International Journal of Agriculture Sciences
ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 11, Issue 5, 2019, pp.-7959-7962.
Available online at https://www.bioinfopublication.org/jouarchive.php?opt=&jouid=BPJ0000217

Research Article

INFLUENCES OF NUTRIENTS ON PHYSIOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL CHANGES IN MULBERRY (*Morus alba* L.)

NAZAR A.*[1], KALARANI M.K.[2], JEYAKUMAR P.[1], KALAISELVI T.[3], ARULMOZHISELVAN K.[4] AND MANIMEKALAI S.[5]
[1]Department of Crop Physiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India
[2]Tapioca and Castor Research Station, Yethapur, 636 119, Salem, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India
[3]Department of Agricultural Microbiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India
[4]Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Anbil Dharmalingam Agricultural College and Research Institute, Trichy, 620009, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India
[5]Department of Agricultural Entomology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India
*Corresponding Author: Email -agrinazar@gmail.com

Received: February 27, 2019; Revised: March 11, 2019; Accepted: March 12, 2019; Published: March 15, 2019

Abstract: A field experiment was conducted to study the influence of combined application of biofertilizers and micronutrients on physiological and biochemical parameters of mulberry variety Victory 1 (V1). Biofertilizers were given as soil application and micronutrients either by soil or foliar application depending upon the treatments. Among the treatments, 100 % RDF + Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$ @ 25 kg ha^{-1} each + Recommended dose of Biofertilizers (Azos: *Azospirillum lipoferum*, Phospho: *Bacillus megaterium var*. Phosphaticum and Potash mobilizer: *Frateuria aurantia* @1500 ml/ha each) has significantly influenced the physiological and biochemical parameters of mulberry as compared to other combinations of nutrients and application methods. This treatment recorded the highest values for physiological parameters *viz*., chlorophyll content, photosynthetic rate and the lowest in transpiration rate. Similarly, soluble protein, carbohydrates, total phenolics and nitrate reductase (NR) activity were found to be higher in this treatment compared to other treatments.

Keywords: *Mulberry, Micronutrients, Biofertilizers, Physiological parameters*

Citation: Nazar A., *et al*., (2019) Influences of Nutrients on Physiological and Biochemical Changes in Mulberry (*Morus alba* L.). International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 11, Issue 5, pp.- 7959-7962.

Introduction

Sustainability and any improvement in sericulture as a venture requires optimal use, management and preservation or reconstruction of soil fertility and physical properties both of which rely heavily on soil biological processes and maintenance of biodiversity. Mulberry plant can be cultivated for several years due to its perennial characteristics and leaves are to be harvested five times in a year. Due to periodical pruning this crop removes the soil nutrient reserves and need proper nutrient management for a successful crop. Several researchers have established the beneficial effect of combined use of the chemical and organic fertilizers to alleviate the deficiency of many macro and micronutrients in mulberry. The potential of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) reduces dependence on high levels of fertilizer inputs [1]. The PGPR plays a very important role in yield improvement by synthesizing different phytohormones including auxins, cytokinin's and gibberellins which can positively influence plant growth by enhancing physiological and biochemical parameters of plant and that can modulate plant growth and development [2]. Plant lifecycle depends on the supply of essential elements at optimum quantity and at appropriate stage of plant growth. All essential elements have specific impact on physiological and biochemical parameters of plant growth. Hence present investigation was undertaken to find out the influence of application of micronutrients along with biofertilizers on mulberry.

Material and Methods

A field experiment was conducted at D. Perumapalayam village of Salem district, Tamil Nadu in an established mulberry garden with variety (V1) Victory 1 planted at a spacing of (5+3) x 2 feet in paired row system. The mulberry plants pruned for 5 times in a year with a time interval of 70 days. The following treatments were imposed after each pruning. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design and replicated thrice with 12 treatments.

T_1- Control (100% RDF)
T_2- T_1+ Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$ @25 kg ha^{-1} each.
T_3-T_2+ Recommended dose of Biofertilizers (RDBF) (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_4-75 % RDF + Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, Fe SO_4, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$@ 25kg ha^{-1} + RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_5-T_1+ Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ & $MgSO_4$@ 15kg ha^{-1}
T_6-T_5+ RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_7-75 % RDF + Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$ @15kg ha^{-1} + RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_8-T_1+ 0.5 % Foliar Spray of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$
T_9-T_1+ 0.2 % Foliar Spray of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$
T_{10}-T_8+ RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_{11}-T_9+ RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)
T_{12}-75 % RDF + 0.2 % Foliar Spray of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$ + RDBF (Azos, Phospho and Potash Mobilizer)

Young leaves were selected at random from each treatment on 65 DAPR (Days after pruning) and analysed for physiological and biochemical parameters.

Biofertilizers

The bio-fertilizer inoculants Azos: *Azospirillum lipoferum*, Phospho: *Bacillus megaterium var*. Phosphaticum and Potash mobilizer: *Frateuria aurantia* used in this study were mass multiplied on respective medium and the bacterial inoculants cells were separated and concentrated by tangential flow filtration system (PALL Life Sciences Inc.) and formulated in a liquid based cell encapsulation medium with declared cell count of 1 x 10^8 CFU ml^{-1} and given as soil application at recommended dosage of 1500 ml ha^{-1} in Bio-fertilizer Production Unit, Department of Agriculture, Salem .Mulberry leaves were analyzed for different physiological and biochemical parameters at 65 DAPR of each crop following the prescribed standard procedures. The chlorophyll content of mulberry leaf was estimated by adopting the procedure outlined by 1971 [3], photosynthetic rate, stomatal conductance and transpiration rate were recorded by using LI-6400-XT portable photo synthesis system. Total carbohydrate content [4], soluble protein content [5] total phenol content [6] and NR activity [7] of mulberry leaves were also estimated. Analysis were done and the statistical scrutiny of the experimental data was done by the method of analysis of variance as suggested by 1992 [8].

Results and Discussion

Physiological Parameters

Chlorophyll content

The fractions of chlorophyll a and chlorophyll b as well as total chlorophyll content were estimated in leaf samples collected from various treatments and presented in the [Table-1]. Among the treatments, the highest total chlorophyll content was registered with the treatment T_3 (3.35 mg g^{-1}) followed by T_4 (3.38 mg g^{-1}) and T_7 (2.88 mg g^{-1}). Increase in chlorophyll content at 25, 40 and 60 DAPR of mulberry due to the combined application of *Azospirillum, Rhizobium* and effective microorganism (EM) in soil was reported by 2008 [9] and as foliar spray of EM alone in mulberry [10] which might be due to synergistic interaction of biofertilizers and EM. The findings are also in tune with the report of [11], [12] and [13]. Similar results obtained due to application of biofertilizer and nutrients with increased intercellular CO_2 concentration in mulberry [14] and increased photosynthesis leading to better utilization of stored carbohydrates [15]. The increased amount of chlorophyll content in leaves indicated the photosynthetic efficiency and it can be used as one of the criteria on for quantifying photosynthetic rate in mulberry [16]. Higher levels of chlorophyll content are indicative of higher photosynthetic efficiency of plants [17], [18] and [19].

Table-1 *Influence of micronutrients and biofertilizers on physiological parameters*

Treatments	Chl a (mg g^{-1})	Chl b (mg g^{-1})	Total Chl (mg g^{-1})	Transpiration rate (mmol H_2O $m^{-2}s^{-1}$)
T_1	1.68	0.69	2.37	6.80
T_2	1.98	1.11	3.09	6.60
T_3	3.04	1.38	4.42	6.09
T_4	2.38	1.67	4.05	6.17
T_5	1.79	0.88	2.67	6.78
T_6	2.25	1.26	3.51	6.42
T_7	2.41	1.15	3.56	6.27
T_8	1.87	.84	2.71	6.65
T_9	1.83	.82	2.65	6.75
T_{10}	2.18	1.29	3.47	6.46
T_{11}	1.94	1.16	3.10	6.51
T_{12}	2.05	1.03	3.08	6.54
Mean	2.12	1.10	3.22	6.99
SEd±	0.0676	0.0375	0.1249	0.207
CD (0.05%)	0.1375	0.0764	0.2541	0.419

Photosynthetic rate

With respect to photosynthetic rate, the treatment T_3 exhibited higher efficiency to record the highest value of Pn (28.62 µmol CO_2 m^{-2} s^{-1}) followed by T_4 (27.73 µmol CO_2 m^{-2} s^{-1}) which was on par with T_3. Significant differences were found among other treatments also [Fig-1]. However, the lowest photosynthetic rate of 17.06 µmol CO_2 m^{-2} s^{-1} was recorded in treatment T_1. In the present study, application of biofertilizer leads to increase in mobilization of NPK and all micro nutrients. A high nitrogen content in the leaf tissue allows the plant to have more chlorophyll, RuBisCo and triggering a higher rate of photosynthesis [20]. Phosphorus is an element that directly affects the process of photosynthesis [21] and phosphorus has been reported to affect the dark reactions of photosynthesis, the apparent quantum efficiency, and starch accumulation, but the rate of electron transport and stomatal conductance is not affected [22]. Potassium is an element that directly involved in translocation of photosynthate from source to sink. Photosynthesis is an important component of the plant's capacity in utilization of atmospheric CO_2 and correlated with nutrients [23].

Transpiration rate

The transpiration rate of mulberry [Table-1] was significantly influenced by the application of micronutrients and biofertilizers and the lowest transpiration rate of 6.09 mmol H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1} was recorded in treatment T_3 followed by T_4 and T_7 with 6.17 and 6.27 mmol H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1} respectively and the highest transpiration rate was observed in T_1 followed by T_5 with 6.80 and 6.78 mmol H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1} respectively. When photosynthesis was high, transpiration was low especially in the micronutrient and biofertilizer due to much of H_2O used for photosynthesis before the water vapor was released in the transpiration process. When water absorbed by the plant roots from the soil is not entirely used to produce dry matter, because most of the total water absorbed by the roots (90%) is lost via transpiration [24]. Similar finding was also made by 2017 [25] in the leaves of AR-14 mulberry variety attributing to the fact that foliar application of nutrients can increase the leaf diffusive resistance and lower transpiration rates. It is therefore apparent from various studies and also from the present study that application of micronutrient and biofertilizer leads to the reduction in transpiration rate which might enhance the relative water content and in turn higher leaf yield.

Stomatal conductance

The higher stomatal conductance was registered in treatment T_3 imposed plants which recorded gaseous exchange of 0.902 mmol H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1} followed by T_4 with 0.899 mmol H_2O $m^{-2}s^{-1}$ [Fig-1]. The treatment T_3 recorded 30.91 percent increase in stomatal conductance over control which was in corroboration with the findings of 2011 [21] who observed significantly increased stomatal conductance in mulberry plants due to the application of *Azotobacter chroococcum* + *Azospirillum brasilense* + *Bacillus megaterium*.

Biochemical Parameters

Soluble protein

A positive and significant effect of micronutrients and biofertilizers on mulberry was witnessed in soluble protein also [Table-2]. Among the treatment, T_3 accumulated the highest soluble protein (22.19 mg g^{-1}) followed by T_4 with 21.78 mg g^{-1} and these two treatments were significantly different from other treatments. The lowest soluble protein content of 14.01 mg g^{-1} was observed in treatment T_1. The N_2 fixing property of *Azospirillum* increased the N availability which in turn increased protein content. The increased soluble protein content due to micronutrient and biofertilizer application was strongly supported by [24] and [25]. Also, at 2008 [26] observed the same results with combined application of poultry manure with biofertilizers. Hence, a combined application of nutrient and bio fertilizers is not only improving higher RuBP case level but also effective in increasing in sugars and soluble protein in mulberry leaves are very much needed for growth of young and late age silkworm. Significant increase in total soluble protein content in leaves denotes an increase in the nutritional status of mulberry leaves in terms of biochemical contents through application of microorganisms [30]. Further the nitrogen fixing activity of microorganisms increased the nitrogen availability which in turn might have increased the protein content in the leaves.

Total carbohydrate

Data pertaining to total carbohydrate content of mulberry under different micronutrient and biofertilizer treatments revealed a significant variation compared to control and among the treatments, maximum total carbohydrate content was recorded in T_3 (21.61 mg g^{-1}) followed by T_4 with 21.27 mg g^{-1} and the lowest carbohydrate content was observed in T_1 [Fig-2]. Increase in the nutritional status of the mulberry leaves in terms of biochemical contents through the application of fertilizers and biofertilizers have also been recorded by earlier workers [28-30].



Fig-1 Influence of micronutrients and biofertilizers on physiological parameters of mulberry



Fig-2 Influence of micronutrients and biofertilizers on total carbohydrates (mg g^{-1}) of mulberry

The synergistic action of introduced organisms increased the vigor and vitality of plant which resulted in enhanced metabolic activities of the plant.

Table-2 *Influence of micronutrients and biofertilizers on biochemical*

Treatments	Soluble protein (mg g^{-1})	Total Phenolics (mg g^{-1})	Nitrate reductase (μNO_2 g^{-1} hr^{-1})
T_1	14.01	0.79	73.62
T_2	18.81	1.30	89.15
T_3	22.19	1.95	124.90
T_4	21.78	1.90	120.59
T_5	15.22	0.79	80.84
T_6	20.65	1.82	103.91
T_7	20.75	1.86	110.86
T_8	17.18	1.13	84.24
T_9	16.35	0.98	81.36
T_{10}	20.14	1.73	99.51
T_{11}	18.50	1.65	94.07
T_{12}	18.39	1.46	92.88
Mean	18.71	1.45	96.33
SEd±	0.604	0.050	3.147
CD (0.05%)	1.229	0.102	6.401

Total phenolics

The total phenolics content [Table-2] of mulberry in treatment T_3 was the highest (1.95 mg g^{-1}) followed by T_4 and T_7 with 1.90 mg g^{-1} and 1.86 mg g^{-1}, respectively which were on par with each other. The lowest total phenolics content was recorded in T_1 (0.79 mg g^{-1}) received only recommended dose of fertilizers. Phenolics are physiologically active secondary compounds produced by higher plants and are involved in the modulation of cell wall plasticity [31]. In the present study, higher phenolics content observed in T_3 might be due to decreased polyphenol oxidase activity in the treated plants which have resulted in high phenol content and this is in accordance with the findings of 2009 [32] and 2007 [33] in turmeric. Cheynier *et al.* [34] also reported that the application of nutrient and biofertilizers increased the total phenolics in mulberry. Phenolic constituents of plants have an anti-oxidant activity and offer protection against oxidative damage [35].

Nitrate reductase (NR) activity

Elevated NR activity was found in the treatment T_3 (124.90 μg NO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}) followed by T_4 (120.59 μg NO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}) [Table-2]. The importance of minerals like Fe, Mg, Zn and Mn for enzyme activation is well recognized and reported earlier [36,37]. They also reported that, this enzyme is found to be stimulated in rice plants by monovalent cations such as Na+, K+ and in Vigna mungo by divalent cation such as Ca++. Increase in NR activity by magnesium, zinc and molybdate also observed by 2005 [38] and reported that, NR activity is to considered as predictive index of crop yield through proteins of foliage.

Conclusion

From the experiment, it is concluded that the treatment consisted of 100 % RDF + Soil application of $ZnSO_4$, $FeSO_4$, $MnSO_4$ and $MgSO_4$ @ 25 kg ha^{-1} each + Recommended dose of Biofertilizers (Azos:*Azospirillum lipoferum*, Phospho: *Bacillus megaterium var*. Phosphaticum and Potash mobilizer: *Frateuria aurantia*) (T_3) has showed significant influence on physiological (chlorophyll content, photosynthetic rate, transpiration rate, stomatal conductance) and biochemical parameters (soluble protein, total carbohydrate, total phenolics, NR activity) which in turn positively correlated with the quantity and quality of mulberry leaves for better growth and development of silkworm.

Application of Research: Adopting this finding mulberry and silkworm rearing farmers get higher leaf yield and ultimately higher silk yield and income.

Research category: Micronutrients

Acknowledgement / Funding: Authors are thankful to Department of Crop Physiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India

Abbreviations:

μg g^{-1}: Micro gram per gram
CD : Critical Difference
CFU : Colony Forming Units
cm^2 : Centimetre square
DAPR : Days After Pruning
$FeSO_4$: Ferrous sulphate
FYM : Farm Yard Manure
ha^{-1} : Per hectare
h^{-1} : Per hour
mg g^{-1}: Milligram per gram
$MgSO_4$: Magnesium sulphate
$MnSO_4$: Manganese sulphate
NR : Nitrate Reductase
NS : Non Significant
ppm : Parts Per Million
RDF : Recommended Dose of Fertilizers
RBD : Randomized Block Design
SEd : Standard Error of deviation
$ZnSO_4$: Zinc sulphate

*** Research Guide or Chairperson of research: Professor Dr M.K. Kalarani**
University: Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu
Research project name or number: PhD Thesis

Author Contributions: All authors equally contributed

Author statement: All authors read, reviewed, agreed and approved the final manuscript. Note-All authors agreed that- Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to publish / enrolment

Study area / Sample collection: Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

Cultivar / Variety name: Mulberry (*Morus alba* L.) Victory-1

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Ethical approval: This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.
Ethical Committee Approval Number: Nil

References

[1] Lucy M., Reed E. and Glick B.R. (2004) *Anton Leeuw*., 86, 1–25.
[2] Glick B.R. (2012) *Scientifica*, 23.
[3] Yoshida S., Formo D.A. and Cock J.H. (1971) *In, Laboratory manual for physiological studies of rice. IRRI., Philippines*, 36-37.
[4] Yemm E.W. and Willis A.J. (1954) *Biochem. J*., 508-514.
[5] Lowry O.H., Rose Brought N.T., Farr L.A. and Randall R.J. (1951) *J. Biol., Chem*., 193, 265-275.
[6] Mallick C.P. and Singh M.B. (1980) *In, Plant Enzymology and Histo Enzymology. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi*, 286.
[7] Nicholas J.C., Harper J.E. and Hageman R.H. (1976) *Pl. Physiol*., 58, 731-735.
[8] Gomez K.A. and Gomez A.A. (1992) *Statistical procedure for agricultural research. New York, Wiley Inter-Science Publications*.
[9] Vinoj S. (2008) *M.Sc., Thesis, Periyar University, Salem*, 90.
[10] Gnanaselvi M. (2007) *M.Phil. Thesis, Periyar University, Salem, Tamil Nadu*, 49.
[11] Singh P.K., Singh B.D. and Saraswat S.B. (1991) *Indian Silk*, 14(2), 15-16.
[12] Das P.K., Choudhury P.C., Ghosh A., Katiyar R.S., Madhava Rao Y.R., Mathur V.B. and Mazumder M.K. (1994) *Indian J. Seric*.,33(2), 170-173.
[13] Ramarethinam S., Marimuthu M. and Murugesan N.V. (2005) *Biofertilizer News Letter*, 13(2), 2-8.
[14] Panneerselvam R., Muthukumarasamy M.L. and Karikalan. (1997) *Photosyn*., 34, 605-609.
[15] Ahmed F., Sultana R., Ahmed O., Akhtaruzzama M. and Iqbal M.T. (2017) *Int. J. Agric. Biol. Eng*.,10(5), 104–114.
[16] Sujathamma P. and Dandin S.B. (2000) *Indian J. Seric*., 39(2), 117-121.
[17] Patil S.V., Mallikarjunappa R.S., Bongale U.D. and Dandin S.B. (1998) *Proceedings of National Seminar on Tropical Sericulture, Bangalore*, 1, 14-17.
[18] Watson, J.D. (1952) *Advances Agron*.,4, 101-145.
[19] Raj A. and Tripathy M.P. (1999) *Indian J. Plant Physiol*., 4(3), 219-220.
[20] Osaki M., Shinano T., Matsumoto M., Ushiki J., Shinano M.M., Urayama M. and Tadano V. (1995) *Soil Sci.Plant Nutr*.,41, 635-647.
[21] Warren, C.R. (2011) *Tree Physiol*., 31, 727-739.
[22] Brahim M., Loustau D., Gaudillère J.P. and Saur E. (1996) *Ann. Sci. For*., 53, 801–810.
[23] Ma T.Z., Peng Z. and Zhen Y.W. (1995) *J. Pineal Res*., 60, 424–434.
[24] Sterling T.M. (2004) *Transpirationlwater movement throughplants. Mexico (US), New Mexico State University Pr.*
[25] [25] Sori W., Bhaskar R.N., Sudhir K., Shashidhar K.R. and Sarithakumari S. (2008) *Influence of Bio-inoculants on available N, P and K content of M-5 Mulberry garden under Rainfed Condition, Moriculture (Eds. K. Jaiswal, S. P. Trivedi, B.N. Pandey and R. K. Khatri), APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi*, 165.
[26] Chakraborty U., Chakraborty B.N., Basnet M. and Chakraborty A.P. (2008) J. *Appl. Microbiol*., 107, 625- 634.
[27] Madhubabu M.T., Swamy T., Kameswara R.P. and Seshagiri R.M. (1992) *Indian J. Seric*., 31(2), 111-114.
[28] Sengupta K., Ray D., Singh B.D. and Krishnaswami S. (1972) *Indian J. Seric*., 11(1), 28- 29.
[29] Loganath R. and Sivashankar K. (1986) *Indian J. Seric*.,25(1), 1-5.
[30] Subburethinam K.M. and Sulochana C. (1991) *Indian J. Seric*., 30(2), 121-123.
[31] Wallace G. and Fry S.C. (1994) *Int. Rev. Cytol*., 151, 29–68.
[32] Jaleel C.A., Zhao C., Mohamed S., Al Juburin, H.M., Moussa H.R., Gomathinayagam M. and Paneerselvam R. (2009) *Front. Biol*., 4(4), 419-423.
[33] Lakshmanan S., Munikrishnappa H.M., Mallikarjuna B. and Geethadevi R.G. (2007) *Ind. J. of Seric*.,47 (1),40-44.
[34] Cheynier V., Comte G.G., Davies K.M., Lattanzio V. and Martens S. (2013) *Plant.Physiol. Biochem*.,72, 1–20.
[35] Evans C.A., Mille N.J. and Paganga (1997) Tren. Pl. Sci., 2, 152-159.
[36] Broyer T.C. and Stout P.R. (1959) *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiology*, 10, 277-300.
[37] Ghosh M.K. and Srivastava R.C. (1993) *Curr. Sci*., 65(9), 714-718.
[38] Johnson D.R., Lee P.K.H., Holmes V.F., Fortin A.C. and Alvarez-Cohen L. (2005) *Applied and Environmental Microbiol*.,71, 7145- 7151.