

## **Original Research Article**

# **Effect of spacing and mulch on post harvest disease incidence and sensory evaluation in Strawberry**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** To study the response of plant spacing and mulch material on post harvest disease incidence and sensory evaluation in Strawberry.

**Study design:** The investigation was laid in randomized block design.

**Place and Duration of Study:** Sample: Farmer's field in Dhankhuloi village of Jorhat district, Assam and Department of Horticulture, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, during November-April of two consecutive years 2019-20 and 2020-21.

**Methodology:** We included included twenty treatments with five spacings viz. 20 cm x 30 cm, 30 cm x 30 cm, 30 cm x 40 cm, 40 cm x 40 cm and 40 cm x 60 cm along with four mulch materials i.e. paddy straw, red mulch, silver black mulch and no mulch. Percent post harvest disease incidence and sensory evaluation was conducted.

**Results:** Out of 20 treatments, the treatment combination of widest spacing 40 cm x 60 cm along with silver black mulch showed least percent postharvest disease incidence (18.90%) while maximum (42.82%) was obtained in no mulch applied plots with 20 cm x 30 cm spacing. Sensory evaluation showed treatment combination of 40 cm x 40 cm spacing with silver black mulch exhibited better organoleptic qualities.

**Conclusion:** Positive effects of wider spacing and plastic mulch material might have contributed to least post harvest disease incidence in strawberry. Fruits of strawberry mulched with silver black plastic and wider spacing owing to favourable microclimate may have contributed to a sweeter taste and, consequently, better consumer acceptance.

*Keywords: [Strawberry, spacing, mulch, postharvest disease incidence, sensory evaluation ]*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Strawberry has commanded a premier position in the world fruit market due to its attractive fruit and pleasant distinctive flavor. It has adapted well to highly varying climatic conditions. Strawberry cultivation recently received some impetus in India and has become very popular among the farming community due to earlier and higher prices. (Pramanick *et al.*, 2013). However, the growers do not seem to adopt proper agronomic practices due to various reasons. Adopting optimum plant spacing and mulch material can help farmers earn more prices in the market. Optimum plant spacing facilitates better plant growth and development thereby maximizing yield and efficient utilization of land (Bhatia *et al.*, 2017). Mulches are materials applied over the soil surface which helps in weed suppression, soil moisture conservation and modifying soil temperature. The strawberry fruits lying on the ground comes in contact with soil making the fruits dirty and susceptible to soil-borne pathogen infections, leading to reduced fruit quality. This is an additional advantage of using mulches in strawberry production by reducing the number of diseased and dirty berries (Reham *et al.*, 2019). However, no work has been done on the effect of plant spacing and

mulch on percent post harvest disease incidence and sensory evaluation of strawberry under Jorhat condition and hence the present study has been undertaken.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

A field investigation was carried out at farmers' field in Dhankhuloi village of Jorhat district of Assam, India during the consecutive years 2019-2020 and 2020-21 to study the effect of spacing and mulch material on quality of Strawberry fruit with the twenty treatments and three replications laid out in Randomized Block Design. The treatments comprised of various spacing viz., S1 -20 cm x 30 cm, S2- 30cm x 30 cm, S3 -30cm x 40 cm, S4 -40 cm x 40 cm, S5 -40cm x 60 cm and four mulch materials i.e. M1-paddy straw, M2- red mulch, M3-silver black mulch and M4- no mulch. The experimental plot was brought to fine tilth by ploughing, clod crushing and harrowing and vermicompost @ 2.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> was mixed uniformly in the soil during bed preparation. No fertilizers were applied, foliar spray of NPK 19-19-19 @ 5g per litre was applied at ten days interval along with micronutrients. Percent post harvest disease incidence were recorded in the laboratory by using the formula as mentioned by Kuyu and Tola(2018): and the data was statistically analyzed using SPSS software. The organoleptic characteristics of the strawberry fruits viz. firmness, colour, flavour and sweetness were tested at harvest by sensory evaluation carried out with the help of a sensory panel of judges using a 5 point hedonic scale and fruits with score above 3.0 was considered acceptable (Gude *et al.*, 2017).

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Percent post harvest disease incidence

The data presented in Table 1; Table 2 and Fig.1 revealed that, different spacing and mulch treatment combination had significant effect on percent post harvest disease incidence in strawberry.

The strawberry has excellent sensory characteristics but it is highly perishable, with limited postharvest life due to high moisture content, sugars and acids, therefore making it an ideal substrate for proliferation of pathogenic organisms that cause considerable postharvest damage. The pathogens *Botrytis cinerea*, followed by *Rhizopus stolonifer*, *Colletotrichum* spp *Mucor* spp., are mainly responsible for postharvest diseases of strawberry fruit. *Botrytis cinerea* can cause infection before harvest, in the field stage and stays dormant in storage, till the conditions become favourable for their development.

Percent disease incidence was noted significantly least (27.42%) with wider spacing of 40 cm x 40 cm whereas the maximum (31.35%) was recorded with the closest spacing of 20 cm x 30 cm. This might be attributed to the fact that proper plant spacing helps to prevent the development of foliar diseases; because wider rows improve wind penetration to reduce humidity through the crop canopy, thus making the environment suboptimal for disease infestation. Similar views were expressed by Brar *et al.*, (2013) in their study.

**Table 1. Effect of spacing and mulch on percent post harvest disease incidence**

| Treatment         | Post harvest disease incidence (%) |                    |                    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                   | 2019-2020                          | 2020-21            | Pooled             |
| <b>Spacing(S)</b> |                                    |                    |                    |
| 20 cm x 30 cm     | 30.79 <sup>c</sup>                 | 31.91 <sup>c</sup> | 31.35 <sup>c</sup> |
| 30 cm x 30 cm     | 29.47 <sup>b</sup>                 | 30.63 <sup>b</sup> | 30.05 <sup>b</sup> |

|                                      |                    |                    |                    |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 30 cm x 40 cm (S <sub>3</sub> )      | 29.07 <sup>b</sup> | 30.28 <sup>b</sup> | 29.67 <sup>b</sup> |
| 40 cm x 40 cm (S <sub>4</sub> )      | 27.37 <sup>a</sup> | 28.22 <sup>a</sup> | 27.79 <sup>a</sup> |
| 40 cm x 60 cm (S <sub>5</sub> )      | 26.92 <sup>a</sup> | 27.93 <sup>a</sup> | 27.42 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>SEd(±)</b>                        | 0.41               | 0.46               | 0.31               |
| <b>CD(P=0.05)</b>                    | 0.83               | 0.94               | 0.62               |
| <b>Mulches(M)</b>                    |                    |                    |                    |
| Paddy straw(M <sub>1</sub> )         | 31.24 <sup>c</sup> | 32.32 <sup>c</sup> | 31.78 <sup>c</sup> |
| Red mulch(M <sub>2</sub> )           | 21.54 <sup>b</sup> | 22.85 <sup>b</sup> | 22.20 <sup>b</sup> |
| Silver Black mulch (M <sub>3</sub> ) | 20.76 <sup>a</sup> | 21.99 <sup>a</sup> | 21.37 <sup>a</sup> |
| No mulch(M <sub>4</sub> )            | 41.36 <sup>d</sup> | 42.00 <sup>d</sup> | 41.69 <sup>d</sup> |
| <b>SEd(±)</b>                        | 0.36               | 0.41               | 0.28               |
| <b>CD(P=0.05)</b>                    | 0.74               | 0.84               | 0.55               |
| <b>SEd(±)</b>                        | 0.82               | 0.93               | 0.62               |
| <b>CD(P=0.05)</b>                    | NS                 | 1.88               | 1.23               |

**Table 2. Effect of spacing and mulch interaction on percent post harvest disease incidence**


| Interaction (S x M)                              |         | Post harvest disease incidence (%) |        |  |         |               |              |
|--|---------|------------------------------------|--------|--|---------|---------------|--------------|
| Treatment combination                            | 2019-20 | 2020-21                            | Pooled | Treatment combination                            | 2019-20 | 2020-21       | Pooled       |
| T <sub>1</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 33.33   | 34.55                              | 33.94  | T <sub>11</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 21.25   | 22.95         | 22.10        |
| T <sub>2</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>2</sub> )  | 24.15   | 25.48                              | 24.81  | T <sub>12</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 41.34   | 41.89         | 41.61        |
| T <sub>3</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>3</sub> )  | 23.28   | 24.40                              | 23.84  | T <sub>13</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>1</sub> ) | 30.46   | 31.51         | 30.98        |
| T <sub>4</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>4</sub> )  | 42.41   | 43.22                              | 42.82  | T <sub>14</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 19.32   | 20.36         | 19.84        |
| T <sub>5</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 31.82   | 32.44                              | 32.13  | T <sub>15</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 18.80   | 19.46         | 19.13        |
| T <sub>6</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>2</sub> )  | 22.52   | 24.11                              | 23.32  | T <sub>16</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 40.89   | 41.56         | 41.22        |
| T <sub>7</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>3</sub> )  | 21.92   | 23.90                              | 22.91  | T <sub>17</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>1</sub> ) | 29.30   | 30.75         | 30.03        |
| T <sub>8</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>4</sub> )  | 41.63   | 42.07                              | 41.85  | T <sub>18</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 19.29   | 20.40         | 19.85        |
| T <sub>9</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 31.29   | 32.36                              | 31.82  | T <sub>19</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 18.55   | 19.25         | <b>18.90</b> |
| T <sub>10</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 22.42   | 23.91                              | 23.16  | T <sub>20</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 40.56   | 41.29         | 40.93        |
|  |         | <b>2019-20</b>                     |        | <b>2020-2021</b>                                 |         | <b>Pooled</b> |              |
| <b>SEd(±)</b>                                    |         | 0.82                               |        | 0.93   |         | 0.62          |              |
| <b>CD(P=0.05)</b>                                |         | NS                                 |        | 1.88   |         | 1.23          |              |

• Superscript by same letter means they are at par

Minimum post harvest disease incidence (21.37%) was observed under silver black mulch whereas maximum (41.69%) was recorded under no mulch treatments. It might be due to the fact that the use of plastic mulch may cause less humid surroundings for the plants and, hence, less incidence of Botrytis. Minimum botrytis fruit rot infection observed in plants under silver black polyethylene and maximum in bare soil followed by paddy straw, mainly because straw is favourable medium for spread of *Botrytis cinerea*. The results are in agreement of Kumar *et al.*, (2012) and Sharma *et al.*, (2004).

The data from the interaction effect of spacing and mulch revealed that treatment combination T<sub>19</sub> (40 cm x 60 cm with silver black mulch) recorded least per cent post harvest disease incidence (18.90 %) in the study. During the entire period of study, the percent

disease incidence observed irrespective of the treatments could be attributed by presence of disease causing inoculums due to favourable environmental conditions.



**Fig. 1. Effect of spacing and mulch on percent post harvest disease incidence**

### Sensory evaluation

The fruits of different treatments were subjected to sensory evaluation for evaluating firmness, skin colour, pulp colour, flavour and sweetness are presented in Table 3.

The highest numerical rating with respect to firmness (Hedonic scale rating 4.14), skin colour (4.42), pulp colour (4.28), flavour (3.57), sweetness (3.71) was observed under treatment combination T<sub>15</sub> (40 cm x 40 cm spacing with silver black mulch) having good overall acceptability. The numerical rating was lowest with respect to firmness (3.28), skin colour (3.28), pulp colour (2.28), flavour (2.00), sweetness (1.85) were recorded in T<sub>17</sub> (40 cm x 60 cm spacing and paddy straw) giving acceptability score of 2.53 and T<sub>12</sub> (30 cm x 30 cm with no mulch) giving score of 2.93 and both had the overall acceptability below 3.

The better organoleptic qualities under wider spacing could be due to fact that sufficient sunlight under wider spacing might have led to better conversion of starch to sugar as observed by Anil(2019). The better organoleptic traits under plastic mulch treatment could be due to more reflection of photosynthetically active radiation(PAR) into fruiting zone which elevated sugar conversion in agreement with views of Dhanush et al.,(2017). In the study, the panel gave at par ratings to the samples for acceptance of the external appearance, indicating that the consumers would accept better sample, despite differences in physical characteristics. The average hedonic value, however, did not always faithfully represent the opinions of the judges as a group as opined by Amorim et al.,(2013).

**Table 3. Effect of spacing and mulch interaction on Sensory evaluation**

| Treatment combination | Sensory evaluation rating |             |             |         |           | Average |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|
|                       | Firmness                  | Skin colour | Pulp colour | Flavour | Sweetness |         |
|                       |                           |             |             |         |           |         |

|  |      |      |      |      |      |             |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| T <sub>1</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 3.71 | 3.85 | 2.57 | 2.85 | 2.71 | 3.13        |
| T <sub>2</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>2</sub> )  | 3.42 | 4.42 | 3.71 | 3.85 | 3.57 | 3.79        |
| T <sub>3</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>3</sub> )  | 3.71 | 4.42 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 3.77        |
| T <sub>4</sub> (S <sub>1</sub> M <sub>4</sub> )  | 3.57 | 4.57 | 3.71 | 3.42 | 3.28 | 3.71        |
| T <sub>5</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 3.85 | 4.28 | 3.28 | 3.42 | 2.85 | 3.53        |
| T <sub>6</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>2</sub> )  | 3.85 | 4.71 | 3.71 | 3.42 | 3.14 | 3.76        |
| T <sub>7</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>3</sub> )  | 3.42 | 4.14 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 2.42 | 3.42        |
| T <sub>8</sub> (S <sub>2</sub> M <sub>4</sub> )  | 3.57 | 4.00 | 3.71 | 3.42 | 3.14 | 3.56        |
| T <sub>9</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>1</sub> )  | 3.57 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 3.14 | 3.42 | 3.45        |
| T <sub>10</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 3.85 | 4.71 | 4.00 | 3.42 | 3.42 | 3.88        |
| T <sub>11</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 3.85 | 3.71 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 2.71 | 3.28        |
| T <sub>12</sub> (S <sub>3</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 3.42 | 3.28 | 2.57 | 3.00 | 2.42 | 2.93        |
| T <sub>13</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>1</sub> ) | 3.42 | 3.57 | 3.00 | 3.71 | 3.42 | 3.42        |
| T <sub>14</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 3.85 | 4.00 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 3.42        |
| T <sub>15</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 4.14 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 3.57 | 3.71 | <b>4.02</b> |
| T <sub>16</sub> (S <sub>4</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 3.85 | 4.00 | 3.57 | 3.28 | 3.14 | 3.56        |
| T <sub>17</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>1</sub> ) | 3.28 | 3.28 | 2.28 | 2.00 | 1.85 | 2.53        |
| T <sub>18</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>2</sub> ) | 3.71 | 3.85 | 3.85 | 3.57 | 3.14 | 3.62        |
| T <sub>19</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>3</sub> ) | 3.00 | 4.28 | 3.71 | 3.14 | 2.42 | 3.31        |
| T <sub>20</sub> (S <sub>5</sub> M <sub>4</sub> ) | 3.85 | 4.42 | 4.00 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 3.68        |

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The results indicate that fruits grown under T<sub>15</sub> (40 cm x 40 cm spacing with silver black mulch) had least percent post harvest disease incidence and better organoleptic qualities.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

## REFERENCES

1. Pramanick KK, Kishore DK, Sharma SK, Das BK, Murthy BNS. Strawberry cultivation under diverse agro-climatic conditions of India. *Int J Fruit Sci.* 2013;13:36–51.
2. Bhatia SK, Sharma R, Kumar R. Effect of different planting time and spacing on growth, yield and quality of Strawberry (*Fragaria*×*Ananassa*) cv. Ofra, *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 2017;5(5): 207-211.
3. Reham MA, Attalah SY, Badawy IFM Aboalmajd SA. Effect of Plastic Mulching on Strawberry Fruit Yield and Quality. *Assiut J. Agric. Sci.*2019;50 (4):126-141.
- 4 Kuyu,C.G.,Tola,Y.B. (2018). Assessment of banana fruit handling practices and associated fungal pathogens in Jimma town market, southwest Ethiopia. *Food Sci. Nutr.*, pp. 1-8.
5. Gude K,Swaney-Stueve M, Rivard C, Pliakoni E. Consumer test of spring-planted, day-neutral strawberries grown in a high tunnel system. Poster presented at: The Annual Conference of the American Society of Horticultural Sciences; 2017 Sept 19-22; Big Island, HI.
6. Brar JS, Dhaliwal, HS, Bal JS, Singh SP.Influence of inter-plant spacing on microclimatic and horticultural parameters of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) orchard.*Res. Crops.* 2013;14 (1): 205-212.
7. Kumar PS,Choudhary VK, Bhagawati R. Influence of mulching and irrigation level on water-use efficiency, plant growth and quality of strawberry (*Fragaria ananassa*). *Ind. J. Agril. Sci.*,2012. **82** (2): 127-133.
8. Sharma., R.R., Sharma, V.P. and Pandey, S.N. (2004). Mulching influences plant growth and albinism disorder in strawberry under subtropical climate. *Acta Hortic.* **662**: 187- 191.
9. Anil, G.Y.(2019).Studies on plant density and nutrient requirement in banana cv.Grand Naine.PhD Thesis submitted to V.N.M. Krishividyaapeeth,Parbhani.
10. Dhanush, K. V., Patil,D. R., Kantesh, G., Patil,S. N. and Alur, A.(2017). Studies on the influence of different types of studies on the influence of different types of mulches on growth, yield and quality of Grapes (*Vitis vinifera* L.) cv. Kishmish Rozavis White.Bioscan. 12(2): 953-957.
11. Amorim,A.V., Garruti,D.S., Lacerda,C.F., Moura,C.F.H. and Gomes-Filho,E.(2013). Postharvest and sensory quality of pineapples grown under micronutrients doses and two types of mulching. *Afr. J Agril Res.* **8**(19):2240-224.