

Reprint from Coconut Journal, Vol. XV. No. 2
January - March, 1962. Pages 66-69

RP-73

Studies on the development of coconuts during the different months of the year

By

K. VIJAYALAKSHMI, M. DIVAKARAN PILLAI, AND M. M. KRISHNA MARAR
Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod

M. T. M. Press Ltd., Ernakulam

Studies on the development of coconuts during the different months of the year

By

K. VIJAYALAKSHMI, M. DIVAKARAN PILLAI, AND M. M. KRISHNA MARAR

Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod

INTRODUCTION

THE coconut palm is peculiar in that when once it begins to bear it continues to bear all through the year and all through its life extending for a period of 60 years or more. In a regular bearing palm every leaf axil will have an inflorescence and the production of inflorescences is a continuous process in successive leaf axils at intervals of about a month. The female flowers will take about 12 months to develop into mature forms and at any particular time there will be found on the tree 12 or more fully opened bunches in different stages of development from the button stage to the ripe nut. Every bunch of coconut is subjected to a full weather cycle of 12 months and the final yield as also the quality of nuts will bear the imprint of the cumulative effect of this impact. Hence the actual conditions encountered by the different bunches at similar stages of development will be quite different. All these indicate the need to study the development of nuts produced in the different months of the year in order to be able to measure the effects of different seasons on nut development. This paper records the preliminary results of an investigation in progress since 1958 at this Research Station. Studies on nut development reported by Patel (1938) and Gangolly *et. al.* (1953) relate only to the different stages available at a particular time.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Six regular and heavy bearing palms were selected and the date of stigmatic receptivity of the female flowers on the inflorescences

produced in the successive leaf axils were noted. At intervals of two months one nut at random was selected from each bunch of the selected trees for detailed study of nut characteristics. The character of husked coconut could be studied only from the sixth month onwards as proper husking was not found possible before that period. Copra was made only from nuts 10 months old and over. Though a number of characters have been studied, discussion in this paper is confined to the more important of them, viz., volume and weight of unhusked and husked nut and copra content per nut.

RESULTS

A perusal of the detailed data collected showed that maximum development of the nut was at 10 months' stage and that later on there was a decline in weight showing the onset of maturity. This stage was, therefore, thought to be best for comparison among nuts of different months in respect of characters such as weight and volume of unhusked and husked nuts. Comparison of copra was however made based on 12 months old nuts. The data are summarised in Table 1.

TABLE 1.

Average weight, and volume of unhusked and husked 10-month-old nuts and copra content of 12-month-old nuts fertilised in different months.

Month of receptivity	Husked nut		Unhusked nut		Wt. of copra (gms)
	Wt. (gms)	Vol. (c. c)	Wt. (gms)	Vol. (c. c)	
March, 1958	732	651	1956	3099	—
April, 1958	639	591	1933	2991	139
May, 1958	674	643	2010	2988	208
June, 1958	646	557	1795	2943	192
July, 1958	554	580	1446	2122	176
August, 1958	527	585	1539	2260	145
September, 1958	625	560	2291	2987	150
October, 1958	591	517	1658	2260	174
November, 1958	598	557	1826	2587	168
December, 1958	557	562	1743	2697	168
January, 1959	559	561	1798	2830	158
February, 1959	623	618	1653	3063	171

It is seen that in general the weight and volume of the unhusked and husked nuts were higher in those inflorescences which reached the stage of stigmatic receptivity during summer months than those of rainy or cold weather periods. Copra content per nut was also high in the summer months. This is in general agreement with the findings reported by Patel (1928). Inter-relations among the different characters were also calculated. The results are summarised in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

Characters	Total correlation
1. Weight of copra and weight of husked nut	0.4693
2. Weight of husked nut and volume of husked nut	0.6054†
3. Weight of unhusked nut and volume of unhusked nut	0.6915†
4. Weight of husked nut and weight of unhusked nut	0.6040†
5. Volume of husked nut and volume of unhusked nut	0.5256

† Significant at 5 per cent level.

There is indication to show that the effect of season is not operating in the same way or to the same extent in the different characters. Probably this is why the amount of variation explained on the basis of association of characters is less than 50 per cent even where significance has been attained. Admittedly more data are required to draw definite and valid conclusions.

In order to have a rough idea of the effect of some meteorological factors affecting the development of nuts of inflorescences produced in the different months of the year, the data on weight and volume of husked coconuts recorded at 10 months stage were examined for possible correlation with hours of sunshine and maximum temperature at different periods of growth. There was an indication of differential relationship according to the stage of development. Maximum temperature and hours of sunshine appear to be negatively correlated in the earlier stages of development while they are positively correlated with development towards the later stages. Active formation and deposition of kernel takes place during the latter half of development and this process may be favourably influenced by the prevalence of longer hours of sunshine and higher maximum temperatures at that stage.

This study is being followed up on a large scale to verify earlier findings and also to gather more data for a critical appraisal of the part played by different meteorological factors in bringing about the differences in nut development seen in the coconut palms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our sincere thanks are due to Dr. K. M. Pandalai for his interest in this work and to Mr. A. S. Pankajakshan, Statistician for helping in the statistical interpretation of the data presented.

REFERENCES

1. Gangolly, S. R. and Chathukutty Nambiar, M. 1953 *Indian Coconut Journal*, 7, 1.
2. Patel, J. S. 1938 *The Coconut - A Monograph*.