

## Evaluating the Performance of Improved Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas*) Varieties at Shishir, Southern Ethiopia

Mohammed Awel

Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Jinka Agricultural Research Center, Crop Science Research  
Directorate, Jinka, Ethiopia

**\*Corresponding Author:** Mohammed Awel, Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Jinka  
Agricultural Research Center, Crop Science Research Directorate, Jinka, Ethiopia

### ABSTRACT

Field trial was conducted in 2014 rainy season at the Shishir Kebele of South Ari Woreda. The objective of the study was to evaluate the performance of improved sweet potato varieties with a view to identify those that may be adaptable with high yielding potential in the study area. The treatments consisted of 7 sweet potato varieties: Awassa-83, Temesgen, Beletech, Kulfo, Tula, Belela, Guntutea and a local check. These were laid out in a Randomized complete block design with 3 replications. Significant differences were observed on the parameters mean number of roots per plot, total fruit weight per hectare, marketable fruit weight per hectare, unmarketable fruit weight per hectare, mean vine weight per plot, average root diameter and average root length. Maximum number of roots per plot was recorded on varieties Beletech (87.00) and Local check; whereas minimum number of roots per plot was recorded on Guntutea and Kulfo. Awassa-83 (135.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Kulfo (124.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) recorded maximum marketable fresh weight per hectare; whereas minimum mean marketable fresh weight per hectare was recorded on Local check (43.00 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>). Sweet potato need to be cultivated as a stable food crop for food security and nutritional security to feed the ever increasing population of Ethiopia. To increase production and productivity appropriate varieties has to be looked for beside other agronomic and plant protection activities. In the present experiment, since the local variety performed less as compared to the improved ones farmers should avoid using of the Local variety and replace with the well performed white fleshed and orange fleshed sweet potato varieties.

**Keywords:** Orange fleshed; Sothern Ethiopia; sweet potato; variety evaluation; white fleshed;

### INTRODUCTION

Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L) Lam.) is a dicotyledonous plant that belongs to the family Convolvulaceae (Austin, 1988). It is among the important food crops in the world, after wheat, rice, maize, Irish potato, and barley and it ranks second following Irish potato in the world's root and tuber crops production and third after Irish potato and cassava in consumption in several parts of tropical Africa (Lenne', 1991 and Talekar, 1987). Sweet potato is both a staple and a vegetable crop, containing a significant amount of proteins, provitamin A, B, and C and minerals such as Ca, Fe and Na (Alvarez, 1986 and Lenne', 1991). It is drought resistant, hardy and can grow in marginal areas, thus contributing to improved food security. Considering its importance, sweet potato is seen as a major root crops cultivated in global food crop production. It is grown widely throughout Sub Saharan Africa and is one of the most important food crops in Africa (FAOSTAT, 2013).

Ethiopia ranks fifteenth in the world in terms of sweet potato production (Dan *et al.*, 2013).

The annual production of sweet potato in Ethiopia is 2,701,599 tons. About 53,369 ha of land are annually covered by sweet potato in the main rainy season (FAOSTAT, 2014). In Ethiopia sweet potato ranks the first in total production (42.84%) and the second in area coverage (25.43%) next to Irish potato from root and tuber crops cultivated (CSA, 2014). It is an attractive food crop among farmers because it requires less care and input (CIP, 1995). Sweet potato is commonly grown around densely populated areas in the South, South Western and Eastern parts of the country. At least 20 million Ethiopians depend on this crop as their source of food (Assefa *et al.*, 2007). It grows in the lowland and mid altitude areas of the Southern region and grows both in belg/short rainy season/and meher/main rainy seasons/ in small plots by subsistence farmers (Tenaw *et al.*, 2011).

Sweet potato has received increased attention because it can adapt to a wide range of environmental conditions and grows even on marginal areas with poor soils of limited fertility and inadequate moisture (Bioethics Nuffield Council, 2004). In Ethiopia, sweet potato is widely grown on about 50,000 ha with an average yield of only 7 t/ha (Geleta, 1996). This is quite low as compared to the world average yield of 14.9 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (FAO, 2001) and experimental storage root yield ranging between 30 to 73 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (Bhagsari and Ashley, 1990 and Varma *et al.*, 1994).

According to Geleta (1996), the reason for its low productivity in Ethiopia is low soil fertility, lack of agronomic packages especially plant nutrient management. In addition, poor seedbed preparation, the diverse and complex biotic, abiotic and human factors have contributed to the existing low productivity of sweet potato in Ethiopia. Some of the production constraints include lack of good quality planting materials, poor soil management practices, lack of suitable seedbed preparation, disease, insect pests, weeds and improper time of planting and harvesting (Enyi, 1977; Onwueme and Sinha, 1991).

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Description of the Study Area**

The experiment was conducted at South Ariworeda *Shishir Kebele*, in Southern Ethiopia. The site is located at N 06.43520 and E038.25425 with altitude of 1442 m.a.s.l. The soil at the site is characterized as sandy clay loam with PH of 7.68. The livelihood of the people of the zone is mostly pastoral and agro-pastoral.

### **Planting Materials and Experiment Methodology**

Seven improved and recommended varieties of sweet potato (Awassa 83, Beletech, Belela, Temesgen, Kulfo, Guntutea and Tula) were brought from Hawassa research center and tried for their adaptation with local variety in RCBD with three replications in 2014 with the objective to identify Sweet potato variety/ies that is/are better in yield and other agronomic characteristics. Six rows with recommended spacing of 30 cm between plant and 60 cm between rows were followed. No fertilizer and other chemicals were applied to this experiment.

### **Data Collection and Statistical Analysis**

Data were collected on parameters like average root number per plot, total fresh weight per hectare, marketable fresh weight per hectare, unmarketable fresh weight per hectare, average vine weight per plot, average root diameter and average root length. Diseased, deformed and tubers with a weight of less than 100 gram were recorded as unmarketable. Analysis of variance for the collected parameters was performed as per the methods described by Gomez and Gomez (1984) using SAS computer software (SAS, 2009). Least Significant difference (LSD) test was used to separate the means at 5% probability level.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The result of ANOVA showed that there is significant variation ( $P < 0.05$ ) between varieties for yield and yield related parameters (Table 1). Maximum number of roots per plot was recorded on varieties Beletech (87.00) and Local check (90.66) with no significant difference over Belela (76.33); whereas minimum number of roots per plot was recorded on Guntutea and Kulfo with no significant difference over the varieties Tula, Temesgen and Awassa-83.

Total fresh weight per hectare showed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) among varieties (Table 1). Highest total fresh weight per hectare was recorded on the varieties Awassa-83 (162.33 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Kulfo (140.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>); lowest total fresh weight per hectare was recorded on Local check (55.00 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) with no significant difference over Temesgen (63.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Tesfaye *et al.* (2011), also reported significant variation between sweet potato genotypes in yield and other desirable traits in their adaptation trial in different agro ecologies of Ethiopia.

Mean marketable fresh weight per hectare also showed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) among varieties (Table 1). Maximum marketable fresh weight per hectare was recorded on the varieties Awassa-83 (135.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Kulfo (124.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>); whereas minimum mean marketable fresh weight per hectare was recorded on Local check (43.00 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Mean unmarketable fresh weight per hectare also showed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) among varieties (Table 1). Maximum unmarketable fresh weight per hectare was recorded on the

## Evaluating the Performance of Improved Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas*) Varieties at Shishir, Southern Ethiopia

varieties Awassa-83 (26.66 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and minimum mean unmarketable fresh weight per hectare was recorded on varieties Beletech, Belela, Guntutea and Local check with no significant difference over the varieties Temesgen and Kulfo. Again mean vine weight per plot also showed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) among varieties (Table 1). Awassa-83 (18.66 kg) and Kulfo (19.00 kg) recorded the heaviest vine weight with no significant difference over the variety Tula (16.33 kg). Local check (12.00 kg) recorded the lightest vine weight with no

significant difference over the varieties Temesgen (14.66 kg), Beletech (15.00 kg), Belela (14.33 kg) and Guntutea (15.00 kg).

Average root diameter and length showed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) among varieties (Table 1). Variety Kulfo recorded the thickest (49.33 cm) and shortest (6.63 cm) average root diameter and length respectively; in contrast the variety Awassa-83 recorded the thinnest (31.00 cm) and longest (12.16 cm) average root diameter and length respectively.

**Table1.** Mean values for yield and yield components of eight sweet potato varieties grown at Shishir in 2014 cropping season

Varieties	MNRPP	TFWPH	MFWPH	UMFWPH	MVW	ARD	ARL
Awassa 83	69.00 <sup>BC</sup>	162.33 <sup>A</sup>	135.66 <sup>A</sup>	26.66 <sup>A</sup>	18.66 <sup>A</sup>	49.33 <sup>A</sup>	12.16 <sup>A</sup>
Temesgen	63.66 <sup>BC</sup>	73.66 <sup>ED</sup>	58.66 <sup>CD</sup>	15.00 <sup>BC</sup>	14.66 <sup>BC</sup>	35.66 <sup>CD</sup>	11.00 <sup>A</sup>
Beletech	87.00 <sup>A</sup>	104.66 <sup>BC</sup>	93.33 <sup>B</sup>	11.33 <sup>C</sup>	15.00 <sup>BC</sup>	46.66 <sup>AB</sup>	8.45 <sup>B</sup>
Belela	76.33 <sup>AB</sup>	96.66 <sup>BCD</sup>	83.33 <sup>BC</sup>	13.33 <sup>C</sup>	14.33 <sup>BC</sup>	35.00 <sup>CD</sup>	8.35 <sup>B</sup>
Guntutea	58.33 <sup>C</sup>	83.00 <sup>CD</sup>	71.00 <sup>BC</sup>	12.00 <sup>C</sup>	15.00 <sup>BC</sup>	28.33 <sup>E</sup>	6.53 <sup>B</sup>
Kulfo	55.00 <sup>C</sup>	140.66 <sup>A</sup>	124.66 <sup>A</sup>	16.00 <sup>B</sup>	19.00 <sup>A</sup>	31.00 <sup>DE</sup>	6.63 <sup>B</sup>
Tula	66.66 <sup>BC</sup>	110.33 <sup>B</sup>	90.33 <sup>B</sup>	20.00 <sup>B</sup>	16.33 <sup>AB</sup>	44.00 <sup>B</sup>	7.36 <sup>B</sup>
Local	90.66 <sup>A</sup>	55.00 <sup>E</sup>	43.00 <sup>D</sup>	12.00 <sup>C</sup>	12.00 <sup>C</sup>	37.66 <sup>C</sup>	11.66 <sup>A</sup>
Significance	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mean ± SE	70.83± 5.15	103.29±8.87	87.50±9.12	15.79±2.09	15.62±1.17	38.45±1.74	9.02±0.75
LSD(0.05)	15.64	26.91	27.68	6.34	3.55	5.29	2.27
CV (%)	12.60	14.88	18.06	22.93	12.98	7.85	14.42

Means followed by the same letter in the same column are not significantly different at 5 % LSD test and the reverse is true for different letters. SE= standard error MNRPP=mean number of roots per plot, TFWPH=total fresh weight per hectare, MFWPH = marketable fresh weight per hectare, UMFWPH=unmarketable fresh weight per hectare, MVW=mean vine weight, ARD=average root diameter, ARL=average root length

**Table2.** Mean square values for yield and yield components of eight sweet potato varieties grown at Senegal, in 2015 to 2016

Source	DF	MNRPP	TFWPH	MFWPH	UMFWPH	MVW	ARD	ARL
Replication	2	23.29ns	350.04ns	307.12ns	21.16ns	12.50ns	5.79ns	1.43ns
Variety	7	498.85*	3685.56*	2933.42*	81.99*	16.13*	169.23*	15.52*
Error	14	79.76	236.27	249.83	13.11	4.11	9.12	1.69

\*=significant, ns =non significant, MNRPP=mean number of roots per plot, TFWPH=total fresh weight per hectare, MFWPH = marketable fresh weight per hectare, UMFWPH=unmarketable fresh weight per hectare, MVW=mean vine weight, ARD=average root diameter, ARL=average root length

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Sweet potato need to be cultivated as stable and food security crop to feed the ever increasing population of Ethiopia. To increase production and productivity appropriate varieties has to be looked for beside other agronomic and plant protection activities.

In the present experiment, since the local variety performed less as compared to the improved ones farmers should avoid using of the Local variety and replace with the well performed white fleshed and orange fleshed sweet potato varieties. Other agronomic trials should be done

for the success of production and productivity of sweet potato in the area. Nutrient content and other quality parameter analysis and also suitable post harvest management practices needs to be done to improve the quality and longtime use of the crop. Especially the beta-carotene content of the orange fleshed sweet potato variety should be studied in advance to overcome the nutritional security problem in the studied area. Using improved varieties of sweet potato especially Awassa-83 from the white fleshed and Kulfo from orange fleshed could make an important contribution to increase agricultural production and productivity in areas

## Evaluating the Performance of Improved Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas*) Varieties at Shishir, Southern Ethiopia

like Shishir where there is low practice of using improved crop varieties. To this end, use of improved sweet potato technologies such as improved varieties could be one of the alternatives to improve productivity by small farmers. However, the use of improved sweet potato varieties is not yet studied in the area. Thus, this research work is initiated to investigate the impact of including improved hot pepper varieties on the existing production system is of paramount important.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Alvarez, M.N., (1986). Sweet Potato and the African Food Crisis. pp. 66-69. In: proc. Third Symp. Intl. Soc. Tropical Root and Tuber Crops - Africa Branch held in Warri, Nigeria, 17-23Aug, 1986.
- [2] Assefa Tofu, Anshebo T., Tsegaye E., Tadesse T. (2007), Progress on Orange- Fleshed Sweet potato Research Development in Ethiopia. Proceedings of the 13th ISTRC Symposium, pp.728-731.
- [3] Austin D. F. (1988), The Taxonomy, evaluation and genetic diversity of sweet potato and related, wild species in exploration, maintenance and utilization of sweet potato genetic resources. Edited by P. Gregory. International Potato centre: Lima, Peru, P. 27-60.
- [4] Bhagsari, A.S. & Ashley, D.A. (1990), Relationship of photosynthesis and harvest index of sweet potato yield. *J. Am. Soc. Hort. Sci.* 111, 288-293.
- [5] Bioethics Nuffield Council. (2004), The use of GM crops in developing countries. Case study 5: Improved resistance to viruses in sweet potato.
- [6] CSA (Central Statistical Agency). 2014. Crop Production Forecast Sample Survey, 2013/14. Report on Area and Production for Major Crops (for Private Peasant Holdings 'Meher' season). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [7] Dan. J., Mary. K. G., and Leigh A. (2013), Sweet potato Value Chain: Ethiopia, EPAR (Evans School Policy Analysis and Research) Brief No 219, Wevans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.
- [8] Enyi, B.A.C. (1977), Analysis of growth and tuber yield in sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) cultivars. *J. Agric. Sci.* 88, 421- 430.
- [9] FAO. (2001), FAO Production Year Book, Basic Data Unit, Statistics Division, FAO, Rome, Italy, Vol. 53 pp. 95.
- [10] FAOSTAT (The Food and Agriculture Organization Corporate Statistical Database). (2014), Agricultural production statistics. (<http://www.fao.org/faostat>.) (Accesses on February 10, 2014.
- [11] FAOSTAT.(2013), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Accessed at:[http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/index/en/?is\\_o3=ETH](http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/index/en/?is_o3=ETH)
- [12] Geleta Legese. (1996), Improved Technologies for Sweet Potato Production in Ethiopia. Research Achievements and Technology Transfer Attempts in Southern Ethiopia. pp 9-18. In:Proc. of the Second Tehcnol. Gener. Trans. And Gap Analysis Workshop, 9-11 July, Nazareth, Ethiopia.
- [13] International Potato Center (CIP). (1995). People centered research for sustainable production. Circular, Vol. 21 (21:1).
- [14] Lenne', J.M. (1991), Diseases and Pests of Sweet Potato: South east Asia, the pacific and east Africa. Natural Resources Institutes. Bulletin No. 46 Vii + 116pp.
- [15] Onwuewe, I.C. &T.D. Sinha. (1991), Field crop production In tropical Africa. Principles and practice. Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Co-operation.
- [16] SAS (Statistical Analysis System) Software. (2009), Version 9.2.Inc.Carry, North Carolina, USA.
- [17] Talekar, N.S., (1987), Resistance in sweet potato weevil. *Insect Sci. Applic.* Vol. 8:819-823.
- [18] Tenaw workayehu, Waga, M., &Legesse, H. (2011), Awassa Growth habit, plant density and weed control on weed and root yield of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*L.): Hawassa, Ethiopia.
- [19] Tesfaye T., Engida T., Aseffa T., Teshome A., Asfawu K., Yohannis G., Daniel M. (2011), Performance of medium and late maturing sweet potato germplasms in different agro ecologies of Ethiopia. In: Proceedings of the 14th annual conference of the crop science society of Ethiopia. 28-29 April 2011. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [20] Varma, V.S.,K. P.Singh, N.K. Singh, J.R.P. Singh and S.P. Verma et al., (1994), Rajendra Shakark and 43:Two high yielding selections of sweet potato. *J. Root Crops*, 20:15-19.

**Citation:** Mohammed Awel. (2018). Evaluating the Performance of Improved Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea Batatas*) Varieties at Shishir, Southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry*, 5(6), pp 33-36.

**Copyright:** © 2018 Mohammed Awel et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.