

UTILISATION OF JAMUN JUICE BY MAKING BLENDED RTS BEVERAGES

N. Priyanka, A. V. D. Dorajeerao and V. Sudhavani

Horticultural College and Research Institute, Venkataramannagudem - 534 101 (Andhra Pradesh), India.

Abstract

The present study was conducted during the year 2014-15 at HCRI, Venkataramannagudem. The juices used in the study were those obtained from mango, grapes and pineapple blended in different proportions with jamun juice. These juice blends were utilized for the preparation of RTS and were evaluated for their quality throughout the acceptable period of storage. Colour, TSS, acidity, pH, reducing sugars, non-reducing sugars total sugars and overall acceptability were observed throughout the storage period. The optical density of the beverages, acidity, reducing sugars and total sugars increased continuously during storage period, while pH, non-reducing sugars decreased during the storage period. The decrease in organoleptic acceptability was due to the change in the composition of these parameters. The RTS prepared from 75% of jamun juice blended with 25% grape juice had highest overall acceptability among all the combinations. However, all these RTS beverages were acceptable up to 90 days of storage period.

Key words: Jamun, RTS, colour, optical density, nutrition sectors.

Introduction

Recent researches in the food and nutrition sectors have called the attention of consumers towards the interest in fresh and processed foods that offer some additional benefits to health (Abdullah and Cheng, 2001). In order to meet these new standards of food demand, many native or introduced fruits, little explored economically, can be tested as raw material for domestic industrial use. Jamun (*Syzygium cumini* L.) is an evergreen tropical tree belonging to the family Myrtaceae which is native to India.

Jamun starts flowering in March-April and the fruits appear in May- June. The berry is oblong, ovoid and shining crimson black (rich in anthocyanin pigment and anti-oxidants) when fully ripe. Jamun fruits are universally accepted to be very good for medicinal purpose especially for curing diabetes because of its effect on pancreas (Joshi, 2001). The fruit, its juice and seed contain a metabolite called 'jamboline' which is believed to check the pathological conversion of starch into sugar in case of increased production of glucose. Besides, jamun fruit is an effective food remedy for bleeding piles and correcting liver disorders. Since the fruit is a very rich source of anthocyanin, it imparts anti-oxidant properties too.

In addition, the ripe berries form a good source for

vitamins, minerals, pectin and ascorbic acid. It is used as an effective therapeutic medicine against diabetes, heart and liver trouble. However, jamun fruit is highly perishable; the short shelf-life of fruit has made it available only for short period, which makes its valuable properties unrealized by several people. Since, there has been an increasing demand for health promoting food products like those of jamun a clear necessity is felt to preserve the fruit in various forms.

Fruits, which are rich in nutrients but are not accepted due to high acidity or poor taste and flavour can be blended with other fruits to improve their acceptability and make use of available nutrients (Khan et al., 1988). Blending of the fruit juices helps in improving nutrient elements, reducing cost of production by using cheaper fruits in the blends and also leads to new product development (Kalra et al., 1991). Once the acceptability is improved for any product, its demand increases and eventually fetches a good price in market. Viable or more acceptable blends of fruit juices can be further utilized in the preparation of corresponding beverages from them which will further widen the scope of their acceptable presentation in the market. The present study revealed that the blending improves the overall acceptability of RTS as the physico-chemical parameters showed

desirable values in different blends as compared to pure jamun juice.

Materials and Methods

In the present study, the fruits were collected from the local market. Well ripe fruits were collected and washed. Diseased, withered fruits were discarded. The fruit juice was extracted as per the procedure outlined by Srivastava and Kumar (1994).

Preparation of blends

The fruit juices thus prepared were blended in different proportions *viz.*, 75:25, 50:50, 25:75 with jamun juice as per the respective treatment combinations and the observations were recorded for different blends. The stock preparations were made at different levels as per the treatments and they were further used in the preparation of RTS along with pure jamun juice.

Preparation of ready to serve (RTS) beverage

RTS was prepared by using the respective blends by addition of sugar syrup and permitted quantity of preservatives. The TSS was adjusted to 10 °B. Citric acid (0.3%) was added to maintain the acidity and Sodium benzoate (100ppm) was used as preservative.

Storage and proximate analysis

RTS beverages were stored in pet bottles at ambient conditions. The proximate analyses of jamun based beverages were done for different parameter. The samples were kept against a white piece of paper. Colour of the samples was ascertained by visual observation. Also the optical density (O.D.) of the samples was taken for greater accuracy by using colorimeter (Mazumdar and Mazumdar, 2003). The absorbance of the clear samples was obtained at 600 nm (Wave length of minimal absorbance) in colorimeter against distilled water blank. The total soluble solids were determined by using hand refractometer and expressed in °Brix as followed by Ranganna (1986). The titrable acidity was analysed by the procedure followed by Ranganna (1986). The pH of the RTS was recorded with the help of pH meter as followed by Covenin (1984). Total sugars and reducing sugars were determined following the method described by Lane and Eyon (Ranganna, 1986). The overall acceptability was recorded by using 9 point hedonic scale (Amerine et al., 1965).

Results and Discussion

Colour

The effect of treatments, storage period and their interactions showed significant difference in colour of the RTS beverages (table 1). There was a significant

difference with respect to the optical density (OD) throughout the storage period. It was increased from the day of preparation (0.101) to 90 days of storage (0.107) but there was a non-significant difference in OD up to 60 days of storage.

Among the treatments the highest OD (0.109) was recorded in the RTS prepared from 75% jamun juice + 25% grape juice (T_6) and 75% jamun juice + 25% mango (T_3), which was on par with RTS beverages prepared from pure jamun juice (0.108) (T_{10}) and RTS prepared from 50% jamun juice + 50% mango juice (0.107) (T_2). The lowest OD (0.091) was observed in the RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% pineapple juice (T_7).

Total soluble solids

Non-significant difference in TSS was found in the RTS beverages prepared from different juice blends with respect to the storage period and interactions among them (table 1). All the RTS beverages were maintained at 10°Brix without any change till 90 days of storage. Similar results were obtained by Jakhar *et al.* (2013).

Titrable acidity

The results obtained on titrable acidity (table 2) showed that there were significant differences among the treatments and the interaction between juice blends and storage intervals. The percentage of titrable acidity significantly increased from the day of preparation (0.276%) to 90 days of storage (0.299%).

The lowest titrable acidity (0.115%) was found in the RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% grape juice (T_4) significantly preceded by the RTS from 50% jamun juice + 50% grape juice (0.239%) (T_5). Titrable acidity was found to be at maximum (0.345%) in RTS prepared from pure jamun juice (T_{10}).

The increase in titrable acidity might be due to the formation of organic acids by the degradation of ascorbic acid (Sharma *et al.*, 2009). However, in any particular treatment, the increase in titrable acidity was not significant. Sakhale *et al.* (2012) reported that the slight growth of micro-organisms in the beverages may leads to the increase in titrable acidity.

pН

There were significant differences with regard to pH among the treatments, storage intervals and their interactions (table 2). The average pH over all treatments was found to show significant decrease from 4.34 (initial day) to 3.51 (90 days of storage).

Among the treatments, the highest pH (4.32) was noticed in the RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% grape juice (T_4) on par with the RTS prepared from

				Colour*				Total	Total Soluble Solids (°B)	(olids (°B)	
	Juice blends		Storage p	eriod (days after pre	sparation)		Stor	age period	(days afte	er preparat	tion)
$\delta \text{lamun + 17}\%$ $Candy \text{ tuft}$ $Candy tuft$		0	30	09	06	Mean	0	30	09	06	Mean
	T ₁ : 25% Jamun + 75% Mango	Candy tuft pink (0.098)	Candy tuft pink (0.098)	Candy tuft pink (0.109)	Pink parafait (0.115)	0.105	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
δ Jamun + 25% Straw berry Straw berry Straw berry Straw berry Straw berry (0.10) (0.00) <t< td=""><td>T_2: 50% Jamun + 50% Mango</td><td>Pink parafait (0.099)</td><td>Pink parafait (0.099)</td><td>Pink parafait (0.112)</td><td>Clear pink (0.117)</td><td>0.107</td><td>10.00</td><td>10.00</td><td>10.00</td><td>10.00</td><td>10.00</td></t<>	T_2 : 50% Jamun + 50% Mango	Pink parafait (0.099)	Pink parafait (0.099)	Pink parafait (0.112)	Clear pink (0.117)	0.107	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
δ_1 amun + 75% Camelia Casino Cas	T_3 : 75% Jamun + 25% Mango	Straw berry pink (0.103)	Straw berry pink (0.104)	Straw berry pink (0.109)	Chocolate (0.119)	0.109	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
$\delta_4 \text{lamun} + 50\%$ Casino Casino Casino Rust 0.105 1000 <	T_4 : 25% Jamun + 75% Grapes	Camellia pink (0.098)	Camellia pink (0.099)	Camellia pink (0.100)	Brick red (0.113)	0.102	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
δ Jamun + 25% Summer punch Summer punch Rose 0.109 10.00	$T_s: 50\%$ Jamun + 50% Grapes	Casino pink (0.100)	Casino pink (0.101)	Casino pink (0.105)	Rust (0.115)	0.105	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
$\delta_{\rm Jamun+75\%$ Sunset snow Sunset snow Sunset snow Veranda blush 0.091 </td <td>T₆: 75% Jamun + 25% Grapes</td> <td>Summer punch pink(0.105)</td> <td>Summer punch pink (0.105)</td> <td>Summer punch pink (0.106)</td> <td>Rose pink (0.118)</td> <td>0.109</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>10.00</td>	T ₆ : 75% Jamun + 25% Grapes	Summer punch pink(0.105)	Summer punch pink (0.105)	Summer punch pink (0.106)	Rose pink (0.118)	0.109	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
6 Jamun + 50% Venetian pink Venetian pi	T_{7} : 25% Jamun + 75% Pineapple	Sunset snow (0.097)	Sunset snow (0.096)	Sunset snow (0.091)	Veranda blush pink (0.080)	0.091	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
δ Jamun+25% Pomegranate Pomegranate Pomegranate Pomegranate Pomegranate Brown 0.097 10.00<	T ₈ : 50% Jamun + 50% Pineapple	Venetian pink (0.098)	Venetian pink (0.098)	Venetian pink (0.093)	Shell pink (0.089)	0.094	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
0% Jamu Roselle Roselee Roselle <	T ₉ : 75% Jamun+ 25% Pineapple	Pomegranate pink (0.102)	Pomegranate pink (0.102)	Pomegranate pink (0.095)	Brown (0.090)	0.097	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
	T_{10} : 100% Jamun	Roselle pink (0.106)	Roselle pink (0.107)	Roselle pink (0.107)	Caramine red(0.111)	0.108	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
SEmt C.D. at 5% SEmt 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002 - 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.002	Mean	0.101	0.101	0.103	0.107	0.103	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
0.001 0.002 - 0.001 0.002 - 0.001 0.002 - 0.001 0.003 -	Factor		SEm±		C.D. at	:5%		SEm±		C.D.	at 5%
0.001 0.002 - 0.001 0.003 -	T		0.001		0:00	5		I			1
0:001	D		0.001		0.00	2		I			1
	T×D		0.001		0:00	3		ı			

Table 1: Effect of jamun based blends and storage period on colour and Total Soluble Solids (°B) of RTS beverages

1085

	Tituchlo osiditu (0/)												
		Titrable acidity (%)						pH					
Juice blends	Stora	ge period	(days afte	er prepara	ation)	Storag	ge period	l (days a	fter pre	paration)			
	0	30	60	90	Mean	0	30	60	90	Mean			
$T_1: 25\%$ Jamun + 75% Mango	0.230	0.237	0.245	0.249	0.240	4.51	4.23	4.07	3.90	4.18			
T ₂ : 50% Jamun + 50% Mango	0.267	0.270	0.282	0.293	0.278	4.45	4.13	4.00	3.87	4.11			
T ₃ : 75% Jamun + 25% Mango	0.297	0.300	0.312	0.319	0.307	4.38	4.03	3.47	3.40	3.82			
T_4 : 25% Jamun + 75% Grapes	0.100	0.110	0.120	0.128	0.115	4.61	4.32	4.24	4.12	4.32			
T_5 : 50% Jamun + 50% Grapes	0.230	0.233	0.240	0.254	0.239	4.45	4.24	3.93	3.89	4.13			
$T_6: 75\%$ Jamun + 25% Grapes	0.327	0.330	0.335	0.338	0.333	4.36	4.13	3.79	3.68	3.99			
T_7 : 25% Jamun + 75% Pineapple	0.320	0.330	0.335	0.338	0.331	4.41	4.05	3.87	3.66	4.00			
T_8 : 50% Jamun + 50% Pineapple	0.325	0.340	0.347	0.353	0.341	4.35	4.01	3.63	3.47	3.86			
T ₉ : 75% Jamun+ 25% Pineapple	0.330	0.340	0.349	0.356	0.344	4.27	3.90	3.61	3.51	3.82			
T ₁₀ : 100% Jamun	0.333	0.340	0.348	0.359	0.345	4.31	3.96	3.59	3.40	3.81			
Mean	0.276	0.283	0.291	0.299	0.287	4.34	3.98	3.67	3.51	3.87			
Factor	SEm±		C.D. at 5%		SEm ±			C.D. at 5%					
Т		0.024		0.069		0.09			0.25				
D 0.001		0.003		0	.04	0.10							
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{D}$		0.026		0.0	074	0.12			0.35				

Table 2: Effect of jamun based blends and storage period on Titrable acidity (%) and pH of RTS beverages

Table 3: Effect of jamun based blends and storage period on reducing sugars (%) and non-reducing sugars (%) of RTS beverages.

		Red	ucing su	gars (%)		Non-reducing sugars (%)					
Juice blends	Stora	ige period	(days aft	er prepara	ation)	Storag	e period	l (days a	fter pre	paration)	
	0	30	60	90	Mean	0	30	60	90	Mean	
$T_1: 25\%$ Jamun + 75% Mango	5.98	6.17	6.34	6.53	6.26	2.06	1.88	1.76	1.61	1.83	
T_2 : 50% Jamun + 50% Mango	5.41	5.60	5.78	5.87	5.66	1.85	1.70	1.60	1.57	1.68	
$T_3: 75\%$ Jamun + 25% Mango	5.37	5.55	5.75	5.93	5.65	1.11	0.97	0.82	0.70	0.90	
$T_4: 25\%$ Jamun + 75% Grapes	6.55	6.71	6.94	7.00	6.80	0.24	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.16	
$T_5: 50\%$ Jamun + 50% Grapes	6.36	6.60	6.79	6.84	6.65	0.34	0.25	0.14	0.09	0.20	
$T_6: 75\%$ Jamun + 25% Grapes	5.96	6.10	6.15	6.28	6.07	0.65	0.59	0.45	0.44	0.53	
T_7 : 25% Jamun + 75% Pineapple	4.14	4.32	4.51	4.64	4.40	1.98	1.87	1.65	1.64	1.79	
$T_8: 50\%$ Jamun + 50% Pineapple	4.22	4.44	4.58	4.66	4.48	1.76	1.61	1.58	1.56	1.63	
T ₉ : 75% Jamun+25% Pineapple	4.74	4.90	4.83	5.07	4.82	1.10	1.05	0.95	0.92	1.00	
T ₁₀ : 100% Jamun	4.81	4.98	5.15	5.20	5.03	0.90	0.79	0.77	0.66	0.78	
Mean	5.35	5.54	5.68	5.80	5.59	1.20	1.09	0.98	0.93	1.05	
Factor	SEm±		C.D. at 5%		SEm ±			C.D. at 5%			
Т	0.22		0.63		0.22			0.63			
D		0.02		0	.05	0.01			0.03		
T×D		0.32		0	.89	0.23			0.66		

the 25% jamun juice + 75% mango juice (4.18) (T_1). The lowest pH (3.81) was noticed in the RTS prepared from 100% jamun juice (T_{10}).

The pH of the particular treatment decreased with increase in the proportion of other juices (mango, grapes and pineapple) used while preparing the starter juice combinations for it. The increase in acidity of the drink

		Total sugars (%)							Overall acceptability			
Juice blends	Stora	ge period	(days aft	er prepara	ation)	Storag	ge period	l (days a	fter pre	paration)		
	0	30	60	90	Mean	0	30	60	90	Mean		
$T_1: 25\%$ Jamun + 75% Mango	8.04	8.05	8.10	8.14	8.08	6.19	5.99	5.83	5.40	5.85		
$T_{2}: 50\%$ Jamun + 50% Mango	7.26	7.30	7.38	7.43	7.34	4.30	4.19	3.98	3.60	4.02		
$T_{3}: 75\%$ Jamun + 25% Mango	6.48	6.52	6.57	6.63	6.55	6.22	6.03	5.90	5.46	5.90		
$T_4: 25\%$ Jamun + 75% Grapes	7.20	7.30	7.39	7.44	7.33	6.22	6.03	5.88	5.47	5.90		
T_5 : 50% Jamun + 50% Grapes	6.70	6.85	6.93	6.93	6.85	8.03	7.85	7.68	7.20	7.69		
$T_6: 75\%$ Jamun + 25% Grapes	6.20	6.25	6.29	6.38	6.28	9.00	8.83	8.65	8.25	8.68		
T_7 : 25% Jamun + 75% Pineapple	6.12	6.20	6.17	6.28	6.19	6.18	5.99	5.83	5.40	5.85		
T_8 : 50% Jamun + 50% Pineapple	5.98	6.05	6.16	6.22	6.10	8.00	7.85	7.63	7.25	7.68		
T_9 : 75% Jamun+ 25% Pineapple	5.84	5.95	5.78	5.99	5.89	8.00	7.87	7.67	7.20	7.69		
T ₁₀ : 100% Jamun	5.71	5.78	5.92	5.85	5.81	6.22	6.05	5.90	5.47	5.91		
Mean	6.55	6.62	6.67	6.73	6.64	6.84	6.67	6.49	6.07	6.52		
Factor	SEm±			C.D. at 5%		SEm±			C.D. at 5%			
Т	0.26		0.72		0.47			1.31				
D		0.01		0	.02	0.03			0.08			
T×D		0.28		0	.78	0.51			1.44			

Table 4: Effect of jamun based blends and storage period on Total sugars (%) and Overall acceptability of RTS beverages

attributed to the increase in release of hydrogen ions during the storage. Therefore the corresponding decrease was noticed in pH (Akhtar *et al.*, 2013)

Reducing sugars

The data (table 3) revealed that there were significant differences among the treatments, storage intervals and their interactions. Among the treatments, the highest amount of reducing sugars (6.8%) was observed in the RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% grape juice (T_4) which was on par RTS from 50% jamun juice + 50% grape juice (6.65%) (T_5) and also with RTS from 25% jamun juice + 75% mango juice (6.26%) (T_1).

The analysis revealed that the reducing sugars increased steadily and significantly from the minimum (5.35%) on the day of preparation to the maximum (5.80%) at 90 days of storage.

Sakhale *et al.* (2012) reported that the increase in reducing sugars might be due to the conversion of non-reducing sugars into reducing sugars in presence of citric acid.

Non-reducing sugars

The effect of treatments on percentage of nonreducing sugars was found to be significant (table 3). The non-reducing sugars were found to decline significantly from the day of preparation (1.20%) to 90 days of storage (0.93%). This decline was due to their conversion into reducing sugars.

The highest percentage of non-reducing sugars (1.83%) was observed in RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% mango juice (T_1) which was on par with RTS beverages prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% pineapple juice (1.79%), 50% jamun juice + 50% mango juice (1.68%) and 50% jamun juice + 50% pineapple juice (1.63%). The lowest percentage of non-reducing sugars (0.16%) was found in the RTS from 25% jamun + 75% grape juice (T_4).

Total sugars (%)

There were significant differences among the treatments, storage intervals and their interactions (table 4). Among different RTS beverages, the highest value of total sugars (8.08%) was found in the RTS prepared from 25% jamun juice + 75% mango juice (T_1) followed by the RTS from 50% jamun juice + 50% mango juice (7.34%) (T_2). The RTS prepared from the jamun juice 100% (T_{10}) was found to have the least quantity of total sugars (5.81%). The percentage of total sugars increased significantly from the day of preparation (6.55%) to 90 days after storage (6.73%). However, the increasing trend in total sugars was observed by earlier workers and was ascribed due to inversion of sugars and hydrolysis of polysaccharides into simple sugars (Sonia *et al.*, 2010).

Overall acceptability

The organoleptic score presented in Table 4 revealed significant differences with respect to overall acceptability due to the treatments and storage intervals as well as their interactions. Significant decreases were found to occur in overall acceptability throughout the storage period from the day of preparation (6.84) to 90 days of storage (6.07).

The maximum overall acceptability (8.68) was obtained by the RTS prepared from 75% jamun juice + 25% grape juice (T_6). It was on par with RTS beverages prepared from 50% jamun + 50 grape juice (7.69) (T_5), 75% jamun + 25% pineapple (7.69) (T_9) and 50% jamun + 50 pineapple juice (7.69) (T_8) but superior from the control (5.91) (T_{10}) with a significant difference. The minimum score (4.02) was obtained by the RTS prepared from 50% jamun juice + 50% mango juice (T_2).

Overall acceptability decreased from RTS beverages made out of grape juice combinations to those made from mango juice combinations. Pineapple juice blends with jamun gave intermediately acceptable RTS beverages as compared to grapes and mango. The superiority of RTS prepared from grape juice combinations in general and 75% jamun + 25% grapes (T_6) in particular might be due to several reasons as evident from the results of the present study.

References

- Abdullah, A. and T. Cheng (2001). Optimization of reduced calorie tropical mixed fruits jam. *Food Quality and Preference*, **12**: 63-68.
- Akhtar, S., J. Ali, B. Javed and F.A. Khan (2013). Studies on the preparation and storage stability of pomegranate juice based drink. J. of Scientific Res., 16(2): 191-95.
- Amerine, M.D., R.M. Pangborn and E.B. Roesster (1965). *Principles of sensory evaluation of foods*, Academic press, London, 602.

- Covenin, M. (1984). Effectof different Post harvest Treatment on Physico-chemical changes during storage and shelf life of Mango. *M. Sc. Thesis*. Department of Horticulture, Bangladesh Agricultural University. 15-25.
- Jakhar, M.S., P.K. Vaish and S. Pathak (2013). Studies on the standardization of guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) and barbados cherry (*Malpighia glabra* L.) blended readyto-serve beverage. *Progressive Horticulture*, **45(1)** : 95-99.
- Joshi, S. G (2001). Medicinal plants. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co.Kalra, S.K., Tandon, D.K. and Singh, S.P. (1991). Evaluation of mango-papaya blended beverage. *Indian Food Packer*, **45(1)**: 33-36.
- Khan, A., H. Singh, B. R. Krishna and A. K. Bhatia (1988). Carotene enriched beverages. *Indian Food Packer*, **42(2)** :27-29.
- Mazumdar, B. C. and K. Mazumder (2003). *Methods on physico chemical analysis of fruits*. Daya publishing house, New Delhi.
- Ranganna, S. (1986). Handbook of analysis and quality control for fruit and vegeTable products. Second edition Tata McGraw-Hill Pub. Co, New Delhi, India. 105-106, 12-15, 9-10 and 94-104.
- Sakhale, B. K., V. N. Pawar and R. C. Ranveer (2012). Studies on development of soymilk based mango RTS beverage. *Electronic J. of Environmental, Agri. and Food Chem.*, 11(5): 523-28.
- Sharma, M., R. Gehlot, R. Singh and S. Siddiqui (2009). Changes in chemical constituents of guava-jamun blends ready-toserve drink and squash during storage. *Haryana J. of Hort. Sci.*, **38 (3&4)**: 259-63.
- Sonia, Rakesh, G., R. Singh and B. S. Yadav (2010). Changes in chemical constituents and overall acceptability of jamun ready-to-serve (RTS) drink and nectar during storage. *Haryana J. of Hort. Sci.*, **39(1&2)** : 142-44.
- Srivastava, R. P. and S. Kumar (1994). Browning reactions in fruit and vegeTable preservation principles and practices. 2nd Edition. International Book Distributing Company, Lucknow. India. pp. 79-83.