Correlation studies in avocado (*Persea americana*) accessions for morphological and biochemical characters

B M Muralidhara^{1&2}, R Venugopalan¹, T Sakthivel¹, G Karunakaran¹, M K Honnabyraiah² and Siddanna Savadi³

^{1&2} ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hesaraghatta, Lake Post, Bengaluru-560 089, Karnataka, India
²College of Horticulture, Bengaluru, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkote- 587 104, Karnataka, India
³ICAR-Directorate of Cashew Research, Puttur - 574 202, Karnataka, India
Received: 4 July 2021; Accepted: 19 December 2022

ABSTRACT

The correlation coefficients were estimated for different morphological and biochemical traits in 83 avocado (*Persea americana* Mill.) accessions of South India. The fruit weight, fruit length, fruit width, pulp weight and seed weight showed highly significant positive correlations with fruit yield, while peel per cent showed negative correlation with fruit yield. These traits can be utilized for selection of high-yielding genotypes. The total phenols content has positive correlation with DPPH antioxidant activity. The dry-matter content of pulp showed highly significant positive correlation with oil content of fresh and dry pulp, while moisture content in pulp showed negative correlation with oil content of fresh pulp. The dry-matter content and moisture content of pulp can be utilized for selection of high oil-yielding accessions.

Key Words: Oil content, Selection, Correlation, Dry-matter, FRAP

Avocado (Persea americana Mill.) belonging to Lauraceae family commercially grown in more than 80 countries (FAO STAT, 2019). It is a rich source of several bioactive compounds (Gomez-Caravaca et al., 2015 and Salazar-Lopez et al., 2020). The broader genetic base for leaf shape, fruit shape, peel colour, pulp colour, peel thickness and seed shapes is available in India due to seeds propagation from many decades (Tripathi et al., 2022). To build up a viable breeding knowledge of interrelationships programme, between yield and yield contributing characteristics is required. Hence, selection of genotypes directly based on yield may not be realistic and it depends on several other contributing components. Simple correlation analysis enables indirect selection of required trait (Robinson et al., 1951). Hence present study was formulated to know direct and indirect relationship between different morphological and biochemical characters of avocado.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out at ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bengaluru, during 2018-19 and 2019-20. Eight-three accessions collected from different parts of South India were characterized for quantitative characters, viz. fruit length (cm), fruit width (cm), fruit

*Corresponding author : murlidhara.m@icar.gov.in

weight (g), pulp weight (g), pulp per cent, seed weight (g), seed per cent, peel weight (g), peel per cent, length of seed cavity (cm), width of seed cavity (cm), seed length (cm), seed width (cm), leaf length (cm), leaf width (cm), pedicel diameter (cm), peel thickness (mm) and yield per tree. The biochemical characters, such as CUPRAC (Cupric Reducing Antioxidant Capacity) activity, FRAP (ferric reducing antioxidant power) activity, DPPH (2,2-diphenyl- 1-picrylhydrazyl) activity, total phenols, total carotenoids (mg /100g), TSS (total soluble solids) (° Brix), moisture content (%), dry-matter content (%), oil content in dry pulp (%), oil content in fresh pulp (%) and crude fiber (%) were also studied. The mean values were used for correlation studies. Correlations between morphological and biochemical traits were analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficients by SPSS 16.0 software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The fruit length showed highly significant positive correlation with fruit width (0.38), fruit weight (0.72), pulp weight (0.75), pulp per cent (0.56), peel weight (0.48), length of seed cavity (0.78), seed length (0.67) and yield (0.36/tree), showing negative correlation with seed percent (-0.42) and peel percent (-0.46) (Table 1.). The accessions having more fruit

| Trait | Ţ | ΡM | FWT | PLW | ЫР | SWT | SP | PEWT | РЕР | LSC | WSC | SL | SW | Ľ | ΓN | PDD | PET | YEL |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|-------------|------------|-----------|-------------|--|-------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|----------|------|
| Ц | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FW | 0.38*** | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FWT | 0.72*** | 0.83*** | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PLW | 0.75*** | 0.79*** | 0.98*** | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| РРТ | 0.56*** | 0.35** | 0.52*** | 0.64*** | . | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWT | 0.31** | 0.65*** | 0.64*** | 0.51*** | -0.23* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SPT | -0.42*** | -0.22* | -0.36*** | -0.50*** | -0.92*** | 0.44*** | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PEWT | 0.48*** | 0.73*** | 0.77*** | 0.72*** | 0.25* | 0.48*** | -0.32** | ~ | | | | | | | | | | |
| PEPT | -0.46*** | -0.40*** | -0.50*** | -0.52*** | -0.46*** | -0.41*** | 0.08 | 0.08 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| LSC | 0.78*** | 0.29** | 0.60*** | 0.59*** | 0.24* | 0.45*** | -0.06 | 0.32** | -0.46*** | ~ | | | | | | | | |
| WSC | 0.20 | 0.72*** | 0.61*** | 0.48*** | -0.20 | 0.91*** | 0.38*** | 0.50*** | -0.35** | 0.42*** | ~ | | | | | | | |
| SL | 0.67*** | 0.35** | 0.57*** | 0.51*** | 0.07 | 0.61*** | 0.11 | 0.33** | -0.44*** | 0.76*** | 0.51*** | ~ | | | | | | |
| SW | 0.17 | 0.65*** | 0.55*** | 0.42*** | -0.28* | 0.96*** | 0.45*** | 0.48*** | -0.32** | 0.34** | 0.93*** | 0.51*** | . | | | | | |
| LL | 0.10 | -0.07 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.08 | 0.08 | 0.10 | -0.03 | -0.007 | 0.154 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.02 | ~ | | | | |
| LW | 0.20 | -0.05 | 0.09 | 0.05 | -0.12 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.26* | 0.15 | 0.25* | 0.15 (| 0.65*** | ~ | | | |
| PDD | 0.15 | 0.43*** | 0.38*** | 0.38*** | 0.20 | 0.14 | -0.25* | 0.50*** | 0.05 | -0.05 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.11 | -0.05 | -0.17 | . | | |
| PET | -0.26* | 0.13 | -0.04 | -0.10 | -0.19 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.24* | 0.28** | -0.37*** | 0.09 | -0.21 | 0.11 | -0.09 | -0.20 | 0.36*** | ~ | |
| YEL | 0.36*** | 0.35** | 0.38*** | 0.35** | 0.12 | 0.33** | -0.03 | 0.26* | -0.25* | 0.28* | 0.25* | 0.30** | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.16 | -0.01 | ~ |
| *** Signi | ficant at (| 0.001 lev | *** Significant at 0.001 level; ** 0.01 level; * 0.05 level | level; * 0 | .05 level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FL: Fruit | length; F | =W: Fruit | width; FV | VT: Fruit w | /eight; PL | -W: Pulp w | veight; PI | LP: Pulp | per cent; { | FL: Fruit length; FW: Fruit width; FWT: Fruit weight; PLW: Pulp weight; PLP: Pulp per cent; SW: Seed weight; SP: Seed per cent; PLWT: Peel weight; PEP: Peel | weight; S | SP: Seed | per cen | t; PLWT | : Peel v | veight; F | EP: Pe | e |
| per cent; | : LSC: Le | ingth of s | per cent; LSC: Length of seed cavity; WSC: Width of | y; WSC: \ | | eed cavity | /; SL: Se | ed length | I; SW: See | seed cavity; SL: Seed length; SW: Seed width; LL: Leaf length; LW: Leaf width; PDD: Pedicel diameter; PET: | .L: Leaf le | ength; LV | /: Leaf v | vidth; PI | DD: Pe(| dicel dia | meter; F | PET: |
| Peel thic | kness; Y | Peel thickness; YLD: Yield per tree | l per tree | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

January–April 2024

length might have more pulp weight, pulp percentage and less seed percentage. The similar findings were reported by Srivastava *et al.* (2023), Rathor (2005), Kumar *et al.* (2006) and Patel *et al.* (2017). Simi (2006) reported positive correlation of fruit length with fruit weight and diameter of mango. Fruit width exhibited positive direct effect on fruit weight (0.83), pulp weight (0.79), seed weight (0.64), peel weight (0.73), width of seed cavity (0.72), seed width (0.65) and pedicel diameter (0.43), showing negative correlation with seed per cent (-0.22) and peel per cent (-0.40).

Fruit weight showed highly positive correlation with pulp weight (0.98), pulp per cent (0.52), seed weight (0.64), peel weight (0.77), seed length, seed width, length and width of seed cavity but had negative correlation with seed per cent (-0.36) and peel per cent (-0.50). Pulp weight expressed significant positive correlation with pulp per cent (0.64) but had negative correlation with seed (-0.50) and peel (-0.52) per cent. Pulp percent showed negative effect on seed per cent and peel per cent of fruit. Seed weight positively correlated with seed percent (0.44), peel weight (0.48) but had negative correlation with peel per cent (-0.41).

Seed per cent and peel weight showed highly significant correlation. Peel per cent reported negative correlation with seed and seed cavity characters. Positive and significant correlation was recorded for seed length and seed cavity characters, seed length and seed width, leaf length and leaf width, pedicel diameter and peel thickness. Positive correlation of seed length and length seed cavity (0.521), seed circumference and length of seed cavity (0.496) was reported by Gopi et al. (2021) which is in agreement with the present study. The fruit weight, fruit length, fruit width, pulp weight and seed weight showed highly significant correlation effect on yield of the plant while peel percent showed negative correlation on yield which indicates higher the fruit and seed weight more will be the yield (Table 1).

The CUPPRAC antioxidant activity showed highly and positive relationship with FRAP activity (0.40) and positive relationship with oil content in fresh pulp (0.35) and dry-matter content of pulp (0.33), whereas negatively correlated with moisture content (-0.33) (Table 2.). The similar positive correlation was reported for total phenols and antioxidants activity by Wang *et al.* (2010); Muralidhara *et al.* (2019), Muralidhara *et al.* (2020) and Lal et *al.* (2023). Total phenols had positive correlation with DPPH activity (0.80) and FRAP

| ſ | 48 | |
|---|----|--|

| Table 2: Correlation matrix for biochemical characters of avocado | rix for bioch | nemical cha | aracters of a | avocado | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|----------|----------------|--|-------|
| | CUPRAC | FRAP | DPPH | Total | | Total | Oil content | Moisture | Oil content | Dry | Crude |
| Trait | activity | activity | activity | phenols | TSS | carotenoids | carotenoids (dry weight) | content | (fresh weight) | matter | fibre |
| CUPRAC | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| activity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRAP activity | 0.40*** | . | | | | | | | | | |
| DPPH activity | 0.17 | 0.24* | ~ | | | | | | | | |
| Total phenols | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.80*** | . | | | | | | | |
| (B) TSS (°B) | 0.09 | 0.024 | 0.22* | 0.21 | ~ | | | | | | |
| Total carotenoids | 0.13 | 0.45*** | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.21 | | | | | | |
| Oil content (Dry weight) | 0.22* | -0.10 | 0.093 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.18 | . | | | | |
| Moisture content | -0.33** | -0.08 | 0.051 | 0.04 | -0.30** | -0.27* | -0.65*** | - | | | |
| Oil content (Fry weight) | 0.35** | 0.016 | -0.004 | 0.03 | 0.25* | 0.24* | 0.85*** | -0.95*** | ~ | | |
| Dry matter | 0.33** | 0.08 | -0.05 | -0.04 | 0.30** | 0.27* | 0.65*** | -1** | 0.95*** | . | |
| Crude fibre | -0.01 | -0.13 | -0.11 | -0.05 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.21 | -0.06 | 0.14 | 0.06 | ~ |
| *** Significant at 0.001 level; **0.01 level; *0.05 level | rel; **0.01 lev | /el; *0.05 lev | /el | | | | | | | | |

activity expressed highly significant correlation with total carotenoids content. Veena *et al.* (2019) reported that total phenols had a significant positive correlation with total antioxidants (0.68).

Total carotenoids also had positive correlation with oil content in fresh pulp (0.24) and dry-matter content of pulp (0.27) and negatively correlation with moisture content (-0.27). This will help to identify high oil content accessions based on dry-matter content. Dry-matter content of pulp had highly positive correlation with oil content of dry (0.65) and fresh pulp (0.95) (Table 2). Lu *et al.* (2009) and Carvalho *et al.* (2015) reported dry-matter and carotenoids content had positive relationship with fatty acid content. The negative correlation between oil content and moisture content in different varieties of avocado were also reported by Bezuidenhout and Bezuidenhout (2014). Carvalho *et al.* (2015) reported positive correlation of oil content with dry matter content of pulp in avocado.

CONCLUSION

The fruit weight, fruit length, fruit width, pulp weight and seed weight showed highly significant positive correlation with fruit yield and can be utilized for selection of high-yielding genotypes. The drymatter content of pulp showed highly significant positive correlation with oil content of fresh and dry pulp whereas moisture contentment showed negative correlation with oil content of fresh pulp. The drymatter and moisture content of pulp can be utilized for selection of high oil yielding accessions.

REFERENCES

- Bezuidenhout J, Bezuidenhout C. 2004. Oil content of the commercial avocado varieties and the relationship with moisture and ripening pattern. *South African Avocado Growers Association Yearbook* **37**: 62-64.
- Carvalho C P, Jorge B E, Velasquez M A, Jose R C V. 2015. Fatty acid content of avocados (*Persea americana* Mill.) cv. Hass in relation to orchard altitude and fruit maturity stage. *Agron. Colomb.* **33**(2): 220-27.
- FAOSTAT. 2019. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. http://www.fao.org/faostat/ en/#data/QC.
- Gomez-Caravaca A M, Lopez-Cobol A, Verardo V, Pasini F, Caboni M F, Segura-Carretero A and Fernandez-Gutierrez A. 2015. Evaluation of phenolic content in avocado fruit and its by-products. *J. Food Process. Technol.* 6(5): 72.
- Gopi V, Ananthan M, Aneesa Rani M S, Kumar M, Jeyakumar P and Krishnamoorthy V. 2021. Correlation Analysis of

Avocado (*Persea americana* Mill.) genotypes from Lower Pulney Hills of Tamil Nadu. *Bio. Forum–An Int. J.* **13**(4): 468-70.

- Juma I, Nyomora A, Hovmalm H P, Fatih M, Geleta M, Carlsson A S and Ortiz R O. 2020. Characterization of Tanzanian avocado using morphological traits. *Diversity* **12**(2): 64.
- Kumar T, Joseph P and Johnkutty I. 2006. Variability physicochemical characteristics of mango genotypes in Northern Kerala. J. Trop. Agric. 44: 57-60.
- Lal N, Kumar A, Marboh E S, Pandey S D and Nath V. 2023. Genetic diversity in litchi (*Litchi chinensis*) for morphological and physico-chemical traits. *Current Horticulture* 11(1):33-36.
- Lu Q Y, Zhang Y, Wang Y, Wang D, Lee R P, Gao K, Byrns R and Heber D. 2009. California Hass avocado: profiling of carotenoids, tocopherols, fatty acids, and fat content during maturation and from different growing areas. J. Agri. Food Chem. 57: 10408-13.
- Muralidhara B M, Veena G L, Bhattacherjee A K and Rajan S. 2019. Antioxidants in ripe peel and pulp of twelve mango (*Mangifera indica*) cultivars. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.* 89(10): 1580-84.
- Muralidhara B M, Veena G L, Rajan S, Hudedamani U and Bhattacharjee A K. 2020. Screening of mango hybrid population for identifying nutritionally rich hybrids-A special focus on carotenoids. *Indian J. Hortic.* **77**(3): 399-405.
- Patel M C, Satodiya B N, Barot H R, and Patel D A. 2017. Evaluation of mango (*Mangifera indica*) genotypes for fruit and quality characters. *Current Horticulture* **5**(2), 22-24.
- Rathor C S. 2005. Genetic characterization of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) germplasm under North Indian conditions. *M.Sc thesis*, Indian Agricultural Research Institute.
- Robinson H F, Comstock R E and Harvey P H. 1951. Genotypic and phenotypic correlations in corn and their implications in selection. *Agron. J.* **43**:282-87.
- Salazar-Lopez N J, Dominguez-Avila J A, Yahia E M, Belmonte-Herrera B H, Wall-Medrano A, Montalvo-Gonzalez E and Gonzalez-Aguilar GA. 2020. Avocado fruit and by-products as potential sources of bioactive compounds. *Food Res. Int.* **138**: 109774.
- Simi S. 2006. Characterization of traditional mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) varieties of Southern Kerala. Ph. D Thesis. Kerala Agricultural University.
- Srivastava K K, Kumar D, Singh S R, and Barman P. 2023. Effect of container size on yield and root morphology of different fruit crops. *Current Horticulture* **11**(2), 29–32.
- Tripathi P C, Karunakaran G, Sakthivel T, Sankar V, Senthilkumar R, Muralidhara B M, Rajendiran S, Venkaravanappa V, Madhu G S and Nesara B. 2022. Avocado cultivation in India. *Technical Bulletin*. TB-18/22.
- Veena G L, Muralidhara B M and Rajan S. 2019. Genetic diversity of mango (*Mangifera indica*) bioactive components. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.* 89(12): 2107-10.
- Wang W, Bostic, T R and Gu L. 2010. Antioxidant capacities, procyanidins and pigments in avocados of different strains and cultivars. *Food chem.* **122**(4): 1193-98.