

## Effect of Size of Polybag on Survival and Growth of Mango Grafts

P. M. Haldankar<sup>1</sup>, Y. R. Parulekar<sup>1</sup>, M. M. Kulkarni<sup>1</sup> & K. E. Lawande<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Horticulture, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli-415712, Dist.-Ratnagiri, (M.S.), India

<sup>2</sup> Vice Chancellor, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli-415712, Dist.-Ratnagiri, (M.S.), India

Correspondence: P. M. Haldankar, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli-415712, Dist.-Ratnagiri, (M.S.), India. Tel: 91-942-180-9721. E-mail: parag5663@rediffmail.com, paraghaldankar@yahoo.co.in

Received: October 15, 2013 Accepted: December 20, 2013 Online Published: January 2, 2014

doi:10.5539/jps.v3n1p91

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jps.v3n1p91>

### Abstract

Mango is the most important fruit crop of India's western coast. Mango is commercially propagated by epicotyl grafting. Presently, epicotyl grafts are prepared in 6" × 8" poly bags which restrict root growth and such grafts take longer time for establishment in the field and growth is reduced. Hence, experiment was conducted for optimizing the size of poly bag for cv. Alphonso and Kesar for vigorous growth of epicotyl grafts. The investigation was undertaken in Randomized Block Design with four treatments viz. T<sub>1</sub>-10" × 14" bags (Alphonso grafts), T<sub>2</sub>-10" × 14" bags (Kesar grafts), T<sub>3</sub>-6" × 8" bags (Alphonso grafts), T<sub>4</sub>-6" × 8" bags (Kesar grafts) replicated five times with a unit of 200 grafts per treatment per replication. The sprouting and survival percentage was not affected by size of bags. Among all the treatments, the larger size bags of T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> improved the vigour of grafts remarkably by producing longer tap root, greater root spread and more number of secondary roots with increased plant height, girth at collar, number of leaves per graft and plant spread over the small sized bags in treatment T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>. The RGR recorded in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> was better than that of T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>.

**Keywords:** Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.), polybag, Alphonso, Kesar, sprouting, survival, roots, vegetative growth, relative growth rate

### 1. Introduction

Mango is the most important fruit crop in India established on 22,97,000 ha in almost eleven states. Maharashtra is one of the leading states in India, contributing for 20.96 percent area. In Maharashtra, Konkan region is known for mango cultivation. Konkan region of Maharashtra is unique owing to its agro climatic conditions viz. moderate temperatures, high relative humidity, assured rainfall and lateritic to medium black soils. These conditions are favorable for cultivation of Alphonso which is a choicest variety of mango. It is also the earliest variety in the region and possess unique flavor which retains even after processing. At present, it is established on 1,82,000 ha and its further expansion is expected on 1,00,000 ha. However, it is a shy bearing variety having very low average production of 1.5 t/ha as compared to the national average of 6.6 t/ha (Anonymous, 2011). Apart from Alphonso, Kesar variety is also preferred for cultivation in konkan region. This variety is famous for its specific flavor, sweet taste and uniform light yellow color. It is a moderate bearer and its demand is increasing in recent years. In India, mango is commercially propagated by epicotyl grafting (Gunjate & Limaye, 1977) which is also known as stone grafting. In this grafting technique, fresh mango stones are sown immediately after harvest and grafts are prepared on tender epicotyl. Annually, about 50,00,000 grafts are sold through public and private sector nurseries of konkan region. These grafts are prepared in 6" × 8" poly bags having thickness of 200 gauge (Anonymous, 2013). Mango is deeply tap rooted and fast growing fruit crop (Ranjit Singh, 1969). By the time of the sale of grafts, many times the roots are penetrated through the plastic bags. Further, such grafts take longer time for establishment in the field after transplanting and subsequent growth remains slow. However, healthy grafts with strong undisturbed root system establish quickly in the field and can be trained early for canopy development. In countries like Israel, preparations of grafts in larger sized bags help for proper root development and better establishment of graft in field. Hence, investigation was under taken to study the effect of performance of mango grafts of cv. Alphonso and Kesar in various sized poly bags.

## 2. Material and Methods

### 2.1 Methodology

The experiment was conducted in plot No. 10, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Dapoli (MS), India, during 2011-12. The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design with treatments viz. T<sub>1</sub>- 10" X 14" bags (Alphonso grafts), T<sub>2</sub> - 10" × 14" bags (Kesar grafts), T<sub>3</sub> - 6" × 8" bags (Alphonso grafts), T<sub>4</sub> - 6" X 8" bags (Kesar grafts). These treatments were replicated five times with a unit of 200 grafts per treatment per replication. The bags used for experiment were of black polythene with 200 gauge thickness. These bags were punched at bottom for provision of drainage. Potting mixture of soil: sand: compost (1:1:1) was used for filling the experimental bags. Ripe mango fruits were selected for extraction of stones. The extracted stones were thoroughly washed with water and immersed in carbendazim (0.2%) for 10 minutes. The raised beds of 100 cm long, 60 cm wide and 30 cm in height were prepared and farm yard manure @ 5 kg per bed was mixed in the upper layer of soil. The stones were sown on these beds and covered with fine soil. Sprouted stones having 20 days old epicotyls were used for grafting. Such stones were uprooted from the bed with appropriate care. The mother plants of cv. Alphonso and Kesar were marked in budwood nursery for collection of scion sticks. The scions of 5 months maturity, 15-20 cm length having deep green colour and pencil size thickness with swollen apical bud were selected for grafting from mother plants. The grafts were prepared by wedge grafting method (Majumdar & Rathore, 1970). These prepared grafts were planted in previously filled bags as per the treatment details. These bags were kept under poly tunnels and were watered regularly as per requirement. The observations viz. sprouting of grafts, survival of grafts (after 180 days) were recorded. After survival, 20 grafts per treatment per replication were randomly selected for recording growth observations viz. height (cm), girth at collar (cm), number of leaves and plant spread (cm). After one year of preparation, 10 grafts per treatments per replication were randomly selected to record the root parameters viz. length of tap root (cm), root spread (cm) and number of secondary roots.

### 2.2 Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis was performed as per the Anova suggest by Panse and Sukhatme (1997). The "P" value of percentage data for sprouting and survival of mango grafts were estimated by statement square test. Standard Deviation was calculated as per the procedure advocates by Rangaswami (1995).

## 3. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Effect of size of bags on sprouting and survival of epicotyls grafts Cv. Alphonso and Kesar

| Sr. No. | Treatments  | Sprouting (%)                      | Survival after 180 days (%)        |
|---------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1.      | T <sub>1</sub> - 10" X 14" bags (Alphonso grafts) | 78.30 <sup>a</sup><br>(78.30±3.38) | 61.50 <sup>a</sup><br>(61.50±1.80) |
| 2.      | T <sub>2</sub> - 10" X 14" bags (Kesar grafts)    | 78.40 <sup>a</sup><br>(78.40±2.53) | 59.50 <sup>a</sup><br>(59.50±1.73) |
| 3.      | T <sub>3</sub> - 6" X 8" bags (Alphonso grafts )  | 77.30 <sup>a</sup><br>(77.30±2.82) | 60.00 <sup>a</sup><br>(60.00±0.79) |
| 4.      | T <sub>4</sub> - (6" X 8" bags Kesar grafts)      | 76.80 <sup>a</sup><br>(76.80±3.19) | 60.40 <sup>a</sup><br>(60.40±1.85) |
|         | Range   | 78.40-76.80                        | 61.50-59.50                        |
|         | S.Em±.  | 2.44                               | 0.74                               |
|         | C.D. at 5 %                                       | 5.17                               | 2.22                               |
|         | P- Value  | 0.79679                            | 0.13982                            |

The sprouting percentage ranged between 76.80 (T<sub>4</sub>) to 78.40 (T<sub>2</sub>) for various treatments. However, the difference in sprouting percentage among various treatments was non significant. The percentage survival of grafts ranged between 59.50% (T<sub>2</sub>) to 61.50% (T<sub>1</sub>). However, the difference in survival percentage among the treatments after 180 days was also non significant.

The sizes of polybag do not influence the sprouting and survival of mango grafts. Stone graft is prepared on tender mango epicotyls of about 20 days (Anonymous, 2013). During the initial period of growth the adequate food is provided by fleshy cotyledons. Further, the reserved assimilates in scion stick helps for its sprouting. A

successful union of rootstock and scion contribute for survival hence there was no effect of size of polybag on sprouting and survival of mango grafts.

Table 2. Effect of size of bag on root length (cm), root spread (cm) and number of secondary roots of mango grafts variety Alphonso and Kesar

| Treatment      | Length of tap root (cm)             | Root spread (cm)                    | No. of secondary roots             |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| T <sub>1</sub> | 54.00 <sup>a</sup><br>(54.00±21.09) | 51.40 <sup>a</sup><br>(51.40±11.93) | 67.40 <sup>a</sup><br>(67.40±9.74) |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 46.00 <sup>a</sup><br>(46.00±4.47)  | 48.40 <sup>a</sup><br>(48.40±6.77)  | 75.00 <sup>a</sup><br>(75.00±5.96) |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 25.00 <sup>b</sup><br>(25.00±5.61)  | 23.80 <sup>b</sup><br>(23.80±4.02)  | 29.20 <sup>b</sup><br>(29.20±3.70) |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 33.60 <sup>ab</sup><br>(33.60±7.86) | 28.60 <sup>b</sup><br>(28.60±6.07)  | 25.20 <sup>b</sup><br>(25.20±5.50) |
| Range          | 54.00-25.00                         | 51.40-23.80                         | 75.00-25.20                        |
| S.Em±.         | 5.45                                | 5.04                                | 3.13                               |
| C.D. at 5 %    | 16.33                               | 15.12                               | 9.38                               |

The mango grafts of T<sub>1</sub> (54.00 cm) had longest tap root which was at par with T<sub>2</sub> (46.00 cm) and significantly superior T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> (Table 2). The shortest tap root was observed in T<sub>3</sub> (25.00 cm) which was followed by T<sub>4</sub> (33.60 cm), both were at par with each other. The number of secondary roots were maximum in T<sub>2</sub> (75.00) followed by T<sub>1</sub> (67.40). The minimum secondary roots were in T<sub>4</sub> (25.20) which were at par with T<sub>3</sub> (29.20). Larger size bags provided greater space for root expansion and development. The availability of more potting mixture in bigger bags ensured continuous moisture supply to developing grafts which helped in better root growth. Large bag also provide additional nutrients than the small bag. It resulted in the longer tap root, better root spread and higher number of secondary roots in treatment T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>. Prawoto (1984), Matin and Banik (1993), and Gera, Sharma, Bhandari and Srivastava (1996) recorded similar findings in cocoa, teak and *Dalbergia sissoo* respectively.

Table 3. Effect of size of bag on plant height, RGR for plant height, girth at collar and RGR for girth at collar of epicotyls grafts Cv. Alphonso and Keshar

| Sr. No. | Treatments     | plant height (cm)                   |                                     |                                    | RGR of plant height (cm/cm/day) |                       | Girth at collar(cm)              |                                   |                                  | RGR of girth at collar (cm/cm/day) |                       |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|         |                | 210 days                            | 270 days                            | 330 days                           | 210-270 days                    | 270-330 days          | 210 days                         | 270 days                          | 330 days                         | 210-270 days                       | 270-330 days          |
| 1.      | T <sub>1</sub> | 24.91 <sup>ab</sup><br>(24.91±1.29) | 37.96 <sup>a</sup><br>(37.96±1.95)  | 51.15 <sup>a</sup><br>(51.15±2.52) | 0.007019 <sup>a</sup>           | 0.004972 <sup>b</sup> | 2.38 <sup>a</sup><br>(2.38±0.14) | 4.78 <sup>a</sup><br>(4.78±0.20)  | 5.91 <sup>a</sup><br>(5.91±0.20) | 0.011672 <sup>a</sup>              | 0.003511 <sup>c</sup> |
| 2.      | T <sub>2</sub> | 26.44 <sup>a</sup><br>(26.44±3.81)  | 33.74 <sup>a</sup><br>(33.74±4.50)  | 48.10 <sup>a</sup><br>(48.10±3.77) | 0.006435 <sup>c</sup>           | 0.006299 <sup>a</sup> | 2.17 <sup>a</sup><br>(2.17±0.12) | 4.41 <sup>ab</sup><br>(4.41±0.16) | 5.69 <sup>a</sup><br>(5.69±0.20) | 0.011742 <sup>a</sup>              | 0.004272 <sup>b</sup> |
| 3.      | T <sub>3</sub> | 21.40 <sup>b</sup><br>(21.40±1.49)  | 26.00 <sup>b</sup><br>(26.00±1.97)  | 32.30 <sup>c</sup><br>(32.30±2.56) | 0.003239 <sup>d</sup>           | 0.003613 <sup>c</sup> | 2.18 <sup>a</sup><br>(2.18±0.13) | 4.07 <sup>b</sup><br>(4.07±0.19)  | 4.90 <sup>b</sup><br>(4.90±0.19) | 0.010451 <sup>b</sup>              | 0.003076 <sup>d</sup> |
| 4.      | T <sub>4</sub> | 22.38 <sup>b</sup><br>(22.38±1.30)  | 32.90 <sup>ab</sup><br>(32.90±1.31) | 39.00 <sup>b</sup><br>(39±5.26)    | 0.006741 <sup>b</sup>           | 0.002415 <sup>d</sup> | 2.26 <sup>a</sup><br>(2.26±0.20) | 3.26 <sup>c</sup><br>(3.26±0.31)  | 4.50 <sup>c</sup><br>(4.50±0.18) | 0.006111 <sup>c</sup>              | 0.005425 <sup>a</sup> |
| 5.      | Range          | 26.44-21.40                         | 37.96-26.00                         | 51.15-32.30                        | 0.007019-0.003239               | 0.006299-0.002415     | 2.38-2.17                        | 4.78-3.26                         | 5.91-4.50                        | 0.011742-0.006111                  | 0.005425-0.003076     |
| 6.      | S.Em±.         | 1.27                                | 1.59                                | 1.88                               | 0.00053                         | 0.00039               | 0.09                             | 0.13                              | 0.11                             | 0.00056                            | 0.00047               |
|         | C.D. at 5 %    | 3.80                                | 4.78                                | 5.64                               | 0.00160                         | 0.00120               | 0.27                             | 0.39                              | 0.34                             | 0.00170                            | 0.00150               |

The height of mango graft seven months after preparations recorded significant variation among the treatments. The maximum plant height (cm) was recorded in T<sub>2</sub> (26.44) followed by T<sub>1</sub> (24.91) which were at par with each other after 210 days of grafting. The minimum height (cm) was noticed in T<sub>3</sub> (21.40). The significant difference in height of mango grafts persisted throughout the period of experimentation during 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> month. At

eleventh month, the tallest grafts were found in T<sub>1</sub> (51.15 cm) which was at par with T<sub>2</sub> (48.10) and significantly superior over T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>. The continuous increase in height was noted irrespective of treatments. The relative growth rate differed among treatment. The maximum relative growth rate (RGR) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (0.007019 cm/cm/day) during 210-270 days after graft preparation which was significantly superior over rest of the treatments. The minimum RGR was recorded in T<sub>3</sub> (0.003239). The RGR for plant height was higher during 210-270 days after grafting in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> which gradually reduced in subsequent period.

The girth at collar region varied between 2.38 cm (T<sub>1</sub>) to 2.17 cm (T<sub>2</sub>) at 7 month after preparation of graft. It expanded to 5.91 cm (T<sub>1</sub>) to 4.50 cm (T<sub>4</sub>) at 11<sup>th</sup> month. The variation recorded among different treatments was significant throughout the experimental period. The growth rate recorded in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> was higher as compared to T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>. The maximum RGR for girth at collar region was observed at 210-270 days after preparation of grafts which showed a decreasing trend in subsequent period up 330 days after graft preparation.

Table 4. Effect of size of bag on number of leaves RGR for number of leaves, plant spread and of RGR for plant spread of epicotyls grafts Cv. Alphonso and Keshar

| Sr. No. | Treatments     | Number of leaves                   |                                    |                                    | RGR of no. of leaves   |                       | Plant spread (cm)                  |                                    |                                    | RGR of plant spread (cm/cm/day) |                       |
|---------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
|         |                | 210 days                           | 270 days                           | 330 days                           | 210-270 days           | 270-330 days          | 210 days                           | 270 days                           | 330 days                           | 210-270 days                    | 270-330 days          |
| 1.      | T <sub>1</sub> | 14.88 <sup>b</sup><br>(14.88±0.90) | 27.57 <sup>a</sup><br>(27.57±1.67) | 37.21 <sup>b</sup><br>(37.21±1.82) | 0.010277 <sup>a</sup>  | 0.005007 <sup>b</sup> | 17.89 <sup>b</sup><br>(17.89±1.20) | 28.01 <sup>a</sup><br>(28.01±0.48) | 34.35 <sup>b</sup><br>(34.35±1.89) | 0.007495 <sup>a</sup>           | 0.003387 <sup>c</sup> |
| 2.      | T <sub>2</sub> | 18.13 <sup>a</sup><br>(18.13±3.46) | 28.65 <sup>a</sup><br>(28.65±1.91) | 41.39 <sup>a</sup><br>(41.39±2.52) | 0.007844 <sup>b</sup>  | 0.006136 <sup>a</sup> | 23.21 <sup>a</sup><br>(23.21±1.75) | 27.91 <sup>a</sup><br>(27.91±5.77) | 43.03 <sup>a</sup><br>(43.03±4.76) | 0.006302 <sup>c</sup>           | 0.003942 <sup>a</sup> |
| 3.      | T <sub>3</sub> | 14.45 <sup>b</sup><br>(14.45±0.53) | 20.86 <sup>b</sup><br>(20.86±1.84) | 26.67 <sup>c</sup><br>(26.67±1.79) | 0.0006076 <sup>c</sup> | 0.004114 <sup>c</sup> | 19.70 <sup>b</sup><br>(19.70±1.43) | 27.88 <sup>a</sup><br>(27.88±0.83) | 31.68 <sup>b</sup><br>(31.68±1.57) | 0.005815 <sup>d</sup>           | 0.002012 <sup>d</sup> |
| 4.      | T <sub>4</sub> | 13.95 <sup>b</sup><br>(13.95±0.66) | 18.52 <sup>b</sup><br>(18.52±1.71) | 22.47 <sup>d</sup><br>(22.47±2.19) | 0.004682 <sup>d</sup>  | 0.003220 <sup>d</sup> | 18.26 <sup>b</sup><br>(18.26±1.19) | 27.35 <sup>a</sup><br>(27.35±2.39) | 34.85 <sup>b</sup><br>(34.85±2.37) | 0.006718 <sup>b</sup>           | 0.004027 <sup>a</sup> |
| 5.      | Range          | 18.13-13.95                        | 28.65-18.52                        | 41.39-22.47                        | 0.010277-0.004682      | 0.006136-0.003220     | 23.21-17.89                        | 28.01-27.35                        | 43.03-31.68                        | 0.007495-0.005815               | 0.004027-0.002012     |
| 6.      | S.E.m±         | 1.02                               | 1.09                               | 1.18                               | 0.00077                | 0.00031               | 0.61                               | 2.83                               | 1.91                               | 0.00063                         | 0.00045               |
|         | C.D. at 5 %    | 3.05                               | 3.26                               | 3.55                               | 0.00240                | 0.00100               | 1.83                               | 8.48                               | 5.71                               | 0.00190                         | 0.00140               |

The number of leaves recorded in T<sub>2</sub> was maximum from 7 to 11 months of graft preparation followed by T<sub>1</sub> (Table 4). The minimum leaves were produced in T<sub>4</sub> (22.47) during entire growth period. It was also apparent that relative growth rate in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> was faster as compared to T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>. The maximum leaves were found in T<sub>2</sub> (41.39) up to 330 days after graft preparation. It was followed by T<sub>1</sub> (37.21). The RGR for production of leaves was high in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> as compare to T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>. It was faster during 210-270 days as compare to subsequent period.

The plant spread recorded in T<sub>2</sub> was maximum during 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> month after preparation of graft. The maximum plant spread was recorded in T<sub>2</sub> (43.03 cm) after 11<sup>th</sup> month which was significantly superior over rest of the treatments. All other treatments were at par with each other.

A well developed root system contribute for better uptake of nutrients and water from the soil, increased formation of amides, amino acids, proteins, lipids, hormones and other organic substances (Amar Singh, 2003). In the present investigation, the vegetative growth parameters viz. plant height, girth at collar, number of leaves and plant spread as well as RGR of vegetative parameters was significantly superior in T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>1</sub>. Larger bag size, greater volume of soil with more nutrients helped for vigorous growth of grafts. Increase in plant height and increased number of leaves also improved the rate of photosynthesis which might have contributed in better growth. The differences in the root length in the various polythene bag sizes are due to differences in leaf growth and supply of photosynthate to the roots (Adu-Berko, Idun, & Amoah, 2011). Ridge (1991) also reported that the leaves produced in plant are directly proportional to photosynthate produced. Gera, Sharma, Bhandari and Pant (2000), Singh (1998) and Dhakal (1979) also reported similar findings in albizia, bhalia and mango respectively.

#### 4. Conclusion

Thus, the experiments concluded that polybag size has no significant effect on sprouting and survival of epicotyls grafts of mango. However, it has significant effect on length of tap root (cm), root spread as well as number of secondary roots. Similarly, the important growth parameters like plant height (cm), girth at collar (cm),

number of leaves per plant and plant spread differed significantly due to size of polybag. Bigger size polybags produced healthier grafts as compared to small size polybags.

### Acknowledgement

We sincerely wish to thank to Centre of Excellence for mango established at Dr. B. S. Konkan KrishiVidyapeeth, Dapoli, MS, India under Indo-Israel Work Plan funded by MSHMPB (NHM), Pune for providing facilities for this research work. Thanks are also due to Ms. Sana Mukadam, Ms. Sheetal Patil, Mr. Ganesh Korake, Mr. Mahadeo Pethkar, Mr. Alwala Kireeti, Ms. Vaishnavi Magar, Mr. Shravan Mansute and Ms. Chaitali Todankar for their cooperation during this investigation.

### References

- Adu-Berko, F., Idun, I. A., & Amoah, F. M. (2011). Influence of the size of nursery bags on the growth and development of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale*) seedling. *American Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 1(4), 440-441.
- Amar Singh. (2003). *Fruit physiology and production* (pp. 88-92). A Book Published by Kalyani Publishers, Ludhiana.
- Anonymous. (2011). *Indian Horticultural Database 2010-2011*. (pp. 90-99). Retrieved from [www.scribd.com/doc/104824870/Indian-Horticulture-Database-2011](http://www.scribd.com/doc/104824870/Indian-Horticulture-Database-2011).
- Anonymous. (2013). *Mango Production Technology* (p. 9). Dr. Balasaheb sawant konkan krishi vidyapeeth, Dapoli (MS) India.
- Dhakal, D. (1979). Studies on stone grafting in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). A M. Sc. (Agri) Thesis, Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli Dist. Ratnagiri (M.S.).
- Gera, M. S., Sharma, A. S., Bhandari, & Pant, N. C. (2000). Improved seedling quality of polybag plants of *Albizia procera*- use of mounted angle iron beds. *Indian-Forester*, 126 (9), 943-947.
- Gera, M. S., Sharma, A. S., Bhandari, & Srivastava, R. L. (1996). A trial on improved polybag seedling production system. *Indian Forester*, 122(11), 992-998.
- Gunjate. R. T., & Limaye, V. P. (1977). Effect of material of stock and scion and method of grafting of succession stone grafting in mango. *Dapoli Agri. Coll. Man.*, 7, 20-24.
- Majumdar, P. K., & Rathore, D. S. (1970). Epicotyl grafting in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). *Curr. Sci.*, 39-42.
- Matin, M. A., & Banik, R. L. (1993). Effect of polybag size on growth of some forest tree seedlings of Bangladesh. *Bangladesh- Journal of Forest science*, 22(1/2), 37-43.
- Panse, V. G., & Sukhatme, P. V. (1997). *Statistical methods for agricultural workers*. ICAR Rev. In P. V. Sukhatme & V. N. Amble (Eds.). (pp. 97-156).
- Prawoto, A. (1984). The influence of polybag size on cocoa seedling growth and the result of budding in the nursery. *Menara-Perkebunan*, 52(3), 71-76.
- Rangaswamy, R. (1995). *Textbook of agricultural statistics* (2nd ed.). New Age International Publishers.
- Ranjit Singh. (1969). *Fruits A Book Published by National Book Trust* (p. 32). New Delhi, India.
- Ridge, I. (1991). *Plant Physiology* (p. 233). Hodder and Stoughton Educational.
- Singh, B. P. (1998). Growth and growth analysis of bhulia (*Flemingia macrophylla*) in relation to date of sowing and size of polythene bags in nursery. *Indian-Journal-of-Forestry*, 21(1), 34-37.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).