Mutation Breeding in Fruit Crops: Historical Milestones, Technological Advances, and Practical Applications

Ronak Kuri[1*]; Santosh Kumar Jakhar[2]; Naresh Kumar[3]; Santosh Choudhary[4]; Mahesh Kumar Poonia[5]

[*1]Ph.D. scholar Department of Horticulture, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan 342304, India.
[2]Master's Scholar, Department of Animal Science, Palli Siksha Bhavana (Institute of Agriculture) Visva-Bharati Sriniketan, West Bengal, India
[3]Ph.D. scholar Department of Agronomy, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan 342304, India.
[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan 342304, India.
[5]Professor, Department of Horticulture, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan 342304, India.
*Corresponding Author

Received:- 18 April 2025/ Revised:- 27 April 2025/ Accepted:- 30 April 2025/ Published: 05-05-2025

Abstract— *Mutation breeding offers an effective strategy for the genetic improvement of fruit crops, particularly those hindered by long juvenile phases, complex reproductive barriers, or limited genetic variability. By inducing heritable changes using physical (e.g., gamma rays, X-rays, ion beams) or chemical (e.g., EMS, sodium azide) mutagens, desirable traits can be introduced without disrupting the overall genetic integrity of elite cultivars. Historically, mutation breeding began in the early 20th century and has since led to the official release of over 3,000 improved crop varieties worldwide. Key achievements include the development of disease-resistant, seedless, dwarf, and early-maturing cultivars in species such as Japanese pear, guava, papaya, and banana. The use of in vitro techniques like somatic embryogenesis and cell suspension cultures has enhanced mutation efficiency, especially in vegetative propagated crops, by reducing chimerism and allowing high-throughput screening. Recent advancements such as TILLING, EcoTILLING, and insertional mutagenesis (via T-DNA and transposons) enable precise gene targeting and rapid identification of mutant alleles. Molecular markers and tissue culture-based selection techniques further accelerate the breeding cycle and improve selection accuracy. Success in mutation breeding depends on factors such as optimal mutagen dose, treatment duration, tissue sensitivity, and genotype. Strategic integration of traditional mutation techniques with modern biotechnological tools has greatly improved the ability to develop superior fruit cultivars with enhanced tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses, improved quality, and better adaptability. Mutation breeding thus remains a valuable approach in sustainable fruit crop improvement.*

Keywords— Mutation breeding; Fruit crop improvement; Induced mutagenesis; In vitro techniques; Molecular markers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Genetic improvement plays a crucial role in enhancing the productivity of fruit crops (Rugini et al., 2020). However, tree fruit breeding faces several challenges, including extended juvenile periods, the lack of suitable germplasm, and the typically large size of the trees. Additionally, controlled breeding in many fruit crops is hindered by issues like delayed flowering, poor fruit setting due to abortive embryos, and significant fruit drop. Even when successful fruit varieties exist, they often come with various agronomic and horticultural challenges. One of the key methods in improving fruit trees is harnessing genetic variation, whether natural or induced. When desirable traits are absent in existing cultivated varieties or when a high-yielding variety is compromised by genetic defects, such as disease susceptibility, mutation breeding can be an effective solution. This approach is especially useful in cases where there is a strong linkage between beneficial and undesirable traits. Moreover, in fruit crops where sexual reproduction is absent, or the breeding cycle is exceptionally long, induced mutations can help generate new variability and break the limitations posed by these factors (Sattar et al., 2021). One notable obstacle in fruit breeding is the reluctance of growers to adopt new varieties, which limits the potential of cross-breeding. In addition, specific challenges such as polyploidy, incompatibility, and apomixis can make it difficult to obtain useful recombinants. Mutation breeding, however,

offers an efficient alternative by inducing changes in specific traits of an elite cultivar without disrupting the broader characteristics demanded by the fruit industry and consumers.

Mutations refer to heritable changes in the phenotype of an organism, caused by chemical alterations at the genetic level (Nei, 2007). These alterations can lead to new heritable traits in plants, which can be selected for and utilized in developing new crop varieties with improved characteristics. The frequency of mutations can be increased by using various mutagens, and these mutations are referred to as induced mutations. A mutant variety is a new plant variety that results from mutagenesis or somaclonal variation. Mutant varieties can be developed in different ways:

1. Direct use of a mutant line, which is generated through mutagenesis or somaclonal variation.
2. Indirect use of a mutant line, where the mutant serves as a parent in cross-breeding programs.
3. Use of a specific mutant gene or allele, which imparts a desired trait.
4. Utilization of genes from wild species, which are introduced into the plant's genome through irradiation or mutagen-induced translocations.

Mutation breeding is particularly beneficial in overcoming the constraints of conventional breeding methods, enabling faster development of improved fruit varieties with desirable traits.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PLANT MUTATION BREEDING

The concept of plant mutations dates back to as early as 300 BC, with ancient records from China mentioning unusual variations in cultivated crops. However, the scientific understanding of mutations as a mechanism of generating variability began to take shape in the late 19th century, thanks to the pioneering work of Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries (Theunissen, 1998). While studying evening primrose (*Oenothera*), de Vries observed sudden and heritable changes in plants that could not be explained by the traditional Mendelian concepts of segregation and recombination. He described these abrupt, inheritable changes as "mutations," a term he introduced to the scientific community, laying the foundation for mutation theory in genetics. The practical application of mutation breeding gained momentum with the discovery of the mutagenic effects of X-rays, a breakthrough attributed to Lewis J. Stadler in the 1920s. Stadler's experiments demonstrated that exposure to X-rays could artificially induce mutations in plant genomes, thereby expanding the potential for creating genetic diversity beyond natural limits. The first successful commercial application of this technique was achieved in 1934 with the development of a mutant tobacco variety. This milestone marked the beginning of mutation breeding as a practical plant improvement strategy. From the 1950s onward, the use of mutagenesis—particularly through radiation—became widespread in global breeding programs. During this period, a wide array of crops, including cereals, legumes, vegetables, and ornamentals, were treated with physical (e.g., gamma rays, X-rays) and chemical mutagens (e.g., EMS, sodium azide) to induce variability in traits such as disease resistance, plant stature, yield, maturity, and quality.

The success of mutation breeding lies in its ability to create precise genetic changes without significantly altering the overall genetic background of elite cultivars. This characteristic makes it especially attractive for crops where conventional hybridization is limited by biological or agronomic constraints. To date, more than 3,300 officially released mutant varieties have been recorded worldwide, with significant contributions to food security, crop resilience, and nutritional improvement (FAO/IAEA Mutant Variety Database). Mutation breeding has thus evolved from a theoretical genetic concept into a robust and targeted tool in modern crop improvement programs (Oladosu *et al*., 2016).

III. MUTAGENESIS IN CROP IMPROVEMENT

Induced mutagenesis has emerged as a pivotal tool in the genetic enhancement of crop plants, especially in fruit crops where traditional breeding is limited by biological constraints (Oladosu et al., 2016). Through the application of physical or chemical mutagens, breeders have been able to generate novel genetic variations that contribute to the development of superior cultivars. The major applications of induced mutations in crop improvement include:

1. Development of improved cultivars with traits such as earliness, higher yield, and better quality.
2. Induction of male sterility, facilitating hybrid seed production.
3. Production of haploids, enabling homozygous lines for breeding.
4. Creation of genetic variability in otherwise uniform cultivars.

5. Overcoming self-incompatibility, improving pollination and fruit set.
6. Enhancement of adaptation, including stress tolerance and wide adaptability.

TABLE 1
NOTABLE MUTANT TRAITS DEVELOPED IN MAJOR FRUIT CROPS THROUGH INDUCED MUTAGENESIS

Fruit	Mutant Traits Developed	Fruit	Mutant Traits Developed
Apple	Early maturity, red skin color, compact tree, russet-free fruit skin, variegated leaf	Loquat	Larger fruit size
Pear	Resistance to diseases	Pomegranate	Dwarf plant stature
Peach	Increased fruit size and yield, disease resistance	Papaya	Dwarfness
Citrus	Seedlessness, red pigmentation in fruit and juice	Japanese Pear	Disease resistance
Apricot	Early maturity	Indian Jujube	Early maturity, fruit shape variation
Plum	Early flowering	Banana	Earliness, improved bunch size
Pineapple	Spineless variants	Apricot (again)	Earliness

(Source: Jain, 2002)

3.1 Fruit Crops with High Potential for Mutation Breeding:

The following fruit crops have shown considerable scope for genetic improvement through induced mutation techniques:

TABLE 2
POTENTIAL FRUIT CROPS FOR GENETIC IMPROVEMENT VIA INDUCED MUTATION BREEDING

Fruit Crop	Target Traits for Improvement
Mango	Disease resistance, flavour improvement, stress tolerance, amenability to in vitro techniques
Date Palm	Bayoud disease resistance, creation of favorable microclimates in semi-arid regions
Coconut	Improvement as a staple in coastal and island ecosystems
Cashew	Higher yield, abiotic stress tolerance, better kernel quality
Avocado	Rootstock resistance to *Phytophthora* root rot
Papaya	Short cropping duration, resistance to papaya ringspot virus, delayed ripening
Citrus spp.	Seedlessness, disease resistance, water-use efficiency, compatibility with molecular breeding
Carambola	Compact plant habit, sub-acid flavor, self-compatibility
Jujube	Better fruit quality, early blooming, resistance to diseases, color and shape variants
Guava	Early flowering, seedlessness, tolerance to abiotic and biotic stresses
Annona spp.	Dwarf plants, extended shelf-life, fewer or smaller seeds
Litchi	Smaller seeds, extended harvest period
Banana	Resistance to nematodes and *Black Sigatoka* disease

(Source: Jain, 2002)

Mutation breeding, particularly when integrated with tissue culture, molecular marker-assisted selection, and genomic tools, can accelerate the development of elite varieties. Advances in technologies like CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing, TILLING (Targeting Induced Local Lesions IN Genomes), and genome-wide mutation screening have further refined the precision and applicability of induced mutations in perennial fruit crops (Singh et al., 2024). These approaches help in tailoring specific traits without disturbing the overall genetic makeup and consumer acceptance of established cultivars.

IV. PROCEDURE OF MUTATION BREEDING

Mutation breeding involves three primary types of mutagenesis:

1. **Induced Mutagenesis** – Mutations caused by exposure to physical agents like gamma rays, X-rays, ion beams, or chemical mutagens.

2. **Site-Directed Mutagenesis** – Specific changes introduced at target DNA sequences.
3. **Insertional Mutagenesis** – Genetic alterations via DNA insertions using methods such as T-DNA transformation or activation of transposable elements (Oladosu et al., 2016).

A critical step in this process is mutant screening and confirmation. Screening helps identify individuals with the desired mutations, while confirmation ensures the exclusion of false positives (Oladosu et al., 2016).

4.1 Mutagenic Agents:

Mutagens are broadly classified as:

- Physical Mutagens (e.g., gamma rays, X-rays, ion beams)
- Chemical Mutagens (e.g., EMS, sodium azide)

Mutation induction can be performed on various plant materials including seeds, seedlings, and in vitro cultured tissues. While seeds are traditionally used, modern techniques increasingly employ vegetative propagules and explants like leaf discs, stem pieces, calli, anthers, microspores, ovules, and protoplasts for inducing mutations.

Chemical mutagens are often preferred for creating point mutations. Physical mutagens are used to induce larger genetic changes like chromosomal rearrangements. Notably, mutation frequency and type depend more on the dose and exposure duration than the mutagen type.

4.2 Physical Mutagenesis:

Physical mutagens offer precise and reproducible results, especially gamma rays due to their uniform tissue penetration (Oladosu et al., 2016).

Commonly, the LD_{50} dose (lethal dose for 50% of the treated population) is used, but this may cause high mortality and overshadow useful mutations. A more practical approach is using lower lethality doses (e.g., LD_{20}) that ensure better survival (up to 80%), improving the chances of retaining beneficial mutants.

4.3 Chemical Mutagenesis:

Chemical mutagens generally act more gently and do not require sophisticated equipment.

These are effective in generating a higher ratio of desirable mutations compared to physical mutagens. However, they often pose health hazards (e.g., carcinogenicity), necessitating strict safety measures. Factors such as mutagen concentration, treatment duration, and temperature influence the efficiency of chemical mutagenesis (Kodym and Afza, 2003). Due to their high reactivity, it is essential to use freshly prepared solutions of chemical mutagens.

TABLE 3
COMMONLY USED PHYSICAL MUTAGENS

Mutagen	Source	Key Characteristics	Hazard Level
X-rays	X-ray machine	Electromagnetic radiation; penetrates several mm to cm into tissues	Dangerous, penetrating
Gamma Rays	Radioisotopes (^{60}Co, ^{137}Cs)	Deeply penetrating electromagnetic radiation from isotopes or nuclear reactors	Very dangerous, highly penetrating
Neutrons	Reactors or accelerators	Uncharged particles (fast, slow, thermal); deep tissue penetration	Extremely hazardous
Beta Particles	Radioisotopes (^{32}P, ^{14}C)	Ionizing electrons; shallow penetration	Potentially hazardous
Alpha Particles	Radioisotopes	He nuclei; strong ionization; minimal penetration	Very dangerous
Protons	Nuclear reactors/accelerators	Hydrogen nuclei; penetrate several cm into tissues	Very dangerous
Ion Beam	Particle accelerators	High-speed ions (20–80% speed of light); high energy deposition	Dangerous

(Source: Oladosu et al., 2016)

TABLE 4
COMMONLY USED CHEMICAL MUTAGENS

Mutagen Type	Examples	Mode of Action
Alkylating Agents	EMS, MMS, DMS, MNU, ENU, DES, MNNG, NDMA, NDEA	Add ethyl/methyl groups to DNA bases, causing mispairing or base loss leading to mutations
Azide	Sodium azide	Similar to alkylating agents
Hydroxylamine	Hydroxylamine	Similar to alkylating agents
Antibiotics	Actinomycin D, mitomycin C, azaserine, streptonigrin	Induce chromosomal aberrations; may cause cytoplasmic male sterility
Nitrous Acid	Nitrous acid	Deaminates cytosine to uracil, leading to transition mutations
Acridines	Acridine orange	Intercalate into DNA, causing frame-shift mutations by distorting DNA helix
Base Analogues	5-BU, 2AP, Maleic hydrazide, 5-BdU	Mimic normal bases, cause base transitions and tautomeric shifts during DNA replication

(Source: Oladosu et al., 2016)

V. TYPES OF MUTATIONS

Mutations can be broadly categorized into the following types based on their location and nature:

5.1 Intragenic or Point Mutations:

These occur within a single gene, involving changes in the DNA sequence such as base substitutions, deletions, or insertions (Zhang and Gerstein, 2003). When insertions or deletions are not in multiples of three nucleotides, they cause frame-shift mutations, which can significantly disrupt gene function by altering the reading frame. Even the insertion or deletion of a single base pair can render a gene non-functional.

5.2 Intergenic or Structural Mutations (Chromosomal Rearrangements):

These involve larger-scale changes in chromosome structure and typically result from chromosome breakage and incorrect rejoining (Lu et al., 2025). Ionizing radiation is a common cause of such mutations. Structural mutations are classified into:

- **Deletions (Deficiencies)**: Loss of chromosome segments; often lethal but can also disrupt specific biochemical pathways.
- **Duplications**: Repetition of chromosome segments; have played a significant role in the evolution of diploid crops.
- **Inversions**: A chromosome segment is reversed end-to-end (180° rotation); common in crop genomes.
- **Translocations**: Exchange of segments between non-homologous chromosomes; frequently observed in plant breeding.

Approximately 90% of chromosomal aberrations induced by ionizing radiation are deletions, many of which lead to lethality (Pathirana, 2011).

5.3 Genome Mutations (Changes in Chromosome Number):

These mutations involve alterations in the entire set or number of chromosomes. They are primarily of three types:

- **Autopolyploidy**: Multiple sets of chromosomes derived from the same species.
- **Allopolyploidy**: Combination of genomes from different species through interspecific or intergeneric hybridization followed by chromosome doubling.
- **Aneuploidy**: Loss or gain of one or a few chromosomes, leading to an unbalanced genome.

5.4 Nuclear vs. Extranuclear (Plasmone) Mutations:

Mutations can also be classified based on their genetic location:

- Nuclear mutations affect the DNA within the chromosomes in the nucleus.
- Extranuclear (Plasmone) mutations occur in organelles such as mitochondria and chloroplasts, and can influence traits like cytoplasmic male sterility.

VI. NEW METHODS FOR MUTATION INDUCTION

Over the past two decades, rapid advancements in in vitro plant tissue and cell culture techniques have significantly enhanced the efficiency of mutation breeding, especially in vegetatively propagated crops such as *banana* and *Citrus* spp. (Pathirana, 2011). These methods offer several key advantages:

- High-throughput mutant production in limited space.
- Controlled laboratory screening for stress-related traits like salt tolerance, resistance to toxic elements, or fungal toxins.
- Pre-selection of promising mutants prior to field trials, reducing time and resources.
- Elimination of chimeras through successive subcultures in clonal crops.

Such protocols have been successfully standardized for important crops like banana, facilitating the generation and evaluation of large mutant populations under controlled conditions.

6.1 Insertional Mutagenesis:

Insertional mutagenesis serves as a powerful approach for generating targeted mutants, particularly for functional genomics studies, as the induced mutations are tagged with known DNA sequences. Two major techniques are employed:

1. T-DNA Insertion: Utilizes *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* to introduce T-DNA fragments into plant genomes. These are considered genetically modified organisms (GMOs) due to the presence of foreign DNA (Gelvin, 2017).

2. Transposon Tagging: Relies on mobile genetic elements (transposons) naturally present in the plant genome. When activated, transposons move to new genomic locations, creating mutations. This method is increasingly utilized in mutation breeding as a non-GMO tool for gene disruption and trait discovery (Ben-Amar et al., 2016).

VII. RECENT ADVANCES IN MUTATION BREEDING

Modern biotechnological advancements have significantly enhanced the efficiency and precision of mutation breeding, especially in fruit crops. Techniques such as tissue culture and molecular biology are now being effectively combined with conventional breeding to create, identify, and propagate desirable mutations (Jain, 2002).

Biotechnological Tools: Somatic embryogenesis; Somaclonal variation; Micropropagation & micrografting; Cryopreservation of embryogenic cultures; In vitro selection under stress; Somatic hybridization and Embryo rescue.

7.1 In Vitro Mutagenesis:

Using in vitro techniques for mutation induction offers several advantages: Allows mutation in a large number of propagules within limited space. Enables repeated subcultures to separate mutated from non-mutated tissues. Somatic embryogenic cultures derived from a single cell reduce chimerism risk. Budwood or seeds may be irradiated if somatic embryogenesis delays flowering. Multiple grafting cycles help overcome any residual chimerism.

7.2 In Vitro Selection of Mutants:

This approach involves applying selection pressure (e.g., salt, phytotoxins) on irradiated cultures (callus, protoplasts, or cell suspensions). Regenerated plants are then screened in greenhouse or field conditions.

- Example: Strawberry mutants showing resistance to *Phytophthora cactorum*.
- Molecular markers are used to confirm genetic changes.

TABLE 5
IN VITRO MUTAGENESIS IN VEGETATIVELY PROPAGATED CROPS

Crop	Treated Material	Mutagen & Dose	Regeneration	Selected Traits
Banana	Shoot tips	Carbon-ion beam (0.5–128 Gy)	Direct regeneration	Disease resistance
Banana	Shoot tips	γ-rays (60 Gy)	Direct regeneration	Earliness (Mutant: Novaria)
Banana (var. Lakatan, Latundan)	Shoot tips	γ-rays (25–40 Gy)	Direct regeneration	Dwarfism, larger fruit size
Pineapple (var. Queen)	Crowns	γ-rays	Axillary bud regeneration	Reduced spine density
Pear	In vitro shoots	γ-rays (3.5 Gy)	Shoot microcuttings	Changes in russeting, fruit size, tree architecture

TABLE 6
SELECTABLE AGRONOMIC TRAITS IN CELL CULTURES

Trait	Selection Agent
Disease resistance	Pathotoxins / Crude toxins / Culture filtrates
Herbicide tolerance	Herbicides
Salt tolerance	High NaCl / Seawater
Metal tolerance	Toxic metal concentrations
Cold tolerance	Exposure to low temperatures
Drought tolerance	Polyethylene glycol (PEG) / High osmoticum
Enhanced amino acid content	Amino acid analogues or high doses
Flooding tolerance	Anaerobic growing conditions

(Source: Suprasanna et al., 2015)

TABLE 7
DNA MARKERS FOR GENETIC VARIATION ANALYSIS

Category	Marker Types
Genomic DNA (Restriction-based)	RFLP (Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism)
PCR-based Markers	RAPD, SCAR, SSR, EST-SSR, ISSR, SNP, SRAP, ASAP, VNTR, STS
PCR + Restriction Combination	AFLP (Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism), CAPS
Array-based Markers	DArT (Diversity Array Technology), Microarray, Bead Array

VIII. STRATEGIES FOR MITIGATING DRAWBACKS IN MUTATION INDUCTION IN FRUIT CROPS

While mutation breeding offers great potential, especially in vegetatively propagated and perennial fruit crops, it faces several technical challenges. These include low mutation efficiency, chimerism, and the difficulty of obtaining homozygous recessive mutants. However, strategic integration of cellular, tissue culture, and molecular biology tools can help overcome these limitations (Mba et al., 2013).

8.1 Cellular and Tissue Biology Strategies

One of the primary issues in induced mutation breeding is the low efficiency and quality of mutant populations. In vegetatively propagated crops, chimerism—where only part of a plant carries the mutation—is a major hurdle. Furthermore, because many beneficial mutations are recessive, achieving homozygosity is essential for trait expression. Several in vitro culture systems, such as cell suspensions and somatic embryogenesis, have shown promising results in overcoming these challenges.

8.2 Somatic Embryogenesis:

Somatic embryogenesis, which involves regenerating whole plants from single cells, offers a solution to both chimerism and low mutation frequency. The process begins with the proliferation of undifferentiated callus, which is then induced into embryogenic cells. These are exposed to mutagens, and due to the totipotency of plant cells, complete plants are regenerated

from these single cells. As each regenerated plant originates from a single mutated cell, they are free from chimerism. This method has been successfully used to produce mutant banana lines (Mba et al., 2013).

8.3 Rapid In Vitro Multiplication:

In cases where somatic embryogenesis is not feasible or validated, rapid multiplication systems using meristematic tissues offer an alternative. Although this method doesn't achieve the same level of homozygosity or chimera-free plants as somatic embryogenesis, repeated cycles of regeneration and subculture help to segregate chimeras. A notable success using this method is the development of the mutant banana cultivar 'Novaria', through shoot tip irradiation and subsequent in vitro multiplication (Mba et al., 2013).

8.4 Molecular Biology Strategies:

Molecular tools enhance the precision and efficiency of mutation detection and selection. Techniques like TILLING (Targeting Induced Local Lesions IN Genomes) allow high-throughput detection of mutations in specific genes, reducing reliance on time-consuming field trials. Though these tools may not always confirm the phenotypic expression of a mutation, they greatly streamline the screening process. Additionally, various molecular markers are routinely used to identify and track mutations and genetic variation in germplasm collections (Jain et al., 2021).

IX. BIOTIC STRESS RESISTANCE: A SUCCESSFUL EXAMPLE

One of the early and successful applications of mutation breeding in fruit crops was in Japanese pear (Pyrus serotina var. culta). In the 1960s, Japanese scientists used chronic gamma irradiation on the highly susceptible cultivar 'Nijisseiki' to develop a resistant mutant 'Gold-Nijisseiki' against black spot disease caused by *Alternaria alternata*. Following this, other susceptible cultivars such as 'Shinsui' and 'Osa-Nijisseiki' were also improved via mutation breeding, leading to resistant lines 'Kotobuki-Shinsui' and 'Osa-Gold'. Notably, 'Osa-Gold' is self-compatible, removing the requirement for additional pollinizer trees in orchards—a major commercial advantage (Pathirana, 2011). Moreover, mutation breeding has contributed to the development of salinity and drought-tolerant lines in citrus, addressing major abiotic stresses in fruit production systems.

X. ACHIEVEMENTS OF MUTATION BREEDING

Mutation breeding has proven to be a powerful tool in the genetic improvement of fruit crops, leading to the development of several commercially valuable traits. Noteworthy improvements include disease resistance in Japanese pear and peach, seedlessness in citrus and guava, dwarf plant types in papaya and pomegranate, and early fruiting in crops like banana, apricot, jujube, plum, and apple. These traits significantly enhance the agronomic and commercial value of cultivars. The success of mutation breeding is closely linked to the careful selection of appropriate technologies for inducing mutations and selecting desirable mutants. With the integration of modern plant tissue culture and molecular biology techniques into conventional breeding frameworks, the generation of new genetic variants has become more targeted and efficient. The application of mutation techniques has introduced vast genetic diversity, contributing not only to plant breeding but also to the fields of genetics and genomics. Globally, the widespread implementation of mutation breeding has led to the release of thousands of improved varieties across a broad range of crops, translating into billions of dollars in added agricultural revenue. The FAO/IAEA's Mutant Variety Database (MVD) maintains detailed records of officially released mutant cultivars worldwide. These records include data on the type and dose of mutagen used, traits improved, and where available, related agronomic information. According to this database, as of December 2016, a total of 3,246 mutant varieties had been officially released. A mutant variety, as recognized in the MVD, may result from the direct use of a line developed via chemical or physical mutagenesis, somaclonal variation, or activation of endogenous transposable elements; or from its indirect use as a parent in cross-breeding programs. In some cases, genes from wild species have been introduced into cultivated genomes through radiation-facilitated translocations (Viana et al., 2019).

XI. NEW TECHNIQUES FOR MUTATION INDUCTION, SCREENING, AND UTILIZATION

Recent advances have greatly expanded the scope and accuracy of mutation breeding. Novel methods for inducing mutations now include exposure to space flight conditions, high-energy ion irradiation, and the activation of transposable elements. Additionally, techniques such as site-directed mutagenesis using restriction endonucleases and homologous recombination have enabled more precise genetic modifications. These innovations are supported by molecular approaches that improve the screening and utilization of mutant lines. A major breakthrough in this area is the development of TILLING (Targeting Induced Local Lesions IN Genomes), a high-throughput and cost-effective reverse genetics method that allows for the identification of mutations at the DNA level. A related technique, EcoTILLING, has been adapted for detecting natural nucleotide

polymorphisms. The use of DNA markers tightly linked to desired traits has further enhanced the efficiency of selection through marker-assisted breeding. These molecular tools are essential for tracking and confirming mutations and reducing the need for large-scale field trials. Ultimately, combining mutation induction with gene sequencing and molecular marker technologies opens up new possibilities for developing cultivars with improved nutrient uptake, enhanced root systems, and tolerance to abiotic and biotic stresses. This will be critical in advancing sustainable agriculture in the face of climate variability and resource constraints (Oladosu et al., 2016; Ma et al., 2021).

XII. PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN INDUCED MUTAGENESIS

Achieving success in mutation breeding requires careful attention to technical parameters and biological variables. The dose of a mutagen that produces the highest frequency of desirable mutations with the least collateral damage is considered optimal. For physical mutagens such as gamma rays or ion beams, this is typically determined by conducting radio sensitivity tests and estimating the lethal dose for 50% of the treated population (LD_{50}). In many fruit crops, LD_{50} values have been standardized under in vitro conditions to guide effective treatment protocols. For chemical mutagens, several factors influence the outcome, including the freshness and stability of the solution, concentration of the mutagen, exposure time, treatment temperature, and the condition of the target tissue. Other influential parameters include the presence of catalytic ions such as Cu^{2+} and Zn^{2+}, pH (commonly maintained near 7.0), and pre- and post-treatment handling methods. Similarly, in the case of physical mutagens, environmental conditions such as oxygen levels, moisture content, and temperature, as well as the physical state of the tissue (presence of dust, fibers, or microbial contaminants), can affect mutation efficiency and plant survival. In general, while the specific steps and responses may vary between sexually and asexually propagated crops, certain fundamental principles apply across systems. These include a clear understanding of the genetic background and reproductive biology of the target crop, the selection of appropriate propagation materials, knowledge of chromosome number and genetic lineage, careful choice of mutagen and dose, and the availability of infrastructure for screening and selection. It is also essential to employ effective methods for detecting and separating stable mutants from chimeric tissues. A strategic combination of these considerations enhances the reliability and success rate of induced mutagenesis in fruit crop improvement programs (Roychowdhury and Tah, 2013).

XIII. CONCLUSION

Mutation breeding has emerged as a powerful and precise tool for the genetic improvement of fruit crops, especially where, conventional breeding faces biological and logistical limitations. Over the decades, its application has led to the development of improved cultivars with traits such as disease resistance, dwarfism, seedlessness, and early maturity. The integration of modern biotechnological advancements—like in vitro mutagenesis, molecular markers, and TILLING—has significantly enhanced the efficiency and accuracy of mutant selection. Additionally, innovative screening techniques and strategic use of tissue culture have overcome major challenges such as chimerism and low mutation efficiency in vegetatively propagated crops. As climate change and resource constraints demand more resilient and productive cultivars, mutation breeding will continue to play a crucial role in developing stress-tolerant, high-yielding, and consumer-preferred fruit varieties. The future lies in combining classical mutagenesis with genomics, precision breeding tools, and sustainable agricultural practices to ensure long-term food and nutritional security.

REFERENCES

[1] Ben-Amar, A., Daldoul, S., Reustle, G. M., Krczal, G., & Mliki, A. (2016). Reverse genetics and high throughput sequencing methodologies for plant functional genomics. *Current Genomics, 17*(6), 460–475.

[2] Gelvin, S. B. (2017). Integration of *Agrobacterium* T-DNA into the plant genome. *Annual Review of Genetics, 51*(1), 195–217.

[3] Jain, S. M. (2002). A review of induction of mutations in fruits of tropical and subtropical regions. *Acta Horticulturae, 575*, 295–302.

[4] Kodym, A., & Afza, R. (2003). Physical and chemical mutagenesis. In *Plant functional genomics* (pp. 189–203). Humana Press.

[5] Lu, B., Winnall, S., Cross, W., & Barnes, C. P. (2025). Cell-cycle dependent DNA repair and replication unifies patterns of chromosome instability. *Nature Communications, 16*(1), 3033.

[6] Ma, L., Kong, F., Sun, K., Wang, T., & Guo, T. (2021). From classical radiation to modern radiation: Past, present, and future of radiation mutation breeding. *Frontiers in Public Health, 9*, 768071.

[7] Nei, M. (2007). The new mutation theory of phenotypic evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104*(30), 12235–12242.

[8] Oladosu, Y., Rafii, M. Y., Abdullah, N., Hussin, G., Ramli, A., Rahim, H. A., Miah, G., & Usman, M. (2016). Principle and application of plant mutagenesis in crop improvement: A review. *Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment, 30*(1), 1–16.

[9] Pathirana, R. (2011). Plant mutation breeding in agriculture. *CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutrition and Natural Resources, 6*(032), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1079/PAVSNNR20116032

[10] Roychowdhury, R., & Tah, J. (2013). Mutagenesis—A potential approach for crop improvement. In *Crop improvement: New approaches and modern techniques* (pp. 149–187). Springer.

[11] Rugini, E., Bashir, M. A., Cristofori, V., Ruggiero, B., & Silvestri, C. (2020). A review of genetic improvement of main fruit trees through modern biotechnological tools and considerations of the cultivation and research of the engineered plant restrictions. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 57*(1).

[12] Sattar, M. N., Iqbal, Z., Al-Khayri, J. M., & Jain, S. M. (2021). Induced genetic variations in fruit trees using new breeding tools: Food security and climate resilience. *Plants, 10*(7), 1347.

[13] Singh, D., Chaudhary, P., Taunk, J., Singh, C. K., Chinnusamy, V., Sevanthi, A. M., Singh, V. J., & Pal, M. (2024). Targeting induced local lesions in genomes (TILLING): Advances and opportunities for fast-tracking crop breeding. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology, 44*(5), 817–836.

[14] Theunissen, B. (1998). The scientific and social context of Hugo de Vries' *Mutationstheorie*. *Acta Botanica Neerlandica, 47*(4), 475–490.

[15] Viana, V. E., Pegoraro, C., Busanello, C., & Costa de Oliveira, A. (2019). Mutagenesis in rice: The basis for breeding a new super plant. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 10*, 1326.

[16] Zhang, Z., & Gerstein, M. (2003). Patterns of nucleotide substitution, insertion and deletion in the human genome inferred from pseudogenes. *Nucleic Acids Research, 31*(18), 5338–5348.