



# DEVELOPMENT OF INFLORESCENCE AS INFLUENCED BY PLANTING GEOMETRY AND NITROGEN LEVELS IN GOLDEN ROD (*SOLIDAGO CANADENSIS* L.)

Anushri Agrawal\*, A. V. D. Dorajeerao, V. Vijaya Bhaskar and D. R. Salomi Suneetha

Department of Floriculture and Landscape Architecture, Dr. Y.S.R. Horticultural University, H.C.R.I., Venkataramannagudem - 534 101, West Godavari district (Andhra Pradesh), India.

## Abstract

An investigation was carried out during 2014-15, on effect of planting geometry and nitrogen levels on panicle development and yield of golden rod to understand its developmental phases and time vested with the producers and consumers to handle the material before it is put to ultimate use. It has shown significant differences among the nitrogen doses and planting geometry levels. The study revealed that lower dose of nitrogen ( $0 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) with closer spacing ( $30 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$ ) took minimum number of days to initiation of first panicle, 50% flowering, complete flowering, first floret opening, completion of all floret opening followed by  $100 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  of nitrogen and  $45 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$  spacing respectively, whereas, higher dose of nitrogen ( $300 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) with wider spacing ( $45 \text{ cm} \times 30 \text{ cm}$ ) delayed withering of apical florets. However, maximum numbers of marketable panicles  $\text{plot}^{-1}$  were recorded with  $300 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  nitrogen with  $30 \text{ cm} \times 30 \text{ cm}$  spacing.

**Key words :** Golden rod, panicle, planting geometry.

## Introduction

Golden rod is a herbaceous perennial botanically known as *Solidago canadensis* L. It belongs to the family Asteraceae and is a perennial flower crop cultivated for attractive flower stalk. The genus *Solidago* is native to North America (Biswas and Parya, 2008). The bloom is a pyramid-shaped cluster of many tiny flowers, which are yellow in colour. The inflorescence of golden rod is very complex in nature. Each small head consist several disc florets. Heads are axillary, solitary on main axis as well as on branches and on small branchlets forming a whole compound flower stalk with golden yellow inflorescence. The blooms are very attractive as cut flowers and are used in bouquets as filler material and for floral arrangements. Golden rod is also used as a dry flower and outdoor ornamental plant. Golden rod is one such crop that attracts anincreasing attention, because of its extensive use as filler material and interior decorations. Considering the importance and increasing popularity of the golden rod. It is felt important to study the performance of the crop under different planting geometry levels and nitrogen doses in order to find out the optimum values.

## Materials and Methods

The present investigation was carried out at Horticultural College and Research Institute, Venkataramannagudem (Andhra Pradesh), India in 2014-15 to study the effect of nitrogen levels and planting geometry on growth and yield of golden rod. Sixteen treatment combinations with four levels of nitrogen ( $0$ ,  $100$ ,  $200$  and  $300 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and four levels of planting geometry ( $45 \text{ cm} \times 30 \text{ cm}$ ,  $30 \text{ cm} \times 30 \text{ cm}$ ,  $45 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$  and  $30 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$ ) were tried in factorial randomized block design with three replications. Half dose of nitrogen was applied as per the treatment before planting and the remaining half dose of nitrogen was applied after 45 days of planting. However, potash and phosphorus were applied as a basal dose before planting. The data recorded on all parameters were analyzed by the ANOVA technique as described by Panse and Sukhatme (1967). The treatment means were compared using the critical difference values calculated at 5 per cent level of significance.

## Results and Discussion

### Number of days taken for first panicle initiation

Different levels of nitrogen and planting geometry levels had shown significant influence on number of days

\*Author for correspondence

taken for first panicle emergence (table 1). Among nitrogen levels, the first panicle emergence was earlier (52.96 days) in  $N_1$  followed by  $N_2$  (55.65 days). The minimum number of days taken for first panicle emergence (54.10 days) in closer spacing ( $S_4$ ) followed by  $S_3$  (56.34 days) among planting geometry levels. Number of days taken for first panicle initiation were maximum (60.41 days) with highest dose of nitrogen whereas plants with wider spacing ( $S_1$ ) recorded maximum value (58.90 days). The interaction of  $N_1S_4$  recorded earliest panicle emergence (49.41 days) in terms of first panicle initiation and  $N_1S_4$  was on par with  $N_2S_4$  (52.16 days) and  $N_1S_3$  (52.17 days) whereas, maximum delay in panicle emergence was observed in  $N_4S_1$  (61.60 days), it was on par with  $N_4S_2$  (61.17 days) and  $N_3S_1$  (60.47 days).

#### **Number of days taken for 50% flowering (50% plants showing panicle initiation)**

Significant differences were noticed with respect to number of days taken for 50% flowering among the different levels of nitrogen and planting geometry (table 1).  $N_1$  level took the least number of days for 50% flowering (74.90 days) and was on par with  $N_2$  (76.28 days) whereas, maximum days (82.64 days) was recorded by  $N_4$ . Among planting geometry levels  $S_4$  level was the earliest (75.01 days) was on par with  $S_3$  (77.03 days) and  $S_1$  registered maximum days (82.25 days) in respect of 50% flowering. Among the interactions, the treatment combination of  $N_1S_4$  (70.86 days) was the earliest for 50% flowering, was on par with  $N_2S_4$  (73.28 days),  $N_2S_3$  (74.56 days) and  $N_1S_3$  (74.83 days). On the other side, maximum delay in 50% flowering was recorded by  $N_4S_1$  (86.35 days) among the interactions.

#### **Number of days taken for complete flowering**

There were significant differences among the nitrogen levels and planting geometry levels with regard to complete flowering (table 1).

Among nitrogen levels  $N_1$  recorded minimum days (80.75 days) for complete flowering followed by  $N_2$  level (83.59 days). Among planting geometry levels  $S_4$  recorded minimum days for complete flowering (82.34 days) followed by  $S_3$  (83.91 days). With respect to interactions, best value (78.67 days) was recorded by  $N_1S_4$  level and was on par with  $N_1S_3$  (79.89 days) and  $N_2S_4$  (81.02 days). The maximum delay (89.83 days) was registered by  $N_4S_1$  level and was on par with  $N_4S_2$  (88.32 days) and  $N_3S_1$  (88.04 days) among interactions whereas,  $N_4$  (87.72 days) and  $S_1$  (86.62 days) were late in complete flowering. In golden rod, the inflorescence is capitulum, but it appears like a small floret and stalked. Numerous capitula arise

on the branched plageotropic portion of the main stem which gives an appearance of panicle with a few leaves arising in between. In the present study, the earliest flowering was observed by the application of no nitrogen or lower dose of nitrogen. There was significant delay in the higher doses *i.e.*  $N_3$  and  $N_4$ , however the difference between them was not significant with respect to days taken for first panicle initiation. The widest spacing of 45 cm x 30 cm ( $S_1$ ) took maximum number of days for first panicle initiation, 50% flowering and complete flowering. The plants at 30 cm x 30 cm spacing also took similar amount of time, which was statistical on par with 45 cm x 30 cm in respect of these values.

This might be due to increased vigour and enhanced vegetative growth of plants receiving 200 and 300 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of nitrogen and those spaced at 45 cm x 30 cm as well as 30 cm x 30 cm. These plants as a result of maximum uptake of nutrients by individual plant might have diverted maximum proportion of photosynthates into vegetative parts in the initial life significantly postponing their transition into reproductive phase. Further late occurrence in the developmental phases *viz.*, 50% flowering, complete flowering, first harvesting and second panicle initiation might be prospective to the time taken for first initiation of panicles by the highly nurtured and widely spaced plants. However, an early panicle initiation and flowering in plants with least supply of nitrogen and closer planting geometry might be due to early physiological maturity of plants as a result of their minimum vegetative growth of plant compared to wider spacing. These results are in concurrence with the findings of those reported by Jadhav *et al.* (2014) in calendula, Naidu *et al.* (2014) in marigold, Sharma *et al.* (2010) in marigold, Venugopal and Patil (2010) in helichrysum and Mane *et al.* (2006) in tuberose.

#### **Number of days taken for first floret opening in a panicle**

The data presented for the number of days taken for first floret opening was significantly influenced by different levels of nitrogen and planting geometry (table 2). The minimum number of days taken for first floret opening (7.58 days) was recorded by  $N_1$  level was on par with  $N_2$  (7.96 days) whereas,  $N_4$  recorded maximum number of days (8.62 days) for first floret opening. Among planting geometry levels,  $S_4$  recorded the minimum number of days for first floret opening (7.03 days) and was on par with  $S_3$  (7.32 days) on the other hand,  $S_1$  recorded maximum number of days (9.42 days). With respect to interactions,  $N_1S_4$  recorded minimum number of days (6.42 days) and it was on par with  $N_2S_4$  (6.76

days) and  $N_1S_3$  (6.78 days). The delay in first floret opening was observed in  $N_4S_1$  (9.86 days) and it was on par with  $N_4S_2$  (9.18 days) and  $N_3S_1$  (9.68 days).

#### **Number of days taken for completion of all florets opening in a panicle**

Significant differences were noticed with respect to number of days taken for completion of floret opening among the different levels of nitrogen and planting geometry (table 2).  $N_1$  level was earlier for completion of floret opening (14.27 days) and was on par with  $N_2$  (14.98 days) whereas, among planting geometry levels  $S_4$  level was the earlier (13.15 days) was on par with  $S_3$  (13.69 days). Among the interactions, the treatment combination of  $N_1S_4$  (12.01 days) was the earliest for completion of floret opening compare to all the combinations and was on par with  $N_2S_4$  (12.67 days) and  $N_1S_3$  (12.70 days).

The maximum delay in all floret opening was recorded with  $N_4S_1$  (18.43 days) and was on par with  $N_4S_2$  (17.62 days) and  $N_3S_1$  (18.09 days) among interactions. Among nitrogen levels,  $N_4$  was late for completion of all florets opening whereas, in respect of planting geometry levels, wider spacing ( $S_1$ ) registered maximum days (17.62 days).

#### **Number of days taken for withering of apical florets in a panicle**

Significant differences were noticed with respect to number of days taken for withering of apical florets among the different levels of nitrogen, planting geometry and their interactions (table 2). Among nitrogen levels,  $N_4$  level took the maximum number of days for withering of apical florets (19.55 days) and was on par with  $N_3$  (18.84 days) whereas, among planting geometry levels,  $S_1$  level was the best (21.27 days) in terms of days to withering of apical florets, was on par with  $S_2$  (19.95 days). Among the interactions, the treatment combination of  $N_4S_1$  (22.32 days) was the best and was on par with  $N_3S_1$  (21.91 days) and  $N_4S_2$  (21.08 days). The early (17.11 days) withering of apical floret were recorded by lower level of nitrogen ( $N_1$ ) whereas, among spacing  $S_4$  registered least value (15.84 days). The interaction of  $N_1S_4$  was earlier (14.46 days) for withering of apical florets and was on par with  $N_2S_4$  (15.27 days) and  $N_1S_3$  (15.26 days).

It has shown significant differences among the nitrogen doses and planting geometry levels. Application of nitrogen at 300 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was on par with 200 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with respect to days taken for first floret opening, completion of floret opening and withering of apical

florets. Though, they are on par with each other differ significantly with lower doses since they haddelayed occurrence of floret developmental stages. Thus, the high levels of nitrogen at  $N_3$  and  $N_4$  doses gave maximum time for handling the spikes since they took different stages of bloom and consequent withering in a much delayed manner when compared to  $N_2$ . This might be due to more vegetative growth triggered by higher nitrogen application and the shoots stand at low C: N ratio thereby leading to delay in onset of flowering and occurrence of maturation stages of the bloom. Similar results were also obtained by Verma *et al.* (2012) in gladiolus and Monish *et al.* (2008) in china aster.

Similarly at wider spacing the plants took maximum time to show first floret opening, completion of all florets opening and withering apical florets indicating that the golden rods harvested from the spacing of 45 cm × 30 cm and 30 cm × 30 cm would show the phases of bloom in a delayed fashion giving more time for their utility. Wide spaced plants giving good spikes or flowers was also reported by Jadhav *et al.* (2014) in calendula, Naidu *et al.* (2014) in marigold, Sharma *et al.* (2010) in marigold, Venugopal and Patil (2010) in helichrysum and Mane *et al.* (2006) in tuberose.

#### **Number of panicles per plot**

The graded levels of nitrogen, planting geometry and their interactions showed significant influence on the number of panicles per plot (table 3). The nitrogen level  $N_4$  recorded the highest number of panicles per plot (71.88). Among planting geometry levels,  $S_4$  was the best with 109.32 panicles per plot followed by  $S_3$  (74.56) and  $S_2$  (56.66). Among the interactions, the treatment combination of  $N_4S_4$  recorded the highest number of panicles per plot (111.08) was on par with  $N_3S_4$  (109.23). The minimum number of panicles per plot (67.76) was recorded by  $N_1$  among nitrogen levels. Among planting geometry levels,  $S_1$  registered the minimum number of panicles per plot (38.00). With respect to the interactions,  $N_1S_1$  registered the least number of panicles per plot (36.09).

#### **Number of marketable panicles per plot**

The data on number of marketable panicles per plot as influenced by various levels of nitrogen, planting geometry and their interactions were presented in table 3. Among nitrogen levels the highest number of marketable panicles per plot (42.53) were recorded with  $N_4$  and it was on par with  $N_3$  (40.47). Among planting geometry levels,  $S_2$  recorded highest number of marketable panicles per plot (38.80) was on with  $S_1$  (31.00) and  $S_3$  (29.35). The interaction of  $N_4S_2$  was best with

**Table 1 :** Effect of nitrogen levels, planting geometry and their interaction on different phases of panicle development in golden rod.

Nitrogen level Planting geometry	Days to first panicle initiation					50% flowering					Complete flowering				
	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean
S <sub>1</sub>	55.63	57.90	60.47	61.60	<b>58.90</b>	78.45	80.74	83.45	86.35	<b>82.25</b>	82.78	85.83	88.04	89.83	<b>86.62</b>
S <sub>2</sub>	54.63	57.34	58.33	61.17	<b>57.87</b>	75.44	76.55	79.56	83.44	<b>78.75</b>	81.66	84.62	86.38	88.32	<b>85.25</b>
S <sub>3</sub>	52.17	55.20	58.10	59.87	<b>56.34</b>	74.83	74.56	77.42	81.32	<b>77.03</b>	79.89	82.90	85.44	87.40	<b>83.91</b>
S <sub>4</sub>	49.41	52.16	55.81	59.01	<b>54.10</b>	70.86	73.28	76.44	79.46	<b>75.01</b>	78.67	81.02	84.33	85.34	<b>82.34</b>
Mean	<b>52.96</b>	<b>55.65</b>	<b>58.18</b>	<b>60.41</b>	<b>56.80</b>	<b>74.90</b>	<b>76.28</b>	<b>79.22</b>	<b>82.64</b>	<b>78.26</b>	<b>80.75</b>	<b>83.59</b>	<b>86.05</b>	<b>87.72</b>	<b>84.53</b>
	S.Em.±		CD at 5%			S.Em.±		CD at 5%			S.Em.±		CD at 5%		
N	0.71		2.15			0.76		2.30			0.51		1.53		
S	0.70		2.10			0.77		2.31			0.46		1.38		
N × S	1.16		3.51			1.38		4.17			1.06		3.20		

**Table 2 :** Effect of nitrogen levels, planting geometry and their interaction on development phases of inflorescence in golden rod.

Nitrogen level Planting geometry	Days to first floret opening					Completion of all floret opening					Withering of apical florets				
	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	mean	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	mean	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean
S <sub>1</sub>	8.90	9.26	9.68	9.86	<b>9.42</b>	16.64	17.32	18.09	18.43	<b>17.62</b>	19.88	20.98	21.91	22.32	<b>21.27</b>
S <sub>2</sub>	8.19	8.60	8.75	9.18	<b>8.68</b>	15.73	16.51	16.80	17.62	<b>16.67</b>	18.83	19.76	20.10	21.08	<b>19.95</b>
S <sub>3</sub>	6.78	7.18	7.55	7.78	<b>7.32</b>	12.70	13.41	14.12	14.55	<b>13.69</b>	15.26	16.16	17.01	17.53	<b>16.49</b>
S <sub>4</sub>	6.42	6.76	7.26	7.67	<b>7.03</b>	12.01	12.67	13.56	14.34	<b>13.15</b>	14.46	15.27	16.34	17.27	<b>15.84</b>
Mean	<b>7.58</b>	<b>7.96</b>	<b>8.31</b>	<b>8.62</b>	<b>8.12</b>	<b>14.27</b>	<b>14.98</b>	<b>15.64</b>	<b>16.23</b>	<b>15.28</b>	<b>17.11</b>	<b>18.04</b>	<b>18.84</b>	<b>19.55</b>	<b>18.39</b>
	S.Em.±		CD at 5%			S.Em.±		CD at 5%			SEm±		CD at 5%		
N	0.25		0.76			0.36		1.08			0.56		1.67		
S	0.26		0.78			0.29		0.88			0.49		1.46		
N × S	0.36		1.10			0.79		2.38			1.30		3.92		

**Table 3 :** Effect of nitrogen levels, planting geometry and their interaction on yield of golden rod.

Nitrogen level Planting geometry	Number of panicle per plot					Number of marketable panicle per plot				
	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>3</sub>	N <sub>4</sub>	Mean
S <sub>1</sub>	36.09	37.45	38.12	40.32	<b>38.00</b>	20.18	25.38	38.12	40.32	<b>31.00</b>
S <sub>2</sub>	54.66	55.93	57.06	58.99	<b>56.66</b>	19.76	25.11	54.35	55.99	<b>38.80</b>
S <sub>3</sub>	72.19	73.56	75.34	77.14	<b>74.56</b>	18.34	23.42	37.24	38.38	<b>29.35</b>
S <sub>4</sub>	108.10	108.88	109.23	111.08	<b>109.32</b>	18.00	23.26	32.16	35.43	<b>27.21</b>
Mean	<b>67.76</b>	<b>68.96</b>	<b>69.94</b>	<b>71.88</b>	<b>69.63</b>	<b>19.07</b>	<b>24.29</b>	<b>40.47</b>	<b>42.53</b>	<b>31.59</b>
	SEm		CD at 5%			SEm		CD at 5%		
N	0.35		1.05			2.92		8.79		
S	2.53		7.63			3.37		10.15		
N × S	4.54		13.67			6.02		18.14		

highest number of marketable panicles (55.99) and it was on par with  $N_3S_2$  (54.35),  $N_4S_1$  (40.32),  $N_3S_1$  (38.12). Among nitrogen levels, minimum number of marketable panicles were recorded with  $N_1$  (19.07) whereas, the least value (27.21) was recorded with  $S_4$  in terms of marketable panicles per plot. The interaction of  $N_1S_4$  registered minimum number of marketable panicles (18.00) and it was on par with  $N_1S_3$  (18.34),  $N_2S_4$  (23.26) and  $N_2S_3$  (23.42). It is interesting to note that the number of marketable panicles per plot did not follow the trend as exhibited by the number of total panicles per plot or per  $m^2$  particularly when the planting geometry levels were taken into account. The widest geometry of planting at 45 cm  $\times$  30 cm and next immediate level *i.e.* 30 cm  $\times$  30 cm were on par with respect to number of marketable panicles per plot and both were significantly higher compared to other closer geometry levels that recorded a higher number of total panicles per plot. This clearly indicated that even though the total number of golden rods produced per unit area was higher with the closest orientation of plants or closest planting geometry level, such panicles were of least quality and hence were inferior in marketability. Therefore, the wider spacings only could yield significantly higher number of marketable panicles per plot even though the total number of panicles produced by them was less. On the contrary, the nitrogen levels exerted the similar influence as observed in case of total panicles per plot. The highest number of marketable panicles per plot was registered by the application of nitrogen at 300 kg  $ha^{-1}$ , which was on par with that at 200 kg  $ha^{-1}$ . Similar opinions were expressed by Sodha and Dhaduk (2002) in golden rod and Kishore *et al.* (2010) in marigold.

### Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Dr. Y.S.R.H.U., Venkataramannagudem for providing facilities to carry out the research work at Horticultural College and Research Institute, Venkataramannagudem. They are also grateful to Horticultural Research Station, Pandirimamidi, East Godavari dist. (A.P.) for providing planting material of Golden rod used in the study.

### References

- Biswas, J. and C. Parya (2008). Studies on influence of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth and flowering of golden rod (*Solidago canadensis* L.). *The Orissa Journal of Horticulture*, **36(2)** : 146-48.
- Jadhav, J. G., Neha Chopde, K. S. Gore, Neha Patil, Ashwini and Darshana Gaikawad (2014). Effect of spacing on growth, flower yield and quality of calendula under vidarbha (M.S.) conditions. *Journal of Soils and Crops*, **24(1)** : 82–85.
- Kishore, G. R., J. K. Arya and P. K. Ghalot (2010). Effect of different levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth and flowering of African marigold *cv.* Pusa Narangi. *Progressive Agriculture*, **10(1)** : 80-83.
- Mane, P. K., G. J. Bankar and S. S. Makne (2006). Effect of spacing, bulb size and depth of planting on growth and bulb production in tuberose (*Polianthes tuberosa*) *cv.* Single. *Indian Journal Agriculture Research*, **40(1)** : 64-67.
- Monish, M., V. K. Umrao, A. K. Tyagi and P. M. Meena (2008). Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus levels on growth, flowering and yield of china aster. *Agriculture Science Digest.*, **28(2)** : 97–100.
- Naidu, J., Ashok Haritha, P. Sekhar, R. Chandra and K. Sasikala (2014). Effect of plant growth retardants and spacings on vegetative growth and flower yield of African marigold (*Tagetes erecta* L.) *cv.* Pusa Narangi Gainda. *International Journal of Farm Sciences*, **4(2)** : 92-99.
- Panse, V. G. and B. V. Sukhatme (1967). *Statistical methods for agricultural workers*. ICAR publication, New Delhi, pp. 100-161.
- Sharma, A. K., S. V. S. Chaudhary and Y. C. Gupta (2010). Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus on flowering and yield of African marigold (*Tagetes erecta* Linn.). *Progressive Agriculture*, **10(1)** : 158-60.
- Sodha, B. P. and B. K. Dhaduk (2002). Effect of spacing and nitrogen on *Solidago*. *Journal of Ornamental Horticulture*, New Series, **5(1)** : 63-64.
- Venugopal, C. K. and A. A. Patil (2010). Effect of graded levels of nitrogen and plant population on growth and yield of everlasting flower. *Karnataka Journal Agriculture Science*, **13(3)** : 692-96.
- Verma, R. P., J. P. Singh, S. S. Verma and V. Kumar (2012). Effect of foliar application of urea and planting geometry on growth and flowering of gladiolus *cv.* Sapna. *Annals of Horticulture*, **5(2)** : 192-97.