

Drought stress effects on plant water relations, growth, fruit quality and osmotic adjustment of Tomato (*Solanum Lycopersicum*) under subtropical condition

Abstract

The pot experiments were conducted in 2 subsequent years in the net house of the Dept. of Soil, Water and Environment, Dhaka University to evaluate the effect of water stress on the growth, plant water relations, fruit quality and osmotic adjustment of seven tomato cultivars. The percentage of field capacity levels were 40, 70 and 100. The tomato plants subjected to water stress during their growth period had decreased relative water content (RWC) of leaves and moisture content in tomatoes compared with the plants supplied with adequate moisture. Water use efficiency (WUE) also decreased with increasing moisture stress. A significant increase in organic solutes, glucose (85%), fructose (62%), sucrose (121%) and proline (103%) at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F.C. showed a tendency of these plants to adjust osmotically. Ascorbic acid, citric acid and malic acid were also significantly enhanced by water stress treatments. The quality of fruits was improved as a result of the synthesis of these acids. Water stress did not affect the height of plants and no physical damage due to stress was observed in fruits and were over 90% red. Ripening and fruit quality showed that none of the stress-treated tomatoes deteriorated in quality. On the other hand, water stress enhanced the sweetness of the tomatoes by increasing their glucose, fructose, and sucrose contents and improved the quality by increasing the amount of important acids such as ascorbic acid, malic acid and citric acid.

Keywords: Tomato, Drought Stress, Plant Water Relations, Fruit Quality, Osmotic Adjustment

1. INTRODUCTION

Vegetable crops play an important role in human nutrition. People of Bangladesh, especially in the rural areas, suffer from malnutrition because of imbalanced diet (52).

Tomato is one of the most important and widely grown vegetable crops in the world. A lot of research (1, 2 & 3) was done on it under irrigation in pot or greenhouse experiments. Of more than 100 species of vegetable crops selected for intensive study in representative Asian countries, tomato ranked first (4). It is also a respectable source of some key nutrients such as vitamin A, vitamin C, sugar, ascorbic acid, some protein and iron. In subtropical climate, Tomato (*Solanum Lycopersicum*) is one of the most important and widely cultivated popular vegetables. Worldwide, tomato was the seventh most valuable commodity crop in 2013, with a gross production value of over \$60 billion (5).

Global climate changes such as increased global temperatures and changed rainfall patterns alter plant transpiration rates and affect crop water availability (6). Drought is a major limiting factor for crop production all over the world. The effects of drought stress on tomatoes yield vary widely by soil and climatic conditions (7).

Tomato is sensitive to a number of environmental stresses, especially extreme temperature, drought, salinity, inadequate moisture and environmental pollution, and there is a need to develop varieties that can withstand such environmental stresses (8). Crops production could be enhanced either by supplying adequate water or by growing drought-resistant crops. This could be overcome by selecting crops which have less demand for water or have root systems sufficient to utilize subsurface water.

The degree of availability of water to plants renders great influence on the whole complex physiological processes in plants. It has substantial impact on the chemical composition and physical properties of plant tissues, which in turn have decisive significance on the quality and yield of plants (9). Water deficits in tomato compromise fruit yield and also quality (10, 11 and 12). Plant sensitivity to drought stress varies at different growth stages (13 and 14). Greater WUE (i.e. less water use) before reproduction allows more water to remain in the soil profile for availability later in the season when plants are more susceptible to water stress (15).

Drought stress generally becomes most critical when the plants are at their maximum physiological activity. Water use efficiency is significantly affected by the timing of water application under limited water supply (16). WUE is the units of water used per unit of dry matter produced, often using total water lost by evapotranspiration (17).

Osmotic adjustment occurs in plants in response to salinity as well in response to drought and is currently the focus of much research interest. Solute accumulation caused due to drought (18) leads to a lowering of osmotic potential during stress. Recovery and partial or complete maintenance of turgor under stress conditions are termed osmotic adjustment (19). The organic molecules (glucose, fructose, sucrose, proline etc) act as osmotica and play an important role in osmotic adjustment (20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26.).

In this study, an experiment was conducted to investigate the effects of stress on water relations, quality and osmotic regulation of tomato. The main aim of the present study was to find out a suitable drought resistant tomato variety commonly cultivated in Bangladesh, to evaluate fruit quality, water use efficiency, sustain optimum growth, and solute accumulation under drought stress or with minimum use of water.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The pot experiment was conducted in Bangladesh; geographical location is 20° 34'N-26°38'N and 88° 01'E-92°41'E, mean humidity 79.5%, annual rainfall (average) 2000 mm and maximum annual temperature 36°C and minimum 12°C. The annual precipitation varies from 1500 mm in the north to 5700mm in the northeast (27).

The experiment was conducted in Dhaka district and during the periods from (November-March) in 2 subsequent years.

2.1. The experimental crop

Seven varieties of tomato plants namely, Marglobe, Ruma VF, BR-1, BR-2, BR-3, BR-4 and BR-5 were the test crops.

2.2. Collection of seeds

The seeds of two varieties namely Marglobe and Ruma VF were collected from Bangladesh Agriculture Development Corporation (BADC) farm and five varieties namely BR-1, BR-2, BR-4 and BR-5 from Bangladesh Agriculture Research Institute (BARI) at Gazipur. The two varieties, BR-4 and BR-5 were summer varieties but could be cultivated throughout the year, i.e. both in winter and summer.

3. Experiment type - (Pot experiment)

3.1. The experimental Soil media

The soil used in this experiment was of Demra series under Madhupur tract (According to Reconnaissance soil survey report of Dhaka district, 1965, reviewed in 1987). Soil samples were collected at a depth of 0-15 cm from Katchpur at Demra, Dhaka.

For physical and chemical analysis, collected soil samples were air dried, ground to pass through 2 mm sieve and then mixed thoroughly to make a composite sample. Dry roots, grasses and other vegetative residual parts were discarded from the soil.

3.3.1 Physical and chemical characteristics of soil

The general physical and chemical characteristics, of the soil were:

Textural class- Silty clay loam. Sand-5.8%, silt-60.2%, clay-34.0%, Moisture at field capacity- 33%, Maximum water holding capacity-46%, Hygroscopic moisture-1.40%, Porosity-49%, Bulk density-1.27g/cc, Particle density-2.57g/cc, pH-7.2, EC-143 μ S, OM1.14%, CEC-17.9 meq / 100g soil and N-0.06%.

The morphological characteristics of the soil are presented in table 1,

3.4.1. Experimental design and techniques

The experiment was conducted under natural condition in a completely randomized block design with four treatments and three replications at the net house of the Department of Soil, water environment, Dhaka University. Varieties namely Marglobe, Ruma VF, BR-1, BR-2, BR-4 and BR-5 were used in this experiment in 2 subsequent years. Earthen Pots each containing 8 kg of soil were used in this experiment. The height of the pots was 23 cm, diameter 29 cm and the height of the soil in the pots was 21 cm.

The pots were rearranged once a week so that the plants could receive uniform light and temperature.

Water was added to maintain a constant level of 40, 70 and 100 percent of the field capacity throughout the experimental period. Water levels were maintained by applying water on daily basis. Compensating the loss of water obtained by weighing the pots on a top balance

Table-1

Some morphological characteristics of the soil:

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Demra soil</u>
1. Location Village: Katchpur	
	P.O: Katchpur
	P.S: Demra
	District: Dhaka

-
2. Soil: Demra
 3. Soil tract: Madhupur tract
 4. General soil type: Grey to olive grey terrace
 5. FAQ/UNESCO Legend: Eutric Regosol
 - 6, USDA Soil Taxonomy: Aeric Haplaquept
 7. Topography: Nearly level terrace
 8. Vegetation: Mainly Aus and Aman paddy.

3.4.2. Sowing of seeds and transplantation of seedling

The seeds were sown (Bangladesh Agriculture Development Corporation) at BADC farm and after 24 days of germination two healthy seedlings of uniform size were transplanted to each pot. After transplantation plants were shaded for five days to protect them from sunlight.

The number of plants was thinned to one after one week of transplantation.

3.4.3 Application of water stresses

Three levels of water stresses were imposed in these experiments at the rate of 100%, 70% and 40% of the F.C. in order to investigate the effect of different moisture regimes on osmotic adjustment, relative water content, water use efficiency, moisture content of fruit and fruit quality of plants.

Water was added to maintain a constant level of 40, 70 and 100 percent of the field capacity throughout the experimental period. Water levels were maintained by applying water on daily basis. Compensating the loss of water obtained by weighing the pots on a top balance.

In the experiment, there was no loss of water through drainage as well as no extra gain of water other than the estimated irrigation water. In order to prevent the evaporation loss of water from the soil, the pots were well covered with aluminium foil.

The amount of water lost through transpiration and evaporation, if any, was supplemented by addition of water through funnel daily in the evening. The moisture regime was maintained by weighing the pots on a top balance at a regular interval till the final harvest (November-March). Compensation was allowed for the gain in weight due to vegetative growth of the plants.

Range of water added/day: For 100% F.C.=250-350ml/day, For 70% F.C.200-250ml/day, For 40% F.C.=150-200ml/day.

3.4.4. Nutrient supply

Cow dung was applied in the pot at the rate of 6t/ha and N, P and K at the rate of 260-200-150kg / ha.

The entire amount of potash, phosphorus and half of the nitrogen were mixed at the time of preparation of soil for the pot experiment. The rest half of the nitrogen was applied in two splits, one at the vegetative stage and another at the reproductive stage.

3.4.5. Spacing

Each pot was placed at 40 cm apart from another pot in the same row and each row had a distance of 40 cm.

3.4.6. Weeding

Weeds in the pots were controlled by uprooting and incorporated into the soil in order to ensure that there was no loss of nutrients.

3.4.7. Spraying of insecticide

As growth progressed, the tomato plants were attacked by insects. It was, therefore, necessary to spray the plants with Malathion (1 ml in 1 L water) as insecticide. The insecticide was sprayed as and when required.

3.4.8. Observation of growth

The height of plants and ripening of tomatoes were observed and recorded.



Plate - 1: Tomato plants with fruits in the net house.

269

270

271

272

3.4.9. Harvesting and yield analysis of plant

One plant per pot was harvested at the end of the experiment. All the plant samples were dried in an oven at 65°C and dry weight of the plants was also recorded. Finally, the plant samples were finely ground by plant sample grinder.

The amount of glucose, fructose, sucrose, ascorbic acid, citric acid and malic acid in fruits of tomato were determined by enzymatic method described by (28). Proline was also estimated from leaves by method described by (29) Visual quality and physical damage of the ripe tomatoes was determined according to the rating scale of (30).

3.4.10. Water and plant relation studies.

3.4.10.1 Determination of leaf relative water content (R.W.C)

The use of relative water content (R.W.C) or relative turgidity as an indicator of leaf water status (31). It is readily measurable and more easily linked to plant form and functions than water potential (32). The relative water content of the leaves was determined by the following formula.

$$\text{Relative Water Content RWC \%} = \frac{\text{Fresh weight} - \text{Dry weight}}{\text{Turgid weight} - \text{Dry weight}} \times 100$$

Leaf discs of about 10. mm. The diameter was collected from fresh leaves of the plants. These discs were rapidly transferred into specimen bottles, preventing any loss of water from the discs. The weight of fresh leaf discs was taken and then allowed to obtain turgidity for sixteen hours (33) in distilled water in closed Petri dishes. After attaining turgidity, the discs were taken out with forceps on a tissue paper and placing another over them so that excess water adhering to the surface of the discs was quickly soaked in.

The turgid weight of the leaf discs was then taken. Finally dry weight was taken after being oven dried for at least four hours at a temperature of 60°C.

From the measured relative water content, the leaf water status may also be expressed conveniently (34) by the index relative water deficit (RWD), which is 100 RWC.

3.4.10.2. Measurement of water use efficiency (WUE)

The efficiency of water use was calculated at different moisture regime. The WUE is the units of water per unit of dry matter produced, often using total water lost by both evaporation and transpiration. (17).

$$\text{WUE} = \frac{\text{Water used in Evapotranspiration}}{\text{Dry matter produced}}$$

Dry matter

3.4.10.3. Measurement of moisture content in tomatoes

The moisture percent in tomato fruits was calculated at different moisture stress, In the experiment water content measurements involve weighing the sample, removing the water and reweighing the sample to determine the amount of water removed. When multiplied by 100, this becomes the percentage of water in the sample on fresh weight basis. The moisture content of the sample was given by the formula

$$\% \text{ Moisture in tomatoes} = \frac{(\text{Wt of tomato + container}) - (\text{wt of dry tomato + container})}{(\text{Wt of tomato + container}) - (\text{wt of container})} \times 100$$

3.4.11 Biochemical analysis

3.4.11.1. Determination of proline (29)

For determination of proline in tomato leaves, Purified Proline was used to standardize the sample values.

Reagents:

Acid ninhydrin was prepared by warming 1.25 g ninhydrin in 30 ml glacial acetic acid and 20 ml 6M phosphoric acid, with agitation, until dissolved Kept cold (Stored at 4°C) The reagent remains stable for 24 hours.

Procedure:

- (a) Approximately 0.5 g of plant material was homogenized in 10 ml of 3% aqueous sulfosalicylic acid and the homogenate filtered through whatman # 2 filter paper.
- (b) Two ml of filtrate was reacted with 2ml acid ninhydrin and 2ml of glacial acetic acid in a test tube for 1 hour at 100°C and reaction terminated in an ice bath.
- (c) The reaction mixture was extracted with 4-ml toluene, mixed vigorously with a test tube stirrer for 15-20 sec.
- (d) The chromophore containing toluene was aspirated from the aqueous phase, warmed to room temperature and the absorbance read at 520 nm using toluene for a blank.
- (e) The proline concentration was determined from a standard curve and calculated on a fresh weight basis.

370
371 **3.4.11.2 Determination of Glucose, Fructose, Sucrose, Malic acid, Ascorbic acid**
372 **and citric acid (28)**

373
374 **Sample preparation -**

375 For determination of glucose, fructose, sucrose, malic acid and citric acid in tomato
376 fruits, following techniques are used for sample preparation.

377
378 The sample was homogenized using a mortar; A well-mixed sample was accurately
379 weighed and extracted with hot water (60°C). The extract was transferred
380 quantitatively to a volumetric flask and filled up to the mark with redistilled water.
381 Filtered and used the clear solution for the assay. For clarification (glucose, fructose and
382 sucrose) the following solutions are used 5 ml carrez-I solution (360g potassium
383 hexacyanoferrate-II, $K_4[Fe(CN)_6] \cdot 3H_2O/100ml$. 5ml carrez-II solution (7.20g of $ZnSO_4 \cdot$
384 $7H_2O/100ml$ and 10ml NaOH(0.1 mol/L).

385
386 L. Ascorbic acid: For the assay of ascorbic acid the tomatoes were well minced with an
387 electric mixture and homogenized with metaphosphoric acid (1 5%WN). After mincing
388 the pH of the mixture was adjusted to 3.7 with KOH solution.

389
390
391 Finally the results were statistically analyzed employing the Duncan's New Multiple
392 Range Test (DMRT).

393
394 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

395
396 The objective of this study was to evaluate the effect of stress on growth, fruit quality,
397 moisture content, water use efficiency, Relative water content and osmotic adjustment
398 of different tomato cultivars.

399
400 **3.1. Effect of water stress on shoot development of plants.**

401
402 Shoot development of plants involved in measurement of plant heights during the
403 experimental periods.

404
405
406 The statistical results on the final height of the plants were presented in table 2 (Ist and
407 2nd year) and graphically represented in Fig 1-2.

408
409
410 **3.1.1. Height of plants.**

411
412 Results obtained on the final height of plants indicated that the varieties had different
413 heights. The maximum heights were measured in BR-5. and BR-I. Marglobe, Ruma VF
414 and BR-2 did not differ among themselves in Ist year.

Table - 2: Height of plants in different cultivars.

Year	Cultivars	Height (cm)
Ist year	BR-2	47.87b
	Marglobe	47.74 b
	Ruma VF	44.32 b
	BR-1	61.87a
	BR-5	71.75a

Year	Cultivars	Height (cm)
2 nd year	BR-1	86.00a
	BR-2	79.89 a
	BR-4	84.22 a
	BR-5	91.22 a

In a column, means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.




Fig 2. Effect of water stress on height of plants (2nd Year)




Table -3. Effect of different water stress treatments on height of plants.

Year	Treatment	Height (cm)
1st year	100%F.C	56.90a
	70%F.C	53.66a
	40%F.C	55.22a
Year	Treatment	Height (cm)
2 nd year	100% F.C	75.58 b
	70%F.C	88.17ab
	40% F.C	92.25 a

In a column, means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.

But in 2nd year the results revealed that there was no significant difference in height among the cultivars. The results also showed that the maximum height was obtained at 40% field capacity in 2nd year, but no significant difference was observed among the treatments in 1st year (Table 3).

Discussion.

This result did not confirm the findings of others (32, 35) who reported the reduction of growth due to water stress. The result of the current experiment agreed with the findings of the earlier researcher, (36) and also by (37) those who postulated that when

water becomes available after a short period of stress, growth is very rapid for a short time, so that no net reduction is caused by stress in tomato plant.

3.2. Effect of water stress on plant water relations.

Plant water relation includes leaf relative water content, water use efficiency in plant and moisture content in tomatoes. The study was made at three stress levels includes 100%, 70% and 40% field moisture capacity among four cultivars.

3.2.1. Results

Plant water relation parameters are presented in Table 3-4

Table – 4. Plant water relations in different cultivars.

Cultivars	Leaf relative water content%	Water use efficiency	Moisture content in tomatoes %
BR-1	70.94b	3149b	91.13b
BR-2	66.32 d	3849ab	91.11 b
BR-4	69.90c	4724 a	92.54 a
BR-5	79.35a	2885b	92.41 a

In a column, means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.

Table - 5. Effect of different water stress treatments on plant water relations in plants

Treatment	Relative water content%	Water use efficiency	Water use efficiency in tomatoes %
100% F.C	73.86 a	5372 a	93.04 a
70%F.C	72.02b	3091 b	91.75b
40% F.C	69.0c	2492 b	90.60 c

In a column, means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.

3.2.1.1 Leaf relative water content:

The cultivars differed significantly in their relative water content. The highest relative water content was found in BR-5 cultivars followed by BR-1, BR-4 and BR-2 (Table-4). The results also show that the relative water content decreased significantly with increasing water stress (Table 5). The maximum leaf relative water content was contributed at 100% of field capacity followed by 70 and 40% of field capacities. At 40% F.C. the leaf relative water content decreased by 7%, compared to 100% of the field capacity.

3.2.1.2 Water use efficiency:

The cultivars had great variation in water use efficiency. The statistical data is shown in table 4 indicate that the highest water use efficiency was found in BR-4. There was significant difference in WUE among BR-4 and other three varieties. The results also indicated that like RWC, WUE is also profoundly influenced by water stress.

Here the maximum value was obtained at 100% F.C followed by 70 and 40% field capacities (Table 5). At 40% F.C. the water use efficiency was decreased by 115% compared with 100% F.C. treatment.

3.2.1.3 Moisture content in tomatoes.

The effect of different soil moisture regime on moisture content in tomatoes revealed that there was a significant difference among the cultivars. The highest content of moisture in tomatoes was found in BR-4 and BR-5, which differed significantly from BR-1 and BR-2. There was no difference between BR-1 and BR-2 (Table 4).

The result also revealed that like RWC and WUE, moisture content in tomatoes decreased significantly with water stresses (Table 5). It was 3% lower at 40% of the field capacity compared to 100% field capacity treatment.

Considering the Overall performance among the varieties, BR-5 and BR-4 were contributed better performance in withstanding stress condition.

3.3. Discussion.

Water stress application influenced significantly plant water relations (RWC, WUE and Moisture content). The crop receiving the lowest water stress maintained higher plant water status (RWC & WUE) and highest moisture content.

The result of the experiment clearly demonstrates that the leaf relative water content seemed to be subjected to fluctuation under stress. This result confirmed the findings of others (38, 39 and 36) who stated that the leaf relative water content decreased due to decreasing soil water availability and increasing resistance to water flow in stems and leaves.

A similar trend happened in moisture content in tomatoes. Percentage of moisture in tomatoes decreased with increasing water stress. This result was also in consistent with (40) who observed that with increasing water stress moisture content of the fruit decreased.

The result of water use efficiency indicates that it is higher in control treatment and decreased with increasing stress. This result also agrees with the findings of (41) who observed water use efficiency decreased with increasing water stress. WUE can be increased more by adjustment of timing of plant development than by increasing the photosynthetic potential (42). (43) Suggested that an increase in ratio of mesophyll cell surface to leaf surface might increase the WUE by increasing photosynthesis more than it increases transpiration.

4.1. Effect of water stress on osmotic adjustment and quality parameters.

Concentrations of Proline, Crude protein, Glucose, Fructose, Sucrose, Malic acid, Ascorbic acid and Citric acid.

4.1.1. Results

Concentrations of proline, crude protein, glucose, fructose, sucrose, malic acid, ascorbic acid and citric acid increased with increasing water stresses. Results of these parameters among cultivars and treatments are presented in Table 5 and 6.

Table – 6. Content of organic solutes in different cultivars,

Cultivars	% Proline	% Crude protein	% Glucose	% Fructose	% Sucrose	% Ascorbic Acid	% Malic Acid	% Citric Acid
BR-1	3.46 a b	7.33 a	0.64 c	0.76 b	0.83 c	0.02 b	0.30 b	0.26 b
BR-2	4.17 a	7.86 a	0.97 a	0.98 a	1.40 b	0.02ab	0.37 a b	0.46 a
BR4	3.23 b	9.31 a	0.77 b	0.85 a b	1.67 a	0.03 a	0.44 a	0.44 a
BR-5	3.40 a b	8.54 a	0.89 a b	0.97 a	1.43 b	0.03 a	0.40 a b	0.31 b

In a column, means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.

Proline:

Proline contents in tomato leaves showed that there was significant difference in concentration among the cultivars. The highest concentration was obtained BR-2, followed by BR-1, BR-5 and BR-4 (Table 6).

Water stress also had great influences on synthesis of proline. With the increase in Water stress, proline contents in tomato plants were also increased. There was more than 100% increase in proline content at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F.C. treatment(Table 7).

Crude protein:

A reverse trend was observed in crude protein concentration. The concentration was maximum at 100% F.C. and decreased significantly with increasing water stress (Table 7). At 40% F.C. it was decreased by 33% compared to 100% F.C. No significant difference was observed among the cultivars (Table 6).

Glucose:

The concentration of glucose revealed that among the cultivars BR-2 contained the highest and BR-1 contained the lowest concentration while BR-5 contained the intermediate, followed by BR-4 (Table 6).

Table – 7. Effect of different water stress treatments on organic solutes content in plants.

Treatment	% Proline	% Crude protein	% Glucose	% Fructos e	% Sucrose	% Ascorbic Acid	% Malic Acid	% Citric Acid
100% F.C	2.36 c	9.23 a	0.61 b	0.72 b	0.89 c	0.021 C	0.26 b	0.26 b
70% F.C	3.54 b	8.63 a b	0.71 b	0.78 b	1.13 b	0.028 b	0.39 a	0.41 a
40% F.C	4.80 a	6.92 b	1.13 a	1.17 a	1.97 a	0.037 a	0.48 a	0.44 a

In a column, means followed a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT.

The highest, concentration of glucose (1.13%) in tomato fruits was obtained at 40% F.C. followed by 70 and 100% field capacities (Table 7). There was 85% increase in glucose content at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F. C. treatment

Fructose:

Like glucose, fructose contents in tomato fruits showed that the concentrations among the cultivars differed significantly. The highest concentration was observed in BR-5 and BR-2 and the lowest in BR-1. There was no difference between BR-2 and BR-5, but differed significantly from BR-1 and slightly from BR4 (Table 6).

The water-stressed tomato plants differed significantly and the highest concentration of fructose (1.17%) was found at 40% water stress treatment which was 62% higher than that of 100% F.C. However there was no difference between the treatments 70 and 100% of the F. C. (Table 7).

Sucrose:

Sucrose concentration in four tomato cultivars showed that there was significant difference in concentration among the cultivars. The highest concentration was observed in BR-4 followed by BR-5, BR-2 and BR-1 (Table 6).

Sucrose concentration was also affected by water stresses. The highest concentration was found at 40% and the lowest at 100% field capacity (Table 7). The tomato plants significantly accumulated more sucrose with increasing water stress. There was about 120% increase of sucrose content at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F.C. treatment.

Ascorbic acid:

Ascorbic acid concentration was also affected by water stress. The concentration in fruit increased with increasing water stress and the highest amount was observed at 40% followed by 70% and 100% field capacity (Table 7). An increase of 76% of ascorbic acid concentration was observed at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F.C.

The concentration among the cultivars also differed significantly. BR-4 and BR-5 contained the highest amount followed by BR-2 and BR-1 (Table 6).

Malic acid:

Malic acid concentration was also dependent on variety and treatments. There was significant difference in concentration among the cultivars and BR-4 contained the highest concentration of malic acid followed by BR-5, BR-2 and BR-1 (Table 6). Malic acid concentration was also influenced by the different levels of water stress. (Table 7). There was an increase of about 85% malic acid concentration at 40% F.C. compared with 100% F.C.

Citric acid:

Citric acid concentration was found highest in BR-2 and BR-4 followed by BR-5 and BR-1. (Table 6). Like malic and ascorbic acid, the concentration increased with increasing water stresses. About 69% increase in citric acid was noticed at 40% F.C. compared with that of 100% F.C. treatment. (Table 7).




Plate- 2: Colour of tomatoes (BR-1) at different water stress level.




Plate - 3: Colour of tomatoes (BR-2) at different water stress level.




Plate - 4.: Colour of tomatoes (BR-4) at different water stress level.




Plate -5: Colour of tomatoes (BR-5) at different water stress level.

4.1.1.2. Discussion

A lowering of water potential due to drought stress causes a wide range of changes in physiological responses from a decrease in photosynthesis to closing of stomata and a turgor pressure, decrease is thought to be one of the controlling factors in these changes (44). For this reason, osmotic adjustment is regarded to be important under stressed conditions. The obvious advantage of osmotic adjustment is the enhancement of the capacity of a plant to maintain positive turgor, particularly in roots during water deficits (45).

The organic molecules such as glucose, fructose, sucrose, proline etc act as osmotica and play an important role in osmotic adjustment in plants (20, 21, 22, 46, 23, 24, 25, 47, 48 and 49).

The result of the current experiment revealed that the concentration of proline in tomato leaves increased with increasing water stress. This result confirms the findings of (50, 51 and 52) who postulated that drought stress increased the leaf proline content in plant.

According to (53) water stress decreased protein contents in plants. The present result is also in consistent with the findings which imply that soluble protein did not contribute to osmotic adjustment.

In this experiment, the content of glucose, fructose, sucrose, malic acid, ascorbic acid and citric acid increased significantly against water stress.

These results agree with the findings of (22, 23, 24, 54 and 55) who reported significant increase in glucose, fructose, in some cases sucrose, ascorbic acid and citric acid in faba bean and tomato by salt and water stress.

Ripeness classes of tomatoes were determined according to (30). The tomatoes were red over 90%, classified as red and scored 6 of Grierson and Kader's table 6. 5 in all treatments. No difference was found between the control and water stress treatments (Plate 2-5).

With regard to internal tissue damage due to bruising, no degree of severity and no visible internal tissue damage were observed, The tomatoes had score 1 of Grierson and Kader's table 6.6 in all treatments. Overall visual quality of tomatoes under all treatments was also excellently good; essentially no symptoms of deterioration were noticed. They had the score 9 of the table 6.7 (30).

Additionally, no symptoms of physical damage in any of the treatments could be detected [Score 1 of table 6.8 (30)].

Conclusion:

From the experiment, it can be concluded that under drought stress plants showed a tendency to adjust against drop in water potential in soil by producing organic solutes and important acids.

It is believed that drought-resistant cultivars have wide adaptation and internal physiological

The process of stress by accumulation of solutes and acids. On the other hand, water stress enhanced the sweetness of the tomatoes by increasing glucose, fructose and sucrose contents and improved the quality by increasing the concentrations of important acids such as ascorbic acid, malic acid and citric acid.

Finally, we can conclude that it is possible to use water stress tolerance selection criteria in tomato breeding program for drought resistance.

704
705

706
707
708
709

710

711

BIBLIOGRAPHY

712 1. Kirda et al., Kirda, M. Cetin, Y. Dasgan, S. Topcu, H. Kaman, B. Ekici, M.R. Derici, A.I.
713 Ozguven. Yield response of greenhouse grown tomato to partial root drying and conventional
714 deficit irrigation. *Agric. Water Manage.* 2004. 69: 191-201

715 2. Claussen W. Proline as a measure of stress in tomato plants. *Plant Science*, 2005. 168:
716 241–248.

717

718 3. Tahi H., Wahbi S., Wakrim R., Aganchich B., Serraj R., Centritto M. Water relations,
719 photosynthesis, growth and water-use efficiency in tomato plants subjected to partial
720 rootzone drying and regulated deficit irrigation. *Plant Biosystems*, 2007. 141: 265–274.

721

722 4. Asian vegetable research and development Center. Pre-and post- harvest vegetable
723 technology in Asia, 1977. Shanhua, Taiwan, Roc.

724 5. FAOSTAT. 2014. FAOSTAT database: 2013 production. <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/E>

725

726 6. Walthall, C.L., J. Hatfield, P. Backlund, L. Lengnich, E. Marshall, M. Walsh, et al.
727 Climate change and agriculture in the United States: Effects and adaptation. USDA. 2012.
728 http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/effects_2012/effects_agriculture.

729

730 7. Zegbe et al., J.A. Zegbe, M.H. Behboudian, B.E. Clothier. Response of tomato to partial
731 rootzone drying and deficit irrigation. *Revista Fitotecnia Mexicana*. 2007 30: 125-131

732 8. Kalloo, G. Genetic Improvement of vegetable crops. In *Tomato*. Kallo, G and Bergh,
733 B.O. (ed.), Pergamon press, New York. 1993. 645-666.

734 9. Kramer, P J. Water relations of plants. Academic press, 1983. New York, London.

735 10. Mitchell JP, Shennan C, Grattan SR, May DM. Tomato fruit yields and quality under
736 water deficit and salinity. *J. Am Soc Hortic Sci.* 1991. 116(2):215-221

737 11. Patane, C., and S.L. Cosentino. Effects of soil water deficit on yield and quality of
738 processing tomato under a Mediterranean climate. *Agr. Water Manage.* 2010. 97:131–138.

739

740 12. Kuşcu, H., A. Turhan, and A.O. Demir. The response of processing tomato to deficit
741 irrigation at various phenological stages in a sub-humid environment. *Agr. Water*
742 *Manage.* 2014. 133:92–103.

743

- 744 13. Cattivelli, L., F. Rizza, F. Badeck, E. Mazzucotelli, A. Mastrangelo, E. Francia, et al.
745 Drought tolerance improvement in crop plants: An integrated view from breeding to
746 genomics. *Field Crops Res.* 2008. 105:1–14.
747
- 748 14. Vadez, V., J. Kholova, S. Medina, A. Kakkera, and H. Anderberg. Transpiration
749 efficiency: New insights into an old story. *J. Exp. Bot.* 2014.65:6141–6153.
750
- 751 15. Ratnakumar, P., V. Vadez, S.N. Nigam, and L. Krishnamurthy. Assessment of
752 transpiration efficiency in peanut (*Arachishypogaea* L.) under drought using a lysimetric
753 system. *PlantBiol.* 2009. 11:124–130.
754
- 755 16. Bhuyan, M.A.J and Haque, M.M. Selection of tomato varieties for winter and summer
756 production. *Bangladesh, Hort.* 1983.11: 41-43.
- 757 17. Teare, I.D., Kanemasu, E.T., Powers, W.L and Jacobs, B.S. Water use efficiency and its
758 relation to crop Canopy area, stomatal regulation and root distribution. *Agron. J.*
759 1973.65: 207-211.
- 760 18. Begg, J.E and Turner, N.C. Crop water deficit. *Adv. Agron.* 1976.28: 161-217.
- 761 19. Turner, M. C. and Jones M..M. Turgor maintainance by osmotic adjustment: a review
762 and evaluation in; Turer, N, C and Kramer, P.J. (eds), *Adaptation of plants to water and*
763 *high temperature stress.* 1980.155 -172, Wileys, New York.
- 764 20. Greenway, H. and Munns, R. Mechanisms of salt tolerance in nonhalophytes. *Annual*
765 *review of plant physiol.* 1980.31: 149-90.
- 766 21. Flower, T.J., Rani, A.U and Peacock, J M. Influence of osmotic adjustment on the
767 growth, stornatal conductance and light interception of contrasting sorghum lines in a
768 harsh environment. *Aust. J. plant physiol.* 1990.17(1) 91-105.
- 769 22. McCree, K.J. Whole plant carbon balance during osmotic adjustment to drought and
770 salinity stress. *Aust. J. Plant physiol.* 1986. 13: 33-43.
- 771 23. Ullah, S M., Soja, G and Gerzabek, M.H. Ion uptake, Osmoregulation and plant water
772 relations in faba bean (*Vicia faba*) under salt stress. *Die Bodenkultur.* 1993.44: 291- 301.
- 773 24. Ullah, S.M., Gerzabek M.H and Soja, G. Effect of sea-water and soil salinity on ion
774 uptake, yield and quality of tomato (fruit). *Die Bodenkultur.* 1994. 45(1): 1- 8.
- 775 25. Ullah S. M., Chamon, A. S., Chowdhury, M.S. Rahman, M.M. and Mondol, M.M. Ion
776 uptake, yield and quality of tomato (fruits) under simulated seawater salinity stress.
777 *Dhaka Univ. J. Biol. Sci.* 1997.6(2): 195-204.
- 778 26. Nahar.K, S.M. Ullah and N. Islam. Osmotic Adjustment and Quality Response of Five
779 Tomato Cultivars (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) Following Water Deficit Stress under
780 Subtropical Climate. *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences.* 2011.10 (2): 153-157.
781
- 782 27. Hussain, M.S. Soil classification with special reference to the soils of Bangladesh.
783 *University of Dhaka.* 1992.

- 784 28. Boehringer Mannheim. Methods of Biochemical Analysis and Food Analysis,
785 Sandhofer Stra Be 116 6800 Mannheim 31, W. Germany. 1989. 2-122.
- 786 29. Bates, L.S., Waldren, R.P. and Teare, I.D. Rapid determination of free proline for
787 water stress studies. Plant and soil. 1973.39: 205-207.
- 788 30. Grierson, D and Kader, A. A. Fruit Ripening and Quality. In: The tomato crop
789 (Atherton. J.G and J. Rudich eds). Chapman and Hall. London/New York. 1986.241-280.
- 790 31. Weatherley, P.E.Studies in the water relations of the cotton plants 1. The field
791 measurement of water deficits in leaves. New phytol. 1950. 49: 81- 97.
- 792 32. Hsiao, T.C. Plant responses to water stress. Annu. Rev, plant physiol. 1973. 24: 519-
793 570.
- 794 33. Barrs, H.D and Weatherley, P.E. A re-examination of the relative turgidity techniques
795 for estimating water deficits in leaves. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 1962.15: 413-428.
- 796 34. Shimshi, D.Water status in plants method of measuring. In Arid zone irrigation (ed.
797 Aran, B. Danfors, E. and vadia, Y.) Ecological studies.1973. 5: 249-259. Springer-Verlag,
798 New York.
- 799 35. Zebri, G., Lecain, D.R., Morgan, J.A. Concurrent action of salinity and water stress on
800 leaf gas exchange and water relations in tomato. J. Hort. Sci. 1990. 65(6): 675- 68.
- 801 36. Nahar.K and S.M. Ullah, Morphological and Physiological Characters of Tomato
802 (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) Cultivars under Water Stress. *Bangladesh Journal of*
803 *Agricultural Research*, 2012.37(2): 355-360.
- 804
- 805 37. Gates, C.T. The response of the young tomato plant to a brief period of water
806 shortage. 1. The whole plant and its principal parts. Aust. J Biol. Sci. 1955. 8: 196-214.
- 807 38. Rudich and Luchinsky, U. Water economy. In Arther, J.G and Rudich, J. The tomato
808 crop. 1986. 335- 367.
- 809 39. Tahar, B., Abdellah. A, Abdul. K, A. Al-Shoaibi, Ali M. A. Effect of water stress on
810 growth and water use efficiency (WUE) of some wheat cultivars (*Triticum durum*) grown in
811 Saudi Arabia. Journal of Taibah University for Science. Volume. 2010. 3: 39-48.
- 812 40. Hayata, Y., Tabe, T., Kondo, S., Inoue, K. The effects of water stress on growth, sugar
813 and nitrogen content of cherry tomato fruit, J.Jpn.Soc.Hortic.Sci. 1998. 68(3): 499-504.
- 814 41.Rahman, S.M.L., Newata. E and Sakuratani, T. .Effect of water stress on growth, yield
815 and eco-physiological responses of four tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.)
816 cultivars. J. Jpn. Soc. 1999.68(3): 499-504.
- 817 42. Monteith and Webb. Soil water and nitrogen in Mediterranean type environment.
818 Plant soil. 1981. 58: 1-134.
- 819 43. Nobel P.S. Morphology, nurse plants, and minimum apical temperatures for young
820 *Carnegie gigantea*. Bot Gaz. 1980. 141:188–191

- 821
822 44. Osmond, C.B. Integration of photosynthetic carbon metabolism during stress. In
823 Genetic Engineering osmoregulation Eds. D.W. Rains., Volentine R.C. and Hollander A.
824 1980.171-185.
- 825 45. Oosterhuis, D.M., Ball, R A., Hampton, R.E. Plant indicators of water stress for
826 improved irrigation scheduling. Special report Agricultural Experiment station, Division
827 of Agriculture. University of Arkansas. 1990.144: 33-43.
- 828 46. Torrecillas, A., Guillaume, C., Alarcon, J. J., Ruiz-Sanchez, M.C. Plant Science (Ireland).
829 1995. 105 (2): 169-176.
- 830 47. Nahar.K, S. M. Ullah and R. Gretzmacher. Influence of soil moisture stress on height,
831 dry matter and yield of seven tomato cultivars. *Canadian Journal of Scientific and Industrial*
832 *Research*. 2011. 2(4):160-163.
833
- 834 48. Jnandabhiram C, Sailen P. B. Water Stress Effects on Leaf Growth and Chlorophyll
835 Content but Not the Grain Yield in Traditional Rice (*Oryza sativa* Linn.) Genotypes of
836 Assam, India II. Protein and Proline Status in Seedlings under PEG Induced Water Stress.
837 *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, 2012. 3:971-980
838
- 839 49. Dekoum V. M., Marius A, Liyun L, Akihiro U, Toshinori N, Hirofumi S. Effects of
840 drought stress on growth, solute accumulation and membrane stability of leafy vegetable,
841 huckleberry (*Solanum scabrum* Mill.) *Journal of Environmental Biology*. 2016. 37 (1): 107-
842 14
- 843 50. Song-luan and Cheng Yih Chen. The relationship between Osmotic adjustment and
844 drought resistance Soybean. J. AGRIC ASSOC CHINA NEWSER. 1992. 158: 19-28.
- 845 51. Kundu, P.B and Paul, N.K. Effect of water stress on chlorophyll, Proline and sugar
846 accumulation in Rape (brassica Campestris L.). Bangladesh J. Bot. 1997. 26(1): 83-85.
- 847 52. Nahar.K and R. Gretzmacher. Effect of water stress on nutrient uptake, yield and quality
848 of tomato (L.e) under subtropical conditions Die Bodenkultur. *Austrian Journal of*
849 *Agricultural Research*. 2002.53: 45-51.
850
- 851 53. Nahar.K, S. M. Ullah and R. Gretzmacher. Influence of soil moisture stress on height,
852 dry matter and yield of seven tomato cultivars. *Canadian Journal of Scientific and Industrial*
853 *Research*. 2011. Vol. 2, No. 4.
854
- 855 54. Rose, I.A. Effects of moisture stress on the oil and protein components of soybean
856 seeds. AustJ. J. Agri, Re. 1988. 39(2): 163-170.
- 857 55. Nahar.K. 2014. Effect of Water Stress on Nutrient Uptake, Osmotic Adjustment and Root
858 Development in Different Tomato Cultivars. ISBN 978- 1-312-59237-7. Lulu Publisher
859