

# FRUIT QUALITY ATTRIBUTES OF PROMISING HYBRIDS OF MANGO (MANGIFERA INDICA L.)

D.P. Saha<sup>1</sup>, Ravindra Kumar<sup>1</sup> and Mithilesh Kumar<sup>2</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Fruit and Fruit Technology, Bihar Agricultural College, Sabour (Bhagalpur)

# **ABSTRACT**

Quality attributing characters studied in ten important crosses of known mango cultivars *viz.*, Langra with Sepia, Rani Pasand, Taimuria, Mylepellian, Mithua,AmrapaliandNeelumas well as cultivar Sipiawith Bombai and Langra. The Physical qualities like fruit size (cm),fruit weight (g), pulp (%), stone (%) and peel (%)) as well as the T.S.S. as chemical quality was also significantly varied among differentcrosses. Hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian) mature earlieston 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2009 i.e., 7 days earlier than hybrid 112 (Langra x Mithua). Average fruit size (Length- 10.5 cmand width- 7.7 cm), fruit weight (295 g) and pulp percentage (74.0) was recorded with hybrid 148 (Langra x Neelum). Whereas the minimum peel (19.4 %) and stone (19.1 %) was notedunderthe crosses 124 (Sipia x Langra) and 118 (Langra x Mylepellian) respectively. The hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand) recorded maximum total soluble solids (24.2°Brix).

Key words: Mango, hybrids and fruit quality.

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) is a very popular and choicest fruit crop widely cultivated in almosttropical and subtropical region of the world. Itbelongs to the family Anacardiaceae and

originated in South-East Asia Tropical Regions (Purseglove,1972). Most of the mango cultivar have biennial bearing withthe poor percentage of crossing resulting lowfruiting (Singh *et al,*1980) is a common problem for mangoproduction and breeding. In view to overcomingthe low fruit set problem, alternate bearing, lacking of attractive colour, smaller fruit size and lower pulp percentage and total soluble solids (majorly due to sugar) in both the fields of quality production and breeding, more knowledge onfloral biology and reproductive physiology of themango is important.

Mango is highly cross-pollinated cropgenerally pollination takes place by insects (Ram,1992). Innature, more than 50% of the flowers do notreceive any pollen and number of pollen grainsper pollinated flower is also very low i.e. threeper flower (Majumdar and Sharma,1990). Generally, in mango cultivation the flowering period starts from second fortnight of January andextended up to first fortnight of March in the climatic condition of Bihar depending upon the variety and climatic condition in the particular year. The fruit quality i.e., size with maximum pulp and acid blending sweetness (TSS) as well as attractive colour is highly desirable characters in mango lacking together in a cultivar.

Therefore, keeping in the view of theselackingin quality mango production, thepresent work of investigation was taken toincorporate these desirable characters through hybridization and assess the bearingbehaviorand fruit quality inpromisingcrossing of different mango cultivar i.e. Langra, Sipia, Rani Pasand, Taimuria, Mylepellian, Mithua, Amrapali, Neelum, and Bombay.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

More than 150 mango accessions have been collected at Bihar Agricultural College, Sabour (Bhagalpur)from differentparts of India. The works on varietal improvement is continuing here since long. The present investigation was carried out in AllIndia Co-ordinated Research Project on subtropical fruitsunder Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur, Bihar on mango hybrids (crosses) of the respective region i.e. cv. Langra, Bombai, Zardalu, Bangalora and Hemsagar during the year 2009. Theclimate of Sabour is semi-arid, subtropical alongwith hot desiccating summer and cold frostlesswinter. In this study the selection of hybrid was done by using eye estimation and available statistical tools in physicochemical characteristics of all crossings. Trees under mango hybridization programme were 15 to 19 years oldandmaintained under uniform cultural practices during the course of the investigation. The experimental plot had well-drained alluvialsoil of good fertility with the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Department of Plant Pathology, Bihar Agricultural College, Sabour (Bhagalpur)

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author (Mithilesh Kumar) Email: mithileshkumar@gmail.com

SI.	Hybrid	Parent	Date of	Size		Fruit	Pulp	Peel	Stone	T.S.S.
No	No.		harvesting	Length (cm)	Width (cm)	Wt. (g)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
1.	85	Langra x Rani Pasand	18.06.2009	9.8	7.3	232	68.5	21.1	24.2	24.2
2.	114	Langra x Taimuria	20.06.2009	8.0	7.1	202	64.0	22.0	21.6	21.6
3.	117	Sipia x Mithua	18.06.2009	8.1	6.0	175	60.5	22.6	23.0	23.0
4.	118	Langra x Mylepellian	15.06.2009	8.7	6.1	142	62.7	25.8	19.1	19.1
5.	122	Langra x Mithua	22.06.2009	9.0	6.4	190	66.8	22.6	21.5	21.5
6.	124	Sipia x Langra	18.06.2009	8.5	6.9	152	60.0	19.4	23.5	23.5
7.	129	Bombay x Sipia	20.06.2009	9.6	6.2	205	58.2	22.8	22.2	22.2
8.	137	Sipia x Langra	20.06.2009	8.9	6.8	216	63.8	20.3	19.5	19.5
9.	144	Langra x Amrapali	20.06.2009	7.3	6.6	178	71.3	21.6	24.0	24.0
10.	148	Langra x Neelum	20.06.2009	10.5	7.7	295	74.0	24.8	20.0	20.0

**Table-1**: Fruit quality of promising hybrids of mango.

levelled surface. Trees were spaced at  $08 \times 08 \, \text{m}$ , irrigated viamodified basin system.

The data on day of harvesting ormaturity of the fruitswas decided tree wiseon the basis of 'Tapka' (whenthree or four ripen fruits fell down). The fruit quality parameters such as physical quality- fruit weight (gm), fruit length (cm), width (cm) were recorded upon the average of ten fruits of average size collected randomly from thetree. The average fruit weight (g) was measured of the same fruits during the fruit ripening period using an electronic weighing balance. The fruit length andwidth (cm) were measured on these sampled fruits using a 'digital vernier caliper'. The data on peel (%), pulp (%) and stone (%)of the same ten fruits were determined on weight basis (w/w) whereas thechemical quality- Total Soluble Solids (TSS) content was determined at the fruitripening stage on same 10 mature fruits selected randomly for measuring fruit size and weight. The samples were selected following the sampling method of GB/T8855-2008 fresh fruits and vegetables (SAC, 2008). The Total soluble solid (majorly affected by sugar content) content was determined in mangoes fruitusing a hand refractometer. The data presented in Table-1 are of the selected crossing, where selection was done individually by using basic statistical tools among all crossings.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Fruit maturity**: Hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian) mature earliest on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2009 followed by hybrid 114 (Langra x Taimuria), 129 (Bombay x Sipia),137 (Sipia x Langra) 144 (Langra x Amrapali) and 148 (Langra x Neelum) on 20th June 2009 and hybrid 122 (Langra x Mithua) matured in the last on 22nd June 2020. Variation in fruit maturity in different crosses or varieties

might be due to change in location or inherent genetic variation (Singh, 2002 and Hoda et al., 2003). Similar findings had also reported by Sardar et al. (1998).

**Fruit length**: Data regarding fruit length of ten mango hybrids showed significant differences. Hybrid 148 (Langra x Neelum) produced maximum fruit length of 10.5 cm followed by 9.8 cm and 9.6 cm respectively with the hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand) and 129 (Bombay x Sipia) whereas the minimum length of 7.3 cm noted under the hybrid 144 (Langra x Amrapali).

Fruit width: Differences among fruit width of ten mango hybrids were also found statistically significant (Table-1). Maximum fruit width(7.7 cm) was noted again with thehybrid 148 (Langra x Neelum) followed by hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand) and hybrid 114 (Langra x Taimuria) with 7.3 and 7.1 cm respectively and minimum width of 6.0 cm found to hybrid 117 (Sipia x Mithua). Several workers have studied the fruit size of mango and reported that mango cultivars differed in fruit length and width according to their genetic makeup.

Fruit weight: Highly significant differences in fruit weight were also noted among crosses of different mango cultivars (Table-1). Out of these selected 10 crossings maximum fruit weight (295 g) was recorded in hybrid 148 (Langra x Neelum) followed by hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand) with 232 g and hybrid 137 (Sipia x Langra) with 216g against minimum (142 g) for hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian). The variation in fruit weight is due to attribute of different cultivars used in hybridization to multiply and enlarge the cells membrane of the fruit to accumulate more sugar and water for expanding the cells which is greatly influenced by the genetic makeup of particular cultivar. These results are in agreement with the findings of Uthaiah *et al.* (1990), Dalal *et al.* (2005) Dhua (2004).

**Pulp percentage**: The data (Table-1) showed that mango hybrid148 (Langra x Neelum) had the highest pulp percentage (78.0) followed by hybrid 144 - Langra x Amrapali (71.3 %), hybrid 85 - Langra x Rani Pasand (68.5 %) and hybrid 122- Langra x Mithua (66.8%) whereas the minimum pulp (58.2 %) was noted with hybrid 129 - Bombay x Sipia out of these selected 10 crossings. Sarkar et al. (2001) reported upto 78.1 percent pulp in mango cultivars.

**Peel Percent**: For peel percent, the lowest values among all selected were found for hybrid 124 - Sipia x Langra (19.4 %) followed by hybrid 137 - (Sipia x Langra) and hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand), with 20.3 and 21.4%, respectively Minimum peel (19.4) percent was exhibited by hybrid 124 (Sipia x Langra), followed by hybrid 137 (Sipia x Langra) with 20.3 % and hybrid 85 (Langra x Rani Pasand) with 21.4 % (Table 1). The maximum (25.8) peel percent recorded with hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian). Mitra and Mitra (2001) evaluated 19 cultivars and reported different peel weight in these cultivars.

Seed / stonepercent : Among all the selected crossings the stone weight for fruits in hybrid118 (Langra x Mylepellian) was the lowest (19.1 %) in comparison with the other selected cultivars, confirming a better relationship with the pulp. On the other hand, the percentages of seed contribution to the total fruit weight for hybrid137 (Sipia x Langra)and hybrid148 (Langra x Neelum) were acceptable (20.3 and 21.1 %, respectively). Hybrid 85(Langra x Rani Pasand) and hybrid 144 (Langra x Amrapali) showed the highest percentages of seed to total fruit weight (24.2 and 24.0 %, respectively). Sarkar et al. (2001) reported that as the fruit Evaluation of physicochemical characteristics in mango weight and size in various cultivars differed, seed weight also varied within the cultivars.

# CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of above-mentioned facts, it may beconcluded that among ten mango hybrids, fruit of hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian) matured earliest, whereas hybrid 122 (Langra x Mithua) proved late. Hybrid 148 (Langra x Neelum) had larger fruit with maximum fruit weight and pulp weight or pulp percentage. The minimum stone and peel percent shown by the fruits of hybrid 118 (Langra x Mylepellian)

and 124 (Sipia x Langra). However, in TSS, hybrid (Langra x Rani Pasand) topped the list.

# **REFERENCES**

- Dalal SR, Jadhao BJ, Jogdande ND, AnjaliMohariya. Comparative performance ofmango varieties under Vidarbha Region ofMaharashtra. *Int. J. of Agric.* Sci.2005;1(1): 91-93.
- Dutta P, Dhua RS. A study on physicochemical changes during growth, maturityand ripening Inmango cv. Safdar Pasand. South Indian Hort. 2004; 52(1/6): 297-301.
- 3. Hoda, M.N., Singh, S., Singh, J., 2003. Evaluation of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cultivars for quality attributes. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences 73(9), 504-506.
- 4. Kumar N, Jaiswal US. Bearing behaviour some west and south Indian mangoes. *Haryana J. of Hort. Sci.* 2003; 32(3/4): 154-158.
- 5. Majumdar PK, Sharma DK. Mango. In:Fruits. Tropical and Subtropical. T.K. Boseand S.K. Mitra (ed), 1990;1-62. NayaProkash, Calcutta.
- Mitra, S. and S. K. Mitra. 2001. Studies on physico-chemical characteristics of nineteen mango cultivars grown in west Bengal. Indian Agriculturist. 45(3-4): 29. 5.
- 7. Sarkar, S. K., B. Gautham, G. Neeraja and N. Vijaya. 2001. Evaluation of mango hybrids under Telangana region Andhra Pradesh. Hort. J. 14(1); 13-21.
- 8. Purseglove J.W. Mangoes west of India.Acta. Hort. 1972; 24: 170-174.
- Ram S. Naturally occurring hormones ofmango and their role in growth and drop offruit. Acta Hort. 1992; 321: 400-411.
- SAC. Fresh Fruits and Vegetables—Sampling; GB/T 8855-2008; The Standardization Administration of China:Beijing, China, 2008.
- Sardar, P.K., Hossain, M.A., Islam, M.S., Khondaker, S.M.A.T., 1998. Studies on thephysico- morphological charactersof some popular mango cultivars. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Sciences 25(1), 1-4.
- 12. Singh RN, Sharma DK, Majumder PK. Anefficient technique of mango hybridization. Scientia *Hort.* 1980; 12:299-301.
- 13. Singh, S., 2002. Evaluation of mango cultivars for their flowering, fruiting and fruit quality attributes. *Progressive Horticulture 34(2)*, 240-243.
- Uthaiah BC, Lingaiah HB, Indiresh KM, Hanumaiah H, Rao KB. Fruit characters of some less popular mango varieties. *Mysore J. of Agric. Sci.* 1990; 24(4): 479-481.