

## Original Research Article

### **Performance of *Apis mellifera* L. colonies developed from artificially and naturally inseminated queens**

#### **ABSTRACT**

A comparative study between artificially and naturally inseminated queens of *Apis mellifera* L. colonies was recorded in the apiary and under laboratory condition of Department of Entomology, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat from September 2015 to March 2018. The selection studies were carried out from April, 2015 to January, 2016 from 99 colonies of *A. mellifera* L. and ten viable colonies were selected which were later used for preparation of queen and collection of drones. Comparative performance between artificially inseminated (AI) and naturally inseminated (NI) colonies of *A. mellifera* L. in the year 2016-17 and 2017-18 revealed that in both the years, brood area, pollen area and nectar area have significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months. In 2016-17, the pollination efficiency has significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months except for May, December, January and February. Whereas, in 2017-18, pollination efficiency has significant difference in all the months except for October and March. Honey yield showed significant difference in April, May, June, December, January and February during 2016-17 and in 2017-18, honey yield revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in May, June, December, January and February. Therefore, in both 2016-17 and 2017-18, the performance of AI colonies was significantly higher than NI colonies.

**Key words:** *Apis mellifera* L., artificially inseminated, naturally inseminated and comparative performance

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In conventional breeding honeybees mate within the same colony resulting in the loss of vigour due to inbreeding. Both good and bad characters and the poor brood patterns from homozygous sex alleles are carried with the progenies. On natural mating flights honeybee queens mate with several drones of unknown genotype (Taber and Wandel, 1958) where the strongest male goes for nuptial flight but the female size, vigour etc. is not selected. Artificially inseminated queens ensure truly controlled

mating. Therefore, the genetic progress in selection programmes with honey bees can be obtained much faster than with natural matings. With this method single queens can be inseminated by a homogenous mixed semen sample of a large number of drones (Moritz and Kohnert, 1984). Another advantage of instrumental insemination is the ability to ship semen, rather than live bees, minimizes the risk of spreading pests and diseases (Cobey, 2007).

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The research works on selective breeding of *A. mellifera* L. have been carried out in the apiary and laboratory conditions of Department of Entomology, Assam Agricultural University, from September 2015 to March' 2018.

**Selection of viable colonies of *Apis mellifera*:** The selection of viable colony is an important prerequisite in order to get a successful artificial insemination as we select the viable drone and queen cells from these selected colonies. The selection of viable colonies was carried out from September, 2015 to January, 2016 from 99 colonies of *Apis mellifera* L. Colonies were selected by visual observation and the colonies having good strength were screened out. Then screening of ten viable colonies was done based on parameters viz., colony strength, brood area, pollen area, nectar area, pollination efficiency and honey yield. The strength of each experimental colony was estimated by counting the number of frames with bees and expressed in the number of frames. To measure brood, pollen and nectar area, three combs were selected randomly in each of the ten colonies. A paper grid of size 10 x 10 cm was fixed successively on both sides of each of the selected comb in a colony and the area occupied by eggs, larvae, sealed brood, pollen and nectar were measured and expressed in sq.cm. The average egg, larval, sealed brood area, pollen and nectar area of the three sample combs were then converted for full colony. The observations were repeated at fourteen days interval. Pollination efficiency of the colonies of *A. mellifera* L. was measured in terms of number of pollen loads entering the hive by determining this number at 1000, 1400 and 1700 hours. These studies were repeated three times a month on all the experimental colonies. Number of pollen gatherers per five minute was recorded and the pollen load (milligram) per five minutes was taken as an indicator of pollination efficiency (Mattu and Verma, 1985). The honey of *A. mellifera* L. colonies were extracted and expressed in kilograms per hive.

**Mass rearing of queen bees:** After selection of the ten viable colonies in *A. mellifera*L., they were used for two purposes. First five colonies were used for production of queens and the rest five colonies were used for the drones. The method for queen raising was followed as per Doolittle method developed by G. M. Doolittle (1846). In both the year 2016 and 2017, twenty numbers of *A. mellifera*L. queens were raised in the month of February for artificial insemination. The steps followed for queen production were discussed below:

**Making queen cell cups:** For preparation of queen cell cups, the dripping sticks were first dipped into a weak solution of honey mixed with water. The excess liquid was shaken off from the dripping stick and then was dipped into molten wax to a depth of 6-8mm. Then the dripping stick was removed and exposed to air until the wax solidifies. (Fig. 1A).

**Affixing cell cup:** After preparation of queen cell cups, the cell cups were attached to the bar made of wood, resembling top bar of the frame (Fig. 1B).

**Grafting:**The cell cups were then offered to a colony overnight for the bees to work on the cells and to make them more acceptable and then the cell cups were rinsed with fresh royal jelly (Fig. 1C). Larvae of about 24 hours of age were selected and carefully inserted with the help of grafting needle in the cell cups (Fig. 1D). Then the frame with grafted larvae was given to the cell builder colony (Fig. 1E).

**Transplanting queen cells:**The sealed queen cells were transferred to nucleus colonies and the young queens emerged out from the cells after twelve days (Fig. 1G and 1H).



**A. Making queen cell cups**



**B. Affixing cell cup**



**C. Royal jelly for queen cells**



**D. Grafting**



**E. Transferring of frame with grafted larvae to cell builder colony**



**F. Artificial queen cells**



**G. Nucleus box of *Apis mellifera* L.**



**H. Nucleus box of *Apis cerana* F.**

**Fig. 1(A-H). Mass rearing of queen bees**


**Preparation of drones for artificial insemination:** The mature drones (14 day old) were collected from the selected five colonies of *A. mellifera* L. in “drone flight cage”, and brought to the laboratory for semen collection (Fig 2B). To expose semen, the endophallus of the mature drones were everted by hand in two-steps: the partial eversion (Fig 2D) and the full eversion (Fig 2E). Then the semen from the endophallus was drawn inside the Schelly’s syringe (Fig 2F), and 8µl semen was injected per queen. As per the observation of Woyke (1973), *A. mellifera* L. drones produces on an average 1.5 µl semen and therefore for a good insemination, queen required semen from about eight to ten drones.




**A. Drone flight cage**



**B. Collection of drones**




**C. Everting drones**



**D. Partial eversion**



**E. Full eversion**



**F. Collection of semen**

**Figure2(A-F): Preparation of drones for artificial insemination of queen bee**

## **Preparing the Queen for artificial insemination**


**Preparing the Anaesthetic:**The reduction valve of the carbon dioxide cylinder was adjusted to a delivery pressure of about 5 pounds per square inch and the flow of gas to the queen holder stopper adjusted to a very small stream. It should be just enough to keep the queen quiet.The flow was adjusted with experience by dipping the stopper in water until it gives 2 to 3 bubbles per second (Cobey *et. al.*, 2013).

**Preparing the Queen:**The virgin queens were inseminated between 5 and 12 days post-emergence. After emergence,queens were kept in drone less nucleus colonies with several hundred adult workers. The entrances of the hive were covered with queen excluder material to prevent unwanted natural mating flights (Cobey *et. al.*, 2013).


The equipment used to perform the insemination operation was P. Schely's instrumental insemination device (Fig 3). The syringe and queen holder were aligned on the instrument stand at a 30° to 45° angle to facilitate bypassing the valvelfold. The queen was allowed to move into a tube similar to the queen holder(Fig 6B). When she reaches the constricted end,she moves in the tube in a to and fro movement. Then the queen holder was placed on the upper side of the tube so that the queen moves to the queen holder in such a way that the abdomen of the queen was facing towards the tapering end of the queen holder (Fig 6C). Thus, the queen was placed in the queen holder with her abdomen protruding last three segments(Fig 6D) and then a slow continuous flow of CO<sub>2</sub> was administered. Then the abdominal plates were separated to expose the vaginal orifice using ventral hook to the left and sting hook to the right. Then the syringe tip was dorsally positioned above the "V", defining the vaginal orifice (Fig 5). Then the tip was inserted into the vaginal orifice 0.5 to 1.0 mm, slightly forward of the apex of the "V". Then the tip was inserted further, another 0.5 to 1.0mm, while using the tip to lift the valvelfold ventrally. The valvelfold covering the median oviduct was bypassed so as to prevent back-flow of semen from the vaginal orifice. Then 8µl of semen was delivered directly into the median oviduct (Fig 6F). After insemination, syringe tip was removed. Then again, a small air space and small drop of saline, (~0.5µl) was collected to precede the next insemination. Then, the queens were released from the holder and placed in push-in cage(Fig 6G), and returned her to her nucleus colony. Then, on the next day,the queens were released from the push-in-cage to the nucleus colony (Cobey *et. al.*, 2013).



**Fig 3: Schely's instrumental insemination device**




**Fig 4. (A) Plastic tube, (B) Queen holder, (C) Holding hook, (D) Sting hook and (E) Ventral hook**



**Fig. 5:Sting chamber of queen**

<p><b>A. Queen cages</b></p>	<p><b>B. Passing queen to plastic tube</b></p>	<p><b>C. Passing queen to holder via plastic tube</b></p>	<p><b>D. Queen placed on queen holder</b></p>



**Fig 6(A-G): Preparation of virgin queen for artificial insemination**

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### **Selection of viable colonies of *Apis mellifera* L.**

The selection of viable colonies was worked out from September'2015-January'2016, and out of 99 *A. mellifera* L. colonies, ten viable colonies were selected. The results in table 1 revealed the average data of the ten selected colonies which was later used for preparation of queens and drone selection. The strength of most of the colonies ranged between  $7.7 \pm 0.3$  to  $7.9 \pm 0.3$  number of frames. The brood area of the colonies were found to have ranged between  $2643.6 \pm 209.4$  to  $2715.8 \pm 207.8$  sq.cm. All the ten colonies showed significant differences with regard to area of pollen store which ranged between  $657.01 \pm 87.1$  to  $712.1 \pm 95.07$  sq.cm. The nectar area of the colonies were recorded between  $704.7 \pm 96.4$  to  $740.2 \pm 95.08$  sq.cm. The pollination efficiency of the *A. mellifera* L. colonies were found to have ranged between  $5.8 \pm 0.9$  to  $6.4 \pm 0.9$  milligram of pollen load per five minutes. The honey yield of the colonies ranged between  $1.8 \pm 0.9$  to  $1.9 \pm 0.9$  kilogram. In the selected colonies of *A. mellifera* L. no incidence of diseases and pests were observed during the study period. Swarming and absconding behaviour were also observed to be absent. Moreover, the colonies of were found as very calm in nature.

### **Comparative performance of *Apis mellifera* L. in artificially inseminated and naturally inseminated colonies**

During the course of queen rearing in 2016, all total twenty queens of *Apis mellifera* L. were raised in the month of February'2016 for executing artificial insemination. And out of twenty queens, six queens survived after artificial insemination (AI). For comparison, similar number of colonies having naturally

inseminated (NI) queens were maintained. When the AI queens started effective egg laying, the comparison between AI and NI colonies were made (Table 2).

### **Strength of colony**

The data on the strength of colony revealed that there was significant difference between AI and NI colonies of *A. mellifera* L. during the month of November ( $8.2 \pm 0.2$  numbers of frames in AI and  $7.3 \pm 0.1$  numbers of frames in NI) and December ( $8.9 \pm 0.1$  numbers of frames in AI and  $8.4 \pm 0.1$  numbers of frames in NI).

### **Brood area**

Perusal of data on brood area presented on table 2 revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months from April' 2016 to March' 2017. In both AI and NI colonies, brood area reached peak during May ( $4091.2 \pm 10.5$  sq.cm in AI and  $3882.4 \pm 4.9$  sq.cm in NI) and lowest was recorded in the month of October ( $2039.2 \pm 10.4$  sq.cm in AI and  $1813.8 \pm 11.3$  sq.cm in NI). And in all the months the brood area was significantly higher in AI colonies than the NI colonies since the fecundity of AI queen is more as compared to the NI queens. The maximum temperature coupling with shortage of bee flora affected the brood rearing during July to October. Therefore, the duration from July to October was referred to as lean period for brood rearing. Artificial feeding to the colonies with sugar solution was practiced during this period. Further, it was observed that bee flora was abundant from November to June and were responsible for better performance in brood rearing during this period. Hence, the period beginning from November to June was referred to as honey flow period.

### **Pollen area**

The observations of pollen area revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months from April' 2016 to March' 2017. The lowest pollen area was recorded in the month of August ( $420.2 \pm 7.3$  sq.cm) and peak was recorded in January ( $1349.2 \pm 8.6$  sq.cm) in AI colonies. Similarly, pollen area in the NI colonies was lowest in the month of August ( $321.8 \pm 7.6$  sq.cm) and highest in the month of January ( $1295.2 \pm 14.9$  sq.cm). The pollen was gathered throughout the year in variable quantity depending on the availability of bee flora. However, pollen gathering activity was slowed down from July to October due to dearth of flora. The results were in agreement with the findings of Bisht and Pant (1968). Although there was variations in pollen area in different months, but in all the months the pollen area was higher in AI

colonies than NI colonies due to high vigour of the workers of AI colonies as compared to the NI colonies.

### **Nectar area**

The observations on nectar area showed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months from April'2016 to March'2017. The highest nectar area was recorded in the month of April ( $3619.8 \pm 6.9$  sq.cm) and the lowest during January ( $671.8 \pm 10.4$  sq.cm) in AI colonies. Similarly, the peak nectar area in the NI colonies was found to be  $3443.2 \pm 9.0$  sq.cm in the month of April and lowest nectar area was recorded in the month of January ( $556.0 \pm 12.5$ sq.cm). Thus, from the data we can draw the inference that nectar area in AI colonies was significantly higher than the NI colonies which was due to high vigour of the AI colonies as compared to the NI colonies.

### **Pollination efficiency**

The observations on pollination efficiency revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in the month of April, June, July, August, September, October, November and March. The pollination efficiency during this month's were  $14.0 \pm 0.3$ ,  $8.0 \pm 0.3$ ,  $7.2 \pm 0.3$ ,  $6.6 \pm 0.2$ ,  $4.4 \pm 0.2$ ,  $5.6 \pm 0.2$ ,  $10.0 \pm 0.3$  and  $11.4 \pm 0.2$ , milligram of pollen load in AI colonies and  $10.8 \pm 0.5$ ,  $7 \pm 0.3$ ,  $5 \pm 0.3$ ,  $2.8 \pm 0.2$ ,  $1.8 \pm 0.2$ ,  $2.4 \pm 0.2$ ,  $7 \pm 0.3$  and  $9.2 \pm 0.3$  milligram of pollen load in NI colonies. Thus, pollination efficiency was found to be higher in all the months in AI colonies than the NI colonies and this significantly higher collection of pollen loads by workers of AI colonies could be attributed to high vigour of the workers. Ratnikov (1960) also made similar observation of greater forging efficiency in hybrid workers bees of various other races of *A. mellifera* as compared to their parents.

### **Honey yield**

The observations on honey yield revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in the month of April, May, June, December, January and February, respectively. The respective values during this month's were  $3.1 \pm 0.006$ ,  $2.94 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.5 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.4 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.5 \pm 0.01$  and  $2.6 \pm 0.01$  kilogram honey yield in AI colonies and  $2.9 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.7 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.2 \pm 0.02$ ,  $2.3 \pm 0.02$ ,  $2.3 \pm 0.01$  and  $2.5 \pm 0.03$  kilogram honey yield in NI colonies, respectively.

The comparative performance of *Apis mellifera* L. was again observed between April' 2017 to March' 2018. A total of twenty numbers of queens were raised in the month of February' 2017 and eight queens survived after artificial insemination. Similar number of naturally inseminated colonies were maintained for comparison. The regular month wise data of eight AI and NI colonies were recorded from April' 2017 to March' 2018 (Table 3). The average values of AI and NI colonies in terms of bee strength, brood area, pollen area, nectar area, pollination efficiency and honey yield have been discussed below:

### **Strength of colony**

The data on the strength of colony revealed that there was significant difference between AI and NI colonies of *Apis mellifera* L. only in the month of February' 2018 ( $9.2 \pm 0.1$  numbers of frames in AI and  $8.7 \pm 0.1$  numbers of frames in NI).

### **Brood area**

The observations on brood area was found to have highly significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months from April' 2017 to March' 2018. In both AI and NI colonies, brood area reached peak during May ( $4203.8 \pm 21.6$  sq.cm in AI and  $3836.8 \pm 9.4$  sq.cm in NI) and lowest was recorded in the month of October ( $2018.8 \pm 12.5$  sq.cm in AI and  $1944.2 \pm 9.7$  sq.cm in NI). Hence, although in different months there was variation in brood area but in all the months the brood area was higher in AI colonies than NI colonies due to high egg laying capacity of AI queens than NI queens. This was in conformity with the observations of Oldroyd (1986) who reported that hybrid queens had significantly larger brood area than colonies headed by inbred queens.

### **Pollen area**

The pollen area was found to be significantly different between AI and NI colonies in all the months from April' 2017 to March' 2018. Pollen area was at peak during January ( $1382.2 \pm 6.6$  sq.cm) and lowest during October ( $395.4 \pm 5.9$  sq.cm). Similarly, pollen area in the NI colonies was highest in January ( $1226.8 \pm 6.04$  sq.cm) and lowest in October ( $337.2 \pm 11.5$  sq.cm). Thus, in all the months the pollen area was significantly higher in AI colonies than the NI colonies, which was due to high vigour of the AI colonies as compared to NI colonies. This was in conformity with the observations of Roberts (1956).

### **Nectar area**

The data on nectar area also revealed highly significant difference between AI and NI colonies in all the months where peak nectar storage was recorded to be  $3620.8 \pm 10.7$  sq.cm in AI colonies and  $3321.2 \pm 8.0$  sq.cm in NI colonies in the month of April and lowest was recorded in the month of January in both AI and NI colonies ( $664.4 \pm 7.0$  sq.cm and  $510.0 \pm 10.8$  sq.cm, respectively). However, in all the months of observation significant increase of nectar areas in AI colonies were observed than the NI colonies due to superior workers in AI colonies as compared to workers of NI colonies.

### **Pollination efficiency**

The data on pollination efficiency revealed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in the month of April, May, June, July, August, September, November, December, January and February. The respective values during this month were  $15.2 \pm 0.0.3$ ,  $10.2 \pm 0.3$ ,  $7.0 \pm 0.3$ ,  $6.6 \pm 0.2$ ,  $6.0 \pm 0.3$ ,  $4.6 \pm 0.2$ ,  $12.2 \pm 0.3$ ,  $12.0 \pm 0.3$ ,  $15.2 \pm 0.3$  and  $9.2 \pm 0.3$  milligram of pollen load, respectively in AI colonies and  $12.0 \pm 0.31$ ,  $9 \pm 0.31$ ,  $5.6 \pm 0.24$ ,  $3.8 \pm 0.2$ ,  $3 \pm 0.31$ ,  $1.6 \pm 0.24$ ,  $6.6 \pm 0.24$ ,  $9.2 \pm 0.37$ ,  $13 \pm 0.3$  and  $8.4 \pm 0.2$ , milligram of pollen load, respectively in NI colonies. Thus, pollination efficiency was found to be higher in all the months in AI colonies due to high efficiency of pollen gatherers of AI colonies than the NI colonies.

### **Honey yield**

The data on honey yield showed significant difference between AI and NI colonies in the month of May, June, December, January and February. The respective values during this month's were  $2.9 \pm 0.008$ ,  $2.4 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.5 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.7 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.7 \pm 0.01$  kilogram honey yield, respectively in AI colonies and  $2.7 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.2 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.3 \pm 0.01$ ,  $2.4 \pm 0.01$  and  $2.5 \pm 0.01$  kilogram honey yield, respectively in NI colonies. Thus, honey yield in AI colonies of *Apis mellifera* L. was higher than NI colonies. Ruttner (1967, 1968) also reported such observations in *Apis mellifera* in West Germany.

## **CONCLUAION**

From the present study it is well understood that artificial insemination is an important tool in order to control and improve genetic characteristics of honey bee

species, for the preservation and improvement of local breeds and to create disease resistant lines and lines with high productivity. The comparative performance of AI queen and NI queen indicated a better performance of the artificially inseminated queens over naturally inseminated queens of *A. mellifera* L. with respect to brood area, pollen area, nectar area and pollination efficiency which directly influences honey production. In the present studies, it has been found that brood area increased by five to ten per cent, pollen area increased by twelve to seventeen per cent and likewise nectar area was increased by ten to nineteen per cent in AI colonies as compared to NI colonies. In view of this it can be concluded that in order to retain the vigour and vitality of the exotic and indigenous honey bee species, the AI approach is essential. Hence, bee breeder can utilize AI tool for improving the honey bee races with respect to yield attributing and disease resistant character and this may also be utilized in commercial venture.

#### REFERENCES

- Bisht, D.S. and Pant, N.C. (1968). Studies on brood rearing activity of Indian Honeybee, *Apis indica* F. under Delhi condition. *Indian J. Ent.***30**(3): 109-111.
- Cobey, S.W. (2007). Comparison studies of instrumentally inseminated and naturally mated honey bee queens and factors affecting their performance. *Apidologie*. **38**: 390-410.
- Cobey, S.W.; Tarpy, D.R. and Wokey, J. (2013). Standard methods for instrumental insemination of *Apis mellifera* queens. *J. Apic. Res.***52**(4).
- Mattu, V.K. and Verma, L.R. (1985). Studies on the annual foraging cycle of *Apis cerana indica* F. in Shimla Hills of the North-West Himalayas. *Apidologie*. **16**: 1-18.
- Moritz, R.F.A. and Kohnert, M. (1984). Seasonal effects on Artificial insemination of honey bee queens (*Apis mellifera* L.). *Apidologie*. **15**(2): 223-231.
- Oldroyd, B.P. (1986). Are queen characters and worker characters more important to honey production. In *Africanized honey bees and bee mites*. Chichester UK, Ellis. Horwood. pp. 91-96.
- Ratnikov, A. (1960). Ten years work with hybrids. *Pchelovodstvo*. **37**: 20-22.
- Roberts, W.C. (1956). Hybrid vigour in honeybees. *Proc. XVI Int. Beekeep. Congr. Prelim. Sci. Meet. Vienna, Austria*. pp. 235.
- Ruttner, F. (1967). Hybrid breeding. *Proc. XXI Int. Beekeep. Congr. Summ. Maryland, U.S.A.* pp. 83.

Ruttner, F. (1968). Methods of breeding honeybees: intraracial selection or inter-racial hybrids. *Bee Wld.* **49**: 66-72.

Taber S. and Wandel. J. (1958). Concerning the number of times queen bees mate. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **51**: 786-789.

Woyke, J. (1973). Instrumental Insemination of *A. c. indica* queens. *J. Apic. Res.* **12**(3): 151-58.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are thankful to Lilacharan Dutta, Owner at C.K. Udyogand Retd. Dr. D. Das Borah, Department of Agricultural Statistics, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat for their sincere help during the period of investigation.

**Table 1. Selection of viable *Apis mellifera* colonies**

Data based on mean of 10 colonies

Month of observation	Colony number	Strength (No. of frames with bees)	Brood area (sq.cm)	Pollen area (sq.cm)	Nectar area (sq.cm)	Pollination efficiency (mg)	Honey yield (Transformed) (kg)
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 1	7.9±0.3	2668.2±210.7	672.4±89.1	717.0±92.09	6.4±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 2	7.8±0.3	2680.0±205.3	668.0±89.6	727.2±57.3	5.8±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 3	7.7±0.3	2677.6±207.9	657.0±87.1	718.8±96.3	6.2±0.9	1.9±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 4	7.8±0.3	2643.6±209.4	688.8±97.8	735.0±97.8	6.0±0.8	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 5	7.9±0.3	2663.0±204.6	665.0±88.4	727.6±93.5	6.2±1.01	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 6	7.9±0.3	2672.2±198.9	680.2±90.3	729.0±90.1	6.2±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 7	7.8±0.3	2675.8±204.9	673.2±88.7	732.2±99.5	5.8±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 8	7.9±0.3	2715.8±207.8	712.1±95.07	723.6±87.6	6.0±0.8	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 9	7.7±0.3	2692.6±206.5	661.8±90.5	740.2±95.08	5.8±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	colony 10	7.8±0.3	2664.4±205.04	664.1±88.07	704.7±96.4	6.4±0.9	1.8±0.9
Sept'2015 - Jan'2016	C.D. 5%	NS	33.1	17.8	NS	NS	NS

**Table 2. Comparative performance between artificially and naturally inseminated colonies of *Apis mellifera***

Data based on mean of 6 colonies

M	Strength (No.)	Brood area	Pollen area	Nectar area	Pollination	Honey yield
---	----------------	------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

ON TH	offrames with bees)			(sq.cm)			(sq.cm)			(sq.cm)			efficiency (mg)			(Transformed) (sq.cm)		
	AI	NI	C. D. 5 %	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C.D . 5%
Apr '16	10.0 ±0.0	10.0 ±0.0	NS	3829.8 ±7.5	3678.0 ±9.1	28.9	730.2 ±0.7	573.2 ±5.6	35.2	3619.8 ±6.9	3443.2 ±9.0	26.2	14.0 ±0.3	10.8 ±0.5	1.1	3.1 ±0.006(8.6)	Apr '16	10.0 ±0.0
May '16	10.0 ±0.12	10.0 ±0.12	NS	4091.2 ±10.5	3882.4 ±4.9	23.8	629.8 ±9.2	519.4 ±9.2	50.1	3201.8 ±17.9	2903.4 ±14.1	68.1	10.6 ±0.4	9.0 ±0.3	NS	2.9 ±0.01(7.6)	May '16	10.0 ±0.12
Jun '16	9.2 ±0.12	9.0 ±0.12	NS	3517.8 ±11.5	3381.6 ±6.9	42.9	532.2 ±9.2	479.6 ±7.5	34.1	2333.8 ±6.5	2030.2 ±8.7	32.7	8.0 ±0.3	7.0 ±0.3	0.8	2.5 ±0.01(5.3)	Jun '16	9.2 ±0.12
July '16	7.4 ±0.12	7.3 ±0.12	NS	2680.8 ±5.2	2524.6 ±8.7	25.3	497.4 ±8.1	362.2 ±8.01	29.04	1524.8 ±8.3	1323.8 ±6.5	33.7	7.2 ±0.3	5.0 ±0.3	1.03	1.0 ±0.01(0.0)	July '16	7.4 ±0.12
Aug '16	6.8 ±0.20	6.6 ±0.18	NS	2427.2 ±8.4	2229.0 ±8.6	38.2	420.2 ±7.3	321.8 ±7.6	28.6	1233.6 ±8.1	1038.2 ±6.5	35.2	6.6 ±0.2	2.8 ±0.2	1.03	1.0 ±0.006(0.0)	Aug '16	6.8 ±0.20
Sep '16	6.6 ±0.24	6.4 ±0.24	NS	2102.6 ±11.5	1946.2 ±13.1	48.6	436.8 ±10.4	342.6 ±12.6	47.2	992.2 ±4.4	847.8 ±13	34.2	4.4 ±0.2	1.8 ±0.2	1.1	1.0 ±0.01(0.0)	Sept '16	6.6 ±0.24
Oct '16	6.4 ±0.24	6.2 ±0.20	NS	2039.2 ±10.4	1813.8 ±11.3	41.8	440.8 ±8.7	349.0 ±10.9	35.8	872.0 ±7.6	695.2 ±11.8	24.4	5.6 ±0.2	2.4 ±0.2	1.03	1.0 ±0.01(0.0)	Oct '16	6.4 ±0.24
Nov '16	8.2 ±0.20	7.3 ±0.12	0.80	2926.8 ±5.5	2507.8 ±14.0	52.2	527.8 ±8.6	486.4 ±5.9	38.1	845.0 ±10.5	654.4 ±12.4	22.8	10 ±0.3	7.0 ±0.3	1.5	1.0 ±0.01(0.0)	Nov '16	8.2 ±0.20
Dec '16	8.9 ±0.10	8.4 ±0.18	0.43	3449.8 ±10.1	3342.8 ±10.8	29.1	128.7.4 ±6.2	110.8.0 ±15.2	41.6	783.4 ±5.3	612.2 ±12.4	49.1	11.6 ±0.4	10.6 ±0.2	NS	2.4 ±0.01(5.1)	Dec '16	8.9 ±0.10
Jan '17	9.3 ±0.12	9.0 ±0.22	NS	3494.2 ±5.1	3368.4 ±9.0	28.5	134.9.2 ±8.6	129.5.2 ±14.9	40.7	671.8 ±7.4	556.0 ±12.5	44.7	14.0 ±0.5	11.6 ±0.4	NS	2.5 ±0.01(5.3)	Jan '17	9.3 ±0.12
Feb '17	9.6 ±0.10	9.3 ±0.12	NS	3581.8 ±6.9	3423.6 ±10.3	35.9	105.2.4 ±8.3	922.8 ±9.5	25.02	832.8 ±10.4	625.2 ±11.1	39.7	8.0 ±0.3	7.4 ±0.2	NS	2.6 ±0.01(6.2)	Febr '17	9.6 ±0.10
Mar '17	10 ±0.12	9.8 ±0.12	NS	3672.6 ±9.5	3503.6 ±10.6	54.7	882.4 ±4.6	714.4 ±13.6	43.2	2712.6 ±10.9	2411.0 ±13.3	52.3	11.4 ±0.2	9.2 ±0.3	1.03	2.7 ±0.009(6.6)	Mar '17	10 ±0.12
Mean	6.40 ±.17	6.2 ±.18	0.12	3151.1 ±86.3	2966.8 ±89.3	7.7	798.4 ±7.5.2	622.8 ±40.4	132.9	1626.9 ±1.931.8	1421.7 ±126.9	8.1	9.2 ±0.4	7.1 ±0.4	0.2	3.75 ±0.1	Mean	6.40 ±.17

**Table 3. Comparative performance between artificially and naturally inseminated colonies of *Apis mellifera***

Data based on mean of 8 colonies

M ON TH	Strength (No. offrames with bees)			Brood area (sq.cm)			Pollen area (sq.cm)			Nectar area (sq.cm)			Pollination efficiency (mg)			Honey yield (Transformed) (sq.cm)		
	AI	NI	C. D. 5 %	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C. D. 5%	AI	NI	C.D . 5%
Apr '17	10.0 ±0.0	10±0	NS	3888.6 ±9.0	3774.2 ±8.8	36.3	823.4±12.9	616.6±15.2	63.4	3620.8±10.7	3321.2 ±8.0	18.7	15.2 ±0.3	12.0 ±0.3	1.03	3.1±0.009(8.7)	Apr' 17	10.0±0.0
Ma y'17	10.0 ±0.1	10±0.1	NS	4203.8 ±21.6	3836.8 ±9.4	66.1	758.0±11.6	595.2±12.9	67.7	3145.0±11.1	2989.8 ±10.1	44.2	10.2 ±0.3	9.0±0.3	1.03	2.9±0.008(7.7)	May '17	10.0±0.1
Jun '17	9.3±0.1	8.7±0.1	NS	3674.8 ±8.2	3421.4 ±8.3	22.01	581.8±8.4	386.8±8.3	9.2	2391.2±10.8	2071.6 ±10.6	23.6	7.0±0.3	5.6±0.2	1.1	2.4±0.01(5.1)	Jun' 17	9.3±0.1
July '17	7.6±0.2	7.2±0.2	NS	2842.6 ±9.2	2564.0 ±8.6	28.4	478.2±7.2	384.6±7.5	40.8	1438.6±7.7	1286.4 ±8.6	40.09	6.6±0.2	3.8±0.2	1.03	1.0±0.01(0.0)	July '17	7.6±0.2
Aug '17	7.0±0.0	6.8±0.2	NS	2376.0 ±7.0	2123.4 ±15.2	42.1	427.2±13.2	342.6±11.2	37.6	1310.2±13.6	1172.2 ±9.3	40.3	6.0±0.3	3.0±0.3	0.8	1.0±0.009(0.0)	Aug' 17	7.0±0.0
Sept '17	6.8±0.1	6.6±0.2	NS	2113.6 ±15.5	1974.6 ±8.5	46.5	419.0±11.4	340.4±8.3	44.01	1006.0±6.9	865.8±10.0	34.08	4.6±0.2	1.6±0.2	0.8	1.0±0.008(0.0)	Sept '17	6.8±0.1
Oct' 17	6.2±0.2	6.0±0.2	NS	2018.8 ±12.5	1944.2 ±9.7	45.6	395.4±5.9	337.2±11.5	31.2	867.8 ±13.9	742.4±10.7	14.06	2.0±0.3	1.8±0.3	NS	1.0±0.008(0.0)	Oct' 17	6.2±0.2
Nov '17	8.0±0.1	8±0.1	NS	2953.0 ±8.6	2729.8 ±5.5	15.5	569.8±6.7	428.8±9.3	14.7	818.012.6	640.8±9.1	48.2	12.2 ±0.3	6.6±0.2	1.4	1.0±0.008(0.0)	Nov' 17	8.0±0.1
Dec '17	8.8±0.2	8.4±0.2	NS	3426.4 ±12.6	3239.4 ±9.2	45.6	1305.6±12.7	1115.0±14.6	52.2	796.0 ±11.8	605.0±15.4	73.6	12.0 ±0.3	9.2±0.3	1.3	2.5±0.01(5.6)	Dec' 17	8.8±0.2
Jan' 18	9±0.1	8.6±0.2	NS	3483.0 ±4.7	3317.0 ±12.1	35.8	1382.2±6.6	1226.8±6.04	33.3	664.4 ±7.0	510.0±10.8	47.05	15.2 ±0.3	13.0 ±0.3	0.5	2.7±0.01(6.5)	Jan' 18	9±0.1
Feb r'18	9.2±0.1	8.7±0.1	0.51	3556.4 ±9.8	3423.2 ±10.7	4.5	1021.0±1.7	961.6±10.5	42.8	848.6 ±10.8	615.0±9.5	39.5	9.2±0.3	8.4±0.2	0.5	2.7±0.01(6.6)	Febr '18	9.2±0.1
Mar '18	9.2±0.1	8.8±0.1	NS	3583.6 ±9.7	3463.0 ±7.9	44.3	971.6±7.1	952.4±10.5	28.08	2835.8±12.2	2436.0 ±7.4	41.1	11.2 ±0.2	11.0 ±0.3	NS	2.7±0.01(6.4)	Mar '18	9.2±0.1
Mea n	8.4±0.1	8.2±0.1	0.09	3155.4 ±92.1	3015.0 ±86.9	8.5	742.3±42.03	651.4±40.4	8.1	1589.3±13.00	1471.3 ±130.6	8.2	9.1±0.5	7.5±0.4	0.2	3.8±0.1	Mea n	8.4±0.1