



**FARMERS' KNOWLEDGE TO THE EFFECT OF CHEMICALS IN MANGO  
PRODUCTION: A CASE STUDY IN CHAPAINAWABGANJ**

*Mithun Kumar Ghosh , Md. Shawkat Zaman , Md. Maruf Raihan, Md. Jahangir Alom , and  
Suravy Yeasmin Setu*

**To cite the article:** Mithun Kumar Ghosh , Md. Shawkat Zaman , Md. Maruf Raihan, Md. Jahangir Alom , and  
Suravy Yeasmin Setu (2019). Farmers knowledge to the effect of chemicals in mango production: a case study in  
Chapainawabganj *South Asian Journal of Development Research*, 1(1): 124-133

**Link to this article:** <http://aiipub.com/journals/fsajdr-190930-021027/>

**Article QR**



**Journal QR**



## FARMERS' KNOWLEDGE TO THE EFFECT OF CHEMICALS IN MANGO PRODUCTION: A CASE STUDY IN CHAPAINAWABGANJ

Mithun Kumar Ghosh<sup>1</sup>, Md. Shawkat Zaman<sup>2</sup>, Md. Maruf Raihan<sup>2</sup>,  
Md. Jahangir Alom<sup>2</sup>, Suravy Yeasmin Setu<sup>2</sup>

[\\*mithunbsmrau88@yahoo.com](mailto:*mithunbsmrau88@yahoo.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

**Article Type:** Short communication

**Received:** 29, Sep. 2019.

**Accepted:** 30, Sep. 2019

**Published:** 30, Sep. 2019

### Keywords:

*Mango Cultivation, Knowledge, Mango Growers, Chemicals, Effects*

### ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to assess the present scenario of chemical uses during the cultivation period of mango in Shibganj Upazila and Nawabganj Sadar Upazila in Chapainawabganj district. A total number of 40 mango growers were randomly selected and interviewed by pre-structured questionnaires from December 2018 to January 2019. The data were collected with respect to their age, educational level, cultivating land, times and types of chemicals used, and farmer's consciousness about the excessive use of chemicals in mango. Out of the 40 mango growers, about 80% were under middle-aged category, 6 were illiterate which accounts almost 15%, 8 had primary education, 14 had secondary education, 4 had higher secondary education and 8 (20%) had higher education. Around 0.13-1.33 ha of land was used by 16 (40%) mango growers for cultivation followed by 1.47-2.67 ha by 55% and more than 2.67 ha by 5% of the respondents. Twelve insecticides and twenty-three fungicides under different trade name were most commonly sprayed at 3, 5, and even more than 10 times in the stage of before flower bud initiation, mango flowering, marble-size mango, and finally till ripening stages. Most importantly, 34 (85%) showed medium knowledge and 6 (15%) had high knowledge about the chemicals, environment, health, pest management, production technology, the harmful effect of chemicals in plants and beneficial effects of chemicals in mango production. Farmers were found highly dependent on chemicals for pest management.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Mango is one of the major fruits of Asia and this fruit has its own importance all over the world. It is one of the most delicious and nutritious fruits in the world. Mango belongs to the dicotyledonous family Anacardiaceae and genus *Mangifera* which contains 69 species; from them almost all the commercial cultivars of mango are included in single species *Mangifera indica*. Mango is a cross-pollinated allopolyploid crop having chromosome number  $2n=40$ . It is grown in many subtropical and tropical countries around the world like India, Brazil, Pakistan, Mexico, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, China and Bangladesh.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, EXIM Bank Agricultural University Bangladesh, Chapainawabganj

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Agriculture, EXIM Bank Agricultural University Bangladesh, Chapainawabganj

Mango is one of the most important tropical fruits of the world and is called as “king of fruits”. It is grown more than 85 countries in the world (Takele, 2014). Bangladesh is one of the major mango producing countries (Alexander, 1989). In Bangladesh, it covers an area of 37,830 hectares of land with a yearly production of 11, 61,685 metric ton (BBS, 2016; Sultana *et al.* 2018).

The rank of Bangladesh in mango production is third among the tropical fruits grown in the world with total production at nearly 35,000,000 tons (FAO, 2009). Furthermore, its mango rank is second in terms of area and occupies the third position in production among the fruits grown in Bangladesh (Kobra *et al.*, 2012). The leading mango growing districts are Nawabganj, Rajshahi, Rangpur, Dinajpur and Kushtia. In the year 2010-2011, Bangladesh produced around 1.05 millions of tons of mango (UN FAOSTAT, 2011). It is the leading seasonal cash crop of the northwestern region of Bangladesh and dominates the economy in Chapainawabganj and Rajshahi district. About 85% people of the mentioned districts are directly or indirectly rely on mango cultivation and business (Dhaka Tribune, 2018).

However, Chapainawabganj district is the largest mango cultivated area in Bangladesh. The major cultivar commercially grown under Chapainawabganj are Khirsapati, Langra, Fajli, Awsshina etc. Most of the agricultural lands of this district are occupied by mango orchards. Chapainawabganj alone produced almost 152,285 MT of mangoes on 44,430 hectares of land (BBS, 2015).

The total area of this district is 1702.64 square Km, where 42263 acres are used for mango cultivation and 224764 metric tons’ mango is produced per year (District Statistics, 2011), which contribute 23.78% of the Bangladesh total production. The mango is the most delicious and nutritious fruits in the world. However, attack by insects/pests is one of the most important hurdles in the massive production of mango. Insect pests and diseases not only reduce the yield but also sometimes account for a complete crop failure (Alam SN, 2011). Considering the above fact, toxic synthetic chemical pesticides have widely been used in Bangladesh to reduce the early fall out of mangoes and to increase the yield. However, pesticides are often used indiscriminately and frequently at a very high concentration without knowing the actual purpose of the pesticide being applied. Mango production knowledge and technological gaps of smallholder farmers are common in many countries (Dessalegn *et al.*, 2014). Consequently, the surrounding environment is polluted which also has an adverse effect on human health. Moreover, pesticide adulteration by wholesalers and retailers is a growing concern of many mango growers who are unsure whether insects are becoming more insecticide-resistant or insecticides are being adulterated to the point of ineffectiveness. In most cases, mango growers use pesticides in their fields based on recommendations and advice from their local pesticide dealers. However, the dealers, in general, are not expert personnel. The control of insect attack and fungal diseases are the emerging issues to protect premature mango fall out not only in Chapainawabganj district but also in all over the country. The insect and fungal attack play a negative role in the low yield and poor quality mango production. Mango can be attacked by a plethora of insect pests, however, mango hoppers, fruit fly, mango leaf cutting weevil, mango fruit borer etc. are also considered as the major constraints of low yield mango production. In the present study, a survey on mango cultivation has been conducted in Chapainawabganj Sadar Upazila & Shibganj Upazila of Chapainawabganj district which is the largest mango production area of Bangladesh. Therefore, the objectives of the present research were

- To list down the chemicals used in the study area; and
- Farmers’ knowledge to the effects of chemicals used in mango production.

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **2.1. Study Area**

The study was conducted in Nawabganj Sadar upazila & Shibganj Upazila of Chapainawabganj district. However, the study was in Haripur, Jadupur (two villages in Nawabganj Sadar upazila) and Birahimpur, Mordona, Satrajitpur, Choytonnopur, Mohispur, Chokkirtti, Shampur, Bonkul, Moharajpur, Mobarakpur, Kansat, Bissonathpur, Komlakantopur villages in Shibganj Upazila. A total 40 mango growers were selected randomly from the Sadar Upazila and Shibganj Upazila of the district.

### **2.2. Study Procedure**

The mango growers were asked face to face interview and structured questionnaire was used in this study. The quality of interview and collected data were evaluated to ensure completeness and consistency. Incomplete and inconsistent data were corrected by re-visit and re-examine the relevant mango growers. Mango growers were asked to answer, how many times they had sprayed insecticides and fungicides in each stage, such as two, three, four, five or more than five times, and name of chemicals they use. To determine the knowledge of mango growers, 21 questions were asked regarding the chemicals, environment, health, pest management, production technology, the harmful effect of chemicals in plants, beneficial effect of chemicals in mango production. Each question contains 2 marks; they are marked (0-2) marks according their answer. We categories the knowledge into three groups, Low (up to 22 marks), Medium (23-30), High (above 30). The doses and safety awareness are the prerequisites for applying insecticides/fungicides. The consciousness about the side effects and health hazards of insecticides/fungicides or any other chemicals were assessed among the mango grower and another person through questionnaire.

### **2.3. Characteristics of Mango Growers**

Mango growers were categorized into three groups. One is based on their age (categorized as young, middle and old), level of education, which was further subdivided into five groups such as illiterate (0), primary (class 1-5), secondary (class 6-10), higher secondary (class 11-12), and above higher education. The other one is based on the land that used for mango cultivation, which was subdivided into three such as small (0.13-1.33 ha), medium (1.47-2.67 ha) and large (above 2.67 ha). Extension contact was also measured as yes, no and partly groups.

## **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **3.1. Selected Characteristics of the Farmers**

The characteristics of the farmers were selected to find out their relationship with knowledge regarding the chemicals, environment, health, pest management, production technology, the harmful effect of chemicals in plants, beneficial effect of chemicals in mango production. The farmer's characteristics were age, education, farm size, extension contact. The results on the selected characteristics with the farmers are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that 35% of the farmers were young, 45% were middle-aged, and 20% were old. Out of the 40 mango growers, 6 were illiterate which accounts almost 15%, 8 had primary education which accounts almost (20%), 14 had secondary education which accounts almost (35%), 4 had higher secondary which accounts almost (10%), and 8 had higher education (20%). Around 0.13-1.33 ha of land was used by 16 (40%) mango growers for cultivation followed by 1.47-2.67 ha by 22 (55%) and more than 2.67 ha by 2 (5%). Only 2 (5%) have extension contact, while 20 (50%) have no contact and 18 (45%) have partial contact.

### **3.2. Use of pesticides in the study area**

Mango is a very vulnerable fruit to be attacked by various insects and fungus. Therefore,

recommended insecticides and fungicides spray is necessary to control insect and fungus to get better production of mango. These insecticides and fungicides spray started from mango flower (bud) until mango harvest. The mango growers frequently spray insecticides and fungicides in different stages of mango maturation without following any standard recommendations. As can be seen in table 2.

**Table 1. Salient features of the respondents with their characteristics**

| Variable          | Measuring unit    | Categories                    | Farmers |    |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------|----|
|                   |                   |                               | No.     | %  |
| Ages              | Actual year       | Young(up to35)                | 14      | 35 |
|                   |                   | Middle(36-50)                 | 18      | 45 |
|                   |                   | Old(above50)                  | 08      | 20 |
|                   |                   | Illiterate(0)                 | 06      | 15 |
| Education         | Year of schooling | Primary(class 1-5)            | 08      | 20 |
|                   |                   | Secondary(class 6-10)         | 14      | 35 |
|                   |                   | Higher secondary(class 11-12) | 04      | 10 |
|                   |                   | Above higher                  | 08      | 20 |
|                   |                   | Small(0.13-1.33)              | 16      | 40 |
| Farm size         | Hectare           | Medium(1.47-2.67)             | 22      | 55 |
|                   |                   | Large(Above2.67)              | 02      | 05 |
|                   |                   | Yes                           | 02      | 05 |
| Extension contact | Scale score       | No                            | 20      | 50 |
|                   |                   | Partly                        | 18      | 45 |

**Table 2. List of registered agricultural pesticides used by farmers in the study area**

| SL. NO. | Trade Name of Products | Recommended Pests     | Dosage rate/ha (ml/l/gm/kg) | Dosage used by farmer rate/ha (ml/l/gm/kg) |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 01      | Sulphur 80 WP          | Powdery mildew, Mites | 1.25 g/L of water           |  |
| 02      | Kumulus DF             | Powdery mildew, Mites | 2.00 kg                     | 0.1 g/l                                    |
| 03      | Thiovit 80 WG          | Powdery mildew, Mites | 2.25 kg                     | 1-8 g/l                                    |
| 04      | Rover 80 WG            | Red spider mites      | 2.25 kg                     |  |
| 05      | Sayon 80 WG            | Red spider mites      | 2.25 kg                     |  |
| 06      | Goldvit 80 WDG         | Powdery mildew        | 2 g/L of water              |  |
| 07      | Amistar Top            | Anthracoze            | 1 ml/L of water             | 0.5-1 ml/L                                 |
| 08      | Rai 325 SC             | Early blight          | 2 ml/L of water             | 1-2 ml/L                                   |
| 09      | Bavistin DF            | Wilt                  | 500 g                       | 1 g/L                                      |

|    |                          |   |                   |            |
|----|--------------------------|---|-------------------|------------|
| 10 | Knowin 50 WP             | Anthracnose   | 1 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 11 | Aimcozim 50 WP           | Red rust  | 750 g             | 1 g/L      |
| 12 | Nayan 50 WP              | Anthracnose   | 1 g/L of water    | 1 g/L      |
| 13 | Goldazim 500 SC          | Powdery mildew                                      | 1 g/L of water    | 1 g/L      |
| 14 | Ecozim 50 WP             | Powdery mildew                                      | 1 g/L of water    | 1 g/L      |
| 15 | Cuptun 50 WP             | Rust  | 1 g/L of water    | 1 g/L      |
| 16 | Curate 50 WP             | Blight  | 2 g/L of water    | 1 g/L      |
| 17 | Corozeb 80 WP            | Blight  | 2 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 18 | Kusum 80 WP              | Blight  | 2 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 19 | Ridomil Gold MZ<br>68 WG | Blight  | 2 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 20 | Tilt 250 EC              | Anthracnose & Powdery<br>mildew                     | 0.5 ml/L of water | 0.5 ml/L   |
| 21 | Antracol 70 WP           | Die back, Black rot, Grey<br>brown blight, Red rust | 2 kg/L of water   | 2.5-5 g/L  |
| 22 | Nativo 75 WP             | Anthracnose   | 0.5 g/L of water  | 0.5-7 g/L  |
| 23 | Trooper 75 WP            | Anthracnose   | 2 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 24 | Sevin 50 WP              | Hopper  | 4 g/L of water    | 2 g/L      |
| 25 | Ripcord 10 EC            | Hopper  | 1 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 26 | Fencord 10 EC            | Shoot fruit borer &<br>Fruit fly                    | 2 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 27 | Typer 10 EC              | Hopper  | 1 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 28 | Decis 2.5 EC             | Shoot & fruit borer                                 | 1 ml/L of water   | 1-4 ml/L   |
| 29 | Tiddo 20 SL              | Termites  | 7 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 30 | Gain 20 SL               | Termite   | 1.00 L            | 1-1.5 ml/L |
| 31 | Confidor 70 WG           | Hopper  | 2 g/L of water    | 1 ml/L     |
| 32 | Karate 2.5 EC            | Hopper  | 1 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 33 | Fighter 2.5 EC           | Hopper  | 1 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 34 | Kick 2.5 EC              | Aphid   | 1 ml/L of water   | 1 ml/L     |
| 35 | Actara 25 WG             | BPH   | 60 g              | 0.1 g/L    |

Twelve insecticides and twenty-three fungicides under different trade names were most commonly sprayed at 3, 5, and even more than 10 times in the stage of before flower bud initiation, mango flowering, marble-size mango, and finally till ripening stages. The most commonly used some fungicides like Nativo, Antracol, Theovit, Seven powder, Amistar Top, Knowing etc. and Insecticides like Decis, Gain, Ripcord, Karate, Actara etc.

### 3.3. Use of growth regulator in the study area

**Table 3. List of registered Plant Growth Regulator (PGR) used by farmers**

| SL. NO. | Trade Name of Products | Name of Registration Holder | Dosage rate/ha (ml/l/gm/kg) | Dosage used by farmer rate/ha (ml/l/gm/kg) | Effectiveness                |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| 01      | Cultar                 | Syngenta                    | 250 g/l                     | 100 g/l                                    | Growth Retardants            |
| 02      | Protozim               | Syngenta                    |                             | 2 ml/l                                     | Prevent immature fruit drops |
| 03      | Flora                  | ACI Crop Care               |                             | 3 ml/l                                     | Growth Regulator             |
| 04      | Mirakulan              | Auto Crop Care Limited      | 0.5-1 ml/l                  | 1 ml/l                                     | Growth Regulator             |
| 05      | Biovit                 | Sweet Agrovet Limited       | 2 ml/l                      | 2 ml/l                                     | Growth Regulator             |

Data contained in table 3 indicated that most of the farmers in the study area used Cultar in soil or in direct xylem of the root by removing the phloem in the month of August. It is growth retardants. Though it is not permitted by the govt. of Bangladesh but farmers use it secretly. As the price of Cultar is very high (10000 tk/l), farmers use it in underdose. Farmers also used other PGR like Flora, Protozim, Biovit, Mirakulan etc. after 40-50 days of fruit setting, which increase fruit weight, size and prevent premature fruit drops and Cracking.

To produce flower, a bud should enough mature about 7-8 months. If the majority percent of bud produce three times new shoot; it will not get enough time for maturation to produce flower. To control this phenomenon farmers (30%) used Cultar in the month of August as a growth retardant which enhances profuse flowering even flower come out from stem. Which also overcome alternate bearing. We found that farmers used under dose of Cultar. As it is not registered by Bangladesh government, they collected it top secretly and do not follow the proper application method. They used it in direct xylem of root by removing the phloem. But repeated phloem removing from root in several years hamper the natural healing process. If the large roots fail to heal the removed phloem or microbial pathogenic rotting occur, the root suffers in food deficiency for long run and finally certain portion of a tree or whole tree dies. If severe surface root pruning occurs for intercultural operation, it also harmful to the feeder root to the surface of the plant. Satyendra Singh Narvariya and C.P. Singh (2018) found cultar is most commonly used for the induction of flowering in off season, control tree vigour for HDP (canopy management), increase fruit set and yield, improve fruit quality when applied to the soil but has the drawback of relatively high persistence in both soil and fruit in mango. This is alarming issue for the owner of the orchard, but not concerning issue to the grower who leases the orchard for a certain period. If the Cultar uses increase continuously in every year, the growth is drastically reduced for plant.

### 3.4. Spraying of chemicals

**Table 4. Number of sprays to the mango trees during production**

| Insecticide or fungicide sprayed before flower bud initiation | Farmers |    | No. of spray        |
|---|---------|----|---------------------|
|   | No.     | %  |                     |
|   | 28      | 70 | 2                   |
|   | 10      | 25 | 1                   |
|   | 2       | 5  | 0                   |
| On the inflorescence before flower opening                    | No.     | %  | No. of spray        |
|   | 12      | 30 | 2                   |
|   | 24      | 60 | 1                   |
|   | 4       | 10 | 0                   |
| Applied chemical in marble size mango setting                 | No.     | %  | Days after interval |
|   | 22      | 55 | 10                  |
|   | 12      | 30 | 15                  |
|   | 6       | 15 | 20                  |
| Applied PGR & Micronutrient after 40-50 days of fruit setting | No.     | %  | No. of spray        |
|   | 28      | 70 | 1-2 times           |
|   | 12      | 30 | 0 times             |
| After marble size to till ripening                            | No.     | %  | No. of application  |
|   | 22      | 55 | 3-5                 |
|   | 12      | 30 | 6-8                 |
|   | 6       | 15 | >8                  |
| Using Cultar on the soil                                      | No.     | %  | Yes or No           |
|   | 12      | 30 | Yes                 |
|   | 28      | 70 | No                  |

Table 4 explains that the mango growers frequently sprayed insecticides and fungicides in different stages of mango maturation. As can be seen in Table, at the stage of before flower bud initiation 70% mango growers sprayed 2 times, 25% sprayed 1 time and 5% growers did not spray. At the stage of the inflorescence before flower opening, 30% mango growers sprayed insecticides/fungicides for 2 times, 60% sprayed for 1 time and 10% never sprayed. Applied chemical in marble size mango setting 22 (55%) mango growers sprayed insecticides/fungicides 10 days' intervals, 12 (30%) mango growers sprayed insecticides/fungicides 15 days' intervals and 6 (15%) mango growers sprayed 20 days interval. Application of PGR & Micronutrient after 40-50 days' fruit setting 28 (70%) growers used 1-2 times, 12 (30%) growers used 0 times spray. After marble size to till ripening, 55% growers used 3-5 times, 30% used 6-8 times and 15% growers used more than 8 times application. Out of 40 growers, 12 (30%) used Cultar and 28 (70%) growers did not use it.

### 3.5. Knowledge of the mango growers to chemicals

Data presented in table 4 indicated that Most 85% of the respondents had medium knowledge with 15% having high knowledge about the chemicals, environment, health, pest management, production



technology, harmful effect of chemicals in plants and beneficial effect of chemicals in mango production. The mean was 29.18.

**Table 5. Knowledge of the respondents to different chemicals**

|  | Measuring unit | Categories      | Farmers |    | Mean |
|--|----------------|-----------------|---------|----|------|
|  | Scale score    | Low (up to 22)  | No.     | %  |      |
|  |                |                 |         | 00 | 00   |
|  |                | Medium (23-30)  | 34      | 85 |      |
|  |                | High (above 30) | 6       | 15 |      |

Now a day's intensive agriculture becomes popular in our country day by day. According to their mango variety and age of the plant, they use fertilizer in the soil like NPK (8-10 kg/ large tree and 2-4 kg/ medium tree), Boron, Magnesium etc. for better yield and growth of plant. They apply all fertilizer in soil after harvesting of mango in the month of august, as natural rainfall occur no irrigation needed. As mango plant does not show quick response in organic manure, so, farmers are not interested to use the organic manure in the soil.

Mango plant prefers dry and cool weather and less moisture during flower bud initiation but we found that before flowering, farmers applied irrigation one time in January and then according to the environmental condition they further irrigated in March and April up to 3-4 times in total mango production period by ring method.

Farmers had medium knowledge regarding the chemicals used for pest management. Pesticide company does not provide information on their product packet regarding the harmful effect of chemicals in plants. So, farmers do not have any knowledge of the harmful effect of chemicals in plants if overdoses used.

Farmers were less aware of their health during spray operation, they only used face mask, long shirt, long pant and cap for their protection to chemical exposer. They were unknown about the suitable part of the day for spray, they sprayed morning to evening as they hire the laborer for whole day. They did not dispose the pesticide container or packets while throwing to the open field.

They received consultation about the pesticides from the retailers and neighbors. As a result, they mistake proper selection of pesticide which also used for other crops like (Cereals and Vegetables) and applies same group pesticide under different trade name which causes economic losses and increases cost of production.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

- Majority of the respondents were middle age, about half of them had below secondary education, around 90% had small to medium farm size and most of them did not have extension contact.
- Cultar was most frequently used among 35 chemicals found in the study area including Flora, Protozim, Biovit, Mirakulan etc.
- Most of the mango growers showed medium knowledge about the chemicals, environment, health, pest management, production technology and harmful effect of chemicals.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author was grateful to the students of Faculty of Agriculture, EXIM Bank Agricultural University

Bangladesh (EBAUB) for their amiable assistance to make the current research successful as well as thankful to authorities of EBAUB.

#### REFERENCES

1. Alam, SN. (2011). Insect pest management for quality horticultural crop production in Bangladesh. HORTEX NEWSLETTER, Vol. 11, No. 2.
2. Alexander, DMCE. (1989). The mango in Australia, Common-wealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Australia, pp. 1-28.
3. BBS (2015). Year Book of Agricultural statistics of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Bureau of Stat. Div. Ministry plan. Gov. people's Repub. Bangladesh. pp. 199-200.
4. BBS (2016). Year Book of Agricultural statistics of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Bureau of Stat. Div. Ministry plan. Gov. people's Repub. Bangladesh. pp. 202-203.
5. Dessalegn, Y., Assefab, H., Dersoc, T., Tefera, M. (2014). Mango Production Knowledge and Technological Gaps of Smallholder Farmers in Amhara Region, Ethiopia. American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences, vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 28-39.
6. Dhaka Tribune (2018a), Mango plays vital role in improving livelihood in Rajshahi, The Dhaka Tribune, June 3, 2018.
7. District Statistics (2011). Chapainawabganj, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), Statistics and Information Division (SID), Ministry of Planning, Government of The People's Republic of Bangladesh.
8. FAO (2009). Production Yearbook. Statistical series No. 142. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy, pp. 163.
9. Kobra, K., Hossain, MA., Talukder, MAH., Bhuyan, MAJ. (2012). Performance of twelve mango cultivars growing in different agro-ecological zones of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Agriculture Research. Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 691-710.
10. Takele, H. (2014). Review of mango value chain in Ethiopia, Journal of biology, agriculture and health care, vol. 4, pp. 230239.
11. UN FAOSTAT (2011). Statistics from: Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nations: Economic and Social Development: The Statistical Division. UN Food and Agriculture Organization Corporate Statistical Database.
12. Satyendra Singh Narvariya and Singh, C.P. (2018). Cultar (P333) a Boon for Mango Production – A Review. Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci. 7(02): 1552-1562.
13. Sultana, A., Chowdhury, M. F. Pervez, A.K.M.K. (2018). Present status of mango cultivation in Bangladesh: case of Shibgonj upazilla of Chapainawabgonj district, Journal of Agricultural and Rural Research, 2(3): 47-55.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).