

# Influence of various edible oil coatings on the shelf life of Cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana L.*)

## Abstract

An experiment entitled “Influence of various edible oil coatings on the shelf life of Cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana L.*)” was conducted to examine the effects of different edible oil treatments on the shelf life and quality of cape gooseberry fruits. The study was carried out at the Horticulture Research Laboratory, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology, and Sciences (SHUATS), Prayagraj, during February to March 2024. The experiment employed a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with 12 treatments and 3 replications, using various edible oils, including Rice Bran Oil, Olive Oil, Coconut Oil, Cinnamon Oil, and Mustard Oil, under both ambient and cold storage conditions. Key findings include, treatments T<sub>9</sub> (Olive Oil + Cold Storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut Oil + Cold Storage) were most effective in extending shelf life to 20 and 19 days, respectively, compared to the untreated control (14 days). Minimum postharvest loss (10.0%) was observed in T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) which was stored in Cold storage. To minimize postharvest losses and for keeping maximum quality during storage, low temperature is needed than higher temperature. Financial analysis revealed T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) as the most profitable treatment with the highest B:C ratio(1.19). The study concludes that the application of edible oils, particularly Olive Oil and Rice Bran Oil, in combination with cold storage, can significantly enhance the shelf life and quality of cape gooseberry fruits, facilitating better marketability and export potential.

**Keywords** -*Physalis peruviana L.*, Shelf life, Cold storage, Olive oil, Coconut oil.

## 1. Introduction

The Cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana L.*), is also referred to as Mokai, Rasbhari, Tepari, Husk cherry, in India. It is a member of the family of Solanaceae. This fruit stands out for its high content of antioxidants (ascorbic acid and A provitamin), phosphorus, iron, protein and fiber (Fischer et al., 2011)<sup>[8]</sup>. It is extensively cultivated throughout India, with predominant cultivation occurring in Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, and Rajasthan. The annual herbaceous, erect-growing, self-pollinated, small crop of tropical fruits was cultivated in India. It is possible to use the crop as a nutraceutical as reported by (Ramadan and Morsel, 2007)<sup>[19]</sup>. The fruit is a small berry with smooth skin, waxy, orange-yellow skin. Fruits are covered in a papery husk which is bitter and inedible, which is formed from calyxes whose function is to protect fruit during harvest and postharvest. The fruit is small round berry 1.25-2 cm wide, 4-5 g in weight with smooth, glossy, orange-yellow skin and juicy pulp containing 100-300 very small yellowish seeds, discoid up to 2 mm long, and structure to a cherry tomato. Usually, calyx and

skin color can be used to indicate maturity. When fully ripe, the fruit is sweet but with a pleasing grape-like tang (Duarte and Paull, 2015)<sup>[6]</sup>. The fruit of cape gooseberry belongs to the group of climacteric fruits (Avila *et al.*, 2006)<sup>[3]</sup>, additionally it is classified as a highly perishable food (Balaguera *et al.*, 2016). When the calyx is removed from the cape gooseberries, the fruits have higher respiration rates, generating higher levels of ethylene and accelerating their decay, it is not adequately stored. In addition to some contamination during the production stage, goldenberry suffers post-harvest diseases caused by several fungi. Fruits harvested at immature stage or at advanced maturity are more prone to suffer physiological damages during postharvest and have lower quality than fruits harvested at the proper maturity stage (Kader, 2002)<sup>[12]</sup>. The shelf life of cape gooseberry fruit with calyx is estimated at 30 days, while without calyx can be decreased to 5 days when stored at room temperature. Coating of fruits with some safe coating materials or some oils may reduce physical weight loss (PLW), loss of moisture and retained better quality for long time. Falguera *et al.*, (2011)<sup>[7]</sup> concluded that Edible oils such as coconut oil and olive oil have gained concern due to their superiority against bacteria, yeast, and molds, as well as their safety for the environment and consumer health. Singh *et al.*, (2017)<sup>[21]</sup> reported that Edible oil coating of olive oil is effective than others in retaining the colour of the fruits by inhibiting degradation of chlorophyll of the fruits and increased synthesis of carotenoids and anthocyanin pigments or probably have senescence delaying action by blocking the point of attack by ethylene.

## **2. Materials and methods**

The present investigation entitled “Influence of various edible oil coatings on the shelf life of Cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana L.*)” was conducted in the Horticulture Research Laboratory, Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology, and Sciences (SHUATS), Prayagraj, during February to March 2024.

### **2.1 Fruit sample**

The material used for the present experiment were freshly, mature cape gooseberry. The cape gooseberry fruits of uniform size, disease and bruise free were purchased from fruit market (mandi) were immediately transferred to the laboratory of Department of Horticulture, SHUATS, Prayagraj. In the laboratory, the fruits were sorted, graded and washed with distilled water. Thereafter fruits were air dried. Thereafter fruits were divided into requisite lot for further handling.

### **2.2 Coating materials**

This methodology was based on Muley and Singhal (2020)<sup>[16]</sup>. In the present study, five types of coatings viz. Rice bran oil, olive oil, coconut oil, cinnamon oil and mustard oil were used for application on cape gooseberry fruits.

### **2.3 Application of edible coatings**

Fruits were coated with edible coatings of rice bran oil, olive oil, coconut oil, cinnamon oil, mustard oil and control were kept on trays. For the application of coatings on the

fruits, brushing and dipping of fruits very perfectly, in particular coating material and coating was applied gently on the surface of fruits.

## 2.4 Storage

The edible oil coated cape gooseberry fruits were stored at different storage conditions i.e. at ambient (22°C-25°C) and in cold storage (Refrigerated) conditions (6°C).

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

Present experiment was laid out in Factorial a Completely Randomized Design (CRD factorial) with 12 treatments replicated 3 times viz.

| T               | Treatments                              |
|-----------------|---|
| T <sub>1</sub>  | Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) |
| T <sub>2</sub>  | Rice bran oil + Ambient condition       |
| T <sub>3</sub>  | Olive oil + Ambient condition           |
| T <sub>4</sub>  | Coconut oil + Ambient condition         |
| T <sub>5</sub>  | Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition        |
| T <sub>6</sub>  | Mustard oil + Ambient condition         |
| T <sub>7</sub>  | Untreated + Cold storage                |
| T <sub>8</sub>  | Rice bran oil + Cold storage            |
| T <sub>9</sub>  | Olive oil + Cold storage                |
| T <sub>10</sub> | Coconut oil + Cold storage              |
| T <sub>11</sub> | Cinnamon oil + Cold storage             |
| T <sub>12</sub> | Mustard oil + Cold storage              |

**Table. 01. Treatment combinations for the experiment.**

## 3. Result

The fruits were analyzed after every 4 days up to the last stage of shelf life of fruits for different physical and biochemical constituents. Changes in different parameters namely Physiological loss in weight (%), Titratable acidity, Total soluble solids (°Brix), and Ascorbic acid (mg / 100 g) (Vitamin-C) content were investigated. Different studies indicate that ethylene can be associated to different processes during ripening of cape gooseberry fruits such as softening, antioxidant activity, and color change (Gutiérrez et al., 2008; Valdenegro et al., 2012)<sup>[10]</sup>.

### 3.1 Fruit Physical Parameters

**Fruit Weight (g):** The treatments T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) and by T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) showed significantly influenced loss in weight of fruit, with weights (initial weight 11.35g) (11.26g) and (initial weight 11.06g) (10.99g) respectively, after 16 days of storage. This indicates that the combination of edible oils and cold storage effectively maintains fruit weight over an extended period. Gharezi et al., (2012)<sup>[9]</sup> indicated that the cold

storage retained minimum weight loss which is in agreement with the finding of this study. It has been reported that coating process on fruits led to reduce weight loss.

**Fruit Diameter (cm):** The maximum change in diameter (length) of fruit after 16 days of storage was observed in T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) coated fruits gave the highest change in fruit diameter (2.32cm at 0 DAS) and (2.10cm at 16 DAS) among treatments. The edible oil coated fruits stored in refrigerated condition showed no significant change in fruit diameter among treatments. The maximum change in diameter (width) of fruit after 16 days of storage was observed in T<sub>1</sub> (control) uncoated fruits (2.50cm at 0 DAS) and (2.25cm at 16 DAS) among treatments. The edible oil coated fruits stored in refrigerated condition showed no significant change in fruit diameter among treatments.

**Pulp weight (g):** The maximum fresh Pulp weight (g) (10.63g and 9.86g) was observed in T<sub>8</sub> and T<sub>10</sub>. However, minimum Pulp weight (g) (6.96g and 7.33g) in T<sub>12</sub> and T<sub>11</sub>.

**Fruit color:** It was observed that the maximum mean retention of excellent fruit colour is (7.8) was found in fruits treated with olive oil (T<sub>9</sub>) followed by (T<sub>10</sub>), (T<sub>7</sub>) and (T<sub>8</sub>) with 7.4, 4.85 and 4.29 hedonic rating with the minimum colour rating of 3.86 in cinnamon oil coating (T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>11</sub>) which proved to be inferior than untreated conditions accounting to 3.23 ratings. Edible oil coating of olive oil proved effective than others in retaining the colour of the fruits by inhibiting degradation of chlorophyll of the fruits and increased synthesis of carotenoids and anthocyanin pigments or probably have senescence delaying action by blocking the point of attack by ethylene. The present findings were supported by **Singh et al.**<sup>[21]</sup>.

**Physiological loss in weight (PLW) (%):** The maximum Physiological weight loss (%) (26.58%) and (19.83%) was recorded under T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) and T<sub>3</sub> (Olive oil + Ambient condition). However, the minimum Physiological weight loss (PLW) (%) (0.59%) and (0.62%) was recorded with T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage). Morillon et al. (2002) explained that, the main cause of weight loss of fruit as a result of migration of water from the fruit to the environment during storage.

**Ghareziet al., (2012)**<sup>[9]</sup> indicated that the cold storage retained minimum weight loss which is in agreement with the finding of this study. It has been reported that coating process on fruits led to reduce weight loss. **López et al. (2016)**<sup>[14]</sup> reported a significant weight loss reduction from 23% to 15% in cape gooseberry samples stored during 15 days at 17 °C, with the use of a whey and beeswax-based coating. The present findings are supported by **Wijewardane**<sup>[25]</sup>, who stated that the coatings consisting of edible oil was found effective in reducing the PLW. Minimum reduction in PLW of cape gooseberry coated with olive coating was probably due to maintenance of maximum moisture content around the surface of the fruit etc. along with storage having high humidity and cold storage conditions. The composite oil coating preserves the quality of fruit retarding ethylene emission and hence reduces PLW in pineapple fruits. Similar results were also reported by **Jagadeesh et al.**<sup>[11]</sup> in guava fruits.

### 3.2 Fruit Bio-chemical Parameters

**Total soluble solid (°Brix):** The level of total soluble solids (°Brix) of control and coated cape gooseberry fruits showed significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference (Table 03). The maximum

Soluble Solids (TSS) after 16 days of storage (15.10 T.S.S. °Brix) and (14.90 T.S.S. °Brix) was recorded under T<sub>1</sub> Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) and T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition). However, the minimum Soluble Solids (13.90 T.S.S. °Brix) and (13.90 T.S.S. °Brix) was recorded with T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage). Overall, a gradual increase in TSS was observed during the entire storage period. In this regard, **Debeaufort et al.** [51] explained that the edible coatings are selective barriers to O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> modifying internal atmospheres and slowing down the respiration rate of fruit. **Muñoz et al. (2017)** [15] were able to prolong cape gooseberries stored from 9 to 11 days while maintaining a weight loss of less than 10% with the use of a chitosan and aloe vera based coating. According to what was reported by **Pinzón et al. (2015)** [18], when the samples exceed losses greater than 10% of the weight, the freshness of fruits and vegetables disappears.

**Ascorbic acid (mg / 100 g):** The maximum Ascorbic acid after 16 days of storage (34.67) and (34.36) was recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage). However, the minimum Ascorbic acid (27.83) was recorded with T<sub>1</sub> (control) Untreated + Ambient condition. In this case, it has been reported that ascorbic acid is a precursor to the production of brown pigments, and the change in the amount of ascorbic acid causes browning of the tissue, which ultimately causes the loss of the quality of berries (**Biolatto et al., 2006**) [4]. The change in color to brown (browning) occurs in T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) and T<sub>11</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Cold storage) after 8<sup>th</sup> day of storage. The occurrence of high acidity in fruits can contribute to a relatively stable ascorbic acid content during post-harvest storage (**Tavarini et al., 2007**) [24]. It has been reported that the decrease in vitamin C can be attributed to the decrease in the antioxidant capacity of berries during storage (**Arena et al., 2001**) [2]. Researchers also believe that decreasing vitamin C levels at the end of storage may be due to a reduction in water content that leads to the oxidation of vitamin C (**Amodio et al., 2007**) [1]. Vitamin C content, coating treatments led to higher vitamin C values than the control fruit, it is a protective barrier against permeability to O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>, thus decreasing vitamin autooxidation (**Sogvar et al., 2016**) [22].

**Fruit acidity (pH):** The pH values for uncoated and coated fresh goldenberries stored at ambient condition as well as those stored at cold storage are presented in Table 03. The maximum Ascorbic acid after 16 days of storage (34.67) and (34.36) was recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage). However, the minimum Ascorbic acid (27.83) was recorded with T<sub>1</sub> (control) Untreated + Ambient condition. pH values of the coated and uncoated goldenberries placed at ambient condition did not show significant changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) from the 4<sup>th</sup> day of storage; however, the pH values of all samples were increased during the storage time. The pH rise is explained by the fruit ripening and decomposition process caused by hydrolysis, oxidation, or fermentation that modifies the concentration of hydrogen ions [23]. On the other hand, the fruits stored at 4 °C and 95% RH maintained the pH values constant along storage days, except for the uncoated goldenberries, in which the pH values increased. Results suggest that the coatings helped to maintain the initial pH values when the fruits are kept at cold storage during 16 days of storage, delaying the fruit ripening and ensuring a controlled microbial growth. This behaviour is explained by

the fact that the coated fruits maintained a more acidic pH, which is favourable to inhibiting bacterial growth.

**Titrateable Acidity:** The minimum acidity after 16 days of storage (0.92) and (0.92) was recorded under T<sub>8</sub> (Rice bran oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage). However, the maximum acidity (1.17) was recorded with T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition). In addition, increasing the temperature during different times of the storage actually increased the respiration rate, so it can be concluded that a high storage temperature reduces the titrateable acidity (Piga et al., 2000)<sup>[17]</sup>. The reduction in total acid content in the berries with coating was less than the decrease in berries without coating, which can be due to the fact that the berries continue to derive carbohydrates and nutrients from the calyx coating after harvest.

### 3.3 Organoleptic Rating

The maximum Overall Organoleptic rating (7) and (7) was recorded under T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage). However, the minimum Overall Organoleptic rating (3.4) was recorded with T<sub>1</sub> (control) Untreated + Ambient condition during 16 days of storage. The decreased organoleptic rating might be ascribed to certain biochemical changes in pear pulp which increased after prolonged storage the butter and juicy textures of the ripened pear fruits points out a possible involvement of cell wall substances and their degrading enzymes (pectin-esterase and poly galacturonans) in the ripening process during storage as viewed by Singh et al., (2017)<sup>[21]</sup>. Similar results were observed by 12 who observed that maximum acceptability in terms of taste was retained by coconut oil coating without any objectionable change up to 6-8 days of storage.

### 3.4 Economy of the treatments

**Cost of treatment:** The Lowest cost of treatment (Rs.75) was observed in T<sub>1</sub> Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) and T<sub>7</sub> (Untreated + cold storage) while highest (Rs.125) in T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) and T<sub>11</sub> (Cinnamon oil + cold storage).

**Post harvest loss:** The Minimum postharvest loss (10.0%) was observed in T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) while maximum (60.0%) was observed in T<sub>1</sub> Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) and T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition). The postharvest storage of fruits is one of the main drivers of the food industry. Fruit loss can occur quantitatively and qualitatively between harvest and consumption (Liato et al., 2017)<sup>[13]</sup>. On the other hand, berry harvesting at the full maturity stage helps maintain fruit quality because the berries usually show high acidity at their peak of maturity (Rincón et al., 2016)<sup>[20]</sup>.

**Marketable fruit (%):** The Minimum marketable fruits left after 16 days of storage was (40%) in T<sub>1</sub> Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) and T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) and maximum (90%) in T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage).

**Net return:** The Lowest net return (Rs.50) was observed in T<sub>1</sub> Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) and T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition) while highest (Rs.113) in T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage).

**Benefit cost ratio:** The Maximum Benefit cost ratio (B:C) of present investigation was (1.19) observed in T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) followed by T<sub>8</sub> (Rice bran oil + Cold storage) (1.07), while minimum BCR was (0.4) observed in T<sub>5</sub> (Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

| T   | Treatment details                       | Fruit weight (gm) |       |       |       |       | Pulp weight (gm) |       |       |       |      | Physiological loss in weight (%) |      |       |       |       |
|-----|---|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|----------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|
|     |   | 0                 | 4     | 8     | 12    | 16    | 0                | 4     | 8     | 12    | 16   | 0                                | 4    | 8     | 12    | 16    |
| T1  | Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) | 9.4               | 8.97  | 8.32  | 8.06  | 7.92  | 8.76             | 8.35  | 7.82  | 7.34  | 7.04 | -                                | 4.56 | 11.49 | 14.25 | 15.71 |
| T2  | Rice bran oil + Ambient condition       | 9.4               | 9.1   | 8.69  | 8.2   | 7.82  | 7.83             | 7.51  | 7.24  | 7.02  | 6.82 | -                                | 3.24 | 7.55  | 12.76 | 16.84 |
| T3  | Olive oil + Ambient condition           | 11.1              | 10.76 | 10.29 | 9.77  | 8.9   | 9.5              | 9.1   | 8.42  | 8.14  | 7.81 | -                                | 3.04 | 7.26  | 11.97 | 19.83 |
| T4  | Coconut oil + Ambient condition         | 9.67              | 9.36  | 9     | 8.49  | 8.18  | 8.4              | 8.2   | 7.95  | 7.65  | 7.35 | -                                | 3.12 | 6.84  | 12.09 | 15.31 |
| T5  | Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition        | 9.63              | 9.16  | 8.81  | 8.26  | 7.07  | 8.67             | 8.38  | 8.13  | 7.69  | 7.33 | -                                | 3.84 | 8.56  | 14.23 | 26.58 |
| T6  | Mustard oil + Ambient condition         | 11.03             | 10.65 | 10.16 | 9.53  | 9.02  | 9.3              | 9     | 8.82  | 8.62  | 8.23 | -                                | 3.47 | 7.87  | 13.59 | 18.23 |
| T7  | Untreated + Cold storage                | 9.33              | 9.31  | 9.29  | 9.26  | 9.24  | 8.23             | 7.93  | 7.76  | 7.7   | 7.62 | -                                | 0.21 | 0.45  | 0.73  | 0.93  |
| T8  | Rice bran oil + Cold storage            | 12.13             | 11.91 | 11.29 | 11.27 | 11.24 | 10.63            | 10.39 | 10.21 | 10.08 | 9.94 | -                                | 0.18 | 0.35  | 0.52  | 0.79  |
| T9  | Olive oil + Cold storage                | 11.06             | 11.05 | 11.03 | 11.01 | 10.99 | 9.3              | 9.05  | 8.95  | 8.75  | 8.64 | -                                | 0.12 | 0.25  | 0.47  | 0.62  |
| T10 | Coconut oil + Cold storage              | 11.35             | 11.32 | 11.3  | 11.28 | 11.26 | 9.86             | 9.55  | 9.34  | 9.15  | 9.02 | -                                | 0.11 | 0.27  | 0.45  | 0.59  |
| T11 | Cinnamon oil + Cold storage             | 8.78              | 8.61  | 8.58  | 8.56  | 8.54  | 7.33             | 7.08  | 7.05  | 6.95  | 6.65 | -                                | 0.23 | 0.56  | 0.73  | 0.97  |
| T12 | Mustard oil + Cold storage              | 8.13              | 7.86  | 7.8   | 7.78  | 7.77  | 6.96             | 6.67  | 6.41  | 6.39  | 6.19 | -                                | 0.19 | 0.34  | 0.66  | 0.81  |

**Table02. Effect of different edible oil coatings on physical parameters of fruits stored for 16 days.**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table03. Effect of different edible oil coatings on Bio-chemical parameters of fruits stored for 16 days.**

| T   | Treatment details                       | Total soluble solids (TSS) |      |      |       |      | Ascorbic acid (mg / 100 g) |       |       |       |       | Titratable acidity |      |      |      |      | Fruit acidity (pH) |      |      |      |      |
|-----|---|----------------------------|------|------|-------|------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
|     |   | 0                          | 4    | 8    | 12    | 16   | 0                          | 4     | 8     | 12    | 16    | 0                  | 4    | 8    | 12   | 16   | 0                  | 4    | 8    | 12   | 16   |
| T1  | Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) | 13.2                       | 14.1 | 12.5 | 14.3  | 15.1 | 22.88                      | 28.23 | 30.85 | 26.76 | 27.83 | 1.66               | 0.97 | 1.02 | 1.1  | 1.04 | 3.4                | 3.45 | 3.52 | 3.6  | 3.67 |
| T2  | Rice bran oil + Ambient condition       | 13.8                       | 13.6 | 13.8 | 14.2  | 14.4 | 20.93                      | 24.23 | 29.45 | 33.63 | 31.53 | 1.56               | 0.96 | 0.94 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 3.5                | 3.56 | 3.6  | 3.65 | 3.77 |
| T3  | Olive oil + Ambient condition           | 12.8                       | 13.2 | 13.5 | 14.4  | 14.3 | 21.6                       | 27.33 | 30.15 | 31.22 | 33.66 | 1.65               | 1.06 | 0.91 | 1.06 | 1.11 | 3.55               | 3.6  | 3.64 | 3.7  | 3.75 |
| T4  | Coconut oil + Ambient condition         | 13.5                       | 13.7 | 13.8 | 14.17 | 14.7 | 23.22                      | 26.66 | 29.8  | 31.36 | 32.18 | 1.54               | 1.12 | 0.97 | 1.15 | 1.1  | 3.47               | 3.55 | 3.68 | 3.75 | 3.77 |
| T5  | Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition        | 12.9                       | 13.9 | 13.6 | 14.3  | 14.9 | 21.3                       | 24.68 | 28.37 | 30.8  | 32.67 | 1.66               | 0.92 | 0.97 | 1.15 | 1.17 | 3.67               | 3.76 | 3.86 | 3.84 | 3.98 |
| T6  | Mustard oil + Ambient condition         | 13.2                       | 13.6 | 13.3 | 14.4  | 14.8 | 20.88                      | 24.67 | 29.32 | 30.89 | 32.67 | 1.56               | 0.96 | 1.1  | 0.97 | 1.08 | 3.48               | 3.59 | 3.75 | 3.87 | 3.99 |
| T7  | Untreated + Cold storage                | 13.4                       | 13.4 | 14.2 | 14.2  | 14.5 | 23.2                       | 27.66 | 30.39 | 29.33 | 32.88 | 1.63               | 1.19 | 1.24 | 1.17 | 1.04 | 3.45               | 3.52 | 3.57 | 3.65 | 3.68 |
| T8  | Rice bran oil + Cold storage            | 13.2                       | 13.1 | 13.7 | 14.1  | 13.9 | 22.66                      | 25.67 | 28.93 | 30.2  | 33.44 | 1.23               | 1.12 | 1.37 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 3.17               | 3.61 | 3.78 | 3.91 | 4.02 |
| T9  | Olive oil + Cold storage                | 12.7                       | 13.4 | 13.3 | 13.3  | 13.9 | 22.18                      | 25.78 | 28.86 | 31.18 | 34.36 | 1.42               | 1.23 | 1.19 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 3.65               | 3.91 | 4.17 | 3.97 | 4.2  |
| T10 | Coconut oil + Cold storage              | 13.1                       | 13.6 | 13.5 | 14    | 14.2 | 23.66                      | 26.78 | 29.97 | 32.48 | 34.67 | 1.66               | 1.51 | 1.37 | 1.08 | 0.92 | 3.64               | 3.76 | 3.87 | 3.96 | 4.1  |
| T11 | Cinnamon oil + Cold storage             | 13.3                       | 13.8 | 13.1 | 13.23 | 14.4 | 22.18                      | 25.6  | 27.38 | 31.14 | 33.18 | 1.52               | 1.37 | 1.23 | 1.08 | 0.96 | 3.53               | 3.6  | 3.67 | 3.75 | 3.8  |

**T12**

Mustard oil +  
Cold storage

13.5 12.6 13.4 14.3 14.3 20.18 24.89 28.24 30.86 33.4 1.57 1.43 1.22 1.11 0.94 3.67 3.73 3.9 3.98 4.06

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table04. Effect of different edible oil coatings on organoleptic ratings of fruits stored for 16 days.**

| T               | TREATMENT DETAILS                       | OVERALL ORGANOLEPTIC RATING |   |   |    |    |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|----|----|
|                 |   | 0                           | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| T <sub>1</sub>  | Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) | 9                           | 8 | 6 | 4  | 3  |
| T <sub>2</sub>  | Rice bran oil + Ambient condition       | 9                           | 8 | 7 | 6  | 5  |
| T <sub>3</sub>  | Olive oil + Ambient condition           | 9                           | 8 | 6 | 6  | 5  |
| T <sub>4</sub>  | Coconut oil + Ambient condition         | 9                           | 8 | 7 | 6  | 5  |
| T <sub>5</sub>  | Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition        | 9                           | 8 | 6 | 5  | 4  |
| T <sub>6</sub>  | Mustard oil + Ambient condition         | 9                           | 8 | 7 | 6  | 5  |
| T <sub>7</sub>  | Untreated + Cold storage                | 9                           | 8 | 8 | 7  | 6  |
| T <sub>8</sub>  | Rice bran oil + Cold storage            | 9                           | 8 | 7 | 7  | 6  |
| T <sub>9</sub>  | Olive oil + Cold storage                | 9                           | 9 | 8 | 7  | 7  |
| T <sub>10</sub> | Coconut oil + Cold storage              | 9                           | 9 | 8 | 8  | 7  |
| T <sub>11</sub> | Cinnamon oil + Cold storage             | 9                           | 8 | 6 | 5  | 4  |
| T <sub>12</sub> | Mustard oil + Cold storage              | 9                           | 8 | 7 | 7  | 5  |

**Table05. Benefit cost ratio of edible oil coating treatments on fruits stored for 16 days.**

| T  | TREATMENT DETAILS                       | Benefit Cost Ratio      |              |                                |
|----|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
|    |   | Cost of treatment (Rs.) | Profit (Rs.) | Benefit cost Ratio (B:C Ratio) |
| T1 | Control (Untreated + Ambient condition) | Rs. 75                  | Rs. 50       | 0.66                           |
| T2 | Rice bran oil + Ambient condition       | Rs. 82                  | Rs. 75       | 0.91                           |
| T3 | Olive oil + Ambient condition           | Rs. 109                 | Rs. 100      | 0.92                           |
| T4 | Coconut oil + Ambient condition         | Rs. 95                  | Rs. 88       | 0.93                           |
| T5 | Cinnamon oil + Ambient condition        | Rs. 125                 | Rs. 50       | 0.4                            |
| T6 | Mustard oil + Ambient condition         | Rs. 85                  | Rs. 88       | 1.03                           |
| T7 | Untreated + Cold storage                | Rs. 75                  | Rs. 75       | 1                              |

|            |                              |         |         |      |
|------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|------|
| <b>T8</b>  | Rice bran oil + Cold storage | Rs. 82  | Rs. 88  | 1.07 |
| <b>T9</b>  | Olive oil + Cold storage     | Rs. 109 | Rs. 113 | 1.04 |
| <b>T10</b> | Coconut oil + Cold storage   | Rs. 95  | Rs. 113 | 1.19 |
| <b>T11</b> | Cinnamon oil + Cold storage  | Rs. 125 | Rs. 75  | 0.6  |
| <b>T12</b> | Mustard oil + Cold storage   | Rs. 85  | Rs. 88  | 1.03 |

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Considering the result of the present investigation, it is concluded that treatment T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) was the best treatment for extending shelf life of cape gooseberry. The maximum Shelf life (20 days) and (19 days) was observed under treatment T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) and T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage). Minimum postharvest loss (10.0%) was observed in T<sub>9</sub> (Olive oil + Cold storage) followed by T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) which was stored in refrigerated condition. To minimize postharvest losses and for keeping maximum quality during storage, low temperature is needed than higher temperature. The maximum benefit cost ratio (B:C) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> (Coconut oil + Cold storage) (1.19) in cape gooseberry.

#### 7. REFERENCE

1. **Amodio M.L, Colelli G, Hasey J.K, Kader A. 2007.** A comparative study of composition and postharvest performance of organically and conventionally grown kiwifruits. *Journal Science Food and Agriculture* 87, 1228–1236.
2. **Arena E, Fallico A, Maccarone E. 2001.** Evaluation of antioxidant capacity of blood orange juice as influenced by constituents concentrate. *Food Chemistry*. 74, 423-427.
3. **Avila, J. A.; Moreno, P.; Fischer, G.(2006);** Miranda, D. Influencia de la madurez del fruto y del secado del cáliz en uchuva (*Physalis peruviana* L.), almacenada a 18o C. *Acta Agronomica*, v. 55, n. 4 p. 29-38, 2006.
4. **Biolatto A.E, Vazquez D.M, Sancho A.J, Carduza F.A, Pense N. 2005.** Effect of commercial conditioning and cold quarantine storage treatments on fruit quality of ‘Rouge La Toma’ grapefruit (*Citrus paradise* Macf.). *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 35, 167-176.
5. **Debeaufort, F.J., Quezada-Gallo, A. and Voilley, A. (1998)** Edible films and coatings: tomorrow’s packaging: a review. *Critical Review in Food Science and Nutrition*, 38: 299-313.
6. **Duarte O, Paul RE, 2015.** Banana Passionfruit. In: *Exotic Fruits and Nuts of the New World*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International,
7. **Falguera, V., Quintero, P.J., Jiménez, A., Muñoz, J.A. and Ibarz, A., 2011.** Edible films and coatings: structures, active functions and trends in their use. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 22(6), 292-303 .
8. **Fischer, G., A. Herrera and P.J. Almanza. 2011.** Cape gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana* L.). In: Yahia, E.M. (Ed.) *Postharvest biology and technology of tropical and subtropical fruits*. V.2 Acai to citrus. Woodhead Publishing, Oxford, UK, p.374-396.
9. **Gharezi, M., Joshi, N., and Sadeghian, E. (2012).** Effect of postharvest treatment on stored cherry tomatoes. *Journal Nutrition and Food Sciences*, 2(8): 157-167

10. **Gutiérrez, M.S., G.D. Trinchero, A.M. Cerri, F. Vilella and G.O. Sozzi. 2008.** Different responses of goldenberry fruit treated at four maturity stages with the ethylene antagonist 1-methylcyclopropene. *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 48: 199-205.
11. **Jagadeesh, S. L., Rokhade, T. S. and Lingaraj, U.,** Influence of post-harvest treatments on storage behaviour of guava fruits cv. Sardar. *J Maharashtra Agri Univ* 26: 297-300 (2001).
12. **Kader, A.A. 2002.** Postharvest technology of horticultural crops. 3rd., edition, California, University of California (System). Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. ANR Publications, California. 535p.
13. **Liato V., Hammami R., Aïder M., 2017.** Influence of electro-activated solutions of weak organic acid salts on microbial quality and overall appearance of blueberries during storage. *Food Microbiology*, vol 64: 56-64
14. **López, D., Cuatin, L., Andrade, J., & Osorio, O. (2016).** Evaluation of an edible coating whey protein and beeswax on the physical and chemical quality of gooseberry (*Physalis peruviana* L.). *Acta Agronomica*, 65(4), 326–333. <https://doi.org/10.15446/acag.v65n4.50191>
15. **Muley, A. B., & Singhal, R. S. (2020).** Extension of postharvest shelf life of strawberries (*Fragaria ananassa*) using a coating of chitosan-whey protein isolate conjugate. *Food Chemistry*, 329(January), 127213.
16. **Muñoz, A.; Barbosa, A.; Bustos, D.; Ramírez, Y.; Vásquez, Y.; García, J.; Guancha, M.** Conservation of Uchuva (*Physalis Peruviana*) by Applying a Coating Based on Chitosan and Aloe Vera, Using the Spray Method. *Inf. Técnico* 2017, 81, 86–94.
17. **Piga A, D Aquino S, Agabbio M. 2000.** Influence of cold storage and shelf-life on quality of Salustiana, Orange fruits 55, 37-44.
18. **Pinzón, E. H., Reyes, A. J., Álvarez-Herrera, J. G., Leguizamo, M. F., & Joya, J. G. (2015).** Comportamiento del fruto de uchuva *Physalis peruviana* L., bajo diferentes temperaturas de almacenamiento. *Revista de Ciencias Agrícolas*, 32(2), 26–35.
19. **Ramadan MF, Morsel JT. Golden berry (2007):** A novel fruit source of fat-soluble bioactives. *Inform.*;15:130- 131.
20. **Rincón, C.M, Patiño, O.J., Plazas, E.A., Bulla, M.E., Roza G. and Puyana, M. (2014)** Estudio químico preliminar y evaluación de la actividad antioxidante, antialimentaria y tóxica, de la especie *Pernettya prostrata* (Ericaceae). *Revista Cubana de Plantas Medicinales*, 19, 138-150.
21. **Singh, H., Kachwaya, D. S., Kuchi, V. S., Vikas, G., Kaushal, N. and Singh, A., (2017).** Edible Oil Coatings Prolong Shelf Life and Improve Quality of Guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci* 5: 837-43.
22. **Sogvar, O. B., Koushesh Saba, M., & Emamifar, A. (2016).** Aloe vera and ascorbic acid coatings maintain postharvest quality and reduce microbial load of strawberry fruit. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 114, 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postharvbio.2015.11.019>
23. **Souza, M.P.; Vaz, A.F.M.; Cerqueira, M.A.; Texeira, J.A.; Vicente, A.A.; Carneiro da Cunha, M.G.** Effect of an Edible Nano multi-layer Coating by Electrostatic Self-Assembly on the Shelf Life of Fresh-Cut Mangoes. *Food Bioprocess Technol.* 2015, 8, 647–654. [CrossRef]

24. **Tavarini S, Remorini D, Massai R. 2007.** Antioxidant capacity, ascorbic acid, total phenols and carotenoids change during harvest and after storage of Hayward kiwifruit. *Journal of Food Chemistry* 107, 282-288.
25. **Wijewardane, N. A., (2013)** Application of polysaccharide based composite film wax coating for shelf life extension of guava. (var. Bangkok Giant). *J post-Har Tech* 1: 016-021 (2013).

UNDER PEER REVIEW