



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2023; 12(8): 2495-2498  
© 2023 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 02-06-2023  
Accepted: 04-07-2023

**Siva Lakshmi B**  
PG Scholar, Department of  
Floriculture and Landscape  
Architecture, College of  
Horticulture, Dr. YSR  
Horticultural University,  
Venkataramannagudem, West  
Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

**Raju DVS**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-DFR  
Regional Station, Vemagiri, East  
Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

**Dorajee Rao AVD**  
Professor, Department of  
Floriculture and Landscape  
Architecture, College of  
Horticulture, Dr. YSR  
Horticultural University,  
Venkataramannagudem, West  
Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

**Ravindra Kumar K**  
Senior Scientist, HRS, Kovvur,  
West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

**Madhavan S**  
Scientist, ICAR-DFR Regional  
Station, Vemagiri, East  
Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Siva Lakshmi B**  
PG Scholar, Department of  
Floriculture and Landscape  
Architecture, College of  
Horticulture, Dr. YSR  
Horticultural University,  
Venkataramannagudem, West  
Godavari, Andhra Pradesh,  
India

## Influence of bio-stimulants on growth and flowering in Chrysanthemum (*Dendranthema grandiflora* T.) cv. local yellow

**Siva Lakshmi B, Raju DVS, Dorajee Rao AVD, Ravindra Kumar K and  
Madhavan S**

### Abstract

The present experiment entitled "Influence of Bio-Stimulants on Growth and Flowering of Chrysanthemum" was conducted at ICAR-DFR, Regional Station, Vemagiri in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with ten treatments each replicated thrice. Different bio-stimulant formulations such as *Trichoderma viride* (9, 18 and 36 g per plant), *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (9, 18 and 36 g per plant) and Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi (9, 18 and 36 g per plant) were applied to soil. Significant variations in growth and flowering were noticed after application of bio-stimulants. The plants treated with Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi @18 g per plant recorded maximum plant height (62.36 cm), chlorophyll content (69.90 SPAD units), plant spread (54.83 cm), number of primary branches (13.87), secondary branches (27.65), leaf area (4690.23 cm<sup>2</sup>), fresh weight of leaf (64.38 g), dry weight of leaf (6.96 g), fresh weight of shoot (667.06 g), dry weight of shoot (206.14 g), fresh weight of root (39.99 g), dry weight of root (17.99 g), root-shoot ratio (0.087), number of flowers per plant (394.29) and flower yield per plant (925.26 g).

**Keywords:** *Trichoderma viride*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi, growth and flowering parameters

### Introduction

Chrysanthemum is one of the most cultivated garden plants primarily for its blossoms (Prasad *et al.* 2012) [21]. It is commonly known as 'Guldaudi' in India and 'Mum' or 'Glory of East' in the USA. It gets its name from the Greek words "chrysos" means golden and "anthos" means flower. It is widely cultivated in many parts across world owing to its economic value, elegance and aesthetic beauty (Navale *et al.*, 2010) [20]. Chrysanthemum is widely grown in India for both cut flower and loose flower purpose. The loose flowers are mainly used in religious offerings and for preparing garlands and venis as adornments. It is an important source of essential oils and sesquiterpenoids. Some of the chrysanthemum species are also extensively cultivated for pyrethrum, an important botanical. The flowers are used to prepare herbal infusion known as chrysanthemum tea which has many health benefits including recovery from influenza in some parts of the world.

The quality of chrysanthemum blooms is greatly affected by the quantity and source of nutrients. At present, these nutrients are being supplied through chemical fertilizers. The imbalanced and indiscriminate use of chemical inputs *i.e.*, fertilizers and pesticides over the years resulted in accumulation of toxic chemical residues in the soil, depleting the organic carbon content and native micro flora and fauna. All these factors contribute to lower productivity of chrysanthemum. The use of chemical fertilizers has not only resulted in the deterioration of soil health but also has led to some serious environmental problems. Use of bio-stimulants in crop production helps in sustainable and ecologically safe farming of chrysanthemum through enhancement of growth and flowering by absorption of more water and nutrients, besides being effective in inhibiting the soil borne pathogens by various bio-control mechanisms. Henceforth, the present study was conducted to evaluate the suitable biostimulant formulation for profitable and sustainable chrysanthemum cultivation.

### Materials and Methods

The biostimulant formulations at different concentrations *viz.*, of T<sub>1</sub>: control, T<sub>2</sub>: *Trichoderma viride* @ 9 g per plant, T<sub>3</sub>: *Trichoderma viride* @ 18 g per plant, T<sub>4</sub>: *Trichoderma viride* @

36 g per plant, T<sub>5</sub>: *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 9 g per plant, T<sub>6</sub>: *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 18 g per plant, T<sub>7</sub>: *Pseudomonas fluorescens* @ 36 g per plant, T<sub>8</sub>: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi @ 9 g per plant, T<sub>9</sub>: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi @ 18 g per plant and T<sub>10</sub>: Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi @ 36 g per plant were applied to the soil in three split doses.

One month old rooted cuttings of cv. Local Yellow were transplanted in the main field with a plot size of 3 m × 3 m for each treatment and each plot consisted of 16 plants at a spacing of 40 cm × 40 cm. All the bio-stimulants were applied in split doses at the time of planting, 30 and 60 days after planting. Initial bio-stimulant doses were applied after incubating in neem cake (10 g per plant) for 15 days. The second and third split doses were directly applied to soil without neem cake. Cultural and management practices were followed regularly. Three plants were selected at random and tagged in each treatment, for the purpose of recording observations on various parameters of growth and flowering.

## Results and Discussion

The data corresponding to growth and flowering in chrysanthemum as influenced by application of bio-stimulants are presented in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4.

### Growth parameters Plant height

Maximum plant height was maximum for T<sub>9</sub> treatment (62.36 cm) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (59.86 cm) while lowest plant height was registered in T<sub>1</sub> (51.46 cm). This might be due to the production of auxins, gibberellins, cytokinins and vitamins at optimum level in the plants treated by AM fungi. The above compounds could have increased water uptake in treated plants thereby effecting a significant enhancement in plant height through the processes like cell division and cell multiplication at relatively rapid rates. The application of AM fungi @ 36 g per plant was could not be more effective at higher concentrations compared to lower levels. It might be due to the reason that at higher doses, AM fungi acts as parasite to host plant by competing for more extent of carbon for its survival (Garrido *et al.*, 2010) [12].

Similar findings were also reported by Prasanna (2007) [22] in Gerbera, Elizabeth George (2012) [10] in Crossandra, Raju and Haripriya (2001) [19] in Gundumalli.

### Plant spread

Plant spread was recorded highest in T<sub>9</sub> (54.83 cm) and it was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (53.89 cm) whereas minimum plant spread was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (45.46 cm). It might be due to the AMF extending their hyphae through plant roots thereby exploring a more amount of soil volume and enhancing the uptake of nitrogen and phosphorous which in turn expand plant canopy structure and architecture, leading to an increased plant spread.

Similar findings were also reported by Asrar and Elhindi (2011) [2] and Hussain *et al.* (2016) [13] in marigold.

### Chlorophyll content (SPAD units)

Chlorophyll content was highly recorded in T<sub>9</sub> (69.90) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (67.86). The least content of chlorophyll was noticed in T<sub>1</sub> (61.96). It might be due to the symbiotic associations between host and fungi. This association would have led to higher water and nutrient uptake resulting in higher biosynthesis of chlorophyll. More chlorophyll content

could be associated with higher nitrogen uptake, since chlorophyll consists of elemental nitrogen (Clapperton and Reid, 1992) [8]. However, the application of AM fungi @ 36 g per plant was could not be more effective at higher concentration compared to lower levels. It might be due to the reason that at higher doses AM fungi acts as parasite to host plant by competing for more extent of carbon for its survival. These results are in accordance with Manoharan *et al.* (2010) [17] in *Erythrina variegata* and Nagarajappa *et al.* (2003) [18] in papaya, Asrar and Elhindi (2011) [2] in marigold.

### Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>)

The highest leaf area (4690.23 cm<sup>2</sup>) was noticed in plants treated with T<sub>9</sub> which was on par with the T<sub>10</sub> (4647.78 cm<sup>2</sup>). The lowest leaf area (3982.23 cm<sup>2</sup>) was recorded T<sub>1</sub>. Which might be due to the Application of AMF at an optimum dose *i.e.* 18 g per plant. It might be enhanced the production of cytokinins it could have hastened the cell expansion and division in plants associated with mycorrhiza plants.

Similar findings were also reported in Van Staden and Davey (1979) [23] in grapevines, Ravindra kumar *et al.* (2014) [24] in chrysanthemum.

**Table 1:** Vegetative parameters of chrysanthemum as influenced by different bio-stimulants

Treatments	Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Chlorophyll (SPAD units)	Plant height (cm)	Plant spread (cm)
T <sub>1</sub>	3982.23	61.96	51.46	45.46
T <sub>2</sub>	4324.39	64.36	54.65	48.34
T <sub>3</sub>	4635.59	66.40	56.13	51.87
T <sub>4</sub>	4620.94	65.50	55.62	49.55
T <sub>5</sub>	4069.72	62.80	55.97	50.02
T <sub>6</sub>	4266.64	63.70	57.32	53.36
T <sub>7</sub>	4154.15	64.90	56.47	52.39
T <sub>8</sub>	4463.13	63.50	58.96	51.26
T <sub>9</sub>	4690.23	69.90	62.36	54.83
T <sub>10</sub>	4647.78	67.86	59.86	53.89
Mean	4385.48	69.90	56.88	51.09
S.Em (±)	65.68	0.61	0.75	0.94
CD (5%)	194.86	1.80	2.23	2.73

### Number of primary branches

Primary branches per plant was highly recorded in T<sub>9</sub> (13.87) which was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (13.00) and least was observed in T<sub>1</sub> (7.30).

### Number of secondary branches

No. of Secondary branches per plant was recorded highly in was noticed in T<sub>9</sub> (27.65) which was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (26.99). While lowest number of secondary branches per plant (21.21) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub>. It might be due to the application of AM fungi that increased vegetative growth, root colonization, thereby enhancing the uptake of phosphorus through roots and increase in the absorption of nutrients from the soil surface. These factors might have caused cell elongation and multiplication eventually leading to multiple branching from the main stem and main or primary branches.

Similar findings were also reported in Bagyaraj and Powell (1985) [4] in marigold, Kale *et al.* (1987) [14] in Aster and salvias and Cazares and Smith (1996) [6] in *Tagetes erecta* and *Zinnia elegans*.

### Fresh and dry weight of leaves per plant (g)

Maximum fresh and dry weight of leaves per plant (64.38 g and 6.96 g) was shown in T<sub>9</sub> and which was on par with T<sub>10</sub>

(57.83 g and 6.80 g). However, the lowest fresh and dry weight of leaves was registered in T<sub>1</sub> (26.22 g and 3.20 g). This might be due to mycorrhizal symbiotic associations with host plants, assisting in the effective exploration of rhizosphere for water and nutrients. Such a phenomenon could have enhanced the photosynthetic efficiency of plants through an increase in leaf area index thus leading to an increased fresh weight of leaf, eventually resulting in higher dry weight of leaves per plant.

Similar findings were reported by Aboul Nasr (1996)<sup>[11]</sup> in zinnia, Asrar and Elhindi (2011)<sup>[12]</sup> in African marigolds.

**Table 2:** Vegetative parameters of chrysanthemum as influenced by different bio-stimulants

Treatments	No. of primary branches	No. of secondary branches	Fresh weight of leaves per plant (g)	Dry weight of leaves per plant (g)
T <sub>1</sub>	7.30	21.21	26.22	3.20
T <sub>2</sub>	9.96	22.67	43.68	4.78
T <sub>3</sub>	11.07	24.98	53.76	6.72
T <sub>4</sub>	10.89	24.07	49.80	4.98
T <sub>5</sub>	11.85	24.01	39.52	4.56
T <sub>6</sub>	12.93	26.75	47.70	4.87
T <sub>7</sub>	12.60	25.69	41.58	4.62
T <sub>8</sub>	12.79	26.54	54.08	6.76
T <sub>9</sub>	13.87	27.65	64.38	6.96
T <sub>10</sub>	13.00	26.99	57.88	6.80
Mean	11.63	25.06	47.85	5.43
S.Em (±)	0.48	0.52	2.25	0.44
CD (5%)	1.43	1.54	6.51	1.27

#### Fresh and dry weight of shoot (g)

The fresh weight of shoot was highly observed in T<sub>9</sub> (667.06 g) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (600.03 g) however, lowest was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (528.09 g).

The maximum shoot dry weight was observed in T<sub>9</sub> (206.14 g) next by T<sub>10</sub> (192.75 g) however lowest was shown in T<sub>1</sub> (138.06 g). Which may be due to AM fungi application which increased the rate of sucrose translocation from expanded leaves since they had a higher photosynthetic surface *i.e.* leaf area. Such increase in photo assimilation may be due to a corresponding increase in dry and fresh weights of shoot or more biomass per plant.

Similar findings were reported by Ravindra kumar *et al.* (2014)<sup>[24]</sup> in chrysanthemum, Boyer *et al.* (2014)<sup>[5]</sup> in strawberry.

#### Fresh and dry weight of root (g)

The studies reveal that significantly highest fresh weight of root was recorded in T<sub>9</sub> (39.99 g) which was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (38.57 g). While T<sub>1</sub> recorded minimum fresh weight of root (24.09 g).

The dry weight of root was maximum in T<sub>9</sub> (17.99 g) and it was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (16.34 g), a minimum was observed in T<sub>1</sub> (8.21 g). This might be due to the reason that mycorrhizal association could expand the root hairs and total root volume subsequently leads to enhancement of root biomass and also the symbiotic association between plant and mycorrhizae resulted in an increase in water and phosphorous absorption from more volume of soil by the hyphae leading to increase in fresh and dry weight of plant roots (Chandra *et al.*, 2010)<sup>[7]</sup>. Similar results were reported in Ravindra Kumar *et al.* (2014)<sup>[24]</sup> in chrysanthemum, Bagheri *et al.* (2018)<sup>[3]</sup> in zinnia.

#### Root-shoot ratio

The highest root-shoot ratio was recorded in T<sub>9</sub> (0.087) and it was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (0.086) however minimum was registered

in T<sub>1</sub> (0.059). It might be due to more relative development of root system as compared to shoot system, facilitating efficient nutrient absorption (Clapperton and Reid 1992)<sup>[8]</sup>.

Similar reports were found by Khade *et al.* (2009)<sup>[15]</sup> in papaya, Bagheri *et al.* (2018)<sup>[3]</sup> in zinnia.

**Table 3:** Vegetative parameters of chrysanthemum as influenced by different bio-stimulants

Treatments	Fresh weight of shoot (g)	Dry weight of shoot (g)	Fresh weight of root (g)	Dry weight of root (g)	Root - shoot ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	528.09	138.06	24.09	8.21	0.059
T <sub>2</sub>	539.89	157.06	26.75	9.76	0.062
T <sub>3</sub>	572.01	173.06	35.07	14.16	0.082
T <sub>4</sub>	567.01	171.09	33.17	12.90	0.075
T <sub>5</sub>	569.06	172.39	35.06	14.30	0.083
T <sub>6</sub>	579.03	179.70	37.09	14.62	0.085
T <sub>7</sub>	574.07	175.06	36.33	14.50	0.083
T <sub>8</sub>	589.56	180.06	37.89	15.20	0.084
T <sub>9</sub>	667.06	206.14	39.99	17.99	0.087
T <sub>10</sub>	600.03	192.75	38.57	16.34	0.086
Mean	578.58	174.54	34.40	13.79	0.079
S.Em (±)	9.41	4.60	1.29	0.72	0.003
CD (5%)	27.95	13.66	3.83	2.15	0.008

#### Number of flowers per plant and Flower yield per plant (g)

The highest number of flowers per plant was recorded in T<sub>9</sub> (394.29) which was on par with T<sub>10</sub> (378.06) while minimum was observed in T<sub>1</sub> (264.06).

#### Flower yield per plant (g)

The maximum flower yield per plant (925.26 g) was registered in T<sub>9</sub> and which was statistically on par with T<sub>10</sub> (890.23 g) whereas, T<sub>1</sub> recorded lowest flower yield per plant (624.15 g). The promotion of flowering and quality by mycorrhizal inoculation may be due to improvement in nutrient concentrations like K, P, Zn and S and hormonal effect caused by fungal colonization. It helps in more photosynthesis and the production of efficient carbohydrates. This could have supported higher sink numbers thus increasing the retention of a greater number of flowers, with higher mean weight and multiple pickings in the same duration of flowering and also the enhanced flowering of plants and led to increases the flower yield.

The results are in accordance with, Garmendia and Mangas (2012)<sup>[11]</sup> in Rose. Long *et al.* (2010)<sup>[16]</sup> in zinnia, Dufault *et al.* (1990)<sup>[9]</sup> in gerbera

**Table 4:** Vegetative parameters of chrysanthemum as influenced by different bio-stimulants

Treatments	Number of flowers per plant	Flower yield per plant (g)
T <sub>1</sub>	264.06	624.15
T <sub>2</sub>	337.46	800.90
T <sub>3</sub>	368.26	880.65
T <sub>4</sub>	349.39	818.53
T <sub>5</sub>	324.81	757.54
T <sub>6</sub>	352.54	821.09
T <sub>7</sub>	339.89	795.73
T <sub>8</sub>	367.63	863.31
T <sub>9</sub>	394.29	924.26
T <sub>10</sub>	378.06	890.23
Mean	347.64	817.54
S.Em (±)	8.98	21.20
CD (5%)	26.69	62.99



## Conclusion

Application of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi @ 18 g per plant was found best in plant height, plant spread, chlorophyll content, leaf area, number of primary branches, number of secondary branches, fresh weight of leaf, dry weight of leaf, fresh weight of shoot, dry weight of shoot, fresh weight of root, dry weight of root, root-shoot ratio that led to highest flower yield per plant.

## References

1. About Nasr, A. Effect of vesicular arbuscular mycorrhiza on *Tagetes erecta* and *Zinnia elegans*. Mycorrhiza. 1996;6:61-64
2. Asrar A, Elhindi KM. Alleviation of drought stress of marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) plants by using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences. 2011;18:93-98.
3. Bagheri V, Shamshiri M, Alaei H, Salehi H. Effect of Three Species of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi on Growth and Nutrients Uptake in Zinnia Plant under Drought Stress Conditions. Journal of Plant Productions. 2018;41(4):2-5.
4. Bagyaraj DJ, Powell CL. Effect of VAM inoculation and fertilizer application on growth of marigold. New Zealand Agricultural Research. 1985;28(1):169-73.
5. Boyer LR, Feng W, Gulbis N, Hajdu K, Richard J, Harrison RJ, Jeffries P. 2014. The Use of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi to Improve Strawberry Production in Coir Substrate. Frontier Plant Science. 2014;7(1):1245-56.
6. Cazares E, Smith JE. Effects of vesicular arbuscular mycorrhiza on *Tagetes erecta* and *Zinnia elegans*. Mycorrhiza. 1996;6:61-64.
7. Chandra S, Srivastava N, Narayan RP, Sharma N, Kehri HK. Efficacy of microbial inoculants on reducing the phosphatic fertilizer input in chrysanthemum. Indian Journal of Horticulture. 2009;66(1):83- 87.
8. Clapperton MJ, Reid MD. A relationship between plant growth and increasing VA mycorrhizal inoculum density. New phytologist. 1992;120(2):227- 32
9. Dufault RJ, Philips T, Kelly JW. Nitrogen and potassium fertility and plant production influence the field production of gerbera. Horticultural Science. 1990;25(12):1599-02.
10. Elizabeth, George. Integrated nutrient management on gerbera the growth, flower yield and post-harvest quality of gerbera (*Gerbera jamesonii* Bolus.) cv. Galileo Red under poly house condition; c2012.
11. Garmendia I, Mangas VJ. Application of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on the production of cut flower roses under commercial-like conditions. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research. 2012;10(1):166-74
12. Garrido, Alison E, Bennett, Juan F, Sharon YS. The dark side of the mycorrhiza. Journal of plant signalling and behaviour. 2010;5(8):1019-21.
13. Hussain S, Sharif M, Khan S, Wahid F, Nihar H, Ahmad W, Khan I, Haider N, Yaseen T. Vermicompost and mycorrhiza effect on yield and phosphorus uptake of wheat crop. Sarhad Journal of Agriculture, 2016;32(4):372- 81.
14. Kale RD, Bano K, Sreenivasa MN, Bagyaraj DJ. Influence of worm cast on the growth and mycorrhizal colonization of two ornamental plants. South Indian Horticulture, 1987;35:433-37.
15. Khade WS, Rodrigues BF. Studies on arbuscular mycorrhization of papaya. African Crop Science Journal. 2009;17(3):155-65.
16. Long LK, Yao Q, Huang YH, Yang RH, Gou J, Zhu HH. Effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal fungi on Zinnia and the different colonization between Gigaspora and Glomus. World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology. 2010;26:1527-31.
17. Manoharan PT, Gomathinayagam S, Vellasamy S. Influence of AM fungi on the growth and physiological status of *Erythrina variegata* Linn. Grown under different water stress conditions. European Journal of Soil Biology. 2010;46(2):151-56
18. Nagarajappa A, Patil CP, Swamy GSK, Patil PB. Influence of VAM on Drought Tolerance of Papaya. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2003;16:434-37.
19. Navale MUSA, Akalade, Desai JR, Nannavare PV. Influence of plant growth regulators on growth, flowering and yield of chrysanthemum (*Dendranthema grandiflorum*). International Journal of Pharma & Biosciences. 2010;1(2):396-99.
20. Prasad K, Aggarwal A, Yadav K, Tanwar A. Impact of different levels of superphosphate using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* on *Chrysanthemum indicum* L. Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition. 2012;12(3):451-62.
21. Prasanna VP. Influence of microbial inoculants on growth and flower yield of gerbera under greenhouse conditions. M.Sc. thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore; c2007. p. 73-75.
22. Van Staden JV, Davey. The synthesis, transport and metabolism of endogenous cytokinins. Plant Cell Environment. 1979;2:93-06.
23. Raju NS, Haripriya K. Integrated nutrient management in Crossandra (*Crossandra infundibuliformis* L.) cv. Dindigul Local. South Indian Horticulture. 2001;49:181-84.
24. Ravindra Kumar, Kanwar P, Singh, Raju DVS. Symbiotic effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi on Growth and Flowering of Micro propagated Plants of Chrysanthemum. International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management. 2014;5(3):369-74.