

# The Peculiarities of Vegetable Grafting Technology in Georgia

**Nato Kakabadze**

*Georgian Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia*

(Presented by Academy Member Avtandil Korakhashvili)

**ABSTRACT.** Since vegetable grafting technology is relatively new to Georgia, it is very important to further develop the introduced technology, and testing of adapted species to be grown in different regions of Georgia under various climate and soil conditions. Within the study, the ability of the plants to match with other species were identified for Georgia, as well as potential productivity of their combination varieties. It was established that Tomato rootstock TD2 F1 affects the grafted one and in the result, the plant starts blooming period earlier and the amount of yield is increased. Maxifort F1 causes difference in the growth of a plant; a grafted plant grows a bit better and faster in compare with un-grafted one. In case of sweet pepper, the diseases have not been identified either, though, the rootstock positively influenced on the quantity of the crop. As it is evident from the results of pumpkin cultures study, it is desirable to test the grafted plants in an environment where a source from which disease can be spread is present because the above- mentioned technology is one of the measures applied in order to fight against these diseases. © 2018 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

**Key words:** vegetable grafting, rootstocks, grafting-stocks, combination varieties, disease resistance

It is very important to further develop the technology of vegetable grafting and conduct testing of the introduced and adapted species to be grown in different regions of Georgia under various climate and soil conditions.

The aim of the research is to supply Georgian farmers to produce highly competitive vegetable and orchard cultures with the help of the grafted seedlings studied within the present project. The object of research: 15 combinations of 6 cultures were presented for study, namely, 7 tomatoes, 4

aubergines, 1 sweet pepper, 1 cucumber, 1 water melon, and 1 melon.

**Material and Methods.** The study was conducted on 3-3 cultures of solanaceae and cucumber families, particularly on tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill), sweet pepper (*Capsicum annuum*), aubergine (*Solanum melongena*), cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.), melon, (*Cucumis melo*), and water melon. (*Citrullus lanatus*).

For tomato, aubergine and sweet pepper rootstocks of the same vegetables were used. But for “pumpkin family” sprout rootstock was used.

**Table 1. The number of plants survived**

Grafted combinations	Number of grafted plants (unit)	Saved plants	
		number	%
Tomato	350	215	61
Aubergine	254	149	58
Sweet pepper	45	12	27
Cucumber	108	25	23
Water melon	88	8	9
Melon	88	7	8

To produce scion-grafted seedlings, the Hole Insertion Method (HIG) was used .

From rootstocks and grafting-stocks a hybrid grafted seedling was obtained, also within family of the culture – a mixed grafted combinations of cultures were tested. Accordingly, within one culture we got 9 combinations, and in 6 cultures we got – 54. Some mixed combinations of cultures were added (e.g. tomato (rootstock) x aubergine (rootstock), tomato x sweet pepper : 18 variations altogether. We received 72 grafted combinations: 12 rootstocks and 18 for grafting which were moved to the testing Plot of Agricultural Research Center of Georgia. There some advantages of grafted vegetables and orchard cultures were demonstrated. The chosen testing plot also had a demonstration function where the representatives of research institutions and farmers associations were invited to observe testing process to see the results of the study and participate in the grafting process.

Next to the grafted plants, control rootstocks were planted which were later used to conduct phenological and morphological studies and comparison.

For rootstocks the following vegetables were used: Tomato - Maxifort F1 and TD-2F1; Aubergine - ZippyF1, NiloF1 and RedScorpion F1; Sweet pepper - TE135F1; Pumpkin - 109W F1 . Also the rootstocks of cucumber, water melon and melon.

For grafting we tomato used: Belfort F1, Shady lady F1, also B-3 and B-13 (rosy tomato and local

species of tomatoes.) Aubergine – Nilo F1; Sweet pepper - Samanter F1; Cucumber - Olimpian F1;

Water melon - Dinasty F1; Melon - Merlin F1.

Sowing: plants from solanace family were sown 10.03.2016 Grafting process took place:

Tomato – May 3-5. 2016; Aubergine – May 6-7. 2016; Pumpkin family crops - May 17-20.2016 . Planting: tomato, aubergine, sweet pepper – June 14. 2016. Cucumber, melon, water melon - June 31. 2016

The study of basic phenological characteristics was conducted based on BBCH scale. The method of grafting the vegetables is based on the principle of joining rootstocks and cambium grafting plant roots. This principle is carried out through different methods in different cultures.

After grafting, the seedlings are used to be transplanted to a particular environment with adequate technology; specifically they were planted in an adaptation space where they were kept for 6-7 days on following conditions: 25<sup>0</sup> temperature and 95% humidity.

Grafting took place before the seedlings of the above mentioned cultures were grown in a greenhouse. The sowing process took place in the containers specially allotted for the seedlings. After grafting process was finished, grafted seedlings were moved to an adaptation camera for 6-7 days, and after they were returned back to greenhouse until the seedlings were ready to be replanted in the field.

The following aspects of the grafting process were studied percentage of seedlings left after

**Table 2. Influence of rootstock on phenological characteristics**

Tomato	Height of plant (cm)	Harvest (kg)	Harvest per one plant
Maxifort F1 × Belfort F1	1.25	27.10	1.35
TD2 F1 × Belfort F1	1.10	19.95	1.66
Belfort F1	1.0	22.85	1.14
Maxifort F1 × Shady lady F1	0.85	23.10	1.15
Shady lady F1	0.8	9.70	0.48
TD2 F1 × Shady lady F1	0.7	19.7	1.23
Maxifort F1 × B3-8	1.35	18.60	1.16
B3-8	1.30	20.40	1.27
Maxifort F1 × B3-13	1.45	21	1.3
TD2 F1 × B3-13	1.40	42.35	3
B3-13	1.40	19.10	1.19
Maxifort F1	1.75	-	-
TD2 F1	1.50	-	-

grafting of each culture. After transplanting – the beginning of blossom; full blossom, the first typical fruit, type of plant growth, height of the plant. Observation was carried out on Verticillous wilt, on Fusarium wilt and resistance against other pests and diseases.

### Results

Table (1) shows that, the highest percentage of survival has tomato (61%) and the lowest indicators have water melon and melon (8-9%). The influence of rootstocks on phenomenological development and on other characteristics was studied.

It is noteworthy that rootstocks -Maxifort F<sub>1</sub> and TD -2F<sub>1</sub> had no influence on tomato hybrid Belfort's grafted plants ( Maxifort F<sub>1</sub> x belfort F<sub>1</sub>; TD -2F<sub>1</sub> x Belfort F<sub>1</sub>) beginning of blossom, full blossom and beginning of ripening (The rootstocks were compared with non grafted hybrids for control). Different results were depicted in grafted plants of Shady lady and B3-13 combinations, in particular: combinations of grafted plants TD2 F<sub>1</sub> x Shady lady F<sub>1</sub> and TD2 F<sub>1</sub> x B3-13 started blossom earlier than control plants (non-grafted) and grafted combinations with Maxifort.

There has been a difference identified between average amounts of crops which was obtained from grafted combinations; The difference was namely in the following combinations: TD2 F<sub>1</sub> x Belfort F<sub>1</sub>, TD2 F<sub>1</sub> x

Shady lady F<sub>1</sub>, TD2 F<sub>1</sub> x B3 -13, the crop was more than the crop collected from control combinations: Maxifort F<sub>1</sub>. Rootstocks also has an effect on the height of the plants: height of grafted plant - Maxifort F<sub>1</sub> exceeded the control ones. It should be noted that Maxifort F<sub>1</sub> is characterized by strong undetermined growth (1.75 cm), while TD2 F<sub>1</sub> – semi-determined growth (1.50 cm). In this case, a rootstock had very little influence on the strength of plant growth.

The same observation process was carried out on aubergine. In this case, 4 types of rootstocks were selected and one root for grafting. From those rootstocks - 3 were aubergines and 1 tomato - Maxifort F<sub>1</sub>. The beginning and full flowering period in all four combinations were the same. Also, the first typical fruit appeared in aubergine x aubergine combination, but in tomato x aubergine combination the fruit did not develop. So, there was no crop.

In case of sweet pepper, one grafted combination (TE135F<sub>1</sub> x Samanter F<sub>1</sub>) was compared to un-grafted seedling, also, a rootstock was planted separately. It should be mentioned that grafted and un-grafted versions do not differ significantly according to their phenological development and height; though, on one plant, on average was picked up a higher yield (0.44 kg-control, and 0.29 kg – grafted one). The amount of crop gathered was different in case of cucumber, e.g. in a grafted plant 109W F<sub>1</sub> x Olympic F<sub>1</sub>, the yield picked up was by 70 % higher than in control one.

**Conclusion.** Tomato rootstock TD<sub>2</sub> F1 affects the grafted one and as the result, the plant starts blooming period earlier and the amount of yield is increased. Maxifort F1 causes difference in the growth of a plant; a grafted plant grows a bit better and faster in compare with un-grafted one. In case of sweet pepper, the diseases have not been identified, though, the rootstock positively influenced on the quantity of the crop. As it is evident from the results of pumpkin cultures study, it is desirable to test the grafted plants in an

environment where a source from which disease can be spread is present because the above-mentioned technology is one of the measures applied in order to fight against the diseases: Verticillium wilt, Fusarium wilt.

The research was fulfilled within the framework of USAID support, in 2015. New technology of grafting seedlings was initiated with the help of professor Mosbal Kushad, professor of the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

*სოფლის მეურნეობის მეცნიერება*

## ბოსტნეულის მცნობის ტექნოლოგიის თავისებურებები საქართველოში

### ნ. კაკაბაძე

*საქართველოს სოფლის მეურნეობის მეცნიერებათა აკადემია, თბილისი, საქართველო*

*(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიის წევრის ა. კორახაშვილის მიერ)*

ბოსტნეული კულტურების მცნობის ტექნოლოგია საქართველოსთვის სიახლეს წარმოადგენს, შესაბამისად მნიშვნელოვანია ჩითილის წარმოების ტექნოლოგიების სრულყოფა, რასაც წინ უძღოდა საქართველოს განსხვავებულ ნიადაგურ-კლიმატურ რეგიონებში გავრცელებული ბოსტნეული და ბაღჩეული კულტურების გასავრცელებლად დაშვებული, ადაპტირებული და ინტროდუცირებული ჯიშების გამოცდა და საცდელი ნაკვეთების მოწყობა, მცნობის ტექნოლოგიის დახვეწასთან ერთად ჩვენ მიერ შერჩეულ იქნა ცალკეული ბოსტნეული და ბაღჩეული კულტურების ახალი საძირეები და სანამყენეები, დადგენილ იქნა სხვადასხვა ჯიშებთან/ჰიბრიდებთან მათი შეთვისების უნარი, კომბინაციების მრავალფეროვნების პოტენციური პროდუქტიულობა.

## REFERENCES

1. Kilchevsky A.V., Hotyleva V.V. (2007) Ecological selection of plants. 372 p. Minsk.
2. Mayo K. (1984) The theoretical basis of plant breeding. 324 p. M.
3. Mineev V., Debrecin G., Mazur B. (1999) Biological agriculture and mineral fertilizers. 321 p. M.
4. Poskrebyshv P. (2006) Tomato card, French pepper, potatoes and other garden savages. Science and life. 63 p. M.
5. Oreshkin M.V. (2010) Agroecological features of optimization of humus content *Zh. The Cube*. 61, 7:201p GAU.
6. Timonov V.Y., Chernysheva N.M., Balabanov S.S., Kartamyshev N.I. (2009) Mechanical processing and agrophysical properties of soils. *Bulletin of the Kursk Agricultural Academy*, 9: 209.
7. Lebedovsky I.A. (2007) On the issue of agroecological assessment of soils on the content of heavy metals. *Zh. The Cube*. 32 :8: 27-29. GAU.
8. Maqueda C., Morillo E., Perez-Rodriguez J.L. (1989) Interaction in aqueous solution of certain pesticides with fulvic acids from a spodosol soil. 5: 336 –345. M.
9. Butenko R. G. (2002) Culture of isolated tissues and the physiology of plant morphogenesis. 13-24 and 200-204 Pp.
10. Volume K.N. (2000) Physiology of plant. 373-376 p.
11. Korakhashvili A., Gaidamashvili M. (2016) Agrobiotechnology. G.60-72 p.

*Received June, 2018*