## Manipulations of source sink relationships through mepiquat chloride for enhancing cotton productivity and monetary returns in north western India

# KULVIR SINGH\*, HARINDER PAL SINGH, PANKAJ RATHORE, KULDEEP SINGH AND SUDHIR KUMAR MISHRA

Punjab Agricultural University, Regional Staion, Faridkot-151 203 \*E-mail: kulvir@pau.edu

**ABSTRACT :** Field experiments were conducted during *kharif* 2014 and 2015 at PAU, Regional Station, Faridkot to manipulate source sink relationships in American cotton through application of mepiquat chloride. Highest seed cotton yield (2976 kg/ha) was recorded with application of mepiquat chloride @1500 ml/ha primarily due to improved boll weight (3.92g) and bolls/plant (53.2). Consequently, highest net returns of Rs 83405/ha and B:C ratio (2.0) was recorded with the application of mepiquat chloride @1500 ml/ha indicative of its monetary benefits. mepiquat chloride not only suppressed the height of cotton plants significantly but also resulted into the higher yield attributes due to favorable source sink relationships over control. Therefore, for maximizing the monetary returns, farmers should opt for mepiquat chloride application @1500 ml/ha {@500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS} should be considered a useful production practice for enhancing cotton yield under semi arid conditions of north western India.

Key words : American cotton, bolls, monopods, seed cotton yield and sympods

Cotton is one of the important cash crops in world. Cotton crop attains excessive vegetative growth mainly due to high soil fertility; coincidence of vegetative growth period with rainy season coupled with high humidity. Thick crop canopy prevents penetration of light besides shading of bolls and utilization of plant energy on the formation of vegetative stature which results in shedding of flower buds, flowers and immature bolls. Excessive vegetative growth often occurs at the expense of reproductive growth and a large fraction of squares and small bolls on the lower sympods either shed or open poorly resulting in low yield. Cotton plants must have a harmonic balance between vegetative and reproductive growth for adequate photosynthates supply for healthy boll development leading to better productivity.

Shekar et al., (2015) reported that the use of chloro mepiquat chloride increases the N uptake resulting into higher seed cotton yield. Under extreme cases, rotting of lower bolls also occurs. The loss of reproductive structures alters the physiological growth and development of the plant by redirecting assimilates which normally are incorporated into these abscised organs to other plant parts. Most source sink research has focused on leaf boll relationships (harmonic balance) with little study of vegetative storage reserves. Gwathmey and Clement (2010) reported that source sink balance can be altered by using plant growth regulator such as mepiquat chloride (MC). The best way to prevent excessive vegetative growth is to manage for early and high fruit set. If early fruit are not set, the crop may compensate by setting fruit at higher nodes and

at outer fruiting positions leading to delayed crop maturity. Growth retardants like mepiquat chloride (MC) and 2,3,5 tri iodo benzoic (TIBA) are known to reduce inter nodal length, thereby, reducing plant height and stimulating the translocation of photosynthesis towards reproductive sinks (developing cotton bolls), all of which result in higher yields. Plant growth regulators (PGRs) may enhance yield by increasing the retention of photosynthates into developing bolls. PGRs have been widely used in developed nations for increasing cotton production by adjusting plant growth and to improve lint yield and fiber quality. Mepiquat chloride (MC) is used in cotton production across the globe to control plant growth and maximize yield and quality. Application of MC at squaring stage or at both squaring and flowering stages significantly improved cotton quality parameters like fiber length (1.7%) and fiber strength (2.8%)without significant loss of yields (Ren et al., 2013). At present, no study is available that shows the quantitative effects of mepiquat chloride (application rate and time of application) on yield dynamics of American cotton in this region and their monetary evaluation. Farmer's also seek information on cotton response to growth retardants and their field utility. Moreover, with ongoing new product testing/ registrations and consequently much sought after mechanization required for cotton picking, this aspect is gaining importance. Ever growing labour shortage for picking will further aggravate the problem of cotton farmers and necessitates for lesser number of picking even if machine picking becomes reality in coming decade or so (Singh and Rathore, 2015). Generation of such information through field experimentation is therefore of prime importance. In the present work, it was intended to study the role of mepiquat chloride in manipulation of source

sink relationships so as to have favorable influence on yield and yield attributes. Similarly, optimum dose and ideal time of application of mepiquat chloride for realizing high productivity and its economic viability was also evaluated.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment arranged in complete randomized block design was conducted during kharif 2014 and 2015 at Punjab Agricultural University, Regional Research Station, Faridkot which lies in Trans Gangetic agro climatic zone, representing the Indo Gangetic alluvial plains (30°40'N and 74°44'E) of Punjab situated at 200 m above MSL. The experimental field during 2014 was having loamy sand soil, with slightly alkaline pH 8.7, EC (0.24dS<sup>-m</sup>), O.C (0.27 %), medium in available P (17.5 kg/ha) but high in available K (675kg/ha).During 2015, soil properties were slightly different *i.e.* loamy sand, near normal{ pH=8.4, EC=0.18 m mhos, OC% = 0.42}, P (kg/ha) =21.7, high in K (750 kg/ha). Bt hybrid NCS 855 BGII was planted in first fortnight of May for both years on a well prepared field and grown by following the recommended package of practices except for the treatments under study. A planting geometry of 67.5 x 75 cm was maintained. During 2014, 7 treatments [i.e. Control; mepiquat chloride @1000 ml/ha,80-85 DAS, single application; mepiquat chloride @1250 ml/ ha,80-85 DAS, single application; mepiquat chloride @1500 ml/ha,80-85 DAS, single application; mepiquat chloride@1500 ml/ ha@500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60,75 and 90 DAS) 3 applications; mepiquat chloride @1750 ml/ha (500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 625ml/ ha at 60,75 and 90 DAS) 3 applications and detopping at 70-80DAS] were studied but 8 treatments were evaluated during 2015.After evaluating the yield data of 2014, an additional

treatment i.e. mepiquat chloride @1500 ml/ha (750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS; 2 applications) was included in studies during 2015 for comparison with other treatments having same dosage because of labour saving. The chemical mepiquat chloride (5% w/w) was mixed with water (@200 L/ha) and delivered uniformly using a knapsack sprayer. Production cost was calculated by adding cost of all the fixed inputs. Monetary parameters were calculated on the basis of prevailing market price of inputs and seed cotton. The data were analyzed statistically using SAS Proc to test the significance. Since number of treatments during both years was different, hence mean of values for both years have been used to discuss results.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Effect of mepiquat chloride on growth, yield attributes and seed cotton yield : The data on various growth related parameters clearly indicated significant effect of mepiquat chloride on recorded parameters. At all application rates, mepiquat chloride was found to be effective in reducing the plant height over control, during both of the study years. Application of mepiquat chloride @1750 ml/ha (@500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha+ 625ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) recorded statistically least plant height of 139.1 and 93.4 cm, for 2014 and 2015, respectively (Table 1). Mepiquat chloride treated plants were reported to be typically shorter, more compact and possessed a characteristically darker green color than untreated plants. A similar trend as that of height was also recorded for monopods per plant which decreased with application of mepiquat chloride. Ren et al., (2013) also reported better canopy architecture with dwarf plants, short sympodia, smaller leaves and bigger bolls obtained by chemical regulation through mepiquat chloride. Interestingly, de topping at 70-80 DAS resulted in an increase of monopod/plant, though effect was significant during 2014 only. Shekar et al., (2015) too reported the suppression of plant height with the use of chloro mepiquat chloride. The primary reason for reduced height in mepiquat chloride treated plants could due to the suppressed production of gibberellic acid, a hormone responsible for cell elongation. Mepiquat chloride @ 1500ml/ha (@ 500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) resulted in highest sympods/plant (31.3) followed by its single application @1500 ml/ha (28.2) at 80-85 DAS while the least number was observed under control (21.6). This clearly indicated that mepiquat chloride has been responsible for the improved lateral growth by retarding vertical height. Gwathey and Clement (2010) and Shekar et al., (2015) also reported that mepiquat chloride can improve cotton productivity. However, we application of mepiquat found that chloride@1750ml/ha resulted in decline in sympods/plant as compared to its other levels of application during both the years which was clearly indicative of its deleterious effect at higher dose under test location. A reduction in biomass was observed by the all treatments of mepiquat chloride over control (165 q/ha) indicative of shifting of source sink relationships in treated plots (Table 1).

Among yield contributing parameters, bolls/plant was significantly affected with application of chemical during both years while boll weight varied significantly only during 2014.The highest bolls/plant (53.2) and boll weight (3.92g) was recorded with application of mepiquat chloride (@500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha+ 500ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) while control recorded least value for boll/plant (37.8) as well as for boll weight (3.38 g) .This clearly indicated Table 1. Effect of mepiquat chloride on growth and ancillary parameters of American cotton

	. –	Dose	Plant	height	(cm)	Mon	opods/p.	lant	Syml	pods/pla	nt	Bior	nass (q/h	ıa)	Plan	t stand	/ha
	(I.	nl/ha <u>)7</u>	014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean
		15	14.1	135.2	164.7	2.00	1.72	1.9	23.7	19.4	21.6	205	151	178	18615	18900	18758
00, Single application at $80-85$ DAS         160.8       112.8       136.8       1.83       1.30       1.6 $27.7$ $25.7$ $26.7$ 173       128       151       18279       18800       1854         50, Single application at $80-85$ DAS       1.50       1.22       1.4       28.1       28.2       28.2       142       119       131       19153       18200       1867         00, Single application at $80-85$ DAS       1.15       1.5       30.1       32.5       31.3       191       133       162       18011       19300       1865         00, Single application at $80-85$ DAS       1.15       1.5       30.1       32.5       31.3       191       133       162       18011       19300       1865         00, Single applications @500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha at $60,75$ and 90 DAS)       130.1       133       162       153       18414       19500       1895         50       (3 applications @500 ml/ha + 625ml /ha + 625ml/ha at $60,75$ and 90 DAS)       136       131       94       117       18145       18100       1812         50       (3 applications @500 ml/ha + 625ml /ha + 625ml /ha at $60,75$ and 90 DAS)       135.0       135.0       135.0       136       131       94		16	52.5	115.0	138.8	1.66	1.47	1.6	30.1	23.0	26.6	180	132	156	18750	19200	18975
160.8112.8136.81.831.301.6 $27.7$ $25.7$ $26.7$ $173$ 12815118279188001850550, Single application at 80-85 DAS149.1106.8128.01.501.221.428.128.228.21421191311915318200186760, Single application at 80-85 DAS1.491.501.221.428.128.128.228.21421191311915318200186760, Single application at 80-85 DAS1.491.151.530.132.531.31911331621801119300186560, Single applications @500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60,75 and 90 DAS)18012615318414195001895613 applications @500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 60.75 and 90 DAS)1801261531814519500189563139.193.4116.31.830.831.7521.91801261531814519500189563(3 applications @500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 625ml/ha at 60,75 and 90 DAS)1801261531814419500189563(3 applications @500 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha + 625ml/ha at 60,75 and 90 DAS)18024.926.5141941171814518100181264103.8119.42.662.072.428.024.926.514194117181461950018200	00,	Single	appli	cation é	at 80-85	5 DAS											
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		16	50.8	112.8	136.8	1.83	1.30	1.6	27.7	25.7	26.7	173	128	151	18279	18800	1854(
	250,	Single	appli	cation é	at 80-85	5 DAS											
600, Single application at 80-85 DAS $146.6 \ 108.7 \ 127.7 \ 1.89 \ 1.15 \ 1.5 \ 30.1 \ 32.5 \ 31.3 \ 191 \ 133 \ 162 \ 18011 \ 19300 \ 1865$ $00 \ (3 \ applications (a)500 \ ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60,75 \ and 90 \ DAS)         00 \ (3 \ applications (a)500 \ ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60,75 \ and 90 \ DAS)         50 \ (3 \ applications (a)500 \ ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 625ml/ha \ at 60, 75 \ and 90 \ DAS)         50 \ (3 \ applications (a)500 \ ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 625ml/ha \ at 60, 75 \ and 90 \ DAS)         50 \ (3 \ applications (a)500 \ ml/ha + 625ml/ha \ 2.66 \ 2.07 \ 2.4 \ 28.0 \ 24.9 \ 26.5 \ 141 \ 94 \ 117 \ 18145 \ 18100 \ 1812         AS       - 101.4 \ - 0.094 \ - 0.94 \ 2.65 \ 141 \ 94 \ 117 \ 18145 \ 18100 \ 1812         AS       - 101.4 \ - 0.094 \ - 0.94 \ 2.65 \ 190 \ 26.5 \ 141 \ 94 \ 117 \ 18145 \ 18100 \ 1812         AS       - 101.4 \ - 0.094 \ - 0.94 \ 2.66 \ 2.07 \ 2.4 \ 28.0 \ 24.9 \ 26.5 \ 141 \ 94 \ 117 \ 18145 \ 18100 \ 1812         AS       - 101.4 \ - 0.094 \ - 0.94 \ - 0.94 \ 2.66 \ 2.07 \ 2.4 \ 2.6 \ 0.94 \ 2.6 \ 2.8 \ $		14	9.1	106.8	128.0	1.50	1.22	1.4	28.1	28.2	28.2	142	119	131	19153	18200	1867
	500,	Single	appli	cation é	at 80-85	5 DAS											
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		14	16.6	108.7	127.7	1.89	1.15	1.5	30.1	32.5	31.3	191	133	162	18011	19300	1865
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	009	(3 app.	licatior	ns @500	) ml/ha	+ 500ml	/ha + 50	0ml/ha	at 60,75	and 90	DAS)						
50 (3 applications @500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha + 625ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS)         5       135.0 103.8 119.4 2.66 2.07 2.4 28.0 24.9 26.5 141 94 117 18145 18100 1812         AS       - 101.4 0.94 - 10.0 - 19.0 - 19.0 - 127 - 18200 - 18200         (00 (2 applications @750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS)         5)       12.0 9.8 - 0.56 0.34 - 4.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS - NS NS - 18.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS - 18.0 18.0 - 18.0 18.0 18.0 18.0 18.0 18.0 18.0 18.0		13	9.1	93.4	116.3	1.83	0.83	1.3	26.3	17.5	21.9	180	126	153	18414	19500	1895
\$\$\$ 135.0 103.8 119.4 2.66 2.07 <b>2.4</b> 28.0 24.9 <b>26.5</b> 141       94 117 18145 18100 1812         AS       - 101.4 0.94 - 10.0       - 19.0 - 127 - 1820       - 18200 - 1820         (00 (2 applications @750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS)       - 4.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS - 1820       - 18200 - 1820	750	(3 app	licatior	ns @50(	) ml/ha	+ 625ml	/ha+ 625	5ml/ha a	ut 60, 75	and 90	DAS)						
AS - 101.4 0.94 19.0 - 127 18200 - 100 (2 applications @750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS) - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS -	b۵	13	35.0	103.8	119.4	2.66	2.07	2.4	28.0	24.9	26.5	141	94	117	18145	18100	1812
- 101.4 0.94 19.0 - 127 - 18200 - 100 (2 applications @750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS) 12.0 9.8 - 0.56 0.34 - 4.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS -	AS																
00 (2 applications @750 ml/ha + 750 ml/ha at 75 and 90 DAS) 5) 12.0 9.8 - 0.56 0.34 - 4.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS -			ı	101.4		ı	0.94	ı	ı	19.0		ı	127	ı	ı	18200	'
5) 12.0 9.8 - 0.56 0.34 - 4.0 3.9 - 28.3 16.4 - NS NS -	200	(2 app.	licatior	as @750	) ml/ha	+ 750 ml	/ha at 7:	5 and 90	(SAC)								
	2)	1.	2.0	9.8	ı	0.56	0.34	I	4.0	3.9	ı	28.3	16.4	I	NS	NS	'

Treatments	Dose	Boll	s/plant		Boll	weight (g)		Seed cotto	on yield (k	g/ha)
	(ml/ha)	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean
Control		42.1	33.4	37.8	3.33	3.42	3.38	2524	1732	2128
Mepiquat		49.9	43.2	46.6	3.56	3.81	3.69	3151	2201	2676
chloride 12	50, Single	application	at 80-85	DAS						
Mepiquat		45.5	46.0	45.8	3.50	3.97	3.74	2885	2315	2600
chloride 15	00, Single	application	at 80-85	DAS						
Mepiquat		57.6	48.7	53.2	3.70	4.13	3.92	3422	2529	2976
chloride 15	00 (3 appli	ications @5	00 ml/ha	+ 500ml /ł	na + 500ml	/ha at 60,	75 and 90	DAS)		
Mepiquat		50.4	36.1	43.3	3.36	3.30	3.33	3125	1816	2471
chloride 17	50 (3 appli	ications @5	00 ml/ha	+ 625ml /ł	na+ 625ml/	ha at 60,	75 and 90	DAS)		
De-topping		46.6	40.0	43.3	3.43	3.74	3.59	3049	2074	2562
at 70-80 D.	AS									
Mepiquat		-	50.0	-	-	3.87	-	-	2455	-
chloride 15	00 (2 appli	cations @7	50 ml/ha ·	+ 750 ml/h	ia at 75 an	nd 90 DAS)				
CD (p=0.05	)	10.4	5.9	-	NS	0.34	-	474	286	-

Table 2. Effect of mepiquat chloride on yield attributes and seed cotton yield

that all treatments of mepiquat chloride favored source sink relationships towards the improved seed cotton yield (Table 2). Mean of 2 years data revealed highest seed cotton yield (2976 kg/ha) with application of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ ha (500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) followed by 2676 kg seed cotton yield under its single application @1250 ml/ha at 8085 DAS (Table 2).Control treatment recorded significantly reduced yield of 2524 kg and 1732 kg seed cotton as compared to yield under application of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ha (500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha+ 500ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) during 2014 and 2015, respectively. Similarly, non significant differences were observed among test treatments for GOT, lint

Table 3. Effect of mepiquat chloride on GOT and lint parameters

Treatments	Dose	GC	DT (%)		Lint	yield (kg/h	ia)	Seed	yield (kg/h	.a)
	(ml/ha)	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean
Control		37.0	34.6	35.8	934.7	598.9	766.8	1589.4	1133.0	1361.2
Mepiquat		36.8	33.7	35.3	1061.4	683.7	872.6	1816.2	1344.3	1580.3
chloride 100	0, Single	application	at 80-85	DAS						
Mepiquat		37.0	32.7	34.9	1164.1	720.7	942.4	1987.6	1480.2	1733.9
chloride 125	0, Single	application	at 80-85	DAS						
Mepiquat		37.6	33.1	35.4	1085.4	767.3	926.4	1800.3	1547.7	1674.0
chloride 150	0, Single	application	at 80-85	DAS						
Mepiquat		36.6	33.3	35.0	1255.0	842.3	1048.7	2167.0	1686.6	1926.8
chloride 150	0 (3 appl	ications @50	00 ml/ha -	+ 500ml ,	/ha + 500m	1/ha at 60	,75 and 9	0 DAS)		
Mepiquat		35.3	31.7	33.5	1105.1	578.6	841.9	2019.8	1237.4	1628.6
chloride 175	0 (3 appl	ications @50	00 ml/ha -	+ 625ml ,	/ha+ 625ml	/ha at 60,	75 and 9	0 DAS)		
De-topping		36.5	31.9	34.2	1113.1	662.7	887.9	1936.5	1411.3	1673.9
at 70-80 DA	S									
Mepiquat		-	32.9	-	-	807.1	-	-	1647.8	-
chloride 150	0 ( 2 app	lications @7	'50 ml/ha	+ 750 ml	/ha at 75 a	and 90 DA	S)			
CD (p=0.05)		NS	1.21	-	NS	96.4	-	296.6	194.7	-

yield for year 2014 only but during 2015, parameters such as GOT, lint yield as well as seed yield were statistically affected (Table 3) probably due to reduced ginning outturn values for the later year. Numerically reduced value of GOT (%) as well as lint yield with mepiquat chloride @ 1750 ml/ha (500 ml/ha + 625ml/ha+ 625ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) revealed that source sink relationships were negatively affected with higher dose of chemical. This clearly indicated that application of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ha (500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha + 500ml/ ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) was the best combination to get higher yield and yield attributes. Our results elucidated that application of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ha (500 ml/ha + 500ml/ha+ 500ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) has potential to improve yield while keeping vegetative and reproductive growth in harmony.

Effect of mepiquat chloride on monetary parameters : The data clearly indicated significant effect of treatments on various monetary parameters. Among the chemical treatments, the cost of chemical and man power involved in its application as well as more picking charges due to increased seed cotton yield, significantly raised the total cost of cultivation over control (Table 4).Significantly higher net returns (Rs 83045/ha) and B: C ratio (2.0) were recorded with application of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ha as compared to control. Singh et al., (2015) has also reported beneficial effect of various plant growth regulators in improving the seed cotton yield as compared to control conditions. This was indicative of favorable effect of mepiquat chloride @ 1500 ml/ ha (500 ml/ha + 500 ml/ha+ 500 ml/ha at 60, 75 and 90 DAS) application in improving seed cotton yield and resulting in an extra income of Rs.29458/ha over the control.

Table	4.	Effect	of	mepiquat	chloride	on	monetary	parameters
-------	----	--------	----	----------	----------	----	----------	------------

Treatments Do	se (	Cost of		Gro	ss retur	ns	N	et return	is		B : C	
(ml/h	a) cultiva	tion (Rs	/ha)		(Rs/ha)			(Rs/ha)			Ratio	
	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean	2014	2015	Mean
Control	38169	33416	35793	106016	72744	89380	67846	39328	53587	1.77	1.17	1.5
Mepiquat	40990	35892	38441	120862	85176	103019	79872	49284	64578	1.94	1.37	1.7
chloride 1000, S	Single app	olication	at 80-8	35 DAS								
Mepiquat	42810	37105	39958	132379	92442	112411	89568	55337	72453	2.08	1.48	1.8
chloride 1250, S	Single app	olication	at 80-8	35 DAS								
Mepiquat	41338	37964	39651	121201	97230	109216	79813	59266	69540	1.92	1.55	1.7
chloride 1500, S	Single app	olication	at 80-8	35 DAS								
Mepiquat	44606	39248	41927	143725	106218	124972	99119	66970	83045	2.21	1.70	2.0
chloride 1500 (3	applicat	ions @50	0 ml/ha	1 + 500m	1 /ha +	500ml/ha	a at 60,7	75 and 9	0 DAS)			
Mepiquat	42999	35145	39072	131250	76272	103761	88251	41127	64689	2.04	1.16	1.6
chloride 1750 (3	applicat	ions @50	0 ml/ha	ı + 625m	1 /ha+ 6	525ml/ha	at 60, 7	75 and 9	0 DAS)			
De-topping	41922	37008	39465	128088	87108	107598	86166	50100	68133	2.05	1.35	1.7
at 70-80 DAS												
Mepiquat	-	38804	-	-	103110	-	-	64306	-	-	1.65	-
chloride 1500 (	2 applica	tions @75	50 ml/h	a + 750	ml/ha a	t 75 and	90 DAS)					
CD (p=0.05)	2844	1719	-	19910	12036	-	17066	10316	-	NS	0.20	-

### REFERENCES

- **Gwathmey, C. O. and Clement, J. D. 2010.** Alteration of cotton source sink relations with plant population density and mepiquat chloride. *Field Crop Res.* **116** : 101-07.
- Ren, X., Zhang, L., Dua, M., Evers, J. B., Werf,
  W., Tiana, X., Li, Z. 2013. Managing mepiquat chloride and plant density for optimal yield and quality of cotton. *Field Crop Res* 149: 1-10.
- Shekar, K., Venkataramana, M. and Kumari, S. R. 2015. Response of hybrid cotton to chloro mepiquat chloride and de topping under high

density planting. J. Cotton Res. Dev. 29: 84-86.

- Singh, Kulvir and Rathore, Pankaj 2015. Effect of different defoliants and their rate and time of application on American cotton cultivars under semi-arid conditions of north western India. *Res. on Crops* **16** : 258-63.
- Singh, Kulvir, Rathore, P. and Singh, K. 2015. Dose and time dependent efficacy alteration of different defoliants on seed cotton yield. J. Env. Biol. 36: 891-95.

Received for publication : August 1, 2016 Accepted for publication : October 19, 2016