Effect of Different Defoliants and Time of Application on Defoliation Percentage and Boll Opening Percentage in High Density Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.)
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ABSTRACT

Aims: To evaluate the time and type of chemical defoliants to improve the mechanical and manual picking of high density cotton CO 17 in terms of higher defoliation and increase boll opening percentage.

Study Design: The study was performed in split plot design with seven treatments and four replications.

Place and Duration of Study: This field study was carried out in Department of Crop Physiology TNAU, Coimbatore during September 2019 to January 2020.
Keywords: Cotton; defoliation; NDVI; SPAD meter; seed cotton yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cotton is a perennial plant with indeterminate growth character which provides employment and sustenance to a population of nearly 42 Million people in India. It grows in tropical and subtropical regions around the world, including the India, Americas, Africa and Egypt. There are four commercially grown species of cotton available and Gossypium hirsutum occupied 90% of world production. Cotton is an important cash crop for Indian farmers. It is third in total acreage planted among all crops in India after rice and wheat. India is projected to produce 28.7 million bales of cotton in 2018-19 and India recorded first in cotton cultivated area of 12,235 in thousand hectares and productivity of 519 kilogram per hectare and second place in production after China during 2017-2018 [1]. In Tamil Nadu most of the cotton cultivars produce huge foliage even at the time of crop maturity which delay in opening of bolls and resulted in asynchronized boll opening. The multiple pickings require more expenditure and is also time consuming because of dependence of labors. The availability of labors and picking cost is also a serious problem of current situation. Most of the farmers uproot the cotton after one or two pickings and in this situation the unopened bolls cannot contribute to final seed cotton yield. These problems can be solved by introduction of mechanical picking in cotton cropping system. For mechanical picking, it is necessary to shed the leaves artificially through application of defoliants which will also synchronize boll opening [2]. It will help in timely vacation of the field for next crop and also which contain ethylene help in leaf drop, synchronous and early boll opening due to full exposure to sunlight. It makes cotton ready for single picking by machine [3].

Defoliation is the detachment or drop of leaves from plant. Physiologically matured leaves detached naturally but in case of chemical defoliants induce abscission layer in the petiole which helps to early and uniform dropping of leaves. Defoliants applied before harvesting in response to enhance the harvesting efficiency in terms of reduce trash in the lint, pest and diseases, lodging of plants. The defoliating too late or early can negatively affect the yield due to presence of higher number of late season immature bolls. However, the seed cotton yield was greater in the plots where defoliant was applied at the time of 60 per cent boll maturity [4]. They use several techniques to determine crop maturity, including 60 percent open bolls, 3 Nodes above cracked boll and visual inspection of cut bolls (hard to cut and brown seed coats). Proper defoliation has numerous benefits including reducing the amount of leaf and other plant material in harvested seed cotton [5], reducing damage to fiber in the ginning process by lessening the amount of cleaning required for lint quality, reducing losses to boll rot, and allowing for earlier harvest to avoid weathering [6]. Defoliants function optimally when applied to mature, healthy leaves at appropriate rates [7]. Application of ethephon (90 ml) resulted in the optimal defoliation effect and ripening of the cotton on 5 and 15 days respectively after the chemical application. It was found that the Ethephon application had a larger effect on the cotton defoliation than the boll opening rate [8]. [9] observed that earlier application at 140 DAS lead to severe yield loss but later application of defoliants at 150 DAS significantly and adversely recorded higher defoliation and yield. At present there is no recommendation for defoliants in Tamil Nadu, hence the present study was conducted with the aim to identify the type of defoliant, their physiological mechanisms and suitable time of application.
2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment was conducted at Department of Cotton, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during 2019 to 2020. The soil of experimental field was clay loam in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 8.38), low in organic carbon (0.52%), low in available nitrogen (202 kg/ha), medium phosphorus (14.0 kg/ha) and high in available potassium (878 kg/ha). The maximum and minimum temperature was 30.4°C and 20.8°C from sowing to final harvest. CO 17 cotton variety was used as experimental material and it is medium duration variety had 140 to 150 days. This variety was developed for mechanized harvest of with high density planting (100 X 10 cm spacing). The experiment was laid out in a split-plot design with four replications. The main plot consist of three stage of defoliant spray viz., Spray at 120 DAS, Spray at 127 DAS and Spray at 134 DAS (Days After Sowing) and the sub-plots were seven foliar treatments (Control, 2, 4 D (0.5%), Ethephon (0.5%), Ethylene (0.5%)+ Triiodobenzoic acid-TIBA (450 ppm), Sodium chlorate (0.9%), 6 benzylaminopurine (BAP) @ 0.1%, Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%). Control treatment was sprayed with water. Each plot had 6 X 5 m area were arranged accordingly so that each plot could be mechanically harvested without affecting other plots. Recommended cultural practices and plant protection measures were followed throughout the crop growing season.

2.1 Defoliation Percentage and Boll Opening Percentage

Defoliation Percentage and boll opening percentage was calculated by using the formula given by [10],

\[
\text{Defoliation Percentage} = \frac{L_a - L_b}{L_a} \times 100\%
\]

Where,

- \(L_a\) = Number of leaves before treatment,
- \(L_b\) = Number of leaves after treatment.

Boll opening percentage was determined on the tagged plants. Bolls on each plant were examined and recorded as either opened or closed and the boll opening percentage was calculated by following equation,

\[
\text{Boll Opening Percentage} = \frac{OB}{TB} \times 100\%
\]

Where,

- \(OB\) = Number of opened bolls,
- \(TB\) = Number of Total bolls.

2.2 Soil Plant Analytical Development (SPAD)

SPAD readings were recorded by using Chlorophyll Meter (SPAD 502) designed by the Soil Plant Analytical Development (SPAD) section, Minolta, Japan. The Minolta SPAD-502 measures chlorophyll content as ratio of transmittance of light at wavelength of 650 nm and 940 nm. Five readings were taken from each replication and the average value computed using method described [11].

2.3 Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

The NDVI value was recorded by using green seeker (handheld crop sensor). It is calculated from near infra red (NIR) and red wavelength regions. Instead, it was higher in green leaves, lower in yellow and orange leaves, but intermediate in red leaves, which may due to a low sensitivity of the bands used for NDVI for the color change from green to yellow color [12].

2.4 Seed Cotton Yield and Statistical Analysis

One week after application of the last defoliation treatments, seed cotton yield was determined in plots by manual harvesting of the center two rows of each plot and calculated g plant\(^{-1}\). Number of bolls harvested from each plant with replication was counted and total number of bolls per plant was calculated. Bolls weight was calculated by adding the weight of five bolls from each plant and divided it by total number of fruits and expressed in g boll\(^{-1}\).

The data collected were subjected to statistical analysis in split-plot design using Least square design (LSD) [13].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect of Defoliants on Defoliation Percentage

Significant differences between the treatments, time of applications and interaction effects used for study were observed for various parameters.
The leaf SPAD value, NDVI value and defoliation percentage were significantly different between treatments and time of application and these parameters observed in 4 and 15 days after defoliants spray. As per observation, immediately after application of the defoliants the green leaves showed shedding symptoms on 4 days after defoliants spray to 15 days after spray. The leaves shedding were observed significantly higher in (63.6, 64.9 and 63.4%) Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) treatment followed by Sodium chlorate (0.9%) treatments at three different times of defoliants spray. Defoliants spray at 120 DAS showed significantly higher defoliation rate from 4 days after defoliants spray. These two defoliants work better in 120 DAS of defoliants application. At 15 days after defoliants spray Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) recorded higher defoliation (98.6, 98.1 and 97%) in all three time of application which is on par with Sodium chlorate (0.9%). Similar results were observed in [14] and [15] found the highest defoliation rate in Drop Thidiazuron + diuron treated plants. It might be due to the change of the ethylene to auxin ratio, leaf abscission prematurely occurred after application of defoliants like Thidiazuron [16]. Although, some defoliants were used to enhance the boll maturity [17]. Defoliation indicated that chemical induced abscission results in reduced chlorophyll, photosynthesis, alterations in carbohydrate transport, and hormone crosstalk. The increase of ROS-scavenging enzymes in plants will increased the abscission of leaves, and boll opening due to stress [18].

3.2 Effect of Defoliants on Physiological Parameters

As plants aging, chlorophyll content of leaves decreases. 4 days after defoliants spray, Sodium chlorate (0.9%) showed significantly less SPAD value which is on par with 2, 4 D (0.5%), 120 and 127 DAS recorded lowest SPAD value compare to 134 DAS. In interaction effect, Sodium chlorate (0.9%) at 120 DAS registered significantly lowest value when compare to other treatments. Finally at 15 days after defoliants spray, 134 DAS recorded significantly lowest value. Sodium chlorate (0.9%) at 127 DAS and 2, 4 D (0.5%) at 134 DAS registered lowest SPAD values. Sodium chlorate (0.9%) showed lowest value (21.8 units) followed by Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) treatment (23.9 units). Lower SPAD value indicates that degradation of chlorophyll in response to defoliants application which enhances the defoliation process. In this, we conclude sodium chlorate works better in later maturity stages and Thidiazuron and Diuron works better in early maturity stages of cotton. Similar result showed by [19] that the chlorophyll content decreased more in thidiazuran defoliant treated plants when compare to control plants. It may be due to the degradation of chlorophyll and formation of anthocyanin and xanthophylls.

At 4 days after defoliants spray foliar spray at 120 DAS showed significantly lowest NDVI in Sodium chlorate (0.9%) (0.437 units) treatment followed by (0.507 units) Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) (0.467 units). Similar results were observed in [17] for Thidiazuron and Diuron treatments at three different times of defoliants spray. These two defoliants work better in 120 DAS of defoliants application. At 15 days after defoliants spray Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) recorded higher defoliation (98.6, 98.1 and 97%) in all three time of application which is on par with Sodium chlorate (0.9%). Similar results were observed in [14] and [15] found the highest defoliation rate in Drop Thidiazuron + diuron treated plants. It might be due to the change of the ethylene to auxin ratio, leaf abscission prematurely occurred after application of defoliants like Thidiazuron [16]. Although, some defoliants were used to enhance the boll maturity [17]. Defoliation indicated that chemical induced abscission results in reduced chlorophyll, photosynthesis, alterations in carbohydrate transport, and hormone crosstalk. The increase of ROS-scavenging enzymes in plants will increased the abscission of leaves, and boll opening due to stress [18].

| Treatments                        | Defoliation % (4 days after defoliants spray) | Defoliation % (15 days after defoliants spray) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
|                                   | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean |
| Control                           | 5.2     | 6.2     | 7.6     | 6.3   | 37.9    | 27.7    | 26.1    | 30.6 |
| 2, 4 D (0.5%)                     | 42.4    | 35.8    | 32.7    | 37.0  | 73.8    | 74.7    | 73.5    | 74.0 |
| Ethephon (0.5%)                   | 33.9    | 35.9    | 33.3    | 34.4  | 60.9    | 65.3    | 66      | 64.1 |
| Ethephon (0.5%) + TIBA (450 ppm)  | 36.6    | 23.4    | 33.6    | 31.2  | 70.2    | 69.7    | 69.3    | 69.7 |
| Sodium chlorate (0.9%)            | 45.7    | 49.9    | 45.4    | 47.0  | 97.5    | 97.3    | 96.4    | 97.1 |
| 6-BAP (0.1%)                      | 22.9    | 23.1    | 23.2    | 23.1  | 62.1    | 61.3    | 63      | 62.1 |
| Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%)      | 63.6    | 64.9    | 63.4    | 64.0  | 98.6    | 98.1    | 97      | 97.9 |
| Mean                              | 35.8    | 34.2    | 34.2    | 71.6  | 70.6    | 70.2    |          |      |
| Factors                           | M S M at S S at M M S M at S S at M |
| SEd                               | 0.13** | 0.48** | 0.78** | 0.83**| 0.41    | 1.00**  | 1.65**  | 1.72**|
| CD (0.05)                         | 0.035  | 0.97    | 1.60    | 1.68  | NS      | 2.02    | 3.42    | 3.50 |

* Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability ** Denotes significant at the 0.01 level of probability
eventually leading to the degradation of the plastoglobuli, which might be due to a low sensitivity of the bands used for NDVI for the color change from green to yellow [12]. This non continuous response to senescence does not represent chlorophyll content, higher NDVI in red leaves might be a consequence of the presence of anthocyanins, which have been shown to contribute to increased NDVI values [21]. As senescence is progressing, a swelling of thylakoid membranes, a slight increase in the number of plastoglobuli, and a decrease of pigment contents is observed; eventually leading to the degradation of the thylakoid membranes, the significant increase in the number and size of plastoglobuli, and to the further decrease of chlorophyll contents [22].

**Table 2. Effect of defoliants on chlorophyll index (SPAD unit) of CO 17 cotton variety**

| Treatments                  | (4 days after defoliants spray) | (15 days after defoliants spray) |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                             | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean |
| Control                     | 40.7    | 42.2    | 42.4    | 41.8  | 31.3    | 34.9    | 31.1    | 32.4 |
| 2, 4 D (0.5%)               | 37.6    | 37.6    | 36.6    | 37.3  | 28      | 31.8    | 22.3    | 27.4 |
| Ethephon (0.5%)             | 39.5    | 38.8    | 41.4    | 39.9  | 28.1    | 29.9    | 29.2    | 29.1 |
| Ethephon (0.5%)+ TIBA       | 39.3    | 34.9    | 41.7    | 38.6  | 30.9    | 25.8    | 31      | 29.2 |
| Sodium chlorate (0.9%)      | 32.9    | 37.1    | 40.9    | 37.0  | 23.8    | 21.8    | 23.4    | 23.0 |
| 6-BAP (0.1%)                | 42.3    | 42.3    | 38.6    | 41.1  | 30.4    | 30.5    | 28.7    | 29.9 |
| Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%)| 40.03   | 40.6    | 41.4    | 40.8  | 23.9    | 24      | 27      | 25.0 |
| Mean Factors                | M       | S       | M at S  | S at M | M       | S       | M at S  | S at M |
| SEd                         | 0.20**  | 0.46**  | 0.77**  | 0.81** | 0.15**  | 0.039** | 0.65**  | 0.68** |
| CD (0.05)                   | 0.57    | 0.94    | 1.61    | 1.63  | 0.43    | 0.80    | 1.35    | 1.38  |

*Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability  ** denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability

**Table 3. Effect of defoliants on NDVI (NDVI unit) of CO 17 cotton variety**

| Treatments                  | (4 days after defoliants spray) | (15 days after defoliants spray) |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                             | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean |
| Control                     | 0.727   | 0.727   | 0.730   | 0.728 | 0.645   | 0.615   | 0.660   | 0.640 |
| 2, 4 D (0.5%)               | 0.547   | 0.653   | 0.703   | 0.634 | 0.220   | 0.210   | 0.0335  | 0.255 |
| Ethephon (0.5%)             | 0.613   | 0.713   | 0.740   | 0.689 | 0.0375  | 0.0315  | 0.415   | 0.0368 |
| Ethephon (0.5%)+ TIBA       | 0.590   | 0.690   | 0.707   | 0.662 | 0.530   | 0.470   | 0.560   | 0.520 |
| Sodium chlorate (0.9%)      | 0.437   | 0.717   | 0.700   | 0.618 | 0.195   | 0.0355  | 0.265   | 0.272 |
| 6-BAP (0.1%)                | 0.677   | 0.757   | 0.700   | 0.711 | 0.550   | 0.540   | 0.580   | 0.557 |
| Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%)| 0.507   | 0.727   | 0.760   | 0.664 | 0.0395  | 0.265   | 0.0330  | 0.0330 |
| Mean Factors                | M       | S       | M at S  | S at M | M       | S       | M at S  | S at M |
| SEd                         | 0.005** | 0.009** | 0.015** | 0.015**| 0.003*  | 0.006** | 0.010*  | 0.01* |
| CD (0.05)                   | 0.015   | 0.018   | 0.037   | 0.0316| 0.008   | 0.012   | 0.021   | 0.021 |

*Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability  ** Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability
## Table 4. Yield parameters of CO 17 cotton variety as influenced by different defoliants and time of application

| Treatments                        | Number of bolls | Single boll weight (g) | Seed cotton yield (g/plant) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
|                                   | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean | 120 DAS | 127 DAS | 134 DAS | Mean |
| Control                           | 15      | 16      | 20      | 17.0  | 6.1     | 5.1     | 5.8     | 5.7   | 61.8   | 60      | 56.8    | 59.5 |
| 2, 4 D (0.5%)                     | 17      | 15      | 12      | 14.7  | 5.9     | 5.7     | 4.4     | 5.3   | 56.4   | 51.1    | 57.2    | 54.9 |
| Etephon (0.5%)                    | 14      | 18.3    | 12      | 14.8  | 5.2     | 5.3     | 5.5     | 5.3   | 63.7   | 59.9    | 60.4    | 61.3 |
| Etephon (0.5%) + TIBA (450 ppm)  | 14.3    | 15.7    | 16      | 15.3  | 6.4     | 6.5     | 4.2     | 5.7   | 67.4   | 52.3    | 51.9    | 57.2 |
| Sodium chlorate (0.9%)            | 15      | 19      | 11.7    | 15.2  | 5.6     | 6.3     | 4.7     | 5.5   | 51.1   | 59.5    | 51.4    | 54.0 |
| 6-BAP (0.1%)                      | 16      | 14.3    | 15.7    | 15.3  | 5.2     | 6       | 4.8     | 5.3   | 56.7   | 55.2    | 50.6    | 54.2 |
| Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%)      | 17      | 13      | 15.3    | 15.1  | 4.5     | 4.7     | 5.6     | 4.9   | 59.9   | 61.5    | 62.1    | 61.2 |
| Mean                              | 15.4    | 15.9    | 14.6    | 15.1  | 5.6     | 5.7     | 5.0     | 5.0   | 59.6   | 57.1    | 55.8    |      |
| Factors                           | M       | S       | M at S | S at M| M       | S       | M at S | S at M| M       | S       | M at S | S at M|
| SEd                               | 0.11**  | 0.22**  | 0.036**| 0.038**| 0.05**  | 0.06**  | 0.10** | 0.10**| 0.25**  | 0.69**  | 1.13**  | 1.19**|
| CD (0.05)                         | 0.030   | 0.44    | 0.76    | 0.76  | 0.13    | 0.12    | 0.23    | 0.21 | 0.70    | 1.40    | 2.34    | 2.42 |

*Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability ** Denotes significant at the 0.05 level of probability
3.3 Effect of Defoliants on Boll Opening Rate and Yield Attributes

120 DAS registered significantly higher number of bolls. Ethephon (0.5%) (18.3 Nos) and Sodium chlorate (0.9%) (19 Nos) was increased number of bolls in 127 DAS. 120 DAS and 127 DAS registered higher boll weight. Ethephon (0.5%) + TIBA (450 ppm) were recorded higher single boll weight at 120 DAS (6.4 g) and 127 DAS. Sodium chlorate (0.9%) also had higher single boll weight at 120 DAS. [23] and [24] indicated that the seed cotton weight decreased by 14% in late sowing results were coinciding with our study. Ethephon (0.5%) and Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) showed higher yield than other treatments. In other side, time of application and its interaction effect 120 DAS registered higher yield compare to other time of defoliants applications. Ethephon (0.5%) + TIBA (450 ppm) in 120 DAS and Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) at 127 and 134 DAS had good yield. Similar results given by [25] stated that defoliant applied plants give more seed cotton yield than control plants. The use of different defoliants and intervals of their application did not significantly affect the seed index and ginning outturn [26].

Significantly higher boll opening percentage was recorded in 120 and 127 DAS. In treatments effect Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) recorded higher boll opening followed by Sodium chlorate (0.9%). In interaction effect, Sodium chlorate (0.9%) spray at 120 DAS and Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) spray at 127 and 134 DAS were recorded higher boll opening rate. [27] stated that all applications contributed to more opened bolls than control plots. [14] indicated that defoliant applications formed more opened bolls than control plot. Ethephon is an ethylene precursor that is used as both defoliation and boll-opening compound in cotton. Economically, the application of a single defoliant may induce satisfactory outcome; however, the mixtures would perform better under less desirable defoliation conditions.

4. CONCLUSION

The result of this study explored that the effect of different defoliants and time of application on defoliation, boll opening, physiological and yield of high density Cotton. Thidiazuron + Diuron (0.03%) and Sodium chlorate (0.9%) significantly works better in per cent defoliation within 15 Days after defoliants spray. In this defoliation effect because of the defoliants decreased the SPAD, NDVI values representing the chlorophyll or greenness of leaves and without affecting final yield. These results indicate that the high density Cotton CO 17 possibly mechanized picking with these effective defoliants with high boll opening rate.

DISCLAIMER

The research work was funded and supported by University Core Project (UCP 2019-20), Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to University Core Project (2019 - 2020) and also acknowledge Department of Crop Physiology and Department of Cotton, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore for financially supporting this research work.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Cotton Statistics and News. Weekly Publication of Cotton Association of India; 2020.
2. Wang HM, Gao K, Fang S, Zhou ZG. Cotton yield and defoliation efficiency in response to nitrogen and harvest aids. Agron J. 2019;111:250–256.
3. Du MW, Li Y, Tian XL, Duan LS, Zhang MC, Tan WM, Xu DY, Li ZH. The phytotoxin coronatine induces abscission-related gene expression and boll ripening during defoliation of cotton. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e97652.
4. Awan HU, Awan IU, Mansoor M, Khakwani AA, Khan MA, Ghazanfarullah, Khattak B. Effect of defoliant application at different stages of boll maturity and doses of sulfur on yield and quality of upland cotton. Sarhad J Agric. 2012;28:245-47.
5. Valco TD, Snipes CE. Uniform harvest-aid performance and lint quality evaluation. In Supak JR, Snipes CE, (Eds.). Cotton Harvest Management: Use and Influence of Harvest Aids. The Cotton Foundation, Memphis, TN. 2001:167–180.
6. Siebert JD, Steward AM. Correlation of defoliation timing methods to optimize cotton yield, quality and revenue. J Cotton Sci. 2006;10:146–154.
7. Brecke BJ, Banks JC, Cothren JT. Harvest aid treatments: Products and application timing. In J.R. Supak and C.E. Snipes (Eds.). Cotton Harvest Management: Use and Influence of Harvest Aids. The Cotton Foundation, Memphis, TN. 2001:119–142.
8. Han X, Yu JY, Lan YB, Kong FX, Yi LL. Determination of application parameters for cotton defoliants in the Yellow River Basin. Int J. Precis Agric Aviat. 2019;2(1):51–55.
9. Kulvir Singh, Pankaj Rathore, Gumber RK. Impact of harvest-aid defoliants on yield of American cotton and their monetary evaluation. Intl J. of Plant Res. 2015;28(2):41-46.
10. Du MW, Li Y, Tian XL, Duan LS, Zhang MC, Tan WM, Xu DY, Li ZH. The phytotoxin coronatine induces abscission-related gene expression and boll ripening during defoliation of cotton. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e97652.
11. Monje OA, Bughere B. Inherent limitation of non-destructive chlorophyll meters. A comparison of two types of meters. Hort. Sci. 1992;27:71-89.
12. Motohka T, Nasahara KN, Oguma H, Tsuchida S. Applicability of green-red vegetation index for remote sensing of vegetation phenology. Remote Sens. 2010;2:2369–2387.
13. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. 2nd Ed. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA; 1984.
14. Beyyavas VH, Halioglu, Cevher IC. The effect of defoliant application on yield and yield components of some cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) cultivars at timely and late sowing. Int J Agric Environ Food Sci. 2020;4(2):157-164.
15. Raghavendra T, Reddy YR. Efficacy of defoliants on yield and fibre quality of American cotton in semi-arid conditions. Indian J. Agric Res. 2020;54.
16. Du MW, Ren XM, Tian XL, Duan LS, Zhang MC, Tan WM, Li ZH. Evaluation of harvest aid chemicals for the cotton winter wheat double cropping system. J Integr Agric. 2013;12:273–282.
17. Faircloth J, Specialist P, Wilson H. Cotton harvest aid selection and application timing. Am J. Orthopsychiatry. 2009;83:143–144.
18. Djanaguiraman M, Devi DD, Shanker AK, Sheeba JA, Bangarusamy U. The role of nitrophenol on delaying abscission of tomato flowers and fruits. J. Food Agric Environ. 2004;2:183–186.
19. Jin Dingsha Y, Xiangru Wang Y, Yanchao Xu, Huiping Gui, Hengheng Zhang, Qiang Dong, Ripon Kumar Sikder, Guozheng Yang, Meizhen Song. Chemical defoliant promotes leaf abscission by altering ros metabolism and photosynthetic efficiency in Gossypium hirsutum. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21:2738.
20. Keskitalo J, Bergquist G, Gardeström P, Jansson S. A cellular timetable of autumn
senescence. Plant Physiol. 2005;139:1635–1648.

21. Vina A, Gitelson AA. Sensitivity to foliar anthocyanin content of vegetation indices using green reflectance. IEEE Geosci Remote Sens Lett. 2018;464–468.

22. Simeonova E, Sikora A, Charzynska M, Mostowska A. Aspects of programmed cell death during leaf senescence of mono-and dicotyledonous plants. Protoplasma. 2000;214:93–101.

23. Killi F, Bolek Y. Timing of planting is crucial for cotton yield. Acta Agr Scand B S P. 2005;56(2):155-160.

24. Haliloglu H, Cevheri CI, Beyyavas V. The effect of defoliant application on yield and yield components of some cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) cultivars at timely and late sowing. Int J Agric Environ Food Sci. 2020;4(2):157-164.

25. Mrunalini K, Rekha MS, Murthy VRK. Effectiveness of harvest-aid defoliants and environmental conditions in high density cotton. Int J Curr Microbiol and Appl Sci. 2018;7(2):2312-2316.

26. Meena RA, Monga D, Ratna Sahay. Effect of defoliation on maturity behavior and seed cotton yield in cotton. J Cotton Res Dev. 2016;30(1):63-65.

27. Ming-Wei D, Xiao-Ming R, Xiao-Li T, Liu-Sheng D, Ming-Cai Z, Wei-Ming T, Zhao-Hu L. Evaluation of harvest aid chemicals for the cotton-winter wheat double cropping system. J. Integr Agric. 2013;12(2):273-282.