

Original Research Article

EFFECT OF DIFFERENT PACKAGING MATERIALS AND CHEMICALS ON SHELF LIFE AND QUALITY OF AONLA (*Emblica officinalis* L.)

ABSTRACT

To extend the shelf life of Aonla fruits and for regulating marketing for acceptability and profit during distant transportation and storage, Aonla fruits can be coated with chemicals and coating material which are safe for consumption and packed in packaging materials. So, to find out effect of different packaging materials and chemicals on shelf life and quality of Aonla (*Emblica officinalis* L.), a lab experiment was conducted at the Post Harvest Laboratory, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj (U.P.) during the year 2022. The experiment comprised of 13 treatments of different coating materials viz. untreated fruits, 5% Chitosan Wax, 1% Calcium Nitrate, 400 ppm Cycocel, 0.1% Sodium Benzoate and packaging materials viz. Nylon Net Bags, Poly Ethylene Bags, CFB Box which are replicated thrice in a completely Randomized Design. The objectives of the experiment were to evaluate the effect of different treatments on Quality and shelf life of aonla. From the present investigation treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel packed in Poly Ethylene Bags) was found best with minimum physiological weight loss %, minimum rotting of fruits and best in terms of Bio-chemical attributes i.e., Total Soluble Solids (TSS °Brix), Titrable Acidity (%), Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g) and Organoleptic Qualities i.e., maximum retention of Fruit colour and minimum fruit shriveling till the end of storage period.

Keywords: Chitosan, Cycocel, Calcium Nitrate, Sodium Benzoate, Poly Ethylene bags, CFB Box, Aonla

Comment [R1]: Please, review the use of capital letter.

Comment [R2]: Please eliminate the semicolon before "a"

Comment [R3]: It is recommended writing the keywords in alphabetical order.

1. INTRODUCTION

Indian Gooseberry or Aonla (*Emblica officinalis* L.) also known as Wonder Fruit for health and belongs to family Euphorbiaceae. The chromosome number of aonla is $2n=28$ and in case of variation from $2n=98$ to 104 has also been observed. Aonla fruit are round globose or oblate in shape. Fruit colour is changing from green to yellow or brick red colour when mature. Aonla is the major constituents in Chayvanprash and Trifla preparations and used in Ayurvedic and Unani System of Indian medicines. Aonla fruit is useful in curing anemia, Artherosclerosis, cough, diarrhea and jaundice

(Kavita, [1]) and is reported to possess antiviral, antibacterial, anticarcinogenic, antioxidative, cardiovascular (Baliga *et al.* [2]) expectorant activities.. The fruit is rich source of ascorbic acid and contains about 20 times more vitamin C than the citrus fruits. It contains 500-1500 mg of ascorbic acid per 100g of pulp (Chauhan *et al.* [3])

Aonla fruits having shelf life of 6 to 7 days and being perishable in nature, it is difficult to store and transport it over long distances. For transportation to distant markets and for minimum losses from spoilage of fruit, it is necessary to prolong shelf life of Aonla. Likewise, packaging materials also have a significant impact on the quality and storage life of fruits. Packaging creates a modified atmosphere surrounding the fruits by decreasing

Comment [R4]: Would you include, how much is it the postharvest losses of this fruit?

O₂ level and increasing CO₂ level. As a result, respiration and metabolic activities slow down which ultimately help in maintaining the quality parameters of aonla. Factors like water vapour losses, ripening rates, skin thickness, infestation etc affect the post harvest life of fruits and by checking these factors; the shelf life can be increased up to certain period. Therefore, application of physical barrier such as surface coating may be used to regulate permeability of water vapour and other gases, retard ripening and restricts insect infestation as well as microbial growth.[4-7]

Edible coating like chitosan act as an excellent O₂ barrier, CO₂ permeation and antibacterial activity against microorganisms and some other coating materials are also available like Cycocel, Calcium Nitrate and Sodium Benzoate which help to reduce post harvest decay, delay senescence, reduce fruit weight loss and help in maintaining quality.

In order to have good return and to avoid market glut it becomes essential to store the fruits for a considerable period. But very less research has been done for chemicals combined with packing materials for their positive effect on quality and shelf life of fruit. Therefore, this experiment has been proposed with the following objectives:

1. To study the effect of different packaging materials and different level of chemicals on shelf life and quality of Aonla.
2. To study the changes in organoleptic quality during storage.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was laid out during October month of 2022, ripe, uniformly sized, shape and colour Aonla cv. Kanchan were harvested at proper stage of maturity and fruits were plucked carefully and brought to the Post-harvest Laboratory, Department of Horticulture of Horticulture, Sam Higginbottom University of

Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Allahabad.

2.1 Experiment Details

The experiment was conducted in completely randomized design with thirteen treatments and three replications comprising of different coating materials viz., Chitosan Wax (5%), Calcium Nitrate (1%), Cycocel (400 ppm), and Sodium Benzoate (0.1%) and packed in Nylon net bags, Polyethylene bags and CFB box.

2.2 Preparation of Coating material

For Coating of fruits with calcium nitrate, 10g of Ca(NO₃)₂ was dissolved in a little amount of distilled water and volume was made upto one litre with distilled water to get 1% Ca(NO₃)₂ solution and used for dipping the fruits [8,10].

For Preparation of Cycocel coating, The stock solution was prepared by dissolving one gram of Cycocel in little amount of distilled water and diluted it with distilled water to one litre. From this stock solution, desired concentration as per treatment (400 ppm) was prepared by diluting with distilled water and used for dipping the fruits [11].

For coating of fruits with Sodium Benzoate, One gram of Sodium Benzoate was dissolved in a little amount of distilled water and emulsion is further diluted with distilled water to one litre and used for dipping the fruits.[11-12] The fruits were dipped for three minutes with particular solution of respective chemical and surface dried in room temperature and to prepare 5% Chitosan solution, 50g of chitosan powder was added in aqueous solution of 2% acetic acid (20ml in 1000ml of water) as solvent [12-14]. To facilitate adhesion of the coating, 0.1% Tween 80 was added. (Contreras-Oliva *et al.*[15])

2.3 Treatment Details:

T₀– Control (untreated fruits), T₁ – 5% Wax + Nylon Net Bag, T₂ - 5% Wax + Perforated Poly Ethylene bags, T₃ – 5% Wax + Corrugated Fiber Board Box, T₄ – 5% Wax + 1% Calcium Nitrate +

Comment [R5]: Would you include information about the statistical analysis of the results?

Nylon Net Bag, T₅ – 5% Wax + 1% Calcium Nitrate + PE Bags, T₆ – 5% Wax + 1% Calcium Nitrate + CFB Box, T₇ – 5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + Nylon Net Bags, T₈ – 5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags, T₉ – 5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + CFB Box, T₁₀ – 5% Wax + 0.1 % Sodium Benzoate + Nylon Net Bags, T₁₁ – 5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags, T₁₂ – 5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + CFB Box

2.4.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Physical Attributes

3.1.1 Physiological Weight Loss (%)

The data in Table 1 revealed that as the storage period progressed, the physiological loss in weight (%) was increased. Effect of treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded the minimum physiological weight loss % [1.40 (3 days), 2.70 (6 days), 5.65 (9 days), 7.35 (12 days) and 10.05 (15 days)]% over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly highest physiological weight loss % [4.95 (3 days), 8.25 (6 days), 11.37 (9 days), 14.19 (12 days) and 17.18 (15 days)]%. Coating in fruit crops may have slowed down respiration and transpiration, which could have helped in lowering fruit weight loss. Similar results were obtained by Yadav and Singh [16] while working on aonla fruits.

3.1.2 Per Cent Rotting

It was revealed from the Table 1 that as the storage period progressed, the percent rotting was increased irrespective of storage conditions. Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded lowest per cent rotting [0.65 (9 days), 2.45 (12 days) and 4.90 (15 days)] % over all other treatments whereas treatment T₀ (control) was found having highest rotting percentage [3.70 (9 days), 6.90 (12 days) and 11.45 (15 days)] %. Thus elimination and/or reduction of rotting during storage are crucially important for preserving the good quality of

fruits. In the present investigation, application of Cycocel allowed minimum rotting during storage.

3.2 Quality Attributes

3.2.1 Total Soluble Solids (TSS) (°Brix)

Data in Table 2 revealed that Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded the minimum TSS (°Brix) [12.50 (3 days), 13.05 (6 days), 14.05 (9 days), 13.10 (12 days) and 12.95 (15 days)] °Brix over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly highest TSS (°Brix) [14.80 (3 days), 15.50 (6 days), 16.05 (9 days), 15.92 (12 days) and 15.15 (15 days)] °Brix. It was also found that Treatment T₉ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + CFB Box) was at par with treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. However, its effect was found non-significant at 0 days. To sum up, there was significant increase in TSS content till it reached peak followed by gradual decline irrespective of storage treatments. The increase of TSS during storage can be due to breakdown of complex polymers into simple substances by hydrolytic enzymes. The retention of TSS in T₈ might be due to decrease in Physiological loss in weight followed by slow degradation of soluble contents of fruits.

3.2.2 Titrable acidity (%)

The data in Table 2 revealed that Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded the maximum Titrable acidity (%) [2.39 (3 days), 2.30 (6 days), 2.12 (9 days), 2.22 (12 days) and 2.35 (15 days)] % over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly lowest Titrable acidity (%) [1.50 (3 days), 1.38 (6 days), 1.25 (9 days), 1.35 (12 days) and 1.60 (15 days)] %. It was also found that Treatment T₉ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + CFB Box) was at par with treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. However, its effect was found non-significant at 0 days. To sum up, it was found that with advancement of storage there was significant

Comment [R6]: Would you include information about the protocols that you followed in the determination and quantification of all the chemical parameters that you mentioned in the results section?

Also it is important to describe the panel of the sensorial test.

Comment [R7]: Would you consider graphing your results, and in this way obtain a model or equation that could allow you to predict the shelf life of the fruit, in which you determined the best combination of coverage and packaging?

decrease in acidity followed by gradual increase irrespective of storage treatments. This may be due to synthesis of some organic acids due to initiation of process of fermentation and also may be attributed to concentration of cell contents due to loss of moisture in all treatments after prolonged storage.

3.2.3 Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g)

The data in Table 3 revealed that ascorbic acid dropped steadily throughout the storage period and Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded the maximum Ascorbic acid (mg/100g) [300.28 (3 days), 295.41 (6 days), 287.39 (9 days), 280.24 (12 days) and 268.29 (15 days)] (mg/100g) over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly lowest Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g) [283.32 (3 days), 274.39 (6 days), 257.80 (9 days), 241.28 (12 days) and 228.24 (15 days)] (mg/100g). During storage, ascorbic acid was lost due to activation of phenoloxidase and ascorbic acid oxidase enzymes whereas coating could have inhibited O₂ diffusion and slowed respiration rate, delaying deteriorative oxidation reaction of fruit ascorbic acid. Similar results were recorded by Singh *et al.* [17]

3.2.4 Reducing Sugar (%)

The data in Table 3 revealed that as the storage period advanced the reducing sugar (%) in fruits increased continuously and Treatment T₁₁ (5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags) recorded the minimum Reducing Sugar % [1.36 (3 days), 1.52 (6 days), 1.68 (9 days), 1.74(12 days) and 1.91 (15 days)] % over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly highest reducing sugar % [2.05 (3 days), 2.15 (6 days), 2.32 (9 days), 2.42 (12 days) and 2.61 (15 days)] %. It was found that Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) was at par with Treatment T₁₁ (5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. However, its effect was found non-significant at 0 days. Regarding packaging materials the fruits packed in nylon net bags showed the highest reducing sugar percentage and lowest

percentage was observed in PE Bags. The rate of hydrolysis of starch to simple sugars might be higher in untreated fruits due to normal respiration whereas in coated fruits it is lower.

3.2.5 Non-Reducing Sugar (%)

The data in Table 4 revealed that as the storage period advanced, the non – reducing sugar (%) in fruits increased continuously and Treatment T₁₁ (5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags) recorded the minimum Non-Reducing Sugar % [0.38 (3 days), 0.44 (6 days), 0.59 (9 days), 0.68(12 days) and 0.72(15 days)] % over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly highest Non-Reducing Sugar % [1.25(3 days), 1.48 (6 days), 1.55 (9 days), 1.62 (12 days) and 1.70 (15 days)] %. It was found that Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) was at par with Treatment T₁₁ (5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. However, its effect was found non-significant at 0 days. Coated fruits having lower level of non-reducing sugar might be due to altered respiration process resulting in slow hydrolysis of starch.

3.2.6 Total Sugar (%)

The data in Table 4 revealed that Treatment T₁₁ (5% Wax + 0.1% Sodium Benzoate + PE Bags) recorded the minimum Total Sugar % [1.74 (3 days), 1.96 (6 days), 2.27 (9 days), 2.42 (12 days) and 2.63 (15 days)] % over all other treatments whereas Treatment T₀ (control) was found having significantly highest Total Sugar % [3.30 (3 days), 3.63 (6 days), 3.87 (9 days), 4.04 (12 days) and 4.31 (15 days)] %. Fruits with Coating may have lower respiration rate and metabolic activity, leading to a slower breakdown of complex polysaccharides (Baldwin *et al.* [18]). Similar results are also reported by Gangwar *et al.* [9] in aonla.

3.3 Organoleptic Quality

3.3.1 Colour

It was revealed from table 5 that as the storage period advanced, the fading of colour increased, recording gradual reduction in score. At all stages of storage, Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded best score on hedonic scale [7.95 (9 days), 7.80 (12 days) and 7.60 (15 days)] over all other treatments whereas treatment T₀ (control) was found having lowest score for colour change [6.50 (9 days), 5.80 (12 days) and 4.50 (15 days)]. It was also found that Treatment T₉ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + CFB Box) was at par with treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. This could be due to external application of wax which increased glossiness of fruit while Cycocel helped to maintain firmness throughout storage period as reported by Patel et al. [19] in Guava.

3.3.2 Fruit Shrivelling

The progress of development of fruit skin shrivelling was observed visually at three days

interval. The intensity of shrivelling was worked out on 0 to 4 scale. Table 5 depicts that during the course of storage, it was found that with advancement of storage period, fruit shrivelling was increased. Treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) recorded lowest score for shrivelling [0.40 (9 days), 0.90 (12 days) and 1.50 (15 days)] over all other treatments whereas treatment T₀ (control) was found having highest fruit shrivelling [2.0 (9 days), 2.55 (12 days) and 3.55 (15 days)]. It was also found that Treatment T₉ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + CFB Box) was at par with treatment T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) during the whole storage period of study. Application of Wax and chemicals to fruits helps them in reduction of respiration rate and against excessive moisture loss and does not effect in natural appearance of fruits and its quality as reported by Jagadeesh and Rokhade [20] in guava.

Table 1: Effect of different Packaging materials and Chemicals on Physiological Weight Loss (%) and Rotting (%) of Aonla

Treatments	Physiological Weight Loss (%)					Rotting (%)		
	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days
T ₀	4.95	8.25	11.37	14.19	17.18	3.70	6.90	11.45
T ₁	3.70	6.90	8.80	12.10	15.60	3.50	6.05	10.10
T ₂	2.38	4.25	7.05	9.90	13.25	3.30	5.20	9.50
T ₃	3.18	5.05	7.85	10.60	14.30	3.45	5.60	9.70
T ₄	3.10	6.08	8.20	10.40	13.50	2.25	4.35	8.10
T ₅	1.98	4.01	6.70	8.90	11.45	2.10	3.90	7.05
T ₆	2.20	4.90	7.20	9.80	12.40	2.12	4.05	7.10
T ₇	2.18	5.40	7.70	9.70	12.80	1.05	2.70	5.55
T ₈	1.40	2.70	5.65	7.35	10.05	0.65	2.45	4.90
T ₉	1.80	3.70	6.70	8.30	11.40	0.95	2.50	5.10
T ₁₀	3.71	6.80	8.80	12.90	16.70	2.95	5.50	9.30
T ₁₁	2.50	5.00	7.08	10.20	14.90	2.75	3.95	8.05
T ₁₂	3.01	5.00	7.89	11.35	15.35	2.80	4.05	8.10
F-Test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
C.V.	2.232	1.161	0.803	0.597	0.471	2.729	1.429	0.809
S.E.(m)	0.036	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.037	0.038	0.036	0.037
CD (5%)	0.104	0.102	0.105	0.105	0.109	0.111	0.106	0.109

Table 2: Effect of different Packaging materials and Chemicals on TSS (⁰Brix) and Titrable Acidity (%) of Aonla

Treatments	Total Soluble Solids (⁰ Brix)						Titrable Acidity (%)					
	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days
T ₀	11.80	14.80	15.50	16.05	15.92	15.15	2.46	1.50	1.38	1.25	1.35	1.60
T ₁	11.84	14.10	14.80	15.80	15.50	14.90	2.42	1.60	1.52	1.43	1.59	1.70
T ₂	11.81	13.95	14.60	15.50	15.10	14.70	2.36	1.85	1.71	1.55	1.70	1.80
T ₃	11.78	14.00	14.65	15.50	15.00	14.75	2.40	1.80	1.68	1.50	1.65	1.75
T ₄	11.78	13.90	13.90	14.95	14.50	14.05	2.43	2.10	1.98	1.75	1.90	1.98
T ₅	11.81	13.05	13.70	14.50	14.00	13.70	2.38	2.34	2.22	1.98	2.04	2.15
T ₆	11.75	13.25	13.80	14.70	14.30	13.85	2.42	2.33	2.18	1.92	2.01	2.08
T ₇	11.70	13.10	13.95	14.80	14.10	13.35	2.37	2.05	1.95	1.70	1.85	1.93
T ₈	11.81	12.50	13.05	14.05	13.10	12.95	2.42	2.39	2.30	2.12	2.22	2.35
T ₉	11.80	12.70	13.25	14.30	13.30	13.05	2.43	2.38	2.28	2.05	2.15	2.28
T ₁₀	11.74	14.05	14.50	15.05	14.95	14.50	2.34	1.90	1.83	1.62	1.75	1.88
T ₁₁	11.82	13.60	13.90	14.85	14.45	14.05	2.39	2.30	2.10	1.85	1.98	2.05
T ₁₂	11.83	13.85	14.00	14.90	14.35	14.15	2.38	2.29	2.05	1.82	1.95	2.02
F-Test	N.S	S	S	S	S	S	N.S	S	S	S	S	S
C.V.	0.444	0.471	0.445	0.433	0.431	0.468	2.035	2.273	3.221	3.570	3.429	3.166
S.E (m)	0.030	0.037	0.036	0.037	0.036	0.038	0.028	0.027	0.036	0.036	0.037	0.036
C.D. (5%)	-	0.107	0.105	0.109	0.105	0.111	-	0.079	0.105	0.104	0.107	0.105

Table 3: Effect of different Packaging materials and Chemicals on Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g) and Reducing Sugar (%)

Treatments	Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g)						Reducing Sugar (%)					
	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days
T ₀	311.09	283.32	274.39	257.80	241.28	228.24	1.39	2.05	2.15	2.32	2.42	2.61
T ₁	311.15	290.49	282.23	277.52	270.21	254.43	1.35	1.92	2.08	2.16	2.30	2.45
T ₂	310.92	297.75	290.38	280.15	274.38	260.84	1.37	1.78	1.92	2.02	2.09	2.30
T ₃	310.86	296.16	290.12	281.15	273.19	257.84	1.37	1.85	1.96	2.09	2.15	2.34
T ₄	310.90	290.25	285.72	279.37	271.04	258.22	1.28	1.69	1.86	1.98	2.04	2.27
T ₅	310.98	296.43	291.37	283.42	278.75	266.39	1.29	1.50	1.69	1.80	1.95	2.10
T ₆	310.89	293.65	287.13	282.26	273.95	260.28	1.26	1.57	1.78	1.88	1.97	2.13
T ₇	311.05	294.42	290.18	280.14	272.72	261.12	1.38	1.62	1.80	1.92	2.01	2.23
T ₈	310.96	300.28	295.41	287.39	280.24	268.29	1.30	1.39	1.56	1.70	1.79	1.95
T ₉	310.92	298.71	293.27	285.54	264.49	265.33	1.29	1.46	1.62	1.76	1.88	2.01
T ₁₀	311.07	292.75	286.89	277.44	270.01	256.93	1.27	1.52	1.72	1.82	1.97	2.19
T ₁₁	310.87	297.82	292.74	282.19	275.61	261.15	1.32	1.36	1.52	1.68	1.74	1.91
T ₁₂	310.82	295.92	290.33	280.93	273.09	258.56	1.29	1.43	1.58	1.72	1.92	2.04
F-Test	N.S	S	S	S	S	S	N.S	S	S	S	S	S
C.V.	0.025	0.022	0.019	0.023	0.024	0.024	4.382	3.923	3.575	3.343	3.194	2.789
S.E (m)	0.043	0.026	0.044	0.040	0.030	0.052	0.033	0.037	0.037	0.037	0.037	0.035

C.D. (5%)	-	0.108	0.093	0.107	0.108	0.103	-	0.107	0.107	0.107	0.108	0.103
-----------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Table 4: Effect of different packaging materials and Chemicals on Non – Reducing Sugar (%) and Total Sugar (%)

Treatments	Non – Reducing Sugar (%)						Total Sugar (%)					
	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days	0 Days	3 Days	6 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days
T ₀	0.29	1.25	1.48	1.55	1.62	1.70	1.68	3.30	3.63	3.87	4.04	4.31
T ₁	0.32	1.05	1.15	1.25	1.34	1.42	1.67	2.97	3.23	3.41	3.64	3.87
T ₂	0.24	0.92	0.99	1.08	1.22	1.28	1.61	2.70	2.91	3.10	3.31	3.58
T ₃	0.26	0.98	1.04	1.10	1.28	1.32	1.63	2.83	3.00	3.19	3.43	3.66
T ₄	0.22	0.89	0.95	1.02	1.12	1.20	1.50	2.58	2.81	3.00	3.16	3.47
T ₅	0.22	0.72	0.78	0.88	0.92	0.98	1.51	2.22	2.47	2.68	2.87	3.08
T ₆	0.24	0.78	0.83	0.96	1.01	1.09	1.50	2.35	2.61	2.84	2.98	3.22
T ₇	0.22	0.80	0.88	0.98	1.06	1.12	1.60	2.42	2.68	2.90	3.07	3.35
T ₈	0.26	0.49	0.58	0.68	0.72	0.78	1.56	1.88	2.14	2.38	2.51	2.73
T ₉	0.24	0.64	0.72	0.82	0.86	0.90	1.53	2.10	2.34	2.58	2.74	2.91
T ₁₀	0.36	0.74	0.80	0.92	0.98	1.02	1.63	2.26	2.52	2.74	2.95	3.21
T ₁₁	0.26	0.38	0.44	0.59	0.68	0.72	1.58	1.74	1.96	2.27	2.42	2.63
T ₁₂	0.26	0.58	0.69	0.74	0.78	0.84	1.55	2.01	2.27	2.46	2.70	2.88
F-Test	N.S	S	S	S	S	S	N.S	S	S	S	S	S
C.V.	22.886	7.126	7.395	6.330	5.909	5.996	4.582	2.602	2.494	2.178	2.006	1.885
S.E (m)	0.034	0.032	0.037	0.035	0.036	0.038	0.042	0.036	0.038	0.036	0.035	0.036
C.D. (5%)	-	0.094	0.108	0.103	0.104	0.111	-	0.105	0.111	0.105	0.103	0.104

Table 5:Effect of different Packaging materials and Chemicals on Organoleptic Score

Treatment	Hedonic Score for Colour			Fruit Shrivelling Score		
	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days	9 Days	12 Days	15 Days
T ₀	6.50	5.80	4.50	2.00	2.55	3.55
T ₁	7.50	7.10	6.90	1.55	2.10	3.15
T ₂	7.75	7.55	7.30	1.40	1.95	2.85
T ₃	7.60	7.50	7.20	1.40	2.01	3.05
T ₄	7.30	6.90	6.85	1.20	1.50	2.10
T ₅	7.70	7.50	7.30	0.60	1.25	1.90
T ₆	7.60	7.30	7.20	0.65	1.30	2.05
T ₇	7.50	7.20	7.05	0.80	1.20	2.05
T ₈	7.95	7.80	7.60	0.40	0.90	1.50
T ₉	7.90	7.60	7.40	0.45	0.95	1.55
T ₁₀	7.20	6.80	6.70	1.30	1.85	3.00
T ₁₁	7.60	7.30	7.10	0.90	1.50	2.65
T ₁₂	7.55	7.10	7.00	1.05	1.65	2.75
F-Test	S	S	S	S	S	S
C.V.	1.544	1.270	1.569	5.772	4.439	2.765
S.E.(m)	0.067	0.053	0.063	0.035	0.041	0.039

C.D. (5%)	0.195	0.153	0.183	0.102	0.119	0.115
-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of result of the experiment, the following conclusions may be made-

1. Among the different treatments, T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel + PE Bags) was found to be best for extending the shelf life of Aonla.
2. It was best in terms of Physical attributes i.e., minimum Physiological Loss in Weight PLW (%) and minimum per cent Rotting.
3. Bio-chemical attributes i.e., Total Soluble Solids (TSS⁰Brix), Titrable Acidity (%), Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g) were best recorded with Treatment T₈.
4. Fruits treated with T₈ (5% Wax + 400 ppm Cycocel packed in Perforated Poly Ethylene bags) Scored best for organoleptic score.

REFERENCES

1. Kavita, M.B. Amalaki (Indian Gooseberry): An ancient food supplement. Int. J. Res. Ayur. Pharmacy, 2013; 4(1): pp 11-14.
2. Baliga, M.S., Prabhu, A.N., Prabhu, D.A., Shivashankara, A.R., Abraham, A. and Palatty, P.L. Antidiabetic and cardioprotective Effects of Amla (*EmblicofficinalisGaertn*) and its Phyto Chemicals: Preclinical Observations, Bioactive Food as Dietary Interventions for Diabetes, 2013; pp. 583 -600
3. Chauhan, O.P., Srivastava, S., Pandey, P. and Rai, G.K. A study on the development of aonla blended sauce. Beverage & Food World, 2005; 32 (5): 31-32
4. Ahmad, S., Tomar, Y. K., Rawat, J. M. S. and Rawat, V. Physico- chemical studies of some Aonla (*Emblica officinalis* G.) cultivars. Advances in Plant Sciences. 2010; 23(1): 129-130
5. Jaiswal, R., Singh, G. and Sagar, A. K. Studies on physico-chemical characteristics of aonla (*Emblica officinalis Gaertn.*) fruits. Progressive Agriculture, 2007; 7(1/2): 90-92
6. Asma Hassan, Gousia Hussain, Bisati, I. A. and Singh, D. B. Shelf life of aonla (*Emblica officinalis Gaertn.*) cv. NA-7 under ambient conditions. Env. and Ecol. 2009; 27(3A):1288-1291.
7. Carpita N and Cann M. To study postharvest behavior of Aonla. American Society of plant physiology, 2000; 52-108.
8. Lodhi, D. K. and Tiwari, R. Effect of calcium nitrate on physico-chemical changes and shelf-life of aonla (*Emblica officinalis Gaertn*) fruits. Annals of Plant and Soil Research, 2017; 19(1): 32-36.
9. Gangwar, Santosh; Shukla, H.S.; Katiyar, Dheerendra and Pandey, Vivek. Effect of Calcium nitrate on physico-Chemical changes and shelf- life of Aonla Fruits cv. Banrasi, Krishna, kanchan and NA-7. Hort. Flora Res. Spectrum 2012; 1(3): 253-258.
10. Kumar, S.; kumar, A.; Baig, M.G. and Chaubey, B.K. Effect of calcium on physicochemical changes in aonla (*Embilica officinalis Gaertn*) fruits cv. Indian. J. Hort. 2005; 62(4): 324-326.
11. Dhupal, S.S.; Karal, A.R.; Garande, V.K.; Patil, B.T.; Masalkar, S.D. and Kshirsagar, D.B. Shelf Life of Aonla Fruits; Influenced By Post Harvest Treatment and Packaging Materials.

- Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 2008; 42(3): 189-194.
12. Kore, V. T.; Devi, H. L.; Haque, S. and Kabir, J. Post harvest treatments, packaging, storage and value addition of aonla: an overview. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Minor Fruits and Medicinal Plants for Health and Ecological Security (ISMF & MP), West Bengal, India, 2012; 19-22 December.
 13. Dhemre, J. K.; Waskar, D. P.; Masalkar, S. D. and Gaikwad, R. S. Effect of post harvest treatments on shelf life and quality of mango cv. Kesar in cool storage and ambient conditions. Agric. Sci. Digest; 2005; 25(2):79-84.
 14. Gupta, V. K. and Mukherjee, D. The influence of wax emulsion, morphactin and Plant Growth Regulators on storage behaviour of Indian gooseberry fruits. Scientia Horticulture, 1982; 16: 155-162.
 15. Contreras-Oliva, A. Perez-Gago, M.B. Salvador, A. Bermejo, A. and Rojas-Argudo, C. Physico-chemical, sensory and nutritional quality of oranges cv. Valencia coated with chitosan. Publicadocomo ARTICULO enAgrociencia., 2012; 46: 441-453
 16. Yadav, V.K. and Singh, H.K. Studies on the pre-harvest application of chemicals on shelf-life of aonla (*Emblica officinalis Gaertn.*) fruits at ambient temperature. J Appl Hort., 1999; 1(2): 118-121
 17. Singh, B.P.; Panday, G.; Sarolia, D.K.; Pandey, M.K. and Pathak, R.K. Shelf-life evaluation of aonla cultivars. Indian. J. Hort. 2005; 62(2): 137-140
 18. Baldwin, E. A., Burns, J. K., Kazokas, W., Brecht, J. K., Hagenmaier, R. D., Bender, R. J. and Pesis, E. Effect of two edible coatings with different permeability characteristics on mango (*Mangifera indica L.*) ripening during storage. Postharvest Biology and Technology, 1999; 17(3): 215-226.
 19. Patel, A.B., Patel, B.I. and Katrodia, J.S. Extension of storage life of guava (*Psidium guajava L.*) fruits. Indian Fd. Packer. 1993; 87(1): 5-9.
 20. Jagadeesh, S.L. and Rokhade, A.K. Effect of post harvest treatment on keeping quality of guava (*Psidium guajava L.*) fruits cv. Sardar-1. Karnataka J. Agri. Sci. 1998; 11(4): 1003-1008