## **Research Paper**

*Article history:* Received : 21.06.2011 Revised : 28.07.2011 Accepted : 24.09.2011

# Effect of fertigation on growth, yield and quality of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. MADHU BINDU under South Gujarat conditions

■R.V. TANK, N.L. PATEL<sup>1</sup> AND J.R. NAIK<sup>1</sup>

#### Associated Authors:

<sup>1</sup>Department of Horticulture, N.M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, NAVSARI (GUJARAT) INDIA

Author for correspondence : R.V. TANK

Department of Horticulture, N.M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, NAVSARI (GUJARAT) INDIA **Abstract :** An experiment to study the effect of fertigation on growth, yield and quality of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. MADHU BINDU under South Gujarat conditions was carried out for two years at the Regional Horticultural Research Station, ASPEE College of Horticulture and Forestry, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsasi, Gujarat in randomized block design with 9 fertigation treatments and a control having surface irrigation @ 1.0 IW/CPE ratio + 100 per cent fertilizer through soil. The results of experiment showed early flowering and maturity of first fruit, shortest bearing height, maximum plant height and stem girth, number of functional leaves and total leaf area were found due to application of fertigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 100 per cent recommended dose of fertilizer (RD) which remained at par with treatment of fertigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 80 per cent RD. The higher yield of papaya fruits in above treatments was about 31.90 and 31.07 per cent, respectively over control treatment which was attributed to higher number and weight of fruits. These treatments also maintained its superiority in improving quality of papaya fruits. While total carotenoids contents remained unaffected due to different treatments.

Key words : Papaya, Fertigation, Growth, Yield, Quality

How to cite this article : Tank, R.V., Patel, N.L. and Naik, J.R. (2011). Effect of fertigation on growth, yield and quality of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. MADHU BINDU under South Gujarat conditions, *Asian J. Hort.*, **6** (2) : 339-343.

**P**apaya (*Carica papaya* L.) belongs to family Caricaceae is an important fruit crops of the tropics and sub tropics and deserves greater attention due to its high nutritive value and production potentiality. The crop is extremely sensitive to collar rot under flood irrigation where water comes in direct contact with the trunk. Application of water and soluble nutrients to growing plants through fertigation is an effective method to obtain higher and quality yield along with saving of water and labour. Fertigation involves not only efficient use of the two most precious inputs like water and nutrients but also ensures their simultaneous availability to plants. Jeyakumar et al. (2010) and Sadarunnisa et al. (2010) reported positive influence of fertigation on plant growth, yield and quality of papaya. Badgujar et al. (2004) also revealed the favourable response of fertigation on yield and yield attributing parameters of Grand Naine banana.

Gujarat is the second largest (14100 ha) state under papaya cultivation in India after Andhra Pradesh

(Anonymous, 2009). Warm and humid conditions of South Gujarat make papaya cultivation effective in this region. Hence, the present experiment entitled fertigation studies in papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. MADHU BINDU under South Gujarat conditions was planned and carried out to know the effect of fertigation on growth, yield and quality of papaya.

#### **RESEARCH METHODS**

The present experiment was conducted during the year 2007-08 and 2008-09 at Regional Horticultural Research Station, ASPEE College of Horticulture and Forestry, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, Gujarat. The experimental soil was deep black having moderate drainage as well as good water holding capacity with 7.8 pH belongs to great soil group Vertic Ustochrepts under soil series of Jalalpor. Transplanting of papaya was done with healthy seedlings of 60 days age at a distance of 2.1 m x 1.9 m in triangular fashion. The treatments



comprised of nine fertigation treatments viz., drip irrigation @ 0.4 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 60 per cent RD  $(T_1)$ , drip irrigation @ 0.4 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 80 per cent RD ( $T_2$ ), drip irrigation @ 0.4 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 100 per cent RD ( $T_3$ ), drip irrigation @ 0.6 PEF + N and  $K_2O \otimes 60$  per cent RD ( $T_4$ ), drip irrigation  $\otimes 0.6$  PEF + N and  $K_2O \otimes 80$  per cent RD (T<sub>5</sub>), drip irrigation  $\otimes 0.6$ PEF + N and  $K_2O @ 100$  per cent RD (T<sub>6</sub>), drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 60 per cent RD ( $T_7$ ), drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 80 per cent RD  $(T_8)$ , drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 100 per cent RD  $(T_0)$ , in addition to soil application of 100 g phosphorus at 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> month and at 3 months after transplanting and a control having surface irrigation at 1.0 IW/CPE ratio + 100 per cent RDF of N,  $P_2O_5$  and  $K_2O$  at 2, 4, 6 and 8 months after transplanting through soil  $(T_{10})$ . The recommended doze of fertilizer was 200 g N, 200 g P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 250 g K<sub>2</sub>O per plant. In case of fertigation, N and K<sub>2</sub>O applied through drip in form of urea and muriate of potash, respectively in twelve equal splits at 15 days intervals starting from 45 days after transplanting.

The required quantity of water was applied at alternate day on the basis of evaporation under drip irrigation treatments except rainy days. In case of control treatment required quantity of water was applied on the basis of IW/CPE ratio using 15 cm throat size parshall flume. High density polyethylene pipes (HDPE) of 75 mm diameter was directly connected from a 3 HP submersible pump to head unit of the drip irrigation system. The head unit consisted of screen filter (40 m<sup>3</sup>/ hr), pressure gauge, fertigation tank (90 litres), by pass assembly and control valve. Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)

pipes of 75 mm and 50 mm diameter were used as main and sub main, respectively. Lateral of 16 mm diameter of low density polyethylene pipe (LDPE) was laid out at the distance of 2.1 m in the every plot and two 8 lph capacity drippers were placed at 30 cm on the either side of the plant trunk. Each lateral was provided with lateral cock in order to deliver desired quantity of water and fertilizer to each treatment. The system was operated at alternate day and the optimum pressure of 1.2 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> was maintained in the drip system with the help of control valve. The observations on growth, yield and yield attributing characters and fruit quality were recorded and analysed statistically.

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads:

### Growth parameters:

The measurements on growth parameters (Table 1) of the plant revealed the significant influence of fertigation in papaya. Among all the treatments, the plants which received drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 100 per cent RD (T<sub>9</sub>) resulted in bearing height at lower level and minimum days to flowering and days to maturity of first fruit after transplanting. The shortest flowering height was noted in treatment T<sub>8</sub>. It might be due to effective utilization and accurate placement of fertilizers in soluble form at the active root zone area resulting in vigorous growth which ultimately resulted in early flowering and bearing (Madhumathi *et al.*, 2004). The maturity was delayed in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> (Surface 1.0 IW/CPE ratio

| Table 1 : Effect of fertigation on growth parameters (Pooled data) |                    |                        |                   |                        |                 |                   |                      |  |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| Treatments   | Height at<br>first | Bearing<br>height (cm) | Days to flowering | Days to<br>maturity of | Plant<br>height | Stem<br>girth     | No. of<br>functional | Total leaf<br>area/plant<br>$(m^2)$ at 240 |
|  | flowering<br>(cm)  |                        |                   | first fruit            | (cm)            | (cm)<br>At 300 DA | leaves/plant<br>ATP  | (m <sup>2</sup> ) at 240<br>DATP           |
| T <sub>1</sub>   | 83.28              | 92.08                  | 91.27             | 278.00                 | 150.39          | 31.22             | 37.13                | 4.49                                       |
| T <sub>2</sub>   | 75.78              | 83.67                  | 83.17             | 268.07                 | 160.14          | 33.09             | 39.97                | 5.14                                       |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>  | 72.45              | 79.92                  | 80.97             | 263.13                 | 166.68          | 34.17             | 41.10                | 5.46                                       |
| $T_4$  | 76.94              | 84.72                  | 86.63             | 272.90                 | 160.36          | 32.31             | 39.33                | 4.92                                       |
| T <sub>5</sub>   | 71.04              | 77.94                  | 78.67             | 261.80                 | 170.85          | 35.51             | 42.50                | 5.79                                       |
| $T_6$  | 63.99              | 73.26                  | 75.33             | 259.07                 | 179.89          | 36.97             | 44.30                | 6.30                                       |
| T <sub>7</sub>   | 70.40              | 77.49                  | 78.63             | 263.27                 | 171.27          | 34.72             | 41.70                | 5.38                                       |
| T <sub>8</sub>   | 60.45              | 68.34                  | 71.37             | 253.57                 | 184.81          | 38.84             | 46.60                | 6.58                                       |
| T <sub>9</sub>   | 62.65              | 67.94                  | 69.10             | 249.00                 | 189.02          | 40.18             | 48.73                | 6.88                                       |
| T <sub>10</sub>  | 74.71              | 83.74                  | 81.50             | 267.07                 | 164.00          | 34.27             | 41.53                | 5.28                                       |
| S.E. ±   | 2.62               | 2.39                   | 1.81              | 3.81                   | 4.78            | 1.26              | 1.24                 | 0.28                                       |
| C.D. (P=0.05)  | 7.48               | 6.82                   | 5.18              | 10.94                  | 13.62           | 3.62              | 3.52                 | 0.80                                       |
| C.V. %   | 9.68               | 8.07                   | 5.50              | 3.54                   | 7.68            | 8.81              | 7.97                 | 13.46                                      |

+ 100 per cent of N,  $P_2O_5$  and  $K_2O$  through soil) as compared to higher level of fertigation treatments ( $T_9$  and  $T_8$ ). This might be due to moisture stress experienced between the irrigation intervals and competition of nutrients with weeds which was also reported by Agrawal and Agrawal (2005) in banana. The results of present investigation are in confirmation with those of earlier workers Sharma *et al.* (2005) and Sadarunnisa *et al.* (2010).

The growth parameters *viz.*, plant height, stem girth; number of functional leaves and leaf area were significantly influenced due to different treatments. Application of drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and K<sub>2</sub>O @ 100 per cent RD ( $T_0$ ) and drip irrigation @ 0.8 PEF + N and  $K_2O \otimes 80$  per cent RD (T<sub>s</sub>) in addition to soil application of 100 g  $P_2O_5$  each at  $1^{1/2}$  month and 3 months after transplanting to papaya plants resulted in taller plants with thicker girth, maximum number of functional leaves and leaf area. The increase in plant height, stem girth, number of functional leaves and leaf area might be due to the higher uptake and accumulation of nutrients in leaf tissues which in turn ensure photosynthetic efficiency causing greater synthesis, translocation and accumulation of carbohydrates (Ghanta et al., 1995). Similar findings were reported by Srinivas (2000). The better performance of papaya crop in terms of plant height and girth was observed under drip irrigation largely due to adequate supply of water and reduced weed growth (Rungsimanop et al., 1987). The vigorous growth was earlier reported by Sharma et al. (2005), Sadarunnisa et al. (2010) and Jeyakumar et al. (2010) in papaya due to fertigation.

#### Fruit characteristics:

Fruit characteristics like fruit length, circumferences,

volume, pulp thickness and firmness were influenced significantly and found maximum (Table 2) in the treatment  $T_{9}$  and  $T_{8}$ . But fruit cavity volume and index noted minimum in these treatments. It might be due to production of more photosynthates due to more number of leaves and leaf area besides enhanced physiological traits might have resulted in better transfer to the sink, developing fruit with thicker pulp and low cavity index in fertigated plants (Jeyakumar et al., 2010). The increase in fruit volume could be ascribed to bigger size of fruits under optimum dose of fertilizer through drip irrigation. Lower cavity index is beneficial in papaya as it relates with more pulp thickness (Muthulakshmi et al., 2007). Among the different treatments under study, treatments  $T_9$  and  $T_8$ resulted in low cavity index due to the increase in the volume of the fruit with a corresponding increase in pulp thickness. Similarly, Jeyakumar et al. (2010) also noted low cavity index in papaya under fertigation. The increase in fruit characteristics in papaya with fertigation was reported by Singh and Singh (2006) and Jeyakumar et al. (2010).

#### Yield and yield attributes:

The positive influence of higher levels fertigation ( $T_9$  and  $T_8$ ) on growth attributes and fruit characteristics ultimately reflected in maximum number of fruits per plant, average fruit weight and yield of papaya (Table 3) in these particular treatments in present study. This might be due to the increase in growth traits which helped to increase the synthesis of carbohydrates which utilized for the development of fruits. In the present study, the plant receiving treatment  $T_9$  recorded higher number of fruits per plant, average fruit weight and fruit yield over rest of the treatments but, it was at par with treatment  $T_8$ . The

| Table 2 : Effect of |                         | on fruit characteristics     |                      |                          |                              |                           |  |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Treatments          | Fruit<br>length<br>(cm) | Fruit circumferences<br>(cm) | Fruit<br>volume (cc) | Fruit cavity volume (cc) | Fruit<br>cavity<br>index (%) | Pulp<br>thickness<br>(cm) | Fruit<br>firmness<br>(kg/cm <sup>2</sup> ) |
| $T_1$               | 18.55                   | 36.93                        | 1027.44              | 321.51                   | 31.23                        | 2.91                      | 3.40                                       |
| T <sub>2</sub>      | 19.33                   | 40.04                        | 1116.15              | 311.04                   | 27.88                        | 3.00                      | 3.50                                       |
| T <sub>3</sub>      | 20.53                   | 41.40                        | 1169.71              | 288.99                   | 24.81                        | 3.16                      | 3.46                                       |
| $T_4$               | 19.11                   | 39.89                        | 1082.00              | 313.10                   | 29.07                        | 3.04                      | 3.40                                       |
| T <sub>5</sub>      | 19.79                   | 41.90                        | 1240.15              | 285.52                   | 23.11                        | 3.34                      | 3.47                                       |
| T <sub>6</sub>      | 21.64                   | 43.24                        | 1301.57              | 257.91                   | 19.83                        | 3.65                      | 3.63                                       |
| T <sub>7</sub>      | 19.95                   | 42.33                        | 1226.44              | 281.23                   | 23.31                        | 3.53                      | 3.46                                       |
| T <sub>8</sub>      | 23.81                   | 46.66                        | 1337.45              | 244.51                   | 18.31                        | 3.94                      | 3.74                                       |
| T9                  | 24.23                   | 45.09                        | 1357.95              | 232.21                   | 17.09                        | 4.05                      | 3.91                                       |
| T <sub>10</sub>     | 19.76                   | 42.04                        | 1159.11              | 297.81                   | 25.73                        | 3.27                      | 3.44                                       |
| S.E. ±              | 0.67                    | 1.11                         | 41.93                | 11.93                    | 1.20                         | 0.14                      | 0.12                                       |
| C.D. (P=0.05)       | 1.90                    | 3.16                         | 120.26               | 34.00                    | 3.45                         | 0.40                      | 0.33                                       |
| C.V. %              | 8.69                    | 7.07                         | 8.50                 | 11.29                    | 12.30                        | 11.14                     | 8.57                                       |

Asian J. Hort. | Vol. 6 | 2 | Dec., 2011| 339-343 Hind Agricultural Research and Training Institute

increase in yield was largely as a consequence of higher fruit number and fruit weight. Apart from this, drip irrigation restricts the fluctuations in soil water potential within a narrow range and maintained favourable water regime leading to higher yield (Bresler, 1977). The adoption of fertigation might have maintained congenial moisture regime and better nutrient availability through out the crop growth period than surface method of irrigation. Differences in yield between fertigated plants and plants under conventional method of irrigation might be due to constant and continuous supply of water and nutrients in soluble form to the wetted area of the root zone ensuring better availability of nutrients (Mahalakshmi et al., 2001 and Kavino et al., 2004). The increased in yield parameters and yield through fertigation were reported by Sharma et al. (2005).

#### **Quality:**

Fertigation had significant influence on quality parameters by recording higher levels of TSS, total sugars, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugar, and ascorbic acid (Table 4). However, total carotenoids content in fruit was remain unchanged. An improvement in the quality parameters under the higher level of fertigation treatments  $(T_0 \text{ and } T_s)$  could be due to better availability of water and nutrients through out the plant growth period. The quality improvement was due to involvement of K in carbohydrate synthesis, breakdown and translocation of starch, synthesis of protein and neutralization of physiologically important organic acids which has been noted by Tisdale and Nelson, (1966). The superiority of fertigation treatments in improving the quality of papaya also been reported by Jeyakumar et al. (2002), Jeyakumar et al. (2010) and Sharma et al. (2005).

| Table 3: Effect of fertigation on yield and yield attributes (Pooled data) |                        |                           |                        |                    |  |  |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Treatments   | Number of fruits/plant | Average fruit weight (kg) | Fruit yield (kg/plant) | Fruit yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| T <sub>1</sub>   | 19.77                  | 0.931                     | 18.44                  | 41.48              |  |  |
| T <sub>2</sub>   | 21.23                  | 1.032                     | 21.89                  | 49.24              |  |  |
| T <sub>3</sub>   | 22.60                  | 1.107                     | 24.99                  | 56.24              |  |  |
| $T_4$  | 21.13                  | 1.045                     | 22.03                  | 49.56              |  |  |
| T <sub>5</sub>   | 23.80                  | 1.173                     | 27.92                  | 62.82              |  |  |
| T <sub>6</sub>   | 24.73                  | 1.221                     | 30.24                  | 68.03              |  |  |
| T <sub>7</sub>   | 23.97                  | 1.194                     | 28.62                  | 64.39              |  |  |
| T <sub>8</sub>   | 28.37                  | 1.240                     | 35.05                  | 78.87              |  |  |
| T <sub>9</sub>   | 28.43                  | 1.252                     | 35.48                  | 79.83              |  |  |
| T <sub>10</sub>  | 22.87                  | 1.057                     | 24.16                  | 54.36              |  |  |
| S.E. ±   | 1.19                   | 0.036                     | 1.50                   | 3.38               |  |  |
| C.D. (P=0.05)  | 3.42                   | 0.103                     | 4.31                   | 9.69               |  |  |
| C.V. %   | 12.34                  | 7.84                      | 13.69                  | 13.69              |  |  |

| Treatments            | TSS ( <sup>0</sup> Brix) | Total sugars<br>(%) | Reducing sugars (%) | Non-reducing<br>sugars (%) | Ascorbic acid<br>(mg/100 g pulp) | Total carotenoids<br>(mg/100 g pulp) |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>T</b> <sub>1</sub> | 8.90                     | 7.62                | 6.71                | 0.92                       | 27.22                            | 2.33                                 |
| <b>T</b> <sub>2</sub> | 9.67                     | 8.50                | 7.31                | 1.20                       | 29.07                            | 2.30                                 |
| T <sub>3</sub>        | 10.07                    | 8.94                | 7.65                | 1.28                       | 30.32                            | 2.29                                 |
| $T_4$                 | 9.52                     | 8.25                | 7.14                | 1.11                       | 28.19                            | 2.28                                 |
| T <sub>5</sub>        | 9.95                     | 8.93                | 7.63                | 1.30                       | 30.69                            | 2.26                                 |
| T <sub>6</sub>        | 10.50                    | 9.58                | 8.19                | 1.40                       | 33.11                            | 2.22                                 |
| T <sub>7</sub>        | 10.15                    | 8.77                | 7.57                | 1.20                       | 31.15                            | 2.20                                 |
| T <sub>8</sub>        | 10.98                    | 9.90                | 8.45                | 1.45                       | 35.07                            | 2.20                                 |
| T <sub>9</sub>        | 11.22                    | 10.05               | 8.55                | 1.50                       | 35.86                            | 2.17                                 |
| T <sub>10</sub>       | 9.75                     | 8.61                | 7.44                | 1.17                       | 29.04                            | 2.21                                 |
| S.E. ±                | 0.27                     | 0.28                | 0.27                | 0.07                       | 1.04                             | 0.12                                 |
| C.D. (P=0.05)         | 0.78                     | 0.81                | 0.76                | 0.19                       | 2.98                             | NS                                   |
| C.V. %                | 6.60                     | 8.57                | 9.32                | 14.47                      | 8.23                             | 9.10                                 |

Asian J. Hort. | Vol. 6 | 2 | Dec., 2011| 339-343 Hind Agricultural Research and Training Institute

#### REFERENCES

**Agrawal, N.** and Agrawal, S. (2005). Effect of drip irrigation and mulches on the growth and yield of banana cv. DWARF CAVENDISH. *Indian J.Hort.*, **62** (3): 238 - 240.

Anonymous (2009). State wise area, production and productivity of papaya. National Horticulture Board, Indian Horticulture Data base- 2009, 104 p.

**Badgujar, C.D.,** Deshmukh, S.S., Dusane, S.M. and Shinde, S.S. (2004). Influence of N and K fertigation and different plant densities on yield of banana cv. GRAND NAINE. *South Indian Hort.*, **52** (1-6): 22-28.

Bresler, E. (1977). Drip irrigation: Principles and applications to soil-water management. *Adv. Agron.*, **29**: 343-393.

**Ghanta, P.K.,** Dhua, R. S. and Mitra, S. K. (1995). Effect of varying levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth, yield and quality of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.). *Ann. Agric. Res.*, **16** (4): 405-408.

Jeyakumar, P., Kumar, N. and Soorianathasundaram, K. (2002). Fertigation studies in papaya (*Carica papaya* L.). *South Indian Hort.*, **50** (6): 200-207.

Jeyakumar, P., Amutha, R., Balamohan, T.N., Auxcilia, J. and Nalina, L. (2010). Fertigation improves fruit yield and quality of papaya. II International Symposium on papaya, ISHS, *Acta Hort.*, 581 : 369-376.

**Kavino, M.,** Kumar, N., Soorianathasundaram, K. and Jeyakumar, P. (2004) Effect of fertigation on the growth and development of first ratoon crop (R1) of banana Robusta (AAA) under high density planting system. *Indian J. Hort.*, **61** (1): 39-41.

**Madhumathi, C.,** Syed Sadarunnisa and Purushottam, K. (2004).Fertigation studies in Robusta banana. In: Proceedings of National Seminar on Banana Industry. Present Scenario and Future Strategies at B.C.K.V., Kalyani, West Bengal, pp. 120-124.

Mahalakshmi, M., Kumar, N., Jayakumar, P. and Soorianathasundara, K. (2001). Fertigation study in banana under high density planting system. *South Indian Hort.*, **49** (Special): 86-91. **Muthulakshmi, S.,** Balamohan, T.N., Amutha, R., Baby Rani, W., Indira, K. and Mareeswari, P. (2007). Inter specific hybridization in papaya (*Carica papaya* L.). *Res .J. Agric. & Biol. Sci.*, **3** (4): 260-263.

**Rungsimanop, C.,** Saksri, A. and Srimukul (1987). Some irrigation methods which influence the growth of custard apple and papaya when intercropped in north-east Thailand. In: Proc. Internat Symp. Agril. Mechanization and International Co-operation in High Technology Era. Uni. of Tokyo, Japan.

**Sadarunnisa, S.,** Madhumathi, C., Hari Babu, K., Sreenivasulu, B. and Rama Krishna, M. (2010). Effect of fertigation on growth and yield of papaya cv. REDLADY. II International symposium on papaya, *Acta Hort.*, **851** : 395-399.

**Sharma, H.G.**, Dubey, P., Agrawal, N. and Satpute, P. (2005). Effect of fertigation through water soluble fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of papaya. International Conference on Plasticulture and Precision Farming. 17-21 November, 2005, New Delhi, 250 pp.

**Singh, H.K.** and Singh, A.K.P. (2006). Effect of fertigation on growth and yield of papaya with drip irrigation. *Progressive Hort.*, **38** (2): 214-217.

Srinivas, K. (2000). Micro irrigation and fertigation in fruit crops. In: Use of plastics in horticulture with special emphasis on drip irrigation/fertigation and plastic mulching. In: Khan et al. (eds.). University of Agricultural Sciences, BANGALORE, KARNATAKA (India), pp 38-42.

**Tisdale, S.L.** and Nelson, W.N. (1966). *Soil fertilizers*, Mac Millen C., London, 81 p.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*