

# Effect of chemicals and growth regulators on post-harvest shelf-life and quality in papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. Red Lady

D. Ramesh, B. Prasanna Kumar<sup>1</sup>, M. Rajasekhar and D.R. Salomi Suneetha

Horticultural College and Research Institute Dr YSR Horticultural University Venkataramannagudem - 534 101, India E-mail: prasanna652002@yahoo.com

#### ABSTRACT

The present investigation on papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) cv. Red Lady was carried out at Horticultural College and Research Institute, Venkataramannagudem, West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh, during the year 2010-11. The study was carried out using 9 different treatments involving two chemicals calcium nitrate and calcium chloride at 1, 2, 3 and 4% concentration and two growth regulators, viz.,  $GA_3$  at 75, 100, 150 and 200mg/l, and BA at 100, 125, 150 and 175mg/l concentration conducted separately in a factorial concept of completely randomized design (CRD), with three replications, under laboratory conditions. Physical parameters studied were per cent fruit ripening, physiological loss in weight (PLW), fruit firmness, shelf-life, and, physic-chemical properties studied were: total soluble solids (TSS), total sugars, reducing sugars, acidity, ascorbic acid and Brix:acid ratio. Fruits treated with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% showed significantly low PLW, per cent fruit ripening, and the highest fruit-firmness, shelf-life, lowest total soluble solids, total sugars, reducing sugars, Brix:acid ratio, and highest acidity and ascorbic acid content, which were on par with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 2% application. Fruits treated with GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l also exhibited similar results for these parameters. It was concluded that CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% had a beneficial impact on shelf-life of papaya fruits upto 10.67 days without any loss in either physical or physic-chemical properties. Similarly, application of growth regulators such as GA<sub>3</sub> and BA (@ 100mg/l significantly increased shelf-life of papaya fruits upto 12 days and 11 days, respectively, while showing the best physical and physico-chemical properties.

Key words: Papaya, PLW, GA, BA, calcium chloride, fruit firmness, total soluble solids

#### **INTRODUTION**

Papaya (Carica papaya L.) has gained popularity in recent years because of ease of its cultivation, quick returns and adaptability to diverse soil and climatic conditions. Moreover, papaya fruits are delicious and commercially important because of their high nutritive and medicinal value. Papaya is cultivated in India in an area of 96,000ha, with production of 39,13,000t. In Andhra Pradesh, the crop is grown in an area of 18,759ha, with production of 15,00,720t (NHB Database, 2010). A new papaya cultivar, Red Lady, introduced from Taiwan has replaced traditional varieties like Coimbatore Selections, Coorg Honey Dew and Pusa Selections because of its high productivity, red colour flesh and gynodioecious nature. Papaya is a highly perishable fruit and can be stored only for four days at room temperature. Post-harvest losses in papaya up to 75 and 90 per cent have been reported in India and Costa Rica (Cerdaz and Seenz, 1993). Storage of papaya fruits at low

temperature is limited, as, these are susceptible to chilling injury. However, experimental evidence has revealed that post-harvest treatment of fruits, in general, with various ripening retardants like wax emulsion, gibberellins, calcium chloride, benzyl adenine and spermine, improved shelf-life and quality of fruits and vegetables (Mehta et al, 1986; Padhmanabhan et al, 1994; Bhagwan, 1998). Salts of calcium have been shown to inhibit ethylene production and, thus, delay ripening (Al-Ani and Richardson, 1985). Fruits treatment with calcium prevented post-harvest losses in ber and pear (Siddiqui and Gupta, 1988). In addition to this, a few growth regulators are believed to promote shelf-life of papaya fruits. It is suggested that GA<sub>3</sub> @100mg/l significantly suppresses succinate activity of malate dehydrogenase during post-harvest ripening of papaya and, thus, retards ripening (Mehta et al, 1986). Hence, the present investigation was undertaken to study the effect of some chemicals and growth regulators on quality, shelf-life

and storage of fruit of papaya cv. Red Lady under local agro-climatic conditions.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

The present investigation was carried out at Department of Post Harvest Technology, Horticultural College and Research Institute, Venkataramannagudem, near Tadepalligudem, APHU, West Godavari district (A.P.) during the year 2010-11. Fruits at full maturity (characterized by all-green and without any yellow or red colour development) were considered. For each treatment, ten good fruits, free from pests and diseases, were selected and subjected to treatment with chemicals and growth regulators in both the experiments. Chemicals of analytical grade, viz., calcium chloride (CaCl<sub>2</sub>) and calcium nitrate (CaNO<sub>2</sub>) @ 1%, 2%, 3% and 4%, and growth regulators, viz., gibberellic acid (GA) @75mg/l, 100mg/l, 150 mg/l, and 200 mg/l, and, benzyl adenine (BA) @ 100mg/l, 125mg/l, 150mg/l and 175mg/l, and Control (water treatment) were used. After application of chemicals, all the fruits were wrapped in newspaper for storage studies. Observations on physical and physico-chemical parameters were recorded at 0, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> day after chemical application. Physical parameters studied included physiological loss in weight (PLW), per cent fruit ripening, fruit firmness (kg cm<sup>-2</sup>), shelf-life (days); physico-chemical parameters included total soluble solids -TSS (%), total sugars (%), reducing sugars (%), acidity (%), ascorbic acid (mg/100 g), and TSS: Acid ratio. The experiment was conducted in completely randomized design with factorial concept and two factors, viz., chemicals or growth regulators (Factor-1) and storage period (Factor-2), with 9 treatments replicated thrice. Data were subjected to statistical analysis as per Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## **Physical parameters**

Papaya is one of the important tropical fruit crops grown in India. Commercial potential of this crop could not be exploited on a large scale due to high perishability of the fruit and poor post-harvest storage facilities. The shelf-life of papaya fruits is relatively short compared to other tropical fruits as a direct consequence of weak cell-wall integrity. Experimental findings revealed that treatment of fruits with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% resulted in delayed ripening (41.52%) and fruits retained their firmness upto the 12<sup>th</sup> day, which was on par

with treatment using  $Ca(NO_2)_2 @ 2\% (42.82)$ . This may be attributed to the possibility that high concentrations of externally added calcium inhibited induction of ripening (Ferguson, 1984). Inhibitory effect of calcium on ethylene synthesis, without modifying the capacity to respond to higher concentration of ethylene, helped delay natural ripening (Brady, 1987). Post harvest treatment with GA<sub>2</sub> @ 100mg/ 1 also resulted in minimum per cent ripening (34.39) than with rest of the growth regulator treatments. Growth regulators slowed down the ripening process by retarding pre-climacteric respiration rate, thereby postponing their climacteric peaks, compared to untreated Control fruits (58.65). This was also reported by Gautam and Chundawat (1989). GA<sub>2</sub>, being a growth promoter, is reported to also have an antagonistic effect on ethylene biosynthesis (Diller, 1969) (Table 1).

Fruits treated with CaCl, @ 4% resulted in best retention of fruit-firmness (6.45) upto the 12<sup>th</sup> day of observation, followed by the application of  $Ca(NO_2)_2 @ 3\%$ (5.75), which was on par fruits treated with CaCl. @ 3% (5.93). Among all the growth regulators used at different concentrations, fruits treated with GA<sub>2</sub> @ 100mg/l recorded the highest firmness (7.92), followed by that at BA @ 150mg/ 1 (6.97) irrespective of the date of observation. The major cause of loss in firmness during ripening is due to dissolution of the cell wall and middle lamella by the action of hydrolyzing enzymes (Hulme, 1958). Breakdown of middle lamella (which holds the cell firmly) is brought about by the action of pectolytic enzymes, mainly, polygalacturonase. The inhibitory effect of Ca<sup>2+</sup> on the process of softening may have been due to an applicable degree of Ca<sup>2+</sup> binding during pectin solubilization (Shear, 1975) (Table 1).

As evident from data the lowest PLW (9.61%) was observed with  $CaCl_2 @ 4\%$  which was on par with  $Ca(NO_3)_2$ @ 2% (9.74%) than in rest of the treatments. Similarly, treatment of fruits with GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l recorded the lowest PLW (8.84), which was on par with that in BA 150mg/l and was significantly lower than rest of the growth regulator treatments. Highest PLW (13.64%) was observed in Control, which resulted in quick deterioration of fruits. This may be due to the role of calcium on limiting electrolyte breakage attributed to altered membrane permeability (Bangerth, 1979). Jones and Lunt (1970) contended that calcium controlled disintegration of mitochondria, endoplasmic reticulum and cytoplasmic membrane and, thus, helped retard respiration (Table 1).

*J. Hortl. Sci.* Vol. 9(1):66-73, 2014

Treatment         3 <sup>rd</sup> day           CaCl <sub>2</sub> @ 1%         14.20 (22.14)           CaCl <sub>2</sub> @ 2%         12.40 (20.61)           CaCl <sub>2</sub> @ 3%         10.40 (18.81)           CaCl <sub>2</sub> @ 4%         8.12 (16.55)		Per cent truit ripening				Fruit fir	Fruit firmness (kg cm²)	cm <sup>-2</sup> )			Phy	Physiological Loss of Weight (%	of Weight (%)	
	Days a	Days after treatment				Days 2	Days after treatment	nent				Days after treatment	atment	
	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9th day	12 <sup>th</sup> day	Mean	3rd day	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9th day 12th day		Mean	3rd day	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9 <sup>th</sup> day	12 <sup>th</sup> day	Mean
		64.50 (53.42)	94.30 (76.18)	49.33 (45.32)	10.20	6.06	2.33			7.87 (16.29)	11.03 (19.40)	14.4 (22.30)	17.97 (25.08)	12.82 (20.77)
	1) 22.50 (28.31)	65.17 (53.82)	95.00 (77.07)	48.77(44.96)	11.32	6.33	3.67			7.63 (16.03)	10.67(19.06)	12.67 (20.85)	14.83 (22.65)	11.45 (19.65)
	_	64.50 (53.42)	94.50 (76.42)	47.48(43.90)	11.60	7.20	3.93			6.76(15.07)	9.63(18.08)	11.4 (19.73)	13.67 (21.70)	10.37 (18.64)
	5) 18.47 (25.45)	50.17(45.09)	89.32 (70.92)	41.52(39.50)	12.27	7.87	4.60		6.45 5	5.57 (13.65)	8.03(16.46)	11.27 (19.61)	13.55 (21.60)	9.61 (17.83)
Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ), @ 1% 11.40 (19.73)	3) 21.5 (27.62)	62.17 (52.03)	94.20 (76.06)	47.32 (43.86)	11.60	6.33	2.93			7.63 (16.03)	10.67(19.06)	12.67 (20.85)	14.83 (22.65)	11.45 (19.65)
$Ca(NO_3)^2$ , @ 2 % 8.10 (16.53)	-	52.43 (46.39)	91.21 (72.75)	42.82 (40.47)	11.73	6.13	4.00		5.75 5	5.87 (14.02)	9.27 (17.72)	11.01 (19.38)	12.80 (20.96)	9.74 (18.02)
$a(NO_3)^2$ @ 3% 13.40 (21.47)		64.17 (53.22)	94.30 (76.18)	48.84(44.96)	11.40	7.20	3.67			5.30 (14.54)	9.57 (18.02)	11.76 (20.05)	13.40 (21.47)	10.26 (18.52)
$Ca(NO_3)^{-1}$ , @ 4% 15.17 (22.92)	~	67.67 (55.34)	98.20 (82.28)	51.55 (47.66)	10.87	6.02	3.00		5.22 7	7.76(16.17)	10.9(19.28)	12.6 (20.79)	15.03 (22.81)	11.57 (19.76)
Control 15.40 (23.10) Mean 11 80 (20.21)	0) 25.5 (30.33) 1) 22 08 (22 26)	82.53 (65.28) 63 60 (53 12)	99.55 (86.14) 94 54 (77 11)	55.75 (51.22)	9.60 11 18	4.13 636	1.77 3 32		4.10	7.97 (16.40) 7.04 (15.36)	11.57 (19.88) 10 15 (18 55)	16.27 (23.79) 12 26 (20.82)	18.73 (25.64) 14 98 (22 73)	13.64 (21.43)
		Ē			F tect	SF d	E			F tect	SF d	E		
1001 1		(P=0.05)			1021 1	2010	(P=0.05)	5)		1071 1		(P=0.05)		
Chemical (C) *	0.92	2.13			*	0.04	0.07	6		*	0.09	0.17		
Storage *	0.71	1.65			*	0.03	0.06			*	0.07	0.13		
period (S)														
Interaction * C x S	0.61	3.7			*	0.07	0.14			*	0.17	0.24		
A <sub>3</sub> @75mg/l 11.41 (19.74)		63.17 (52.63)	77.34)	47.82 (44.33)	11.28	6.29	4.13			5.80 (13.93)	10.57 (18.97)	12.00 (20.27)	14.6 (22.46)	10.74 (18.91)
A, @ 100mg/1 8.84 (17.30)		57.26 (49.17)	72.12 (58.12)	39.39 (37.67)	13.4	8.8	6.13			4.87 (12.75)	8.03(16.46)	10.40(18.81)	12.07 (20.33)	8.84 (17.09)
GA, @150mg/l 12.23 (20.47)	_	60.17 (50.86)	77.20 (61.47)	42.98 (40.25)	12.27	8.07	4.87	1.6	6.7 5	5.33 (13.35)		10.90 (19.28)	12.63 (20.82)	9.56 (17.82)
		64.5 (53.42)	98.20 (82.28)	50.90 (47.28)	7.28	6.28	2.93			5.57 (13.65)	8.89 (17.35)	11.07 (19.43)	12.03 (20.29)	8.89 (17.68)
		64.17 (53.23)	94.20(76.06)	48.23 (44.48)	11.73	6.13	4		5.77 5	5.67 (13.77)	9.27 (12.72)	11.57 (19.88)	13.13 (21.24)	9.91 (18.16)
		64.15 (53.21)	94.30(76.18)	48.70(44.86)	12.13	7.33	4.47	1.6 6		5.87 (14.02)	9.73 (18.17)	12.50 (20.70)	15.03 (22.81)	10.78 (18.93)
	_	57.38 (49.24)	77.20 (61.47)	41.86(39.51)	12.27	8.13	5.67			4.53 (12.29)	8.30 (16.74)	10.43 (18.84)	12.13 (20.38)	8.85 (17.06)
75mg/l	_	64.25 (53.27)		49.76 (45.78)	11.6	8.07	4.93			5.70 (13.81)	9.13 (17.59)	12.40 (20.62)	13.76 (21.77)	10.24 (18.45)
Control 30.40 (33.46) Mean 14.48 (22.06)	6) 40.50 (39.52) 6) 24.49 (29.54)	64.50(53.42) 62.17(52.05)	99.2(84.86) 89.20(72.78)	58.65 (52.82)	11.6	7.07	2.8 4.44	1.2 5 1.66	5.67 7	7.76(16.17) 5.42(13.75)	10.90(19.28) 9.16(17.79)	12.60(20.79) 11.28(19.85)	15.1(22.86) 12.67(21.44)	11.59 (19.78)
		6			F test	SE.d	8			Ftest	SE.d	6	~	
		(P=0.05)					(P=0.05)	5)				(P=0.05)		
Growth *	0.90	2.10			*	0.06	0.09			*	0.10	0.18		
regulators (G)														
Storage * neriod (S)	0.68	1.65			*	0.50	0.08			*	0.09	0.15		
Interaction *	0.57	2.80			*	0.80	0.20			*	0.19	0.26		

68

ciological loce of woight in fruit fir it win . 4 7 ÷ . 4 4 ; ŝ 4 4 ģ + Lff -Tahle

Treatment	Shelf life	Treatment	Shelf life
	(in days)		(in days)
CaCl, @ 1%	9.00	GA <sub>3</sub> @75ppm	11.33
CaCl, @ 2%	9.67	GA <sub>3</sub> @100ppm	12.00
CaCl, @ 3%	9.33	GA <sub>3</sub> @150ppm	11.67
CaCl, @ 4%	10.67	GA <sub>3</sub> @200ppm	10.67
$Ca(NO_{3})_{2} @ 1\%$	9.00	BA@100ppm	11.00
$Ca(NO_{3})_{2} @ 2\%$	10.50	BA@125ppm	10.00
$Ca(NO_{3})_{2} @ 3\%$	8.25	BA@150ppm	9.33
$Ca(NO_3)_2 @ 4\%$	9.33	BA@175ppm	10.33
Control	7.33	Control	8.67
Mean	9.34	Mean	10.56
S.Ed	0.39	S.Ed	0.20
CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)	0.83	CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)	0.44

 Table 2. Effect of postharvest application of chemicals and growth

 regulators on shelf life (in days) in papaya cv. Red Lady

Fruits treated with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% recorded the highest shelf-life (10.67 days) over other treatments, and was on par with Ca(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> @ 2% application (10.50 days). Among the growth regulators applied, significantly higher shelf-life was recorded with GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l (12 days), followed by GA<sub>3</sub> @ 150mg/l (11.67 days) than in rest of the treatments. Further, in both the cases, untreated fruits resulted in the lowest shelf-life (7.33 and 8.67, respectively) (Table 2). The most important physiological effect of GA<sub>3</sub> is that it influences oxidative or peroxidative enzyme activity by increasing production of oxidative inhibitors (such as polyhydroxy cinnamic acids) in large quantities. This may have helped extend shelf-life of the fruits, as stated by Frenkel and Dyck (1973).

#### **Physico-chemical parameters**

The lowest per-cent reducing sugars (7.51) was observed with CaCl, @ 4% whereas, the highest per cent (8.65) was seen in untreated fruits. Similarly, fruits treated with GA<sub>2</sub> @ 100mg/l resulted in lowest amounts of reducing sugars (6.78%) compared to that in the remaining treatments. Fruits treated with CaCl, @ 4% resulted in lowest (10.48%) total sugars than that in rest of the treatments; whereas, highest per cent total sugars (13.31) was observed in untreated fruits (Table 3). In the Control, total soluble solids (TSS) increased during ripening due to enzymatic conversion of starch to simple sugars (Hussain et al, 2008). However, reduction in the TSS of calcium-treated papaya may have been due to inhibition or retardation of conversion of starch to simple sugars (which slows down electrolytic breakage and metabolic activity, thereby retarding ripening (Izumi and Watada, 1994; Agar et al, 1999).

Total soluble solids (TSS) in papaya fruits increased with an increase in storage period from the  $3^{rd}$  day (10.60°B) to the 9<sup>th</sup> day (13.56°B) and, thereafter, decreased until the 12th day (12.40°B) with application of chemicals at different days of storage. Further, mean TSS of fruits with use of various growth regulators also increased from the 3<sup>rd</sup> day (8.37°B) to the 9<sup>th</sup> day (14.33°B). Thereafter, it decreased until the 12<sup>th</sup> day (12.07°B). The increase in TSS may be attributed mainly to conversion of starch and other polysaccharides to soluble forms of the sugars (Mukherjee and Dutta, 1967). Rate of increase in TSS content was slow in fruits treated with CaCl<sub>a</sub> @ 4% (10.91°B) and GA<sub>a</sub> 100mg/l (11.14°B) compared to the Control fruits (13°B). In fruits showing higher shelf-life, TSS decreased at a slower rate. Further, among growth regulators, fruits treated with GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l had lower TSS (11.14°B) indicating that the ripening process slowed down. These findings are in conformity with those of Kumbhar and Desai (1986) in sapota.

Highest titratable acidity (0.30%) was observed in fruits treated with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% and lowest (0.19%) was observed in the untreated fruits. Similarly, fruits treated with GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l recorded highest (0.26%) titrable acidity than the rest of the treated fruits. Acidity decreased gradually from the 3<sup>rd</sup> day to the 12<sup>th</sup> day in all the treatments (Table 4). Decline in acidity can be attributed to a decrease in citric acid content during storage, as reported by Medlicott and Thompson (1985). There was a continuous decrease in acidity of papaya fruits with progressive storage period, as was utilization of organic acids during respiration (Singh *et al*, 1954).

Ascorbic acid content of papaya fruits treated with  $CaCl_2 @ 4\%$  recorded the highest values (48.60 mg/100g fresh weight), whereas, fruits treated with  $Ca(NO_3)_2 @ 2\%$  recorded a value of 47.33 which was on a par with the former, but higher than that in Control (41.00). Similarly, fruits treated with GA<sub>3</sub> 100mg/l resulted in highest (42.67) ascorbic acid content than fruits treated with rest of the growth regulators. Untreated fruits recorded the lowest value for this (34.14) (Table 4). TSS:acid ratio of papaya fruits treated with CaCl<sub>2</sub> @ 4% was the lowest (55.48), whereas, the highest ratio (79.35) was observed in untreated fruits. This may be due to a slow hydrolysis of starch to sugars, and, a gradual build-up of sugars in calcium-treated fruits.

Treatment CaCl_@ 1% 5:80 CaCl_@ 2% 5:62 CaCl_@ 3% 5:04 CaCl_@ 3% 5:04							( or ) e mgne ermor				51	lotal Soluble Solids (Brix)	I entine	BTLX)	
0 0 0 1 % 0 2 % % 0 3 % %		Days after treatment	treatment			Ď	Days after treatment	nt					Days after treatment	It	
() () () () () () () () () () () () () (	3 <sup>rd</sup> day	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9 <sup>th</sup> day	12 <sup>th</sup> day	Mean	3 rd day	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9 <sup>th</sup> day	12 <sup>th</sup> day	Mean	3rd day	6 <sup>th</sup> day	9th day	9th day 12th day Mean	Mean
0 0 0 7 % % 8 % %	5.80 (13.93)	8.25 (16.69)	9.97 (18.40)	7.77 (16.18)	7.95 (16.30)	9.05(17.51)	11.20 (19.55)	13.47(21.53)	10.90(19.28)	11.16(19.47)	10.69	13.43	13.65	12.68	12.61
	5.62 (13.71)	8.20(16.64)	9.63(18.08)	7.66(16.06)	7.78(16.12)	8.45(16.90)	11.08(19.44)	13.43(21.50)	10.51(18.92)	10.87(19.19)	10.6	12.76	13.55	12.65	12.39
	5.04(12.97)	7.93 (16.35)	9.60(18.05)	7.52 (15.91)	7.52 (15.82)	8.31(16.75)	10.97(19.34)	13.30(21.39)	10.32(18.74)	10.73(19.05)	10.51	12.54	13.54	12.34	12.23
	5.03(12.96)	7.16(15.52)	8.70 (17.15)	7.51 (15.90)	7.10 (15.38)	8.30(16.74)	10.81(19.19)	12.25(20.49)	10.25(18.67)	10.40(18.77)	10.4	12.04	13.05	12.15	11.91
Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ), @ 1% 5.10	5.10(13.05)	8.60 (17.05)	9.80(18.24)	7.79 (16.21)	7.82 (16.14)	8.90 (17.36)	11.86(20.14)	13.22(21.32)	11.51 (19.83)	11.37(19.66)	10.61	12.2	13.54	11.85	12.05
Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ), @ 2% 5.02	5.02 (12.95)	8.05(16.48)	9.63(18.08)	7.58 (15.97)	7.57 (15.87)	8.60(17.05)	11.98 (20.25)	12.81(20.97)	11.50(19.82)	11.22(19.52)	10.46	12.07	13.15	12.22	11.98
@ 3%	5.80 (13.93)	8.69 (17.14)	9.85 (18.29)	7.82 (16.24)	8.04(16.40)	9.40(17.85)	12.98 (21.12)	13.34(21.42)	11.88(20.16)	11.90(20.14)	10.45	13.32	13.68	12.22	12.42
$Ca(NO_3)_2 @ 4\% 5.90$	5.90(14.06)	8.80 (17.25)	10.13(18.56)	7.88 (16.30)	8.18(16.54)	9.70(18.14)	12.16(20.41)	13.38(21.45)	12.29(20.52)	11.88(20.13)	10.65	12.5	13.72	12.5	12.34
	6.57 (14.85)	9.47 (17.92)	10.56(18.96)	7.98 (16.41)	8.65 (17.03)	10.50(18.91)	13.51 (21.56)	13.86(21.85)	12.61(20.80)	12.62(20.78)	11	13.85	14.2	12.95	13
Mean 5.54	5.54(13.60)	8.35 (14.95)	9.76(16.17)	7.72 (16.13)	9.02 (17.47)	11.83(20.11)	13.22 (21.32)	11.31(19.64)	10.6 12.75	13.56 12.4					
F test	st	SE.d	CD(P=0.05)	(		F test	SE.d	CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)			F test	SE.d	CD(P=0.05)	0.05)	
Chemical *		0.06	0.12			*	0.11	0.34			*	0.04	0.07		
Storage *		0.05	0.10			*	0.07	0.15			*	0.03	0.06		
perrou (3) Interaction C x S *		0.12	0.24			*	0 41	0 41			*	0.07	0.14		
GA @75ma/1 / 53	1 53 (17 70)	7 05 (16 38)	(92 J (1 E JE))	6 25 (15 17)	6 01 (15 15)	8 JA116 681	11 67 (10 03)	13 56 (71 60)	11 54/10 86)	11 24/10 52)	26 25	11 87		11 57	11 21
	(77.21) CC.+	7 91 (16 23)	0.72 (10.70) 0 07 (16 50)	(11.01) 00.0	(01.01) 10.0	7 01/16 72)	(66,01) 20,11	12 74/71 24/	(09.(1) + C.11	(76.01)+711	C 7.0	11.75		1 27	10.11
GA @150mo/1 4.30	4.21 (12.67) (C2.21) (	(67.01) 10.7	(0C.01) / 0.0 (17.57) 11.9	(co.c1) +/.0 7 09(1544)	7 30 (15 57)	(67.01)10.7	11.20(19.62)	13.24(21.34)	11 18 (19 53)	11 15(19 43)	0.2 8 79	12 24		11 43	11.14
	4 89 (12 77)	8 27 (16 71)	9 15(17 61)	7 12 (15 47)	7 36 (15 64)	8 50 (16 95)	12.23 (20.48)	13 74(21 76)	11 68 (19 98)	11 54(19 79)	8.3	13.47		12 38	12 08
	5.37 (13.40)	8.74 (17.19)	9.65(18.10)	7.76(16.17)	7.88 (16.22)	8.30(16.74)	11.61(19.92)	13.02(21.15)	11.78 (20.07)	11.18(19.47)	8.22	11.86		11.41	11.19
	5.35 (13.37)	8.67 (17.12)	9.64 (18.09)	7.23 (15.60)	7.72 (16.04)	8.27(16.71)	12.63 (20.82)	13.65 (21.68)	11.34 (19.68)	11.47(19.72)	8.27	13.57		12.3	12.33
	5.24 (13.23)	7.32 (15.69)	8.64 (17.09)	7.01 (15.35)	7.05 (15.34)	7.84 (16.26)	12.34 (20.56)	13.27(21.36)	11.28 (19.62)	11.18(19.45)	8.28	13.59		12.37	12.36
	5.29(13.30)	8.56(17.01)	9.68 (18.13)	7.22 (15.59)	7.69 (16.00)	8.10 (16.53)	12.56 (20.75)	14.02(21.99)	12.85 (21.00)	11.88(20.07)	8.3	13.76		12.56	12.47
lo	6.23 (14.45)	9.49 (17.94)	10.22(18.64)		8.68 (17.07)	9.25 (17.70)	13.56(21.60)	15.12(22.88)	12.98 (21.12)	12.72(20.82)	9.26	13.81	15.37	13.2	12.91
Mean 5.13	5.13(13.08)	8.33 (16.77)	9.16(17.61)	7.33 (15.67)	8.24 (16.68)	12.25 (20.48)	13.66 (21.69)	11.76(20.05)	8.37	12.87 14.33	12.07				
F test	st	SE.d	CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)			F test	SE.d	CD(P=0.05)			F test	SE.d	CD(P=0.05)	=0.05)	
Growth *		0.06	0.11			*	0.13	0.25			*	0.06	0.08		
regulators (G)															
Storage period (S)		*	0.04			0.08	*	0.07			0.21	*	0.05	0.07	
Interaction G x S *		0.11	0.22			*	0.18	0.35			*	0.08	0.16		

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		T					12	ò					
1 % 2 % 3 % 3 % 3 % 3 %	6 <sup>th da</sup> 0.23(2	s atter treatmen	nt		Da	Days after	r treatment	t	Days	ys after	r treatment	nent	
[% 2% 4% @ 1% 3%		9 <sup>th</sup> day	12 <sup>th</sup> day	Mean	3 <sup>rd</sup> day 6	6 <sup>th</sup> day 9 <sup>th</sup>	9th day 12th day	ay Mean	3 <sup>rd</sup> day 6	6 <sup>th</sup> day 9	9th day 1:	12 <sup>th</sup> day 1	Mean
2% 3% @ 1% @ 2% 3%		0.18(2.43)	0.17(2.36)	0.22(2.67)					39.01	70.34 8			73.20
3% 4% @ 2 % 3 %	_	0.24(2.81)	0.19(2.50)	0.26(2.92)		46.40 5			38.74		83.15 9		70.88
4% @ 1 % 3 %	~	0.25(2.87)	0.20(2.56)	0.28(2.99)			56.67 39.30		36.90			91.25	52.88
a 1% a 2 % 3%	4) 0.32 (3.24)	0.28(3.03)	0.22(2.69)	0.30(3.10)	38.63		7.09 43.03		27.24				55.48
@ 2 % 3%	~		0.13(2.07)	0.19(2.47)					39.43				51.26
@ 3%	~	0.23(2.75)	0.19(2.50)	0.24(2.81)					35.79		72.12 7		57.52
200	9) 0.24(2.81)	(69)	0.18(2.43)	0.23(2.75)		47.17 5			39.56	65.96 8			70.92
$Ca(NO_3)^2$ @ 4% 0.25 (2.87)	~	.56)	0.16(2.29)	0.21(2.60)	4.67		$\mathfrak{c}$		41.24	70.24 8			73.86
	~		0.15(2.22)	0.19(2.47)	33.47	46.20 5	52.21 32.13	2 41	50.64	79.12 8	87.98	. 29.66	79.35
Mean 0.29 (3.09	9) 0.25(2.86)	0.22(2.39)	0.18(2.40)	35.94			7.41	38.73	60.67 8	80.01 8	89.64		
F test	SE.d	CD $(P=0.05)$			F test	SE.d (	CD $(P=0.05)$	()	F test S	SE.d	CD $(P=0.05]$	).05)	
Chemical (C) *	0.08	0.02			*	0.67 1	1.32				4.59		
Storage period (S) *	0.05	0.09			*	0.37 0	0.74		*		9.23		
Interaction C x S NS	ı	ı			*		2.34		NS		,		
GA <sub>3</sub> @ 75mg/l 0.31 (3.19)	9) 0.19(2.50)	0.16(2.29)	0.10(1.81)	0.19(2.45)					40.33		~		51.33
	9) 0.29 (3.09)	0.21(2.62)	0.19(2.50)	0.26(2.88)		41.21 5	1.72 40.13		37.90				55.47
	~	0.19(2.50)	0.14(2.14)	0.22(2.63)			48.32 33.2		40.99				51.78
		0.16(2.29)	0.13(2.07)	0.20(2.52)	32.57	36.24 4	5.23 32.97	7 36.75	41.44	53.26 7	75.46 8	85.36	63.88
		0.15(2.22)	0.12(1.98)	0.18(2.38)					43.46				55.94
		0.18(2.43)	0.16(2.29)	0.20(2.55)			40.21 37.3		41.33			83.62	53.36
BA @ 150mg/l 0.32 (3.24)	4) 0.27(2.98)	0.21(2.62)	0.17(2.36)	0.24(2.80)					37.24				55.98
BA @ 175mg/l 0.31 (3.1		0.18(2.43)	0.13(2.07)	0.21(2.58)		<b>(</b> 4.)			38.13			86.43	51.34
Control 0.24 (2.81	1) 0.17 (2.36)	0.14(2.14)	0.10(1.81)	0.16(2.28)		<b>(</b> 1)			43.48				68.90
Mean 0.29 (3.10	0) 0.21(2.64)	0.18(2.40)	0.14(2.12)	35.32		$\mathcal{C}$	6.10	40.48			3.49		
F test	SE.d	CD $(P=0.05)$			F test	SE.d	CD $(P=0.05)$	5)	F test S	SE.d	CD (P=0.05)	0.05)	
Growth *	0.90	2.10			*	0.67	1.32		*	7.69	5.38		
regulators (G)													
Storage period (S) *	0.68	1.65			*	0.42	0.84		*	3.30	8.25		
Interaction G x S *	0.57	2.80			*		2.64		NS				

# Shelf-life and quality in papaya

Among the growth regulators tested, fruits treated with  $GA_3$ @ 100mg/l resulted in lowest TSS:acid ratio (55.47), and untreated fruits had a value of 68.90. TSS:acid ratio of papaya fruits recorded a gradual increase with increasing storage period. The increase in TSS:acid ratio can be attributed to starch breakdown, resulting in free sugars, and, a decline in organic acids due to their consumption during respiration (Ghafir *et al*, 2009). The decline in TSS:acid ratio in calcium-treated papaya may be due to a retardation in TSS levels by calcium but the retention of acidity at high levels (Mahajan *et al*, 2008). Further, a gradual decline in TSS:acid ratio was recorded with increasing CaCl<sub>2</sub> concentration. These results are in agreement with findings of Rajkumar *et al* (2005) in papaya and Goud (1979) in sapota.

It is concluded that chemicals such as  $CaCl_2 @ 4\%$  have proved their beneficial impact on shelf-life of papaya fruits upto 10.67 days without any loss in either physical or physico-chemcial properties. Similarly, application of the growth regulator GA<sub>3</sub> @ 100mg/l also increased shelf-life in papaya fruits upto 12 days, with the best physical and physico-chemical attributes.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their gratitude to Dr. YSR Horticultural University, Venkataramannagudem, West Godavari district, Andhra Pradesh for providing financial assistance and facilities for research work during post graduation studies in the year 2010-2011.

# REFERENCES

- Agar, I.T., Massanti, R., Hess-Pierce, B. and Kader, A.A. 1999. Post harvest  $CO_2$  and ethylene production and quality maintenance of fresh cut kiwi fruit slices. *J. Food Sci.*, **64**:433-440
- Al-Ani, A.M. and Richardson, D.G. 1985. Effect of calcium and nitrogen on respiration and ethylene evolution of Anjour pear fruits. *Iraqi J. Agril. Sci. Zanco.*, **3**:81-95
- Bengerth, F. 1979. Calcium related physiological disorders of plants. *Ann. Rev. Phytopath.*, **17**:92-122
- Bhagwan, A. 1998. Biochemical studies on polyamines, ethylene, lipoxygenase and lipid peroxidation during ripening and senescence of tomato fruits and their relation to shelf life. Ph.D. Thesis, submitted to Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad
- Brady, C.J. 1987. Fruit ripening. Ann. Rev. Pl. Physiol.,

**38**:155-167

- Cerdaz, M.D. and Seenz, M.V. 1993. A survey of postharvest management of papaya in Paquera. *Pentavenas Agronomia Costa-Rica*, **17:**49-54
- Diller, D.H. 1969. Stage of maturity and storage life in banana. *Hort. Sci.*, **4**:111-114
- Ferguson, J.B. 1984. Calcium in plant senescence and fruit ripening. *Pl. Cell Environ.*, **7**:447-455
- Frenkel, C. and Dyck, R. 1973. Auxin exhibition of ripening in Battele pears. *Pl. Physiol.*, **51**:6-9
- Gautam, S.K. and Chundawat, B.S. 1989. Post-harvest changes in sapota cv. Kalipatti: effect of various postharvest treatments on biochemical changes. *Indian J. Hort.*, **46**:310-315
- Ghafir, S.A.M., Gadalla, S.O., Murajei, B.N. and El-Nady, M.F. 2009. Physiological and anatomical comparison between four different apple cultivars under cold storage conditions. *African J. Pl. Sci.*, **3**:133-138
- Goud, P.V. 1979. Studies on the effect of post harvest Ethrel treatment on ripening of sapota (*Achras sapota*) var. Oval. M.Sc. Thesis, Submitted to Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University, Hyderabad
- Hulme, A.C. 1958. Some aspects of the biochemistry of apple and pear fruits. *Adv. Food Res.*, **8**:297-313
- Hussain, P.R., Dar, M.A., Meena, R.S., Mir, M.A., Shafi, F. and Wani, A.M. 2008. Changes in quality of apple (*Malus domestica*) cultivars due to gamma irradiation and storage conditions. J. Food Sci. Technol., 45:444-449
- Izumi, H. and Watada, A.E. 1994. Calcium treatments affect storage quality of shredded conditions. J. Food Sci. Technol., 59:106-109
- Jones, R.W. and Lunt, O.R. 1970. The functions of calcium in plants. *Bot. Rev.*, **30:**407-423
- Kumbhar, S.S. and Desai, U.T. 1986. Studies on shelf-life of sapota fruits. J. Maharastra Agri. Univ., 11:184-186
- Mahajan, B.V.C., Randhawa, J.S., Kaur, H. and Dhatt, A.S. 2008. Effect of post harvest application of calcium nitrate and gibberellic acid on the storage life of plum. *Indian J. Hort.*, **65**:94-96
- Medlicott, A.P. and Thompson, A.K. 1985. Analysis of sugars and organic acids in ripening mango fruits (*Mangifera indica* L.) var Keitt by high performance liquid chromatography. J. Food Agri., **36**:561-566
- Mehta, P.M., Raj, S.S. and Raju, P.S. 1986. Influence of fruit ripening retardant on succinate and malate dehydrogenases in papaya with emphasis on preservation. *Indian J. Hort.*, 43:169-434

- Mukharjee, S.K. and Dutta, M.N. 1967. Physico-chemical changes in Indian guava (*Psidium guajava*) during fruit development. *Curr. Sci.*, **36**:675-678
- NHB Database, 2010. nhm.nic.in/IndiaDataBase/Database 2010.pdf
- Padhmanabhan, G., Nagarajan, A., Manian, K. and Annamalai Nathan, K.C. 1994. Effect of fused calcium slats on post-harvest preservation in fruits. *Madras Agri. J.*, 82:47-50
- Panse, V.C. and Sakhatme, P.V. 1985. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. ICAR Publication, New Delhi
- Rajkumar, M., Karuppaiah, P. and Kandasamy, R. 2005.

Effect of calcium and gibberllic acid on post harvest behavior of papaya cv. Co-2. *Indian J. Hort.*, **62:**327-331

- Shear, C.B. 1975. Calcium related disorders of fruits and vegetables. *Hort. Sci.*, **10**:361-365
- Siddiqui, S. and Guptha, O.P. 1988. Effect of post harvest application of calcium chloride and diphenyl package on the storage behaviour of ber fruits. *Haryana Agril. Univ. J. Res.*, **18**:337-340
- Singh, K.K., Kapur, N.S. and Mathur, P.B. 1954. Studies on cold storage of mangoes. *Indian J. Agril. Sci.*, 24:137-148

(MS Received 06 December 2012, Revised 30 December 2013, Accepted 04 January 2014)