



# Effect of Micro Organic Fertilizer on Growth and Yield of Threatened *Melientha suavis* Pierre Species in Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam

Nguyen Minh Tuan <sup>a\*</sup> and Dang Thi To Nga <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Agronomy, Thai Nguyen University of Agriculture & Forestry, Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2024/v36i44458

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/113647>

Original Research Article

Received: 20/12/2023  
Accepted: 26/02/2024  
Published: 28/02/2024

## ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted at Thai Nguyen province to evaluate the response of micro-organic fertilizer on growth of vegetative and yield of *Melientha suavis* Pierre species in the spring and summer season 2023. The experiment included four treatments was designed in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications. The characteristics include height of plant, diameter of trunk, leaf number, leaf size and yield were measured. The results indicated that applying the T3 treatment greatly in response enhancing height of plant, diameter of trunk, leaf number as well as leaf size compared to untreated control. Furthermore, application of the T3 treatment have the best results in yield of 380.0 kg/ha and 313.3 kg/ha in the spring and summer season, respectively. Therefore, the result could recommend applying micro-organic fertilizer can be practical tool for increasing growth of vegetative as well as yield in *Melientha suavis* pierre under field conditions.

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [nguyenminhtuan@tuaf.edu.vn](mailto:nguyenminhtuan@tuaf.edu.vn);

**Keywords:** *Melientha suavis* Pierre; vegetative growth; yield; micro-organic fertilizer.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

"*Melientha suavis* Pierre (*M.suavis*) with local name as Ngot rung, Phac Van which has been distributed at Lao Cai, Cao Bang, Bac Kan, Lang Son, Quang Ninh, Bac Giang, Ninh Binh, Thanh Hoa, Nghe An, Ha Tinh, Hue and Thai Nguyen province of Vietnam. *M.suavis* species known as with high nutrients as well as commercial value" [1-4]. Recently, the individual plants number of *M.suavis* species decreased seriously caused by habitat destruction like loss by deforestation and overexploiting of flowers. According to Ban et al. 2007 [5] the *M. suavis* was identified threatened species vulnerable locally in the Red List of Threatened in Viet Nam including Thai Nguyen province

The mineral fertilizers applied in agricultural production markedly response harmful to the yield, quality of products, environment, quality of soil, water and also reduced vitamins contents, minerals contents and other useful compounds [6,7]. "However, the use micro-organic fertilizer in agriculture not only enhancing the physical and chemical of soil, improving growth of the plants and increasing biological properties but also very most useful in safe for the environment, animals and human. Furthermore, micro-organic fertilizers also consider have a good way to decrease use of chemical fertilizers in agriculture production caused by microorganisms have definite beneficial roles in the fertility of the soil rhizosphere and the growth of the plants" [8,9].

Additionally, the information about vegetative growth performance and yield of *M.suavis* species under the application of micro-organic fertilizer so far lacking. Therefore, the aims of this work to measure response of micro-organic fertilizer on vegetative growth and yield of *M.suavis* species under field conditions.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Plant Materials and Experiment Treatments

The experiment was conducted from January 2023 to December 2023 at Na Khao's garden, Trung Hoi commune, Dinh Hoa district, Thai Nguyen province. The experiment consist of four treatments including T1: control treatment (without micro-organic fertilizer), T2: 3 kg micro-organic fertilizer/tree; T3: 5 kg micro-organic

fertilizer/tree; T4: 7 kg micro-organic fertilizer/tree. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications and three uniform plants was taken as an experiment unit.

### 2.2. Data Collection

Plant height (cm) was evaluated from ground level to the tip of an opened leaf. The trunk diameter (mm) was determined above the ground surface with the help of digital Vernier calipers and the average was calculated. The leaf number per shoot was determined by counting and the average leaf number was calculated. The leaf length (cm) and leaf width (cm) was measured with the help of a Vernier calliper. The shoots number per tree was measured by choosing randomly three trees, and the number of shoots was counted. The total shoots harvest was weighing to calculate yield per treatment

### 2.3 Statistical Analysis

The SAS 9.1 statistical software using to analysed the data obtained from the study. The least significant difference was calculated following a significance F-test (at  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Effect of Micro-organic Fertilizer on Vegetative Growth of *M. suavis* Species

Form the Figs. 1A and 1B, the T3 treatment application has the highest height of plant with value of 173.9 cm in the spring season and 175.4 cm in the summer season, followed by the other treatments. In contrast the lowest height of plant was observed to control treatment with a value of 135.9 cm in the spring season and 137.1 cm in the summer season, although there was not statistically significant difference at  $p < 0.05$ . For the trunk diameter, it was observed that the higher trunk diameter was obtained at the T2, T3 and T4 treatments. In contrast the minimum trunk diameter with value of 1.97 cm and 1.98 cm in the spring and summer seasons, respectively was found in untreated control, although there was not statistically significant difference at  $p < 0.05$  Figs. 1A and 1B). For the tree canopy, the lowest value at 66.8 cm in the spring season

and 69.2 cm in the summer was recorded in untreated control. Whereas the maximum tree canopy was found in the T3 treatment at 95.2 cm and 102.7 cm in the spring and summer seasons, respectively. These results are in agreement with former work reported by Khehra and Bal, [10].

### 3.2 Effect of Micro-organic Fertilizer on the Shoots Number of *M. suavis* Species

In the case of spring season, the data in Table 1 indicated that there was a significant difference among treatments on shoots number per tree. In terms, the highest spring shoots number (of 132.0 shoots per tree) was obtained with the T3 treatment application. Whereas the lowest value of 65.7 number of shoots per tree was recorded for control treatment. For the number of summer shoots, the highest shoots number was obtained in T3 treatment application with value of 130.0 shoots per tree, while the untreated control had the lowest value (of 63.0 shoots per tree). Moreover, the T2 and T4 treatments also have

the higher shoots number per tree as compared to untreated control (Table 1).

### 3.3 Effect of Micro-organic Fertilizer Character of shoot of *M. suavis* Species

In the case of spring season, the data displayed in Table 2 indicated that there was significant difference on shoot length for all treatments as compared to untreated control. In terms, the T3 treatment application had the highest shoot length (18.6 cm), followed by the T2 and T4 treatments with values of 18.0 cm and 17.9 cm, respectively. Whereas the untreated control had the minimum shoot length with value of 16.0 cm. Moreover, the T3 treatment had the maximum shoot length (18.5 cm), while the untreated control had the minimum shoot length with value of 16.1 cm. On the other hand, the T2 and T4 treatment also had the higher shoot length as compared to untreated control (Table 2), which was found in the case of summer season. This results are in agreement with the finding reported by Dahiya et al., [11].




Fig. 1. Effect of micro-organic fertilizer on plant height, diameter trunk and tree canopy of *M.suavis* species (A: spring season 2023; B: summer season 2023)

Table 1. Effect of micro-organic fertilizer on the shoots number of *M.suavis* species


Treatments	Spring shoot number/tree	Summer shoot number/tree
T1	65.7 <sup>c*</sup>	63.0 <sup>c</sup>
T2	106.7 <sup>b</sup>	104.3 <sup>b</sup>
T3	132.0 <sup>a</sup>	130.0 <sup>a</sup>
T4	93.7 <sup>b</sup>	91.0 <sup>b</sup>
P	<0.05	<0.05
Cv%	9.66	8.68
LSD.05	19.21	16.84

\*Means followed by different letters are significantly different within columns by Duncan's multiple range Test,  $P \leq 0.05$

**Table 2. Effect of micro-organic fertilizer on shoot character of *M.suavis* species**

Seasonal	Treatments	Shoot length (cm)	Shoot diameter (mm)	Leaf number/shoot (leaf)	Leaf Length (cm)	Leaf width (cm)
<b>Spring season 2023</b>	T1	16.0 <sup>b*</sup>	1.82 <sup>b</sup>	7.3 <sup>b</sup>	9.6 <sup>c</sup>	3.4 <sup>a</sup>
	T2	18.0 <sup>a</sup>	2.03 <sup>ab</sup>	8.3 <sup>a</sup>	11.2 <sup>ab</sup>	3.6 <sup>a</sup>
	T3	18.6 <sup>a</sup>	2.37 <sup>a</sup>	8.7 <sup>a</sup>	11.7 <sup>a</sup>	3.9 <sup>a</sup>
	T4	17.9 <sup>a</sup>	2.13 <sup>a</sup>	8.2 <sup>a</sup>	10.4 <sup>bc</sup>	3.6 <sup>a</sup>
	P	<0,05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	>0.05
	Cv%	4.96	7.25	5.12	5.79	6.9
	LSD.05	1.75	0.3	0.83	1.24	0.5
<b>Summer season 2023</b>	T1	16.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.80 <sup>a</sup>	6.8 <sup>b</sup>	9.4 <sup>b</sup>	3.5 <sup>a</sup>
	T2	17.7 <sup>a</sup>	2.00 <sup>a</sup>	8.2 <sup>ab</sup>	10.8 <sup>a</sup>	3.6 <sup>a</sup>
	T3	18.5 <sup>a</sup>	2.35 <sup>a</sup>	8.8 <sup>a</sup>	11.5 <sup>a</sup>	4.0 <sup>a</sup>
	T4	17.3 <sup>ab</sup>	2.08 <sup>a</sup>	7.8 <sup>ab</sup>	10.7 <sup>ab</sup>	3.7 <sup>a</sup>
	P	<0.05	>0.05	<0.05	<0.05	>0.05
	Cv%	4.37	11.0	8.74	5.98	9.37
	LSD.05	1.51	0.46	1.38	1.27	0.7

\*Means followed by different letters are significantly different within columns by Duncan's multiple range Test,  $P \leq 0.05$



**Fig. 2. Effect of micro-organic fertilizer on yield of *M.suavis* species**

For the shoot diameter, the results in Table 2 showed that the T3 treatment had the maximum diameter of shoot (2.37 mm), followed by the T4 treatment with value of 2.13 mm, whereas the untreated control gave the lowest value of shoot diameter, which was obtained in the case of spring shoot. However, there were no statistically significant among treatment in shoot diameter in the case of summer shoot in this study (Table 2).

Similar finding was reported by Dahiya et al., [11].

From the results showed in Table 2, it was observed that leaf number from untreated control was lower as compared to the other treatments in the case of spring shoot. In term, the highest leaf number (8.7 leaves/shoot) was obtained in the T3 treatment application, whereas the lowest

leaf number with value of 7.3 leaves/shoot was observed in untreated control. Moreover, the T2 and T4 treatments had the higher leaf number per shoot as compared to untreated control (Table 2). Moreover, the leaf number in the case of summer season was displayed in Table 2. In terms, the highest leaf number (of 8.8 leaf/shoot) was obtained in the T3 treatment application, whereas the lowest leaf number (6.8 leaves/shoot) was observed in the control treatment. These results are by the findings of Ennab, [8].

Furthermore, the results displayed in Table 2 indicated that there was significantly differences among treatments concerning leaf length ( $p < 0.05$ ). In terms, the T3 treatment gave the highest leaf length with values of 11.7 cm and 11.5 cm, whereas the control treatment had the lowest leaf length with values of 9.6 cm and 9.4 cm in the spring and summer seasons, respectively. However, there were no statistically significant differences among treatments concerning leaf width in both spring and summer seasons ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### 3.4 Effect of Micro-organic Fertilizer on Yield of *M. suavis* Species

The results displayed in Fig. 2 indicated that the maximum yield (380.0 kg/ha) was obtained in the T3 treatment application, whereas the control treatment had the minimum yield with value of 300.0 kg/ha, which was observed in the case of the spring season. Moreover, the results in Fig. 2 also indicated that the maximum yield (313.3 kg/ha) was obtained in the T3 treatment application, whereas the control treatment had the minimum yield (226.7 kg/ha cm).

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the T3 treatment with 5 kg micro-organic fertilizer/tree application greatly improving vegetative growth parameters, shoot length, diameter, number of leaves per shoot, as well as yield. Hence, we recommended the application of 5 kg micro-organic fertilizer/tree gave the best practical tool for enhancing vegetative growth and yield of *Melientha suavis* pierre species under field condition in Thai Nguyen province.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdul-Baki AA, and Anderson JD. Relationship between Decarboxylation of Glutamic Acid and Vigor in Soybean Seed 1. Crop Sciences. 1973;13:227-232.
2. Charoenchai L, Settharaksa S, Songsak T, Ruangrunsi N, and Kraisintu K. Phytochemical screening tests of *Melientha suavis* Pierre and *Urobotyra siamensis* Hiepko extracts. Bulletin of Health, Science and Technology (BHST). 2013;11(2):13-20.
3. Le CT, Liu B, Barrett RL, Lu LM, Wen J, and Chen ZD. Phylogeny and a new tribal classification of Opiliaceae (Santalales) based on molecular and morphological evidence. Journal of Systematics and Evolution. 2018;56:56-66.
4. Tianpech N, Swatsitang P, and Tianpech S. Antioxidan capacity and nutritional values of Pak-wanpa (*Melientha suavis* Pierre). KKU Sci. J. 2008;36:75-82.
5. Ban NT, Ly TD, Tap N, Dung VV, Thin NN, Tien NV, Khoi NK. Vietnam Red Data Book, Part II: Plant. Natural Science and Technology Publishing House, Hanoi, Vietnam; 2007.
6. Bogatyre AN. What are we to eat or how to live longer?. Pishchevaya Promyshlennost. 2000;7: 34-35 (C.F. CAB).
7. Srivastava AK. Integrated nutrient management. In: Advances in Citrus Nutrition, AK. Srivastava (Ed.) Springer-Verlag, The Netherlands. 2012;369–389.
8. Ennab HA. Effect of Organic Manures, Biofertilizers and NPK on Vegetative Growth, Yield, Fruit Quality and Soil Fertility of Eureka Lemon Trees (*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm)", J. Soil Sci. and Agric. Eng., Mansoura Univ. 2016;7(10):767-774.
9. Krauss A. Quality production at balanced fertilization: The key for competitive marketing of crops", Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> CIEC International Symposium on Role of Fertilizers in Sustainable Agriculture. August 21- 22, 2000; Suceava, Romania:1-16.
10. Khehra S, and Bal JS. Influence of organic and inorganic nutrient sources on growth of lemon (*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm.) cv. Baramasi. J. Exp. Bio. and Agri. Sci. 2014; 2(1S):126 – 129.

11. Dahiya SS, Singh S, and Dalal RP. Studies on the effect of organic manure versus organic plus inorganic fertilizers in sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis* Osbeck) cv. Jaffa. Haryana. *J. Hort. Sci.* 2013; 42(1/2):9-12.

---

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/113647>