

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

ABSTRACT

The investigation 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 [1]. 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 [2-4, 12-15]. Self incompatibility was reported in several commercial Indian mangos such as Bombay Green, Chausa, Dasherri and Langra [6-7]

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was laid out in an 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.

S.No.	Accessions	Fruit set percentage at 15 days after bagging
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
	Mean	12.93
	CD @ 5%	5.58
	SEm±	1.98

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

REFERENCES

- [1].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.
- [2].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.
- [3].Nady, N.H. and Sanaa, S.E. 2015. Self and cross compatibility in some mango cultivars. *Egypt Journal of Horticulture*. 42(2): 759-770.
- [4].Rasool, A., Krismastuti, F. S. H., Zulfajri, M., Meliana, Y., & Sudewi, S. (2024). A smart way to increase the growth and productivity of crops through nano-fertilizer. In *Molecular Impacts of Nanoparticles on Plants and Algae* (pp. 333-346). Academic Press.
- [5].National Horticulture Board. 2020-21. Data base of Horticultural crops. Gurgoan, India.
- [6].Sharma, D.K. and Singh, R.N. 1972. Investigations on self-incompatibility in (*Mangifera Indica* L.). *Acta Horticulturae*. 24: 126-130.
- [7].Khatana, K., Malgotra, V., Sultana, R., Sahoo, N. K., & Maurya, S. Das Anamika and Chetan DM (2023) Advancements in Immunomodulation. *Drug Discovery, and Medicine: A Comprehensive Review. Acta Botanica Plantae V02i02*, 39, 52.
- [8].Touseef, M. (2023). Exploring the Complex underground social networks between Plants and Mycorrhizal Fungi known as the Wood Wide Web. *Plant Science Archives. V08i01*, 5.
- [9].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.
- [10]. Reddy, C. A., Oraon, S., Bharti, S. D., Yadav, A. K., & Hazarika, S. (2024). Advancing disease management in agriculture: A review of plant pathology techniques. *Plant Science Archives*.
- [11]. Nweze, C. C., & Muhammad, B. Y. (2023). Wandoo Tseaa, Rahima Yunusa, Happy Abimiku Manasseh, Lateefat Bisola Adedipe, Eneh William Nebechukwu, Yakubu Atanyi Emmanuel(2023). Comparative Biochemical Ef-fects of Natural and Synthetic Pesticides on Preserved Phaseolus vulgaris in Male Albino Rats. *Acta Botanica Plantae*, 2, 01-10.
- [12]. Stitou, Majda, Anas Fadli, Ouïam Chetto, Abdelhak Talha, Rachid Benkirane, and Hamid Benyahia. 2017. "Fruit Quality Analysis in Four New Mandarin Hybrids During Maturation Period". *Annual Research & Review in Biology* 18 (6):1-10. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ARRB/2017/37108>.

- [13]. Shrilatha K A, I. B. Biradar, Satish D, H. P. Hadimani, R. S. Jawadagi, and Nayana K R. 2024. "Deciphering the Traits Association and Path Coefficient Analysis Among Yield Attributing Traits of Snap Melon (*Cucumis Melo* Var. *Momordica*) Genotypes". *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports* 30 (6):392-99. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i62054>.
- [14]. Muñoz-Sanz JV, Zuriaga E, López I, Badenes ML, Romero C. Self-(in) compatibility in apricot germplasm is controlled by two major loci, S and M. *BMC Plant Biology*. 2017 Dec;17:1-6.
- [15]. Zhang L, Chen X, Chen X, Zhang C, Liu X, Ci Z, Zhang H, Wu C, Liu C. Identification of self-incompatibility (S-) genotypes of Chinese apricot cultivars. *Euphytica*. 2008 Mar;160:241-8.

UNDER PEER REVIEW