



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2021; 10(6): 181-183  
© 2021 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 03-03-2021  
Accepted: 12-04-2021

**Zarna K Patel**  
Department of Fruit Science,  
ASPEE College of Horticulture  
and Forestry Navsari,  
Agricultural University, Navsari,  
Gujarat, India

**BN Patel**  
Department of Fruit Science,  
ASPEE College of Horticulture  
and Forestry Navsari,  
Agricultural University, Navsari,  
Gujarat, India

**SN Saravaiya**  
Department of Vegetable  
Science, ASPEE College of  
Horticulture and Forestry  
Navsari, Agricultural University,  
Navsari, Gujarat, India

**Sneha M Patel**  
Department of Floriculture and  
Landscape Architecture, ASPEE  
College of Horticulture and  
Forestry Navsari, Agricultural  
University, Navsari, Gujarat,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Zarna K Patel**  
Department of Fruit Science,  
ASPEE College of Horticulture  
and Forestry Navsari,  
Agricultural University, Navsari,  
Gujarat, India

## Influence of fruit bagging on chemical composition of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) Under high density planting

Zarna K Patel, BN Patel, SN Saravaiya and Sneha M Patel

### Abstract

Field Experiment was carried out at Regional Horticultural Research Station, ASPEE College of Horticulture and Forestry, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari from January 2018 to July 2018 in Sonpari variety of mango. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with factorial concept and repeated thrice with twenty one treatment combination. The experiment consisted of three planting distance (D) viz., 5 m × 5 m (D<sub>1</sub>), 3 m × 3 m (D<sub>2</sub>) and 3 m × 2 m (D<sub>3</sub>) and seven fruit bagging materials (B) viz., control (B<sub>1</sub>) newspaper bag (B<sub>2</sub>), brown paper bag (B<sub>3</sub>), transparent PP bag (B<sub>4</sub>), butter paper bag (B<sub>5</sub>), muslin cloth bag (B<sub>6</sub>) and non woven bag (B<sub>7</sub>). The fruits were bagged at egg stage (55-60 days after fruit set). Results showed that chemical parameters such as TSS, reducing sugars, total sugars, non-reducing sugars and titrable acidity were significantly affected by planting distance. TSS, reducing sugar and total sugars were significantly higher and titrable acidity was significantly lower in the planting distance 5m × 5m (D<sub>1</sub>). Non-reducing sugar was found higher under 3 m × 3 m distance (D<sub>2</sub>). While, ascorbic acid content and β carotene (μg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) were not significantly affected by planting distance. Regarding effect of different bagging material, TSS, reducing sugar, total sugar, non-reducing, titrable acidity and ascorbic acid were significantly improved by newspaper bag followed by muslin cloth bag while β-carotene content of fruit was significantly higher in brown paper bag followed by muslin cloth bag. No significant effect was found for the chemical properties of mango fruits between planting distance and different bagging material.

**Keywords:** Mango, planting distance, bagging materials, chemical properties

### Introduction

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) belongs to family Anacardiaceae has been grown in India since long and is considered as “King of Fruits”. It is one of the choicest and most ancient fruits known to mankind. India is the major producer and exporter of mangoes in the world. The productivity of mango in India is comparatively less than other mango producing countries. The low productivity of mango is mainly due to low plant population per hectare, improper orchard management practices, pests and diseases problems *etc.* Therefore, high density plantation and management are necessary to deal with this unfavorable situation of low productivity which gives higher yield at low cost with more resilience to climatic stresses along with maintains export quality of fruits. High density planting (HDP) is one of the technology for mango cultivation worldwide to increase productivity without affecting the quality of fruits. It has the potential to yield 200 per cent more produce than that of the traditional method (Singh, 2017) [21].

Climatic abbreviation such as sudden rise in temperature, humidity and unseasonal rain are the main problems in recent years. Such adverse climate not only affects the external appearance of the fruit but also aggravate the pest and diseases incidence. Thus, to prevent the losses caused by biotic and abiotic factors several good agricultural practices (GAP) are becoming popular throughout the world (Sharma, 2009) [16]. Among them, pre-harvest fruit bagging emerged as an effective method. It was known to originate in Japan and Korea. Countries such as Mexico, Chile and Argentina do not import fruits unless they were bagged (Sharma *et al.*, 2014) [17]. Bagging not only improves the visual quality of fruits but also improves the internal quality of fruits by promoting skin colouration and reducing blemishes by change micro-environment. Hence an experiment was undertaken to study the influence on fruit bagging on quality of fruits.

## Materials and Methods

The experiment was carried out at Regional Horticultural Research Station, ASPEE College of Horticulture and Forestry, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari during the year 2018. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with factorial concept and repeated thrice with twenty one treatment combinations. The experiment consisted of three planting distance (D) viz., 5 m × 5 m (D<sub>1</sub>), 3 m × 3 m (D<sub>2</sub>) and 3 m × 2 m (D<sub>3</sub>) and seven fruit bagging materials (B) viz., control (B<sub>1</sub>) newspaper bag (B<sub>2</sub>), brown paper bag (B<sub>3</sub>), transparent PP bag (B<sub>4</sub>), butter paper bag (B<sub>5</sub>), muslin cloth bag (B<sub>6</sub>) and non woven bag (B<sub>7</sub>). All fruits at egg stage (55-60 days after fruit set) were bagged and tied with the help of plastic thread to the fruit stalk. Six perforations of 4 mm diameter were made at the bottom of all the bags except muslin cloth and non woven bags for proper ventilation. Observations of chemical parameters were taken at ripe stage. For that study, three fruits were randomly selected per replication from six fruits and analyzed to determine the fruit chemical composition (TSS, reducing, non-reducing and total sugars, acidity, ascorbic acid and β carotene) at ripe stages. TSS was recorded by using digital hand refractometer (Range of 0 to 32 °Brix). Reducing sugars, total sugars and non-reducing sugars were determined by method suggested by Lane and Eylon (1923) [8] as described by Ranganna (1986) [14]. Titrable acidity was estimated by titrating known amount of pulp against 0.1 N NaOH using phenolphthalein as indicator Ranganna (1986) [14]. Ascorbic acid content of fruits

was determined by Dye method given by Ranganna (1986) [14]. β-carotene content of mango fruits was estimated by spectrophotometric method as detailed by Raj *et al.* (2016) [13]. The statistical analysis of data was carried out as per the method prescribed by Panse and Sukhatme (1985) [12]. The standard error of mean (S. Em.) was worked out and the critical difference (C. D.) at 5 per cent was calculated whenever the results were found significant.

## Results and Discussion

### Effect of planting distance

Table 1 showed the significant effect of planting distance and bagging materials on chemical parameters of mango fruit. In case of planting distance, the maximum TSS (19.90 °Brix), reducing sugars (5.15%), total sugars (12.12%) and minimum titrable acidity (0.16%) were obtained in the planting distance of 5 m × 5 m. Significantly highest non-reducing sugar content of fruit (7.07%) was noted in D<sub>2</sub> (3 m × 3 m), which was at par with D<sub>1</sub> (5 m × 5 m) being 6.98%. It might be due to lesser competition among plants for nutrients and better penetration of sunshine for photosynthesis (Pal *et al.*, 2017) [11]. The results are in agreement with the findings of Singh (2003) [19], Brar *et al.* (2013) [2], Kumar *et al.* (2017) [7] and Singh *et al.* (2007) [20] in guava; Sarrwy *et al.* (2012) [15] in banana; Gaikwad *et al.* (2017) [3] in mango. While, Ascorbic acid content and β carotene (μg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) were not significantly affected by planting distance.

**Table 1:** Effect of planting distance and bagging materials on chemical composition of mango fruit cv. Sonpari at ripe stage

| Treatments                          | TSS (°Brix) | Reducing sugar (%) | Total sugars (%) | Non-reducing sugars (%) | Titrable acidity (%) | Ascorbic acid (mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> ) | β-carotene content (μg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| <b>Planting distance (D)</b>        |             |                    |                  |                         |                      |   |  |
| D <sub>1</sub> (5 m × 5 m)          | 19.90       | 5.15               | 12.12            | 6.98                    | 0.16                 | 32.99                                   | 721.64                                       |
| D <sub>2</sub> (3 m × 3 m)          | 18.63       | 4.21               | 11.28            | 7.07                    | 0.17                 | 32.32                                   | 693.70                                       |
| D <sub>3</sub> (3 m × 2 m)          | 18.42       | 4.36               | 10.82            | 6.46                    | 0.18                 | 32.00                                   | 681.20                                       |
| S.Em.±                              | 0.21        | 0.12               | 0.13             | 0.17                    | 0.003                | 0.63                                    | 14.18  |
| C.D. at 5%                          | 0.61        | 0.34               | 0.38             | 0.49                    | 0.01                 | NS                                      | NS   |
| <b>Bagging materials (B)</b>        |             |                    |                  |                         |                      |   |  |
| B <sub>1</sub> : Control            | 17.84       | 4.05               | 9.66             | 5.61                    | 0.20                 | 29.33                                   | 422.88                                       |
| B <sub>2</sub> : Newspaper bag      | 20.55       | 5.33               | 13.15            | 7.82                    | 0.14                 | 36.26                                   | 779.72                                       |
| B <sub>3</sub> : Brown paper bag    | 19.02       | 4.69               | 12.10            | 7.41                    | 0.15                 | 32.82                                   | 1290.10                                      |
| B <sub>4</sub> : Transparent PP bag | 18.34       | 3.99               | 10.01            | 6.02                    | 0.19                 | 30.78                                   | 478.64                                       |
| B <sub>5</sub> : Butter paper bag   | 19.01       | 4.51               | 10.95            | 6.43                    | 0.16                 | 32.82                                   | 592.72                                       |
| B <sub>6</sub> : Muslin cloth bag   | 19.52       | 4.92               | 12.36            | 7.44                    | 0.15                 | 35.59                                   | 916.11                                       |
| B <sub>7</sub> : Non woven bag      | 18.59       | 4.52               | 11.64            | 7.12                    | 0.18                 | 29.47                                   | 411.73                                       |
| S.Em.±                              | 0.32        | 0.18               | 0.20             | 0.26                    | 0.004                | 0.96                                    | 21.67  |
| C.D. at 5%                          | 0.93        | 0.52               | 0.57             | 0.75                    | 0.01                 | 2.73                                    | 61.92  |
| <b>Interaction effect (D × B)</b>   |             |                    |                  |                         |                      |   |  |
| S.Em.±                              | 0.56        | 0.32               | 0.35             | 0.45                    | 0.007                | 1.66                                    | 37.53  |
| C.D. at 5%                          | NS          | NS                 | NS               | NS                      | NS                   | NS                                      | NS   |
| C.V. %                              | 5.13        | 12.02              | 5.28             | 11.52                   | 7.75                 | 8.84                                    | 9.30   |

### Effect of bagging materials

In case of different bagging materials, the maximum TSS (20.55 °Brix), reducing sugars (5.3%), total sugars (13.15%), non-reducing sugars (7.82%), ascorbic acid content of fruit (36.26 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) and minimum titrable acidity content of fruit (0.14%) was noticed in fruits bagged with newspaper bag. It was at par with brown paper and muslin cloth bag. These findings are in agreement with those of Mingire *et al.* (2017) [9], Haldankar *et al.* (2015) [4] and Mohapatra (2016) [10] in mango. Abbasi *et al.* (2014) [11] also noted that the fruits bagged using newspaper bag improve the TSS content of fruits. β-carotene content was found maximum (1290.10 μg

100 g<sup>-1</sup>) in fruits bagged with brown paper bag, which was at par with muslin cloth bag (916.11 μg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>). It might be due to bagging of fruits change the micro-environment favorably around the fruits with respect to light, humidity and temperature and ultimately improve the quality of fruits (Shinde *et al.*, 2015) [18]. The results are in conformity with Mingire *et al.*, (2017) [9], Haldankar *et al.* (2015) [4], Mohapatra, 2016 [10], Islam *et al.* (2017<sup>a</sup>) [5] and Islam *et al.* (2017<sup>b</sup>) [6] in mango.

Combined effect of planting distance and bagging materials on chemical properties of mango fruit were remained non-significant.

## Conclusion

Owing to the results obtained during this study, it is inferred that fruits bagged with newspaper bag with planting distance of 5 m × 5 m was found better for enhancing the chemical properties of mango fruit cv. Sonpari.

## References

1. Abbasi NA, Chaudhary MA, Ali MI, Azhar H, Irfan A. Studies on tree fruit bagging influences quality of guava harvested at different maturity stages during summer. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, 2014;16(3):543-549.
2. Brar JS, Dhaliwal HS, Bal JS, Singh SM. Influence of inter-plant spacing on microclimate and horticultural parameters of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) orchard. *Res. Crops.* 2013;14(1):205-212.
3. Gaikwad SP, Chalak SU, Kamble AB. Effect of spacing on growth, yield and quality of mango. *J. Krishi Vigyan.* 2017;5(2):50-53.
4. Haldankar PM, Parulekar YR, Kireeti A, Kad MS, Shinde SM, Lawande KE. Studies on influence of bagging of fruits at marble stage on quality of mango cv. Alphonso. *J. Pl. Studies* 2015; 4(2):12-20.
5. Islam MT, Rahman MS, Shamsuzzoha M, Chowdhury AK, Alom R. Influence of pre-harvest bagging on fruit quality of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Mishribhog. *Int. J. Biosci* 2017a; 11(3):59-68.
6. Islam MT, Shamsuzzoha M, Rahman MS, Haque MM, Alom R. Influence of pre-harvest bagging on fruit quality of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) cv. Mollika. *J. Biosci. Agric. Res* 2017b; 15(01):1246-1254.
7. Kumar RK, Jaganath S, Guruprasad TR, Narayana CK, Balakrishna AN. Studies on plant density and integrated nutrient management for growth, yield, quality and shelf life of guava cv. Lalit in rainy season. *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci* 2017;5(2): 354-366.
8. Lane JH, Eynon L. Volumetric determination of reducing sugars by means of Fehling's solution, with methylene blue as internal indicator 1923;25(1):143-149.
9. Mingire SS, Haldankar PM, Parulekar YR, Kadam DS, Haldavanekar PC. Studies on influence of pre-harvest bagging of fruits on quality of mango cv. Ratna. *Indian J. Hort* 2017;74(2):178-183.
10. Mohapatra S. Studies on the effect of types of bag on mango fruit cv. Ratna. *Thesis M. Sc. (Horti.)* submitted to Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli 2016, 124.
11. Pal M, Lal S, Nautiyal P, Joshi P. Response of high density spacing on physico-chemical quality and yield of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) cv. Pant Prabhat. *Int. J. Agric. Sci* 2017;9(9):3962-3965.
12. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. "Statistical Method for Agricultural Workers", ICAR., New Delhi 1985, 152-161.
13. Raj D, Sharma R, Patel NL. "Handbook of Food Sci. and Technol. Chemistry and Safety 2016;1:452.
14. Rangana S. "Manual of Analysis of Fruit and Vegetable Products". Tata Mc. Grew Hill Publishing Company Ltd., New Delhi 1986, 7-12.
15. Sarrwy SMA, Mostafa EAM, Hassan HSA. Growth, yield and fruit quality of Williams banana as affected by different planting distances. *Int. J. Agric. Sci.* 2012;7(5):266-275.
16. Sharma RR. "Fruit Production: Problems and Solutions". International Book Distributing Company, Lucknow, India 2009, 649.
17. Sharma RR, Reddy SVR, Jhalegar MJ. Pre-harvest fruit bagging: a useful approach for plant protection and improved post-harvest fruit quality-a review. *J. Hort. Sci. and Biotech* 2014;89(2):101-113.
18. Shinde SM, Haldankar PM, Parulekar YR, Haldavanekar PC, Bhavne SG, Godase SK *et al.* Effect of pre-harvest bagging with different type of bags on physico-chemical properties of mango cv. Kesar. *Green Farming* 2015;6(4):809-812.
19. Singh A. Light interception behavior of guava and its effects on vegetative growth, fruit yield and quality. *Thesis., Ph.D.*, submitted to Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana 2003, 120.
20. Singh BP, Singh RA, Singh G, Killadi B. Response of bagging on maturity, ripening and storage behaviour of "Winter guava". *Acta Horticulturae* 2007;735:597-601.
21. Singh SP, Payal Jaiswal, Kumar A. Ultra high density plantation of mango: New technology for increasing the income of farmers. *Indian Farmer* 2017;4(5):368-375.