## PHOTOS, TABLES, AND FIGURES

Table 15. Average monthly quality ratings for Kurapia on 4 ET<sub>0</sub>-based irrigation levels in 2014.

Table 15. Ave	March	April .	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	AVG
Foliage									
80%	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9
60%	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
40%	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
20%	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9
Flowering									
80%		1.0	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.7	4.1
60%		1.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.1
40%		1.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.1	4.2
20%		1.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.2	4.2
Pest Tolerand	ce								
80%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
60%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
40%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
20%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Disease Resis	tance								
80%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
60%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
40%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
20%	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Vigor									
80%	4.7	4.5	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9
60%	4.2	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7
40%	3.9	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
20%	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9
Overall Appe	earance								
80%	2.3	3.7	4.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.2	4.2
60%	2.2	3.4	4.0	4.4	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.8	4.1
40%	2.2	3.3	4.0	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.1
20%	2.3	3.2	4.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.9	4.2

## PHOTOS, TABLES, AND FIGURES




Figure 23a. Average monthly plant growth index of Kurapia in 2014 on 4  $ET_o$ –based irrigation levels. Bars represent  $\pm$  1 SE. No significant differences using ANOVA and Tukey's HSD at p< 0.05. Drop in July reflects pruning to 1m-diameter circle.




Figure 23b. Average monthly relative plant growth index of Kurapia in 2014 on 4  $ET_o$ —based irrigation levels. Bars represent  $\pm$  1 SE. No significant differences using ANOVA and Tukey's HSD at p < 0.05. Drop in July reflects pruning to 1m-diameter circle.