J Indian bot Soc Vol 72 (1993) 119-126

ASSESSMENT OF GROWTH, YIELD AND BIOCHEMICAL COMPONENTS IN ABELMOSCHUS ESCULENTUS MOENCH CV. PUSA MAKHMALI FUMIGATED WITH SULPHUR DIOXIDE.

Y.S. TOMER, VINAY GUPTA AND GOVIND PRAKASH

Eco-physiology Lab., Department of Botany, Meerut University, Meerut -250 004, India. (Accepted January 1993)

Abelmoschus esculentus cv. (Okra) Pusa Makhmali was subjected to 320, 667 and 1334 µg m⁻³ of SO₂. Slight reductions in most of the growth and biochemical attributes were observed at 320 μ g m⁻³ SO, concentration in earlier stages of plant growth, but these reductions became significant with increase in concentrations of the pollutant and plant age. In the leaves of mature plants of okra, potassium, phosphorus and carbohydrate contents were found to be reduced significantly. Foliar pH and ascorbic acid contents were also decreased. In fruits, the amounts of K, P, N, protein and carbohydrate were decreased appreciably, while sulphur content was considerably increased both in leaves and fruits. Yield, in terms of number of fruits plant⁻¹ and their fresh and dry weights, was also adversely affected.

Key Words: SO,, growth, yield, biochemical components, reduction.

was given in 1 m³ ployethylene chambers supported on Sulphur dioxide, a noxious air pollutant, is a aluminium frames. Sulphur dioxide was produced by byproduct of fuel combustion. The fumigant may enter passing a continuous air current using suction pump the plants through roots as sulphite ions, through through aqueous solution of sodium metabisulphite stomata in gaseous form or after having dissolved which was ionized under pressure to generate SO, in water as sulphite ions. At higher concentrations (Agrawal et al., 1982). The gas thus generated, was of the pollutant the plants may show visible injury passed gradually into the chambers through a teflon symptoms and at lower concentrations, these may show tubing and mixed with the ambient air of the chamber. many physiological and biochemical alterations (Ziegler, The gas in the chamber was monitored at the interval 1972; Jager and klein, 1980; Pierre and Queiroz, of two hours following Dennis (1913). 1981; Wellburn, 1982 and Koziol and Whatley, 1984). Recent evidences indicate that these negative Three samplings of five plants each for each impacts are mainly caused by free oxygen radicals treatment, were made after 15, 30 and 45 days of (Jager, 1982; Dubey, 1992 and Singh and Rao, 1992). exposure. The intact plants, excavated from each plot The present study reveals changes in growth, bioat every sampling time, were washed with smooth chemicals and yield of Abelmoschus esculentus Moench run tap water and then analysed. The plants were exposed to various levels of SO₂. analysed with regard to leaf injury percentage, growth parameters (Plant length, root and shoot MATERIALS AND METHODS length, number of leaves plant⁻¹ and leaf area), fresh The seeds of Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa and dry matter accumulations in shoot and root and net Makhmali procured from I.A.R.I., New Delhi, were primary productivity. Development of foliar injury, if grown in four plots. The size of each experimental any, in the treated plants was observed periodically. plot was 10 x 4 m^2 . One of these plots was used for The plant parts were dried in an oven at 80°C for 24 control and the remaining plots were used for 320, 667 hours to find out phytomass accumulation.

7

and 1334 μ g m⁻³SO, treatment, respectively. The seed spacing was kept 25 cm from plant to plant and 35 cm from line to line. Watering was done in the form of free surface flow once a week. Fifteen day old plants were treated with SO₂ concentration of 320, 667 and 1334 μ g m⁻³. A control with identical conditions of growth, but without SO, exposure, was used. The treatment

Chlorophyll a and b and total chlorophyll contents were determined as given by Arnon (1949).

Leaf extract pH was determined with a digital pH meter by homogenizing 5 g fresh leaves with 25 ml double distilled water. Ascorbic acid content was

Received August 1992

| Parameter | Days | | $SO_{2} (\mu gm^{-3})$ | | | C.D. | | |
|---------------------|----------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| | | 0 | 320 | 667 | 1334 | 5% | 1% | |
| | | | - • | - 1 | L | | | |
| | 20 | 8 | ab 19.09 | ad 1769 | D 16 50 | 2.66 | | |
| Snoot length | 30 | 19.50 | 10.00 | 17.00 | 10.50 | 2.00 | | |
| (cm) | 15 | 32.80 | 20 78 | 28 41 | 26 11 | 3 44 | 5 1 1 | |
| | | 52.80 | 27.70 s'h' | 20.41 o'h' | 20.11 b' | J .77 | 5.11 | |
| | | લ | a ن مان | a b bc | C C | | | |
| | 60 | 64 40 | 55 45 | 50 11 | 45 41 | 9 47 | 14.17 | |
| | 00 | 9'.+0 8' | a'h' | b' | -13.11 h' | | | |
| | | а Я | ab | ab | ĥ | | | |
| Root length | 30 | 8.20 | 7.66 | 7.45 | 6.98 | 0.78 | | |
| (cm) | 20 | a. | ab | b | b | | | |
| () | 45 | 11.20 | 10.09 | 9.68 | 8.85 | 1.51 | | |
| | | a | Ь | bc | c | | | |
| | 60 | 16.70 | 14.11 | 12.30 | 11.43 | 2.39 | 3.43 | |
| | | a' | a'b | b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | ab | ab | Ь | | | |
| Plant height | 30 | 27.50 | 25.74 | 25.13 | 23.48 | 4.16 | | |
| (cm) | | | a | a b | bc | c | | |
| | 45 | 44.00 | 39.87 | 38.09 | 34.96 | 4.69 | 7.03 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | a' b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | b | bc | с | | | |
| | 60 | 81.10 | 69.56 | 62.41 | 56.84 | 9.84 | 14.64 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | ab | ab | b | | | |
| Number of leaves | 30 | 6.30 | 5.95 | 5.75 | 5.41 | 0.65 | | |
| plant ⁻¹ | | a | ab | b | Ь | | | |
| | 45 | 12.20 | 11.00 | 10.40 | 9.60 | 1.73 | 2.58 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | a'b' | Б' | | | |
| | | a | b | bc | C | 0.00 | 2.22 | |
| | 60 | 17.70 | 14.90 | 13.48 | 12.14 | 2.32 | 3.23 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | D, | D. | | | |
| | 20 | a 22.40 | ab | a D | D 28 12 | 4 29 | | |
| Leaf area | 30 | 33.40 | 31.52 | 30.29 | 28.12 | 4.38 | ** | |
| (cm) | | 8 | | DC R1 22 | с 74.42 | 10 47 | 10 66 | |
| | 45 | 90.40 | 87.20 | 81.32 | 14.42 | 12.47 | 19.00 | |
| | | 8 | a'b' | a'b' | D | | | |
| | <i>.</i> | 8 100 CO | b | DC DD DD | C | 14.00 | 31 64 | |
| | 60 | 122.50 | 102.53 | 93.22 | 82.44 | 14.33 | 21.04 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | b' | b ' | | | |

Table 1: Growth response of Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali exposed to various concentrations of sulphur dioxide.

Similar superscripts and underscripts in a parameter represent insignificant difference at 5% and 1% level respectively.

calculated by the method given by Keller and Schwager (1977).

At the final harvest after 60 days, phosphorus, potassium, sulphur and carbohydrate contents were determined in leaves and fruits while soluble and protein nitrogens and total protein contents were determined only in fruits. Phosphorus content was determined by using stannous chloride method following Allen (1940), postassium by volumetric method (Ward and Johnston, 1962), carbohydrate by acetone colorimetric method (Yemm and Willis, 1954) and sulphur by following the method of Patterson (1958).

The protein content was determined by the method suggested by Layne (1957) and that of nitrogen by micro-Kjeldahl method of Jackson (1958). Number, length, fresh weights and dry weights of fruits were also recorded in the mature crop of okra.

The recorded data were analysed statistically using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and then by determining the critical differences (C.D.) at 5% and 1% levels of significance.

Assessment of growth, yield and biochemical components

Table 2: Fresh weight, dry weight fractions and net primary productivity (N.P.P.) of *Abelmoschus esculentus* cv. Pusa Makhmali exposed to 320, 667 and 1334 μ g m⁻³ sulphur dioxide.

| Parameter | Days | Days $SO_2 (\mu g m^{-3})$ | | | | C.D. | | |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------|----------------|--|
| ····· | | 0 | 320 | 667 | 1334 | 5% | 1 % | |
| | | a | ab | ab | b | | | |
| Fresh weight | 30 | 19.302 | 17.550 | 17.030 | 16.081 | 3.038 | | |
| of shoot (g) | 4.5 | 8 | b | b | b | | | |
| | 45 | 85.320 | 72.875 | 70.143 | 65.871 | 10.787 | 15.969 | |
| | | a | a`b' ⊾ | a`b' ⊾ | b' 1- | | | |
| | 60 | a 115 504 | 03 562 | 88 503 | 0 80 555 | 14 242 | 21 190 | |
| | 00 | 115.50 4 a' | 93.302 h' | 00.373 h' | 00.333 h' | 14.245 | 21.109 | |
| | | <u>ц</u> а | ab | h | ь Б | | | |
| Fresh weight | 30 | 1.303 | 1.162 | 1.130 | 1.051 | 0.163 | 0.239 | |
| of root (g) | | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | | а | ь | Ь | b | | | |
| | 45 | 2.602 | 2.203 | 2.103 | 1.970 | 0.351 | 0.520 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | (0) | a | b | b | b | | | |
| | 60 | 5.505 | 4.366 | 4.134 | 3.733 | 0.670 | 0.990 | |
| | | 8 | D' | b' | b' | | | |
| Total fresh | 30 | a 20.605 | aD | 8D | D 17 122 | 2 615 | | |
| weight plant ⁻¹ | 50 | 20.005 | 10.712 b | 10.100 b | 17.152 | 2.015 | | |
| (g) | 45 | 87 922 | 75 078 | 72 246 | 67 841 | 12.00 | 17 056 | |
| | 15 | a' | a'h' | 12.240 s'h' | b' | 12.00 | 17.950 | |
| | | <u>~</u> а | b | h | ь Б | | | |
| | 60 | 121.009 | 97.928 | 92.724 | 84.588 | 15.875 | 23.640 | |
| | | aʻ | a'b' | b' | b' | 101010 | 201010 | |
| | | a | ab | ab | b | | | |
| Dry weight of shoot (g) | 30 | 5.324 | 4.860 | 4.711 | 4.466 | 0.811 | | |
| | | 8 | b | Ь | Ь | | | |
| | 45 | 23.671 | 20.404 | 19.623 | 18.416 | 3.163 | 4.740 | |
| | | a | 8 D · | 8 'D' | D' | | | |
| | 60 | a 31 702 | 25 624 | D 24.625 | D 22 150 | 4 092 | 5 029 | |
| | 00 | 91.792 9' | 23.024 b' | 24.033 h' | 22.139 b' | 4.082 | 3.938 | |
| | | a | ah | ь Б | b | | | |
| Dry weight | 30 | 0.330 | 0.297 | 0.284 | 0.263 | 0.044 | 0.065 | |
| of root (g) | | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | 0.011 | 0.005 | |
| | | a | b | b | ь | | | |
| | 45 | 0.674 | 0.572 | 0.535 | 0.490 | 0.094 | 0.138 | |
| | | a ' | a'b' | ь' | р, | | | |
| | | a | Ь | bc | c | | | |
| | 60 | 1.464 | 1.166 | 1.105 | 0.970 | 0.193 | 0.288 | |
| | | a' | Ь' , | b' | b' | | | |
| Phytomase (a) | 30 | a 5 654 | ad 5 1 5 7 | ab 4 005 | b 4 700 | 0.600 | | |
| nytomass (g) | 50 | 5.034 | 5.157 b | 4.993 h | 4.729 | 0.689 | | |
| | 45 | 24.345 | 20 975 | 20 158 | 18 QAA | 2 265 | 5 D45 | |
| | | a' | a'h' | a'h' | h' | 5,505 | J.U 4 J | |
| | | 8 | b | Ь | b | | | |
| | 60 | 33.256 | 26.790 | 25.743 | 25.129 | 4.430 | 6.445 | |
| | | a' | Ь' | b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | ab | ab | Ъ | | | |



Similar superscripts and underscripts in a parameter represent insignificant difference at 5% and 1% level respectively.

| | Days | | $SO_2(\mu g m^{-3})$ | | | C.D. | | _ |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------|----------------------|------------|-------------|---------|-------|---|
| Parameter | • | 0 | 320 | 667 | 1334 | 5% | 1 % | |
| | | 8 | ab | <u>ь</u> | b | | | |
| Chlorophyll a | 30 | 0.953 | 0.855 | 0.808 | 0.731 | 0.127 | 0.179 | |
| (mg gfw ⁻¹) | | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | Ъ | Ъ | b | | | |
| | 45 | 1.780 | 1.484 | 1.339 | 1.263 | 0.254 | 0.373 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | Ե' | Ե' | | | |
| | | a | b | ь | b | | | |
| | 6 0 | 2.135 | 1.640 | 1.520 | 1.362 | 0.322 | 0.467 | |
| | | a' | b' | b' | b' | | | |
| | | a | ab | ab | Ъ | | | |
| Chlorophyll b | 30 | 0.640 | 0.604 | 0.587 | 0.586 | 0.053 | | |
| $(mg g f w^{-1})$ | | a | ab | b | b | | | |
| | 45 | 1.150 | 1.050 | 1.010 | 0.942 | 0.140 | | |
| | | 8 | b | Ъ | Ъ | | | |
| | 60 | 1.350 | 1.119 | 1.060 | 0.990 | 0.193 | 0.281 | |
| | | a' | a'b' | Ъ' | b' | | | |
| | | - a | ab | Ъ | Ь | | | |
| Total chlorophyll | 30 | 1.593 | 1.459 | 1.395 | 1.287 | 0.189 | 0.270 | |
| (mg gfw ⁻¹) | ••• | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b ' | | | |
| | | - 8 | h | Ъ | b | | | |
| | 45 | 2.930 | 2.534 | 2.409 | 2.205 | 0.383 | 0.560 | |
| | 10 | 2.200 a' | a'h' | a'b' | •b' | | | |
| | | ч 9 | h | h | Ь | | | |
| | 60 | 3 485 | 2.759 | 2.580 | 2.352 | 0.487 | 0.718 | |
| | 00 | s' s' | L./.87 | b' | b' | | | |
| | | ч Я | ah | ab | ab | | | |
| I asf avtract | 30 | 6 74 | 6.37 | 6.22 | 6.04 | 0.58 | | |
| | 50 | 9 | ah | ab | b | | | |
| pn | 45 | 6 78 | 6 21 | 6.04 | 5.83 | 0.87 | | |
| | 43 | 0.78 | 0.21 h | h | b | | | |
| | 60 | 6 87 | 6 04 | 5 89 | 5.61 | 0.78 | 1.14 | |
| | 00 | 0.07 | 9'h' | a'h' | b' | | | |
| A vectorial and | 20 | a 0.040 | 0.037 | 0 036 | 0.034 | | | |
| Ascordic acid | 30 | 0.040 | 0.037 | 6.050 h | h | | | |
| $(mg g dw^{-1})$ | 15 | a ۵.000 | au 0.073 | 0 060 | 0.063 | 0.010 | 0.014 | |
| | 43 | 0.080 | | 0.009 | 5.005 k' | V.VIV | | |
| | | a | aD | | U , | | | |
| | | 8 | b A A A A | DC D DT | | . 0.014 | 0.020 | |
| | 60 | 0.100 | 0.085 | 0.079 | 0.014 | 0.014 | 0.020 | |
| | | a' | a' <u>b'</u> | <u> </u> | <u>b'</u> | | | |

Table 3: Effects of different concentrations of SO, on biochemical parameters in the leaves of Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali.

Similar superscripts and underscripts in a parameter represent insignificant differene at 5% and 1% level respectively.

OBSERVATIONS

Plants exposed to 1334 μ g m⁻³ of SO₂ showed foliar lesions much earlier than those of plants fumigated to the other two concentrations. Plants exposed to 320, 667 and 1334 μ g m⁻³ SO₂ showed first visible injury symptoms at 37, 26 and 23 days of plant age, respectively, and the injury initially being confined to the mature leaves of treated plants. The injury after earlier exposures was in the form of pale yellowish/chlorotic patches mostly confined to the margins and tips of leaves. However, after prolonged exposures the injury was in the form of necrosis and the symptoms extended to interveinal areas also. At this stage younger leaves were also affected.

Shoot length, root length and hence the total plant length was adversely affected by SO_2 exposure. Such effects became more pronounced with the increase of SO_2 level and number of days of exposures. Initially i.e. after 15 days of exposures the reductions in shoot and root lengths, number of leaves plant ⁻¹ and leaf area could attain only at 5% level of significance. Further, with an increase in the plant age highly considerable reductions in these parameters were also observed i.e. at 1% level of significance (Table 1).

Assessment of growth, yield and biochemical components

2

Table 4: Phosphorus, Potassium, Sulphur, Carbohydrate, Nitrogen and Protein Contents in mature crop of Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali on exposure to a series of concentrations of Sulphur dioxide.

| Parameter | SO ₂ (μg m ⁻³) | | | | C.D. | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------|------------|-------|--------|--|
| | 0 | 320 | 667 | 1334 | 5% | 1% | |
| LEAVES | | | | | | | |
| | а | b | b | ь | | | |
| Phosphorus | 0.420 | 0.345 | 0.323 | 0.299 | 0.058 | 0.085 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | b' | b' | | | |
| | a | b | b | ъ | | | |
| Potassium | 0.750 | 0.600 | 0.571 | 0.528 | 0.089 | 0.129 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | р, | b' | ь' | | | |
| | a | b | bc | c | | | |
| Sulphur | 0.350 | 0.401 | 0.419 | 0.450 | 0.035 | 0.052 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | b' | b' | | | |
| | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Carbohydrate | 73.702 | 61.836 | 58.814 | 55.125 | 9.310 | 13.905 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | b' | b' | | | |
| FRUITS | | | | | | | |
| | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Phosphorus | 0.530 | 0.443 | 0.424 | 0.399 | 0.074 | 0.107 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | a | b | b | ь | | | |
| Potassium | 0.940 | 0.783 | 0.751 | 0.708 | 0.106 | 0.155 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | b' | р, | b' | | | |
| | a | b | bc | c | | | |
| Sulphur | 0.275 | 0.306 | 0.318 | 0.338 | 0.031 | 0.045 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | a | ab | b | b | | | |
| Carbohydrate | 58.201 | 51.974 | 49.932 | 47.273 | 7.028 | 10.416 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | a'b' | a'b' | b' | | | |
| | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Soluble Nitrogen | 0.547 | 0.425 | 0.393 | 0.350 | 0.077 | 0.112 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | b' | р, | b' | | | |
| • | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Protein Nitrogen | 2.848 | 2.249 | 2.078 | 1.915 | 0.393 | 0.580 | |
| (mg gdw ⁻¹) | ล่ | p, | b' | b ' | | | |
| | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Total Nitrogen | 3.395 | 2.674 | 2.471 | 2.267 | 0.481 | 0.716 | |
| | a' | р, | b' | b' | | | |
| | a | b | b | b | | | |
| Protein content | 17.802 | 14.063 | 12.994 | 11.975 | 2.432 | 3.634 | |
| P.N. x 6.25 (mg gdw ⁻¹) | a' | b' | р, | p, | | | |

Similar superscripts and underscripts in a paramenter represent insignificant difference at 5% and 1% level respectively.

Reductions in plant length, leaf area and leaf number/plant led to reduction in the fresh and dry weights of the plants and therefore, the net primary productivity was decreased (Fig. 1). After 15 days of exposures highly significant reductions i.e. at 1% level were observed only in the fresh and dry weights of root, while reductions in fresh and dry weights of shoot and whole plant remained significant only at 5% level. After 30 and 45 days of exposures all these attributes showed highly significant reductions (Table 2). Fumigations with sulphur dioxide also rendered reductions in chlorophyll contents. Reduction in chlorophyll a was found to be higher than noted in chlorophyll b. Amounts of chlorophyll a and total chlorophyll were reduced more appreciably at all the stages of plant growth, while chlorophyll b showed such reductions only at the crop maturity. Foliar pH and ascorbic acid contents were also adversely affected in plants exposed to all the three concentrations of SO₂ used. Leaf extract pH showed appreciable reductions at 30 and 45 days of plant

| | | | | | | <u></u> | _ |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|---------|---|
| Parameter | $SO_2 (\mu gm^{-3})$ | | | C.D | | | |
| | 0 | 320 | 667 | 1334 | 5% | 1% | |
| | a | b | Ь | b | | | |
| Number of | 12.63 | 9.52 | 8.90 | 8.10 | 2.09 | 3.05 | |
| fruits plant ⁻¹ | a' | р, | р, | b' | | | |
| • | а | Ь | Ъ | ь | | | |
| Length of fruit (cm) | 12.50 | 10.80 | 10.69 | 10.60 | 1.68 | | |
| Fresh weight | 3 | b | bc | с | | | |
| of fruits plant ⁻¹ | 115.565 | 76.757 | 70.004 | 62.058 | 9.129 | 13.283 | |
| (g) . | a | р, | b'c' | c' | | | |
| Dry weight | а | ь | bc | С | | | |
| of fruits plant ⁻¹ | 30.694 | 19.87 5 | 17.9 5 6 | 15.717 | 4.133 | 6.014 | |
| (g) . | a' | b' | р, | р, | | | |

Table 5: Yield response of Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali exposed to Sulphur dioxide.

Similar superscripts and underscripts in a parameter represent insignificant different at 5% and 1% level respectively.

Fig. 1: Effect of different concentrations of SO₂ at different days on N.P.P. (Net Primary Productivity) in Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali.

an appreciable increase in sulphur level of leaves and fruits was also observed. Ultimately, the pollutant incurred a great reduction in the economic

124



Different superscripts in respective days represent significant differences at 5% level of significance employing Critical Difference (C.D.).

```
Values in Control :

30 days : 0.180 g plant<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

45 days : 0.541 g plant<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

60 days : 0.544 g plant<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>
```

growth and more appreciable later on. Ascorbic acid content exhibited non-significant reduction at 30 days of plant growth but later on it got reduced significantly (Table 3). yield of okra (Table 4).

Yield of fruits : number of fruits plant⁻¹, length and their fresh and dry weights was decreased significantly by all the three concentrations of SO_2 applied (Table 5).

DISCUSSION

On the basis of present findings it may be inferred that Abelmoschus esculentus cv. Pusa Makhmali is highly susceptible to SO_2 pollution. The damage rendered in plants by the pollutant may be due to the accumulation of sulphur compounds in the mesophyll tissues of the leaves. These compounds may cause destruction of chloroplasts leading to the interveinal chlorosis, necrosis, and reduced leaf area (Wellburn et al., 1972; Farroq et al., 1988). Mature leaves were found to be more susceptible to the gas than the younger leaves as they have more functional stomata and larger intercellular spaces which facilitate rapid gas flow (Evans and Ting, 1974; Davies, 1980).

The decrease in leaf number, area and the photosynthetic activity of plants, produced an unfavourable effect on the overall growth and development of plants. Reduction in length, fresh and dry weights of shoot and root may be ascribed to the reduced photosynthetic activity and thereby lowering the translocation of photosynthetic products in shoot and root (Noyes, 1980; Saxe, 1983). Further, the reduced photosynthetic ability of chlorophyll molecules is associated with the formation

Analysis of K, P and carbohydrate contents in the treated plants revealed reductions even at higher level of sighificance. Nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, protein and carbohydrate levels in fruits of fumigated plants were decreased significantly at both (5 and 1%) levels of significance. On the contrary, Assessment of growth, yield and biochemical components

of toxic ions (H⁺, HSO₃¹⁻, SO₃²⁻ and SO₄²⁻) on the dissoultion of SO₂ in water and displacing Mg²⁺ ions from the chlorophyll molecule and converting it to a photosynthetically inactive brown pigment phaeophytin (Rao and Le Blanc, 1966; Malhotra and Hocking, 1976; Saxe, 1983). The chief cause for reduced photosynthetic activity is the competition between SO₂ and CO₂ for reaction site on RuBP-Carboxylase enzyme (Ziegler 1972; Mansfield and Jones, 1984).

Sulphurous and sulphuric acids formed by SO_2 and H_2O inside the leaf tissues seem to lower the foliar pH level (McClean *et al.*, 1968; Prasad and Rao, 1982). This alteration in the pH may influence the pH dependent enzymatic activities in plant cells which in turn would adversely affect the metabolic phenomena of the treated plants.

Mapson (1958) opined that lowering of ascorbic acid level in the SO₂ treated plants is owing to the sulphonation of S-H groups, while Hogler and Herman (1973) and Young and Loewus (1975) suggested that the formation of sulphite is accompanied with generation of free oxygen radicals which convert ascorbic acid into DHA or oxalic acid. Overtly, it appears that the presently studied cultivar Pusa Makhmali of ladies finger is highly susceptible to prolonged exposures with 320, 667 and 1334 μ g m⁻³ of SO₂.

REFERENCES

Agarwal M P K Nandi & D N Rao 1982 Effects of Ozone and Sulphur dioxide pollutant separately and in mixture on chlorophyll and carotenoid pigments of *Oryza sativa*. Water Air Soil pollut. **18** 449-459.

Allen R J L 1940 The estimation of phosphorus. Biochem J 34 858-865.

Arnon D I 1949 Copper enzyme in isolated chloroplasts, polyphenoloxidase in *Beta vulgaris*. *Plant physiol* 24 1-15.

Constantinidou H A & T T Kozlowski 1979 Effects of sulphur dioxide and ozone on *Ulmus americana* seedling. II carbohydrates, proteins and lipids. *Can J Bot* 57 176-184.

A gradual decline in total phosphorus and potassium contents of leaves and fruits was also noted in the experimental taxon. This lowering of potassium and phosphorus is found to be involved in increased susceptibility of the plants.

The reduction in nitrogen, protein and carbohydrate contents might be the result of decreased photosynthesis (Constantinidou and Kozlowski, 1979; Koziol and Jordon, 1978; and Saxe, 1983) or inhibition of protein synthesis or enhanced protein degradation (Rabe and Kreeb, 1979). The increase in the amount of sulphur in SO₂ exposed plants is due to its uptake through stomata, the metabolic utilization and ultimately its deposition into different tissues of the plants (Garsed and Read, 1977; Pandey, 1982).

Advanced flowering in treated plants as compared to untreated ones may be due to the fact that under stress conditions plants would have been in hurry to complete their life cycles. Sulphur dioxide adversely affects flowering and fertilization by reducing the reproductive physiology of plants which finally leads to significant reductions in the quality, quantity and dimensions of fruits (Manning and Wardaro, 1974; Oshima *et al.*, 1977; Varshney and Varshney, 1981). Davies T 1980 Grasses more sensitive to SO_2 pollution in conditions of low irradiance and short days. *Nature* 284 483-485.

Dennis L M 1913 Gas analysis. The MacMillan Co., New York pp 273-276.

Dubey P S 1992 Studies on plant responses to air pollution. Tropical Ecosystems; Ecology and Management. Editors K P Singh and J.S. Singh pp. 499-503 Wiley Eastern Limited New Delhi.

Evans L S & I P Ting 1974 Ozone Sensitivity of leaves: Relationship to leaf water content; gas transfer resistance and anatomical characteristics. *Am J Bot* 61 592-597.

Farooq M, R P Saxena & M U Beg 1988 Sulphur dioxide resistance of Indian trees. I Experimental evaluation of visible symptoms and SO₂ sorption. *Water Air Soil pollut* 40 307-316.

Garsed S G & D J Read 1977 Sulphur dioxide metabolism in soyabean *Glycine max* var Biloxi I. The effects of light and dark on the uptake and translocation of ³⁵SO₂. New phytol **78** 111-119.

Hogler L & R H Herman 1973 Oxalate metabolism. Am J Clin Nutr 26 758-765.

Jackson M L 1958 Soil Chemical Analysis. Asia Publishing House Bombay.

Jager H J & Klein 1977 Die Bedeutung stofwechselphysiologischer Reaktionen von pflanzen als kenngrossen fur SO₂ Immissionwirkungen, *Phytopath* **89** 128-134. Jager HJ & Klein 1980 Biochemical and physiological effects of SO₂ on plants, Angew Botanik 54 337-**348**.

Keller T & H Schwager 1977 Air pollution and ascorbic acid. Eur J path 7 338-350.

Koziol MJ&CF Jordon 1978 Changes in carbohydrate levels in red kidney bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) exposed to sulphur dioxide. J Exp Bot 29 1037-1043.

Koziol M J & F R Whatley 1984 Photosynthetic gas exchange in leaves affected by air pollutants. pp 147-169 In Gaseous Air pollutants and plant Metabolism London Butterworths.

Layne E 1957 Spectrophotometic and turbidimetric methods for measuring proteins. In Colowick S P Kaplan N O (eds.) Methods in Enzymology pp 447-454 New York Academic Press.

Patterson G D 1958 Sulphur. In Colorimetric Determination of Nonmetals pp 261-308 Interscience publishers Inc New York.

Pierre M & O Oueiroz 1981 Enzymic and metabolic changes in bean leaves during continuous pollution by subnecrotic levels of SO₂. Environ. Pollut 25 41-51.

Prasad BJ&DNRAO 1982 Relative Sensitivity of a leguminous and a cereal crop of SO₂. Environ. Pollut **21** 57-70.

Rabe R & K H Kreeb 1979 Enzyme activities and chlorophll and protein content in plants as indicators of air pollution. Environ Pollut Ser A 18 119-137.

Rao D N & F Leblanc 1966 Effect of sulphur dioxide on the lichen with special reference to chlorophyll, Bryologist 69 69-72.

Saxe H 1983 Long term effects of low levels of SO, on bean plants (Phaseouls vulgaris) II Imission response effect on biomass production quantity and quality, Plant Physiol 57 108-113.

Malhotra S S & S S Khan 1984 Biochemical and physiological impact of major pollutants. Air pollutant and plant life 113-157 John Wiley and Sons New York.

Manning WJ & PM Wardaro 1974 Effects on growth and development of tomato plants. Phytopathol 64 582.

Mansfield TA & T Jones 1984 Growth environment interactions in SO₂ responses of grasses. In SO₂ pollution and plant productivity, ed by W.E. Winner, H.A. Mooney and R. Goldskin. California Stanford University press.

Mapson L W 1958 Metabolism of ascorbic acid in plant. Ann Rev Plant Physiol 9 119-150.

McClean DC, DC Maccune, LH Einstein, RH Mandl & G N Woodruff 1968 Effects of acute hydrogen fluoride and nitrogen dioxide exposures on citrus and ornamental plants of Central Florida. Environ Sci Tech 2 444-449.

Noyes R D 1980 The comparative effects of sulphur dioxide on photosynthesis and translocation in bean. Physiol and Plant Path 16 73-79.

Oshima R J, O W Braegelmann, O W Baidwin, V Vanway & O C Taylor 1977 Reduction of tomato fruit size and yield by Ozone. Am Soc Hortic Sci 102 289-293.

Singh S K & D N Rao 1992 Plants as sink for sulphur dioxide. Tropical Ecosystem: Ecology and Management Ed K P Singh and J S Singh pp 469-479 Wiley Eastern Ltd New Delhi.

Varshney S R K & C K Varshney 1981 Effect of SO, on pollen germination and pollen tube growth. Environ Pollut 24 87-92.

Ward C & F B Johnston 1962 Chemical Methods of plant Analysis. Canada Department of Agriculture publication No. 1064 pp. 4-17.

Wellburn A R 1982 Effects of SO₂ and NO₂ on metabolic function. In MH Unsworth and DP Ormrod (eds.) 169-187 Effects of Gaseous Pollutants in Agriculture and Horticulture Butterworths London.

Wellburn A R, O Majernick & F A M Wellburn 1972 Effects of SO₂ and NO₂ polluted air upon the ultrastructure of chloroplasts. Environ Pollut 3 37-49.

Yemm EW & A J Willis 1954 The estimation of carbohydrate in plant extracts by anthrone? Biochem J **57** 508-514.

Young J C & F A Loewus 1975 Metabolic conversion of ascorbic acid to oxalic acid in oxalate accumulating plants. Plant Physiol 56 283-285. Ziegler I 1972 Effects of SO₂ on the activity of ribulose 1,5-diphosphate carboxylase in isolated spinach chloroplasts. Planta 103 115-163.

Pandey S N 1982 Ameliorating effects of urea spray on wheat (Triticum aestivum) plants exposed to SO₂. *Environ Pollut* 27 73-82.