



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
www.phytojournal.com
JPP 2020; 9(3): 503-507
Received: 10-03-2020
Accepted: 14-04-2020

PD Hendre

Subject Matter Specialist
Horticulture, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra, Bahhaleshwar,
Ahmednagar, India

SA Ranpise

Head, Department of
Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri,
Maharashtra, India

PS Pawar

Jr. Horticulturist, AICRP on
Fruits, Department of
Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri,
Maharashtra, India

Effect of different irrigation and fertigation levels on fruit quality parameters in sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck) cv. Phule Mosambi

PD Hendre, SA Ranpise and PS Pawar

Abstract

Water and nutrient use efficiency are primary requirements for optimum and sustained citrus productivity. The interactive effect of irrigation and fertigation levels on fruit quality parameters of 10-year-old sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck) cv. Phule Mosambi was studied in factorial randomized block design with nine treatment combinations and control with surface irrigation and band placement of conventional fertilizers. The interaction effects in the treatment T₁ (I₁F₁) i.e. irrigation level I₁-100% etc. through drip along with fertigation level F₁-100% RD through WSF recorded significantly the maximum juice, optimum TSS, higher ascorbic acid, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugars, total sugars and A grade fruit yield. There was also a significant influence of T₁ (I₁F₁) on per cent A grade fruit yield.

Keywords: Fertigation, irrigation studies, sweet orange, quality parameters

Introduction

The citrus is a leading fruit crop of World. The sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck) is one of the most important fruit crop amongst the citrus group in India and particularly in Maharashtra state. In India, the important citrus fruits grown are mandarins, sweet oranges and acid lime sharing 40.60 per cent, 26.00 per cent and 25.10 per cent, respectively of total citrus fruit production in country. Andhra Pradesh ranks first in area (82.89 thousand ha) and production (2003.10 thousand MT) whereas, Maharashtra ranks second in area (55.20 thousand ha) and production (684.80 thousand MT) [2].

Sweet orange is a rich source of sugars, acids, polysaccharides and many phytochemicals such as vitamin C and carotenoids which provide health benefits against various diseases including cardiovascular and cancer diseases. Since sweet orange contains natural antioxidants, this citrus fruit clears the body of free radicals, thus increasing pH levels of body making them lead a healthier and energetic life and free of disease.

As a perennial evergreen tree, citrus requires water and nutrients round the year for higher orchard efficiency (Davies and Albrigo) [5]. The shortage of water and nutrients in any stage of the crop reduces the yield and quality of the fruits drastically. Moreover, the substantial loss of nutrients from plant root zone through deep percolation and surface runoff under traditional methods of irrigation and fertilization causes the pollution of water in surface and ground water sources of the region, which is a threat to human life (Hanson *et al.*) [9]. The use of water and nutrients through drip irrigation (DI) in concurrence with plant demand, therefore, could be one of the potential options for sustainable citrus production.

In the present investigation, different irrigation and fertigation regimes were used to study the influence of water and nutrients on fruit quality of sweet orange cv. Phule Mosambi.

Material and Methods

A two-year field trial was conducted during 2017 and 2018 at the research farm of All India Coordinated Research Project on Fruits, Department of Horticulture, MPKV, Rahuri, situated between 19°20' and 19°57' N latitude and 74°02' and 74°19' E longitude with an altitude of 531 above MSL in the scarcity zone of Ahmednagar district in Maharashtra. The pattern of rainfall is erratic and the region comes under semi-arid climate having irrigation facility. The experiment was conducted on 10 years old sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck) cv. Phule Mosambi budded on Rangpur lime rootstock (*Citrus limonia* Osbeck) planted at a distance of 6 x 6 m. The soil of experimental site was medium black with pH of 8.12 and EC of 0.21 dSm⁻¹. *Ambia bahar* crop was taken in sweet orange wherein the water stress was induced in the month of November-December.

Corresponding Author:**PD Hendre**

Subject Matter Specialist
Horticulture, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra, Bahhaleshwar,
Ahmednagar, India

The sweet orange orchard with 60 trees was selected for ten treatments under the study. Each treatment was replicated thrice having two plants in each replication. The experiment was laid out in factorial randomized block design comprising two factors of irrigation and fertigation with each having three levels and a control. In this investigation nine treatments included three irrigation levels (I) *i.e.*, I₁-irrigation at 100% ETc., I₂- irrigation at 80% ETc. and I₃- irrigation at 60% ETc. with three fertigation levels (F) *i.e.*, F₁- 100% of recommended dose (RD) through water soluble fertilizers (WSF), F₂- 80% of RD through WSF and F₃- 60% of RD with WSF through drip irrigation. The treatments combinations tested were T₁ -I₁F₁-Drip irrigation at 100% of ETc with 100% of RD through WSF, T₂ -I₁F₂-Drip irrigation at 100% of ETc with 80% of RD through WSF, T₃ -I₁F₃- drip irrigation at 100% of ETc with 60% of RD through WSF, T₄-I₂F₁- drip irrigation at 80% of ETc with 100% of RD through WSF, T₅- I₂F₂- drip irrigation at 80% of ETc with 80% of RD through WSF, T₆-I₂F₃- drip irrigation at 80% of ETc with 60% of RD through WSF, T₇-I₃F₁- drip irrigation at 60% of ETc with 100% of RD through WSF, T₈-I₃F₂- drip irrigation at 60% of ETc with 80% of RD through WSF, T₉-I₃F₃- drip irrigation at 60% of ETc with 60% of RD through WSF and T₁₀- Control - surface irrigation as per the farmer practice with conventional fertilizers at 100% RDF as band placement. The recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) for sweet orange in the region is 800 g N: 300 g P₂O₅: 600 g K₂O + 20 kg FYM + 15 kg neem cake/plant/year that was used for fertigation with water soluble fertilizers (WSF) in treatments while band placement of conventional fertilizers (BPF) were used for control. The application of fertilizers for band placement was done with urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash while water soluble fertilizer grades like urea, urea phosphate (12:61:0), potassium phosphate (0:52:34) and sulphate of potash (0:0:50) were used for fertigation. The fertigation was done at fortnightly interval with 18 splits for each of the levels *i.e.* 100% (F₁), 80% (F₂) and 60% (F₃) of RD through WSF in four main stages comprising 5 splits of 40% each of N, P₂O₅ and K₂O during January to March in first stage, 5 splits each of 30% N and P₂O₅ and 10% of K₂O during April and May in second stage, 4 splits each of 20% of N and P₂O₅ and K₂O during June and July in third stage and 4 splits each of 10% N and P₂O₅ and 30% K₂O during August and September in fourth stage. All standard package of practices was followed during the experiment *viz.*, weeding, pest and disease management etc. Irrigation duration for delivery of water to different treatments was controlled with the help of control valve at the inlet of each treatment plot. Each plant in the treatment plot was irrigated with double lateral spaced at 90 cm apart each having 6 emitters of 4 L h⁻¹ discharge rate. Irrigation was given on alternate day on the basis of daily crop-evapotranspiration rate (ETc) computed from the reference evapotranspiration (ETr) with the help of Phule Jal mobile application depicting the real time ETr values of the orchard and the crop coefficient (Kc) as suggested by Allen *et al.* [1] and modified by Petillo and Castel [18] from the equation $ETc = ETr \times Kc$. The net irrigation requirement was computed from the formula, $V = [(ETr - R_e) \times Kc \times A \times F] / Eu$

where, V = volume of water applied to each plant per day (mm³); ETr = Reference evapotranspiration at the irrigation level (mm/day); Kc = Crop coefficient (as per crop stage); A = canopy area of tree (m²) and F = wetting factor under canopy *i.e.*, 70% of canopy area; R_e was taken as the effective rainfall (mm/day) for the day and Eu was the taken as 90% emission uniformity.

The juice was expressed as weight of juice out of the total fruit weight in percent and the titratable acidity was estimated by titrating juice with 0.1 N NaOH by using the method as suggested by AOAC [3]. The total soluble solids (TSS) of the sweet orange fruit juice was recorded by using hand refractometer (Erma, Japan) having range of 0-32 °Brix. The ascorbic acid, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugars and total sugars were estimated by the standard method described by Ranganna [20]. The Grade A, B and C fruits in percent were calculated with the help of citrus fruit size category as given by Ladaniya [14] and the total number of fruits in various grades were expressed in percent grade A, B or C out of total fruits.

Results and Discussion

The effect of different irrigation and fertigation levels and their interactions showed a significant increase in juice (%). The data as per Table 1 shows that the irrigation level I₁-100% ETc recorded significantly the maximum juice content (47.54%), lowest TSS (9.57 °B), maximum ascorbic acid (58.26 mg 100 ml⁻¹ of juice) and highest reducing sugars (4.09%), non-reducing sugars (2.64%) and total sugars (6.73%). The fertigation level F₁ with 100% RD through WSF showed maximum juice content (46.48%), lowest TSS (9.64 °B), maximum ascorbic acid (57.81 mg 100 ml⁻¹ of juice), highest reducing sugars (4.00%), non-reducing sugars (2.61%) and total sugars (6.60%) which was observed to be at par with F₂ having fertigation level of 80% of RD through WSF in case of juice and ascorbic acid content. The effect of irrigation and fertigation as individual and that of interaction on titratable acidity was observed to be non-significant.

The interaction effects of different irrigation and fertigation levels on juice content, TSS, ascorbic acid, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugars and total sugars were found to be significant. The treatment T₁ (I₁F₁) having irrigation level I₁-100% ETc through drip along with fertigation level F₁-100% RD through WSF recorded significantly the maximum juice (48.52%) and ascorbic acid content (59.89 mg 100 ml⁻¹ of juice) than rest of the treatment combinations which was found to be statistically at par with T₂ (I₁F₂) having irrigation at 100% of ETc and fertigation level of 80% of RD through WSF, T₄ (I₂F₁) having irrigation at 80% ETc with fertigation level of 100% of RD through WSF and T₅ (I₂F₂) having irrigation at 80% of ETc and fertigation at 80% of RD through WSF. The higher soil water and nutrients availability might be the reason for higher juice and ascorbic acid content in sweet orange. Similar results were obtained by Shirgure *et al.* (2001) [22] and Shirgure *et al.* (2004) [21] in acid lime, Desai *et al.* (2014) [6] in Kinnow mandarin, Panigrahi and Srivastava (2017) [17] in citrus, Kuchanwar *et al.* (2017) [13] in Nagpur mandarin and Goramnagar *et al.* (2017) [8] in acid lime.

Table 1: Effect of irrigation and fertigation levels on fruit quality parameters in sweet orange Pooled Mean

| Treatment | Juice (%) | TSS (°Brix) | Titratable acidity (%) | Ascorbic acid (mg 100 ml ⁻¹ of juice) | Reducing sugars (%) | Non-reducing sugars (%) | Total sugars (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Irrigation Levels (I) | | | | | | | |
| I ₁ | 47.54 | 9.57 | 0.49 | 58.26 | 4.09 | 2.64 | 6.73 |
| I ₂ | 46.44 | 9.78 | 0.45 | 57.82 | 4.05 | 2.41 | 6.46 |
| I ₃ | 42.89 | 10.46 | 0.4 | 53.53 | 3.73 | 1.96 | 5.69 |
| SE (m) + | 0.2 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| CD at 5% | 0.59 | 0.14 | NS | 0.64 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| Fertigation Levels (F) | | | | | | | |
| F ₁ | 46.48 | 9.64 | 0.47 | 57.81 | 4.00 | 2.61 | 6.60 |
| F ₂ | 46.33 | 9.87 | 0.45 | 57.4 | 3.97 | 2.31 | 6.28 |
| F ₃ | 44.06 | 10.31 | 0.41 | 54.4 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 6.00 |
| SE (m) + | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| CD at 5% | 0.59 | 0.14 | NS | 0.64 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| Interaction (I X F) | | | | | | | |
| T ₁ -I ₁ F ₁ | 48.52 | 9.42 | 0.52 | 59.89 | 4.15 | 3.03 | 7.17 |
| T ₂ -I ₁ F ₂ | 48.07 | 9.47 | 0.5 | 59.39 | 4.10 | 2.51 | 6.61 |
| T ₃ -I ₁ F ₃ | 46.05 | 9.83 | 0.45 | 55.5 | 4.04 | 2.38 | 6.41 |
| T ₄ -I ₂ F ₁ | 47.77 | 9.56 | 0.48 | 59.15 | 4.07 | 2.47 | 6.53 |
| T ₅ -I ₂ F ₂ | 47.54 | 9.63 | 0.46 | 58.92 | 4.07 | 2.43 | 6.5 |
| T ₆ -I ₂ F ₃ | 44.01 | 10.14 | 0.42 | 55.4 | 4.02 | 2.35 | 6.36 |
| T ₇ -I ₃ F ₁ | 43.15 | 9.94 | 0.43 | 54.39 | 3.79 | 2.33 | 6.11 |
| T ₈ -I ₃ F ₂ | 43.4 | 10.5 | 0.40 | 53.9 | 3.76 | 1.98 | 5.74 |
| T ₉ -I ₃ F ₃ | 42.11 | 10.96 | 0.38 | 52.31 | 3.65 | 1.58 | 5.23 |
| SE (m) + | 0.34 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.37 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| CD at 5% | 1.02 | 0.25 | NS | 1.10 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| T ₁₀ -Control | 44.84 | 10.30 | 0.41 | 55.34 | 3.82 | 2.16 | 5.98 |

The interaction effect of different irrigation and fertigation levels on TSS was found to be significant. The treatment T₁ (I₁F₁) having irrigation level I₁-100% etc. through drip along with fertigation level F₁-100% RD through WSF recorded the minimum TSS 9.42 °B than rest of the treatment combinations. The treatment T₉ (I₃F₃) having irrigation at 60% ETC with fertigation level of 60% of RDF through WSF recorded significantly the highest TSS 10.96 °B. The increase of water stress under the lower irrigation levels caused a significant increase in TSS. Yakushiji *et al.* (1998) [24] showed that water stress leads to an increase in TSS, which is not as a result of dehydration of the fruit, but rather as a result of the osmo-regulatory response caused by the lack of water. This agrees with Koo and Smajstrla (1984) [12] who elaborated that irrigation and fertigation reduce the total soluble solids. These results are in conformity with Holzapfel *et al.* (2001) [10], Shirgure *et al.* (2003) [23], Ghosh and Pal (2010) [7] in sweet orange, Panigrahi and Srivastava (2011) [16] in Nagpur mandarin, Nagaz *et al.* (2015) [15] in sweet orange and Amina *et al.* (2018) [14] in *Citrus reticulata* Blanco.

The interaction effects between different irrigation and fertigation levels on reducing sugars (%), non-reducing sugars (%) and total sugars (%) were found to be significant. The treatment T₁(I₁F₁) comprising irrigation level I₁-100% ETC through drip along with fertigation level F₁-100% RDF through WSF recorded significantly maximum reducing sugars (4.15%), non-reducing sugars (3.03%) and total sugars (7.17%) as compared to the rest of the treatment combinations. The occurrence of these results might be due to the fact that higher NPK fertilization results in higher sugar accumulation. The results are in conformity with those of Ghosh and Pal [7] in sweet orange cv. Mosambi and Karuna *et al.* (2017) [11] in Kinnow mandarin.

The interaction effect of irrigation and fertigation on per cent A grade yield as tabulated in Table 2 shows that the treatment T₁ i.e. I₁ F₁, drip irrigation at 100% ETC and fertigation with 100% of RD recorded the highest A grade fruit yield (21.35%) in pooled result followed by T₂ i.e. I₁F₂. This result is in agreement with Pratima and Sharma [19] in kiwifruit.

Table 2: A, B and C grade yield (%) of sweet orange during *Ambiabahaar* as influenced by different levels of irrigation and fertigation Pooled Mean

| Treatments | A grade (%) | B grade (%) | C grade (%) |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Irrigation Levels (I) | | | |
| I ₁ | 20.64 | 39.37 | 39.99 |
| I ₂ | 19.84 | 38.12 | 42.04 |
| I ₃ | 17.67 | 30.21 | 52.12 |
| SE (m) + | 0.17 | 0.37 | 2.21 |
| CD at 5% | 0.49 | 1.09 | 6.56 |
| Fertigation Levels (F) | | | |
| F ₁ | 20.17 | 37.66 | 42.17 |
| F ₂ | 19.7 | 36.2 | 44.09 |
| F ₃ | 18.28 | 33.83 | 47.89 |
| SE (m) + | 0.17 | 0.37 | 2.21 |
| CD at 5% | 0.49 | 1.09 | NS |
| Interaction (I X F) | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| T ₁ -I ₁ F ₁ | 21.35 | 40.62 | 38.03 |
| T ₂ -I ₁ F ₂ | 21.23 | 40.15 | 38.62 |
| T ₃ -I ₁ F ₃ | 19.35 | 37.33 | 43.32 |
| T ₄ -I ₂ F ₁ | 20.91 | 39.53 | 39.56 |
| T ₅ -I ₂ F ₂ | 20.42 | 38.89 | 40.69 |
| T ₆ -I ₂ F ₃ | 18.19 | 35.93 | 45.88 |
| T ₇ -I ₃ F ₁ | 18.24 | 32.84 | 48.92 |
| T ₈ -I ₃ F ₂ | 17.47 | 29.56 | 52.97 |
| T ₉ -I ₃ F ₃ | 17.29 | 28.23 | 54.47 |
| SE (m) + | 0.29 | 0.64 | 3.83 |
| CD at 5% | 0.85 | NS | NS |
| T ₁₀ -Control | 17.98 | 31.1 | 50.92 |

Conclusion

The treatment T₁ (I₁F₁) i.e. - irrigation level-100% ETC through drip along with fertigation level-100% RD through WSF was found to be superior with respect to fruit quality parameters as it recorded significantly the maximum juice, optimum TSS, higher ascorbic acid, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugars, total sugars and A grade fruit yield. Therefore, the sweet orange orchard can be irrigated with 100% etc. through drip along with fertigation level-100% RDF through WSF for optimum quality parameters in fruits.

References

- Allen RG, Pariera LS, Raes Smith M. Crop evapotranspiration: Guidelines for computing crop requirement. Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56, FAO, Rome, Italy, 1998.
- Anonymous. Horticulture statistics at a glance 2018, National Horticulture Database, 2018, 175-177.
- AOAC. Official Methods of Analysis (6th Edn.), Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, Washington, D. C, 1995.
- Amina, Tariq Hira, Afzal S, Ashraf Tehseen MB, Nawaz Shaukat. Optimization and determination of doses of phosphorous and potassium for *Citrus reticulata* Blanco under the agro-climatic conditions of Sargodha, Pakistan: Effect on yield and fruit quality of Citrus. *Acta Scientifica Agril.* 2018; 2(6):48-55.
- Davies, Fredrick S, Albrigo L Gene. Citrus. CAB International Wallingford, 1994, 254.
- Desai S, Hasan H, Sonawane A, Rajurkar GB, Singh D. Effect of different levels of drip irrigation and potassium fertilizer on fruit yield and quality of Kinnow (*Citrus reticulata* Blanco) cv. Kinnow. *Intern. Engineering J.* 2014; 23(2):50-56.
- Ghosh SN, Pal PP. Effect of basin versus drip irrigation on quality production in Mosambi sweet orange. *J Hort. Sci.* 2010; 5(1):25-29.
- Goramnagar HB, Sonune BA, Ingle YV, Raut RF. Effect of irrigation and fertigation on quantitative and qualitative traits of acid lime. *J of Pharmacognosy and Phytochem.* 2017; 7(4):3075-3078.
- Hanson Blaine, Simunek R, Jiri Jirka, Hopmans Jan W. Evaluation of urea-ammonium-nitrate fertigation with drip irrigation using numerical modelling. *Agric. Water Manage.* 2006; 86(1-2):102-113.
- Holzappel EA, Lopez C, Jouban JP, Matta R. The effect of water and fertigation on canopy growth and yield on 'Thompson Navel' Oranges. *Chilean J of Agric. Res.* 2001; 61:51-60.
- Karuna K, Mankar, Abhay, Nirgude, Vishal, Patel VB *et al.* Effects of NPK fertigation on physico-chemical attributes and leaf nutrient status of Citrus reticulata Blanco cv. Kinnow. *Chem. Sci. Rev. Lett.* 2017; 6(23):1583-1586.
- Koo KCJ, Smajstrla AG. Effects of trickle irrigation and fertigation on fruit production and juice quality of Valencia Orange. *Proc. of Florida State Hort. Soc.* 1984; 97:8-10.
- Kuchanwar OD, Bhujade NH, Chopde NK, Patil BS. Effect of fertigation on leaf nutrient content and fruit quality of high density plantation of Nagpur mandarin. *J Pharmacog. Phytochem.* 2017; 6(6):1711-1713.
- Ladaniya MS. Growth, maturity, grade standards and physico-mechanical characteristics offruit in citrus. In: Citrus Fruit - Biology, Technology and Evaluation. Academic Press, 2008, 203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374130-1.X5001-3>.
- Nagaz K, Mokh ELF, Ben Hassen N, Masmoudi M, Ben Mechli N, Baba SY *et al.* Impact of deficit irrigation on yield and fruit quality in orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck cv. Meski Maltaise) in Southern Tunisia. 26th Euro-mediterranean Regional Conference and Workshops-Innovate to improve irrigation performances by International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, 12-15 October 2015 Montpellier, France. Workshop theme: Precision irrigation for sustainable crop production, 2015.
- Panigrahi P, Srivastava AK. Integrated use of water and nutrients through drip irrigation in Nagpur mandarin. *J of Agric. Engg.* 2011; 48(3):44-51.
- Panigrahi P, Srivastava AK. Water and nutrient management effects on water use and yield of drip irrigated citrus in vertisol under a sub-humid region. *J Integ. Agric.* 2017; 16:1184-1194.
- Petillo MG, Castel JR. Water balance and crop coefficient estimation of a citrus orchard in Uruguay. *Spanish J Agric. Res.* 2007; 5(2):1-12.
- Pratima P, Sharma N. Vegetative growth, flowering and fruiting characteristics in kiwifruit cultivars as influenced by deficit irrigation. *Intern. J Sci Res.* 2015; 4(1):2479-2483.
- Ranganna S. Hand book of analysis and quality control for fruits and vegetables products. Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd, New Delhi, India, 1986.
- Shirgure PS, Srivastava AK, Singh S, Pimpale AR. Drip irrigation scheduling on growth, yield and quality of acid lime (*Citrus aurantifolia* Swingle). *Indian J Agr. Sci.* 2004; 74(2):92-94.
- Shirgure PS, Shrivastava AK, Shyam Singh. Effect of nitrogen fertigation and band placement fertilizer application on soil-leaf nutrient buildup and incremental growth of acid lime. *J of Soil and Water Cons.* 2001; 45(3&4):42-48.
- Shirgure PS, Shrivastava AK, Shyam Singh. Irrigation scheduling and fertigation in acid lime (*Citrus*

- aurantifolia* Swingle). Indian J of Agril. Sci. 2003; 73(7):36-37.
24. Yakushiji H, Morinaga K, Nonami H. Sugar accumulation and partitioning in Satsuma mandarin tree tissues and fruit in response to drought stress. J American Soc. Hort. Sci. 1998; 123:719-726.