

1

2 **Self-fertility and preferential cross-fertilization in mango (*Mangifera indica*)**

3

4 V. Pérez¹, M. Herrero² & J.I. Hormaza¹

5 ¹ Department of Subtropical Fruit Crops, Instituto de Hortofruticultura Subtropical y
6 Mediterránea “La Mayora”, (IHSM La Mayora-CSIC-UMA) 29750 Algarrobo-Costa,
7 Málaga, Spain.

8 ² Department of Pomology, Estación Experimental de Aula Dei, CSIC, Apdo. 13034/
9 50080 Zaragoza, Spain.

10

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) is a tropical fruit tree originated from Southeastern Asia,
14 which is cultivated worldwide in regions with tropical and subtropical climates. Mango
15 cultivation area has significantly extended in the last decades often to regions where
16 environmental conditions are not the most favourable for optimal mango flower
17 development and fruit set and, consequently, several reproductive problems had been
18 described in this species. Some of them could be related to self-incompatibility, but so
19 far information is not clear on the possible self-incompatibility system operating in this
20 crop. In this work we study pollen tube growth, following self and cross pollination, in
21 three mango cultivars (‘Osteen’, ‘Kent’ and ‘Kensington’). Paternity was also
22 determined in the offspring of two of these cultivars - ‘Osteen’ and ‘Kent’ - and in a
23 solid block of an additional cultivar, ‘Keitt’. Sequential examination of pollen tube

24 growth showed that pollen tubes grew to the base of the style in both cross- and self-
25 pollinated pistils of the different cultivars examined. Paternity analysis of ‘Osteen’ and
26 ‘Keitt’ offspring in monovarietal orchards showed the production of fruits resulting
27 from self-fertilization in both cultivars. The results from the multivarietal orchard
28 corroborate this fact for ‘Osteen’ and ‘Kent’, but showed a preference for outcrossing in
29 ‘Osteen’. Pollen tube behaviour and paternity analysis show self-fertility in this species
30 but the higher proportion of fruits resulting from outcrossing suggests a preference for
31 cross-fertilization.

32

33

34 **Keywords**

35 Self-incompatibility, pollen tube, paternity analysis, mango, *Mangifera indica*

36

37 **1. Introduction**

38 Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) belongs to the Anacardiaceae, a family that contains about
39 70 genera and 850 species (Bompard and Schnell, 1997) including other species of
40 agronomic interest such as pistachio (*Pistacia vera* L.), cashew (*Anacardium*
41 *occidentale* L.), ambarella (*Spondias dulcis* Forst.), or yellow and purple mombins
42 (*Spondias mombin* L. and *Spondias purpurea* L., respectively). The genus *Mangifera*
43 includes about 70 species, mostly restricted to tropical Asia, of which at least 12 are of
44 local commercial importance.

45 Mango is an andromonoecious evergreen tropical tree that has been cultivated
46 for millennia in Southern Asia. Cultivation spread outside its centre of origin and
47 domestication throughout many tropical and subtropical regions of the world along

48 trading routes where selections of the cultivars best adapted to particular conditions was
49 made. Currently, mango is one of the five most important fruit species worldwide
50 (together with bananas, oranges, grapes and apples) with a total world production that
51 has reached about 40 million tons in 2013 (FAOSTAT, 2016). A few countries (India,
52 China, Thailand, Indonesia and Mexico) account for over 70% of world production,
53 being India, with about 18 millions tons, the main mango producing country.

54 Mango inflorescences are composed thirsoids that present a high number of
55 flowers with a variable proportion of both hermaphrodite and male flowers. Mango
56 trees have low fruit set, usually lower than 0.1% under open pollination, due to a
57 massive drop of flowers and developing fruitlets (Singh, 1960). This situation is
58 common to other fruit tree species and different reasons, such as environmental factors
59 (Sturrock, 1966; Huang et al., 2010), alternate bearing (Dambreville et al., 2013), high
60 number of malformed flowers (Sturrock, 1966), empty and degenerated embryo sacs
61 (Shuraki and Sedgley, 1996), immature female reproductive organs (Sturrock, 1966;
62 Martinez-Pallé and Herrero, 1998), or starch deficiencies in flowers (Alcaraz et al.,
63 2010, 2013), have been proposed to explain this low flower to fruit ratio. However,
64 information is still elusive to explain the reasons behind the massive premature flower
65 abscission in mango.

66 One of the reasons could be the existence of a self-incompatibility mechanism.
67 Since Darwin (Darwin, 1876), considerable knowledge has been accumulated on self-
68 incompatibility mechanisms in flowering plants (Darwin, 1876; Charlesworth and
69 Willis, 2009; De Nettancourt, 2013; Gibbs, 2014). Incompatibility systems create
70 barriers to avoid self-fertilization, promoting gene exchange and preventing genetic
71 erosion (Takayama and Isogai, 2005; Charlesworth and Willis, 2009). The possible
72 existence of self-incompatibility in mango was proposed based on results particularly

73 from Indian cultivars, as ‘Dushehari’ or ‘Dasherri’, ‘Chausa’, ‘Bombay Green’ and
74 ‘Langra’ (Singh et al., 1962; Mukherjee et al., 1968; Sharma and Singh, 1970; Ram et
75 al., 1976). Recently, it has also been suggested in ‘Malika’ and ‘Amrapali’ which are
76 progeny of ‘Dushehari’ (Dutta et al., 2013), and ‘Ataulfo’ in Mexico (Gehrke-Vélez et
77 al., 2012). However, results based on fruit set are difficult to interpret due to the low
78 fruit set, even following hand-pollination, in this species. An evaluation of the pollen
79 tube behaviour has been reported in a number of cases (Maklad et al., 2011; Dutta et al.,
80 2013) showing different time requirements for self and cross pollen tubes to reach the
81 base of style. Even some studies report the presence of mango seeds without endosperm
82 after self-pollination, although no differences in pollen tube growth were found between
83 self- and cross-pollinated flowers (Mukherjee et al., 1968). Seed degeneration and
84 fruitlet drop during the month following initial fruit set has also been reported (Sharma
85 and Singh, 1970; Singh and Sharma, 1972), with higher fruit drop after self-pollination
86 (Dag et al., 1997). However, so far a clear-cut procedure to evaluate self-incompatibility
87 in mango is still missing.

88 The availability of molecular tools that allow the paternity analysis of the
89 embryos produced can be highly useful to advance in the understanding of possible self-
90 incompatibility mechanisms in mango. The first studies with molecular markers in
91 mango to evaluate outcrossing rate were performed with isozymes (Dag et al., 1997;
92 Dag et al., 1998; Dag et al., 2009), pointing out a high rate of outcrossing in fruits from
93 plants placed near pollinizer trees. Later, studies continued with microsatellite and
94 AFLP markers showing similar results (Schnell et al., 2006; Santos and Neto, 2011).

95 With the objective of advancing in the knowledge of self-incompatibility
96 mechanisms in mango, in this work we studied pollen tube kinetics and dynamics along

97 the style after controlled hand pollinations, and used microsatellite markers to analyse
98 seed paternity after open pollination.

99

100 **2. Material and methods**

101 **2.1. Pollination and pollen tube growth**

102 *Plant material and pollinations*

103 Three mango cultivars ('Osteen', 'Kent' and 'Kensington') maintained at the IHSM La
104 Mayora, Málaga, Spain, mango germplasm collection at latitude 36°45'N, longitude
105 4°4' W and altitude 35 m above sea level were used as pollen donor and recipient
106 genotypes. Most mango cultivars produce monoembryonic seeds while some produce
107 polyembryonic seeds, in which only one of the embryos is of gametic origin and the rest
108 are somatic (Aron et al., 1998). 'Osteen' and 'Kent' are monoembryonic cultivars
109 whereas 'Kensington' is polyembryonic. A diallel cross was performed in which each
110 cultivar was hand-pollinated with pollen from the other genotypes including self-
111 pollination. Flowers of the female recipients were collected in the morning, from 08:30
112 to 10:30 hours, before anther dehiscence. Then, these flowers were emasculated and
113 placed on wet paper inside a Petri dish, in the lab, each dish containing 20 flowers. For
114 each cross, six dishes were prepared to allow for six fixing times, with a total of 18 Petri
115 dishes per female recipient genotype. Flowers from the pollen donors, after collection in
116 the field, were also preserved in the lab until anther dehiscence. Female recipient
117 flowers were pollinated in the lab, from 14:00 to 15:00 hours, by rubbing the dehisced
118 anther of a flower of the pollen donor on the stigma of the female recipient flower. After
119 pollination, flowers were fixed every four hours, at 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24 hours in
120 formalin: acetic acid: ethanol (FAA) at 1:1:18 (v/v/v) (Johansen, 1940).

121

122 *Microscopic observations*

123 To monitor pollen tube growth rate in the stigma and style, the fixed pistils were
124 washed in distilled water, and left in 5% sodium sulphite for 24 hours. Samples were
125 autoclaved for five minutes at 1 Kg/cm² in sodium sulphite (Jefferies and Belcher,
126 1974), and then the individual styles were squashed onto glass slides with 0.005% (w/v)
127 aniline blue in 0.15N K₃PO₄ (O'Brien and McCully, 1981). Microscope slides were
128 preserved at 100% relative humidity at 4°C overnight. Pollen tubes were visualized with
129 a Leica DM LB2 epifluorescent microscope (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) with a 340-380
130 excitation filter and LP 425 barrier filter after squashing the coverslip. Number of pollen
131 tubes in the stigma and in the upper, middle and basal sections of the style was counted.
132 Pollen tube kinetics at the style level was evaluated as the percentage of the style length
133 traversed by the longest pollen tube.

134

135 **2.2. Outcrossing rate**

136 *Plant material*

137 Two experiments were performed, one in a multivarietal mango orchard with pollen
138 available from a wide range of cultivars, and the other in an orchard with two adjacent
139 monovarietal blocks. For the first experiment, fruits for paternity analysis were obtained
140 in a collection of mango varieties at the IHSM La Mayora, Málaga, Spain. The planting
141 pattern is 3m x 4m, showing the same distance between trees throughout the plot. Fruits
142 were collected, from September to November, from three trees of 'Osteen' and 'Kent'

143 that were surrounded by different mango varieties. After seed extraction, the tissue of
144 the embryonic axis was used for DNA extraction.

145 For the second experiment, fruits for paternity tests were obtained from a
146 commercial mango orchard in Benamocarra (Málaga, Spain). Two opposite plots, one
147 with only ‘Osteen’ and the other with only ‘Keitt’ trees, were used; an additional row of
148 ‘Kent’ was also present at the border of the ‘Osteen’ plot (Fig. 4). The distance between
149 rows of trees was 3.5 m. In each plot fruit samples were taken from trees at different
150 distances from the opposite plot. Ten fruits from two trees were collected in each row,
151 and the seeds were removed for DNA extraction as described above.

152

153 *DNA extraction and SSR analysis*

154 DNA from the embryos was extracted using the method reported by Hormaza (2002).
155 Initial amplification was performed with 16 SSR loci, previously developed for mango
156 by Viruel et al., (2005), that allowed assigning paternity. PCR amplifications were
157 performed in 15µl volumes containing 15 ng of genomic DNA, 16 mM (NH₄)₂SO₄, 67
158 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.8, 0.01% Tween20, 2 mM MgCl₂, 0.1 mM each primer, 0.625 mM
159 each dNTP and 0.5 units of BiotaqTM DNA polymerase (Bioline, London, UK).
160 Forward primers were labeled with florescent dyes on the 5’ end (Proligo, France).
161 Reactions were carried out on an I-cycler thermocycler (Bio-Rad Laboratories,
162 Hercules, CA, USA) using the following temperatures: a step of one minute at 94°C
163 followed by 35 cycles of 30 s at 94°C, 30 s at 50°C of annealing temperature and an
164 extension step of five minutes at 72°C.

165 PCR amplified fragments were analysed by capillary electrophoresis in a CEBTM
166 8000 capillary DNA analysis system (Beckman Coulter, Fullerton, CA, USA). The

167 results allowed the selection of 7 primers (LMMA6, LMMA7, LMMA8, LMMA9,
168 LMMA10, LMMA11 and LMMA15) that were enough to discriminate the different
169 genotypes available as pollen donors.

170 For the evaluation of outcrossing rate in the monovarietal block experiment, the
171 protocol was performed as described above for the multivarietal orchard but, in this
172 case, only three loci, LMMA9, LMMA10 and LMMA11, were used since they allow
173 unequivocal differentiation between the two varieties, ‘Osteen’ and ‘Keitt’.

174

175 *Paternity analysis*

176 Results from the capillary DNA analysis system were analysed using the Cervus 3.0
177 software (Marshall et al., 1998; Kalinowski et al., 2007), that allows assignment of
178 paternity to the most likely parents with a known level of statistical confidence by using
179 a likelihood-based approach generating a statistic, Δ LOD, that is defined as the
180 difference in positive log likelihood ratios (LOD) between the top two candidate parents
181 (Hauser et al., 2011). Two confidence levels were used, 80% and 95%.

182

183 **3. Results**

184 **3.1. Pollen germination and pollen tube grow *in vivo***

185 In spite that the flowers were hand pollinated some flowers did not show pollen tubes in
186 the style in all the crosses. The proportion of pistils with pollen tubes was variable
187 depending on the cultivars; it was higher for ‘Kensington’ (82%), whereas for ‘Osteen’
188 and ‘Kent’ the values were 56% and 40% respectively, regardless of the pollen donor

189 genotype. Few pollen tubes were observed in the small mango stigmas, with differences
190 in the average number of pollen tubes between cultivars, which were higher for
191 ‘Kensington’, 8.91 ± 0.89 , compared to 2.64 ± 0.61 in ‘Osteen’ or 2.05 ± 0.58 in ‘Kent’.
192 Pollen grains rapidly germinated and grew in the style and no rejection of pollen tubes
193 in self-pollinating samples in the three genotypes was observed (Fig. 1).

194 Evaluation of pollen tube kinetics showed that germination proceeded rapidly
195 and, in all crosses, pollen tubes could be observed at the base of the style in some
196 flowers 4 hours after pollination (Fig. 2A, B, C), although the number of pollen tubes
197 did not stabilize at the base of the style until 16 hours after pollination. Pollen tubes
198 reached the base of the style in most of the flowers analysed (Fig. 2D, D, F) with an
199 average of 0.5-1.5 tubes, following both cross and self pollinations, (Fig. 2G, H, I). The
200 best pollen receptor genotype was ‘Kensington’ with 76% flowers with pollen tubes at
201 the style base, followed by ‘Osteen’ with 45%, and, finally, ‘Kent’ with 28 % for all
202 crosses.

203

204 **3.2. Outcrossing rate in a multivarietal mango orchard**

205 Unequivocal paternity, with a 95% confidence level, could be assigned to 91 of the 95
206 ‘Osteen’ fruits analysed. Fruits that did not reach the confidence level were not taken
207 into account. The results from the fruits analysed showed that only 6% of the ‘Osteen’
208 fruits resulted from self-fertilization. The paternity analysis showed that in 55% of the
209 cases the pollen donor was ‘Kensington’ and in 15% ‘Keitt’. Other genotypes, also
210 present in the orchard, were assigned as parents at a lower rate (Fig. 3A).

211 The situation was different for ‘Kent’, in which the paternity analyses showed
212 that half of the fruits (48%) resulted from self-fertilization. In this case, for 62 of the 71

213 fruits analysed, paternity could be assigned with a confidence level of 80% (45 fruits
214 with 95% confidence level, and 15 fruits with 80% confidence level); fruits with a
215 confidence level lower than 80% were not taken into account. For the fruits resulting
216 from cross-pollination, the main pollen donor genotypes were ‘Kensington’ (18%),
217 ‘Keitt’ (11%), ‘Manzanillo Núñez’ (8%) and ‘Irwin’ (6%). The rest of the genotypes
218 showed a percentage lower than 5% (Fig. 3B).

219

220 **3.3. Outcrossing rate in monovarietal mango orchards**

221 In this case, most of the fruits resulted from self-fertilization in both ‘Osteen’ (79%) and
222 ‘Keitt’ (76%). Most of the outcrossed ‘Osteen’ fruits had ‘Keitt’ as pollen donor and
223 less than 7% ‘Kent’ due to the presence of a row of this cultivar bordering the ‘Osteen’
224 plot (Fig. 4). For ‘Keitt’, most of the outcrossed fruits had ‘Osteen’ as pollen donor
225 (Fig. 4). In general, the rate of outcrossing decreased with increasing distance from the
226 pollen donor both for ‘Osteen’ (0.26, 0m; 0.25, 17m; 0.20, 35m; 0.10, 52m; 0.21, 66m)
227 and ‘Keitt’ (0.35, 25m; 0.35, 60m; 0.15, 95m; 0.10, 130m).

228

229 **4. Discussion**

230 **4.1. Pollen germination and pollen tube growth in vivo**

231 Although self-incompatibility had been previously reported for some mango cultivars
232 (Singh et al., 1962; Mukherjee et al., 1968; Sharma and Singh, 1970; Ram et al., 1976;
233 Gehrke-Vélez et al., 2012; Dutta et al., 2013), our results with ‘Osteen’, ‘Kent’ and
234 ‘Kensington’ do not suggest an evident self incompatibility system at the stigma or style
235 level that can significantly affect pollen tube growth. However, this pollen tube

236 behaviour cannot rule out a post-zygotic embryo rejection as a late-acting self
237 incompatibility system (Mukherjee et al., 1968), similarly to what has been suggested
238 for cashew, *Anacardium occidentale*, (Aliyu, 2007; Wunnachit et al., 1992), also a
239 member of the Anacardiaceae.

240 Differences in the number of pollen tubes at the stigma were found between
241 cultivars, which can be due to differences in the adhesion, hydration or germination of
242 the pollen grains. Results in ‘Kensington’ showed more pollen tubes at the stigmatic
243 region than in ‘Osteen’ or ‘Kent’. This better performance of ‘Kensington’ as pollen
244 receptor is interesting since this cultivar has polyembryonic seeds, where all the
245 embryos except one are of somatic origin (Maheshwari, 1950). Similar differences in
246 pollen tube behaviour have been recorded in sweet cherry flowers depending on the
247 genotype (Hormaza and Herrero, 1999) or the mating combination (Hedhly et al., 2005,
248 2015).

249

250 **4.2. Selfing and outcrossing in mango**

251 The results show a high outcrossing rate in mango in the line of previous paternity
252 studies using morphological (Singh et al., 1962; Mukherjee et al., 1968; Sharma and
253 Singh, 1970) and molecular traits (Schnell et al., 1994; Dag et al., 1997; Degani et al.,
254 1997b; Dag et al., 1998; Dag et al., 2001; 2009; Santos and Neto, 2011). Those results
255 suggest the presence of negative selection after fertilization of fruits resulting from
256 selfing, a similar situation to that also reported in other subtropical fruit crops such as
257 avocado or lychee (Degani et al., 1995; Degani et al., 1997a; Alcaraz and Hormaza,
258 2011).

259 As expected, outcrossing rate was higher in the multivarietal than in the
260 monovarietal orchards. In the multivarietal orchard, the high percentage of outcrossing
261 observed in ‘Osteen’ could be due to a higher synchronization in flowering time with
262 the rest of the genotypes present in the orchard. In contrast, the high proportion of fruits
263 resulting from self pollination in ‘Kent’ appears related to the fact that, under our
264 environmental conditions, ‘Kent’ flowering time was significantly later than most of the
265 genotypes in the collection.

266 In the monovarietal orchards studied, self-fertilization prevailed over cross-
267 fertilization, with a low outcrossing rate for both genotypes, ‘Osteen’ and ‘Keitt’. In
268 those orchards, a decrease in the percentage of fruits derived from outcrossing with
269 increasing distance to the pollinizer was obtained. Similar results have been obtained
270 previously in mango (Degani et al., 1997b; Dag et al., 1998; Dag et al., 2009), and in
271 other subtropical fruit trees such as avocado or lychee (Degani et al., 1995; Degani et
272 al., 1997a; Alcaraz and Hormaza, 2011).

273

274 **4.3. Preferential cross-fertilization versus cryptic self-incompatibility in mango**

275 Floral incompatibility systems are a common phenomenon in several plant species,
276 resulting in the avoidance of self-fertilization or crossing with genetically close
277 genotypes favouring genetic exchange. The occurrence of self-incompatibility in some
278 mango cultivars has been described previously (Singh et al., 1962; Mukherjee et al.,
279 1968; Sharma and Singh, 1970; Ram et al., 1976; Gehrke-Vélez et al., 2012; Dutta et
280 al., 2013), but no conclusive data about a possible incompatibility system in this species
281 have been put forward. In this study a combination of molecular and microscopic
282 techniques was used. Thus, microsatellite markers were used to assess the paternity of

283 fruits harvested from ‘Osteen’ and ‘Kent’ trees in a multivarietal orchard. The results
284 showed in ‘Kent’ a similar percentage of cross and self-fertilized fruits, suggesting self-
285 compatibility in this cultivar. However, in ‘Osteen’ only a small proportion of the fruits
286 were the result of self-fertilization. Since the high percentage of cross-fertilization
287 observed in this cultivar could conflict with previous observations showing no
288 production problems in monovarietal orchards of this variety, a second experiment was
289 performed in an orchard with just two cultivars in different opposite plots: ‘Osteen’ and
290 ‘Keitt’. A paternity analysis was made from the fruits harvested from trees belonging to
291 both varieties located at different distances from the pollen donor. The results showed a
292 high majority of fruits produced by self-fertilization especially in the trees farther away
293 from the pollen donor, suggesting that self-fertility is possible in these two mango
294 cultivars.

295 Therefore, the results suggest self-fertility for ‘Kent’, but in ‘Osteen’, although
296 self-fertilization is possible, a preferential trend for cross-fertilization has been recorded.
297 This could be related to the presence of a cryptic self-incompatibility system in this
298 mango variety that would favour cross-fertilization but, in the absence of pollen from
299 other genotypes, would make self-fertilization possible. The term cryptic self-
300 incompatibility was introduced to refer to the cases in which selfing is possible although
301 fertilization with cross-pollen is preferred (Bateman, 1956). Still, no differences could
302 be observed in pollen tube growth in self- and cross-pollinations, with no apparent
303 incompatibility symptoms at the stigma or style levels. In this sense, the term late acting
304 self-incompatibility was introduced by Seavey and Bawa (1986) and thoroughly
305 discussed recently by Gibbs (2014) to explain the lack of selfed fruits after apparently
306 successful self pollen tube growth in the stigma and style. The results obtained in this
307 work suggest that mango could have a combination of the two systems and additional

308 work in other cultivars is needed to study if this could be a more widespread process in
309 other cases that have been considered to be self-compatible. Similar results of a
310 preferential selection over offspring have been obtained not only in mango (Dag et al.,
311 1998; 2009), but also in avocado or lychee (Degani et al., 1986; Degani et al., 1995;
312 Degani et al., 1997a; Degani et al., 2003; Alcaraz and Hormaza, 2011). Usually those
313 results have been explained in terms of inbreeding depression (Charlesworth and
314 Charlesworth, 1987). In any case, preferential cross-fertilization without excluding self-
315 fertilization is a bet-hedging strategy either for avoiding inbreeding depression or for
316 ensuring reproduction (Holsinger, 1996; Kruszewski and Galloway, 2006; Cachi et al.,
317 2013).

318 **Conflicts of interest**

319 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

320

321 **Acknowledgements**

322 The research was supported by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad –
323 European Regional Development Fund, European Union (AGL2012-40239, AGL2013-
324 43732-R, AGL2016-77267-R and Recupera2020) and Gob. Aragón A-43. V. Pérez was
325 supported by a Cabildo de La Palma- CSIC PhD scholarship. We thank David
326 Sarmiento for providing a mango orchard to perform some of the experiments, Yolanda
327 Verdún for lab assistance and Sonia Ruiz and Sonia Cívico for field assistance.

328

329 **References**

- 330 Alcaraz M.L., Hormaza J.I., Rodrigo J., 2010. Ovary starch reserves and pistil
331 development in avocado (*Persea americana*). *Physiol. Plantarum*. 140 (4), 395-
332 404.
- 333 Alcaraz, M.L., Hormaza, J.I., 2011. Influence of physical distance between cultivars on
334 yield, outcrossing rate and selective fruit drop in avocado (*Persea americana*,
335 Lauraceae). *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 158 (3), 354-361.
- 336 Alcaraz, M.L., Hormaza, J.I., Rodrigo, J., 2013. Pistil starch reserves at anthesis
337 correlate with final flower fate in avocado (*Persea americana*). *PloS One*. 8
338 (10), e78467.
- 339 Aliyu, O.M., 2007. Pollen-style compatibility in cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.).
340 *Euphytica*. 158 (1), 249-260.
- 341 Aron, Y., Czosnek, H., Gazit, S., Degani, C., 1998. Polyembryony in mango (*Mangifera*
342 *indica* L.) is controlled by a single dominant gene. *HortScience*. 33 (7), 1241-
343 1242.
- 344 Bateman, A.J., 1956. Cryptic self-incompatibility in the wallflower: *Cheiranthus cheiri*
345 L. *Heredity*. 10 (25), 257-261.
- 346 Bompard, J.M., Schnell, R.J., 1997. Taxonomy and systematics, in: Litz, R.E. (Eds.),
347 The mango: botany, production and uses. CAB International, Wallingford,
348 Oxon, pp. 21–47.
- 349 Cachi, A.M., Hedhly, A., Hormaza, J.I., Wünsch, A., 2014. Pollen tube growth in the
350 self-compatible sweet cherry genotype, ‘Cristobalina’, is slowed down after self-
351 pollination. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 164 (1), 73-84.

- 352 Charlesworth, D., Charlesworth, B., 1987. Inbreeding depression and its evolutionary
353 consequences. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 18, 237-268.
- 354 Charlesworth, D., Willis, J.H., 2009. The genetics of inbreeding depression. *Nat. Rev.*
355 *Genet.* 10 (11), 783-796.
- 356 Dag, A., Degani, C., Gazit, S., 2001. In-hive pollen transfer in mango. *Acta Hortic.* 561,
357 61-65.
- 358 Dag, A., Degani, C., Gazit, S., 2009. Gene flow in mango orchards and its impact on
359 yield. *Acta Hortic.* 820, 347-350.
- 360 Dag, A., Eisenstein, D., Degani, C., El-Batsri, R., Zelig, M., Ziv, G., Gazit, S., 1997.
361 ‘Tommy Atkins’ mango as pollenizer for ‘Lily’. *Acta Hortic.* 455, 209-216.
- 362 Dag, A., Eisenstein, D., Gazit, S., El-Batsri, R., 1998. Effect of pollenizer distance and
363 selective fruitlet abscission on outcrossing rate and yield in ‘Tommy Atkins’
364 mango. *J. Am. Soc. Hortic. Sci.* 123 (4), 618-622.
- 365 Dambreville, A., Lauri, P.É., Trottier, C., Guédon, Y., Normand, F., 2013. Deciphering
366 structural and temporal interplays during the architectural development of
367 mango trees. *J. Exp. Bot.* 64 (8), 2467-2480.
- 368 Darwin, C., 1876. *The Effects of Cross and Self Fertilisation in the Vegetable Kingdom.*
369 John Murray, London.
- 370 Degani, C., El-Batsri, R., Gazit, S., 1997a. Outcrossing rate, yield, and selective fruit
371 abscission in ‘Ettinger’ and ‘Ardith’ avocado plots. *J. Am. Soc. Hortic. Sci.* 122
372 (6), 813-817.

- 373 Degani, C., Goldring, A., Gazit, S., Lavi, U., 1986. Genetic selection during the
374 abscission of avocado fruitlets. *J. Am. Soc. Hortic. Sci.* 21(5), 1187-1188.
- 375 Degani, C., Lahav, E., El-Batsri, R., Gazit, S., 2003. Caging single avocado trees with a
376 beehive does not guarantee exclusive formation of selfed progeny. *J. Am. Soc.*
377 *Hortic. Sci.* 38 (7), 1433-1434.
- 378 Degani, C., Stern, R.A., El-Batsri, R., Gazit, S., 1995. Pollen parent effect on the
379 selective abscission of ‘Mauritius’ and ‘Floridian’ lychee fruitlets. *J. Am. Soc.*
380 *Hortic. Sci.* 120 (3), 523-526.
- 381 Degani, C., Yutko, O., El-Batsri, R., Gazit, S., 1997b. Outcrossing rate in adjacent
382 ‘Maya’ and ‘Tommy Atkins’ mango blocks. *Sci. Hort.* 70 (1), 25-30.
- 383 De Nettancourt, D., 2013. Incompatibility in Angiosperms (Vol. 3). Springer Science &
384 Business Media, New York.
- 385 Dutta, S., Srivastav, M., Rymbai, H., Chaudhary, R., Singh, A., Dubey, A., Lal, K.,
386 2013. Pollen–pistil interaction studies in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cultivars.
387 *Sci. Hort.* 160, 213-221.
- 388 FAO (2016) Agricultural data: FAOSTAT. URL <http://www.faostat.org> [accessed on 20
389 June 2016].
- 390 Gehrke-Vélez, M.R., Castillo-Vera, A., Ruiz-Bello, C., Moreno-Martinez, J., Moreno-
391 Basurto, G., 2012. Delayed self-incompatibility causes morphological alterations
392 and crop reduction in ‘Ataúlfo’ mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). *New Zeal. J. Crop*
393 *Hortic.* 40 (4), 215-227.

- 394 Gibbs, P.E., 2014. Late-acting self-incompatibility – the pariah breeding system in
395 flowering plants. *New Phytol.* 203 (3), 717-734.
- 396 Hauser, L., Baird, M., Hilborn, R., Seeb, L.W., Seeb, J.E., 2011. An empirical
397 comparison of SNPs and microsatellites for parentage and kinship assignment in
398 a wild sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) population. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 11
399 (s1), 150-161.
- 400 Hedhly, A., Hormaza, J.I, Herrero, M., 2005. Influence of genotype-temperature
401 interaction on pollen performance. *J. Evolution. Biol.* 18 (6), 1494–1502.
- 402 Hedhly, A., Wünsch, A., Kartal, Ö., Herrero, M., Hormaza, J.I., 2016. Paternal-specific
403 S-allele transmission in the sweet cherry (*Prunus avium* L.): the potential for
404 sexual selection. *J. Evolution. Biol.* 29, 490-501
- 405 Holsinger, K.E., 1996. Pollination biology and the evolution of mating systems in
406 flowering plants. *Evol. Biol.* 29, 107-149.
- 407 Hormaza, J.I., 2002. Molecular characterization and similarity relationships among
408 apricot (*Prunus armeniaca* L.) genotypes using simple sequence repeats. *Theor.*
409 *App. Genet.* 104 (2-3), 321-328.
- 410 Hormaza, J.I., Herrero, M., 1999. Pollen performance as affected by the pistilar
411 genotype in sweet cherry (*Prunus avium* L.). *Protoplasma.* 208 (1-4), 129-135.
- 412 Huang, J.-H., Ma, W.-H., Liang, G.-L., Zhang, L.-Y., Wang, W.-X., Cai, Z.-J., Wen, S.-
413 X., 2010. Effects of low temperatures on sexual reproduction of ‘Tainong 1’
414 mango (*Mangifera indica*). *Sci. Hort.* 126 (2), 109-119.

- 415 Jefferies, C.J., Belcher, A.R., 1974. A fluorescent brightener used for pollen tube
416 identification in vivo. *Stain Technol.* 49 (4), 199-202.
- 417 Johansen, D.A., 1940. *Plant Microtechniques*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- 418 Kalinowski, S.T., Taper, M.L., Marshall, T.C., 2007. Revising how the computer
419 program CERVUS accommodates genotyping error increases success in
420 paternity assignment. *Mol. Ecol.* 16 (5), 1099-1106.
- 421 Kruszewski, L.J., Galloway, L.F., 2006. Explaining outcrossing rate in
422 *Campanulastrum americanum* (Campanulaceae): geitonogamy and cryptic self-
423 incompatibility. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 167 (3), 455-461.
- 424 Maheshwari P. (Eds) (1950) *An Introduction to the Embryology of Angiosperms*. New
425 York: McGraw-Hill.
- 426 Maklad, M.F., Desouky, I.M., Rashed, M.A., Ageez, A., 2011. Molecular markers for
427 self incompatibility phenomena in some mango cultivars. *Egypt. J. Genet. Cytol.*
428 40 (2), 351-363.
- 429 Marshall, T.C., Slate, J., Kruuk, L.E.B., Pemberton, J.M., 1998. Statistical confidence
430 for likelihood-based paternity inference in natural populations. *Mol. Ecol.* 7 (5),
431 639-655.
- 432 Martinez-Pallé, E., Herrero, M., 1998. Pollen tube pathway in chalazogamous *Pistacia*
433 *vera* L. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 159, 566-574.
- 434 Mukherjee, S.K., Singh, R.N., Majumder, P.K., Sharma, D.K., 1968. Present position
435 regarding breeding of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) in India. *Euphytica.* 17 (3),
436 462-467.

- 437 O'Brien, T.P., McCully, M.E., 1981. The Study of Plant Structure: Principles and
438 Selected Methods. Termarcarphi Pty. Ltd., Melbourne.
- 439 Ram, S., Bist, L.D., Lakhanpal, S.C., Jamwal, I.S., 1976. Search of suitable pollinizers
440 for mango cultivars. Acta Hortic. 57, 253-264.
- 441 Sachar, D.K., Singh, R.N., 1970. Self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.).
442 Hortic. Res. 10, 108-118.
- 443 Santos, C.A.F., Neto, F.P.L., 2011. Outcrossing rate between 'Haden' and 'Tommy
444 Atkins' mangoes estimated using microsatellite and AFLP markers. Pesqui
445 Agropecu. Bras. 46 (8), 899-904.
- 446 Schnell, R., Brown, J.S., Olano, C., Meerow, A., Campbell, R., Kuhn, D., 2006. Mango
447 genetic diversity analysis and pedigree inferences for Florida cultivars using
448 microsatellite markers. J. Am. Soc. Hortic. Sci. 41 (4), 993-993.
- 449 Schnell, R., Knight, R., Harkins, D., Zill, G., 1994. Eliminating zygotic seedlings in
450 'Turpentine' mango rootstock populations by visual roguing. J. Am. Soc. Hortic.
451 Sci. 29 (4), 319-320.
- 452 Seavey, S.R., Bawa, K.S., 1986. Late-acting self-incompatibility in Angiosperms. Bot.
453 Rev. 52 (2), 195–219.
- 454 Sharma, D., Singh, R., 1970. Self-incompatibility in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.).
455 Hortic. Res. 10, 108-118.
- 456 Shuraki, Y.D., Sedgley, M., 1996. Fruit development of *Pistacia vera* (Anacardiaceae)
457 in relation to embryo abortion and abnormalities at maturity. Aust. J. Bot. 44 (1)
458 ,35-45.

- 459 Singh, U., 1960. Studies in the fruit-drop of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). II. Nature
460 and extent of fruit-drop. Hort. Advance. 4, 142-54.
- 461 Singh, R.N., Sharma, D.K., 1972. Some pollination problems in mango. Acta Hortic.
462 24, 134-138.
- 463 Singh, R.N., Sharma, D.K., Majumdar, P.K., 1962. Self-incompatibility in mango
464 (*Mangifera indica* L.) var. Deshehari. Curr Sci. India. 31 (5), 209-209.
- 465 Sturrock, T.T., 1966. The mango inflorescence. Fla. State Hortic. Soc. Proc. 79, 366-
466 369.
- 467 Takayama, S., Isogai A., 2005. Self-incompatibility in plants. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.
468 56, 467-489.
- 469 Viruel, M.A., Escribano, P., Barbieri, M., Ferri, M., Hormaza, J.I., 2005. Fingerprinting,
470 embryo type and geographic differentiation in mango (*Mangifera indica* L.,
471 Anacardiaceae) with microsatellites. Mol. Breeding. 15 (4), 383-393.
- 472 Wunnachit, W., Pattison, S.J., Gilesb, L., Millington, A.J., Sedgley, M., 1992. Pollen
473 tube growth and genotype compatibility in cashew in relation to yield. Journal
474 Hortic. Sci. 67 (1), 67-75.
- 475
- 476
- 477
- 478
- 479

480

481

482 **Figure legends**

483 **Figure 1 Pollen tube growth in self-pollinized mango flowers.** (A) ‘Kent’, (B) ‘Osteen’ and (C)

484 ‘Kensington’. Aniline blue stain. Bars = 100µm.

485 **Figure 2 Pollen tube growth in the in a diallel pollination of three cultivars.** Expressed as % of style

486 travelled by the longest pollen tube (mean ± SE). (A, B, C), % of flowers with pollen tubes in the base of

487 style, (D, E, F) and number de pollen tubes in the base of style (mean ± SE), (G, H, I). In pistils of

488 ‘Kensington, KS’ (A, D, G), ‘Osteen, OS’ (B, E, H), and ‘Kent, KT’ (D, F, I).

489 **Figure 3 Assignment of paternity in a mango orchard with a collection of varieties.** Expressed as the

490 percentage of fruits originating for each parental genotype. (A) ‘Osteen’ as maternal genotype and (B)

491 ‘Kent’ as maternal genotype.

492 **Figure 4 Diagram of outcrossing rate in a solid mango block of ‘Keitt’ adjacent to a solid block of**

493 **‘Osteen’.** Expressed as the outcrossing rate for each genotype. On the top of the diagram the rows (r)

494 from which samples were taken and the distance between them in each plot (number of trees and distance

495 in meters) are represented. Bordering the ‘Osteen’ plot there was a single row with ‘Kent’ trees.

496 Outcrossing rate results are shown at the bottom of the diagram, and the grey line represents

497 decreasing/increasing of outcrossing rate with distance.