

Table S1. Physicochemical characterization of five different cultivars of mango samples

Cultivars	JM	QM	GF	HY	TN
TA(g/100g)	4.96±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	8.20±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	6.93±0.02 <sup>d</sup>	9.01±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	7.30±0.01 <sup>c</sup>
TSS ( <sup>o</sup> Brix)	12.38±0.12 <sup>e</sup>	14.81±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	16.02±0.20 <sup>c</sup>	17.91±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	16.54±0.12 <sup>b</sup>
pH	4.99±0.02 <sup>a</sup>	4.66±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	4.86±0.02 <sup>b</sup>	4.50±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	4.82±0.02 <sup>b</sup>
L	50.38±0.13 <sup>c</sup>	49.74±0.07 <sup>b</sup>	51.44±0.05 <sup>a</sup>	51.70±0.03 <sup>d</sup>	61.76±0.14 <sup>cd</sup>
a	4.64±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	-0.67±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	4.80±0.02 <sup>b</sup>	5.10±0.07 <sup>c</sup>	6.56±0.11 <sup>a</sup>
b	38.51±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	30.64±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	36.88±0.08 <sup>e</sup>	40.57±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	55.61±0.12 <sup>d</sup>
Total Sugar content (g/g d.w.)	8.43±0.05 <sup>e</sup>	10.18±0.25 <sup>d</sup>	14.81±0.07 <sup>c</sup>	17.23±0.22 <sup>a</sup>	14.97±0.12 <sup>b</sup>
Reducing sugar content (g/g d.w.)	5.84±0.26 <sup>c</sup>	3.83±0.08 <sup>e</sup>	5.09±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	6.66±0.03 <sup>b</sup>	7.17±0.21 <sup>a</sup>
β-carotene (mg/g d.w.)	0.44±0.08 <sup>b</sup>	0.28±0.02 <sup>d</sup>	0.28±0.04 <sup>e</sup>	0.32±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	0.81±0.01 <sup>a</sup>
TPC (mg GAE/g d.w.)	18.05±0.05 <sup>a</sup>	10.84±0.55 <sup>c</sup>	14.48±0.09 <sup>e</sup>	10.83±0.05 <sup>b</sup>	25.43±0.52 <sup>d</sup>
DPPH Scavenging activity (mg Vc/100g)	1.86±0.12 <sup>e</sup>	0.74±0.08 <sup>c</sup>	1.65±0.06 <sup>d</sup>	1.07±0.04 <sup>b</sup>	2.46±0.11 <sup>a</sup>

JM: Jinmang cultivar; QM: Qingmang cultivar; GF: Guifei cultivar; HY: Hongyu cultivar; TN: Tainong cultivar. The mean and standard deviation (n=3) were calculated for three replicates. Values in total data with different letters are significantly different (p < 0.05).

Table S2. Statistical analysis for flavor attributes of five varieties mango samples.

Cultivars	JM	QM	GF	HY	TN
overall aroma	1.85±0.88 <sup>d</sup>	1.55±0.44 <sup>e</sup>	2.00±0.66 <sup>c</sup>	2.10±0.55 <sup>b</sup>	2.4±0.39 <sup>a</sup>
tropical fruit	1.75±0.75 <sup>c</sup>	1.8±0.67 <sup>b</sup>	1.8±0.48 <sup>b</sup>	1.85±0.41 <sup>a</sup>	1.75±0.35 <sup>c</sup>
floral	1.35±0.82 <sup>d</sup>	1.40±0.61 <sup>c</sup>	1.55±0.69 <sup>a</sup>	1.45±0.64 <sup>b</sup>	1.2±0.42 <sup>e</sup>
honey/sweet	1.7±0.54 <sup>c</sup>	1.4±0.7 <sup>d</sup>	1.95±0.57 <sup>a</sup>	1.85±0.67 <sup>b</sup>	1.65±0.41 <sup>c</sup>
green	0.65±0.34 <sup>d</sup>	0.85±0.53 <sup>c</sup>	0.95±0.55 <sup>b</sup>	0.65±0.47 <sup>d</sup>	1.45±0.55 <sup>a</sup>
melon	0.9±0.52 <sup>d</sup>	1.4±0.66 <sup>b</sup>	1.55±0.55 <sup>a</sup>	1.15±0.24 <sup>c</sup>	1.55±0.6 <sup>a</sup>
wood	1.1±0.21 <sup>d</sup>	1.1±0.52 <sup>d</sup>	1.4±0.52 <sup>b</sup>	1.2±0.42 <sup>c</sup>	1.6±0.52 <sup>a</sup>
rosin	1.5±0.47 <sup>b</sup>	1.4±0.7 <sup>c</sup>	1.3±0.54 <sup>d</sup>	1.1±0.46 <sup>e</sup>	1.75±0.35 <sup>a</sup>

JM: Jinmang cultivar; QM: Qingmang cultivar; GF: Guifei cultivar; HY: Hongyu cultivar; TN: Tainong cultivar. The mean and standard deviation (n=10) were calculated for three replicates. Values in total data with different letters are significantly different (p < 0.05)