

Print ISSN : 0972-8813
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 21(2) May-August 2023]

Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



ADVISORYBOARD

Patron

Dr. Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Members

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. J.P. Jaiswal, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. S.P. Singh, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Malobica Das Trakroo, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. R.S. Jadoun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

EDITORIALBOARD

Members

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India
Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India
Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India
Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A
Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.
Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India
Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium
Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines
Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India
Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India
Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India
Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India
Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India
Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India
Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia
Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.
Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India
Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India
Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.
Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.
Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India
Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India
Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.
Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Managing Editor

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Assistant Managing Editor

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Technical Manager

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

PANTNAGAR JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

Vol. 21(2)

May-August, 2023

CONTENTS

Evaluation of seed quality parameters in forage oat (<i>Avena sativa</i> L.) germplasm	129
HARSHITA NEGI, VAIBHAV BIST, AKIRTI BALLABH and BIRENDRA PRASAD	
Mepiquat Chloride: An effective plant growth regulator to improve growth and productivity of rice in North-Western Himalayan region of India	135
S. K. YADAV, D. K. SINGH, KIRTI SHARMA, PRATIMA ARYA, SUPRIYA TRIPATHI and YOGESH SHARMA	
Performance of Integrated Nutrient Management for yield and Net Income of lentil (<i>Lens culinaris Medik</i>)	141
KUMARI ANJALI and HIMANSHU VERMA	
Potential and scope of Agarwood (<i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i> lamk.) cultivation in India	145
SNEHA DOBHALL, DURGA BAHUGUNA, REETIKA BINJOLA, GARIMA BHATT, RAJ KUMAR, AYUSH JOSHI, KANICA UPADHYAY and NEELAM CHAUHAN	
Effect of transplanting date on incidence of insect pests of rice	154
R. DOGRA and A. K. PANDEY	
Measuring the antixenosis responses of <i>Spodoptera litura</i> larvae to different soybean germplasms by leaf choice method	170
ASHUTOSH and NEETA GAUR	
Long term efficacy of different herbal fumigants against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Tribolium castaneum</i> (Herbst)	174
DEEPA KUMARI and S. N. TIWARI	
Screening of different combinations of <i>Trichoderma harzanium</i> and <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> for growth promotion activity in rice plants under glass house conditions	186
SAPNA, BHUPESH CHANDRA KABDWAL and ROOPALI SHARMA	
Role of Fungal Effector Proteins for Disease Expression in Plants	191
HINA KAUSAR, GEETA SHARMA and BHAGYASHREE BHATT	
Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on performance of rose cv. Rose Sherbet	203
LOLLA RACHANA, V. K. RAO and D. C. DIMRI	
A Review-Tomato quality as influenced by preharvest factors	209
H.N. PRASAD, BANKEY LAL, SUNITA BHANDARI, RAKESH BHARGAVA, VIPUL PRATAP SINGH and ANSHU KAMBOJ	
Effect of ZnO Nanoparticles on Macronutrients Content of <i>Pleurotus sajor- caju</i> (Oyster Mushroom)	218
LEEMA and H. PUNETHA	
Nutritional, sensory and shelf-life analysis of pearl millet-based value-added biscuits enriched with <i>jamun</i> seed powder	224
SAVITA, AMITA BENIWAL, VEENU SANGWAN and ASHA KAWATRA	
Quality characteristics of low salt functional chicken meat patties incorporated with Barnyard Millet	234
DEEPSHIKHA SINGH, ANITA ARYA, P. PRABHAKARAN, P.K. SINGH, SHIVE KUMAR, N.C. HAHN and A.K. UPADHYAY	

Effect of supplementation of tulsi (<i>Ocimum sanctum</i>) leaf powder on growth performance in commercial broiler	239
SURAJ GAJANAN MADAVI, RAJKUMAR1, KARTIK TOMAR, SHIWANSHU TIWARI, D.S. SAHU, S.P. YADAV and GULAB CHANDRA	
Combating antimicrobial resistance through gene silencing	246
BEENU JAIN, ANUJ TEWARI, ANUPRIYA MISRA and YASHOVARDHAN MISRA	
Effect of aluminium nano particles on humoral immune response of wistar rats	256
SHODHAN K.V, SEEMA AGARWAL and R S CHAUHAN	
Effect of nano zinc on body weight and behaviour of Wistar rats	262
ABHIVYAKTI PATHAK, SEEMA AGARWAL and R.S. CHAUHAN	
The growth potential of thermophilic Campylobacters on various culture media	267
NAWAL KISHOR SINGH, A. K. UPADHYAY, MAANSI, AMAN KAMBOJ and AJAY KUMAR	
Meta-analysis of rabies diagnostic tests in dogs	271
A. K. UPADHYAY, R. S. CHAUHAN, MAANSI and N. K. SINGH	
Growth Performance of <i>Schizothorax richardsonii</i> fingerlings with different feeding strategies	274
TOSHIBAA, DIKSHA ARYA, SUMIT KUMAR, H.C.S BISHT and N.N. PANDEY	
Observation of fish mortality in the mudflat of Siruthalaikadu Creek, Palk Bay, Southeast Coast of India	279
ABINAYA R, KANISHKAR A and SAJEEVAN MK	
Physiochemical properties of pretreated tomato powder from different drying technique	282
SHRADDHA SETHI and NEERAJ SETHI	
A Review: Energy analysis of different fodder crop production in India	290
RAHUL KUMAR YADAV, RAVI PRATAP SINGH, ANIL KUMAR and SAURABH KUMAR SINGH	
A review on current scenario of paddy straw management machineries: Viable solution for in-situ residue management	297
VISHNU JI AWASTHI, RAJ NARAYAN PATERIYA, ABHISHEK MISHRA, KETAN BHIBHISHAN PHALPHALE and ABHINAV KUMAR	
Field evaluation of Tractor-Operated Pneumatic Planter for maize crop planting	305
AMIT KUMAR, JAYAN P R and VISHNU JI AWASTHI	
Assessing flood inundation for breach of Jamrani Dam, Uttarakhand using HEC-RAS 2D	314
JYOTHI PRASAD, LOVEJEET SINGH and SHIVA PRASAD H.J	
Attitude and constraints faced by the beneficiaries of Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana in Garhwal region of Uttarakhand	320
TRIPTI KHOLIA and ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL	
Effectiveness of participatory newsletter on honey production: A study in Nainital district of Uttarakhand	327
MALIK, AAFREEN, ANSARI, M.A. and AMARDEEP	
Food habits of farm women and their haemoglobin level	322
REETA DEVI YADAV, S.K. GANGWAR, CHELPURI RAMULU and ANUPAMA KUMARI	

Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on performance of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

LOLLA RACHANA, V. K. RAO* and D. C. DIMRI

Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145 (U. S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

**Corresponding author's email Id: vkrahort@yahoo.com*

ABSTRACT: The present investigation was carried out at Model Floriculture Centre, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. The trial was laid in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments. Among all the treatments plant height (63.53 cm), plant spread (55.57 cm), number of branches (5.93), number of leaves (189.33) and stem diameter (1.31 cm) were found maximum in plants treated with humic acid @ 3 mL L⁻¹ and 75% Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF-60:120:120 NPK kg ha⁻¹) i.e., T₄ after 150 days of application. T₄ also exhibited maximum leaf area per plant (1023.75 cm²), early flower bud appearance (31.47 days), days taken for bud to bloom (12.47 days), 50 per cent flowering (49.33 days), maximum number of flowering shoots per plant per month (3.8), earliest days to harvest (44.40 days), maximum bud length (3.19 cm), bud diameter (1.85 cm), flower diameter (5.44 cm), number of petals per flower (46.73) and longest flower longevity (5.73 days). Weight of single flower (3.97 g) and 100 flowers (398.87 g), number of flowers per plant per month (18.13), flower yield per plant per month (61.72 g), flower yield per plant per hectare (5693.17 Kg) and shelf life (29.20 hr) were also enhanced by T₄ which also recorded highest benefit – cost ratio (2.62) whereas lowest value (0.73) was noticed in T₉ (Arka microbial consortium + 50 % RDF).

Key words: Biostimulants, biofertilizer, flowering, rose, shelf life, yield

Rose (*Rosa hybrida* L.) belongs to the family Rosaceae, it has chromosome number 2n=14 and is native to the temperate regions of Northern Hemisphere. Due to multiple uses of rose, it has great demand for production throughout the year. In many regions the traditional methods of farming are still used (Sivaramane *et al.*, 2015). Under conventional cultivation practices, rose plants are grown with chemical farming system which in excess may cause frequent changes in soil pH, contaminates air and water and kills beneficial insects and other natural ecosystem members. To avoid this, agricultural practices have been advancing towards sustainable, organic and environment- friendly systems. Plant extracts called biostimulants contain a variety of bioactive chemicals. These compounds can often improve the plant's nutrient utilisation efficiency as well as its tolerance to biotic and abiotic challenges. Various technical revolutions have been proposed in recent years in order to improve the sustainability of production systems by drastically reducing the use of agrochemicals. Usage of chemicals and/or microorganisms that strengthen plant development, increase tolerance to unfavourable soil and environmental factors and increase resource use

efficiency would be an optimistic approach. Such compounds are biostimulants and biofertilizers. The studies related to the application of biostimulants and biofertilizers on rose flower cultivation are meagre in number. Therefore, the present experiment was carried out to study the effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on the performance of rose cv. Rose Sherbet.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The investigation was conducted at Model Floriculture Centre, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar during December 2021 to May 2022 and it is 243.84 metres above mean sea level, is situated at 29° North latitude and 79.3° East longitude and has humid, sub-tropical climate with the maximum temperature ranging from 32°C to 44°C in summer and minimum temperature ranging from 0°C to 4.4°C in winter. The summer is dry and hot, winter is too cold and frost can be expected from the last week of December to middle of February. The onset of Monsoon usually occurs from the last week of June and continues in appreciable

amounts up to the last week of September. The soil is classified as a mollisol. It has a sandy loam texture and has an ideal water holding capacity as well as appropriate drainage. The trial was laid out under open condition in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments viz., T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120 NPK kg ha⁻¹), T_2 -75 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 -75 % RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 -50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium. Fulvic acid, humic acid (himedia) were applied at 15, 30 and 45 days through foliar application after planting @ 3g L⁻¹. Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika) was applied at 15, 30 and 45 days through foliar application after planting @ 3mL L⁻¹ and IIHR- Arka microbial consortium was applied 10 days after planting through soil drenching, @ 50 g L⁻¹ plant⁻¹. Three months old rose cv. Rose Sherbet plants which were propagated through stem cuttings were selected for investigation. 30 cm³ pits were dug and filled with a mixture of soil and FYM. Recommended dose of NPK fertilizers were applied as per treatments. The fertilizers were applied in the form of NPK (12:32:16), urea and muriate of potash. The healthy plants were selected and planted in the December

2021 with a spacing of 60 cm x 60 cm. Certain gaps were noticed due to plant mortality and these gaps were replaced with new plants grown in the nursery for this purpose. Uniform cultural practices were followed for all the treatments during the investigation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on analysis of variance (ANOVA), significant differences were recorded between treatments for all characteristics at 5% level of significance. The data presented in Table 1 depict vegetative parameters viz. plant height (63.53 cm), plant spread (55.57 cm), number of branches per plant (5.93), number of leaves per plant (189.33), stem diameter (1.31 cm) and leaf area per plant (1023.75 cm²) were found highest in T_4 (75 % RDF + Humic acid).

This could be owing to the easier nutrient absorption, which would encourage protein synthesis from stored carbohydrates. These results are in conformity with El-Nashar (2021) in calendula, Praveen *et al.* (2021) in rose, Ali *et al.* (2014) in tulip and Nasiri *et al.* (2015) in geranium.

There was a significant difference was among all treatments for other parameters (Table 2). Earliest days to flower bud appearance (31.47 days), days

Table 1: Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on vegetative growth attributes of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

Treatments	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)	Number of branches per plant	Number of leaves per plant	Stem diameter (cm)	Leaf area per plant (cm ²)
T_1	57.80	52.83	5.27	176.00	1.26	959.15
T_2	61.27	54.23	5.67	186.00	1.29	996.50
T_3	53.80	51.00	5.07	165.47	1.25	906.46
T_4	63.53	55.57	5.93	189.33	1.31	1023.75
T_5	57.13	52.23	5.47	171.00	1.26	921.52
T_6	60.53	54.03	5.60	185.87	1.28	991.93
T_7	54.93	51.43	5.13	167.47	1.26	914.13
T_8	59.40	53.20	5.40	180.80	1.27	943.06
T_9	52.60	50.57	4.93	162.27	1.24	895.90
SEm ±	0.71	0.42	0.07	1.03	0.01	8.60
CD _{0.05}	2.15	2.55	0.21	3.11	0.02	25.80
CV(%)	2.14	1.38	2.34	1.02	0.87	1.56

T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120NPK kg ha⁻¹) T_2 -75 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 -75 %RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 -50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium

taken for bud to bloom (12.47days), days taken to 50 per cent flowering (49.33 days), maximum number of flowering shoots (3.80) and earliest days to harvest (44.40 days) was registered in T_4 . The formation of early flower bud might have been impacted by triggering of such metabolic activity and lowering of the C: N ratio by the accumulation of carbohydrates. Early blooming would have also been influenced by the increased production of auxin and growth factors brought on by the application of humic acid.

This may also be related to gibberellin-like activity of humic acid, according to Vaughan *et al.* (1985). Similar results were reported by Bashir *et al.* (2016), Jabbar and AL-Bakkar (2022) in rose, Najarian *et al.* (2022) in *Pelargonium × hortorum* and Mirzaei *et al.* (2019) in gerbera.

With regards to flower quality parameters (Table 3), significantly improved the bud length (3.19 cm), bud diameter (1.85 cm), flower diameter (5.44 cm), number of petals per flower (46.73) and flower longevity (5.73 days) by foliar application of humic

Table 2: Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on flowering of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

Treatments	Days to flower bud appearance	Days for bud to bloom	Days to 50 % flowering	No. of flowering shoots plant ⁻¹	Days to harvest
T_1	39.80	12.80	54.87	2.40	56.13
T_2	35.07	12.53	51.33	3.27	48.60
T_3	43.73	12.87	59.47	1.80	63.60
T_4	31.47	12.47	49.33	3.80	44.40
T_5	41.80	12.80	58.47	2.07	52.80
T_6	35.00	12.67	51.60	3.00	49.20
T_7	44.00	12.93	58.40	1.80	63.27
T_8	38.40	12.93	55.33	2.80	54.20
T_9	43.80	13.00	60.33	1.73	64.20
SEm ±	1.09	0.30	0.59	0.10	1.30
CD _{0.05}	3.29	NS	1.78	0.31	3.91
CV(%)	4.85	4.1	1.86	7.16	4.10

T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120NPK kg ha⁻¹) T_2 -75 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 - 75 %RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 -50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IHR- Arka microbial consortium

Table 3: Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on flower quality of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

Treatments	Bud length (cm)	Bud diameter (cm)	Flower diameter (cm)	Number of petals flower ⁻¹	Flower longevity (days)
T_1	2.75	1.52	5.09	43.47	4.67
T_2	3.03	1.67	5.29	45.27	5.27
T_3	2.39	1.50	5.06	40.60	3.80
T_4	3.19	1.85	5.44	46.73	5.73
T_5	2.51	1.51	5.15	42.87	4.47
T_6	3.00	1.60	5.27	44.20	5.20
T_7	2.48	1.46	5.05	40.07	4.27
T_8	2.83	1.61	5.26	43.00	4.93
T_9	2.35	1.45	4.93	39.53	3.47
SEm ±	0.05	0.04	0.14	0.47	0.14
CD _{0.05}	0.16	0.13	NS	1.42	0.43
CV(%)	3.56	5.06	4.92	1.92	5.34

T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120NPK kg ha⁻¹) T_2 -75 % RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 - 75 %RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 -50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IHR- Arka microbial consortium

acid + 75% RDF i.e., T_4 (Table 3).

This could be associated with better absorption of nutrients, particularly the gibberellin-like compounds in humic acid (Al-Hayani, 2016). The humic acid induced significantly higher number of petals per flower as has the ability to improve plant membrane permeability, intensify plant enzyme systems, speed up cell division and boost root development which ultimately resulted plants became healthier and have more food available to them and ultimately more number of petals per flower (Khaled and Fawy, 2011). These results of present study are in accordance with the findings of Al-Hayani (2016) who observed similar results

in lemon (*Citrus lemon* L.) when treated with humic acid.

The data presented in Table 4 shows that significantly increased fresh weight of single flower (3.97 g) and 100 flowers (398.87 g), number of flowers per plant per month (15.55), flower yield per plant per month (51.24 g), flower yield per hectare per month (5693.17 Kg) and improved shelf life (29.20 hr) was noted in T_4 . The increased photosynthetic activity brought by the application of humic acid along with NPK may have contributed to an increase in dry matter accumulation and effective partitioning of photosynthates toward the sink, which could explain the increase in flower weight. The increased number of flowers per plant

Table 4: Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on flower yield and shelf life of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

Treatments	Weight of single flower (g)	Weight of 100 flowers (g)	Number of flowers plant ⁻¹ month ⁻¹	Flower yield plant ⁻¹ month ⁻¹ (g)	Flower yield ha ⁻¹ month ⁻¹ (Kg)	Shelf life (hrs)
T_1	3.47	348.07	10.10	33.13	3680.64	27.87
T_2	3.73	381.37	14.07	45.99	5110.23	28.60
T_3	3.30	333.87	7.82	26.28	2920.29	27.00
T_4	3.97	398.87	15.55	51.24	5693.17	29.20
T_5	3.42	333.33	8.75	28.69	3187.32	27.73
T_6	3.69	370.17	13.80	45.34	5037.45	28.20
T_7	3.33	330.13	7.75	25.30	2811.22	26.93
T_8	3.55	355.90	12.13	39.18	4352.84	28.00
T_9	3.24	318.70	6.15	20.28	2253.09	26.73
SEm ±	0.07	5.03	0.12	0.61	67.64	0.15
CD _{0.05}	0.22	15.08	0.36	1.83	202.80	0.47
CV(%)	3.73	2.47	1.95	3.00	3.00	0.98

T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120NPK kg ha⁻¹) T_2 -75 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 - 75 %RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 - 50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium

Table 5: Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on economics of cultivation of rose cv. Rose Sherbet

Treatments	Total expenditure (Rs ha ⁻¹)	Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Gross return (Rs ha ⁻¹)	B:C Ratio
T_1	403736.66	3680.64	596263.30	1.96
T_2	432713.46	5110.23	827856.82	2.62
T_3	405049.65	2920.29	473086.75	1.51
T_4	475724.08	5693.17	922294.18	2.62
T_5	444477.76	3187.32	516345.54	1.48
T_6	426688.19	5037.45	816067.15	2.62
T_7	398612.78	2811.22	455417.25	1.48
T_8	620852.14	4352.84	705160.25	1.39
T_9	594211.00	2253.09	364999.78	0.73

T_1 -100 % Recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF- 60:120:120NPK kg ha⁻¹) T_2 -75 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_3 -50 %RDF + Fulvic acid, T_4 - 75 %RDF + Humic acid, T_5 -50 % RDF + Humic acid, T_6 -75 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_7 - 50 % RDF + Sea weed extract (IFFCO Sagarika), T_8 -75 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium, T_9 -50 %RDF + IIHR- Arka microbial consortium

might be due to the presence of growth-promoting substances viz. essential plant nutrients, vitamins, enzymes and antibiotics.

Improved translocation of more metabolites from source to sink may have resulted in higher yield. These results are in line with the findings of Bashir *et al.* (2016) in gladiolus, Praveen *et al.* (2021) in rose, El-Nashar (2021) in calendula and Jabbar and AL-Bakkar (2022) in rose. The thickened cells of the flowers would indicate a longer shelf life as they would have acquired more nutrition. The thicker cells are meant to increase the longevity of flowers. It is possible that cytokinin and auxin present in humic acid boosted antioxidant levels and senescence resistance (Zhang and Schmidt, 1997). These results were similar to Jabbar and AL-Bakkar (2022) in rose, Bashir *et al.* (2016) in gladiolus and Mirzaei *et al.* (2019) in gerbera.

The variation in benefit – cost ratio (Table 5) and the maximum cost benefit ratio was found in T₄ (2.62) T₂ (2.62) and T₆ (2.62) followed by T₁ (1.96) while the minimum ratio was noted in T₅ (0.73). This difference in the ratio could be due to variation in variable cost and yield. These results are in conformity with the findings of Archana (2018) in tuberose.

CONCLUSION

The results of the present study showed that for getting better growth and flowering of rose cv. Rose Sherbet in open conditions under Tarai conditions of Uttarakhand, the plants must be sprayed with humic acid @ 3g L⁻¹ at 15-day intervals, three times after planting and 75 per cent RDF (60:120:120 NPK kg ha⁻¹) which enhances the vegetative growth, flowering, flower quality, yield and shelf life.

REFERENCES

- Al-Hayani, A. M. (2016). Effect of rootstock and humic acid spray on lemon (*Citrus lemon* L.) seedlings I. tolerance to irrigation water salinity. *Basrah Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 29(2): 485-501
- Ali, A., Rehman, S. U., Raza, S. and Butt, S. J. (2014). Combined effect of humic acid and NPK on growth and flower development of *Tulipa gesneriana* in Faisalabad, Pakistan. *Journal of Ornamental Plants*, 4 (4): 39-48
- Archana, J. (2018). Effect of nutrients, biostimulants, packaging and storage temperatures on growth, flowering and storability of tuberose (*Polianthes tuberosa* L.) cv. Bidhan Rajni I. M. Sc. Thesis, Sri Konda Laxman Telangana State Horticultural University, Hyderabad, Telangana, India. 156 p
- Bashir, M., Qadri, R. W. K., Khan, I., Zain, M., Rasool, A. and Ashraf, U. (2016). Humic acid application improves the growth, floret and bulb indices of gladiolus (*Gladiolus grandiflorus* L.). *Pakistan Journal of Science*, 68 (2): 121-127
- El-Nashar, Y. I. (2021). Effect of levels of humic acid at different times on improvement of the growth of calendula (*Calendula officinalis* L.) Plant. *Alexandria Science Exchange Journal*, 42 (3): 665-675
- Jabbar, I. Y. and AL-Bakkar, A. H. A. Q. (2022). The effect of irrigation with magnetized water and spraying with humic acid on the production of cut flowers of the rose plant cv. Elida. *The European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, 3 (2): 93-97
- Khaled, H. and Fawy, H. A. (2011). Effect of different levels of humic acids on the nutrient content, plant growth and soil properties under conditions of salinity. *Soil and Water Research*, 6 (1): 21-29
- Mirzaei, N., Jabbarzadeh, Z. and RasouliSadaghiani, M. H. (2019). Investigation of some morphological and biochemical characteristics and vase life of *Gerbera jamesonii* cv. Dune cut flower using humic acid and nano calcium chelate. *Iranian Journal of Horticultural Science and Technology*, 20 (2): 157-170
- Sivaramane, N., Kumar, A., Singh, D.R. and Arya, P. (2015). An economic analysis of traditional and hi-tech rose (*Rosa spp.*) cultivation. *Journal of Ornamental*

- Horticulture*, 11(1): 21-26.
- Najarian, A., Souri, M. K. and Nabigol, A. (2022). Influence of humic substance on vegetative growth, flowering and leaf mineral elements of *Pelargonium x hortorum*. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 45 (1): 107-112
- Nasiri, Z., Khalighi, A. and Matlabi, E. (2015). The effect of humic acid, fulvic acid and kristalon on quantitative and qualitative characteristics of geranium. *International Journal of Biosciences*, 6: 34-41
- Praveen, T. M., Patil, S. R., Patil, B. C., Seetharamu, G. K., Rudresh, D. L., Pavankumar, P. and Patil, R. T. (2021). Influence of biostimulants on growth and yield of floribunda rose cv. Mirabel. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 10 (1): 2701-2705
- Vaughan, D. and Malcom, R.E. (1985). Influence of Humic Substances on Growth and Physiological Processes. In: 'Vaughan, D., Malcolm, R.E.(Eds.) *Soil Organic Matter and Biological Activity*'. Dordrecht: Springer, The Netherlands. 16: 37-75.
- Zhang, X. and Schmidt, R. E. (1997). The impact of growth regulators on alpha-tocopherol status of water-stressed *Poa pratensis* L. *International Turfgrass Society Research Journal*, 8(2): 1364-1371

Received: August 1, 2023

Accepted: August 30, 2023