

THE USE OF THERMOCOUPLES TO EVALUATE LOW TEMPERATURE  
STRESS TOLERANCE OF FLOWER BUDS OF REDCREST PEACH  
(PRUNUS PERSICA)

by

RIFAT FAROOQ H. CHAUDHRY

B. Sc., West Pakistan Agricultural University  
Lyallpur, Pakistan, 1963

---

4871

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree


MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Horticulture and Forestry

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

LD  
2668  
T4  
1990  
C472  
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	3
Nature of Cold Resistance in Plants . . . . .	3
General Considerations . . . . .	3
Intercellular Ice Formation . . . . .	4
Intracellular Ice Formation . . . . .	4
Winter Injury Problem in Peaches . . . . .	4
General Considerations . . . . .	4
Among Different Cultivars . . . . .	6
Within the Same Cultivars . . . . .	6
At Different Stages of Bud Development . . . . .	6
At Various Seasonal Conditions . . . . .	7
At Different Locations . . . . .	8
Methods of Evaluating Stress Tolerance of Plants . . . . .	8
Electrical Conductivity Test . . . . .	8
TTC (Triphenyl Tetrazolium Chloride) Test . . . . .	9
Visual Observations . . . . .	9
Use of Thermocouples to Measure Stress Tolerances . . . . .	10
MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	12
RESULTS . . . . .	19
Characteristics of Freeze Curves of Peach Flower Buds . . . . .	19
Variation of Freeze Curves . . . . .	19
Association of Freeze Curves with Freeze Injury . . . . .	22
DISCUSSION . . . . .	33

**THIS BOOK  
CONTAINS  
NUMEROUS PAGES  
WITH ILLEGIBLE  
PAGE NUMBERS  
THAT ARE CUT OFF  
OR MISSING.**

**THIS IS AS  
RECEIVED FROM  
THE CUSTOMER.**

**THIS BOOK  
CONTAINS  
NUMEROUS  
PICTURES THAT  
ARE ATTACHED  
TO DOCUMENTS  
CROOKED.**

**THIS IS AS  
RECEIVED FROM  
CUSTOMER.**



	Page
Characteristics of Freeze Curves of Peach	
Flower Buds . . . . .	33
Variation of Freeze Curves . . . . .	34
Association of Freeze Curves with Freeze Injury . . .	35
SUMMARY . . . . .	37
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	38
LITERATURE CITED . . . . .	39

## INTRODUCTION

Each winter trees of peach, Prunus Persica, are seriously affected by winter injury in Kansas and other parts of the United States. Peaches are susceptible to many types of low temperature injury. The damage to peach flower buds during the winter season has been an important problem in peach crop production. This problem has been given attention in all peach growing regions of Kansas as well as other states.

The peach crop of eastern United States suffered great losses during 1949, 1950, and 1955, due to freezes at blossoming time and after the crop had been set. The areas between Georgia and north Virginia were reported to be seriously affected (32).

During freezing, ice crystals are formed in plant tissues. When water turns to ice, 80 calories of heat per gram of water must be eliminated (4). This energy release causes an influx of heat and a corresponding rise in temperature. This can be measured with thermocouples and recorded with a potentiometer. When the temperature of plant tissues cools, the freezing of water can be plotted. Characteristic freezing curves are observed that indicate the point of ice crystallization. These freezing points are called "isotherms."

The use of thermocouples makes it possible to measure the influx of heat due to ice crystallization in plant tissue at the point where the thermocouple is inserted. If ice crystallization is associated with low temperature injury to plants, then theoretically the temperature at which killing occurs can be measured.

Some methods like the electrical conductivity test, triphenyl tetrazolium chloride test, and visual observation were commonly used by other research workers to determine cold temperature stress tolerance in fruit crops (2, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 26, 27, 28, 37, 38). Recently, McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (28) have used thermocouples to determine stress hardness of woody plant stems.

In this investigation the use of thermocouples to measure low temperature stress tolerance in Redcrest peach flower buds was investigated. The purpose of this study was to find out if chart isotherm can be associated with the killing point of Redcrest peach flower buds. No previous attempt has been made to apply this technique to fruit crops.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Nature of Cold Resistance in Plants

General Considerations. Levitt (24) reported that low temperatures injure plant cells by dehydration, impaired metabolism, mechanical injury, and destruction of protoplasm due to ice formation within cells. Injury also occurs when large crystals of ice form in intercellular spaces crushing tissues. Cracks in frozen plant tissues were cited as evidence of this.

Resistance to low temperature injury can be acquired by plants and is a variable factor both among species and plant populations and within the same plant (8, 24, 37). Hardened plants can withstand long exposures to freezing temperatures without injury (8). Resistance to low temperatures is acquired in plants, and the degree of tolerance varies from day to day and throughout the season. Temperature is an important factor influencing plant hardiness (37). It controls the equilibrium of chemical reactions that change the resistance of protoplasm to freezing. Abrupt changes in temperature do not allow plants to harden quickly enough to survive the changing conditions (24).

Moisture is another factor that influences plant hardiness (8, 28). Slightly desiccated tissues survived lower temperatures than fully turgid tissues (8). McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (28) determined that the control of water loss by the cell was an important factor of plant hardiness.

Photoperiod is an additional factor related to changes in plant hardiness (44).

Intercellular Ice Formation. Levitt (24) found that ice first forms in the intercellular spaces of plants rather than within the cells. Large masses of ice between cells were more harmful than small ice crystals.

During slow freezing, water moves out of the living portion of cells to the ice crystals in the intercellular spaces (8). Death resulted from a disorganization of the protoplasm since the water for maintenance of structure was depleted. Pure water moved out of the cells to the ice particles and the sap was concentrated. At the killing temperatures, salts may have become toxic to the protoplasm.

Hudson and Idle (21) and Bloch et al. (3) agreed that initial freezing was due to ice crystallization of the free intercellular fluids.

Intracellular Ice Formation. According to Chandler (8) ice forms in the protoplasm and in the vacuole of cells composing plant tissues that lack hardiness. When more than a very small amount of ice forms in the protoplasm, the cell dies. Levitt (24) stated that intracellular ice formation is almost always lethal to the cell.

### Winter Injury Problem in Peaches

General Considerations. Winter killing of peach fruit buds is a limiting factor to a profitable peach crop (9, 36, 41, 43). In Kansas low temperatures during winter cause fruit bud killing (36, 43). Winter injury to peach buds is considered a single limiting factor to peach production in Illinois (9). Savage and

Cowart (41) described winter injury in its various forms as one principal factor affecting peach tree longevity in Georgia.

Edgerton (14) reported that temperature characteristics influence the degree of peach bud hardiness. A rapid rate of temperature drop, a lower minimum temperature, an extended period of low temperature, and a rapid rate of temperature increase have been associated with greater flower bud mortality. Proebsting (36) observed that more peach flower bud damage occurs at low humidities than at high humidities.

The flower bud hardiness of a peach cultivar was the result of the interaction between hereditary factors of that cultivar and environmental conditions (36). Mowry (31) found that bud hardiness in peaches was a heritable character. The average bud hardiness of a cultivar during winter was a useful criterion for selecting parents that transmit bud hardiness.

During spring, as peach buds advance in development they become increasingly susceptible to low temperature. Late blooming cultivars were recommended by Blake and Steelman (2) for sites where late spring frosts occur. Oberle (32) developed peach and nectarine cultivars having more hardiness to frost during the blossom season.

Cullinan and Weinberger (10) found no relationship between rate of fertilizer application and degree of hardiness of peach flower buds. According to Edgerton (13), buds from trees that received heavy nitrogen and late cultivation were less winter hardy than buds from trees given moderate nitrogen. Savage and Cowart (41) found that fertilizer should be enough to give

normal growth to trees.

Among Different Cultivars. Campbell (5), Cullinan and Weinberger (10), and Knowlton and Dorsey (22) found that the degree of hardiness of peach flower buds, leaf buds, and wood varied from one cultivar to another. The seasonal variations in cold hardiness of peach flower buds also differed among cultivars (9, 37, 39). Chaplin (9) reported that the difference in hardiness among peach cultivars was not consistent. It varied throughout the year and from year to year as environmental factors varied.

Within the Same Cultivars. Seasonal variations in cold hardiness of peach flower buds occur not only among cultivars but also within the same cultivar (9, 13, 39). Mowry (36) found that different frequencies of temperature fluctuations caused difference in dormant peach bud hardiness of the same cultivar. One peach cultivar may be classified as hardy or tender to low temperatures under different situations.

Proebsting (36) and Edgerton (13) studied the variations in bud hardiness within one peach cultivar. The temperature at which injury occurred was highly variable. Prolonged low temperatures, 28 to 30°F or lower, increased hardiness. Duration of the low temperature was more important than intensity.

At Different Stages of Bud Development. Several research workers (10, 22, 30, 32, 38, 45) found that the hardiness of developing peach flower buds varies as the bud grows during the spring. Proebsting and Mills (39) reported that Elberta flower buds lost hardiness rapidly at the pink stage of bud development.

Mowry (30) reported that open flowers were less hardy than unopened buds. Weaver (45) agreed that retarded bud stages were more hardy during bloom. Further, the time of bloom was not associated with blossom hardiness. Oberle (32) found no correlation between the season of ripening of the fruit and hardiness of the flowers. Blake (1) observed that the flower buds on an individual shoot exhibited a wide range of developmental stages. This variability could be sufficient for some buds to escape damage from a particular low temperature period near bloom.

Proebsting (37) found that as bud development progressed, the temperature lethal to buds increased.

At Various Seasonal Conditions. Mowry (36) reported that peach varieties vary in hardiness during mild winters and severe winters.

Cullinan and Weinberger (10) found that as a peach tree enters the dormant season its buds become progressively more resistant to low temperatures. Chaplin (9) and Meader (26) found that the killing point of peach fruit buds fluctuates directly with the temperature changes during the winter months. Proebsting (37) found that the large differences in hardiness of Elberta peach fruit buds occur within one dormant season. Further, the seasonal hardiness of those buds differed from year to year.

The air temperatures during the dormant season affected hardiness of Elberta peach fruit buds at Yakima Valley, Washington (38), but this relationship was not close enough to be of any value.



At Different Locations. Mowry (36) reported that flower bud hardiness was influenced by temperature variability within and between climatic regions at different latitudes. Mowry (29) agreed that dormant flower buds of one peach cultivar differ in hardiness when grown in a northern latitude as compared to those grown in a southern latitude.

#### Methods of Evaluating Stress Tolerance of Plants

Electrical Conductivity Test. The electrical conductivity test has been used by several workers to evaluate low temperature stress tolerance of plants (7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 23, 46, 47, 48, 49). Filingner and Cardwell (17) studied the winter hardiness of red raspberry canes by reading the electrolytic resistance of plants or plant part. They found this technique to be a rapid method. The apparatus was portable and could be taken to the field to study plants after adverse weather. The plant was not destroyed when determinations were made. Campbell and Ghosheh (7) also used the electrical conductivity method to study hardiness of grapes.

Donoho and Walker (12) found that in Elberta peach the electrical conductance of twigs from cold-injured trees was greater than those from uninjured trees. Lapins (23) studied the cold hardiness of apple seedlings by using the same method. Significant differences were found in hardiness among various seedling progenies.

Emmert and Howlett (15) studied the electrolytic determinations of the resistance of 55 apple varieties to low

temperature. They found Garnet crab apple hardier than McIntosh apple in the fall.

TTC (Triphenyl Tetrazolium Chloride) Test. The TTC (triphenyl tetrazolium chloride) test can determine freeze damage to plant tissues (33, 34, 35, 40, 42).

Purcell and Young (40) used the TTC test to determine whether living and dead bark of citrus tree could be distinguished. About four square inches of bark was cut into three pieces. One piece was tested immediately, another was submerged in boiling water for 1 minute before exposure to  $-20^{\circ}\text{F}$  for 30 minutes and thawing. Results showed that inside surfaces of untreated (alive) plug developed a uniform red color during incubation. Frozen and boiled (dead) samples developed no color. If the red formazan derivative was produced by the TTC reduction, the tissue was considered to be viable.

Visual Observations. Several workers (2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 26, 37) found visual observations to be a simple and accurate method to measure low temperature stress injury.

Campbell and Lingle (6) visually examined the signs of winter injury in strawberry plants. Dead tissue oxidized quickly and became brown, distinguishing it from living tissue.

Campbell (5) studied the winter hardiness of more than 30 different peach cultivars by visual observations. The injury was rated as light, medium, and severe, depending on the degree of severity of winter injury to twigs, leaf buds, and sapwood. The discoloration of investigated sapwood of all trees ranged from dark walnut to various shades of brown color.

In artificial freezing tests of peach fruit buds Chaplin (9) determined the fruit bud injury by cutting the thawed buds transversely at midpoint with a razor blade. Cullinan and Weinberger (10) reported that the amount of injury and death to tissues could be detected easily by sectioning the bud through the floral axis noting the browning of the injured parts. Microscopic observations were frequently used to determine the degree of injury.

#### Use of Thermocouples to Measure Stress Tolerances

Lorenzen (25) considered thermocouples relatively accurate for temperature measurements in agricultural research. Esau (16) fully explained the construction and application of thermocouples for temperature recording of tree buds and fruits. He suggested that the completed thermocouples should be placed in a glass tube for protection against accidental damage.

McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (27) studied seasonal variations in freezing curves of stem sections of redosier dogwood, Cornus stolonifera, by the use of thermocouples. Different seasonal curves had different numbers of freezing points. In a similar experiment (28) the presence or absence of two freezing points in the second freezing cycle was used as a criterion for establishing viability.

Graham and Mullin (20) found three freezing points in the freeze curve of deciduous Azalea stems. The third freezing point, occurring at  $-37^{\circ}$  to  $42^{\circ}\text{C}$  in midwinter, was the killing point. They completely agreed upon the killing point shown by

the freezing curve (19). They further stated that the thermocouple technique saved time and material. They described it as a simple and accurate method. Esau (16) stated that the main advantage of using the thermocouple is its ability to measure actual temperature inside the tissue of a plant.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The plant materials collected for this study during the winter of 1969-70 were Redcrest peaches grown at the Horticulture Farm of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. The trees were four years old and in good vigor. Healthy branches were selected at random throughout the dormant season and until the swollen stage of bud development. The branches were cut and tied in a bundle, placed in a moist plastic bag to keep them fresh, and kept in the laboratory in a refrigerator until used. Before freezing the branches were cut into pieces 4 to 5 inches in length. Each twig had several flower buds on it.

The thermocouples were made in the laboratory, using a fine gauge copper and constantan wires. They were constructed with a long pointed tip as illustrated in Fig. 1.

For temperature recording a Honeywell Model Elektronik 16 multipoint strip chart recording potentiometer was used (Fig. 2). The chart range of temperature was  $-50^{\circ}\text{F}$  to  $+100^{\circ}\text{F}$ . A chart speed of 8 inches/hour was used.

To insert thermocouples a cut was made with a razor blade to remove the tip of the fruit bud, and the pointed end of the thermocouple was inserted in the bud (Fig. 3). The twig and thermocouple wire were secured tightly with electrician's tape. The electrician's tape held the thermocouple point in the bud tip and could be easily removed after freezing.

For most of the freezing tests six thermocouples were used,




Fig. 1. A thermocouple showing pointed end ready to be inserted in the bud.




Fig. 2. Multipoint strip chart recording potentiometer which records the freezing temperatures of buds by means of thermocouples.




Fig. 3. Thermocouple after inserting in the flower bud tip.



unless any thermocouple failed to perform by getting broken or by being misplaced.

In each thermos bottle there was one thermocouple. In initial experiments each thermos bottle contained four twigs bearing buds, including that twig in which the thermocouple was inserted in a fruit bud. In later experiments thermos bottles contained one twig since only one bud was studied to obtain more accurate results on freeze injury relative to recorded temperatures.

The place of junction of the thermocouple and bud tip was kept uncovered to determine whether the thermocouple remained in the bud throughout the freezing procedure (Fig. 3). A small hole was made in the lid of each thermos bottle stopper to allow the thermocouple wires to pass through as shown in Figs. 1 and 4.

The temperature in the thermos bottle was lowered at a rate between 9 and 27°F/hour, until experimented temperature had been reached. Following removal from the freezer, these thermos bottles were transferred to a refrigerator at 33°F for 12 hours for slow thawing of tissues. The tissues were removed from the thermos bottles and kept for 24 hours in a sealed chamber containing water for complete thawing under humid conditions at room temperature (28, 39).

Upon removal from the humid chamber, the buds were sectioned and examined for evidence of injury. Visual observations were made with the help of a 2" x 4" magnifying lens. The injury rating was done on the basis of brown color of apex




Fig. 4. Thermos bottle ready to put in freezer after having thermocouple and bud in it.

and pistil in dormant and swollen buds, respectively. All buds were classified as alive, 1; damaged, 2; or dead, 3. The data were presented either as percentages or as individual bud observation.

Each potentiometer chart was labeled according to the number and date of freeze test conducted. Also plant materials were kept in bundles and labeled according to thermocouple number and date of freeze test conducted.

The data taken from charts were: temperature at which each isotherm occurred in °F; height (rise in temperature) of each isotherm in °F; distance isotherms traveled in inches until reached at their original temperatures; maximum and minimum temperatures in °F recorded by each thermocouple on the chart; the whole chart distance traveled by each thermocouple in inches.

The returning time to reach at original temperature of each isotherm was calculated by the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Distance thermocouple traveled in inches} \times 60}{\text{Chart speed (8"/hr)}}$$

= Returning time in minutes

The rate of temperature drop for each thermocouple during freeze test was calculated as follows:

$$\frac{(\text{Max. temp. } ^\circ\text{F} - \text{min. temp. } ^\circ\text{F}) \times \text{chart speed (8"/hr)}}{\text{Distance thermocouple traveled in inches}}$$

= Rate of temperature drop in degree/hr.

## RESULTS

### Characteristics of Freeze Curves of Peach Flower Buds

In Fig. 5 the typical freeze curve of dormant Redcrest peach flower bud is represented (green). Isotherm I occurred at 20°F. The plateau of isotherm I is shown. Isotherm II occurred at 1°F. No additional characteristics of the curve are important.

Table 1 describes the important characteristics of freeze curves as measured by thermocouples inserted into dormant flower buds during controlled freezing tests. The average rate of temperature drop was 12.1°F per hour. Isotherm I occurred at about the same temperature, 16°F. The average height of isotherm I, which is the rise in temperature after influx of heat, was 3.9°F. The average returning time of isotherm I, which is the time taken to reach the original temperature where isotherm occurred, was 11.9 minutes and varied. Isotherm II occurred at -2.3°F and varied. The average height of isotherm II was 2.8°F. The returning time of isotherm II was 1.8 minutes and was constant.

### Variation of Freeze Curves

Average and range of temperatures in °F where isotherm I and isotherm II occurred in dormant flower buds are presented in Table 2. No temperature range indicates that either none of the six thermocouples went through the isotherms, only one of




Fig. 5. Thermocouple 5 showing: 1. Isotherm I occurring at  $20^{\circ}\text{F}$ ; 2. The plateau of isotherm I; 3. The isotherm II occurring at  $1^{\circ}\text{F}$ .

Table 1. Important characteristics of typical freeze curves of dormant Redcrest peach flower buds when temperature was measured intermittently by thermocouples inserted into flower buds during controlled freezing tests.

Date freeze test conducted	Thermo-couple number	Rate of temperature drop (°F/hr)	Isotherm I			Isotherm II		
			Temperature occur (°F)	Height of isotherm (°F)	Returning time (Min.)	Temperature occur (°F)	Height of isotherm (°F)	Returning time (Min.)
Feb. 18	1	12.9	17.0	3.5	8.4	- 1.6	4.6	1.9
	2	13.6	17.5	4.5	8.4	- 7.3	2.3	1.9
	3	11.3	17.0	3.5	15.0	9.4	3.6	1.9
	4	11.4	16.5	4.5	15.0	- 0.5	1.0	1.9
	5	12.3	16.0	4.0	8.4	- 3.0	2.5	1.9
	6	11.2	12.5	3.5	16.2	-11.0	3.0	1.2
Average		12.1	16.1	3.9	11.9	- 2.3	2.8	1.8

them did, or all went through the isotherm at the same temperature.

The average temperature of isotherm I ranged from 15.6°F on February 10, to 23.5°F on February 21 (Table 2). The average temperature for isotherm II varied from -2.8°F on February 7, to 20.5°F on March 3. Also the range of temperature of isotherm II was greater than isotherm I.

The characteristics of freeze curves of swollen fruit buds are presented in Table 3. The average and range of temperatures where isotherm occurred were similar to those of dormant buds. Isotherm II did not occur in all but a limited number of swollen buds.

#### Association of Freeze Curves with Freeze Injury

Table 4 indicates the relative amount of low temperature injury that can be associated with important parts of the freeze curve. The table shows the minimum temperature that the buds were exposed to in each experiment and the temperature at which each isotherm occurred. Data showing that buds can survive isotherm I without injury were obtained on February 4, 7, 16(B), and 18(B). Almost all buds were found dead. Thermocouple data indicated that isotherm II had occurred.

Table 5 shows a similar type of results obtained from examination of only those buds monitored with thermocouples. Evidence showing that buds can survive isotherm I was obtained on February 20, 23, 24, 27, and March 2. No buds were alive after isotherm II. Some buds were damaged before isotherm II.

Table 2. Average and range of temperatures associated with commencement of isotherm I and II when freeze curve was measured by thermocouples inserted into dormant flower buds of Redcrest peach.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Isotherm I		Isotherm II	
	Average temperatures	Range temperatures	Average temperatures	Range temperatures
	(°F)	Min. °F - Max. °F	(°F)	Min. °F - Max. °F
Feb. 4	19.3	16.6 - 22.0	6.4	1.4 - 14.0
Feb. 5	18.6	16.4 - 20.0	3.5	2.7 - 7.5
Feb. 6	18.1	17.7 - 20.0	0.8	4.8 - 6.5
Feb. 7	16.9	15.0 - 18.2	- 2.8	- 0.7 - 4.2
Feb. 10	15.6	12.0 - 17.5	6.5	3.0 - 9.0
Feb. 16	17.8	15.0 - 19.5	10.2	7.4 - 17.0
Feb. 16	17.6	16.2 - 19.5	12.5	---
Feb. 18	16.0	16.0 - 17.5	- 2.3	-11.0 - 9.4
Feb. 18	16.7	14.5 - 21.0	---	---
Feb. 19	19.4	16.2 - 21.5	0.0	2.0 - 2.0
Feb. 19	19.0	17.0 - 22.5	3.8	- 2.5 - 9.0
Feb. 20	20.8	18.0 - 23.5	0.5	---
Feb. 21	23.5	19.0 - 27.5	10.1	- 2.6 - 16.5
Feb. 22	22.1	19.0 - 28.0	13.0	---
Feb. 23	21.1	19.0 - 24.5	7.3	1.0 - 13.0
Feb. 24	22.9	18.0 - 25.0	17.5	---
Feb. 27	20.9	19.0 - 25.5	4.5	- 2.4 - 15.0
March 1	21.0	20.0 - 23.0	14.5	1.5 - 23.4
March 2	21.5	20.0 - 23.0	7.8	0.5 - 16.0
March 3	20.9	20.0 - 24.0	20.5	---
March 4	21.5	21.0 - 22.5	11.0	5.0 - 17.0



Table 3. Average and range of temperatures associated with commencement of Isotherm I and II when freeze curve was measured by thermocouples inserted into swollen fruit buds of Redcrest peach.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Isotherm I		Isotherm II	
	Average tempera- tures	Range temperatures	Average tempera- tures	Range temperatures
	(°F)	Min. °F - Max. °F	(°F)	Min. °F - Max. °F
March 12	19.0	-----	-----	-----
March 13	21.7	19.5 - 24.5	-----	-----
March 19	23.6	20.0 - 25.5	-----	-----
March 29	16.7	14.0 - 20.0	6.5	-----
April 1	17.3	16.5 - 18.5	- 7.0	-----

Table 4. Percentages of injury to dormant Redcrest peach flower buds relative to important parts of freeze curves.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature exposure (Degrees F)	Temperature of isotherm I (Degrees F)	Temperature of isotherm II (Degrees F)	Injury rating		
					Alive	Damaged	Dead
					%	%	%
February 4	1	- 0.4	22.0	---	25	--	75
	2	- 4.5	18.5	1.4	--	--	100
	3	- 6.1	20.0	---	25	--	75
	4	- 9.5	19.6	5.0	--	25	75
	5	-17.0	16.7	5.2	--	--	100
February 5	1	0.4	19.3	2.7	50	--	50
	2	- 4.9	16.4	7.5	--	--	100
	3	- 8.2	20.0	0.5	--	--	100
February 7	1	1.3	17.4	---	75	--	25
	2	- 4.0	17.0	-0.7	--	--	100
	3	- 6.9	15.0	-4.2	--	--	100
	4	-10.5	16.9	-3.5	--	--	100
	5	-14.0	18.2	---	--	--	100
February 16 A*	1	- 2.5	18.9	9.5	50	--	50
	2	- 6.0	18.5	7.5	--	--	100
	3	- 6.0	19.5	17.0	--	--	100
	4	- 6.8	17.2	---	67	--	33
	5	-10.5	15.0	7.4	--	--	100
	6	-15.5	18.0	10.0	--	--	100
February 16 B*	1	14.0	16.2	---	--	--	100
	2	12.0	17.0	---	25	--	75
	3	11.0	19.5	12.5	50	--	50
	4	9.9	17.2	---	25	--	75
	5	8.6	18.4	---	--	--	100

Table 4 (concl.).

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature exposure (Degrees F)	Temperature of isotherm I (Degrees F)	Temperature of isotherm II (Degrees F)	Injury rating		
					Alive	Damaged	Dead
					%	%	%
February 18 B*	1	20.9	---	---	100	--	--
	2	10.9	21.0	---	100	--	--
	3	6.0	17.0	---	75	--	25
	4	5.1	15.0	---	50	--	50
	5	2.0	16.0	---	50	--	50
	6	- 4.4	14.5	---	100	--	--
February 19 B*	1	- 6.5	17.0	-2.5	---	--	100
	2	- 3.0	18.5	---	---	--	100
	3	-13.0	17.0	0.0	---	--	100
	4	-15.2	22.5	9.0	---	--	100
	5	-20.0	20.0	5.0	---	--	100

\* A - Experiment conducted in morning; B - experiment conducted in evening.

Table 5. Relationship of isotherms I and II to low temperature injury of Redcrest peach dormant flower buds when only buds containing thermocouple were examined.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm I temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm II temperature (Degrees F)	Injury rating* (Individual bud)
February 20	1	4.6	20.4	---	3
	2	0.0	23.5	---	1
	3	- 2.3	20.0	0.5	3
	4	- 6.0	22.5	---	3
	5	-14.0	18.0	---	3
February 21	1	- 3.1	27.5	- 2.6	3
	2	- 3.4	24.0	16.5	3
	3	- 5.8	27.0	---	3
	4	- 7.8	19.0	---	3
	5	-19.5	----	---	3
February 22	1	6.3	20.0	13.0	3
	2	5.2	20.0	---	1
	3	4.0	28.0	---	1
	4	- 2.0	19.0	0.0	3
	5	- 2.7	20.0	---	1
	6	- 5.0	26.0	---	3
February 23	1	7.0	21.5	---	3
	2	4.7	24.5	8.0	3
	3	3.5	20.5	---	3
	4	3.4	20.5	---	1
	5	- 1.0	19.0	1.0	3
	6	- 8.0	21.0	13.0	3

Table 5 (cont.).

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm I temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm II temperature (Degrees F)	Injury rating*
February 24	1	12.7	23.0	---	1
	2	- 0.2	21.5	---	3
	3	- 1.5	25.0	17.5	3
	4	- 3.0	24.5	17.5	3
	5	- 4.2	25.5	---	3
	6	- 6.2	18.0	---	3
February 27	1	17.5	19.0	---	1
	2	10.5	18.5	15.0	3
	3	- 0.5	20.5	1.0	3
	4	- 3.5	25.5	- 2.4	3
March 1	1	1.0	22.5	---	3
	2	- 1.7	20.0	17.5	3
	3	- 1.8	20.0	23.4	3
	4	- 3.9	21.0	---	3
	5	- 8.0	20.0	1.5	3
	6	-10.7	23.0	15.6	3
March 2	1	10.1	21.5	16.0	3
	2	5.9	20.0	7.0	3
	3	3.2	23.0	---	1
	4	0.0	20.0	0.5	3
	5	0.0	23.0	---	3

Table 5 (concl.).

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm I temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm II temperature (Degrees F)	Injury rating*
March 3	1	20.6	21.5	---	3
	2	15.0	20.0	---	3
	3	5.5	20.0	---	3
	4	- 0.5	20.0	---	3
March 4	1	17.0	22.5	17.0	3
	2	10.7	25.5	---	3
	3	5.9	21.5	5.0	3
	4	5.2	21.0	---	3
	5	3.5	21.0	---	3

\* Injury rating:

1. Alive
2. Damaged but not entirely dead
3. Dead

Also isotherm II was not detected in many buds even though temperatures decreased far enough to expect a second isotherm.

Table 6 shows the percentages of swollen fruit buds injured by artificial freezing as related to isotherms I and II. A large portion of buds on stems removed from the freeze chamber immediately after isotherm I survived. Where isotherm II occurred, fruit buds were dead, but isotherm II was absent from most freeze curves.

Table 7 shows the relationship between freeze curves and swollen fruit bud injury when only monitored buds were examined. Peach swollen fruit buds were capable of surviving isotherm I. Isotherm II could not be detected.

Table 6. Percentages of injury to Redcrest peach swollen fruit buds relative to important parts of freeze curves.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm I temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm II temperature (Degrees F)	Injury rating		
					Alive	Damaged	Dead
					%	%	%
March 19	1	31.5	--	--	75	--	25
	2	25.0	25.0	--	75	--	25
	3	18.0	24.0	--	75	--	25
	4	4.9	25.5	--	--	--	100
	5	1.2	20.0	--	--	--	100
March 29	1	14.5	14.5	--	100	--	--
	2	12.5	20.0	--	--	--	100
	3	9.0	14.0	--	--	--	100
	4	6.5	16.0	6.5	--	--	100
	5	1.0	19.0	--	--	--	100



Table 7. Relationship of isotherms I and II to low temperature injury of Redcrest peach swollen fruit buds when only buds containing thermocouple were examined.

Date freeze test conducted 1970	Thermo- couple number	Minimum temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm I temperature (Degrees F)	Isotherm II temperature (Degrees F)	Injury rating*
March 12	1	-19.5	19.0	--	3
	2	-21.0	19.0	--	3
	3	-21.5	19.0	--	3
	4	-21.8	19.0	--	3
	5	-23.4	19.0	--	3
March 13	1	23.5	23.5	--	1
	2	21.0	21.0	--	1
	3	19.4	20.0	--	1
	4	17.0	24.5	--	1

\* Injury rating:

1. Alive
2. Damaged but not entirely dead
3. Dead

## DISCUSSION

### Characteristics of Freeze Curves of Peach Flower Buds

The use of thermocouples made it possible to establish a characteristic freeze curve of peach flower buds. These characteristics have value for understanding the freezing process of peach flower buds as well as identifying killing points of the buds.

When ice crystals are formed, 80 calories of heat are eliminated (4). This influx of heat was measured by thermocouples and presented a freeze curve. This characteristic freeze curve of peach flower bud showed two freezing points--isotherm I and isotherm II, as shown in Fig. 5. Isotherm I is believed to be the result of intercellular ice formation in peach flower bud tissues; similarly, isotherm II, of intracellular ice formation. It already had been found by McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (27) in stem sections of redosier dogwood, Cornus stolonifera.

The height and returning time of isotherms may be of some importance. According to the data presented in Table 1, the average height of isotherm I was greater than isotherm II. The height of the isotherm may represent the amount of water crystallized during a freeze test. Therefore, a greater amount of water crystallized during intercellular ice formation than intracellular, as indicated by the heights of isotherm I and isotherm II in Table 1. In future studies the height of the

isotherm could be related to moisture content of the tissues and be helpful in studying winter hardiness of fruit crops.

Several times buds were exposed to very low temperatures to find out if any third isotherm occurred (Tables 4, 7). No evidence of such kind was found. Thus only two isotherms occurred in peach flower buds. These results agree with McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (28).

### Variation of Freeze Curves

In dormant flower buds isotherm I occurred almost at the same temperature, as shown in Table 2. Isotherm II occurred at various temperatures. The average temperature of isotherm II also indicated that isotherm II was rising as the dormant season progressed. This could lead to the idea that with the approach of spring, hardiness may be decreasing in Redcrest peach dormant flower buds. Proebsting (37) also found similar results in Elberta peach fruit buds.

In most of the freezing tests for swollen fruit buds, the isotherm II was found missing (Table 3). Most probably this could be due to some physiological changes inside the bud. A high moisture content in samples, the placement of the thermocouple, and the cooling rates for freeze tests were some of the reasons described by McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (28) which generally prevent the occurrence of a second freezing point. They suggested fast cooling rates for detecting a second freezing point in samples with high moisture level. But no definite reason could be produced for the absence of a second

isotherm in swollen fruit buds of peach at the present stage of this investigation.

#### Association of Freeze Curves with Freeze Injury

The freezing test conducted on February 18(B) has shown that isotherm I and its plateau have no association with any type of injury to fruit bud (Table 4). McLeester, Weiser, and Hall (27) considered the plateau of the first isotherm as another freezing point while studying winter hardiness of woody plants.

According to data collected about the dormant flower bud injury, all the buds which had undergone isotherm II were observed dead. Some evidence of dead buds was found even before isotherm II. This could be due to field injury or mechanical injury at the time of inserting the thermocouple into the bud. Occasionally buds were examined immediately after they were brought from the field and some were found dead, showing the field injury. The above discussion encourages one to believe that there may be a direct relationship between isotherm II and the killing point of dormant peach flower buds.

The killing point of dormant flower buds varied during the winter season (Tables 4, 5). Some other research workers also found similar results (9, 13, 26, 39).

The use of the thermocouple technique seems to be very accurate and useful to evaluate the low temperature stress tolerance of peach flower buds. The main advantage of this

technique is the thermocouple's capability to measure the actual temperature inside the bud tissue.

Generally it is difficult to find the exact temperature where the killing point occurs in peach flower buds. Therefore, use of the thermocouple technique may prove useful to solve this problem in the future.

## SUMMARY

A characteristic freeze curve is established by the use of thermocouples in Redcrest peach flower buds. This characteristic freeze curve has two freezing points--isotherm I and isotherm II.

Isotherm II appears as a killing point in dormant flower buds of Redcrest peach. The killing point of dormant flower buds varies even under the same variety and condition. As the dormant season progressed the hardiness of peach flower buds seemed to be decreasing. Isotherm II was missing in most swollen Redcrest peach flower buds.

The height of the isotherm may be of some importance in future studies of winter hardiness of plants.

The use of thermocouples seems to be a useful technique to determine the low temperature stress tolerance in peach flower buds. The main advantage of the thermocouple use is its capability to measure the actual temperature inside the bud tissue.

In future studies the use of the thermocouple technique may prove useful to solve the problem of finding the exact temperature of the killing point in peach flower buds.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his very sincere appreciation and thanks to Dr. Neil W. Miles, Major Professor, for his interest, encouragement, and excellent guidance in research techniques and thesis preparation; also to the committee members--Dr. Ronald W. Campbell, Chairman, Department of Horticulture and Forestry, KSU, and Dr. Jerry S. Weis of the biology division, KSU--whose cooperation, wise criticism, and valuable suggestions on this research work are acknowledged with gratitude.

Thanks are due to his friends, Mr. Mohammad Aslam, for rendering help in preparation of the photographic aspect of this thesis, and Rana. Mohammad Sarfraz Khan for his moral support.

Special appreciation is expressed to his brother, Dr. Iftikhar Hussain Chaudhry, for his encouragement and concern.

The writer also wishes to extend his thanks to others who have helped in this study but are not mentioned by name.

## LITERATURE CITED

1. Blake, M. A. 1943.  
Classification of fruit bud development on peaches and nectarines and its significance in cultural practice.  
N. J. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 706:1-24.
2. Blake, M. A., and P. H. Steelman, Jr. 1944.  
Preliminary investigations of the cold resistance of peach fruit buds at the pink bud stages of development.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 45:37-41.
3. Bloch, R., D. H. Walters, and W. Kuhn. 1963.  
Structurally caused freezing point depression of biological tissues.  
J. Gen. Physiol. 46:605-615.
4. Bueche, F. 1965.  
Principles of physics.  
McGraw-Hill Book Co., p. 218.
5. Campbell, R. W. 1948.  
More than thirty peach varieties survived minus thirty-two degrees Fahrenheit.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 52:117-120.
6. Campbell, R. W., and John C. Lingle. 1954.  
Some effects of low temperatures on the flower primordia of the strawberry.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 64:259-262.
7. Campbell, R. W., and Ghosheh. 1957.  
Hardiness studies of selected grape varieties.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 70:161-164.
8. Chandler, W. H. 1954.  
Cold resistance in horticultural plants. A review.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 64:552-572.
9. Chaplin, C. E. 1948.  
Artificial freezing tests of peach fruit buds.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 52:121-129.
10. Cullinan, F. P., and J. H. Weinberger. 1934.  
Studies on the resistance of peach buds to injury at low temperatures.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 32:244-251.
11. Dester, S. T., W. E. Tottingham, and L. F. Graber. 1932.  
Investigations of hardiness of plants by measurement of electrical conductivity.  
Plant Physiol. 7:63-78.



12. Donoho, C. W., Jr., and David R. Walker. 1960.  
The effect of controlled temperature treatments on  
hardiness of Elberta peach trees.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 75:148-154.
13. Edgerton, L. J. 1950.  
Cold hardiness of peach fruit buds.  
Farm Research Vol. XVI, No. 1:1. Jan.
14. Edgerton, L. J. 1960.  
Studies on cold hardiness of peach trees.  
N.Y. (Cornell) Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 958:1-30.
15. Emmert, F. H., and E. S. Howlett. 1953.  
Electrolytic determinations of the resistance of  
fifty-five apple varieties to low temperature.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 62:311-318.
16. Esau, Paul. 1956.  
Construction and application of thermocouples for con-  
tinuous temperature recording of tree buds and fruits.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 68:15-19.
17. Filinger, G. A., and A. B. Cardwell. 1941.  
A rapid method for determining when a plant is killed  
by extremes of temperatures.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 39:85-86.
18. Filinger, G. A., and D. C. Zeiger. 1951.  
Hardiness studies of some French crab rootstock  
selections.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 57:145-149.
19. Graham, Phil, and Robert Mullin. 1969.  
Three methods for determining flower bud hardiness of  
deciduous Azalea.  
Hort. Sci. 4(No.2):154.
20. Graham, Phil, and Robert Mullin. 1969.  
The determination of lethal freezing temperature of  
deciduous Azalea florets and stems by a freezing  
curve method.  
Hort. Sci. 4(No.2):153.
21. Hudson, M. A., and D. B. Idle. 1962.  
The formation of ice in plant tissues.  
Planta. 57:718-730.
22. Knowlton, H. E., and M. J. Dorsey. 1927.  
A study of the hardiness of the fruit buds of the  
peach.  
W. Va. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 211.

23. Lapins, K. 1962.  
Artificial freezing as a routine test of cold hardiness of young apple seedlings.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 81:26-34.
24. Levitt, J. 1956.  
Wintering of plants.  
American Inst. of Biol. Sci. Washington 6, D.C.
25. Lorenzen, Coby, Jr. 1949.  
The thermocouple in agricultural research.  
Agr. Eng. 30:275-279.
26. Meader, E. M., and M. A. Blake. 1943.  
Seasonal trend of fruit bud hardiness in peaches.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 43:91-98.
27. McLeester, R. C., C. J. Weiser, and T. C. Hall. 1968.  
Seasonal variations in stem sections of cornus stolonifera (Mich x.)  
Plant and Cell Physiol. 9:807-817.
28. McLeester, R. C., C. J. Weiser, and T. C. Hall. 1969.  
Multiple freezing points as a test for viability of plant stems in the determination of frost hardiness.  
Plant Physiol. 44(1):37-44.
29. Mowry, J. B. 1960.  
Factors in productivity of peach varieties.  
Illinois State Hort. Soc. Trans. 94:110-119.
30. Mowry, J. B. 1964.  
Seasonal variation in cold hardiness of flower buds on 91 peach varieties.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 85:118-127.
31. Mowry, J. B. 1964.  
Inheritance of cold hardiness of dormant peach flower buds.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 85:128-133.
32. Oberle, G. D. 1957.  
Breeding peaches and nectarines resistant to spring frosts.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 70:85-92.
33. Parker, J. 1951.  
Moisture retention in leaves of conifers of Northern Rocky Mountains.  
Bot. Gaz. 113:210-216.

34. Parker, J. 1953.  
Some applications and limitations of tetrazolium chloride.  
Science 118:77-79.
35. Parker, J. 1963.  
Cold resistance in woody plants.  
Bot. Rev. 29:123-201.
36. Peach Tree Life Seminar Proceedings. 1967.  
Kansas State University, Manhattan.
37. Proebsting, E. L., Jr. 1959.  
Cold hardiness of Elberta peach fruit buds during four winters.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 74:144-153.
38. Proebsting, E. L., Jr. 1963.  
The role of air temperatures and bud development in determining hardiness of dormant Elberta peach fruit buds.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 83:259-269.
39. Proebsting, E. L., Jr., and H. H. Mills. 1961.  
Loss of hardiness by peach fruit buds as related to their morphological development during the pre-bloom and bloom period.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 78:104-110.
40. Purcell, A. E., and R. H. Young. 1963.  
The use of tetrazolium in assessing freeze damage in citrus trees.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 83:352-358.
41. Savage, E. F., and E. F. Cowart. 1943.  
Factors affecting peach tree longevity in Georgia.  
Ga. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. No. 219.
42. Steponkus, P. L., and P. O. Lanphear. 1967.  
Refinement of the triphenyl tetrazolium chloride method of determining cold injury.  
Plant Physiol. 42:1423-1426.
43. The Peach. 1899.  
Issued by Kansas State Hort. Soc.
44. Van Huystee, R. B., C. J. Weiser, and P. H. Li. 1967.  
Cold acclimation in Cornus stolonifera under natural and controlled photo period and temperature.  
Bot. Gaz. 128:200-205.

45. Weaver, G. M. 1966.  
Response of peach varieties to blossom frost.  
Fruit Var. and Hort. Dig. 20(4):66-68.
46. Wilner, J. 1955.  
Results of laboratory tests for winter hardiness of  
woody plants by electrolytic methods.  
Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 66:93-99.
47. Wilner, J. 1960.  
Relative and absolute electrolytic conductance tests  
for frost hardiness of apple varieties.  
Can. J. Pl. Sci. 40:630-637.
48. Wilner, J., and W. A. Russell. 1955.  
Results of electrolytic test of winter hardiness of  
apple varieties grown on uniform Malus Robusta No. 5  
clonal root stock.  
Proc. West. Can. Soc. Hort. Vol. II.
49. Wilner, J., et al. 1960.  
Note on two electrolytic methods for determining  
frost hardiness of fruit trees.  
Can. J. Pl. Sci. 40:563-565.

THE USE OF THERMOCOUPLES TO EVALUATE LOW TEMPERATURE  
STRESS TOLERANCE OF FLOWER BUDS OF REDCREST PEACH  
(PRUNUS PERSICA)

by

RIFAT FAROOQ H. CHAUDHRY

B. Sc., West Pakistan Agricultural University  
Lyallpur, Pakistan, 1963

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Horticulture and Forestry

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Each winter trees of peach, Prunus Persica, are seriously affected by winter injury in Kansas and other parts of the United States. Peaches are susceptible to low temperature injury. The damage to peach flower buds during the winter season has been important to peach crop production. This problem has been given attention in all peach growing regions of Kansas as well as other states.

Some methods like the electrical conductivity test, triphenyl tetrazolium chloride test, and visual observation are commonly used to determine cold temperature stress tolerance in fruit crops.

In the present investigation the use of the "thermocouple technique" to evaluate low temperature stress tolerance in Redcrest peach flower buds was investigated. The purpose of this study was to find out if chart isotherm can be associated with the killing point of Redcrest peach flower buds. No previous attempt has been made to apply this technique in fruit crops.

During freezing, ice crystals are formed in plant tissues. When water turns to ice, 80 calories of heat per gram of water are eliminated. This energy release causes an influx of heat and a corresponding rise in temperature. This can be measured with thermocouples and recorded with a potentiometer. When the temperature of plant tissues cools, the freezing of water can be plotted.

A characteristic freeze curve is established by the use of thermocouples in Redcrest peach flower buds. This

characteristic freeze curve has two freezing points--isotherm I and isotherm II.

Isotherm II appears as a killing point in dormant flower buds of Redcrest peach. The killing point of dormant flower buds varies even under the same variety and conditions. As the dormant season progressed the hardiness of peach flower buds seemed to be decreasing.

The height of isotherms may be meaningful in studying winter hardiness of plants.

The use of thermocouples seems to be a useful technique to evaluate the low temperature stress tolerance in peach flower buds. The main advantage of the thermocouple use is its capability to measure the actual temperature inside the bud tissue.

In future studies the use of the thermocouple technique may prove useful to solve the problem of finding the exact temperature of the killing point in peach flower buds.