

GENOTYPIC RESPONSE ON GROWTH AND YIELD IN PAPAYA

D. K. VARU^{1*}, K. D. PATEL² AND SANDIP MAKHMALE¹

¹Department of Horticulture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh - 362 001, Gujarat

²Polytechnic College of Horticulture, JAU, Junagadh

e-mail: dkvaru@jau.in

KEYWORDS

Genotypic
Flowering
Distillate
Selection

Received on :
12.07.2018

Accepted on :
21.08.2020

*Corresponding
author

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was undertaken to study the genetic variability of 9 genotypes of papaya along with Pusa Dwarf as a check for various horticultural characters. Fruit yield is the main trait commercially useful to the farmers. The number of fruits and fruit yield per plant were recorded significantly highest (36.38 and 33.81 kg/pl. and 84.52 t/ha, respectively) in genotype selection-4. Significantly highest fruit length and weight (25.02 cm and 1832 g) were noted in Selection-6, whereas, highest fruit girth (47.3 cm) was noted in Pusa Dwarf but was observed at par with Selection-4. While, the highest pulp weight (1327.93 g) and pulp seed ratio (1230.56) were noted in Selection-4, but highest pulp-peel ratio (5.74) was noted in Selection-8. In case of growth, bearing and plant height have also a great role to check the lodging of plants which were performed better (59.42 and 148.16 cm, respectively) in Pusa Dwarf but, highest stem girth (38.40 cm) in Selection-6 which were observed at par with Selection-4.

INTRODUCTION

A wide range of fruit biodiversity is available in the Saurashtra region of Gujarat. Among various fruit crops, papaya belongs to the genus *Carica*, which is monotypic and only includes the species *Carica papaya* L, which is the most important species from the family Caricaceae (Badillo, 2000). Papaya is one of the important fruit crops of the region due to higher remuneration as well as easy to cultivate with more production per unit area. It has a high nutritive and medicinal value especially vitamin A (2020 IU/100g) (Azad, et al., 2012). It also possesses vitamin B, folate, and pantothenic acid besides minerals like potassium and magnesium (Popenoe, 1974). It is an excellent source of beta carotene which may prevent cancer, diabetes, and heart disease (Aravind et al., 2013) and it is also utilized in the pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries (Retuta et al., 2012). Papain is also the most important product prepared from the dried latex of its immature fruits used as raw materials of various industries.

In Saurashtra, the papaya cultivars most commonly grown are those of indigenous groups which is dioecious. Genotypes of these groups present fruits for good characters like size, shape and weight of fruit as well as pulp color of the fruit. However, no released varieties available for planting in the region may lead to greater vulnerability to diseases, pests, and edaphoclimatic variations, compromising the crop sustainability, due to the high genetic variability. It is vital to know about the intensity of genetic variation in commercially grown papaya genotypes to help growers selecting appropriate management practices, as well as providing information about papaya breeding. The estimation of genetic parameters (i.e. morpho-agronomic and fruit quality traits) in papaya genotypes, allows choosing suitable methods,

e.g. simple breeding methods such as mass selection (Foltran et al., 1993). Also, the selection in the segregating populations may reveal great chances of success, due to the wide genotype variability and high heritability values (Silva et al., 2008).

The agro-climatic condition of the region is also coupled with papaya genotypes provided opportunity for the commercial cultivation. The yield and quality of local types grown by the farmers are good and competent with national varieties. Hence, the promising papaya genotype in the region is an option for increasing the production and productivity of papaya as there is nothing any public variety in the region as well as in the state.

Taiwan grouped varieties like Red Leady, 786, Sweet Charley, etc. are from private sectors under cultivation in the region. Some drawbacks in these varieties with the higher price of planting materials as well as susceptibility against the virus with poor fruit set were observed from the farmers' feedback. So that there is a need to identify season stable uniform papaya genotypes valuable for local as well as export markets that may prove highly remunerative to the papaya growers. Therefore, it felt essential to evaluated these genotypes along with commercial cultivar for selection of promising variety under the Saurashtra region. To study variability among fruit crops, plant growth, yield, and fruit quality are important traits (Aulakh, 2005 and Pandey et al., 2007). That means comparison of various physicochemical traits associated with the fruit quality of different papaya genotypes or cultivar is necessary for the identification of promising papaya cultivar. According to the above considerations, the present study aimed to investigate the performance of these genotypes along with commercial cultivar to fulfill the objective like to know the genotypic performance on growth, flowering, and fruit

yield in papaya under the Crop Improvement Project in the papaya at Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, JAU, Junagadh.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh. Nine different genotypes and one cultivar Pusha Dwarf (check) were evaluated in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications and data were analyzed. The seeds treated with carbendazim before sowing of different genotypes of papaya were sown in polythene bags to raise the seedlings under the control condition. The pits of 30 × 30 × 30 cm in dimensions were dug at the spacing of 1.8 × 1.8 meters each way. The seedlings having uniform growth of about 20 to 30 cm height were selected and three seedling were transplanted in each pit at the spacing of 15 cm apart in a triangular fashion. All plants were given uniform cultural operation as per the recommended package of practices. The soil of the experimental field was sandy loam to alluvial type. The selected plants were marked with a metal tag for recording observation. The observations on growth, flowering, and yield parameters were recorded. At the time of maturity, the fruits of different selections and cultivar were harvested at maturity indices with twisting the fruit keeping a small intact pedicel with each fruit. The various parameters were recorded. The chemical analysis for estimating reducing, non- reducing and

total sugars was done by titrimetric methods of Lane and Eynon described by Ranganna (1979). The data were statistically analyzed by the method of analysis of variance using RBD as described by Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fruit yield and attributes

Fruit yield is the most important and polygenic character. Besides, better management of orchard, genetic diversity *i.e.* variety is another important factor influencing the yield. The present study showed significant variation among the various genotypes and cultivar with respects to yield and yield attributes. It is revealed from the table 1 that, the highest number of fruit per plant and fruit yield (36.38, 33.81 kg/pl. and 84.52 ton/ha, respectively) was recorded in Selection-4 during all three years as well as pooled, but was observed at par with Selection-6 and 8 during pooled. The variations in yield and yield attributes might be due to different genetic sources with respect to their genetic makeup. It might be also due to various physiological phenomenon, *viz.* photosynthetic efficiency, rate of translocation of photosynthates from source to sink and photo-respiration that took place in the plant body and different genetic constitution of varieties, which are responsible for expression of genetic characters under a particular set of environment. This is in conformity with the findings of Kumar *et al.* (2015), Tyagi *et al.* (2015), Varu (2019), Anh *et al.* (2011), Varu (2020) and Meena *et al.* (2012) in papaya; Deshmukh *et*

Table 1 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on number of fruits/pls. and fruit yield

Selections	No. of fruits/pls.				Fruit yield (kg/pls.)				Fruit yield (t/ha)			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	31	30.8	27.67	29.82	26.2	24.09	16.18	22.16	65.51	60.22	40.45	55.39
Selection-2	32.33	31.87	30.33	31.51	29.04	21.51	17.49	22.68	72.6	53.78	43.73	56.7
Selection-3	33.33	30.97	29.55	31.28	21.27	15.36	20.27	18.97	53.17	38.4	50.68	47.42
Selection-4	38.33	37.03	33.77	36.38	37.08	34.39	29.96	33.81	92.69	85.97	74.89	84.52
Selection-5	29.33	29.53	27.92	28.93	31.13	18.85	21.06	23.68	77.83	47.13	52.66	59.21
Selection-6	30.67	33.2	33.67	32.51	30.39	23.36	25.7	26.49	75.98	58.41	64.25	66.21
Selection-7	22	20.67	24.55	22.41	16.77	18.8	22	19.19	41.92	46.99	54.99	47.97
Selection-8	37	32.27	28	32.42	31.39	26.99	23.26	27.21	78.48	67.48	58.14	68.03
Pusa Dwarf	35.4	33.13	26.17	31.56	27.9	20.02	15.84	21.25	69.75	50.04	39.59	53.13
S.Em.+	1.678	1.385	1.279	1.605	1.643	1.185	0.785	2.498	4.106	2.963	1.963	6.246
C. D. at 5%	5.03	4.15	3.84	4.81	4.92	3.55	2.35	7.49	12.31	8.88	5.88	18.73
YxT/S.Em.+	-	-	-	1.457	-	-	-	1.844	--	-	-	3.135
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	4.15	-	-	-	5.25	--	-	-	8.92
C. V. %	9.04	7.72	7.62	8.21	10.19	9.08	6.38	9.08	10.19	9.08	6.38	9.08

Table 2 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on growth parameters

Selections	Plant height (cm)				Bearing height (cm)				No. of leaves per plant			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	184	166	181.33	177.11	68.4	64.57	75.53	69.5	28.53	26.4	36.21	30.38
Selection-2	181.67	151.53	163	165.4	77.33	69.27	57.6	68.07	29.53	23.53	36.67	29.91
Selection-3	189	164.67	175.67	176.44	82.67	62.97	61.67	69.1	32	25.67	35	30.89
Selection-4	185	159.17	172.67	172.28	75.67	66.03	56.8	66.17	38.6	28.53	42.02	36.38
Selection-5	187.33	149.4	184.33	173.69	66.67	61.3	68.13	65.37	31.2	29.87	44.33	35.13
Selection-6	241.33	179.6	254	224.98	86.93	88	83.47	86.13	32.4	31.6	50.42	38.14
Selection-7	210.33	157.37	205.67	191.12	107.6	74.03	82.53	88.06	30.6	34.53	50.3	38.48
Selection-8	199	167.97	163.33	176.77	94.13	71.13	59.57	74.94	33.27	37.6	37.33	36.07
Pusa Dwarf	158	137.13	149.33	148.16	63.87	60.47	53.93	59.42	48.33	33.2	42.78	41.44
S.Em.+	8.312	6.505	8.056	9.15	2.216	2.325	2.921	5.708	1.541	1.642	2.266	3.026
C. D. at 5%	24.92	19.5	24.15	27.43	6.64	6.97	8.76	17.11	4.62	4.92	6.79	9.07
YxT/S.Em.+	-	-	-	7.617	-	-	-	1.844	-	-	-	1.844
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	21.68	-	-	-	5.25	-	-	-	5.25
C. V. %	7.46	7.08	7.61	9.33	4.78	5.87	7.6	7.63	7.89	9.45	9.42	12.01

Table 3 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on growth parameters

Selections	No. of node per pl.				Length of inter node (cm)				Stem girth (cm)			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	32	27.33	28.67	29.33	5.27	4.8	5.1	5.06	31.8	25.22	24.63	27.21
Selection-2	21.17	18.5	19.5	19.72	4.33	4.17	4.62	4.37	35.9	27.13	25.22	29.42
Selection-3	22.33	19.33	20.33	20.67	5.43	4.97	4.03	4.81	38	26.88	31.78	32.22
Selection-4	19.33	17.67	18.33	18.44	4.27	4.13	5.03	4.48	36.13	27.12	31.42	31.56
Selection-5	20.33	21.33	23.33	21.67	3.53	3.62	3.74	3.63	36.07	27.35	31.22	31.55
Selection-6	27.33	23.5	24.5	25.11	7.3	7.02	7.49	7.27	45.93	32.6	36.66	38.4
Selection-7	24	21.17	22.17	22.44	6.77	6.22	7.1	6.69	40.6	35.44	37.67	37.9
Selection-8	22.17	19.83	20.83	20.94	4.17	4.27	4.17	4.2	37.67	29.52	28	31.73
Pusa Dwarf	22.33	21.33	23	22.22	3.5	3.58	4.18	3.76	40.07	26.88	30.58	32.51
S.Em. +	0.931	0.978	1.152	0.592	0.167	0.177	0.101	0.215	1.611	1.538	1.373	2.313
C. D. at 5%	2.79	2.93	3.45	1.68	0.5	0.53	0.3	0.64	4.83	4.61	4.12	6.94
YxT/S.Em. +	-	-	-	1.025	-	-	-	0.152	-	-	-	1.51
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	NS	-	-	-	0.433	-	-	-	NS
C. V. %	6.88	8.03	8.95	10.15	5.85	6.44	3.47	6.53	7.34	9.29	7.72	8.05

Table 4 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on fruit length, girth and weight

Selections	Fruit length (cm)				Fruit girth (cm)				Fruit weight (kg)			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	26.27	19.98	23.83	23.36	43.17	32.73	39.33	38.41	1269.07	1126.53	1454.67	1283.42
Selection-2	20.6	19.53	14.7	18.28	47.2	45.71	47.93	46.95	1317.2	1060.6	1248.33	1208.71
Selection-3	24.27	18.88	16.79	19.98	44.8	38.83	44.17	42.6	1174.6	797.93	1455	1142.51
Selection-4	24.23	23.71	20.95	22.97	46.23	42.61	45.1	44.65	1810.4	1384.03	1744.33	1646.26
Selection-5	21.27	17.49	16.45	18.4	47.6	45.71	44.77	46.03	1297.7	916.53	1220.33	1144.86
Selection-6	28	24.61	22.45	25.02	45.93	45.17	46.12	45.74	1686.4	1444.8	1832	1654.4
Selection-7	23.07	21.22	20.6	21.63	37.13	39.2	44.57	40.3	1528.33	1325.87	1717.67	1523.96
Selection-8	23.5	20.3	19.49	21.1	45.6	43.73	43.37	44.23	1620.8	1369.13	1268.33	1419.42
Pusa Dwarf	18.67	20.15	18.82	19.21	44.73	46.2	50.96	47.3	1164	1045	1536.67	1248.56
S.Em. +	0.83	0.62	0.771	1.103	0.938	1.025	1.058	1.505	69.998	55.495	64.031	94.162
C. D. at 5%	2.49	1.86	2.39	3.31	2.81	3.07	3.17	4.51	209.86	166.38	191.97	282.31
YxT/S.Em. +	-	-	-	0.745	-	-	-	1.008	-	-	-	0.063
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	2.12	-	-	-	2.87	-	-	-	0.18
C. V. %	6.16	5.2	6.9	6.12	3.63	4.2	4.06	3.97	8.48	8.26	7.41	8.06

Table 5 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on pulp, peel and seed weight

Selections	Pulp weight (g)				Peel weight (g)				Seed weight (g)			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	938.83	831.07	1122.33	964.08	221.33	224	292	245.78	98.23	106	106.93	103.72
Selection-2	1056.67	799.93	951.67	936.09	148.27	189.67	160.37	166.1	100.07	88.05	96.38	94.83
Selection-3	917.2	552.87	1141.93	870.67	141.87	140.93	247.6	176.8	98.4	87.85	109.18	98.47
Selection-4	1448.47	1131.53	1403.8	1327.93	251.73	226.23	282.51	253.49	79.2	103.9	109.01	97.37
Selection-5	1104	666.67	1043.73	938.13	231.67	152.43	195.92	193.34	72.67	69.1	71.05	70.94
Selection-6	1392.87	1077	1492.74	1320.87	279.13	272.27	294.1	281.83	82.83	110.85	125.33	106.34
Selection-7	1160.67	979.6	1394.25	1178.17	158.67	275	308.13	247.27	49.53	60.51	80.83	63.63
Selection-8	1331.73	1074.6	1053.33	1153.22	203.2	191.83	215.25	203.43	82.27	72.44	79.04	77.92
Pusa Dwarf	861	804.33	1080.7	915.34	221.33	224	292	259.4	98.23	106	106.93	94.18
S.Em. +	39.904	33.021	46.502	79.918	8.515	10.987	14.823	24.543	1.601	2.957	3.343	6.923
C. D. at 5%	119.64	99	139.42	239.61	25.53	32.94	44.44	73.58	4.8	8.87	10.02	20.76
YxT/S.Em. +	-	-	-	40.188	-	-	-	6.981	3.36	5.86	5.83	6.72
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	114.38	-	-	-	19.87	-	-	-	8.04
C. V. %	6.09	6.5	6.78	6.52	6.28	4.74	5.03	5.4	4.08	5.86	5.83	5.4

al. (2013) in guava; Chaudhry et al. (2014) in grapes; Thapa et al. (2012) and Lyngdoh et al. (2013) in Okra. The bearing height of the plant is good to shine for the economic value of the crop and the check variety Pusa Dwarf performed with the lowest bearing height but was also found at par with Selection-4.

Growth attributes

Variation in growth parameters like plant height and number of leaves per plant were found significant (Table 2) and the

lowest plant height (148.16 cm) and a maximum number of leaves per plant (41.44) were recorded in Pusa Dwarf. However, it was on par with Selection-2, 4 and 5. The number of nodes per plant and the length of the internode is also important traits influencing the number of fruits per plant. Similarly, stem girth affecting the lodging of plants. The minimum number of nodes per plant (18.44), length of internode (3.63 cm), and highest stem girth (38.40 cm) were recorded in Selection-4, 5 and 6, respectively. Several workers

Table 6 : Evaluation of different selections and cultivar on pulp peel, pulp seed ratio and TSS

Selections	Pulp peel ratio				Pulp seed ratio			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
Selection-1	4.25	3.71	3.85	3.94	840.61	725.07	1015.4	860.36
Selection-2	6.45	4.21	4.96	5.21	956.6	711.89	855.28	841.26
Selection-3	5.18	3.67	6.01	4.96	818.8	465.02	1032.75	772.19
Selection-4	5.81	5.01	5.93	5.58	1369.27	1027.63	1294.79	1230.56
Selection-5	6.97	4.37	5.74	5.69	1031.33	597.57	972.68	867.19
Selection-6	5	3.96	5.08	4.68	1310.03	966.15	1367.41	1214.53
Selection-7	4.26	3.57	5.43	4.42	1111.13	919.09	1313.42	1114.55
Selection-8	6.57	5.75	4.9	5.74	1249.47	1002.16	974.29	1075.31
Pusa Dwarf	3.32	4.07	3.37	3.58	782.07	716.41	965.03	821.17
S.Em. +	0.265	0.226	0.237	0.402	39.834	33.543	45.371	77.066
C. D. at 5%	0.79	0.68	0.71	1.21	119.43	100.57	136.03	231.05
YxT/S.Em. +	-	-	-	0.243	-	-	-	39.876
C. D. at 5%	-	-	-	0.69	-	-	-	113.5
C. V. %	8.63	9.18	8.16	8.64	6.56	7.33	7.22	7.07

hitherto have compared varieties by Narasing *et al.*, 1958; Nakasone *et al.*, 1972; Selvaraj *et al.*, 1975, Ito *et al.* 1977 and Varu (2019 and 2020) in papaya; Chaudhry *et al.* (2014) in grapes; Thapa *et al.* (2012) and Lyngdoh *et al.* (2013) in Okra.

Fruit attributes

Length, girth, and weight of fruits were the major components of fruit size under the present study (Table 4). The result was also found significant and the highest fruit length and weight (25.02 cm and 1832 g, respectively) were noted in Selection-6, but at par with Selection-4. Whereas, the highest fruit girth (47.30 cm) was noted in Pusa Dwarf and was observed at par with Selection-2 and 4, 5, 6 and 8. The variation in fruit length, girth, and weight might be based on the fact that every genotype has its nature in the development of fruits. It also might be attributed to the genetic constitution of the plants. It may also be due to phenotypic and genotypic interactions among the selections. Similar findings were reported by Kumar *et al.* (2015); Das (2013), Das and Dinesh (2014), Chalak *et al.* (2016); Goenaga *et al.* (2001), Tyagi *et al.* (2015) and Varu (2019 and 2020) in papaya; Deshmukh *et al.* (2013) in guava and Chaudhry *et al.* (2014) in grapes; Thapa *et al.* (2012) and Lyngdoh *et al.* (2013) in Okra.

Likewise, the highest pulp weight (1327.93 g) and pulp seed ratio (1230.56) were noted in Selection-4 and observed at par with Selection-6, 7 and 8. The lowest peel weight (166.10 g) and seed weight (63.63 g) were registered in Selection-2 and 7, respectively. However, the highest pulp-peel ratio (5.74) was noted in Selection-8 and which was found at par with Selection-4, 2, 5 and 6. Such variation among the selections in pulp, peel and seed characters may be attributed to the genetic makeup of the plants. Seed weight might be due to pollen availability, stigmatic fertility, and effective fertilization. Variations in those characters in papaya fruit were also observed by Nakasone *et al.*, 1972; Selvaraj *et al.*, 1975; Sulikeri *et al.*, 1977; Pal *et al.*, 1980; Allan, 1981 and Sundarajan and Krishnan, 1984 in papaya.

REFERENCES

Allan, P. 1981. Clonal "Honey Gold" Pawpaws, A horticultural and commercial success. *Citrus and Subtropical Fruit J.* 575: 19-53.

Anh, N. T., Trang, P. N., Hong, N. T. B. and Hoan, N. G. 2011. Evaluating agronomic characteristics of twelve local papayas (*Carica papaya* L.) varieties in Viet Nam. *Bull. Inst. Trop. Agr.*, 34: 15-22.

Aravind, G., Bhowmik, D., Duraival, S. and Harish, G. 2013. Traditional and Medicinal uses of *Carica papaya*. *J. Medicinal Plant Studies.* 1(1): 7-15

Aulakh, P. S. 2005. Performance of different guava cultivars under the arid irrigated conditions of Punjab. *Prog. Hort.* 37: 328-330.

Azad, M.A.K., Rabbani, M.G. and Amin, L. 2012. Plant regeneration and somatic embryogenesis from immature embryos derived through interspecific hybridization among *Carica* species. *International J. Molecular Sciences.* 13: 1706517076.

Badilo, V. M. 2000. *Carica* L. vs *Vasconcella* St. Hil. (Caricaceae): con la rehabilitación de este último. *Ernstia, Maracay*, v.10, n.2, p.74-79.

Chalak, S. U., Kamble, A. B. and Bhalekar, S. G. 2016. Evaluation of different papaya cultivars for yield, quality, and papaya ringspot disease under Pune conditions. *J. Krishi Vigyan.* 5(1): 60-63.

Choudhary, R. S., Zagade, V. S., Mabooodurrahman, Khalakar, G. D. and Singh, N. K. 2014. ISSR based genotypic differentiation of grape (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *The Bioscan.* 9(2): 823-828, 2014 (Supplement on Genetics and Plant Breeding)

Das, S. C. 2013. Studies on papaya cultivation and evaluation of different varieties and Hybrids in Tripura. *Asian J. Hort.* 8(2): 470-474.

Das, S. C., and Dinesh, M. R. 2014. Studies on fruit set and germination in some papaya cultivars. *Acta Hort.* 1022: 87-90.

Deshmukh, N. A., Lyngdoh, P., Jha, A. K.; Patel, R. K., and Deka Bidyut C. 2013. Comparative study on newly developed guava hybrids with commercial cultivars under mid-hills of NE India. *The Bioscan.* 8(4): 1467-1470, 2013 (Supplement on Genetics and Plant Breeding).

Foltran, D. E., Gonçalves, P. S., Sabino, J. C., Igue, T., Vilela, R. C. F. 1993. Estimativas de parâmetros genéticos e fenotípicos em mamão. *Bragantia*, v. 52, p. 7 15, 1993.

Goenaga, R., Irizarry, H., and Amadora, R. 2001. Yield and fruit quality of papaya fruits grown at two locations in Puerto Rico. *J. Agric Univ.* 85(3-4): 127-134.

Ito, P.J., Atubra, O.K. and Norman, J.C. 1977. Performance of Hawaiian cultivars of Pawpaw (*Carica papaya* L.) in Ghana. *Acta Hort.* 53: 321-324.

Kumar, M., Prasad, Y., Kumar, M., Prakash, S., and Kumar, S. 2015. Evaluation of genetic variability, genetic advance, heritability, and character association for yield and its contributing traits in papaya. *Society Plant Research.* 28(2): 99-102.

Lyngdoh, Y. A., Mulge, R., and Shadap, A. 2013. Heterosis and

- combining ability studies in near homozygous lines of okra [*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench] for growth parameters. *The Bioscan*. **8(4)**: 1275-1279.
- Meena, B.S., Varma, L.R. and Mehta, R.S. 2012.** Evaluation of papaya varieties under North Gujarat conditions. *Indian J. Hort.* **69(1)**: 114-116.
- Nakasone, H.Y., Crozier, J.A., and Ikehara, D.K. 1972.** Evaluation of 'Waimanalo', a new papaya strain. Technical Bulletin, HAES, Hawaii Univ. **79**: 12.
- Narasim, R.V., Madhava Rao, V.N. and Venkataraman, T.M. 1958.** Co1, a new word in papayas, *Indian J. Hort.* **2(3)**: 3-5.
- Pal, D.K., Subramanyam, M.D., Divakar, N.G., Iyer, C.P.A. and Selvaraj, Y. 1980.** Studies on the physicochemical composition of fruits of 12 papaya varieties. *J. Food Sci. and Tech.* **17(6)**: 254-256.
- Pandey, D., Shukla, S. K., Yadav, R. C., and Nagar, A. K. 2007.** Promising guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cultivars for North Indian condition. *Acta Hort.* **735**: 91-94.
- Panse V. G. and Sukhatme P.V. 1985.** Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. 4th ed. ICAR, New Delhi.
- Popenoe, W. 1974.** Manual of Tropical and Subtropical Fruits, Hafner Press, PP.225-269.
- Ranganna, S. 1979.** Manual of analysis of fruit and vegetable products. Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd., New Delhi, 1979. 15
- Retuta, 2012.** Biochemical characteristics of papaya, Processing of the XV Eucarpia meeting on genetics and breeding of papaya., 2-4 September 2013, Torino-Italy.
- Selvaraj, P., Raman, K.R., and Balakrishna, R. 1975.** A study on the performance of Solo Papaya. *Prog. Hort.* **7**: 5-10.
- Silva, F. F., Pereira, M. G., Ramos, H. C. C., Damasceno Junior, P. C., Pereira, T. N. S., Gabriel, A. P. C., Viana, A. P., Daher, R. F., Ferregueti, G. A. 2008.** Estimation of genetic parameters related to morpho agronomic and fruit quality traits of papaya. *Crop Breeding and Applied Biotechnology*, v. 8, p. 65-73, 2008.
- Sulikeri, G.S., Sharanappa, K., Rao, M.M. and Bojappa, K.M. 1977.** Solo papaya a promising new find to Karnataka. *Curr. Res.* **6(9)**: 149-150.
- Sundarrajan, S., and Krishnan, B.M. 1984.** Improved papaya varieties, Proc. of National Sem. on Papaya and Papain Production, TNAU, pp. 40-41.
- Thapa, U., Rai, A. K., and Chakarborty R. 2012.** Growth and yield of okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) as influenced by seed weight. *The Bioscan*. **7(4)**: 711-714.
- Tyagi, M., Singh, H., and Jawandha, S. K., 2015.** Performance of papaya cultivars grown under protected conditions. *Indian J. Hort.* **72(3)**: 334-337.
- Varu, D. K. 2019.** Response of different selections and variety on growth, flowering, yield and quality in papaya. *AGRES – An International e. J.* (2019) Vol. 8, Issue 2: 109-119
- Varu, D. K. 2020.** Evaluation of various selections on growth, flowering, yield and quality in papaya. *International J. Chemical Studies*. **8(1)**: 1105-1111



**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTALISTS
ASSOCIATION**

The National Environmentalists Association is chartered in Ranchi as a nonprofit scientific and educational association of like minded academician, researchers, scientists from all over the nation for the furtherance and diffusion of knowledge of Life Sciences in general and Environmental Science in particular.

The association not only honours its members but also provides FELLOWSHIP to outstanding contributors to the subject and the society.

Contact :

For Editorial Information

Prof. M. P. Sinha
Vice Chancellor
Sido Kanhu Murmu University
Dumka - 814 110
Jharkhand, INDIA

For information regarding Association :

SECRETARY,
National Environmentalists Association,
D-13, Sai Roofs, 1st Floor,
H. H. Colony,
Ranchi - 834002
Jharkhand, India

E-mails : editor.bioscan@gmail.com
dr.mp.sinha@gmail.com
nat.env.assoc@gmail.com

Cell : 94313-60645; 9572649448

Ph. : 0651-2244071

Website : www.thebioscan.com
: www.neaindia.org

NAAS Rating : 5.26

U.S.A. Office

2827 Videre Dr.,
Wilmington,
DE 19808 We, USA

Type setter Bandana Solutions Facility Management LLP
Published by Aditi Publications, Patliputra, Patna

The Bioscan

An International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences

ISSN : 0973-7049

Volume 15(3) : 2020

Published as an official organ by

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTALISTS ASSOCIATION

CONTENTS

Page

A. RESEARCH PAPER

1. Comparison and molecular profiling of Begomovirus infecting chilli (*Capsicum annum*) in gangetic alluvial zone of West Bengal
Uday Bikash Oraono, Lourembam Sanajaoba Singh and Jayanta Tarafdar—275 - 280
2. Assessment of probiotic characteristics of *L.plantarum*
Sravani Kandula And Rita Narayanan—281 - 286
3. Effect of rate and frequency of micronutrient on growth attributes and dry matter yield of Banana Cv. grand naine under south Gujarat condition
Narendra Singh, Sonal Tripathi, Patel V. A., Jaimin Naik and Chauhan Aditi—287 - 290
4. Character association and path analysis for seed yield and its components in Grass pea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.)
Gangishetti Ranjithkumar, Sandip Debnath and Duddukur Rajasekhar—291 - 295
5. Determination of physical and biometric properties of onion bulbs in relation to design of digger cum windrower
Shiddanagouda Yadachi and Kiran Nagajjanavar—297 - 301
6. Polygenic variation for morphological and biochemical traits of brinjal genotypes (*Solanum melongena* L.) and its wild relatives
Nisha Sharma, K. D. Bhutia, Rajesh Kumar, Sita Kumari Prasad, Ankita Debnath and Malay Marut Sharma—303 - 309
7. Effect of different sources of horizontal transmission of bacterial flacherie on Et_{50} for symptom expression and mortality of PM X CSR₂
B. L. Kavyashree., R. N. Bhaskar and C. Doreswamy—311 - 314
8. Comparative biology of *Goniozus nephantidis* (Muesbeck) on *Galleria mellonella* L. and *Corcyra cephalonica* (Stainton)
A. V. Desai, M. R. Siddhapara and N. P. Trivedi—315 - 321
9. Efficiency of ovatide on mass seed production of climbing perch (*Anabas testudineus*, Bloch, 1972) in Nalbari district, Assam
Ankur Rajbongshi, A. Ali, M. Chakravarty, M. Deka, H. Mazumdar, Pranab Kr Das and S. Baishya—323 - 326
10. Study of combining ability and gene action for yield and yield component characters in interspecific hybrids of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L. X *Gossypium barbadense* L.)
S. B. Gohil., M. B. Parmar., M. P. Patel and D. A. Patel—327 - 333
11. Per oral inoculation of *Lysinibacillus sphaericus* with pathogenic microbes on rearing and cocoon parameters of silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L.
H. G. Anusha, R. N. Bhaskar and K. V. Anitharani—335 - 338
12. Effect of fungicides, plant extracts and bioagents on spore germination of *Colletotrichum lindemuthianum* causing field bean anthracnose

The Journal is Currently Abstracted / Indexed in

- Paryavarn Abstract, INDIA
- Indian Science Abstract, INDIA
- Cambridge Science Abstract, U.S.A.
- Zoological Record, U.K.
- Directory of Open Access Journal (DOAJ)
- Chemical Abstract, U. S. A.
- Research BIB
- Indian Science
- Journal Seek
- Scientific Indexing Service (SIS)

Journal is currently rated by

Index Copernicus

Universal Impact Factor

NAAS

DISCLAIMER

The Publisher and Editors cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information in this journal; the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Publisher/ Association and Editors, neither does the publication of advertisements constitute any endorsement by the Publisher / Association and Editors of the products advertised.

- S. Narasimha Rao, S.L. Bhattiprolu, A. Vijaya Gopal and V. Sekhar— 339-344
13. Evaluation in vitro different fungicides for growth of *Rhizoctonia bataticola*
A.M. Kadam, S.S. Chavan and A.H. Kendre — 345- 349
14. Evaluation of gladiolus varieties for flowering and cut flower traits under indo-gangetic plains
Girish,P. M., Anjana Sisodia and Anil K. Singh— 351- 355
15. Effect of land configuration and different organic sources on growth, yield and quality of carrot under organic farming
B. Solanki, A. R. Kaswala, P.K. Dubey and A.P. Italiya— 357- 362
16. Verification and usability analysis of medium range weather forecast for the Kokrajhar district of lower Brahmaputra valley zone of Assam
Kuldip Medhi, Kushal Sarmah, Vinod Upadhyay, Sunil Kumar Paul, Athar N. Islam and Bikash J. Gharphalia— 363 - 370
17. Canonical root analysis and clustering for characterization and evaluation of aromatic rice germplasm based on morphological characters
G. Parimala, Ch. Damodhar Raju, L.V. Subba Rao and K. Uma Maheswari— 371 - 374
18. Genetic divergence analysis of sesame genotypes (*Sesamum indicum* L.)
Dasari Rajitha, T. Srikanth, D. Padmaja and T. Kiran Babu—375 - 379
19. Nutrient uptake and chemical properties of soil after harvest of baby corn (*Zea mays* L.) as influenced by organic manures and fertilizers
D.H. Roopashree , S .Kamal Bai . Nagaraju and S.Raghavendra— 381 - 384
20. Genotypic response on growth and yield in papaya
D. K. Varu.,K. D. Patel and Sandip Makhmale— 385 - 389
21. Studies on frequency distribution of yield and yield related traits in F₂M₂ generation of sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.)
Rajesh Kumar Kar , Tapash Kumar Mishra and Banshidhar Pradhan — 391 - 395
22. Correlation and path analysis in cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp)
R.M. Nagalakshmi, R. Usha Kumari and R. Ananda Kumar—397 - 401
23. A simple and efficient method for DNA extraction from rabi sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench]"
S. S. Gadakh, G. D. Khalekar.,U. S. Dalvi, A. A.Kale and P.L.Kulwal— 403 - 406
24. Determination of economic injury level (EIL) of sugarcane plassey borer *Chilo tumidicostalis* hampson (Lepidoptera: pyralidae)
R. K. Nath and D. K. Saikia— 407- 409
25. Performance of different summer mung (*Vigna radiata* L.) varieties sown at different dates under Manipur valley condition
Meghna Gogoi, Jamkhogin Lhungdim, Kamal Kant, Urjashi Bhattacharya and Gauri Mohan — 411 - 414



ZONAL CO-ORDINATORS OF THE ASSOCIATION

- Prof. N. Behera
School of Life Science,
Sambalpur University
- Dr. Nirmal Kumar
ISTAR, Vallabh Vidyanagar,
Anand, Gujarat
- Dr. P. N. Sudha
D. K. M. College for Women,
Vellore
- Prof. S. P. S. Dutta
Dept. of Environmental Science,
Jammu University, Jammu
- Dr. V. Salom Gnana Thanga
Dept. of Env. Scs.,
University of Kerala, Kariavattom
Tiruvananthapuram, Kerala

Publications of the Association

The Bioscan

An International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences

The Ecoscan

An International Quarterly Journal of
Environmental Sciences

**Both the Journals are
online**

**Both the Journals are
available on Google.com**

Websites of the Journals are
www.theecoscan.in
www.thebioscan.in

FEATURES OF ASSOCIATION

- Association is registered under 80G of I.T.
- Prestigious fellowship of the Association (F. N. E. A.) to academicians of the nation.
- Regular annual conference of national and international levels organized by the Association.
- Young Scientist and Senior Scientist award during the conference of the Association.



_____ 062 & 082

_____ 000 & 000

THE BIOSCAN : SUBSCRIPTION RATES				
		India (Rs.)	SAARC Countries	Other Countries
Individuals	One Year	1,000	2,000(I:C)	US \$200
	Life Member*	10,000		
Institutions	One Year	3,000	6,000(I:C)	US \$400
	Life Member*	30,000		

*Life Member will receive the journal for 15 years while other benefits will continue whole life

THE BIOSCAN : MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please enter my subscription for the above journal for the year / life member.

Name:

Address:

E-mail:

Payment Rs. : by DD / MD in favour of
National Environmentalists Association payable at Ranchi, No. Dated
..... is enclosed.

NOTE: FOR MEMBERSHIP THE ABOVE INFORMATION CAN BE SENT ON SEPARATE SHEET