



# Impact of Foliar Micronutrient Application on Yield and Physical Traits of 'Amrapali' Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.)

D. R. Singh <sup>a++</sup> and Mahendra Pratap <sup>a#\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Horticulture, Post Graduate College Ghazipur U.P. 233001, India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56557/pcbmb/2024/v25i11-128846>

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://prh.ikpress.org/review-history/12264>

Original Research Article

Received: 22/05/2024

Accepted: 25/07/2024

Published: 05/09/2024

## ABSTRACT

The present study highlights about impact of Foliar Micronutrient Application on Yield and Physical Traits of 'Amrapali' Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). An experiment was conducted at Main Experiment Station, Department of Horticulture, Post Graduate College Ghazipur (U.P.) during the year 2020-2024. In Randomized Block Design with eight treatments *i.e.* Control (water spray), ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, Borax 0.5%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% and FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% in three replications and considering one plants as a unit. The observations were recorded for yield and physico-chemicals attributes of mango fruit. Maximum number of fruits per shoot, fruit retention per cent, fruit yield (kg/tree), and minimum fruit

<sup>++</sup> Professor & Head;

<sup>#</sup> Research Scholar;

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail: mahendrapratap6593@gmail.com;

**Cite as:** Singh, D. R., and Mahendra Pratap. 2024. "Impact of Foliar Micronutrient Application on Yield and Physical Traits of 'Amrapali' Mango (*Mangifera Indica* L.)". *PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY* 25 (11-12):40-45. <https://doi.org/10.56557/pcbmb/2024/v25i11-128846>.

drop were recorded with the application of FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% followed by ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%. All the phyco-chemical characters were influenced by foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, Borax 0.5%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% in alone. The fruit length, width, fruits weight were recorded maximum with the foliar application of FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% followed by ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%. The application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> at 0.4% topically to increase fruit volume showed a nearly identical pattern. The mango fruit's weight, pulp, and stone ratio were measured.

**Keywords:** *Mangifera indica*; therapeutic properties; amrapali variety; foliar application.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

With 44% of the global mango production, India is the leading mango-producing nation. There are good chances of developing a thriving market for the export of this fruit to other nations, along with its byproducts, such as mango juice in bottles and slices in cans. Mangoes are currently exported to almost 20 nations, while its products are shipped to more than 40 countries. Nevertheless, the current outcome is disappointingly minimal. Mangos have the potential to generate significant foreign cash for India by exporting both raw and processed mangoes. Large tracts of land might be developed and used to expand the production of this desirable fruit in a profitable and beneficial manner. Mangos have special nutritional and therapeutic properties in addition to being high in carbohydrates and vitamins A and C. 73.0–86.7% moisture, 11.6-24.3% carbs, 0.3–1.0% protein, 0.1–0.8% fat, 0.3–0.7% mineral, 650–25900 µg vitamin A, and 3-83 mg vitamin C are found in every 100 grams of mango fruit. According to nutritional experts, ripe mango fruits are not only visually appealing and tasty, but they also have fattening, laxative, diuretic, and highly stimulating properties. 9.5% of seed kernels are protein, 8–12% are fat, 79.2% are starch, 2% are mineral content, and 2% are fiber. In addition to being useful for propagation, the stones make excellent cow stock feed [1-3].

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present investigation was carried out at Main Experiment Station, Department of Horticulture, P.G. College Ghazipur, under Veer Bahadur Singh Purvanchal University Jaunpur (U.P.) during the year 2020 -2024. In the current study, 16 year-old, uniform mango plants spaced 2.5 x 2.5 m apart served as the experimental subjects. There are seven micronutrients viz ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, Borax 0.5%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%, ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%, FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% and FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% +

Borax 0.5% along with control. Thus total eight treatments were tested in randomized block design with three replications to see the impact of these treatments on yield attributing characters and yield of Amrapali variety of mango [4]. Observations on number of fruits per shoot, fruit length, fruit width, fruit volume, stone weight of fruit, pulp weight, pulp stone ratio, fruit drop, fruit retention and fruit yield per tree were recorded and subjected to statistical analysis. The results were given below [5].

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Yield Attributes and Yield

Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively, provide an overview of the data on the quantity of fruits per shoot, fruit drop %, fruit retention percentage, and fruit yield (kg/tree). The results indicate that the T8 FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5% and T6 ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% sprays yielded the maximum fruit retention, fruit production (kg/tree), with the least fruit drop percentage, and number of fruits per shoot. Conversely, fruit retention %, minimum number of fruits per shoot, and maximum fruit drop all suggest water control (water spray). The greater fruit retention could be the result of an increase in the body's natural levels of auxin and other metabolites. Zinc is known to be essential for the synthesis of auxin (IAA) because it activates the enzyme tryptophan synthetase [6].

Fruit retention under sprays appears to have increased, indicating that the treatments have impacted the auxin balance to prevent fruit loss. These results closely align with a finding made by Ruby and Brahmachari [7] that a substantial reduction in fruit drop occurred when litchi were treated with 1% zinc sulfate. Kumar et al. [8] discovered that the most effective treatment for increasing the quantity of beautiful flowers and fruit retention in mango cv. Amrapali was a foliar application of urea 2% combination with ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 0.5% or Borax 0.5%. Vashistha et al. [9]

Additionally, urea at 1%+ZnSO<sub>4</sub> at 0.4%+Borax at 0.4% applied topically resulted in the greatest number of fruits/shoots and fruit retention, while water spray (control) produced the fewest fruits and fruit retention in mango fruit (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Amrapali. Khan et al. (2010) found that when applied topically to Aonla fruits, 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> + 0.1% thiourea was followed by 0.25% Borax + 0.1% thiourea. According to fruit yield (kg/tree) statistics, spraying T6 ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% after applying T8 FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5% was the most effective technique to increase fruit output. when the minimum fruit production of a control tree was observed. The increased fruit yield resulting from foliar nutrition application could be attributed to improved nutrient uptake through efficient absorption and, consequently, more lush vegetative growth in the first phases, which generated more metabolites for the fruit's development. importance of these nutrients in improving physiological processes that increase fruit weight, width, and length, which in turn increases yield.

The present finding is consistent with the conclusions of Singh [10] They found that when

zinc spray was applied, either by itself or in combination with other nutrients, the yield of Aonla cv. NA-10 was much higher than the control. Similarly, Bhowmick et al. [11] revealed that Amrapali mangoes received a 0.5% foliar spray of borax.

### 3.2 Physical Characters of Fruit

The statistics (Tables 5 and 6, respectively) clearly showed that all treatments increased fruit size relative to the control by a significant amount. Using (T8) FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5% spray, the maximum fruit length and width were measured. The minimum fruit width and length for the control treatment were recorded. The effective metabolite absorption and accumulation of the fruit during its early stages of development could account for fruit size increases caused by nutrient spraying. Spraying the plant with zinc-rich ZnSO<sub>4</sub> may have reduced the permeability of the cell walls, increasing the amount of water that could be mobilized in the fruit and increasing its size.

These results closely match the findings of other guava researchers [12,13].

**Table 1. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on number of fruits per shoot**

Treatments	No. of fruit per shoot		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray) 1.09	1.15	1.18	1.165
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	2.55	2.64	2.595
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	1.77	1.85	1.81
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	2.46	2.55	2.505
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	2.04	2.11	2.075
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	2.68	2.78	2.73
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	2.61	2.71	2.66
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	2.75	2.83	2.79
S. Em ±	0.069	0.072	0.0705
CD at 5%	0.209	0.22	0.2145
CV	5.313	5.382	5.3475

**Table 2. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit drop**

Treatments	Fruit drop (%)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	96.04	96.01	96.025
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	93.8	93.78	93.79
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	96.87	96.85	96.86
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	94.24	94.21	94.225
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	95.45	95.42	95.435
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	93	92.96	92.98
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	93.32	93.3	93.31
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	91	90.98	90.99
S. Em ±	0.866	0.863	0.8645
CD at 5%	2.627	2.618	2.6225
CV	1.594	1.588	1.591

**Table 3. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit retention**

Treatments	Fruit retention (%)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	3.96	3.99	3.975
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	6.2	6.22	6.21
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	3.13	3.15	3.14
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	5.76	5.79	5.775
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	4.55	4.58	4.565
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	7	7.04	7.02
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	6.68	6.7	6.69
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	9	9.02	9.01
S. Em ±	0.135	0.152	0.1435
CD at 5%	0.41	0.46	0.435
CV	4.049	4.519	4.284

**Table 4. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit yield**

Treatments	Fruit yield(kg/tree)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	17.4	17.73	17.565
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	23.33	23.78	23.555
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	18.59	18.95	18.77
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	21.87	22.29	22.08
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	21.19	21.6	21.395
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	24.54	25.02	24.78
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	23.78	24.24	24.01
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	25.24	25.73	25.485
S. Em ±	0.525	0.488	0.5065
CD at 5%	1.593	1.481	1.537
CV	4.136	3.733	3.9345

**Table 5. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit length**

Treatments	Fruit length(cm)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	8.38	8.64	8.51
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	9.37	9.66	9.515
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	8.6	8.87	8.735
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	9.24	9.52	9.38
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	8.78	9.05	8.915
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	10.51	10.83	10.67
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	9.83	10.13	9.98
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	10.68	11.01	10.845
S. Em ±	0.208	0.238	0.223
CD at 5%	0.63	0.722	0.676
CV	3.816	4.242	4.029

Maximum fruit length and breadth were also obtained in the mango cultivar Himsagar by foliar treatments of Zn (0.5%) + B (0.2%) + Mn (1%) + Ca (0.6%) and organic mulching (10 cm thick of dried leaves). When compared to the control group, fruit weight and volume rose considerably across all treatments (Table 7). However, the

highest impact was observed with the application of T<sub>8</sub> FeSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%. Zinc may have been used as a result of the pulp's higher concentration and faster cell division. The increase in fruit weight brought on by zinc spraying may be the result of extra food material building up in fruit trees.

**Table 6. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit width**

Treatments	Fruit width (cm)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	5.45	5.59	5.52
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	5.87	6.03	5.95
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	5.59	5.75	5.67
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	5.83	5.99	5.91
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	5.77	5.93	5.85
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	6.2	6.37	6.285
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	6.04	6.2	6.12
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	6.46	6.64	6.55
S. Em ±	0.131	0.132	0.1315
CD at 5%	0.397	0.4	0.3985
CV	3.844	3.764	3.804

**Table 7. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit weight [13]**

Treatments	Fruit weight (g)		
	2021-22	2022-23	Average
T <sub>1</sub> : Control (Water spray)	142.19	144.01	143.1
T <sub>2</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	165.18	167.3	166.24
T <sub>3</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	155.08	157.07	156.075
T <sub>4</sub> : Borax 0.5%	163.48	165.58	164.53
T <sub>5</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1%	158.25	160.28	159.265
T <sub>6</sub> : ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	189.48	191.91	190.695
T <sub>7</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + Borax 0.5%	173.99	176.23	175.11
T <sub>8</sub> : FeSO <sub>4</sub> 1% + ZnSO <sub>4</sub> 1%+ Borax 0.5%	201.05	203.64	202.345
S. Em ±	4.233	3.814	4.0235
CD at 5%	12.84	11.569	12.2045
CV	4.349	3.869	4.109

#### 4. CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated that spraying ZnSO<sub>4</sub> on fruit can significantly increase both its weight and volume. Kumar et al. [8] found that topically applying Zn (0.5%, 1.0%), B (0.4%, 0.6%), Cu (0.5%, 1.0%), and NAA (15 mg 1<sup>-1</sup>) significantly increased the weight of the fruit. Goswami et al. (2012) found that applying ZnSO<sub>4</sub> topically increased the fruit volume of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Sardar. The application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> at 0.4% topically to increase fruit volume showed a nearly identical pattern. The mango fruit's weight, pulp, and stone ratio were measured.

#### DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

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.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

- Goswami AK, Shukla HS, and Mishra PK. Effect of pre-harvest application of micronutrients on quality of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Sardar. Horticulture Flora Research Spectrum. 2012;1(1):60-63.
- Khan S, Singh HK, Vishwanath and Pratap B. Influence of foliar feeding of nutrients and thiourea on fruit yield and quality of Aonla. Indian Journal of Fertilizers. 2010; 6(8):28-30.
- Goswami AK, Shukla HS, Mishra PK. Effect of pre-harvest application of micronutrients on quality of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Sardar. Horticulture Flora Research Spectrum. 2012;1(1): 60-63.
- Anshuman Singh AK Singh, Ravi Pratap Singh, Nitesh Sharma, Kunwar AP, Singh, AP, Singh Anand Singh. Effect of foliar application of micro nutrients on yield and Physical quality of Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Amrapali. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2018;6(6): 2525-2530

5. Khan S, Singh HK, Vishwanath Pratap B. Influence of foliar feeding of nutrients and thiourea on fruit yield and quality of Aonla. *Indian Journal of Fertilizers*. 2010;6(8):28-30.
6. DR Singh and Mahendra Pratap. Effect of foliar application of micronutrients on yield attributes, yield and chemical characters of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Amrapali. *International Journal of Research in Agronomy*. 2024;7(5):733-736
7. Ruby R, Brahmachari VS. Effect of foliar application of calcium, zinc and boron on cracking and physico-chemical composition of litchi. *Orissa Journal of Horticulture*. 2001;29(1):50-54.
8. Kumar S, Kumar A, Verma DK. Effect of micronutrients and NAA on yield and quality of litchi (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.) cv. Dehradun. *International Seminar on Research Trend Hi. Tech Horticulture and PHT, Kanpur Feb*. 2004;4-6:193.
9. Vashistha K, Yadav AL, Singh HK, Yadav DK. Effect of foliar spray of nutrients on fruit drop, yield and quality attributes of mango fruit (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Amrapali. *Plant Archives*. 2010;10(1):359-360.
10. Singh DM. Studies on foliar feedings of nutrient on yield and quality of Aonla fruit (*Emblca officinalis* Gaetn.) M.Sc.(Ag) Horticulture, Thesis submitted to N.D.U.A.&T. Faizabad; 2002.
11. Bhowmick N, Banik BC, Hasan MA, Ghosh B. Response of pre-harvest foliar application of zinc and boron on mango cv. Amrapali under New Alluvial Zone of West Bengal. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*. 2012;69(3):428-431.
12. Pal A, Pathak RK, Pal K, Singh T. Effect of foliar application of nutrients on yield and quality of guava fruits (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Sardar guava. *Progressive Horticulture*. 2008;3(1):89-90.
13. Singh VK, Tripathi VK. Efficacy of GA<sub>3</sub>, boric acid and zinc sulfate on growth, flowering, yield and quality of strawberry cv. Chandler. *Prog. Agri*. 2010;10(2):345-348.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://prh.ikpress.org/review-history/12264>