

Original Research Article

Effect on Vegetative Growth and Economic Feasibility of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) cv. Kufri Bahar through Foliar Spray of Bulk CCC & Nano CCC

Abstract

A field experiment consisting 12 treatments having 3 replications was carried out from November (2020-21 & 2021-22) to assess economic feasibility of CCC and Nano CCC on potato. CCC-CS NFs (0.04, 0.08, 0.12, 0.16 and 0.20% w/v), CCC (0.04, 0.08, 0.16, 0.20% w/v), bulk chitosan (BCH 0.01% w/v) and control (water) were applied through foliar application at tuber initiation at 25th day and tuber bulking at 45th days. Pooled data of two years showed that CCC-CS NFs (0.20%) got maximum net return and maximum leaves/plant followed by 0.16% CCC-CS NFs as comparative to rest of treatments. Non-significant difference in leaf area was recorded in all concentration of CCC-CS NFs, CCC, BCH and control.

Keywords: Chitosan, Chlorocholine chloride, Tuber and Nanoformulation

Introduction

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) is the 3rd most important food crops in the world in terms of quantities produced and consumed (Visvanathan *et al.*, 2016). Potato was originated and first domesticated at the Andes Mountains of South America. It is conventionally grown during short days and cool season (Krystyna, 2015). It requires optimum air temperature (18-25°C) and soil temp (17-19°C) respectively (Drakopoulos, *et al.*, 2018). Potato is an annual, herbaceous and dicotyledonous vegetatively propagated; plant can produce 5-20 tubers, which will be genetic clones of the mother seed plant and can also be propagated through botanical seeds known as true potato seeds (TPS). Potato produces flowers and berries that contain 100-400 botanical seeds (Anon., 2020). Potato is an important crop for starch industry and many processed products are prepared from potato *viz.*, potato chips, french fries, potato flakes and potato starch (Akyol, *et al.*, 2016). India is the second largest producer of potato contributing to 12% of global production with 53.02 million tonnes from 2.16 million ha area with an average productivity of 24.54 t/ha (Anon., 2019).

Comment [H1]: The MS describe the findings of effect of CCC application in Nano and Bulk form; while material and methods as well as results and discussion section is not sufficient to be go as complete MS. Hen MS need severe rigorous major revision for its acceptance. The section wise comments were mentioned below:

Comment [H2]: Write the location of experiment;
Avoid lengthy sentences (1st sentence of abstract);
Spell out abbreviations at first place and then use them (CCC need to be spelled out).
Write results in quantifiable terms (Such as percent increase in studied parameters);
Write concluding statements.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Comment [H3]: Optimum.

In potato tuberisation is a complex process that is result of differentiation of an underground stolon or modified stem into a specialized storage organ tuber. During tuberization, significant alteration occurs in physiology, hormonal and biochemistry take place (Ewing and Struik 1992) along with increase in starch deposition and in percentage of cells mitosis (Duncan and Ewing 1984). Earlier findings concluded that direct or indirect involvement of plant growth substances may involve in tuberisation. Several effects of Chlorocholine chloride (CCC) treatment on potato may account for such an improvement of tuber yield which may due to antagonistic behavior of CCC against GA₃ which may inhibit synthesis of GA₃ and promotes tuberisation in potato (Harada and Lang 1965). First, CCC treatment could depress the growth of stems, leaves and stolons which might be due to gibberellins inhibition, but promote tuber initiation and tuber bulking because of photosynthates movement towards the roots (Dyson, 1965; Menzel, 1980; Tezuka *et al.*, 1989; Hussain *et al.*, 2006). Hence, CCC has been immensely used in tuber crop and good choice for obtaining higher yields. Moreover, optimization of lower dose of CCC may help overcome this risk and increase yield and quality of tuber crops.

With the advancements in nanotechnology, the application of nano materials has positively responded to increase the crop yield. In this line various agro-chemical including plant growth regulator have been applied through nano-based technology by using chitosan as a base material. Further, plant growth regulators can also be explored through nanotechnology to increase their efficacy with these remarks; The CCC which has been used in many crops for higher yield can also be a potential candidate for novel nano-based formulations (Sharma *et al.*, 2020). The aim of the proposed study was to see the effect of nano-formulation of CCC on growth and economics of Kufri Bahar cultivar of potato.

Material & Methods

The present experiment was undertaken at Department of Horticulture, Rajasthan College of Agriculture (RCA), MaharanaPratap University of Agriculture & Technology (MPUAT), Udaipur (Rajasthan) during 2020-21 & 2021-22. Field experiment was laid out in randomized plots (2.1 × 3 m) with five rows with 7 plants. Tubers were sown on ridge and furrow method at

Comment [H4]: Incomplete;
Information on following aspects were lacking:
1) Information on soil and climatic condition of selected location is lacking;
2) Information on weather condition prevailing is also not given;
3) Information on crop management practices also need to be write herewith in short;
4) Procedure followed and references for the same need to be written;
5) Information in statistical procedure followed for data analysis is not mentioned.

spacing 60 × 30 cm. Plants were subjected to fertilizer application, irrigation, weeding, earthing up and plant protection were followed as per standard agronomic practices. The CCC-CS NFs (0.04, 0.08, 0.12, 0.16 and 0.20% w/v), CCC (0.04, 0.08, 0.16, 0.20% w/v), bulk chitosan (BCH 0.01% w/v) and control (water) were applied through foliar application at tuber initiation at 25th day and tuber bulking at 45th day. Economic analysis was done as per local market rates of potato & inputs given during crop duration. Leaf number was measured manually and leaf area through leaf area meter.

Results and Discussion

Number of leaves per plant was significantly increased in CCC-CS NFs (0.12% to 0.16%) as compared to CCC (0.04%–0.08%), BCH and control. Pooled data of two years showed that 0.20% CCC-CS NFs recorded maximum (386 leaves) followed by 0.16% CCC-CS NFs (373 leaves) as compared to control (334 leaves) (Table 1). Non-significant difference in leaf area was recorded in all concentration of CCC-CS NFs, CCC, BCH and control (Table 2). However, as per pooled data analysis all the concentrations of CCC-CS NFs got maximum net return over the control, BCH and all concentrations of CCC. The maximum net return received in CCC-CS NFs 0.20% (Rs. 267005.90) followed by CCC-CS NFs 0.16% (Rs. 257799.10) while minimum in control (Rs. 170228.30) (Table 2). On the basis of mean value CCC-CS NFs was more effective plant growth inhibitor. Application of CCC-CS NFs significantly improved leaf number as compared to control and bulk CCC. According to previous studies CCC treated plants inhibit gibberellin biosynthesis which shortens the internodes which induce more laterals and leaves. Similar findings have been observed by Sharma *et al.* (1998a) in potato, Zheng *et al.* (2012) *Lilium* Oriental hybrids 'Sorbonne' (Choudhary *et al.* 2019) *Coleus forskohlii*.

Conclusion

The present investigation was carried out to evaluate the effect of chitosan-based CCC nano-formulations (CCC-CS NFs) on growth and economical properties of potato cv. Kufri Bahar. Results showed that higher doses of CCC-CS NFs affected the growth as well as output which

Comment [H5]: Write significant findings Information on table 2 need to express in more elaborative form; Discussion for both table is not sufficient and need to be strengthened for both table 1 and 2; Explanation should be given for both years than pooled data to be it more meaningful and explanatory. Year to year, among concentration and among treatment chemicals variation and reasons for the same supported with reference will a one way to strengthened result and discussion. If possible than analysis the data in table 2 for statistical analysis.

Comment [H6]: Avoid repetition of text in conclusion; Write conclusion in quantifiable terms.

ultimately lead to maximum profit. In future multiple trials of these experiment should be evaluated for stable results and other plant growth regulators also be explored in nano form.

References

- Akyol, H., Riciputi, Y., Capanoglu, E., Caboni, M.F. and Verardo, V., 2016. Phenolic compounds in the potato and its byproducts: an overview. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*,**17**:835.
- Anonymous. 2019. *Annual Report*. Published on July 2020. ICAR- Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla. <http://cpri.icar.gov.in>.
- Anonymous.2020. International Potato Center. Accessed on 9th November 2020. <https://cipotato.org/potato>.
- Choudhary, A.K., Upadhayaya, S.D., Sharma, A. and Raidas, D.K. 2019. Effect of plant growth hormones on growth, tuber character and forskolin content of patherchur (*Coleus forskohlii* (Willd) Briq). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*,**8**:686-688.
- Clegg, K.M. 1956. The application of the anthrone reagent to the estimation of starch in cereals. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, **7**:40-44.
- Drakopoulos, D., Scholberg, J.M.S. and Lantinga, E.A. 2016. Influence of reduced tillage and fertilization regime on crop performance and nitrogen utilization of organic potato. *Organic Agriculture*,**6**:75-87.
- Dubois, M., Gilles, K.A., Hamilton, J.K., Rebers, P.T. and Smith, F. 1956. Colorimetric method for determination of sugars and related substances. *Analytical chemistry*, **28**:350-356.
- Duncan, D.A. and Ewing, E.E. 1984. Initial anatomical changes associated with tuber formation on single-node potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) cuttings. *Annals of Botany*,**53**:607-610.
- Dyson, P.W. 1965. Effects of gibberellic acid and (2-chloroethyl) tri-methyl ammonium chloride on potato growth and development. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*,**16**: 542-549.
- Ewing, E. and Struik, P.C. 1992. Tuber formation in potato: induction, initiation and growth. *Horticultural Reviews*,**14**: 89-198.
- Harada, H. and Lang, A. 1965. Effects of some (2-chloroethyl) - tri-methyl-ammonium chloride analogues and other growth retardants on gibberellin biosynthesis in *Fusarium moniliforme*. *Plant Physiology*,**40**:176-183.

- Hussain, I., Chaudhry, Z. and Muhammad, A. 2006. Effect of chlorocholine chloride, sucrose and BAP on in vitro tuberization in potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L. cv. Cardinal). *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, **38**: 275-282.
- Krystyna, Z. and Milena, P. 2015. Possibility to predict the yield of potatoes grown under two crop production systems on the basis of selected morphological and physiological plant indicators. *Plant Soil Environment*, **63**: 165-170.
- Menzel, C.M. 1980. Tuberization in potato at high temperatures. Responses of gibberellin and growth inhibitors. *Annals of Botany*, **46**: 259-265.
- Sharma, G., Kumar, A., Devi, K.A., Prajapati, D., Bhagat, D., Pal, A., Raliya, R., Biswas, P. and Saharan, V., 2020. Chitosan nanofertilizer to foster source activity in maize. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, **145**: 226-234.
- Sharma, N., Kaur, N. and Gupta, A.K. 1998a. Effects of gibberellic acid and Chlorocholine chloride on tuberisation and growth of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, **78**: 466-470.
- Tezuka, T., Takahara, C. and Yamamoto, Y. 1989. Aspects regarding the action of CCC in hollyhock plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **40**: 689-692.
- Visvanathan, R., Jayathilake, C., Jayawardana, B.C. and Liyanage, R. 2016. Health-beneficial properties of potato and compounds of interest. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, **96**: 4850-4860.
- Zheng, R.R., Wu, Y. and Yi-ping, X.I.A. 2012. Chlorocholine chloride and paclobutrazol treatments promote carbohydrate accumulation in bulbs of *Lilium* Oriental hybrids 'Sorbonne'. *Biomedicine & Biotechnology*, 136-144.

Table 1 Effect of foliar application of CCC-CS NFs on growth parameters of potato *cv.* Kufri Bahar in field condition

Treatment (%)	No. of leaves/plant			Leaf area (cm ²)		
	1 st Year	2 nd Year	Pooled	1 st Year	2 nd Year	Pooled
Control	332.67 ± 6.02 ^g	335.33 ± 6.02 ^f	334.00 ± 3.50 ⁱ	18.93 + 0.26 ^a	18.94 + 0.26 ^a	18.94 + 0.13 ^a
BCH (0.01)	337.67 ± 5.13 ^{fg}	336.33 ± 3.05 ^{ef}	337.00 ± 4.09 ^{hi}	19.00 + 0.35 ^a	19.23 + 0.33 ^a	19.2 + 0.27 ^a
CCC						
0.04	347.33 ± 3.51 ^{defg}	349.67 ± 5.03 ^{cdef}	348.50 ± 3.50 ^{fg}	19.00 + 0.25 ^a	19.29 + 1.06 ^a	19.25 + 0.40 ^a
0.08	351.66 ± 8.02 ^{cdef}	355.67 ± 8.14 ^{cd}	353.67 ± 5.85 ^{def}	19.60 + 0.58 ^a	19.41 + 0.13 ^a	19.50 + 0.35 ^a
0.12	357.00 ± 5.00 ^{bcde}	359.67 ± 2.51 ^{bcd}	358.33 ± 1.25 ^{cde}	19.8 + 0.45 ^a	19.59 + 0.22 ^a	19.64 + 0.20 ^a
0.16	362.33 ± 4.50 ^{bcd}	365.67 ± 4.16 ^{bc}	364.00 ± 0.50 ^c	19.86 + 1.67 ^a	19.74 + 0.06 ^a	19.80 + 0.83 ^a
0.20	366.00 ± 2.64 ^{bc}	366.00 ± 2.64 ^{bc}	366.00 ± 1.32 ^{bc}	20.08 + 1.60 ^a	20.13 + 0.27 ^{ab}	20.10 + 0.85 ^a
CCC-CS NFs						
0.04	342.33 ± 3.05 ^{efg}	345.67 ± 3.05 ^{def}	344.00 ± 2.64 ^{gh}	18.99 + 0.20 ^a	19.60 + 1.07 ^a	19.30 + 0.53 ^a
0.08	351.33 ± 5.13 ^{cdef}	352.67 ± 5.13 ^{cde}	352.00 ± 1.50 ^{efg}	19.05 + 1.15 ^a	19.68 + 0.42 ^a	19.36 + 0.76 ^a
0.12	361.00 ± 8.00 ^{bcd}	363.67 ± 7.38 ^{bc}	362.33 ± 2.75 ^{cd}	19.37 + 0.41 ^a	19.85 + 0.33 ^a	19.61 + 0.17 ^a
0.16	372.66 ± 4.72 ^{ab}	374.33 ± 3.51 ^{ab}	373.50 ± 1.00 ^b	20.10 + 1.36 ^a	20.08 + 0.340 ^a	20.09 + 0.51 ^a
0.20	384.33 ± 7.09 ^a	387.67 ± 10.0 ^a	386.00 ± 4.09 ^a	20.24 + 0.54 ^a	20.29 + 0.35 ^a	20.27 + 0.19 ^a

The growth parameters were recorded at harvest (100 days after emergence). Each value is mean of triplicate and each replicate consisted of 3 samples. 1st foliar spray was done at 25 days after tuber emergence (tuber initiation stage) & 2nd at 45 days after tuber emergence (tuber bulking stage). Mean ± SE followed by same letter is not significantly different at p = 0.05 as determined by Tukey- Kramer HSD. BCH represents bulk chitosan dissolved in 1% acetic acid.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Table 2 Effect of foliar application of CCC-CS NFs on economic feasibility of all treatments

Treatment (%)	Yield (Kg/ha)	Gross return (Rs.)	Fixed cost for treatment (Rs.)	Additional cost of foliar spray (Rs.)	Total cost of cultivation (Rs.)	Net return (Rs.)
Control (water)	27304.83	273048.30	100820.00	2000.00	102820.00	170228.30
BCH 0.01	30104.18	301041.80	100820.00	6100.00	106920.00	194121.80
CCC						
0.04	31550.59	315505.90	100820.00	13600.00	114420.00	201085.90
0.08	33032.91	330329.10	100820.00	27200.00	128020.00	202309.10
0.12	34601.35	346013.50	100820.00	40800.00	141620.00	204393.50
0.16	35336.49	353364.90	100820.00	54400.00	155220.00	198144.90
0.20	37074.41	370744.10	100820.00	68000.00	168820.00	201924.10
CCC-CS NFs						
0.04	34013.10	340131.00	100820.00	9700.00	110520.00	229611.00
0.08	35555.36	355553.60	100820.00	19400.00	120220.00	235333.60
0.12	37488.95	374889.50	100820.00	29100.00	129920.00	244969.50
0.16	39741.91	397419.10	100820.00	38800.00	139620.00	257799.10
0.20	41632.59	416325.90	100820.00	48500.00	149320.00	267005.90

Price of produce taken basis on as per rate of horticulture farm and local mandi rate @ Rs.10 kg

Formatted: Font: Not Bold