

Volume 9 | Issue 1 | June, 2018 | 21-27 Visit us: www.researchjournal.co.in International Journal of Processing and Post Harvest Technology

**R**ESEARCH **P**APER

DOI: 10.15740/HAS/IJPPHT/9.1/21-27

# Physico-chemical changes of *Kujithekera* (*Garcinia cowa* Roxb.) fruit during storage

# **S**. Dutta<sup>1</sup> and M. Neog<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Horticulture, Assam Agricultural University, **Jorhat (Assam) India** <sup>2</sup>Directorate of Extension Education, Assam Agricultural University, **Jorhat (Assam) India** 

\*Author for Correspondence

**Research chronicle : Received :** 15.12.2017; **Revised :** 17.05.2018; Accepted : 25.05.2018

## SUMMARY:

*Kujithekera* (*Garcinia cowa* Roxb), commonly known as Cowa is a sub-tropical minor fruit grows well in Assam. Fruits are juicy having sub-acid taste and suitable for preparation of jam and pickles, sundried slices given in dysentery as medicine. An attempt was made to understand the changes in physico-chemical qualites of *Kujithekera* fruit during storage at ambient temperature (Mean temp 29.8°C, Mean RH 79.6%) for 6 days at an interval of two days. The physico-chemical changes of the fruit during storage using five different treatments were studied. There was significant increase in physiological loss in weight with advancement of storage period. The bio-chemical qualities of the treated fruits like TSS, crude protein, fat, ash were found to decrease significantly with the advancement of storage period. The fruits treated with 1 per cent wax emulsion retained the highest TSS, both in pulp and peel on 6 days after storage. The fruit pulp qualities like crude protein, fat, ash, total phenl were almost same in wax coated fruits and CaCl<sub>2</sub> treated fruits on 6 days after storage.

KEY WORDS : Kujithekera, Garcinia cowa Roxb, Physico-chemical, Wax emulsion

How to cite this paper : Dutta, S. and Neog, M. (2018). Physico-chemical changes of *Kujithekera (Garcinia cowa* Roxb.) fruit during storage. *Internat. J. Proc. & Post Harvest Technol.*, **9** (1) : 21-27. DOI: 10.15740/ HAS/IJPPHT/9.1/21-27. Copyright@ 2018: Hind Agri-Horticultural Society.

Kujithekera (Garcinia cowa Roxb), commonly known as Cowa belongs to the family Clusiaceae is one of the important indigenous fruits of Assam. Fruits are globose but slightly tapering and somewhat oblique towards the apex, dull red outside and orange inside when ripe. Fruits are juicy having sub-acid taste and suitable for preparation of jam and pickles. Garcinia is the source for a natural diet ingredient hydroxycitric acid (HCA) which is an anti obesity compound and is known to inhibit lipid and fatty acid synthesis in living

systems.Information on physico-chemical changes in *Kujithekera* fruit across storage is lacking. The present study was undertaken to study the physico-chemical changes of *Kujithekera* fruit during storage.

# EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

*Kujithekera (Garcinia cowa* Roxb.) belongs to the family Clusiaceae is an evergreen middling sized tree with an oval crown and dark brown green foliage. Fruits are drupe, globuse but slightly tapering and somewhat oblique

towards apex, dull red outside, orange inside when ripe, 4-6 seeded crowned by the persistent stigma. Fruits are juicy having sub-acid taste. *Kujithekera* fruits of uniform maturity, size and colour were harvested from the experimental Orchard, Department of Horticulture, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat.

The harvested fruits were subjected to various post harvest treatments and the treated fruits were packed in perforated (0.2% ventilation) LDPE (100 gauge) bags and kept at ambient conditions  $(29.8 \pm 1.1^{\circ}C, RH 79.6 \pm$ 3%). The treatment regimes included: T<sub>1</sub>: Dipping the fruits in 100 ppm sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) solution for 5 min, air dried and packed, T<sub>2</sub>: Dipping the fruits in 2 per cent calcium chloride (CaCl2) solution for 5 min, air dried and packed,  $T_3$ : Dipping the fruits in 1 per cent wax emulsion for 5 min, air dried and packed,  $T_A$ : Fruits kept in an open tray without packaging and chemical treatment, T<sub>5</sub>: Fruits packed without any chemical treatment. In all the treatments except T<sub>5</sub>, The experiment was carried out under Factorial Completely Randomized Design with 4 replications. Physico-chemical qualities were analysed at 3 days interval upto 9 days.

# Moisture content:

The moisture content of the selected fruit species was determined by using moisture analyzer (A.O.A.C, 1999).

#### Physiological loss in weight (PLW):

The PLW was determined using the following formula (Song and Kumar, 1995) and the results were expressed in percentage.

$$PLW(\%) = \frac{\text{Initial weight} - \text{Final weight}}{\text{Initial weight}} x100$$

# **Titratable acidity :**

The titrable acidity (TA) of the fresh juice was estimated by volumetric method (AOAC, 2000).

#### **TSS-acid ratio:**

The TSS-acid ratio was calculated by dividing the total soluble solid (TSS) by titrable acidity of the respective fruit sample.

pH:

The pH of the flesh juice was determined by a glass electrode pH meter.

#### **Crude protein :**

The total nitrogen was estimated by Micro-Kjeldahl (A.O.A.C., 1965).

$$Total nitrogen (\%) = \frac{(a - b) x normality x 14 x}{yalume made up x100}$$
  
g of sample x aliquot taken

where,

a = Volume (ml) of standard acid required for the sample

b = Volume (ml) of standard acid required for the blank.

The volume of total nitrogen content was multiplied by a factor 6.25 to attain the value of crude protein content. The estimation of crude protein content was thus expressed in percentage.

## **Crude fat:**

The crude fat as ether extract was determined from oven dried sample using a Soxhlet apparatus (A.O.A.C., 1980).

Crude fat (%) = 
$$\frac{\text{Weight of ether extract (g)}}{\text{Weight of the sample (g)}} x100$$

#### Ash content :

The ash content was determined by dry ashing method described by (A.O.A.C., 1965).

 $Per cent ash = \frac{Weight of ash}{Weight of the sample} x100$ 

# EXPERIMENTAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads :

#### Physiological loss in weight (PLW):

Physiological loss in weight (PLW) was found to increase with the advancement of storage period, recording 0.79 per cent on 6 days of storage in the present instance (Table 1). Chaudhury and Banerjee (1959) also reported that at room temperature, the fruits lost about 15 per cent of their weight within 5 days of storage. Polyethylene packaging significantly checked the PLW over control under all the treatments. Polyethylene packaging might checked direct evapotranspiration and maintained restricted gaseous exchange inside the bags (Gaur *et al.*, 1978).

# Moisture content:

The moisture content of the fruits decreased significantly with increase in storage period (Table 1). The highest moisture content (92.65%) was recorded in wax treated fruits ( $T_3$ ) and the lowest was in fruits kept in open condition ( $T_5$ ). This might be due to the reason that wax coating blocked the stomata and lenticels and checked direct evapotranspiration as reported by Gaur *et al.* (1978). Fruits kept in an open condition had higher evaporation rate.

## TSS:

The TSS of the fruits was found to decrease significantly throughout the storage period (Table 2). The decrease in TSS may be due to the fact that these treatments in the polyethylene bags retarded the respiration and conversions of polysaccharides into disaccharides and monosaccharides. But, the slight initial increase in wax coated fruits may be due to the hydrolysis of polysaccharides into simple sugars (Akhtar *et al.*, 2012). These results also support the findings of Munoz *et al.* (2006) who reported that the soluble solids content decreased under cold storage as a result of respiration in strawberries. However, in case of the non treated fruits it is possible that the fruit held in open condition had decreased TSS due to a higher respiration rate. Similar studies have also been reported by Tariq *et al.* (2001).

# **Titrable acidity:**

There was a significant decrease in titrable acidity during storage both in pulp and peel (Table 2). This might be due to the conversion of acids into salts and sugars by enzymes particularly invertase (Kumar et al., 1992). The lowest titrable acidity was recorded in  $T_5$  which could be due to depletion of organic acids as a result of relatively faster respiration and ripening rate of fruits at ambient storage (Wills et al., 1989). In general, the fruits packed in polyethylene bags showed higher level of titrable acidity. The atmospheric modification created when fruits are packaged with polyethylene bags may delay respiration and as a direct effect, the consumption of respiration substrates such as organic acids and sugars is retarded. Consequently, as the fruit respires, the O<sub>2</sub> level could decrease and the CO<sub>2</sub> level increases in the bags (Kader, 1985). Under these atmospheric conditions, the respiration rate of the fruit decrease which is helpful

	Treatments (T)									
_	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	T <sub>5</sub>	Mean				
Storage period (S), days	Physiological loss in weight (%) [Initial value (0 day): 0]									
2	0.43	0.42	0.25	0.55	0.60	0.45				
4	0.60	0.58	0.34	0.69	0.81	0.60				
6	0.80	0.69	0.49	0.91	1.07	0.79				
Mean	0.61	0.56	0.36	0.72	0.83	-				
		C.D. (P=0.05),	T = 0.08, S = 0.0	06, T x S = $0.14$						
		S.E.±, T =	0.04, S = 0.03, T	$\Gamma \ge 0.07$						
		Ν	Aoisture content (9	%) [Initial value (0	) day): 0]					
2	93.26	93.69	94.45	93.72	93.04	93.63				
4	92.34	92.47	92.92	92.14	92.23	92.42				
6	89.87	90.49	90.57	90.74	90.05	90.34				
Mean	91.82	92.22	92.65	92.20	91.77	-				
		C.D. (P=0.05),	T = 0.10, S = 0.0	08, T x S = NS						
		S.E.±, T =	= 0.05, S = 0.04,	$T \ge S = NS$						

NS= Non-significant

since high acidity in fruit has been suggested to contribute in part to the flavour retention of ripened fruit (Bron and Jacomino, 2006).

# TSS - acid ratio:

It is interesting to note that the TSS - acid ratio decreased with the advancement of storage period from

Table 2: Change		1.		- <u>j</u>		Treatmen	ts (T)							
	Pulp							Peel						
Storage period	$T_1$	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>	T <sub>4</sub>	T <sub>5</sub>	Mean	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	T <sub>5</sub>	Mean		
(S), days			Tot	al soluble so	olids (°B) (	Initial value	e (0 day): I	Pulp=19.13	3, Peel=9.7	0)				
2	18.55	19.00	19.38	16.45	15.35	17.75	9.42	9.65	9.85	9.20	9.12	9.45		
4	16.15	16.90	17.35	14.30	14.00	15.74	8.90	9.20	9.32	8.75	8.80	8.99		
6	12.93	13.20	14.60	12.83	12.70	13.25	8.50	8.80	9.18	8.27	8.38	8.63		
Mean	15.88	16.37	17.11	14.52	14.02		8.94	9.22	9.45	8.74	8.77			
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.30, S=0.23, TxS=0.52							C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.10, S=0.08, TxS=NS						
	S.E.±, T=0.15, S=0.12, TxS=0.26							S.E.±, T=0.05, S=0.04, TxS=NS						
			1	Fitrable acid	lity (%) (In	itial value (	(0 day): Pu	lp=3.82, P	eel=4.88)					
2	3.38	3.57	3.78	3.24	3.23	3.44	4.62	4.78	4.88	4.62	4.39	4.66		
4	3.13	3.18	3.58	3.35	3.10	3.27	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.20	4.15	4.32		
6	3.02	3.10	3.40	3.13	2.93	3.12	3.38	4.00	4.17	3.77	3.60	3.88		
Mean	3.18	3.28	3.58	3.24	3.08		4.25	4.39	4.54	4.20	4.05			
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.10, S=0.08, TxS=0.17							C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.10, S=0.08, TxS=NS						
	S.E.±, T=0.05, S=0.04, TxS=0.08							S.E.±, T=0.05, S=0.04, TxS=NS						
				TSS-acid	ratio (Initia	al value (0 d	day): Pulp=	=5.01, Peel	l=1.99)					
2	5.49	5.33	5.13	5.09	4.75	5.16	2.03	2.02	2.02	1.99	2.08	2.03		
4	5.17	5.32	4.85	4.43	4.51	4.85	2.06	2.09	2.035	2.08	2.11	2.08		
6	4.27	4.26	4.29	4.10	4.34	4.25	2.22	2.20	2.19	2.19	2.32	2.22		
Mean	4.98	4.97	4.76	4.54	4.54		2.10	2.10	2.08	2.08	2.17			
		C.D.(P=0	.05), T=0.	17, S=0.13	, TxS=0.30	)	C	C.D.(P=0.0	5), T=0.0	5, S=0.04	4, TxS=N	IS		
	S.E.±, T=0.08, S=0.07, TxS=0.15						S.E.±, T=0.03, S=0.02, TxS=NS							
				pH	(Initial valu	ie (0 day): l	Pulp=5.01,	Peel=1.99	))					
2	3.84	3.80	3.70	3.89	3.89	3.83	1.42	1.35	1.33	1.48	1.50	1.42		
4	3.95	4.01	3.87	4.21	4.24	4.06	1.47	1.42	1.35	1.52	1.60	1.48		
6	4.32	4.21	4.01	4.41	4.47	4.28	1.70	1.60	1.57	1.70	1.70	1.65		
Mean	4.04	4.00	3.86	4.18	4.20		1.53	1.46	1.42	1.57	1.60			
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.06, S=0.04, TxS=0.10							C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.08, S=0.06, TxS=NS						
	S.E.±, T=0.03, S=0.02, TxS=0.05							S.E.±, T=0.04, S=0.03, TxS=NS						
				Crude prote		tial value ((	) day): Pul	p=2.15, Pe	eel=2.65)	-				
2	2.11	2.12	2.13	1.94	1.87	2.03	2.64	2.65	2.65	2.64	2.62	2.64		
4	2.06	2.06	2.10	1.92	1.85	1.99	2.61	2.63	2.65	2.59	2.50	2.60		
6	1.99	2.00	2.00	1.88	1.84	1.94	2.61	2.61	2.63	2.47	2.58	2.58		
Mean	2.05	2.06	2.08	1.91	1.85		2.62	2.63	2.65	2.57	2.56	2.50		
	2.05											70		
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.02, S=0.02, TxS=0.04 S.E.±, T=0.01, S=0.01, TxS=0.02							C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.04, S=0.03, TxS=0.07 S.E.±, T=0.02, S=0.02, TxS=0.04						

Internat. J. Proc. & Post Harvest Technol., 9(1) June, 2018: 21-27

24 HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

2 to 6 days in all the treatments in the pulp while the ratio registered an increasing trend in the peel during the storage period (Table 2). Though both TSS and titrable acidity individually showed a decreasing trend across storage in all the treatments under study, it might be plausible that the decrease in acidity in the peel was at a slower rate resulting in the higher ratio across storage in that part of the fruit.

## Pulp pH :

Pulp pH was found to increase during storage (Table 2). The rise in pH till the end of the storage might be possible due to oxidation of acid during storage resulting in higher pH. Islam *et al.* (2013) also inferred similar results in his studies on mango. The growing up trend of pulp pH was also observed elsewhere (Shahjahan *et al.*, 1994). The pH both in pulp and peel were found to be significat with corresponding decrease in titrable acidity.

## **Crude protein:**

The present study revealed decrease in protein values as the period of storage increased might be due to increased utilization of the nutrient by associated microflora (Olusegun *et al.*, 2011) . The low protein content found in fruit pulp may be attributed to decreased metabolic rate. Espinosa *et al.* (2013) and Hagenmaier (2005) found similar observations in sour sop fruit which showed a reduction in ethylene production rate and probably had a decreased protein synthesis including enzymes. The wax coated fruits acted as a barrier for the microflora to feed on it and it also restricted water loss which might result in the retention of the nutrients and proteins. The decrease in crude protein may also have been as a result of the breakdown of protein by endogenous proteinases (Osuji and Umezurike, 1985).

# Fat:

The fat content of the *Kujithekera* fruits in the present study (Table 3) is found to follow a decreasing trend which might be because of volatilization of low molecular weight fatty materials. Similar trend was also observed by Wurochekke *et al.* (2013) in an indigenous and 'Kapoho solo' varieties of papaya.

#### Ash:

The ash content in both pulp and peel decreased across storage in all the treatments (Table 3). The decreasing trend of ash content both in the pulp and peel might be due to the softening of tissues. Similar trend was also found by Adetuyi *et al.* (2008) and Othman (2009). Moreover, the decreased ash value might be due to the leaching losses during the storage. The ash content is the constituent of minerals which also indicate that the mineral contents are also degrading with increase in

	in biochemical qualities of <i>Kujithekera</i> fruit across storage Treatments (T)													
			Pulp				Peel							
Storage period	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	T <sub>5</sub>	Mean	$T_1$	$T_2$	T <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	T <sub>5</sub>	Mean		
(S),days	Fat content (g/100g) in Kujithekera across storage (Initial value (0 day): Pulp=0.78, Peel=0.27)													
2	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.76	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.26		
4	0.75	0.75	0.76	0.74	0.72	0.75	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.23	0.21	0.23		
6	0.72	0.74	0.74	0.72	0.69	0.72	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.20	0.19	0.22		
Mean	0.74	0.75	0.76	0.74	0.72		0.23	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.21			
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.005, S=0.003, TxS=0.008							C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.013, S=0.010, TxS=NS						
	S.E.±, T=0.002, S=0.002, TxS=0.004						S.E.±,T=0.02, S=0.02, TxS=0.04							
	Ash content (%) in <i>Kujithekera</i> across storage (Initial value (0 day): Pulp=1.26, Peel=1.81)													
2	1.19	1.20	1.23	1.17	1.18	1.20	1.66	1.71	1.76	1.61	1.58	1.67		
4	1.14	1.16	1.18	1.12	1.10	1.14	1.65	1.68	1.73	1.57	1.55	1.64		
6	1.12	1.16	1.16	0.78	0.95	1.04	1.60	1.64	1.68	1.53	1.55	1.60		
Mean	1.15	1.17	1.19	1.02	1.08		1.64	1.68	1.73	1.57	1.57			
	C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.11, S=0.08, TxS=NS						C.D.(P=0.05), T=0.02, S=0.02, TxS=NS							
	S.E.±,T=0.05, S=0.04, TxS=NS							S.E.±, T=0.01, S=0.01, TxS=NS						

NS=Non-significant

storage.Similar results were also observed by Wurochekke *et al.* (2013) in the indigenous semi ripe papayas. Sharma *et al.* (2012) also reported 1.37 per cent ash in *G. pedunculata.* Onwuzulu *et al.* (1987) also found a decrease in the ash content of sweet orange as the period of storage increased. Moreover, for wax coated fruits, it could be attributed to the alterations in the structure of cell wall polysaccharides and their covalent cross-links with minerals, which could maintain higher levels of calcium in the fruit with the formation of calcium pectates resulting in more ash content (Onwuzulu *et al.*, 1987)

Thus, it can be concluded that the fruits dipped in 1 per cent wax emulsion for 5 min, air dried and packed in transparent perforated (0.2% ventilation) LDPE bags (25  $\mu$ ), appeared to be the best treatment for retention of nutritional qualities like TSS, crude protein, fat and ash of *Kujithekera* fruits at six (6) days after storage.

# LITERATURE CITED

- A.O.A.C. (1965). Official methods of analysis, 10<sup>th</sup> Ed. Association Of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- A.O.A.C. (1980). Official methods of analysis, 13<sup>th</sup> Ed. Association Of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D. C., U.S.A.
- A.O.A.C. (2000). *Official methods of analysis*. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D. C., U.S.A.
- Adetuyi, F. O., Ayileye, T. A. and IBO, D. (2008). Comparative study of quality changes in shea butter coated pawpaw *Carica papaya* fruit during storage. *Pak. J. Nutr.*, 7: 658-662.
- Akhtar, A., Abbasi, N. A., Hussain, A. and Bakhsh, A. (2012). Preserving quality of loquat fruit during storage by modified atmosphere packaging. *Pak. J. Agric. Sci.*, **49**: 419-423.
- Bron, I. U. and Jacomino, A. P. (2006). Ripening and quality of Golden papaya fruit harvested at different maturity stages. *Braz. J. Plant Physiol.*, **18**: 389-396.
- Chaudhury, J. K. and Banerjee, H. (1959). Physiological changes in litchi during storage at normal and low temperature. *Indian J. Plant Physiol.*, **2**: 141-144.
- Espinosa, I., Ortiz, R., Tovar, B., Mata, M. and Montalvo, E. (2013). Physiological and physico-chemical behaviour of soursop fruits refrigerated with 1-methylcyclopropene. *J. Food Quality*, 36: 10-20.
- Gaur, G. S.; Bajpai, P. N. and Azad, C. S. (1978). Post harvest

physiology of litchi fruits-I. Prog. Hort., 10: 63-77.

- **Hagenmaier, R. D. (2005).** A comparison of ethane, ethylene and CO<sub>2</sub> peel permeance for fruit with different coatings. *Postharv. Bio. Technol*, **37**: 56-64.
- Islam, M. K., Khan, M. Z. H., Sarkar, M. A. R., Absar, N. and Sarkar, S. K. (2013). Changes in acidity, TSS and sugar content at different storage periods of the postharvest mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) influenced by Bavistin DF. *Int. J. Food Sci.* pp. 1-8.
- Kader, A. (1985). Postharvest biology and technology: An overview. In : *Postharv. Technol. Hort. Crops.* Academic Press, New York, U.S.A.
- Kumar, R., Kaushik, R. A. and Charria, A. S. (1992). Effect of post harvest treatments on the quality of mango during storage. *Haryana J. Hort. Sci.*, 21: 46-55.
- Munoz, P. H., Almenar, E., Ocio, M. and Gavara, R. (2006). Effect of calcium dips and chitosan coating on post harvest life of strawberries (*Fragaria ananassa*). J. *Postharv. Bio. Technol.*, **39**: 247-253.
- Olusegun, A. M., Passy, O. G. and Terwase, D. S. (2011). Effects of waxing materials, storage conditions on protein, sugar and ash contents of citrus fruits stored at room and refrigerated temperatures. *J. Asian Scientific Res.*, **2**:913-926.
- Onwuzulu, O. W., Obani, O. W. and Okoye, W. F. (1987). Storage of fruits in waxed / grease proofed wrappers. *Nig. stored prod. Res. Inst. Tech.*, 10: 73-77.
- Othman, O. (2009). Physical and chemical composition of storage-ripened papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) fruits of eastern tanzania. *Tanz. J. Sci.*, **35**: 47-56.
- Shahjahan, M. S., Sheel, M. A., Zaman, M. A. and Sakur, M. A. (1994). Optimization of harvesting maturities for major mango cultivars in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh J. Sci. Industrial Res.*, 12: 209-215.
- Sharma, B. D., Sanjappa, M. and Balakrishnan, N. P. (1993). Botanical survey of India, Calcutta. *Flora of India*, **3**: 98-131.
- Sharma, P., Jha, A. B., Dubey, R. S. and Pessarakli, M. (2012). Reactive oxygen species, oxidative damage and antioxidative defense mechanism in plants under stressful conditions. J. Bot., 217037 10.1155/2012/217037.
- Song, M. H. and Kumar, G. (1995). Physiological studies during storage of ltchi (*Litchi sinensis* Sonn.) fruit *cv*. Rose Sented. *Adv. Plant Sci.*, 8: 126-133.
- Tariq, M.A., Tahir, F. M., Asi, A.A. and Pervez, M.A. (2001). Effect of controlled atmosphere storage on damaged citrus

**<sup>26</sup>** *Internat. J. Proc. & Post Harvest Technol.*, **9**(1) June, 2018 : 21-27 HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

fruit quality. Internat. J. Agric. Bio., 3: 9-12.

Wills, R., Mcglasson, W., Graham, D., Tlee, H. and Hall, E. (1989). Postharvest-An introduction to the physiology and handling of fruit and vegetables, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, U.S.A.

Wurochekke, A. U., Eze, H.T. and Declan, B. (2013).

Comparative study on the nutritional content of carica papaya at different ripening stages. *Internat. J. Pure Appl. Sci. Technol.*, **14**: 80-83.

# ■ WEBLIOGRAPHY

A.O.A.C. (1999). http: //kb.psu.ac.th/psukb/bitstream/2553/ 1573/2/271250 app.pdf.

