Advances in Crop Science and Technology
ISSN: 2329-8863
Bento, Adv Crop Sci Tech 2022, 10:9
Review Article
Open Access

Review on Influence of Genotypes and Harvest Stage on Yield and Yield Components of Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas* (L) Lam)

Kedir Jaleto Bento*

Departement of Horticulture, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Kulumsa Agricultural Research Center, Asella, Ethiopia

Abstract

Genotype and harvesting age are found to be an important factor which affects the yield and yield components of sweet potato. Knowing harvesting age in sweet potato production is essential for above ground fresh biomass yield vine length leaf number marketable tuberous root number per plant marketable tuberous root weight per plant, marketable tuberous root yield per hectare, tuberous root length tuberous root diameter and tuberous root dry matter content. It was found that the yield and yield components of sweet potato is highly related to the harvest stage. Based on reviewed information almost all the above parameters increased to some extent as harvest stage delayed. Sweet potato genotypes have different above ground biomass yield and tuberous root yield and differences in yield components among the studied genotypes of sweet potato could be attributed to genetic diversity. This review article can be used as a reference resource for researchers, students, agricultural extension workers and smallholders working in elsewhere on sweet potato production.

Keywords: Tuberous root; Dry matter; Genotype; Harvest stage; Leaf number

Introduction

Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) is an herbaceous dicotyledonous plant and belongs to the family Convolvulaceae [1]. It is originated in Central America or tropical south America and globally the seventh most important food security tuberous root crop after wheat, rice, maize, potato, barley and cassava [2-6]. Wider adaptability and beta carotene content of orange fleshed genotypes are special attributes of sweet potato unlike staple food crops [7]. Globally Production of 112.8 million tons (in 115 countries) reported in 2017 and China is the leading producer followed by Sub-saharan African countries[8]. Asia (75.1 %), Africa (20.8 %), America (3.3 %), Oceania (0.08 %) and Europe (0.1 %) are regions shared production of sweet potato from 2007 to 2017 [8].

Sweet potato is widely grown in Ethiopia with an average national tuberous root yield of 8 t/ha, which is low compared to the global average production 14.8 t/ha [9]. Sweet potato has a potential of giving 50 to 60 t/ha but the yield obtained from farmer's field is lower than 6 to 8 t/ha [6]. [10] reported that average yield of 37.1 t/ha obtained for the Belela variety. This indicates that national as well as regional yield is lower than attainable yield at research station. The result obtained from Melkassa Agricultural Research Center showed that Kudadie variety produced the highest total tuberous root yield (138.7 t/ha) [11]. Total tuberous root yield of 0.88 t/ha was obtained from Tulla variety at Jimma University College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine [12]. According to marketable tuberous root yield ranged from 4.6 t/ha for Kulfo variety to 111.06 t/ha for local variety at Borena Zone [13]. This yield gap could be attributed to inappropriate land preparation, sub-optimal plant population, lack of improved genotype, poor crop management practices, improper harvest stage and post-harvest problems [14]. Sweet potatoes have a different genotype and the productivity of this genotype was different even in the same environmental conditions. The stage of harvest is determined by consumers demand and market price. Optimum harvest stage is important for vine yield and tuberous root yield. It varies among genotypes environmental conditions and market demand.

Reported that harvesting period ranges from 70 to 150 DAP. Also reported that harvesting stage ranges from 90 to 240 DAP. Sweet potato is commonly harvested 150 DAP but there is variability in harvest stages among genotype [15-17]. Harvesting vines at 105 DAP gave optimum production of above ground fresh biomass without reducing yield of tuberous roots [18]. Tuberous roots were smaller when harvested at 90 DAP than 120, 150 and 180 DAP [17]. Tuberous root yield of 12.77 t/ha was found when tuberous roots were harvested at 150 DAP and 9.0 t/ha at 120 DAP [19].

Literature Review

Therefore the objective of this paper is: To review the effect of harvest stageon yield and yield components of sweet potato.

Influence of genotypes and harvest stage on yield and yield components of sweet potato.

Influence of harvest stage and genotype on above ground fresh biomass, vine length and leaf number: The objective of knowing harvesting age in sweet potato crop production is to optimize the biomass production and to harvest the crop before any deterioration on biomass, dry matter content and quality occurs. Above ground fresh biomass, vine length and leaf number per plant are parameters related to vine yield which is used for animals feed. As harvest stage delayed

***Correspondent author:** Kedir Jaleto Bento, Departement of Horticulture, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Kulumsa Agricultural Research Center, Asella, Ethiopia; E-mail: kedireiarhort@gmail.com

Received: 10-May-2022, Manuscript No. ACST-22-63405; **Editor assigned:** 12-May-2022, PreQC No. ACST-22-63405 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 26-May-2022, QC No. ACST-22-63405; **Revised:** 11-Jul-2022, Manuscript No. ACST-22-63405 (R); **Published:** 18-Jul-2022, DOI: 10.4172/2329-8863.1000532

Citation: Kedir Jaleto Bento (2022) Review on Influence of Genotypes and Harvest Stage on Yield and Yield Components of Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas* (L) Lam). Adv Crop Sci Tech 10:532.

from 90 to 120 DAP above ground fresh biomass increased and decreased after 120 DAP [20,21]. As the report of [22] vine growth was slow at 30 DAP, fastest at 60 DAP and slowed down at 90 and 120 DAP. Decrease in above ground fresh biomass as harvest stages delayed is linked to senescence and leaf abscission, death of the whole plants and allocation of photo assimilates from above ground (shoots) to tuberous roots.

It reported that reduced growth of sweet potatoes is realized towards 120 and 150 DAP and this might be due to reduced nutrient uptake and ageing of the vines further than 150 DAP which resulted in reduction of nutrient and dry matter accumulation [21]. Genotype having longest vine, can also be used as a good vine source especially where production is aimed at producing vines for animals feed and planting material business especially at off season.

Sweet potato continues to branching as long as environmental conditions are favorable which increases leaf number per plant. However, the leaves formed earlier in the growing season start to fall and the total number of leaves decreased to end of the growing season [23].

Influence of harvest stage and genotype on marketable and unmarketable tuberous root number per plant and early reported that marketable tuberous root number per plant increased from 75 DAP up to 120 DAP [22,25]. It also reported that marketable tuberous root number per plant increased up to 120 DAP and declined at later harvest dates up to 180 DAP [26]. Marketable tuberous root number per plant were lower when the crop harvested at 90 DAP than when harvested at 120 and 150 DAP [27]. pointed out that the number of marketable tuberous roots number per plant increased as more time was allowed for tuber development before harvest meaning that at 105 DAP tuberous roots categorized as unmarketable due under sized turned to marketable category as time of harvest delayed due to tuberous bulking [28]. The differences in marketable tuberous root number per plant could also be attributed to varietal and harvest stage differences. The reduction in the marketable tuberous root number per plant at early harvest stages may be due to the impact of source sink activity of the plant early harvested tuberous roots were immature. The early harvest may leads to minimal partitioning of photo assimilates to the tuberous roots thereby reducing their marketable tuberous root number and increases unmarketable tuberous root numbers which were immature.

More unmarketable tuberous root number per plant recorded at early harvest stages due to more number of immature tuberous roots, whereas at later harvest stages due to cracking and oversized tuberous roots.

Influence of harvest stage and genotype on total tuberous root number per plant, tuberous root length and tuberous root diameter

According to total tuberous root number per plant increased till 120 DAP and declined at later harvesting dates [26]. Among sweet potato genotypes, significant difference of total tuberous root number per plant was reported by several authors [29-32].

A significant increase in tuberous root length was observed as time of harvest delayed [33, 34,26].This shows that tuberous roots gained enough photo assimilates as time of harvest delayed. [35] stated that the highest tuberous root length (19.70cm) was obtained at 120 DAP. [26] reported that, tuberous root length was found to be maximum in "WBSP-4" variety (15.21 cm) followed by "Kamala Sundari" (14.55 cm) and "Tripti" (14.50 cm) genotype. These differences were observed due to varietal differences.

[26] reported that the tuberous root diameter increased up to 150 DAP. Varietal differences were also reported in tuberous root diameter [36,26,37]. The observed differences could be attributed to varietal differences.

[38] reported that harvest time had a significant effect on the weight of tuberous roots, with the maximum weight obtained at 150 DAP. The maximum tuberous roots weight per plant were obtained at 300 DAP, 1.57kg for 'NP001' variety and 1.98kg for 'Solomon' variety [40]. Late harvested plants have more time to deposit photo assimilates from vegetative parts to tuberous roots, which resulted in increased tuberous root size and weight.

Effects of harvest stage and genotype on marketable and unmarketable tuberous root weight per plant

Among evaluated genotype most of them produced the highest tuberous root weight per plant as harvest of time delayed to 120 DAP [20]. There was a significant increase in marketable tuberous root weight from 90 DAP to 150 DAP and then decreased among genotype [26]. Marketable tuberous root weight per plant was increased with delays in harvest stage. This might be because plants have enough time to accumulate photo assimilates to tuberous roots from above ground parts as the time of harvesting is delayed.

Influence of harvest stage and genotype on marketable, unmarketable and total tuberous root weight per hectare

[40] early reported that the highest marketable tuberous root yield was obtained at 120 DAP with a mean yield of 35.49 t/ha followed by those harvested at 105 DAP (25.30 t/ha) and 90 DAP (17.5 t/ha) [35]. Also found highest marketable tuberous root yield (17.67 t/ha) at 150 DAP. Similarly, early maturity studies showed that the yield of three clones at 75, 90 and 105 DAP were 13, 23 and 33 t/ha, respectively [41]. Marketable tuberous root yield of 12.77 t/ha was found when the tuberous roots were harvested at 150 DAP while it was 9.0 t/ha at 120 DAP [19]. [27] also reported that the percentage of marketable tuberous roots was lower at 90 DAP than marketable tuberous roots obtained at 150 DAP [38]. Reported the maximum weight obtained at 150 DAP. In line with this, marketable tuberous roots were significantly smaller at 90 DAP than 120, 150 and 180 DAP [17]. The highest marketable tuberous root yield were reported at later harvesting [42]. Marketable tuberous root yields were higher at 150 DAP and lower at 90 DAP [43]. Tuberous root bulking continued under favorable conditions to accumulate photo assimilates in the roots. The marked reduction in marketable tuberous root weights of plants harvested during growth attributed to the suboptimal synthesis and partitioning of photo assimilates to the tuberous roots. At this stage the leaves were not mature enough to prepare photo assimilates to feed tuberous roots (strong sink at later growth stages).

[17] reported that unmarketable root yield was increased as harvesting dates delayed from 90 DAP to 180 DAP, this is due to sweet potato weevil damage to tuberous roots at prolonged harvest stages specially if droght is prolonged. Weevil damage and other root injuries are often associated with drought and significantly increased as harvesting was delayed. Acoording to the above author all the tuberous roots harvested at 180 DAP were classified as unmarketable.

Total tuberous root yield increased as the harvest stages were delayed from 90 to 150 DAP [17]. The highest total tuberous root yield were reported at later harvest stage [42]. [44] recorded higher total tuberous root yield after 155 DAP harvests compared to 105 DAP and 130 DAP. Normally as harvesting date delayed total tuberous yield increased if we evil damage is controlled through different integrated pest controlling measures. As harvest stage delayed means of total tuberous weight per hectare was increased due to the optimal synthesis and partitioning of carbohydrates to the tuberous roots from vegetative parts at later harvest stages.

Discussion

Effects of harvest stage and genotype on harvest index and tuber dry matter content

Harvest Index (HI) is a measure of partitioning photo assimilates from above ground parts to tuberous roots. Harvest index increased as time of harvest stage delayed.

[45] stated that harvest index ranged from 43 to 77% at final harvest 135 DAP and at 105 DAP the harvest index ranged from 22 to 62%. The harvest index for sweet potato ranged from 1.2% to 56% [46]. The harvest index was proportional to marketable and total fresh tuberous root yield and inversely proportional to total biomass. As harvest stages delayed the increase of harvest index were obtained due to more accumulate of photo assimilates to tuberous roots.

Tuber dry matter accumulation increased as harvest stage delayed According to data on the dry matter content of eight clones for three seasons showed that dry matter increased significantly from 75 to 90 DAP when the maximum dry matter occurs during this period and tends to deteriorate after that and at 105 DAP the dry matter content in majority of the clones decreased[41]. Dry matter content of about 27% could be obtained when the crop harvested either at 105 or 120 DAP [40]. Dry matter content increased with interval from planting to harvest up to 150 DAP but 180 DAP [17]. Earlier report showed that, decreasing tuberous root dry matter content towards harvest was reported [45,46]. A higher dry matter percentage was obtained at 150 DAP (41.6% and 23.4%) and this was higher than the dry matter recorded at 90 DAP, but not at 120 DAP [27]. Also came to conclusion that there is a significant effect of harvest stage on the dry matter content of tuberous roots. This implies that when sweet potato is harvested at 150 DAP it received maximum vegetative growth as well as development of tuberous roots which aided maximum photosynthesis and hence the accumulation of dry matter in the tuberous roots were higher. The average dry matter content in sweet potato is approximately 30% but vary widely depending on cultivar, location, climate, day length, soil type, incidence of pests, diseases and cultivation practices.

Conclusion

In Ethiopia, Sweet potato is widely grown in south, southwestern and eastern parts of the country by small-scale farmers and with limited area coverage northern part of Ethiopia also produces this food security crop for human consumption and animal feed. However the productivity of the crop remained low due to periodic drought, lack of planting materials during off season, lack of improved genotype, poor extension system, inappropriate harvest time and mono cropping habit of the country. Authors worldwide have been conducted research to moderate the above problems and some of the findings have been published in different journals. However, there is no a complete reference source of these information. Therefore, this review summarized the major articles that have been published in different Journals dealing with effects of harvest stage and genotypes on yield and yield components of sweet potato in elsewhere. It highlights the effects of different harvest stages on above ground fresh biomass yield, vine length, leaf number, marketable tuberous root number per plant, marketable tuberous root weight per plant, marketable tuberous root yield per hectare, tuberous root length, tuberous root diameter and tuberous root dry matter content. Based on reviewed information, almost all the above parameters increased to some extent as harvest stage delayed. This review article can be used as a reference resource for researchers, students, agricultural extension workers and smallholders globally working on sweet potato.

References

1. Purseglove JW (1972) Monocotyledons (*Tropical Crops* S). Longman, London, 272.
2. Van Jaarsveld PJ, Faber M, Tanumihardjo SA, Nestel P, Lombard CJ, et al. (2005) Beta-carotene-rich orange-fleshed sweet potato improves the vitamin A status of primary school children assessed with the modified-relative-dose-response test. Am J Clin Nutr 81:1080–1087.
3. Lebot V (2009) Tropical root and tuber crops: cassava, sweet potato, yams and aroids. 2nd Edition, CABI, 541.
4. Ahn O, Kim SH, Kim CY, Lee JS, Kwak SS ,et al (2010) Exogenous sucrose utilization and starch biosynthesis among sweet potato cultivars. Carbohydr Res 345:55–60.
5. Wang Z, Li J, Luo Z, Huang L, Chen X, et al. (2011) Characterization and development of EST-derived SSR markers in cultivated sweetpotato (*Ipomoea batatas)*. BMC Plant Biol 11:139.
6. Daniel M, Gobeze L (2016) Sweet Potato Agronomy Research in Ethiopia: Summary of Past Findings and Future Research Directions. Agri Food Sci Res 3:1-11.
7. Trancoso-Reyes N, Ochoa-Martínez LA, Bello-Perez LA, MoralesCastro J, Estevez-Santiago R ,et al. (2016) Effect of pre-treatment on physicochemical and structural properties, and the bioaccessibility of β-carotene in sweet potato flour. Food Chem 200:199–205.
8. FAOSTAT (2019) Food Agriculture and Organization (FAOSTAT). Rome.
9. Tofu A, Anshebo T, Tsegaye E, Tadesse T (2007) Summary of progress on orange-fleshed sweetpotato research and development in Ethiopia. Proceedings of the 13th ISTRC Symposium 728-731.
10. Teshome A , Amenti C (2010) On farm participatory evaluation and selection of sweet potato (Early, Medium and Late set) genotype at Adami Tulu Jiddo Kombolcha District. Intern J Agric 2:1-5.
11. Terefe B (2003) Agronomical and physiological factors affecting growth, development and yield of sweet potato in Ethiopia. University of Pretoria.
12. Bezawit M, Solomon T , Jima N (2015) Evaluation of orange fleshed sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) genotype for yield and yield contributing parameters in the humid tropics of Southwestern Ethiopia. J Plant Sci 10:191-199.
13. Desalegn R, Addis Shand Tigre W (2015) Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L) Lam) Genotype Evaluation in Borana Mid Altitude. 3:248-251.
14. Fekadu G, Hussein S, Laing M (2015) Diagnostic assessment of sweetpotato production in Ethiopia: Constraints, post-harvest handling and farmers preferences. Research on Crops 16:104-115.
15. Bertelson D, Dismukes R, Hoff F, Lee H (1994) Sweet potatoes: An economic assessment of the feasibility of providing multiple-peril crop insurance. Economic Research Service, USDA.
16. Ehisianya CN, Lale NES, Umeozor OC, Amadi CO, Zakka U (2011) Evaluation of effectiveness of variety, tillage method and time of harvest

on sweet potato yield and the population of sweet potato weevils, Cylas punctillis (Bohemann) (Coleoptera: Brentidae). Int J Adv Scie Tec Res 1:165-180.

17. Alvaro A, Andrade MI, Makunde GS, Dango F, Idowu O, et al. (2017) Yield, nutritional quality and stability of orange fleshed sweet potato cultivars successively later harvesting periods in Mozambique. Open Agriculture 2:464-468.
18. Ahmed M, Nigussie D, Abebie B (2012) Effect of planting methods and vine harvesting on shoot and tuberous root yields of sweet potato I*pomoea batatas* (L.) Lam. in the Afar region of Ethiopia. Afr J Agric Res 7:1129-1141.
19. Islam M, Shimu A (2018) Growth and Yield Response of Sweet Potato Genotypes at Different Harvesting Stage. Res Rev: J Crop Sci Technol 5:43-49.
20. Caliskan ME, Sogut T, Boydak E, Erturk E , Arioglu H (2007). Growth, yield, and quality of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam.)* cultivars in the southeastern anatolian and east mediterranean regions of Turkey. Turkish J Agric Forestry 31:213-227.
21. Etela I, Kalio G (2011) Yields components and 48-h rumen dry matter degradation of three sweet potato genotype in n'dama steers as influenced by date of harvesting. J Agr Soci Res (JASR) 11:15-21.
22. Kathabwalika D, Chilembwe E, Mwale V, Kambewa D, Njoloma J (2013) Plant growth and yield stability of orange fleshed sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) genotypes in three agro-ecological zones of Malawi. Int Res J Agric Sci Soil Sci 3:383-392.
23. Somda ZC, Kays SJ (1990) Sweet potato canopy morphology: leaf distribution. J Am Society Hortic Sci 115:39-45.
24. Kakaty BM, Thamburaj S , Stalin P (1992) Studies on the growth and yield of sweet potato at different stages of harvest. J Root Crops 18 : 73-76.
25. Indira P, Lakshmi KR (1984) Yield, starch and sugar content of sweet potato tubers harvested at different stages of maturity. South Indian Horticulture 32: 275-279.
26. Nath R, Chattopadhyay A, Kundu C, Majumder A, Islam S, et al. (2007) Production Potential of Sweet potato in Red and Laterite Zones of West Bengal. J Root Crops 33:97-103.
27. Shigwedha MN (2012) Determination of the appropriate duration of sweet potato genotype to mature. Agricola 50.
28. Sen H, Mukhopadhyay SK, Goswami SB (1990) Relative performance of some sweet potato entries at early harvest. J Root Crops 16:18-21.
29. Hossain MM, Mondal MAA (1994) Effect of vine parts on the growth and yield of three sweet potato genotype. J Scientific Indust Res 29:181-184.
30. Bhuiyan MKR, Mannan MA, Ahmed MS, Ahmed HU (1996) BARI SP-4 and BARI SP-5: two improved sweet potato cultivars for Bangladesh. J Root Crops 22:93-100.
31. Bhattacharya N (2001) Growth, development and tuber quality of sweet potato cultivars grown as rainfed under upland and low land situations. Ph.D. Thesis submitted to Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Mohanpur, Nadia, West Bengal, India.
32. Ramaswamy N, Muthukrishnan CR (1980) Studies on different stages of harvest of sweet potato under Coimbatore conditions. South Indian Horticulture 28:48-51.
33. Kumar (2004) Effect of harvest maturity and storage on physicochemical characteristics of sweetpotato. M.Sc. Thesis, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Mohanpur, Nadia, West Bengal, India.
34. De Albuquerque JRT, Ribeiro RMP, Pereira LAF, Junior APB, DA Silveira LM, et al. (2016) Sweet potato cultivars grown and harvested at different times in semiarid Brazil. Afr J Agric Res 11:4810-4818.
35. Goswami RK (1990) Variation in growth attributes and quality parameters in some sweet potato genotypes. J Root Crops 17:73-75.
36. Rahman MH, Alam patwary MM, Barua H, Hossain M , Nahar S (2013) Evaluation of orange fleshed Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam) genotypes for higher yield and quality. The Agriculturist 11:21-27.
37. Jahan M, Islam A, Siddique M (2009) Studied on growth and yield of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* poir) as influenced by variety and time of harvest.
38. Richardson K (2011) Optimal harvest time for two late-maturing heirloom genotype Of sweet potato. Crop Research Report 6.
39. Alcoy A, Garcia A, Baldos D, Robles R , Cuyno R (1993) Influence of planting material and time of harvest on plant to plant yield variability of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam)*. Philippine J Crop Sci 18:187-193.
40. Vimala B, Hariprakash B (2011) Research Note Evaluation of some promising sweet potato clones for early maturity. Electronic J Plant Breeding 2:461-465.
41. Andrade Júnior VCD, Azevedo AM, Pedrosa CE, Viana DJ, Figueiredo JA, et al. (2014) Influence of harvest time and cultivation sites on the productivity and quality of sweet potato. Hortic Bras 32.
42. Larbi A, Etela I, Nwokocha H, Oji U, Anyanwu N, et al. (2007) Fodder and tuber yields, and fodder quality of sweet potato cultivars at different maturity stages in the West African humid forest and savanna zones. Animal Feed Sci Technol 135:126-138.
43. Queiroga RCF, Dos Santos MA, De Menezes MA, Vieira CPG, Da Conceicao Silva M (2007). Fisiologia e produção de cultivares de batata-doce em função da época de colheita. Hortic Bras 25.
44. Bhagsari AS, Ashley DA (1990) Relationship of photosynthesis and harvest index to sweet potato yield. J Am Society Hortic Sci 115: 288-293.
45. Monamodi E, Bok I, Karikari S (2003) Changes in nutritional composition and yield of two sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas L)* culrivars during their growth in Botswana. UNISWA Journal of Agriculture 11:5-14.
46. Bradbury JH, Holloway WD (1988) Chemistry of tropical root crops: significance for nutrition and agriculture in the Pacific. Canberra (Australia) ACIAR.