

Original Research Article

Effect of "Dextril" ($C_{11}H_{18}Cl_2O_7P$) as growth retardant on tomato seedlings quality

ABSTRACT:

The effect of different concentrations of growth retardant "Dextril" ($C_{11}H_{18}Cl_2O_7P$) on tomato (*lycopersicon esculentum* c.v Huda F1) seedlings quality was studied, at the agriculture- Alexandria- egypte, on 2010. Tomato seedlings were sprayed when the second true leaf was appeared with "Dextril" at (0.02 – 0.04 – 0.06 – 0.08 – 0.1%) levels, to promote seedlings tolerance to heat stress during summer – autumn period and limit stem growth and elongation.

The results showed that, "Dextril" treatment of (0.02 -0.04 – and 0.06%) levels improved seedlings quality and decreased stem height by 30, 32, and 35% respectively compared to the control, whereas, 0.08 and 0.1% levels showed a toxic effects. Treatment with "Dextril" increased as well, stem diameter, fresh and dry weight of shoots, but it didn't affected leaf number compared to the control.

Key words: Tomato, seedling, growth retardants, Dextril.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Tomato is the most important vegetable cultivated in green houses in the world. It is considered as a main crop in Syria, and it occupies 75% of total green houses which count 129000. The technique of seedlings production is as important as crop production, because, most tomato growers use plant seedling and prepare them under protected conditions.

Tomato seedlings are subjects during their production in summer, to a high temperature which cause stem elongation and diameter reduction, and finally, bad seedling quality, they become less tolerant to environmental stress and die after planting.

Plant growth retardants are used to retard the shoot length of plants without changing developmental patterns or evoke phototoxic effects. This has been achieved not only by reducing cell elongation but also by lowering the rate of cell division and regulating the plant height physiologically (Rademacher, 1995, 2000). Most plant growth retardants inhibit the formation of gibberellins (GAs) and can thus be used to reduce unwanted shoot elongation (Singh, 2004; Mansuroglu et al., 2009).

Plant growth retardants are synthetic substances, which inhibit, for a period of time, the elongation of stem and shoots, without irreversible blocking of vital metabolic and developmental processes in plants (Caprita et al., 2005).

The inhibition effects of gibberellins biosynthesis, resulting in internodes shortening, and long term growth suppression of many plants. The activity of growth retardants occur after stem penetration or root uptake following irrigation or rainfall. Flowering can be enhanced in some crops, and intensified leaf greening with a little or no toxicity (Hafeez- ur- Rahman et al.,1989).

The effects of growth retardants vary with plant species, genotype, concentration used, method of application, plant age and various other factors which influence the uptake and translocation of the chemicals, (Cathey1964).

Growth retardants have some other physiological effects, they could induce the more intense accumulation of compounds that influence taste, color, and flavor, thus improving the quality and the commercial value of the products (Caprita et al., 2005).

Growth retardants are used widely in agriculture, especially, on cereal crops, to prevent their lodging and decrease grain loss at ripening and enhance plant tolerance to environmental stress, without affecting positively growth and production (Likhoshirvo, 2007; Matisiak, 2006; Maciorowski et al., 2006).

Chlormeguat, and its related commercial compounds: Cycocel and Dextril are the most important growth retardants. Treatment of fruit trees and vegetable seedlings or plants with growth retardants, decreased stem height and increased its thickness (Jacov, 1990; El Shahat, 1990; Bezuglova, 2000).

Branch growth of apple, peach and bear trees when treated with growth retardants (200 -400 ppm) after 2 weeks of blooming, were reduced (Disks, 1980; Nagy and Tabi, 1982).

Several studies demonstrated that spraying tomato plants with growth retardants improved their capacity to tolerate low temperatures and increased early and total yield (Budekeyana and Temeco, 2007; Budekeyana, 1998; El-Asdoud, 1993; Czapski et al.,1990).

Treating of tomato, potato, cauliflower, and cabbage seedlings with growth retardants at (250 – 1000 mg/l) two alternative times, with 7 – 10 days intervals resulted in stem shortening and thickness, intensifying leaf greening, improve root system which promote seedling quality without any residual effects in tomato fruits, potato tubers, cauliflower head and cabbage leaves (Malivania et al., 2007; Avakyan, 2000; Hickman et al., 1999; Genchew and Miller, 1983).

Purpose of the present investigation was to examine the retarding effects of Dextril on tomato seedlings quality and their tolerance to after planting shock.

2. material and methods:

Tomato seeds (*lycopersicon esculentum* c.v Huda F1) were sown in trays containing 50 holes of 65 cm³ volume filled with pitmos, and were allowed to germinate in the green house at 25 ± 4C°.

When the second leaf was emerged, seedling were treated with growth retardant "Dextril" at five levels, as following:

1- seedling sprayed with distilled water (control).

2- seedling sprayed with "Dextril" 0.02%.

3- seedling sprayed with "Dextril" 0.04%.

4- seedling sprayed with "Dextril" 0.06%.

5- seedling sprayed with "Dextril" 0.08%.

6- seedling sprayed with "Dextril" 0. 1%.

A completely randomized design was employed for the experimental design, which consist of 6 treatments with 4 replicates, and 20 seedlings for each replicate.

Seedlings were fertilized twice during growth period with (delta spray) TE+ 20:20:20, (1g/ L of water). They were treated as well with fungicide (Privicur –N) and insecticide (lentrak), to prevent infection with fungal diseases and insects.

When seedlings are 40 days old, plant quality was determined by measuring:

1- Seedling height / cm.

2- seedling stem diameter / mm.

3- Number of leaves by plant.

4- Leaf area (cm² / plant).

5- Fresh and dry weight of shoots and roots (g / plant).

6- Degree of adaptation after planting.

Temperature degrees (minimal and maximal) were registered during growth period in the green house (Table 1).

Table (1): maximal and minimal temperatures during growth period.

Date C°	1 st week	2 ^{ed} week	3 ^{ed} week	4 th week	5 th week	6 th week
Maximal	34.6	34.8	34.4	35.4	35.6	35.8
Minimal	20.4	20.8	21.2	21	22.2	22.6

Table (1) showed that the mean of maximal temperature (34.4- 35.8) was greater by 6 to 8 C° than the maximum optimal degrees needed for growth, and the minimal temperature was greater as well by 3 to 4 C° than the minimal optimal degrees for growth.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

3-1- Effect of "Dextril" on seedling height, stem diameter, number of leaves and leaf area:

Treatment with different concentrations of Dextril significantly affect seedlings quality (Table 2). Lower concentrations of Dextril (0.02 – 0.04 – 0.06%) improved standard characters of seedlings. Plant height was decreased, while stem diameter and leaf area were increased compared to the control. The number of leaves was affected only with high concentrations (0.06- 0.08- 0.1%).

Table (2): Effect of "Dextril" on seedling height, stem diameter, number of leaves and leaf area

Treatments	Seedling height/cm	Seedling diameter/mm	Number of leaves	Leaf area/cm ² /plant
Control	18.5 ^a	3.3a	4.3 ^a	167 ^a
Dextril 0.02%	13 ^b	4.5 ^b	4.3 ^a	244 ^b
Dextril 0.04%	12.5 ^b	4.5 ^b	4.2 ^a	213 ^c
Dextril 0.06%	12 ^b	4 ^c	3.9 ^b	206 ^d
Dextril 0.08%	6.7 ^c	2.5 ^d	3 ^c	96 ^e
Dextril 0.1%	6.5 ^c	2.5 ^d	3 ^c	87 ^e
LSD 5%	3.5	0.194	0.43	21.4


The inhibitory effect of Dextril on plant height may due to the inhibition of cell division of stem apex as it was demonstrated for other growth retardants like CCC on sunflower (Lovett and Orchard, 1981) and TIBA, on sorghum (Hatley et al., 1985).

The effect of Dextril may due as well to its effect on gibberellins biosynthesis like other growth retardants which is responsible on stem elongation (Singh, 2004; Mansuroglu et al., 2009).

Dextril effect on stem diameter may due to the inhibition of longitudinal cell growth and the stimulation of cell width when used in low concentrations (Bezuglova, 2000).

Many works showed that application of growth retardants like MH (Maleic hydrazid) and CCC on sorghum during flower initiation and 7 days after, resulted in the reduction of plant height and leaf area (Mehetre and Lad, 1995), while, foliar application of CCC (500 ppm), significantly increased leaf area per plant as compared to the control.

Saisanker (2001) found that foliar application of growth retardant daminozide (400 – 800 ppm) on sunflower genotypes, significantly decrease plant height over control, while stem diameter was not significantly different among treatments. (Whipker and Mc Call, 2000; Hanchinamath 2005), demonstrated that foliar application of mepiquat chloride (1000 ppm) and lihocin (1000 ppm), significantly decreased plant height and increased the number of leaves and leaf area in cluster bean.



Fig(1) Trans section of epidermal and cortical cells of tomato control (right) and tomato treated with Dextril 0.02% (left). Scanning electron microscopy, SEM.

Fig (1) showed that cell sizes of plant control are larger than cells of treated plants with Dextril. The mechanism of reduction in plant height due to application of growth retardants appears to be due to slowing down of cell division and reduction in cell expansion. It has been suggested that, TIBA, cycocel and mepiquat chloride are anti-gibberellin dwarfing agents, leading to a deficiency of gibberellin in the plant and reduce the growth by blocking the conversion of geranyl pyrophosphate to copalyl pyrophosphate which is the first step of gibberellin synthesis (Moore, 1980). Thus, reduction in plant height is due to retardation of transverse cell division particularly in cambium which is the zone of meristematic activity at the base of the internodes (Grossman, 1990).

3-2- Effect of Dextril on shoots and roots fresh and dry weight:

Shoots fresh and dry weight significantly increased with low concentration (0.02%) of Dextril, while, 0.04% and 0.06% of Dextril had no significant effect compared to the control (Table 3).

(0.02 and 0.04%) of Dextril enhanced fresh and dry weight of roots compared to the control, whereas, high concentrations had a negative effects as shown in table (3).

Table(3): Effect of Dextril on shoots and roots fresh and dry weight.

Treatments	Shoot weight /g / plant		Root weight /g / plant	
	Fresh	Dry	Fresh	Dry
Control	3.9 ^a	0.64 ^a	1.15 ^a	0.11 ^a
Dextril 0.02%	4.4 ^b	0.93 ^b	1.67 ^b	0.16 ^b
Dextril 0.04%	4.2 ^{ab}	0.81 ^{ab}	1.51 ^b	0.15 ^b
Dextril 0.06%	3.7 ^{ac}	0.77 ^{abc}	1.23 ^c	0.11 ^a
Dextril 0.08%	1.8 ^d	0.38 ^d	0.45 ^d	0.06 ^c
Dextril 0.1%	1.6 ^d	0.33 ^d	0.36 ^d	0.05 ^c
LSD 5%	0.42	0.22	0.27	0.032

The stimulatory effect of low concentration of Dextril on roots fresh and dry weight may due to the enhancement of root system growth, so, mineral absorption will be stimulated and this will reflects on shoot growth (Kanade et al., (2002).



Fig (2) Effects of spraying tomato seedlings with Dextril on plant height. 1. Control. 2- Dextril 0.02%. 3- Dextril 0.04%. 4- Dextril 0.06%. 5- Dextril 0.08%. 6- Dextril 0.1 %.

Also, many studies reported that application of growth retardants like cycocel, significantly increased chlorophyll content compared to the control in groundnut genotypes (Chetti, 1991). Foliar application of TIBA (50 and 100 ppm), Mepiquat chloride (500 – 100 ppm) and lihocin (500 – 1000 ppm) at 45 days after planting, resulted in increased chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll (Pravin et al. 2001).

Kanade et al., (2002), reported that foliar application of cycocel (500 and 1000 ppm) in sunflower increased chlorophyll content significantly over control, this stimulation of chlorophyll content by growth retardants may enhance photosynthesis and consequently, improve shoot and root fresh and dry weight.

3-3- Effect of Dextril on adaptation degree of tomato seedlings after planting in field:

Tomato seedlings exhibited differences in their adapting capacity after planting in field. Treatment with Dextril (0.02 and 0.04%) increased seedlings adaptation to 100% compared to the control 90% (Table 4).

Table 4: Effect of Dextril on adaptation degree of tomato seedlings after planting in field:

Treatments	Adapting degree %	N.of days after planting to form new leaf
Control	90	5
Dextril 0.02%	100	4
Dextril 0.04%	100	4
Dextril 0.06%	90	4
Dextril 0.08%	30	8
Dextril 0.1%	30	8

High concentrations of Dextril (0.08 and 0.1%) decreased seedlings adaptation to planting. Otherwise, new leaf was formed on the plant after 4 days of planting compared to the control (5 days).

The effect of growth retardants in decreasing stem height and increasing stem diameter may produce a vigor seedling more adaptable to field conditions. Otherwise, the stimulation of root system by Dextril treatment, may as well enforce the seedling stability in the soil and increase the adaptation to field environments.

It was demonstrated that treatments with growth retardant cycocel (1500 ppm) recorded higher total phenols after 60 days (Kashid, 2008), the enhancement of plant phenols may increase the lignifications of stem cell walls, and in consequence, improve the strength of seedlings to support field planting.

Singh and Kaur (1980), reported that phenols play a paramount role in reproductive development and growth of mung bean. Phenols play a very important role in host plant interactions and it also imparts disease resistance in the plant system.

4. CONCLUSION:

This investigation has produced results suggesting that Dextril could be well used to control tomato seedlings growth and improve their quality. Where supply of low concentrations of Dextril (0.02 and 0.04%) may produce plants with desired characters could support field conditions.

REFERENCES:

- 1- Rademacher, W. Growth Retardants: Biochemical Feature and Applications in Horticulture. Acta hortic., 1995; 394: 57-73.
- 2- Rademacher, W. Growth Retardants: Effects on gibberellin biosynthesis and other metabolic pathways. Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol. Mol. Biol., 2000; 51: 501-531.
- 3- Singh, A. K. Response of pot marigold (*Calendula officinalis*) to plant regulators. Ind. J. Agric. Sci., 2004; 74: 130 – 132.
- 4- Mansuroglu, S., O. Karaguzel, V. Ortacesme and M.S. Sayan. Effect of paclobutrazol on flowering, leaf and flower colour of *Consolida orientalis*. Pak. J. Bot., 2009; 41: 2323-2332.
- 5- Caprita ,A, Rodica Caprita. Plant Growth Retardants for the Treatment of Vegetables Used as row Materials for the Food Industry. Scientifical Researches. Agro alimentary Processes and Technology, 2005; Volume XI, No,1, 173-178.

- 196 6- Hafeez-ur-Rahman, M. Asif Khan and Khalid Mahmood Khokhar; Effects of Paclobutrazol on Growth and Yield
197 of Tomato. Pakistan J. Agric. Res. 1989; Vol. 10, no. 1.
- 198 7- Cathey, H. M. Physiology of growth retarding chemicals. Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol., 1964; 15: 271- 302.
- 199 8- Likhoshirvo, F. N. The uses of growth retardants to resist lodges of Graminae crops. Plant protect. J. 2007;
200 (2):31-34. (In Russian).
- 201 9- Matysiak, K. Influence of trinexapac-ethyl on growth and development of winter J. of plant protection
202 research / Inst. of plant protection, Polish acad. of science. – Poznan-Warsaw. 2006; Vol. 46, (2) : 133-143.
- 203 10- Maciorowski, R.M; K. Werwinska;Z. Nita; Stankowski . The reaction of naked and hulled oat on growth
204 regulators treatment at different nitrogen Biuletyn Institute Hodowli i Aklimatyzacji Roslin. Warszawa. 2006; N.
205 239:137-146.
- 206 11- Jocov, B. C. The uses of growth stimuli and retardants on vegetables. Agric. Bullet. 51. Moscow. 1990. (In
207 Russian).
- 208 12- El. Shhat, N. A. Plant hormones and their agricultural application. Cairo, Madbolli publ. 1990; 607 pp. (In
209 Arabic).
- 210 13- Bezuglova, O. C . Fertilizers and Regulators. Rastov, Ed. Feniks 316 PP . 2000. (In Russian).
- 211 14- Dicks, J. Mode of action of growth retardants. In Recent development in the use of plant growth retardants -
212 British plant Growth Regulator Group, Monograph N4, London : 1980; 1-14.
- 213 15- Nagy and Tabi, - Bezuglova, O. C . 2000. Fertilizers and Regulators. Rastov, Ed. Feniks . 1982; 316 PP. (In
214 Russian).
- 215 16- Budekeyna, N. B. and L. F. Temeco. The effect of Benycol substance on tomato plants in greenhouses. Agric. J.
216 2007; (10): 32-34. Moscow. (In Russian).
- 217 17- Budekeyna, N. B. Studying the effect of CCC on tomato seedlings grown under greenhouse conditions. Plant
218 protect. J. 1998; (2): 45 – 47. Moscow (In Russian).
- 219 18- El-Asdoudi, A.H. Incidence of tomato fruits with cracking and blossom-end rot and its relation to chlormequat
220 (CCC) spraying Ann. Agr. Sc, 1993; Vol. 38: 637- 642.
- 221 19- Czapski, J; M. Horbowicz; J. Borkowski. Effect of chlormequat (CCC) on the accumulation of ethephon in
222 tomatoes and on ethephon-stimulated ripening Acta agrobot. Warszawa. 1990; 41(1) :39-45.
- 223 20- Malivania, N. N., N. B. Budekeyana, T. F. Alexiyafa. The effectiveness of Sercon on potato and cauliflower
224 plants. Agric. Chemist. J. 2007; (9):32-37. Moscow. (In Russian).
- 225 21- Avakyan, A. G. The effectiveness of the growth retardant on tomato plants under greenhouse
226 conditions (long-term growth season). Vegetable Sci. J. 2000; (4): 89 – 91. (In Russian).
- 227 22- Hickman, G. W; E.J. Perry; R. J. Mullen. Growth regulator controls tomato transplant height. Calif.
228 Agr. 1999; 43.(5) :19 -20.
- 229 23- Genchew, S.; K. Miler. Effect of the retardant chlorcholinechloride (ccc) on plastid pigments content of
230 tomatoes plant Growth Regulators . 1983; 585-590.
- 231 24- Lovett, G.V. and Orchard, P.W. Morphological and anatomical changes in sunflower by chloromepiquat and
232 their possible significance. In: proceeding of the 6th International sunflower association, Newel and University
233 Armidal, Astralia. 1981; Pp. 323-331.
- 234 25- Hatley, O.E., Roth, G.W., Marshall, H.G. and R.R.JR. Effect of management practices on gran yirld test weight
235 and lodging of sorghum. Agron. J. 1985; 76 (3): 379-383.

236 26- Mehetre, S.S., and Lad, S.K. Effect of foliar application of growth substances on growth and yield. Soyabean
 237 genetics newsletter, 1995; 22: 132-134.

238 27- Saisankar, S. Influence of plant growth regulators, chemicals and nutrients on productivity potential in green
 239 gram [*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczak]. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agril. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka, India; 2001.

240 28- Whipker, B. E., Mc Call, I. Response of potted sunflower cultivars to damidonide foliar sprays and
 241 paclobutrazol drenches. Hort. Technol., 2000; 10 (1): 209-211.

242 29- Hanchinamath, P.V. Effect of plant growth regulators, organics and nutrients on growth physiology and yield in
 243 clusterbean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* L. Taub). M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agril. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka,
 244 India; 2005.

245 30- Moore, T. C., Biochemistry and Physiology of Plant Hormone, Narosja publishing house, New Delhi, 1980;
 246 107-131.

247 31- Grossman, K., Plant retardants as tool in physiological research. Physiol. Plantarum 1990; 78: 642-648.

248 32- Chetti, M. B. Evaluation of Chamatkar on groundnut. Pestology, ., 1991; 25: 43-50.

249 33- Pravin Prakash, Chetti, M. B. and Hosmani, R. M. Influence of plant growth regulators on physiological
 250 parameters and their relationship with yield IPS and tuber propagated potato. Ann. Pl. Physiol., 2001; 14 (1): 16-20.

251 34- Kanade, B. C., Patil, A. J., Zope, R. E. and Kankal, V. Y. Influence of foliar spray of cycocel on growth and
 252 yield attributes of safflower. J. Maharashtra Agril. Univ., ., 2002; 27 (1): 49-51.

253 35- Kashid, Dinesh A. Effect of growth retardants on growth, physiology and yield in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*
 254 L.), Thesis submitted to the University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad 2008.

255 36- Singh, G. and Kaur, M. Effect of growth regulators on pudding and yield of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.
 256 Wilczek). Indian J. Pl. Physiol., 1980; 23: 366-370.

257

258

259