

# Studies on self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) germplasm

## ABSTRACT

The investigation entitled “Studies on self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) germplasm” was carried out during the period 2022-2023 at Mango Research Station, Nuzvid, Eluru District, Andhra Pradesh. In the present study among the genotypes evaluated, six genotypes *viz.*, F-4 (47.22%), G-19 (39.38%), D-13 (30.98%), C-24 (25.35%), E-2 (25.13%) and H-16 (22.43%) recorded higher fruit set percentage than best check Chinnarasam (16.56%). Whereas the lower fruit set percentage was recorded in H-32 (2.23%).

**Keywords:** *Mangifera indica*, self-incompatibility, fruit set percentage, genotypes.

## INTRODUCTION

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) is the most nutritive and delicious fruit crop belonging to the Anacardiaceae family and originated in Indo-Burma region. Due to its popularity and importance, mango is often named ‘King of fruits’ for its luscious flavour and taste. It is recognized as the pride fruit of India, being the richest source of vitamin A (4800 I.U.), vitamin C, minerals and other nutrients (Bhamini *et al.*, 2018). In India, mango is cultivated in an area of 2325 thousand hectares with production of 208.99 lakh tonnes and 9.0 MT/ha productivity. The major mango-growing states in India encompass Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Bihar, West Bengal and Gujarat *etc.* Notably, in Andhra Pradesh it is cultivated in an area of 378.94 thousand ha, yielding a production of 4926.22 MT and productivity of 13 MT/ha (NHB Data base, 2020-21). Low productivity of some mango cultivars is associated with low fruit set and high fruit drop of immature fruits. Self incompatibility is reported as the serious factor affecting low fruit set in many mango cultivars (Gehrke-Velez *et al.*, 2012). Self incompatibility was reported in several commercial Indian mangos such as Bombay Green, Chausa, Dasherri and Langra (Singh *et al.*, 1962 and Sharma and Singh, 1972).

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted to “study the self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) germplasm”. The experiment was laid out in a Randomised Block Design consisting of 36

genotypes and 4 checks *viz.*, Banaganapalle, Chinnarasam, Jalal and Suvarnarekha with 3 replications.

### **Bagging methodology**

When the panicle reaches maturity *i.e.* 10% of the flowers are opened, the opened flowers are removed and the panicle is covered with a muscline cloth bag. After 15 days of bagging the per cent fruit set was recorded.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **1. Per cent fruit set (15 days after bagging)**

Significant variation was observed with respect to fruit set percentage at 15 days after bagging among the genotypes studied (Table 1). The fruit set percentage ranged from 2.23% to 47.22%, with a mean value of 12.93% and sixteen genotypes were found to possess higher fruit set percentage over the mean. Among the genotypes evaluated, six genotypes *viz.*, F-4 (47.22%), G-19 (39.38%), D-13 (30.98%), C-24 (25.35%), E-2 (25.13%) and H-16 (22.43%) recorded higher fruit set percentage than best check Chinnarasam (16.56%). Whereas the lower fruit set percentage was recorded in H-32 (2.23%). Similar findings were reported by Nady and Sanaa (2015) who stated that fruit set (25%) was maximum when mango cv. Sedik was self pollinated.

## **CONCLUSION**

In the present findings among the genotypes evaluated, six genotypes *viz.*, F-4 (47.22%), G-19 (39.38%), D-13 (30.98%), C-24 (25.35%), E-2 (25.13%) and H-16 (22.43%) recorded a significantly higher fruit set percentage than best check Chinnarasam (16.56%).

**Table 1.** Fruit set percentage at 15 days after bagging in mango genotypes.

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Accessions</b>	<b>Fruit set percentage at 15 days after bagging</b>
1.	B-6	11.24
2.	B-9	2.62
3.	B-10	4.28
4.	B-17	18.35
5.	B-20	6.60
6.	C-1	15.07
7.	C-6	18.63
8.	C-13	4.35
9.	C-24	25.35

10.	D-7	3.90
11.	D-12	12.70
12.	D-13	30.98
13.	E-2	25.13
14.	E-3	5.09
15.	E-6	21.64
16.	E-8	13.84
17.	E-11	10.38
18.	F-4	47.22
19.	F-10	19.65
20.	F-12	12.07
21.	F-16	6.27
22.	G-7	3.51
23.	G-19	39.38
24.	G-28	4.62
25.	G-30	12.04
26.	H-5	13.60
27.	H-7	5.03
28.	H-16	22.43
29.	H-17	6.50
30.	H-32	2.23
31.	H-49	14.09
32.	H-58	16.03
33.	I-1	6.31
34.	I-2	8.06
35.	I-3	6.33
36.	I-4	6.02
37.	Banaganapalle	7.41
38.	Chinnarasam	16.56
39.	Jalal	8.06
40.	Suvarnarekha	3.64
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>12.93</b>
	<b>CD @ 5%</b>	<b>5.58</b>
	<b>SEm±</b>	<b>1.98</b>

## REFERENCES

- Bhamini, K, Anjani, K, Jaiswal, U.S, Feza, M.A. and Ruby, R. 2018. Morphological characterization of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) germplasm using dus testing. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 7(05): 2944-2959.
- Gehrke-Velez, M.R, Castillo-Vera, A, Ruiz-Bello, C. and Moreno-Martínez, J.L. 2012. Different factors involved in the low fruit set of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). *Interciencia*. 36: 378-385.
- Nady, N.H. and Sanaa, S.E. 2015. Self and cross compatibility in some mango cultivars. *Egypt Journal of Horticulture*. 42(2): 759-770.
- National Horticulture Board. 2020-21. Data base of Horticultural crops. Gurgoan, India.
- Sharma, D.K. and Singh, R.N. 1972. Investigations on self-incompatibility in (*Mangifera Indica* L.). *Acta Horticulturae*. 24: 126-130.
- Singh, R.N, Majumdar, P.K. and Sharma, D.K. 1962. Self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) var. Deshehari. *Current Science*. 31(5): 209-211.

UNDER PEER REVIEW