

## Original Research Article

### Effect of Sulphur on the Yield and Quality of Potato Varieties in Tista Meander Floodplain Soil of Bangladesh

#### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was carried out at Breeder seed Production Centre (BSPC), Debiganj, Panchagarh during the Rabi season of 2016-2017 to study the effect of five levels of sulphur application on yield and quality attributes of three potato varieties. There were five treatments comprising different levels of sulphur such as T<sub>1</sub> (control-no sulphur), T<sub>2</sub> (75% RDS), T<sub>3</sub> (100% RDS), T<sub>4</sub> (125% RDS) and T<sub>5</sub> (150% RDS). Three BARI released potato variety; BARI Alu 36 (4.26R), BARI Alu 40 (4.45W) and BARI Alu 25 (Asterix) were used in this experiment. Healthy well sprouted and uniform size potato tubers were planted at the spacing of 60 cm x 25 cm. The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications. The tuber yield and yield contributing characters were significantly influenced by the application of sulphur. Maximum tuber yield (39.28 t/ha) was recorded in BARI Alu 40 (4.45w). Highest dry matter content, specific gravity and starch content were found in BARI Alu 40 (4.45w), which was followed by BARI Alu 36 (4.26R) in case of specific gravity and starch content. Sulphur application in potato varieties showed significant influence on tuber yield of potato. This parameter increased with increasing dose of sulphur up to 100% RDS. Thereafter, further increase in sulphur did not showed any remarkable influence. Besides, sulphur application in potato varieties showed significant influence on tuber quality of potato. The highest dry matter%, and starch% were recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (control-no sulphur), which was followed by T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> treatment. After that these parameters decreased with increasing dose of sulphur. On the other hand, maximum dry matter yield and starch yield were recorded in the treatment T<sub>3</sub>, which was followed by all other treatments except T<sub>1</sub>. The minimum dry matter yield and starch yield were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub>. Combined effect showed insignificant influences between varieties and sulphur levels. BARI Alu40 (4.45w) was found superior over other varieties in terms of yield and quality attributes. Treatment T<sub>3</sub> (100% RDS) was found superior over other treatments in terms of yield.

*Keywords: Potato variety, Sulphur, Tuber yield, Starch and Dry matter*

#### 1. Introduction

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) belongs to the family Solanaceae and genus *Solanum* [24]. It is one of the major world food crops in its ability to produce high food per unit area per unit time [7]. Potato is an important cash crop in Bangladesh. It is also used as food and cash crop in cool countries. It can meet up vegetable demand and provide necessary nutrients for the people of the low income group [9, 10]. Besides, it is consumed in different forms such as boiled or fried and many different processed products like chips, French fries, flakes, powder etc. The average yield of potato in Bangladesh is 19.55 t/ha;

Comment [HS1]: What are cool countries?

which is much below the crop potential productivity [1]. Genetical makeup has great influences on yield and quality of potato tubers. Various varieties of potato having wide variation in their yield potential and quality attributes have been evolved [14]. These varieties further show variation in their attributes under different agro climatic conditions. The influence of location and cultivars on quality of potato tubers have been reported by researchers [13, 26]. Potato is the most sensitive crop to nutrient stress because of its sparse root system. Thus it needs high dose of fertilizers for getting full yield potential. Soil nutrient stress is the most significant factor controlling crop yield [22]. Sulphur is one of sixteen essential nutrient elements and fourth major nutrient after NPK, required by plants for proper growth and yield as it is known to take part in many reactions in all living cells [21]. Sulphur deficient plants had poor utilization of nitrogen, phosphorus and potash and a significant reduction of catalase activities at all age [15]. Intensive cropping and use of high-grade fertilizers have caused the depletion of sulphur in soils. Plants are deficit to sulphur in low organic matter, acidic condition, sandy in nature and highly leached soil. Decrease in tuber dry matter yield, starch and essential amino acids particularly cystine and leucine were observed with sulphur deficiency [6, 17]. Sulphur has a direct effect on soil properties as it may reduce soil pH which improves the availability of microelements such as Fe, Zn, Mn and Cu as well as crop yield and its related characteristics [23]. The need of application of sulphur along with its beneficial effects on yield and quality has been reported by earlier workers [4, 18, 19]. Hence, an experiment was conducted to determine the effect of sulphur on the yield and quality of potato varieties.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

### 2.1 Experimental site and soil characteristics

The experiment was conducted at BSPC, Debiganj, Panchagarh under AEZ-3 (Tista Meander Floodplain soil) during the Rabi season of 2016-2017 to study the effect of sulphur rate and variety on the yield and quality of potato. The soil was moderately acidic (pH=5.70) in nature and very low organic matter content (0.90%). Total N content was (0.05%) and exchangeable K (0.24 meq per 100g). Phosphorus (P) and Iron (Fe) content of this soil is very high. Sulphur (S) content of this soil is very low. Boron (B), Zinc (Zn), Calcium (Ca) and Magnesium (Mg) were below the critical level. The chemical properties of initial soils of BSPC, Debiganj, Panchagarh have been shown in table-1.

**Table 1.** The chemical properties of initial soils of the experimental fields

Location	Soil texture	pH	O.M%	Ca	Mg	K	Total N%	P	S	B	Cu	Fe	Mn	Zn
				Meq/100g										
BSPC, Debiganj	Sandy Loam	5.70	0.90	1.30	0.45	0.24	0.05	108.00	4.16	0.20	1.8	72	15	0.53
Critical level		-	-	2.0	0.5	0.12	-	7.0	10	0.2	0.2	4.0	1.0	0.6

### 2.2 Experimental design, treatments and method of fertilizer application

The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replications. There were five treatments comprising different levels of the sulphur T1 (Control- no sulphur), T2 (75% RDS), T3 (100% RDS), T4 (125% RDS), T5 (150% RDS). Fertilizers were used as a soil test basis except gypsum. Urea, TSP, MoP, Gypsum, Magnesium sulphate, Zinc sulphate and Boric acid were used as a source of N, P, K, S, Mg, Zn and B, respectively. Entire phosphorus, potassium, Sulphur,

magnesium, zinc, boron and half of nitrogen were applied at the time of planting and mixed with soil. Remaining half of nitrogen was applied by the side of the row at 30 DAP (days after planting) followed by earthing up.

\*RDS= Recommended dose of sulphur.

### 2.3 Planting, harvesting and intercultural operation

Potato variety BARI Alu36 (4.26R), BARI Alu40 (4.45W) and BARI Alu25 (Asterix) were used as a test crop. The unit plot size was 3m×3m. Whole tubers of the potato were planted with a spacing of 60 cm x25cm on 28th November of 2016. Potato was harvested on 27<sup>th</sup> February of 2017. Intercultural operations and other agronomic practices were done as per requirement.

### 2.4 Soil sampling and chemical analysis

After collection, soil samples were analyzed following standard laboratory method (Page et al., 1989). Core sampler method [3] and wet oxidation method [27] were used to determine the bulk density and organic carbon, respectively. Glass electrode pH meter (1:2.5) was used to determine soil pH. According to Page [16], 0.5M NaHCO<sub>3</sub> (pH 8.5), NH<sub>4</sub>OAc and CaCl<sub>2</sub> extraction procedures were used to determine the available P, exchangeable K and available S, respectively. The Kjeldahl method was used to determine the total N.

### 2.5 Data collection

Data were taken on plant height (cm), foliage coverage, number of stem per hill, tuber per hill, weight of tuber per hill, tuber yield and dry matter, starch, specific gravity and senescence of potato plant. Plant height, foliage coverage and Stem per hill were assessed at 60 days after planting using green method [8].

### 2.6 Statistical analysis

Data that were taken from the field experiment has been analyzed by MSTATC program and means separation was done by Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT) [20]. One way ANOVA table was used to perform this analysis.

## RESULTS and DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Effects of variety on the tuber yield and yield contributing characters of potato

Results revealed that yield and yield contributing characters of potato were significantly influenced by the variety (Table-2). The highest plant height (73.18cm) was observed from BARI Alu 36 (4.26R) and the lowest was observed in BARI Alu40 (4.45W), which was followed by BARI Alu25 (Asterix). Maximum foliage coverage, tuber per hill, tuber weight per hill and tuber yield of potato were found from BARI Alu40 (4.45W) and the minimum was recorded in BARI Alu36 (4.26R), which was followed by BARI Alu25 (Asterix). In case of stem per hill maximum number of stem per hill was recorded in BARI ALu25 (Asterix) and the minimum was recorded in BARI Alu36 (4.26R), which was followed by BARI Alu40 (4.45W). Kumar et al. (2008) and Jaiswal *et al.* (2008) Similar findings also reported significant variation in tuber yield of different potato varieties [11, 12]. Bhardwaj and his team were also found significant difference among different genotypes for tuber yield [2].

**Table 2.** Effect of variety on the tuber yield and yield contributing characters of potato

Variety	Plant height (cm)	Foliage Coverage (%)	Stem/hill (No.)	Tuber/hill (No)	Tuber weight/hill (Kg)	Tuber yield (t/ha)
BARI Alu 36 (4.26R)	73.18 a	80.20 b	7.30 b	10.32 b	0.51 b	33.98 b
BARI Alu 40 (4.45W)	66.56 b	89.33 a	8.33 b	13.26 a	0.59 a	39.28 a
BARI Alu 25 (Asterix)	67.02 b	82.53 b	9.76 a	11.45 b	0.52 b	34.78 b
CV%	6.52	4.41	16.47	19.15	7.02	6.84

Means followed by the same or no letter in the same column do not differ significantly each other at 5% level of DMRT.

### 3.2 Effect of variety on dry matter, starch, specific gravity and senescence's of potato

Results revealed that significant variation was observed among dry matter, starch, specific gravity and senescence's of potato due to varieties effect (Table-3). The Highest dry matter content, specific gravity and starch content were found in BARI Alu40(4.45w), which was followed by BARI Alu36(4.26R) in case of specific gravity and starch content. The lowest was recorded in BARI Alu25 (Asterix). In case of senescence's%, the highest was found in BARI Alu25 (Asterix) and the lowest was recorded in BARI Alu40 (4.45W). Jaiswal and team were also reported differences in quality parameters among different varieties of potato [11, 25].

Comment [HS2]: Space

Comment [HS3]: Space

**Table 3.** Effect of variety on the dry matter, starch, specific gravity and Senescence's of potato

Variety	Dry matter (%)	Starch (%)	Specific gravity	Senescence's % at 90 DAP
BARI Alu 36 (4.26R)	21.25 b	16.09 a	1.088 ab	81.53 b
BARI Alu 40 (4.45W)	22.20 a	16.99 a	1.092 a	77.86 c
BARI Alu 25(Asterix)	20.05 c	14.88 b	1.082 b	94.13 a
CV%	5.94	7.68	0.56	3.95

Means followed by the same or no letter in the same column do not differ significantly each other at 5% level of DMRT.

### 3.3 Effect of Sulphur dose on the tuber yield and yield contributing characters of potato

Results revealed that significant variation were observed among plant height, foliage coverage, tuber weight per hill and tuber yield of potato. On the other hand, there was no significant variation between stem per hill and tuber per hill due to application of different doses sulphur (Table-4). The highest plant height was observed in T<sub>3</sub> (100% RDS), which was statistically identical to T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>4</sub> and T<sub>5</sub> treatments. The lowest plant height was observed in T<sub>1</sub> (control-no sulphur). Maximum foliage coverage was found in T<sub>4</sub> (125% RDS) treatment, which was statistically identical to T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>5</sub>. Minimum foliage coverage was found in T<sub>1</sub> treatment. The highest tuber weight per hill and tuber yield of potato were recorded in T<sub>3</sub> (100% RDS), which was statistically identical to all other treatments except T<sub>1</sub>. The lowest weights of tubers per hill and tuber yield of potato were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> (control-no sulphur). Improvement in tuber yield was not observed with 125% RDS and 150% RDS application. Heavy applications of sulphur can result in yield reductions [5].

Comment [HS4]: Insert comma

**Table 4.** Effect of sulphur dose on the tuber yield and yield contributing characters of potato

Treatment	Plant height (cm)	Foliage coverage (%)	Stem/hill (No.)	Tuber/hill (No)	Tuber weight /hill (Kg)	Tuber yield (t/ha)
T <sub>-1</sub>	49.73 b	62.77 c	8.80	11.16	0.37 b	25.16 b
T <sub>-2</sub>	73.57 a	86.55 b	8.24	12.47	0.58 a	38.05 a
T <sub>-3</sub>	74.04 a	88.55 ab	8.38	11.86	0.60 a	40.07 a
T <sub>-4</sub>	74.00 a	92.00 a	8.97	11.71	0.57 a	38.39 a
T <sub>-5</sub>	73.26 a	90.22 ab	7.93	11.17	0.58 a	38.40 a
CV%	6.52	4.41	16.47	19.15	7.02	6.84

Means followed by the same or no letter in the same column do not differ significantly each other at 5% level of DMRT.

### 3.4 Effect of Sulphur doses on dry matter, starch, specific gravity and senescence's of potato

Results revealed that significant variations were observed among dry matter, starch, and senescence's of potato due to application of different dose of sulphur. On the other hand there was no significant difference in specific gravity of tubers (Table-5). The highest dry matter%, and starch% were recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (control-no sulphur), which was followed by T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> treatment. After that these parameters decreased with increasing dose of sulphur. On the other hand, maximum dry matter yield and starch yield were recorded in the treatment T<sub>3</sub>, which was followed by all other treatments except T<sub>1</sub>. The minimum dry matter yield and starch yield were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub>. In case of senescence's of potato, maximum was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> treatment. The minimum was recorded in T<sub>4</sub> treatment.

**Table 5.** Effect of Sulphur dose on dry matter, starch, specific gravity, and Senescence's of potato

Treatment	Dry matter (%)	Dry matter yield (t/ha)	Starch (%)	Starch yield (t/ha)	Specific gravity	Senescence's % at 90 DAP
T <sub>-1</sub>	22.28 a	5.62 b	17.06 a	4.30 b	1.093	94.00 a
T <sub>-2</sub>	21.17 ab	8.07 a	16.03 ab	6.10 a	1.088	82.88 b
T <sub>-3</sub>	21.21 ab	8.51 a	16.05 ab	6.42 a	1.088	84.77 b
T <sub>-4</sub>	20.81 b	8.04 a	15.63 b	6.04 a	1.086	78.00 c
T <sub>-5</sub>	20.37 b	7.83 a	15.21 b	5.96 a	1.084	82.88 b
CV%	5.94	9.13	7.68	11.03	0.56	3.95

Means followed by the same or no letter in the same column do not differ significantly each other at 5% level of DMRT.

### 3.5 Combined effect of variety and sulphur levels

Combined effect showed insignificant influences between varieties and sulphur levels.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

From the above discussion it may be concluded that, BARI Alu40 (4.45w) was found superior over other varieties in terms of yield and quality attributes. Treatment T<sub>3</sub> (100% RDS) was found superior over other treatments in terms of yield. Combined effect showed insignificant influences between varieties and sulphur levels.

#### REFERENCES

1. BBS. The year Book of Agricultural statistics of Bangladesh. Stat. Div. Minis. Planning, Govt. Peoples Repub. Bangladesh, Dhaka; 2013.
2. Bhardwaj V, Pandey SK, Manivel P, Singh SV, Kumar D. 2008. Stability of indigenous and exotic potato processing cultivars in Himachal Pradesh hills. Proceedings of the Global Potato Conference, New Delhi, 2008; 22-22.
3. Blake GR. Bulk density. In: Black CA. editor. Methods of Soil Analysis, Part I., Madison (Wisconsin): American Society of Agronomy. 1965; 374-390.
4. Chettri M, Modal SS, Roy B. Influence of potassium and sulphur with or without FYM on growth, productivity and disease index of potato in soils of West Bengal. J. Indian Potato Assoc. 2002; 29: 61-65.
5. Eddins AH. Effect of inoculated sulphur, Lime and mercury compounds on the yield of potatoes. Am. J. Potato Res., 1934; 11: 295-302.
6. Eppendorfer WH, Eggum BO. Effects of sulphur, nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and water stress on dietary fiber fractions, starch, amino acids and on the biological value of potato protein. Plant Foods Hum. Nutr., 1994; 45: 299-313.
7. FAOSTAT. World food and agricultural organization data of statistics, Rome, Italy. 2010. <http://faostat.fao.org/site/567/default.aspx#ancor>.
8. Groves S, Wiltshire J, Briddon A, Cunningham A. Managing maturity to improve crop processing quality and storage. Project Report, British potato Council, London, 2005; 48.
9. Hossain MA, Miah MAM. Post Harvest Losses and Technical Efficiency of potato storage systems in Bangladesh. 2012.
10. Islam MZ, Zaman MM, Hossain MM, Hossain A. Integrated nutrient management with liming for potato production in North-West region of Bangladesh. Annual Report 2008-2009, Tuber Crops Research Centre, Bangladesh Agricultural Res Inst, Gazipur, Bangladesh 2009.
11. Jaiswal, RK, Nandekar DN, Rajni N. Performance of processing cultivars of potato in satpura zone of Madhya Pradesh. Proceedings of the Global Potato Conference, Dec. 9-12, New Delhi. 2008; 23-23.
12. Kumar D, Singh V, Singh BP, Singh RP. Growth and yield of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) plants grown from in vitro plantlets in net-house. Proceedings of the Global Potato Conference, Dec. 9-12, New Delhi, 2008; 61-61.
13. Kumar D, Ezekiel R, Khurana SMP. Effect of location, season and cultivar on the processing quality of potatoes. J. Indian Potato Assoc. 2003; 30: 247-251.
14. Marwaha RS, Pandey SK, Kumar D, Singh SV, Kumar P. Potato processing scenario in India: Industrial constraints, future projections, challenges ahead and remedies-A review. J. Food Sci. Technol. 2010; 47: 137-156.

15. Nasreen S, Haque SMI, Hossain MA. Sulphur effects on growth responses and yield of onion. *Asian J. Plant Sci.* 2003; 2: 897-902.
16. Page AL, Miller RH, Kuny DR. *Methods of Soil Analysis*. Madison: Soil Science Society of America. 1989.
17. Petite JM, Ormrod DP. Effects of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide on shoot and root growth of Kennebec and Russet Burbank potato plants. *Am. J. Potato Res.* 1988; 65: 517-527.
18. Prokash O, Singh S, Singh V. Status and response of sulphur in alluvial soils for higher yields of vegetable crops. *Fertilizer News.* 1997; 42: 23-24.
19. Singh JP, Marwaha RS, Srivastava OP. Processing and nutritive qualities of potato tuber as affected by fertilizer nutrients and sulphur application. *J. Indian Potato Assoc.* 1995; 23: 32-37.
20. Steel RCB, Torrie JH. *Principles and Procedures of Statistics*, McGraw Hill Book, New York. USA. 1960; 377-398.
21. Sud KC, Sharma RC. Sulphur needs of potato under rainfed conditions in Shimla hills. In: *Potato Global Research and Development*, Khurana, S.M.P., G.S. Shekhawat, S.K. Pandey and B.P. Singh (Eds.), vol.2. Indian Potato Association, Shimla. 2002; 889-899.
22. Tamir H. Increasing agricultural production in Ethiopia through improved soil, water and crop management practices, In: *Towards a Food and Nutrition Strategy for Ethiopia*, Belshaw, D.G.R. (Eds.), ONCCP; Ethiopia, 1989; 243-275.
23. Tantawy E, EL-Beik EM, EL-Beik AK. Relationship between growth, yield and storability of onion (*Allium cepa* L.) with fertilization of nitrogen, sulphur and copper under calcareous soil conditions. *Res. J. Agric. Biological Sci.*, 2009; 5:361-371.
24. Thompson HC, Kelly WC. *Vegetable Crops*, Tata McGraw Hill Publ. Co. Ltd., New Delhi. 1972; 372-385.
25. Ullah Z, Saikia M. Yield performance of processing potato varieties in the plains of Assam. *Proceedings of the Global Potato Conference*, Dec. 9-12, New Delhi. 2008; 22-22.
26. Uppal DS, Khurana SMP. Chipping performance of potato varieties grown at different locations. *J. Indian Potato Assoc.* 2001; 28: 233-236.
27. Walkley AC, Black TA. Estimation of soil organic carbon by chromic acid titration method. *Soil Science*, 1935; 47, 29-38.