



E-ISSN: 2278-4136

P-ISSN: 2349-8234

JPP 2018; 7(6): 2346-2349

Received: 22-09-2018

Accepted: 24-10-2018

**Mithlesh Kr Meena**Department of Horticulture,  
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,  
India**RS Rathore**Department of Horticulture,  
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,  
India**Jitendra Kumar Tak**Department of Horticulture,  
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,  
India**LN Mahawer**Department of Horticulture,  
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,  
India

## Effect of tuber size & weight on yield and quality of greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) under southern Rajasthan conditions

Mithlesh Kr Meena, RS Rathore, Jitendra Kumar Tak and LN Mahawer

### Abstract

The present investigation entitled "Effect of Tuber size & weight on Yield and quality of greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) Under Southern Rajasthan Conditions" was conducted during June 2017 to March 2018 at Horticulture Farm, Department of Horticulture, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Udaipur. The experiment were comprising with different weight of tubers (25g, 50g, 75g, 100g, 125g, 150g, 175g, 200g, 225g and 250g) and three replications. The vegetative growth parameters were significantly influenced by different weight of tubers. Minimum days to sprouting (14.40 days), maximum speed of emergence (81.50%), no. of leaves per vine after four months (96.00), vine length after four months (183.76cm), girth of vines after four months (6.06 cm), leaf area (8181.76 cm<sup>2</sup>) were recorded in highest weight of tuber (250g). Maximum sprouting percentage (100%) was found in treatment T1 (25g) and T4 (100g). The maximum survival percentage (90.00%) was found in treatment T9 (225g). The minimum days to harvesting from sowing (215 days) was observed in treatment T10 (250g). The maximum number of tubers per vine (3.33), tuber length (18.18 cm), tuber diameter (9.99 cm), tuber yield per vine (1.97 kg) and yield (24.36 t/ha) were recorded highest in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g). The maximum gross return (□ 730800ha<sup>-1</sup>), net return (□ 545141 ha<sup>-1</sup>) with BC Ratio (2.90) were observed under treatment T8 (200g).

**Keywords:** Minisett, tuber weight, growth and yield

### Introduction

Greater yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) belongs to the family Dioscoreaceae and it has chromosome number (2n=2x=20 & 2n=4x=40). It belongs to genus Dioscorea which contains about 600 species (Coursey, 1967). It contains anthocyanin pigment in its bright lavender colour tuber which can be extracted as food colourant (Jose *et al.*, 2015) <sup>[11]</sup>. It is a very nutritive vegetable and contains starch (27.88 g), vitamin A (138 µg) protein (1.53 g) and fibre (0.65-1.40%) per 100 g of edible part. It is widely used for making vegetable, chips, Puri and fried vegetable for canning, dehydration and flour manufacture.

The main constraints in cultivation of greater yam are lack of availability of healthy planting materials and low multiplication ratio i.e.1:6, therefore, released varieties take a long time to reach to the farmer. The traditional method of producing of yams involves cutting a yam into small pieces called setts. Each sett weighs 300-350g depending on location and tradition. The sets are then planted and in one hectare area about 18-20 qt. sets are required. This means large quantities of greater yam are required for propagation purpose and marketable tubers are reserved for planting. The cost of planting materials is over 33 percent of the total outlay for yam production, so there is a need to improve the rate of yam multiplication (Okoli and Akorada, 1995).

The minisett technique is a unique technique and fulfills the need. It was developed by National Root Crops Research Institute (NRCRI), Nigeria. The minisett technique involves cutting a yam tuber into small size pieces and planting them. The purpose of Minisett technique is not to produce large tuber but to produce large number of healthy planting seed yams. The minisett technique is profitable due to lower materials cost and higher yield (Eyitayo *et al.*, 2010). It enhance the multiplication ratio (1:24) to large extent. Buds are spread all over the periderm (body surface) of yam tuber. Hence any portion of yam tuber having is capability to sprouting and producing a new plant (George *et al.*, 2004). It is an effective and viable technology which is quite farmer friendly and farmers oriented. This technique presents a rapid and cheap multiplication method for greater yam and produced healthy greater yams. It also offers a chance to reduce the production cost of greater yam.

### Material and Methods

An experiment entitled "Standardization of minisett technique in greater yam

### Correspondence

**Mithlesh Kr Meena**Department of Horticulture,  
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,  
India

(*Dioscorea alata* L.) Under Southern Rajasthan Conditions.” was conducted at Horticulture farm, Department of Horticulture, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur which is situated at South Eastern part of Rajasthan. This region falls under agro-climatic Zone IV a i.e. "South-humid Southern Plain and Aravalli Hills" of Rajasthan at altitude of 582.17 meter above mean sea level, 24°35' latitude and 74°42' E longitude. This region has a typical sub-tropical climate, characterized by mild winters and summers. The average rainfall of this tract ranges from 592.5 mm to 620 mm per year. More than 90 per cent of rainfall is received during mid-June to September with scanty showers during winter months. The experiment was laid out with Randomized Block Design with ten treatments and three replications. In miniset technique, mother seed yam of 500-1000g that have broken dormancy are cut into pieces weighed of 25g, 50g, 75g, 100g, 125g, 150g, 175g, 200g, 225g, 250g, with the help of sharp knife and tubers were treated with fungicide (12% carbendazim + 63% mencozeb). The tubers from each treatment were sown in pots filled with moist growing media containing 75% soil + 25% FYM. The pots watered regularly. The experimental field was ploughed once with a mould board plough in the beginning followed by cross harrowing with disc cultivator and finally by planking to prepare the field to fine tilth. Basal application of well rotten FYM @ 3 tons ha<sup>-1</sup> was incorporated in experimental area before transplanting. The layout of experiment was made as per treatments and replications. Yam seedlings were ready for transplanting 2 months after sowing of tubers. Seedling were planted at 7.5 cm depth keeping 90 x 90 cm spacing and covered with soil. Irrigation may be given at weekly intervals in the initial stage and afterwards at about 10 days interval. Bamboo poles were used as staking material to support the trailing vines. Initially the vines were tied with the coir string. The crop was harvesting manually 8 months after planting. The crop was harvested at full physiological maturity stage. A light irrigation 2-3 days before harvesting was required. Vines were removed first and then tubers were dug out manually with proper care. Cleaning was done to remove adhered roots and soil particles.

## Result and Discussion

### Effect of tuber weight on phonological traits

#### Days to sprouting

A perusal of data indicated that different weight of tubers were significantly affected the minimum time taken for day to sprouting (14.40 days) was recorded in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) due to larger tubers have larger surface area to retain water, this contributed to it to sprout faster compare to smaller tuber (Onwueme *et al.*, 1984).

#### Sprouting percentage

The data revealed that the sprouting percentage was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum sprouting percentage (100%) were recorded in treatment T<sub>2</sub> (50 g) and T<sub>4</sub> (100 g), whereas, the minimum sprouting percentage (86.67%) were recorded in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (25g), T<sub>6</sub> (150g). Aswathy *et al.*, (2017) [2] reported that the increasing trend of sprouting with increasing weight of planting material in Kasturi turmeric.

#### Survival percentage

The data revealed that the survival percentage was significantly influenced by different weight of tubers. The

maximum survival percentage (90.00) was recorded in treatment T<sub>9</sub> (225g) and minimum survival percentage (40.00) was recorded in T<sub>5</sub> (125g).

#### Speed of emergence (%)

The data revealed that the speed of emergence (%) was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum speed of emergence (81.50%) was found in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) and minimum speed of emergence (60.50%) was recorded in T<sub>4</sub> (100g).

#### Number of leaves after four months

An examination of data revealed that the number of leaves was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum number of leaves (96.00) was recorded in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) and minimum number of leaves (51.00) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Girth of vines after four months

An examination of data revealed that the girth of vines was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum girth of vines (6.06 cm) was recorded in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) and minimum girth of vines (4.03cm) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Length of vines after four months

An examination of data revealed that the length of vines was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum length of vines (183.73cm) was recorded in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) and minimum length of vines (99.09cm) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) after four months

An examination of data revealed that the leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum leaf area (8181.76cm<sup>2</sup>) was recorded in treatment T<sub>10</sub> (250g) and minimum leaf area (2900.89cm<sup>2</sup>) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g). Aswathy *et al.*, 2017 [2] reported that the maximum node bits produced more leaf area, roots and root length in Kasturi turmeric.

The present finding also supported with Onwueme (1972) [15], Asadu *et al.*, (1987) [1] and Cyansa- Ameyaw *et al.* (1999), Okonmah *et al.* (2009), Ch'ng *et al.* (2017) are reported that larger sets are quickly established and more vigorous as compared to small weight of seed yam and promote vegetative growth parameters such as number of leaves, length of vines and basal portion of greater yam.

**Table 1:** Effect of tuber weight on days to sprouting, sprouting percentage, survival percentage and speed of emergence (%) in greater yam

Treatments	Days to sprouting	Sprouting percentage	Survival percentage	Speed of emergence (%)
T <sub>1</sub>	22.83	86.70	73.33	61.67
T <sub>2</sub>	23.90	100.00	66.66	62.86
T <sub>3</sub>	20.70	96.67	76.66	70.17
T <sub>4</sub>	16.60	100.00	50.00	60.50
T <sub>5</sub>	16.10	93.33	40.00	63.83
T <sub>6</sub>	19.37	86.70	86.66	72.53
T <sub>7</sub>	17.50	90.00	73.33	75.23
T <sub>8</sub>	17.00	90.00	86.66	73.70
T <sub>9</sub>	17.33	93.33	90.00	75.14
T <sub>10</sub>	14.40	86.70	66.66	81.50
SEm±	0.60	2.59	1.81	1.84
CD (0.05)	1.78	7.69	5.39	5.47
CV (%)	9.7	8.4	7.7	7.9

**Table 2:** Effect of tuber weight on number of leaves, girth of vines, length of vines after 4 months and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>)

Treatments	Number of leaves per vine	Girth of vines(cm)	Length of vines (cm)	Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	51.00	4.03	99.09	2900.89
T <sub>2</sub>	52.57	4.71	100.70	2960.68
T <sub>3</sub>	52.97	5.12	104.40	3491.62
T <sub>4</sub>	53.00	4.21	126.13	3593.58
T <sub>5</sub>	54.27	4.46	107.82	3631.32
T <sub>6</sub>	59.67	5.02	146.47	4454.17
T <sub>7</sub>	53.53	5.85	144.13	3566.77
T <sub>8</sub>	92.67	5.49	178.87	7281.39
T <sub>9</sub>	65.47	5.25	176.27	5143.12
T <sub>10</sub>	96.00	6.06	183.73	8181.76
SEm±	1.31	0.13	3.88	134.500
CD (0.05)	3.86	0.36	11.52	399.620
CV (%)	6.2	7.7	8.5	8.9

### Effect of tuber weight on yield attributes

#### Number of tuber per vine

An examination of data revealed that the number of tuber per vine was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum number of tuber per vine (3.33) was recorded in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g) and minimum number of tuber per vine (1.37) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Tuber length per vine (cm)

An examination of data revealed that the length of tuber per vine was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum length of tuber per vine (18.18 cm) was recorded in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g) and minimum length of tuber per vine (12.74 cm) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

**Table 3:** Effect of tuber size on days to harvesting from sowing, number of tubers per vine, tuber length (cm) and tuber diameter (cm)

Treatments	Days to harvesting	Tubers per vine	Tuber length (cm)	Tuber Diameter (cm)
T <sub>1</sub>	227.00	1.37	12.74	4.95
T <sub>2</sub>	228.67	1.77	12.92	5.20
T <sub>3</sub>	226.00	1.90	14.30	5.42
T <sub>4</sub>	226.00	2.07	14.56	5.79
T <sub>5</sub>	226.00	2.17	14.08	6.13
T <sub>6</sub>	224.00	2.63	16.41	7.54
T <sub>7</sub>	224.00	2.63	16.83	7.64
T <sub>8</sub>	222.00	3.33	18.18	9.99
T <sub>9</sub>	215.00	3.27	17.53	8.50
T <sub>10</sub>	215.00	3.10	17.47	7.78
SEm±	0.67	0.10	0.41	0.32
CD (0.05)	NS	0.31	1.22	0.94
CV (%)	0.90	12.8	7.9	13.8

#### Tuber diameter per vine (cm)

An examination of data revealed that the diameter of tuber per vine was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum diameter of tuber per vine (9.99cm) was recorded in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g) and minimum diameter of tuber per vine (4.95cm) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Tuber yield (kg) per vine

An examination of data revealed that the tuber yield (kg) per vine was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum tuber yield per vine (1.97 kg) was recorded in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g) and minimum tuber yield per vine (0.86 kg) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

#### Tuber yield (t/ha)

An examination of data revealed that the tuber yield (t/ha)

was significantly influenced by various tuber weights. The maximum tuber yield per vine (24.36t/ha) was recorded in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g) and minimum tuber yield per vine (10.61 t/ha) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (25g).

The above results are in conformity with the findings of Onwueme, (1972) [15], Nwoke *et al.* (1974) [18], Obigbesan, (1980) [13], ferguson *et al.*, (1984) [9], Kayode *et al.*, (1984) [12], Okonmah *et al.* (2009) in greater yam.

**Table 4:** Effect of tuber size on tuber yield (kg) per vine, tuber yield (t) per hectare

Treatments	Tuber yield (kg) per vine	Tuber yield (t/ha)
T <sub>1</sub>	0.86	10.61
T <sub>2</sub>	0.87	10.76
T <sub>3</sub>	0.89	11.02
T <sub>4</sub>	1.11	13.67
T <sub>5</sub>	1.27	15.69
T <sub>6</sub>	1.42	17.55
T <sub>7</sub>	1.43	17.59
T <sub>8</sub>	1.97	24.36
T <sub>9</sub>	1.94	23.93
T <sub>10</sub>	1.94	23.99
SEm±	0.024	0.294
CD (0.05)	0.071	0.872
CV (%)	5.2	5.2

### Economics Feasibility

The maximum gross return (₹ 730800 ha<sup>-1</sup>), net return (₹ 545141 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and BC Ratio (2.90) were observed under treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g), whereas, minimum gross return (₹ 318300 ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in treatment T<sub>1</sub> (25g). The minimum net returns (₹ 183434.7 ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in treatment T<sub>2</sub> (50g), while lowest B: C Ratio (1.25) was recorded in treatment T<sub>3</sub> (75g). The results are in agreement with the findings of Chinaka *et al.* (1983) [3], Oyolu, (1983) [17], Eytayo *et al.* (2010) [8], those worked on greater yam.

**Table 5:** Economic feasibility of different treatments of greater yam

Treatments	General cost (Rs/ha)	Gross returns (Rs/ha)	Net returns (Rs/ha)	BC Ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	131650	318300	186650	1.41
T <sub>2</sub>	139365	322800	183435	1.31
T <sub>3</sub>	147139	330600	183461	1.25
T <sub>4</sub>	154797	410100	255303	1.65
T <sub>5</sub>	162512	470700	308188	1.90
T <sub>6</sub>	170205	526500	356295	2.09
T <sub>7</sub>	177984	527700	349716	1.96
T <sub>8</sub>	185659	730800	545141	2.94
T <sub>9</sub>	193444	717900	524456	2.71
T <sub>10</sub>	201093	719700	518607	2.58

### Conclusion

The following silent findings are drawn on the basis of investigation. The vegetative growth characteristics like days to sprouting, speed of emergence (%), no. of leaves per vine, length of vines (cm), girth of vines (cm), leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) and yield attributes like days to harvesting from sowing and quality attributes like dry matter percentage were recorded superior in highest weight of tuber (250g). The tuber yield per vine (kg), tuber yield (t/ha), tuber length (cm), tuber diameter (cm), number of tubers per vine were recorded superior in 200g weight of tuber. The sprouting percentage was recorded best in 50g, 100g weight of tuber and survival percentage found superior in 225g weight of tuber. The economics concerned, maximum gross return, net return and BC ratio was recorded for treatment T<sub>8</sub> (200g). However, the cost of

planting material are less (Rs 7715.5/ha) in small weight of tubers T1 (25g) compared to (Rs 77158.75/ha) large weight of tubers T10 (250g).

## References

- Asadu CLA, Ezeumah HC, Nweke FI, Akammigbo FOR. The performance of size cultivars of white yam derived from three sources and evaluated across three zones in southern Nigeria, In: Linking similar environment", cassava based cropping system. Research I, Ibadan, Nigeria, 1987, 215-223.
- Aswathy TS, Jessykutty PC. Rapid multiplication of *kasturi* turmeric (*Curcuma aromatica* Solisab.) through minisett technique and nursery management. Journal of Spices and Aromatic Crops. 2017; 26(1):47-50.
- Chinaka CC, Eluagu LS, Okereke HE, Enyinnia T. Large scale production of seed yams using maize for staking compared with trellis and pyramid methods. Annual Report of National Root Crops Research Institute, Umudike, Nigeria, 1983.
- Ch'ng HY, Yang KKY, Othman SB. Influence of minisett size of purple yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.) towards the seedling emergence and growth rate in production of seed yam. International Journal of Applied Research. 2017; 3(4):367-370.
- Coursey DG. Yam on the account of the nature, origins, cultivation and utilization of the useful members of the discoreaceae, Longman, London, UK, 1967.
- Cyansa-Ameyaw CE, Hahn SK, Alarez MM, Doku EV. Determination of optimal sett size for white guinea yam (*Dioscorea rotundata* Poir.) seed yam production: Trends in sprouting in pre sprout nursery and field performance. In: Tropical root crops in developing economy Ofori, F., Hahn, S.K. (eds.), proceeding of the 9<sup>th</sup> Symposium of the International Society of Tropical Root Crops, 20-26 October, 1991, 1999.
- Enyi BAC. Effect of seed size and spacing on growth and yield of lesser yam (*Dioscorea esculenta*). The journal of agricultural science. 1972; 72(2):215-225.
- Eyitayo OA, Anthony TO, Therasas I. Economics of seed yam production using minisett technique in Oyo state, Nigeria. Field Actions Science Reports. 2010; 4(2):1-5.
- Ferguson TU, Hayans PH, Spence JA. The effect of sett size, sett types and spacing on some aspects of growth, development and yield in white Lisbon yam (*Dioscorea alata*). In: 6<sup>th</sup>Symposium of International Society of Roots and Tuber crops (ISRTC), from 21-26 Feb, 1983. Eds. International Potato Center, CIP, Lima, Peru, 1984, 649-655.
- George J, Nair SS, Sree Kumari MT. Rapid multiplication of quality planting material in tuber crops. Central Tuber Crops Research Institute, Sreekariyan, Kerela, 2004, 30-33.
- Jose A, Muhammed R. Extraction and evaluation of anthocyanin from *Dioscorea alata* L. for its application as a natural food colour. The International Journal of Science and Technologies. 2015; 3(9):41-47.
- Kayode GO. The effect of sett size and spacing on tuber yield of white guinea yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*) in Rainfrost and Savana Zones of Nigeria. Experimental Agriculture. 1984; 20(1):53-57.
- Obigbesan GO. Growth yield and quality of Chinese yam (*Dioscorea esculenta*) as affected by seed tuber size. In: Terry, E.R., Oduro, K.A. and Caveness, E. (eds.) of the 1<sup>st</sup> Triennial Root Crops Symposium. ISRTC- Africa branch. 8-12 Sept. 1980. International Development Center, Ottawa, Canada, 1980.
- Okoli OO, Akoroda MO. Providing seed tubers for the production of food yams. African Journal of Root and Tuber crops. 1995; 1(1):1-6.
- Onwueme IC. Influence of the weight of planted tuber on the growth and performance of white yam (*D. rotundata* Poir.) plants. Nigeria Agricultural Journal. 1972; 19(1):170-173.
- Onwueme IC. Sett weight effects on time of tuber formation and on tuber yield characteristics in water yam (*Dioscorea alata* L.). The Journal of Agricultural Science. 1978; 91(2):317-319.
- Oyolu C. Recent approaches to seed yam production. In: 6<sup>th</sup> Symposium of the International Society for Tropical Root Crops at International Center of Potato (CIP), Lima, Peru, 1983.
- Nwoke EIO, Njoku E, Okonkwo SNC. The effect of size of seed yam on yield of individual plants of (*Dioscorea rotundata*). Department of Botany, University of Nigeria, Nsukka Memo, Nigeria, 1974.