

Efficacy of *Ascophyllum nodosum* seaweed extracts on growth, yield and quality parameters in Thompson Seedless grapes

ABSTRACT:

The experiment was conducted on Thompson Seedless grafted on Dogridge rootstock planted at ICAR- National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune during the year 2021-2022. The experiments were carried out in completely randomized block design. Standard cultural practices were followed during the experimentation. The *A. nodosum* was applied with different concentrations varying from 0.25 kg/ha to 1.25 kg/ha at 4-6 inch cane growth, 8-14 inch cane growth (14 days after 1st spray), 10 days after fruit set, 2 weeks after 3rd spray, 2 weeks after 4th spray and Vernal Stage. The result obtained from this study showed that the chlorophyll content index (44.30 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{m}^2$), leaf area index (1.88 cm^2), bunch weight (216.16 g), berry diameter (14.83 mm), berry length (19.81 mm), yield/ha (16.86 ton), TSS (21.05^o Brix) and Acidity (0.66%) were recorded higher in treatment treated with *A. nodosum* @ 0.75 kg/ha. From this study, it is concluded that foliar application of *A. nodosum* @ 0.75 kg/ha recorded higher chlorophyll content in leaf and chlorophyll content index also helpful for improving and increasing yield and quality parameters in Grapes.

Keyword: *A. nodosum*, Chlorophyll, Growth, quality, yield.

Introduction

Grape (*Vitis vinifera L.*) is a fruit, botanically a berry, of the deciduous woody vines of the flowering plant genus *Vitis* and belongs to the family Vitaceae. Grape is one of the essential commercial fruit crops of temperate to tropical regions (1). India's major grape growing states are Maharashtra, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, and Tamil Nadu. Among the grape-growing states, Karnataka stands second in area after Maharashtra. (2).

Most modern and traditional grape-growing regions are facing challenges due to the unpredictability of weather conditions and warming trends. Innovative and sustainable tools such as seaweed-based bio-stimulants may play a key-role in the development of environment-friendly viticulture strategies to improve yields, biotic/abiotic stress tolerance (3). Seaweeds are used in agriculture to provide nutrients, bio stimulation and soil conditioning. Seaweed extracts contain several substances that promote plant growth, such as auxins, cytokines, betaines and gibberellins, as well as organic substances, such as amino

acids, macronutrients and trace elements, which can improve crop yield and quality(4).The quality of the grape is depend on berry size, colour and pulp content in the berries while, yield is governed by number of bunches per vine and bunch weight (5).

A.nodosumis an exclusive mixture of beneficial bioactive compound (alginic acid, oligosaccharides, betaines, mannitol, fructose containing polymer, other carbohydrates and nutrients) from *A. nodosum* seaweed. It is powered by Acadian BioSwitchtm, an advanced technology which enhances natural processes within the plants by switching on gene expression and active compound production that stimulates plant growth and protects against environmental stresses. Hence the experiment was conducted to study the effect of *A.nodosum* seaweed extract on growth, quality and yield of Thompson Seedless grapes in India.

Material and Methods

The experiment was conducted on Thompson Seedless grafted on Dogridge rootstock planted at ICAR- National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune during the year 2021-2022. The experiments were carried out in randomized block design. Standard cultural practices were followed during the experimentation. The *A. nodosum* was applied at various doses at different growth stages of grape development as per the protocol. Following treatments were applied by spraying using 1000 liter of water per hectare.

Table 1: Treatment details:

| Treatments | Stages of Application | | | | | Version Stage |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| | 4-6 inch cane growth. 1-2 inch bunch | 8-14 inch cane growth (14 days after 1 st spray) | 10 days after fruit set | 2 weeks after 3 rd spray | 2 weeks after 4 th spray | |
| T ₁ | 0.25 kg/ha | 0.25 kg/ha | 0.25 kg/ha | 0.25 kg/ha | 0.25 kg/ha | 0.25 kg/ha |
| T ₂ | 0.50 kg/ha | 0.50 kg/ha | 0.50 kg/ha | 0.50 kg/ha | 0.50 kg/ha | 0.50 kg/ha |
| T ₃ | 0.75 kg/ha | 0.75kg/ha | 0.75kg/ha | 0.75kg/ha | 0.75kg/ha | 0.75 kg/ha |
| T ₄ | 1.00 kg/ha | 1.00kg/ha | 1.00kg/ha | 1.00kg/ha | 1.00kg/ha | 1.00 kg/ha |
| T ₅ | 1.25 kg/ha | 1.25kg/ha | 1.25kg/ha | 1.25kg/ha | 1.25kg/ha | 1.25 kg/ha |
| T ₆ | Control | - | - | - | - | - |

Yield and quality parameters:

The mean bunch weight was derived by averaging the weight of ten bunches randomly from each treatment and was expressed in grams per bunch, while 50 berries were randomly selected from each treatment at harvest and their mean weight was recorded to determine the 50 berry weight in grams and calculated by using weighing balance (Adair Dutt, Mumbai, India). Pedicel thickness was derived by averaging the pedicel randomly from each treatment and measured using verniercaliper (RSK, China) and expressed in millimeter (mm). Berry length, berry diameter and berry skin thickness were derived by averaging the 10 berries randomly from each treatment and measured using verniercaliper (RSK, China) while expressed in millimeter (mm). Berry Skin thickness was measured using micro screw gauze (No. 103-101-10, Mitutoyo, Japan) and expressed in micrometer (mm). Total soluble solids and acidity were derived by the juice of 10 berries randomly from each treatment and measured by using hand refractometer (ERMA INC, Tokyo, Japan) and Acid-base titration method respectively. Total soluble solids (TSS) were expressed in degree brix ($^{\circ}\beta$) and acidity was expressed in percentage (%). Total Chlorophyll content was determined by using DMSO method. Total Chlorophyll content index measured with the help of SPAD instrument. LAI quantifies the amount of leaf material in a canopy. The total Leaf area was measured at 45 days after 1st application. LAI are calculated by using following formula.

$$\text{LAI} = \text{leaf area (cm}^2\text{)} / \text{Ground area (m}^2\text{)}$$

LAI is a measure for the total area of leaves per unit ground area and directly related to the amount of light that can be intercepted by plants. The data was analysed using statistical software SAS (version 9.3).

Grape petioles were sampled by using standard method of IIHR (6). The leaves present on the opposite of the first inflorescence of the cane were chosen for petiole sampling (7). Petiole sampling was done in the morning hours at the rate of 3-4 leaves per plant and only the petioles were retained. Petiole sampling was done during the 45 days after Oct pruning.

Result and discussion:

Effect of *A. nodosum* Chlorophyll contents in leaf of Thompson Seedless Grapes

Effect of *A.nodosum* Chlorophyll content in leaves and Chlorophyll content index (SPAD) was presented in table no. 2 and 3. Result showed that the chlorophyll content was increased due to application of *A. nodosum*. After 1st to 4th spray chlorophyll and Chlorophyll content index (SPAD) value show the increasing pattern but after 4th spray of application, chlorophyll and Chlorophyll content index (SPAD) value decreased. Maximum chlorophyll (mg/g) was found in treatment treated with T₃ (2.79 mg/g) after 7 days of application at 2nd weeks after 3rd spray followed by treatment T₂ (2.49 mg/g). Similar result obtained by (8).

Table 2: Effect of *A. nodosum* after 7 days of application on Chlorophyll content (mg/g) in leaves of Thompson Seedless Grapes

| Treatments | Stages of Application | | | | | Version Stage |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| | 4-6 inch cane growth. 1-2 inch bunch | 8-14 inch cane growth (14 days after 1 st spray) | 10 days after fruit set | 2 weeks after 3 rd spray | 2 weeks after 4 th spray | |
| T ₁ | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 2.37 | 1.45 | 1.42 |
| T ₂ | 1.08 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 2.49 | 1.74 | 1.89 |
| T ₃ | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 2.79 | 2.17 | 2.43 |
| T ₄ | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 2.07 | 1.27 | 1.34 |
| T ₅ | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 2.01 | 1.15 | 1.17 |
| T ₆ | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 1.00 |
| SEm(±) | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.20 | 0.14 |
| C.D.@ 5 % | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.77 | 1.05 | 0.59 | 0.40 |

Effect of *A. nodosum* after 7 days of application on Chlorophyll content index (µmol/m²) in Thompson Seedless Grapes

Effects of *A.nodosum* Chlorophyll content index are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Effect of *A. nodosum* after 7 days of application on Chlorophyll content index (µmol/m²) (SPAD) in Thompson Seedless Grapes

| Treatment | Stages of Application | | | | | Version Stage |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| | 4-6 inch cane growth. 1-2 inch | 8-14 inch cane growth (14 days | 10 days after fruit set | 2 weeks after 3 rd spray | 2 weeks after 4 th spray | |

| | bunch | after 1 st spray) | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| T₁ | 35.40 | 36.00 | 39.62 | 40.90 | 40.80 | 38.51 |
| T₂ | 37.00 | 38.80 | 41.94 | 42.28 | 41.70 | 40.14 |
| T₃ | 38.40 | 40.00 | 42.14 | 44.30 | 43.60 | 41.69 |
| T₄ | 33.60 | 34.80 | 39.30 | 40.70 | 39.80 | 37.64 |
| T₅ | 33.00 | 33.20 | 39.28 | 39.60 | 39.40 | 36.90 |
| T₆ | 32.20 | 28.60 | 32.82 | 38.60 | 38.40 | 34.14 |
| SEm(±) | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.42 | 0.62 | 0.70 | 0.84 |
| C.D.@ 5 % | 3.24 | 2.71 | 4.22 | 1.83 | 2.07 | 2.50 |

The Chlorophyll content index was increased due to the application of *A.nodosum*. The highest Chlorophyll content index was recorded in treatment treated with T₃ (44.30 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{m}^2$) after 7 days of application at 2nd weeks after 3rd spray followed by treatment T₂ (42.28 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{m}^2$). The Chlorophyll content index also enhanced with the application of *A.nodosum* in grapes. Similar results were also reported by (3).

Table 4: Effect of *A.nodosum* after 7 days of application on leaf area index (cm²) in Thompson Seedless Grapes

| Treatment | Stages of Application | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| | 4-6 inch cane growth. 1-2 inch bunch | 8-14 inch cane growth (14 days after 1 st spray) | 10 days after fruitset | 2 weeks after 3 rd spray | 2 weeks after 4 th spray | Version Stage |
| T₁ | 1.01 | 1.35 | 1.23 | 1.58 | 1.41 | 1.35 |
| T₂ | 1.08 | 1.41 | 1.30 | 1.60 | 1.42 | 1.38 |
| T₃ | 1.40 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.88 | 1.69 | 1.69 |
| T₄ | 0.98 | 1.34 | 1.20 | 1.42 | 1.35 | 1.33 |
| T₅ | 0.94 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.34 | 0.99 | 0.92 |
| T₆ | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 0.90 |
| SEm(±) | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.09 | 0.06 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| C.D.@ 5 % | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.23 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.18 |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

The data presented in Table 4, showed that the leaf area index was increased due to the application of *A. nodosum*. The highest leaf area index was recorded in treatment T₃ (1.88 cm²) followed by treatment T₂ (1.60 cm²) after 7 days of application at 2 weeks after 3rd spray. Similar results were reported by (9), they reported that the maximum leaf area reported by using *A. nodosum* in grapes and also reported by (10) in Thompson Seedless grapes. (8), they reported that the *A. nodosum* (4 g/l) treatment resulted in significantly the largest leaf area (169.24 cm² and 173.97 cm²) in Flame Seedless.

Effect of *A. nodosum* on yield parameters in Thompson Seedless Grapes

The data on yield and quality parameters was depicted in Table 5 & 6. Data presented in table showed that, the application of *A. nodosum* increases berry length, berry diameter, average bunch weight, 50 berries weight, TSS, acidity and yield/vine. The data showed that the application of Acadian Gold star significantly increases the yield and quality parameters. Among the treatments, treatment T₃ (*A. nodosum* @ 0.75 Kg/ha) recorded significantly highest bunch weight (216.16 g) and yield/ha (16.48 t/ha) compared to rest of the treatment. The application of *A. nodosum* increases berry weight, Berry size and yield of grapes. Similar results was recorded by (11) and bunch weight by (12). The maximum berry length (19.80 mm) and berry diameter (14.80 mm) were recorded with the application of Acadian gold star @ 0.75 Kg/ha (T₃).

The maximum yield /ha reported in treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum* @ 0.75 Kg/ha) (16.86 t/ha) followed by treatment T₂ (16.69 t/ha). The foliar application of *A. nodosum* increases the yield, similar result reported by (13) in Hamlin, Washington Navel, Pineapple orange and Ruby Red grape fruit. (14) reported same result on grapevines of the cv. Black Magic. (15) Investigated that the foliar application of Acadian seaweed increased yield in Thompson Seedless grapes. Similar result were reported by (16) and (17) in tomato.

| Treatment | Bunch weight (g) | 50 berry weight (g) | Berry length (mm) | Berry diameter (mm) | Yield/ha (t/ha) | Benefit Cost ratio |
|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| T₁ | 193.90 | 112.66 | 18.30 | 13.10 | 15.12 | 1:1.51 |
| T₂ | 213.94 | 120.60 | 19.00 | 14.60 | 16.69 | 1:1.67 |
| T₃ | 216.16 | 125.78 | 19.80 | 14.80 | 16.86 | 1:1.69 |
| T₄ | 194.82 | 114.50 | 18.30 | 13.60 | 15.20 | 1:1.52 |
| T₅ | 192.56 | 106.76 | 18.70 | 13.80 | 15.02 | 1:1.50 |
| T₆ | 174.86 | 95.72 | 17.80 | 13.10 | 13.64 | 1:1.36 |
| SEm(±) | 4.77 | 1.25 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.37 | - |
| C.D.@ 5 % | 14.16 | 3.70 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 1.10 | - |

Table 5: Effect of *A. nodosum* on yield parameters of Thompson Seedless Grapes

The quality parameters such as T.S.S. and acidity are greatly influenced by the application of *A. nodosum* and presented in Table 6. Among the quality parameters the highest total Soluble Solid (21.05°B) was recorded in treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/Ha). Yield per hectare (16.86 Ton) and Benefit Cost Ratio (1.69) were recorded higher in treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/ha). Other quality parameters like Pedicel thickness (0.66 mm) was recorded maximum in treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75kg/ha). Among the treatments, the treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75kg/Ha) was found to be highly significant for most of the characters i.e. total bunch weight, 50 berry weights, berry length and berry diameter whereas treatment T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75kg/Ha) showed significant values for the parameters like pedicel thickness, skin thickness and TSS. From the observations it was observed that the treatment (T₃) *A. nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/ha was effective for enhancement of length and diameter of grapes berry. Similar result found by (11). The different doses of *A. nodosum* have showed effects on yield and quality parameters in grapes. Similar result obtained by (12). The TSS acidity ratio were reported higher in treatment treated with T₃ (*A. nodosum*@ 0.75 kg/Ha) i.e. 31.86. The application of sea weed extract (*A. nodosum*) increases TSS acidity ratio. Similar result were reported in Thompson Seedless by (8), (18) (19).

Table 6: Effect of *A. nodosum* on quality parameters of Thompson Seedless Grapes

| Treatment | TSS (°Brix) | Acidity (%) | TSS/Acidity ratio | Skin thickness (mm) | Pedicel thickness (mm) |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| T₁ | 19.36 | 0.74 | 26.37 | 0.30 | 0.17 |
| T₂ | 20.57 | 0.69 | 29.87 | 0.30 | 0.13 |
| T₃ | 21.05 | 0.66 | 31.86 | 0.26 | 0.16 |
| T₄ | 20.68 | 0.67 | 30.94 | 0.32 | 0.14 |
| T₅ | 19.56 | 0.72 | 27.33 | 0.28 | 0.12 |
| T₆ | 18.65 | 0.77 | 24.40 | 0.33 | 0.16 |
| SEm(±) | 0.34 | 0.02 | 0.95 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| C.D.@ 5 % | 1.02 | 0.07 | 2.81 | 0.04 | 0.03 |

Correlation between different parameters of Thompson Seedless grapes.

The correlations between different parameters are studied present in Table No.7. The positive and negative correlations between different yields and quality parameters are found due to use of different concentration of *A.nodosum*.

The bunch weight are positively correlated with yield per ha. The berry length and berry diameter showed very strong positive relationship with each other. The Acidity was negatively correlated with bunch weight, 50 berry weight, berry length, berry diameter and yield. Berry length, berry diameter and berry weight found positive relation with each other. Similar result reported by (20).

Table 7: Correlation between different parameters of Thompson Seedless grapes.

| | Bunch weight (g) | 50 berry weight (g) | Berry length (mm) | Berry diameter (mm) | Yield/ha (t/ha) | TSS (⁰Brix) | Acidity (%) | TSS/ Acidity ratio |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Bunch weight (g) | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 50 berry weight (g) | 0.965 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Berry length (mm) | 0.909 | 0.852 | 1 | | | | | |
| Berry diameter (mm) | 0.907 | 0.803 | 0.924 | 1 | | | | |
| Yield/ha (t/ha) | 1.000 | 0.965 | 0.908 | 0.908 | 1 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| TSS (°Brix) | 0.874 | 0.916 | 0.780 | 0.818 | 0.875 | 1 | | |
| Acidity (%) | -0.817 | -0.870 | -0.753 | -0.777 | -0.817 | -0.990 | 1 | |
| TSS/Acidity ratio | 0.834 | 0.887 | 0.762 | 0.791 | 0.835 | 0.996 | -0.998 | 1 |

Nutrient contents in Petioles of Thompson Seedless Grapes

The recorded on nutrient status in leaf petioles presented in Table no 8. Plant petioles (50–60) at 5th Node position were collected during fruit bud differentiation stage after October pruning following the procedure described by (21). The nitrogen content in grape petioles reported higher (1.83 %) in treatment treated with T₃ (*A.nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/ha) followed by T₂ (1.77%). Similar result reported by (22). They reported that the highest petiole nitrogen (2.96 and 2.12%) was observed in high yielding vineyards. The phosphorus (0.68 %) and potassium content (3.65%) in grape petioles reported higher in treatment treated with T₃ (*A.nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/ha) followed by treatment T₂. Similarly the calcium (99%), magnesium (0.47 %) and sulphur content (0.21%) in grape petioles reported maximum in treatment treated with T₃ (*A.nodosum*@ 0.75Kg/ha). (23), they reported that the highest nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, magnesium and sulphur content was recorded higher in table purpose white type grape varieties.

Table 8: Nutrient contents in Petioles of Thompson Seedless Grapes at 45 DAP.

| Treatment | N % | P % | K % | Ca % | Mg % | S % | Fe ppm | Mn ppm | Cu ppm | Boron ppm | Mo % | Na % |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T₁ | 1.53 | 0.23 | 2.51 | 0.58 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 98 | 111 | 61 | 82.01 | 0.58 | 0.2 |
| T₂ | 1.77 | 0.55 | 3.22 | 0.83 | 0.36 | 0.18 | 101 | 65 | 38 | 50.65 | 0.39 | 0.25 |
| T₃ | 1.83 | 0.68 | 3.65 | 0.99 | 0.47 | 0.21 | 126 | 48 | 29 | 43.42 | 0.56 | 0.41 |
| T₄ | 1.65 | 0.67 | 2.48 | 0.75 | 0.34 | 0.14 | 54 | 68 | 37 | 48.24 | 0.44 | 0.26 |
| T₅ | 1.53 | 0.52 | 2.85 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 87 | 77 | 40 | 47.44 | 0.49 | 0.28 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|----|----|-------|------|-----|
| T ₆ | 1.48 | 0.51 | 3.12 | 0.78 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 56 | 43 | 79 | 53.81 | 0.48 | 0.3 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|----|----|-------|------|-----|

Conclusion:

The present study illustrated that the all treatments of *A.nodosum* increases chlorophyll content index in leaf, yield and quality parameters as compared to untreated control. The application of *A.nodosum*@ 0.50kg/ha and 0.75 kg/ha found to increases the chlorophyll content in leaf. The Berry length, diameter, yield per vine, yield per acre, yield per ha and TSS (Brix) was recorded higher intreatment treated with *A. nodosum*@ 0.75kg/ha. Hence, it can concluded from this study, that the application of *A.nodosum*) @ 0.75 kg/ha is better for yield and quality parameters.

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. NO

2. NO

3. NO

References:

1. Gowda, V.N., Keshava, S.A., Shyamamma, S., (2008). Growth, yield and quality of Bangalore Blue grapes as influenced by foliar applied polyfeed and multi-K. Proceed. Int. Sympos. Grape Product. Process.,Acta Hort. (785), 207-211.

2. Ramteke, S. D., Bhagwat, S. R., Gavali, A. H., Langote, A., Khalate, S. M., & Kalbhor, J. N. (2021). Pre-harvest Application of Ethrel and Potassium Schoenite on Yield, Quality, Biochemical Changes, and Shelf-life in Crimson Seedless Grapes. *International Journal of Agriculture Environment and Biotechnology*, (14). (4)-489-494.
3. Ali Sabir, Kevser Yazar, Ferhan Sabir, Zeki Kara, M. Atilla Yazici, Nihal Goksu (2014). Vine growth, yield, berry quality attributes and leaf nutrient content of grapevines as influenced by seaweed extract (*A. nodosum*) and nano size fertilizer pulverizations. *Scientia Horticulturae* (175) 1–8.
4. Khan M, Hafeez-ur-Rahman A, Ahmed M, Abbas G, Ahmed N. (2009). Effect of Gibberellic acid on growth and fruit yield of grape cultivar 'Flame Seedless'. *International Journal of Biology and Biotechnology*, 6 (4):265- 268.
5. Ramteke S. D, Abhijeet Khot and Anil Birhade (2017). Efficacy of Plantozyme on Physiological parameters and yield components in Thompson Seedless Grapes under Pune condition. *The Bioscan* 12(3): 1437-1441.
6. Bhargava B.S. 2001. Annual Report, Maharashtra State Grape Growers Association, Pune.
7. Patel, V.B. and Chadha, K.L., 2002. Effect of sampling time on the petiole nutrient composition in grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Indian J. Hort.* 59 (4): 349-354.
8. Stino R. G, M. A. Ali, M. A. Abdel-Mohsen, M. A. Maksoud and A.Y.I. Thabet (2017). Quality attributes of Flame seedless grapes as affected by some bio-stimulants. *International Journal of Chem Tech Research* 10 (2): 273-288.
9. Frioni T, Sabbatini P, Tombesi S, Norrie J, Poni S, Gatti M and Palliotti A (2018). Effects of a biostimulant derived from the brown seaweed *A. nodosum* on ripening dynamics and fruit quality of grapevines. *Sci. Hortic.* 232: 97-106.
10. Sharma A K, R .G Somkuwar, A. K Upadhyay, A P Kale, R. M Palghadmal and J Shaikh (2023). Effect of bio-stimulant application on growth, yield and quality of Thompson Seedless. *Grape insight* 1(1):48-53.
11. Norrie J., J. and P. Keathley (2006). Benefits of *A. nodosum* Marine-Plant Extract Applications to 'Thompson Seedless' Grape Production. Proc. Xth IS on Plant Bioregulators in Fruit Eds. A.D. Webster and H. Ramirez *Acta Hort.* 727.
12. Koke. D, Bal, S celik , C. Ozer and A. Karauz (2010). The influences of different seaweed doses on table quality characteristics of cv. Trakya Ilkeren (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Bulg. J. Agric. Sci.*, 16: 429-435.

13. Koo, R.C.J. and S. Mayo. (1994). Effects of seaweed sprays on citrus fruit production. *Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc.* 107:82–85.
14. Colapietra, M. (1999). Biostimulant fertilizers and irrigation on dessert grapes. *InformatoreAgrarioSupplemento*, 55(50): 23–26.
15. Norrie, J.; Branson, T. and Keathley, P. E. (2002). Marine plant extracts impact on grape yield and quality. *ActaHorticulturae*, (594): 315 – 319.
16. Varinder Sidhu and Dilip Nandwani (2017). Effect of Stimplex on Yield Performance of Tomato in Organic Management System. *Annals of Advanced Agricultural Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1. Pg .11-15.
17. Zodape, S. T., Gupta, Abha., Bhandari, S.C., Rawat, U.S., Chuadhary, D.R., Eswaran, K. and Chikara, J. (2010). Foliar application of seaweed sap as bio-stimulant for enhancement of yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum Mill*). *Journal of Scientific & Industrial Research*. 70: 215-219.
18. Abd El-Ghany, A. A. Marwad, I. A., El-Samir A. and El- Said, B. A. (2001). The effect of two yeast strains or their extraction on vines growth and cluster quality of ‘Thompson Seedless’ grapevines. *Assuit J. Agric. Sci.*, 32: 214–224.
19. Ismaeil, Faten H. M.; Wahdan, M. T. and El-Sheikh, A. F. (2003). Response of ‘Thompson Seedless’ and ‘Roomy red’ grape cultivars to foliar sprays with yeast extract and GA. *J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ.*, 28 (8): 6321–6334.
20. Navjot Gupta, KS Brar, MIS Gill and NK Arora (2015). Studies on Variability, Correlation and Path Analysis of Traits Contributing to Fruit Yield in Grapes. *Indian J. Plant Genet. Resour.* 28(3): 317-320.
21. Patel V. B., K. L. Chadha and J. Kumar. 2003. Micronutrient content in petiole and leaf lamina as affected by applied nitrogen in grape (*Vitis vinifera L.*) cv Perlette. *Ind. J. Hort.* 60 : 214—221.
22. Yogeeshappa H , S. I. Tolanur, A. S. Police Patil, Y. M. Ramesha, B.N. Manjunatha and Siddaram (2010). Nutrient Composition of Petioles of Grapes (Cv Thompson Seedless) Under Low and High Yielding Vineyards in Bijapur. *Environment & Ecology* 28 (3A): 1810—1814.
23. Anita E. Kondi, Shankar Meti, B.V. Champa and M.S. Nagaraja (2018). Comparison of Petiole Nutrient Contents of Different Table and Wine Grape Varieties. *Int.J. Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci* 7(1): 447-453.

UNDER PEER REVIEW