

Journal of Scientific Research and Reports

Volume 30, Issue 11, Page 1106-1117, 2024; Article no.JSRR.127253 ISSN: 2320-0227

Effect of Organic Manures and Bio-fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Dragon Fruit (*Hylocereus undatus* L.) under Western Uttar Pradesh Conditions

Prashant Chauhan a++*, Arvind Kumar a#, Sanjay Kumar Tripathi a#, Hariom Katiyar b†, Amit Kumar a‡, Arunesh Kumar Verma a++ and Satyam Singh a++

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i112638

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/127253

Original Research Article

Received: 14/09/2024 Accepted: 21/11/2024 Published: 27/11/2024

++ PG Research Scholar;

Cite as: Chauhan, Prashant, Arvind Kumar, Sanjay Kumar Tripathi, Hariom Katiyar, Amit Kumar, Arunesh Kumar Verma, and Satyam Singh. 2024. "Effect of Organic Manures and Bio-Fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Dragon Fruit (Hylocereus Undatus L.) under Western Uttar Pradesh Conditions". Journal of Scientific Research and Reports 30 (11):1106-17. https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i112638.

[#] Professor;

[†] Associate Professor;

[‡] Ph.D. Research Scholar,

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: prashantkrt113@gmail.com;

ABSTRACT

The field experiment was conducted at the Horticultural Research Centre. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, during 2023. All treatments were applied in a randomized block design with three replications, including T0- Control (No manures), T1- 100% N as FYM, T2- 100% N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya, T3- 100% N as FYM + NPK Microbial Consortium, T4- 100% N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium, T5- 100% N as Vermicompost, T6- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya, T7- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium, and T8- 100% RDF. The application of treatment 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium (T7) was found significantly superior in terms of number of new branches per pillar (12.67, 16, 18.67 and 20.33) at 30, 60, 90 and 120 days after treatment, plant canopy spread (5.10 and 5.27 m²) at initial and harvest stage, number of flower per pillar(24), days taken from flowering to fruit harvest (29.93), number of fruits per pillar(19.33), length of the fruit (9.81cm), width of the fruit (9.02cm), fruit weight (390.85 g), peel thickness (3.65 mm), specific gravity(1.12), fruit yield per pillar (7.55 kg), fruit yield per hectare (8.38 t/ha), TSS (14.17° Brix), ascorbic acid content (8.74 mg/100 g) and minimum titratable acidity (0.24 %) of dragon fruit. The study highlights the potential of integrating organic manures and biofertilizers to enhance the growth, yield and quality of dragon fruit, offering a sustainable and ecofriendly alternative to chemical fertilizers. Further research can explore the long-term impacts of these organic treatments on soil health, nutrient dynamics, and their adaptability to different agroclimatic regions for broader applicability.

Keywords: Hylocereus undatus L.; organic manures; bio-fertilizers: vermicompost: growth and yield; fruit quality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dragon fruit (Hylocereus undatus L.), is a member of the Cactaceae family of cactus, has gained global popularity due to its unique appearance, nutritional value and potential health benefits (Singh & Kumar 2023; Zaid et al. 2024). It is a tropical and subtropical fruit that has captivated the interest of both producers and consumers, not only because of its vibrant color and exotic flavor but also due to its rich content of antioxidants, vitamins, minerals and fiber. As demand for dragon fruit continues to rise, there is increasing interest in optimizing its cultivation practices to improve both the quality and quantity of yield. Among the various factors influencing crop growth, organic manures and bio-fertilizers have emerged as sustainable alternatives to synthetic fertilizers, which often have detrimental effects health. on soil environmental sustainability and long-term agricultural productivity.

In recent years, the shift toward organic farming has been driven by the growing concerns over soil degradation, loss of biodiversity and the accumulation of chemical residues in food products. Organic manures and bio-fertilizers, rich in essential nutrients and beneficial microorganisms, play a crucial role in enhancing

soil fertility and promoting plant growth (Sahu, 2023; Kumar et al. 2022). Key organic practices include using Jeevamrit, a microbial culture made from cow dung, urine, jaggery, soil, pulse flour, and water, which promotes crop growth and pest resistance (Kumari et al. 2022). Panchagavya and compost tea are emphasized for enhancing soil health and crop productivity (Maity et al. 2020). Farmyard manure (FYM), consisting of livestock waste and feed, improves soil structure, moisture retention, and nutrient availability, thus supporting healthy crop growth (Chahal et al. 2020). Additionally, vermicompost, produced by earthworms, serves as an effective organic fertilizer that boosts plant development and acts as a biocontrol agent against pests, promoting sustainable agriculture (Joshi et al. 2015).

These organic inputs improve soil structure, water retention and nutrient availability, creating a favourable environment for plant roots to thrive (Arden-Clarke & Hodges 1988; Fageria 2012; Murphy 2015). Additionally, bio-fertilizers containing nitrogen-fixing bacteria, phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms and mycorrhizal fungi help in enhancing nutrient uptake and improving the plant's resistance to biotic and abiotic stress (Chaudhary *et al.* 2022; Rabani *et al.* 2023).

Despite the recognized benefits of organic inputs production. there is a limited understanding of their specific effects on dragon fruit cultivation, particularly in terms of growth and yield parameters. While several studies have demonstrated the positive impact of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on other fruit crops, comprehensive research on their application to dragon fruit remains scarce. The limited research on dragon fruit's response to these organic inputs creates a significant knowledge gap, especially with respect to the interaction between different organic amendments and the physiological and quality traits of the crop.

Previous studies have largely focused on conventional fertilizers, leaving а gap potential understanding the of organic alternatives to improve both the agronomic performance and quality attributes of dragon fruit (Srivastava et al. 2021). This study aims to evaluate the impact of different organic manures and bio-fertilizers on the growth and yield parameters of dragon fruit, as well as to assess how these organic inputs influence the quality attributes of the fruit. By addressing these research gaps, the study seeks to provide insights that can guide sustainable dragon fruit cultivation practices, contributing to agricultural productivity and environmental sustainability.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted on wellestablished dragon fruit orchard situated at Horticulture Research Centre Sardar of Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology in Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, during 2023. Meerut district is situated in the Indo-Gangetic plains of India, with geographical coordinates ranging between 28°57' to 29°02' North latitude and 77°40' to 77°45' East longitude. The effect of organic manures and biofertilizers was noted on dragon fruit yield with 9 treatments and 3 replications. All the treatments applied in randomized block design with three replications viz. T0- Control (No manures), T1-100 % N as FYM, T2- 100 % N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya, T3- 100 % N as FYM + NPK Microbial Consortium, T4- 100 % N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium, T5-100% Vermicompost, T6- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya, T7- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK MicrobialConsortium and T8- 100% RDF.

recorded Observations were for parameters across growth, fruit physical traits. vield and quality. New branches were counted at 30, 60, 90, and 120 days after treatment for each pillar, and the mean number was recorded. The canopy spread was measured in North-South and East-West directions at 0 days and final harvest using a measuring tape, and the canopy was calculated in square (m²). The number of flowers per pillar was counted up to final harvest, and the average number per plant was determined. The number of days from full bloom to fruit harvest was recorded by tagging ten flowers per plant and calculating the mean for replications. The total number of fruits per pillar was counted at harvest, and the average number of fruits per pillar was calculated. The length of ten randomly selected ripe fruits was measured using a scale and recorded in centimeters (cm). The width of ten randomly selected fruits at their broadest point was measured using a scale and recorded in centimeters (cm). The weight of ten randomly selected fruits was recorded in grams (g) using an electronic balance, and the average weight was calculated. The peel thickness was measured at the midpoint of the fruit using a Vernier caliper and recorded in millimeters (mm). The specific gravity of the fruits was calculated by dividing the weight of the fruit by its volume, determined using the water displacement method. Fruit yield per pillar was recorded until the final harvest and expressed in kilograms (kg). The yield per hectare was calculated in tons per hectare (t/ha) by multiplying the yield per pillar by the number of pillars per hectare. The total soluble solids in the ripened fruit were measured using a hand refractometer and expressed in °Brix. The ascorbic acid level was determined by titrating a known weight of fruit sample with 2, 6dichlorophenol indophenols dye and oxalic acid, and expressed as mg/100g of fruit pulp. The titratable acidity was determined by titrating the fruit pulp with N/10 NaOH using phenolphthalein as an indicator and expressed as a percentage (%). The data recorded for the parameters was statistically analyzed by following Randomized 5% level Block Design (RBD) at significance as suggested by Gomez and Gomez (1996).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The current result of different treatments affect the growth, yield and quality of dragon fruit.

3.1 Growth Parameters

Number of new branches per pillar: The data presented Table 1 treatments had wide range of variations in respect of all the characters of growth parameters. All the parameters were influenced significantly due to the effect of various treatments. The data revealed that various treatments significantly enhanced the number of new branches per pillar. The maximum number of new branches per pillar was reported with treatment 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium (12.67, 16, 18.67 and 20.33) at 30, 60, 90 and 120 days after treatment, respectively. The minimum average value in terms of number of new branches per pillar was recorded under the control (4.33, 6.33, 8, 8.33) at 30, 60, 90 and 120 days after treatment, respectively. It clearly indicates the dosage of 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium works better than the treatments. The results are in accordance with the finding of Khatun et al. (2023), Singh et al (2022), Rawat et al. (2022) and Verma et al. (2019) in dragon fruit.

Plant canopy spread (m²): The significant differences in the canopy spread were recorded due to application of different combinations of manures and bio-fertilizers. The maximum canopy spread of plant was recorded in 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium treatment (5.10 and 5.27 m²) at initial and harvest stage which remained at par with 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya. It was discovered that the control had minimum plant canopy spread (3.19 and 3.31 m²) at initial and harvest stage in Table 1. The enhanced plant canopy spread is related to the gibberellin synthesis and in vermicompost. Gibberellins presence encourage cell elongation and division, which in turn causes an increase in the spread of the plant canopy. The positive effect of vermicompost and bio-fertilizers on plant canopy spread has been reported by Ghosh et al. (2014) in sweet orange, Jain et al. (2020) in guava, Om, P.M. (2020) in mango and Rashmi (2019) in dragon fruit.

Number of flowers per pillar: The maximum number of flowers per pillar (24) were recorded in T7- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium treatment which remained at par with T6- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya

(22.67) in Table 1. It was discovered that the control had minimum number of flowers per pillar. As reported by the earlier researcher, the application of manures and vermicompost combined with biofertilizers produced the largest number of flowers per pillar and greatly increased the number of microorganisms in the soil. Khatun *et al.* (2023) and Sahu (2023) also observed the similar results in dragon fruit.

Days taken from flowering to fruit harvesting: The minimum number of days taken from flowering to fruit harvesting was recorded in 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium (29.93) followed by 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (30.45) and 100 % N as Vermicompost (30.79). Whereas maximum number of days taken to fruit picking was recorded in control (35.82) followed by 100% N as FYM. Due to the combined effect of various manures and bio-fertilizers, the fruit reached a marketable maturity slightly earlier than control. Results obtained are in close conformity with the findings of (Pushpakumara et al. 2005), Parween et al. (2018) and Pandey (2023) in Dragon fruit.

3.2 Physical Parameters of Fruit

Number of fruits per pillar: Among the treatments, 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium had received highest number of fruits per pillar (19.33) followed by 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavva and 100% RDF. While the minimum number of fruits (12.33) were observed in control followed by 100 % FYM (15) and 100% N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (15.67). The fact that there were more fruits per pillar might be because vermicompost, a nutrient-rich fertilizer, has raised soil's concentration of macro micronutrients. Consequently, their combined application assisted in promoting the plants' vegetative and reproductive phases. The similar results were reported by Choudhary et al. (2022) in pomegranate and Rashmi (2019) in dragon fruit.

Length of the fruit (cm): The maximum fruit length (9.81 cm) was recorded with T7- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium treatment which remained at par with 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (9.57 cm) but significantly higher than rest of the treatments. On the other hand, minimum fruit length was

Table 1. Effect of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on number of new branches per pillar, Number of flower per pillar and Days taken from flowering to fruit harvest of Dragon fruit

| Treatments | Number of new branches per pillar | | | | Plant canopy spread (m²) | | Number of flower per | Days taken from flowering to fruit |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | 30 DAT | 30 DAT | 30 DAT | 30 DAT | Initial | At harvest | pillar . | harvest |
| T0-Control (No manures) | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.19 | 3.31 | 16.67 | 35.82 |
| T1-100 % N as FYM | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 4.07 | 4.18 | 19.33 | 32.16 |
| T2-100 % N as FYM + Jeevamrut + | | | | | 4.22 | 4.34 | 20.00 | 31.81 |
| Panchagavya | 7.67 | 7.67 | 7.67 | 7.67 | | | | |
| T3-100 % N as FYM + NPK Microbial | | | | | 4.32 | 4.46 | 20.67 | 31.99 |
| Consortium | 8.33 | 8.33 | 8.33 | 8.33 | | | | |
| T4-100 %N as FYM + Jeevamrut + | | | | | | | | |
| Panchagavya +NPK Microbial Consortium | 9.67 | 9.67 | 9.67 | 9.67 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 21.67 | 31.37 |
| T5-100 % N as Vermicompost | 10.33 | 10.33 | 10.33 | 10.33 | 4.61 | 4.75 | 21.33 | 30.79 |
| T6-100 % N as Vermicompost + | | | | | 4.86 | 5.02 | 22.67 | 30.45 |
| Jeevamrut +Panchagavya | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | | | | |
| T7-100 % N as Vermicompost +Jeevamrut | | | | | | | | |
| + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial | 12.67 | 12.67 | 12.67 | 12.67 | 5.10 | 5.27 | 24.00 | 29.93 |
| Consortium | | | | | | | | |
| T8-100 % RDF as inorganic | 11.33 | 11.33 | 11.33 | 11.33 | 4.75 | 4.90 | 22.00 | 31.04 |
| Mean | 9.25 | 9.25 | 9.25 | 9.25 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 20.92 | 31.71 |
| SE(m)± | 0.417 | 0.417 | 0.417 | 0.417 | 0.208 | 0.149 | 0.578 | 0.795 |
| C.D. @ 5% | 1.262 | 1.262 | 1.262 | 1.262 | 0.445 | 0.451 | 1.749 | 2.403 |
| C.V. % | 8.663 | 8.742 | 8.521 | 8.649 | 6.023 | 5.92 | 4.948 | 4.286 |

recorded under T0- control (7.17 cm) in Table 2. This might be because vermicompost increases soil moisture retention and microbial activity, which in turn leads to enhanced enzymatic activity and improved growth parameters, which may have translated into longer fruit. This is in accordance with the results of (Verma *et al.* 2019) and Ayesha (2022) in dragon fruit.

Width of the fruit (cm): The result showed under T0-control gave minimum width of the fruit (8.64 cm) followed by T1- FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (7.59 cm) in Table 2. The maximum width of the fruit was recorded in T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium (9.02 cm) followed by T6- 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (8.85 cm). The results are line with Rashmi (2019) and Ayesha (2022) in dragon fruit.

Fruit weight (g): The maximum fruit weight (390.85 g) was reported in 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by 100% N as Vermicompost+ Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (373.2 g) and 100 % RDF (365.61 g) in Table 2. However, minimum fruit weight (312 g) was observed in control followed by 100% N as FYM (330.67 g) and 100% N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (336.81 g) in Table 2. This is because some growth-promoting compounds generated by biofertilizers may have improved root development, water movement, nutrient deposition, and uptake. The present study is in line with the findings of (Pawar et al. 2020) in sweet orange, Bindu and Renjan et al. (2024) in papaya and Prerna (2023) in dragon fruit.

Peel thickness: The data presented in Table 2 revealed that, highest peel thickness (3.65 mm) was registered in treatment T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium which was found at par with treatment T6-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (3.53 mm) and the least peel thickness (2.32 mm) was recorded in treatment T0- control. IAA and GA3 found in vermicompost, jeevamrut, and panchagavya may have stimulated cell division, wall expansion, meristematic activity, and photosynthetic efficiency in plants, which aid in development and increased peel thickness, as a result of the beneficial effects of a balanced supplement of major and micronutrients. Similar result was reported by Verma et al. (2019) and Rashmi (2019) in dragon fruit.

Specific gravity: The data revealed that maximum specific gravity (1.12) of the fruit was recorded in treatment T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by T6-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium and T8-100 % RDF, while the minimum specific gravity (0.91) of fruit was reported under T0-control in Table 2. Similar findings were observed by Pandey (2023) and Ayesha (2022) in dragon fruit.

3.3 Yield Parameters

Fruit yield per pillar (kg/piller): The application of various manures and bio-fertilizers were significantly improved the fruit vield per pillar as compared to control during the fruiting season in Table 3. The pillars fertilized with 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavva + NPK Microbial Consortium gave the highest fruit yield (7.55 kg/ piller) followed by 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya (6.84 kg/ piller) and 100% N as Vermicompost (6.58 kg/ piller) . This is because the plant has more readily available nutrients and a higher level of various endogenous hormones as a result of vermicompost, ieevamrut panchagayya. These factors may have improved flowering and pollen germination, which in turn increased the number of fruits per plant and the set of fruits, which may have directly affected the fruit yield. The present study is in line with the findings of (Rathod et al. 2022) in Mango, Khatun et al. (2023) and Rashmi (2019) in Dragon fruit.

Fruit yield per hectare (t/ha.): The maximum fruit yield per hectare (8.38 t/ha) was recorded under the treatment T7 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavva + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by T6 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya and T8 100 % RDF (7.6 and 7.31 t/ha, respectively), whereas minimum fruit yield (4.26 t/ha) was recorded under control treatment during field experiment. Improved physical, chemical, and biological qualities of the soil led to a greater supply of plant nutrients that were mobilized and solubilized, which in turn produced good crop development and yield. Higher yield response resulting from application of organic manures coupled with bio-fertilizers is attributed to these improved features. These results are in conformity with the findings of (Dwivedi et al. 2010) in Guava, Khatun et al. (2023), Then (2014) and Rashmi (2019) in Dragon fruit.

Table 2. Effect of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on Number of fruit per pillar, length, width, weight, Peel thickness and Specific gravity of the dragon fruit

| Treatments | Number of fruits per pillar | Length of the fruit (cm) | Width of the fruit (cm) | Fruit weight(gm) | Peel thickness (mm) | Specific gravity |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| T0-Control (No manures) | 12.33 | 7.17 | 6.36 | 312.0 | 2.32 | 0.91 |
| T1-100 % N as FYM | 15.0 | 8.3 | 7.59 | 330.67 | 2.70 | 0.97 |
| T2-100 % N as FYM + Jeevamrut + | 15.67 | 8.54 | 7.82 | 336.81 | 2.85 | 1.0 |
| Panchagavya | | | | | | |
| T3-100 % N as FYM + NPK Microbial | 16.0 | 8.68 | 8 | 339.37 | | |
| Consortium | | | | | 2.96 | 1.02 |
| T4-100 %N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya | a | | | | | |
| +NPK Microbial Consortium | 17.33 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 354.3 | 3.09 | 1.05 |
| T5-100 % N as Vermicompost | 17.0 | 8.98 | 8.25 | 345.29 | 3.24 | 1.07 |
| T6-100 % N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + | 18.33 | 9.57 | 8.85 | | | |
| Panchagavya | | | | 373.2 | 3.53 | 1.10 |
| T7-100 % N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + | | | | | | |
| Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium | 19.33 | 9.81 | 9.02 | 390.85 | 3.65 | 1.12 |
| T8-100 % RDF as inorganic | 18.0 | 9.43 | 8.64 | 365.61 | 3.38 | 1.09 |
| Mean | 16.55 | 8.853 | 8.103 | 349.78 | 3.08 | 1.036 |
| SE(m)± | 0.51 | 0.248 | 0.238 | 8.380 | 0.093 | 0.026 |
| C.D. @ 5% | 1.542 | 0.749 | 0.719 | 25.340 | 0.281 | 0.079 |
| C.V. % | 5.569 | 4.986 | 5.237 | 4.263 | 5.485 | 4.442 |

Table 3. Effect of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on Fruit yield per pillar (kg) and Fruit yield (t/ha), TSS, Ascorbic acid and Titratable acidity of Dragon fruit

| Treatments | Fruit yield per pillar (kg) | Fruit yield (t/ha) | T.S.S. (°Brix) | Ascorbic acid (mg/100gm) | Titratable acidity (%) |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| T0-Control (No manures) | 3.84 | 4.26 | 10.15 | 5.11 | 0.39 |
| T1-100 % N as FYM | 4.96 | 5.51 | 11.74 | 6.43 | 0.34 |
| T2-100 % N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya | 5.27 | 5.85 | 11.91 | 6.69 | 0.32 |
| T3-100 % N as FYM + NPK Microbial Consortium | 5.43 | 6.03 | 12.37 | 7.25 | 0.31 |
| T4-100 %N as FYM + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + | | | | | |
| NPK Microbial Consortium | 6.14 | 6.82 | 12.82 | 7.57 | 0.30 |
| T5-100 % N as Vermicompost | 5.87 | 6.52 | 13.26 | 7.83 | 0.28 |
| T6-100 % N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + | 6.84 | 7.60 | 13.68 | | |
| Panchagavya · | | | | 8.39 | 0.25 |
| T7-100 % N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + | | | | | |
| Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium | 7.55 | 8.38 | 14.17 | 8.74 | 0.24 |
| T8-100 % RDF as inorganic | 6.58 | 7.31 | 13.41 | 8.02 | 0.26 |
| Mean | 5.83 | 6.475 | 12.612 | 7.336 | 0.29 |
| SE(m)± | 0.201 | 0.225 | 0.365 | 0.238 | 0.013 |
| C.D. @ 5% | 0.609 | 0.68 | 1.104 | 0.718 | 0.039 |
| C.V. % | 5.171 | 5.888 | 7.047 | 5.888 | 7.047 |

3.4 Qualitative Parameters

Total soluble solid: The data presented in Table 3 revealed that, maximum total soluble solid (14.17° B) was recorded in Dragon fruit with T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by T6 (13.68° B) and T8 (13.41° B). while minimum total soluble solid (10.15° B) was recorded in T0-control. Because to the use of micronutrient-rich vermicompost biofertilizers, beneficial soil microbes such as bacteria that fix nitrogen and phosphate, as well hormones growth including auxins, gibberellins, and cytokinins, have been found. Its porosity, aeration, drainage, and water-holding capacity are exceptionally good (Shina et al. 2013). The TSS content of fruits could have increased if these growth hormones stimulated GA production and prevented GA inactivity. Mehraj et al. (2014) reported that availability micronutrients Ωf through vermicompost increased sweetness along with other chemical characters in strawberry. The present study is in line with the findings of (Changotra et al. 2017) in strawberry, Kumar and Kumar (2014) in mango, Choudhary et al. (2023) in pomegranate and Rashmi (2019) in Dragon fruit.

Ascorbic acid content: Maximum ascorbic acid content (8.74 mg/100g) in fruit was found with T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by T6-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya and T8- 100% RDF (8.39 and 8.02 mg/100g respectively), while minimum ascorbic acid content (5.11 mg/100g) in fruit was found under T0- control. Similar results were reported by Patidar *et al.* (2018) in Cape gooseberry, Prerna (2023) and Sahu (2023) in Dragon fruit.

Titratable acidity: The result showed in Table 3 that the minimum titratable acidity (0.24%) was recorded in the treatment T7-100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium followed by treatment T6 (0.25%), while the maximum value (0.39 %) was noticed in T0-control and was found on par (0.34 %) with treatment T1. When various organic manures were applied in conjunction with bio fertilizers, the titratable acidity of fruits decreases. This could be because micronutrients have a beneficial effect on the conversion of acids into sugar and their derivatives through the glycolytic pathway or be employed in respiration.

This may be the possible reason behind decrease fruit acidity as the acidity of fruit is inversely proportional to TSS (Singh *et al.* 2010). Similar results were also reported by Pandey (2023) and Prerna (2023) in Dragon fruit.

4. CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that the application of treatment 100% N as Vermicompost + Jeevamrut + Panchagavya + NPK Microbial Consortium (T7) was found significantly superior in terms of number of new branches per pillar, plant canopy spread (m²), number of flower per pillar, number of fruits per pillar, length of the fruit (cm), width of the fruit (cm), fruit weight (a), peel thickness (mm), specific gravity, fruit yield per pillar (kg), fruit yield per hectare (t), TSS (°Brix), ascorbic acid content (mg/100 g) highlight the positive impact of organic manures and bio-fertilizers. Additionally, the reduction in flowering-to-harvest duration and titratable acidity underscores their effectiveness in enhancing fruit development. These findings confirm the potential of organic bio-fertilizer combinations to boost productivity while promoting sustainable eco-friendly horticultural practices.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative Al technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

Arden-Clarke, C., & Hodges, R. D. (1988). The environmental effects of conventional and organic/biological farming systems. II. Soil ecology, soil fertility and nutrient cycles. *Biological Agriculture & Horticulture, 5*(3), 223–287.

Ayesha, S. (2022). Studies on the influence of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on plant growth, yield, quality and storage of dragon fruit [Hylocereus undatus (Haworth) Britton & Rose and Hylocereus polyrhizus (FAC Weber) Britton & Rose]

- (Doctoral dissertation, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore).
- Bindu, B., & Renjan, B. (2024). Integrated nutrient management of papaya (Carica papaya L.): Application of microbial consortium enriched organic manures for yield and fruit enhancement. International quality Journal of Plant & Soil Science, 36(8), 187-195.
- Chahal, H. S., Singh, A., Dhillon, I. S., & Kaur, J. (2020). Farmyard manure: A boon for integrated nutrient management. International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 13(4), 483–495.
- Changotra, P., Bashir, D., Hussain, S., & Kaur, A. (2017). Cultivation on strawberry (*Fragaria × ananassa* Duch.) cv. Chandler as affected by bio and inorganic fertilizers under open conditions. *Global Journal of Bio-Science and Biotechnology*, 2(7), 332–343.
- Chaudhary, P., Singh, S., Chaudhary, A., Sharma, A., & Kumar, G. (2022). Overview of biofertilizers in crop production and stress management for sustainable agriculture. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 13*, 930340.
- Choudhary, R. C., Bairwa, H. L., Lakhawat, S. S., Jat, G., Yadav, S. K., & Singh, M. (2022). Effect of organic manures on growth and floral characteristics of pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) cv. Bhagwa. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 11(4), 2001–2005.
- Dwivedi, D. H., Lata, R., Ram, B. B., & Babu, M. (2010). Effect of bio-fertilizer and organic manures on yield and quality of 'Red Fleshed' guava. In XXVIII International Horticultural Congress: Science and Horticulture for People (pp. 239–244).
- Fageria, N. K. (2012). Role of soil organic matter in maintaining sustainability of cropping systems. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, *43*(16), 2063–2113.
- Ghosh, B., Irenaeus, T. K. S., Kundu, S., & Datta, P. (2014). Effect of organic manuring on growth, yield and quality of sweet orange. *Acta Horticulturae*, 1024, 121–125.
- Gomez, K. A., & Gomez, A. A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley & Sons.

- Jain, M., Bhatnagar, P., & Verma, N. (2020). Effect of organic manures, inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on growth parameters of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Sardar in Mrig Bahar crop of sub humid agroecological zone of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 8, 2582–2587.
- Joshi, R., Singh, J., & Vig, (2015). Vermicompost as an effective organic fertilizer and biocontrol agent: Effect on growth, vield and quality of plants. Reviews in Environmental Science and Biotechnology. 14 137-159.
- Khatun, R., Rahman, M. H., Mondal, M. T. R., Alam, M. S., Ali, M. I., & Islam, M. M. (2023). Growth and yield impacts of organic manure and pruning on dragon fruit (*Hylocereus undatus* Haw.). *Journal of Agroforestry and Environment*, 16(2), 1–8.
- Kumar, M., & Kumar, R. (2014). Response of organic manures on postharvest quality of mango (Mangifera indica L.) cv. Dashehri. Journal of Agricultural Science, 34, 310– 312.
- Kumar, P., Singh, V., Johar, V., Kumar, A., & Kadlag, S. S. (2022). Uses of plant growth regulators and biofertilizers in fruit crops: A review. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change, 12, 314–326.
- Kumari, S., Meena, L., Raghavendra, K. J., & Karwal, M. (2022). Jeevamrit/Jeevamrutha: Organic concoctions for natural farming. *Agriculture and Food E-Newsletter, 4*(5), 40–42.
- Maity, P., Rijal, R., & Kumar, A. (2020).

 Application of liquid manures on growth of various crops: A review.

 International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 11, 1601–1611.
- Mehraj, H., Ahsan, M. K., Hussain, M. S., Rahman, M. M., & Uddin, A. J. (2014). Response of different organic matters in strawberry. *Bangladesh Research Publications Journal*, 10(2), 151–161.
- Murphy, B. W. (2015). Impact of soil organic matter on soil properties—a review with emphasis on Australian soils. *Soil Research*, *53*(6), 605–635.

- Om, P. M. (2020). Effect of organic nutrient sources and microbial consortium on kurukkan seedlings and bearing Amrapali mango (Doctoral dissertation, Division of Fruits & Horticultural Technology, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi).
- Pandey, L. (2023). Effect of different feeding methods of NPK and Boron on growth, flowering, fruiting, yield and quality of dragon fruit [Hylocereus costaricensis (Web) Britton and Rose] (Doctoral dissertation, ANDUAT, Ayodhya).
- Perween, T., Mandal, K. K., & Hasan, M. A. (2018). Dragon fruit: An exotic super future fruit of India. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(2), 1022–1026.
- Patidar, A., Bahadur, V., & Singh, R. (2018). Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on growth, yield, and quality of cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana* L.).
- Pawar, P. S., Garande, V. K., & Bhite, B. R. (2020). Effect of vermicompost and biofertilizers on growth, yield and fruit quality of sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck) cv. Mosambi. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 9(4), 3370–3374.
- Perween, T., & Hasan, M. A. (2019). Growth, yield and quality of dragon fruit as influenced by NPK fertilization. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*, 76(1), 180–183.
- Prerna, P. (2023). Effect of different reproductive flush, biostimulants and growth regulators on fruit set, yield and quality of dragon fruit [Hylocereus polyrhizus (Britton & Rose)] under Saurashtra region (Doctoral dissertation, JAU, Junagadh).
- Pushpakumara, D. K. N. G., Gunasena, H. P. M., & Karyawasam, M. (2005). Flowering and fruiting phenology, pollination vectors and breeding system of dragon fruit (*Hylocereus* spp.). Sri Lankan Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 4(2), 81–91.
- Rabani, M. S., Hameed, I., Gupta, M. K., Wani, B. A., Fayaz, M., Hussain, H., & Ahad, M. B. (2023). Introduction of biofertilizers in agriculture with emphasis on nitrogen fixers and phosphate solubilizers. In *Microbiomes for the Management of Agricultural Sustainability* (pp. 71–93).
- Rashmi, P. (2019). Standardization of organic manures for dragon fruit in central dry zone of Karnataka (Doctoral dissertation,

- University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga (Mudigere)).
- Rathod, K. D., Patel, M. J., Macwan, S. J., & Patel, J. S. (2022). Effect of biofertilizers and bioinoculants on yield and quality of mango cv. Mallika. *Biological Forum—International Journal*, 14(3), 1343–1349.
- Rawat, A. K., Maji, S., Mayaram, R., Maurya, A. K., & Meena, R. C. (2022). Effect of fertilizers, vermicompost and farmyard manure on growth of red dragon fruit (*Hylocereus costaricensis* (Web.) Britton and Rose). *AGBIR*, *38*(4), 332–335.
- Sahu, M. K. (2023). Standardization of organic nutrient dose and plants per pole in dragon fruit (Doctoral dissertation, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat).
- Singh, B. M., Shukla, R., Pandey, N. K., Chaudhary, K. P., Nongthombam, J., & Kumar, S. (2022). Cluster demonstration on integrated nutrient management in dragon fruit at farmer field of Aizawl district Mizoram, India. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science, 34*(23), 680–685.
- Singh, R., Sharma, R. R., & Singh, D. B. (2010). Effect of vermicompost on plant growth, fruit yield and quality of strawberries in irrigated arid region of northern plains. *Indian Journal of Horticulture, 67*(3), 318–321.
- Singh, S., & Kumar, S. (2023). A review on nutritional, medicinal and bio-active compound of dragon fruit (*Hylocereus polyrhizus* (FAC Weber) Britton & Rose). *International Journal of Biochemistry Research* & *Review*, 32(5), 57–67.
- Srivastava, A. K., Wu, Q. S., Mousavi, S. M., & Hota, D. (2021). Integrated soil fertility management in fruit crops: An overview. *International Journal of Fruit Science*, 21(1), 413–439.
- Then, K. H. (2011). The effect of compost application to improve the red pitaya yield under various mixture fertilizer rates. *International Symposium on Tropical and Subtropical Fruits, 10*(24), 189–192.
- Verma, R. S., Lata, R., Ram, R. B., Verma, S. S., & Prakash, S. (2019). Effect of organic, inorganic and bio-fertilizers on vegetative characters of dragon fruit (*Hylocereus undatus* L.) plant. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 8(6), 726–728.

Zaid, A., Verma, N., Chandra, V., Dessai, U. S., & Govind, B. (2024). The role of exotic fruits in modern diets: Health benefits and

nutritional value. *Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology, 27*(10), 1468–1474.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. 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/127253