

Shoot Pruning on Fruit and Seed Production of Two Winter Tomato Varieties

Md Razzab Ali¹, Abdul Goffar², MMR Salim², Mehbub Hasan³ and H Mehraj^{3,4*}

¹Scientific Officer, Olericulture Division, HRC, BARI, Gazipur, Dhaka, Bangladesh

²Senior Scientific Officer, Olericulture Division, HRC, BARI, Gazipur, Dhaka, Bangladesh

³Lab of Vegetable and Floricultural Science, Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Kochi University, Kochi, Japan

⁴The United Graduate School of Agricultural Sciences, Ehime University, Ehime, Japan

***Corresponding Author:** H Mehraj, Lab of Vegetable and Floricultural Science, Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Kochi University, Kochi and The United Graduate School of Agricultural Sciences, Ehime University, Ehime, Japan.

Received: January 29, 2018; **Published:** April 16, 2018

Abstract

This study was aimed to evaluate the effect of different pruning systems on the production of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) during winter in Bangladesh. Plants were pruned differently, such as, one shoot (P₁), two shoot (P₂), three shoot (P₃) with normal pruning (P₀) as a check. We used two tomato varieties and these were BARI Tomato 2 (V₁) and BARI Tomato 15 (V₂). We designed the experiments in complete randomized block design with three replicates. We didn't found any significant difference for days to 50% flowering, number of fruits/plant, single fruit weight and fruit yield/plant for the pruning treatment irrespective to the varieties. In combination of stem pruning and variety, we found that stem pruning slightly decrease the yield of both tomato varieties. Two shoot pruning (P₂) showed highest seed yield (14.5 g/plant; 49.6 kg/ha) and viability (85.2%). The highest seed yield was found from P₀V₁ (60.2 kg/ha), whereas the lowest (34.7 kg) from P₀V₂. The highest viability was found from P₁V₁ and P₃V₃ (99.0%) and the lowest viability (3.3%) recorded from P₁V₂. Both varieties performed differently to the different stem pruning. From the result of the current study, at least one/two stem pruning can be suggested for the seed production of tomato.

Keywords: *Lycopersicon esculentum*; Shoot; Pruning; Fruit and Seed

Abbreviation

HRC: Horticulture Research Centre; BARI: Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute; BER: Blossom-End Rot; FC: Fruit Cracking; RCBD: Complete Randomized Block Design; DAT: Days After Transplanting; LSD: Least Significant Difference

Introduction

Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) is one of the most important vegetable throughout the world as well as in Bangladesh. The total tomato production exceeds all other crops (exception of the potato and sweet potato) [1]. It is used as multi-purpose, both in raw or processed forms. Irrespective to the economical class, Bangladeshis preferred it equally. Tomatoes are good source of minerals, vitamins [2,3] and anti-oxidant [4]. 40% vitamin C and 20% vitamin A of the recommended daily allowance can be fulfilled through the consumption of single ripe tomato [5]. It has the first preference with high value in vegetable market of Bangladesh, which motivates the farmers to cultivate more tomato. Despite the total cultivated area and production have increased gradually over the years, but the productivity is still low (6.46 t/ha) compared to the average yield of the world (26.29 t/ha) [6]. The annual tomato production in Bangladesh is about 167000 metric tons [7] and demands for vegetable seeds are 2700 tones while supply are 791.2 tons per year (63.2 tones for government sectors and 728 tones for private sectors, respectively) in Bangladesh [8]. Bangladeshi growers faced several problems on high yield with good quality tomato production. Several factors are responsible to the high yield and quality tomato production; and among these factors, some are plant population [9,10], stem pruning and cultivar selection [11]. Temporarily unfavorable climatic conditions [12,13], high

insect pest infestation and viral diseases [14,15] and fungal diseases [16] cause tomato much lower fruit yield in tropical and subtropical areas than that of temperate climates [17,18]. The physiological disorders such as BER and FC [13,19] are also responsible for the reduction of fruit quality and marketable yields as well [12,13,19,20]. BER and FC might also be influenced by source-sink relationships [21]. Tomato yield significantly decrease in the plants with side shoots [22]. Pruning facilitates the efficiency of photosynthesis and minimizes the diseases risk. A proper pruning system is important to balance the relationship between source-sink and carbon-nitrogen ratio [23]. The number of stems in tomato plant can affect to the development of fruit number [23] through the regulation of the N-CHO [24]. Stem pruning are essential for better yield and quality of tomatoes [9,17,25,26]. It can reduce the pest incidence [27,28], thereby increase yields. Tomato plant can be cultivated with one or two stems [12,15,22,29] for the increase of fruit yield. It was theorized that fruit and seed production of tomato can be increased in Bangladesh through pruning. Concerning the above mentioned theory, the aim of this study was to determine the effects of stem pruning on the fruit and seed production of two tomato varieties under the condition of Bangladesh.

Materials and Methods

The experiment was conducted at Olericulture Division, HRC, Bangladesh in 2014 - 2015 winter season (Mid October to mid-April). Plants were pruned the at four different pruning stages [No pruning as control (P_0), one shoot (P_1), two shoot (P_2), and three shoot (P_3)] to BARI Tomato 2 (V_1) and BARI Tomato 15 (V_2) varieties. The seeds were sown in the on October 20, and seedlings were transplanted in the main plot on November 19, 2014. The experiment was designed in RCBD with three replications. The plot size was 4.8 x 1 m² with 60 x 40 cm² spacing. Land was fertilized with cow dung, N, P, K, S, Zn and B @ 1000, 248, 88, 123, 21, 4.9 and 1.7 kg/ha respectively. Half of the cow dung, entire P, S, Zn, B and 1/3rd of K were applied as basal dose during final land preparation. The remaining cow dung was applied in pits while K in two equal installments as split at 15 and 30 DAT. The entire urea fertilizers were applied at three equal installments at 15, 30 and 45 DAT. Irrigation, weeding, other intercultural operation and plant protections measures were taken timely. Data were collected on days to 50% flowering, individual fruit weight, fruit yield, number of seeds, seed yield, seed viability, 1000-seed weight, and percent of filled seed. Seed viability was determined by the Top of Paper Method [30].

The collected data were analyzed using a MSTAT-C package computer program. The analysis of variance was performed and means were compared by LSD test at 5% level of significance [31].

Results and Discussion

Fruit production characteristics

Days to 50% flowering and number of fruits: It was not found any significant effect on days to 50% flowering through pruning and variety (Table 1 and Table 2). Pruning had not any significant effect on number of fruits per plant but pruning-variety combination showed significant effect (Table 1). The highest number of fruit was found from P_2 (32.5/plant) followed by P_0 (32.2/plant), while the lowest from P_1 (31.0/plant) (Table 1). Regarding combine effect, it was found the highest number of fruit from both P_0V_1 and P_3V_1 (35.0/plant) (Table 2).

| Treatments | Days to 50% flowering | Fruit | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Number/plant | Single wt. (g) | Yield (kg/plant) | Calculated yield (t/ha) |
| P_0 | 51.3 ^a ± 1.3 | 32.2 ^a ± 1.1 | 70.2 ^a ± 1.9 | 2.2 ^a ± 0.2 | 76.9 ^a ± 3.6 |
| P_1 | 51.3 ^a ± 1.1 | 31.0 ^a ± 1.7 | 67.2 ^{ab} ± 1.6 | 2.1 ^a ± 0.1 | 75.8 ^a ± 4.1 |
| P_2 | 51.3 ^a ± 1.6 | 32.5 ^a ± 1.3 | 66.5 ^{ab} ± 1.6 | 2.2 ^a ± 0.2 | 76.4 ^a ± 4.3 |
| P_3 | 51.3 ^a ± 0.9 | 32.0 ^a ± 1.2 | 64.5 ^b ± 1.2 | 2.1 ^a ± 0.4 | 75.3 ^a ± 3.9 |
| LSD(0.05) | 0.9 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 7.3 |
| CV (%) | 1.0 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 5.6 |

Table 1: Effect of pruning on yield contributing characters and yield of tomato.

Note: Values are means of three replicates with standard error; values in a column with having similar and dissimilar superscript letter(s) are statistically similar ($p > 0.05$) and different ($p < 0.05$) respectively; P_0 : Control; P_1 : One Shoot; P_2 : Two Shoot; P_3 : Three Shoot

| Treatments | Days to 50% flowering | Fruit | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Number/plant | Single wt. (g) | Yield/plant | Yield/ha |
| P ₀ V ₁ | 50.3 ^b ± 1.4 | 35.0 ^a ± 1.1 | 77.3 ^a ± 2.1 | 2.6 ^a ± 0.04 | 86.1 ^a ± 3.1 |
| P ₁ V ₁ | 50.3 ^b ± 1.7 | 32.7 ^{ab} ± 1.2 | 72.1 ^b ± 2.4 | 2.3 ^{bc} ± 0.02 | 78.0 ^{bc} ± 2.6 |
| P ₂ V ₁ | 50.3 ^b ± 1.2 | 34.7 ^a ± 1.1 | 70.1 ^{bc} ± 1.8 | 2.2 ^c ± 0.05 | 75.6 ^{cd} ± 2.9 |
| P ₃ V ₁ | 50.3 ^b ± 1.5 | 35.0 ^a ± 1.0 | 62.9 ^d ± 1.7 | 2.5 ^{ab} ± 0.09 | 84.1 ^a ± 3.3 |
| P ₀ V ₂ | 52.3 ^a ± 1.6 | 29.3 ^{bc} ± 0.8 | 63.2 ^d ± 2.5 | 1.9 ^d ± 0.05 | 65.0 ^e ± 2.8 |
| P ₁ V ₂ | 52.3 ^a ± 1.3 | 29.3 ^{bc} ± 1.1 | 62.3 ^d ± 2.0 | 1.9 ^d ± 0.03 | 65.3 ^e ± 3.0 |
| P ₂ V ₂ | 52.3 ^a ± 1.4 | 30.3 ^{bc} ± 1.0 | 62.2 ^d ± 2.2 | 1.9 ^d ± 0.01 | 66.0 ^e ± 3.3 |
| P ₃ V ₂ | 52.3 ^a ± 1.5 | 29.0 ^c ± 0.9 | 66.1 ^{cd} ± 2.1 | 2.0 ^d ± 0.06 | 69.5 ^{de} ± 3.6 |
| LSD(0.05) | 0.9 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 7.3 |
| CV (%) | 1.0 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 5.6 |

Table 2: Effect of pruning-variety combinations on yield contributing characters and yield of tomato.

Note: Values are means of three replicates with standard error; values in a column with having similar and dissimilar superscript letter(s) are statistically similar ($p>0.05$) and different ($p<0.05$) respectively;

P₀: Control, P₁: one shoot, P₂: two shoot, P₃: three shoot; V₁: BARI Tomato 2; and V₂: BARI Tomato 15

Single fruit weight and Fruit yield: Highest single fruit weight was found from P₀ (70.2g) (Table 1), whereas regards to combining effect, the highest single fruit weight was found from P₀V₁ (77.3 gm) (Table 2). The higher number of fruits and mean single fruit weight was found from pruned plants. There was not any significant effect on fruit yield through pruning (Table 1). However, tomato varieties in combination with different types of pruning showed significant effect in fruit yield (Table 2). The highest fruit yield was found from P₀V₁ (2.6 kg/plant and 86.1 t/ha) which was statistically similar with by P₃V₁ (2.5 kg/plant and 84.1 t/ha) (Table 2).

Seed production characteristics

Number of seeds per plant and their yield: Pruning effect did not show any significant variation for number of seed per fruit (Table 3). In case of combining effect, the highest number of seed was frond from P₀V₁ (181.7/fruit) and the lowest from P₀V₂ (105.0/fruit) (Table 4). Seed yield per plant was varied significantly by pruning. The highest seed yield was found from P₂ (14.5 g/plant) followed by P₁ (14.1 g/plant), while the lowest from P₃ (12.9 g/plant) (Table 3). The higher seed yield was also found from P₀V₁ combination (17.8 g/plant) (Table 4).

| Treatments | Seed | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | Number/fruit | Yield (g/plant) | Viability | 1000-seed wt. (g) | Filled (%) | Yield (kg/ha) |
| P ₀ | 143.4 ^a | 13.9 ^{ab} | 70.5 ^b | 3.0 ^c | 91.0 ^a | 56.8 ^{ab} |
| P ₁ | 134.2 ^a | 14.1 ^{ab} | 51.2 ^b | 3.2 ^b | 81.9 ^b | 48.2 ^{ab} |
| P ₂ | 136.4 ^a | 14.5 ^a | 85.2 ^a | 3.4 ^a | 92.2 ^a | 49.6 ^a |
| P ₃ | 130.5 ^a | 12.9 ^b | 56.8 ^c | 3.3 ^b | 93.9 ^a | 44.2 ^b |
| LSD(0.05) | 19.6 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 4.4 |
| CV (%) | 8.2 | 6.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 10.8 | 5.3 |

Table 3: Effect of pruning on the seed production of tomato.

Note: Values are means of three replicates; Values in a column with having similar and dissimilar superscript letter(s) are statistically similar ($p>0.05$) and different ($p<0.05$) respectively; P₀: Control, P₁: one shoot, P₂: two shoot, P₃: three shoot

| Treatments | Seed | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Number/fruit | Yield (g/plant) | Viability | 1000-seed wt (g) | Filled (%) | Yield (kg/ha) |
| P ₀ V ₁ | 181.7 ^a | 17.8 ^a | 93.3 ^b | 3.1 ^c | 89.2 ^{ab} | 60.2 ^{ab} |
| P ₁ V ₁ | 152.9 ^{bc} | 16.2 ^b | 99.0 ^a | 3.2 ^c | 88.4 ^{ab} | 55.1 ^b |
| P ₂ V ₁ | 164.7 ^{ab} | 16.8 ^{ab} | 95.0 ^b | 3.3 ^b | 93.9 ^a | 60.2 ^a |
| P ₃ V ₁ | 150.6 ^b | 13.8 ^c | 99.0 ^a | 3.1 ^c | 93.4 ^a | 47.3 ^c |
| P ₀ V ₂ | 105.0 ^c | 10.0 ^e | 47.7 ^d | 2.9 ^d | 92.8 ^a | 34.7 ^e |
| P ₁ V ₂ | 115.5 ^c | 12.0 ^d | 3.3 ^f | 3.2 ^c | 75.4 ^b | 41.4 ^d |
| P ₂ V ₂ | 108.2 ^c | 12.2 ^d | 75.3 ^c | 3.5 ^a | 90.5 ^{ab} | 42.5 ^d |
| P ₃ V ₂ | 110.4 ^c | 12.1 ^d | 14.7 ^e | 3.4 ^{ab} | 94.4 ^a | 41.1 ^d |
| LSD(0.05) | 19.6 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 4.4 |
| CV (%) | 8.2 | 6.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 10.8 | 5.3 |

Table 4: Effect of pruning-variety combinations on the seed production of tomato.

Note: Values are means of three replicates; Values in a column with having similar and dissimilar superscript letter(s) are statistically similar ($p > 0.05$) and different ($p < 0.05$) respectively; P₀: Control, P₁: one shoot, P₂: two shoot, P₃: three shoot; V₁: BARI Tomato 2; and V₂: BARI Tomato 15

Seed viability: Seed viability was varied significantly among the different pruning. The highest seed viability was observed from P₂ (85.2%), while the lowest from P₃ (56.8%) (Table 3). Nevertheless, the P₁V₁ combination (99.0%) showed highest viability, which was statistically identical with P₃V₁ (99.0%) (Table 4).

1000 seed weight: 1000 seed weight showed significant variation by the application of different pruning to the tomato varieties (Table 3 and Table 4). The highest 1000 seed weight was from P₂ (3.4g), which was closely followed by P₁ (3.2g) (Table 3). The maximum 1000 seed weight was also found from P₂V₂ combination (3.5g) that was statistically similar with P₃V₂ (3.4 g) (Table 4).

Percentage of filled seed: Percentage of filled seed also showed significant variation among the pruning treatments and their combination with variety. The highest percentage of filled seed was obtained from P₃ (93.9%). P₂ (92.2%) and P₀ (91.0%) was statistically similar with P₃ (Table 3). The highest percentage of filled seed was found from P₃V₂ treatment combination (94.4%), which was closely followed by P₃V₁ (93.9%) and P₃V₁ (93.4%). All of the treatment combinations were statistically identical with P₃V₂ treatment (Table 4).

Seed yield: Seed yield showed significant variation by different pruning. The highest amount of seed was produced in P₂ (49.6 kg/ha), which was statistically similar with P₁ (48.2 kg) and P₀ (47.5 kg/ha) (Table 3). P₂V₁ (60.2 kg/ha) was found as the best treatment combination for seed yield that was statistically identical with P₀V₁ (56.8 kg/ha) (Table 4).

Discussion

Current study didn't show noticeable effect by side shoot pruning. But side shoot pruning can cause the early flowering by diversion of photosynthates that would have been used for growth of new shoots and leaves to flower production [32]. Fruit set was reduced in tomato plant at no side shoot pruning condition [33], which caused by the distribution of proper sunlight. Sunlight not only influences the flowering and fruit set but also enhances fruit quality and colour development of fruit [34]. The higher mean fruit weight could be attributed by the less number of photosynthates demanding shoots in pruned plants, which resulted in partitioning of more dry matter to the fruits. Bangladeshi farmers use excessive fertilizers that promote side shoot formation at early growing stage in tomatoes. Pruning of stem can increase fruit load by bringing back the balance source: sink ratio in plants [35]. Stem pruning increase in generative sink strength compared to the relative increase in source, and this not only increases overall fruit production but also reduces available assimilates per fruit [36]. Assimilate production is an influential factor for optimal fruit load [37]. Producers can maintain optimal fruit load by seasonal

assimilate supply through fruit pruning and changing stem density [38]. Pruning reduces disease pressure and leaf shading of fruit to protect them from sunburn which is also considered as an important factor [37]. Stem density can be altered through increased planting density or allowing side shoots to develop on plants. It is well documented that increasing plant density decreases total fruit yield per plant but increases yield per unit area [39,40]. Yield of tomato increased by shoot pruning due to the increased average fruit weight and number of fruit per plant. Our results are also agreed with Ara, *et al.* [9] and Huat, *et al.* [41]. Pruning facilitates more stem; increased number of clusters; high fruit set percentage which leads to higher yield per plant. Atefeh, *et al.* [42] and Zhang [43] reported previously similar to our study. Seed production in BARI Tomato 2 was better than that of BARI Tomato 15. Pruning of the side shoot reduces the number of seed per fruit and seed yield; conversely it was better for seed viability, 1000-seed weight and percentage of filled seed. Germination and seedlings emergence requires a lot of energy which are supplied from the oxidation of seed storage materials. The average weight of 1000 seeds is important for seed quality [44,45].

Conclusions

Different stem pruning can influence the individual fruit weight, fruit yield, number of seed, seed viability, 1000 seed weight and seed yield. There was major difference in variety. BARI Tomato 2 showed higher seed production and viability than that of BARI Tomato 15. Shoot pruning is probably being considered as a technique to manipulate fruit load. But, pruning to multiple stems will probably require more stringent management of fruit load, at least for larger number of fruited cultivars, otherwise plants may become overly generative and long term productivity limited.

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest.

Bibliography

1. FAOSTAT. "Food and Agricultural commodities production/Commodities by regions". Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Statistics Division (2015).
2. Jones CM., *et al.* "Characterization and inheritance of the antocyanin fruit (Aft) tomato". *Journal of Heredity* 94.6 (2003): 449-456.
3. Beecher GR. "Nutrient Content of tomatoes and tomato products". *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine* 218.2 (1998): 98-100.
4. Shi J and ML Maguer. "Lycopene in tomatoes: Chemical and physical properties affected by food processing". *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 20.4 (2000):293-334.
5. Kelly TW and G Boyan.. "Commercial tomato production handbook. University of Georgia Coop". Research Bulletin (2010): 1312.
6. FAO. "Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Soil Survey Project of Bangladesh". Soil Research. Technical Reports 57 (2003): 140-141.
7. BBS. "Statistical year Book of Bangladesh, Stat. Div. Minis. Planning, Govt. People Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka (2005).
8. BSGDMA. "Bangladesh Seed Grower Dealer and Merchants Association". Asian Seed Congress Manila, Phillippines (2007).
9. Ara N., *et al.* "Effect of spacing and stem pruning on the growth and yield of tomato". *International Journal of Sustainable Crop Production* 2.3 (2007): 35-39.
10. Davis JM and Estes ED. "Spacing and pruning affect growth, yield and economic returns of staked fresh-market tomatoes". *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 118 (1993): 719-725.

11. Maboko MM and Du Plooy CP. "Effect of pruning on yield and quality of hydroponically grown cherry tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)". *South African Journal of Plant and Soil* 25.3 (2008): 178-181.
12. Kleinhenz V, et al. "Biomass Accumulation and Partitioning of Tomato under Protected Cultivation in the Humid Tropics". *European Journal of Horticultural Science* 71.4 (2006): 173-182.
13. Max JFJ and Horst WJ "Influence of nighttime electrical conductivity of substrate solution on fruit cracking and blossom-end rot of greenhouse tomato in the tropics". *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 172.6 (2009): 829-838.
14. Nguyen THN., et al. "Manipulation of Ultraviolet Light Affects Immigration Behavior of *Ceratohripoides claratris* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae)". *Journal of Economic Entomology* 102.4 (2009): 1559-1566.
15. Maboko MM., et al. "Effect of plant population, fruit and stem pruning on yield and quality of hydroponically grown tomato". *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 6.22 (2011): 5144-5148.
16. Heine G., et al. "Effect of manganese on the resistance of tomato to *Pseudocercospora fuligena*". *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 174.5 (2011): 827-836.
17. Muhammad A and Singh A. "Yield of tomato as influenced by training and pruning in the Sudan Savanna of Nigeria". *Journal of Plant Sciences* 2.3 (2007): 310-317.
18. Max JFJ., et al. "Effects of greenhouse cooling method on growth, fruit yield and quality of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) in a tropical climate". *Scientia Horticulturae* 122.2 (2009): 179-186.
19. Liebisch F., et al. "Blossom-end rot and fruit cracking of tomato grown in net-covered greenhouses in Central Thailand can partly be corrected by calcium and boron sprays". *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 172.1 (2009): 140-150.
20. Mutwiwa UN., et al. "Effects of NIR-reflection Greenhouse Cooling on Blossom-end Rot and Fruit Cracking". *African Journal of Horticultural Science* 1 (2008): 33- 43.
21. Bertin N. "Analysis of the Tomato Fruit Growth Response to Temperature and Plant Fruit Load in Relation to Cell Division, Cell Expansion and DNA Endoreduplication". *Annals of Botany* 95.3 (2005): 439-447.
22. Navarrete M and Jeannequin B. "Effect of frequency of axillary bud pruning on vegetative growth and fruit yield in greenhouse tomato crops". *Scientia Horticulturae* 86.3 (2000):197-210.
23. Franco JL., et al. "Influence of different types of pruning on cherry tomato fruit production and quality". *Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment* 7 (2009): 248-253.
24. Guan HP and HW Janes. "Light regulation of sink metabolism in tomato fruit". *Journal of Plant Physiology* 96.3 (1991): 916-921.
25. Preece JE. "The biology of horticulture". Ed. John Wiley & sons, New York (1995).
26. Srinivasan S., et al. "The effect of spacing, training and pruning in hybrid tomato". Ed. CAB international (2001):
27. Kanyomeka L and Shivute B. "Influence of pruning on tomato production under controlled environments". *Agricultura Tropica et Subtropica* 32.2 (2005): 79-83.
28. Saunyama IGM and Knapp M. "Effect of pruning and trellising of tomatoes on red spider mite incidence and crop yield in Zimbabwe". *African Crop Science Journal* 11.4 (2003): 269-277.
29. Rahmatian A., et al. "Effect of grafting on growth, yield and fruit quality of single and double stemmed tomato plants grown hydroponically". *Horticulture Environment and Biotechnology* 55.2 (2014): 115-119.

30. Bicksler AJ. "Testing Seed Viability Using Simple Germination Tests". *A Regional supplement to ECHO Development Notes* 11 (2011).
31. Gomez, K. A. and AA Gomez. "Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research. 2nd edition". John Wiley and Sons. New York (1984): 680.
32. Frank F. "Pruning Tomato. Suggested Cultural Practices for Tomato" - AVRDC (2000): 213.
33. Alam MS., *et al.* "Effect of different staking methods and stem pruning on yield and quality of summer tomato". *Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research* 41.3 (2016): 419.
34. Ahmed S., *et al.* "Effect of pruning on the yield and quality of Kinnow fruit". *Journal of Agriculture and Social Science* 2.1 (2006): 51-53.
35. DE Koning NM. "Model predictions of optimum shoot density and truss size in glasshouse tomato". *Acta Horticulturae* 417.11 (1996): 99-106.
36. Nederhoff E. "Plant management for generative or vegetative steering". *Practical Hydroponics and Greenhouses* (2009):51-54.
37. Heuvelink E., *et al.* "Effect of leaf area on tomato yield". *Acta Horticulturae* 691 (2005): 43-.50.
38. XIAO S., *et al.* "Two Instead of three leaves between tomato trusses: measured and simulated effects on partitioning and yield". *Acta Horticulturae* 654 (2004): 303-308.
39. Papadopoulos AP and Pararajasingham S. "The influence of plant spacing on light interception and use in greenhouse tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.): A review". *Scientia Horticulturae* 69.1-2 (1997):1-29.
40. Saglam N and Yazgan A. "The effects of planting and the number of trusses per plant on earliness, yield and quality of tomato grown under unheated plastic tunnel". *Acta Horticulturae* 412.29 (1995).
41. Huat J., *et al.* "Limiting factors for yields of field tomatoes grown by smallholders in tropical regions". *Crop Protection* 44 (2013): 120-127.
42. Atefeh T., *et al.* "The effects of shrub pruning and fruit thinning on seed germination and seedling of tomato in the next generation (*Lycopersicum esculentum* Mill)". *Journal of Biodiversity and Environmental Sciences* 5.14 (2011): 105-110.
43. Zhang YW. "Spacing and Pruning Effect on Tomato Yield". *AVRDC Journal* 156 (1999): 1-5.
44. Grigoryan G. A. "Changes in seed quality in tomato in relation to variety and fertilizer treatment". *Scientia Horticulturae* 12 (1977): 21-25.
45. Mc-Donald MB. "Seed Quality Assessment". *Science Research* 8 (1998): 265-275.

Volume 13 Issue 5 May 2018

©All rights reserved by H Mehraj., *et al.*