# Relationship analysis among intergeneric hybrids of *Ascocentrum* based on floral characters

Katare Renuka Shamrao and Sobhana A

ICAR, Directorate of Floricultural Research, Pune, Maharashtra, India

#### ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken for characterizing 30 intergeneric hybrids of *Ascocentrum* orchid based on floral characters and cluster analysis. The results showed that variety V25 (*Mokara* Syam *Ascocenda* Doung Porn) produced more number of spikes/plant/year (7.86), whereas, variety V11 (*Vascostylis* Blue Bay White) produced more number of florets/spike (40.67). Hybrid V3 (*Ascocenda* Kultana × *Vanda* Bitzs Heartthrob) had highest length (9.33 cm) and width (9.00 cm) of flower. Cluster analysis with 14 floral characters was done by classifying hybrids/varieties into 12 groups. Cluster 2 and 5 had five members, whereas, cluster 11 and 12 with only one member each. The cluster 2 and cluster 5 were less similar to each other with an inter-cluster distance 6.27,whereas highest inter-cluster distance was observed in cluster 6 and cluster 10 (41.47). Cluster 10 had high mean values for spike length (51.12 cm), flower length (7.94 cm) and width of flowers (7.50 cm). whereas cluster 6 which included V6 (*Ascocenda* Sirichi Fragrance) and V11 (*Vascostylis* Blue Bay White) had lowest internodal length with the highest value for number of florets/ spike. This cluster also observed to have low flower length and width (2.52 cm and 2.42 cm, respectively). This indicated that these varieties produce flowers in the dense bunch.

Key words: Floral character, Intergeneric hybrid, Cluster analysis, Ascocentrum, Mokara, Ascocenda, Vascostylis, Kagawara

onopodials have recently gained popularity due to the availability of a large number of varieties and hybrids involving intergeneric ones that show a wide range of variability in floral characters. Ascocentrum is a small flowered monopodial, vandaceous orchid having erect inflorescence and lasting flower. Vanda gained more popularity through the bigeneric hybrid Ascocenda (Ascocentrum × Vanda); the bright orange flowers, more number of florets and longevity are contributed by Ascocentrum. This was subsequently used for the production of multi-generic vandaceous hybrids, viz., Mokara, Kagawara, Vascostylis, etc. and many other bigeneric and multigeneric hybrids have been evolved in Ascocentrum alliance. The species and cultivars/ hybrids are visually differentiated on the basis of colour and size of flowers.

## **Material and Methods**

The study was carried out at College of Horticulture, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur during 2016-

2018. Thirty Ascocentrum varieties/hybrids were used. The characterisation was done in selected healthy and insect-free varieties of intergeneric hybrids, viz Ascocenda, Vascostylis, Mokara, and Kagawara, where in one of the parents was Ascocentrum. The thirty selected varieties (Table 1) were grown in even slope span rain shelter having 200 micron UV film and 25 %UV stabilised shade net. Two to three years old, fully grown flower-bearing plants, 5 each of 30 varieties, were arranged in completely randomised design with three replications. The observations on floral characters were made by measuring and counting floral parts as required. Number of spikes produced per year in each variety/hybrid was noted. Other floral parameters such as length of spike, length of rachis, length of floral stalk (length of peduncle), girth of spike at base, intermodal length, length of pedicel (pedicel of single floret), length of flower and width, length of labellum (lip length) and width of labellum (lip width) length of column and length of spur were measured in centimetres. The data collected on these characters were subjected to one way ANOVA using OPSTAT (online based software developed by CCS HAU, Hisar) and cluster analysis was performed using Minitab Version-18.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: rinkukatare07@gmail.com

 Table 1: Intergeneric hybrids of Ascocentrum selected for field evaluation

Variety No.	Varieties
V <sub>1</sub>	Ascocenda Udomochai
$V_2$	$Ascocenda{\rm Kraillerk}{\rm White}\times Vanda{\rm Sanderiana}$
$V_3$	$Ascocenda{\rm Kultana}\times Vanda{\rm Bitzs}{\rm Heartthrob}$
$V_4$	<i>Ascocenda</i> Yip Sum Wah × <i>Vanda</i> Josephine Van Brero
$V_5$	Ascocenda Suksamran Sunlight
$V_6$	Ascocenda Sirichi Fragrance
$V_{7}$	Vascostylis Pine River Blue
$V_8$	Vascostylis Pine River Pink
$V_9$	Vascostylis Aroonsri Beauty
V <sub>10</sub>	Vascostylis Pine Rivers Fuchsia Delight
V <sub>11</sub>	Vascostylis Blue Bay White
V <sub>12</sub>	Mokara Walter Oumae Pink
V <sub>13</sub>	Mokara Calypso × $Vanda$ Doctor Anek
V <sub>14</sub>	Mokara Rassmatozz
V <sub>15</sub>	<i>Mokara</i> Khaw Piak Suan × <i>Ascocenda</i> Bicentennial Yellow Spot
V <sub>16</sub>	Mokara Khaw Piak Suan × Ascocenda Jiraprapra
V <sub>17</sub>	<i>Mokara</i> Sayan × <i>Ascocenda</i> Bangkuntein Gold
V <sub>18</sub>	<i>Mokara</i> Calypso Pink
V <sub>19</sub>	<i>Mokara</i> Calypso Jumbo
V <sub>20</sub>	Mokara Chao Praya Sunset Yellow Spot
V <sub>21</sub>	<i>Mokara</i> Chao Praya Sunset Orange
$V_{22}$	Mokara Sunspot Orange
$V_{23}$	Mokara Omayaiy Yellow
V <sub>24</sub>	Mokara Omayaiy Orange
$V_{25}$	Mokara Syam Ascocenda Doung Porn
$V_{26}$	Mokara Chark Han Pink
V <sub>27</sub>	Kagawara Youthong Beauty
$V_{28}$	Kagawara Cristae Low
$V_{_{29}}$	Kagawara Boon Rub
V <sub>30</sub>	Kagawara Samrong

## **Results and Discussion**

High variation was observed in all the varieties and hybrids on spike characters (Table 2). Variety  $V_{25}$  (7.86) to produced more number of spikes/plant/ year which was on a par with  $V_{23}$  (6.33) and  $V_{27}$  (6.00). Whereas,  $V_{16}$  (1.00) produced least number of spike/ plant/year which was on apar with  $V_{12}$ ,  $V_{22}$ ,  $V_{32}$ ,  $V_{10}$ ,  $V_{11}$ ,

 $\rm V_{_{12}},\, V_{_{13}},\, V_{_{17}},\, V_{_{19}},\, V_{_{20}},\, V_{_{21}},\, V_{_{22}},\, V_{_{26}},\, V_{_{28}}$  and  $\rm V_{_{30}}.$  In spike length, variety  $V_{23}$  (54.70 cm) recorded maximum value which was on a par with  $V_{24}$  (47.53 cm). Whereas, V<sub>o</sub> (17.33 cm) recorded minimum spike length which was on a par with  $V_{1}$ ,  $V_{2}$ ,  $V_{3}$ ,  $V_{6}$ ,  $V_{7}$ ,  $V_{11}$ ,  $V_{12}$ ,  $V_{13}$ ,  $V_{15}$ ,  $V_{16}$ and  $V_{_{17}}$ . Rachis length was higher in  $V_{_{30}}$  (28.80 cm) It was on a par with  $V_8, V_{10}, V_{18}, V_{19}, V_{21}, V_{23}, V_{24}, V_{25}, V_{26}, V_{27}, V_{27}, V_{28}$  and  $V_{29}$ , However, it was low in  $V_{16}$  (8.67 cm) which on par with  $V_{1}, V_{2}, V_{3}, V_{5}, V_{7}, V_{9}, V_{12}, V_{13}, V_{15}$  and  $V_{17}$ . In case of peduncle length, again  $V_{23}$  (27.60 cm) had higher value on a par with  $V_{25}$  (24.40 cm) and  $V_{_{24}}$  (23.47 cm). Regarding peduncle length,  $V_{_3}$  (8.47 cm) had highest value followed by  $V_2$  (6.63 cm),  $V_{24}$ (6.53 cm),  $\mathrm{V_{_{23}}}$  (6.43 cm) and  $\mathrm{V_{_{25}}}$  (6.10 cm). In girth,  $V_{2}$  (8.47 cm) had highest value, followed by  $V_{2}$  (6.63 cm),  $V_{24}$  (6.53 cm),  $V_{23}$  (6.43 cm) and  $V_{25}$  (6.10 cm).  $V_{6}$ (2.80 cm) had a minimum value and it was on par with  $V_{8}$  (2.73 cm),  $V_{10}$  (2.53cm)  $V_{7}$  (2.40 cm) and  $V_{11}$ . The varieties The Mokara is the trigeneric hybrid with the parents Ascocentrum, Arachnis and Vanda (Lee 1994). Arachnis a tall, climbing and epiphytic orchid (Tan 1976), being one of the parents of Mokara, it might have contributed the higher values in the inflorescence characters.

The Ascocentrum varieties/hvbrids also exhibited considerable variation for flower characters. Variety  $V_{11}$  (40.67) produced more numbers florets / spike, whereas,  $V_{15}$  (5.67) produced least number of florets/ spike, and was on apar with  $V_2, V_3, V_4, V_{12}, V_{13}, V_{14}, V_{16}$  $\rm V_{_{18}},\, \rm V_{_{20}},\, \rm V_{_{21}},\, \rm V_{_{24}}$  and  $\rm V_{_{26}}.\,\,$  The intermodal length was highest in  $V_5$  (5.00 cm) and low in  $V_{11}$  (0.70 cm) which was on par with  $V_{10}$  (1.07 cm). Hybrid  $V_3$  (8.47 cm) had highest pedicel length, whereas, it was low in  $V_{_{11}}$ (2.23 cm). Hybrid V<sub>2</sub> (8.47 cm) also recorded highest length of flower (9.33 cm) and width of flower (9.00 cm), whereas lowest length and width of flower (2.27 cm and 2.13 cm, respectively) was observed in V<sub>11</sub>. The lip length and lip width, and less variation were observed as many of hybrids/ varieties had near to similar lip length and width. Lip length ranged from 1.80 cm  $(V_{10})$  to 4.80 cm  $(V_{2})$ , and lip width from 3.77 cm ( $V_3$ ) to 1.20 cm ( $V_9$ ). Variety  $V_{18}$  (1.17 cm) and  $V_{21}$ (1.17 cm) had high column length. The  $V_{_{29}}$  (0.43 cm) and V<sub>20</sub> (0.43 cm) had less column length. The spur length, high variation was observed. Hybrid  $V_{_3}$  (0.90 cm) and  $V_{27}$  (0.90 cm) had high value for spur length, whereas, it was low in  $V_{12}$  (0.23 cm) and  $V_{30}$  (0.23) The variations in flower characters of Ascocentrum varieties and hybrids have been reported (Rajkumar

		ŝ	pike chara	cters					Flower	character	S2			
Variety no.	No. of spikes/ year/ plant	Spike length (cm)	Rachis length (cm)	Peduncle length (cm)	Spike gʻirth (cm)	No. of florets/ spike	Internodal length (cm)	Pedicel length (cm)	Length of flower (cm)	Width of flower (cm)	Lip length (cm)	Lip width (cm)	Column length (cm)	Spur length (cm)
17	3.00	24.33	12.17	12.17	1.80	20.67	1.73	3.23	3.70	3.47	2.33	1.77	0.50	0.60
< ۱	(1.99)	(5.02)	(3.62)	(3.62)	(1.67)	(4.63)	(1.65)	(2.06)	(2.17)	(2.11)	(1.83)	(1.66)	(1.22)	(1.26)
17	2.00	25.00	12.50	12.50	2.57	9.67	1.50	6.63	6.67	6.33	3.43	3.20	0.70	0.53
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	(1.72)	(2.08)	(3.66)	(3.66)	(1.89)	(3.26)	(1.58)	(2.76)	(2.77)	(2.71)	(2.11)	(2.05)	(1.3)	(1.24)
17	2.67	22.50	10.87	11.63	2.50	8.00	2.17	8.47	9.33	9.00	4.80	3.77	1.10	0.90
× *	(1.88)	(4.81)	(3.43)	(3.51)	(1.87)	(2.99)	(1.78)	(3.08)	(3.21)	(3.16)	(2.41)	(2.03)	(1.45)	(1.38)
17	3.00	31.87	15.00	16.87	2.17	9.00	1.80	5.73	6.30	5.90	2.37	2.50	0.57	0.80
<b>V</b> _4	(1.99)	(5.73)	(4.00)	(4.22)	(1.78)	(3.16)	(1.67)	(2.59)	(2.70)	(2.63)	(1.84)	(1.87)	(1.25)	(1.33)
17	3.00	27.33	12.33	15.00	2.20	16.67	5.00	3.37	6.43	6.23	2.53	1.37	0.97	0.80
20	(1.99)	(5.32)	(3.64)	(4.00)	(1.79)	(4.20)	(2.44)	(2.09)	(2.73)	(2.69)	(1.88)	(1.54)	(1.4)	(1.34)
17	5.00	24.40	14.50	9.90	1.40	37.67	1.27	2.80	2.77	2.70	3.10	2.17	0.90	0.73
6 6	(2.45)	(2.03)	(3.94)	(3.28)	(1.55)	(6.21)	(1.51)	(1.95)	(1.94)	(1.92)	(2.03)	(1.78)	(1.38)	(1.32)
17	2.67	22.67	14.00	8.67	1.57	14.67	1.47	2.40	2.53	2.43	2.63	1.63	0.60	0.53
~~~	(1.91)	(4.86)	(3.86)	(3.11)	(1.60)	(3.96)	(1.57)	(1.84)	(1.88)	(1.85)	(1.91)	(1.62)	(1.26)	(1.24)
17	3.67	30.00	17.50	12.50	1.67	33.33	1.37	2.73	2.77	2.70	2.63	1.53	0.50	0.63
8	(2.16)	(5.56)	(4.25)	(3.66)	(1.63)	(5.85)	(1.54)	(1.93)	(1.94)	(1.92)	(1.91)	(1.59)	(1.22)	(1.28)
17	3.00	17.33	11.60	5.73	1.30	17.00	1.33	3.00	2.80	2.53	2.57	1.20	0.53	0.57
6 <b>^</b>	(1.99)	(4.28)	(3.55)	(2.59)	(1.52)	(4.23)	(1.53)	(2.00)	(1.95)	(1.88)	(1.89)	(1.48)	(1.24)	(1.25)
11	2.33	34.33	23.00	11.33	1.40	32.67	1.07	2.53	2.73	2.37	1.80	1.33	0.70	0.43
<b>v</b> 10	(1.82)	(5.93)	(4.89)	(3.49)	(1.55)	(5.78)	(1.44)	(1.88)	(1.93)	(1.83)	(1.67)	(1.53)	(1.30)	(1.20)
17	3.00	24.33	15.50	8.83	1.17	40.67	0.70	2.23	2.27	2.13	2.43	1.87	0.60	0.37
V 11	(1.99)	(2.03)	(4.06)	(3.13)	(1.47)	(6.45)	(1.30)	(1.80)	(1.81)	(1.77)	(1.85)	(1.69)	(1.26)	(1.17)
													Table 2 (c	ontinued)

### SHAMRAO AND SOBHANA

2 (continued)	Table													
(1.20)	(1.30	(1.92)	(1.84)	(2.78)	(2.83)	(2.66)	(2.18)	(5.44)	(1.93)	(5.04)	(4.38)	(09.9)	(2.97)	<b>2</b> 5
0.43	0.70	2.70	2.40	6.73	7.00	6.10	3.77	28.73	2.73	24.40	18.20	42.60	7.87	Λ
) (1.22)	(1.43	(1.64)	(1.84)	(2.90)	(2.96)	(2.74)	(2.16)	(3.62)	(1.93)	(4.92)	(2.00)	(96.9)	(2.43)	V 24
0.50	1.03	1.70	2.40	7.43	227	6.53	3.67	12.10	2.73	23.47	24.07	47.53	5.00	Λ
(1.28)	(1.32	(1.63)	(1.91)	(2.93)	(3.02)	(2.72)	(1.97)	(4.49)	(1.89)	(5.33)	(5.29)	(7.45)	(2.70)	<b>^</b> 23
0.63	0.73	1.67	2.63	7.57	8.10	6.43	2.87	19.33	2.57	27.60	27.10	54.70	6.33	Δ
) (1.22)	(1.34	(1.59)	(1.88)	(2.68)	(2.76)	(2.38)	(1.69)	(3.83)	(1.87)	(4.34)	(4.12)	(5.89)	(1.95)	<b>^</b> 22
0.50	0.80	1.53	2.53	6.20	6.60	4.67	1.87	13.77	2.50	17.97	16.03	34.00	2.87	17
) (1.18)	(1.47)	(1.93)	(2.05)	(2.89)	(2.93)	(2.56)	(1.89)	(3.38)	(1.95)	(4.15)	(4.45)	(00.9)	(1.50)	v <sub>21</sub>
0.40	1.17	2.73	3.20	7.37	7.57	5.57	2.57	10.43	2.80	16.43	19.00	35.43	1.27	17
(1.28)	(1.37	(1.73)	(1.82)	(2.74)	(2.59)	(2.63)	(1.84)	(3.40)	(1.83)	(4.32)	(4.12)	(5.89)	(1.82)	<b>^</b> 20
0.63	0.87	2.00	2.30	6.50	5.70	5.90	2.37	10.67	2.33	17.93	16.03	33.97	2.33	17
(1.29)	(1.45)	(1.92)	(1.98)	(2.71)	(2.78)	(2.64)	(1.88)	(5.01)	(1.92)	(4.18)	(4.46)	(6.03)	(1.62)	<b>v</b> 19
0.67	1.10	2.70	2.90	6.33	6.73	5.97	2.53	24.33	2.70	16.50	19.03	35.53	1.63	17
) (1.14)	(1.47	(1.83)	(1.93)	(2.41)	(2.44)	(2.34)	(1.91)	(3.51)	(1.73)	(3.38)	(4.31)	(5.39)	(2.23)	۷ 18
0.30	1.17	2.33	2.73	4.83	4.93	4.47	2.63	11.33	2.00	10.40	17.60	28.00	4.00	17
(1.28)	(1.44	(1.70)	(1.92)	(2.69)	(2.91)	(2.18)	(1.68)	(3.83)	(1.63)	(3.46)	(3.74)	(2.00)	(1.99)	۷ 17
0.63	1.07	1.90	2.70	6.23	7.47	3.77	1.83	13.67	1.67	11.00	13.00	24.00	3.00	17
) (1.25)	(1.33	(1.49)	(1.68)	(2.50)	(2.59)	(2.42)	(1.91)	(2.83)	(1.82)	(3.51)	(3.09)	(4.58)	(1.41)	۷ 16
0.57	0.80	1.23	1.83	5.23	5.70	4.87	2.67	7.00	2.30	11.33	8.67	20.00	1.00	17
(1.32)	(1.41	(1.52)	(1.90)	(2.70)	(2.72)	(2.19)	(1.94)	(2.56)	(1.62)	(3.72)	(3.49)	(2.00)	(2.14)	۷ 15
0.73	1.00	1.30	2.60	6.30	6.40	3.80	2.77	5.67	1.63	13.00	11.33	24.33	3.67	7 7
(1.16)	(1.34	(1.61)	(1.84)	(2.73)	(2.76)	(2.45)	(1.70)	(2.83)	(1.76)	(3.97)	(3.93)	(5.50)	(2.29)	V 14
0.33	0.80	1.60	2.37	6.47	6.60	5.00	1.90	00:2	2.10	14.77	14.43	29.20	4.33	17
) (1.14)	(1.29	(1.59)	(2.04)	(2.60)	(2.61)	(2.16)	(1.72)	(3.41)	(1.76)	(3.72)	(3.59)	(2.07)	(1.81)	۷ 13
0.30	0.67	1.53	3.17	5.80	5.83	3.67	1.97	10.67	2.10	12.83	11.97	24.80	2.33	17
(1.11)	(1.29	(1.49)	(1.97)	(2.58)	(2.80)	(2.17)	(1.66)	(3.05)	(1.72)	(3.74)	(3.60)	(5.09)	(1.82)	۷ 12
0.23	0.67	1.23	2.90	5.67	6.83	3.70	1.77	8.33	1.97	13.00	12.00	25.00	2.33	17

#### INTERSPECIFIC HYBIRDS OF ASSOCENTRUM

74

and Sharma, 2010; De *et al.*, 2015; Deepa, 2017; Kasutjianingati and Firgiyanto, 2018).

Cluster analysis with 14 different floral characters revealed 12 clusters at 75 % similarity (Table 3 and Fig. 1). Cluster 2 and 5 had five members, whereas cluster 11 and 12 with only one member The cluster 2 and cluster 5 were less similar with each other with inter-cluster distance of 6.27, whereas, the highest inter-cluster distance was observed in cluster 6 and cluster 10 (41.47) (Table 4).

Cluster 10 had high mean values for spike length (51.12 cm), flower length (7.94 cm) and width of flower (7.50 cm). Cluster 11 had high mean values for a number of spikes/plant/year, intermodal length (3.77 cm) and had high flower length (7.00 cm) and width of flower (6.73 cm) next to cluster 10. Whereas, cluster 6 including  $V_6$  (Ascda Sirichi Fragrance) and  $V_{11}$  (Vasco Blue Bay White) had lowest internodal length with the highest value for number of florets/spike. This cluster also had low flower length and width (2.52 cm and 2.42 cm, respectively).This indicates that these varieties produce flowers in the dense bunch.

## Conclusion

It can be concluded that selection based on these traits would be most effective for plant breeders in developing new *Ascocentrum* orchid varieties.

## Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to the Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur, for financial assistance.

## References

- Jadhav DP, Dalal NR, Saha TN, Kadam GB, Jadhav PR, and Nimbalkar RD, 2024. Efficient in-vitro regeneration protocol in chrysanthemum (Chrysanthemum morifolium) from ray florets. *Current Horticulture* **12** (2), 28–32.
- Tanveer FM and Mohammad GR. 2010. Assessment of genetic diversity among orchids using morphological characters. Available at: https://www.pollinia. org/april2015/articles/miano.pdf [Accessed on 29/6/2019].
- Sunitha, Sheela M.N., Suresh J.Kumar and Makeshkuma T. 2023, Morphological and physiological responses of CMD resistant cassava(Manihot esculenta) genotypes to nutrient regimesS. *Current Horticulture* 12(2): 33-37.

17	1.33	35.17	18.27	16.90	2.40	7.87	2.33	5.83	7.00	6.67	2.40	1.50	0.90	0.57
V 26	(1.52)	(00.9)	(4.39)	(4.18)	(1.84)	(2.97)	(1.83)	(2.61)	(2.83)	(2.77)	(1.84)	(1.58)	(1.38)	(1.25)
17	6.00	39.50	24.37	15.13	2.03	18.43	2.67	5.87	6.23	6.30	2.20	1.50	0.70	1.10
V 27	(2.62)	(6.34)	(5.03)	(3.96)	(1.74)	(4.38)	(1.92)	(2.62)	(2.69)	(2.70)	(1.79)	(1.58)	(1.3)	(1.44)
17	3.10	42.87	25.53	17.33	1.90	24.20	1.93	4.60	3.80	3.93	2.63	1.50	0.60	0.50
V 28	(2.02)	(6.62)	(5.14)	(4.24)	(1.70)	(5.01)	(1.71)	(2.37)	(2.19)	(2.22)	(1.91)	(1.58)	(1.26)	(1.22)
7.7	3.33	28.87	17.10	11.77	1.67	20.53	1.73	4.33	3.43	3.33	2.37	1.30	0.43	0.73
$V_{29}$	(2.08)	(5.46)	(4.25)	(3.57)	(1.63)	(4.64)	(1.65)	(2.31)	(2.11)	(2.08)	(1.84)	(1.51)	(1.20)	(1.32)
17	2.00	40.87	28.80	12.07	1.67	30.07	1.47	3.60	3.33	3.13	1.87	1.87	0.43	0.23
V 30	(1.72)	(6.47)	(5.46)	(3.61)	(1.63)	(5.57)	(1.57)	(2.14)	(2.08)	(2.03)	(1.69)	(1.69)	(1.20)	(1.11)
C.D.@5%	0.418	0.712	0.547	0.715	0.071	0.60	0.133	0.125	0.106	0.117	0.097	0.303	0.084	0.073
SE(m)±	0.147	0.251	0.193	0.252	0.025	0.211	0.047	0.044	0.037	0.041	0.034	0.107	0.03	0.026
C.V.	12.654	7.762	8.029	11.339	2.497	8.828	4.613	3.256	2.577	2.891	3.111	11.025	3.855	3.552
The data in pa	renthesis in	dicate soua.	re root transfo	rmed values										

Table 3: Inter clust	er distan	ce among 1;	2 clusters in A	1 scocentrum	hybrids/vai	ieties						
Clu	ister 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5	Cluster 6	Cluster 7	Cluster 8	Cluster 9	Cluster 10	Cluster 11	Cluster 12
Cluster1 (	0.00											
Cluster2 1.	3.28	0.00										
Cluster3 1	6.32	6.24	00.00									
Cluster4 1	4.77	10.63	16.11	00.0								
Cluster5	7.80	6.27	10.18	10.47	0.00							
Cluster6 1.	9.04	31.85	33.42	32.24	26.16	00.00						
Cluster7 {	9.78	12.56	12.79	19.71	10.06	23.98	0.00					
Cluster8 1	4.81	27.35	30.74	24.47	21.50	11.61	22.82	00.0				
Cluster9 1.	6.33	22.53	27.47	14.60	18.26	25.50	25.11	14.86	0.00			
Cluster10 3	31.33	32.32	37.73	21.93	30.62	41.47	39.35	30.84	17.08	0.00		
Cluster11 2	3.34	29.91	34.43	22.35	25.99	27.47	32.91	19.15	12.89	17.45	00.0	
Cluster12 2	2.27	31.58	36.11	25.14	26.49	23.68	30.35	12.67	11.57	23.87	18.53	0.00
Variable	CI	uster1 C	luster2 Cli	uster3 Clu	ster4 Clu	ister5 Clu	ister6 Clus	ter7 Clust	er8 Cluste	er9 Cluster1	0 Cluster11	. Cluster12
No. of spikes/ year/ plant		3.17	2.93	1.84	3.16	3.33 4	1.00 2.1	84 3.0	0 3.58	5.67	7.87	2.00
Spike length (cm)		26.60	25.67 5	31.25 3	4.09 2	6.44 2	4.37 20.	.00 32.1	.7 39.3	0 51.12	42.60	40.87
Rachis length (cm)	-	14.64	12.45	9.77 1	6.87 1	4.31 1	5.00 12.	80 20.5	25 22.9	8 25.59	18.20	28.80
Peduncle length (cn	(u	11.97	13.22 1	11.48 1	7.22 1	2.13 (	9.37 7.:	30 11.9	2 16.3	25.54	24.40	12.07
Spike girth (cm)		1.74	2.07	2.40 5	3.44	1.96	1.29 1.4	$14 1.5^{-1}$	4 2.21	2.65	2.73	1.67
No. of florets / spike	d)	20.60	8.27	7.50 1	0.35 1	3.89 3	9.17 15.	.84 33.0	0 22.3	2 15.72	28.73	30.07
Internodal length (c	cm)	1.73	1.98	2.42 2	3.19	3.15 (	0.99 1.4	40 1.2	2 2.38	3.27	3.77	1.47
Pedicel length (cm)	_	3.78	4.56	6.67	5.54	3.87 2	2.52 2.1	70 2.6	3 5.48	6.48	6.10	3.60
Length of flower (cr	m)	3.57	6.47	7.52 (	3.63 (	3.28	2.52 2.0	67 2.7.	5.55	7.94	7.00	3.33
Width of flower (cm	ц)	3.40	6.11	7.12 (	3.53	5.76 2	2.42 2.4	48 2.5	4 5.52	7.50	6.73	3.13
Lip length (cm)		2.35	2.89	3.32 2	2.56	2.65 2	2.77 2.1	60 2.2	2 2.58	2.52	2.40	1.87
Lip width (cm)		1.54	1.67	2.22	2.05	1.87 5	2.02 1.4	1.4.	3 2.66	1.69	1.50	1.87
Column length (cm)		0.47	0.77	0.95 (	0.86	1.07 (	0.75 0.4	57 0.6	0 0.80	0.88	0.70	0.43
Spur length (cm)		0.45	0.42	0.74 (	).58 (	).72 (	0.155 0.1	55 0.5	3 0.76	0.57	0.43	0.23

#### INTERSPECIFIC HYBIRDS OF ASSOCENTRUM

[Current Horticulture 12 (3)



Fig. 1: Dendrogram showing clustering of 30 hybrids/varieties of Ascocentrum

- Kadam GB, Desai P, Raju DVS, Kumar PN, Saha TN, Kumar J and Prasad KV. 2023. Evaluation of genetic variability in fragrant rose (Rosa× hybrida) cultivars under open field cultivations. *Current Horticulture* **11** (2): 33–38.
- Kasutjianingati K & Firgiyanto R. 2018. Characterization of morphology from orchid Vanda sp. as a genetic information source for preservation and agribusiness of orchids in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 207. 012006. 10.1088/1755-1315/207/1/012006.
- Deepa T. 2017. Evaluation of fragrant Vandaceous orchids for ornamental traits. M.Sc. thesis, submitted to Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur, 98p

- De LC, Rajeevan PK, Rao AN, Srivastava M & Chhetri G. 2015. Morphological characterization in Vanda species. International Journal of Scientific Research 4(1): 2277-8179.
- Rajkumar K and Sharma G. 2010. Morphological and molecular characterization of intergeneric hybrids between the orchid genera *Renanthera* and *Vanda*. *Acta Horticulturae* 855. 169-176.
- Lee YH. 1994. Genomic and meiotic analysis of *Mokara* orchids. *Journal of Heredity*, 85(1): 39-43.
- Tan K. 1976 Taxonomy of Arachnis, Armodorum, Esmeralda, and Dimorphorchis (Orchidaceae) Part II. Selbyana 1(4): 365-373.