



Influence of Irrigation Scheduling and Fertigation on Quality of Bhagwa Cultivar of Pomegranate under Semi-arid Conditions of Rajasthan

Manisha Jangir ^{a#*}, K. K. Meena ^{b†}, Vivek Kumar ^{a#}
and Nupur Sharma ^{c‡}

^a Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura, Jaipur, India.

^b Department of Horticulture, S.K.N. College of Agriculture, SKNAU, Jobner, Jaipur, India.

^c Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Sawai Madhopur, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i42790

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/96943>

Original Research Article

Received: 29/12/2022

Accepted: 01/03/2023

Published: 03/03/2023

ABSTRACT

The field experiment was conducted at Horticulture farm, Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura (Jaipur-Rajasthan) during 2019-20 and 2020-21. The experiment comprised of 12 treatment combinations consisting of 3 drip irrigation levels (50%, 75% and 100% at PE level) and 4 fertigation levels (100%, 75%, 50% of recommended dose of fertilizers through drip and 100% of RDF as basal dose). The experiment was laid out in factorial Randomized Block design. The experimental results revealed that among different treatment combinations highest fruit quality

Ph.D. Horticulture;

† Associate Professor;

‡ Subject Matter Specialist (Agronomy);

*Corresponding author: E-mail: manishajangir94@gmail.com;

characters such as TSS (B^0), TSS:Acid, reducing sugar (%), total sugar (%) and lowest value for acidity (%) and non-reducing sugar (%) of pomegranate fruit was found under treatment I_2F_3 (75% irrigation at PE level + 75 % RDF through drip).

Keywords: Irrigation; fertigation; pomegranate; Bhagwa; qualitative parameters.

1. INTRODUCTION

Irrigation water and nutrients are the most crucial inputs which directly affect the plant vegetative growth, development, yield and quality of product. Application of irrigation water and fertilizers together through drip is the most efficient way of applying water and nutrient to the plant root zone. These inputs are efficiently harnessed by plants as these are placed near root zone of the plant. For proper water management, scheduling of water is beneficial [1]. Scheduling of irrigation is the process which helps an irrigator to determine the timing, frequency and quantity of water that is to be applied to the crop. The main task is to estimate crop water requirement in the perspective of growth stages of plant and climate [2]. Pomegranate needs supplemental irrigation for proper growth and for commercial cultivation of pomegranate in dry and arid region, water itself is a limiting factor [3]. Through fertigation both water and fertilizer can be applied more precisely, in controlled quantity and at appropriate time and frequency directly to the root zone with drip irrigation as per the crop requirements at different growth stages [4]. Fertigation through drip can minimize the fertilizer usage up to 25-40 per cent [5-7] and increased fertilizer use efficiency [8].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted on five-year-old pomegranate plants cv. Bhagwa growing under high density planting system (3 m×3 m spacing), at the Horticulture Farm, Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura, Jaipur. The experiment was conducted on 36 plants in randomized block design. The experiment comprised of 12 treatment combinations consisting of 4 fertigation levels (100%, 75%, 50% of recommended dose of fertilizers through drip and 100% of RDF as basal dose) and 3 drip irrigation levels (50%, 75% and 100% at PE level). The “*Mrig Bahar*” (June-July) crop had been chosen for the present experiment. Recommended dose of N,P and K used were applied @ 625, 250 and 250 g per plant respectively. Water soluble fertilizers were

applied through drip irrigation system (fertigation). Amount of water soluble fertilizers were determined by calculating the amount of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in recommended dose. All fertilizers were applied in ten equal split doses at weekly interval (from 16 August to 30 October in both the years). Weighed quantity of water soluble fertilizers (19:19:19) along with urea as per treatment requirement were mixed in water and injected through venturi meter. Pan Evaporation method was used for estimating crop water requirement (Mane et al. 3).

3. OBSERVATIONS

1. **TSS (0 Brix)** : Total soluble solids of juice was recorded with the help of “Digital Refractometer” (Brix: 0.0 to 53.0 %) by taking a drop of juice of composite sample on prism of the refractometer and observing it against the light as it works on the principle of refraction of light.
2. **Acidity (%)** : The titrable acidity of the fruit juice was determined by the method given by Ranganna, [9]. For this 10 ml of juice was titrated against 0.1N NaOH using phenolphthalein as an indicator. The percentage acidity of the juice was expressed as citric acid in grams in 100 ml of fruit juice.
Acidity (%)
$$= \frac{0.0064 \times \text{Volume of NaOH used}}{\text{Volume of sample taken}} \times 100$$
3. **TSS: Acid ratio**: From T.S.S. and acidity of fruit juice, T.S.S.: Acid ratio was worked out by dividing T.S.S. (0 B) by acidity (%).
4. **Sugars**:

Reducing sugar (%): The reducing sugar was estimated by DNS method [10].

Reagents:

- (i) Dinitro salicylic acid (DNS) reagent:
Dinitro salicylic acid = 1g
Crystalline phenol = 200mg
Sodium sulphite = 50mg
1 per cent NaOH = 100 ml

- (ii) Rochelle salt :
Na-K tartrate = 40g
Volume = 100 ml
- (iii) Standard glucose solution: (1mg/ml)
Dissolve 100 mg glucose in 100 ml of distilled water.
- (iv) Working standard solution: (100µg/ml)
10 ml standard solution make up to 100 ml with distilled water.

Estimation: Reducing sugar was estimated by using DNS reagent and Rochelle salt. Pulp (0.5ml) (100 times diluted) was added with 2.5ml D.W., 3ml DNS reagent and heated in boiling water bath, cooled and 1 ml of Rochelle salt was added. The absorbance was measured at 510 nm on spectrophotometer, model Spectronic-20. The value was plotted against a standard curve prepared from glucose. The figure was expressed on percentage basis.

Total sugar (%): Total sugar was estimated by Anthrone reagent method [11].

Reagent:

- A. Anthrone reagent =2 mg/ml in conc. H₂SO₄
- B. Standard glucose solution =1mg/ml
100 mg glucose was dissolved in 100 ml distilled water.
- C. Working Standard Solution =100 µg/ml
10 ml standard solution was dissolved in 100 ml distilled water.

Estimation: Total sugar content was determined by using Anthrone reagent method [11]. 0.5ml of diluted pulp (100 times) was taken. 0.5 ml of diluted H₂O and 4ml Anthrone reagent was put in chilled water for 5-10 times and absorbance was measured at 630 nm on Spectronic-20.

The amount of sugar present in the pulp was plotted against standard curve prepared from glucose. The content was expressed on per cent basis.

Non-reducing sugar (%): The amount of non-reducing sugar was obtained by dividing the total sugar by factor 0.95 and subtracting the reducing sugar from the resultant.

$$\text{Non-reducing sugar (\%)} = (\text{Total Sugar (\%)} \times 0.95) - \text{Reducing Sugar (\%)}$$

The experimental data were statistically analysed as per the method suggested by Panse and Sukhatme [12].

4. RESULTS

4.1 Total Soluble Solids (^oBrix)

The data on T.S.S. (^oB) of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels, fertigation and their interaction are presented in the table. The results are presented as pooled value for both the years of experiments.

As obvious from the table that irrigation levels significantly affected the T.S.S. (^oB) in pomegranate. Pooled data of both the years presented showed that the maximum and minimum T.S.S. (^oB) (14.24 and 12.59) was found under treatments I₂ and I₁ respectively. Among fertigation levels, the maximum and minimum T.S.S. (^oB) (14.21 and 12.86) was found under treatments F₃ and F₄ respectively.

4.1.1 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on T.S.S. (^oB). Based on the found data, Pooled data for both the years showed that maximum T.S.S. (^oB) (14.92) was recorded in the treatment I₂F₃ and minimum T.S.S. (^oB) (11.94) was recorded in the treatment I₁F₄.

4.2 Acidity (%)

The data regarding acidity (%) of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels and fertigation and their interaction are presented in Table 1. The data reveal that the different irrigation levels significantly affected the acidity (%), where Pooled data for both the years showed that the mean minimum (0.46 %) and mean maximum acidity (%) (0.54 %) was observed in treatment I₂ and I₁ respectively. Similarly, different fertigation levels significantly affected the acidity (%), where pooled data for both the years showed that the mean minimum (0.48 %) and mean maximum acidity (%) (0.52 %) was observed in treatment F₂ and F₄ respectively.

4.2.1 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on acidity (%). Based on the found data, pooled data for both the years showed that minimum acidity (%) (0.45 %) was recorded in the treatment I₂F₂ and maximum

acidity (%) (0.56) was recorded in the treatment I_1F_4 .

4.3 TSS: Acid Ratio

The data on TSS: acid of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels, fertigation and their interaction are presented in Table 1. As obvious from the table that irrigation levels significantly affected the TSS: acid in pomegranate.. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum TSS: acid (30.17 and 24.23) was found under treatments I_2 and I_1 respectively. Similarly, fertigation levels significantly affected the TSS: acid in pomegranate.. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum TSS: acid (30.28 and 25.77) was found under treatments F_3 and F_1 respectively.

4.3.1 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on TSS: acid. Based on the found data, Pooled data for both the years showed that maximum TSS: acid (32.94) was recorded in the treatment I_2F_3 and minimum TSS: acid (22.93) was recorded in the treatment I_1F_1 .

4.4 Sugars (Reducing Sugar, Non-reducing Sugar, Total Sugar)

4.4.1 Reducing sugar

The data on reducing sugar (%) of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels, fertigation and their interaction are presented in Table 1. As obvious from the table that irrigation levels significantly affected the reducing sugar (%) in pomegranate. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum reducing sugar (%) (8.45 and 7.24) was found under treatments I_2 and I_1 respectively. As presented in the table that fertigation levels significantly affected the reducing sugar (%) in pomegranate. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum reducing sugar (%) (8.36 and 7.70) was found under treatments F_3 and F_4 respectively.

4.4.2 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on reducing sugar (%). Based

on the pooled data for both the years the maximum reducing sugar (%) (8.81) was recorded in the treatment I_2F_3 and minimum reducing sugar (%) (6.95) was recorded in the treatment I_1F_4 .

4.5 Total Sugar (%)

The data on total sugar (%) of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels, fertigation and their interaction are presented in Table 1. As obvious from the table that irrigation levels significantly affected the total sugar (%) in pomegranate. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum total sugar (%) (8.93 and 8.09) was found under treatments I_2 and I_1 respectively. As presented in the table that fertigation levels significantly affected the total sugar (%) in pomegranate.. Pooled data of both the years showed that the maximum and minimum total sugar (%) (8.94 and 8.30) was found under treatments F_3 and F_4 respectively.

4.5.1 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on total sugar (%). Based on the found data, Pooled data for both the years showed that maximum total sugar (%) (9.26) was recorded in the treatment I_2F_3 and minimum total sugar (%) (7.79) was recorded in the treatment I_1F_4 .

4.6 Non-reducing Sugar (%)

The data regarding non-reducing sugar (%) of pomegranate as affected by drip irrigation levels and fertigation and their interaction are presented in Table 1. The data revealed that the different irrigation levels significantly affected the non-reducing sugar (%), where pooled data for both the years showed that the mean minimum (0.93 %) and mean maximum non-reducing sugar (%) (1.25 %) was observed in treatment I_3 and I_1 respectively. Similarly, different fertigation levels significantly affected the non-reducing sugar (%), where pooled data for both the years showed that the mean minimum (1.00 %) non-reducing sugar (%) was observed in treatment F_3 and mean maximum non-reducing sugar (%) (1.07 %) was observed in treatment F_4 which was found statistically at par with F_2 .

Table 1. Effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation on qualitative parameters

Treatments	TSS (°Brix)	Acidity (%)	TSS : acid ratio	Reducing sugar (%)	Total sugar (%)	Non-reducing sugar (%)
Irrigation Levels (I)						
I ₁	12.59	0.54	24.23	7.24	8.09	1.25
I ₂	14.24	0.46	30.17	8.45	8.93	0.96
I ₃	13.83	0.48	28.79	8.36	8.82	0.93
SEm±	0.22	0.01	0.45	0.13	0.14	0.02
CD (5 %)	0.62	0.02	1.28	0.36	0.39	0.05
Fertigation Levels (F)						
F ₁	13.37	0.51	25.77	7.92	8.51	1.05
F ₂	13.79	0.48	29.05	8.11	8.72	1.07
F ₃	14.21	0.48	30.28	8.36	8.94	1.00
F ₄	12.86	0.52	25.84	7.70	8.30	1.07
SEm±	0.25	0.01	0.52	0.15	0.16	0.02
CD (5 %)	0.71	0.03	1.48	0.42	0.45	0.06
Interaction (IxF)						
I ₁ F ₁	12.42	0.55	22.52	7.15	8.00	1.26
I ₁ F ₂	12.80	0.52	25.38	7.33	8.19	1.27
I ₁ F ₃	13.19	0.52	26.45	7.55	8.40	1.20
I ₁ F ₄	11.94	0.56	22.58	6.95	7.79	1.27
I ₂ F ₁	14.05	0.48	28.03	8.34	8.82	0.96
I ₂ F ₂	14.48	0.45	31.61	8.55	9.03	0.97
I ₂ F ₃	14.92	0.45	32.94	8.81	9.26	0.91
I ₂ F ₄	13.51	0.48	28.11	8.11	8.60	0.97
I ₃ F ₁	13.65	0.50	26.75	8.25	8.71	0.93
I ₃ F ₂	14.07	0.47	30.16	8.45	8.92	0.95
I ₃ F ₃	14.50	0.47	31.44	8.71	9.15	0.89
I ₃ F ₄	13.13	0.50	26.83	8.02	8.49	0.95
SEm±	0.43	0.02	0.90	0.25	0.27	0.03
CD (5 %)	1.24	0.04	2.56	0.72	0.78	0.10

I₁ - 50% irrigation at PE, I₂ - 75% irrigation of PE, I₃ - 100% irrigation of PE, F₁ - 100 % RDF as basal dose plant⁻¹, F₂ - 100 % RDF at weekly interval plant⁻¹, F₃ - 75 % RDF at weekly interval plant⁻¹, F₄ - 50 % RDF at weekly interval plant⁻¹

4.6.1 Interaction effect (I x F)

Interaction effect of drip irrigation levels and fertigation presented in the table showed significant effect on non-reducing sugar (%). Based on the found data, pooled data for both the years showed that minimum non-reducing sugar (%) (0.89 %) was recorded in the treatment I₃F₃ and maximum non-reducing sugar (%) (1.27 %) was recorded in the treatment I₁F₄ which was statistically at par with I₁F₂ treatment.

5. DISCUSSION

It is clear from the results presented in the table obtained that irrigation and fertigation levels significantly enhanced the fruit quality parameters (TSS, acidity, TSS: acid, sugars) of pomegranate.

The maximum TSS, TSS: acid and juice content, were recorded in plants that received higher RDF

through fertigation. It might be possibly due to higher levels of fertigation maximizing the growth of the plant and facilitating the accumulation of more carbohydrates into the fruit. During subsequent fruit development, such metabolites (starch) will hydrolyse in to sugars [13] which increases the TSS and decreases the acidity. The lesser TSS content under low N fertilization conditions can be elucidated by less transport of photosynthates from the leaves to the fruit. Higher qualitative attributes under fertigation might be due to the prevalence of low temperature at the time of fruit ripening, which not only prevented the excessive loss of respiratory substances but also promoted the translocation of photosynthates from leaves to the fruits [14]. Better accumulation of metabolites improved the fruit quality of winter crop due to diversion of synthesized food materials of spring flushed crop to monsoon flushed crop [15]. The similar findings were observed by

Ramniwas et al. [16], Ramniwas et al. [17], Kumawat et al. [18], Mahadevan et al. [19] in guava and Shanmugasundaram and Balakrishnamurthy [20], Haneef et al. [21], Tanari et al. [22], Suman and Jain [23], Pawar and Dingre [24] in pomegranate.

Drip irrigation improved the fruit quality parameters by providing constant moisture regime in the soil due to which root remains active throughout the season resulting in optimum supply of nutrient and proper translocation of food which promoted the fruit growth and improved the fruit quality. Such results are also in conformity with the findings of Athani et al. [25] and Athani et al. [26] in guava cv. 'Sardar', Sarolia et al. [27] and Kumawat et al. [18] in guava.

6. CONCLUSION

Among treatment combinations, treatment I₂F₃ (75% irrigation at PE level + 75% RDF through drip) recorded maximum juice content, T.S.S., TSS:acid, reducing sugar, total sugar while minimum acidity and non-reducing sugar which remained statistically at par with F₂, which remained statistically at par with I₂F₂ (75% irrigation at PE level + 100 % RDF through drip).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The present research paper contains the observations from the doctoral research of the corresponding author and approved by the Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur, thus we want to thank the institution for rendering the required facilities for successful completion of the present work. We are further thankful to Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi for providing financial assistance for the present research work.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Tan CS. Estimating crop evapotranspiration for irrigation scheduling. *Agriculture Canada*. 1980; 25 (4):26-29.
2. Tan CS, Layne REC. Application of a simplified evapotranspiration model for predicting irrigation requirements of peach. *Horticultural Science*. 1981;16(2):172-173.
3. Prasad RN, Bankar GJ, Vaishishtha BB. Problems and prospects of pomegranate cultivation in arid region. *Symposium on Recent Advances in Management of Arid Ecosystems*, Jodhpur. 1997;March 3-5.
4. Yadav JSP, Singh AK, Rattan RK. Water and nutrient management in sustainable agriculture. *Fertilizer News*. 1998;43(12): 103-117.
5. Kale SS. Irrigation water and N fertilizer management through drip irrigation for brinjal in Entisol. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri (M.S.); 1995.
6. Hasan M, Sirohi NPS, Kumar V, Sharma MK, Singh AK. Performance evaluation of different irrigation scheduling methods for peach through efficient fertigation system network. *VII International Symposium on Temperate Zone fruit in the Tropics and Subtropics*, *Acta Horticulture*. 2007;662.
7. Thakur N, Sharma Y, Singh SK. Drip irrigation and fertigation in fruits crops. *Book of Abstracts, 5th Indian Horticulture Congress*, November 6-9, 2012 held at, Ludhiana. 2012;218.
8. Ranghaswami MV, Arunadevi K, Selvaraj PK, Kumar V. Optimal irrigation and fertigation scheduling on mulberry yield and water use efficiency. *7th International Micro Irrigation Congress*, September 10-16 2006, PWTC, Kuala Lumpur. 2006;1-14.
9. Ranganna S. *Hand book of analysis and quality control for fruit and vegetable products*. Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. New Delhi; 1986.
10. Miller GL. Use of dinitrosalicylic acid reagent for determination of reducing sugar. *Journal of Analytical Chemistry*. 1959;31:426-428.
11. Dubois M, Gilles K, Hamilton J. A colorimetric method for the determination of sugars. *Nature*. 1951;168.
12. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. In: *Statistical methods for agriculture workers*. ICAR, New Delhi. 1985;145-155.
13. Hulme AC. *The biochemistry of fruits and their products*. Academic Press, New York. 1970;1& 2.
14. Singh A, Dhaliwal GS. Influence of radiation interception and canopy temperature on fruit quality of Sardar guava at different planting distance. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*. 2004; 61:118-121.
15. Chandra R, Govind S. Influence of time and intensity of pruning on growth, yield

- and fruit quality of guava under high density planting. Tropical Agriculture. 1995;72:110-113.
16. Ramniwas, Kaushik RA, Sarolia DK, Pareek S, Singh V. Effect of irrigation and fertigation scheduling on growth and yield of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) under meadow orcharding. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2012b;7(47):6350-6356.
 17. Ramniwas, Kaushik RA, Pareek S, Sarolia DK, Singh V. Effect of drip fertigation scheduling on fertilizer use efficiency, leaf nutrient status, yield and quality of 'Shweta' guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) under meadow orcharding. National Academy of Science Letters. 2013;36(5):483-488.
 18. Kumawat KL, Sarolia DK, Kaushik RA, Jodha AS. Effect of irrigation and fertigation scheduling on growth, flowering, yield and economics of guava cv. Lalit under ultra high density planting system. Indian Journal of Horticulture. 2017;74(3): 362-368.
 19. Mahadevan A, Kumar S, Swaminathan V, Gurusamy A, Sivakumar T. Effect of crop regulation and fertigation on quality characters of guava (*Psidium guajava*) cv. Sardar. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017b;6(11):2137-2141.
 20. Shanmugasundaram T, Balakrishnamurthy G. Effect of fertigation on flowering and yield of tissue culture pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) cv. Mridula grown under ultra high density planting (UHDP). Asian Journal of Horticulture. 2013;8(2): 601-604.
 21. Haneef M, Kaushik RA, Sarolia DK, Mordia A, Dhakar M. Irrigation scheduling and fertigation in pomegranate cv. Bhagwa under high density planting system. Indian Journal of Horticulture. 2014;71(1):45-48.
 22. Tanari, N, Ramegowda, S, Thottan, A. and Girigowda, M. 2019. Effect of fertigation of primary nutrients on pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) fruit productivity and quality. Tropical Plant Research, 6(3):424-432.
 23. Suman M, Jain MC. Influence of plant growth regulators and fertigation on yield and economic feasibility of pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) cv. Sinduri under high density planting system. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2020;8(5):192-196.
 24. Pawar DD, Dingre SK. Productivity, water use, quality and economics of pomegranate fertigation in semiarid conditions of India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9(6):2503-2510.
 25. Athani SI, Prabhuraj HS, Ustad AI, Swamy GSK, Patil PB, Kotikal YK. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on vegetative growth parameters, fruit characters, quality and yield of 'Sardar' guava. 1st International Guava Symposium, Dec. 5-8, CISH, Lucknow. 2005a;70.
 26. Athani SI, Ustad AI, Kotikal YK, Prabhuraj HS, Swamy GSK, Patil PB. Variation in growth parameters, fruit characters, quality and yield of 'Sardar' guava as influenced by vermicompost. 1st International Guava Symposium, Dec. 5-8, CISH, Lucknow. 2005b;71.
 27. Sarolia DK, Singh V, Kaushik RA, Ameta KD, Pareek S. Effect of micro irrigation on growth, yield and quality of Sardar guava under semi arid conditions of Rajasthan. Book of Abstracts, 4th Indian Horticulture Congress, Nov. 18-21, New Delhi. 2010; 158-59.

© 2023 Jangir 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:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/96943>