [Ma13]: The data related to the growth of vine, leaf, flowering and fruiting

VEGETATIVE AND FRUIT PARAMETERS

The plant height at all intervals of growth period is significantly higher in P₂ (291.80 cm). Whereas in case of training systems, T₁ (293.79 cm) recorded highest vine length. The interaction between pruning methods and training systems was observed to be non significant on vine length.

Leaf area determined 90 days after sowing was significantly different in all the treatments of interaction. But the treatment P₂ T₁ recorded highest leaf area (640.39 cm²) and it was on par with P₃T₁ (638.89 cm²).

Among various treatments of pruning P₂ (30.90) took lowest number of days to first flowering. Whereas training and interaction treatments were found to be non significant for the same parameter.

The results related to days taken to 50 % flowering was found non significant in all the treatments of pruning, training and interaction effect.

Meanwhile, the number of days taken to first harvest and number of fruits per vine were significantly different among pruning and training systems P₂ (23.77), T₁(23.08) recorded the maximum values for the parameter number of fruits per vine. While, interaction effect was found non-significant for both the parameters.

Pruning treatments were found significant for the parameters fruit length, fruit diameter and fruit weight. Maximum data recorded is from P₂ treatment (20.85cm), (5.61cm), and (274.02g) respectively. For the same parameters the training treatments and interaction effect were found non-significant.

YIELD PARAMETERS

Various levels of pruning, training systems and interaction effect were found significant for all the yield parameters.

Maximum yield per vine, per plot, per hectare and marketable fruits was recorded in P₂ (6.40 kg), (70.14 kg), (141.68 t) and (137.15 t) respectively and it was on par with P₃ (5.80 kg), (63.10 kg) and (128.26 t). For training systems, the treatment T₁ recorded maximum yield per vine (5.98 kg), yield per plot (65.80 kg), yield per hectare (133.08 t) and marketable fruits (128.02 t).

Among treatments of interaction effect P₃T₁ recorded maximum yield per vine (6.97 kg), per plot (76.68 kg), per hectare (154.90 t) and marketable yield (150.10 t) and it was on par with the treatment P₂T₁.

Deformed fruits parameter was found non-significant for all the treatments of pruning, training and interaction effect.

DISCUSSION

The longest vine length was reported in P₃T₁ might be due to the pruning and training treatments which lead to the diversion of nutrients to the main shoot, resulted in the exposure of pruned plant to light conditions which rather improved the photosynthetic activities of the plant. These results were in accordance with that of Suthar *et al.* (2007) in cucumber.

Maximum leaf area was recorded in P₂T₁ might be due to better interception of sunlight into the canopy structure which resulted in wider leaf area. Similar results were reported by Hao *et al.* (2010) in cucumber.

The days to first flowering and 50 % flowering though found to be non-significant, P₂T₁ recorded lowest number of days. This may be due to the highest vine length and maximum leaf area. The results are in accordance with the findings of Suthar *et al.* (2007) and Kumar *et al.* (2014).

Comment [Ma15]: Please include this in references

Fruit length, fruit diameter and fruit weight might be affected by dry matter partitioning, because of these pruning and training systems drastic changes are seen canopy architecture in umbrella and low middle training systems at a relatively younger stage appeared to be unfavourable for dry matter partitioning to fruits sink. Similar results were reported by Sanjeev *et al.* (2014) and Premalatha *et al.* (2006) in cucumber.

Among the yield parameters P₃T₁ recorded minimum days for first harvest and highest number of fruits per vine this was due to the wider leaf area which lead to enhanced photosynthetic activities resulted in a greater number of fruits per vine. Similar results were reported by Sanjeev *et al.* (2014).

Among the yield parameters P_3T_1 recorded the maximum values for all the parameters this might be due to longest vine length, maximum leaf area, a greater number of fruits per vine, per plot comparing to other treatments. These results are in conformity with the findings of Suthar and Ram (2006), Sanjeevet *et al.* (2014), Al- Habri *et al.* (1996) and Vikramet *et al.* (2017) who reported that the yield of the plant increases as we increase the height of pruning operation we perform.

Comment [Ma16]: parameters. This might be.....

Comment [Ma17]: remove

The same treatment of interaction P_3T_1 recorded maximum yield of marketable fruits and minimum percentage of deformed fruits because the fruits were subjected to open conditions which resulted in less incidence of pest and diseases and favoured the production of higher marketable yield when compared to other methods. The present results were inconsistent with the reports of Suthar *et al.* (2007) and Al- Habri *et al.* (1996) in cucumber.

CONCLUSION

One of the key considerations for a successful intensive crop production is to maximize outputs while minimizing inputs. The farmers can control the loss caused by fast growth following proper pruning and training operations on the crop. Overcrowding of fruits on plant and fast growing nature of plant are the two problems seen in the farmer fields and this can be overcome by pruning up to 60cm and single head training system was found better for getting higher yields. While in case of interaction effect, single head training system with pruning up to 75cm (P_3T_1) was found to be the best treatment and the treatment P_2T_1 was found on par with it. Owing to the results, we can clearly recommend pruning and training to the farmers for getting higher and quality yield. Pruning of side vines and flowers up to 60cm or 75cm with single head training system is to be implemented by our farmers for better yields.

Comment [Ma18]: According to the results, Pruning of side vines and flowers up to 60cm or 75cm with single head training system promotes higher and better quality yields.

REFERENCES

- Al-Harbi, A.R., Alsadon, A.A. and Khalil S.O. 1996. Influence of training system and growing media on growth and yield of cucumber cultivars. *Alexandra Journal of Agricultural Research*.41: 355-365.
- Al-Obeid, S. 2007. Effect of growth techniques (pruning method) on the production of cucumber grown in greenhouses. *Arab University Journal of agriculture science*. 15(1): 19-27.
- Bacci, L., Picanco, M.C., Gonring, A.H.R., Guedes, R.N.C. and Crespo, A.L.B. 2006. Critical yield components and key loss factors of tropical cucumber crops. *Crop Protection*. 25(10): 1117 – 1125.
- Hao, X., Wen, G., Papadopoulos, A.P. and Khosla, S. 2010. A twin-head "V" High -wire greenhouse Cucumber production system for reducing crop start-up costs. *Hort Technology*.20(6): 963-970.
- More, T.A. 2015. Cucurbitaceous Vegetables (Cucumber). *Textbook of Vegetables, Tuber and Spice crops*. 254-261.
- Panase, V.G and Sukhatme, P.V. 1985. *Statistical methods for agricultural workers*. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, India.
- Premalatha, M.G.S., Wahundeniya, K.B., Weerakkody, W.A.P. and Wicramathunga, C.K. 2006. Plant training and spatial arrangement for yield improvements in greenhouse Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) varieties. *Tropical Agricultural Research*.18: 346-357.
- Sanjeev Kumar, Patel, N.B. and Saravaiya, S.N. 2014. Response of parthenocarpic cucumber to fertilizers and training systems under naturally ventilated polyhouse in sub tropical conditions. *International Journal of Current Research*. 6(8): 8051 – 8057.
- Suthar and Ram, M. 2006. Effect of pruning and ethrel application on vegetative growth and fruit yield of Cucumber under greenhouse condition. *Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences*.35: 92-95.
- Suthar, M.R., Arora, S.K., Bhatia, A.K., Singh, V.P. and Malik, T.P. 2007. Effect of pruning and ethrel application on flowering behavior of Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus*. L) under polyhouse conditions. *Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences*.36: 135-138.
- Vikram, K.K., Ameta, K.D., Suresh kumar, T., Akshay,C., Suman, G. and Satveer yadav. 2017. Effect of spacing and training on growth and yield of polyhouse grown Cucumber (*Cucumis Sativus* L.). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 6(8): 299 – 304.

Comment [Ma19]: Keep some space between two references. Because it will be more clear on that way. Or else you can use bullet format as well.

eg:

•Al-Harbi, A.R., Alsadon, A.A. and Khalil S.O. 1996. Influence of training system and growing media on growth and yield of cucumber cultivars. *Alexandra Journal of Agricultural Research*.41: 355-365.

•Al-Obeid, S. 2007. Effect of growth techniques (pruning method) on the production of cucumber grown in greenhouses. *Arab University Journal of agriculture science*. 15(1): 19-27.