

## **Studies on the Physiological and Biochemical Composition of Different Mango Cultivars at Various Maturity Levels**

**M. Z. Shafique, M. Ibrahim, M. O. H. Helali and S. K. Biswas**

*Fruit Processing & Preservation Research Division,  
BCSIR Laboratories Rajshahi, Bangladesh*

### **Abstract**

A comparative study on physiological and biochemical composition of ten varieties of mangoes was carried out at three maturity stages viz. immature, mature and ripe to find out the standard one. During the investigation, whole weight of the mangoes, pulp content, weight of peel and stone, total soluble solid (TSS), pH, acidity, sugar content and vitamin C were determined at three maturity stages. It was observed that all the varieties at ripe stages had higher sugar content as compared to immature and mature stages. Attractive flavour and pleasant taste were also developed in ripe stages and differed from one another due to varietal specific. This characteristic odour which appeared during ripening is due to ester and components of carbonyl types.

### **Introduction**

Mango is now recognized as one of the best fruits of all indigenous fruits due to its excellent flavour, attractive fragrance, beautiful shades of colour, delicious taste and high nutritive value.<sup>1</sup> It is grown commercially in eighty seven countries.<sup>2,3</sup> Several hundred varieties are grown in the Indian subcontinent but a few specific varieties are commercialized according to preferences of different regions of the countries. India contributes about 64 % of the world mango production. Other mango producing countries are Mexico, Pakistan, Brazil, Philippines and Thailand. The total world production of Mango is 15.7 million metric tonnes.<sup>3</sup> About

250 varieties of mangoes are grown in Bangladesh.<sup>4</sup> Little information about some varietal characteristics have so far been recorded. But information about its export is still unknown though it has a great export potential. Among the main constituents of this fruit, carbohydrate and acid contribute a great deal to the food value of the fruit. Of the three parts of the mango, pulp is the part most utilized for human consumption. It is cross pollinated and largely propagated by seeds. Awareness in respect of improved mango production is lacking. In view of the above aspects, the present study has been undertaken to throw light on some of the

constituents of mango with a view to apprehending the fruit as a supplementary food having a good calorific value as well as to select the varieties for plantation with a hope to be a member of the mango exporting countries.

### Materials and Methods

The present experiment was carried out at BCSIR Laboratories, Rajshahi during the period from March to August 2002. The mangoes used for this experiment were procured randomly from three mango gardens adjacent to BCSIR Laboratories, Rajshahi to get a clear picture about the constituent and quality of the mango cultivars. In this experiment mango of ten varieties were selected and each variety contained ten mangoes. The mangoes under experiment were Fazli, Ashina, Langra, Surjapuri, Khirshapat, Gopalbhog, Kisanbhog, Mohanbhog, Latabombai and Ranipasand. The mangoes were analyzed at three different maturity stages viz. immature (40 days after pollination), mature and ripe stages. The immature mangoes were cleaned, weighed, peeled and the stone was separated. The physical characteristics of the mangoes viz. whole weight of mango, weight of skin, weight of stone, weight of pulp were determined using standard methods and recorded in Table I. The total soluble solid (TSS) were determined with a hand refractometer.<sup>5</sup> Sugar was determined by colorimetric method,<sup>6,7</sup> vitamin C was determined titrimetrically using 2, 6-dichlorophenolindophenol,<sup>8,9</sup> acidity was

determined titrimetrically with the visual acid-base method<sup>10</sup> and the pH was determined with a digital pH meter.<sup>11</sup> The chemical composition of the mangoes were determined at the above three stages and the results are recorded in Table IIa and IIb. The above data were statistically analysed and the mean of different parameters was compared by least significant difference (LSD) test. The organoleptic tests and the physical characters (e.g. colour, flavour and taste) of these ripe mangoes were carried out and evaluated by a panel of seven judges. The mangoes were classified as follows on the basis of their grading; excellent - 80 % or above, good - 70-79 % and fair below 70 % depending on colour, flavour and taste. The results are given in table III.

### Results and Discussion

It is evident from Table I that the whole weight of all the mangoes increased gradually with maturity. The rate of increase is different for different Significant difference was observed among the cultivars at three maturity stages. In the immature stage, the lowest weight was found in Ranipasand (16.1 gm) and the highest weight was found in Fazli (123.2 gm). At mature and ripe stages, the minimum and maximum weights were also found in Ranipasand and Fazli varieties respectively. The results agreed with the reported results of Hossain *et al.*<sup>12</sup> In the immature stage skin content of Fazli and Surjapuri is 20.3 g but Mohanbhog and Ranipasand were 22.4 and 22.7 g respectively.

**Table I. The Physiological characteristics of ten mango varieties at different maturity levels**

| Sl. No. | Name of mango varieties | Whole weight (g) |       |       | Skin (%)         |      |      | Stone (%)        |      |      | Pulp (%)         |      |      |
|---------|-------------------------|------------------|-------|-------|------------------|------|------|------------------|------|------|------------------|------|------|
|         |                         | *Maturity stages |       |       | *Maturity stages |      |      | *Maturity stages |      |      | *Maturity stages |      |      |
|         |                         | 1                | 2     | 3     | 1                | 2    | 3    | 1                | 2    | 3    | 1                | 2    | 3    |
| 1       | Fazli                   | 132.2            | 245.5 | 650.2 | 20.3             | 14.3 | 12.2 | 6.2              | 10.4 | 11.2 | 73.5             | 75.3 | 76.6 |
| 2       | Ashina                  | 93.5             | 185.2 | 590.4 | 21.7             | 15.6 | 13.7 | 6.9              | 11.8 | 11.0 | 71.4             | 72.6 | 75.3 |
| 3       | Langra                  | 59.3             | 103.3 | 315.5 | 22.3             | 18.5 | 15.1 | 9.9              | 12.3 | 12.8 | 67.8             | 69.2 | 72.1 |
| 4       | Surjapuri               | 27.6             | 95.6  | 260.3 | 20.3             | 16.8 | 13.8 | 9.1              | 11.1 | 13.1 | 70.6             | 72.1 | 73.1 |
| 5       | Khirshapat              | 32.4             | 72.5  | 276.5 | 22.3             | 18.2 | 16.7 | 10.8             | 14.2 | 13.5 | 66.9             | 67.6 | 69.8 |
| 6       | Gopalbhog               | 29.3             | 65.6  | 208.7 | 20.6             | 17.4 | 14.7 | 10.2             | 11.3 | 13.1 | 69.2             | 71.3 | 72.2 |
| 7       | Kisanbhog               | 34.2             | 107.2 | 303.5 | 21.4             | 17.8 | 15.0 | 10.1             | 12.5 | 13.8 | 68.5             | 69.7 | 71.2 |
| 8       | Mohanbhog               | 38.6             | 135.1 | 370.5 | 22.4             | 18.0 | 15.3 | 10.3             | 13.8 | 14.2 | 67.3             | 68.2 | 70.5 |
| 9       | Latabombai              | 19.5             | 85.0  | 193.4 | 22.1             | 18.1 | 16.2 | 11.5             | 14.5 | 14.3 | 66.4             | 67.4 | 69.5 |
| 10      | Ranipasand              | 16.1             | 532   | 150.6 | 22.7             | 17.2 | 16.8 | 10.8             | 15.3 | 14.5 | 66.5             | 67.5 | 68.7 |
|         | LSD (0.01 %)            | 3.43             | 3.55  | 4.78  | 2.01             | 1.18 | 0.34 | 1.25             | 0.52 | 0.42 | 2.82             | 3.72 | 0.83 |
|         | LSD (0.05%)             | 2.67             | 2.61  | 3.50  | 1.48             | 0.86 | 0.25 | 0.92             | 0.38 | 0.31 | 2.07             | 2.72 | 0.61 |

\* Maturity Stage 1 = Immature stage, Maturity stage 2 = Mature stage, Maturity stage 3 = Ripe stage

Table IIa. The biochemical characteristics of ten mango varieties at different maturity levels

| Sl. No. | Name of mango varieties | pH               |      |      | Vitamin C (m/100gm) |       |       | Acidity as citric acid (%) |      |      | Sugar-Acid ratio (%) |       |        |
|---------|-------------------------|------------------|------|------|---------------------|-------|-------|----------------------------|------|------|----------------------|-------|--------|
|         |                         | *Maturity stages |      |      | *Maturity stages    |       |       | *Maturity stages           |      |      | *Maturity stages     |       |        |
|         |                         | 1                | 2    | 3    | 1                   | 2     | 3     | 1                          | 2    | 3    | 1                    | 2     | 3      |
| 1.      | Fazli                   | 3.5              | 4.2  | 5.4  | 0.53                | 0.24  | 0.15  | 90.3                       | 56.5 | 43.5 | 12.26                | 47.31 | 108.67 |
| 2.      | Ashina                  | 2.8              | 3.7  | 4.8  | 0.65                | 0.32  | 0.16  | 103.2                      | 65.7 | 36.4 | 09.69                | 33.75 | 96.25  |
| 3.      | Langra                  | 2.7              | 3.2  | 4.6  | 0.62                | 0.31  | 0.13  | 86.5                       | 52.7 | 42.3 | 09.19                | 43.55 | 131.54 |
| 4.      | Surjapuri               | 3.2              | 3.5  | 5.1  | 0.58                | 0.35  | 0.15  | 92.3                       | 56.4 | 40.8 | 11.03                | 32.57 | 101.33 |
| 5.      | Khirshapat              | 2.9              | 3.4  | 4.8  | 0.61                | 0.28  | 0.12  | 96.4                       | 62.3 | 48.5 | 09.51                | 45.36 | 162.50 |
| 6.      | Gopalbhog               | 2.5              | 2.8  | 4.2  | 0.57                | 0.30  | 0.13  | 84.2                       | 60.5 | 40.3 | 10.88                | 39.33 | 150.00 |
| 7.      | Kisanbhog               | 2.7              | 3.2  | 4.7  | 0.64                | 0.29  | 0.16  | 92.5                       | 63.6 | 39.2 | 08.28                | 39.31 | 116.88 |
| 8.      | Mohanbhog               | 2.5              | 2.7  | 4.5  | 0.58                | 0.33  | 0.15  | 90.4                       | 62.5 | 37.3 | 11.21                | 33.94 | 114.67 |
| 9.      | Latabombai              | 2.8              | 3.4  | 4.3  | 0.63                | 0.30  | 0.14  | 93.1                       | 61.6 | 38.1 | 08.57                | 35.00 | 112.00 |
| 10.     | Ranipasand              | 2.6              | 3.6  | 4.9  | 0.57                | 0.34  | 0.13  | 95.2                       | 65.4 | 35.2 | 11.93                | 40.00 | 120.00 |
|         | LSD (0.01 %)            | 0.26             | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.024               | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.31                       | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.196                | 0.043 | 0.806  |
|         | LSD (0.05%)             | 0.19             | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.018               | 0.019 | 0.021 | 0.23                       | 0.21 | 0.23 | 0.144                | 0.032 | 0.591  |

\* Maturity stage 1 = Immature stage, Maturity stage 2 = Mature stage, Maturity stage 3 = Ripe stage

**Table III. The grading of ripen mango fruits as judged by the panel of seven judges based on general qualities of mango**

| Sl. No. | Name of mango cultivars | Physical characters | Marking by individual judges |    |    |    |    |    |    | Total | Mean | Order of rating |
|---------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|------|-----------------|
|         |                         |                     | 1                            | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  |       |      |                 |
| 1       | Fazli                   | Colour              | 70                           | 65 | 68 | 75 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 490   | 70.0 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 63                           | 58 | 57 | 67 | 53 | 59 | 64 | 521   | 60.1 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 81                           | 83 | 85 | 84 | 82 | 80 | 82 | 577   | 82.4 | Excellent       |
| 2       | Ashina                  | Colour              | 60                           | 52 | 57 | 49 | 50 | 52 | 48 | 368   | 52.6 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 45                           | 43 | 41 | 50 | 53 | 51 | 49 | 332   | 47.4 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 63                           | 61 | 58 | 45 | 61 | 56 | 45 | 389   | 55.6 | Fair            |
| 3       | Langra                  | Colour              | 73                           | 78 | 69 | 73 | 75 | 71 | 76 | 515   | 73.6 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 93                           | 74 | 88 | 71 | 74 | 98 | 96 | 614   | 87.7 | Excellent       |
|         |                         | Taste               | 90                           | 93 | 89 | 94 | 96 | 84 | 87 | 633   | 90.4 | Excellent       |
| 4       | Khirshapat              | Colour              | 92                           | 90 | 88 | 87 | 93 | 94 | 87 | 631   | 90.1 | Excellent       |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 75                           | 82 | 74 | 85 | 70 | 76 | 84 | 546   | 78.0 | Good            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 78                           | 88 | 78 | 86 | 88 | 86 | 83 | 587   | 83.9 | Excellent       |
| 5       | Gopalbhog               | Colour              | 75                           | 72 | 78 | 63 | 86 | 69 | 77 | 520   | 74.3 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 72                           | 83 | 70 | 75 | 78 | 80 | 81 | 539   | 77.0 | Good            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 90                           | 86 | 95 | 79 | 88 | 87 | 82 | 607   | 86.7 | Excellent       |
| 6       | Kisanbhog               | Colour              | 67                           | 77 | 65 | 72 | 78 | 71 | 62 | 492   | 70.3 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 60                           | 57 | 54 | 63 | 65 | 60 | 59 | 418   | 59.7 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 73                           | 68 | 74 | 77 | 69 | 65 | 72 | 498   | 71.1 | Good            |
| 7       | Mohanbhog               | Colour              | 65                           | 71 | 60 | 74 | 66 | 75 | 68 | 479   | 68.4 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 63                           | 60 | 68 | 72 | 65 | 76 | 70 | 474   | 67.7 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 70                           | 73 | 61 | 66 | 74 | 70 | 62 | 476   | 68.0 | Fair            |
| 8       | Latabombai              | Colour              | 72                           | 78 | 73 | 80 | 84 | 70 | 74 | 531   | 75.9 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 66                           | 72 | 65 | 63 | 68 | 81 | 62 | 477   | 68.1 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 74                           | 73 | 79 | 82 | 85 | 80 | 76 | 549   | 78.4 | Good            |
| 9       | Ranipasand              | Colour              | 71                           | 76 | 72 | 85 | 80 | 75 | 71 | 530   | 75.7 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 68                           | 62 | 60 | 65 | 59 | 63 | 54 | 436   | 61.6 | Fair            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 75                           | 72 | 76 | 82 | 86 | 75 | 84 | 550   | 78.6 | Good            |
| 10      | Surjapuri               | Colour              | 82                           | 76 | 72 | 80 | 84 | 82 | 79 | 555   | 74.3 | Good            |
|         |                         | Flavour             | 78                           | 72 | 68 | 73 | 78 | 82 | 81 | 532   | 76.0 | Good            |
|         |                         | Taste               | 80                           | 85 | 81 | 78 | 85 | 82 | 80 | 571   | 81.6 | Excellent       |

In the ripe stage, Fazli was only 12.2 % whereas Khirsapat, Ranipasand, Mohanbhog, Kishanbhog and Langra have higher skin content than that of Fazli. Although skin is the non-edible portion of mango, the mangoes of some varieties contained skin significantly different from others. A gradual increase in weight of stone was also observed with the increase of maturity. The seed (stone) content of some variety differs significantly from others. In ripe stage, Fazli and Gopalbhog have 11.2 % and 13.1 % seed respectively which were analysed statistically and LSD results found significant both at 0.05 % Levels. The pulp content is the edible portion of mangoes and is given much importance during evaluation. The composition of mango pulp varies from location of cultivation, variety and stage of maturity. The major constituents of the pulp are water, carbohydrates, organic acids, fats, minerals, pigments, tannins, vitamins and flavour compounds. It was determined at the three maturity stages, which varied from 66.4 to 73.5 %, 67.4 to 75.3 % and 68.7 to 76.6 % for immature, mature and ripe mangoes respectively. The difference in pulp content was significant among the mango cultivars at the three maturity levels.

Table IIa shows that pH of the mangoes ranged from 2.5 to 3.5, 2.7 to 4.2 and 4.2 to 5.4 for immature, mature and ripe mangoes respectively. LSD results show that the changes are significant both at 0.01 % and 0.05 % levels. The acidity of all the mangoes decreased with maturity. It is due to the

breakdown of starch into more sugars thereby lowering down the percentage of acidity of the fruits.<sup>13</sup> The acidity was determined at all the three stages and reported as citric acid. A gradual decrease for all the varieties was observed with the changes in advancement of maturity. The gradual decrease in acid content may be due to conversion of acids into sugars by some physiological and biochemical changes in the fruits. Our findings agree with the results as reported by Robbani *et al.*<sup>14</sup>

Regarding vitamin C, a gradual decrease in vitamin C content was observed with the increase of maturity. Fazli contains 90.3 %, 56.5 % and 43.5 % vitamin C at immature, mature and ripe stages respectively. The results were statistically analysed and found significant both at 0.01 % and 0.05 % levels respectively. TSS content is considered as a measure of quality for most of the fruits. Generally taste and particularly sweetness of the fruits depend on the percentage of TSS content. From the Table IIa, it is evident that, in ripe stage Khirsapat, Gopalbhog and Ranipasand contained 21.8 %, 22.6 % TSS respectively. Langra also contained 20.2 % TSS. It is well known to all that the above cited varieties are quality mangoes and have a great demand. Sucrose, glucose and fructose constitute the bulk of carbohydrate and most of the soluble solid in mango pulp. It is rich source of  $\beta$ -carotene.<sup>15</sup>

The characteristics odour that appeared in the fruits during ripening is components of ester

and carbonyl types. The difference in odour among the varieties is due to variation in flavoring components. More than hundred volatile components have been identified, major ones being terpenes although several other hydrocarbons, esters and alcohol were also present in ripe mango fruit.<sup>16</sup>

A gradual decrease in non-reducing and reducing sugars were found until maturity. When the fruits started to ripen on the tree i.e. after about 96 days from fruit set, a decrease in reducing sugar was noted. The soluble sugars of the fruit pulp consist mainly of glucose, fructose and sucrose. The rate of starch accumulation was rapid at the beginning of fruit growth and slowed down later but it continued to increase up to maturity.

Like TSS content, sugar-acid ratio is also considered as a measure of quality of fruit. It is generally recognized that quality fruits have higher sugar-acid ratio whereas fruits of less quality have lower sugar-acid ratio, Khirsapat, Gopalbhog and Langra have sugar-acid ratio of 162.50, 150.00 and 131.25 respectively. On the other hand, Mohonbhog and Ashina have sugar-acid ratio of 114.67 and 96.25 respectively. Our findings agree with the reported results elsewhere.<sup>17</sup>

Mangoes are generally harvested at physiological mature stage and ripened for optimum fruit quality. The fruit displays erratic ripening behaviour either on the tree or after harvest depending on the variety and environmental conditions. It is evident from Table III

that the taste of Khirshapat, Langra, Gopalbhog and Surjapuri is excellent. The excellent colour was found in the case of Khirshapat. All the three parameters of Ashina and Mohanbhog are fair in rating. It is concluded from Table III that Khirshapat, Langra, Gopalbhog and Surjapuri are best quality mangoes. On the other hand, Fazli, Kishakbhog, Lata Bombai and Ranipasand are also quality mangoes but not like Langra, Gopalbhog, Khirshapat etc.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Director, BCSIR Laboratories, Rajshahi for providing laboratory facilities to carry out the research work. The authors are indebted to Dr. K.N. Ahmed, Senior Scientific Officer, BCSIR Laboratories, Rajshahi for his heartiest co-operation to analyse the data and valuable suggestions. Thanks are also due to Mr. M. Abdur Razzak, Tech. and M. Anisur Rahman Jr. Tech. for their co-operation and help throughout the research work.

### References

1. M. Ibrahim, M. R. Karim, M. S. Alam and M. A. Gofur. Effect of application of plant hormone on the productivity and maturity of mango. *J. Bio Sci.* **7** (1999) 111-114.
2. Anonymous, FAO, Food and Agriculture Production Year Book. FAO, Rome, (1990).
3. L. B. Singh. The Mango, Leonard Hill London, (1968) 359.

4. A. A. M. Amzad Hossain and Aziz Ahmed. A Monograph on Mango Varieties of Bangladesh. Horticulture Research Centre, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Joydebpur, Gazipur (1994) 155.
5. M. A. Gofur, M. Z. Shafique, M. O. H Helali, M. Ibrahim, M. M. Rahman and M. A. Hakim. Effect of application of plant hormone on the control of fruit drop, yield and quality characteristics of mango (*Mangifera indica L.*) *Bangladesh J. Sci. Ind. Res.* **XXI (III)** (1998) 163-171.
6. M. Dubois, K. Gilles, J. Hamittion, K. Revrs and F. Smilth. A colorometric method for determination of sugar. *Nature*. **168** (1951) 167.
7. J. Jayaraman. Laboratory Manual in Biochemistry, New age International, New Delhi, India. (1981) 180.
8. O. A. Bessey and C. G. King. The distribution of vitamin C in plant and animal tissues and its determination. *J. Biol. Chem.* **103** (1933) 687-698.
9. A. Mahadevan and R. Sridhar. Methods in Physiological Plant Pathology, 2nd Ed. Sivakami Publication, Madras, India (1982) 171.
10. S. Ranganna, Handbook of Analysis and Quality control for Fruit and Vegetable Products, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Lt. New Delhi. (1986) 123.
11. M. Ibrahim, Application of Plant Hormone on the Control of Anthracnose Disease, Yield and Quality Characteristics of Mango. Ph. D. Thesis, Institute of Biological Sciences, Rajshahi University, Bangladesh (2002) 181.
12. A. K. M. Amzad Hossain. Manual on Mango Cultivation in Bangladesh, Published by Bangladesh Horticulture Division, Bangladesh Horticultural Research Institute, Joydebpur, Gazipur, Bangladesh (1989) 82.
13. D. K. Tandon and S. K. Kalra. Studies on developing mango fruits to assess maturity. *Indian Journal of Horticulture*. **43** (1986) 51-59.
14. M. Robbani, A. F. M. sharfuddin and M. G. Rabbani. Effect of growing conditions and GA<sub>3</sub> on growth, yield and quality of Grape CV. ZAKKAO. *Bangladesh Horticulture*. **24 (1&2)** (1996) 71-75.
15. D. K. Salunkhe and S. S. Kadam, Hand Book of Fruit Science and Technology, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York. (1995).
16. G. L. K. Hunter, W. A. Bucek and T. Radfod. Volatile components of canned Alphonso mango. *J. Food Sci.* **39** (1974) 900.
17. K. P. Palaniswamy, C. R. Muthukrishan and K. G. Shanmugavclu, Physico-chemical characteristics of some varieties of mango. *Indian Food Packer*, (1974) 12-19.