

## POST HARVEST LOSSES AND MARKETING TECHNOLOGIES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN KANPUR, UTTAR PRADESH, INDIA

Sharad Sachan<sup>1</sup>, Roop Kumar<sup>2</sup> and Subhash Kumar Jawla<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2&3</sup>School of Agriculture, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar (144411), Punjab (INDIA) <sup>2</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail:-roop.24857@lpu.co.in

### Abstract

The present study was conducted for the post harvest losses occurring in fruits, vegetables, food grains and oilseeds and marketing of farm produce in Kanpur district. This study was conducted to identify the major determinants of post harvest factors to reduce the losses and maximize the production. This research work was conducted in Ghatampur, Kalyanpur, Vidhnu, Bilhaur, Patara and Bhitargaon block using structured questionnaire. The main crops of Kanpur district were taken which were categorized among fruits, vegetables and food grains and vegetables. The various supports important for the area were for agri business, market development and sustainable agro market development. Among the studied blocks it was found that block Bilhaur and Kalyanpur has the maximum potential for the development of agribusiness. the post harvest losses, it was found that in fruits and food grains the post harvest losses has reduced when compared from 2016 to 2017 whereas it was reverse in case of vegetables. The losses were found to be more at farm level, storage level and processing level.

Keywords : Post harvest losses, Agriculture markets, Livelihood, Marketing technologies, Farmers

#### Introduction

The use of new technologies by the farmers such as HYV seeds, irrigation, pesticides, fungicides, fertilizers etc have made India a self-efficient in filling the tummies of the citizens. The livelihood of the people in the country depends directly or indirectly on the agriculture. The agribusiness leads to commercial agriculture by production, processing, storage and marketing of agricultural products. The agribusiness has been promoted by GOI under various schemes providing the boost in socio economic status of the farmers in India (Kumar, P., Dwivedi, P. (2018a), Kumar, P., Kumar S. et al. (2018b), Kumar, P., Misao, L., et al., 2018c, Kumar P, Dwivedi, P. 2018d, Kumar, P. and Purnima et al., 2018e, Kumar, P. Pathak, S. 2019f, Kumar, P. Siddique, A. et al., 2019g). All the agencies are lined up with the farmers and their association, farm producer-market linkages, profitable enterprises and agro based industries to provide technical as well as practical aspect to develop the skill, thus developing an effective agribusiness system in the country (Reardon, et al., 1999; Goletti, et al. 2001), (Kumar et al. 2018). The growth pertaining to agriculture will require value addition activities to generate the employment opportunities in the country (Siddique, A. Kumar, P. 2018h, Siddique, A., Kandpal, G., Kumar P. 2018i, Pathak, S., Kumar, P., P.K Mishra, M. Kumar, M. 2017j, Prakash, A., P. Kumar, 2017k., Kumar, P., Mandal, B., 2014L, Kumar, P., Mandal, B., Dwivedi P., 2014m., Kumar, P., Kumar, P.K., Singh, S. 2014n).

The quality of fresh fruits and vegetables cannot be improved after they are harvested, thus the harvesting time of these crops become more important. The harvesting of the crops will decide the quality and the quantity of post harvest losses. Thus they should be harvested at proper stage, form and size. Over mature or less mature produce have less self life and reduced storage life (Kumar, P. 2013o., Kumar, P., Dwivedi, P. 2015p, Gogia, N., Kumar, P., Singh, J., Rani, A. Sirohi, Kumar, P. 2014q, Kumar, P., 2014r. Kumar, P., Dwivedi, P., Singh, P., 2012s, Mishra, P.K., Maurya, B.R., Kumar, Pp. 2012t, Kumar, P., Mandal, B., Dwivedi, P. 2011u. Kumar, P., Mandal, B., Dwivedi, P. 2011v, Kumar, P., Pathak, S. 2016w, Pathak, S., Kumar, P., Mishra, P.K., Kumar, M. 2016x). The optimum harvesting will also lead to proper development of flavor and colour development during ripening. Those fruits and vegetables which are harvested early do not attain proper ripening. The farmers have their on way of judging maturity based on shape, size, smell, colour, texture, taste and resonance which may vary from crop to crop. The right harvesting time depends on the climatic conditions and time of harvest. The harvesting time is different for different crops. For most of the vegetables and fruits the proper harvesting time is either early in morning or late evening. The harvesting should be carried out at the coolest time of the day i.e either in morning or evening.

The harvesting leads to cleaning, sorting, checking, grading, packing and dispatching of the agricultural products. The storage of horticultural crops has become very important in relation to fresh production and distribution. The markets available in cities are fully accustomed to hold the large quantity of fruits and vegetables through modern storage techniques as compared to the rural areas. The lack of the storage facilities lead to greater post harvest losses. The produce at the time of harvest are in abundant which either leads it to be sold in less price or post harvest losses. The amount of losses will be depending upon the type of commodities, pre and post harvest practices and the climatic conditions. The total loss can be finalized by taking summation of all the losses occurred at each stage of marketing chain. There have been many studies which have worked out the losses at individual stage where as this research will put in focus on all the losses throughout the chain. Thus the main objective of this research is (i) To identify the major determents of post harvest factors and (ii) To determine the harvest need of farm produce for better marketing (Kumar, P., Harsavardhn, M. et al., 2018y. Kumar, P., Yumnam, J. et al., 2018z, Kumar, P., Pandey, A.K., et al., 2018aa., Kumar, P., Kumar, S. et al., 2018bb, Kumar, P., Krishna, V., et al., 2018cc).

### **Methods and Materials**

**Study area-** The study area consist of Ghatampur, Kalyanpur, Vidhnu, Bilhaur, Patara and Bhitargaon block for detailed study with the help of survey schedule.

**Time period-** The data has been conducted taking two years in consideration for comparing the various parameters .i.e. 2016 and 2017

**Respondents-** The respondents taken were the Agricultural Officers, Agri businessmen, public representive and farmers.

**Crops-** The crops taken were main crops of the district categorized into fruits, vegetables, food grains and oilseeds.

**Research conduct-**The present study was conducted by using interactive survey methods with intensive discussion held with the respondents. The SPSS has been used for further statistical analysis.

### **Result and Discussion**

The findings of the study are given below

# Important supports for Agribusiness, market and sustainable agro based market development

The above table 1 and graph 1 reveals the type of support required for agribusiness development. The most important support is integrated agribusiness education followed by financial fascilities, business risk mitigation insurance support with the least to be agribusiness federation. In comparison with the areas Kalyanpur followed by Bilhaur has most potential for the purpose where as Vidhnu has the lowest potential.

**Table 1 :** Supports important for the agribusinessdevelopment

| Parameters    | Ghatampur | Kalyanpur | Vidhnu | Bilhaur | Patara | Bhitargaon | Mean  |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|------------|-------|
| Integrated    |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| agri-business |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| education     | 78        | 87        | 71     | 83      | 65     | 81         | 77.50 |
| Export-       |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| import        |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| legislation   | 56        | 68        | 52     | 65      | 78     | 49         | 61.33 |
| Agribusiness  |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| federations   | 49        | 74        | 42     | 71      | 46     | 75         | 59.50 |
| Commercial    |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| agri-policies | 75        | 62        | 68     | 60      | 58     | 48         | 61.83 |
| Financial     |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| Facilities    | 85        | 67        | 80     | 62      | 79     | 43         | 69.33 |
| Business risk |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| mitigation    |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| insurance     |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
| support       | 42        | 91        | 39     | 92      | 49     | 74         | 64.50 |
| Mean          | 64.17     | 74.83     | 58.67  | 72.17   | 62.50  | 61.67      |       |
| 100           |           |           |        |         |        |            |       |
|               |           |           |        |         |        | _          |       |



The table 2 and graph 2 reveals the type of support for market development. The most important support is homestead storage followed by product chain values and banking instant loan with lowest support of localized processing. In comparison with the block of the city Bilhaur and Kalyanpur have the highest potential for the purpose. Table 3 and graph 3 shows the type of support for sustainable Agro-Market development is highest for Agribusiness education whereas least is with the Agri standard commodity legislation. Bilhaur and Kalyanpur block have the most potential for the purpose.

# Cumulative losses at various levels in fruits, vegetables spices and flowers

Table 4 and Graph 4 reveals the post harvest losses occurring in fruits in the study area. It was seen that more losses were found in Banana followed by Mango, papaya and aonla where as minimum losses were reported in citrus. Talking about the losses during different stages of post harvest it was found that maximum losses were in farm level, processing level and consumer levels. This suggest more structural changes are required at farm, storage and processing level

#### **Table 2 :** Types of support for market development

|  |                 | 11          |            |            | 1      |            |               |
|--|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Parameters   | Ghatampur       | Kalyanpur   | Vidhnu     | Bilhaur    | Patara | Bhitargaon | Mean          |
| Homestead  | 85              | 87          | 63         | 92         | 67     | 63         |               |
| storage  |                 |             |            |            |        |            | 76.17         |
| Product  | 72              | 81          | 53         | 88         | 58     | 53         |               |
| chain values   |                 |             |            |            |        |            | 67.50         |
| Banking  | 71              | 57          | 66         | 62         | 62     | 76         |               |
| instant loan   |                 |             |            |            |        |            | 65.67         |
| Costing and  | 52              | 61          | 56         | 87         | 46     | 56         |               |
| pricing  |                 |             |            |            |        |            | <b>59.6</b> 7 |
| Localized  | 31              | 52          | 39         | 93         | 49     | 49         |               |
| processing   |                 |             |            |            |        |            | 52.17         |
| Market   | 57              | 62          | 52         | 48         | 62     | 42         | 53.83         |
| 100<br>90<br>80<br>70<br>60<br>40<br>30<br>20<br>10<br>0 |                 |             |            |            |        | Vidl       | aur           |
| Homest   | ead Product cha | ain Banking | Costing an | d Localize | d Mar  | ket        |               |

**Table 3 :** Types of supports important for sustainable agromarket development

pricing

processing

federations

storage

values

instant loan

| Parameters                             | Ghatampur | Kalyanpur | Vidhnu | Bilhaur | Patara | Bhitargaon | Mean  |
|--|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|------------|-------|
| Agri-business education                | 51        | 87        | 62     | 83      | 52     | 55         | 65.00 |
| Agri-business training                 | 68        | 71        | 58     | 93      | 48     | 48         | 64.33 |
| Agri-business<br>Cooperatives          | 75        | 57        | 52     | 66      | 58     | 52         | 60.00 |
| Agri standard<br>commodity legislation | 47        | 51        | 37     | 56      | 47     | 46         | 47.33 |
| Farmer and human<br>right recognition  | 37        | 52        | 43     | 79      | 41     | 45         | 49.50 |
| Gender neutral farming<br>system       | 38        | 42        | 58     | 72      | 52     | 57         | 53.17 |
| Mean                                   | 52.67     | 60.00     | 51.67  | 74.83   | 49.67  | 50.50      |       |



| Fruit      | Percent cumulative losses |      |       |      |        |                          |       |      |      |           |            |      |
|------------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|--------|--------------------------|-------|------|------|-----------|------------|------|
|            | Farm Market               |      |       |      | Storag | Storage level Processing |       |      |      | ner level | Total      |      |
|            | level                     |      | level |      |        |                          | level |      |      |           | cumulative |      |
|            | 2016                      | 2017 | 2016  | 2017 | 2016   | 2017                     | 2016  | 2017 | 2016 | 2017      | 2016       | 2017 |
| Mango      | 8.4                       | 8.1  | 2.7   | 2.2  | 5.2    | 4.7                      | 4.9   | 4.3  | 1.9  | 1.5       | 23.1       | 20.8 |
| Guava      | 5.6                       | 5.2  | 2.2   | 1.5  | 4.3    | 3.7                      | 3.9   | 3.5  | 1.7  | 1.2       | 17.7       | 15.1 |
| Aonla      | 6.5                       | 6.1  | 3.5   | 3.1  | 3.5    | 3.1                      | 3.2   | 2.6  | 2.1  | 1.5       | 18.8       | 16.4 |
| Papaya     | 7.2                       | 6.9  | 2.5   | 2.2  | 4.6    | 4.2                      | 4.1   | 3.5  | 2.3  | 1.9       | 20.7       | 18.7 |
| Banana     | 8.1                       | 8.3  | 2.6   | 2.1  | 6.5    | 5.9                      | 6.2   | 5.6  | 1.8  | 1.2       | 25.2       | 23.1 |
| Jack Fruit | 3.5                       | 3.5  | 1.6   | 1.4  | 2.9    | 2.5                      | 2.6   | 2.1  | 1.2  | 0.5       | 11.8       | 10.0 |
| Ber        | 3.9                       | 3.7  | 1.9   | 1.5  | 3.2    | 2.8                      | 2.6   | 2.3  | 1.1  | 0.6       | 12.7       | 10.9 |
| Citrus     | 4.2                       | 4.0  | 2.3   | 2.1  | 1.9    | 1.6                      | 1.2   | 0.9  | 1.0  | 0.5       | 10.6       | 9.1  |

Table 4 : Cumulative losses at various levels in fruits



The table 5 and graph 5 shows that the post harvest losses were found more in 2017 as compared to 2016 in vegetables whereas the same has reduced in fruits and foodgrains. It was found tht the maximum losses were reported in tomato followed by brinjal, cauliflower and cabbage where as minimum was found to be in carrot. The post harvest losses were more during farm level, storage level and processing level.

| Table 5 : Cumulative losses a | t various levels in vegetables |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|

| Vegetable   | Percent cumulative losses |                         |      |      |                                |      |      |           |        |           |       |       |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------|------|--------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|
| s           | Farm                      | Farm level Market level |      |      | Storage level Processing level |      |      | ing level | Consun | ner level | Total |       |
|             |                           |                         |      |      |                                |      |      |           |        |           |       | ative |
|             | 2016                      | 2017                    | 2016 | 2017 | 2016                           | 2017 | 2016 | 2017      | 2016   | 2017      | 2016  | 2017  |
| Chilli      | 1.2                       | 1.5                     | 1.0  | 1.2  | 1.5                            | 1.7  | 1.4  | 1.6       | 0.8    | 1.0       | 5.9   | 7     |
| Okra        | 1.4                       | 1.8                     | 1.1  | 1.3  | 1.7                            | 1.8  | 1.6  | 1.8       | 0.7    | 1.0       | 6.5   | 7.7   |
| Tomato      | 2.5                       | 2.9                     | 2.1  | 2.5  | 2.8                            | 3.0  | 2.5  | 2.8       | 1.1    | 1.3       | 11    | 12.5  |
| Brinjal     | 2.3                       | 2.5                     | 1.5  | 1.8  | 2.5                            | 2.7  | 2.2  | 2.5       | 0.5    | 0.6       | 9.0   | 10.1  |
| Cauliflower | 1.9                       | 2.1                     | 1.4  | 1.6  | 2.3                            | 2.8  | 2.0  | 2.2       | 0.8    | 0.9       | 8.4   | 9.6   |
| Cabbage     | 1.5                       | 1.9                     | 1.1  | 1.5  | 1.8                            | 2.1  | 1.5  | 1.7       | 0.9    | 1.1       | 6.8   | 8.3   |
| Spinach     | 1.4                       | 1.6                     | 1.2  | 1.6  | 1.6                            | 1.8  | 1.5  | 1.6       | 1.1    | 1.2       | 6.8   | 7.8   |
| Melon       | 0.6                       | 0.9                     | 0.4  | 0.5  | 0.9                            | 1.2  | 0.8  | 0.9       | 0.5    | 0.6       | 3.2   | 4.1   |
| Radish      | 0.8                       | 1.2                     | 0.4  | 0.6  | 1.1                            | 1.3  | 0.8  | 1.1       | 1.0    | 1.2       | 4.1   | 5.4   |
| Carrot      | 0.5                       | 0.9                     | 0.2  | 0.3  | 0.9                            | 1.1  | 0.8  | 0.9       | 0.5    | 0.6       | 2.9   | 3.8   |
| Turnip      | 0.6                       | 0.8                     | 0.3  | 0.4  | 0.8                            | 1.2  | 0.6  | 0.8       | 0.8    | 1.0       | 3.1   | 4.2   |
| Cucurbits   | 0.8                       | 1.2                     | 0.3  | 0.4  | 1.1                            | 1.2  | 0.9  | 1.1       | 0.6    | 0.9       | 3.7   | 4.8   |



# **Table 6 :** Cumulative losses at various levels in foodgrains and oilseeds

| Foodgrain  | Percent cumulative losses |       |       |              |      |               |      |                  |      |                |            |      |
|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|------|---------------|------|------------------|------|----------------|------------|------|
| s and      | Farm                      | level | Marke | Market level |      | Storage level |      | Processing level |      | Consumer level |            | al   |
| oilseeds   |                           |       |       |              |      |               |      |                  |      |                | cumulative |      |
|            | 2016                      | 2017  | 2016  | 2017         | 2016 | 2017          | 2016 | 2017             | 2016 | 2017           | 2016       | 2017 |
| Wheat      | 2.3                       | 2.1   | 1.2   | 1.1          | 1.9  | 1.2           | 0.9  | 0.7              | 1.2  | 0.9            | 7.5        | 6    |
| Paddy      | 3.2                       | 2.8   | 1.9   | 1.7          | 1.5  | 1.5           | 0.8  | 0.7              | 0.8  | 0.5            | 8.2        | 7.2  |
| Maize      | 2.6                       | 2.5   | 1.5   | 1.2          | 1.6  | 1.6           | 0.6  | 0.5              | 1.5  | 1.2            | 7.8        | 7.0  |
| Pearl      | 2.8                       | 2.3   | 1.6   | 1.3          | 1.4  | 1.4           | 0.9  | 0.7              | 1.2  | 0.8            |            |      |
| millet     |                           |       |       |              |      |               |      |                  |      |                | 7.9        | 6.5  |
| Pigeon pea | 2.9                       | 2.7   | 1.8   | 1.6          | 1.9  | 1.8           | 0.7  | 0.6              | 0.9  | 0.5            | 8.2        | 7.2  |
| Sorghum    | 3.1                       | 2.8   | 1.9   | 1.9          | 1.8  | 1.6           | 0.8  | 0.5              | 0.7  | 0.4            | 8.3        | 7.2  |
| Mustard    | 3.0                       | 2.8   | 1.8   | 1.2          | 1.9  | 1.5           | 0.9  | 0.3              | 0.8  | 0.6            | 8.4        | 6.4  |

Table and Graph 6 interpretate that the post harvest losses were least as compared to vegetables and fruits. It was due to the reason that the food grains have more self life as compared to others. In comparison to the foodgrains and oilseed the maximum losses were found to be in paddy, sorghum and pigeon pea where as minimum in wheat. The same trend was found regarding the losses was farm level, storage level and processing level.



### Conclusion

The following research was conducted in the six blocks of Kanpur district in Uttar Pradesh i.e Ghatampur, Kalyanpur, Vidhnu, Bilhaur, Patara and Bhitargaon during the period of 2016-17. The survey was conducted with the help of survey schedule and secondary data collected from different government agencies. The main crops of Kanpur district were taken which were categorized among fruits, vegetables and food grains and vegetables. The various supports important for the area were for agri business, market development and sustainable agro market development. Among the studied blocks it was found that block Bilhaur and Kalyanpur has the maximum potential for the development of agribusiness.

While India has a huge range of biodiversity due to which a specific agribusiness policy by the government needed to be customized based on the area specific. The Government of India must look after agribusiness as a part of policies that have the specific relevance to its development including National Agricultural Policy, export-import policies etc. The import and export of commodities should be tax free to provide more incentive to the sector. The agribusiness development gives emphasis on regulatory environment, establishing Agro-processing zones and development of agro-technologies to ensure the income generation. Media should be given priorities to increase the advertisement on technologies suitable for small scale agribusiness. Taking about the post harvest losses, it was found that in fruits and food grains the post harvest losses has reduced when compared from 2016 to 2017 whereas it was reverse in case of vegetables. The losses were found to be more at farm level, storage level and processing level.

As the post harvest losses were found to be maximum at farm level, storage level and processing level, this could be decreased as a part of increasing food production to feed the upcoming population. These losses shows lack of basic knowledge and facilities at various levels. Government should conduct various training to the stake holders at farm level, storage level and processing level. These trainings and workshop will educate the farmers, processing units and storing units to reduce the post harvest losses.

### References

- Atanda, S.A.; Pessu P.O.; Agoda S.; Isong I.U. and Ikotun (2011). The concepts and problems of postharvest food losses in perishable crops. African Journal of Food Science, 5(11) 603-6013.
- Bautista, O.K. and Acedo, A.L. Jr. (1987). Postharvest handling of fruits and vegetables. Philippines.
- Bell, A.; Mazaud, F. and Mück, O. (1999). Guidelines for the analysis of postproduction systems. FAO, Rome, Italy. 102p. http://www.fao.org/inpho.
- Bhuyan, M.S and Raju, V. (2018). Post Harvest Losses and Marketing Technologies of Agricultural Products in Bangladesh. International Journal of Marketing and Human Resource Management, 9(1): 18–30.
- Boxall, R.A. (2001). Post-harvest losses to insects-a world overview. International Bioterioration and Biodegradation, 48(1-4): 137-152.
- Boxall, R.A. (2002). Storage losses. In Crop Post-harvest: Science and Technology Volume 1: principles and Practice (Eds P. Golob, G. Farrell & J.E. Orchard), pp. 143-169. Oxford: Blackwell Sciences, Ltd. de Lima,
- C.P.F. (1982). Strengthening the food conservation and crop storage section. Field documents and final technical report, project PFL/SWA/002. Rome: FAO FAO, 2013. Food wastage footprint: Impacts on natural resources.
- FAO (2011). Global food losses and waste: Extent, Causes and Prevention
- Gogia, N.; Kumar, P.; Singh, J.; Rani, A.S. and Kumar, P. (2014q). Cloning and molecular characterization of an active gene from garlic (*Allium sativum* L.)" International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 7(1): 1-10.
- Hodges, R.J.; Buzby, J.C. and Bennett, B. (2011). Postharvest losses and waste in developed and less developed countries: opportunities to improve resource use. Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge University Press, (149): 37-45.
- Kumar, P. (2013o). Cultivation of traditional crops: an overlooked answer. Agriculture Update, 8(3): 504-508.
- Kumar, P. (2014r). Studies on cadmium, lead, chromium, and nickel scavenging capacity by *in-vivo* grown Musa paradisiacal. using atomic absorption spectroscopy, Journal of Functional and Environmental Botany, 4(1): 22-25.
- Kumar, P. and Dwivedi, P. (2015p). Role of polyamines for mitigation of cadmium toxicity in sorghum crop, Journal of Scientific Research, B.H.U.; 59: 121-148.
- Kumar, P. and Mandal, B. (2014L). "Combating heavy metals toxicity from hazardous waste sites by

harnessing scavenging activity of some vegetable plants, vegetos, 26(2): 416-425.

- Kumar, P. and Pathak, S. (2016w). Heavy metal contagion in seed: its delivery, distribution, and uptake, Journal of the Kalash Sciences, An International Journal, 4(2): 65-66.
- Kumar, P. and Pathak, S. (2019f). Responsiveness index of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench) grown under cadmium contaminated soil treated with putrescine and mycorrhiza, Bangladesh J. Bot., 48 (1).
- Kumar, P. Purnima *et al.* (2018e). Impact of Polyamines and Mycorrhiza on Chlorophyll Substance of Maize Grown under Cadmium Toxicity; International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 7(10): 1635-1639.
- Kumar, P.; Kumar, P.K. and Singh, S. (2014n). Heavy metal analysis in the root, shoot and a leaf of *Psidium guajava* L. by using atomic absorption spectrophotometer, Pollution Research, 33(4): 135-138.
- Kumar, P.; Mandal, B. and Dwivedi, P. (2014m). Phytoremediation for defending heavy metal stress in weed flora, International Journal of Agriculture, Environment & Biotechnology, 6(4): 587-595.
- Kumar, P.; Dwivedi, P. and Singh, P. (2012s). Role of polyamine in combating heavy metal stress in stevia rebaudiana Bertoni plants under in vitro condition, International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 5(3): 185-187.
- Kumar, P.; Harsavardhn, M. *et al.* (2018y). Effect of Chlorophyll a/b ratio in Cadmium Contaminated Maize Leaves Treated with Putrescine and mycorrhiza, Annals of Biology, 34(3): 281-283.
- Kumar, P.; Krishna, V. et al. (2018cc). Assessment of Scavenging Competence for Cadmium, Lead, Chromium and Nickel Metals by in vivo Grown Zea mays L. using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer, Annals of Ari-Bio Research, 23(2): 166-168.
- Kumar, P.; Kumar, S. *et al.* (2018bb). Evaluation of Plant Height and Leaf Length of Sorghum Grown Under Different Sources of Nutrition, Annals of Biology, 34(3): 284-286.
- Kumar, P.; Mandal, B. and Dwivedi, P. (2011u). Heavy metal scavenging capacity of Mentha spicata and *Allium cepa*, Medicinal Plant-International Journal of Phytomedicines and Related Industries, 3(4): 315-318.
- Kumar, P.; Mandal, B. and Dwivedi, P. (2011v). Screening plant species for their capacity of scavenging heavy metals from soils and sludges. Journal of Applied Horticulture, 13(2): 144-146.
- Kumar, P.; Pandey, A.K. *et al.* (2018aa). Phytoextraction of Lead, Chromium, Cadmium, and Nickel by Tagetes Plant Grown at Hazardous Waste site, Annals of Biology, 34(3): 287-289.
- Kumar, P.; Siddique, A. *et al.* (2019g). Role of Polyamines and Endo-mycorrhiza on Leaf Morphology of Sorghum Grown under Cadmium Toxicity, Biological Forum An International Journal. 11(1): 01-05.
- Kumar, P.; Yumnam, J. *et al.* (2018z). Cadmium Induced Changes in Germination of Maize Seed Treated with Mycorrhiza, Annals of Agri-Bio Research, 23(2): 169-170.
- Kumar, R.; Jilte R. and Ahmadi, M.H. (2018). Electricity alternative for e-rickshaws: an approach towards green

city, International Journal of Intelligent Enterprise, 5(4): 333-344.

- Mishra, P.K.; Maurya, B.R. and Kumar, P. (2012t). Studies on the biochemical composition of *Parthenium hysterophorus* L. in different season, Journal of Functional and Environmental Botany, 2(2): 1-6.
- Pathak, S.; Kumar, P.; Mishra, P.K and Kumar, M. (2017j). Mycorrhiza assisted approach for bioremediation with special reference to biosorption, Pollution Research, 36(2).
- Pathak, S.; Kumar, P.; Mishra, P.K. and Kumar, M. (2016x). Plant-based remediation of arsenic-contaminated soil with special reference to sorghum- a sustainable approach for a cure. Journal of the Kalash Sciences, An International Journal, 4(2): 61-65.

- Prakash, A. and Kumar, P. (2017k). Evaluation of heavy metal scavenging competence by in-vivo grown *Ricinus communis* L. using atomic absorption spectrophotometer" Pollution Research, 37(2): 148-151.
- Siddique, A. and Kumar, P. (2018h). Physiological and Biochemical basis of Pre-sowing soaking seed treatments-An overview, Plant Archive, 18(2): 1933-1937.
- Siddique, A.; Kandpal, G.; Kumar P. (2018i). Proline accumulation and its defensive role under Diverse Stress condition in Plants: An Overview, Journal of Pure and Applied Microbiology, 12(3): 1655-1659.
- Spore (2011). Post-harvest management. Adding value to crops. The magazine for agricultural and rural development in ACP countries. N° 152. http://spore.cta.int