



Responses of Different Levels of Pruning and Biofertilizer on Fruit Growth and Quality of Assam Lemon [*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm] under the Foothills of Arunachal Pradesh, India

T. P. Rathour ^a, P. K. Nimbolkar ^{b++*}, L. Wangchu ^a,
A. S. Mailappa ^c and N. Devachandra ^a

^a Department of Fruit Science, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

^b Department of Fruit Science, Central Agricultural University Imphal, Pasighat-791102, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

^c Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2023/v13i82081

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/100529>

Original Research Article

Received: 24/03/2023

Accepted: 28/05/2023

Published: 10/06/2023

ABSTRACT

The present experiment was conducted in the Department of Fruit Science, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh, during the year 2021-2022. The trial was laid out using two factorial RBD replicated thrice. Assam lemon trees were pruned at 25% (P₁), 50% (P₂) from the

⁺⁺ Assistant Professor;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: prashantnimbolkar111@gmail.com;

top apex and soil drenching with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 90g/plant (B₁), Trichoderma @ 90g/plant (B₂), Azotobacter @ 15g/plant (B₃) and a combination of PGPR (*Pseudomonas fluorescens*) @ 90g/plant + Trichoderma @ 90g/plant + Azotobacter @ 15g/plant (B₄) at two feet away from the tree trunk with the interaction of both factors and were compared with control. The results revealed that the morphological and biochemical characters were significantly affected by high pruning intensity (50%) and biofertilizers treatment B₄ (*Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 90g/plant + Trichoderma @ 90g/plant + Azotobacter @ 15g/plant) and their combinations. It was concluded that the treatment P₂B₄ pruning 50% + *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 90g/plant + Trichoderma @ 90g/plant + Azotobacter @ 15g/plant in Assam lemon were vital for fruit morphological and biochemical characteristics.

Keywords: Pruning intensity; fruit growth; quality and biofertilizers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Citrus (*Citrus sp.*) is one the world's primary fruit crops grown in many tropical and subtropical nations. It is a member of the *Rutaceae* family, which has 140 genera and 1300 species [1]. The lemon fruit's main distinguishing qualities are its oval to elliptical form, intensely aromatic rind, and strong acidity levels. It is in high demand in both the domestic and foreign markets due to its distinctive aroma, vitamin C, titratable acidity, carotenoids, folate, fiber, zero fat, and high concentration of natural antioxidants. Assam lemon is a significant dwarf cultivar of lemon that is appropriate for high-density planting and is widely grown in North-Eastern India [2]. It bears early in northern West Bengal and southern Arunachal Pradesh, with three fruiting seasons: April-May, August-September and November-December. Early vegetative flushes of previous season growth are often more productive. So, pruning is very much essential to manipulate various aspects of fruiting and quality. Pruning branches is a cultural strategy that enhances fruit morphology and quality responses. Shoot trimming has a significant impact on tree development and photosynthesis because it changes the design of the aerial sections. Fruits normally grow faster in pruned trees, and depending on growth conditions, an equilibrium between shoots and roots can be achieved [3]. Lemon trees bear three times a year, correct manuring and fertilising must be used to achieve the best yields and quality production, which is dependent on healthy and vigorous tree growth. Furthermore, in addition to the traditional application of chemical fertilisers, a combination of bio-fertilizers must be use to avoid the negative effects of chemical fertilisers while also improving soil physical properties by increasing nutrient and water holding capacity, total pore space, aggregate stability, erosion resistance, and temperature insulation [4]. However, nothing is known about the response of lemons to

pruning and nutrient management in this area. Keeping this in mind, the current inquiry was carried out to investigate the effect of different levels of pruning and biofertilizers on fruit growth and quality parameters of Assam lemon [*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm] under the foothills of Arunachal Pradesh.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current study was conducted on a seven-year-old Assam lemon orchard at the Citrus Fruit Block, College of Horticulture and Forestry, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh, India, from 2021 to 2022. The orchard is geographically located at 28° 04' 43" N latitude and 95° 19' 26" E longitude, with an altitude of 153 m above mean sea level. The experiment was set up using two Factorial Randomized Block Designs (FRBD) and 15 treatment combinations (three levels of pruning and five levels of biofertilizers), each with three replications. PGPR (*Pseudomonas fluorescens*) @ 90g/plant (B₁), Trichoderma @ 90g/plant (B₂), Azotobacter @ 15g/plant (B₃), and a combination of PGPR (*Pseudomonas fluorescens*) @ 90g/plant + Trichoderma @ 90g/plant + Azotobacter @ 15g/plant (B₄) were applied alone and in combination with different levels of pruning. Pruning practices were performed in February 2021, and biofertilizers were applied to the soil two feet away from the tree stem at the same time. During the experiment, crop management measures such as irrigation, weeding, and other cultural treatments were carried out at regular intervals. Data on fruit morphology, yield and quality were collected from three labelled plants for each treatment. There were total 45 treatment trees. The following observations were recorded.

2.1 Fruit Length (mm)

After harvest, the fruit length was measured from the blossom end to the pedicels with a digital

Vernier caliper. The average length of the fruit was then expressed in millimeters (mm).

2.2 Fruit Width (mm)

The width of the fruits was measured using a digital Vernier caliper in the center of four representative fruit samples from each plant and expressed millimetres (mm).

2.3 Fruit Volume (cm³)

The fruit volume was recorded using the water displacement method and represented in cubic centimeters (cm³). The fruits were chosen at random from each treatment.

2.4 Fruit Weight (g)

Four fruits were chosen at random and their weights were recorded using a precision weighing scale. The average weight of the fruits was stated in grams (g).

2.5 Peel Weight (g)

After peeling with a knife, the peel weight of a randomly selected representative fruit sample (four in number) from each treatment was recorded using an accurate weighing balance and mentioned in grams (g).

2.6 Number of Seeds per Fruit

The number of seeds per fruit was manually counted after extracting seeds from fully matured fruits separately from four randomly selected fruits, and the average was derived by dividing the total number of seeds by the total number of fruits. It is given as the number of seeds per fruit.

2.7 Total Soluble Solids (°Brix)

The fruit's TSS was tested using a hand-held refractometer (0°B-32°B). The reading was taken through the eyepiece after a little drop of fruit juice was deposited on the prism surface.

2.8 Titratable Acidity (%)

The fruit's titratable acidity was assessed by titrating the fruit juice against 0.1N NaOH solution using phenolphthalein as an indicator (light pink endpoint) and stated as a percentage in terms of citric acid [5].

$$\text{Titratable acidity (\%)} = \frac{\text{Titre reading} \times \text{Normality of alkali} \times \text{Equivalent weight of acid}}{\text{Volume of the sample taken} \times 100}$$

2.9 Vitamin C Content (mg/100 g)

Ascorbic acid was estimated using the spectrophotometric method as given by Jagota and Dani [6].

2.10 Juice Content (ml)

The juice was extracted from four randomly selected fruits and was measured in a measuring cylinder. The average juice content per fruit was then expressed in milliliters (ml).

2.11 Total Sugars (%)

Total sugar content was estimated by the Anthrone method as described by Hedge and Hofreiter [7].

2.12 Reducing Sugar (%)

Reducing sugar content was estimated by the spectrophotometric method as described by Somogyi [8].

2.13 Non-Reducing Sugar (%)

Non-reducing sugar was calculated by using the formula.

$$\text{Non-reducing sugar} = \text{Total Sugar} - \text{Reducing Sugar}$$

2.14 Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis of two-factorial RBD was done using Microsoft excel. Calculating the corresponding 'F' values as reported by Gomez and Gomez [9]. Determined the significance and non-significant of the variation due to the different treatments.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Fruit Length (mm)

The results depicted in Table 1 made it clear that the fruit length had significantly increased over the applied pruning levels. P₀ (unpruned) had the least fruit length (78.23 mm), whereas P₂ (50% pruning) had the largest (85.98 mm). Similar to this, biofertilizer strains dramatically lengthen fruit, with treatment B₄ (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) having the longest fruit (89.54 mm) and treatment B₀ (no-biofertilizer) having the shortest (76.52 mm). The interaction of factors significantly improved fruit length; the treatment combination P₂B₄ (Pruning 50% length of shoot +

PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) had the longest fruit length (90.72 mm), while P₀B₀ (control) had the shortest (69.33 mm).

These results may be explained by the longer fruit length in citrus plants that had undergone significant pruning compared to unpruned plants, which was caused by improved sunlight penetration in the plant canopy [10]. Similar to this, larger fruit size in heavily pruned plants may be attributed to lower fruit density and an increase in the leaf-to-fruit ratio, which provided higher photosynthates to the plants under this treatment; however, lower fruit size in unpruned plants may be caused by higher photo assimilate competition among developing fruits [11]. Similar results were discovered by Ghosh [12] when pruning and biofertilizers were combined, and it was noted that the pruning increased nutrient availability and the production of photosynthates, which led to an increase in fruit weight, volume, and peel thickness.

3.2 Fruit Width (mm)

Fruit width (Table 1) was shown to be substantially and significantly influenced by pruning levels. P₀ had the smallest (46.32 mm) fruit width, whereas P₂ had the largest fruit width (53.70 mm). Similarly, biofertilizer levels had a substantial impact on fruit width as well, with treatment B₄ having the highest maximum (56.81 mm) and treatment B₀ having the lowest (42.88 mm). Additionally, there was a significant interaction between pruning and biofertilizers, with a maximum effect of (59.85 mm) treatment combination P₂B₄ and a minimum of (39.82 mm) treatment combination P₀B₀ (control).

Lower fruit density and a higher leaf-to-fruit ratio, which provided more photosynthates to the plants under this treatment, may be responsible for the heavily pruned plants' larger fruit sizes; in contrast, higher photo assimilate competition among developing fruits may be the cause of unpruned plants' smaller fruit sizes [11]. Shamseldin et al. [13] also noted that Washington navel orange fruit quality and length were increased by biofertilizer inoculation with *Pseudomonas fluorescence* strain 843 growth-promoting rhizobacteria.

3.3 Fruit Weight (g)

It has been demonstrated (Table 1) that pruning levels have a significant effect on fruit weight. P₀

had the lightest fruit weight (84.30 g), whereas P₂ had the heaviest fruit (94.54 g). The weight of the fruit is also significantly influenced by biofertilizer levels, with treatment B₄ having the highest fruit weight (100.33 g) and treatment B₀ having the lowest fruit weight (83.86 g). Also increasing fruit weight throughout treatments was recorded in the interaction of pruning and biofertilizers, with the maximum value (103.67 g) recorded in treatment combination P₂B₄ and the lowest value (78.61 g) reached in P₀B₀ (control). These results might be due to the more sunlight penetration in the plant canopy, which led to greater fruit weight and color development in citrus plants that had been heavily pruned as opposed to unpruned plants. Increased cell division, cell elongation, fruit weight, enhanced root development, and improved water absorption and nutrient deposition transfer are all factors that can improve fruit quality, as can hormone induction and appropriate nutrient delivery [12]. This could be connected to more effective fertilizer application when using organic nutrition [14].

3.4 Fruit Volume (cm³)

The amounts of pruning significantly affected fruit volume (Table 1). The fruit volume of P₂ was maximum (69.01 cm³), whereas P₀ was minimum (56.01 cm³). Similar results were reported for the biofertilizer levels on fruit volume, with B₄ having the highest level (78.29 cm³) and B₀ having the lowest level (54.33 cm³). Additionally, there was a significant interaction between pruning and biofertilizers, with a maximum impact of P₂B₄ (83.92 cm³) and a minimum (45.51 cm³) of P₀B₀.

It might be a result of the pruning increases the nutrient availability and the production of photosynthates, leading to bigger fruits and a higher fruit volume. The increased photophosphorylation and the dark reaction of photosynthesis, which result in the accumulation of more carbohydrates and also enhance the translocation of photosynthates, which mobilize the stored material from the leaves and stem towards the fruit, maybe the cause of the increased fruit volume with the nutrient application, which is increased by biofertilizers through nutrient mobilization [15].

3.5 Peel Weight (g)

Table 1 illustrated that pruning levels had a significant influence on peel weight. The peel weight of P₂ was the highest (40.22 g), while the peel weight of P₀ was the lowest (34.39 g). Similarly, the biofertilizer levels had a substantial impact on peel weight, with treatment B₄ having

the maximum (43.78 g) and B₁ having minimum (34.64 g). Additionally, the interaction of two components increased peel weight throughout treatments, with the maximum value (44.88 g) recorded in treatment combination P₂B₄ and equalling (44.08 g) to P₁B₄, and the lowest value (28.93 g) recorded in P₀B₁. The results of Ghosh [12] concur with our findings, which showed that pruning increased the number of nutrients available and the production of photosynthates, leading to an increase in fruit weight, volume and peel thickness.

3.6 Number of Seeds per Fruit

Table 1 shows that the pruning levels considerably impact the typical number of seeds per fruit. P₂ had the most seeds per fruit on

average (0.16), whereas P₀ had the fewest seeds per fruit on average (0.03). Similar to this, biofertilizer levels had a substantial impact on the number of seeds per fruit. Maximum number of seeds (0.22) in treatment B₄ and the minimum number of seeds (0.03) in treatments B₁ (PGPR) and B₂ (PGPR + Trichoderma). The average number of seeds per fruit also increased as a result of the interaction of two factors, with treatment combination P₂B₄ recording the highest value (0.25) and P₀B₀, P₀B₁, and P₀B₂ acquiring the lowest value(0.00), respectively. The presence of less and more number of seeds in a fruits may be due to the availability of nutrient sources as well the absorption of more amount of nutrients in highly pruned branches in faster rate.

Table 1. Effects of pruning severity and biofertilizers on fruit growth parameters of Assam lemon

Treatments	Fruit length (mm)	Fruit width (mm)	Fruit weight (g)	Fruit volume (cm ³)	Peel weight (g)	Number of seeds/fruit
(A) Effect of Pruning Severity						
P ₀	78.23	46.32	84.30	56.01	34.39	0.03
P ₁	83.26	47.40	90.59	63.27	38.28	0.06
P ₂	85.98	53.70	94.54	69.01	40.22	0.16
S.Em ±	0.085	0.059	0.060	0.073	0.058	0.000
C.D. 0.05%	0.246	0.171	0.174	0.211	0.167	0.001
(B) Effect of Biofertilizers						
B ₀	76.52	42.88	83.86	54.33	35.21	0.08
B ₁	80.04	45.49	87.03	57.61	34.64	0.03
B ₂	82.78	49.60	88.74	60.27	36.99	0.03
B ₃	83.57	50.93	89.08	63.32	37.54	0.08
B ₄	89.54	56.81	100.33	78.29	43.78	0.22
S.Em ±	0.142	0.099	0.100	0.121	0.096	0.000
C.D. 0.05%	0.410	0.286	0.291	0.351	0.278	0.001
Effect of (AXB) Interaction						
P ₀ B ₀	69.33	39.82	78.61	45.51	33.03	0.00
P ₀ B ₁	74.88	43.96	81.94	50.57	28.93	0.00
P ₀ B ₂	78.86	45.04	82.23	54.58	33.66	0.00
P ₀ B ₃	79.24	47.77	82.78	56.05	33.97	0.00
P ₀ B ₄	88.83	55.00	95.95	73.33	42.37	0.17
P ₁ B ₀	79.78	40.40	85.22	57.92	35.28	0.00
P ₁ B ₁	80.44	40.41	87.55	58.75	35.68	0.00
P ₁ B ₂	82.88	49.92	89.33	59.90	37.77	0.00
P ₁ B ₃	84.13	50.69	89.46	62.17	38.57	0.08
P ₁ B ₄	89.06	55.59	101.37	77.63	44.08	0.23
P ₂ B ₀	80.44	48.41	87.76	59.56	37.33	0.24
P ₂ B ₁	84.81	52.09	91.67	63.50	39.30	0.08
P ₂ B ₂	86.60	53.84	94.65	66.33	39.53	0.08
P ₂ B ₃	87.33	54.32	95.01	71.75	40.08	0.17
P ₂ B ₄	90.72	59.85	103.67	83.92	44.88	0.25
S.Em ±	0.425	0.296	0.301	0.364	0.288	0.001
C.D. 0.05%	1.231	0.857	0.872	1.054	0.835	0.003

3.7 Total Soluble Solids (°Brix)

When compared to all other pruning treatments, the severity of pruning had a significant influence on TSS content (Table 2). TSS was highest (5.40 °Brix) in the treatment that pruned 50% of the length of the shoots (P_2) and lowest (5.22 °Brix) in the un-pruned (P_0). Similarly, differing biofertilizer levels had a significant influence on TSS, with treatment B_4 (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) having the greatest (5.51 °Brix) and treatment B_0 (No- biofertilizers) having the lowest (5.19 °Brix). The interaction between pruning severity and biofertilizer levels, on the other hand, was found to be non-significant. The increase in total soluble solids content in fruits could be ascribed to improved nutrient availability and hormone induction, which promotes cell division, cell elongation, increased fruit quantity and weight, improved root development, and improved water uptake and nutrient deposition. This could be related to increased fertilizer use efficiency through the use of biological nutrition sources [14].

3.8 Titratable Acidity (%)

Pruning had a large and considerable (Table 2) impact on titratable acidity. The treatment (P_2) had the highest (5.71%) titratable acidity while the lowest (4.33%) was recorded in P_0 . The use of different biofertilizers also showed a significant influence on titratable acidity, with treatment B_4 (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) having the greatest (5.89%) and treatment B_0 having the lowest (4.51%). Similarly, the combination of pruning severity and biofertilizer levels increased titratable acidity, with the maximum titratable acidity (5.90%) reported in treatments pruning 50% + PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter (P_2B_4) and Pruning 25% + PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter (P_1B_4), which is comparable to P_2B_2 (5.84%), P_2B_3 (5.85%), and P_0B_4 (5.88%), while treatment control (P_0B_0) had the lowest (3.72%). Pruning and biofertilizer interaction had a considerable effect on titratable acidity. It could be because pruning enhanced the rate of photosynthesis, resulting in higher light penetration into the inner tree canopy, and biofertilizers impact auxin hormones, which function as carbohydrate mobilization from the source of skin (fruits), resulting in increased fruit quality. The higher titratable acidity could be due

to the fact that the humic acid and fulvic acid components of organic matter formed water-soluble micronutrients, enhancing their

availability and absorption and resulting in improved quality [16].

3.9 Vitamin C Content (mg/100 g)

Pruning levels had a considerable impact on vitamin C content (Table 2). The pruning 50% length of shoots (P_2) treatment had the highest ascorbic acid content (120.37 mg) and the lowest (100.20 mg) in the un-pruned treatment (P_0). Similarly, the use of different doses of biofertilizer had a significant influence on ascorbic acid, with treatment B_4 (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) having the greatest ascorbic acid concentration (130.68 mg) and treatment B_0 (no-biofertilizers) having the lowest (100.41 mg). Furthermore, a substantial interaction between pruning severity and biofertilizer levels was discovered. The treatment pruning 50% + PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter (P_2B_4) had the maximum concentration of ascorbic acid (141.08 mg), whereas the control (P_0B_0) had the lowest concentration (85.79 mg). The presence of ascorbic acid in fruits can be ascribed to adequate nutrition and hormone stimulation, which promotes cell division, cell elongation, a rise in fruit number and weight, increased root development, and improved water transfer and nutrient deposition. This could be attributed to increased fertilizer efficiency through the use of organic nutrition sources [14]. Ghosh [12] discovered similar results and confirmed that high-degree pruning intensity with biofertilizers increases titratable acidity.

3.10 Total Sugars (%)

Pruning levels improved the total sugar content of Assam lemon fruits considerably (Table 2). P_2 had the highest amount of sugar (8.41%), while P_0 had the lowest (6.20%). Furthermore, biofertilizer dosages had a significant impact on lemon fruit total sugars, ranging from 6.40% in treatment B_0 to 9.40% in treatment B_4 . The interaction between pruning intensity and biofertilizer levels was also shown to be significant, with P_2B_4 having the highest (9.84%) and P_0B_0 having the lowest (4.74%).

It could be because of proper nutrition delivery and growth hormone stimulation, which increased cell division, cell elongation, better translocation of water intake, and nutrient deposition as a result of fertilizer usage efficiency [17]. Nanaso [18] reported a similar result, observing that the greatest total sugar was detected in sweet orange due to biofertilizer

inoculation with Azotobacter, PSB, and Trichoderma.

3.10.1 Reducing and non-reducing sugar

Pruning levels significantly (Table 3) increased the reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar content, with the maximum value (2.12% and 6.39%) recorded in P₂ and the lowest (1.88% and 4.41%) recorded in P₀. Furthermore, biofertilizer levels altered the reducing sugars and non-reducing sugars of lemon fruits, ranging from 1.82% and 4.68% in B₀ to 2.18% and 7.33% in B₄. The interaction between pruning intensity and biofertilizer levels was also shown to be significant, with P₂B₄ having the highest reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar levels (2.20% and 7.75%) and P₀B₀ having the lowest (1.40% and 3.41%). Sugar levels may have increased due to the availability of accessible photosynthates for developing fruits, and enhanced sunlight penetration in the canopy may have improved quality. The findings for the enhancement of reducing sugar and non-reducing sugar quality parameters in Assam lemon are consistent with those of Nath [19]. Reducing sugars in fruits improved may be owing to adequate food delivery and activation of growth hormones, which promoted cell proliferation, according to Nath and Baruah [20]. The improved fruit quality could be explained by the fact that the varied nutrient sources improved plant capacity for greater uptake of nutrients from the rhizosphere,

culminating in the conversion of acid to sugar and their derivatives via the reverse glycolytic pathway [21].

3.11 Juice Content (ml) and Juice pH

The amount of trimming has a significant impact on the juice content (Table 3). The treatment pruning 50% length of shoots (P₂) accumulated the higher amount of juice (33.81 ml), while the un-pruned (P₀) condition yielded the least (28.33 ml).

Similarly, the application of biofertilizer levels had a significant impact on juice content. Treatment B₄ (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) yielded the maximum juice (36.97 ml), while treatment B₀ (No- biofertilizers) yielded the least (28.67 ml). Furthermore, the interaction of pruning and biofertilizer levels had a significant influence on juice content, with P₂B₄ (50% pruning + PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) producing the most juice (40 ml) and P₀B₁ (No pruning + PGPR) producing the least (26.37 ml). When Shamseldin et al. [13] investigated microbial bio-fertilization options to boost the yield and quality of Washington navel orange, they discovered a similar outcome. They discovered that inoculating bio-fertilizer with Pseudomonas fluorescence strain 843 growth-boosting rhizobacteria boosted the juice content of Washington navel oranges substantially.

Table 2. Effects of pruning severity and biofertilizers on biochemical characteristics of Assam lemon fruits

Treatments	Total soluble solids (°Brix)	Titrateable acidity (%)	Vitamin C content (mg/100 g)	Total sugars (%)
(A) Effect of Pruning Severity				
P ₀	5.22	4.33	100.20	6.20
P ₁	5.32	5.22	112.10	7.90
P ₂	5.40	5.71	120.37	8.41
S.Em ±	0.008	0.008	0.107	0.015
C.D. 0.05%	0.025	0.023	0.311	0.043
(B) Effect of Biofertilizers				
B ₀	5.19	4.51	100.41	6.40
B ₁	5.26	4.84	103.45	7.03
B ₂	5.28	5.09	109.08	7.27
B ₃	5.32	5.10	110.85	7.42
B ₄	5.51	5.89	130.68	9.40
S.Em ±	0.014	0.013	0.179	0.025
C.D. 0.05%	0.041	0.038	0.519	0.071
Effect of (AXB) Interaction				
P ₀ B ₀	5.11	3.72	85.79	4.74
P ₀ B ₁	5.17	3.77	90.88	5.39
P ₀ B ₂	5.18	4.11	98.95	5.70

Treatments	Total soluble solids (°Brix)	Titrateable acidity (%)	Vitamin C content (mg/100 g)	Total sugars (%)
P ₀ B ₃	5.21	4.15	100.74	6.05
P ₀ B ₄	5.42	5.88	124.66	9.13
P ₁ B ₀	5.22	4.62	105.32	6.65
P ₁ B ₁	5.23	4.97	106.54	7.63
P ₁ B ₂	5.28	5.31	110.87	7.99
P ₁ B ₃	5.36	5.31	111.46	8.03
P ₁ B ₄	5.51	5.90	126.30	9.22
P ₂ B ₀	5.23	5.18	110.11	7.82
P ₂ B ₁	5.37	5.78	112.92	8.07
P ₂ B ₂	5.38	5.84	117.42	8.13
P ₂ B ₃	5.40	5.85	120.34	8.17
P ₂ B ₄	5.61	5.90	141.08	9.84
S.Em ±	N.S.	0.039	0.537	0.074
C.D. 0.05%	N.S.	0.113	1.556	0.213

Table 3. Effects of pruning severity and biofertilizers on biochemical characteristics of Assam lemon fruits

Treatments	Reducing sugar (%)	Non-reducing sugar	Juice pH	Juice content (ml)
(A) Effect of Pruning Severity				
P ₀	1.88	4.41	2.00	28.33
P ₁	2.07	5.94	2.03	31.80
P ₂	2.12	6.39	2.08	33.81
S.Em ±	0.004	0.010	0.004	0.046
C.D. 0.05%	0.012	0.029	0.012	0.134
(B) Effect of Biofertilizers				
B ₀	1.82	4.68	1.99	28.67
B ₁	2.01	5.12	2.00	29.62
B ₂	2.06	5.32	2.02	30.18
B ₃	2.06	5.46	2.04	31.11
B ₄	2.18	7.33	2.14	36.97
S.Em ±	0.007	0.016	0.007	0.077
C.D. 0.05%	0.012	0.048	0.012	0.223
Effect of (AxB) Interaction				
P ₀ B ₀	1.40	3.41	1.96	26.58
P ₀ B ₁	1.90	3.59	1.96	26.37
P ₀ B ₂	1.98	3.82	2.00	27.17
P ₀ B ₃	1.98	4.17	2.00	27.58
P ₀ B ₄	2.16	7.08	2.08	33.92
P ₁ B ₀	2.01	4.74	2.00	29.17
P ₁ B ₁	2.02	5.71	2.00	30.00
P ₁ B ₂	2.07	6.02	2.01	30.58
P ₁ B ₃	2.09	6.04	2.04	32.25
P ₁ B ₄	2.17	7.16	2.10	37.00
P ₂ B ₀	2.04	5.88	2.01	30.25
P ₂ B ₁	2.11	6.07	2.04	32.50
P ₂ B ₂	2.12	6.12	2.06	32.79
P ₂ B ₃	2.12	6.16	2.07	33.50
P ₂ B ₄	2.20	7.75	2.23	40.00
S.Em ±	0.021	0.049	0.020	0.231
C.D. 0.05%	0.061	0.143	0.059	0.669

Pruning had a significant influence (Table 3) on juice pH, with the treatment pruning 50% of the length of the shoots (P_2) having the greatest juice pH (2.08), and the un-pruned (P_0) having the lowest juice pH (2.00). Furthermore, the application of biofertilizer levels had a significant influence on the juice pH content of Assam lemon, according to the research. B_4 (PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter) had the highest juice pH (2.14), while B_0 (No- biofertilizers) had the lowest (1.99). Similarly, the interaction between pruning and biofertilizer levels had no effect on juice pH, with the highest juice pH (2.23) recorded in the treatment pruning 50% + PGPR + Trichoderma + Azotobacter (P_2B_4) and the lowest (1.96) seen in the treatment combinations P_0B_1 (No pruning + PGPR) and P_0B_0 (control).

4. CONCLUSION

From the study, it was concluded that the high pruning intensity (50% from the apex) and biofertilizers combination were found vital in Assam lemon's fruit morphological (fruit length, fruit width, fruit volume, fruit weight, peel weight, and the number of seeds per fruit) and biochemical characteristics (TSS, titratable acidity, ascorbic acid, total sugar, reducing sugar and juice content).

CONFERENCE DISCLAIMER

Some part of this manuscript was previously presented in the conference: 3rd International Conference IAAHAS-2023 "Innovative Approaches in Agriculture, Horticulture & Allied Sciences" on March 29-31, 2023 in SGT University, Gurugram, India. Web Link of the proceeding: <https://wikifarmer.com/event/iaahas-2023-innovative-approaches-in-agriculture-horticulture-allied-sciences/>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors are grateful to Dr. P.K. Nimbolkar, Assistant Professor, Department of fruit Science for providing guidance and financial support during research.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Ghosh A, Dey K, Bhowmick N, Medda PS, Ghosh SK. Impact of different pruning severity and nutrient management on

- growth and yield of lemon cv. Assam lemon (*Citrus limon* Burm.). Int. J. Plant Res. 2016;29(1):25-32.
2. Sharma BD, Hore DK, Gupta SG. Genetic resources of citrus of North Eastern India and their potential use. Genet. Resour. Crop Evol. 2004;51(4):411-418.
3. Kondle R, Gurung S, Bhowmick N. Effect of pruning and paclobutrazol application of acid lime (*Citrus aurantifolia* Swingle) cv. Balaji under Sub-Himalayan Terai region of West Bengal. Int. J. Chem. Stud. 2020; 8(4):201-206.
4. Suhag M. Potential of biofertilizers to replace chemical fertilizers. Int. Adv. Res. J. Sci. Eng. Technol. 2016;3(5):163-167.
5. AOAC. Official methods of analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists International, Washington D.C. 2002:1-12.
6. Jagota SK, Dani HM. A new colorimetric technique for estimation of vitamin C using folin-phenol reagent. Anal. Biochem. 1982;127(1):178-82.
7. Hedge JE, Hofreiter BT. Determination of reducing sugars and carbohydrates, In: Whistler RL, Wolfrom ML. (eds) Methods in carbohydrates chemistry, 17th edn. Academic Press, New York; 1962.
8. Somogyi M. Estimation of sugars by calorimetric method. J. Biol. Chem. 1952;200:245.
9. Gomez AK, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. 2nd edn. Wiley India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. 2010:134-138.
10. Singh SS, Srivestra VS, Singh P. Training/pruning. Advances in citriculture, Kalyani publisher, Karnataka, India. 2004: 206-219.
11. Singh S, Gill PS, Dhillon WS, Singh S. Effect of heading back on photosynthesis, yield and fruit quality in pear. Not. Sci. Biol. 2012;4(4):90-94.
12. Ghosh A. Effect of pruning and nutrient management on growth and yield of lemon cv. Assam lemon (*Citrus limon* Burm.). M.Sc. Thesis, uttar banga Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Pundibari, Coochbehar, West; 2015.
13. Shamseldin A, El-Sheikh MH, Hassan HSA, Kabeil SS. Microbial biofertilization approaches to improve yield and quality of Washington navel orange and reducing the survival of nematode in the soil. J. American Sci. 2010;6(12):264-271.
14. Lal G, Dayal H. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and quality of acid

- lime (*Citrus aurentifolia* Swingle). Afr. J. Agri. Sci. 2014;9(40):2985-2991.
15. Sandhu S, Bal JS, Response of lemon cv. baramasi to foliar feeding of nutrients. Indian J. Hort. 2012;69(2):281-283.
 16. Kumar V, Singh MK, Singh M, Dev P, Mohan B. Influence of Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) on yield and quality of lemon (*Citrus limon* Burn.) cv. pant lemon-I under Western U.P. conditions. Annals of Hort. 2012;5(1):137-139.
 17. Yadav AK, Singh JK, Singh HK. Studies on integrated nutrient management in flowering, fruiting, yield and quality of mango cv. amrapali under high density orcharding. Indian J. Hort. 2011;68(4):453-460.
 18. Nanaso GM. Studies on use of organic manures and biofertilizers on growth, yield and quality in sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* (L.) osbeck) cv. mosambi. M.Sc. Thesis, Mahatma Phule Krshividyaapeeth, Rahuri - 413 722, dist. Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India. 2017:81-107.
 19. Nath JC. Effect of pruning intensity on growth yield and quality of Assam lemon (*Citrus limon* Burm). Haryana J. Hort. Sci. 1994;23(4):281-285.
 20. Nath JC, Baruah K. Effect of pruning and growth regulators on sex expression fruit set, size, drop and yield in Assam lemon (*Citrus limon* Burm.). Hort. J. 2001;14(2):127-133.
 21. Bohane L, Tiwari R. Effect of integrated nutrient management on the physico-chemical parameter of ber under malwa plateau conditions. Annuals Plant and Soil Res. 2004;16(4):346-348.

© 2023 Rathour et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

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

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/100529>