

ISSN 0973-354X  
eISSN 2582-4899

# JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

Volume 15

December 2020

Number 2



Conserving Honey Bees with Forage Plant Mexican Creeper - *Antigonon leptopus*



**Society for Promotion of Horticulture**  
ICAR - Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bengaluru - 560 089



# JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

(Founded in 2005 by the Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Bengaluru, India)

Email : [chiefeditor.jhs@gmail.com](mailto:chiefeditor.jhs@gmail.com) Webpage : <https://jhs.ihr.res.in/index.php/jhs>

## Editor-in-Chief

Dr. S. Sriram

## Editors

Dr. K. Himabindu

Dr. G. Senthilkumaran

Dr. Tejaswini Prakash

Dr. M. Manamohan

Dr. Anil Kumar Nair

Dr. J. Satisha

Dr. P. Venkata Rami Reddy

Dr. I.M. Doreyappa Gowda

Dr. R.H. Laxman

Dr. G.C. Sathisha

## Editorial Advisory Board

### International Editorial Advisory Board

Dr. Nanthi S. Bolan, Australia

Dr. Rod Drew, Australia

Dr. J. Mithila, USA

Dr. Claus Helmut Franz Orth, South Africa

Dr. Ilan Paran, Israel

Dr. Gi-Cheol Song, Republic of Korea

Dr. Jill Stanley, New Zealand

Dr. Palitha Weerakkody, Sri Lanka

### National Editorial Advisory Board

Dr. S. D. Shikhamany

Dr. V. A. Parthasarathy

Dr. K. V. Peter

Dr. Sisir K. Mitra

Dr. S.K. Tikoo

Dr. Seetharam Annadana

Dr. A. Krishnamoorthy

Dr. Leela Sahijram

## SOCIETY FOR PROMOTION OF HORTICULTURE (REGD.)

Email : [sphihr2005@gmail.com](mailto:sphihr2005@gmail.com) Website : [www.sphindia.org](http://www.sphindia.org)

### Executive Council - 2020

**President** : Dr. M.R. Dinesh

**Vice Presidents** : Dr. G. S. Prakash  
Dr. T.N. Shivananda

**General Secretary** : Dr. C. Aswath

**Editor-in- Chief** : Dr. S. Sriram

**Treasurer** : Dr. D.V. Sudhakar Rao

**Joint Secretaries** : Dr. P.C. Tripathi  
Dr. T.H. Singh

**Members** : Dr. T.S. Aghora  
Dr. K.S. Shivashankara  
Dr. Prakash Patil  
Dr. H. S. Oberoi  
Dr. C.K. Narayana  
Dr. B. Narayanaswamy  
Dr. B. Hemla Naik  
Dr. L.N. Mahawer  
Dr. Sanjay Kumar Singh  
Dr. S.K. Mitra  
Dr. S. Hazarika  
Dr. Gobind Acharya

**This Journal is abstracted in CABI, Current Contents, AGRIS, Indian Science Abstracts, Scopus, DOAJ and Redalyc. It is a participant of AmelICA.**

Request for membership subscriptions along with cheque/DD drawn in favour of **Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Bengaluru** may be sent to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089, India. All members except student members and subscribers get all publications of SPH free of cost. Any correspondence other than editorial may be addressed to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089, India.

Advertising space in the journal is available. For information and rates, please contact General Secretary, SPH, IIHR, Bengaluru - 560 089, India. Advertising material should cater to the interest of researchers, subscribers, etc. who are involved in promotion of horticulture. Publication of advertisement is not an endorsement or approval, expressed or implied by the SPH or the editors of any service, product or claim made by the manufacturer.

Coverpage Courtesy : **Rami Reddy P.V.**, P.No. 225

### SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Patron	₹ 20,000
Life member	₹ 5,000
Annual Member	₹ 1,000 / US \$ 100 (US \$ 50 for SAARC countries)
Student Member	₹ 500
Student Life Member	₹ 3,000
Annual Subscription	₹ 1,500 / US \$ 100 (US \$ 60 for SAARC countries) (for institutions)
Enrolment Fee	₹ 200 / US \$ 5 (Additional for all types of Membership)

**NAAS rating of this journal is 3.43. JHS is now available online.  
Authors have to submit manuscripts using the link : <https://jhs.ihr.res.in/index.php/jhs>**

*Technical Assistance : Dr. Sridhar Gutam, Thippeswamy S. and Pramida A.*

# JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

Volume 15

Number 2

December 2020

## CONTENTS

### ***In this Issue***

i-ii

### ***Review***

- Biodiversity of tropical fruits and their conservation in India** 107-126  
Sankaran M. and Dinesh M.R.
- An overview of canopy management in cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.)** 127-135  
Adiga D.J., Veena G.L., Thondaiman V. and Babli M.

### ***Original Research in Papers***

- Phenotypic variability for horticultural and fruit quality attributes in plastic house grown tomato** 136-146  
Adeniji O.T., Tenebe A.V., Ishaka A., Jandong E., Adamu J.T., Adekoya M., Zamzam M.A. and Aremu C.A
- Development and evaluation of novel gladiolus hybrid selections IHRG-7 (IC620379) and IHRG-11 (IC620380) for flower quality and *Fusarium* wilt resistance** 147-152  
Rao T.M., Janakiram T., Negi S.S., Aswath C., Dhananjaya M.V., Kumar R. and Ramachandran N.
- Evaluation of potassium salt of phosphonic acid in Nagpur mandarin with special reference to *Phytophthora* management** 153-160  
Ingle Y.V., Paithankar D.H., Sadawarte A.K. and Bhonde S.R.
- Genetic analysis in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) based on fruit characteristics of 400 genotypes** 161-172  
Sankaran M., Dinesh M.R., Gowda D.C.S. and Venugopalan R.
- Standardization of nitrogen application for potted *Chrysanthemum morifolium* cv. kikiobiory** 173-176  
Tanya Thakur
- Influence of inorganic nutrients on growth, flowering and quality of *Dendrobium* cv. Singapore white** 177-182  
Sujatha A. Nair, Sankar V., Muralidhara, B.M., Awcharae C.M. and Singh D.R.
- Palynological investigations in *Jasminum* spp.** 183-190  
Ganga M., Lakshmi J., Manivannan N. and Rajamani K.



- Effect of putrescine and benzyl adenine on growth, flowering and post-harvest keeping quality parameters in chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum morifolium ramat*)** 191-196  
Taranjit Singh and Madhu Bala
- Studies on bioavailability of iron from fe-fortified commercial edible mushroom *Hypsizygusulmarius* and standardization of its delivery system for human nutrition** 197-206  
Pandey M., Gowda N.K.S., Satisha G.C., Azeez S., Chandrashekara C., Zamil M. and Roy T.K.
- Amino acid profile of eighteen isolates of different edible macrofungal species** 207-220  
Azeez S., Pandey M., Jasmin M.R., Rachitha R., Satisha G.C., Roy T.K.  
Chandrashekara C. and Shivashankara K.S.

### **Short Communications**

- A promising new tamarind selection-lakshamana : Linking biodiversity with livelihood** 221-224  
Kanupriya C., Karunakaran G. and Singh P.
- Mexican creeper, *Antigonon leptopus* Hook. and Arn : An effective bee forage plant to conserve honey bee** 225-228  
Rami Reddy P.V.
- First report on honeydew excretion by the melon thrips, *Thrips palmi* karny (Thysanoptera : Thripidae) and its biochemical analysis** 229-232  
Aravintharaj R., Asokan R. and Roy T.K.
- Influence of potting mixture on growth and economics of stone graft of mango cv. alphonso** 233-237  
Lad O.A., Kulkarni M.M., Ragaji S.G., Gavankar M.S., Burondkar M.M., Gokhale N.B.  
Pawar C.D., Khandekar R.G., Kshirsagar P.J. and Desai V.S.

## ***In this issue...***

### ***Hearty New Year Greetings from our Editorial Team to all the readers of JHS!***

*As the world is slowly coming out of glitches of pandemic, there is no other better way than celebrating 2021 as Year of Fruits and Vegetables as announced by United Nations Assembly to welcome the new year and recognize the importance of nutrition for better health. Fruits and Vegetables ensure the Nutritional Security to humankind. They play key role in addressing the malnutrition that is a major concern. We are proud that JHS creatins awareness of importance of fruits and vegetables by publishing the recent developments in research with respect to these crops.*

*Diversity of fruit crops and genetic resources available with respect to fruit crops are important for developing better fruit crop varieties. **Sankaran and Dinesh** have reviewed the “Biodiveristy of Fruit Crops in India” in a very comprehensive way. There is diversity in Jasmine species. **Ganga et al.** carried out the palynological investigations and recorded the variability in pollen morphology in different species of Jasmine by documenting images using scanning electron microscope. Biodiversity can be linked to livelihood also. One such success story with tamarind selection ‘Lakhamna’ is being reported by **Kanupriya et al.** This tamarind selection has been identified from participatory breeding programme. It has a better pod characters and more preferred by consumers.*

*Protected cultivation has seen greater momentum in last two decades. **Adeniji et al.** identified the best varieties of tomato for polyhouse cultivation in Nigeria. **Rao et al.** selected two gladiolus hybrid selections IIHRG-7 and IIHRG-11 with red purple and red coloured flowers respectively. These hybrids have resistance to Fusarium wilt and suitable for cut flower and flower arrangement purposes. **Sankaran et al.** analysed the variance for 6 quantitative and 30 qualitative traits in mango in 400 genotypes and identified 18 clusters. Selected genotypes from specific clusters can be used in hybridization programme.*

*The production aspects are important in perennial crops. It is crop management that needs to be prioritized for enhanced yield. **Adiga et al.** have reviewed the research work carried in “Canopy Management in Cashew”, providing the wholistic view of cultural operations to have a better crop. Use of soilless medium in nursery industry is gaining importance. Best suited potting mixture for mango stone graft of cv. Alphonso has been identified by **Lad et al.** They found that cocopeat + leaf manure + compost (1:1:2) as pot mixture provided better plant growth.*

*Growing Chrysanthemum in pots is practiced in home and terrace gardens. The cultivar Kikiobiory is well suited for this purpose. **Thakur** has studied the nitrogen requirement for this cultivar and has come out with the recommendation of 300 mg of N per pot applied*



twice in September and October in Punjab for best results. In another study, **Singh and Bala** confirmed that use of benzyl adenine at 200 ppm helped in extended vase life of *Chrysanthemum morifolium* flowers. **Nair et al.** recorded that foliar spray of 30:20:20 NPK at weekly interval recorded more number of flowers of *Dendrobium* cv. Singapore White with significantly longer spikes.

Crop production is directly influenced by pollinators. Decline in honey bee population is a serious concern and to conserve the pollinators community approach through ecosystem services is required. **Rami Reddy** reports the benefits of having ornamental plant Mexican Creeper (*Antigonon leptopus*) as forage plant. This creeper attracted all the four species of honey bees studied. This creeper can be used as bioindicator of honey bee population.

**Aravindaraj et al.** have reported the honey dew secretion by *Thrips palmi* and analysed the composition of it. They had identified different sugars present in the honey dew secretion of *Thrips*. *Thrips* not only cause direct damage but act as vectors of many plant viruses. Management of diseases in perennial crops is a challenge. *Phytophthora* incited root infection in citrus needs concerted efforts. **Ingle et al.** have demonstrated that use of potassium salt of phosphonic acid could help in management of *Phytophthora* root rot in Nagpur Mandarin.

Mushrooms can fill the gaps in nutritional security as they are rich in nutritive value. Iron deficiency is important issue to be addressed. Iron fortified oyster mushroom products have been developed by **Pandey et al.** The bioavailability of iron from Arka Mushroom Fe-Fortified Rasam Powder has been confirmed. In another study, the amino acid profile of 18 isolates of oyster mushroom species belonging to 4 species have been documented by **Azeez et al.** Quantification of essential and non-essential amino acids has been reported. Nutritionally superior isolates can be selected from these isolates.

The editorial team of JHS expresses the sincere efforts of reviewers who really complement the publication processes. All scientists and scholars can utilize the open access of JHS. Recently FAO has made JHS available through AGRIS. It is indexed by Redalyc, CABI\_Hort and Scopus. All subscribers, scientists and scholars are requested to continue their support in publishing quality information in **Journal of Horticultural Sciences**.

**S. Sriram**  
Editor in Chief

**Original Research Paper**

## **Phenotypic variability for horticultural and fruit quality attributes in plastic house grown tomato**

**Adeniji O.T.<sup>1</sup>, Tenebe A.V<sup>3</sup>., Ishaka A.<sup>3</sup> Jandong E.<sup>3</sup>, Adamu J.T.<sup>4</sup>, Adekoya M.<sup>2</sup>  
Zamzam M.A.<sup>2</sup> and Aremu C.A<sup>5</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Crop Science and Horticulture, <sup>2</sup> Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, Federal University Oye Ekiti, Ekiti state, Nigeria; <sup>3</sup> Department of Agronomy, Taraba State University, Jalingo, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup> National Biotechnology Development Agency, Abuja, Nigeria

<sup>5</sup>. Department of Crop Production, Landmark University, Omuaran, Nigeria

\*Corresponding author Email: waleniji@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

**In Sudan agro-ecological zone, tomato production is constrained by dearth of high fruit yielding and quality (*Solanum lycopersicum* [L.]) varieties for cultivation in polyhouse. Exotic and indeterminate tomato genotypes with high fruit yield and quality were evaluated to gain information on variation for fruit yield, quality, shape, and interdependence between traits in Sudan agroecology. Seed were sown during 2018 and 2019. Fruit yield, quality and phenomic traits were measured. Development, °Brix, and fruit yield responded to microclimate factors in the polyhouse over years. ‘Bruno’ was the best for fruit size and ‘Tofi’ for fruit number. Vine length at flowering, fruits/cluster, days to 50% flowering and days to first flowering and fruit brix are heritable. The genotype responses suggest the need for stable and to develop high yielding and quality tomato varieties for protected cultivation in the Sudan agro-ecological zone. Testing stable genotypes in locations could enhance breeding efficiency with respect to genotypic stability. The yield data gained under tropical conditions identified traits of superior genotypes for multiple environment study and to encourage tomato growers to consider protected cultivation in the tropics.**

**Keywords:** Character correlation, Fruit quality, Fruit shape, Fruit yield variability, Genotype by environment, Polyhouse and *Solanum lycopersicum*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* [L.]) diploid (2n=24) is the second most commonly cultivated fruit vegetable after potato throughout the world (FAOSTAT, 2018). It is an annual herb, erect to prostrate stems, dicotyledonous, and grow as a series of branching stem with a terminal bud, determinate or indeterminate growth habit. Anthesis, fruit formation, and retention are temperature sensitive (Mohanty, 2002), and cloudy conditions reduces ripening and fruit yield (Nakia *et al.*, 2005). In West Africa, tomato production takes place in different agro-ecological zones under rain fed conditions, with a single cycle of tomato production annually. As an alternative, greenhouse production could likely allow 3 growth cycles annually. Tomato is a reliable source of nutrients (Arab and Steck, 2000; Ayandeji *et al.*, 2011). Total soluble solids are a

measure of several chemicals and a proxy for sugar content. Higher TSS positively influences likeability and reduces cost associated with processing tomato fruit (Beckles, 2012). Consumers’ choice for fresh tomato fruit is driven by fruit size, color, shape, and texture. Tomato production in the greenhouse is influenced by temperature (high and low), humidity (high or low), day length, and cloud cover which affect physiological and reproductive processes, and attack by insects and pathological organisms (Singh and Ashe, 2005; Tadele, 2016). Beefsteak and cluster tomatoes types are grown in greenhouses throughout the world; limited trials have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa, where greenhouse cultivation of tomato is limited. Local cultivars have low fruit yield, poor fruit quality traits, susceptible to diseases and insect attack,



and unsuitable for cultivation in plastic house. Growers rely on seeds (hybrids or open pollinated) shipped from Europe and Asia for planting in greenhouse. A drawback in attaining a sustainable supply of tomato fruit is absence of quality seeds of promising genotypes and unfavourable climatic conditions (within and between years) and climate shocks.

Under open field cultivation, high temperature and humidity are serious problems for crop production under tropical conditions. Tomato fruit set is very sensitive to low or high temperatures that affect pollen development and anther dehiscence (Gebisa *et al.*, 2017). The cultivation of tomato under polyethylene house in the Sudan agro-ecological zone is limited due to inadequate knowledge of greenhouse production and absence of high yielding, early maturing and disease resistance with extended shelf-life and improved fruit quality traits. High temperature due to climate shocks have increased the incidence of heat stress in crops (Bitta and Gerrats, 2013), and in tomato grown under protected cultivation in Sudan agroecology. Exposure to temperature above 25°C during anthesis causes flower abortion, poor style development and pollen germination (Berry *et al.*, 1988; Peet *et al.*, 1988), reduced fruit set and yield (Li *et al.*, 2011; Zin *et al.*, 2010; Giri *et al.*, 2011). The genotypic response to both optimal and heat stressed conditions in the plastic house is important for fruit yield stability.


Tropical conditions encompass a wide array of environmental conditions and regions. Enhancing production in the tropics requires taking into consideration the diversity of climates and production systems that affect tomato production. Genotype x environment interaction results in variable performance of a genotype over time and space such that in many cases GXE interactions are treated as undesirable and confounding effects (Yan and Tinker, 2006), although they can provide breeding opportunities. The objectives of the research were to: a) evaluate variation for growth and development, fruit yield and fruit quality attributes, b) determine the magnitude of phenomic of fruit shape variability, c) estimate components of genetic variation, interdependence among developmental, fruit yield and fruit quality traits and heritability, and d) identify promising genotypes for fruit yield and fruit quality traits under Sudan agro-ecological zone.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS


### Location and nursery management

Two cycles of experiments were carried out at Greenhouse of Taraba Vegetable, Ardo Kola Local Government Area, Taraba state (latitude 08°46'N, Long 11°22'E), at 222 m above sea level. The experiments were begun in 2 July (rainy season) 2018 and 2019. Humus soil and perlite (Jubaili Nigeria, Ltd., Jalingo, Nigeria) was mixed in the ratio 3:1 (w:w). Fifty-six extruded plastics nursery multicell seedling trays were filled with the mix. Seed of the indeterminate, beefsteak, tomato genotypes viz, Bruno 29402, Dominique 539, Tomato 29206, IND 27812, Tomato 20209 (hybrids), and 'Tofi' (open pollinated), developed by Hazera Seed (Telaviv, Isreal) and Jubaili Seed (Jalingo, Nigeria) companies, respectively, were sown in cells in trays; each planting tray accommodated 260 seedlings.

Weather data in polyethylene house during 2018



Weather data in the polyethylene house in 2019





The greenhouse was  $102.72 \times 57$  m ( $\sim 5,855$  m<sup>2</sup>) and 18 m high of which  $99.37 \times 54.72$  m ( $\sim 5,438$  m<sup>2</sup>) was cultivated. The slightly acidic (pH 5.67) sandy loam soil was ploughed, harrowed, and flat ridges constructed with tractor mounted implements. Each ridge contained double rows, 0.5 m apart with a 1.1 m pathway between double rows. Sixty flat ridges were established in the polyethylene house. The temperature and relative humidity in the plastic house were recorded using a CR200X Data Logger (Campbell Scientific Inc., Australia). Tomato seedlings were hand transplanted (18 April 2018, 20 August 2019 for first and second trials, respectively) in ridges with an inter- and within-row spacing of  $0.5 \times 0.6$  m. Each ridge accommodated 140 plants (70 plants/row). A total of 8,400 plants were established in the polyethylene house. The experiment was arranged in a completely randomized design, each genotype was assigned to a double ridge plot 43 m long and replicated 4 times. Fertigation was begun 2 weeks after transplanting, 25 kg of N18:P18:K18 was dissolved in 100 L of water and applied through the drip irrigation system to plants, each plant received 10 mL of fertilizer. At 4 weeks after transplanting, N17:P9:K27 was dissolved in 100 L of water and applied through the drip irrigation system, each plant received 10 mL of fertilizer. At 6 weeks after transplanting, K61 soluble fertilizer was dissolved in 100 L of water and applied through the drip irrigation system to plants, with each plant receiving 10 mL. Weeding was by hand. Abamectin® (EC) (50 mL; Control Solution Inc., Geneva-Red Bluff, Pasadena, CA), 40 mL of Imidacloprid® (EC; Hebei Xintian Biological Technology Co., Ltd Shijiazhuang, Hebe, China), and Mancozeb® (WP; Sigma-Aldrich Chemie, Taufkirchen, Germany) powder (100 g) was dissolved in 30 L of water and applied at 3 weeks after transplanting to control insect pests and insect-transmitted diseases. A T-shaped rod was inserted at both ends of the plot; tomato vines were trained on twine connected to overhang rods to support plant growth upward. Each tomato plant received 0.59 L of water 4 times a day (2.38 L of water per day) via drip irrigation.

#### Trait measurement and data analysis

The number of days to first flower (d), days to 50% flowering (d), vine length at first flowering and maturity (m), vine length at 50% flowering (cm), days to first fruit (d), days to first ripe fruit (d), interval

between first fruit and fruit maturity (d), individual fruit weight (g), fruit weight/plot (kg), fruit length (cm) and fruit width (cm) were measured. A net plot of  $1.1 \times 3$  m was used for determination of fruit number, fruit number/plot and fruit yield (kg). Twenty randomly picked tomato fruit (5 fruit per replicate) were blended for determination of fruit pH (MP 220; Mettler Toledo, Barcelona, Spain), and soluble solids using hand-held refractometer (model ATC-1, Atago, Bellevue, WA). At maturity, 12 tomato fruits were randomly chosen to measurement of fruit phenomic metric traits. A longitudinal cut was made on each fruit and digitalized (Scanjet G4010 scanner, Hewlett-Packard, Palo Alto, CA) at a resolution of 300 dpi. Scanned fruit images were subjected to morphometric analysis using Tomato Analyzer ver. 3 software (Rodriguez *et al.* 2010; Ohio State University laboratory website, <http://www.oardc.ohiostate.edu/vanderknaap/>). Fifteen fruit descriptors viz. fruit area, fruit perimeter, fruit width mid-height, fruit maximum width, fruit maximum height, fruit mid-width height, fruit maximum width, internal fruit shape index, fruit shape index eccentricity I, fruit shape index eccentricity II, proximal eccentricity, distal eccentricity, obovoid and fruit curved shape and fruit lobes defined by the manufacturer, were automatically received from Tomato Analyzer software (Rodriguez *et al.*, 2010).

Quantitative traits were summarized, all data were subjected to analysis of variance using PROC GLM of SAS (ver. 9.4, SAS Institute, Cary, NC). If the interaction was significant it was used to explain results. Pearson correlation was performed for each year. The formula of Syukur *et al.* (2012) was used to calculate variance due to genotype, coefficient of variation due to genotypic effect (GCV), and phenotype effect (PCV). Heritability in broad sense for each trait was computed following the method of Allard (1960). Broad-sense heritability values  $>82\%$  = very high,  $60-79\%$  = moderately high,  $40-59\%$  = moderately low, and  $<40\%$  = low.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A sustainable supply of fresh and high-quality tomato fruits to markets from polyethylene house requires development and deployment of high fruit yielding, early and medium maturity tomato varieties. This goal may be reached through the knowledge of phenotypic variability, association between traits and heritability. The combined analysis of variance showed statistically

significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) mean squares among the genotypes for development traits (vine length at flowering and vine length at maturity), earliness (days to first flowering and days to 50% flowering) and fruiting cycle (appearance of first fruit, appearance of first mature fruit and interval (days) between appearance of first fruit and first mature fruit) (Table

1a). These traits are important to ensure 2 or 3 production cycles annually in polyethylene house. The variability for earliness, vegetative growth and fruit growth cycle (early, medium or late maturity groups) among the genotypes have implications for harvest, shipment, shelf-life and delivery of fresh tomato fruits to the markets.

**Table 1a. Combined analysis of variance and estimates of Genotypic variation ( $\sigma^2G$ ), Phenotypic variation ( $\sigma^2P$ ), Genotype by Year variation ( $\sigma^2GY$ ), genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and Heritability for developmental, earliness and fruiting cycle in tomato genotypes.**

Source of variation	df	Days to first flower	Days to 50% flowering	Vine length at appearance of first flower	Vine length at 50% flowering	Days to first fruit	Days to 1st ripe fruit	Interval(days) between first fruit &
<b>maturity</b>								
Genotype (G)	5	48.90**	21.01**	774.12**	613.65***	19.28***	21.97***	30.14***
Year (Y)	1	1.22	14.40**	93.64**	18.15	38.03***	4.22**	22.58**
G × Y	5	7.78	2.58*	63.43**	76.40	7.52***	13.28***	13.00**
Error	36	5.27	0.75	11.37	38.08	1.06	0.91	1.68
CV (%)		3.88	1.30	5.43	7.73	1.05	1.37	4.58
Mean		61.64	66.41	62.98	79.87	97.74	69.47	28.45
$\sigma^2P$		7.00	2.82	103.37	163.90	4.69	2.91	5.18
$\sigma^2G$		6.03	2.53	95.44	134.98	2.63	1.47	3.55
$\sigma^2GY$		0.68	0.40	13.02	9.58	3.09	1.62	2.83
PCV		4.29	2.53	16.14	16.02	2.22	2.46	7.99
GCV		3.98	2.39	15.51	14.55	1.65	1.75	6.62
Hb (%)		85	89	92	82	56	51	69

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* significant at 5, 1, or 0.01%, level of probability, respectively, ANOVA.

Highly significant ( $P < 0.01$ ) mean squares differences were recorded among the genotypes for individual fruit weight, number of fruits/plot, fruit weight/plot, number of fruits/plot, fruits/cluster, fruit length, fruit width, number of loculi/fruit, fruit pH and fruit brix (Table 1b). The foregoing may be associated with genetic factors and accumulation of photosynthates in the sink, in addition, the influence of microclimatic factors. Several authors (Dar and Sharma. 2011; Sharma and Singh (2015); Dhyani *et al.* 2017; Jindal *et al.* 2018) have reported significant genotypic effects for fruit yield and yield related traits among tomato varieties grown in polyethylene house condition.

The year (Y) effect significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) influenced days to 50% flowering, vine length at flowering, days to first fruit, days to first ripe fruit, interval between fruit appearance and maturity (Table 1a), and fruits/plot, fruit weight/plot and fruit brix (Table 1b). Findings are in accordance with reports by Dar and Sharma (2011) and Dhyani *et al.* (2017) in tomato varieties grown in polyethylene house and open field respectively. These traits could have been responsive to temperature, humidity and precipitation with low predictability. Therefore, the need for continuous evaluation over years for reliable inferences. On the other hand, vine length at 50% flowering, fruit/plot, fruit/cluster, fruit width, loculi/fruit and fruit acidity were not affected by environmental factors during the

**Table 1b. Combined analysis and estimates of Genotypic variation ( $\sigma^2G$ ), Phenotypic variation ( $\sigma^2P$ ), Genotype  $\times$  Year variation ( $\sigma^2GY$ ), genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) and Heritability ( $H_b$ ) for fruit yield, yield contributing traits and fruit quality attributes among genotypes.**

Source of variation	df	Individual fruit weight	Number fruit/plot	Fruit weight/plot	Number fruit/plot	Number fruit/cluster	Fruit length	Fruit width	Number loculi/fruit	Fruit pH	Fruit Brix
Genotype (G)	5	353.31**	46.63**	7105.08**	496431.88***	7.14**	0.67**	3.34**	10.95**	0.27**	3.48**
Year (Y)	1	133.33	96.10**	2788.9**	60062.50	0.03	0.001	0.87	0.40	0.05	0.75*
G $\times$ Y	5	155.18	34.41**	3215.18**	221164.93	0.08	1.16**	0.80	0.40	0.06	0.91*
Error	36	77.63	11.55	363.79	113708.08	0.05	0.05	0.28	0.19	0.05	0.26
CV (%)		6.49	7.29	4.25	11.22	4.09	4.35	11.77	7.82	4.65	1.06
Mean		135.75	46.58	446.37	3004.63	5.42	5.14	4.64	5.62	4.85	4.64
$\sigma^2P$		53.85	5.82	2207.63	1245.14	178.53	0.31	0.48	2.68	0.11	0.46
$\sigma^2G$		34.46	1.52	882.84	842.75	178.48	0.19	0.38	2.63	0.03	0.32
$\sigma^2GS$		19.39	5.72	1628.4	712.84	0.008	0.01	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.16
PCV		5.41	5.19	10.52	1.17	247	10.83	14.93	29.13	6.84	14.62
GCV		4.32	2.64	7.27	6.50	246	8.48	13.28	28.85	3.57	12.19
H <sub>b</sub> (%)		64	26	40	68	99	61	79	98	27	70

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* significant at 5, 1, or 0.01%, level of probability, respectively, ANOVA.

**Table 2. Mean squares for fruit metric traits among tomato genotypes grown in a greenhouse.**

Source of variation	df	Perimeter	Area	Maximum width	Maximum length	Curve height	Ellipsoidal	Circular	Lobeness	Distal eccentricity	Eccentricity area index	Pericarp thickness	Proximal eccentricity	Obovoid
Genotype (G)	5	96.44**	261.66**	7.69**	6.34**	0.65	0.02**	0.01	14.72**	0.05**	0.13**	0.006	0.003	0.87**
Year (Y)	1	0.01	0.04	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.0001	0.0002	9.00	0.008	0.0008	0.0002	0.008	0.01
G $\times$ Y	5	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.04	0.003	0.0003	8.24	0.003	0.0009	0.0001	0.008	0.01
Error	24	12.59	59.01	0.65	0.63	0.54	0.001	0.007	8.66	0.009	0.0069	0.0069	0.006	0.009
CV (%)		14.6	26.00	14.84	15.94	12.97	0.13	0.13	3.12	0.82	0.42	0.24	0.87	0.31
Mean		24.21	29.24	5.46	4.99	5.68								

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* significant at 5, 1, or 0.01%, level of probability, respectively, ANOVA.

years of evaluation, due to non-significant ( $P_e$  0.05) mean squares (Table 1b). The high impact of the microclimatic factors on earliness and fruit yield and fruit quality traits may be linked to the polygenic nature of these traits and influence of microclimatic factors. The genotype effect accounted for a large proportion of the total variation compared to the year effect and genotype by year interaction (GYI).

The performance of the tomato genotypes for days to 50% flowering, vine length at flowering, number of days to first fruit, number of days to first ripe fruit, interval between fruit appearance and maturity, number of fruits/plot and fruit length and fruit brix were inconsistent with little or no predictability due to highly significant ( $P_d$  0.01) genotype by year interaction (GYI) mean squares. There are a number of previous studies (Carli *et al.*, 2011; Cebolla-Cornejo *et al.*, 2011) among tomato varieties cultivated in the open field with significant GYI for traits considered in this study. The magnitude of GYI variation for fruit brix (total soluble solids) was attributed to temperature, reduced air flow and light intensity within the polyethylene house (Causse *et al.*, 2003). The sugar accumulation in tomato fruits depend upon the

translocation of photo-assimilates from the leaves during fruit ripening (Cebolla-Cornejo *et al.*, 2011). The prospects of genetic improvement for these traits may not be achieved in the short run. The magnitude of genotype by year interaction for traits is useful to select optimal genotypes for earliness, fruit yield and quality traits. The GYI for some traits was responsible for the cross over performance of some genotypes (Table 4). Therefore, selection and recommendation of the genotypes for earliness and fruit yield will be complex. However, insignificant GYI mean squares for fruit pH is in conformity with findings of Causse *et al.* (2003).

A popular morphological feature distinguishing tomato varieties from undomesticated accessions is fruit shape (elongated). The mean squares for genotypes were significant ( $P_e$  0.01) for fruit perimeter, fruit area, fruit maximum width, fruit maximum height, fruit distal eccentricity, eccentricity area index and obovoid (Table 3). Also, ellipsoidal, lobeness, distal eccentricity, eccentricity area index and obovoid had significant ( $P_e$  0.01) mean squares due to genotypes (Table 6b). The mean squares due to the genotype  $\times$  year interaction on fruit metric and phenomic traits were

**Table 3. Mean values for fruit yield, yield contributing traits and fruit quality attributes among tomato genotypes.**

Genotype	Days to first flower	Vine length at 50% flowering	Individual fruit weight	Fruit width	Number fruit/cluster	Number loculi/fruit	Fruit pH	Number of fruit/plot
Burno	61ab <sup>a</sup>	80.09cd	141.79a	4.79b	5b	6b	4.73b	3074.9ab
Dominique	59b	84.29bc	132.09ab	5.05a	5b	5b	4.93ab	2996.3ab
IND 27812	65a	81.08b	137.78a	5.23a	5b	5b	4.65b	2703.8b
Tom 29206	63a	93.98a	141.2a	5.21a	5b	5b	5.17a	2765.ob
Tofi	58b	50c	137.7ab	3.83b	8a	8a	4.83b	3480.8a
Tom 20209	62a	88.94b	124.01b	3.71b	5b	5b	4.85ab	3011ab

not significant ( $P_e$  0.05) for all traits (Table 6a and 6b). The differences for fruit size and shape among tomato genotypes is similar to report of Berwer *et al.* (2007), they indicated that tomato fruit can be small to large, round, with many loci contributing to fruit shape and size.

As shown in Table 3a, days to first flower appearance was early 58 d ('Tofi' and 'Dominique') and late 65 d ('IND 27812'). The interval (days) between appearance of first flower and 50% flowering was 1

d in 'IND 27812' and 10 d in 'Tofi'. In contrast, between 38 and 49 d from transplanting to flowering was recorded in tomato genotypes under rain fed (Mescret *et al.* 2012). 'Dominique' was early for appearance of immature and ripe fruit. The interval (days) between seeding and appearance of first fruit was 67 d in 'Dominique', and 72 d in 'Tomato 29206'. Tomato vines peaked (93.98 cm) in 'Tomato 29209', followed by 'Tomato 29206' with 88.94 cm. A vine length up to 154 cm occurred for determinate and indeterminate tomato genotypes grown in a

**Table 3b. Genotype and year interaction<sup>a</sup> effects on fruit yield and quality traits.**

Genotype ×	Year	Days to:			Fruit			Interval (days) from fruit first to maturity	Fruit number per plant (kg)
		50% flowering	first fruit appearance	first ripe fruit	Brix	Height (cm)	Weight per plot		
Bruno	1	63d	67e	98b	4.97d	5.73a	380.5e	31a	50.53d
	2	65c	70b	101a	3.50e	5.33c	467.0b	31a	75.00a
Dominique	1	65c	67e	96d	5.25a	5.33c	465.6b	29c	59.13c
	2	65c	67e	96d	5.25a	5.38b	465.5b	29c	59.18c
IND 27812	1	65c	68d	97c	3.65e	4.45h	439.8d	25e	58.53c
	2	67b	72a	100a	3.66e	5.73a	451.3c	25e	56.03b
Tofi	1	67b	72a	97c	5.25a	5.31d	425.3c	28d	58.44c
	2	67b	72a	97c	5.25a	5.15e	425.3c	28d	58.44c
Tom 209206	1	67b	71a	97c	5.05c	5.15e	428.0c	29a	55.50c
	2	69a	68b	99a	5.20b	4.45h	413.8c	30b	55.67c
Tom 29209	1	69a	69c	97c	3.50g	4.80f	509.3a	26e	68.84b
	2	69a	70b	100a	5.25a	4.50g	509.3a	32a	68.94b

<sup>a</sup> data in the interaction analyzed with Least Squares Means and means separated with Least Significant Difference.

<sup>b</sup> values in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different,  $P < 0.05$

greenhouse (Kallo *et al.*, 2012). Length of tomato vines is associated with adaptation and physiology.

The numbers of fruit harvested per plot was highest in 'Tofi' (Table 3a), this is a common trait of cluster tomato). Medium to high fruit per plant is consistent with effective pollination, fruit set and retention, and small sized fruit. Fruits of 'Bruno', 'Dominique' and 'IND 27812' are large (fruit length and width). Tomato fruits are sold by weight, 'Bruno', 'Tom 29206' and 'Tofi' appear to hold promise for individual fruit weight (Table 3a), and fruit weight/plot (Table 3b). The mean values for individual fruit weight in this study are larger than those reported by Cheema *et al.* (2013) for indeterminate tomatoes grown in a greenhouse. This may be linked to hereditary factors, high fruit set, large fruit size and efficient accumulation of photosynthate. The number of fruits/cluster is an index for fruit weight, 'Tofi' recorded the highest fruits/cluster (Table 3a). High fruits/cluster may be attributed to long fruits than wide. The total soluble solids (°Brix) were low ('Tom 20209') moderate ('Dominique' and 'IND 27812'). The mean values recorded for fruit brix are closer to those reported by Purkayastha and Mahanta, (2011). 'Bruno' and 'Dominique' were best for fruit size (fruit length and fruit width).

The mean values for fruit perimeter was on par with 'Dominique' and 'Bruno' and greater than mean values for 'IND 27218' and 'Tofi'. 'Bruno', 'Tomato 29206' and 'Dominique' had the best fruit area, fruit maximum width, and fruit height which agrees with mean values reported for fruit height and fruit diameter (Table 4). The proportion of fruit area outside the ellipse to total fruit area is important for fruit size. 'Bruno' performed best, followed by 'Tom 20209' and 'Tom 20906'. A morphological feature influencing preference for tomato cultivar is fruit shape. 'Bruno' are obovoid, indicating the greater proportion of the fruit is below the mid-fruit height. 'Bruno', 'Tom 20206' and 'Tom 20209' are circular and ellipsoidal compared to 'Dominique' and 'IND 27812'. Fruit height measured along a curved line through the fruit was long in 'Dominique', but short in 'IND 27812'. 'Bruno' performed best for distal eccentricity and eccentricity area index. The spherical fruit shape was observed in the genotypes with fruit shape index (0.86 – 0.99). Variation in fruit size (fruit length and diameter) is associated with genetic makeup and moderated by cell size and intercellular space of the flesh, as was observed by Regassa *et al.* (2012) and Jindal *et al.* (2015).

**Table 4. Mean values for some fruit phenomic traits among tomato genotypes grown in a greenhouse.**

Genotype	Perimeter (cm)	Area(cm <sup>2</sup> )	Maximum width (cm)	Maximum length(cm)	Ellipsoidal	Lobeness	Eccentricity area index	Distal eccentricity	Obovoid
Dominique	28.79 <sup>a</sup>	19.52d	5.59ab	4.38ab	0.20a	6.97b	0.21d	0.21d	0.31b
Bruno	27.03a	30.9b	6.06a	6.06a	0.10c	5.74d	0.56a	0.56a	0.97a
Tom 29309	24.54b	37.6a	6.41a	5.60ab	0.08d	6.17c	0.49b	0.50b	0.09b
Tom 29206	22.27b	30.9b	5.73ab	5.39b	0.09a	6.34bc	0.49b	0.50b	0.06b
IND 27812	18.54c	27.23c	3.52c	3.51b	0.17ab	9.77a	0.32c	0.33c	0.09b
Tofi	18.33c	27.00c	2.33d	2.71c	0.08a	6.22c	0.22d	0.31c	0.08bc

<sup>a</sup> values in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different, P<0.05 level, Tukey's test.

**Table 5. Pearson's correlation coefficient between agronomic, fruit metric and fruit quality attributes in tomato genotypes.**

	D.50FL <sup>a</sup>	FAMP	Frpp	Frl	Frw	FrPl	FrW/Pl	Fr Cl	Lo Fr	Fr pH
FAMP	-0.36									
FrPP	0.78**	-0.78**								
Frl	0.35	0.32	0.28							
Frw	-0.77**	0.57	-0.38	-0.11						
FrPl	0.40	-0.29	0.77**	0.77**	-0.77**					
FrW/P	0.77**	-0.16	0.59	0.67	-0.21	0.59				
Fr Cl	0.78**	-0.15	0.48	0.79*	-0.66	0.86**	0.66			
Lo Fr	0.87**	-0.26	0.59	0.76**	-0.57	0.78**	0.83**	0.91**		
Fr pH	-0.43	0.77**	-0.63	-0.08	0.84**	-0.63	-0.13	-0.61	-0.43	
Brix	-0.31	-0.51	-0.05	-0.97**	0.03	-0.62	-0.58	-0.76**	-0.63	-0.06

\*, \*\* = significant at 1 and 5 % level of probability.

<sup>a</sup> D.50FL = Days to 50% Flowering, FAMP = Days between first and mature fruit, FrPP = Fruit/plant, Frl = Fruit Length, Frw = Fruit width, FrPl = Fruit/Plot, FrW/Pl = Fruit weight/plot, Fr Cl = Fruit/Cluster, Lo Fr = Loculi/Fruit, Fr pH = Fruit acidity, Brix = Total soluble solids.

The number of days to first flowering, days to first ripe fruit, fruit brix, fruit weight per plot were better during 2018 compared to 2019. Differences in solar radiation, temperature and humidity received in the polyethylene house over years influenced truss appearance and fruit yield. Pék and Helyes (2004) had noted differences in earliness and fruit yield in tomato varieties due to climatic factors. In contrast, fruit height, interval between fruit appearance and fruit maturity performed better during 2019 evaluation. Considering fruit weight per plot, 'Tom 29206' had higher fruit weight during 2018, while 'Bruno' and 'IND 27812' performed best during 2019. Trend of results for fruit yield and fruit quality traits in Sudan agro ecology may be due largely to inherent genetic factors and positive response by tomato genotypes to microclimate, which influences accumulation of photosynthate, growth and transpiration.

### Genetic variability and Heritability

The amount of phenotypic variability in a crop is predicated on inherent genetic variation, the phenotypic expression is essential for selection. For all traits, the magnitude of phenotypic variance is greater than their corresponding genotypic variance, environmental variance, and variance due to genotype by year interaction. (Table 1a and 1b). Also, the genotypic variance had larger, or smaller magnitude than variance due to genotype by year interaction depending on trait. This is associated with the influence of microclimatic factors in the expression of these traits. As shown in tables 1 and 2, the mean values for phenotypic variance were farther apart for vine length at first flowering and 50% flowering, individual fruit weight, fruit weight/plot and fruit/plot). The estimates for phenotypic coefficient of variation were larger in magnitude

than their corresponding genotypic coefficient of variation. In another study, Syukur and Rosidah (2014) reported large magnitude for PCV compared to GCV in pepper (*Capsicum annum* L.). This suggest some influence of micro climatic factors. A little difference between PCV and GCV estimates indicates less environmental sensitivity. Therefore, selection based on phenotype will be worthwhile for improvement. Broad sense heritability estimates provides information about a trait and its interaction with the environment. It comprised additive and non-additive gene effects. Broad-sense heritability is classified as very high ( $e^2$  82%), moderately high (60-79%), moderately low (40-59%), and low ( $d^2$  40%). A high ( $e^2$  82%) broad sense heritability estimates were found for days to first flowering, days to 50% flowering, vine length at first flower, vine length at 50% flower, number of fruits per cluster, and number of loculi per fruit. This is indicative of high contribution of additive and non-additive gene effects compared to low contribution of microclimatic factors in phenotypic expression of these traits. These traits were least sensitive traits. In addition, fruit width and fruit brix had moderately high broad sense heritability estimates. This suggest a greater level of environmental sensitivity. A low ( $d^2$  40%) broad sense heritability indicates preponderance of environmental factors (precipitation and temperature) in the expression of these traits. However, it is possible to achieve improvements on a short run-in traits with high broad-sense heritability and with high phenotypic coefficient variance slightly larger than their genetic coefficient variance. In contrast, it would take more time to improve traits with low heritability, because of their low genetic variance component, and genetic coefficient of variation and genotype by year interaction.

The number of days to 50% first flowering had positive and significant correlation coefficient with fruit/plant ( $r = 0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ), fruit weight/plot ( $r = 0.77^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ), fruit/cluster ( $r = 0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ) and loculi per fruit ( $r = 0.87^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). This suggest that early to medium flowering genotypes will account for higher fruits/plant and fruit yield. In addition, the desire to have 3 cycles of tomato production annually may be feasible. Similar findings were reported by Islam *et al.*, 2010 and Tembe *et al.*, 2017). The number of

days between fruit appearance and mature fruit had significant negative correlation coefficient with fruits/plant ( $r = -0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ) and significantly positive correlation coefficient with fruit pH ( $r = 0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). This suggest that genotypes with few days between fruit appearance and maturity will have low of fruit/plant and vice versa. 'IND 27812' had 25 d between fruit appearance and maturity with lowest fruit/plant. Results in this study are similar with those reported by Wali and Kabura, 2014 and Tembe *et al.*, 2017). The correlation coefficient between number of fruit/plot and fruit/plant was positive and significant ( $r = 0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). Fruit length recorded positive and significant association with fruit/plant ( $r = 0.77^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ), fruit/cluster ( $r = 0.79^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ), loculi/fruit ( $r = 0.76^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). This indicates that tomato fruits are oblong in shape and improvement in fruit length will account for more fruits/cluster. On the other hand, a significantly negative correlation coefficient was recorded in the association between fruit length and fruit brix ( $r = 0.97^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). The number of fruits/plant correlated positively with fruit length ( $r = 0.84^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ) and number of loculi/fruits ( $r = 0.78^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ). The association between fruit weight/plant and number of loculi/fruit showed statistically significant ( $r = 0.83^{**}$   $P < 0.01$ ).

Fruit development and size was dependent on micro climate, the 2019 evaluation was best for fruit yield. Moderate to high temperature, humidity, hot air and day length influenced physiological processes for high fruit yield and fruit quality, and earliness for 3 cycles of production annually. Tomato genotypes were responsive to microclimatic variables, inconsistent in fruit appearance, fruit development, fruit number and fruit brix, and fruit yield across years. Genotype  $\times$  Year Interactions (GYI) are important to consider when developing stable varieties for a specific environment. For optimal performance, manipulation of micro-climate and breeding works are essential.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge with thanks the Vice Chancellor of Taraba State University, Prof Ado Vincent Tenebe for providing the platform to carry out this research, and Taraba state Vegetable Company and Onida Agriculture and Aquaculture Solutions for hosting this research. We thank Hazera Seed (Telaviv, Isreal) and Jubaili Nigeria, Ltd., Jalingo, Nigeria for providing tomato seeds for this research.

## REFERENCES

- Arab L., Steck L., 2000. Lycopene and cardiovascular diseases. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. **71**:1691-1695.
- Allard W. 1960. Principles of plant breeding. John Willey Sons, London.
- Anonymous 2009. Weather report. Nigeria Meteorological Agency, Yola International Airport, Yola, Adamawa state, Nigeria.
- Ayandeji A.O.R., Omidiji D. 2011. Determinant post-harvest losses among Tomato farmers in Imeko-Afon Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Science Frontier Research*. **11**(5):22-28.
- Beckles D.M., 2012. Factors affecting the postharvest sugars and total soluble solids in tomatoes (*S. lycopersicon*) fruits. *Post-harvest Biotechnology* **53**:129-140.
- Berry S., Rafique U.M. 1988. Effect of High Temperature on Fruit Set in Tomato Cultivars and Selected Germplasm.
- Brewer M.T., Moysenko J.B., Monforte A.J., van der Knaap E. 2007. Morphological variation in tomato: A comprehensive study of quantitative trait loci controlling fruit shape and development. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **58**(6):1339-1349. doi: 10.1093/jxb/.
- Carli, P., Barone, A. Fogliano, V. Frusciante, L. and Ercolano, M.R. 2011. Dissection of genetic and environmental factors involved in tomato organoleptic quality. *BMC Plant Biology*. **11**:234-241.
- Causse, M., M. Buret, K. Robini, and P. Verschave. 2003. Inheritance of nutritional and sensory quality traits in fresh market tomato and relation to consumer preferences. *Journal of Food Science*. **68**:2342–2350.
- Causse M., Friguet C., Coiret C., Lépricier M., Navez B., Lee M., Holthuysen N., Sinesio F., Moneta E., and Grandillo S., 2010. Consumer preferences for a fresh tomato at the European scale: A common segmentation on taste and firmness. *Journal Food Science*. **75**(9):S531-S541.
- Cebolla-Cornejo, J., S. Rosello, M. Valcarcel, E. Serrano, J. Beltran, and F. Nuez. 2011. Evaluation of genotype and environment effects on taste and aroma flavor components of Spanish fresh tomato varieties. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry*. **59**: 2440-2450.
- Cheema D.S., Kaur P., Dhunna O.S., Singh P., Kaur S., and Dhaliwal D.S. 2013. Off season production of tomato under net house conditions. *Haryana Journal of Horticultural Science*. **32**(3-4):288-289.
- Dar, R.A. and J.P. Sharma. 2011. Genetic variability studies of yield and quality traits in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). *International Journal of Plant Breeding and Genetics*. **5**:168-174.
- Dhyani, S., Misra, A.C, Panday, V, Sajwan, P. 2017. Evaluation of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon* L.) hybrids for fruit yield characters in hill region of Uttarakhand, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. **6**(9):1622-1633.
- Gebisa B., Gezu D., Alemayehu B., Fikadu T. 2017. Performance evaluation of Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) varieties under supplemental irrigation at Erer Valley, Babile District, Ethiopia. *Journal of Plant Sciences*. **5**(1):1-5.
- Giri A., Heckathorn S., Mishra S., Krause C. 2011. Heat stress decreases levels of nutrient-uptake and assimilation proteins in tomato roots. *Plants*. **6**. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants6010006>.
- Jindal, S.K., Dhaliwal, M.S., Chawl, N. 2018. Comparative performance of different tomato hybrids under naturally ventilated polyhouse. *International Journal of Horticulture Science*. **5**(14):1-12.
- Kallo, G., Challisia, K.A., Majors, S.N.G, Singh, M. 2012. Stability analysis of tomato. *Vegetable Science* **25**(1):81-84.
- Li, Z., Palmer, W.M., Martin, A.P., Wang, R., Rainsford, F., Jin, Y., Patrick, J.W., Yang, Y., Ruan, Y.L. 2011. High invertase activity in tomato reproductive organs correlates with enhanced sucrose import into, and heat tolerance of young fruit. *Journal of Experimental*



- Botany*, **63**, 1155-1166. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err329>
- Meseret, D., Ali, M., Kassahun, B. 2012. Evaluation of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) genotypes for yield and yield components. *African Journal of Plant Science and Biotechnology* **6**(special issue 1):50-56.
- Mohanty, B.K., 2002. Study on variability, heritability, interrelationship and path analysis in tomatoes. *Annals of Agriculture Research* **23**:65-69.
- Naika, S, Defense, J.V.L, De Goffan, J.V.L, Helms, M., VanDam, B. 2005. Tomato cultivation: Production transformation, and commercialization. 5th ed. Agromisa and Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation Foundation, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Pék, Z, Helyes, L., 2004. The effect of daily temperature on truss flowering rate of tomato. *Journal of the Science Food and Agriculture* **84**: (13): 1671-1674.
- Peet, M., Sato, S., Gardner, R. 1998. Comparing Heat Stress Effects on Male- Fertile and Male-Sterile Tomatoes. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **21**, 225-231. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.1998.00281>.
- Purkayastha, M.D, Mahanta, C.L. 2011. Physicochemical properties of five different tomato cultivars of Meghalaya and their suitability in food processing. *African Journal of Food Science*. **5**(4):657-667.
- Rodríguez, G, Strecker, J., Brewer, M., Gonzalo, M.J., Anderson, C., & Lang, L. (2010). Tomato Analyzer version 3 user manual, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. [http://www.oardc.osu.edu/vanderknaap/ûles/Tomato\\_Analyzer\\_3.0\\_Manual.pdf](http://www.oardc.osu.edu/vanderknaap/ûles/Tomato_Analyzer_3.0_Manual.pdf).
- Regassa, M.D, Mohammed, A, Bantte, K. 2012. Evaluation of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) genotypes for yield and yield components. *African Journal of Plant Science and Biotechnology*. **6**:45-49.
- Sharma, V.K, Singh, T. 2015. Performance evaluation of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) hybrids for increased productivity under polyhouse conditions in temperate areas. *Journal of Agriculture and Crops*. 2015; **1**(6):68-74.
- Singh, R., Ashe, B. 2005. Performance of tomato and sweet pepper under greenhouse. *Harayana Journal of Horticulture Science* **34**(1-2):174-175.
- Syukur M., Rosidah S. 2014. Estimation of the genetic parameter for quantitative characters of pepper (*Capsicum annum* L.). *Journal of Tropical Crop Science* **1**:4-8.
- Tadele, S. 2016. Evaluation of improved tomato varieties (*L. esculentum* Mill) performance against pest under open and glasshouse condition. *International Journal of Research Studies in Agriculture Science* **2**:1-7.
- Yan, W. and Tinker, N.A. 2006. Biplot analysis of multi-environment trial data: Principles and applications. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*. **86**:623-645.

**(Received on 30.01.2020 and Accepted on 30.12.2020)**

# INFORMATION TO CONTRIBUTORS

*Journal of Horticultural Sciences*, an international journal, is the official publication of **Society for Promotion of Horticulture (SPH)**. It covers basic and applied aspect of original research on all branches of horticulture and other cognate disciplines, which promotes horticulture in its broadest sense. Its goals are to apprise horticultural scientists and others interested in horticulture of scientific and industrial developments and extension findings. The area of research include evaluation of germplasm, breeding, agronomic practices, physiology, biochemistry, biotechnology, soils and plant nutrition, plant protection, weed control, pesticide residue, post harvest technology, economics, extension, farm machinery and mechanization, etc. which facilitate in the growth and expansion of horticulture. The journal is published twice a year, in June and December.

**The Journal of Horticultural Sciences (JHS)** publishes critical reviews, research papers and short communications. Three copies of the manuscript and an electronic form (CD, MS Word) should be submitted to the Chief Editor, JHS, SPH, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bangalore-560 089. The manuscript should preferably pertain to the research work carried out during the last five years. Author(s) must certify that the manuscript (s) has/have not been sent elsewhere for publication. All the authors have to become the members of SPH when a paper is accepted for publication. All papers will be refereed. Short communications on significant research findings, new record / technology are welcome. Besides invited review papers, scientists with vast experience on a particular field of research can also submit review papers which will be refereed. Decision of the Chief Editor / Editorial board is final. Authors are permitted to photocopy their article for non-commercial and scientific purpose. No reprints shall be provided *gratis*. Acceptance of manuscript for publication in JHS shall automatically mean transfer of copyright to the SPH. The chief editor/ Editorial board assumes no responsibility for the statements, opinion or facts expressed in the journal, which rests entirely with the author(s) thereof. Mention of a pesticide or a commercial or proprietary product does not constitute an endorsement or recommendation for the use.

**Title:** The title of the article should be bold and in running form. Use the font Times New Roman (14 point). Botanical / scientific names should be italicized. Author name(s) should be in running and bold with full address of the first author including e-mail address (it is mandatory as future correspondence will be only through e-mail). The address of other author(s), if different from the first author, should be given as footnotes and indicated by consecutive superscript numbers. A brief running title should be provided on a separate sheet.

**Abstract:** The abstract should not exceed 200 words. It should be suitable for indexing and publication in abstracting journal. Very pertinent keywords may be furnished.

**Text:** The text should be typed in double space on one side of good quality paper (21 x 29 cm) with 3cm margin on all sides **without justifying the text** and in clear and concise English. Use the font Times New Roman (12 point). The paper should be divided into subheadings (placed on the left margin and in upper case) such as Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, Acknowledgements, and References. Units and abbreviations should be in metric (SI) system. It is desirable that authors take due care on clarity and brevity of the paper. The length of the paper should not exceed 2500 words.

**Tables/ Illustrations/ Photographs:** Each table should be on a separate sheet with a short title at the end of the paper, numbered in the order in which it appears in the text. The data reported must be subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. The illustrations should be relevant to the research findings and should not be repeating of data presented in the table. Only very good photographs, mounted on hard paper to avoid folding, given on a separate sheet of paper with title, which are reproducible, will be accepted. Data to be presented in graphical form should be sent on quality glossy contrast paper without folding.

**References:** References should be cited in the text in the form of (Anon., 1999; Prakash, 2002; Krishnamoorthy and Mani, 2004). The term *et al* should be used when there are more than two authors. The letters, a,b,c,... should be used following the year, to distinguish between two or more papers by the same author(s) in one year. References at the end of the text should be given in the following form:

Shikhamany, S. D. and Satyanarayana, G. 1973. A study on the association of leaf nutrient contents with poor yields in Anab. E.shahi grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Ind. J. Hort.*, **30**: 376 - 380

Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. 1978. Statistical methods for Agricultural workers. ICAR, New Delhi, p 108.

Srinivas, K. 1987. Response of watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* Thunb. Musf) to drip and furrow irrigation under different nitrogen and plant population levels. Ph.D thesis, UAS, Bangalore

Mehta, N. K. and Sharma, S. D. 1986. Studies on flowering and fruit retention in some cultivars of peach (*Prunus persica* Batch). In: Advances in Research on Temperate Fruits. *Proc. Nat'l. Symp. Temp. Fruits*, Solan (India), Dr. Y. S. Parmar Univ. Hort. and Forestry, pp 37-42

Krishnamoorthy, A. and Mani, M. 2000. Biological Control of Pests of Vegetable Crops.p367-78. In: Biocontrol Potential and its exploitation in sustainable Agriculture. Vol. 2: Insect Pests. Upadhyay, R. K. Mukerji, K. G. and Chamola, B.P. (ed.). Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, New York

Cover photo (s) shall be included at the discretion of Editor. Authors may submit photographs/figures/diagrams for cover page while submitting the manuscript.

## AUTHOR INDEX - VOL. 15 ( 1&2) 2020

Name	Page	Name	Page
<b>A</b>		Gavankar, M. S.	233
Adamu, J.T.	136	Gokhale, N. B.	233
Adekoya, M.	136	Gowda D. C. S.	161
Adeniji, O.T.	136	Gowda, N. K. S.	197
Aghora T.S.	62	I	
Ahamed N.	17	Ingle Y. V.	153
Aravintharaj, R.	229	Ishaka, A.	136
Aremu, C.A.	136	J	
Ashok Kumar J.	45	Jadhav S.B.	67
Asokan, R.	229	Janakiram, T.	147
Aswath C.	93	Jandong, E.	136
Aswath, C.	147	Jasmin M. R.	207
Awcharae, C. M.	177	Jessy Mol K.K.	52
Azeez, S.	197, 207	K	
<b>B</b>		Kalaivanan D.	9
Babli, M.	127	Kanupriya, C.	221
Bala, M.	191	Karunakaran, G.	221
Bhatt R.M.	62	Katwate S.M.	67
Bhonde, S. R.	153	Khandekar, R. G.	233
Burondkar, M. M.	233	Kshirsagar, P. J.	233
<b>C</b>		Kulkarni, M. M.	233
Chandran, N. K.	81	Kumar D.	17
Chandrashekara C.	197, 207	Kumar, R.	147
<b>D</b>		L	
Desai, V. S.	233	Lad, O. A.	233
Dhananjaya, M. V.	147	Lakshmana Reddy D.C	52
Dinakara Adiga, J.	127	Lakshmi, J.	183
Dinesh, M. R.	107, 161	Laxman R.H.	35
<b>G</b>		M	
GaneshamurthyA.N.	9	Madhavi Reddy K	52
Ganga, M.	183	Manivannan, N.	183
		Manjunath B.L.,	35



<b>Name</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Page</b>
Manoj Y.B.	52	Sankar V	177
Meena H.R.	72	Sankaran, M.	107, 161
Mohan N.	62	Satisha G.C.	197, 207
Muralidhara, B. M	177	Shejal A. Porob	97
<b>N</b>		Shilpa Pandurangaiah,	27
Nair A.K.	35	Shivashankar K.S.	27
Negi, S. S.	147	Shivashankara, K. S.	207
<b>P</b>		Singh D. R.	177
Paithankar, D. H.	153	Singh S.R.	17
Pandey, M.	197, 207	Singh, P.	221
Pawar, C. D.	233	Singh, T.	191
Priya Devi S	45, 97	Somasundaram J.	72
<b>R</b>		Sriram S.	81
Rachitha R.	207	Srivastava K.K.	17
Radha T.K.	72	Sudhakar Rao D.V.	27
Ragaji, S. G.	233	Sujatha A. Nair	177
Raghu B.R.	1	Susmita C.	62
Raghupathi H.B.	9	<b>T</b>	
Rajamani, K.	183	Tanya Thakur	173
Rajiv Kumar	93	Tejaswini Prakash	81
Ramachandran, N.	147	Tenebe, A.V.	136
Ramachandrudu K	45	Thangam M	45, 97
Rami Reddy, P. V.	225	Thondaiman, V.	127
Rao, T. M.,	147	<b>V</b>	
Rashmi I.	72	Veena, G.L.	127
Ravishankar K.V	27	Venugopalan, R.	161
Roy, T. K.	197, 207, 229	Vichare S.V	67
Rupa T.R	9	<b>Y</b>	
<b>S</b>		Yousuf S.	17
Sadashiva A.T.	27	<b>Z</b>	
Sadawarte, A. K.	153	Zamil, M.	207
Safeena S.A.	45	Zamzam, M.A.	136

## SUBJECT INDEX - VOL. 15 (1&2) 2020

Name	Page	Name	Page
<b>A</b>			
Alphonso	233	Foot rot	152
Amino acid score	207	Free amino acids	207
Antigonon	225	Fruit development	97
Anti-senescence compound	191	Fruit trees	9
Apis spp	225	Fruit quality	136
Arka Mushroom Rasam	197	Fruit shape	136
<b>B</b>			
B:C ratio	233	Fruit yield	136
Bee flora	225	Fruits	107
Bioavailability	197	Fusarium wilt	147
Biplot analysis	161	<b>G</b>	
Bound amino acids	207	Garden pea	62
Breeding	62	GCV	161
Bulb	67	Genetic diversity	17
<b>C</b>			
Canopy management	127	Genetic analysis	161
Carotene	27	Genetic divergence	45
Carotenoid	27	Genotype by environment	136
CGMS	52	Gerbera	93
Character correlation	136	Germplasm	1, 107
Chrysanthemum	173, 191	GIS	107
Conservation	107	Gladiolus	147
Copper	72	Goa	97
Correlation coefficient	45	Groundwater depletion	9
Curry leaves	1	Growth	67
Cut flower production	177	Growth parameters	233
Cut-flower	93	Gummosis	152
<b>D</b>			
Delayed flowering	191	<b>H</b>	
Dendrobium	177	Heritability	161
Distribution	1	High temperature	62
Diversity	1	Honey bees	225
Drought	9	Honeydew	229
<b>E</b>			
Early summer	62	Hot pepper	52
Evaluation	93, 147	Hybrid	67
Ex situ	107	Hypsizygus ulmarius	197
<b>F</b>			
Flower	67	<b>I</b>	
Flowering	147	In situ	107
		Iron	72
		Iron fortified	197
		<b>J</b>	
		Jasminum spp	183
		<b>K</b>	
		Kikiobiory	173



<b>Name</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>L</b>			
LC-MS-MS	229	Pruning	127
Leaf analysis	72	Pulp recovery	221
Lycopene	27	<b>Q</b>	
<b>M</b>			
Manganese	72	Quality	177
Mango	161, 233	Quantitative character	45
Marker Assisted Selection	52	<b>R</b>	
Micronutrient deficiency	72	Resistance Gene Analogues (RGA)	81
Mitochondria	52	Rootstocks	127
Morphotypes	1	Rose	81
Mushrooms	197	<b>S</b>	
<b>N</b>			
Nagpur mandarin	152	Sapota	72
Nitrogen	173	Scheduling irrigation	35
Novel hybrids	93	Selection	221
Nucleotide Binding Site-Leucine	81	Single linkage cluster analysis	17
Rich Repeats (NBS-LRR)		Single type tuberose	67
Nutrients	177	Soil volume wetting	35
Nutrition	207	Soilless media	233
<b>O</b>			
Onion	17	Solanum lycopersicum	136
Orchid	177	Spacing	35
ORF	52	Standardization	173
Ornamental creeper	225	Stress tolerance	62
<b>P</b>			
Palynology	183	Sugars	229
Papaya yield	35	<b>T</b>	
PBZ	127	Tamarind	221
PCV	161	Thrips palmi	229
Peak water	9	Tomato	27
Perennial crops	9	Training	127
Phytophthora	152	Tropical	107
Pink types	97	<b>V</b>	
Planting geometry	127	Variability	136
Podosphaera pannosa	81	Varieties	107
Policy issue	9	Vase life	147, 191
Pollen germination	183	Vegetable cowpea	45
Pollen morphology	183	<b>W</b>	
Polyhouse	93, 136	Water use efficiency	35
Potassium salt of phosphonic acid (PSPA)	152	Wax apple	97
Potted plants	173	White types	97
Powdery mildew	81	Wild species	107
Principal component analysis	17	<b>Y</b>	
		Yield	221
		<b>Z</b>	
		Zinc	72



**STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS ABOUT  
JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES**

(Form IV)

Place of Publication : Bengaluru

Periodicity of publication : Half-yearly

Printer's Name : Mr. Ravikumar, B.A.

Nationality : Indian

Address : Resolution Print Media  
#131, 6<sup>th</sup> Main, Meenakshinagar  
Kamakshipalya, Bengaluru - 560 079.

Publisher's Name : Society for Promotion of Horticulture

Address : ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research  
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.  
Bengaluru - 560 089

Editor-in-Chief : Dr. S. Sriram

Nationality : Indian

Address : ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research  
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.  
Bengaluru - 560 089.

Name and addresses of individuals who own the journal and partners or are shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital : Society for Promotion of Horticulture  
ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research  
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.  
Bengaluru - 560 089.

I, Dr. S. Sriram, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

June 30, 2020

Sd/-  
(S. Sriram)  
Editor-in-Chief



## SOCIETY FOR PROMOTION OF HORTICULTURE

ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research  
Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru-560 089, India  
sphiihr2005@gmail.com / chiefeditor.jhs@gmail.com  
Website : <https://sphindia.org>

### ENROLMENT FORM

Name in full (in block letters) :  
Dr./Mrs./Mr./Ms.

Designation :

Address for communication :

Phone No. :

E-mail ID :

Type of membership : Patron / Life member / Annual member / Student member\*

Payment :

Demand Draft No. / Date :

Bank :

Place :

Date : SIGNATURE

#### Membership fee structure :

Type of membership	Membership amount	Enrolment fee	Total membership amount payable by Demand Draft (₹)
Patron	20,000/-	200/-	20,200/-
Life Member	5,000/-	200/-	5,200/-
Annual Member (India )	1,000/-	200/-	1,200/-
i. For SAARC authors	US \$ 100	US \$ 5	US \$ 105
ii. For SAARC countries	US \$ 50	US \$ 5	US \$ 55
Student member*	500/-	200/-	700/-

\*The application of student members must be certified by their Head of dept. or equivalent and the student member shall not receive a copy of the journal.

Please send the duly filled-in enrolment form along with Demand Draft drawn in favour of Society for Promotion of Horticulture, by post to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editorial team acknowledges the services of the following reviewers

**Dr. Shylesha A.N.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-NBAIR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Ashwath Narayan**

Associate Professor, UAS, Raichur

**Dr. Mohan C.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CTCRI, Trivandrum

**Dr. Chavalli Sarada**

Associate Professor, YSRHU, Guntur

**Dr. Dinesh R.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IISR, Calicut

**Dr. Kalaivanan D.**

Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Sudhakar Rao D.V.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Fakrudin B.**

Professor, College of Horticulture, UHS, Bengaluru

**Dr. Hebbar K.B.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CPCRI, Kasaragod

**Dr. Hima Bindu**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Satisha J.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Krishnamurthy K.S.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CPCRI, Kasaragod

**Dr. Kundan Kishore**

Principal Scientist, CHES (ICAR-IIHR), Bhubaneswar

**Dr. Sankaran M.**

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Madhu Bala**

Associate Professor, PAU, Ludhiana

**Dr. Nandeesh P.**

Senior Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru



**Dr. Venkatarami Reddy P.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Prakash Tripathi**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Prasad R.D.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIOR, Hyderabad

**Dr. Rajashekar P.E.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Rajiv Kumar**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Ravindran Chandran**  
Horticulturist, TNAU, Coimbatore

**Dr. Ramani S.**  
Former Project Coordinator, AICRP on Honey Bees and Pollinator,  
Bengaluru

**Dr. Veena S.S.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-CTCRI, Trivandrum

**Dr. Smaranika Mishra**  
Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Sujatha A. Nair**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Tejaswini Prakash**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Usha Bharathi T.**  
Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Sridhar V.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

**Dr. Srinivasan V.**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IISR, Calicut

Sd/-  
**(S. Sriram)**  
Editor-in-Chief

## New Varieties/ Technologies of ICAR-IIHR



**New Water Melon - Arka Shyama variety**



**Arka Red - New Gerbera variety**



**Leaf curl resistant chilli varieties Arka Tejaswi, Arka Saanvi and Arka Tanvi**



**Arka Abhi**



**Arka Shuba**

## New Varieties/ Technologies of ICAR-IIHR



Arka Herbiwash - Safe way of removing pesticide residues



Arka Bharath - New teasel gourd variety

***Journal of Horticultural Sciences is indexed by the following abstracting and indexing services***



*Article published in Journal of Horticultural Sciences are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.*

