

ISSN 0973-354X
eISSN 2582-4899

JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

Volume 15

December 2020

Number 2



Conserving Honey Bees with Forage Plant Mexican Creeper - *Antigonon leptopus*



Society for Promotion of Horticulture
ICAR - Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bengaluru - 560 089



JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

(Founded in 2005 by the Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Bengaluru, India)

Email : chiefeditor.jhs@gmail.com Webpage : <https://jhs.ihr.res.in/index.php/jhs>

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. S. Sriram

Editors

Dr. K. Himabindu

Dr. G. Senthilkumaran

Dr. Tejaswini Prakash

Dr. M. Manamohan

Dr. Anil Kumar Nair

Dr. J. Satisha

Dr. P. Venkata Rami Reddy

Dr. I.M. Doreyappa Gowda

Dr. R.H. Laxman

Dr. G.C. Sathisha

Editorial Advisory Board

International Editorial Advisory Board

Dr. Nanthi S. Bolan, Australia

Dr. Rod Drew, Australia

Dr. J. Mithila, USA

Dr. Claus Helmut Franz Orth, South Africa

Dr. Ilan Paran, Israel

Dr. Gi-Cheol Song, Republic of Korea

Dr. Jill Stanley, New Zealand

Dr. Palitha Weerakkody, Sri Lanka

National Editorial Advisory Board

Dr. S. D. Shikhamany

Dr. V. A. Parthasarathy

Dr. K. V. Peter

Dr. Sisir K. Mitra

Dr. S.K. Tikoo

Dr. Seetharam Annadana

Dr. A. Krishnamoorthy

Dr. Leela Sahijram

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTION OF HORTICULTURE (REGD.)

Email : sphiihr2005@gmail.com Website : www.sphindia.org

Executive Council - 2020

President : Dr. M.R. Dinesh

Vice Presidents : Dr. G. S. Prakash
Dr. T.N. Shivananda

General Secretary : Dr. C. Aswath

Editor-in- Chief : Dr. S. Sriram

Treasurer : Dr. D.V. Sudhakar Rao

Joint Secretaries : Dr. P.C. Tripathi
Dr. T.H. Singh

Members : Dr. T.S. Aghora
Dr. K.S. Shivashankara
Dr. Prakash Patil
Dr. H. S. Oberoi
Dr. C.K. Narayana
Dr. B. Narayanaswamy
Dr. B. Hemla Naik
Dr. L.N. Mahawer
Dr. Sanjay Kumar Singh
Dr. S.K. Mitra
Dr. S. Hazarika
Dr. Gobind Acharya

This Journal is abstracted in CABI, Current Contents, AGRIS, Indian Science Abstracts, Scopus, DOAJ and Redalyc. It is a participant of AmeliCA.

Request for membership subscriptions along with cheque/DD drawn in favour of **Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Bengaluru** may be sent to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089, India. All members except student members and subscribers get all publications of SPH free of cost. Any correspondence other than editorial may be addressed to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089, India.

Advertising space in the journal is available. For information and rates, please contact General Secretary, SPH, IIHR, Bengaluru - 560 089, India. Advertising material

should cater to the interest of researchers, subscribers, etc. who are involved in promotion of horticulture. Publication of advertisement is not an endorsement or approval, expressed or implied by the SPH or the editors of any service, product or claim made by the manufacturer.

Coverpage Courtesy : **Rami Reddy P.V.**, P.No. 225

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Patron	₹ 20,000
Life member	₹ 5,000
Annual Member	₹ 1,000 / US \$ 100 (US \$ 50 for SAARC countries)
Student Member	₹ 500
Student Life Member	₹ 3,000
Annual Subscription	₹ 1,500 / US \$ 100 (US \$ 60 for SAARC countries) (for institutions)
Enrolment Fee	₹ 200 / US \$ 5 (Additional for all types of Membership)

NAAS rating of this journal is 3.43. JHS is now available online.

Authors have to submit manuscripts using the link : <https://jhs.ihr.res.in/index.php/jhs>

Technical Assistance : Dr. Sridhar Gutam, Thippeswamy S. and Pramida A.

JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES

Volume 15

Number 2

December 2020

CONTENTS

In this Issue

i-ii

Review

- Biodiversity of tropical fruits and their conservation in India** 107-126
Sankaran M. and Dinesh M.R.
- An overview of canopy management in cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.)** 127-135
Adiga D.J., Veena G.L., Thondaiman V. and Babli M.

Original Research in Papers

- Phenotypic variability for horticultural and fruit quality attributes in plastic house grown tomato** 136-146
Adeniji O.T., Tenebe A.V., Ishaka A., Jandong E., Adamu J.T., Adekoya M., Zamzam M.A. and Aremu C.A
- Development and evaluation of novel gladiolus hybrid selections IHRG-7 (IC620379) and IHRG-11 (IC620380) for flower quality and *Fusarium* wilt resistance** 147-152
Rao T.M., Janakiram T., Negi S.S., Aswath C., Dhananjaya M.V., Kumar R. and Ramachandran N.
- Evaluation of potassium salt of phosphonic acid in Nagpur mandarin with special reference to *Phytophthora* management** 153-160
Ingle Y.V., Paithankar D.H., Sadawarte A.K. and Bhonde S.R.
- Genetic analysis in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) based on fruit characteristics of 400 genotypes** 161-172
Sankaran M., Dinesh M.R., Gowda D.C.S. and Venugopalan R.
- Standardization of nitrogen application for potted *Chrysanthemum morifolium* cv. kikiobiory** 173-176
Tanya Thakur
- Influence of inorganic nutrients on growth, flowering and quality of *Dendrobium* cv. Singapore white** 177-182
Sujatha A. Nair, Sankar V., Muralidhara, B.M., Awcharae C.M. and Singh D.R.
- Palynological investigations in *Jasminum* spp.** 183-190
Ganga M., Lakshmi J., Manivannan N. and Rajamani K.



- Effect of putrescine and benzyl adenine on growth, flowering and post-harvest keeping quality parameters in chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum morifolium ramat*)** 191-196
Taranjit Singh and Madhu Bala
- Studies on bioavailability of iron from fe-fortified commercial edible mushroom *Hypsizygusulmarius* and standardization of its delivery system for human nutrition** 197-206
Pandey M., Gowda N.K.S., Satisha G.C., Azeez S., Chandrashekara C., Zamil M. and Roy T.K.
- Amino acid profile of eighteen isolate of different edible macrofungal species** 207-220
Azeez S., Pandey M., Jasmin M.R., Rachitha R., Satisha G.C., Roy T.K.
Chandrashekara C. and Shivashankara K.S.

Short Communications

- A promising new tamarind selection-lakshamana : Linking biodiversity with livelihood** 221-224
Kanupriya C., Karunakaran G. and Singh P.
- Mexican creeper, *Antigonon leptopus* Hook. and Arn : An effective bee forage plant to conserve honey bee** 225-228
Rami Reddy P.V.
- First report on honeydew excretion by the melon thrips, *Thrips palmi* karny (Thysanoptera : Thripidae) and its biochemical analysis** 229-232
Aravintharaj R., Asokan R. and Roy T.K.
- Influence of potting mixture on growth and economics of stone graft of mango cv. alphonso** 233-237
Lad O.A., Kulkarni M.M., Ragaji S.G., Gavankar M.S., Burondkar M.M., Gokhale N.B.
Pawar C.D., Khandekar R.G., Kshirsagar P.J. and Desai V.S.

In this issue...

Hearty New Year Greetings from our Editorial Team to all the readers of JHS!

As the world is slowly coming out of glitches of pandemic, there is no other better way than celebrating 2021 as Year of Fruits and Vegetables as announced by United Nations Assembly to welcome the new year and recognize the importance of nutrition for better health. Fruits and Vegetables ensure the Nutritional Security to humankind. They play key role in addressing the malnutrition that is a major concern. We are proud that JHS creatins awareness of importance of fruits and vegetables by publishing the recent developments in research with respect to these crops.

*Diversity of fruit crops and genetic resources available with respect to fruit crops are important for developing better fruit crop varieties. **Sankaran and Dinesh** have reviewed the “Biodiveristy of Fruit Crops in India” in a very comprehensive way. There is diversity in Jasmine species. **Ganga et al.** carried out the palynological investigations and recorded the variability in pollen morphology in different species of Jasmine by documenting images using scanning electron microscope. Biodiversity can be linked to livelihood also. One such success story with tamarind selection ‘Lakhamna’ is being reported by **Kanupriya et al.** This tamarind selection has been identified from participatory breeding programme. It has a better pod characters and more preferred by consumers.*

*Protected cultivation has seen greater momentum in last two decades. **Adeniji et al.** identified the best varieties of tomato for polyhouse cultivation in Nigeria. **Rao et al.** selected two gladiolus hybrid selections IIHRG-7 and IIHRG-11 with red purple and red coloured flowers respectively. These hybrids have resistance to Fusarium wilt and suitable for cut flower and flower arrangement purposes. **Sankaran et al.** analysed the variance for 6 quantitative and 30 qualitative traits in mango in 400 genotypes and identified 18 clusters. Selected genotypes from specific clusters can be used in hybridization programme.*

*The production aspects are important in perennial crops. It is crop management that needs to be prioritized for enhanced yield. **Adiga et al.** have reviewed the research work carried in “Canopy Management in Cashew”, providing the wholistic view of cultural operations to have a better crop. Use of soilless medium in nursery industry is gaining importance. Best suited potting mixture for mango stone graft of cv. Alphonso has been identified by **Lad et al.** They found that cocopeat + leaf manure + compost (1:1:2) as pot mixture provided better plant growth.*

*Growing Chrysanthemum in pots is practiced in home and terrace gardens. The cultivar Kikiobiory is well suited for this purpose. **Thakur** has studied the nitrogen requirement for this cultivar and has come out with the recommendation of 300 mg of N per pot applied*



twice in September and October in Punjab for best results. In another study, **Singh and Bala** confirmed that use of benzyl adenine at 200 ppm helped in extended vase life of *Chrysanthemum morifolium* flowers. **Nair et al.** recorded that foliar spray of 30:20:20 NPK at weekly interval recorded more number of flowers of *Dendrobium* cv. Singapore White with significantly longer spikes.

Crop production is directly influenced by pollinators. Decline in honey bee population is a serious concern and to conserve the pollinators community approach through ecosystem services is required. **Rami Reddy** reports the benefits of having ornamental plant Mexican Creeper (*Antigonon leptopus*) as forage plant. This creeper attracted all the four species of honey bees studied. This creeper can be used as bioindicator of honey bee population.

Aravindaraj et al. have reported the honey dew secretion by *Thrips palmi* and analysed the composition of it. They had identified different sugars present in the honey dew secretion of *Thrips*. *Thrips* not only cause direct damage but act as vectors of many plant viruses. Management of diseases in perennial crops is a challenge. *Phytophthora* incited root infection in citrus needs concerted efforts. **Ingle et al.** have demonstrated that use of potassium salt of phosphonic acid could help in management of *Phytophthora* root rot in Nagpur Mandarin.

Mushrooms can fill the gaps in nutritional security as they are rich in nutritive value. Iron deficiency is important issue to be addressed. Iron fortified oyster mushroom products have been developed by **Pandey et al.** The bioavailability of iron from Arka Mushroom Fe-Fortified Rasam Powder has been confirmed. In another study, the amino acid profile of 18 isolates of oyster mushroom species belonging to 4 species have been documented by **Azeez et al.** Quantification of essential and non-essential amino acids has been reported. Nutritionally superior isolates can be selected from these isolates.

The editorial team of JHS expresses the sincere efforts of reviewers who really complement the publication processes. All scientists and scholars can utilize the open access of JHS. Recently FAO has made JHS available through AGRIS. It is indexed by Redalyc, CABI_Hort and Scopus. All subscribers, scientists and scholars are requested to continue their support in publishing quality information in **Journal of Horticultural Sciences**.

S. Sriram
Editor in Chief

Original Research Paper

Genetic Analysis in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) based on fruit characteristics of 400 genotypes

Sankaran M.*, Dinesh M. R.*, Gowda D.C.S. and Venugopalan R.

Division of fruit crops, ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research
Hesaraghatta Lake post, Bengaluru - 560 089

*Corresponding author Email : drmrinesh@gmail.com, kmsankaran@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The analysis of variance for 6 quantitative traits and 30 qualitative traits showed significant differences among the 400 genotypes of mango which indicates the existence of high heterozygosity. Among the 18 clusters formed, the highest fruit weight of 1404.27 g was recorded in cluster 10 followed by cluster 15 with 1280.67g whereas the lowest fruit weight was recorded in cluster 16 (30.94g). The highest fruit length (22.03 cm) was recorded in cluster 10 followed by 17.80 cm in cluster 14. Similarly, the fruit diameter was highest (12.18 cm) in cluster 10 followed by 12.03 cluster 4. The fruit thickness was highest (10.60 cm) in cluster 15 followed by cluster 4 with 9.96 cm. The pulp recovery was maximum (87.16%) in cluster-14 followed by followed by cluster 4 and 18 with 79.28 and 78.41 %, respectively. The clusters 15 had the varieties meant for pickle making and possessed the less TSS whereas the TSS of above 19°B was recorded in cluster 2. The maximum inter cluster (D^2) value was obtained between cluster 10 and cluster 11. These clusters may be used for hybridization programme due to wide variability and possibility of transgressive sergeants. Estimates of phenotypic variance and genotypic variance had only a narrow difference for all six characters studied indicating that these characters are not much influenced by environmental factors and highly heritable which can be exploited by adopting clonal selection or selection of chance seedlings and selection as parents for breeding purpose.

Key words: Biplot analysis, GCV, Genetic analysis, Heritability, Mango and PCV,

INTRODUCTION

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) is originated from the Indo-Burma region and genus *Mangifera* has more than 60 species world-wide, the highest diversity being found in the Malayan Peninsula, Borneo and Sumatra (Bompard,1993). Mukherjee (1953) opines that mango has been under cultivation for at least 4000 years with over 1000 varieties in cultivation. Almost all these are selections made from open-pollinated seedlings and selection by man from seedlings of unknown parentage has played the most significant role in the development of new mango cultivars (Singh, 1963). Mango is a premier fruit crop in India as well as some other countries in the tropical world with respect to being its eminent place in nutritional security and employment and income generation. The present

scenario and expected future need of mangoes necessitate bringing improvement in mango with respect to the productivity not only per tree but also per unit area of land. A need has therefore, arisen to develop high yielding varieties of dwarf plant type, high fruit quality and resistant to biotic and abiotic stresses. Studies have been made for understanding diversity in the genus *Mangifera* and the possibility of its use in improvement of mango through introduction and selection of promising varieties for commercial cultivation and making further improvement in the existing varieties through inter-specific and inter-varietal hybridization and induction of useful mutations.

Mukherjee (1948) has described 72 mango varieties from Bengal, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.



Simultaneously, Naik and Gangolly (1950) have described 335 varieties of South India. Apart from the fruit characters, they have also laid great stress on the vegetative characters. The list of 1595 cultivars of mango in world (Pandey, 1998) was revised with the names of 1663 cultivars by Pandey and Dinesh (2010). The updated list now contains the names of 1682 cultivars. There are seven centres of diversity exists in India which includes (i) humid subtropical region (Manipur, Tripura, Mizoram and south Assam), (ii) Chhota Nagpur Plateau (trijunction of Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and Bihar), (iii) Santhal Paragana, (iv) Southern Madhya Pradesh (tribal area) adjoining Odisha and Andhra Pradesh, (v) Dhar Plateau of Madhya Pradesh adjoining South Rajasthan and Gujarat, (vi) humid tropical southern peninsular India and (vii) Andaman & Nicobar group of islands (Yadav and Rajan, 1993). A list of the names of cultivars available in the world as probable gene sources for dwarf-ness, fruit size, red peel colour, high pulp content, high content of total soluble solids, long shelf-life of fruit, regularity in fruit bearing, earliness and lateness in fruit maturity and good processing quality have been mentioned by Pandey and Dinesh (2010). Dinesh and Vasugi (2002) catalogued 151 cultivars of mango including *M. zeylanica*. Another lot of 223 varieties of mango were catalogued by Dinesh *et al.*, (2012) using Bioversity International Descriptors and they developed barcodes for these varieties through molecular characterization. There is a great variation in fruit weight in mango. Pandey and Dinesh (2010) categorized mango on the basis of fruit weight as very small (99g and below), small (100-149g), medium large (150-299g), large (300-500g) and very large (more than 500g) fruited varieties. Out of 61 varieties of mango registered in U.S.A., 19 varieties have been reported to bear large to very large fruits (Brooks and Olmo, 1972). The evaluation of genetic variability with in a cultivated crop has important consequences in plant breeding and germplasm management. The yield and its contributing traits improvement in this crop can be achieved through selection of superior genotypes with desirable traits existing in nature. Mahalanobis (D^2) statistics which is based on the multivariate analysis of quantitative trait is powerful tool for measuring genetic divergence among the population. Therefore, an attempt has been made to study the variability of fruit characteristics among 400 mango germplasm.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experimental materials consists of 400 mango genotypes belonging to different geographical regions of the world were evaluated for over the three years (2014-17) at ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bengaluru. The experimental material comprised of 400 mango germplasm belonging to different geographical regions and evaluated in the year 2015, 2016 and 2017. The fruit characteristics such as fruit weight (g), fruit length (cm), fruit diameter (cm), fruit thickness (cm), pulp recovery (%) and TSS (°Brix) have been recorded by using the standard procedure. Thirty qualitative characteristics have been used to catalogue 400 varieties as per the standard descriptors given by the Bioversity International (IPGRI, 1997). At the first instance, statistical tools such as ANOVA and F-test were used to evaluate the significant difference ($p < 0.05$) among the varieties/hybrid individually for all the traits. Least Significant Difference (LSD) was computed as a Post-hoc test (Cochran and Cox, 1957). SAS GLM was used to develop suitable codes for the statistical analysis (SAS V 9.3 2012).

Biometrical Analysis

With a view to understand the extent of diversity to which the observed variation were due to genetic factors, the phenotypic variance (PV), genotypic variance (GV), phenotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV), broad sense heritability (h^2), genetic advance (GA) and genetic advance as per cent over mean (GAM) were computed (Falconer, 1985; Venugopalan, 2015).

Estimation of genetic parameters

$$\text{Genotypic variance } (\sigma_g^2) = \frac{\text{Treatment MSS} + \text{Error MSS}}{r}$$

Environmental variance (σ_e^2) = Error mean sum of squares

$$\text{Phenotypic variance } (\sigma_p^2) = \sigma_g^2 + \sigma_e^2$$

Coefficient of variation

The coefficient of variation (CV) being a standardized form of variance is useful for comparing the extent of variation between different characters with different scales. Genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation were estimated according to

Burton and Dewane (1953) based on estimate of genotypic and phenotypic variance.

$$\text{Genotypic coefficient of variation} = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_g^2}}{\bar{X}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Phenotypic coefficient of variation} = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_p^2}}{\bar{X}} \times 100$$

Where \bar{X} = General mean of the character

σ_g^2 = Genotypic variance

σ_p^2 = Phenotypic variance

Heritability (h^2)

Heritability in broad sense was calculated as the ratio of genotypic variance to the phenotypic variance and expressed in percentage (Falconer, 1985).

Heritability (h^2) =

Where σ_g^2 = Genotypic variance

σ_p^2 = Phenotypic variance

Expected genetic advance

Expected genetic advance (EGA) was calculated using the formula given by Robinson *et al.*, (1949).

$$\text{EGA} = i \times h^2 \times \hat{\sigma}_p$$

Where i = Selection of differential (2.06) at five per cent selection intensity

h^2 = Heritability in broad sense

$\hat{\sigma}_p$ = Phenotypic standard deviation

Genetic advance over mean

Genetic advance as per cent over mean was worked out as suggested by Johnson *et al.*, (1955).

GAM =

Where GA = Genetic advance

= General mean of the character

Correlation

Genotypic (r_g) and phenotypic (r_p) coefficients of correlation were estimated as suggested by Al-Jibourie *et al.*, (1958).

$$\text{Genotypic correlation} = \frac{C_o V_{xy} (G)}{\sqrt{V_x (G) \times V_y (G)}}$$

$$\text{Phenotypic correlation} = \frac{C_o V_{xy} (P)}{\sqrt{V_x (P) \times V_y (P)}}$$

Where

$C_o V_{xy} (G)$ = Genotypic covariance between x and y

$C_o V_{xy} (P)$ = Phenotypic covariance between x and y

$V_x (G)$ = Genotypic variance of character x

$V_x (P)$ = Phenotypic variance of character x

$V_y (G)$ = Genotypic variance of character y

$V_y (P)$ = Phenotypic variance of character y

Test of significance of correlation was tested by comparing the 'r' value with obtained value.

Estimated heritability (broad sense) was classified as low (< 30 %), medium (30 – 60 %) and high (> 60 %) and the range of genetic advance as a percentage of mean was classified as low (< 10 %), moderate (10 – 20 %) and high (> 20 %) as suggested by Johnson *et al.* (1955). SAS package was used to develop suitable codes for the statistical analysis (SAS V 9.3 (2012)).

Using quantitative traits, the genetic distance among the populations is calculated using D2 statistics (Rencher, 1995) on the basis of multiple characters. The clustering of genetic groups is done by a method suggested by Tocher (Rao, 1974). The means of all the characters were subjected to Squared Euclidian Cluster analysis and a dendrogram was derived using Ward's method (Rencher, 1995).

RESULTS

The analysis of variance for 6 quantitative traits showed significant differences among the 400 genotypes of mango which indicates the existence of genetic diversity. Means for different qualitative characters of 400 accessions of mango are given as Supplementary Table S1 (Available online). The maximum fruit weight of 1404.27g in variety Sora followed by 1280.67g in variety Amini where as the

minimum fruit weight was of 29,51g in variety Kana Appe followed by 39.31g in variety Halasage. The fruit length was maximum (22.03 cm) in var. Sora followed 16.77cm in hybrid 7/15 where as the minimum fruit length of 4.33cm was recorded in var. Pacharasi. The maximum fruit diameter 13.50 cm was recorded in var. Dorgani Kavi followed by 11.33 cm in var. Maharaja Pasand where as minimum fruit diameter of 3.33 cm was recorded in var. Dodderi Jeerige. The maximum fruit thickness of 11.40cm was recorded in var. Dorgani Kavi followed by 9.87 in var. Amini whereas the minimum thickness was recorded (2,80cm) in Haldotta Appe. The highest pulp recovery (89.67%) was recorded in var. Manoranjan followed by 88.20 % in var. Lahara whereas the lowest pulp recovery was recorded in var. Halasage. The highest TSS (°Brix) of 31.00 was recorded in var. Dattatreya

local followed by 30.67 in var.K-0-7 where as the lowest was recorded in var. Halasage (5.5%)

The cluster mean analysis (Table 1) reveals that there is a huge variation among the clusters. Highest fruit weight of 1404.27 g was recorded in cluster 10 followed by cluster 15 with 1280.67g. Whereas the lowest fruit weight was recorded in cluster 16 (30.94g). The highest fruit length (22.03 cm) was recorded in cluster 10 followed by 17.80 cm in cluster 14. Similarly, the fruit diameter was highest (12.18 cm) in cluster 10 followed by 12.03 cluster 4. The fruit thickness was highest (10.60 cm) in cluster 15 followed by cluster 4 with 9.96 cm. The pulp recovery was maximum (87.16%) in cluster-14 followed by cluster 4 and 18 with 79.28 and 78.41 %, respectively.

Table 1. Cluster mean for quantitative traits of 400 mango genotypes

Clusters	Fruit weight (g)	Fruit length (cm)	Fruit diameter (cm)	Fruit thickness (cm)	Pulp (%)	TSS (°Brix)
Cluster 1	376.51	10.81	8.19	7.25	74.48	18.95
Cluster 2	246.93	9.27	7.16	6.43	70.35	19.36
Cluster 3	144.69	8.04	5.94	5.27	63.28	18.31
Cluster 4	1188.69	15.30	12.03	9.96	79.28	14.97
Cluster 5	197.24	8.78	6.62	5.94	68.42	19.23
Cluster 6	527.53	12.60	9.09	7.91	78.60	19.26
Cluster 7	1015.20	16.77	11.07	9.60	79.26	17.47
Cluster 8	452.59	11.20	8.73	7.72	73.79	18.64
Cluster 9	835.55	13.70	10.75	9.26	79.25	17.02
Cluster 10	1404.27	22.03	12.18	9.50	78.78	13.53
Cluster 11	86.84	5.97	5.24	4.62	60.68	17.50
Cluster 12	965.09	15.32	11.08	9.14	79.49	16.27
Cluster 13	305.87	10.09	7.66	6.85	72.30	19.18
Cluster 14	1077.39	17.80	11.00	9.13	87.16	13.60
Cluster 15	1280.67	15.93	11.67	10.60	74.23	11.23
Cluster 16	38.94	6.70	3.40	3.12	27.54	13.98
Cluster 17	625.93	13.25	9.46	8.70	78.37	17.14
Cluster 18	714.91	14.11	9.70	8.41	78.41	17.79
Average	340.525	10.076	7.59	6.7289	70.7	18.581

The maximum inter cluster (D^2) value was obtained between cluster 10 and cluster 11. These clusters may be used for hybridization programme due to wide variability and possibility of transgressive sergeants. The minimum cluster distance was obtained in cluster

2 and cluster 5 which indicates that the accessions belonging to such clusters are relatively close. The selection of parents from genetically close clusters may be due to narrow genetic base and inbreeding depression.

The pattern of distribution of accessions in different clusters indicating the existence genetic diversity which is related to geographical distribution. These 400 genotypes were grouped in to 18 clusters as presented in Table 2 which is apparent that cluster 1 (28 accessions), cluster 2(63 accessions), cluster 3(50 accessions), cluster 4 (3 accessions), cluster 5 (56 accessions), cluster 6 (20 accessions), cluster 7 (1 accessions), cluster 8 (34 accessions), cluster 9 (7 accessions), cluster 10 (1 accession), cluster11 (24

accessions), cluster 12 (6 accessions), cluster 13 (53 accessions) cluster14 (1 accession), cluster15 (1 accession), cluster16 (3 accessions), cluster17 (12 accessions) and cluster 18 (10 accessions).The clusters such as 7, 10, 14 and 15 had 1 accession in each with hybrid 7/15, Sora, Tella Gulabi and Amini, respectively. All these accessions possessed the fruit weight ranged from 1015.20g to 1280.67g which are meant for pickle making.

Table 2. Distribution mango accessions in various clusters

Clusters	Varieties/Hybrids
Cluster 1 (48accessions)	Ananas, Arka Puneet, Ashrafi, Bangalore Sindhura, Bennet Alphonso, Bombay Green, Chambeliwala, Chinnarasam, Cipia, Dalbia, Dilpasand, Dori,Fazrizafarani,H-165,H-85, Himsagar, Kacha Meetha, Kadikai, Kari Ishad, Karkanchavadi Rumani, Keitt, Khazri, Kitchner, Kurd, Lord, Madan Rao Pasand, Mahmood Bahar, Maya, Motichoor, Muffarai, Mulgoa, Mumbaigar, Murshidabad, Navneet, Nom- Dok-Moi, Nr.25, Pattar, Peddarasam, Potte, Prior, Rangoon Goa, Rumani, Salem, Sanakalu, Santi, Mulgoa, Tatamidi, Tenkasi Banganpalli, Thogarapalli.
Cluster 2 (63accessions)	Almas, Alphonso black, Ambika, Ameer gola, Andamans local, Apple Rumani, Ashruf-Us-Samar, Asiquote, Badami modal, Bhopdya, Borsha, Botlimavu, Brindabani, Chimut, CISH M-2, Devrakhio, Dofasala, Gidagana Mavu, Gopal Bhog, Guruvam, Hindustan Ball,Hy-87, Hyder Sahib, IRS (Long fruit), Jawahar, Kasturi Mamidi (R), Kohinoor, Kottur Konum, Kove Sara, Lal Sundari, Lat Sundari, Mahamoozda, Malai Misri, Malgesh, Mandor Katta, <i>Mangifera zeylanica</i> , Manibhatta Appe, Manipur, Manoranjan (Sreddy), Moreh, Muvandan, Nagin, Neelgoa, Olour, Panchavarnam, Papayakhas, Prabhashankar, Puttu, Raja Pasand, Ramphalya, Raspuri, Rosa, Safeda Malihabad, Santhura Collection, Sardar, Sensation, Sepia, Sindhu, Sundar Langra, Sundarshan, Tenkasi Rumani, Tofanchan and Vellaikulamban
Cluster 3 (50accession)	Adderi jeerige, Amrapali, Anfas, Balekoppa appe, Bappakkai, Barbalia, Bombay darsha, Chengavarikai, Coorg Collection, Dattatreya local, Dashehari Clone-51, Ec 95862, Gomavu, H-12 (Arka udaya), H-151, Hamsa Mamidi, Hilario, Hittalhalli Appe, Jeerige, Kalapadi, Kalkuni, Karigal Appe, Kerala Kalapadi, Khas-Ul-Khas, Kintalavenipeta, K-o-22, Kobbe, Kurukkan, Kutumba Appe, La resorce -1, La Resource-2, Lalmuni, Lazzat baksh, Licthi, <i>Mangifera griffithi</i> , Narayanasheni, Narela (SR), Nekkare, Paiyur-1, Sabre, Sadamidi, Safeda Lucknow, Siddapura Alavalli, Siroli, Terpentine, Thali, Thumbbeedu, Vattam, Vinayaka Hegde, Willard
Cluster 4 (3 accessions)	DorganiKayi, Maharaja Pasand(L), Safed Mulgoa
Cluster 5 (56 accessions)	Achar Pasand, Agarabathi, Akhadya, Alfazli, All season, Ambalavi, Ananthabhatta appe, AtiMadhuram, Bandariya, Bhutto Bombay, Bobbalipunasa, Bombayno.1, Carabao(g), Carabao(s), Chandanum, Chitanga, Fernandin, Furtad, H-14, IRS (Small fruit), Isagoor Appe, Janardhan Pasand, Java, Kalapara, Kalgundi Koppa Appe, ,Karanjio, Khuddus, Kishen Bhog, Zardalu, KM P7, <i>Mangifera odorata</i> , Miranda, Mohammada Vikarabad, Mohandas, Mylupilian, Naati, Nalla Mamidi, Neeleshwari, Neelphonso, Neeluddin, Pacharisi (TN), Panakalu, Peach, PKM-2, Ratnagiri Alphonso, Ratul, Ropeday, Royal Special, Samarbehisht Chausa, Shandariya, Sharbathi Bagri, Shidadakke Appe, Surankundi, Virudhanagar, Yakutti and Zardalu
Cluster 6 (20 accessions)	Arya Samaj, Azam-Us –Samar, Badaaam, Bandar bandal, Chausa, Fakir, Fakirwala, Hansraj, Jalal, Kerala Dwarf, Lahara, Lal Khatra, Manoranjan, Ostin, Padiri, Sai Sugandh, Samparpatti Totapuri, Swathantram, Thatnur and Vanraj.
Cluster 7 (1 accession)	Hybrid 7/15

Cluster 8 (34 accessions)	Abbas, Allampurbaneshan, Aryavarthana Rasalu, Black ceri, Bombay alphonso, Bombay natasala, Bombay peda, Chandrama, Chettalli, Dannalli appe, Danti Mamidi, Fazli, Goa Kodur, H-56, Harsha, Himam Pasand, Hyb-11/14, Intimax (P3), Jehangir, Kalami Hindustani, Kensington, K-o-11, Ku-8, Mage Mavu, Manjeera, Mombasa, Mundappa Black, Navaneetham, Nazukbadan, Neeleshan, Pkm 1, Ruswani, Thorappadi, Warate Gidaga
Cluster 9 (7 accessions)	Arka Aruna, Begum Pasand, Black Andrews, Hamlet, Katta Gola, Rajapuri, Thambva
Cluster 10 (1 accession)	Sora
Cluster 11 (24 accessions)	Appemidi, Chandrakaran, Chanshi, Creeping, DodderiJeerige, Elaichi, Gurumurthy Appe, Hajeera, Heera Chowki, Huli Appekai, Kalakai, Kempikundi, Lalpasand, Malange, Muregeer, Musoore, Mylapuri, Nuha (M), Pacharasi, Rasool, Rubi, Starch, Tenkasi Neelum, Vhout
Cluster 12 (6 accessions)	Himayat Pasand, Kerali Goa, Kothapalli Kobbari, Mutwar Pasand, Shahjahan, Tenneru
Cluster 13 (55 accessions)	Alphonso, Anda, Arka anmol, Arka Neelkiran, Asif Pasand, Au Rumani, Badagulab, Chauthi, Cherukurasam, Chitha, Colaso, Dashehari, Dwarf Rumani, Faluda, Gaddahall Appe, Goa Bunder, Goa Mankurd, Gola, Goran Appe, Hur (SR), Jamedar, K-0-7, Kadari, Kadri, Kalakand, Kalwa Gudda, Kesar, Kirsapati, Kolanka Goa, Krishna, Laddu, Langra, Latif, Lemon, Maharaja of Mysore, Mallika, Mandamane, Nagalapalli Rasalu, Neelum,Nr-34 Local, Panchadara Kalasa, Papayaraju Goa, Peter, Pulihara, Ratna, Rehman, Pasand, Salem Bangalora, Shakkar Gola, Sushan Bhog, Suvarna Rekha, Swarna Jehangir, Taimur Pasand, Tephala, Tokio, Xavier
Cluster 14 (1 accession)	Tella Gulabi
Cluster 15 (1 accessions)	Amini
Cluster 16 (3 accessions)	Halasage, Haldotta Appe, Kana Appe-1
Cluster 17 (17 accessions)	Balakondapari, Balakrishnan, Banganapalli, Cowasji Patel, Ebatti Mavu, Eldon, Elephant Head, K -0-32, Kasturi Mamidi (l), Khudadath, K-0-15, Lily, Maharaja Pasand(rd), Shendriyo, Tommy Atkins, Totapuri, Whiteceri
Cluster 18 (10 accessions)	Anardana,Gaddemar,Kmh-1, Makaram, Mohan Rao Pasand, Mulgoa Black, Nymath, Pahilwan, Papaya (SR), Rebello

Estimates of phenotypic variance and genotypic variance had only a narrow difference for all six characters studied indicating that these characters are not much influenced by environmental factors (Table 3). This also suggests the presence of sufficient genetic variability which can be exploited by adopting clonal selection or selection of chance seedlings. The maximum PCV was recorded for fruit weight followed by fruit length and fruit diameter. This indicates the better scope for phenotypic selection of these traits for improvement.

Heritability and genetic advance for fruit characters varied considerably. The high heritability (0.84 to 0.94) and high estimate of genetic advance recorded for fruit weight, fruit length, fruit diameter, fruit thickness, pulp

recovery and TSS. High heritability indicates the effectiveness of selection through phenotypic performance but it does not mean a high genetic gain. However, high heritability associated with high genetic advance proves more useful for efficient improvement of a character through simple selection. In the present study, high heritability estimates with high genetic advance as per cent over mean was observed for the all the fruit traits studied indicating the possible role of additive gene action, whereas moderate heritability with low genetic advance as per cent over mean indicating the non-additive gene action. In the present investigation, the estimates of genotypic correlations in general were higher than phenotypic correlations, indicating the presence of inherent association between various characters.

A total of 30 characters have been used to group the 400 genotypes as per standard descriptor of the Bioversity International (Table 4) which is evident that

there are gradations of variations due to the heterozygosity nature of the crop.

Table 3. Genetic parameters for fruit characteristics of 400 mango accessions

Characters	Mean	Range	CV	GCV	PCV	h ²	Genetic advancement as % of mean
Fruit weight (g)	336.61	29.10-1404.2	15.141	63.946	65.714	0.946	128.37
Fruit length (cm)	10.050	4.33-22.03	6.228	25.317	26.072	0.942	50.72
Fruit diameter (cm)	7.57	3.23-13.50	5.589	20.529	21.276	0.930	40.86
Fruit thickness(cm)	6.71	2.80-11.40	8.287	19.346	21.046	0.844	36.68
Pulp recovery (%)	70.76	18.93 -89.67	4.762	13.234	14.065	0.885	25.69
TSS (°Brix)	18.61	5.50-31.00	8.124	20.501	22.052	0.864	39.32

Table 4. Grouping of 400 germplasm of mango based on qualitative traits

Character	Percentage (%)	Character	Percentage (%)	Character	Percentage (%)
1.Fruit shape		11.Fruit beak type		1. Slightly Juicy	50.00
1. Oblong	67.5	1. Absent	79.75	2. Juicy	41.75
2. Elliptic	1.50	2. Pointed	14.75	3. Very Juicy	8.25
3. Roundish	30.5	3. prominent	3.75	21.Pulp aroma	
4. Ovoid	0.25	4. Mammiform	1.75	1 Mild	55.50
5. Obovoid	0.25	12.Fruit sinus type		2. Intermediate	28.75
2.Shape of fruit apex		0. Absent	53.50	3. Strong	15.75
1. Acute	48.75	1. Shallow	38.25	22.Presence of turpentine flavour	
2. Obtuse	38.75	2. Deep	8.25	0. Absent	61.00
3. Round	12.50	13.Fruit skin waxiness		1. Mild	22.00
3.Fruit attractiveness		1. Waxy	95.50	2. Intermediate	9.50
1. Poor	15.75	2. Non-waxy	4.50	3. Strong	7.50
2. Average	35.25	14.Pulp colour of ripe fruit		23.Veins on stone	
3. Good	39.00	1. Light yellow	1.00	1. Level with surface	46.75
4. Excellent	10.00	2. Golden yellow	-	2. Depressed	14.50
4.Fruit skin surface texture		3. Yellow orange	66.00	3. Elevated	38.75
1. Smooth	84.75	4. Orange	14.50	24.Pattern of stone venation	
2. Rough	15.25	5. Greenish yellow	0.25	1. Parallel	46.00
5.Density of lenticels on fruit skin		6. Yellow	17.50	2. Forked	54.00
3. Spare	21.25	7. Light orange	0.25	25 Quantity of fiber on stone	
5. Medium	23.00	8. Dark orange	0.50	3. Low	57.50
7. Dense	55.75	15.Pulp texture of ripe fruit		5. Intermediate	27.50
6.Fruit stalks insertion		3. Soft	25.50	7. High	15.00
1. Vertical	71.25	5. Intermediate	40.00	26.Adherence of fiber to stone	

2. Oblique	28.75	7. Firm	34.50	3. Weak	12.25
7.Depth of fruit stalk cavity		16.Adherence of fruit skin to pulp		5. Intermediate	29.75
0. Absent	41.25	0. Absent (free)	17.75	7. Strong	58.00
1. Shallow	43.75	3. Weak	38.00	27Space occupied by seed inside the stone (%)	
2. Medium	6.50	5. Intermediate	27.00	1. < 25	1.75
3. Deep	7.75	7. Strong	17.25	2. 26 - 50	2.25
4. Very deep	0.75	17.Quantity of fiber in pulp		3. 51 - 75	19.25
8. Fruit stalks attachment		0. Absent	3.75	4. 76- 100	76.75
3. Weak	6.50	3. Low	48.75	28.Seed shape	
5. Intermediate	55.25	5. Medium	32.25	1. Ellipsoid	2.75
7. Strong	38.25	7. High	15.25	2. Oblong	13.75
9.Fruit neck prominence		18.Adherence of fiber to fruit skin		3. Reniform	83.50
0. Absent	80.75	3. Low	49.75	29.Type of embryony	
1. Slightly prominent	12.75	5. Intermediate	39.25	1. Monoembryony	91.50
2. Prominent	5.50	7. High	11.00	2. Polyembryony	8.50
3. Very prominent	1.00	19. Fiber length in the pulp.		30.Eating quality	
10.Slope of fruit ventral shoulder		3. Short (0.58 -2)	44.25	3. Poor	16.75
1. Slopping abruptly	9.00	5. Medium (2.1-5)	6.50	5. Good	63.50
2. Ending in a long curve	44.75	7. Long (5.1 & above)	49.25	7. Very good	15.50
3. Rising and then rounded	46.25	20.Pulp juiciness		9. Excellent	4.25

DISCUSSION

The analysis of variance for 6 quantitative traits exhibited the significant differences among the 400 genotypes of mango which indicates the existence of genetic diversity within the *Mangifera indica*. The maximum fruit weight of 1404.27g in var. Sora followed by 1280.67g in var. Amini whereas the minimum fruit weight was of 29,51g in var. Kana Appe followed by 39.31g in var. Halasage. The results are similar as reported by Pandey and Dinesh (2010). While selecting the parents for hybridization programme, the quantitative characters such as fruit weight, fruit length, fruit thickness, fruit diameter, and pulp recovery should be considered as all of them have high heritability. Transgressive segregation was observed for fruit size in the progeny (Iyer and Subramanyam, 1987) and it appeared to be governed by additive genes (Sharma and Majumder, 1988a). Detailed study conducted by Prabhuram (1998) based

on heritability, expected genetic advance and total genetic variance gave useful information on inheritance of different fruit characters. Fruit weight was influenced considerably by the environmental conditions. Equal proportion of the additive and non-additive components of the total genetic variance influenced its genotype. Rajan *et al.*, (2009) found high degree of broad sense heritability in mango varieties for the length and weight of fruit, peel weight and length and weight of stone. The fruit length was maximum (22.03 cm) in var. Sora followed 16.77cm in hybrid 7/15 where as the minimum fruit length of 4.33cm was recorded in var. Pacharasi. Fruit length shows transgressive segregation in either side of the parental limits and therefore, suggested a polygenic control of this character. Also, this character was influenced by environment to a considerable extent (Pandey, 2012). The maximum fruit thickness of 11.40cm was recorded in var. Dorgani Kavi followed by 9.87 in var. Amini whereas the minimum thickness

was recorded (2,80cm) in Haldotta Appe. Fruit thickness showed polygenic control and was highly influenced by environmental factors. For breadth of fruit the genotypic contribution appeared to be comparatively lesser than in most of the traits. The peel colour and attractiveness are considered as important qualitative traits in mango, only 10% of the germplasm possess excellent attractiveness out of 400 germplasm screened. A high frequency of hybrids with red peel or burgundy blush can be recovered from crosses where one of the parents has an intense red blush (Brittall *et al.*, 2004). The highest pulp recovery (89.67%) was recorded in var. Manoranjan followed by 88.20 % in var. Lahara whereas the lowest pulp recovery was recorded in var. Halasage. The highest TSS (°Brix) of 31.00 was recorded in var. Dattatreya local followed by 30.67 in var.K-0-7 where as the lowest was recorded in var. Halasage (5.5%). Sharma and Majumder (1988) stated that total Beta carotenoid pigments and T.S.S. content in these two hybrids exceeded the better parent Dashehari suggesting the gene action showing transgressive segregation for this trait. On the other hand, light yellow colour of pulp appeared dominant over orange yellow in the progenies of Alphonso x Neelum cross (Iyer, 1991). According to Prabhuram (1998), total soluble solids (T.S.S.) content in some hybrids transgressed either of the parents Amrapali and Sensation, which suggested a polygenic control for this trait and that it was influenced considerably by environmental factors.

Brettall *et al.*, (2004) observed that many important fruit quality aspects such as fruit weight, fruit shape, ground skin colour, fruit width and pulp depth have high heritability, and can therefore be readily selected in a breeding programme. For non-ordered traits scored in discrete categories (blush colour, bloom, lenticel colour, embryo type and flavour), an estimate was made of data consistency from multiple scores for individual hybrids at different times and locations. Relatively high consistency value was recorded for fruit flavour, and in combinations involving Kensington Pride. The analysis of blush colour and fruit flavour in twelve families of hybrids has confirmed that these characters have a strong genetic component, the high frequency of hybrids with red or burgundy blush can be recovered from crosses where one parent has an intense red blush colour. Singh *et al.*, (2004) observed wide magnitude of phenotypic coefficient of variation

with high genetic advance for yield per plant and fruit weight in 31 chance seedlings of mango.

Biometrical studies

The analysis of variance for 6 quantitative traits showed significant difference among 400 germplasm of mango indicating the existence of diversity. These germplasms have been grouped in to 18 clusters and distribution of germplasm among the clusters varied in numbers which indicates that genetic divergence was related to geographical differentiation. The clustering of genotypes from different eco-geographical locations in to one cluster can be attributed to possibility of free exchange of germplasm. Similar observation was recorded by Singh and Gupta. However, unidirectional selection practiced for a particular trait or a group of linked traits in several places may produce similar phenotype which can be aggregated in to one cluster irrespective of their geographical origin as reported by Singh and Gupta (1968). The maximum inter cluster (D^2) value was obtained between cluster 10 and cluster 11. These clusters may be used for hybridization programme due to wide variability and possibility of transgressive segregants (Singh, 1991; Singh *et al.*, 1991). The minimum cluster distance was obtained in cluster 2 and cluster 5 which indicates that the accessions belonging to such clusters are relatively close. The selection of parents from genetically close clusters may be due to narrow genetic base and inbreeding depression (Singh and Gupta, 1968).

Qualitative characters

Out of 30 qualitative characters studied in 400 germplasm, the fruit shape distribution was observed to be oblong (67.5%), elliptic (1.50%), roundish (30.5%), ovoid (0.25%), and obovoid (0.25%), fruit attractiveness, fiber free, pulp recovery (>70%), pulp aroma (mild 55.50 (%), intermediate (28.75%) and strong (15.75%)); TSS and eating quality (poor (16.75%), good (63.50%), very good (15.50%) & excellent (4.25%) are very important for commercial point of view.

Sharma (1987) opined that flesh colour is controlled by additive genes. However, Iyer (1991) observed that light yellow colour is dominant over orange-yellow in the progenies of Alphonso x Neelum cross. Dinesh (2003), carried out using half-sib analysis and found that fruit characters like fruit weight, TSS and

pulp percentage are controlled by non additive factors and heritability is less. Lavi *et al.* (1998) reported that parents should not be chosen on the basis of phenotype since offspring performance is quite unpredictable. With regard to skin colour, it was found that when red-coloured varieties were crossed with green-coloured varieties, gradation of colour in the progenies indicated that it is controlled by a number of loci (Sharma, 1987; Iyer and Subramanyam, 1987). The presence of beak on the fruit seems to be dominant as the entire progenies had beak on their fruits when 'Totapuri' was used as one of the parents (Iyer and Subramanyam, 1979). Bunch bearing was found to be dominant over single fruiting (Sharma *et al.*, 1972). Inheritance of red peel colour in the cross Amrapali x Sensation suggested no clear out dominance, as the cross between these parents with yellow and red peel respectively yielded hybrids with yellow, green yellow, fully green and red colouration on peel in various intensities. A high heritability with a high expected genetic advance clearly suggested that the inheritance of this trait was governed more by additive genes (Prabhuram, 1998). Sharma and Majumder (1988) in the crosses involving Totapuri Red Small and Sensation (both red peeled ones) and yellow-peeled varieties Dashehari and Amrapali revealed that the red peel colour was dominant and governed by duplicate genes, thereby showing various gradations of pink blush on the fruits. They reported that a few hybrids bore fruits with green colour which suggested that the red colour is in heterozygous condition. Fruit peel colour was found to be governed by a number of loci (Iyer and Subramanyam, 1987). Red peel colour is dominant over yellow and green and gradation of red peel suggested role of duplicate gene. Fruit quality varied in different hybrids developed at IARI, New Delhi. Fruit pulp colour is governed more by additive genes and that the environmental influence is very low (Prabhuram, 1998). Based on two hybrids, *viz.*, Amrapali and Mallika, Fibre in pulp showed high heritability and high

expected genetic advance, which suggested the genetic variance to be additive in nature. Aroma in pulp showed high heritability with a moderately high expected genetic advance. This suggested equal contributions of additive and non-additive genetic variance. On the other hand, genetic variance of fruit taste might have been governed mostly by non-additive genes.

Most of the commercially important varieties have been evolved as open pollinated progenies; still there are lot scopes to explore the OP varieties through exploitation of variability by selections. However, the varieties such as Alphonso, Amrapali, Arka Anmol, Arka Puneet, Bobbali punasa, Bombay no.1, Creeping, Danti Mamidi, Dashehari, Goa Kodur, Maharaja of Mysore, Mohammada Vikarabad, Mohan Rao Pasand, Neelgoa, Prabha shankar, Prior and Sardar, possess an excellent eating quality which can be utilized the breeding programme as well as commercial cultivation for table purpose.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of variance for 6 quantitative traits showed significant differences among the 400 genotypes of mango which indicates the existence of genetic diversity. The maximum inter cluster (D^2) value was obtained between cluster 10 and cluster 11. These clusters may be used for hybridization programme due to wide variability and possibility of transgressive sergeants. Estimates of phenotypic variance and genotypic variance had only a narrow difference for all six characters studied indicating that these characters are not much influenced by environmental factors. This also suggests the presence of sufficient genetic variability which can be exploited by adopting clonal selection or selection of chance seedlings.

REFERENCES

- Al-Jibourie, H. A., Miller, P. A. and Robinson, H. F. 1958. Genotypic and environmental variance in an upland cotton cross of interspecific origin. *Agronomy Journal*. **50**: 663-637.
- Bompard, J. M., 1993. The genus *Mangifera* rediscovered: the potential contribution of wild species to mango cultivation. *Acta Horti*. **341**: 69-77.
- Brettell, R. I. S., Johnson, P. R., Kulkarni, V. J., Muller, W. and Bally, I. S. E., 2004. Inheritance of fruit characters in hybrid mangoes produced through controlled pollination. *Acta Horti*. **645**: 319-326.

- Brooks, R. M. and Olmo, M. P. 1972. Register of new fruit and nut varieties. 2nd ed. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley.
- Burton G.W. and Devane E. M. 1953. Estimating heritability in tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) from replicated clonal material. *Agronomy Journal*. **45**: 478-481.
- Cochran, W. G. and Cox, G. M. 1957. Experimental designs. 2nd ed. Wiley, New York.
- Dinesh, M. R. and Vasugi, C.S. 2002. Catalogue of mango germplasm. Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hesseraghatta Lake PO, Bangalore 560089. p. 160.
- Dinesh, M.R. 2003. Genetical studies in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). *J. Appl. Hort.* **5**:27-28
- Dinesh**, M.R., Vasugi, C., Ravishankar, K.V. and Reddy, Y. T. N. 2012. Mango Catalogue, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hesseraghatta Lake PO, Bangalore 560089. p.468
- Falconer DS. 1985. Introduction to Quantitative Genetics. ELBL.
- IPGRI. 1989. Descriptors for Mango. International Board for Plant Genetic Resources, Rome, Italy
- Iyer, C.P.A. and Subramanyam, M.D. 1979. Improvement of mango by selection and hybridization. Annual Report of Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bangalore, p. 16
- Iyer, C.P.A. and Subramanyam, M.D. 1987. Improvement of mango by selection and hybridization. Annual Report of Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bangalore, p. 11
- Iyer, C.P.A. 1991. Recent advances in varietal improvement in mango. *Acta Hort.* **291**: 109–132.
- Johnson, H. W., Robinson, H. F. and Comstock R.E. 1955. Estimates of genetic and environmental variability in soybeans. *Agronomy Journal* **47**: 311 “ 318.
- Lavi, U., Tomer, E. and Hillel, J. 1998. Components of genetic variance and genetic correlations of mango traits. *Sci. Horti.* **75**:11-25.
- Mukherjee, S. K. 1948. The varieties of the mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) and their classification. *Bull Bot. Soc. Bengal.* **2**:101-133.
- Mukherjee, S. K. 1953. The mango—its botany, cultivation, uses and future improvement, especially as observed in India, *Economic Botany.*, **7**:130-162.
- Naik, K.C. and Gangolly, S. R. 1950. Classification and Nomenclature of South Indian Mangoes. The Madras Department of Agriculture, Printing Press, Madras, p.311.
- Pandey, S. N. and Dinesh, M. R. 2010. Mango, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, pp. 30-97.
- Pandey, S.N., 1998. Mango cultivars. In: Mango Cultivation edited by R.P. Srivastav, International Book Distributing Company, Lucknow, India, pp 39-99.
- Prabhuram, R. 1998. Breeding Studies with Special Reference to Red Peel Colour in Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). Ph.D Thesis, New Delhi. p. 86.
- Rajan, S., Yadava, L.P. and Sexena, R. K. 2009. Genetic divergence in mango varieties and possible use in breeding. *Indian J. Horti.* **66** (1): 7-12.
- Rao, C. R. 1965. Linear Statistical Inference and its Applications. 2nd Ed. John Wiley.
- Rencher, A. C. 1995. Methods of Multivariate Analysis, John Wiley and Sons.
- SAS V 9.3. 2012. Statistical Analysis System, V 9.3, SAS Institute Inc., Carry NC.
- Sharma, D. K. 1987. Mango breeding. *Acta Hort.* **196**: 61-67.
- Sharma, D. K. and Majumder, P. K. 1988a. Further studies on inheritance in mango. *Acta Hort.* **231**: 106–11.
- Singh, R. B. and Gupta, M. P. 1968. Multivariate analysis of divergence in upland cotton. *Indian J. Genet.* **28**: 151-157.
- Singh, S. P., 1991. Genetic divergence and canonical analysis in hyacinth bean (*Dolichos lablab* Medik.). *J. Genet. Plant Breed.* **45**: 7- 12.

- Singh, S. P., Shukla, S. and Singh N. 1991. Genetic divergence in to breeding for fatty acids in opium poppy (*P. somniferum* L.). *J. Genet Breed.*, **52**: 301-306.
- Singh, J., Singh, R.R., Dubey, P. S. and Singh, U. K. 2004. Studies on genetic variability and character association for yield and quality traits in mango chance seedlings. *J. Appl. Biol.*, **14**:37-39.
- Singh, S.N., 1963. Studies on the morphology, viability and preservation of pollen grains of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.), litchi (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.) and loquat (*Eriobotrya japonica* Lind.). *Agra Univ. J Res. Sci.*, **12**: 317 - 322.
- Venugopalan, R., 2015. Statistical Techniques in Quantitative Genetics for Fruit Crop Improvement Research. Chapter 08, In Fruit Breeding (Editor: M. R. Dinesh) under the series 'Frontiers in Horticultural Science', by K. V. Peter. ISBN NO.9789383305513, New India Publishing Agency. pp 103-126.
- Yadav, I. S. and Rajan, S., 1993. Genetic resources of mango. Advances in horticulture, Vol. 1. Fruit, part1, (Eds) K.L. Chadha and O.P. Pareek, eds. Malhotra Publishing House, New Delhi, p.77-93.
- (Supplementay data : Table S1).

(Received on 04.10.2019 and Accepted on 13.11.2020)

INFORMATION TO CONTRIBUTORS

Journal of Horticultural Sciences, an international journal, is the official publication of **Society for Promotion of Horticulture (SPH)**. It covers basic and applied aspect of original research on all branches of horticulture and other cognate disciplines, which promotes horticulture in its broadest sense. Its goals are to apprise horticultural scientists and others interested in horticulture of scientific and industrial developments and extension findings. The area of research include evaluation of germplasm, breeding, agronomic practices, physiology, biochemistry, biotechnology, soils and plant nutrition, plant protection, weed control, pesticide residue, post harvest technology, economics, extension, farm machinery and mechanization, etc. which facilitate in the growth and expansion of horticulture. The journal is published twice a year, in June and December.

The Journal of Horticultural Sciences (JHS) publishes critical reviews, research papers and short communications. Three copies of the manuscript and an electronic form (CD, MS Word) should be submitted to the Chief Editor, JHS, SPH, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bangalore-560 089. The manuscript should preferably pertain to the research work carried out during the last five years. Author(s) must certify that the manuscript (s) has/have not been sent elsewhere for publication. All the authors have to become the members of SPH when a paper is accepted for publication. All papers will be refereed. Short communications on significant research findings, new record / technology are welcome. Besides invited review papers, scientists with vast experience on a particular field of research can also submit review papers which will be refereed. Decision of the Chief Editor / Editorial board is final. Authors are permitted to photocopy their article for non-commercial and scientific purpose. No reprints shall be provided *gratis*. Acceptance of manuscript for publication in JHS shall automatically mean transfer of copyright to the SPH. The chief editor/ Editorial board assumes no responsibility for the statements, opinion or facts expressed in the journal, which rests entirely with the author(s) thereof. Mention of a pesticide or a commercial or proprietary product does not constitute an endorsement or recommendation for the use.

Title: The title of the article should be bold and in running form. Use the font Times New Roman (14 point). Botanical / scientific names should be italicized. Author name(s) should be in running and bold with full address of the first author including e-mail address (it is mandatory as future correspondence will be only through e-mail). The address of other author(s), if different from the first author, should be given as footnotes and indicated by consecutive superscript numbers. A brief running title should be provided on a separate sheet.

Abstract: The abstract should not exceed 200 words. It should be suitable for indexing and publication in abstracting journal. Very pertinent keywords may be furnished.

Text: The text should be typed in double space on one side of good quality paper (21 x 29 cm) with 3cm margin on all sides **without justifying the text** and in clear and concise English. Use the font Times New Roman (12 point). The paper should be divided into subheadings (placed on the left margin and in upper case) such as Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, Acknowledgements, and References. Units and abbreviations should be in metric (SI) system. It is desirable that authors take due care on clarity and brevity of the paper. The length of the paper should not exceed 2500 words.

Tables/ Illustrations/ Photographs: Each table should be on a separate sheet with a short title at the end of the paper, numbered in the order in which it appears in the text. The data reported must be subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. The illustrations should be relevant to the research findings and should not be repeating of data presented in the table. Only very good photographs, mounted on hard paper to avoid folding, given on a separate sheet of paper with title, which are reproducible, will be accepted. Data to be presented in graphical form should be sent on quality glossy contrast paper without folding.

References: References should be cited in the text in the form of (Anon., 1999; Prakash, 2002; Krishnamoorthy and Mani, 2004). The term *et al* should be used when there are more than two authors. The letters, a,b,c,... should be used following the year, to distinguish between two or more papers by the same author(s) in one year. References at the end of the text should be given in the following form:

Shikhamany, S. D. and Satyanarayana, G. 1973. A study on the association of leaf nutrient contents with poor yields in Anab. E.shahi grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Ind. J. Hort.*, **30**: 376 - 380

Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. 1978. Statistical methods for Agricultural workers. ICAR, New Delhi, p 108.

Srinivas, K. 1987. Response of watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* Thunb. Musf) to drip and furrow irrigation under different nitrogen and plant population levels. Ph.D thesis, UAS, Bangalore

Mehta, N. K. and Sharma, S. D. 1986. Studies on flowering and fruit retention in some cultivars of peach (*Prunus persica* Batch). In: Advances in Research on Temperate Fruits. *Proc. Nat'l. Symp. Temp. Fruits*, Solan (India), Dr. Y. S. Parmar Univ. Hort. and Forestry, pp 37-42

Krishnamoorthy, A. and Mani, M. 2000. Biological Control of Pests of Vegetable Crops.p367-78. In: Biocontrol Potential and its exploitation in sustainable Agriculture. Vol. 2: Insect Pests. Upadhyay, R. K. Mukerji, K. G. and Chamola, B.P. (ed.). Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, New York

Cover photo (s) shall be included at the discretion of Editor. Authors may submit photographs/figures/diagrams for cover page while submitting the manuscript.

AUTHOR INDEX - VOL. 15 (1&2) 2020

Name	Page	Name	Page
A		Gavankar, M. S.	233
Adamu, J.T.	136	Gokhale, N. B.	233
Adekoya, M.	136	Gowda D. C. S.	161
Adeniji, O.T.	136	Gowda, N. K. S.	197
Aghora T.S.	62	I	
Ahamed N.	17	Ingle Y. V.	153
Aravintharaj, R.	229	Ishaka, A.	136
Aremu, C.A.	136	J	
Ashok Kumar J.	45	Jadhav S.B.	67
Asokan, R.	229	Janakiram, T.	147
Aswath C.	93	Jandong, E.	136
Aswath, C.	147	Jasmin M. R.	207
Awcharae, C. M.	177	Jessy Mol K.K.	52
Azeez, S.	197, 207	K	
B		Kalaivanan D.	9
Babli, M.	127	Kanupriya, C.	221
Bala, M.	191	Karunakaran, G.	221
Bhatt R.M.	62	Katwate S.M.	67
Bhonde, S. R.	153	Khandekar, R. G.	233
Burondkar, M. M.	233	Kshirsagar, P. J.	233
C		Kulkarni, M. M.	233
Chandran, N. K.	81	Kumar D.	17
Chandrashekara C.	197, 207	Kumar, R.	147
D		L	
Desai, V. S.	233	Lad, O. A.	233
Dhananjaya, M. V.	147	Lakshmana Reddy D.C	52
Dinakara Adiga, J.	127	Lakshmi, J.	183
Dinesh, M. R.	107, 161	Laxman R.H.	35
G		M	
GaneshamurthyA.N.	9	Madhavi Reddy K	52
Ganga, M.	183	Manivannan, N.	183
		Manjunath B.L.,	35



Name	Page	Name	Page
Manoj Y.B.	52	Sankar V	177
Meena H.R.	72	Sankaran, M.	107, 161
Mohan N.	62	Satisha G.C.	197, 207
Muralidhara, B. M	177	Shejal A. Porob	97
N		Shilpa Pandurangaiah,	27
Nair A.K.	35	Shivashankar K.S.	27
Negi, S. S.	147	Shivashankara, K. S.	207
P		Singh D. R.	177
Paithankar, D. H.	153	Singh S.R.	17
Pandey, M.	197, 207	Singh, P.	221
Pawar, C. D.	233	Singh, T.	191
Priya Devi S	45, 97	Somasundaram J.	72
R		Sriram S.	81
Rachitha R.	207	Srivastava K.K.	17
Radha T.K.	72	Sudhakar Rao D.V.	27
Ragaji, S. G.	233	Sujatha A. Nair	177
Raghu B.R.	1	Susmita C.	62
Raghupathi H.B.	9	T	
Rajamani, K.	183	Tanya Thakur	173
Rajiv Kumar	93	Tejaswini Prakash	81
Ramachandran, N.	147	Tenebe, A.V.	136
Ramachandrudu K	45	Thangam M	45, 97
Rami Reddy, P. V.	225	Thondaiman, V.	127
Rao, T. M.,	147	V	
Rashmi I.	72	Veena, G.L.	127
Ravishankar K.V	27	Venugopalan, R.	161
Roy, T. K.	197, 207, 229	Vichare S.V	67
Rupa T.R	9	Y	
S		Yousuf S.	17
Sadashiva A.T.	27	Z	
Sadawarte, A. K.	153	Zamil, M.	207
Safeena S.A.	45	Zamzam, M.A.	136

SUBJECT INDEX - VOL. 15 (1&2) 2020

Name	Page	Name	Page
A			
Alphonso	233	Foot rot	152
Amino acid score	207	Free amino acids	207
Antigonon	225	Fruit development	97
Anti-senescence compound	191	Fruit trees	9
Apis spp	225	Fruit quality	136
Arka Mushroom Rasam	197	Fruit shape	136
B			
B:C ratio	233	Fruit yield	136
Bee flora	225	Fruits	107
Bioavailability	197	Fusarium wilt	147
Biplot analysis	161	G	
Bound amino acids	207	Garden pea	62
Breeding	62	GCV	161
Bulb	67	Genetic diversity	17
C			
Canopy management	127	Genetic analysis	161
Carotene	27	Genetic divergence	45
Carotenoid	27	Genotype by environment	136
CGMS	52	Gerbera	93
Character correlation	136	Germplasm	1, 107
Chrysanthemum	173, 191	GIS	107
Conservation	107	Gladiolus	147
Copper	72	Goa	97
Correlation coefficient	45	Groundwater depletion	9
Curry leaves	1	Growth	67
Cut flower production	177	Growth parameters	233
Cut-flower	93	Gummosis	152
D			
Delayed flowering	191	H	
Dendrobium	177	Heritability	161
Distribution	1	High temperature	62
Diversity	1	Honey bees	225
Drought	9	Honeydew	229
E			
Early summer	62	Hot pepper	52
Evaluation	93, 147	Hybrid	67
Ex situ	107	Hypsizygus ulmarius	197
F			
Flower	67	I	
Flowering	147	In situ	107
		Iron	72
		Iron fortified	197
		J	
		Jasminum spp	183
		K	
		Kikiobiory	173



Name	Page	Name	Page
L			
LC-MS-MS	229	Pruning	127
Leaf analysis	72	Pulp recovery	221
Lycopene	27	Q	
M			
Manganese	72	Quality	177
Mango	161, 233	Quantitative character	45
Marker Assisted Selection	52	R	
Micronutrient deficiency	72	Resistance Gene Analogues (RGA)	81
Mitochondria	52	Rootstocks	127
Morphotypes	1	Rose	81
Mushrooms	197	S	
N			
Nagpur mandarin	152	Sapota	72
Nitrogen	173	Scheduling irrigation	35
Novel hybrids	93	Selection	221
Nucleotide Binding Site-Leucine	81	Single linkage cluster analysis	17
Rich Repeats (NBS-LRR)		Single type tuberose	67
Nutrients	177	Soil volume wetting	35
Nutrition	207	Soilless media	233
O			
Onion	17	Solanum lycopersicum	136
Orchid	177	Spacing	35
ORF	52	Standardization	173
Ornamental creeper	225	Stress tolerance	62
P			
Palynology	183	Sugars	229
Papaya yield	35	T	
PBZ	127	Tamarind	221
PCV	161	Thrips palmi	229
Peak water	9	Tomato	27
Perennial crops	9	Training	127
Phytophthora	152	Tropical	107
Pink types	97	V	
Planting geometry	127	Variability	136
Podosphaera pannosa	81	Varieties	107
Policy issue	9	Vase life	147, 191
Pollen germination	183	Vegetable cowpea	45
Pollen morphology	183	W	
Polyhouse	93, 136	Water use efficiency	35
Potassium salt of phosphonic acid (PSPA)	152	Wax apple	97
Potted plants	173	White types	97
Powdery mildew	81	Wild species	107
Principal component analysis	17	Y	
		Yield	221
		Z	
		Zinc	72



**STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PARTICULARS ABOUT
JOURNAL OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCES**

(Form IV)

Place of Publication : Bengaluru

Periodicity of publication : Half-yearly

Printer's Name : Mr. Ravikumar, B.A.

Nationality : Indian

Address : Resolution Print Media
#131, 6th Main, Meenakshinagar
Kamakshipalya, Bengaluru - 560 079.

Publisher's Name : Society for Promotion of Horticulture

Address : ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.
Bengaluru - 560 089

Editor-in-Chief : Dr. S. Sriram

Nationality : Indian

Address : ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.
Bengaluru - 560 089.

Name and addresses of individuals who own the journal and partners or are shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital : Society for Promotion of Horticulture
ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research
Hessaraghatta Lake P.O.
Bengaluru - 560 089.

I, Dr. S. Sriram, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

June 30, 2020

Sd/-
(S. Sriram)
Editor-in-Chief



SOCIETY FOR PROMOTION OF HORTICULTURE

ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research
Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru-560 089, India
sphiihr2005@gmail.com / chiefeditor.jhs@gmail.com
Website : <https://sphindia.org>

ENROLMENT FORM

Name in full (in block letters) :
Dr./Mrs./Mr./Ms.

Designation :

Address for communication :

Phone No. :

E-mail ID :

Type of membership : Patron / Life member / Annual member / Student member*

Payment :

Demand Draft No. / Date :

Bank :

Place :

Date : SIGNATURE

Membership fee structure :

Type of membership	Membership amount	Enrolment fee	Total membership amount payable by Demand Draft (₹)
Patron	20,000/-	200/-	20,200/-
Life Member	5,000/-	200/-	5,200/-
Annual Member (India)	1,000/-	200/-	1,200/-
i. For SAARC authors	US \$ 100	US \$ 5	US \$ 105
ii. For SAARC countries	US \$ 50	US \$ 5	US \$ 55
Student member*	500/-	200/-	700/-

*The application of student members must be certified by their Head of dept. or equivalent and the student member shall not receive a copy of the journal.

Please send the duly filled-in enrolment form along with Demand Draft drawn in favour of Society for Promotion of Horticulture, by post to General Secretary, Society for Promotion of Horticulture ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bengaluru - 560 089.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editorial team acknowledges the services of the following reviewers

Dr. Shylesha A.N.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-NBAIR, Bengaluru

Dr. Ashwath Narayan

Associate Professor, UAS, Raichur

Dr. Mohan C.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CTCRI, Trivandrum

Dr. Chavalli Sarada

Associate Professor, YSRHU, Guntur

Dr. Dinesh R.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IISR, Calicut

Dr. Kalaivanan D.

Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Sudhakar Rao D.V.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Fakrudin B.

Professor, College of Horticulture, UHS, Bengaluru

Dr. Hebbar K.B.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CPCRI, Kasaragod

Dr. Hima Bindu

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Satisha J.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Krishnamurthy K.S.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-CPCRI, Kasaragod

Dr. Kundan Kishore

Principal Scientist, CHES (ICAR-IIHR), Bhubaneswar

Dr. Sankaran M.

Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Madhu Bala

Associate Professor, PAU, Ludhiana

Dr. Nandeesh P.

Senior Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru



Dr. Venkatarami Reddy P.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Prakash Tripathi
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Prasad R.D.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIOR, Hyderabad

Dr. Rajashekar P.E.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Rajiv Kumar
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Ravindran Chandran
Horticulturist, TNAU, Coimbatore

Dr. Ramani S.
Former Project Coordinator, AICRP on Honey Bees and Pollinator,
Bengaluru

Dr. Veena S.S.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-CTCRI, Trivandrum

Dr. Smaranika Mishra
Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Sujatha A. Nair
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Tejaswini Prakash
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Usha Bharathi T.
Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Sridhar V.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IIHR, Bengaluru

Dr. Srinivasan V.
Principal Scientist, ICAR-IISR, Calicut

Sd/-
(S. Sriram)
Editor-in-Chief

New Varieties/ Technologies of ICAR-IIHR



New Water Melon - Arka Shyama variety



Arka Red - New Gerbera variety



Leaf curl resistant chilli varieties Arka Tejaswi, Arka Saanvi and Arka Tanvi



Arka Abhi



Arka Shuba

New Varieties/ Technologies of ICAR-IIHR



Arka Herbiwash - Safe way of removing pesticide residues



Arka Bharath - New teasel gourd variety

Journal of Horticultural Sciences is indexed by the following abstracting and indexing services



Article published in Journal of Horticultural Sciences are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

