EFFECT OF SPRAYING PUTRESCINE AND HUMIC ACID SPRAYING ON CHEMICAL PARAMETERS OF TOMATO PLANT LYCOPERSICON ESCULENTUM

Mansoor Abed ABOOHANAH, Jamal Ahmed Abbass SALMAN, Laith Jaafar Hussein HNOOSH

University of Kufa, Faculty of Agriculture,1st Qizweniya Street, Kufa, Najaf, IRAQ

Corresponding author email: jamal.selman@uokufa.edu.iq

Abstract

Field experiment was conducted in An-Najaf governorate during spring of 2016. The aim of this experiment was to study the effect of different concentrations of putrescine 0, 50, 100 mg L^{-1} . and humic acid 0, 500 and 1000 mg L^{-1} spraying on chemical parameters of tomato plant. The experiment included nine treatments, i.e. the interactions of three concentrations of putrescine (0, 50, 100 mg L^{-1}) and three concentrations of humic acid (0, 500 and 1000 mg L^{-1}). Sprays were applied twice during season at fifteen days interval that was done on forty-five days from cultivation. Factorial experiment within Randomized Complete Block Design (R. C. B. D.) was used with three replications. Means were compared according to Duncan's Multiple Range Test (D.M.R.T.) at probability of 0.05. Results can be summarized as follows: the use of different concentrations of putrescine with conc. 100 mg L^{-1} and humic acid with control treatment which gave the least values for the above-mentioned parameters. The interactions between two factors (putrescine and humic acid) showed the presence of significant effects on most of the studied chemical parameters.

Key words: putrescine, humic acid, tomato plant, Lycopersicon esculentum.

INTRODUCTION

Tomato, Lycopersicon esculentum Mill., is in the family Solanaceae and is a widely distributed annual vegetable crop. Tomato was high nutritional quality. It is rich in vitamin C, lycopene and different phenolic compounds (Scalfi et al., 2000). Tomatoes are important not only because of the large amount consumed, but also because of their high health and nutritional contributions to humans. Most important, tomato consumption has been shown to reduce the risks of cardiovascular disease and certain types of cancer, such as cancers of prostate, lung, and stomach (Canene-Adams et al., 2005). United Nations FAO reports that the world production of tomato in 2019 was 180766329.00 tons and in IRAO was 619543.00 tons (FAO, 2021).

Polyamines (PAs) are organic polycations found in all living organisms. In higher plants putrescine (Put), spermidine (Spd) and spermine (Spm) are the most abundant PAs and are involved in the various developmental processes (Tonon et al., 2004).

Putrescine which having a role in the regulation of plant developmental and physiological processes. (Kusano et al., 2007). A variety of roles have been proposed for PAs, including cell division, root growth, flower and fruit development and apoptosis (Paschalidis & Roubelakis-Angelakis, 2005). PAs were reported to be involved in stabilization of membrane and scavenging of free radicals (Velikova et al., 1998), osmotic adjustment (Aziz et al., 1999), mineral nutrition (Prakash & Prathapasenan, 1988).

Humic substances are a heterogeneous mixture of naturally occurring organic materials those arise from the decay of plant and animal residues. These organic materials contain carbon, which serves as a food source for soil organisms such as bacteria, algae, fungi and earthworms. These soil organisms break the chemical bonds in the residues as they digest the carbon. The remaining by-products serve as building blocks of humic substances, which are not easily decomposed by soil organisms (Hopkins & Stark, 2003) and this will decrease nutrients leaching with irrigation water, and so increase fertilizers use efficiency (Mikkelsen, 2005). In this concern, Selim et al. (2009) found that application of humic substances through drip irrigation enhanced tubers yield quantity, starch content and total soluble solids and this application associated with the decrease of nutrients leaching, which was reflected on increasing macroand micronutrients concentration in potato tubers. as well as increasing concentration of these nutrients in soil after tubers harvesting.

The objective of this study was to investigate the effect of foliar application of putrescine and humic acid as well as their interaction on growth improvement, chemical parameters, and determining the best application level of both factors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A Field experiment was conducted during the growing season in spring of 2016 at desert region between An Najaf and Karbala provinces. Seeds were sown in agriculture plate on 15/12/2015 and then after 25 days seedlings (3-5 true leafs and 10-15 cm height) were planted in the field.

Then, the experimental plot was divided in to 27 furrows at 4 m length. The distance between each furrow is two, and each furrow was bedding the animal fertilizer as width 35 cm to each furrow about 3 tons·d⁻¹. Seedlings were cultivated at 40 cm apart on furrow. The experiment design was factorial with two factors adopted with Randomized Complete Block Design R.C.B.D. in three replicates with two factors i. e.: 1 - Putrescine with two concentrations 50 and 100 mg·L⁻¹ spraying on vegetative part, besides control treatment (spraying with Distilled water only); 2 -Humic acid 500 and 1000 mg·L⁻¹ spraying on vegetative parts, besides control treatment (spraving with Distilled water only). Agricultural practices were done equally and when it is considered necessary (cultivation, weeding, etc.) as mentioned in (Matlob et al., 1989). Period between spraying putrescine treatments and humic acid was one weak.

Irrigation was done from well water with E.C. of 5.6 dS·m⁻¹ by dripping system. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used to compare means when it is considered significant at probability of 0.05 (Al-Rawi & Khalaf-Allah, 2000).

Parameters:

Determination of N, P, K in Leaves and Fruits.

Nitrogen Determination in Leaves and Fruits: by using Micro-Kjeldahl according to Jackson (1958).

Phosphorous Determinations in Leaves and Fruits: by using Ammonium molybdenum and Spectrophotometer methods on 882 nm according to Olsen and Sommers (1982).

Potassium Determination in Leaves and Fruits: by using Flame photometer.

Total soluble carbohydrates in Leaves $(mg \cdot g^1)$:

according to Duboies et al. (1956). Total Chlorophyll in Leaves (mg·100 g⁻¹): By using acetone to extract chlorophyll pigment according to Mackinney (1941), by using the following equation: Ascorbic Acid Determination in Fruits mg·100 g⁻¹: Titration with 2, 6-dichlorophenol indophenol according to (A.O.A.C, 1980).

Total Soluble Solids in fruits (T.S.S.) by using Handel Refractometer according to Al-Ani (1985).

 Table 1. Chemical and Physical Characteristics for Field
 Soil in the Beginning of the Experiment

| Characters | Value | Unit | | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------|--|--|
| pH | 7.1 | | | |
| EC | 1.4 | dS⋅m ⁻¹ | | |
| | | as·m· | | |
| Ca ⁺² | 16.6 | | | |
| Mg^{+2} | 5.8 | | | |
| Na^+ | 2.9 | | | |
| K^+ | 0.6 | mM·L ⁻¹ | | |
| SO_4^{-2} | SO4-2 10.8 Cl ⁻ 15.9 | | | |
| Cl- | | | | |
| HCO3- | 1.0 | | | |
| Soluble P | 0.16 | mg·L ⁻¹ | | |
| O.M. | 5.0 | g·kg ⁻¹ | | |
| CaCO ₃ | 285.5 | g∙kg ⁻¹ | | |
| Clay | 20 | | | |
| Silt | 65 | g·kg ⁻¹ | | |
| Sand | 915 | | | |
| Texture | Sandy | | | |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

With regards to the spraying putrescine, resultd in Table 2 shows that there was a significant difference between treatments of putrescine, particularly treatment of 100 mg·L⁻¹ that gave the highest values for chemical parameters of leaves which included N, P, K concentration, total soluble carbohydrate and total chlorophyll in leaves with 2.11%, 0.24%, 1.96%, 2.82 mg·g⁻¹ and 36.88 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively compared with control treatment (sprayed with distilled water) that gave 1.70%, 0.22%, 1.51%, 2.41 mg \cdot g⁻¹ and 32.92 mg \cdot 100 g⁻¹, respectively. Moreover, humic acid with concentration 1000 mg·L⁻¹ spraying had a significant effect on chemical parameters of leaves which included N, P, K concentration, total soluble carbohydrate and total chlorophyll in leaves were 2.30%, 0.25%, 2.25%, 2.86 mg·g⁻¹ and 37.52 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively. Meanwhile, control treatment gave the lowest values i.e. 1.53%, 0.20%, 1.41%, 2.39 mg·g⁻¹ and 32.19 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively.

The interaction between factors showed significant differences on chemical parameters of leaves, and the treatment of putrescine 100 mg·L⁻¹ × humic acid with concentration 1000 mg·L⁻¹ gave the highest values the of chemical parameters of leaves were 2.555%, 0.259%, 2.458%, 3.05 mg·g⁻¹ and 39.99 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively compared putrescine 0 × humic acid 0 presented the lowest value of

chemical parameters of leaves were 1.452%, 0.178%, 1.236%, 2.31 mg \cdot g¹ and 31.60 mg \cdot 100 g⁻¹, respectively.

Results in Table 3 reveals that there was a significant difference between the treatments of putrescine, the treatment (100 mg·L⁻¹) gave the highest value of chemical parameters of fruits which included N, P, K concentration, T.S.S and amount of vitamin C in fruits were 2.01%, 0.16%, 1.15%, 5.00 and 27.77 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively compared with the control treatment which gave the lowest means i.e. $(1.62\%, 0.21\%, 1.44\%, 4.20 \text{ and } 23.44 \text{ mg·100g}^{-1})$ respectively.

Spraying humic acid at a concentration 1000 mg·L⁻¹ clearly affected on chemical parameters of fruits which included N, P, K concentration, T.S.S and amount of vitamin C in fruits were 2.21%, 0.23%, 1.51%, 5.03 and 26.66 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively compared with control treatment (without spraying of humic acid) that gained the least values i.e. (1.41%, 0.15%, 0.98%, 4.27 and 23.55 mg·100 g⁻¹) respectively.

The interaction between factors appeared significant differences on all chemical parameters of fruits and the treatment of putrescine 100 mg·L⁻¹ × humic acid with concentration 1000 mg·L⁻¹ gave the best values were 2.420%, 0.242%, 1.546%, 5.23 and 29.66 mg·100g⁻¹, respectively. While, the treatment of (0 Putrescine ×0 humic acid) which gave the lowest values 1.260%, 0.120%, 0.690%, 3.83 and 22.00 mg·100 g⁻¹, respectively.

Table 2. Effect of putrescine and foliar application of humic acid on chemical parameters of leaves of tomato plant

| Treatments | | Concentrations | Nitrogen concentration in leaves (%) | Phosphorus concentration in leaves (%). | Potassium concentration in leaves (%). | Total soluble carbohydrate in leaves (mg ⁻¹). | Total chlorophyll in leaves (mg·100 g ⁻¹) |
|-------------------------------|-----|----------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Putrescine mg·L ⁻¹ | | 0 | 1.70c | 0.22a | 1.51b | 2.41b | 32.92c |
| | | 50 | 1.92b | 0.23a | 1.83a | 2.75a | 34.97b |
| | | 100 | 2.11a | 0.24a | 1.96a | 2.82a | 36.88a |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 0 | 1.53c | 0.20b | 1.41c | 2.39b | 32.19c |
| Humic acid mg·L ⁻¹ | | 500 | 1.90b | 0.24a | 1.64b | 2.72a | 35.05b |
| _ | C | | 2.30a | 0.25a | 2.25a | 2.86a | 37.52a |
| | | | | | | | |
| Putrescine mg·L ⁻¹ | | 0 | 1.452ef | 0.178c | 1.236f | 2.31d | 31.60e |
| 6 | 0 | 500 | 1.645d | 0.233b | 1.364e | 2.36cd | 32.49d |
| | 0 | 1000 | 2.005bc | 0.239b | 1.940b | 2.56c | 34.66c |
| | | 0 | 1.550e | 0.211c | 1.475d | 2.41c | 32.08de |
| × | 20 | 500 | 1.882c | 0.238b | 1.654c | .286b | 34.90c |
| | | 1000 | 2.325ab | 0.255a | 2.365a | 2.98a | 37.92b |
| | 100 | 0 | 1.592e | 0.223bc | 1.522c | 2.46c | 32.90d |
| Humic acid mg·L ⁻¹ | | 500 | 2.180b | 0.244ab | 1.895b | 2.95ab | 37.76b |
| | 100 | 1000 | 2.555a | 0.259a | 2.458a | 3.05a | 39.99a |

Table 3. Effect of putrescine and foliar application of humic acid on chemical parameters of fruits of tomato plant

| Treatments | | Concentrations | Nitrogen concentration in fruits (%). | Phosphorus concentration in fruits (%). | Potassium concentration in fruits (%) | T.S.S. in fruits | Vitamin C in fruit, mg.100 g ⁻ |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--|
| Putrescine, mg·L ⁻¹ | | 0 | 1.62c | 0.16b | 1.15c | 4.20c | 23.44c |
| | | 50 | 1.84b | 0.20a | 1.28b | 4.64b | 24.44b |
| | | 100 | 2.01a | 0.21a | 1.44a | 5.00a | 27.77a |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 0 | 1.41c | 0.15b | 0.98c | 4.27c | 23.55c |
| Humic acid, mg·L | Humic acid, mg·L ⁻¹ | | 1.86b | 0.19a | 1.39b | 4.54b | 25.44b |
| | | | 2.21a | 0.23a | 1.51a | 5.03a | 26.66a |
| | | | • | | | | |
| Putrescine, mg·L ⁻¹ | | 0 | 1.260e | 0.120f | 0.690c | 3.83c | 22.00e |
| , 8 | 0 | 500 | 1.605c | 0.155e | 1.288b | 4.00bc | 24.00d |
| | 0 | 1000 | 1.992b | 0.198c | 1.482ab | 4.76b | 24.33cd |
| | 50 | 0 | 1.450d | 0.157e | 0.984cd | 4.20bc | 22.33de |
| | | 500 | 1.850bc | 0.202c | 1.366b | 4.63b | 25.00d |
| × | | 1000 | 2.225ab | 0.235a | 1.500a | 5.10a | 26.00c |
| | | 0 | 1.505c | d0.184 | 1.260b | 4.78b | 26.33c |
| | 100 | 500 | 2.110b | 0.211b | 1.522a | 5.00ab | 27.33b |
| Humic acid, mg·L ⁻¹ | 100 | 1000 | 2.420a | 0.242a | 1.546a | 5.23a | 29.66a |

The results show that spraying with the Putrescine in combination with humic acid had a significant effect on the increases in chemical parameters of leaves which included N, P, K concentration, total soluble carbohydrate and total Chlorophyll in leaves and chemical parameters of fruits which included N, P, K Concentration, T.S.S and amount of vitamin C in fruits (Tables 2 and 3) respectively. That could be attributed to putrescine spraying induction important biological processes such as ionic balance and DNA, RNA and protein stabilization, hence, leading to the enhancement of free amino acids and increasing in leaf sucrose content. Certain PA changes are correlated with changes in the structure and function of the photosynthetic apparatus (Demetriou et al., 2007). Application of Put. lead to improvement in photosynthetic pigment (Zeid, 2004). Ndaviragije and Lutts (2007) reported improvement in net photosynthesis as response to Put treatment in rice, and that Put. induced stomatal closure in wheat which exhibited high water content (Liu et al., 2000) and these all lead to increase all studied chemical parameters which mention above.

Humic acid spraying which promote growth and increased yield and quality in a number of plant species at least partially through increasing nutrient uptake (Karakurt et al., 2009). Humic acid have been reported to enhance mineral nutrient uptake by plants. increasing the permeability of membranes of root cells (Valdrighi et al., 1996). Humic acid is important for chloroplast system through it leads to the increased rate of photosynthesis in plant and consequently, productions of photosynthesis materials have increased in plant when spraying with humic acid also. In general, spraying with humic acid had increased the length of growth period, rate of carbohydrates, amino acids and proteins in plant. In the same direction, rate of retransfer of photosynthesis materials is done to a great extent from growth parts and consequently, weight of plant will be increased (Farnia & Nasrollahi, 2010).

Tahir et al. (2011) pointed that higher leaf chlorophyll associated to humic spraying could be related to increased cell membrane permeability by humic acid and thus promoting greater efficiency in the absorption of nutrients, especially nitrogen a nutrient with direct relation with leaf chlorophyll concentration. Moreover, the effect of humic acid caused good nutritional status in plant and thus, increased the availability of elements such as: N, P, K which had an activation of biotic activity in plant and then conformation of organic acid such vitamin C (Ertan, 2007). David et al. (1994) reported that promoting growth and nutrient uptake of plants due to the addition of humic substances. The plants take more mineral elements due to better-developed root systems. In addition, the stimulation of ions uptake under the applications of humic materials led many investigators to proposing that these materials affect membrane permeability.

CONCLUSIONS

The addition of putrescine and humic acid by spraying on the shoot of tomato had a significant effect in increasing and improving the chemical characteristic. The double interference treatments between putrescine and humic acid had a significant effect on increasing all the studied traits more than single factors.

REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C. (1980). Official Methods of Analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 13th ed. Washington .USA.
- Al-Ani, A. M. (1985). *The Physiology of Horticultural Yields after Harvest*. Baghdad University. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Iraq (In Arabic).
- Al-Rawi, K. M., & Khalaf-Allah A. M. (2000). Design and Analysis of Agricultural Experiments. Mosul University. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Iraq (In Arabic).
- Aziz, A., Martin-Tanguy, J. & Larher, F. (1999). Salt stress-induced proline accumulation and changes in tyramine and polyamine levels are linked to ionic osmotic adjustment in tomato leaf discs. *Plant Sci.*, 145, 83-91.
- Canene-Adams, K, Campbell, J.K., Zaripheh, S., Jeffery, E.H. & Erdman, J.W. (2005). The tomato as a functional food. *J. Nutr.*, 135, 1226-1230.
- David, P.P., Nelson, P.V. & Sanders, D.C. (1994). A humic acid improves growth of tomato seedling in solution culture. J. Plant Nutr., 17, 173-184.
- Demetriou, G., Neonaki, C., Navakoudis, E. & Kotzabasis, K. (2007). Salt stress impact on the molecular structure and function of the photosynthetic apparatus - the protective role of polyamines. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 1767, 272-280.
- Duboies, M., Gilles, K.A., Hamilton, J.K., Rebers, P.A. & Smith, F. (1956). Colorimetric method for determination of Sugars and related substance. *Anal. An. Chem.*, 28, 350-356
- Ertan, Y. (2007). Foliar and soil fertilization of humic acid affect productivity and quality of tomato. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B. Plant Soil Sci.*, 57(2), 182-186.

- Farnia, A. M., & Nasrollahi, A. (2010). Studying performance and component of chickpea cultivar affected by biological fertilizer. 5th. New Innovations Seminar in Agriculture. Islamic Azad. University of Khorasgan Branch. Isfahan. Iran.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation (FAO). (2021). Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC.
- Hopkins, B. & Stark, J. (2003). Humic acid effects on potato response to phosphorus. *Presented at the Idaho Potato Conference*. January 22-23. USA.
- Jackson, M. L. (1958). Soil Chemical Analysis. Printice Hall Inc. Englewood. Cliffs, N. T. USA.
- Karakurt, Y., Unlu, H. & Padem, H. (2009). The influence of foliar and soil fertilization of humic acid on yield and quality of pepper. *Acta Agric. Scand.*, 59, 233-237.
- Kusano, T., Yamaguchi, K., Berberich, T. & Takahashi, Y. (2007). Advances in polyamine research in 2007. J. Plant Res. 120, 345-50.
- Liu, K., Huihua, F.Q. & Bei Sheng, L. (2000). Inward potassium channel in gourd cells as a target for polyamine regulation of stomatal movements. *Plant Physiol.*, 124(3), 1315-1325
- Mackinney, G. (1941). Absorption of light by chlorophyll solutions. *Biol. Chem.*, 140, 315-322.
- Matlob, A. N., Sultan, A. & Abdool, K. S. (1989). Vegetables Production. Part 1. 2nd ed. Higher Education Publisher in Mosul. Mosul University. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Iraq. (In Arabic).
- Mikkelsen, R.L. (2005). *Humic Materials for Agriculture*. Better Crops. 89. USA.
- Ndayiragije, A. & Lutts, S. (2007). Long term exogenous putrescine application improves grain yield of a salt sensitive rice cultivar exposed to NaCl. *Plant Soil*, 291, 225–238.
- Olsen, S. K. & Sommers, L. E. (1982). *Phosphorus*. (In. Page, A. L. et al.eds. Methods of Soil Analysis. Amer. Agron. Inc. Madison, Wisconsin. New York. USA.).
- Paschalidis, K.A. & Roubelakis-Angelakis, K. A. (2005). Spatial and temporal distribution of polyamine levels

and polyamine anabolism in different organs/tissues of the tobacco plant: correlations with age, cell division/expansion and differentiation. *Plant Physiol.*, 138, 142 – 152.

- Prakash, L. & Prathapasenan, G. (1988). Effect of NaCl salinity and putrescine on shoot growth, tissue ion concentration and yield of rice (Oryza sativa L. GR3). J. Agric. Crop Sci., 160, 325-334.
- Scalfi, L., Fogliano, V., Pentangelo, A., Graziani, G., Giordano, I. & Ritieni, A. (2000). Antioxidant activity and general fruit characteristics in different ecotypes of corbarini small tomatoes. J. Agric. Food Chem., 48, 1363-1366.
- Selim, E.M., Mosa, A.A. & El-Ghamry, A. M. (2009). Evaluation of humic substances fertigation through surface and subsurface drip irrigation systems on potato grown under Egyptian sandy soil conditions. *Agricultural Water Management*, 96, 1218-1222.
- Tahir, M.M., Khurshid, M., Khan, M.Z., Abbasi, M.K. & Kazmi, M. H. (2011). Lignite-derived humic acid effect on growth of wheat plants in different soils. *Pedosphere*, 21, 124-131.
- Tonon, G., Kevers, C., Faivre-Rampant, O., Grazianil, M. & Gaspar, T. (2004). Effect of NaCl and mannitol iso-osmotic stresses on prolin and free polyamine levels in embryogenic Fraxinus angustifolia callus. J. Plant Physiol., 161, 701-708.
- Valdrighi, M.M., Pear, A., Agnolucci, M., Frassinetti, S., Lunardi, D. & Vallini, G. (1996). Effects of compostderived humic acids on vegetable biomass production and microbial growth within a plant (Cichorium intybus) soil system: a comparative study. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 58, 133-144.
- Velikova, V. B., Yordanov, I. T., Georgieva, K. M., Tsonev, T. D. & Goltsev, V. (1998). Effects of exogenous polyamines applied separately and in combination with simulated acid rain on functional activity of photosynthetic apparatus. *J. Plant Physiol.*, 153, 299-307.
- Zeid, I.M. (2004). Response of Bean (Phaseolus vulgaris) to exogenous putrescine treatment under salinity stress. *Pakistan J. Biol. Sci.*, 7(2), 219-225.