Morphological Characterization of Native Mangos from Chiapas, Mexico

Didiana Gálvez-López¹, Miguel Salvador-Figueroa², Ma. de Lourdes Adriano-Anaya², and Netzahualcoyotl Mayek-Pérez^{1,*}

 ¹ Centro de Biotecnología Genómica, Instituto Politécnico Nacional. Blvd. Del Maestro s/n esq. Elías Piña, Col. Narciso Mendoza, 88710. Reynosa, México. Tel/Fax (+52) 8999243627.
 ² Área de Biotecnología, Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas. Carr. a Puerto Madero km 2. 30700, Tapachula,

*Corresponding author. Tel./Fax (+52899) 9243627. E-mail: nmayek@ipn.mx

México.

ABSTRACT

Mango is a major fruit crop throughout sub-tropical and tropical areas of Mexico. In the state of Chiapas, Mexico, new phenotypes have been found. These individuals have originated directly from seeds and after grafting and used for mango plantations. The aim of this work was to characterize mango accessions native to southern Chiapas, Mexico, based on morphological traits. Fifty morphologic traits from leaves (9), inflorescences (6), flowers (10), fruits (10), and seeds (5) were measured during 2005 and 2006 in 41 local mango accessions collected from five locations (Huehuetán, Pijijiapan, Tuxtla Chico, Tapachula, Escuintla) in the state of Chiapas, Mexico. We found significant morphologic variability in mango accessions from Chiapas. Seven fruit traits (length, width, and weight of fruits; pulp thickness and weight; and fibre content and fibre length) and two leaf traits (length and width) were used to index mango morphology. Mango accessions locally named as 'Ataulfo' from Tapachula and 'Ajo' and 'Sin nombre-2' from Tuxtla Chico showed the highest fruit weight and pulp contents and the lowest fibre contents. Based on fruit morphology and growth at southern Chiapas, some mango accessions can be useful for further field evaluations and then propagated for future plantations.

Additional Index Words: Mangifera indica L., fruit quality, fruit yield, morphology, Soconusco region.

Mango (Mangifera indica L.) is a major crop in the state of Chiapas, México, where 26,000 ha are planted and 176,000 Mg were produced during 2008. The majority of mango production ($\approx 95\%$) is located in the southern region known as 'Soconusco' which comprises 17 counties, and where Tapachula county produces nearly one third of the state's mango production (SIAP, 2009). A broad morphological and genetic diversity of mangos has emerged in southern Chiapas due to free sexual recombination and continuous grafting of outstanding plants produced from seeds of commercial cultivars grown and/or consumed in the state. For example, the cultivar 'Ataulfo' (Manila fruit type) was originated in the Soconusco region and was then dispersed throughout Mexico and other areas of the world (Gálvez-López et al., 2007a, b).

Several procedures for the identification and characterization of mango genotypes have been developed based on outstanding fruit morphological traits. However, those traits are visually evaluated in most cases and are thereby subjective morphological characteristics that can improve characterizations for defining the potential use of any genotype (Jaramillo and Baena, 2000). The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) of Rome, Italy, has established a list of descriptors for mango that includes the morphological traits of plant, leaves, flowers, fruits and seeds and provides a universal format for the characterization of mango genetic resources (IBPGR, 1989; IPGRI, 2006). Mango cultivars from Mexico have been characterized based on fruit traits and isozyme patterns (Gálvez-López et al., 2007a, b). The objective of this work was to characterize mango

accessions native to southern Chiapas, Mexico, based on their morphology.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Forty-one mango accessions from the Soconusco region in southern Chiapas, México were located during 2005. Each accession has unknown genetic origin, making it unclear whether the accessions originated by planting of one seed of a cultivar grown at Chiapas, or whether it was obtained directly from local markets or from grafting of local mangos or cultivars planted through Soconusco region. The geographical locations and local names of each accession are shown in Table 1 and Fig. 1.

Accessions were characterized based on mango descriptors listed by IBPGR (1989) and IPGRI (2006). Fifty-three traits (35 qualitative and 18 quantitative) were measured per accession from November 2005 to April 2006 (Tables 2 and 3). Descriptive statistics (mean, amplitude, variance, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation) were calculated for each accession. Data were subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to identify traits that best explained mango morphologic variability. Then cluster analysis of mango accessions was performed based on most explicative morphologic traits derived from PCA, and a single dendrogram based on the Unweighted Paired-Grouping Method with Arithmetic Averages (UPGMA) algorithm was constructed (Hair et al., 1992). Statistical analysis was performed using Statistica® ver. 5.1 for Windows software (StatSoft Inc., Tulsa, OK, USA).

RESULTS

Four morphological traits from the 53 originally measured (flower nature of disc, number of fertile stamens, pistil, and fruit stalk insertion) were eliminated as they showed only one phenotypic class. Qualitative traits showed from two to eight phenotypic classes (Table 2), while quantitative traits with the highest CVs (>35%) were number of fertile stamens, pulp thickness, inflorescence length and fruit weight.



Fig. 1. Origins of mango landraces from Chiapas, Mexico.

| Number | Local name/origin | Number | Local name/origin | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Tuxtla Chico, Chiapas | | | | | | | |
| TCH01 | Agua | TCH08 | Platano | | | | |
| TCH02 | Sin nombre 1 | TCH09 | Sin nombre 3 | | | | |
| ТСН03 | Sin nombre 2 | TCH10 | Piña | | | | |
| TCH04 | Oro | TCH11 | Manzana | | | | |
| TCH05 | Coche | TCH12 | Piña | | | | |
| TCH06 | Amatillo | TCH13 | Cachetio | | | | |
| TCH07 | Alcanforado | TCH14 | Ajo | | | | |
| | Escuintla, C | hiapas | | | | | |
| ESC01 | 1 Piña ESC09 | | Manzana Grande | | | | |
| ESC02 | Amatillo | ESC10 | Viejita | | | | |
| ESC03 | Coche ESC11 | | Oro | | | | |
| ESC04 | Pomarrosa | ESC12 | Tecolote | | | | |
| ESC05 | Canela | ESC13 | Pepino | | | | |
| ESC06 | Tapanero | ESC14 | Pija | | | | |
| ESC07 | Manzana Chico | ESC15 | Melon | | | | |
| ESC08 | Manilon | | | | | | |
| | Huehuetan, C | Chiapas | | | | | |
| HUE01 | Tecolote | HUE03 | Alcanfor | | | | |
| HUE02 | Manililla | HUE04 | Amate | | | | |
| Pijijiapan, Chiapas | | | | | | | |
| PIJ01 | Рарауа | PIJ03 | Cuero | | | | |
| PIJ02 | Piña | PIJ04 | Agua | | | | |
| Tapachula, Chiapas | | | | | | | |
| TAP01 | Ataulfo1 (70) | TAP03 | Ataulfo3 (50) | | | | |
| TAP02 | Ataulfo2 (70) | TAP04 | Ataulfo4 (30) | | | | |

Table 1. Mango accessions collected in Chiapas, Mexico and accessions obtained from the Mango Germplasm

 Bank of INIFAP.

Traits with CV > 10% were disc diameter, flower diameter, and number of sepal and petal (Table 3). The PCA of quantitative data explained more than 50% of total variation into the three former Principal Components (PC) (Table 4). Nine traits were significant, two qualitative (fibre content and fibre length) and seven quantitative (leaf width, petiole length, fruit length, fruit thickness, fruit weight and pulp thickness). The most significant traits were fruit characteristics, and all significant morphological traits were positively associated with morphological variability in mango germplasm (Table 5).

Dispersion of accessions based on the two major PC from PCA divided genotypes into four quadrants. Quadrant III included accessions with high means for fruit weight, thickness and length. Pulp content as well as low fibre contents for outstanding 'Ataulfo' from Tapachula (TAP01, TAP02, TAP03, TAP04) and 'Ajo' (TCH14) and 'Sin Nombre 2' (TCH03) landraces from Tuxtla Chico were also included.

| Trait ^a | Phenotypic classes ^b |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Leaf | |
| Shape | Oblong-lanceolate (6), lanceolate (31), elliptic-oblong (4) |
| Colour of young leaf | Light green (20), light green with brownish tinge (5), light brick red |
| | (7), reddish brown (8), deep coppery tan (1) |
| Texture | Coriaceous (2), Thinly coriaceous (8), Thickly coriaceous (31) |
| Tip | Obtuse (7), Acute (18), Acuminate (16) |
| Margin | Flat (16), Wavy (22), Folded (3) |
| Inflorescence | |
| Position | Terminal (23), Axillary (9), Both terminal and axillary (3) |
| Shape | Conical (18), Pyramidal (8), Broadly pyramidal (9) |
| Flower density | Densely flowered (35) |
| Colour | Light green (5), green with red patches (17), light red (4), dark red (9) |
| Hairiness | Absent (21), Puberulous (9), Pubescent (5) |
| Flower | |
| Type of flower | Pentamerous (25), pentamerous and tetramerous (4), hexamerous (4), |
| 51 | pentamerous and hexamerous (2), tetramerous, pentamerous and |
| | hexamerous (1) |
| Nature of disc | Disc swollen, lobed, broader tan ovary (36) |
| Number of fertile stamens | 5, 1 fertile (36) |
| Pistil | Present (36) |
| Fruit | |
| Shape | Oblong (15), elliptic (6), roundish (15) |
| Colour of skin of mature fruit | Red (1), yellow (20), green-yellow (5), Green (3), orange (1), red- |
| | yellow (4), yellow with red spots (1), yellow with green spots (1) |
| Thickness of fruit skin | Thin (8), medium thick (23), thick (5) |
| Skin texture | Smooth (32) , rough (4) |
| Pulp texture | Firm (13), soft (10), juicy (13) |
| Adherence of skin to pulp | Absent (free) (6), present (adhering) (30) |
| Fibre in pulp | Absent (8), present (28) |
| Quantity of fibre | Scarce (18), abundant (18) |
| Length of fibres | Short (10), medium (17), long (9) |
| Stalk insertion | Vertical (36) |
| Beak type | Absent (15), point (11), prominent (7), mammiform (3) |
| Sinus | Absent (11), present (25) |
| Sinus type | Absent (12), shallow (20), deep (4) |
| Groove | Absent (34), present (2) |
| Shoulders | Level (16), dorsal higher than ventral (8), ventral higher than dorsal |
| | (12) |
| Slope of shoulders | Sloping abruptly (7), ending in a long curve (15), rising and then rounded (14) |
| Anex | Acute (32) obtuse or rounded (4) |
| Basal cavity | Absent (9), present (27) |
| Seed | ···· (·), F ····· (-·) |
| Veins | Level with surface (3) depressed (30) elevated (3) |
| Pattern of venation | Parallel (28), forked (6), both parallel and forked (2) |
| Fibre | Absent (2), present (34) |

| Table 2. Summary | of qu | ualitative morp | holo | ogic trai | ts measured | l in mango | landraces f | rom Ch | iapas. | México. |
|------------------|-------|-----------------|------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------|--------|---------|
| | | | | | | | | | | |

^a Traits according to IBPGR (1989) and IPGRI (2006).

^b Numbers in brackets indicate the number of accessions per class.

| Trait | Parameter | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | Mean | Amplitude | Variance | Standard Deviation | Coefficient of Variation | |
| Leaf length (cm) | 25.6 | 24.9 | 33.0 | 5.7 | 22.4 | |
| Leaf width (cm) | 5.8 | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 15.7 | |
| Petiole length (cm) | 4.1 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 24.1 | |
| Number of nerves | 23.5 | 24.5 | 14.0 | 3.7 | 15.9 | |
| Inflorescence length (cm) | 32.8 | 45.0 | 145.8 | 12.1 | 36.9 | |
| Flower diameter (mm) | 6.6 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 9.7 | |
| Number of anthers | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 21.6 | |
| Number of stamens | 2.9 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 46.0 | |
| Disc diameter (mm) | 2.6 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 12.2 | |
| Number of petals | 5.1 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.7 | |
| Number of sepals | 5.1 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.7 | |
| Fruit length (cm) | 10.2 | 6.3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 17.5 | |
| Fruit width (cm) | 6.9 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 14.7 | |
| Fruit thickness (cm) | 6.0 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 13.3 | |
| Fruit weight (g) | 251 | 362.2 | 8533.3 | 92.4 | 36.9 | |
| Pulp thickness (cm) | 2.1 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 40.6 | |
| Seed length (cm) | 8.4 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 14.7 | |
| Seed weight (g) | 20.2 | 19.6 | 28.2 | 5.3 | 26.3 | |

Table 3. Basic statistic parameters of quantitative traits measured in mango landraces from Chiapas, México.

Quadrant I included accessions with small fruit size and pulp contents, while quadrant II included germplasm with large fruits and high pulp and fibre contents. Finally, quadrant IV included mangos with low fibre contents in fruits but small fruits and low pulp content (Fig. 2).

Using data from the more explicative traits derived from PCA a dendrogram of mango accessions was constructed that showed three major groups of genotypes. Group I included three genotypes with outstanding morphological traits (TCH03, TCH14 and TAP01), and group II showed genotypes collected from all five locations of Chiapas and 'Ataulfo' accessions (TAP02, TAP03, TAP04). Group III included three accessions from Escuintla (ESC06, ESC08, ESC15), one from Tuxtla Chico (TCH09) and other from Pijijiapan (PIJ03). The last genotypes were different from the others because some of the morphological traits were not completely measured due to delayed or absent fructification (Fig. 3). When we constructed dendrograms with all 53 traits, or only nine of the most explicative morphological traits we found similar topologies (data not shown).

DISCUSSION

Broad morphologic diversity was found in native mango from Chiapas. We assumed that optimal conditions for free recombination among mangos introduced from other countries were common for farmers in Chiapas. Recombination is high since novel morphological traits, unreported in formal mango descriptors (IBPGR, 1989; IPGRI, 2006), were found in native mango germplasm. For example, some accessions showed hexamerous flowers and others exhibiting both hexamerous and pentamerous flowers. Other accessions included tetra, penta and hexamerous flowers in the same tree. IPGRI descriptors reported only tetra- or pentamerous flowers in mangos. Kostermans and Bompard (1993) found significant variation in flower morphology in some Mangifera species.

Common flowers in *M. laurina* are pentamerous, tetramerous and pentamerous in *M. casturi* and

| Principal component | Eigenvalue | Total variance (%) | Accumulated variance (%) |
|---------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | 4.82 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| 2 | 2.35 | 15.7 | 47.9 |
| 3 | 1.84 | 12.3 | 60.2 |
| 4 | 1.36 | 9.1 | 69.3 |
| 5 | 1.24 | 8.3 | 77.6 |

Table 4. Eigenvalues for five principal components from the PCA of morphological data measured in mango accessions from Chiapas, Mexico.

Table 5. Eigenvectors of the most descriptive morphologic traits measured in mango germplasm from Chiapas, Mexico.

| Trait | Principal component ^a | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | | |
| Leaf length | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.17 | | |
| Leaf width | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.74* | | |
| Petiole length | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.89* | | |
| Inflorescence length | -0.22 | -0.67 | -0.30 | | |
| Flower diameter | 0.11 | 0.04 | -0.02 | | |
| Disc diameter | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.42 | | |
| Fruit length | 0.77* | 0.15 | 0.12 | | |
| Fruit width | 0.89* | -0.02 | -0.09 | | |
| Fruit thickness | 0.75* | 0.14 | 0.09 | | |
| Fruit weight | 0.92* | 0.19 | 0.04 | | |
| Pulp thickness | 0.81* | -0.22 | 0.09 | | |
| Quantity of fibre | -0.15 | 0.84* | -0.28 | | |
| Length of fibre | -0.02 | 0.72* | 0.24 | | |
| Seed length | 0.57 | 0.28 | 0.22 | | |
| Seed weight | 0.44 | 0.34 | -0.07 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Eigenvalues | 4.82 | 2.35 | 1.84 | | |
| Total variance (%) | 32.2 | 15.7 | 12.3 | | |

^a Values with asterisk indicate the most descriptive traits.



Fig. 2. Dispersion of mango landraces from Chiapas, Mexico based on PCA analysis of morphological data.



Fig. 3. Dendrogram of mango accessions from Chiapas, Mexico based on morphological data.

tetramerous in *M. torquenda* and *M. quadrifida*. In addition, we found three flower types in the same tree. In the same vein, four new fruit skin colors were found (orange, red-yellow, yellow with red spots, yellow with green spots) that were not reported previously (IBPGR, 1989; IPGRI, 2006). Some mango landraces ('Agua,' 'Sin nombre-2,' 'Coche,' 'Amatillo,' 'Ajo,' 'Tecolote' and 'Ataulfo') showed fruit weights similar to those reported by Chávez et al. (2001) in breed cultivars growing in Michoacán, México.

Seven flower traits and two leaf traits were positively associated with morphological variability in mango germplasm. We suggest that the use of only fruit traits can give a good perspective about mango diversity, and expensive and laborious work to obtain more than 50 morphological descriptors can be avoided without losing efficiency and effectiveness in classification of mango germplasm. Mangos for commercial exploitation should exhibit low fibre content in fruits with short fibres; high length, width, thickness and weight of fruits; and high contents of pulp (Human and Rheeder, 2004). Mango cultivars 'Ataulfo' from Tapachula as well as 'Ajo' and 'Sin Nombre-2' from Tuxtla Chico show the highest number of traits mentioned above and can be useful for mango breeding in southern Chiapas.

Although information remains unclear, mangos were probably introduced from Asia to the Caribbean in the 18th century and to Mexico in the 18th and 19th centuries, and were well adapted to climatic conditions of the country at the time of introduction. Mango plants were then dispersed to other countries, and bred mainly in Florida and Hawaii, USA (Duval et al., 2006). Bred cultivars have been introduced to Mexico (Chávez et al., 2001). In southern Chiapas common practices by mango growers consist of allowing mango fruits to germinate and produce sexual plants that are derived from natural and random recombinations. When recombinants show good phenotypic traits, trees are selected and then planted in the orchard. It is therefore common to see small orchards that include a broad range of mango phenotypes (López-Valenzuela et al., 1997).

Our results suggest that native mango populations from Chiapas show genetic differences based on geographical origin and their known history, but the genetic exchange remains. Bred mangos from USA are mono-embryonic while Mexican mangos are commonly poly-embryonic. Close genetic relations among Ataulfo, Manila and Carabao suggest that later cultivars may be parents of Ataulfo, a genotype that originated in Cordoba, Veracruz where Manila was first introduced (Chávez et al., 2001; SAGAR-INIFAP -PRODUCE, 2000).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by Instituto Politecnico Nacional (grant CGPI-20050084) and FOMIX-Gobierno del Estado de Tamaulipas. D. Gálvez-López is also grateful to CONACYT (fellow 169661), PIFI-IPN, Club Rotario de Reynosa A. C. and FOMIX-Tamaulipas (grant TAMPS-2003-C02-09) for financial support of her M. Sc. program at CBG-IPN. S. Hernández-Delgado and N. Mayek-Pérez are S.N.I. and EDI-IPN fellows, and N.M.P. is SNI, EDI-IPN, and COFAA-IPN scholarship.

LITERATURE CITED

- Chávez, C. X., A. P. Vega, L. M. Tapia, and S. Miranda. 2001. Mango, su Manejo y Producción en el Trópico Seco de México. INIFAP, Morelia, México. 40 pp.
- Duval, M. E., J. Bunel, C. Sitbon, A. M. Risterucci, C. Calabre, and F. Le Bellec. 2006. Genetic diversity of Caribbean mangoes (*Mangifera indica* L.) using microsatellite markers. 8th International Mango Symposium, Sun City, South Africa.
- Gálvez-López, D., M. L. Adriano-Anaya, C. Villarrreal-Treviño, N. Mayek-Pérez, and M. Salvador-Figueroa. 2007a. Caracterización isoenzimática de mango criollo de Chiapas. Revista Chapingo serie Horticultura 13: 71-76.
- Gálvez-López, D. M., Salvador-Figueroa, and N. Mayek-Pérez. 2007b. Diversidad morfológica del fruto en germoplasma de mango nativo de Chiapas, México. Cuadernos de Biodiversidad 24: 10-19.
- Hair, J. F., R. F. Anderson, R. L. Tatum, and W. C. Black. 1992. Multivariate Data Analysis, 3rd edition, McMillan Publishing Co., New York. 322 pp.
- Human, C. F., and S. Rheeder. 2004. Mango breeding: results and successes. Acta Horticulturae 645: 331-335.
- International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR). 1989. Descriptors for Mango. Rome, Italy. 22 pp.
- International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI). 2006. Descriptors of Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). Rome, Italy. 44 pp.

- Jaramillo, S., and M. Baena. 2000. Conservación *ex situ* de Recursos Fitogenéticos. Instituto Internacional de Recursos Fitogenéticos (IPGRI). Madrid. 92 pp.
- Kostermans, A. J., and J. M. Bompard. 1993. The Mangoes. Botany, Nomenclature, Horticulture and Utilization, Academic Press, London. pp. 332-338.
- López-Valenzuela, J. A., O. Martínez, and O. Paredes-López. 1997. Geographic differentiation and embryo type identification in *Mangifera indica* L. cultivars using RAPD markers. HortScience 32: 1105-1108.
- SAGAR-INIFAP-PRODUCE. 2000. Logros y Aaportaciones de la Investigación al Cultivo del Mango "Ataulfo" en Chiapas. Tapachula, México. 35 pp.
- Sistema de Informacion Agropecuaria (SIAP). 2009. Sistema de Información Agropecuaria de Consulta. SAGARPA, México. Available in: http://www.siap.sagarpa.gob.mx/ ar comanuar.html (Reviewed: april 11th, 2009).