Evaluation on the effect of silica (DE) for growth and quality of Mango Kesar

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during 2012-2014 at Kittur Rani Channamma College of Horticulture, Arabhavi, Gokak (Karnataka) to study the Effect of Silicon on yield and quality of mango cv. Kesar. and analyzed for various quality parameters. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with nine treatments replicated five times. It was found that, the highest yield per tree (140.93 kg/tree) was recorded in the treatment supplemented in (T_5) Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare which significantly more than the compared to control during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data.It was noticed that the (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectareas RDF + DE 300 kg/ha was best on the basis of physical characteristics like increased in length, diameter and volume of the fruit and the treatment was significantly higher than the untreated control mango fruits. The treatment also helped in better chemical characteristics like increased TSS, total sugars, and reducing sugars and optimum physiological loss in weight, resulting in improved keeping quality at ambient conditions (25-35^{0}C, 50-60% RH). The(T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare treatment was judged as the most effective soil application for the mango cv. Kesar that helped in increasing the quality of the mango fruits during storage even after 18 days of storage. The same treatment was also found to be more effective and significantly more than the compared to control during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data with respect to organoleptic parameters for the mango cv. Kesar.

Key words: Mango, Silica (DE), Yield, Physical parameters, TSS, Shelf life, PLW etc,.

INTRODUCTION

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) is one of the most popular fruit crops in the tropical and sub- tropical regions of the world and belongs to the family Anacardiaceae. It has been under cultivation in the sub-continent from the past 4000 years (De Candolle, 1904) and is said to have originated in the Indo-Burma region (Mukherjee, 1958). It is named as the 'King of the fruits' owing to its wide range of adaptability, captivating flavour, delicious taste and an excellent source of Vitamins A and C. The fruit is not only eaten fresh, but also utilised for processing into various products like nectar, pulp, squash, juice, flakes, pickles and other delicacies.

Mango is grown in more than 87 countries of the world and India ranks first both in area (25.00 million hectares) and production (18.003 million metric tonnes) India contributes to more than 70 per cent of the total world mango production and it is largely grown in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Andhra Pradesh in India (Anon., 2013).In the state of Karnataka the leading fruit crop is mango occupying an area of 178.80 thousand hectares with a total production of 1.80 million metric tonnes of fruit (Anon, 2013). The export of mango pulp from India in 2012-2013 amounted to 147815.69 MT to the World for the worth of Rs. 608 million (Anon, 2013).

In India, nearly one thousand varieties of mango are under cultivation, but only around twenty of them are grown under commercial scale. In Karnataka, mango varieties like Alphonso, Pairi, Banganpalli, Totapuri, Neelum etc., are the popular ones. Mango variety Kesar a popular one cultivated in Gujarat and Maharashtra is also gaining importance in Karnataka. In the recent past numerous investigations have showed that Kesar mango is successfully competing with Alphonso in domestic and export markets in respect of price, keeping quality, processability and overall marketability.

Mango being a highly heterozygous and cross pollinated crop, has resulted in enormous variations in the yield, quality and physico-chemical characteristics in mango which has resulted toresulting to lesser productivity (6.6 t/hectare). Even though the area under mango is expanding rapidly, the pace of development is not appreciable.

Silica is considered as an important beneficial element as it helps in growth and development of plant. Silicon improves the cell wall due to deposition of silicon in the form of silica and phytoliths and thus increases the thickness and erectness of plant. Silicon is one of the elements in the lithosphere and it is the most abundant element in soil next to oxygen and comprises 28 per cent of its weight and 3-17 per cent in soil solution (Epstein, 1999). It is most commonly found in soils in the form of solution as silicic acid (H_4SiO_4) and plants takeup directly as silicic acid (Ma *et al.,* 2004). Being a dominant component of soil minerals, it has many important functions in environment, although siliconSi is not considered as an essential plant nutrient. Because of its ubiquitous presence in the biosphere, most plants can be grown from seed to seed without its presence. Many plants can accumulate siliconSi concentrations higher than essential macro nutrients (Epstein, 1999). Therefore a detailed study on this aspect was undertaken to study the_yield and quality attributes of mango variety Kesar.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment on the“Effect of Silica on growth and yield of mango cv._Kesar”_was carried out at the farmer’s field located in the Nellanatti village which is 0.5 km away from Arabhavi in mango cv. Kesar orchard with nine treatments which were imposed as soil applications.

Climate

Arabhavi is considered to have the benefit of both South-West and North-East monsoons. The mean annual rainfall of this area is about 530 mm distributed over a period of five to six months (June-November) with prominent peaks during July to October.The mean maximum temperature during the period (2012) of experimentation was 30.45^0 C, minimum temperature 18.86^0 C with relative humidity ranging from 63.39 to 87.16 per cent. The annual rainfall during the experimentation period was 350.7 mm during 2012. Mean maximum temperature during 2013 was 29.83^{0}C, mean minimum temperature 19.77^{0}C with relative humidity ranging from 52.00 to 86.30 per cent. The annual rainfall during the experimentation period was 110.88 mm.

Experimental details

A field experiment was carried out at the farmer’s field located in the Nellanatti village which is 0.5 km away from Arabhavi in mango cv. Kesar orchard with nine treatments which were imposed as soil applications.

List 1: Treatment details

Treatments
T1 : Control
T2 : Recommended dose of fertilizer (750:200:700 g/tree/year of N, P and K)

T3 : Half dose of recommended dose of fertilizer	
T4 : Half dose of RDF + DE 300 kg/ha	
T5 : Half dose of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha	
T6 : Half Dose of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha	
T7 : RDF + DE 300 kg/ha	
T8 : RDF + DE 600 kg/ha	
T9 : RDF + DE 900 kg/ha	

DE: Diatomaceous Earth

Number of treatments : 9

Number of replications : 3

Variety -: Kesar

Number of trees : 81 (3 trees/treatment)

Age of the tree -: 24

Design of the experiment : RBD

Nine treatments were replicated thrice with Randomized Block Design. Three trees were selected for each replication and totally eighty one (81) trees were selected for the experiment. Diatomaceous earth (DE) used as a source of silica was applied as a basal dose to the respective treatment in this experiment.The recommended dose of fertilizers was applied as per the package of practice of UHS, Bagalkot. Fertilizer dose of 750 g of Nitrogen, 200 g of Phosphorous and 700 g of Potassium was applied in the form of Urea, Diammonium phosphate and Muriate of potash in addition to 50 kg of farm yard manure. The fertilizers were applied in two split doses. It is grown in irrigated conditions. Regular cultural operations like irrigation, weeding etc. are carried out. No severe pest and diseases were recorded during research period (2012-2013 and 2013-2014)..

Observations recorded

The following observations on yield and quality attributes were recorded on each treatment.

Yield and Quality parameters

Raw weight of fruit (g)

Immediately after the harvest of the fruit the stalk was removed and the weight of raw fruit was recorded and expressed in grams.

Fruit yield – number of fruits per tree

The number of fruits harvested from each treated tree was counted at the time of harvest and the data expressed as number of fruits per tree.

Fruit yield (kg/tree)

The fruits harvested from each tree were weighed and expressed in kilograms of fruit per tree.

Fruit yield (t/ha)

The fruits harvested from each tree were weighed and converted to hectare basis based on number of trees per hectare (100) and expressed in tones per hectare.

PHYSICAL PARAMETERS OF MANGO FRUIT

Length of fruit (cm)

The length of the fruit from stalk end to the apex of fruit was determined at harvest, with the help of digital Vernier callipers and expressed in centimetres.

Breadth of fruit (cm)

The breadth of fruit was determined as the maximum linear distance between two shoulders of the fruit with the help of digital Vernier callipers and expressed in centimetres.

Volume of fruit (ml)

Fruit volume was determined by the conventional water displacement method, and the mean was computed and expressed asmillilitre.

Specific gravity of the fruit (g/ml)

This was computed as the ratio of fresh weight of fruit to its volume and expressed as gram/millilitre.

Ripe weight of the fruit (g)

The fruits were ripened at room temperature and their ripe weight was recorded in grams.

Pulp weight of the fruit (g)

Mango pulp, after separation from the peel and stone was weighed and the weight expressed in grams.

Peel weight of fruit (g)

The peel of ten fruits from each treatment were separated, weight recorded in grams and the mean weight was computed

Stone weight of fruit (g)

The stones of ten fruits of each treatment were separated from the pulp and their mean weight was worked out and expressed in grams.

Pulp recovery (per cent)

The pulp recovery from the ripe fruits was determined by the following formula:

$$\text{Pulp percentage} = \frac{\text{Weight of pulp (g)}}{\text{Weight of the ripe fruit (g)}} \times 100$$

POST HARVEST BEHAVIOUR OF FRUIT

Number of days taken for ripening

Fully mature mango fruits were harvested and the date of harvest was recorded. The difference between the date of harvest and date of ripening gives the number of days taken for ripening.

Physiological loss in weight (per-cent)

At harvest, the raw mango fruits were weighed and the weight of the fruits was recorded and the fruits were kept for ripening. The fruits were then ripened at room temperature and at the proper stage of ripeness the weight of the fruit was recorded again. The physiological loss in weight was then calculated as:

$$\text{Physiological Loss in weight} = \frac{\text{Raw weight of fruit (g)} - \text{Ripe weight of fruit (g)}}{\text{Raw weight of the fruit (g)}} \times 100$$

Shelf life (days)

The shelf life of fruits was determined by counting the number of days from harvesting to till the fruits remained in good condition without spoilage.

Bio-Chemical Parameters of Fruits

Total soluble solids (^{0}B)

The juice extracted by crushing the ripe pulp from the two halves of each fruit, separately was strained through muslin cloth and used for measuring total soluble solids. TSS was determined by Voisny Erma hand refractometer (0^0 to 32^0 range) and expressed in ^{0} Brix.

Titratable acidity (per cent)

A composite sample of one gram was blended using the blender and volume made upto 10 ml with distilled water. It was then titrated against 0.1N sodium hydroxide to the phenolphthalein end point and expressed as per cent maleic acid.

$$\text{Per cent maleic acid} = \frac{\text{Volume of Sample (ml)} \times \text{Normality of the alkali} \times \text{Molecular weight of acid} \times 100}{\text{Aliquot taken (ml)} \times \text{Weight of sample (g)} \times 1000}$$

Sugar-acid ratio

Sugar-acid ratio of fruit pulp was computed as the ratio of total sugars to the titratable acid.

Total sugars (per cent)

The content of total sugar per cent in the ripe fruit pulp was estimated by the phenol-sulphuric acid method as described by Dubios*et al*. (1951).

Reducing sugar (per cent)

The reducing sugar content of the ripe fruit pulp was estimated by the dinitrosalicylic acid method as developed by Miller (1972).

Non-reducing sugar (per cent)

The non-reducing sugar content was computed by the following formula :

Non-reducing sugar (%) = Total sugar (%) – Reducing sugar (%)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of silica (DE) on yield of mango cv. Kesar

The yield parameters are measured in terms of number of fruits per tree, yield per tree and yield per hectare. Fruit characters like fruit weight, fruit length, diameter of fruit and volume of fruit were recorded.The quality parameters like shelf life, total soluble solids and physiological loss in weight were recorded to know the influence of application of silicon on yield and quality of mango cv. Kesar.

The significant differences were observed in the yield per tree with soil application of silica (DE) and RDF on mango. The highest yield per tree (140.93 kg/tree) was recorded in the treatment supplemented in (T_5) Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare which significantly more than the treatment supplemented with (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare (132.77 kg/tree) compared to control during 2012-2013. In 2013-2014 highest yield (145.04 kg/tree) was recorded in the treatment (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare which was on par with T_5 (Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare) of 137.37 kg/tree compared to control (120.75 kg/tree). Similarly, in the pooled data highest yield was recorded in the treatment with (T_5) Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare (139.15 kg/tree) which was on par with(RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare) T_7 (138.91 kg/tree), compared to control (125.13 kg/tree (Table 1). Similarly, the highest yield (14.09 t/ha) was recorded in the treatment with (T_5) Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare which was on par with treatment supplemented with T_7(13.27 t/ha) compared to control (12.97 t/ha) during (2012-2013). In 2013-2014 highest yield (14.50 t/ha) was recorded in the treatment with (T_7) RDF+ DE 300 kg per hectare followed by T_5(13.37 t/ha) compared to control (12.07 t/ha). For the pooled data highest yield (13.89 t/ha) was recorded in T_7 and lowest was recorded (10.67 t/ha) in T_6 (Table 1) .Silica (DE) had positive effect on yield characters and was maximum in soil applied with silica -treatments than in control treatment. Previous studies emphasized the beneficial effects of salicylic acid in reducing abiotic stress activity in plants and it was also showed that Si influence a number of physiological processes including flowering, mineral uptake , transport and photosynthesis rate (Epstein, 1994).The essential role of silica on stimulating of antioxidant system in plants as well as immobilization of toxic metals and uptake of essential nutrients effectively encouraged cell division and the biosynthesis of organic foods could explain Silicon had many positive effects on the growth and yield as well physiology and metabolism of different crops. Increased yield might have attributed to more canopy spread which facilitated better harvest of sunlight leading to higher photosynthetic activity of plant, more formation of carbohydrates and more uptakesofother nutrients. Similar results were also noticed by Miyake and Eiichi (1986) instrawberry, Miyake and Eiichi (1983) in cucumber, Cai and Rian (1995 a) in pecan nut,Reaple and Laane (2008) in papaya, Bhavya (2010) in Bangalore Blue grapes, Adatiaand Besford (1986) in cucumber and Ahmed *et al*. (2013) in mango.

The maximum fruit weight (306.17 g) was recorded with treatment (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare and minimum fruit weight was recorded in T_9 (248.53 g) during 2012-13. In 2013-2014 maximum fruit weight (315.73 g) was recorded with DE application of RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare (T_7) and minimum fruit weight was recorded in T_5 (170.50 g). The pooled data had maximum fruit weight (310.95 g) with treatment of RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare (T_7) and minimum fruit weight was recorded in T_5 (225.22 g) (Table 1). Previous studies emphasized the beneficial effects of salicylic acid in reducing abiotic stress activity in plants, it was also shown Si influence a number of physiological processes including flowering, mineral uptake and transport, photosynthesis rate (Epstein, 1994).The essential role of silicon on stimulating of antioxidant system in plants as well as immobilization of toxic metals and uptake of essential nutrients effectively encouraged cell division and the biosynthesis of organic foods could explain Silicon had many positive effects on the growth and yield as well physiology and metabolism of different crops. Increased yield might have attributed to leaf erectness which facilitated better penetration of sunlight leading to higher photosynthetic activity of plant, more formation of carbohydrates and more uptakes of other nutrients. Similar results were also noticed by Miyake and Eiichi (1986) in strawberry, Miyake and Eiichi (1983) in cucumber, Cai and Rian (1995 a) in pecan nut, Reaple and

Laane (2008) in papaya, Bhavya (2010) in Bangalore Blue grapes, AdatiaandBesford (1986) in cucumber, and Ahmed *et al*. (2013) in mango.

5.2.3 Fruit Character

The maximum fruit length (14.53 cm and 14.07 cm and 14.30 cm) was recorded with soil application of RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare (T_7) and the minimum (10.58 cm, 11.85 cm and 10.83 cm) was observed in T_2 during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and Pooled data respectively (Table 2). The diameter of fruit was significantly influenced by soil application of silicon. The maximum fruit diameter (8.98 cm) was recorded in T_8 in 2012-2013 and 8.79 cm and 8.84 cm) was recorded with RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare (T_7) during 2013-2014 and the pooled data and the minimum (6.30 cm, 6.68 cm and 6.49 cm) was recorded in the control during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data (Table 2). It was reported that phytoliths deposited on the cell wall leads to lesser respiration. As a result, cell swelled and helped in cell division and cell elongation. The increase in weight was mainly due to cell division in the initial stages and later due to cell expansion associated with movement of water and other metabolites into the cell causing increase in overall weight of the fruit. Similar results were noticed by Ahmed *et al*. (1997), Nam *et al*. (1996) and Bhavya (2010) in grapes and Nessreen*et al.* (2011) in beans.

The maximum weight of the pulp (266.60 g, 218.33 g and 242.47 g) was recorded with soil application of (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare and the minimum (171.25 g, 153.00 g and 162.13 g) was observed in control during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and Pooled data respectively (Table 3).

The maximum weight of the fruit peel (59.30 g) recorded from T_9 during 2012-2013 and 54.33 g and 56.17 g was recorded with soil application of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare (T_8) during 2013-2014 and pooled data. Minimum (41.0 g, 38.33 g and 39.67 g) peel weight was observed in control during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and Pooled data respectively (Table 3). As silicon restricts the stomata conductance, decreases the plasticity of the cell wall and thus, cell elongation and cell division might have occurred and helped in expansion of tissue and in obtaining maximum fruit pulp and peel weight. The results are in accordance with Nessreen *et al.* (2011) in beans, Bhavya (2010) in grapes and Bertling *et al* (2009) in avocado.

Quality parameters

The application of -DE on shelf life was found significant and the treatment RDF + DE 300 kg/ha (T_7) extended its shelf life up to maximum of 18 days, 17.75 days and 17.87 days during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data respectively (Table 4).The data on physiological loss in weight as indicate that PLW increased slowly along with increased storage period in fruits treated with soil application of silica in 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data. However, physiological loss in weight was comparatively more in control mango samples throughout the storage period (Table 5a, b and c).Babak and Majid (2011) reported that, the use of silicon increased vase life of carnation as it lowered the ethylene production and silicon formed complexes with organic compounds in the cell wall of epidermal cells therefore increased their resistance to degrading enzymes. Silica sources might help in improving fruit quality due to suppression of respiration and reduction in ethylene evolution. The results are in conformity with Kaluwa *et al.* (2010) in avocado and Stamatakis *et al.* (2003) in tomato.

The significant difference was noticed in the total soluble solids, with soil application of silica on mango. Silica gave significant difference in the total soluble solids with maximum content (22.20 ^{0}B, 21.00 ^{0}B and 21.60 ^{0}B) were found in RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare when compared to control. Silica helped in the synthesis of more sugars in the fruit and thus helped in increasing total soluble solids (Table 6). Significant difference was noticed with respect to acidity content of the fruits for soil application of silica. The minimum acidity was noticed in Half of RDF + DE 600 kg per hectare treatment (0.31 %, 0.32 % and 0.31 %). On the contrary, maximum acidity (0.36 %, 0.41 % and 0.35 %) was noticed in the control treatment during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data respectively (Table 6). The decrease in acidity might be due to increase in the total soluble solids and also due to the role of silicon which might have either involved in fast conversion of metabolites into sugar and their derivatives. Similar, observations was made by Ahmed *et al*. (2013) in mango, Su *et al*.(2011) in apple and Stamatakis *et al*. (2003) in tomato.

There were significant differences noticed with respect to total sugar content of the fruit for soil application of silicon. The maximum total sugar content was noticed in (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare treatment (16.11 %, 15.80 % and 15.96 %) when compared with the control treatment during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data respectively (Table 7). Silica helped in synthesis of more sugars in the fruit and thus helped in increasing total sugar content. Similar, observations was made by Su *et a*l. (2011) in apple.

Maximum reducing sugars were noticed in (T_7) RDF + DE 300 kg per hectare treatment (8.20 %, 7.33 % and 7.77 %) during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data respectively and minimum was noticed in control (Table 7). This might be due to the role of silicon which might have either involved in fast conversion of starch. Similar, findings was observed by Bertling*et al* (2009) in avocado stated that, this might be due to the beneficial effects of nutrients which led to faster conversion of starch to sugars and their derivatives. Ahmed *et al*. (2013) in mangoes and Bhavya (2010) in Banglore blue grapes, Stamatakis *et al*. (2003) in tomato and Su *et al*. (2011) in apple also reported same.

Organoleptic parameters

The results with respect to organoleptic parameters indicate that there was a significant difference among the treatments with respect to colour of fruit, colour of pulp, Taste of the fruit, aroma of the fruit and overall acceptability.

Significantly maximum score for colour of the fruit, pulp colour, aroma of the fruit and for the overall acceptability was recorded in T_7 (RDF + DE 300kg/ha) which recorded maximum score for pulp (8.63, 8.83 and 8.73), for the aroma was scored a (9.00, 8.85 and 8.90) as shown in Table 8 a and 8 b during 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and pooled data respectively.This might be due to the essential role of silicon on stimulating of antioxidant systems in plants as well as immobilization of toxic metals and uptake of essential nutrients effectively increased biosynthesis of organic foods and antioxidant capacity under stress conditions could explain the present results (Epstein and Bloom, 2005). Similar results were reported by Tesfay *et al*. (2011) in avocado and Stamatakasi *et al*. (2003) in tomato.

Table.1-Effect of silica (DE) on fruit yield of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**Fruit Yield**								
	Raw fruit weight (g)			**Fruit Yield (kg/tree)**			**Fruit Yield (t/ha)**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled Data**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled Data**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled Data**
T_1	305.30	246.00	275.65	129.35	120.75	125.05	12.93	12.07	12.50
T_2	256.17	224.30	240.24	111.09	127.45	119.27	11.10	12.74	11.92
T_3	292.17	192.60	242.39	106.13	135.19	120.66	10.61	13.51	12.06
T_4	293.00	201.60	247.30	112.39	129.66	121.03	11.23	12.96	12.10
T_5	279.93	170.50	225.22	140.93	137.37	139.15	14.09	13.37	13.91
T_6	258.80	205.75	232.28	91.93	122.18	106.74	9.19	12.21	10.67
T_7	306.17	315.73	310.95	132.77	145.04	138.91	13.27	14.50	13.89
T_8	290.83	216.65	253.74	122.05	133.33	127.69	12.20	13.33	12.76
T_9	248.53	228.35	238.44	132.00	129.85	130.93	13.20	12.98	13.09
SEm±	15.47	11.48	13.47	7.26	4.74	6.02	0.68	0.40	0.65
CD@5%	46.37	34.42	40.38	21.76	14.21	18.07	2.05	1.21	1.86

T_1- Control
T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha
T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha
DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year)
T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha
T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF
T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha
T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table :2Effect of silica (DE) on length and breadth of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**Length (cm)**			**Breadth(cm)**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled Data**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled Data**
T_1	12.73	11.85	12.29	6.30	6.68	6.49
T_2	10.58	11.07	10.83	7.59	7.68	7.64
T_3	13.55	11.55	12.55	8.59	8.13	8.14
T_4	13.33	11.42	12.38	7.27	6.71	6.97
T_5	12.83	11.58	12.21	7.80	7.48	7.65
T_6	13.03	12.93	12.98	6.77	7.52	7.14
T_7	14.53	14.07	14.30	8.88	8.79	8.84
T_8	12.42	12.85	12.64	8.98	8.67	8.83
T_9	12.56	12.75	12.66	8.23	8.06	8.15
S.Em±	0.23	0.58	0.40	0.16	0.18	0.17
CD@5%	0.68	1.75	1.21	0.48	0.54	0.51

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF
+ DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_{5-} Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_{8-} RDF +
DE 600 kg/ha

T_{3-} Half of RDF T_{6-} Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_{9-} RDF
+ DE 900 kg/ha

Table 3 Effect of silica (DE) on ripe fruit, pulp and peel weight of cv. Kesar

Treatments	Ripe fruit weight (g)			Pulp weight (g)			Peel weight (g)		
	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled
T_1	228.60	170.05	199.33	171.25	153.00	162.13	41.0	38.33	39.67
T_2	270.00	190.00	230.00	208.30	174.00	191.15	55.0	42.67	48.84
T_3	206.60	183.35	194.98	206.00	183.32	194.66	51.0	50.00	52.05
T_4	244.33	165.45	204.89	225.00	180.22	202.61	59.0	51.67	55.34
T_5	264.33	161.65	212.94	230.00	186.76	208.38	42.0	50.01	46.01
T_6	273.67	162.65	218.16	210.65	188.67	199.66	52.0	51.00	51.50
T_7	280.00	188.35	234.18	266.60	218.33	242.47	57.0	45.67	51.34
T_8	231.65	196.65	214.15	243.30	203.33	223.34	58.0	54.33	56.17
T_9	284.50	193.32	238.91	255.00	217.00	236.00	59.3	52.65	56.04
S.Em±	6.52	8.22	7.37	7.11	6.08	6.59	3.04	2.43	2.18
CD @5%	19.54	24.65	22.09	21.3	18.23	19.76	9.12	7.28	6.55

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 4: Effect of silica (DE) on post harvest characters of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**Number of days**					
	For ripening			**Shelf life**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**
T_1	5.83	6.35	6.09	15.00	14.75	14.88
T_2	7.50	8.00	7.75	15.67	14.67	15.17
T_3	6.17	8.75	7.46	13.35	14.33	13.84
T_4	7.17	7.67	7.42	16.33	15.07	15.70
T_5	7.67	8.17	7.92	17.35	17.00	17.17
T_6	6.98	7.32	7.15	16.67	15.17	15.92
T_7	7.92	8.08	8.00	18.00	17.75	17.87
T_8	11.00	11.25	11.13	17.33	15.31	16.32
T_9	10.00	11.00	10.50	16.00	15.00	15.50
S.Em±	0.28	0.29	0.28	0.53	0.58	0.55
CD@5%	0.85	0.87	0.86	1.58	1.73	1.65

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 5 a: Effect of silicon on physiological loss in weight of mango cv. Kesar at ambient temperature.

Treatments	Physiological loss in weight (%) at different storage days								
	4 Days			6 Days			8 Days		
	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled
T_1	7.56	7.21	7.39	11.40	9.25	10.33	18.30	17.37	17.84
T_2	8.70	7.91	8.31	12.33	9.73	11.03	17.70	17.68	17.69
T_3	8.10	6.93	7.52	12.25	10.67	11.46	17.40	17.19	17.30
T_4	6.94	6.52	6.73	10.33	8.33	9.33	17.10	16.90	17.00
T_5	9.27	6.89	8.08	13.35	8.35	10.85	18.90	17.04	17.97
T_6	8.92	7.82	8.37	14.50	12.13	13.32	19.49	18.00	18.75
T_7	9.00	8.40	8.70	14.48	12.25	13.37	18.50	19.07	18.79
T_8	9.80	6.89	8.35	15.54	12.11	13.83	19.01	19.31	19.16
T_9	9.50	7.77	8.64	13.26	12.07	12.67	18.06	19.00	18.53
S.Em±	0.27	0.26	0.26	1.67	0.36	1.01	0.35	0.27	0.31
CD @5%	0.81	0.79	0.80	5.01	1.08	3.04	1.05	0.81	0.93

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 5 b: Effect of silica on physiological loss in weight of mango cv. Kesar at ambient temperature.

Treatments	Physiological loss in weight (%) at different days of storage								
	10 Days			12 Days			14 Days		
	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled
T_1	20.34	17.37	18.86	25.73	20.22	22.98	28.58	23.42	26.00
T_2	21.11	17.68	19.40	27.53	22.07	24.80	30.59	24.51	27.51
T_3	21.90	17.04	19.47	27.51	23.45	25.48	34.10	25.76	29.93
T_4	22.20	17.19	19.70	26.77	22.12	24.45	32.10	24.98	28.54
T_5	19.07	16.90	17.98	23.63	19.33	21.48	26.63	22.59	24.61
T_6	21.55	18.00	19.78	28.70	22.48	25.59	29.37	25.35	27.36
T_7	23.70	19.07	21.39	28.40	23.52	25.96	33.96	25.71	29.84
T_8	24.20	19.31	21.76	26.40	23.23	24.82	32.11	26.07	29.09
T_9	23.70	19.00	21.35	25.08	23.52	24.30	34.10	26.37	30.24
S.Em±	0.51	0.27	0.39	0.56	0.97	0.76	0.87	0.67	0.77
CD @5%	1.52	0.81	1.16	1.68	2.91	2.29	2.61	2.01	2.33

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 5 c: Effect of silica on physiological loss in weight of mango cv. Kesar at ambient temperature.

Treatments	**Physiological loss in weight (%) at different days of storage**					
	16 Days			**18 Days**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**
T_1	37.35	30.48	33.86	32.10	30.55	31.33
T_2	37.39	33.92	35.66	41.33	38.68	40.01
T_3	40.33	32.00	36.17	40.95	36.41	38.68
T_4	38.48	33.05	35.77	40.17	35.13	37.65
T_5	32.90	28.92	30.91	38.91	32.13	35.52
T_6	40.48	33.70	37.09	39.29	36.26	37.78
T_7	40.17	37.60	38.89	40.84	36.76	38.80
T_8	39.03	39.58	39.31	40.02	37.22	36.62
T_9	38.93	38.58	38.76	41.72	38.18	39.95
S.Em±	1.12	1.01	1.06	1.29	0.92	1.10
CD@5%	3.37	3.04	3.20	3.88	2.76	3.32

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 6: Effect of silica (DE) on TSS, Titratable acidity and Sugar-Acid ratio of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**TSS (^oB)**			**Titratable Acidity (%)**			**Sugar-Acid Ratio**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**
T_1	19.17	19.33	19.25	0.36	0.41	0.39	48.52	42.67	45.60
T_2	17.92	17.83	17.88	0.35	0.37	0.36	42.58	43.30	42.94
T_3	16.95	17.15	17.05	0.30	0.32	0.30	42.53	41.00	41.77
T_4	20.92	19.00	19.96	0.36	0.33	0.35	50.67	45.00	47.84
T_5	21.73	20.58	21.16	0.31	0.32	0.32	42.58	41.20	41.89
T_6	21.15	19.45	20.30	0.37	0.35	0.36	43.00	40.58	41.79
T_7	22.20	21.00	21.60	0.35	0.33	0.34	45.81	43.71	44.76
T_8	21.00	20.18	20.59	0.33	0.31	0.32	43.20	41.03	42.12
T_9	20.00	19.88	19.94	0.37	0.34	0.36	41.17	39.12	40.15
S.Em±	0.54	0.46	0.50	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.30	1.13	0.71
CD @5%	1.61	1.38	1.49	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.91	3.40	2.15

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha   DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_{5-} Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_{8-} RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_{3-} Half of RDF T_{6-} Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_{9-} RDF + DE 900 kg/h

Table 7: Effect of silicaon Total sugars, Reducing and Non-Reducing sugars on mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**Total Sugars (%)**			**Reducing sugars (%)**			**Non-reducing sugars (%)**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**
T_1	15.20	15.38	15.29	7.22	5.45	6.34	8.00	9.93	8.95
T_2	14.26	13.76	14.01	6.51	5.68	6.10	7.75	8.08	7.91
T_3	15.26	14.16	14.71	7.04	6.10	6.57	8.22	8.06	8.14
T_4	13.03	12.62	12.83	6.32	6.17	6.25	6.71	6.42	6.58
T_5	13.59	12.90	13.25	6.86	6.58	6.72	6.73	6.32	7.53
T_6	14.27	13.23	13.75	6.63	6.98	6.81	7.64	6.25	6.94
T_7	16.11	15.80	15.96	8.20	7.33	7.77	7.91	8.47	8.19
T_8	16.00	15.23	15.62	8.03	7.20	7.62	7.97	8.03	8.00
T_9	15.87	15.40	15.64	7.83	7.18	7.51	8.04	8.22	8.13
S.Em±	0.28	0.29	0.29	0.21	0.24	0.21	0.15	0.24	0.19
CD @5%	0.84	0.86	0.86	0.63	0.71	0.64	0.45	0.71	0.58

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha

Table 8 a: Effect of silica (DE) on Organoleptic characters of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	**Colour of the Peel**			**Colour of the Pulp**		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**Pooled**
T_1	7.42	7.17	7.30	6.92	8.33	7.63
T_2	7.75	7.82	7.79	7.50	7.50	7.50
T_3	6.75	6.00	6.38	6.33	6.92	6.63
T_4	7.05	7.42	7.24	7.58	7.92	7.75
T_5	7.25	7.30	7.28	7.00	7.42	7.21
T_6	7.46	7.08	7.26	7.75	7.92	7.84
T_7	8.63	8.83	8.73	8.75	8.83	8.79
T_8	8.08	7.25	7.67	8.17	8.17	8.17
T_9	8.50	7.92	8.21	9.13	7.83	8.48
S.Em±	0.18	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.30	0.17
CD@5%	0.55	0.62	0.53	0.53	0.89	0.52

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF + DE 300 kg/ha DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_5- Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_8- RDF + DE 600 kg/ha

T_3- Half of RDF T_6- Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_9- RDF + DE 900 kg/ha Cont...

Table 8 b: Effect of silica(DE) on Organoleptic parameter of mango cv. Kesar

Treatments	Taste			Aroma			Overall Acceptability		
	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled Data	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled Data	2012-2013	2013-2014	Pooled
T_1	8.17	8.42	8.30	7.88	8.42	8.15	8.42	8.00	8.21
T_2	7.67	7.93	7.80	6.83	7.58	7.21	6.92	7.75	7.34
T_3	7.17	6.83	7.00	6.33	6.58	6.46	6.25	7.02	6.64
T_4	8.08	7.92	8.00	7.75	8.42	8.09	7.55	7.50	7.53
T_5	8.17	7.50	7.84	8.00	8.68	8.34	8.17	7.75	7.96
T_6	7.32	8.15	7.74	8.42	7.90	8.16	7.42	8.25	7.84
T_7	8.70	9.00	8.85	9.00	8.80	8.90	8.17	8.83	8.50
T_8	8.13	8.50	8.34	6.92	8.85	7.89	8.00	7.92	7.96
T_9	8.50	8.68	8.59	7.92	8.12	8.02	8.50	8.67	8.59
S.Em±	0.26	0.24	0.18	0.26	0.23	0.18	0.21	0.27	0.25
CD @5%	0.77	0.70	0.53	0.79	0.66	0.53	0.62	0.79	0.73

T_1- Control T_4- Half of RDF + DE 300kg/ha T_7- RDF
+ DE 300 kg/ha   DE: Diatomaceous earth

T_2- RDF (750:200:700 g/tree/year) T_{5-} Half of RDF + DE 600 kg/ha T_{8-} RDF +
DE 600 kg/ha

T_{3-} Half of RDF T_{6-} Half of RDF + DE 900 kg/ha T_{9-} RDF
+ DE 900 kg/ha

No conclusion, please add

You can also add acknowledgement if you have.

References

1. Adatia, M. H. and Besford, R. T., 1986, The Effects of Silicon on Cucumber Plants Grown in Recirculating Nutrient Solution. *Annals of Botany*, **58**: 343-351.

2. Ahmed, F. F., Mansour, A. E. M., Mohammed, A.Y., Mostafa, E. A. M. and Ashour, N. E., 2013, Using silicon and salicylic acid for promoting production of Hindybisinnara mango trees grown under sandy soil. *Middle East Journal of Agriculture Research*, **2** (2): 51-55, 2013.

3. Ahmed, F. F., Ragat, M. A., Ahmed, A. A. and Mansour, A. E., 1997, Improving the efficiency of spraying different nutrients for Red Roumy grapes (*Vitisvinifera* L.) by using glycerol and active dry yeast. *Egyptian J. Hort*., **27**: 91-108.

4. Anonymous, 2013, Indian Horticultural Data Base, National Horticultural Board, Gurgaon, India, pp.99.

5. Babak, J. and Majid, R., 2011, Carnation flowers senescence as influenced by nickel, cobalt and silicon. *J. Biol. Environ. Sci*., **5**(15): 147-152.

6. Bertling, I., Tesfasy, S. Z., Bower, J. P. and Kaluma, K., 2009, Effect of post-harvest application of Silicon on 'Hass' Avocado fruit, South African Avocado Growers Association Year Book, 32.

7. Bhavya, H. K., 2010, Effect of foliar silicic acid and boron in Bengaluru Blue grapes, *M. Sc. (Hort.) Thesis*, Univ. Agric. Sci., Bengaluru, p. 95.

8. Cai, D. L. and Rian, F. J., 1995a, Effect of silicon fertilizer on pecan nut yield. *J. Reg. Res*. Develop., **14**: 48 – 50.

9. [*]De Candolle, 1904, Origin of cultivated plants. Kegan Paul, London.

10. Dubois,M., Gilles, K.A., Hamilton, J.K., Rebes, P.A. and Smith,F.,1951, Colometric method for the determination of sugars And related substances. *Anal.Chem*.**28**:350-356.

11. Epstein, E. and Bloom, A. J., 2005, *Mineral Nutrition of Pl. Principlesand Perspectives* 2nd edn. Sunderland, MA, USA.

12. Epstein, E., 1994, The Anomaly of silicon in plant physiology. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*. USA. **91**: 11-17.

13. Epstein, E., 1999, Silicon-Annual review on plant physiology. *Pl. Mol. Biol*., **50**: 641-644.

14. Kaluwa, K., Bertling, I., Bower, J.P. and Tesfey, S.Z., 2010, Silicon application effects on 'Hass' avocado fruit physiology. *Avocado Growers Association Year Book*, pp. 33.

15. Ma, C.C., Qing, F, Yu, B. G. and Tian, R. X., 2004, Effects of silicon application on drought resistance of cucumber plants. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr*.,**50**(5): 623-632.

16. Miller, G. L., 1972, Use of dinitrosalicylic acid reagent for determination of reducing sugars. *Annual of chemistry*, **31**: 426-428.

17. Miyake, Y. and Eiichi, T., 1986, Effect of silicon on the growth of solution-cultured cucumber plant. *Plant Nutr*.,**29**(1): 71-83.

18. Miyake, Y. and Eiichi, T., 1986, Effect of silicon on the growth and fruit production of Strawberry plants. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr*.,**32**(2): 321-326.

19. Mukherjee, S.K., 1958, The origin of mango. *Indian J. Hort*., **15**: 129-134.

20. Nam S.Y., Kim, K., Lim, S and Park J, 1996, Effects of lime and silica fertilizer application on grape cracking. *RDA J. Agric. Sci., Soil &Fert.*,**38**(1): 410-415.

21. Nessreen, H. Abou-baker, Abd-eladl, M. and Mohsen, M. Abbas, 2011,Use of Silicate and Different Cultivation Practices in Alleviating Salt Stress Effect on Bean Plants. *Australian J. Basic & Applied Sci*., **5**(9): 769-781.

22. Realpe and Laane, 2008,Effect of the foliar application of soluble oligomeric silicic acid and low dose boric acid on papaya trees. *4th Intl. Conf., South Africa.*

23. Stamatakis, A., Papadatonakis, N., Lydakis, S. N., Kefalis, P. and Savvas, D., 2003,Effects of Silicon and Salinity on Fruit Yield and Quality of Tomato Grown Hydroponically.*Acta Hort.*, **609**: 141-147.

24. Su, X. W., Wei, S. C., jiang, Y. M. and Haung, Y., 2011, Effects of silicon on quality of apple fruits and Mn content in plants on acid soils. *Shandong Agric. Sci*., **6**(1): 23-28.

25. Tesfay, S. Z., Bertling, I. and Bower, J. P., 2011, Effects of post harvest potassium silicate application on phenolics and other anti-oxidant systems aligned to avocado fruit quality. *Postharvest Biol. Tec*., **60**(2): 92-99.