# Effect of plant growth regulators on flower yield, vase life and economics of dutch rose (Rosa hybrida Linn.) cv. 'PASSION' under polyhouse condition 


#### Abstract
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ABSTRACT : The experiment was carried out at Hi-Tech Horticulture Park, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during 200809. The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments comprising of four levels each of $\mathrm{GA}_{3}(50,100,150$ and 200 ppm$)$ and CCC (1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 ppm ) along with control (Water spray) in protected condition. Among all treatments, an application of $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200 \mathrm{ppm}$ is most effective treatment for increasing number of Flowers per plant, number of flowers per square meter, number of flower per hectare and vase life of rose flowers .From Economic point of view, $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200 \mathrm{ppm}$ was found beneficial as compared to rest of the treatments. The highest net returns and CBR were obtained with $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ 200 ppm.
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Rose (Rosa spp.) or "Taruni pushpa" in Sanskrit belongs to the family Rosaceae. Rose has ever been the world's most favourite and unchallenged Queen of flowers making the number one in world's trade. Species of the genus Rosa have been identified almost everywhere in the Northern Hemisphere, as far as North Alaska and Norway. The Chinese were probably the first to cultivate roses for over 2000 years before. China roses were introduced to the European markets in the mid eighteenth century (Biswas, 1983).

In India, rose is cultivated on an area of 6500 ha in different parts (Anonymous, 2008). The major rose growing states are Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. But, the greenhouse roses with long stems as modern flowers are produced
predominantly in Maharashtra, Karnataka, West Bengal, Delhi, and Punjab (Chandigarh). In Gujarat, particularly Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Surat, Navsari and Valsad districts have vast scope for the cultivation of cut flowers. The areas under flower crops in India crossed 1.5 lakh hectares in the year 2007-08 with a production of 804 thousand metric tons of loose flowers and 3772 million lakhs of cut flowers (Anonymous, 2008). In Gujarat during 2007-08, the area under flower crops was about 8400 ha with production of 54588 MT loose and cut flowers (Anonymous, 2008). In Gujarat, the area under rose cultivation was about 2558 ha with production of 16479 MT flowers. There is great demand for cut flowers in other mega cities of India and other countries also; India's export of floriculture products has gradually
increased from Rs. 115.4 crore in 2001 to Rs. 649.83 crore in year 2008. India is currently exporting cut roses to U.K., U.S.A., Germany, The Netherlands, Switzerland, France, Spain and Poland.

Under protected conditions, the rose is the leading cut flower commercially grown all over world. It ranks first in global cut flower trade. This flower has a worldwide consumption of more than $\$ 40$ billion. However, its cultivation demands special care and attention, so that the flower blooms to their maximum potential. Tremendous progress has been made in raising new varieties by crossbreeding and selection. Previously commercial rose cultivation in India was mainly under open field conditions. However, with the advent of stateof the-art greenhouse cultivation in early 90 's, large scale cultivation of export quality cut flowers in protected condition started, there by totally altering production dynamics. Cut flower trade is worldwide dominated by Hybrid Tea roses cv. Gladiator, Super Star, Happiness, First Red, Passion, etc.

Plant growth regulators play an important role in enhancing growth and development of plant. These chemicals in minute quantities have an influence on flower yield and quality. Growth regulators affect plant metabolism by bringing a change in nutritional and hormonal status of the plant. Growth regulators promote, inhibit or modify the physiological processes of the plant. They increase the flower yield and improve the quality by altering the behaviour of plant systems. They help in synthesis of metabolites and translocation of nutrients and assimilation of these into different plant parts, which ultimately result into higher yield and flower quality improvement.

## RESEARCH METHODS

## Experimental site :

The present experiment was carried out at Hi-tech Horticulture Park, (Greenhouse unit No. 6) Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during the year 200809. Experiment details are given in Table A.

## Treatment details :

Nine treatments studied in the experiment are given in Table B:

Experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design having three replications. The treatments of foliar

| 1. | Location | : | Hi-tech Horticultural Park (Polyhouse Unit no.6), Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, Gujarat (India). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Design | : | Randomized Block Design (RBD) |
| 3. | Year of experiment | : | 2008-09 |
| 4. | Replications | : | Three (3) |
| 5. | Treatments | : | Nine (9) |
| 6. | Spacing | : | $0.40 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.30 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.50 \mathrm{~m}$ (pair row planting) <br> Net plot size $=7.40 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.50 \mathrm{~m}$ <br> Gross plot size $=8.40 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.50 \mathrm{~m}$ |


| Table B : Treatment details |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Sr. No | Treatment No. | Treatments |
| 1. | $\mathrm{~T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 50 \mathrm{ppm}$ |
| 2. | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ |
| 3. | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 150 \mathrm{ppm}$ |
| 4. | $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200 \mathrm{ppm}$ |
| 5. | $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{CCC} 1000 \mathrm{ppm}^{6 .}$ |
| 6. | $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ | CCC 2000 ppm |
| 7. | $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ | CCC 3000 ppm |
| 8. | $\mathrm{~T}_{8}$ | CCC 4000 ppm |
| 9. | $\mathrm{~T}_{9}$ | Control (Water Spray) |

application of growth regulators viz., Gibberellic acid 50, 100, 150 and 200 ppm and Cycocel 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 ppm along with control were given after bending operation. Results of this investigation are discussed by reviewing the available literature.

The grown rose flower plants under different treatments was observed for yield parameters viz., number of Flowers per plant, number of flowers per square meter and number of flower per hectare, Vase life of flowers and the economics of different treatment was calculated on the basis of cost of the treatment.

Statistical analysis of data of various characters will be carried out as per Randomized Block Design (RBD). Analysis of variance will be worked out using standard statistical procedures as described by Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been presented under following heads :

## Number of flowers per plant :

It was observed from Table 1 that, the number of
flowers per plant was increased significantly with the increasing levels of gibberellic acid. GA ${ }_{3}$ through alphaamylase activity, auxin stimulating effect and cell wall loosing, increased cell elongation along with the cell enlargement. All these caused effect on increased leaf area, thereby causing increased photosynthetic area. Thus, this caused increase in carbohydrate food material. Similar trends were in consonance with Bankar and Mukhopadhyay (1982); Gowda (1985, 1988); Bhattacharjee (1993); Patil (2001) and Chaudhari (2003) in rose.

## Number of flowers per square meter:

The flower yield per square meter observed in Table 2 was significantly increased with the increasing levels of gibberellic acid from 50 to 200 ppm . Higher yields of flowers per square meter are attributed to the production of large number of laterals at the early stage, which then

| Table 1 Effect of plant growth regulators on no. of flowers per <br> plant in rose (Rosa <br> polyhouse condition.  <br> Treatment No. Treatments details No. of flowers per plant <br> $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 50$ 15.03 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 100$ 19.00 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 150$ 23.00 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200$ 28.07 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ CCC 1000 12.00 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ CCC 2000 14.00 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ CCC 3000 17.17 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{8}$ CCC 4000 23.37 <br> $\mathrm{~T}_{9}$ Control 13.20 <br>  S.E. $\pm$ 0.863 <br>  C.D. (P=0.05) 2.59 <br>  C.V. $\%$ 8.16 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |


had sufficient time to accumulate reserve carbohydrates for flower bud differentiation. Reports of Sable et al. (1992); Patil (2001) and Chaudhari (2003) on rose confirm the effect of $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$. A similar effect of $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ on flower production was noted by Pappiah and Muthuswamy (1977) in Jasminum auriculatum and Bhattacharjee (1985) in Jasminum arborescence Roxb.

The flower yield per square meter (Table 2) increased with cycocel spray at concentration of 3000 and 4000 ppm . Increased flower yield in recent study are in agreement with the results obtained in rose by Bhattacharjee and Singh (1995) and Patil (2001).

## Number of flowers per hectare (lakh) :

It was observed from Table 3 that the number of flowers per hectare was increased significantly with the application of $\mathrm{GA}_{3}(50,100,150$ and 200 ppm$)$. The increase in yield due to $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ might be due to decrease in

| Table 2: Effect of plant growth regulators on no. of flowers per square meter in rose (Rosa hybrida Linn.) cv. "PAssion" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| under polyhouse condition. |  |  |
| Treatment no. | Treatments details | No. of flower per square meter |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 50$ | 75.03 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 100$ | 95.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 150$ | 115.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200$ | 140.33 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | CCC 1000 | 60.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | CCC 2000 | 70.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}$ | CCC 3000 | 85.83 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}$ | CCC 4000 | 116.83 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{9}$ | Control | 66.00 |
|  | S.E. $\pm$ | 4.327 |
|  | C.D. ( $\mathrm{P}=0.05$ ) | 12.97 |
|  | C.V.\% | 8.19 |



[^0]blind shoots as a result of chemical sprays. In treated plants with GA, reduced the atrophy of flower buds, the main factor responsible for blindness (Dhekney et al.,

| Treatment no. | Treatments details | No. of flower per hectare (lakh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 50$ | 7.50 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 100$ | 9.50 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 150$ | 11.50 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200$ | 14.03 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | CCC 1000 | 6.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | CCC 2000 | 7.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}$ | CCC 3000 | 8.58 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}$ | CCC 4000 | 11.67 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{9}$ | Control | 6.60 |
|  | S.E. $\pm$ | 0.431 |
|  | C.D. ( $\mathrm{P}=0.05$ ) | 1.29 |
|  | C.V.\% | 8.16 |


2000). GA ${ }_{3}$ through alpha-amylase activity, auxin stimulating effect and cell wall loosing, increased cell elongation along with cell enlargement. All this causes

| Treatment no. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treatment details } \\ & \hline \mathrm{GA}_{3} 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vase life of flowers (days) } \\ \hline 9.00 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 100$ | 10.17 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 150$ | 11.27 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200$ | 12.23 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | CCC 1000 | 7.23 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | CCC 2000 | 7.43 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}$ | CCC 3000 | 8.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}$ | CCC 4000 | 8.23 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{9}$ | Control | 5.77 |
|  | S.E. $\pm$ | 0.339 |
|  | C.D. ( $\mathrm{P}=0.05$ ) | 1.02 |
|  | C.V.\% | 6.66 |



Fig. 4 : Effect of plant growth regulators on vase life of flowers in rose (Rosa hybrid Linn.) cv. "PASSION" under polyhouse condition

| Treatment details | Yield (Number of flowers) (Rs. Lakh/ha) | Gross realization (Rs. Lakh/ha) | Total cost of cultivation (Rs. Lakh/ha) | Net return (Rs. Lakh/ha) | CBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1} \quad \mathrm{GA}_{3} 50 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 7.50 | 15.00 | 9.39 | 5.61 | 1:1.59 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2} \quad \mathrm{GA}_{3} 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 9.50 | 19.00 | 9.46 | 9.54 | 1:2.00 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3} \quad \mathrm{GA}_{3} 150 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 11.50 | 23.00 | 9.53 | 13.47 | 1:2.41 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4} \quad \mathrm{GA}_{3} 200 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 14.03 | 28.06 | 9.60 | 18.46 | 1:2.92 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5} \quad$ CCC 1000 ppm | 6.00 | 12.00 | 9.34 | 2.66 | 1:1.28 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6} \quad \mathrm{CCC} 2000 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 7.00 | 14.00 | 9.37 | 4.63 | 1:1.49 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7} \quad \mathrm{CCC} 3000 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 8.58 | 17.16 | 9.40 | 7.76 | 1:1.82 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8} \quad \mathrm{CCC} 4000 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 11.67 | 23.34 | 9.43 | 13.91 | 1:2.47 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{9}$ Control | 6.60 | 13.2 | 9.31 | 3.89 | 1:1.41 |

Average price of flower sale: Rs.2/flower
Cost of inputs: $\mathrm{GA}_{3}=131$ Rs. $/ 1 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{CCC}=950$ Rs. $/ 500 \mathrm{ml}$
had effect on increased leaf area, thereby causing increased photosynthetic area. Thus, caused increase in carbohydrate food material. Similar trends were in consonance with Nanjan and Muthuswamy (1975) and Patil (2001) in rose.

The flower yield per hectare (Table 3) increased with cycocel spray at concentration of 3000 and 4000 ppm. Increased flower yield in recent study are in agreement with the results obtained in rose by Bhattacharjee and Singh (1995) and Patil (2001).

## Vase life of flowers:

The data presented in Table 4 revealed that cut flowers obtained from plants that were treated with $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ 200 ppm showed the maximum vase life as compared to other treatments as well as control. This might be due to higher stalk length as well as more number of petals. $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ reduced the water loss and has anti-senescence property leading to enhanced vase-life of flowers, which was also reported by Dehale et al. (1993). GA increased flower size, which increased stored food material in the tissue, which caused increase in vase life of flowers indirectly. The positive effect of $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ in extending the vase life observed in the present study is in consonance with the findings of Dhekney et al. (2000) in rose and Dutta et al. (1993) and Dehale et al. (1993) in chrysanthemum.

It is obvious from Table 4 that each concentration of CCC (at 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 ppm ) increased the shelf life of rose as compared to control. The vase life of rose was increased with increase in the level of CCC concentration. The maximum vase life ( 8.23 days) was recorded with 4000 ppm . These results are in conformity with the observations of Makwana (1999) in gaillardia and Pandya (2000) in marigold.

## Economics :

Economics is the need of the hour for the farmers while taking a decision regarding the adoption of a new technique in greenhouses. Hence, the gross realization, net realization and cost benefit ratio was computed for different growth regulator treatments (Table 5).

In the present experiment, the highest economical gain of Rs. 18.46 lakh/ha was recorded with $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200$ ppm followed by GA 150 ppm (Rs. 13.47 lakh/ha.), CCC 4000 ppm (Rs. 13.91 lakh/ha.). The highest CBR ( $1: 2.92$ ) was obtained under the $\mathrm{GA}_{3} 200 \mathrm{ppm}$ followed by $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ 150 ppm (1:2.41) and CCC 4000 ppm (1:2.47). These
findings could be supported by reports of Chaudhari (2003) and Patil (2001).
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[^0]:    Fig. 2 : Effect of plant growth regulators on no. of flowers per square meter in rose (Rosa hybrid Linn.) cv. "PASSION" under polyhouse condition

