



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2023; 12(7): 299-302  
© 2023 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 11-04-2023  
Accepted: 29-05-2023

**Pushpendra Singh Yadav**  
M.Sc., Department of  
Horticulture, Faculty of  
Agricultural Sciences and Allied  
Industries, Rama University,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Jitendra Kumar**  
Assistant Professor, Department  
of Horticulture, Faculty of  
Agricultural Sciences and Allied  
Industries, Rama University,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Vinay Joseph Silas**  
Teaching Associate, Department  
of Horticulture, Faculty of  
Agricultural Sciences and Allied  
Industries, Rama University,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Mohit Lal Surendra Kumar**  
Assistant Professor, Department  
of Agricultural Statistics, CSSS  
PG College Machhra, Meerut  
Uttar Pradesh, India

**Braj Kishor**  
Research Scholar, Department of  
Vegetable Science, CSAUA&T,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Pushpendra Singh Yadav**  
M.Sc., Department of  
Horticulture, Faculty of  
Agricultural Sciences and Allied  
Industries, Rama University,  
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

## Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on plant growth, yield and quality traits of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* Mill.) var. Pusa Ruby

**Pushpendra Singh Yadav, Jitendra Kumar, Vinay Joseph Silas, Mohit Lal Surendra Kumar and Braj Kishor**

### Abstract

Present investigation entitled "Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on plant growth, yield and quality traits of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* Mill.) var. Pusa Ruby" was conducted during the Rabi season of 2022 - 23 at Agriculture Research Farm, Rama university, Mandhana, Kanpur. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments viz. T<sub>1</sub> = Control, T<sub>2</sub> = FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha, T<sub>3</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha, T<sub>4</sub> = Neemmanure @ 5 t/ha T<sub>5</sub> = Biovita Granules @ 20 kg/ha, T<sub>6</sub> = Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha, T<sub>7</sub> = FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha, T<sub>8</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha and T<sub>9</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha. The result of the study revealed that the maximum plant height (156.40cm), Number of leaves (98.50), leaf area index (0.960cm), canopy spread (0.243), Days to first flower (40.4), Number of branches per plant (18.49), Number of flowers / plant (32.29), Number of fruit/ plant (20.06), fruit diameter (7.02cm), fruit weight (68.80gm), TSS(6.22° Brix), Ascorbic acid (22.620mg/ 100gm), Reducing sugar, (3.740%), total sugar (4.120%) yield per plot (31.41) and B:C ratio (3.15). Basis on these results treatment T<sub>6</sub> can be suggested to the local farmer of Kanpur regions to obtain higher yield and net return in tomato.

**Keywords:** Tomato, organic manures, biofertilizers, *Solanum lycopersicum*

### Introduction

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) is one of the most important vegetable crops belong to the family *solanaceae*. Due to its greater flexibility in varied agro-climatic conditions, it is produced all over the world for fresh and processed applications. It originated in Peru, Equador and Bolivia regions of Central and South America (Vavilov, 1951) [5].

A fresh tomato fruit contains Calories 18 g, Fat 0.2 g, Sodium 5.0 mg, Potassium 237 mg, Carbohydrate 3.0 g, Protein 0.9 g, Vitamin C 22%, Iron 1%. It has also been reported useful in controlling liver problems, indigestion, arthritis and urinary disorders (Chauhan, 1983) [1]. Its adaptability in both fresh and processed forms has greatly contributed to its quick and widespread acceptance as a significant food product. Its worth is second only to potatoes, but its processing capabilities are the best of all the vegetables. (Sandhu *et al.* 1990) [3]. It is grown throughout the world both in open as well as under protected conditions. In India tomato is grown over an area of 0.81 M hectares with an annual production of 21003 Mt and in Madhya Pradesh, area 37 thousand hectare followed by Haryana 14 hectare, Uttar Pradesh 12.8 thousand hectare, Himachal Pradesh area under tomato is 1.3 thousand hectares and production is 577 Mt. (Horticultural Statistics division DAC & FW, 2020-21). To meet out requirement vegetable of the country there is a necessity to increase the production as well as the productivity. By providing high-quality inputs, one can boost crop production. The most crucial input in any agricultural production programme, seed determines whether a crop will succeed or fail. Without wholesome, high-quality seed, every dollar spent on additional inputs is wasted. One of the most crucial requirements for increasing crop output is good quality seed. Due to the usage of chemical fertilisers, vegetable and high-quality seed output has greatly expanded during the "green revolution." Because they are a labor-intensive crop and a heavy feeder, tomatoes require a lot of organic and inorganic fertilizers (Gajbhiye *et al.* 2003). The extensive use of chemical fertilizers has led to soil sickness, ecological hazards and depletion of non-renewable sources of energy. Moreover, they deteriorate the quality of the produce and are expensive too, leading to reduction in net profit returns to the farmers.

On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence that the intensive agricultural systems have also caused decline in vitamins and mineral contents Introduction 2 of fresh fruits and vegetables. Excessive use of nitrogen fertilizers and imbalanced use of fertilizers have resulted in yield stagnation and deterioration of soil health and poor quality of the vegetable produce. Proper and regular application of farm organic wastes and bio-inoculants are of utmost importance in maintaining the fertility and productivity of agricultural soils (Yadav, 2010) [2]. Organic farming leads to reduction in total crop yield by 9.2 percent, but it provides higher net profits to the farmers by 22.0 percent as compared to conventional farming due the availability of premium prices (20-40%) for the certified organic produce and reduction in cost of cultivation by 11.7 percent (Ramesh *et al.* 2010) [2].

Every year, the demand and acceptance of organic farming is increasing at the rate of 2025 percent. In India, efforts are being made for organic farming of spices, tea, coffee, flowers and vegetables. In the world, organic farming is done in an area of 32.2 lakh hectare, in 141 countries. The certified area under this is 7.2 lakh hectare. In India, total area under organic farming by March, 2009 was 1.2 lakh hectare, out of which 51000 hectare is certified. A total of 7, 14,000 farmers are engaged in organic farming in India (Paul and Rameshwar, 2010) [4].

Biofertilizers help in improving biological activities of desirable microorganisms in the soil and also improve the crop yield and quality of produce. The microorganisms like *Azotobacter* are considered important not only for their nitrogen fixing efficiency, but also for their ability to produce antibacterial, antifungal compound and growth regulators. Likewise, some phosphate solubilizing microbes like PSB are

found to be effective in improving phosphorous use efficiency. Moreover, traditional organic manures release the nutrients slowly, hence their effect is exhibited not only on the instant crop but it is also reflected on the performance of the other succeeding crops (Kumar and Srivastava, 2006). Therefore, the only way to produce high-quality fruits and seed without having a negative impact on the ecology and health of the soil is to employ organic manures and biofertilizers. Attempts have been made in the current studies to use organic manures and biofertilizers for tomato fruit and seed yield with the following general aims in mind:

### Material and Method

Present investigation entitled “Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on plant growth, yield and quality traits of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* Mill.)” var. Pusa Ruby” was conducted during the Rabi season of 2022 - 23 at Agriculture Research Farm, Rama university, Mandhana, Kanpur. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and nine treatments *viz.* T<sub>1</sub> = Control, T<sub>2</sub> = FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha, T<sub>3</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha, T<sub>4</sub> = Neemmanure @ 5 t/ha T<sub>5</sub> = Biovita Granules @ 20 kg/ha, T<sub>6</sub> = Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha, T<sub>7</sub> = FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha, T<sub>8</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha and T<sub>9</sub> = Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha. The crop was raised at spacing of 90 X 30 cm and plot size of 3.6 X 2.4 m. Standard culture practices recommended for cauliflower was followed uniformly in all experimental plots. Experimental data was subjected to statistical analysis as per the standard statistical procedure given by Gomez and Gomez (1984).

**Table 1:** Growth and yield parameters

| Treatments  | Growth Parameters |                  |                 |        |               | Yield Parameters           |                               |                   |                       |
|---|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
|   | Plant Height      | Number of leaves | Leaf Area Index | Canopy | Branch Length | Days taken to first flower | Number of Branche's per plant | Number of flowers | Number of fruit plant |
| T <sub>1</sub> =Control   | 138.30            | 73.10            | 0.650           | 0.114  | 42.520        | 45.8                       | 11.68                         | 20.28             | 10.30                 |
| T <sub>2</sub> =FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha   | 141.40            | 76.70            | 0.690           | 0.145  | 44.310        | 44.5                       | 13.44                         | 22.54             | 12.60                 |
| T <sub>3</sub> =Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha   | 143.20            | 80.40            | 0.740           | 0.155  | 45.470        | 44.0                       | 13.45                         | 23.05             | 13.30                 |
| T <sub>4</sub> = Neemmanure @ 5 t/ha  | 145.40            | 83.40            | 0.790           | 0.166  | 46.540        | 43.7                       | 14.33                         | 24.73             | 15.06                 |
| T <sub>5</sub> = Biovita Granules @ 20 kg/ha  | 147.80            | 86.40            | 0.830           | 0.187  | 47.630        | 43.2                       | 15.45                         | 25.55             | 16.60                 |
| T <sub>6</sub> = Biofertilizers ( <i>Azotobacter</i> + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha              | 156.40            | 98.50            | 0.960           | 0.243  | 52.410        | 40.4                       | 18.49                         | 32.29             | 20.60                 |
| T <sub>7</sub> =FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers ( <i>Azotobacter</i> ) @ 5 kg/ha | 153.60            | 95.60            | 0.910           | 0.226  | 51.260        | 41.2                       | 18.01                         | 30.51             | 20.06                 |
| T <sub>8</sub> =Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha                        | 151.50            | 92.30            | 0.880           | 0.205  | 50.020        | 41.6                       | 17.83                         | 29.93             | 18.60                 |
| T <sub>9</sub> = Neemmanure @ 5 t/ha + Biofertilizers (KSB) @ 5 kg/ha                         | 149.20            | 90.40            | 0.850           | 0.196  | 48.850        | 42.3                       | 16.55                         | 27.25             | 17.30                 |
| CV %  | 1.34              | 2.321            | 0.007           | 0.127  | 1.875         | 1.223                      | 0.217                         | 0.246             | 0.332                 |
| C.D.  | 5.717             | 4.211            | 0.021           | 0.008  | 1.562         | 2.345                      | 0.458                         | 0.744             | 0.681                 |

**Table 1:** Fruit and yield diameter weight

|  | Fruit Diameter | Fruit Weight | Yield per plot | Yield per hectare | TSS   | Ascorbic Acid | Reducing Sugar | Total Sugar | B:C Ratio |
|--|----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| Control  | 3.20           | 50.10        | 22.78          |                   | 4.200 | 14.940        | 1.810          | 7           | 1.58      |
| T <sub>1</sub> =Control                                    | 3.90           | 52.30        | 24.29          |                   | 4.600 | 16.150        | 1.860          | 3.320       | 1.86      |
| T <sub>2</sub> =FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha                | 4.40           | 54.60        | 25.15          |                   | 4.800 | 17.320        | 1.920          | 3.570       | 2.05      |
| T <sub>3</sub> =Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha                      | 4.90           | 57.80        | 26.63          |                   | 5.000 | 18.460        | 1.980          | 3.650       | 2.16      |
| T <sub>4</sub> = Neemmanure @ 5 t/ha                       | 5.70           | 59.40        | 27.35          |                   | 5.200 | 19.630        | 2.010          | 3.740       | 2.32      |
| T <sub>5</sub> = Biovita Granules @ 20 kg/ha               | 7.30           | 68.80        | 32.49          |                   | 6.00  | 22.00         | 2.540          | 4.260       | 3.00      |
| T <sub>6</sub> = Biofertilizers ( <i>Azotobacter</i> + PSB | 7.02           | 66.50        | 31.41          |                   | 6.200 | 22.620        | 2.480          | 4.120       | 3.15      |

|  |       |       |       |  |       |        |       |       |      |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha  |       |       |       |  |       |        |       |       |      |
| T7 =FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers( <i>Azotobacter</i> ) @ 5 kg/ha | 6.70  | 64.20 | 31.03 |  | 6.000 | 21.740 | 2.320 | 4.050 | 2.74 |
| T8=Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5kg/ha                         | 6.10  | 62.40 | 28.75 |  | 5.600 | 20.880 | 2.190 | 3.840 | 2.51 |
| CV%  | 0.099 | 0.709 | 0.193 |  | 0.085 | 0.310  | 0.028 | 0.045 | 1.58 |
| C.D.   | 0.300 | 2.144 | 0.584 |  | 0.256 | 0.938  |       |       | 1.86 |

## Result

The plant height was ranges from 138.30 cm to 156.40 cm. The maximum plant height was recorded in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*+PSB+KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} and followed by the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha} and minimum plant height (138.30 cm) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The maximum number of leaves per plant i.e. 98.5 recorded in T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers *Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} were significantly higher over all but followed by T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. Lowest no of leaves i.e. 73.1 were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The significantly higher leaf area index was recorded i.e. 0.96 in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> followed by the 0.91 and 0.88 which is present in the treatment T<sub>7</sub> and treatment T<sub>8</sub>. The lowest leaf area index in noticed i.e. 0.65 in the treatment control.

The maximum canopy m<sup>2</sup> was recoded i.e 0.243 m<sup>2</sup> in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by 0.226 m<sup>2</sup> in the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum canopy was found in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by 0.145 m<sup>2</sup> in the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha}.

The maximum branch length was recoded i.e 52.41 cm in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by 51.26 cm in the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum length of branch (42.52 cm) was found in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by 44.31 cm in the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha}.

The range of first flower appearance was noticed from the 40.4<sup>th</sup> day to 45.8<sup>th</sup> day in different treatment. The earliest flower appear in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. The last flower appearance was noticed in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> followed by the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha} and T<sub>3</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha}.

The growth of branches in plants found significant because of proper availability of nutrients in available form. The maximum no. of branches i.e 18.49 was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} which is significant over all treatment followed by (18.01) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum no. of branches i.e 11.68 was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The maximum no. of flower i.e 32.29 was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} which is significant over all treatment followed by (30.51) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha +

Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum no. of flower i.e 20.28 was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by (22.54) the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha}.

The maximum no. of fruits (20.60) were found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} which is significant over all treatment followed by (20.06) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and treatment T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum no. of fruits i.e 10.30 were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by (12.60) the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha} and treatment T<sub>3</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha}.

The maximum diameter of fruit (7.3 cm) was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (7.02 cm) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum diameter of fruit i.e 3.2 cm was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control). The maximum fruit weight of 68.68g. was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (66.50 g) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The minimum fruit weight of 50.10 g was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The maximum yield per plot (32.49 kg) was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (31.41 kg.) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and (31.03 kg) treatment T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. The least fruit yield per plot i.e 22.78 kg. was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by (24.29 kg.) the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha} and treatment T<sub>3</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha}. The maximum TSS in fruit (6.6 ° Brix) was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (6.2° Brix) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha}. The lowest TSS in fruit i.e 4.2° Brix was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The highest ascorbic acid in fruit (22.68 mg) was recorded in the in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (22.12 mg) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and treatment T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. The lowest ascorbic acid in fruit (14.94 mg) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by (16.15 mg) the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha} and treatment T<sub>3</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha}.

The maximum reducing sugar in fruit (2.54%) was found in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5

kg/ha}. The least reducing sugar in fruit i.e 1.81% was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control).

The highest total sugar in fruit (4.26%) was recorded in the in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha} followed by (4.12%) the treatment T<sub>7</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter*) @ 5 kg/ha} and treatment T<sub>8</sub> {Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha + Biofertilizers (PSB) @ 5 kg/ha}. The lowest total sugar 3.04% in fruit was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control) followed by 3.30% and 3.57% which is present in the treatment T<sub>2</sub> {FYM Poultry manure @ 8 t/ha} and treatment T<sub>3</sub>{Vermicompost @ 8 t/ha} respectively.

The highest gross return (379995 Rs.), net return (259361 Rs.) and cost benefit ratio (3.15) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>6</sub> {Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha}. Whereas lowest gross return (167574 Rs.), net return (61514 Rs.) and cost benefit ratio (1.58) were recorded in the control treatment.

### Conclusion

The experiment entitled “Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on plant growth”, yield and quality traits of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* Mill.) var. Pusa Ruby”. was conducted on Agricultural Research Farm, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and Allied Industries, Rama University, Kanpur during the *Rabi* season of 2022-23. It was finally observed that the treatment combination ({Biofertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB + KSB) each @ 5 kg/ha}) consisted biofertilizers that increases the growth in term of plant height, no. of branches, branch length, no of branches, no. of flower per plant, leaf area, canopy, quality production in terms of number of fruits per plant, yield per plot, TSS, ascorbic acid, reducing sugar, total sugar. The profit of the cultivation of control treatment had non-significant result because there is no organic manures and biofertilizers are used.

The continuous use of fertilizers reduces the soil capacity for long terms but use of organic manure and biofertilizers helps in improving the soil texture, soil structure, water holding capacity and health of soil and human as well.

### References

1. Chauhan DVS. Vegetable Production in India. Ram Prasad and Sons, Agra; c1983. p. 297.
2. Ramesh P, Panwar NR, Singh AB, Ramana S, Yadav SK, Shrivastava Rahul, *et al.* Status of organic farming in India. *Current Science*. 2010;98(9):1190-1194.
3. Sandhu KS, Cheema DS, Singh S. Studies on the varietal differences in physio-chemical characters of some tomato varieties. *Beverage and Food World*. 1990;17:34-35.
4. Paul YS, Rameshwar. *Jaivik Krishi Prabandhan*. Palampur (HP): S. multicolour offset printing press; c2010. p. 6.
5. Vavilov NI. The origin, variation, immunity and breeding of cultivated plants. *Chronica Botanica*. 1951;13:1-66.