



## **Influence of Different Levels of Sulphur and Potassium and their Interactions on Different Quality and Storage Parameters of Potato**

**Muzamil A. Rather<sup>1</sup>, M. A. Chattoo<sup>1</sup>, T. A. Bhat<sup>1\*</sup>, F. Mushtaq<sup>1</sup>, M. Rashid<sup>1</sup>,  
M. Shah<sup>1</sup> and A. Sultan<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Division of Vegetable Science, Faculty of Horticulture, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir, 190025, India.*

### **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author MAR designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors MAC and FM checked thesis and research work and author TAB managed the analyses of the study and managed the literature searches and all other helped in research and preparation of manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2021/v33i330420

#### Editor(s):

(1) Prof. Marco Trevisan, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Italy.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Tális Pereira Matias, Federal University of Alfenas (UNIFAL-MG), Brazil.

(2) Pawel Pohl, Wroclaw University of Science and Technology, Poland.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/64136>

**Received 09 November 2020**

**Accepted 13 January 2021**

**Published 05 April 2021**

**Original Research Article**

### **ABSTRACT**

Quality and storage attributes are major concern for potato cultivators as well as processors. Therefore an investigation was carried out to study influence of different levels of sulphur and potassium on different quality and storage parameters of potato. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications of two factors with four levels of each factor. The two factors were S (sulphur) and K (potassium) with four levels as, S<sub>0</sub> (control or no sulphur), S<sub>1</sub> (20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>), S<sub>2</sub> (40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) and S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) where as potassium levels were, K<sub>0</sub> (control or no potassium), K<sub>1</sub> (100 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>), K<sub>2</sub> (125 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>). Maximum value (1.48 g cc<sup>-1</sup>) for specific gravity, Soluble solid content (6.31 °Brix), vitamin C (16.58 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), crude protein content(1.93%) and Dry matter content (23.09%) in tubers were recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), besides significantly lower values of physiological weight loss (17.50%), sprouting (16.93%) and rotting (15.04%) were also recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) level followed by S<sub>2</sub> (40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>). Significantly maximum values of quality traits like specific gravity (1.79 g cc<sup>-1</sup>), Soluble solid

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [bhattariqvc@gmail.com](mailto:bhattariqvc@gmail.com);

content (6.92 °Brix), vitamin C (21.62 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), crude protein content (2.35%), Dry matter content (25.49%) in tubers were recorded with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>), further significantly lower values of physiological weight loss (13.89%), sprouting (11.47 %) and rotting loss (9.92%) were recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (150 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>). Conjugation of 150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup> K+ 60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded maximum values of quality traits specific gravity (1.80), soluble solid content (7.63 °Brix), vitamin C (22.10 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), crude protein content (2.49%) and dry matter content (25.92%), however S content of 0.367% was recorded with K<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub>(150 kg K + 60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>), besides significantly lower values of physiological weight loss (13.47%), sprouting (10.44%) and rotting loss (5.43%) followed by S<sub>3</sub>K<sub>3</sub> treatment.

**Keywords:** *Potato; sulphur; potassium; tubers; quality and physiological weight loss.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Potato is a major world food crop ranging fourth only after rice, wheat and maize (Hussain, 2015). Potato crop produces more edible energy and protein per unit time and area compared to many other crops, fits well into multiple cropping systems prevalent in tropical and subtropical agro-climatic conditions, provides profitability and employment generation and is thus expanding rapidly in developing countries. Potato is a starchy tuberous crop from the perennial night shade family. The cultivated potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) is an autotetraploid with chromosome No. 2n=48. Potato has been recognized as wholesome food and having an energy value of 321 kilo joules, carbohydrates 17.47 g, starch 15.44 g, dietary fiber 2.2 g, protein 2 g, water 75 g per 100 g of potato besides other vitamins and nutrients [1]. Quality parameters of potatoes are major concern of potato growers in order to fetch more price. There are various methods to increase the quality of potato tubers one of the best way is the application of nutrients. There are several macro and micro nutrients which are essential for enhancing quality of a plant. Among primary nutrients potassium has a crucial role in the energy status of the plant, translocation and storage of assimilates and maintenance of tissue water relations [2]. Potassium is not an incorporated component of plant molecules, in opposite to N and P which are constituents of proteins, nucleic acids, phospholipids, ATP etc. High mobility in the plant explains the major functional characteristics of K, as the main cation involved in the neutralization of charges and as the most important inorganic osmotic active substance [3]. Potassium is involved in many aspects of the plant physiology. It activates more than 60 enzyme systems, aids in photosynthesis, favours high energy status, maintains cell turgidity, promotes water uptake, regulates nutrient translocation in plant, favours carbohydrate transport and storage, enhances N

uptake as well as protein synthesis and promotes starch synthesis. Potassium application has been reported to increase aerial stem number, plant height, leaf number as well as tuber yield [4]. Besides primary nutrients other nutrients are also important for quality production of vegetable crops. Among them Sulphur is an important macronutrient after NPK, required by plants. As it plays an essential role in chlorophyll synthesis which in turn is essential for the production of starch, sugars, fats, vitamins and other vital compounds through photosynthesis. It is also the basic constituent of the amino acids such as cysteine, cystine and methionine which are building blocks for essential proteins in plants. It acts as activity promoter for various enzymes and vitamins and influences various developmental processes. Many enzymes which are essential for biochemical reactions within the plant cell are activated by sulphur. Continuous removal of S from soils through plant uptake has led to widespread S deficiency and affects soil S budget [5] all over the world. Sulphur applications have been found to improve storage life and quality of vegetable crops [6]. It has been observed when sulphur is present in critical amount in soil (less than 10 ppm), the plant growth, quality and total production of crop is adversely effected [7]. Sulphur application in vegetable crops have been found to improve quality attributes, protein content, oils and vitamins. Keeping in view of the above facts the present investigation entitled "Influence of different levels of sulphur and potassium on different quality and storage parameters of Potato" was carried out.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment entitled "Influence of different levels of sulphur and potassium on different quality and storage parameters of Potato" was conducted at experimental fields of Division of Vegetable Science, SKUAST-K, Shalimar during *Kharief* 2018-2019. The planting material of

potato variety, Shalimar potato-1, chemical fertilizers and FYM were used as an experimental material. Shalimar Potato-1 was planted at a Spacing of 60 cm×20 cm and total no of treatments were 16 in 03 Replications. Experiment was laid in RCBD. 02 factors were used each with four levels The two factors were S (sulphur) and K (potassium) with four levels as, S<sub>0</sub> (control or no sulphur), S<sub>1</sub> (20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>), S<sub>2</sub> (40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) and S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) where as potassium levels were, K<sub>0</sub> (control or no potassium), K<sub>1</sub> (100 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>), K<sub>2</sub> (125 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>). Recommended FYM (25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>), N (160 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and P (100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was applied as a uniform dose as per package of practices for all treatments. Moreover, sulphur and potassium were also applied to soil as per the treatments at the time of planting. Urea (46% N), Di-ammonium phosphate (18% N, 46% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>), Muriate of potash (60% K<sub>2</sub>O) and Gypsum (12% S) were applied as sources of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and sulphur, respectively.

Different quality and storage parameters were recorded are mentioned below.

### 2.1 SPECIFIC Gravity (g cc<sup>-1</sup>)

Representative samples of harvested tubers from each net plot were weighed. The volume of tubers was determined by water displacement method and specific gravity was determined by using formula as under

$$\text{Specific gravity (g/cc)} = (\text{Weight of tubers} / \text{Volume of tubers}) \times 100$$

### 2.2 SSC (°Brix)

Three medium size potatoes from harvested lot of each treatment were washed, peeled, cut into pieces and crushed. Their juice was extracted by juicer with the help of a fine muslin cloth. A drop of this juice was placed on the hand refractometer and TSS was obtained and expressed in °Brix.

### 2.3 Vitamin C Content (mg 100<sup>-1</sup> g)

The freshly harvested tubers preferably of uniform size from representative plants were taken and cut into small pieces. Hundred gram of chopped tubers from each plot/treatment were then used for estimation of Vitamin C content in the laboratory following 2,6-dichlorophenol

indophenol visual titration method (A.O.A.C. 1975) and expressed in milligrams 100 g<sup>-1</sup> of tubers.

### 2.4 Crude Protein Content (%)

The protein content was calculated by multiplying a factor 6.25 (protein factor) with total nitrogen content in tubers. Total nitrogen content in tubers was determined by Kjeldahls method as outlined by Tandon (1993) and expressed in (%).

### 2.5 Dry Matter Content (%)

Dry matter content was determined by drying a known weight 100g of the sample in an oven at 60 °C. After complete drying final weight of the sample was taken and expressed as per cent dry matter content.

$$\text{Dry matter content (\%)} = (\text{Fresh weight of sample} / \text{Dry weight of sample}) \times 100$$

### 2.6 Storage Quality Over a Period of Four Months (Total Weight Loss %)

Tubers were cured for a period of 10 days under shade. After curing, 3 kg of tubers from each treatment were kept in perforated plastic trays at ambient room conditions for 120 days (4 months). The physiological weight loss, sprouting per cent and rotting per cent during storage were recorded after each month in each treatment and total weight loss was then calculated after 4 months of storage of tubers by respective formulas given as:

$$\text{PWL (\%)} = (\text{Initial weight} - \text{final weight} / \text{Initial weight}) \times 100$$

$$\text{Sprouting (\%)} = (\text{No. of sprouted tubers} / \text{Total No. of tubers}) \times 100$$

$$\text{Rotting (\%)} = (\text{No. of rotted tubers} / \text{Total No. of tubers}) \times 100$$

### 2.7 Statistical Analysis

In order to test the significance of results, the experimental data was subjected to statistical analysis as per the standard statistical procedure given by Gomez and Gomez (1984). Levels of significance used for 'F' and 'T' tests were p= 0.05 as given by Fisher (1970).

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Effect of Sulphur on Quality Parameters

Application of sulphur exhibited a significant influence on specific gravity of tubers. Maximum value (1.48 g cc<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by S<sub>2</sub> (1.47 g cc<sup>-1</sup>). Significantly lower value was recorded with S<sub>0</sub> (1.36 g cc<sup>-1</sup>). Significantly higher SSC of 6.31 °Brix was recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by S<sub>2</sub> (6.29 °Brix), S<sub>1</sub> (5.68 °Brix) and control S<sub>0</sub> (5.07 °Brix). Sulphur application @ 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher value (16.58 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) of vitamin C content as compared to lower levels of sulphur and control. Maximum value of crude protein content (1.93%) was recorded with sulphur @ 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> which was statistically at par with S<sub>2</sub> (1.92%) but was significantly superior to S<sub>1</sub> (1.90%) and S<sub>0</sub> (1.77%). Dry matter content was significantly effected by sulphur application, maximum value (23.09%) was recorded with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by S<sub>2</sub> (22.79%) and S<sub>1</sub> (21.92%). Application of sulphur resulted higher N(0.29%), P(0.45%) and K(0.52%) in tubers but impact of increasing levels of sulphur exhibited at par results among themselves, however S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) recorded a sulphur content of 0.34% which was significantly superior to other levels of sulphur. The improvement in above mentioned quality parameters can be attributed to the fact that sulphur is an integral part of sulphur containing amino-acids (Cysteine, cystine and methionine) which are sources of proteins. The increase in SSC might have been possible due to increased synthesis of photosynthates including sugars whose production increases with increase in levels of sulphur. The increase in vitamin C might be due to increased synthesis and translocation of photosynthates from leaves to tubers. The results corroborate well with the observations of Sriramachandrasekharan (2009) in okra, Kumar and Sing [8] in black gram, Sharma et al. (2011) in potato, Hassan et al. [9] in brinjal, Singh et al. [10] in potato, Mudasir et al. [6] in garlic and Muthana et al. [11] in potato.

#### 3.2 Effect of Potassium on Quality Parameters

Specific gravity in tubers increased significantly with increase in the levels of potassium and higher specific gravity of 1.79 g cc<sup>-1</sup> was recorded with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was significantly superior to the values 1.63 g cc<sup>-1</sup>, 1.24 g cc<sup>-1</sup> recorded with K<sub>2</sub> and K<sub>1</sub> and control (1.08 g cc<sup>-1</sup>). Potassium applications exhibited

significant influence in increasing soluble solid content in potato tubers. Maximum soluble solid content of 6.92 °Brix was recorded with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was significantly superior to other levels of potassium. Potassium was effective in increasing the vitamin C content in potato tubers and maximum value of 21.62 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup> was recorded with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was significantly superior to lower levels of potassium. Highest crude protein content of 2.35% was recorded with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) and was significantly superior to crude protein content of 1.73%, 1.92% and 1.54% recorded with K<sub>2</sub> (125 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>), K<sub>1</sub> (100 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) and control (K<sub>0</sub>S<sub>0</sub>) respectively. Increasing levels of potassium exhibited an increase in dry matter content in potato tubers with K<sub>3</sub>(150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) recording 25.49% of dry matter content which was significantly higher than the values recorded with lower levels of potassium. Significant increase in N,P,K and S content in potato tubers was observed with application of potassium, with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) recording N (0.35%), P (0.56%), K (0.79%) and S (0.353%) which was significantly higher than the values recorded with other levels of potassium. Higher specific gravity might be due to the availability of necessary nutrient inputs including potassium at the initial stages of growth as the plants did not face any stress during the crop growth. Potassium is also found to be effective for the enhancement of enzymatic activities, which in turns, helps in the synthesis of carbohydrates and amino acids, which in turn produce the quality tubers. The increase in N, P, K and S content of potato tubers due to application of different rates of potassium could be due to the increased uptake by the plant and increased availability of the nutrients, better root growth and increased physiological activity of roots to absorb nutrients. The results are in correspondence with the results of Das and Behara [12] in sweet potato, Sing et al. [13] in potato, Hariyappa [14] in onion, Al-Moshileh et al. [15] in potato, Bryan et al. [16] in potato, Prabhavati et al. [17] in chilli, Ahmed et al. [18] in faba-bean, Abd El-Latifa et al. [19] in potato, Yohana and Carlos [20], Verma and Singh [21] in onion, Mudasir et al. [6] in garlic, Mohan et al. [22] in potato.

#### 3.3 Interaction Effect of Sulphur and Potassium on Quality Parameters

Interaction among sulphur and potassium exhibited a significant influence on quality parameters of potato. Treatment combination K<sub>3</sub>S<sub>2</sub>(150 kg K+40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) recorded higher values for specific gravity (1.80), soluble solid

content (7.63 °Brix), vitamin C (22.10 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), crude protein content (2.49%), dry matter content (25.92%) and N (0.38%), P (0.58%) and K (0.81%) content in tubers, which were significantly higher than the values recorded with other treatment combinations but exhibited at par results with K<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub>(150 kg K+60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>). Sulphur content in tubers was recorded maximum (0.387%) with treatment combination K<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K+60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was significantly higher than the values recorded with other treatment combinations but exhibited at par

results with K<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub>(150 kg K+60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>). This might be possible due to synergistic relationship between sulphur and potassium applications thereby increased uptake/translocation of N, P, K, S and other nutrients by crop and better translocation of photosynthates from source to sink occurred which improved quality traits of potato. Similar research work was done by, Moinuddin and Shahid [23] in potato, Zengin et al. [24] in sugar beets, Ahmed et al. [18] in faba bean, El-Nemr et al. [25] in tomato and Mudasir et al. [6] in garlic.

**Table 1. Effect of different levels of sulphur on quality parameters**

| Sulphur        | Specific gravity (g cc <sup>-1</sup> ) | Soluble Solid Content (°Brix) | Vitamin C (mg 100 <sup>-1</sup> g) | Crude Protein Content (%) | Dry matter Content (%) |
|----------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| S <sub>0</sub> | 1.36                                   | 5.07                          | 14.27                              | 1.77                      | 20.65                  |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 1.42                                   | 5.68                          | 14.97                              | 1.90                      | 21.92                  |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 1.47                                   | 6.29                          | 15.52                              | 1.92                      | 22.79                  |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 1.48                                   | 6.31                          | 16.58                              | 1.93                      | 23.09                  |
| C.D(p≤0.05)    | 0.05                                   | 0.02                          | 0.33                               | 0.01                      | 0.40                   |
| S:             |  |                               |                                    |                           |                        |

**Table 2. Effect of different levels of potassium on quality parameters**

| Potassium      | Specific gravity (g cc <sup>-1</sup> ) | Soluble Solid Content (°Brix) | Vitamin C (mg 100 <sup>-1</sup> g) | Crude Protein Content (%) | Dry matter Content (%) |
|----------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| S <sub>0</sub> | 1.08                                   | 3.95                          | 11.26                              | 1.54                      | 18.15                  |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 1.24                                   | 6.03                          | 12.52                              | 1.73                      | 20.98                  |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 1.63                                   | 6.44                          | 15.95                              | 1.92                      | 23.83                  |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 1.79                                   | 6.92                          | 21.62                              | 2.35                      | 25.49                  |
| C.D(p≤0.05)    | 0.05                                   | 0.02                          | 0.33                               | 0.01                      | 0.40                   |
| K:             |  |                               |                                    |                           |                        |

**Table 3. Interaction effect of different levels of potassium and Sulphur on quality parameters of potato**

| Treatment combination         | Specific gravity (g cc <sup>-1</sup> ) | Soluble Solid Content (°Brix) | Vitamin C (mg 100 <sup>-1</sup> g) | Crude Protein Content (%) | Dry matter Content (%) |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 1.06                                   | 3.14                          | 10.87                              | 1.50                      | 16.21                  |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 1.07                                   | 3.85                          | 11.23                              | 1.54                      | 18.09                  |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 1.08                                   | 4.33                          | 11.33                              | 1.55                      | 19.05                  |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 1.10                                   | 4.49                          | 11.60                              | 1.57                      | 19.25                  |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 1.16                                   | 5.40                          | 11.87                              | 1.69                      | 19.43                  |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 1.24                                   | 5.75                          | 12.27                              | 1.73                      | 20.64                  |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 1.27                                   | 6.38                          | 12.13                              | 1.74                      | 21.58                  |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 1.30                                   | 6.59                          | 13.80                              | 1.75                      | 22.27                  |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 1.44                                   | 5.72                          | 13.67                              | 1.87                      | 22.07                  |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 1.60                                   | 6.39                          | 14.77                              | 1.93                      | 23.58                  |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 1.74                                   | 6.79                          | 16.50                              | 1.93                      | 24.61                  |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 1.74                                   | 6.86                          | 18.87                              | 1.94                      | 25.05                  |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 1.77                                   | 6.00                          | 20.70                              | 2.03                      | 24.90                  |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 1.78                                   | 6.72                          | 21.63                              | 2.42                      | 25.36                  |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 1.80                                   | 7.63                          | 22.10                              | 2.49                      | 25.92                  |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 1.79                                   | 7.32                          | 22.07                              | 2.47                      | 25.80                  |
| C.D(p≤0.05)                   | 0.10                                   | 0.50                          | 0.66                               | 0.02                      | 0.80                   |
| S × K:                        |  |                               |                                    |                           |                        |

### 3.4 Effect of Sulphur on Storage Parameters

Sulphur application @ 60 kg Sha<sup>-1</sup> (S<sub>3</sub>) recorded significantly lowest values for physiological weight loss (17.50%), sprouting (16.93%) and rotting (15.04%) after 4 months of storage as compared to lower levels of sulphur, while S<sub>0</sub> (control treatment) recorded significantly maximum value of physiological weight loss (20.69%), sprouting (18.63%) and rotting (20.72%) of potato tubers. Lowest cumulative loss of 16.49% was observed with S<sub>3</sub> (60 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was 21.34% lower than the value recorded with control. This might be due to strong negative correlation between sulphur uptake and total weight loss. Lower sulphur applications reduces firmness of the skin of potato tubers which had adverse effects on storability. Due to sulphur applications reduction of microbial infection occurs in addition to imparting firmness to potato tubers. Similar results have been also observed by Nandi et al.

[26] in onion, Ullah et al. [27] in onion, Tripathy et al. [28] in onion, Mudasir et al. [6] in garlic. The results are depicted in Table 4.

### 3.5 Effect of Potassium on Storage Parameters

Application of potassium @ 150 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> registered significantly lowest physiological weight loss (13.89%), sprouting (11.47%) and rotting loss (9.92%) after 4 months of storage as compared to lower levels of potassium. However, K<sub>0</sub> (control treatment) recorded significantly maximum value of physiological weight loss (26.09%), sprouting (23.12%) and rotting (23.93%) of potato tubers. Lowest cumulative loss of 11.76% was observed with K<sub>3</sub> (150 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was 10.73% lower than the value recorded with control. This might be possible due to lower moisture loss from tubers due to thickening of cell wall and reduced rotting and sprouting of tubers. The favourable effect of potassium on storability of potato tubers might be

**Table 4. Effect of different levels of sulphur, potassium and their combinations on shelf life of tubers**

| Sulphur Levels                | PWL (%)      | Sprouting (%) | Rotting (%)  | Cumulative Loss (%) |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|
| S <sub>0</sub>                | 20.69 (4.55) | 18.63 (4.32)  | 20.72 (4.55) | 20.01 (4.47)        |
| S <sub>1</sub>                | 19.34 (4.40) | 17.20 (4.15)  | 16.89 (4.11) | 17.93 (4.23)        |
| S <sub>2</sub>                | 18.27 (4.27) | 16.94 (4.12)  | 15.56 (3.94) | 16.93 (4.11)        |
| S <sub>3</sub>                | 17.50 (4.18) | 16.93 (4.11)  | 15.04 (3.88) | 16.49 (4.06)        |
| C.D(p≤0.05)                   | 0.24         | 0.08          | 0.12         | 0.07                |
| <b>Potassium Levels</b>       |              |               |              |                     |
| K <sub>0</sub>                | 26.09 (5.11) | 23.12 (4.81)  | 23.93 (4.89) | 24.38 (4.94)        |
| K <sub>1</sub>                | 20.39 (4.52) | 18.92 (4.35)  | 18.26 (4.27) | 19.19 (4.38)        |
| K <sub>2</sub>                | 15.43 (3.93) | 16.19 (4.02)  | 16.09 (4.01) | 15.90 (3.99)        |
| K <sub>3</sub>                | 13.89 (3.73) | 11.47 (3.89)  | 9.92 (3.15)  | 11.76 (3.43)        |
| C.D(p≤0.05)                   | 0.24         | 0.08          | 0.12         | 0.07                |
| <b>Interaction</b>            |              |               |              |                     |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 28.90 (5.38) | 24.11 (4.91)  | 28.35 (5.32) | 27.12 (5.21)        |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 26.87 (5.18) | 22.93 (4.79)  | 23.51 (4.85) | 24.43 (4.94)        |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 25.25 (5.02) | 22.81(4.78)   | 21.95 (4.68) | 23.34 (4.83)        |
| K <sub>0</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 23.36 (4.83) | 22.64 (4.76)  | 21.91 (4.68) | 22.64 (4.76)        |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 22.28 (4.72) | 19.65 (4.43)  | 19.07 (4.37) | 20.33 (4.51)        |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 21.00 (4.58) | 18.92 (4.35)  | 17.95 (4.24) | 19.29 (4.39)        |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 19.54 (4.42) | 18.67 (4.32)  | 17.92 (4.23) | 18.71(4.32)         |
| K <sub>1</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 18.75 (4.33) | 18.43 (4.29)  | 18.09 (4.25) | 18.42 (4.29)        |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 17.30 (4.16) | 17.10 (4.14)  | 18.09 (4.25) | 17.50 (4.18)        |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 15.17 (3.90) | 16.27 (4.03)  | 15.33 (3.92) | 15.59 (3.95)        |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 14.87 (3.86) | 15.83 (3.98)  | 14.85 (3.86) | 15.18 (3.90)        |
| K <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 14.42 (3.80) | 15.57 (3.94)  | 16.09 (4.01) | 15.36 (3.92)        |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>0</sub> | 14.28 (3.78) | 13.64 (3.69)  | 17.36 (4.17) | 15.09 (3.88)        |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>1</sub> | 14.34 (3.79) | 10.67 (3.27)  | 10.75 (3.28) | 11.92 (3.45)        |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> | 13.47 (3.67) | 10.44 (3.23)  | 5.43 (2.33)  | 9.78 (3.13)         |
| K <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub> | 13.49 (3.67) | 11.13 (3.34)  | 6.14 (2.48)  | 10.25 (3.20)        |
| C.D(p≤0.05)                   | 0.43         | 0.15          | 0.24         | 0.14                |

possible from negative correlation between potassium uptake and total weight loss. Similar observations were also recorded by Nandi et al. [26] in onion, Bryan et al. [16] in potato, Singh and Lal [2] in potato and Mudasar et al. [6] in garlic. The results are depicted in Table 4.

### 3.6 Interaction Effect of Sulphur and Potassium on Storage of Potato

Treatment combination  $K_3S_2$  (150 kg K+40 kg S  $ha^{-1}$ ) recorded significantly lower value for physiological weight loss (13.47%), sprouting (10.44%) and rotting (5.43%) but exhibited at par results with  $K_3S_3$  treatment recording (13.49%) of physiological weight loss after 4 months of storage. Lowest cumulative loss of 9.78% was recorded with  $K_3S_2$  (150 kg K+40 kg S  $ha^{-1}$ ) which was 17.73% lower than the control ( $K_0S_0$ ). The improvement in storage quality could be possible by synergistic relationship between sulphur and potassium which resulted in improvement of storage qualities of potato tubers because of increased uptake of nutrients like N, P, K and S which increased dry matter content of potato tubers. Similar findings have also been observed by Poornima [29] in onion, Moinuddin and Shahid [23] in potato and Mudasar et al. [6] in garlic. Significant influence of sulphur application in enhancing specific gravity of potato tubers. A gradual increase was observed with increasing levels of sulphur recording a maximum of 1.48 g  $cc^{-1}$  with  $S_3$  (60 kg S  $ha^{-1}$ ) which was significantly superior to the values recorded with other levels of sulphur. The results are depicted in Table 4.

## 4. CONCLUSION

It is concluded that conjugation of 150 kg K  $ha^{-1}$  K+ 60 kg S  $ha^{-1}$  recorded maximum values of quality traits specific gravity (1.80), soluble solid content (7.63 °Brix), vitamin C (22.10 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), crude protein content (2.49%) and dry matter content (25.92%), however S content of 0.367% was recorded with  $K_3S_3$ (150 kg K + 60 kg S  $ha^{-1}$ ), besides significantly lower values of physiological weight loss (13.47%), sprouting (10.44%) and rotting loss (5.43%) followed by  $S_3K_3$  treatment.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Drewnowski A, Colin DR. Vegetable cost metrics show that potatoes and beans provide most nutrients per penny. PLoS One. 2013;8:3277-3279.
2. Singh SK, Lal SS. Effect of potassium nutrition on potato yield, quality and nutrient use efficiency under varied levels of nitrogen application. Potato Journal. 2012;39(2):155-165.
3. Singh P, Kant RH, Singh P, Bahar FA, Singh KN, Pamotra N, Sawhny SK. Influence of sulphur and potassium nutrition on yield and quality of brown sarson (*Brassica campestris*L.) in temperate Kashmir. Research Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2010;1:85-88.
4. Zelelew DZ, Sewa L, Kidane TT, Ghebresslassie BM. Effect of potassium levels on growth and productivity of potato varieties. American Journal of Plant Sciences 2016;7:1629-1638.
5. Aulakh MS. Crop responses to sulphur nutrition. Sulphur in Plants (Eds. Y. P. Abrol and A. Ahmad), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands. 2003; 341-358.
6. Mudasar MM, Chattoo MA, Narayan S, Mir SA. Influence of sulphur and potassium applications on yield, uptake and economics of production of garlic. International Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences. 2017;5:924-934.
7. Jones MB, Oh JH, Ruckman JE. Sulphur Institute Journal. 1972;8(1,2):2-5.
8. Kumar S, Singh TB. Effect of sulphur with and without rhizobium on yield and biochemical composition of black gram. Annuals of Plant Soil Research. 2009; 11(1):58-59.
9. Hasan MM, Chowdhury MAH, Saha BK, Islam MR. Influence of phosphorus and sulphur on yield, yield attributes and biochemical composition of brinjal. Journal of Agroforestry and Environment. 2012; 6(2):109-114.
10. Singh H, Madhu S, Aakash G, Monika B. Effect of nitrogen and sulphur on growth

- and yield attributes of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). International Journal of Plant and Soil Science 2016;9:1-8.
11. Muthanna MA, Anil K, Rajaneesh S, Tiwari A. Effect of boron and sulphur application on postharvest quality after storage and reconditioning of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;610:1028-1035.
  12. Das RC, Behera S. A note on the nutrient uptake and quality of root tubers of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* Lam. (Poir) as affected by potash application. Orissa Journal of Horticulture. 1989;17(t-2): 96-99.
  13. Singh JP, Marwaha RS, Grewal JS. Effect of sources and levels of potassium on potato yield, quality and storage behavior. Journal of Indian Potato Association 1996;23:153-156.
  14. Hariyappa N. Effect of potassium and sulphur on growth, yield and quality parameters of onion (*Allium cepa* L.), M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. 2003;57-64.
  15. Al-Moshileh M, Errebhi MA, Motawei MI. Effect of various potassium and nitrogen rates and splitting methods on potato under sandy soil and arid environmental conditions. Emirates Journal of Agricultural Science. 2005;17(1):01-09.
  16. Bryan G, Hopkins C, Rosen J, Shiffler K, Trent W. Enhanced efficiency fertilizers for improved nutrient management: Potato. Plant Management Network. 2008;7:433-455.
  17. Prabhavathi K, Bidari BI, Shashidhara GB, Mathad JC, Influence of sources and levels of potassium on quality attributes and nutrient composition of red chillies. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Science. 2008;21(3):379-381.
  18. Ahmed MA, Abd-El-Hafez GA, Gabra AM. Effect of phosphorus, potassium and sulphur fertilization on yield and yield components of faba bean grown on silty clay loam soil. Minia Journal of Agricultural Research and Development. 2010;30(1): 67-86.
  19. Abd-El-Latifa KM, Osman EAM, Abdullah R, Abd-el-Kader. Response of potato plants to potassium fertilizer rates and soil moisture deficit. Advances in Applied Science Research 2011;2:388-397.
  20. Yohana CR, Carlos EN. Effect of phosphorus and potassium levels on yield and yield attributes potato. Agronomia Columbinia. 2011;29:205-212.
  21. Verma D, Singh H. Response of varying levels of potassium and sulphur on yield and uptake of nutrients by onion. Annals of Plant and Soil Research. 2012;14:143-146.
  22. Mohan GL, Channakeshava S, Prakash NB, Bhairappanavar ST, Tambat B. Effect of different rates and sources of potassium on growth, yield and potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2017;6(11):443-452.
  23. Moinuddin, Shahid U. Influence of combined applications of potassium and sulphur on yield, quality and storage behavior of potato. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 2007;35:1047-1060.
  24. Zengin M, Gokmen F, Yazic AM, Gezgin S. Effects of potassium, magnesium and sulphur containing fertilizers on yield and quality of sugar beets (*Beta vulgaris* L.). Turkish Journal of Agricultural Forestry. 2009;33:495-502.
  25. El-Nemr MA, Abd El-Baky MMH, Salman SR, El-Tohamy WA. Effect of different potassium levels on the growth, yield and quality of tomato grown in sand-ponic culture. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences. 2012;6(3):779-784.
  26. Nandi RK, Deb M, Matty TK, Sounda G. Response of onion to different levels of irrigation and fertilizer. Crop Research. 2002;23:317-320.
  27. Ullah MH, Huq SMI, Alam MDU, Rahman MA. Impacts of sulphur levels on yield, storability and economic return of onion. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research. 2008;33(3):539-548.
  28. Tripathy P, Sahoo BB, Priyadarshini A, Das SK, Dash DK. Effect of sources



- and levels of sulphur on growth, yield and bulb quality in onion (*Allium cepa* L.). International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management. 2013;4:641-644.
29. Poornima KS. Effect of potassium and sulphur on yield and quality of onion and chilli intercrops in a vertisol. M. Sc. Thesis submitted to University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; 2007.

---

© 2021 Rather 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:*  
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/64136>