



Effects of Earthing up and Pruning Systems on Yield and Net Economic Benefit of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon*)

I. K. Keter^{1,2*}, G. Oloo-Abucheli¹ and M. Muraya¹

¹Department of Plant Sciences, Chuka University, P.O.Box 109-60400, Chuka, Kenya.

²Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO), Coffee Research Institute, Koru Subcenter, P.O.Box 15-40104, Koru, Kenya.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author IKK designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors GOA and MM managed the analyses of the study. Author GOA managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAHR/2020/v7i430104

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Paola A. Deligios, University of Sassari, Italy.

Reviewers:

(1) Adriana Carla Dias Trevisan, University Estadual of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

(2) Pooja S Bhat, Indian Institute of Plantation Management, India.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/65709>

Original Research Article

Received 10 December 2020

Accepted 17 February 2021

Published 25 February 2021

ABSTRACT

Tomato is a popular and extensively cultivated vegetable among the promising commodities in horticultural production in Kenya. It provides a wide variety of nutrients with many health-related benefits. Despite the importance, its yield and net economic benefits is limited by the cultural practices applied by farmers. There is limited knowledge on the effect of integrating pruning and earthing up on tomato yield and net economic benefit. This study investigated the effect of integration of pruning and earthing up on the growth and yield of tomatoes. A split-plot experimental design, arranged in a Randomized Complete Block Design, with three replications was used. The study investigated two factors *i.e.* pruning system in the main plot (single stem, double stem, and triple stem) and earthing up in sub-plots. (0 cm, 10 cm, 20 cm, and 30 cm). Fruit yield data was taken after each harvest. Data were analysed using SAS version 9.4 and significant means were separated using the least significant difference at $\alpha = .05$. The findings of the study revealed that earthing up and pruning system had a significant ($p < .05$) effect on tomato yield and

*Corresponding author: Email: keterkiprop@gmail.com;

net economic benefit. Triple stem pruning system, earthing up to 30 cm had the highest fruit yield with 21.82 tonnes/hectare in cultivation 1 and 21.84 tonnes/hectare in cultivation 2. The findings also revealed that triple stem pruning system, earthing up to 30 cm had the highest net economic benefit per hectare in both cultivation 1 and cultivation 2. To improve tomato yield and consequently improve net economic benefit, farmers are encouraged to consider triple stem pruning system and earthing up to level 30 cm.

Keywords: *Earthing up; pruning system; growth; yield; marketable fruits; net economic.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture provides sustenance for more than 80 per cent of the Kenyan population in terms of employment and food security [1]. The sector contributes directly up to 24 per cent to the National Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 27 per cent indirectly through linkages with manufacturing, distribution and other related sectors [2]. Besides, the sector employs more than 40 per cent of the total population and more than 70 per cent of Kenya's rural people and it accounts for 65 per cent of revenue from exports [2]. The agriculture sector comprises of industrial crops, food crops, horticulture, livestock, fisheries and forestry sub sectors. The industrial crops and food crops contribute 17 per cent and 32 per cent of Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP) while horticulture and Livestock contributes 33 per cent and 17 per cent of AGDP respectively [2]. Studied on the performance of the horticultural sub-sector in Kenya and found that increase in horticultural exports led to increased AGDP [3].

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicon*) is a popular and extensively cultivated vegetable. It is among the promising commodities in horticultural production in Kenya. It is the fourth most popular fresh-market vegetable after potatoes, cabbages, and onions because of its great yield potential and high nutritive value [4]. Over the years, tomato production in Kenya has intensified [5]. Yields, however, have remained low due to a myriad of impediments, key among them being poor cultural practices. Therefore, the production of tomato could be increased through the application of better cultural practices such as proper pruning system and earthing up level. Earthing up is a technique in horticulture of piling soil around the base of the plant [6]. The technique triggers the initiation of plant roots that come in direct contact with nutrients through a process of interception as it grows [7]. It encourages the development of additional roots and root hair to help improve stem length as well as suckers [8]. Plants absorb nutrients primarily through their roots and therefore good growth

and proliferation of the roots are essential in partitioning and set of functional equilibrium [9]. It also improves the distribution of nutrients, water and air circulation which are important in the soil [10].

Earthing up and pruning tomato are important cultural practices in many parts of the country. Removal of unnecessary suckers on the other hand also has a great impact on the tomato fruit yield [11]. Suckers would compete to acquire assimilates and removal of the unnecessary suckers would increase transfer of assimilates into the fruiting trusses consequently increasing yield. Pruning contributes to proper partitioning, which is a requirement for plant growth and development [12]. It also regulates plant growth, flowering, and fruiting responses, [13]. Therefore, there is an attempt to increase the yield of tomato through providing good tomato growth and fruiting by combining cultural practices such as pruning system and earthing up levels. Tomato sucker are unnecessary sinks that reduces translocation of food to the fruits [14]. This fact may not be clear to, most of tomato farmers since they pay less attention to pruning system.

The economic benefit is the biggest concern for commercial tomato growers [15]. In Kenya, the income from tomato agri-enterprises is affected by its yield. Gross economic returns per hectare are among the highest of any vegetable crop, but production costs are also very high. Labour required for transplanting, earthing up pruning and harvesting can account for up to 55% of total production costs [16]. As the supply of agricultural labour decreases and production costs increase, growers must improve efficiency of cultural practices to maintain profitability. Yield and fruit size of tomatoes are influenced by many factors, including plant earthing up and pruning.

Pruning is a labour-intensive practice recommended and used on almost all staked tomatoes [16]. Pruning of tomatoes was based on a study [17] that showed moderate pruning of a determinate cultivar increased fruit yields but

that total marketable yield decreased as pruning severity increased [18]. In addition, plants that were not pruned produced fewer large tomatoes and fewer culls than a heavily pruned plant [19].

The use of earthing up and pruning systems could potentially aid farmers to attain the utmost achievable yield level. However, most of the tomato farmers frequently give less regard to combining earthing up and pruning system. Most efforts have gone towards improving tomato production through pruning [20]. A missing component in studies on tomato production is the effect of the combination of earthing up and pruning system and determination of their technical efficiency [21].

In general, pruning decreased the number of flower clusters and fruit per plant but did not affect fruit count per cluster [11]. Yield also depends on the growth stage at which defoliation occurs: defoliation of field grown tomatoes at the vegetative stage caused no yield reduction, while defoliation during the reproductive stage reduced yields in proportion to the level of defoliation [22]. This study therefore aims at contributing and solving some of these constraints by researching to find out appropriate earthing up level and pruning system for tomato production and utilization in the future.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Site Description and Experimental Design

The study was conducted at Chuka University Research and teaching farm. The first cultivation was carried out in November 2019 and ended in January 2020. The second cultivation commenced in February 2020 and ended in May 2020. The site is situated at 0°19'59" N and 0°19'15.85" S. The area lies in the upper midland zone. Daily temperatures in the area range between 22°C to 36°C. The annual rainfall is 1599 mm distributed bi-modally with the longest rains experienced in November. The climate is favourable for the cultivation of tea, coffee, maize, cowpeas, pigeon peas, tobacco and a variety of other food crops. Soils in this area are classified as humic nitisols [23] and they are of volcano origin with basic and ultrabasic igneous rocks.

The study used a split-plot experiment arranged in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) and replicated three times. Each subplot had six plants. There were two factors, the pruning

system and earthing up. The pruning system was allocated to the main plot, while the earthing up was allocated to the sub-plot. There were four levels of earthing up (no earthing up, earthing up to 10 cm, earthing up to 20 cm and earthing up to 30 cm) and three levels of pruning system (single stem or control level, double stem and triple stem) the treatment were made up by a combination of factor levels resulting to 12 treatments. The plant spacing was 0.6 m by 0.45 m, row spacing and within the row respectively.

2.2 Earthing up and Pruning Systems

Transplanting was done on a level ground. Earthing up was done three weeks after transplanting by hilling the soil around the plant as follows: No earthing up 0 cm (EU0), earthing up to 10 cm (EU1), earthing up to 20 cm (EU2), and earthing up to 30 cm (EU3). Double stem and triple stem suckers below the first pair of the true leaves were maintained. The plants were trained into; Single Stem (SS), Double Stem (DS), and Triple Stem (TS). Where; SS=Single Stem, DS=Double Stem, TS=Triple Stem, DAT=Day after transplant, EU=Earthing Up, PS=Pruning System.

2.3 Data Collection

2.3.1 Tomato fruit size

The fruit size was determined by measuring the fruit at the widest part, starting from the distal to the blossom end, and then at the centre of the fruit. All measurements were made using a Vernier calliper. Fruits were categorized into small (<6 cm), medium (6–8 cm) and large (>8 cm) according to the diameter size [23]. Low-quality fruits were those measuring less than 6 cm and high quality were those measuring above 6 cm as per the marketing quality. The fruits category >6 cm in diameter were counted and considered marketable.

2.3.2 Total fruit yield, marketable and unmarketable yields

All the fruits harvested per 2.5 m x 2 m area were counted and weighed separately on each harvesting date. The average fruit weight was calculated for each treatment in tonnes per hectare. Fruits were separated into two lots of marketable and unmarketable fruits. Marketable fruits were picked at the breaker stage. The size was determined using a Vernier caliper and categorized according to diameter size. Unmarketable fruits were those <6 cm in

diameter with physiological disorders such as cracks and blossom end rot or other types of blemish.

2.3.3 Economic analysis

Net return was obtained by subtracting total expenditure (cost per hectare) from the gross return (revenue). Cost referred to the major component of the net return. It was determined by calculating expenses on the land preparation, purchase of seeds and its application, farmyard manure, chemical fertilizers, pesticides and harvesting. Gross return per hectare was determined by tomato sales based on prevailing farm gate prices according to [20].

$$\text{Net Return} = \text{Gross Return} - \text{Expenditure}$$

2.4 Data Analysis

Data was subjected to the Analysis of Variance using Statistical Analysis System version 9.4 at a probability level of 5 % and where the F-test was significant, Least Significant Difference was used in mean separation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect of Earthing up levels and Pruning Systems on Number of Tomato Fruits under Different Size Categories

In both cultivations, the distribution of fruits in different size categories appeared to respond to earthing up and pruning system treatments. The analysis showed that the treatment TS3 recorded the highest proportion of tomato fruits under category (<6 cm) with an average of 95834 fruits per hectare in cultivation 1 and 101833 in cultivation 2 respectively. The number of fruits was high under TS3, followed by TS2 and TS1; this trend indicates that the triple stem pruning system resulted in a higher proportion of fruits with higher earthing up level. Additionally, under the same pruning system and varied earthing up levels it was observed that more medium-size fruits (6-8 cm) were recorded under high earthing up level 30 cm (Table 2). The treatment SS0 recorded the smallest proportions of fruits under size categories (<6 cm), (6-8 cm) and (>8 cm) in both cultivations as shown in Table 1. The analysis of variance showed that the number of fruits under TS1 and DS3 were not significant ($p < 0.05$) in size categories (6-8 cm) and >8 cm in both cultivations (Table 1).

Earthing up and pruning systems significantly affected the number of fruits in different size

categories. The treatment TS3 recorded the largest number of fruits of the three fruit size categories. This shows that earthing up and pruning probably enhanced satisfactory nutrient uptake and partitioning hence reducing nutrient competition between all potential bearing suckers and trusses. The increase in the number of tomato fruits observed under TS3 agreed with observations made by [19] and [24] who reported that increase in nutrient uptake and partitioning to each sucker was accompanied by an increase in the number of fruits and total yield per unit area. [25] found that nutrient uptake and assimilate competition between fruits during the cell division period affect fruit development. According to a study done by [26] it was mentioned that the number of fruits and their respective size per plant is affected by nutrient uptake efficiency and pruning. They also observed that the number of fruits per plant is increased with an increase in tomato productive suckers and trusses. In addition, according to [27] they reported that the size of fruits was influenced by plant nutrient uptake efficiency.

Generally, plants having sufficient nutrient uptake, form bigger fruits and at the same time get more fruits per plant, thus fruit quality and number increase [28]. The findings of this study are also in agreement with [29] who observed that improved water and nutrient capture considerably increases the average size fruit. They suggested that a raised bed (equivalent to earthing up) in this case enables plants to set many fruits because of improved mineral intake resulting in large fruits.

Physiological responses of the tomato to pruning showed that triple stem plants which were earthed up to level 30 cm produced more fruits in different size categories. This is because there was a balance between the root system and the aboveground plant structure that increased satisfactory nutrient partitioning and allocation on the fruiting sites. In this study, pruning system focused on the removal of unnecessary water suckers to maintain the ideal number of productive suckers. The current results are similar to those of [19] on the effect of plant population, fruit and stem pruning on yield and quality of tomato. They reported that pruning tomato to two stems obtain more fruits than single stem pruned plants. The results were also similar to those by [22], who observed that two stem pruning gave the highest number of fruits per plant as compared to single stem pruned plants.

3.2 Effect of Earthing up Levels and Pruning Systems on Marketable Tomato Fruit Numbers

The results in Table 2 show that earthing up levels and pruning system significantly affected the total marketable yields. This result shows that increasing both earthing up and pruning system levels tended to increase marketable tomato fruit yield per hectare. The average mean progressively increased from (SS1, DS1, TS1), (SS2, DS2, TS2) to the highest average means with respect to individual treatments. However, the lowest in all treatments was obtained from controls (SS1, DS1, and TS1). This implies that marketable yield progressively increased from single stem, double stem, and finally to triple stem in terms of pruning systems. In terms of earthing up, marketable yields increased with increase in the height of earthing up. as shown in table 2. A comparison of the means shows that values from TS0 (control) were not significantly higher, although it was significantly higher than DS2, DS1, DS0, SS3 SS2, SS1 and SS0 treatments because of its increased bearing surface (suckers and trusses). It was also noted that although DS3 was not significantly higher its overall average mean, was higher than TS0. In general, the treatment TS3 recorded the highest number of marketable tomato fruits at an average of 64500 fruits in cultivation 1 and 64333

fruits in cultivations 2 respectively. Whereas the treatment SS0 (control) in both cultivations recorded the smallest proportions of marketable tomato fruits as shown in Table 2.

The result indicates that different treatments significantly influenced the total number of marketable fruits. There were highly significant differences between treatments concerning the total number of marketable fruits per hectare, with the highest number of fruits per hectare observed in TS3 (Table 2). This could be attributed to more fruits produced due to an increase in productive tomato suckers and trusses. Dry matter accumulations in the bearing trusses is ultimately a product of resource partitioning determined by the interaction between the pruning system and earthing up levels as well as competition driven by source-sink relationships [30]. These interactions were the most consequential to the development of crop load (fruits). As the number of tomato suckers and trusses increase, marketable fruits per plant increased asymptotically. This is the evidence that the total marketable fruits were higher in TS3. The current results are similar with those of [17] in their study on the effect of shoot pruning, observed that tomato plants, which were pruned to a single stem, gave the lowest number of marketable fruits per plant as compared to double and triple stem.

Table 1. Tomato fruit number under different size categories and earthing up levels and pruning systems per hectare in cultivations 1 and 2

Treatment	Cultivation 1			Cultivation 2		
	<6 cm	(6-8) cm	(>8) cm	<6 cm	(6-8) cm	(>8) cm
SS0	15668i*	28336i	15000k	21664i	20333i	11000k
SS1	28663h	42000h	19500j	34667g	34000h	15500j
SS2	37000f	50000g	22333i	43000f	42010g	18332i
SS3	48167e	60332f	27669g	54164e	52333f	23659g
DS0	38000f	61330g	25003h	44000f	43334g	21000h
DS1	48166e	60000f	33659f	54166e	53009f	29669f
DS2	60835d	75170e	41833d	66833d	67155e	37833d
DS3	70167c	84000d	51167c	76168c	78008d	47167c
TS0	61500d	77162e	38161e	67500d	69161e	34164e
TS1	71835c	87000c	51167c	77833c	79010c	47168c
TS2	81661b	97669b	59666b	87665b	89672b	55663b
TS3	95834a	108500a	68513a	101833a	100500a	64500a
LSD	2036.9	2151.3	1354.7	2036.9	2155.2	1353.6
C.V	4.6028	3.8908	4.4328	4.1485	4.4057	4.9573

*Means followed by the same letter(s) along the column for earthing up and pruning systems are not significantly different at $P < 0.05$. Mean separation was done within each cultivation. Where; SS0=Single Stem x no Earthing Up (Control), SS1=Single Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, SS2=Single Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm, SS3=Single Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm, DS0=Double Stem x no Earthing up, DS1=Double Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, DS2=Double Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm DS3=Double Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm, TS0=Triple Stem x no Earthing up, TS1=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, TS2=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm, TS3=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm

Table 2. Means of marketable tomato fruits at different levels of earthing up and pruning systems treatments in two cultivations (2019/2020)

Treatment	Cultivation 1	Cultivation 2
	Means	Means
SS0	11500j*	11503k
SS1	15330i	15661j
SS2	18333h	18167i
SS3	21500g	22835g
DS0	22834g	21333h
DS1	30167f	29833f
DS2	37835d	38000d
DS3	47167c	46667c
TS0	34171e	34167e
TS1	47163c	46667c
TS2	55164b	55828b
TS3	64500a	64333a
LSD	1379.6	892.69
C.V	5.0526	3.2784

*Means followed by the same letter(s) along the column for earthing up and pruning systems are not significantly different at 5 % probability level. Mean separation was done within each cultivation. Where; SS0=Single Stem no Earthing Up (Control), SS1=Single Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, SS2=Single Stem Earthing up to 20 cm, SS3=Single Stem Earthing up to 30 cm, DS0=Double Stem no Earthing up (control), DS1=Double Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, DS2=Double Stem Earthing up to 20 cm, DS3=Double Stem Earthing up to 30 cm, TS0=Triple Stem no Earthing up (control), TS1=Triple Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, TS2=Triple Stem Earthing up to 20 cm, TS3=Triple Stem Earthing up to 30 cm

Results obtained showed a high number of marketable fruits, marketable yield and total yield, when plants were pruned to three stems (Table 2). Conversely, plants pruned to three stems with no earthing up had the highest unmarketable yield, mainly because of the higher number of fruits in size category < 4 cm. A similar trend in the results was observed in cultivation 2. The results in both years are in agreement with the findings by [19] and [22] that yield was found to increase with an increase in stem number. Reduced fruit size when plants are subjected to three stems pruning system was reported by [19]. Fruits developing from a single stem tend to grow larger in size, as compared to fruits developing from two and three stems [19]. The increased fruit size with the single stem pruning might be related to the larger fruit size obtained from this treatment [22].

The findings of this study are also in agreement with those of [19] who in their study on the effect of plant population, fruit and stem pruning on yield and quality of tomato, showed that total yields increased with increase in productive suckers per plant. They pointed out that, increase in sucker density with proper nutrient uptake increases both early and total yields per hectare. [31] observed that earthing up of potato crop during the active plant growth period

improved the soil condition, which enabled proper root growth. They indicated that Proper root growth enhanced efficient nutrients absorption that facilitated better growth and development consequently increasing marketable yield [32]. The current results are also in line with the work of [33] who confirmed that earthing up potato after complete plant emergence resulted in better plant performance and yields. Tomato plants with high marketable fruits are more desirable to farmers because they will be able to sell more hence obtaining high net economic return.

3.3 Effect of Earthing Up Levels and Pruning System on Tomato Yields (tonne/ha)

Tomato fruit production in terms of average yield in tonnes per hectare was substantially affected by the combination of earthing up and pruning system treatments. There were significant effects of treatment on average total yield in both cultivations. This result shows that increasing both earthing up and pruning system levels tended to increase total fruit yield in tonnes per hectare. The average mean progressively increased from SS1, DS1, TS1; SS2, DS2, TS2 to the highest average means from SS3, DS3, TS3 in terms of individual treatments. However,

the lowest in all treatments was obtained from earthing up level zero and different pruning systems. This implies that total yield progressively increased also from single stem, double stem, and finally to triple stem in terms of pruning systems. In terms of earthing up, marketable yields increased from control, level 10 cm, 20 cm to 30 cm. similar to marketable yields as shown in Table 3. A comparison of the means shows that TS1 was not significantly different from DS3, because of its increased bearing area (suckers and trusses) and nutrients uptake respectively. It was also noted that TS0 was not significantly different from DS2. Generally, the analysis showed that the treatment TS3 recorded the highest fruit yield (21.82 tonnes and 21.84 tonnes) per hectare in cultivations 1 and 2 respectively. Whereas the treatment SS0 (control) recorded the smallest average yield at 6.21 tonnes/hectare in cultivation 1 and 6.12 tonnes per hectare in cultivation 2 as shown in Table 3.

Yields in both years were influenced by earthing up and pruning system (Table 3). Earthing up probably caused an increase in the circulation of oxygen in the root zone enhances the development of mitochondria and proteins in the root cell leading to an increase in plant growth and development [28]. In this context, it will be

expected that any positive impact on growth is as a result of increasing earthing levels, improved soil aeration and consequently root hair development [34]. Proper root development promotes efficient nutrient uptake and partitioning to the productive suckers and trusses in tomatoes [35]. This led to the development of more flowers and fruits resulting in higher tomato fruit yield per plant [36]. It should be noted that nutrient uptake affects the tomato production by increasing mineral contents, flower clusters, fruit set percentage, and reducing physiological disorders leading to higher yield [37]. The current results are in agreement with the findings of [34] who showed that an increase in root surface area enhances nutrient uptake leading to increased total yields and the number of fruits per plant [38,39] also reported the highest crop yield per hectare after earthing up potato 15 days after complete plant emergence. Nutrients not only increase the yield of tomato by reducing the flower drop but also increase the fruit retention [40].

Overall, production (tonnes/hectare) was directly linked to the number of productive suckers and trusses that affected fruit loads. Thus, yields increased as plant number of productive suckers increased because there were more clusters per unit area. The crop load was on average higher within the triple stem

Table 3. Means of tomato yield in tonnes per hectare at different treatments in two cultivations (2019/2020)

Treatment	Cultivation 1 Means	Cultivation 2 Means
SS0	6.21i*	6.12i
SS1	7.74h	7.73h
SS2	9.64g	9.60g
SS3	11.65f	11.64f
DS0	11.66f	11.62f
DS1	13.53e	13.53e
DS2	15.29d	15.24d
DS3	17.62c	17.58c
TS0	15.29d	15.24d
TS1	17.65c	17.58c
TS2	19.93b	19.89b
TS3	21.82a	21.84a
LSD	0.206	1.196
C.V	1.8212	1.7364

*Means followed by the same letter(s) along the column for earthing up and pruning systems are not significantly different at 5 % probability level. Mean separation was done within each cultivation. Where; SS0=Single Stem no Earthing Up (Control), SS1=Single Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, SS2=Single Stem Earthing up to 20 cm, SS3=Single Stem Earthing up to 30 cm, DS0=Double Stem no Earthing up (control), DS1=Double Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, DS2=Double Stem Earthing up to 20 cm DS3=Double Stem Earthing up to 30 cm, TS0=Triple Stem no Earthing up (control), TS1=Triple Stem Earthing up to 10 cm, TS2=Triple Stem Earthing up to 20 cm, TS3=Triple Stem Earthing up to 30 cm

pruning system with treatment TS3 averaging higher than those from a single stem pruning system. The effect of triple stem pruning earthing up level 30 cm resulting in the production of greater fruit weight may be explained by not only an increase in bearing area (trusses and suckers) but also exposure of the tomato to increased nutrient uptake due to an increase in root hairs development after earthing up. According to [41], who did a study on the influence of sucker pruning and old leaves removal on the growth and yield of tomato, they found that growth, flowering, and fruiting responses are regulated by pruning. [24], indicated that the increase in plant bearing surface led to an increase in total yield. They further explained that pruning limits vegetative growth and allows more light which increases photosynthesis efficiency hence increased fruit yield [42].

3.4 Effect of Earthing up Levels and Pruning System on Net Economic Benefit per Hectare

The results from the analysis of variance for the effect of earthing up and pruning system and their combined effect showed that there was a significant effect on the net economic benefit in

both cultivations. Analysis of the treatment effect showed that the treatment TS3 recorded the highest average net economic benefit per hectare (Kshs 524000 in cultivation 1 and Kshs 596000 in cultivation 2) as compared to treatment SS0 (control) which recorded the smallest average net economic benefit per hectare at Ksh 69000 in cultivation 1 and Ksh 87157 in cultivation 2 (Table 4).

In this study, an increase in yield was dependent on the earthing up level and pruning system used. In cultivation 1, the average marketable yields obtained from the treatment TS3 were 21.82 tonnes per hectare and 21.84 tonnes per hectare in cultivation 2 as opposed to the average yield from control treatment (SS0) as shown previously in Table 3. As a result, the projected total net economic return was higher in treatment TS3 as compared to all other treatments with SS0 being the least in both cultivations. The highest average net economic benefit in cultivation 1 and 2 were Kshs 524,000 and Kshs 596,500, respectively as compared to the lowest net economic return from treatment SS0 (Table 4). These values indicate that increase in marketable yield contributed to the significant improvement of gross income, which could offset the increased cost of production and

Table 4. Tomato net economic benefits (Kshs/Ha) at different treatments levels in cultivation 1 and 2

	Cultivation 1	Cultivation 2
Treatment	Means	Means
SS0	69000i*	87157i
SS1	113500h	139168h
SS2	169000g	200333g
SS3	227833f	266500f
DS0	228167f	266500f
DS1	282333e	327333e
DS2	334000d	383000d
DS3	401333c	490000c
TS0	334167d	383000d
TS1	402334c	459000c
TS2	469333b	533500b
TS3	524000a	596500a
LSD	6102.9	6424.8
C.V	2.5018	2.3281

*Means followed by the same letter(s) along the column for earthing up and pruning systems are not significantly different at 5 % probability level. Mean separation was done within each cultivation. Where; SS0=Single Stem x no Earthing Up (Control), SS1=Single Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, SS2=Single Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm, SS3=Single Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm, DS0=Double Stem x no Earthing up, DS1=Double Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, DS2=Double Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm DS3=Double Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm, TS0=Triple Stem no x Earthing up, TS1=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 10 cm, TS2=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 20 cm, TS3=Triple Stem x Earthing up to 30 cm

even make tomato enterprise more profitable. In this study use of triple stem pruning system appeared to be more productive as compared to single stem and double stem because of higher marketable yields.

The current results are in agreement with findings from [19] who observed that an increase in the number of productive stems led to an increase in yield and sales. This observation is further supported by [16] who found that a single stem pruning system gave the lowest marketable fruit number that ultimately reduced the economic return per plant. They also found that triple stem pruning system gave the highest number of marketable fruits per plant translating to higher yield and higher net economic return. According to [17,20] and [11], tomatoes with more productive suckers and trusses gave higher net returns as compared to tomatoes with few productive suckers.

3.5 Net Return

In case of net return different treatment combination showed different amount of net return. The highest net return (Ksh 524,000 ha⁻¹) was recorded from triple stem pruning system, earthing up level 30 cm. The lowest net return (Ksh 69,000 ha⁻¹) was recorded from single stem pruning system with no earthing up. From economic point of view, it was apparent from the above results that the treatment combination of triple stem pruning system and earthing up to level 30 cm was more profitable compare to other treatments.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

From the results, it can be concluded that combinations of triple stem pruning system and earthing up to level 30 cm produced the highest number of the best quality fruit size (medium and large size fruits), it also gave the highest number of marketable fruits which reflected the final yields per hectare. It is therefore worthwhile investing in optimizing growth conditions, *i.e.* earthing up level 30 cm in combination with triple pruning system. Based on the benefit-cost ratio, it can be concluded that a combination of triple stem pruning system and earthing up to level 30 cm gave the best net return. Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made. To improve tomato fruit size, which consequently improves marketable yields and net economic benefits,

farmers are encouraged to consider triple stem pruning system and earthing up to level 30 cm. According to this study, tomato production through earthing up may be profitable. Although, cost and return estimates are believed to be typical and realistic, individual growers should adjust these values to their own specific situations and circumstances.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

A clearance form from the Chuka University ethics review committee was obtained approving the suitability of the research. The research permit was then acquired from the National Commission of Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) before commencing the research. This study ensured that research procedures steps described for this study were followed in data collection, analysis, and in thesis write up ensuring research ethics. The policy regarding plagiarism was also adhered to.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to Chuka University Internal Research Funds through the directorate of research, extension and publications for partially sponsoring my research. I am very grateful to Chuka University through the Department of Plant Science for providing facilities to run the experiments for this study.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Faling M. Framing agriculture and climate in Kenyan policies: A longitudinal perspective. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2020;106:228-239.
2. Kogo BK, Kumar L, Koech R. Climate change and variability in Kenya: A review of impacts on agriculture and food security. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. 2020;1-21.
3. Dube AK, Ozkan B, Govindasamy R. Analyzing the export performance of the horticultural sub-sector in Ethiopia: ARDL bound test cointegration analysis. *Horticulturae*. 2018;4(4):34.

4. Parr B, Bond JK, Minor T. Vegetables and Pulses Outlook. 2018;1495:3227.
5. Ochilo WN, Nyamasyo GN, Kilalo D, Otieno W, Otipa M, Chege, F. Lingeera EK. Characteristics and production constraints of smallholder tomato production in Kenya. Scientific African. 2019;2.
6. Bertolino S, Asteggiano L, Saladini MA, Giordani L, Vittone G, Alma A. Environmental factors and agronomic practices associated with Savi's pine vole abundance in Italian apple orchards. Journal of Pest Science. 2015;88(1):135-142.
7. Kudoyarova GR, Dodd IC, Veselov DS, Rothwell SA, Yu, Veselov S. Common and specific responses to availability of mineral nutrients and water. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2015;66(8):2133-2144.
8. Pokhrel B, Sorensen JN, Petersen KK. Effect of plant-based organic fertilizers and chicken manure extract on plant growth and root zone activities of tomato. In III International Symposium on Organic Greenhouse Horticulture. 2016;1164:173-180.
9. Benjamin JG, Nielsen DC, Vigil MF. Quantifying effects of soil conditions on plant growth and crop production, geoderma. 2003;116:137-148.
10. Mattar MA, El-Abedin TKZ, Alazba AA, Al-Ghobari HM. Soil water status and growth of tomato with partial root-zone drying and deficit drip irrigation techniques. Irrigation Science. 2020; 38(2):163-176.
11. Mourão I, Teixeira J, Brito LM, Ferreira ME, Moura ML. Pruning system effect on greenhouse grafted tomato yield and quality. Building Organic Bridges. 2014;3: 941-944.
12. Max JFJ, Schmidt L, Mutwiwa UN, Kahlen K. Effects of shoot pruning and inflorescence thinning on plant growth, yield, and fruit quality of greenhouse tomatoes in a tropical climate. Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics (JARTS). 2016; 117(1):45-56.
13. Bertin N, Genard M. Tomato quality as influenced by pre-harvest factors. Scientia Horticulturae. 2018;233:264-276.
14. Ji Y, Nuñez Ocaña, D, Choe D, Larsen DH, Marcelis LF, Heuvelink E. Far-red radiation stimulates dry mass partitioning to fruits by increasing fruit sink strength in tomato. New Phytologist; 2020.
15. Yao Y, Wang X, Chen B, Zhang M, Ma J. Seaweed extract improved yields, leaf photosynthesis, ripening time, and net returns of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* Mill.). American Chemical Society Omega. 2020;5(8):4242-4249.
16. Hesami A, Khorami SS, Hosseini SS. Effect of shoot pruning and flower thinning on the quality and quantity of semi-determinate tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). Notulae Scientia Biologicae. 2012;4(1):108-111.
17. Goda Y, Mohamed AA, Helaly AA, and El-Zeiny OAH. Effect of shoot pruning on growth, yield, and fruit quality of husk tomato (*Physalis pubescens* L.). Journal of American Science. 2014;10(1):5-10.
18. Waraich EA, Ahmad R, Ashraf MY. Role of mineral nutrition in alleviation of drought stress in plants. Australian Journal of Crop Science. 2011;5(6):764
19. Maboko MM, Du Plooy CP, Chiloane S. Effect of plant population, fruit and stem pruning on yield and quality of hydroponically grown tomato. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2011; 6(22):5144-5148.
20. Mazed HK, Akand MH, Haque MN, Pulok MAI, Partho SG. Yield and economic analysis of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) as influenced by potassium and stem pruning. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications. 2015;5(1):1-5.
21. Islam GMN, Arshad FM, Radam A, Alias EF. Good agricultural practices (GAP) of tomatoes in Malaysia: Evidences from Cameron Highlands. African Journal of Business Management. 2012;6(27):7969-7976.
22. Ara N, Bashir MK, Begum S, Kakon SS. Effect of spacing and stem pruning on the growth and yield of tomato. International Journal of Sustainable Crop Production. 2007;2(3):35-39.
23. Jaetzold R, Schmidt H, Hornetz B, Shisanya C. Farm management handbook. Vol II, Part C, East Kenya. Subpart C. 2007;1.

24. Amundson S, Deyton DE, Kopsell DA, Hitch W, Moore A, Sams CE. Optimizing plant density and production systems to maximize the yield of greenhouse-grown 'Trust' tomatoes. Hort Technology. 2012; 22(1):44-48.
25. Ruan YL, Patrick JW, Bouzayen M, Osorio S, Fernie AR. Molecular regulation of seed and fruit set. Trends in Plant Science. 2012;17(11):656-665.
26. Postma JA, Lynch JP. Complementarity in root architecture for nutrient uptake in ancient maize/bean and maize/bean/squash polycultures. Annals of Botany. 2012;110(2):521-534.
27. Badr MA, Hussein SA, El-Tohamy WA, Gruda N. Nutrient uptake and yield of tomato under various methods of fertilizer application and levels of fertigation in arid lands. Gesunde Pflanzen. 2010; 62(1):11-19.
28. Zakaria NI, Ismail MR, Awang Y, Megat Wahab PE, Berahim Z. Effect of root restriction on the growth, photosynthesis rate, and source and sink relationship of chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.) grown in soilless culture. BioMed Research International; 2020.
29. Alliaume F, Rossing WAH, Tiftonell P, Jorge G, Dogliotti S. Reduced tillage and cover crops improve water capture and reduce erosion of fine-textured soils in raised bed tomato systems. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment. 2014;183: 127-137.
30. Li T, Heuvelink E, Marcelis LFM. Quantifying the source-sink balance and carbohydrate content in three tomato cultivars. Frontiers in Plant Science 2015; 6:1-10.
31. Getachew T, Belew D, Tulu S. Combined effect of plant spacing and time of earthing up on tuber quality parameters of potato (*solanum tuberosum* L.) at degem district, north showa zone of oromia regional state. Asian Journal of Crop Science. 2012; 5(1):24-32.
32. Agegnehu G, Nelson PN, Bird MI. Crop yield, plant nutrient uptake, and soil physicochemical properties under organic soil amendments and nitrogen fertilization on nitisols. Soil and Tillage Research. 2016;160:1-13.
33. Tafi M, Siyadat S, Radjabi R, Mojadam M. The effects of earthing up on the potato yield in Dezful (Khouzestan, Iran) weather condition. Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. 2010; 5(5):392-396.
34. Wang J, Li Y, Niu W. Deficit alternate drip irrigation increased root-soil-plant interaction, tomato yield, and quality. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020; 17(3):781.
35. Tracy SR, Black CR, Roberts JA, Mooney SJ. Exploring the interacting effect of soil texture and bulk density on root system development in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). Environmental and Experimental Botany. 2013;91:38-47.
36. Wang Y, Liu F, Richardt Jensen C. Comparative effects of partial root-zone irrigation and deficit irrigation on phosphorus uptake in tomato plants. The Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology. 2012;87(6):600-604.
37. Kumar M, Chaudhary V, Naresh RK, Maurya OP, Pal SL. Does integrated sources of nutrients enhance growth, yield, quality, and soil fertility of vegetable crops. International Journal of Current Microbiology Applied Science. 2018;7(6): 125-155.
38. Azarmi R, Hajieghrari B, Giglou A. Effect of Trichoderma isolates on tomato seedling growth response and nutrient uptake. African Journal of Biotechnology. 2011; 10(31):5850-5855.
39. Maleka KG. Determination of yield and yield components of selected tomato varieties in soil with different levels of cattle manure application. Theses and dissertations (agriculture). 2012;199.
40. Abbasi NA, Zafar L, Khan HA, Qureshi AA. Effects of naphthalene acetic acid and calcium chloride application on nutrient uptake, growth, yield, and post-harvest performance of tomato fruit. Pak. J. Bot. 2013;45(5):1581-1587.
41. Ahmad H, Yeasmin S, Rahul S, Mahbuba S, Uddin AJ. Influence of sucker pruning and old leaves removal on growth and yield of cherry tomato. Journal of Bioscience and Agriculture Research. 2017;12(02):1048-1053.

42. Usall J, Ippolito A, Sisquella M, Neri F. Physical treatments to control postharvest diseases of fresh fruits and vegetables. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*. 2016;122:30-40.

© 2020 Keter et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/65709>