

## SHORT COMMUNICATION

---

# Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> treatment on dormancy duration, sprout growth and sugar content in two potato cultivars

R. EZEKIEL, B. SINGH

*Division of Crop Physiology and Post Harvest Technology, Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla, India*

**ABSTRACT:** Dormant tubers of two potato cultivars Kufri Jyoti and Kufri Chandramukhi were treated for 7 days with 5, 10, 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at 18 ± 1°C and 90–95% RH, and compared with GA treated tubers and with untreated tubers serving as control. During subsequent storage at the same temperature and RH, dormancy duration was reduced by 20 days with CO<sub>2</sub> treatment and by 35 days with GA treatment. In Kufri Jyoti, GA treatment caused 2.6 fold increase in the concentration of reducing sugars and 0.8 fold increase in total sugars in the apical half of the tubers leading to early release of dormancy in apical buds but this increase in sugar content was not observed in the basal half where the buds remained dormant.

**Keywords:** potatoes; dormancy breaking; CO<sub>2</sub> concentration; sprout length; weight loss; reducing sugars; total sugars

Generally, only one potato crop is grown in tropical and sub-tropical countries during winter and in temperate countries during summer. Therefore, there is a sufficient time gap between two crops and there is no need to break dormancy since it is naturally broken in storage. However, there are localities like Punjab and Tamil Nadu in India where two successive crops are raised with a time gap of 2–3 weeks between them and the seed for the second crop comes from the harvest of the preceding crop. In such cases, dormancy breaking is essential. Several chemicals like gibberellic acid, thiourea, carbon-di-sulphide and rindite are used for breaking tuber dormancy (REUST, GUGERLI 1984). GA treatment is commonly used in countries like India for breaking tuber dormancy since it is not toxic, unlike rindite. An increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the storage atmosphere is reported to shorten the dormancy period of potato tubers (BURTON 1968). Treatment with 20% CO<sub>2</sub> for 7 days was found to be as efficient as rindite treatment for breaking tuber dormancy (REUST, GUGERLI 1984). Enhanced dormancy release was observed with a 7-day treatment with 20% CO<sub>2</sub> by COLEMAN and MCINERNEY (1997). The ability of higher concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> to break dormancy has resulted in the exploration of a possibility of using this as an alternative to chemical treatment.

The aim of this investigation was to see how effective CO<sub>2</sub> treatment is in releasing the dormancy of two popular Indian cultivars and to compare its efficacy with that of GA treatment, commonly used in India for breaking tuber dormancy.

### MATERIAL AND METHODS

Potato tubers of two cultivars Kufri Chandramukhi (early duration [70–80 days] variety with large, oval, slightly flattened white tubers having fleet eyes) and Kufri Jyoti (medium duration [90–100 days] variety with large, oval white tubers having fleet eyes) were grown at the Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla, India, during 2002. Seed tubers weighing 50–75 g were planted on 19<sup>th</sup> of April and the crop was raised following the recommended package of practices. Haulms were cut on 5<sup>th</sup> of September and 10 days were allowed for the setting of skin. Tubers harvested on 15<sup>th</sup> of September were cured at 18–20°C for one week and well-cured tubers were exposed to different CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations for 7 days by storing in CO<sub>2</sub> incubators (WTB Binder, Tuttlingen, Germany) maintained at 5, 10, 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. The temperature of CO<sub>2</sub> incubators was maintained at 18–20°C and at RH 90–95%. After 7 days, the tubers were taken out of CO<sub>2</sub> incuba-




Fig. 1. Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> treatment on dormancy of potato tubers of cultivar Kufri Jyoti




Fig. 2. Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> treatment on dormancy of potato tubers of cultivar Kufri Chandramukhi

tors and stored in a BOD incubator with humidity control, maintained at 18–20°C and 90–95% RH. For comparison with gibberellic acid (GA) treatment, tubers were treated with 1 ppm GA<sub>3</sub> for 1 h, after making 3–4 cuts of about 2 mm deep on each tuber. The treated tubers were dried at room temperature and stored in a BOD incubator with humidity control. All the above treatments were replicated thrice and each replication consisted of 30 tubers. Tubers were stored in egg trays and placed in such a manner that the rose end was facing upward. Observations were recorded on number of sprouts per tuber, length of the longest sprout and mean sprout length. Tubers were checked for the appearance of sprouts on alternate days and the appeared sprouts were measured daily until the length of the longest sprout reached 2 mm. Dormancy period was counted from the day of haulm cutting and was considered as released when 80% of the tubers had at least one sprout longer than 2 mm (VAN ITTERSUM, SCHOLTE 1992). For studying the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> treatment on sprout growth and sugar content, observations were started when the tubers had 0.5–0.9 cm long sprout (0 day) and thereafter observations were recorded after 7, 15 and 30 days during storage at 18–20°C and 90–95% RH. Reducing sugar content was determined by the method of NELSON (1944) and total sugars were determined by the Anthrone method (VAN HANDEL 1968). Statistical analysis was done using MSTAT (4.0 C) package.

## RESULTS

The dormancy duration was 97 days in control tubers of Kufri Jyoti (Table 1) and it was reduced to 62 days with GA treatment. While treatment with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> had a low effect on dormancy duration, 10, 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatments reduced it to 77 days. In control tubers of Kufri Chandramukhi, dormancy duration was 97 days and it was reduced to 68 days with GA treatment. Treatments with 5, 10 and 15% CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations had low effects on the dormancy duration of Kufri Chandramukhi but treatment with 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduced it to 77 days. Treatments with different CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations had no significant effect on the number of sprouts per tuber in Kufri Jyoti but in Kufri Chandramukhi, treatment with 20% CO<sub>2</sub> increased the number of sprouts significantly in 30 days after dormancy release (Table 1). GA treatment increased the number of sprouts significantly in Kufri Jyoti but not in Kufri Chandramukhi (Figs. 1 and 2). Kufri Jyoti had a significantly higher number of sprouts than Kufri Chandramukhi. The longest sprout was longer in tubers treated with 5 and 10% CO<sub>2</sub> for one week as compared to 15 and 20% (Table 1). However, there was no significant difference between 5 and 10% CO<sub>2</sub> treatments, and between 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatments. No significant difference in sprout length was observed in 30 days. The sprout length was significantly higher with GA treatment and Kufri Jyoti had longer sprouts than Kufri Chandramukhi. The mean sprout length was significantly

Table 1. Effect of treating dormant potato tubers with different concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> on dormancy period, number and length of sprouts, and weight loss in two potato cultivars

Variety/ Treatment	Dormancy duration (days)	Days of storage after dormancy release												Weight loss (%)		
		No. of sprouts/tuber			length of the longest sprout (cm)			mean sprout length (cm)			7 days after treatment	until dormancy release	30 days after dormancy release			
		0	7	15	30	0	7	15	30	0				7	15	30
<b>Kufri Jyoti</b>																
Control	97	2.3	3.8	3.9	4.4	0.7	1.1	1.3	2.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.7	0.7	2.6	3.6
GA <sub>3</sub>	62	3.4	4.7	5.4	7.7	0.9	1.4	2.0	2.5	0.6	0.9	1.5	1.7	4.3	2.2	3.9
5% CO <sub>2</sub>	95	1.1	2.5	3.0	3.9	0.8	1.0	1.3	3.2	0.8	0.9	1.2	2.4	0.2	3.3	3.5
10% CO <sub>2</sub>	77	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.5	0.9	1.2	1.4	2.1	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.5	0.2	2.5	3.5
15% CO <sub>2</sub>	77	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.7	0.7	0.8	0.9	2.6	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.1	2.2	4.2
20% CO <sub>2</sub>	77	3.1	3.5	3.9	4.2	0.7	0.9	1.2	2.0	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.9	0.1	1.6	3.8
<b>Kufri Chandramukhi</b>																
Control	97	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.7	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.8	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.3	0.8	2.5	2.0
GA <sub>3</sub>	68	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.6	2.0	0.6	1.4	1.5	1.8	3.9	2.2	2.6
5% CO <sub>2</sub>	95	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.2	2.1	0.8	1.1	1.2	2.1	0.1	3.3	2.3
10% CO <sub>2</sub>	95	1.3	1.7	2.0	2.0	0.6	0.8	1.2	2.4	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.6	0.1	2.5	2.2
15% CO <sub>2</sub>	95	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.9	0.4	0.4	0.6	1.2	0.1	2.2	2.4
20% CO <sub>2</sub>	77	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.9	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.1	1.6	2.7
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>																
Treatment		NS	NS	NS	1.4	NS	0.2	0.5	NS	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.7	NS
Variety		0.4	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.1	NS	0.3	0.5	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.4
Interaction		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 2. Effect of treating dormant potato tubers with different concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> on reducing and total sugars (mg/100 g fresh weight) in two potato cultivars

Variety/ Treatment	Reducing sugars (mg/100 g f. wt)						Total sugars (mg/100 g f. wt)					
	before storage		7 days after treatment		at the release of dormancy		before storage		7 days after treatment		at the release of dormancy	
	apical half	basal half	apical half	basal half	apical half	basal half	apical half	basal half	apical half	basal half	apical half	basal half
Kufri Jyoti												
Control	41	37	102	132	103	73	141	172	239	192		
GA <sub>3</sub>		171	68	104	61		249	146	227	125		
5% CO <sub>2</sub>		58	63	139	66		106	109	213	110		
10% CO <sub>2</sub>		39	47	58	37		65	96	142	109		
15% CO <sub>2</sub>		56	65	77	45		130	96	143	119		
20% CO <sub>2</sub>		40	55	75	47		112	101	134	114		
Kufri Chandramukhi												
Control	44	37	50	126	100	87	52	70	248	220		
GA <sub>3</sub>		69	39	99	61		128	83	132	138		
5% CO <sub>2</sub>		37	38	101	61		93	87	140	131		
10% CO <sub>2</sub>		34	43	97	66		43	62	144	156		
15% CO <sub>2</sub>		42	36	114	55		114	59	155	125		
20% CO <sub>2</sub>		67	58	103	45		103	81	153	117		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>												
Treatment		17.0	NS	11.1	16.4		23.6	20.0	7.3	16.1		
Variety		9.8	14.7	6.4	NS		13.6	NS	NS	3.5		
Interaction		24.1	NS	15.7	NS		33.4	28.3	10.4	8.6		

higher with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> as compared to other treatments (Table 1). There was no difference in weight loss in tubers treated with different concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>, 7 days after the treatment but in GA treated tubers the weight loss was significantly higher (Table 1). The higher weight loss in GA treated tubers in the first 7 days after treatment could be attributed to the incisions made to facilitate the entry of GA. However, after the wound healing, there was no difference in the weight loss between control and GA treated tubers. The weight loss was higher in tubers treated with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> until dormancy release but 30 days after the dormancy release, there was no significant difference in weight loss (Table 1).

Reducing and total sugars were determined in the apical and basal halves of the treated tubers. The reducing sugar content in the apical half of GA treated tubers was significantly higher than that in other treatments, 7 days after the treatment (Table 2). There was no significant difference between treatments in the basal half of the tubers. At the release of dormancy, the reducing sugar levels were higher in the apical half of the tubers in control, GA treatment and 5% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment, as compared to treatments with the other three CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. The reducing sugar level was slightly higher in tubers treated with 15% CO<sub>2</sub> as compared to the other three CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. However, the sugar levels in CO<sub>2</sub> treated tubers were lower than those in control. Total sugars were also maximum in the apical half with GA treatment, 7 days after treatment. Among the CO<sub>2</sub> treatments, it was higher with higher CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. In the basal half, it was higher in GA treated and control tubers in Kufri Jyoti, but no large difference was observed in Kufri Chandramukhi. At dormancy release, the total sugar content in Kufri Jyoti was higher in control and GA treated tubers.

## DISCUSSION

Treatment with 20% CO<sub>2</sub> was effective in hastening dormancy release in both the cultivars but was less efficient compared to GA treatment. REUST and GUGERLI (1984) found that 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment was as efficient as rindite treatment and COLEMAN and MCINERNEY (1997) observed that in the presence of ethylene, the effectiveness of 20% CO<sub>2</sub> was comparable to Bromoethane in enhancing dormancy release. But we observed that GA treatment was more effective than 20% CO<sub>2</sub> in hastening dormancy release. In addition, it also increased the number and length of sprouts. CO<sub>2</sub> treatment for 7 days had no effect

on sprout number indicating that short-term treatment does not affect sprout number whereas in an earlier experiment we observed an increase in sprout number when tubers were treated with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> for 60 days (SINGH, EZEKIEL 2001). Treatment with 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduced the length of the longest sprout. COLEMAN (1998) also observed a reduction in the length of the longest sprout with 20% CO<sub>2</sub>. Inhibition of sprout growth was reported when tubers were stored at 5°C with 9.4% CO<sub>2</sub> (KHANBARI, THOMSON 1996) and at 10°C with 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> (BURTON 1989). Mean sprout length was stimulated by 5% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment but inhibited by 10, 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatments. It was reported that at a storage temperature of 10°C, continuous exposure for 16 weeks to 5% CO<sub>2</sub> stimulated sprout growth, 10% CO<sub>2</sub> decreased sprout growth and 15 and 20% CO<sub>2</sub> inhibited sprout growth (BURTON 1989).

GA treatment resulted in 3.8 fold increase in reducing sugar and 0.8 fold increase in total sugar content in the apical half of tubers leading to early release of dormancy in buds located in the apical half but this increase was not observed in the basal half, where the buds remained dormant. But in CO<sub>2</sub> treated tubers a considerable increase was observed only in 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment in Kufri Chandramukhi while in the other treatments there was a small change in the reducing sugar level. COLEMAN (1998) observed increased levels of glucose and fructose with 60% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment but not with 20% CO<sub>2</sub>. However, 20% CO<sub>2</sub> treatment resulted in a slight increase in sucrose content. Increased sugar levels may not be the cause of dormancy release (EMILSSON, LINDBLOM 1963) but the increased availability of sugars is essential for subsequent sprout growth. GA treatment resulted in the accumulation of sugars which were utilized by growing sprouts at the release of dormancy and this was reflected in the low level of reducing sugars in the apical half of GA treated tubers at the release of dormancy.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the Director, Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla, for the facilities.

## References

- BURTON W.G., 1968. The effect of oxygen concentration upon sprout growth on the potato tuber. *European Potato Journal*, 11: 249–265.
- BURTON W.G., 1989. Post-harvest physiology. In: BURTON W.G. (ed.), *The Potato*. Third edition. New York, Longman: 504–510.

- COLEMAN W.K., 1998. Carbon dioxide, oxygen and ethylene effects on potato tuber dormancy release and sprout growth. *Annals of Botany*, 82: 21–27.
- COLEMAN W.K., McINERNEY J., 1997. Enhanced dormancy release and emergence from potato tubers after exposure to a controlled atmosphere. *American Potato Journal*, 74: 173–182.
- EMILSSON B., LINDBLOM H., 1963. Physiological mechanisms concerned in sprout growth. In: IVINS J.D., MILTHORPE F.L. (eds.), *The Growth of the Potato*. London, Butterworths: 45–62.
- KHANBARI O.S., THOMSON A.K., 1996. Effect of controlled atmosphere, temperature and cultivar on sprouting and processing quality of stored potatoes. *Potato Research*, 39: 523–531.
- NELSON N.A., 1944. A photometric adaptation of the Somogyi method for the determination of glucose. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 153: 375–380.
- REUST W., GUGERLI P., 1984. Oxygen and carbon dioxide treatment to break potato tuber dormancy for reliable detection of potato virus Y (PVY) by enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). *Potato Research*, 27: 435–439.
- SINGH B., EZEKIEL R., 2001. Effect of carbon dioxide concentration on sprout growth and sugar contents of potato tubers stored at 20°C. *Journal of Indian Potato Association*, 28: 145–146.
- VAN HANDEL E., 1968. Direct micro determination of sucrose. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 22: 280–283.
- VAN ITTERSUM M.K., SCHOLTE K., 1992. Shortening dormancy of seed potatoes by storage temperature regimes. *Potato Research*, 35: 389–401.

Received for publication December 16, 2004

Accepted after corrections January 11, 2005

## Vliv ošetření CO<sub>2</sub> na délku dormance, růst klíčků a obsah cukrů u dvou kultivarů brambor

**ABSTRAKT:** Hlízy dvou kultivarů brambor Kufri Jyoti a Kufri Chandramukhi jsme ve fázi dormance ošetřovali po dobu sedmi dnů 5, 10, 15 a 20% koncentrací CO<sub>2</sub> při teplotě 18 ± 1 °C a 90–95% relativní vlhkosti. Tyto hlízy jsme porovnávali s hlízami ošetřenými GA a s neošetřenými hlízami, které sloužily jako kontrola. V průběhu následného skladování při stejné teplotě a relativní vlhkosti se délka doby dormance zkrátila o 20 dnů při ošetření CO<sub>2</sub> a o 35 dnů při ošetření GA. U kultivaru Kufri Jyoti ošetření GA způsobilo 2,6násobné zvýšení obsahu redukcujících cukrů a 0,8násobné zvýšení obsahu celkových cukrů v apikální části hlíz. Toto zvýšení obsahu cukrů ve vrcholovém očku mělo za následek dřívější ukončení dormance. Naproti tomu žádné zvýšení obsahu cukrů jsme nepozorovali v bazální části hlíz, kde očka neklíčila.

**Klíčová slova:** brambory; ovlivnění dormance; koncentrace CO<sub>2</sub>; délka klíčků; hmotnostní ztráta; redukcující cukry; celkové cukry

---

*Corresponding author:*

Dr. RAJARATHNAM EZEKIEL, Division of Crop Physiology and Post-harvest Technology,  
Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla-171 001, HP, India  
tel.: + 91 0177 262 48 30, fax: + 91 0177 262 44 60, e-mail: rajarathnamezekiel@yahoo.co.in

---