EFFECT OF NOVEL PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS AND FRUIT BAGGING ON YIELD AND SHELF LIFE OF GUAVA (*Psidium guajava* L.)

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was carried out to identify the effect of novel Plant Growth Regulators and fruit bagging techniques on the yield and shelf life of guava cv Gwalior-27. The research was conducted during 2022-23 and 2023-24 at Horticulture Research Orchard, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, RVSKVV, Gwalior (M.P.). The experiment was laid in Factorial Randomized Block Design with 20 treatment combinations. It was observed that treatment combination P_3B_3 (Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag) produced the maximum yield, while the maximum shelf life of guava fruits was attained in treatmentcombination P_5B_3 (Salicylic acid 600ppm + White polyethylene bag).

KEY WORDS: Novel PGRs, fruit bagging, yield, shelf life, guava

INTRODUCTION

Guava (*Psidium guajava*L.) is very popular fruit. Its available throughout the year except during the summer season. Guava commonly referred to as the "apple of the tropics" or "poor man's apple," is one of the most widely grown fruits in tropical and subtropical climates. It is indigenous to Tropical America, which stretches from Mexico to Peru, and is a member of the Myrtaceae family with chromosome number 2n= 22 (Radha and Mathew, 2007). It is a perishable and has a short postharvest shelf life at environment temperature due to climacteric ripening with changes in physicochemical properties. Early in the 17th century, the Portuguese brought the plant to the Indian subcontinent. However, at the moment, the main nations that produce guavas are Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, Bangladesh, China, Thailand, India, and Pakistan. But given its accessibility, abundance of nutrients, and affordability for the average person, the fruit appears to be indigenous to India (Dinesh and Vasugi, 2010). India is the major producer of guava fruit in the world and it shares about 45 % of total production of guava.

In guava plants, the induction of flowers is significantly facilitated by plant growth regulators. The ovary enlarges and fruit development is initiated by the process of pollination and fertilization, which also causes the ovary to produce growth regulators.Brassinosteroids (BRs) have emerged as pleiotropic phytohormone owing to their wide function in crop growth and metabolism. Homo brassinolide (HBR) being an analogue of BRs is known to improve the growth, yield and quality parameters in many crop plants.Brassinosteroids are a new group of polyhydroxy steroids that have been recognized as a class of phytohormones. Brassinosteroids play prominent roles in many developmental processes including the increase of cell elongation, pollen tube growth, flowering, fruit set (Işç and Gökbayrak 2015) senescence, abscission and maturation (Swamy and Rao, 2008). Brassinosteroids (BRs) are a group of polyhydroxylated steroidal phytohormones that are required for the development, growth, and productivity of plants.

Moreover, Pre-harvest bagging significantly protects the fruit from biotic and abiotic stresses such as incidence of pests (Teixeira *et al*., 2011), birds damage (Jia *et al*., 2005; Sharma *et al.*, 2014), risk of microbial pathogens and disease incidence in fruit (Hofman *et al*., 1997), physical and mechanical damage On tree fruit bagging influences quality of guava harvested at different maturity stages during summer. Fruit fly infestation adversely affects guava crop especially during summer and resulted in significant economic losses.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

1. Experimental Site

The current research was performed in the field of Horticulture Research Orchard, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, RVSKVV, Gwalior (M.P.). The research was conducted during 2022-23 and 2023-24. Gwalior lies at 26^0 $13^{'}$ N latitude and 78^0 14' E longitudes at an altitude of 211.5 m above mean sea level in Gird region. It experiences subtropical climate with summer temperature exceeding 45 ^{0}C in May-June, while the winters are too cold with chilling temperature as low as 2^0C in December and January.The annual rainfall ranges between 650 to 751 mm, most of which received from end of June to end of September. Drought is the common feature due to the scanty and uneven distribution of rainfall.

2. Experimental layout

The experiment was laid in Factorial Randomized Block Design with 20 treatment combinations of novelPlant Growth Regulators and fruit bagging techniqueswith control. The treatment combinationis presented in Table no. 1.

Table no. 1. Treatment combination

S.No.	Notation	Treatment combination
1	P_1B_1	Control
2	P_1B_2	News paper
3	P_1B_3	White polyethene bag
4	P_1B_4	Brown paper bag
5	P_2B_1	Brassinosteroid (0.75 ppm)
6	P_2B_2	Brassinosteroid (0.75 ppm) + News paper
7	P_2B_3	Brassinosteroid (0.75 ppm) + White polyethylene bag
8	P_2B_4	Brassinosteroid (0.75 ppm) + Brown paper bag
9	P_3B_1	Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm)
10	P_3B_2	Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + News paper
11	P_3B_3	Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag
12	P_3B_4	Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + Brown paper bag
13	P_4B_1	Salicylic acid (400 ppm)
14	P_4B_2	Salicylic acid (400 ppm) + News paper
15	P_4B_3	Salicylic acid (400 ppm) + White polyethylene bag
16	P_4B_4	Salicylic acid (400 ppm) + Brown paper bag
17	P_5B_1	Salicylic acid (600 ppm)
18	P_5B_2	Salicylic acid (600 ppm) + News paper
19	P_5B_3	Salicylic acid (600 ppm) + White polyethylene bag
20	P_5B_4	Salicylic acid (600 ppm) + Brown paper bag

3. Experimental Procedure

3.1 Number of fruits per plant

The total number of fruits harvested from each plant was counted and average fruits per plant were also computed.

3.2 Yield per tree (kg)

The fruit of each plant were weighed separately by digital weighing balance and recorded at each picking.

3.3 Yield per hectare (q)

The yield per hectare were calculated in quintal per hectare by calculating total number of plants per hectare and multiplied with average yield per plant.

3.4 Physiological loss in weight (%)

Fruits from each treatment were taken to record the physiological loss in weight. The weight of the fruits was recorded using electronic weighing balance (model: Essae, DS-852, Teraoaka Ltd.) before storage. Thereafter, the weights were recorded at two days interval during storage and the cumulative PLW was calculated with the following formula.

$$\text{PLW (\%)} = \frac{\text{Initial weight} - \text{Final weight}}{\text{Initial weight}} \times 100$$

3.5 Rotting (%) The number of days the mature guava fruits were in edible condition was taken as the shelf life or keeping quality of fruits

RESULT and DISCUSSION

4.1 Number of fruits per plant

Through the analysis of the data presented in table 2 and figure.1 it was found that the interaction effect of the two factors i.e. novel PGRs and fruit bagging exerted statistically significant effect on the number of fruits per plant. Maximum number of fruits per plant in the first second and pooled data was recorded in treatment P_3B_3 (Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag) with 152.07, 157.30 and 154.68, whereas minimum number of fruits per plant in the first, second and pooled data was observed in P_1B_1 (control) with 75.11, 80.80 and 77.95 respectively. The findings are in accordance with Cao *et al.* (2005) who reported that at the organism level, brassinosteroids promote overall growth, reproductive development, shorten the period of vegetative growth, increase crop yield and improve the quality of fruits in arabiodopsis. The results are also in agreement with Sharma *et al.* (2020)observed the effects of five different types of bags on the rainy-season crop of 'Allahabad Safeda' guava. All bags significantly advanced fruit maturity and improved fruit weight, texture, visual appeal, quality, and functional attributes over unbagged (control) fruits.

Table no. 2 Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on Number of fruits per plant of guava during 1st year, 2nd year and polled data

	Number of fruits per plant				
	Novel PGR's				
	1st year				
Fruit bagging	**P_1**	**P_2**	**P_3**	**P_4**	**P_5**
B_1	75.11	142.90	138.71	132.45	136.59
B_2	119.29	143.62	147.12	131.85	138.81
B_3	131.52	146.21	152.07	136.91	141.17
B_4	123.20	142.66	149.41	134.53	139.57
	2nd year				
B_1	80.80	145.46	138.57	133.21	139.24
B_2	123.13	146.35	149.29	134.14	140.28
B_3	134.50	146.04	157.30	139.50	143.82
B_4	127.10	143.83	152.10	136.26	142.11
	Pooled data				
B_1	77.95	144.18	138.64	132.83	137.92
B_2	121.21	144.99	148.20	133.00	139.55
B_3	133.01	146.12	154.68	138.21	142.50
B_4	125.15	143.24	150.76	135.39	140.84
	1st year		**2nd year**		**Pooled**

SE(M)	**5.86**		**6.43**		**6.14**
CD (5%)	**16.78**		**18.41**		**17.58**



Fig. no. 1- Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on number of fruit per plant of guava

4.2 Yield per tree (kg)

Through the evaluation of the data presented in table 3 and figure 2 it was found that the highest yield per tree in the first , second and pooled data was obtained in treatment P_3B_3 (Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag) with 43.79, 40.45 and 42.12 (kg), whereas minimum yield per tree in the first, second and pooled data was recorded in P_1B_1 (control) with 22.05, 21.27 and 21.66 respectively.The findings are in accordance with Rajan *et al.* (2017) who found that post-shooting spray of banana bunches withbrassinosteroid at the rate of 2.0 mg L^{-1} resulted in a yield of 114.46 t ha^{-1} in cultivar Grand Naine as against 84.24 t ha^{-1} in control. The improvement in yield was attributed to the effect of brassinosteroids on cell elongation by increasing the cell permeability to water and osmotic solutes of the cells.

Table no. 3 Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on Yield per tree of guava during 1st year, 2nd year and polled data

	Yield per trees				
	Novel PGR's				
	1^{st} year				
Fruit bagging	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5
B_1	22.05	31.85	32.22	29.63	29.68
B_2	25.36	33.75	34.97	31.62	31.52
B_3	28.96	34.59	43.79	30.51	32.33
B_4	26.80	34.54	37.13	31.39	32.05
	2^{nd} year				
B_1	21.27	33.98	33.96	30.73	30.32
B_2	26.91	33.83	34.95	31.30	31.50
B_3	30.15	35.08	40.45	32.83	33.73
B_4	27.52	33.73	37.31	31.51	31.88
	Pooled data				
B_1	21.66	32.92	33.09	30.18	30.00
B_2	26.13	33.79	34.96	31.46	31.51
B_3	29.06	34.84	42.12	31.67	33.03
B_4	27.66	34.14	37.22	31.45	31.97
	1^{st} year		**2^{nd} year**		**Pooled**
SE(M)	**1.349**		**1.609**		**1.351**
CD (5%)	**3.862**		**4.606**		**3.867**



Fig. no. 2- Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on yield per tree of guava

4.3 Yield per hectare (q)

The examination of the data presented in table 4and figure 3 revealed that the maximum yield per hectare in the first , second and pooled data was found in treatment P_3B_3 (Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag) with 184.17, 171.04 and 176.60 (q), while the minimum yield per hectare in the first, second and pooled data was recorded in P_1B_1 (control) with 92.23, 89.99 and 99.32 (q) respectively.The findings are in agreement with Gomes et al. 2006 who reported that the application of brassinosteroid analog (BR-3) during a period of reproductive development has increased the yield by 65% in passion fruit over control. It stimulated better accumulation of photosynthates resulting into increased fruit number. Similarly, the increased yield was also observed in Navel orange and sweet cherry due to BRs application by Sugiyama and Kuraishi 1989; Roghabadi and Pakkish 2014.Asrey*et al.* (2011) concluded that under subtropical climatic condition, there is frequent fluctuation in atmospheric humidity and steep variation in day night temperature. This phenomenon makes the pomegranate suture (rind) more prone to cracking. Bagging films act as physical barriers and regulate water loss as well as temperature fluctuation and thus prevents fruit cracking.

Table no. 4 Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on Yield per hectare of guava during 1st year, 2nd year and polled data

	Yield per hectare				
	Novel PGR's				
	1st year				
Fruit bagging	**P_1**	**P_2**	**P_3**	**P_4**	**P_5**
B_1	92.23	136.44	137.57	127.56	127.72
B_2	130.45	144.00	148.57	134.15	135.37
B_3	134.98	151.74	184.17	135.07	138.35
B_4	132.22	147.20	157.55	134.58	136.03
	2nd year				
B_1	89.99	144.92	144.84	131.93	130.24
B_2	132.65	144.30	148.37	134.21	135.03
B_3	136.96	149.35	171.04	140.34	143.93
B_4	131.15	144.77	159.18	135.07	136.53
	Pooled data				
B_1	99.32	147.67	148.20	138.73	147.28
B_2	134.55	147.15	151.52	137.19	138.07
B_3	135.55	151.36	176.60	138.70	142.14

B_4	134.67	148.57	161.35	137.83	139.31
	1^{st} year		**2^{nd} year**		**Pooled**
SE(M)	**5.257**		**6.269**		**5.211**
CD (5%)	**15.049**		**17.947**		**14.918**



Fig. no..3- Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on yield per hectare (q) of guava

4.4 Physiological loss in weight (%)

The interaction effect of the two factors i.e. novel PGRs and fruit bagging on the physiological loss in weight of guava fruits presented in table 5 and figure.4 demonstrates that minimum physiological loss in weight of guava fruits was recorded in the combination P_5B_3 (Salicylic acid 600ppm + White polyethylene bag) i.e. (2.98, 4.52 and 5.86) (3.07, 4.59 and 5.85) (3.08, 4.56 and 5.86) respectively throughout 3^{rd} day, 6^{th} day and 9^{th} day of storage in ambient condition in both the year as well as in pooled data. While the maximum physiological loss in weight of guava fruits was recorded in the combination P_1B_1 (control) i.e. (4.23, 6.11 and 7.62) (4.70, 6.13 and 8.12) (4.46, 6.12 and 7.87) respectively throughout 3^{rd} day, 6^{th} day and 9^{th} day of storage in ambient condition in 1^{st} year, 2^{nd} year and in pooled data. The results are in accordance with Arafat (2019) who reported that salicylic acid (SA) different concentrations assessed on mycelial linear growth inhibition (MLGI %) of (*P. capitalensis*) in vitro. Exogenous postharvest treatment of guava fruit with SA tested at five concentrations, three times of immersion and kept for three period time of shelf life. DS per cent evaluated after three period times. Total soluble solids

(TSS) and weight loss (WL) evaluated after three period times. The findings are in agreement with Son and Kim, (2010) who examined the effects of bagging periods on berry cracking during development in grape cv. Kyoho and concluded that the berry weight was highest in late period of bagging treated at 7 to 9 weeks after full bloom as compared to the lowest in unbagged fruits. Bagging also critically reduced the fruit cracking rate as compared with the unbagged treatments.

Table no. 5 Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on physiological loss in weight of guava during 1st year, 2nd year and polled data

	Physiological loss in weight (%)														
	3rd day					6th day					9th day				
	Novel PGR's														
Fruit bagging	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5
B_1	4.23	4.08	3.73	3.45	3.27	6.11	5.63	5.31	4.92	4.80	7.62	6.97	6.64	6.26	6.15
B_2	4.32	3.93	3.65	3.41	3.12	5.86	5.47	5.19	4.96	4.68	7.21	6.82	6.53	6.30	6.03
B_3	4.18	3.81	3.53	3.34	2.98	5.73	5.39	5.08	4.85	4.52	7.07	6.72	6.42	6.20	5.86
B_4	4.26	3.88	3.58	3.38	3.06	5.81	5.42	5.13	4.86	4.60	7.15	6.77	6.47	6.22	5.95
	2nd year														
B_1	4.70	4.22	3.89	3.59	3.41	6.13	5.83	5.51	5.12	5.01	8.12	7.47	7.10	6.82	6.67
B_2	4.44	4.05	3.76	3.53	3.26	5.89	5.67	5.38	5.16	4.88	7.40	7.00	6.85	6.67	6.39
B_3	4.38	4.00	3.70	3.49	3.07	5.75	5.58	5.28	5.06	4.59	7.06	7.12	6.59	6.45	5.85
B_4	4.31	3.96	3.66	3.44	3.19	5.81	5.62	5.32	5.07	4.80	7.24	6.88	6.71	6.49	6.20
	Pooled data														
B_1	4.46	4.15	3.81	3.52	3.34	6.12	5.73	5.41	5.02	4.91	7.87	7.22	6.87	6.54	6.41
B_2	4.38	3.99	3.70	3.42	3.19	5.88	5.57	5.29	5.06	4.78	7.31	6.91	6.69	6.49	6.21
B_3	4.28	3.91	3.61	3.47	3.08	5.74	5.48	5.18	4.95	4.56	7.07	6.92	6.51	6.33	5.86

B_4	4.29	3.92	3.62	3.41	3.10	5.81	5.52	5.22	4.97	4.70	7.20	6.83	6.59	6.36	6.08
	1st year		**2nd year**		**Pooled**	**1st year**		**2nd year**		**Pooled**	**1st year**		**2nd year**		**Pooled**
SE(M) ±	0.033		0.031		0.056	0.030		0.035		0.063	0.028		0.058		0.110
CD (5%)	0.094		0.087		0.161	0.086		0.101		0.181	0.080		0.165		0.315

Fig. no. 4- Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on physiological loss in weight (%)



4.5 Rotting (%)

The interaction effect of the two factors i.e. novel PGRs and fruit bagging on the total sugar shown in table 6 and figure 5 reveals that the minimum rotting was found in the combination P_5B_3 (Salicylic acid 600ppm + White polyethylene bag) i.e. (0, 15.27 and 25.23) (0, 30.13 and 24.66%) (0, 15.02 and 24.95%) in the first, second and pooled data respectively. While the maximum total rotting was found in the combination P_1B_1 (control) i.e. (0, 32.42 and 44.52%) (0, 32.48 and 44.34%) (0, 32.45 and 44.43%) in the first year, second year and pooled data respectively. The findings are in accordance with Baliga *et al.*(2011) who reported that the loss in moisture causes a rapid rise in the concentration of sugars, leading to the maturation of the fruit. Salicylic acid can improve physical properties of fruits such as size in Thompson seedless grapevine. Pre-harvest spray of salicylic acid on Thompson Seedless grape increased cluster weight, length, and berry shape index compared to the control. Abbasi *et al.* (2018) noticed that bagging techniques can protect fruits from pests and eliminates the use of pesticides, thus improves the quality of fruit, by different materials viz. newspaper bags, perforated polyethylene bags, muslin cloth bags and netted cloth bags used for on-tree bagging of guava fruit to improve fruit quality.

Table no. 6 Interaction effect of novel PGR's and fruit bagging on rotting percentage of guava during 1st year, 2nd year and polled data

	Rotting %														
	3rd day					**6th day**					**9th day**				
	Novel PGR's														
Fruit bagging	**P_1**	**P_2**	**P_3**	**P_4**	**P_5**	**P_1**	**P_2**	**P_3**	**P_4**	**P_5**	**P_1**	**P_2**	**P_3**	**P_4**	**P_5**
B_1	-	-	-	-	-	32.42	23.76	22.11	18.71	17.70	44.52	35.00	33.11	29.22	27.70
B_2	-	-	-	-	-	25.04	23.97	20.55	19.17	16.60	38.97	36.73	32.89	29.67	26.60
B_3	-	-	-	-	-	23.11	23.32	19.64	19.28	15.27	35.11	34.40	30.64	29.58	25.23
B_4	-	-	-	-	-	26.32	23.79	21.46	12.35	17.80	37.58	35.29	31.58	29.77	26.93
	2nd year														
B_1	-	-	-	-	-	32.48	22.57	21.57	19.43	17.40	44.347	34.067	32.567	29.933	27.400
B_2	-	-	-	-	-	26.31	23.13	21.23	19.93	17.27	37.800	34.633	32.233	30.433	27.267
B_3	-	-	-	-	-	18.10	23.80	21.63	19.37	14.77	30.133	34.067	32.833	29.867	24.667

B_4	-	-	-	-	-	26.00	23.03	21.67	19.90	18.00	37.667	34.533	32.427	30.400	28.000
	Pooled data														
B_1	-	-	-	-	-	32.45	23.17	21.84	19.07	17.55	44.43	34.54	32.84	29.58	27.55
B_2	-	-	-	-	-	25.67	23.55	20.89	19.55	14.98	38.39	35.68	32.56	30.05	26.93
B_3	-	-	-	-	-	25.20	23.56	20.89	19.32	15.02	32.62	34.23	31.74	29.72	24.95
B_4	-	-	-	-	-	26.16	23.41	21.56	19.44	17.90	37.62	34.91	32.00	30.09	27.47
	1st year		**2nd year**		**Pooled**	**1st year**		**2nd year**		**Pooled**	**1st year**		**2nd year**		**Pooled**
SE(M) ±						1.576		1.274		2.029	0.990		1.590		0.876
CD (5%)						4.513		3.648		5.808	0.279		4.552		2.509



CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the effect of novel Plant Growth Regulators and fruit bagging on the yield and shelf life parameters of guava revealed that treatment combination P_3B_3 (Brassinosteroid (1.5 ppm) + White polyethylene bag) exerted most significant effect on the yield of guava, whereas treatment combination P_5B_3 (Salicylic acid 600ppm + White polyethylene bag) was found most significant in the enhancement of shelf life of guava fruits. Therefore, it can be concluded that Brassinosteroids can applied to enhance the yield of guava along with suitable fruit bagging technique. Salicylic acid combined with fruit bagging plays an important role in reducing the physiological loss in weight and rotting of fruits.

REFRENCES

1. Abbasi, N.A., Chaudhary, M.A., Ali, M.I., Hussain, A. and Ali, I. (2018). On tree fruit bagging influences quality of guava harvested at different maturity stages during summer. *Int. J. Agric. Biol*. **16**(3): 543–549.
2. Arafat, H.K. (2019). Improved the shelf life of guava fruits by salicylic acid against post-harvest black spot disease. *J. Plant Prot. and Path., Mansoura Univ*., **10** (4): 237 – 243
3. Asrey, R., Pal, R.K., Kumar, J. and Sharma, R.R. 2011. Get more by bagging pomegranates on trees. Indian Horticulture, 2011: 12-13.
4. Baliga M S, Baliga B R V, Kandathil S M, Bhat H P, Vayalil P K. 2011. A review of the chemistry and pharmacology of the date fruits (Phoenix dactylifera L.). Food Res. Int.,; 44:1812–1822.
5. Cao, S., Xu, Q., Cao, Y., Quian, K., Zhao, H. and Kuai, B. (2005). Loss of function mutations in DET2 gene lead to an enhanced resistance to oxidative stress in Arabidopsis. *Physiology of Plant***12**(3):57-66.
6. Dinesh, M.R., and Vasugi, C. (2010). Guava improvement in India and future needs. *J. Hort. Sci*., 5 (2): 94-108.
7. Gomes, M.M.A., Campostrini, E., Leal, N.R., Viana, A.P., Ferraz, T.M., Siqueira, L.N., Rosa, R.C.C., Netto, A.T., Núñez-Vázquez, M. and Zullo, M.A.T. 2006. Brassinosteroid analogue effects on the yield of yellow passion fruit plants (Passiflora edulis f. flavicarpa). Sci. Hortic., 110: 235-240.
8. Hofman, P.J., Smith, L.G., Joyce, D.C., Johnson, G.L. and Meibur, G. F. (1997). Bagging of mango (Mangifera indica cv. 'Keitt') fruit influences fruit quality and mineral composition. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 12, 83–91.
9. Isci, B, and Gokbayrak, Z. (2015). Influence of brassinosteroids on fruit yield and quality of table grape 'Alphonse Lavallée'. *VITIS-Journal of Grapevine Research*, **54**(1): 17-19.
10. Jia, H.J., Araki, A. and Okamoto, G. (2005). Influence of fruit bagging on aroma volatiles and skin coloration of 'Hakuho' peach (*Prunus persica Batsch*). *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 35, 61–68.
11. Radha., T. and Mathew, L. (2007). Fruit crops. New Delhi, New India publishing agency, p. 59.

12. Rajan, R., Gaikwad, S.S., Gotur, M., Joshi, C.J. and Chavda, J.K. 2017. Effect of Post Shooting Bunch Spray of Chemicals on Bunch Characters and Yield of Banana (Musa paradisiaca L.) cv. Grand Naine. Int. J. Cur. Microb. Appl. Sci.,6(8): 2471-2475.
13. Roghabadi, M.A. and Pakkish, Z. 2014. Role of brassinosteroid on yield, fruit quality and post-harvest storage of 'TakDanehe Mashhad' sweet cherry (Prunus avium L.). Agric. Commun., 2: 49–56
14. Sharma, R.R., Nagraja, A., Goswami, A.K., Thakre, M., Kumar, R. and Varghese, E. (2020) Influence of on-the-tree fruit bagging on biotic stresses and postharvest quality of rainy-season crop of 'Allahabad Safeda' guava (*Psidium guajava* L.). Crop Protection, volume 135, 105216: pages 1-7.
15. Sharma, R. R.; Pal, R. K.; Asrey, R.; Sagar, V.R.; Dhiman, M.R. and Rana, M.R. (2013). Pre-harvest fruit bagging influences fruit color and quality of apple cv. Delicious. *Agricultural Sciences*, **4**, 443–448.
16. Son, I. C. and Kim, D. I. (2010). Effects of Bagging Periods on Pericarp Characteristics and Berry Cracking in 'Kyoho' Grape (*Vitis* sp.). *Korean Journal of Horticultural Science and Technology*, **28**(3): 381-386.
17. Sugiyama, K. and Kuraishi, S. 1989. Stimulation of fruit set of' 'Morita' Navel orange with brassinolide. Acta Hortic., 239: 345–348.
18. Swamy, K. N., and Rao, S. S. R. (2008). Influence of 28-homobrassinolide on growth, photosynthesis metabolite and essential oil content of geranium [Pelargonium graveolens (L.) *Herit]. Am. J. Plant Physiol*, **3**: 173-174.
19. Teixeira, R., Amarante, C.V.T.D., Boff, M.I.C. and Ribeiro, L.G. (2011a). Control of insect pests and diseases, maturity and quality of 'Imperial Gala' apples submitted to bagging. *Brazilian Magazine of Fruit Culture*, **33**, 394–40