Effect of pre-harvest nutrient application and bagging with different colours of polythene on quality of rainy season guava (*Psidium guajava* Linn.) cv. Allahabad safeda.

Abstract

An investigation was conducted at Horticulture Research Farm, Department of Horticulture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during 2021-22 and 2022-23. The experiment consisted of sixteen treatments viz T_0- Control, T_1- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%), T_2- K_2SO_4 (2%), T_3- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%), T_4- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_5- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene). T_6- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_7- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Silver colour polythene), T_8- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_9- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene), T_{10}- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_{11}- K_2SO_4 2% + Bagging (Silver colour polythene), T_{12}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_{13}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene), T_{14}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_{15}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Silver colour polythene) which were arranged in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. The foliar application of nutrients was done twice at ten days interval. Analysis of the data indicated that treatment T_{14}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene) reported to be best for parameters namely Average fruit weight (163.88), Fruit width (cm) (8.37), Fruit length (cm) (6.17),Volume of fruits (cm^3) (172.03,) Yield/plant (kg) (5.49), Insect damage fruits (%) (0.68), Organoleptic quality (9.78).

Keywords: Bagging, Calcium nitrate, Potassium sulphate, Guava, Quality.

Introduction

Guava (*Psidium guajava* Linn.) is a tropical fruit of high economic importance, particularly in India. Cultivators continuously seek methods to enhance the quality and yield of guava, especially during the rainy season. One promising technique is the use of bagging and foliar application of nutrients. This research aims to assess the effects of different colored bags and foliar applications of nutrients on the quality and yield of guava during the rainy season.

The practice of using bagging materials has become prevalent for various fruits, including guava, pear, apple, grape, peach, banana, longan, mango, dragon fruit, carambola, litchi, Indian jujube, custard apple and citrus. Bagging serves multiple purposes: it enhances fruit appearance, protects against abrasion and temperature fluctuations, prevents diseases and fruit fly infestations and extends shelf-life by two to three days (Pathak, 2008). This environmentally friendly method reduces the need for insecticide spraying, minimizing consumer hazards. Bagging is effective in controlling diseases and insects, improving fruit aesthetics and reducing chemical residues (Kitagawa *et al.,* 1992).

Pre-harvest fruit bagging is a usual phytosanitary practice aimed at improving both internal fruit standard and visual appeal by promoting fruit coloration. Widely used for guava and other tropical fruits, this technique involves enclosing each fruit or fruit bunch on the tree or plant for a specified duration to achieve desired outcomes. Different bag types can affect fruit size, maturity period, peel-to-pulp colour, mineral content, flavour and taste.

The theory suggests that bagging makes fruits more light-sensitive, fostering anthocyanin synthesis upon exposure to light after removal. Compared to unbagged fruits, the anthocyanin content and enzyme activity involved in phenolic metabolism increase significantly after the bag is removed, possibly due to accumulated heat causing higher respiration rates. Additionally, the carbon dioxide accumulated in the bags may produce more acetaldehyde, reducing astringency.

Materials and Methods

The present experiment was carried out during 2021-22 and 2022-23 at Horticulture Research Farm, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Naini, Prayagraj. The experiment was laid out with sixteen treatments which were replicated thrice. The experiment was carried out with the objective to study the effect of bagging and foliar application of nutrients on quality of guava during rainy season. The treatments were T_0- Control, T_1- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%), T_2- K_2SO_4 (2%), T_3- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) T_4- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_5- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene). T_6- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_7- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + Bagging (Silver colour polythene), T_8- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_9- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene), T_{10}- K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_{11}- K_2SO_4 2% + Bagging (Silver colour polythene), T_{12}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Red colour polythene), T_{13}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Green colour polythene), T_{14}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Yellow colour polythene), T_{15}- $Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Bagging (Silver colour polythene).

Results and Discussion

Impact of Bagging on Yield and Quality

The results indicated that bagging significantly regulate the yield and quality of guava. Fruits bagged with red and silver polythene exhibited higher yield and improved quality parameters such as colour, firmness and sugar content compared to those bagged with yellow and green polythene.

Effect of Foliar Nutrient Application

Foliar application of calcium nitrate and potassium sulphate positively affected the fruit size, weight and overall quality. The treatments led to an increase in yield and a reduction in post-harvest physiological loss, aligning with findings from previous studies.

Combined Effects of Bagging and Foliar Application

The combination of red polythene bagging and foliar nutrient application yielded the best results, with significant improvements in both the yield and quality of the guava fruits. This combination also extended the shelf-life of the fruits under ambient storage conditions.

Average fruit weight (g)

Treatment T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging) resulted in the maximum fruit weight, significantly outperforming other treatments. T_{13}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Green polythene bagging) was the second highest. The control (T_0) had the lowest fruit weight. Calcium aids in cell division, elongation, membrane integrity and fruit size, while potassium is crucial for cell processes and fruit size. Warmer temperatures in yellow-bagged fruits likely led to earlier harvesting. Bagging impacts light interception, affecting growth. Studies by Meena *et al.* (2016) confirm that wrapping and calcium chloride treatments improve fruit weight and size.

Fruit width (cm)

Treatment T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging) yielded the maximum fruit width (8.45, 8.28 and 8.37 cm) across two years and pooled data. This was comparable to T_{13}- (Green polythene bagging) and T_{15}- (Silver polythene bagging). The minimum fruit width (6.30, 6.17 and 6.24 cm) was observed in the control (T_0), comparable to several other treatments but significantly lower than the rest.

Calcium nitrate enhances fruit width by improving carbohydrate production and conversion, reducing abscission, and maintaining cell structure. Potassium sulphate is essential for nitrate reduction and optimal fruit width. The superior performance of yellow bagging may be due to favourable changes in the microclimate, aligning with Tiwari *et al.* (2008) findings in guava.

Fruit length (cm)

Treatment T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging) resulted in the maximum fruit length (6.23, 6.11, and 6.17 cm) over two years and pooled data, significantly outperforming other treatments and comparable to T_{12}- (Red polythene bagging), T_{13}- (Green polythene bagging) and T_{15}- (Silver polythene bagging). The control (T_0) had the minimum fruit length (3.70, 3.63 and 3.66 cm), comparable only to T_1. Calcium nitrate enhances fruit length by improving carbohydrate formation and conversion, reducing abscission and preserving cell structure. Potassium is essential for reducing nitrate levels and regulating stomatal aperture, contributing to optimal fruit length. Yellow bagging's superiority may result from favourable microclimate changes, consistent with Sharma *et al.* (2014) findings in Apple.

Volume of fruits (cm^3)

Treatment T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging) achieved the highest fruit volume (171.11, 172.95 and 172.03cm³), significantly surpassing other treatments. T_{13}- (Green polythene bagging) followed with volumes of 163.16, 165.00 and 164.08 cm³. The control (T_0) had the lowest volume (100.66, 108.50 and 104.58 cm³). The increase in fruit volume due to calcium nitrate is attributed to enhanced photosynthesis and translocation of photo assimilates. Potassium sulphate aids in cell division, elongation, and protoplasmic strengthening, contributing to increased fruit volume. The yellow bag's favourable microclimate likely boosted fruit growth. These results align with findings by Gupta *et al.,* (2010) in guava.

Yield/plant (kg)

The pre-harvest application of nutrients and bagging treatments significantly increased yield (kg/plant) during 2020-21 and 2021-22. The pooled analysis showed the highest yield in T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging) with 5.55, 5.44 and 5.49 kg/plant, comparable to T_{15}- (Silver polythene bagging) and T_{13}- (Green polythene bagging). The lowest yield (3.15, 3.09 and 3.12 kg/plant) was in the control (T_0), similar to several other treatments but significantly lower than the rest. These findings align with results from Omar *et al.* (2014) in date palm and Edirimanna *et al.* (2015) in guava.

Insect damage fruits (%)

Pre-harvest treatments significantly influenced insect-damaged fruits (%). The lowest damage (0.57, 0.79 and 0.68%) was recorded in T_{14}- ($Ca(NO_3)_2$ (2%) + K_2SO_4 (2%) + Yellow polythene bagging), comparable to other bagging treatments. The highest damage (25.79% and 23.41%) was in the control (T_0).

Calcium nitrate reduces insect damage by altering cell wall polysaccharides and enhancing cell membrane firmness. Potassium sulphate combats biotic stresses by promoting the production of protective compounds and accelerating lignification. Bagging protects fruits from insects, especially during the rainy season, by creating unfavourable microclimates for pests. These findings are consistent with Edirimanna *et al.* (2015) and Abbasi *et* *al*. (2014), who found that bagging materials and colors significantly affect guava fruit protection against insect damage.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the use of different colored bags and foliar application of nutrients can effectively enhance the quality and yield of guava during the rainy season. The combination of red polythene bagging and foliar application of calcium nitrate and potassium sulphate was particularly beneficial. These findings provide valuable insights for guava cultivators aiming to optimize their production techniques.

Reference

1. Abbasi, NA; Chaudhary, MA; Ali, MI; Hussain, A and Ali I (2014) On tree fruit bagging influences quality of guava harvested at different maturity stages during summer, International Journal of Agriculture and Biology, 16, (3): 543-549.
2. Behera, S.D. and Pathak. S (2015). Preharvest Treatments for Fruit Quality Improvement in Rainy Season Guava (*Psidium guajava*). International Journal of Science and Research. 78-96.
3. Dar, Z.M. and Abraham, G. (2004) Ameliorating effects of $Ca(NO_3)_2$ on growth of NaCl stressed guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) seedlings, Annals of Forestry, 12(1):61-64.
4. Edirimanna, E; Amarathunga, D; Amarasena, B and Kirinde,T. (2015) Effect of bagging materials and bag colour on fruit weight and quality of guava (*Psidum guajava* L.). Annals Sri Lanka Dept. Agri. 17: 297–302.
5. Gupta, RC (2010). Studies on shelf life of aonla (*Emblica officinalis* Geartn.) fruits. M.Sc. (Ag) thesis, NDUAT, Faizabad.
6. Kitagawa, H; Manabe, K and Esguerra, EB (1992). Bagging of fruit on the tree to control disease. Acta Horticulturae, 321, 871–875.
7. Meena, KR; Maji, S; Kumar, S; Parihar, D and Meena, DC (2016) Effect of Bagging on Fruit Quality of Guava. International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management 7(2):330-333.
8. Omar Alaa El-Din Khalil, Adel Mohamed Al-Saif and Mahmoud Abd El-Aziz Ahmed. (2014) Bagging of bunches with different materials influences yield and quality of Rothana date palm fruit. Journal of Food Agric & Environment. 12(2): 520– 522.
9. Pathak, AP; Pal, RKK and Singh, T (2008) Effect of foliar application of nutrients on yield and quality of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) fruits cv. Sardar, Progressive Research, 3(1):89- 90.

10. Sharma, RR; Reddy, SVR and Jhalegar, MJ (2014) Preharvest fruit bagging: a useful approach for plant protection and improved post-harvest fruit quality. Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology, 89 (2):101-113.
11. Tiwari, A; Rajesh, SJ; Piyush, T and Nayak, S (2009). Phytochemical investigations of crown of Solanum melongena L. fruit. International Journal of Phyomedicine. 1. 9-11.
12. Yin, X. (2010). Influence of pre-harvest bagging on fruit quality and storage life. Journal of Agricultural Science, 8(2), 56-63.

Table 1 - Impact of pre-harvest nutrition application and bagging on the fruit weight, fruit width and Fruit length of guava during the rainy season.

Treatments	Average fruit weight (g)			Fruit width (cm)			Fruit length (cm)		
	1st yr.	2nd yr.	Pooled	1st yr.	2nd yr.	Pooled	1st yr.	2nd yr.	Pooled
T0	98.40	101.09	99.75	6.30	6.17	6.24	3.70	3.63	3.66
T1	112.43	105.63	109.03	6.80	6.66	6.73	4.23	4.15	4.19
T2	124.54	118.54	121.54	6.82	6.68	6.75	4.59	4.5	4.54
T3	124.43	120.77	122.60	6.86	6.72	6.79	4.60	4.51	4.55
T4	127.10	119.00	123.05	7.01	6.87	6.94	4.83	4.73	4.78
T5	143.04	114.74	128.89	7.09	6.95	7.02	5.20	5.10	5.15
T6	144.77	143.15	143.96	7.45	7.30	7.38	5.46	5.35	5.41
T7	124.65	120.71	122.68	7.03	6.89	6.96	4.93	4.83	4.88
T8	135.17	126.10	130.64	7.07	6.93	7.00	5.2	5.10	5.15
T9	137.77	131.81	134.79	7.20	7.06	7.13	5.37	5.26	5.32
T10	153.43	136.25	144.84	7.51	7.36	7.43	5.27	5.16	5.22
T11	142.10	111.77	126.94	7.14	7.00	7.07	5.23	5.13	5.18
T12	152.43	149.43	150.93	7.52	7.37	7.44	5.67	5.56	5.61
T13	154.88	149.77	152.33	7.83	7.67	7.75	6.22	6.10	6.16
T14	168.21	159.54	163.88	8.45	8.28	8.37	6.23	6.11	6.17
T15	151.99	141.21	146.60	7.69	7.54	7.61	5.77	5.65	5.71
S.Ed.(±)	2.037	1.862	1.949	0.432	0.426	0.429	0.334	0.329	0.331
C. D. (P = 0.05)	2.88	2.633	2.757	0.865	0.852	0.859	0.669	0.659	0.664

Table 2 – Impact of pre-harvest nutrition application and bagging on the Volume of fruits (cm3), Yield/plant (kg) and Insect damage fruits (%) of guava during the rainy season.

Treatments	Volume of fruits (cm^3)			Yield/plant (kg)			Insect damage fruits (%)		
	1st yr.	**2nd yr.**	**Pooled**	**1st yr.**	**2nd yr.**	**Pooled**	**1st yr.**	**2nd yr.**	**Pooled**
T0	100.66	108.50	104.58	3.15	3.09	3.12	25.79	23.41	24.60
T1	118.99	120.83	119.91	3.23	3.17	3.20	9.96	9.27	9.62
T2	127.98	129.82	128.90	3.41	3.34	3.38	6.47	6.27	6.37
T3	131.10	132.94	132.02	3.52	3.45	3.48	6.48	6.37	6.43
T4	131.63	133.47	132.55	3.61	3.54	3.57	1.91	0.81	1.36
T5	139.65	146.82	143.24	3.73	3.66	3.69	1.24	0.82	1.03
T6	149.50	151.34	150.42	4.08	4.00	4.04	1.12	0.83	0.98
T7	149.00	150.84	149.92	3.78	3.70	3.74	1.75	0.82	1.29
T8	147.98	149.82	148.90	3.96	3.88	3.92	1.84	0.85	1.35
T9	153.65	155.49	154.57	4.21	4.13	4.17	1.09	0.86	0.97
T10	159.45	161.29	160.37	5.01	4.91	4.96	1.04	0.87	0.96
T11	149.00	150.84	149.92	4.37	4.28	4.33	1.12	0.83	0.98
T12	160.90	162.74	161.82	4.51	4.42	4.46	1.03	0.88	0.95
T13	163.16	165.00	164.08	5.04	4.94	4.99	0.89	0.80	0.85
T14	**171.11**	**172.95**	**172.03**	**5.55**	**5.44**	**5.49**	**0.57**	**0.79**	**0.68**
T15	161.72	163.56	162.64	5.11	5.01	5.06	1.01	0.83	0.92
S.Ed.(±)	**2.48**	**2.84**	**2.58**	**0.28**	**0.27**	**0.27**	**1.36**	**0.44**	**0.76**
C. D. (P = 0.05)	**4.97**	**5.67**	**5.15**	**0.55**	**0.54**	**0.55**	**2.71**	**0.88**	**1.53**