

## **Original Research Article**

### **Standardization ~~Standardisation~~ of recipe with value addition for Mango candy (*Mangifera indica*)**

#### **Abstract**

The present experiment was carried out during June 2022 to September 2022 in post-harvest laboratory of Department of Horticulture, SHUATS, Prayagraj. The experiment was conducted in (CRD) completely randomized design, with nine treatments which were replicated thrice. The treatments were **T<sub>0</sub>**: Control (standard recipe), **T<sub>1</sub>**: Mint syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>2</sub>**: Mint syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>3</sub>**: Tulsi syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>4</sub>**: Tulsi syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>5</sub>**: Lemongrass syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>6</sub>**: Lemongrass syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>7</sub>**: Cinnamon syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>8</sub>**: Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%). The Mango candy was stored for 60 days at ambient temperature. From the present investigation it is found that treatment **T<sub>2</sub>**: Mint syrup (1.0%) is superior in respect of the physio-chemical parameters like total soluble solids, acidity, ascorbic acid, total sugar. Treatment **T<sub>2</sub>**: Mint syrup (1.0%) is also found superior in organoleptic score of colour and appearance, texture, flavor and overall acceptability of Mango candy. In terms of benefit cost ratio the highest net return, was also found in **T<sub>2</sub>**: Mint syrup (1.0%) and minimum was recorded in **T<sub>4</sub>**: Tulsi syrup (1.0%), in all the parameters.

**Keywords:** *Mango, Candy, Quality Parameters, Economics.*

## Introduction

Mango belongs to the genus *Mangifera* of the family Anacardiaceae. The genus *Mangifera* contains several species that bear edible fruit. Most of the fruit trees that are commonly known as mangoes belong to the species *Mangifera indica*. The other edible *Mangifera* species generally have lower quality fruit and are commonly referred to as wild mangoes. Mango has become naturalized and adapted throughout the tropics and subtropics. Much of the spread and naturalization has occurred in conjunction with the spread of human population, and as such, the mango plays an important part in the diet and cuisine of many diverse cultures. There are over 1000 named mango varieties throughout the world, which is a testament to their value to humankind. Mango is a common garden tree throughout the tropics. When ripe, this delicious dessert fruit is particularly high in vitamin A. The fruit is also eaten green, processed into pickles, pulps, jams, and chutneys, and is frozen or dried. The fruit is also an important source of sustenance—for birds, bats, insects, and mammals. Although grown widely, mangoes prefer a warm, frost-free climate with a well-defined winter dry season. Rain and high humidity during flowering and fruit development reduces fruit yields. The tree generally flowers in mid- to late winter, with fruit maturing in the early to mid-summer months. Mango trees are usually between 3 to 10 m (10–33 ft) tall but can reach up to 30 m (100 ft) in some forest situations. The canopy is evergreen with a generally spreading habit. The heavy canopy of the mango is a source of

shelter and shade for both animals and human.

Among the other processed products, fruit bar is also popular which is thick, pleasant and dried product made from fruit pulp having greater nutritional value than the fresh fruits because all nutrients are present in concentrated form and therefore, they become a convenience food assortment to get the health benefits of fruits (Wahane *et al.*, 2019). Traditionally mango bars have been prepared from unmarketable surplus and desi variety of mango which otherwise do not find place and price in the market. Blending with ingredients like sugar, milk powder and gelatin may impart enhanced physico-chemical properties and increased nutritive value of processed sweet fruit based products. The aim of the present work was focused on standardizing the protocol for preparation of fruit candy from raw mango and to evaluate storage stability of the candy. Fruit based confectionary items are considered as a popular segment of world market. However, most of the confectionary products are prepared by artificial flavor and sometimes small concentration of fruits. No attempts so far have been made to utilize raw mango or processing into osmotically dehydrated value added product and disposal as a source of income for the farmers. Such confectionary products due to their sweet taste and flavour enjoy a wide acceptance. With increasing awareness of the food value and dietary role of various food constituents, people are now highly discriminative in selecting products. The market tendency is to select those products prepared from natural ingredients. Fruittoffees contain nutrients like vitamins and minerals present in the original fruit and are nutritionally superior to those prepared from sugar or syrup. The osmo-dried or fruit candies are popular and highly acceptable confectionary products liked by almost all age

Comment [C2]: What is this?

Comment [C1]: Role is better

groups as a snack for quick energy. They can be better utilized as a vehicle to promote consumption and utilization of such local fruits that are produced in glut and have quite limited shelf life.

### Materials and Methods

The present investigation entitled “**Standardisation of recipe with value addition for Mango candy (*Mangifera indica*)**” was carried out at post-harvest lab, Department of Horticulture, SHUATS, Naini Agricultural Institute, PRAYAGRAJ in the year 2022-2023.

The treatments were **T<sub>0</sub>**: Control (standard recipe), **T<sub>1</sub>**: Mintsyrup (0.5%), **T<sub>2</sub>**: Mint syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>3</sub>**: Tulsi syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>4</sub>**: Tulsi syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>5</sub>**: Lemongrass syrup (0.5%), **T<sub>6</sub>**: Lemongrass syrup (1.0%), **T<sub>7</sub>**: Cinnamon syrup (0.5%) **T<sub>8</sub>**: Mintsyrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%).

### Results and Discussion

TSS of Mango candy was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At the beginning of storage maximum total soluble solids 77.93<sup>o</sup>Brix was observed in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 76.97<sup>o</sup>Brix observed in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and minimum 73.24<sup>o</sup>Brix in T<sub>0</sub> [Control]. At 60 days after storage maximum TSS recorded is 80.86<sup>o</sup>Brix in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 79.80<sup>o</sup>Brix observed in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and minimum 76.02<sup>o</sup>Brix in T<sub>0</sub> [Control]. Increase in TSS during storage can be due to conversion of polysaccharides into sugars during hydrolysis process. Therefore, TSS found to increase slightly with increase in storage period. Similar findings

reported by **Manivsagan (2011)** in karonda candy and by **Navitha and Mishra (2018)** in Ber candy.

Acidity of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At the beginning of storage maximum acidity 1.00% was observed in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 0.99% observed in T<sub>7</sub> [Cinnamon syrup (1.0%)] and minimum 0.92% in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage maximum acidity recorded is 0.94% in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 0.93% observed in T<sub>1</sub> [Mint syrup (0.5%)] and minimum 0.80% in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. The decrease in acidity (%) in Mango candy during storage can be the result of chemical interaction between Mango candy constituents induced by temperature and action of enzyme. Similar results were reported by **Neelesh (2014)** in papaya candy and **Navitha and Mishra (2018)** in Mango candy.

Ascorbic acid (mg/100g) of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At the beginning of storage maximum Ascorbic acid 32.07 mg/100g was observed in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 31.99 mg/100g observed in T<sub>4</sub> [Tulsi syrup (1.0%)] and minimum is 29.94 mg/100g in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage maximum Ascorbic acid recorded is 27.19 mg/100g in T<sub>2</sub> [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 26.92 mg/100g observed in T<sub>4</sub> [Tulsi syrup (1.0%)] and minimum 25.60 mg/100g in T<sub>5</sub> [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. Ascorbic acid in any food commodity plays an important role in deciding its shelf life. Similar results were reported by **Daisy and Gehlot (2006)** in

Aonlapreserve., and **Neelesh (2014)** in papaya candy.

Reducing sugar (%) of Mango candy was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At the beginning of storage maximum Reducing sugar 24.49% was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 24.45% observed in T4 [Tulsi syrup (1.0%)] and minimum is 23.70% in T0 [Control]. At 60 days after storage maximum Reducing sugar recorded is 26.28% in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 26.05% observed in T7 [Cinnamon syrup (1.0%)] and minimum 25.18% in T5 [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. Reducing sugar in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its shelf life. Usually, high sugar content makes the moisture unavailable for the growth of microorganisms, thus improves the shelf life of food. Similar results were reported by **Daisy and Gehlot (2006)** in Aonlapreserve.

Non-reducing sugar (%) of Mango candy was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At the beginning of storage maximum Non-reducing sugar 33.34% was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 33.28% observed in T4 [Tulsi syrup (1.0%)] and minimum is 30.51% in T0 [Control]. At 60 days after storage maximum Non-reducing sugar recorded is 35.59% in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 35.58% observed in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)] and minimum 33.59% in T0 [Control].

Non-reducing sugar in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its shelf life. Usually, high sugar content makes the moisture unavailable for the growth of microorganisms, thus improves

the shelf life of food. Similar results were reported by **Daisy and Gehlot (2006)** in Aonlapreserve.

Total sugar (%) of Mango candy was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage maximum Total sugar 57.83% was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 57.80% observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and minimum is 54.21% in T0 [Control]. At 60 days after storage maximum Total sugar recorded is 61.87% in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 61.85% observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and minimum 59.04% in T0 [Control]. Total sugar in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its shelf life. Usually, high sugar content makes the moisture unavailable for the growth of microorganisms, thus improves the shelf life of food. Similar results were reported by **Krishnaveniet al. (2001)** in jackfruit RTS, **Jain et al. (2004)** in papaya cubes.

Colour and Appearance (sensory score) of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage best colour and appearance (sensory score) 8.98 was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.93 observed in T1 [Mint syrup (0.5%)] and lowest 8.43 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage best Colour and Appearance (sensory score) recorded is 8.92 in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.79 observed in T1 [Mint syrup (0.5%)] and lowest is 8.10 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. Colour and Appearance in any food commodity

plays important role in deciding its market value. Colour is an attribute of food quality and loss of colour by osmotic dehydration process is one of the most significant changes. Similar results were reported by **Heredia (2004)** and **Singh et al., (2012)** in Ber candy.

Flavour (sensory score) of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage best flavour (sensory score) 8.54 was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.50 observed in T1 [Mint syrup (0.5%)] and lowest 8.42 in T5 [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage best flavour (sensory score) recorded is 7.86 in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 7.75 observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and lowest is 7.31 in T5 [Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)]. Flavour in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its market value. This might be due to degradation of volatile substance and flavor constituents. Similar results were reported by **Hasanuzzaman (2014)** in tomato candy and **Deepak Singh Rathore (2020)** in Ber candy.

Taste (sensory score) of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage best Taste (sensory score) 8.55 was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.52 observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and lowest 8.16 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage best taste (sensory score) recorded is 8.14 in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.13 observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and lowest is 7.64

in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. Taste in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its market value. This might be due to degradation of volatile substance and flavor constituents. Similar results were reported by **Ames (2003)** and **Chavan (2010)** in Jackfruit products.

Texture (sensory score) of Mango candy was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage best Texture (sensory score) 8.97 was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.86 observed in T1 [Mint syrup (0.5%)] and lowest 8.29 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage best texture (sensory score) recorded is 8.91 in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.90 observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and lowest is 8.09 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. Texture in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its market value. This might be due to degradation of volatile substance and flavour constituents. Similar results were reported by **Ames (2003)** and **Chavan (2010)** in Jackfruit products.

Overall acceptability (sensory score) of Mango candy was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. At beginning of storage best Overall acceptability (sensory score) 8.44 was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.37 observed in T8 [Mint syrup (0.5%) + Tulsi syrup (0.5%) + Lemongrass syrup (0.5%)] and lowest 7.85 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. At 60 days after storage best overall acceptability (sensory score) recorded is 8.36 in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] followed by 8.25 observed in

T1[Mintsyrup(0.5%)] and lowest is 7.63 in T3 [Tulsi syrup (0.5%)]. Overall acceptability in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its market value. The increase in overall acceptability score may be due to absorption of atmospheric moisture, dilution of sugars and changes in acidity, oxidation of ascorbic acid as well as changes in biochemical constituents of candy. Similar results were reported by **Sharma (2013)** in apple candy.

It is evident from the treatment details that highest benefit cost ratio was recorded in T2 Mint syrup (1.0%) (1.83) and followed by T0 [Control] (1.81) and lowest benefit cost ratio was recorded in T4 (Tulsi syrup (1.0%)) (1.39).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table1:Effectof herbfavouronTSS (<sup>0</sup>B), Acidity % and Ascorbic acid (mg/100g)ofMangocandy duringstorage.**

Treatment	Total Soluble Solid ( <sup>0</sup> B)					Acidity(%)					Ascorbicacid(mg/100g)				
	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS
T <sub>0</sub>	73.24	73.39	73.54	75.20	76.02	0.95	0.93	0.92	0.91	0.88	31.10	30.14	29.18	27.42	26.09
T <sub>1</sub>	74.36	74.54	74.71	75.38	76.28	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.94	0.93	31.98	31.01	30.04	28.28	26.14
T <sub>2</sub>	77.93	78.22	78.50	80.18	80.86	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.95	0.94	32.07	31.11	30.15	28.39	27.19
T <sub>3</sub>	74.14	74.41	74.68	76.00	76.90	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.92	31.85	30.89	29.93	28.10	26.03
T <sub>4</sub>	75.47	75.76	76.04	77.40	78.32	0.93	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.82	31.99	31.01	30.03	28.19	26.92
T <sub>5</sub>	76.97	77.13	77.29	78.92	79.80	0.92	0.90	0.89	0.85	0.80	29.94	29.42	28.90	27.11	25.60
T <sub>6</sub>	75.35	75.57	75.79	77.18	78.03	0.95	0.94	0.93	0.91	0.88	31.49	30.60	29.71	27.91	26.33
T <sub>7</sub>	73.23	73.39	73.55	75.21	76.34	0.99	0.97	0.96	0.93	0.92	31.84	30.89	29.94	28.06	26.04
T <sub>8</sub>	74.34	74.52	74.70	75.37	76.28	0.97	0.96	0.95	0.91	0.92	31.95	30.99	30.04	28.16	26.52
F Test	S	S	S	S	S	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
SE(m)	0.54	0.54	0.55	0.60	0.58	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.23	0.19	0.15	0.14	0.16
CDat 5%	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.26	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.07

**Table 2: Effect of herbal flavour on Reducing sugar %, Non-reducing sugar %, and Total sugar % of Mangocandy during storage.**

Treatment	Reducing sugar (%)					Non-reducing sugar (%)					Total sugar (%)				
	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS
T <sub>0</sub>	23.7	23.99	24.27	24.9	25.45	30.51	32.05	32.78	32.94	33.59	54.21	55.63	57.05	57.84	59.04
T <sub>1</sub>	23.97	24.26	24.54	25.1	25.76	32.09	33.17	32.8	33.6	34.24	56.06	56.7	57.34	58.7	60
T <sub>2</sub>	24.49	24.78	25.06	25.7	26.28	33.34	34.47	34.05	34.77	35.59	57.83	58.47	59.11	60.47	61.87
T <sub>3</sub>	23.58	23.82	24.05	24.5	25.02	33.08	34.38	33.89	34.8	35.58	56.66	57.3	57.94	59.3	60.7
T <sub>4</sub>	24.45	24.74	25.02	25.7	26.01	33.28	34.27	34	34.89	35.26	57.73	58.38	59.02	60.59	61.27
T <sub>5</sub>	23.91	24.2	24.49	25	25.18	32.62	33.42	33.35	34	34.22	56.53	57.19	57.84	59	59.4
T <sub>6</sub>	24.01	24.29	24.57	25.15	25.61	32.49	33.63	33.48	34.17	34.77	56.5	57.28	58.05	59.32	60.38
T <sub>7</sub>	24.41	24.71	25.01	25.74	26.05	31.62	32.8	32.3	33.02	33.97	56.03	56.67	57.31	58.76	60.02
T <sub>8</sub>	23.93	24.2	24.46	25.03	25.21	33.27	35.31	34.67	33.46	34.74	57.8	58.47	59.13	60.49	61.85
<b>F Test</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.34	0.17	0.25	0.29	0.27	0.38	0.32	0.27	0.32	0.28
<b>CDat 5%</b>	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.15	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.14

**Table3:Effect of herbal flavourescore of Color, Flavor and Taste of Mangocandy during storage.**

Treatment	Colour					Flavour					Taste				
	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS
T <sub>0</sub>	8.81	8.77	8.72	8.66	8.62	8.46	8.41	8.36	8.24	7.64	8.4	8.34	8.27	8.11	7.9
T <sub>1</sub>	8.93	8.9	8.87	8.83	8.79	8.5	8.45	8.39	8.27	7.72	8.45	8.4	8.34	8.03	8.03
T <sub>2</sub>	8.98	9	8.98	8.94	8.92	8.54	8.49	8.43	8.31	7.86	8.55	8.51	8.46	8.34	8.14
T <sub>3</sub>	8.43	8.37	8.3	8.21	8.1	8.33	8.29	8.24	8.14	7.55	8.16	8.13	8.09	7.93	7.64
T <sub>4</sub>	8.68	8.63	8.57	8.5	8.44	8.44	8.39	8.34	8.22	7.48	8.4	8.33	8.25	8.08	7.85
T <sub>5</sub>	8.53	8.47	8.4	8.31	8.24	8.42	8.36	8.3	8.18	7.31	8.28	8.21	8.14	8.01	7.77
T <sub>6</sub>	8.73	8.69	8.64	8.57	8.51	8.45	8.4	8.34	8.22	7.59	8.37	8.31	8.25	8.08	7.88
T <sub>7</sub>	8.83	8.79	8.74	8.69	8.65	8.42	8.37	8.32	8.22	7.62	8.36	8.3	8.24	8.12	7.86
T <sub>8</sub>	8.65	8.54	8.45	8.45	8.64	8.49	8.47	8.45	8.32	7.75	8.52	8.48	8.43	8.32	8.13
F Test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
SE(m)	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04
CDat 5%	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02

**Table4:Effect of herbal flavour on score of texture and overall acceptability and benefit cost ratio of Mangocandy during storage.**

Treatment	Texture					Overall acceptability					B:C Ratio
	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	0DAS	15D AS	30DAS	45DAS	60DAS	
T <sub>0</sub>	8.71	8.49	8.26	8.1	8.61	8.23	8.16	8.09	8.05	8.03	1.81
T <sub>1</sub>	8.86	8.6	8.33	8.02	8.78	8.35	8.32	8.31	8.29	8.25	1.61
T <sub>2</sub>	8.97	8.71	8.45	8.33	8.91	8.44	8.41	8.39	8.37	8.36	1.83
T <sub>3</sub>	8.29	8.19	8.08	7.92	8.09	7.85	7.76	7.67	7.65	7.63	1.58
T <sub>4</sub>	8.56	8.4	8.24	8.07	8.43	8.1	8.02	7.94	7.92	7.91	1.39
T <sub>5</sub>	8.39	8.26	8.13	8	8.23	7.95	7.86	7.77	7.73	7.7	1.57
T <sub>6</sub>	8.63	8.44	8.24	8.07	8.5	8.15	8.13	7.98	7.95	7.91	1.53
T <sub>7</sub>	8.73	8.48	8.23	8.11	8.64	8.25	8.18	8.11	8.08	8.01	1.44
T <sub>8</sub>	8.84	8.63	8.42	8.31	8.9	8.37	8.33	8.22	8.21	8.19	1.51
<b>F Test</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.05	
<b>CDat 5%</b>	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	

## Conclusion

Based on present investigation, it is concluded that T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] was best in terms of best recipe with value addition for preparation of mango candy. The same treatment T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)] was found best in terms of quality changes in mango candy during storage. The maximum maximum B:Crati was observed in T2 [Mint syrup (1.0%)].

## Future Scope

Production and marketing of fruits and vegetables must develop into production aspects, marketing aspects, processing and manufacturing aspects. There is tremendous production of fruits and vegetables in a shorter period. Therefore, to avoid the post-harvest loss and to increase substantial returns to processors for off season consumption. Availability of cheap labour, Government Subsidy for cold storage and processing units, convenience of roads in case for marketing and transport. Availability of cans, bottles, and other equipment at cheap rate, there is tremendous for export of processed products like Jam, jelly, marmalade, pickles, etc. dehydrated and dried vegetables in addition to domestic demand in India.

## References

- Alam S. and Singh (2005).** A process of dehydration on lapowder. Abstract presented in convention of Indian Society of Agriculture Engineers. 39:222.
- Ambri-Rodriguez, S.L., Islas-Hernandez, J.J., Agama-Acevedo, E., Tover, J. and Bello-Perez, L.A., (2008).** "Characterization of a fibre-rich powder made by the liquefaction of unripe banana flour" *Food Chemistry*, 107(4):1515-1521.
- Ames, J.M. (2003).** Browning. *Encyclopedia of Food Science and Nutrition* (2nd). Elsevier
- Anusuya, A.G., Aswathy, P.S., Kousika, S., Alagammai, S. and Priyadarshini, P. (2006).** Study of osmotic dehydration of grapes. Paper presented in "18th Indian Convention of Food Scientists and Technologists", held at Hyderabad in November, pp-67.
- Ari S., Anju K., Dhiman Rakesh Sharma and Manisha Kaushal (2015).** Standardization of Pre-treatments for the Development of Food Products from Papaya with intermediate moisture content (*Carica papaya* L.). *Intl. J. Food. Ferment. Technol.* 6(1):143-149.
- Babalola S.O., Ashaye O.A., Babalola A.O. and Aina J.O. (2002).** "Effect of extreme cold temperature storage on the quality attributes of pawpaw and guava leathers," *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 2:57-60.
- Bal, J.S., (1982).** A study on biochemical changes during room and refrigerator storage of ber. *Progressive Horticulture*. 14:158-161.
- Chavan, U.D., Prabhukhanolkar and Panwar, V.D. (2010).** Preparation of osmotic Dehydration ripe banana slices. *Journal of food sciences and technology*. 47(4):380-386.

**Daisy and Gehlot, R. (2006).** Physical and biochemical changes in fresh and preserved fruits and preserves of cvs. Banarasi and Chakaiya. *Haryana Journal of Horticulture Sciences* 35 (1):57-59.

dehydration of ber fruit. 4th Agricultural Sciences Congress, Jaipur, India. February, 21-24:214.

**Divya A. R., Jayashree S. and Basavarajappa B. (2012).** Effect of storage methods on the nutritional quality of candy made from sapota. *Asian J. Dairy & Food Res.*, 33(2):104-108.

**Hiremath JB, Rokhade AK (2012).** Preparation of Sapota Candy. *International Journal of Food, Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences*, ISSN:2277-209X, 2012;2(1).

**Jain SK, Verma RC, Mathur AN, Murdia LK (2004).** Studies on osmotic dehydration of papaya cubes. *Journal of Interacademia*.; 8(2):221-229.

**Jothi J.S., Monirul Islam, M.D., Serajul Islam, M.D., Rahman R.T., and Shireen Akther (2014).** Development and Shelf-Life Prediction of Pineapple (Ananas comosus) Preserve and Candy. *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research* 10(1):77-85.

**Kaikadi, M.A., Chavan, U.D., and Adsule, R.N., (2016).** "Studies on preparation and shelf-life of ber candy", 22(8):49-50.

**Kustangi K.U. (2002).** Studies on processing of sapota (Manilkara achas (Mill) Fosberg.) Fruits. M.Sc. (Hort.) Thesis, *University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad*, pp:44.

**Lande R., Kale P.B. and Takey S.M. (1999).** Studies on