



## Research Article

# INFLUENCE OF RAW AND TREATED COFFEE PULP EFFLUENT IRRIGATION AND MICROBIAL CULTURE ON FRUIT QUALITY AND YIELD OF BANANA (*Musa paradisiaca* L.)

BASAVALINGAIAH<sup>1</sup>, BHASKAR S.<sup>2</sup>, YOGESH G.S.<sup>\*3</sup>, SRINIVASAMURTHY C.A.<sup>4</sup>, JANARDHAN G.<sup>5</sup> AND GIRISHA H.C.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Extension Education Unit, Madikeri 571 201, University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shimoga, 577204, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, Pusa, New Delhi, 110012, Delhi, India

<sup>3</sup>ICAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Chamaraanagar, 571127, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKV, Bengaluru, 560065, Karnataka, India

<sup>4</sup>Central Agricultural University, Imphal, 795004, Manipur, India

<sup>5</sup>College of Horticulture, Mysuru, 571130, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot, 587104, Karnataka, India

<sup>6</sup>Department of Agricultural Microbiology, College of Agriculture, Hassan, 571114, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKV, Bengaluru, 560065, Karnataka, India

\*Corresponding Author: Email - yogissac@gmail.com

Received: August 03, 2019; Revised: August 24, 2019; Accepted: August 26, 2019; Published: August 30, 2019

**Abstract-** To study the effect of coffee pulp effluent irrigation and microbial culture on yield and yield attributing characters of banana, a field investigation was carried out during 2006 and 2007 at Kollibylu, Mudigere, Chikmagalur District. Alternate irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water with microbial culture recorded maximum bunch yield and pulp to peel ratio (75.1 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.16, respectively) which was on par with alternate irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water without microbial culture (71.0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.07, respectively) followed by fresh water irrigation (70.7 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.05, respectively), 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water with microbial culture (70.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.03, respectively) and 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water without microbial culture (70.1 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.97, respectively). The lowest bunch yield and pulp to peel ratio was recorded in raw coffee pulp effluent irrigation without microbial culture (38.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.46, respectively) which was significantly inferior to all the other treatments.

**Keywords-** Coffee Pulp, Effluent Irrigation, Microbial Culture, Fruit Quality

**Citation:** Basavalingaiah, et al., (2019) Influence of Raw and Treated Coffee Pulp Effluent Irrigation and Microbial Culture on Fruit Quality and Yield of Banana (*Musa paradisiaca* L.). International Journal of Microbiology Research, ISSN: 0975-5276 & E-ISSN: 0975-9174, Volume 11, Issue 8, pp.-1691-1693.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2019 Basavalingaiah, et al., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Academic Editor / Reviewer:** Dr Vijaya Lakshmi V, Dr Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Dr Simerpreet Kaur, Dr R. P. S. Shaktawat

## Introduction

Water is one of the most valuable natural resource available to man for his domestic, agricultural and industrial uses. Growth of population, massive urbanization, rapid rate of industrialization and availability of modern technology in agriculture have accelerated water pollution and led to the gradual deterioration of its quality. India is the seventh largest nation in terms of industries. Majority of the industries are agro-based and utilize large volumes of good quality water and other raw materials and generate almost entire quantity of water as effluent and appreciable quantities of solid wastes. Demand by these industries for water is expected to increase from 5 per cent in 2000 to 11.5 per cent by 2010 and 23 per cent by 2025. Generation of large volume of effluent due to the phenomenal growth of industries and huge quantities of sewage effluent due to population explosion pose a serious threat to environment and water resources [1]. The changing scenario of both issues had researchers to develop strategies for effective utilization of water resources in food production. One among them is recycling of industrial and sewage effluent for crop production, which is having dual advantage of waste recycling with minimizing environmental pollution. Coffee is being cultivated on an area of 3 lakh hectares in India, out of which 2 lakh hectares is in Karnataka. Coffee requires large quantities of water for post harvesting processing, which is then discharged as effluent to natural water bodies posing serious environmental problems. The consumption of water varies from 9-13 cubic meters and from 17-20 cubic meters per ton of coffee processed with or without recycling. Hence there is a great need to conduct studies to overcome the problems of pollution and to suggest the ways of waste water disposal for better purpose like irrigation and manuring.

There is a great potential in trapping nutritive values these effluents, which is known to have considerable quantities of major and minor plant nutrients. In this context the present study was conducted to utilize the coffee pulp effluent for production of baby corn.

## Material and Methods

The experiment was carried out during 2006 and 2007 on farmer's field at Kollibylu, Mudigere, Chikmagalur District, Karnataka, India. The coffee pulp effluent was used as source of irrigation and it was applied as per the crop water requirement during pulping season (December to April). The preliminary analysis of raw and treated coffee pulp effluents was given in the [Table-1]. The pH of raw effluent (3.94) and microbial treated effluent (4.27) was acidic in nature, whereas lime treated effluent (7.16) and microbial and lime treated effluent (7.59) are near to neutral in range. The electrical conductivity ranged from 1.091 to 1.366 dSm<sup>-1</sup>. Higher total solids (suspended solids and dissolved solids) were recorded in raw effluent (16.108 g l<sup>-1</sup>) followed by lime treated effluent (12.338 g l<sup>-1</sup>), microbial treated effluent (9.466 g l<sup>-1</sup>) and microbial and lime treated effluent (8.403 g l<sup>-1</sup>). The concentration of BOD and COD varied with the treatment of effluent. Raw effluent recorded maximum values (16500 and 27700 mg l<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) and microbial and lime treated effluent (7800 and 14900 mg l<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) recorded minimum values. The samples were also analyzed for major and micronutrient contents. There is no much difference with respect to the major and micronutrient contents of treated and raw effluent. The experiment was laid out in RCBD design with 3 replications includes 9 treatments.

Table-1 Chemical composition of raw and treated coffee pulp effluent

Parameters	Raw effluent	Microbial treated effluent	Lime treated effluent	Microbial and lime treated effluent
pH	3.94	4.27	7.16	7.59
EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> )	1.366	1.091	1.343	1.112
Suspended solids (g l <sup>-1</sup> )	7.843	4.512	5.766	3.614
Dissolved solids (g l <sup>-1</sup> )	8.265	4.954	6.572	4.789
Total solids (g l <sup>-1</sup> )	16.108	9.466	12.338	8.403
BOD (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	16500	10200	13600	7800
COD (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	27700	20400	24200	14900
Chlorides (meq l <sup>-1</sup> )	5.84	5.21	4.63	5.42
Bicarbonates (meq l <sup>-1</sup> )	6.72	7.04	6.37	6.82
Total nitrogen (%)	0.105	0.094	0.099	0.112
Total phosphorus (%)	0.0023	0.0028	0.0037	0.0032
Total potassium (%)	0.058	0.0583	0.0613	0.0501
Iron (ppm)	24.49	25.02	23.17	23.33
Zinc (ppm)	0.696	0.762	0.667	0.621
Copper (ppm)	1.793	1.833	2.162	1.810
Manganese (ppm)	0.586	0.531	0.494	0.511

Table-2 Effect of coffee pulp effluent irrigation and microbial culture on yield and fruit characters of banana plant crop

Treatments	Bunch yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Fruit length (cm)	Fruit girth (cm)	Fruit weight (g)	Pulp weight (g)	Pulp to peel ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	70.7	21.47	15.30	204.6	154.0	3.05
T <sub>2</sub>	38.6	12.40	12.07	135.3	96.2	2.46
T <sub>3</sub>	51.3	14.03	12.53	149.7	109.6	2.74
T <sub>4</sub>	61.8	15.23	13.37	169.1	137.7	2.81
T <sub>5</sub>	66.6	17.20	14.20	185.8	137.8	2.88
T <sub>6</sub>	71.0	21.67	15.37	206.2	155.4	3.07
T <sub>7</sub>	75.1	22.27	15.57	211.3	160.4	3.16
T <sub>8</sub>	70.1	21.13	15.17	200.2	149.8	2.97
T <sub>9</sub>	70.5	21.23	15.30	202.3	152.1	3.03
S.Em±	2.44	0.57	0.44	5.9	4.79	0.09
CD at 5%	7.30	1.70	1.32	17.79	14.37	0.26

T<sub>1</sub> - Fresh water irrigation; T<sub>2</sub> - Raw CPE irrigation without microbial culture; T<sub>3</sub> - Raw CPE irrigation with microbial culture; T<sub>4</sub> - Lime treated CPE irrigation without microbial culture; T<sub>5</sub> - Lime treated CPE irrigation with microbial culture; T<sub>6</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water without microbial culture; T<sub>7</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water with microbial culture; T<sub>8</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water without microbial culture; T<sub>9</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water with microbial culture; Note: Recommended dose of fertilizer and FYM is common for all the treatments

Table-3 Effect of coffee pulp effluent irrigation and microbial culture on fruit quality of banana plant crop at harvest

Treatments	TSS (%)	Titrate acidity per cent of citric acid	Reducing sugar (%)	Non-reducing sugar (%)	Total sugar (%)	Sugar to acid ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	22.21	0.107	18.06	2.43	20.49	226.5
T <sub>2</sub>	25.85	0.084	21.05	2.75	23.80	248.1
T <sub>3</sub>	25.49	0.084	21.03	2.74	23.76	256.2
T <sub>4</sub>	25.45	0.084	21.68	2.66	24.34	265.3
T <sub>5</sub>	25.67	0.092	20.93	2.94	23.87	260.4
T <sub>6</sub>	23.26	0.091	19.32	2.73	22.05	260.1
T <sub>7</sub>	23.05	0.090	19.08	2.98	22.06	259.6
T <sub>8</sub>	23.46	0.088	18.99	2.65	21.64	258.9
T <sub>9</sub>	23.60	0.091	19.17	2.79	21.96	243.5
S.Em±	0.98	0.003	0.64	0.14	0.65	12.4
CD at 5%	2.94	0.010	1.90	NS	1.95	37.0

T<sub>1</sub> - Fresh water irrigation; T<sub>2</sub> - Raw CPE irrigation without microbial culture; T<sub>3</sub> - Raw CPE irrigation with microbial culture; T<sub>4</sub> - Lime treated CPE irrigation without microbial culture; T<sub>5</sub> - Lime treated CPE irrigation with microbial culture; T<sub>6</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water without microbial culture; T<sub>7</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water with microbial culture; T<sub>8</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water without microbial culture; T<sub>9</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated CPE and fresh water with microbial culture; Note: Recommended dose of fertilizer and FYM is common for all the treatments

T<sub>1</sub> - Fresh water irrigation, T<sub>2</sub> - Raw effluent irrigation without microbial culture, T<sub>3</sub> - Raw effluent irrigation with microbial culture, T<sub>4</sub> - Lime treated effluent irrigation without microbial culture, T<sub>5</sub> - Lime treated effluent irrigation with microbial culture, T<sub>6</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated effluent and fresh water without microbial culture, T<sub>7</sub> - Alternate irrigation with lime treated effluent and fresh water with microbial culture, T<sub>8</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated effluent and fresh water without microbial culture, T<sub>9</sub> - 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated effluent and fresh water with microbial culture. Banana tissue culture variety Grand naine was used as test crop and was planted in first week of September 2006 at a spacing of 2 m X 2 m. A fertilizer dose of 200:100:300 g N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O per plant were applied to the crop at different growth stages. FYM (10 kg pit<sup>-1</sup>) was supplied and mixed thoroughly in to the top soil 15 days prior to planting. Growth and yield observation were recorded and statistically analyzed [2].

## Results and Discussion

Bunch yield differed significantly due to coffee pulp effluent irrigation and microbial culture [Table-2]. Alternate irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water with microbial culture recorded maximum bunch yield and pulp to peel ratio (75.1 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.16, respectively) which was on par with alternate irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water without microbial culture (71.0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.07, respectively) followed by fresh water irrigation (70.7 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.05, respectively), 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water with microbial culture (70.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 3.03, respectively) and 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water without microbial culture (70.1 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.97, respectively). The lowest bunch yield and pulp to peel ratio was recorded in raw coffee pulp effluent irrigation without microbial culture (38.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.46, respectively) which was significantly inferior to all the other treatments.

The reduction in bunch yield of banana in treatments receiving raw coffee pulp effluent irrigation and lime treated coffee pulp effluent without nitrogen could be due to decreased individual plant performance characters in terms of plant height, pseudostem girth, number of leaves, leaf area, total dry matter accumulation, length of fruits, girth of fruit, fruit weight, number of hands per bunch, number of fingers per bunch fruit length, fruit girth, fruit weight, pulp weight, peel weight and pulp to peel ratio [Table-2] at harvest and at different stages of crop growth. The results clearly show that either undiluted coffee pulp effluent or continuous irrigation with only lime treated coffee pulp effluent has deleterious effect on the growth of banana plant and resulted in its stunted growth. The yield is final expression of growth attained by individual plant during course of its development. Therefore, the poor growth components recorded in these treatments had positively contributed for lower yields. The effect of application of coffee pulp effluent and microbial culture on fruit quality of banana significantly differ with the treatments [Table-3]. The highest and lowest values of TSS and titrable acidity per cent of citric acid in banana plant crop were recorded in raw coffee pulp effluent irrigation without microbial culture (25.85 % and 0.084, respectively). The lowest TSS and highest titrable acidity per cent of citric acid was recorded in fresh water irrigation (22.2 % and 0.107, respectively). Reducing sugars, total sugars and sugars to acid ratio were found highest in lime treated coffee pulp effluent irrigation without microbial culture (21.68 %, 24.34 % and 265.3, respectively) in banana plant crop. The lowest values on fruit quality of banana plant crop were recorded in fresh water irrigation (18.06 % and 18.14 %, 20.44 % and 20.78 %, 226.5 and 210.6 respectively). Alternate and 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water with and without microbial culture recorded higher yield as compared to the other treatments [Table-2]. This might be due to dilution effect in case of alternate and 1:1 ratio irrigation with lime treated coffee pulp effluent and fresh water and also due to greater reduction in BOD and COD load by treating the effluent with lime and microbial culture which resulted in 38 to 26 per cent reduction in microbial treated coffee pulp effluent, 18 to 13 per cent reduction in lime treated coffee pulp effluent and 53 to 46 per cent reduction in lime treated coffee pulp effluent with microbial culture (BOD and COD respectively). The lime treatment enables to raise the soil pH to neutrality and under neutral pH conditions, the inoculated microbial culture grows optimally and then contributing for further reduction of BOD and COD [3 & 4]. Coffee pulp effluent is rich in organic matter and high BOD and COD, it will undergo mineralization at faster rate releasing plant nutrients over it is added to soil [5]. Application of coffee pulp effluent was known to increase the nutrient status of soil indicating better mineralization [6, 7]. Hence it is safer to irrigate standing crop than flooding fallow fields. This might be attributed to the presence of high humic substances which facilitate the timely availability of NPK to the plants through gradual release of nutrients in to the soil and thus contributing for higher yield and quality parameters. Greater absorption of nutrients in turn aids in conversion of vegetative phase in to reproductive phase of the plant [8]. Rapid differentiation of the meristem into various floral primordial structures that determine the future bunch size and also contribute for earlier completion of flower primordial differentiation in the span of four and eight months. In the present investigation also the treatments which favoured the early growth were found to possess greater number of yield components. Yield attributing characters like fruit length, fruit girth, fruit weight pulp to peel ratio. The entire processes of fruit growth and development in banana which are mediated by the interplay of endogenous growth substances and particularly, fruit length, fruit girth and quality parameters of fruit have been associated with endogenous levels of IAA and gibberellins in development parthenocarpic fruit like banana. Humic acids released from organic matter have stimulatory effect on cell elongation in both roots and shoots indicating the possibility of triggering the endogenous production of growth hormones [9-11].

**Application of research:** The effluent is discharged indiscriminately in to paddy lands without growing any crop. Under such situations coffee pulp effluent can serve as source of both water and nutrients, besides it contains a higher amount of organic matter, which is helpful in the build up of organic carbon content and serves as a source of microorganisms in the soil and which, solves the pollution problem.

## Research Category: Agronomy

### Abbreviations:

BOD- Biological Oxygen Demand, COD- Chemical Oxygen Demand, ha- hactare, l- liter, g- gram, mg- milligram, ppm- parts per million, dSm<sup>-1</sup> -desi simons per meter, pH- power of Hydrogen, EC- Electric Conductivity, meq- milli equivalent, cm- centimeter, m- meter, S, Em- Standard Error mean, CD- critical Difference, NS- Non-Significant, FYM- Farm Yard Mannure, CPE- Coffee Pulp Effluent, CFU- Colony Forming Unit, TPF- triphenylformazan.

**Acknowledgement / Funding:** Authors are thankful to University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru, 560065, Karnataka, India. Authors are also thankful to ICAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Mudigere, ZAHRS- Mudigere.

### \*Research Guide or Chairperson of research: Dr Bhaskar S.

University: University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore.

Research project name or number: PhD Thesis.

**Author Contributions:** All authors equally contributed

**Author statement:** All authors read, reviewed, agreed and approved the final manuscript. Note-All authors agreed that- Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to publish / enrolment

**Study area / Sample Collection:** Mudigere

**Cultivar / Variety / Breed name:** Grand Naine Banana

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

**Ethical approval:** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Ethical Committee Approval Number: Nil

### References

- [1] Rani Perumal and Singaram P. (1996) *Indian J. Agric. Chem.*, XXIX(1&2), 1-8.
- [2] Panse V.G. and Sukhatme P.V. (1961) *Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi*, 347.
- [3] Singh Y. and Raj Bahadur (1997) *Indian J. Ecology*, 24, 53-59.
- [4] Sukanya T.S. and Meli S.S. (2004) *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 17(3), 405-409.
- [5] Salakinkop S.R., Hunshal C.S. and Pattar P.S. (2000) *Intl. Conf. on Managing Natural Resources for Sustainable Agric. in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, Feb. 14-18, New Delhi, 201.
- [6] Basavalingaiah, Bhaskar S., Girisha H.C. and Srinivasamurthy C.A. (2009) *National Seminar on Sustainable Waste Management, Mangalore*, 52.
- [7] Basavalingaiah, Bhaskar S., Girisha H.C., Srinivasamurthy C.A., Janardhan J. and Dineshkumar M. (2017) *Intel. J. Tropical Agric.*, 35(3), 443-447.
- [8] Okon Y. (1985) *Trends Biotechnol.*, 3, 323-328.
- [9] Vaughan D. and Linehan D.J. (1976) *Pl. Soil*, 44, 445-449.
- [10] Ushakumari K., Prabhakumari P. and Padmaja P. (1997) *South Indian Hort.*, 45(384), 138-168.
- [11] Tirkey T., Agarwal S. and Pandey S.D. (2002) *South Indian Hort.*, 50 (1-3), 19-24.