

# Identification of Best Exposure Timings of Sodium Hypochlorite in Surface Sterilization of Different Explants in *invitro* Propagation of *Annona muricata*

Archana, S.<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Kulapati Hipparagi<sup>2</sup>, Dr. D. P. Prakasha<sup>3</sup>, Dr. N. K. Hedge<sup>4</sup>,  
Dr. Prabhulinga, G<sup>5</sup>, Dr. Noorulla Haveri<sup>6</sup>

College of Horticulture, Bagalkot, India<sup>1</sup>

Associate Director of Research and Extension, MHREC, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot, India<sup>2</sup>

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Fruit Science, College of Horticulture, Sirsi, India<sup>3</sup>

Director of Education, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot, India<sup>4</sup>

Dep. of Biotechnology and Crop improvement, College of Horticulture, Bagalkot, India<sup>6</sup>

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Plant Pathology, College of Horticulture, Bagalkot, India<sup>6</sup>

\*Corresponding author: sriarchi510@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The most crucial and delicate stage in plant tissue culture is the surface sterilization of the explant. An inappropriate concentration of sterilant may have deadly effects on explants by altering cell division and other metabolic processes that limit the growth and development of explants. Considering the explants observations and sterilization treatments of Sodium hypochlorite (4%), T<sub>6</sub> (7 min), T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) and T<sub>8</sub> (9 min) are selected for green nodal explants as highest response, least days for initiation of response, good health with less contamination and moderate survival of explants. Whereas, T<sub>5</sub> (6 min) T<sub>6</sub> (7 min) and T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) are selected for leaf with lower contamination with good health and survivability. Internode was not selected due to no response with higher contamination and less survivability. Brown nodal explants responded very less and less survivability with higher contamination as compared to other explants.

**Keywords:** *Annona muricata*, Sodium hypochlorite, surface sterilization, invitro propagation

## I. INTRODUCTION

The genus *Annona* is the most economically important containing 120 species. Five edible species have been identified, four of which are from South or Mesoamerica and one from Eastern Africa (Pinto et al., 2010). Soap sop (*Annona muricata* L) is a native of South America is widely distributed throughout tropical and subtropical regions of the world, including India, Malaysia and Nigeria. It is also known as graviola, guanabana, paw-paw and sirsak. *A. muricata* is the herb that is most frequently used to treat most cancers in Jamaica and Trinidad. Moreover, it has been described as anticrustacean, antiparasitic, cytotoxic (acetogenins), antiamebic, antibacterial, antifungal, spasmogenic, vasodilator, smooth muscle relaxant, anti-inflammatory and anti-microbial (Rady et al., 2018). This family has a considerable number of tropical and subtropical habitats around the world, but further geographical development is constrained by the Annonaceae's climatic requirements to regions with extremely precise slope, temperature, relative humidity and soil characteristics (Encina et al., 2014). In addition to traditional techniques for growing plants, cherimoya and other *Annona* species can benefit from the effective application of *in vitro* tissue culture techniques for micropropagation to get over those issues (Santana et al., 2003). *In vitro* propagation is a method, possibly to grow identical plants from superior specimen quickly.

## II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In the present study, experiments were carried out on sterilization and best explant of soap sop for *in vitro* micro propagation during 2020 to 2022 at Tissue culture laboratory, College of Horticulture, Sirsi (University of Horticultural

Sciences, Bagalkot), Uttar Kannada district, Karnataka. *Annona muricata* seedlings were brought from a nursery in Shivamogga, and mother plants were kept in the nursery of the Department of Fruit Science at COH, Sirsi. Four different kinds of explant were used for direct regeneration.

Plant tissue culture losses are attributed to the formation of *in vitro* cultures from mother plants that have been grown in the field and are susceptible to microbial contamination. It is essential to choose the right sterilising chemicals and exposure duration, which will remove only impurities from the living material but not its viability. Hence, sterilization was standardised in the current experiment, where all the explants were washed under tap water for 20 minutes, then washed with distilled water containing two drops of Tween-20 and soaking in Carbendazim (2 mg/L) and Cetrimide (0.5 mg/L) solutions before treating with surface sterilants. The observations were recorded at weekly intervals. Green nodal, brown nodal, internode and leaf explants of *Annona muricata* were used to standardise the procedure for sterilization for direct regeneration. Utilizing practical and efficient disinfectants such as sodium hypochlorite, mercuric chloride and ethanol has made tissue culture practicable (Krikorian 1962).

### 2.1 Procedure

Surface sterilization and preparation of explant (green wood, internode, brown wood and leaves)

Nodal explants and leaves from the seedlings of *Annona muricata* grown in a greenhouse were sterilized by the following procedure.

To lower the bacterial and fungal load, the mother plant was frequently sprayed with Carbendazim (0.2%) and cetrimide (0.5 g/L) at weekly intervals and streptomycin sulphate (0.5 g/L) at 10 days interval.

Using a scissors that had been swabbed with cotton dipped in 70 per cent ethanol, the healthy and freshly sprouted stem was removed from the mother plant that was grown in a polybag under greenhouse conditions.

Leaves of the stem were removed to their half and then nodal explants were prepared.

Stems measuring 10 cm were washed for 10 minutes under running tap water, then soaked for three hours in solution containing Carbendazim (0.2%), cetrimide (0.5g/ L) and two drops of Tween 20.

Initial sterilization with Sodium hypochlorite or mercuric chloride has been taken up and then washed with distil water for four times. Further sterilization was carried out under sterile laminarhood, as per the treatments. Explants were subjected to sterilization treatments in a closed container and repeatedly washed with sterile water inside the laminar air flowchamber for five times.

Treated nodal explants were cut with sterile blades to remove any dead tissues and were fragmented into 3-4 cm length containing two nodes. Leaves were fragmented then both the explants were placed over the MS media containing BAP (1.5mg/L) (Plate 1).

### 2.2 Treatment details

Experiment was done with exposure time of Sodium hypochlorite (4%) on explants. The experimental design used was CRD with 11 treatments, three replications and 10 explants per replication and following treatments were used.

Treatment No.	Treatment
T <sub>1</sub>	Control
T <sub>2</sub>	4% NaOCl for 3 min
T <sub>3</sub>	4% NaOCl for 4 min
T <sub>4</sub>	4% NaOCl for 5 min
T <sub>5</sub>	4% NaOCl for 6 min
T <sub>6</sub>	4% NaOCl for 7 min
T <sub>7</sub>	4% NaOCl for 8 min
T <sub>8</sub>	4% NaOCl for 9 min
T <sub>9</sub>	4% NaOCl for 10 min

NaOCl- Sodium hypochlorite

### 2.3 Statistical analysis

As all the studies were conducted in the laboratory under well-defined condition of medium of growth, temperature and light, complete randomized design (CRD) was employed for analysis of the experiments. Critical difference (C.D.) values given in the table were at one per cent level of significance, where the F test was significant and used to compute the means. Values in percentages were subjected to arc sine transformation to ensure homogeneity. Wherever values were 0 per cent or 100 per cent,  $\arcsin(1/4n)$  and  $\arcsin(100-1/4n)$ , where  $n$  is the number of observations that make up the percentage, were substituted respectively (Panse and Sukhatme 1967). The significance of differences among means was carried out using Duncan's multiple-range test at  $P=0.01$ .

## III. RESULTS

### 3.1 Contamination (%)

There was only fungal contamination was recorded in all the treatments in all the explants. The data on the contamination in green nodal, leaf, brown nodal and internode explants affected by various Sodium hypochlorite (4%) treatment timings are represented in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. Significantly the lowest level (20.00% - 30.00%) of fungal contamination was recorded in  $T_9$  (NaOCl 4% for 10 min) and the highest was noted in  $T_1$  (control) with 100 per cent contamination for all the explants (green, brown nodal, leaf and internode).

### 3.2 Health (+, ++, +++)

The data pertaining to health of green nodal, leaf, brown nodal and internodal explant influenced by various Sodium hypochlorite (4%) treatment timings are presented in the Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 respectively. Health was maintained good to moderate in all the explants in treatment from  $T_5$  to  $T_8$  (NaOCl 4% for 6 min to 9 min).

### 3.3 Initiation of Response (%)

In the present experiment of sterilization explants with different time of Sodium hypochlorite (4%), no response was seen in leaf and internode explants and significantly the highest initiation of response (93.33%) was noted in  $T_8$  (NaOCl 4% for 9 min) in green nodal explants (Table 7). Whereas, brown nodal explants showed response (66.66%) in  $T_6$  (NaOCl 4% for 7 min) (Table 8), which was represented in Plate 2.

### 3.4 Days taken for shoot initiation

Significantly the least days (14.33 to 15.67) taken for initiation of response in green nodal explants was recorded in  $T_6$  to  $T_8$  (NaOCl 4% for 7 to 9 min) (Table 7). 24.50 days were taken for shoot emergence in brown nodal explants in  $T_6$  (NaOCl 4% for 7 min) (Table 8).

### 3.5 Survival (%)

The information in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 relates to the survival of explants in green nodal, leaf, brown nodal and internodal explants respectively, as affected by various Sodium hypochlorite (4%) treatments. Significantly the highest percentage of survival was recorded in  $T_8$  (NaOCl 4% for 9 min) in internode and green nodal explants (80.00%) and in  $T_7$  (NaOCl 4% for 8 min) in leaf and brown wood explants (56.67%).

## IV. DISCUSSION

The pre-treatment in the greenhouse stock plants with systemic fungicides was not enough to avoid all the endogenous pollutants. The disinfection treatments with Sodium hypochlorite helped to sanitize all surface of the explants (Bridg 2000). As it is a highly powerful disinfectant and known as a bacterial killer, ensures a large drop in microbial population even at very small amounts (Odutayo *et al.*, 2007; Eed *et al.*, 2010).

Increasing the exposure duration and concentration of sterilizing agents had reduced the contamination rate because sterilizing chemical ruin the shape and functions of microbe's enzymes (George *et al.*, 2008). Numerous species of bacteria have been controlled well with Sodium hypochlorite treatment (Tiwari *et al.*, 2012). Bacterial populations can be decreased

by very low concentrations of Sodium hypochlorite (Nakagawara *et al.*, 1998) as the percentage of contamination decreases with increasing Sodium hypochlorite concentration and immersion time. It has been shown that Sodium hypochlorite is highly effective against a variety of bacteria even low doses are sufficient to dramatically lower/no bacterial populations. Bridg (2000) obtained high aseptic cultures in nodal explants with low (45%) contamination (bacteria- 30% and fungi- 55%) by treating Sodium hypochlorite (3%) for 15 min with tween 20 as a wetting agent in *A. cherimola* and *A. muricata*. Treating Agrymicin and Benomyl each 30 min and Sodium hypochlorite(1%) for 15 min recorded zero contamination in pitahaya (Vinas *et al.*, 2012). These findings are consistent with those of Badoni and Chauhan's (2010) tests, Oros *et al.* (2020), Feleket *et al.* (2015) and Nelson *et al.* (2015). Similar findings were found by Bridg (2000) as treating of Sodium hypochlorite (3%) for 15 min with tween 20 as a wetting agent in *A. cherimola* and *A. muricata* recorded aseptic cultures with green explants of 55 per cent. Treating Agrymicin and Benomyl each 30 min and Sodium hypochlorite (1%) for 15 min had least damage (16%) in pitahaya (Vinas *et al.*, 2012). Feleket *et al.* (2015) sterilized nodal explants of peach using Sodium hypochlorite (0.25%) for 15 min found least tissue death (4.71%). Higher treatment of Sodium hypochlorite for 10 and 15 minutes did not significantly differ health from one another and effectively managed contamination (Jaskani *et al.*, 2008).

Negative results for increased exposure time were found in explants. Acheampong *et al.* (2015) found that the length of time in pineapple explants were exposed to Sodium hypochlorite improved sterilisation, but exposures that lasted longer than 20 minutes were harmful to the explants. The increasing exposure duration and concentration of sterilant above certain optimum limit cause loss of explants because of the oxidant chemical ingredient ruin the plant tissues (Danso *et al.*, 2011). These findings are similar of the negative effects of Sodium hypochlorite at high concentration were recorded by Colgecen *et al.* (2011).

Similar results in the present experiment were obtained by Bridg (2000) as treating NaOCl (3%) for 15 min with tween 20 as a wetting agent in *A. cherimola* and *A. muricata* recorded aseptic cultures with 45 per cent bud sprouting. Similarly, Nelson *et al.* (2015) treated buds of pineapple with NaOCl (2%) for 20 min recorded response of 40 per cent. According to Estrela *et al.* (2003) the efficacy of Sodium hypochlorite (2%) increased with longer exposure times. In another study, Sodium hypochlorite was shown to be better with more survived explants, because of their more fragile and sensitive cuticles in mother plants cultivated in greenhouse (Sisko 2011). Sour cherry shoots with axillary winter buds found maximum survival (80%) when treated with Sodium hypochlorite (1%) for 20 min with few drops of tween 20 (Mihaljevic *et al.*, 2013). Feleket *et al.* (2015) sterilized nodal explants of peach using Sodium hypochlorite (0.25%) for 15 min recorded the maximum survival (85.71%). In contrary to above results, longer immersion times and higher Sodium hypochlorite concentrations had a detrimental effect on the seeds, turning them a dark shade of black and lowering their germination rates (Pinto *et al.*, (2010) Garcia *et al.*, 2011).

## V. CONCLUSION

In the present study considering the explants observations and sterilization treatments, T<sub>6</sub> (7 min), T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) and T<sub>8</sub> (9 min) are selected for green nodal explants as highest response, least days for initiation of response, good health with less contamination and moderate survival of explants. Whereas, T<sub>5</sub> (6 min) T<sub>6</sub> (7 min) and T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) are selected for leaf with lower contamination with good health and survivability. Internode was not selected due to no response with higher contamination and less survivability. Brown nodal explants responded very less and less survivability with higher contamination as compared to other explants. Some woody plants have been successfully reproduced *in vitro*, although the development of some species has been hampered by challenges in creating aseptic cultures from mature explants and browning of explants by Abbott (1977) and Barghchi and Alderson (1983).

Considering the sterilization procedure and response of explants of above experiment, green nodal and leaf were the best two explants selected for further experiments. Among sodium hypochlorite (4%) treatment timings T<sub>6</sub> (7 min), T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) and T<sub>8</sub> (9 min) are selected for green nodal explants. Whereas, T<sub>5</sub> (6 min) T<sub>6</sub> (7 min) and T<sub>7</sub> (8 min) are selected for leaf explants (Plate 2 and 3).

Treatment		Contamination of green nodal (%)				Contamination of leaf (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	36.67 (37.26) <sup>a</sup>	53.33 (46.92) <sup>a</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>a</sup>	100.00 (90.00) <sup>a</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	50.00 (45.00) <sup>a</sup>	100.00 (90.00) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	33.33 (35.26) <sup>ab</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>a</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>ab</sup>	83.33 (66.09) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	45.00 (42.13) <sup>b</sup>	55.00 (47.87) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	30.00 (33.20) <sup>bc</sup>	43.33 (41.17) <sup>b</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>bc</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>c</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	41.00 (39.81) <sup>c</sup>	52.00 (46.15) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	26.67 (31.08) <sup>cd</sup>	36.67 (37.26) <sup>c</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>cd</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>d</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	37.50 (37.76) <sup>d</sup>	40.60 (39.58) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	23.33 (28.88) <sup>de</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>d</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>de</sup>	53.33 (46.92) <sup>e</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	26.50 (30.98) <sup>e</sup>	37.00 (37.46) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	20.00 (26.56) <sup>e</sup>	23.33 (28.88) <sup>d</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>ef</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	24.00 (29.33) <sup>ef</sup>	35.25 (36.42) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	13.33 (21.41) <sup>f</sup>	16.67 (24.09) <sup>e</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>fg</sup>	43.33 (41.17) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	22.00 (27.97) <sup>fg</sup>	30.00 (33.21) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	10.00 (18.43) <sup>g</sup>	13.33 (21.41) <sup>ef</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>g</sup>	36.67 (37.26) <sup>g</sup>	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29)	20.50 (26.91) <sup>gh</sup>	25.00 (29.99) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	6.67 (14.59) <sup>h</sup>	10.00 (17.99) <sup>f</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>h</sup>	30.00 (33.10) <sup>g</sup>	0.00 (0.28)	0.00 (0.28)	17.60 (24.69) <sup>h</sup>	20.00 (26.56) <sup>g</sup>
<b>S.Em±</b>		0.70	0.89	1.17	0.90	1.33	1.54	1.85	2.14
<b>LSD at 0.01</b>		2.90	3.67	4.85	3.71	NS	NS	7.64	8.85
<b>CV (%)</b>		4.43	4.712	4.87	3.01	8.15	8.21	7.60	7.10

**Table 1: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on contamination in green nodal and leaf explants of *Annona muricata***

Figures above paranthes is indicate the actual values and figures in paranthesis are arc sine transformed values. Values with the same letter are statistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

Treatment		Contamination of brown nodal (%)				Contamination of internodal (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	66.67 (54.76) <sup>a</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>a</sup>	100.00 (90.00) <sup>a</sup>	36.67 (37.26) <sup>a</sup>	53.33 (46.91) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>a</sup>	100.00 (90.00) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	56.67 (48.84) <sup>b</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>a</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>a</sup>	100.00 (90.00) <sup>a</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>ab</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>a</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>ab</sup>	83.33 (65.91) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	53.33 (46.91) <sup>b</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>b</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>ab</sup>	90.00 (72.15) <sup>b</sup>	30.00 (33.20) <sup>abc</sup>	43.33 (41.17) <sup>ab</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>bc</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	36.67 (37.26) <sup>c</sup>	43.33 (41.17) <sup>b</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>bc</sup>	83.33 (66.09) <sup>b</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>bcd</sup>	36.67 (37.26) <sup>bc</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>cd</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	26.67 (31.08) <sup>d</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>b</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>bc</sup>	53.33 (46.91) <sup>c</sup>	23.33 (28.88) <sup>cde</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>cd</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>cde</sup>	53.33 (46.91) <sup>de</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	20.00 (26.56) <sup>d</sup>	23.33 (28.88) <sup>c</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>bcd</sup>	46.67 (43.07) <sup>cd</sup>	20.00 (26.56) <sup>de</sup>	23.33 (28.88) <sup>de</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>de</sup>	46.67 (43.07) <sup>ef</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	13.33 (20.91) <sup>e</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>cd</sup>	33.33 (34.74) <sup>cd</sup>	43.33 (41.12) <sup>cde</sup>	16.67 (24.09) <sup>e</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>ef</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>ef</sup>	43.33 (41.12) <sup>efg</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	10.00 (17.99) <sup>ef</sup>	13.33 (20.91) <sup>d</sup>	26.67 (30.51) <sup>de</sup>	36.67 (37.17) <sup>de</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>e</sup>	13.33 (20.91) <sup>f</sup>	26.67 (30.51) <sup>fg</sup>	36.67 (37.17) <sup>fg</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	6.67 (14.59) <sup>f</sup>	10.00 (17.99) <sup>d</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>e</sup>	30.00 (32.65) <sup>e</sup>	6.67 (14.59) <sup>f</sup>	10.00 (17.99) <sup>f</sup>	16.67 (23.55) <sup>g</sup>	30.00 (32.65) <sup>g</sup>
<b>S.Em±</b>		1.27	1.49	2.38	2.14	1.33	1.54	1.85	2.14
<b>LSD at 0.01</b>		5.25	6.17	9.83	8.84	5.50	6.37	7.64	8.85
<b>CV (%)</b>		6.63	7.13	9.74	6.43	8.15	8.21	7.60	7.10

**Table2: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on contamination in brown nodal and internodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Figures above paranthes is indicate the actual values and figures in paranthesis are arc sine transformed values. Values with the same letter are satistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

Treatment		Health				Survival (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	+++	+++	++	+	60.00 (51.22) <sup>d</sup>	50.00 (45.03) <sup>e</sup>	33.33 (34.95) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.28) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	+++	+++	++	++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>cd</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>d</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>e</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	+++	+++	++	++	80.00 (63.56) <sup>bc</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>d</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>d</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	+++	+++	+++	+++	80.00 (63.56) <sup>bc</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>cd</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>cd</sup>	53.33 (46.92) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	+++	+++	+++	+++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>ab</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>bc</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>bcd</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	+++	+++	+++	+++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>ab</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	76.67 (61.20) <sup>ab</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	+++	+++	+++	+++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>ab</sup>	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>abc</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>abc</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	+++	+++	+++	+++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>ab</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>a</sup>	76.67 (61.20) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	+++	++	++	++	95.00 (77.08) <sup>a</sup>	90.00 (73.17) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (59.03) <sup>abc</sup>	66.67 (55.03) <sup>bc</sup>
<u>S.Em±</u>						2.08	1.76	1.37	1.31
LSD at 0.01						8.60	7.34	5.65	5.40
CV (%)						5.40	4.96	4.37	4.95

**Table 3: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on health and survival in green nodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Figures above paranthesis indicate the actual values and figures in paranthesis are arc sine transformed values for survival. Values with the same letter are satistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

Treatment		Health				Survival (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	++	++	++	+	60.00 (51.22) <sup>b</sup>	50.00 (45.03) <sup>e</sup>	33.33 (34.95) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.28) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	+++	++	++	+	70.00 (56.83) <sup>b</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>d</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>e</sup>	43.33 (41.17) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	+++	+++	++	+	70.00 (56.83) <sup>b</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>d</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>d</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	+++	+++	++	++	75.00 (60.07) <sup>b</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>cd</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>cd</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	+++	+++	++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>bc</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>bcd</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	+++	+++	++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	76.67 (61.20) <sup>ab</sup>	76.67 (61.20) <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	+++	+++	++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>abc</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	+++	++	+	+	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>a</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	++	++	+	+	95.00 (77.08) <sup>a</sup>	90.00 (73.17) <sup>a</sup>	73.33 (59.03) <sup>abc</sup>	63.33 (52.93) <sup>cd</sup>
<u>S.Em±</u>						1.46	2.13	1.78	1.37
LSD at 0.01						6.04	8.78	7.34	5.65
CV (%)						4.21	5.61	4.96	4.37

**Table 4: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on health and survival in leaf explants of *Annona muricata***



Figures above paranthes is indicate the actual values and figures in paranthes is are arc sine transformed values for survival. Values with the same letter are statistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

Treatment		Health				Survival (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	+++	++	++	+	60.00 (51.22) <sup>c</sup>	56.67 (49.10) <sup>e</sup>	46.67 (43.02) <sup>cd</sup>	0.00 (0.28) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	+++	++	++	+	70.00 (56.83) <sup>bc</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>de</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>cd</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	+++	+++	++	++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>bc</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>de</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>bc</sup>	3.33 (10.52) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	+++	+++	++	++	80.00 (63.56) <sup>ab</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>cd</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>bc</sup>	10.00 (18.43) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	+++	+++	+++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>bc</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>d</sup>	13.33 (21.41) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	+++	+++	+++	+++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>a</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	+++	+++	+++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	70.00 (56.83) <sup>ab</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	+++	+++	+++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	86.67 (68.89) <sup>ab</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>a</sup>	16.67 (23.88) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	+++	++	++	+	90.00 (71.57) <sup>a</sup>	83.33 (66.31) <sup>abc</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>cd</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>f</sup>
S.E.m±						2.11	1.75	1.98	0.85
LSD at 0.01						8.72	7.23	8.17	3.51
CV (%)						5.59	4.91	6.86	8.87

**Table 5: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on health and survival in brown nodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Figures above paranthes is indicate the actual values and figures in paranthes is are arc sine transformed values for survival. Values with the same letter are statistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

Treatment		Health				Survival (%)			
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week
T <sub>1</sub>	0	+++	++	++	+	60.00 (50.77) <sup>c</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>e</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>d</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	+++	+++	++	++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>c</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>de</sup>	36.67 (37.26) <sup>d</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	+++	+++	++	++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>c</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>cd</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>c</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	+++	+++	+++	+++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>c</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>cd</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>b</sup>	40.00 (39.23) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	+++	+++	+++	+++	80.00 (63.56) <sup>b</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>ab</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>ab</sup>	46.67 (43.09) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	+++	+++	+++	++	90.00 (72.15) <sup>a</sup>	80.00 (63.56) <sup>a</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>ab</sup>	50.00 (45.00) <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	+++	+++	+++	++	80.00 (63.56) <sup>b</sup>	76.67 (61.20) <sup>a</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>a</sup>	53.33 (46.92) <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	+++	+++	+++	++	70.00 (56.83) <sup>c</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>bc</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>b</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	+++	+++	++	+	80.00 (64.12) <sup>b</sup>	60.00 (50.98) <sup>cd</sup>	46.67 (43.06) <sup>c</sup>	20.00 (26.37) <sup>f</sup>
S.E.m±						2.13	1.46	1.28	1.22
LSD at 0.01						8.78	6.04	5.27	5.02
CV (%)						5.61	4.21	4.09	4.57

**Table 6: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on health and survival in internodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Figures above paranthes is indicate the actual values and figures in paranthes is are arc sine transformed values for survival. Values with the same letter are statistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

**Table 7: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on initiation of response and days taken for shoot induction in green nodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Treatment		Initiation of response (%)				Days taken for shoot induction
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	
T <sub>1</sub>	0	0.00 (0.29) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>g</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>f</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	6.67 (14.96) <sup>d</sup>	10.00 (18.43) <sup>f</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>e</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>e</sup>	22.67 (4.86) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	10.00 (18.43) <sup>c</sup>	13.33 (21.41) <sup>c</sup>	56.67 (48.84) <sup>c</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>d</sup>	21.00 (4.69) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	13.33 (21.41) <sup>b</sup>	16.67 (24.09) <sup>de</sup>	60.00 (50.78) <sup>bc</sup>	83.33 (66.09) <sup>cd</sup>	18.67 (4.43) <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	10.00 (18.43) <sup>c</sup>	20.00 (26.56) <sup>cd</sup>	63.33 (52.75) <sup>bc</sup>	85.00 (67.21) <sup>bc</sup>	18.00 (4.36) <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	16.67 (24.09) <sup>a</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>a</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>b</sup>	90.00 (71.57) <sup>abc</sup>	14.33 (3.92) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	16.67 (24.09) <sup>a</sup>	26.67 (31.08) <sup>b</sup>	73.33 (58.97) <sup>a</sup>	93.00 (74.66) <sup>ab</sup>	15.33 (4.04) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	13.33 (21.41) <sup>b</sup>	23.33 (28.88) <sup>bc</sup>	66.67 (54.76) <sup>b</sup>	93.33 (77.08) <sup>a</sup>	15.67 (4.08) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	3.33 (10.34) <sup>e</sup>	13.33 (21.22) <sup>ef</sup>	40.00 (39.16) <sup>d</sup>	83.33 (66.04) <sup>cd</sup>	19.00 (4.43) <sup>ab</sup>
S.Em±		0.41	0.67	1.01	1.81	0.13
LSD at 0.01		1.67	2.80	4.16	7.48	0.54
CV (%)		4.12	5.09	4.01	5.30	5.64

Figures above paranthesis indicate the actual values and figures in paranthes are arc sine transformed values for initiation of response and square root transformed values for days taken for shoot induction. Values with the same letter are statistically non-significant at LSD ( $p \leq 0.01$ )



**Table 8: Effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on initiation of response and days taken for shoot induction in brown nodal explants of *Annona muricata***

Treatment		Initiation of response (%)				Days taken for shoot induction
Sodium hypochlorite (4%)	Time (min)	1 <sup>st</sup> week	2 <sup>nd</sup> week	3 <sup>rd</sup> week	4 <sup>th</sup> week	
T <sub>1</sub>	0	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	5	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	6	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7	0.00 (0.29)	16.67 (24.09) <sup>a</sup>	33.33 (35.26) <sup>a</sup>	66.66 (54.74) <sup>a</sup>	24.50 (5.05) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	8	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	9	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	10	0.00 (0.29)	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.28) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (0.29) <sup>b</sup>	0.00 (1.00) <sup>b</sup>
<b>S.Em±</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.01</b>
<b>LSD at 0.01</b>		<b>NS</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.05</b>
<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>5.63</b>	<b>1.47</b>

Figures above paranthesis indicate the actual values and figures in paranthesis are arc sine transformed values for initiation of response and square root transformed values for days taken for shoot induction. Values with the same letter are statistically non-s





**Plate 2: Different types of explants used for *in vitro* propagation of *Annona muricata* (a) green nodal, (b) leaves, (c) brown nodal, (d) internode, effect of exposure time of sodium hypochlorite (4%) on response of green and brown nodal explants; (e), (f) and (g)- initiation of response observed in  $T_8, T_7$  and  $T_6$  (4% NaOCl for 9, 8 and 7 min respectively) in green nodal explants. (h) and (i) initiation of response observed in  $T_6$  (4% NaOCl for 7 min) in brown nodal explants after 30 days of initiation**

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Badoni, A. and Chauhan, J. S., 2010, In vitro sterilization protocol for micropropagation of *Solanum tuberosum* cv. 'Kufri Himalini'. *Academia Arena*, 2(4): 24-27.
- [2]. Bridg, H. H. M., Lindemann, E., Ebert, G. F. and Pohlheim, F. L., 2000, Micropropagation and Determination of the in vitro Stability of *Annona cherimola* Mill. and *Annona muricata* L.
- [3]. Colgecen, H., Koca, U. and Toker, G., 2011, Influence of different sterilization methods on callus initiation and production of pigmented callus in *Arnebia densiflora* Ledeb. *Turk. J. Boil.*, 35: 513-520.
- [4]. Danso, K. E., Azu, E., Elegba, W., Asumeng, A., Amoatey, H. M. and Klu G. Y. P., 2011, Effective decontamination and subsequent plantlet regeneration of sugarcane *Saccharum officinarum* L. in vitro. *Int. J. Integ. Boil.*, 11: 90-96.

- [5]. Eed, A. M., Reddy, A. S., Reddy, K. M., Silva, J. A. T., Reddy, V. P., Beghum, H. and Venkatsubbaiah, P. Y., 2010, Effects of antibiotic and fungicides on the in vitro production of citrus limonia osbeck nodal segment and shoot type explants. *Asian and Aust. J. Plant Sci. Biotechnol.*, 4(1): 66-70.
- [6]. Encina, C. L., Martin, E. C., Lopez, A. A., and Padilla, I. M. G., 2014, Biotechnology applied to Annona species: a review. *Revista Brasileira de Fruticultura*, 36: 17-21.
- [7]. Estrela, C., Ribeiro, R. G., Estrela, C. R., Pecora J. D. and Sousa, N., M. D., 2003, Antimicrobial effect of 2% sodium hypochlorite and 2% chlorhexidine tested by different methods. *Braz. Dent. J.*, 14(1): 58-62.
- [8]. Felek, W., Mekibib, F. and Admassu, B., 2015, Optimization of explants surface sterilization condition for field grown peach (*Prunus persica* L. Batsch. cv. garnem) intended for in vitro culture. *Afr. J. Biotechnol.*, 14(8): 657-660.
- [9]. Garcia, R., Pacheco, G., Falcao, E., Borges, G. and Mansur, E., 2011, Influence of type of explants, plant growth regulators, salt composition of basal medium, and light on callogenesis and regeneration in *Passiflorasuberosa* L. (Passifloraceae), *Plant Cell Tissue Organ Cult.*, 106: 47–54.
- [10]. George, E. F., Hall, M. A. and Declerk, G. J., 2008, Mass propagation and essential oil analysis of *Artemisia vulgaris*. *J. Biosci. Bioeng.*, 105: 176- 183.
- [11]. Jaskani, M. J., Abbas, H., Khan, M. M., Qasim, M. and Khan, I. A., 2008, Effect of growth hormones on micropropagation of *Vitisvinifera* L. cv. Perlette. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 40(1): 105.
- [12]. Krikorian, A. D., 1962, Cloning higher plants from aseptically cultured tissues and cells. *Biotechnol. Rev.*, 57: 157-181.
- [13]. Mihaljevic, I., Dugalic, K., Tomas, V., Viljevac, M., Pranjic, A., Cmelik, Z. and Jurkovic, Z., 2013, In vitro sterilization procedures for micropropagation of Oblacinska sour cherry. *Journal of agricultural sciences, Belgrade*, 58(2): 117-126.
- [14]. Nakagawara, S, Goto, T., Nara, M., Ozawa, Y., Hotta, K. and Arata, Y., 1998, Spectroscopic characterization and the pH dependence of bactericidal activity of the aqueous chlorine solution. *Anal. Sci.*, 14: 691–698.
- [15]. Nelson, B. J., Asare, P. A. and Junior, R. A., 2015, In vitro growth and multiplication of pineapple under different duration of sterilization and different concentrations of benzylaminopurine and sucrose. *Biotechnology*, 14(1): 35-40.
- [16]. Odutayo, O. I., Amusa, N. A., Okutade, O. O., Ogunsanwo, Y. R., 2007, Sources of microbial contamination in tissue culture laboratories in southwestern Nigeria. *Afr. J. Agric.*, 2: 067-072.
- [17]. Oros, P. B., Catana, C. and Cantor, M., 2020, Contamination control of invitro cultures of passiflora species for multiplication purpose. *Int. J. Innov. Appr. Agric.*, 4: 488-496.
- [18]. Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V., 1967, Statistical methods of agricultural workers. 2nd endorsement. ICAR Publication, New Delhi, India, 381.
- [19]. Pinto, D. L. P., Almeida, B. B., Viccini, L. F., Campos, J. M. S., Silva, M. L. and Otoni, W. C., 2010, Ploidy stability of somatic embryogenesis-derived *Passiflora cincinnata* Mast. plants as assessed by flow cytometry, *Plant Cell, Tissue Organ Cult.*, 10: 371-379.
- [20]. Rady, I., Bloch, M. B., Chamcheu, R. C. N., Banang M, S., Anwar, M. R., Mohamed, H. and Chamcheu, J. C., 2018, Anticancer properties of graviola (*Annonamuricata*): A comprehensive mechanistic review. *Oxid. Med. Cell. Longev.*
- [21]. Santana, J. R. F. D., Paiva, R., Aloufa, M. A. I. and Lemos, E. E. P., 2003, Efficiency of ampicillin and benomyl at controlling contamination of Annonaceae leaf segments cultured in vitro. *Fruits*, 58(4): 357-361.
- [22]. Sisko, M., 2011, In vitro propagation of Gisela 5 (*Prunus cerasus* × *Prunus canescens*). *Agricultura*, 8: 31 34.
- [23]. Tiwari, S., Arya, A. and Kumar, S., 2012, Standardizing sterilization protocol and establishment of callus culture of sugarcane for enhanced plant regeneration in vitro. *Res. J. Bot.*, 7:1-7.
- [24]. Vinas, M., Fernandez, B. M., Azofeifa, A., and Jimenez, V. M., 2012, In vitro propagation of purple pitahaya (*Hylocereuscostaricensis* [FAC Weber] Britton & Rose) cv. Cebra. *In Vitro Cell. Dev Boil.*, 48(5): 469-477