Original Research Article

Influence of Pre-harvest Bagging on Fruit Quality of Mango (*Mangifera indica*L.) cv. Langra

ABSTRACT

Fruits are susceptible to insect pest infestations, bird attack, various pathogens, and mechanical damages, all of which can reduce their commercial value and thereby cause significant yield and economic losses. The objective of this study was to control mango pests and diseases as well as to improve the fruit quality of mango through bagging technology. An investigation was performed during the year 2016 from March to June for safe mango production by applying minimum use of pesticide entitled studies on influence of bagging on physico-chemical properties and shelf life of mango cv. Langra. The mango fruits were bagged at marble stage(40 days from fruit set)with different types of bags which constituted the various treatments *viz*: T_1: Brown paper bag; T_2: White paper bag; T_3: Polythene bag T_4: Muslin cloth bag; T_5: No bagging (control). Bagging with brown paper bag and white paper bag improved fruit retention, weight of fruit, diameter of fruit, pulp weight, total soluble solids, ascorbic acid, percent of citric acid, reducing sugars and β-carotene at harvest and ripe stage over control. Brown paper bag changed fruit color. In all cases good quality, cleaner, disease and insect free fruits were harvested. The sensory qualities in fruits of brown, white and muslin cloth bags were improved over control. Pre-harvest bagging also reduced occurrence of spongy tissue andthe incidence of mealy bugs. These results indicate that fruit bagging can improve fruit quality through reduction in disease and insect-pest attack and shelf life of mango cv. Langra.

Key words: Mango; Fruit bagging; physico-chemical composition; sensory evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) commonly known as the 'King of fruits' is a popular tropical fruit, especially in Asia. In Bangladesh, in terms of total area and production of fruit crops, mango ranks first and third, respectively. During their growth and development, fruits undergo several physical and chemical changes and are susceptible to insect pest infestations, bird attack, various pathogens, and mechanical damages, all of which can reduce their commercial value and thereby cause significant yield and economic losses. To prevent the losses caused by biotic and abiotic factors, several good agricultural practices are becoming popular throughout the World [1]. Furthermore, the development of alternative techniques to improve the appearance and quality of fruits and to reduce diseases and insect infestations is becoming increasingly important as consumer anxiety over the use of manmade agro-chemicals and environmental awareness increases. Thus, more emphasis is being placed on reducing the use of pesticides to ensure worker safety, consumer health, and environmental protection [2]. An attractive, spotless and pest free fruits of this variety fetch premium rate in the market. In recent years, the climatic aberrations such as sudden rise in the temperature and humidity, abnormal rains especially during fruit development are often experienced. It had not only affected the external appearance of the fruit but also aggravated the pest such as mealy bugs and physiological disorder like spongy tissue which further added in the losses. The affected fruits gain poor price in the market and such fruits are also rejected for processing. It causes serious economic loss to mango growers.

Among several such alternatives, the pre-harvest bagging technique of fruits has been used extensively in several fruit crops to improve skin colour and to reduce the incidence of diseases, insect pests, mechanical damages, sunburn of the skin, agrochemical residues on the fruits, and

bird damages [3][4][5][6]. The aim of this study was undertaken to control mango pests and diseases as well as to improve the fruit quality of mango through bagging technology.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was conducted at the Department of Horticulture, HSTU, Dinajpur, Bangladesh during January to July, 2016. Uniformly grown 10 years old Langra mango grafted trees was selected. The experiment was constructed in Randomized Block Design with five treatments replicated three times with a unit of 50 fruits per treatment per replication. Different types of bags were constituted the treatments *viz*.: T_1: Brown paper double layered bag (BPB) T_2: White paper single layered bag (WPB); T_3: Perforated polythene bag (PB); T_4: Muslin cloth bag (MCB) and T_0: Non-bagged (control). Uniformly grown fruits (40 to 50 days after fruit set) were selected for bagging. The sizes of bags were 25 × 20 cm. Before bagging two perforations (≤ 4 mm diameter) was made for proper ventilation at the bottom of polythene bag and muslin cloth bag. White and brown paper bags were not perforated. The particular bags were wrapped properly at the stalk of each fruit of respective treatments so that it would not be fall down as well as there would not be open space. The observations *viz.* fruit retention (%) and day's require for harvesting after bagging were recorded. Four fruits were randomly selected per treatment per replication to record various physical and chemical compositions which were estimated by the following procedures:

2.1 Physical parameters:

Length and Diameter of Fruit were measured with the help of digital varner caliper and expressed in centimeters (cm).Weight of fruit, pulpandstone was recorded by using electronic balance and expressed in grams (g).

2.2 Chemical composition:

Total Soluble Solid (TSS): Total soluble solids were found out by using Erma Hand Refract meter (0 to 32°Brix) and expressed in °Brix [7].

Citric Acid (%): 10g mango pulp was crushed in a mortar and pestle and transferred in a 100 ml volumetric flask. Volume was made up to 100 ml by distilled water. Then the sample was filtered and 10 ml filtrate was taken in a conical flask. The filtrated was titrated against 0.1 N NaOH using phenolphthalein as an indicator. The results were expressed in percent of citric acid [8].

$$\% \text{ Citric acid} = \frac{0.5 \times \text{Titrate value unknown soln} \times \text{Made volume of unknown sample}}{\text{Titrate value of known soln} \times \text{Aliquot taken} \times \text{Wt.of sample}}$$

Reducing Sugars (%): It was determined according to the method described by Haq(2012) and Santiniet al. (2014)[9,10]with slight modification. Crushing20g of the mango pulp was transferred in a 200 ml volumetric flask. The volume was adjusted to 150 ml by purified water. After a few minutes, 10 ml of lead acetate solution and the minimum amount of potassium oxalate solution were added to allow the sugar dissolution. The volume of the resulting solution was adjusted to 200 ml, and was shaked, filtered and transferred in a burette for the titration. This extraction is titrated against Fehling solutions with the help of methylene blue indicator.

$$\% \text{ Reducing sugar} = \frac{\text{Fehling factor} \times \text{Dilution} \times \ 100}{\text{Titre} \times \text{weight or volume of sample}}$$

Total Sugars: An aliquot of 50 ml of the clarified, de-leaded filtrate was pipette to a 100 ml volumetric flask, 5 ml conc. HCl was added and allowed to stand at room temperature for 24 hours. It was neutralized with conc. NaOH solution followed by 0.1 N NaOH solutions. The volume was made up to the mark and transferred to 50 ml burette having an offset tip and performed the titration on Fehling's solution [11].

$$\% \text{ Total sugar} = \frac{\text{Fehling factor} \times \text{Dilution} \times 100}{\text{weight of sample x Titre}}$$

Ascorbic Acid (mg/100g of Fruit Pulp): Ascorbic acid was estimated as described by McHenry and Graham (1935) [12]. Mango pulp (5g) was mixed with 5 ml of 20% metaphosphoric acid solution and filtered. The filtrate (5 ml) was put in a small beaker and shaken with 2 drops of phenolphthalein solution and titrated against 2, 6-indophenol until pink colour developed.

$$\text{Vit C (mg/100 g)} = \frac{0.5 \times \text{Titrate value unknown soln} \times \text{Made volume of unknown sample}}{\text{Titrate value of known soln} \times \text{Aliquot taken} \times \text{Sample weight}}$$

β-Carotene (µg/100 g of pulp):β-carotene in mango pulp was determined according to the method of Nagata and Yamashita (1992) [13]. One gram of pulp was mixed with 10 ml of acetone: hexane mixture (4: 6) and vortex for 5 minutes. The mixture was filtered and absorbance was measured at 453nm, 505nm and 663nm.

$$\beta\text{-carotene (mg /100ml)} = 0.216\ A_{663} - 0.304\ A_{505} + 0.452\ A_{453}$$

Shelf Life of Fruits (Days): The mature fruits were harvested at 80-85 percent maturity. Twenty harvested mature fruits of each treatment were ripened at ambient temperature by using plastic crates with perforation and traditional paddy straw as ripening material. At the bottom, 2.5 cm layer of paddy straw was made on which fruits were arranged. Simultaneously, two more layers were kept on the first layer. After ripening the various observations *viz*. shelf life (days) and incidence of mealy bug (%) were recorded. The end of shelf life was noted when the fruits were spoiled.

The ripe fruits were also examined for their sensory qualities for assessing colour, flavour and texture by panel of five judges with nine point Hedonic Scale *viz*.1-Dislike extremely, 2-Dislike very much, 3-Dislike moderately, 4-Dislike slightly, 6-Like slightly, 7-Like moderately, 8-Like very much and 9-Like extremely [14].

2.3 Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed by Duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) at $P < 0.05$. All statistical procedures were conducted using SPSS 22.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

3. RESULTS

Fruit retention was significantly improved by pre-harvest bagging materials with brown paper bag (92.92 %), white paper bag (90.97 %) and muslin cloth bag (89.00 %) over control (80.00 %). The fruit retention found in polythene bag (53.67 %) also lowers than control (80.00%) but the difference was significant. The harvesting time was significantly preponed in white paper bag, polythene bag, and muslin cloth bag whereas in brown paper bag, it was significantly delayed (78.67 days). The polythene bag (70.00 days) took minimum days for harvest after bagging. The treatments brown paper bag, white paper bag, polythene bag and muslin cloth bag were as par with control (76.00 days) for days required for harvest after bagging (Table 1).

Table 1. Effects of pre-harvest bagging on fruit retention and days required for harvesting after bagging in mango cv. Langra

Treatments	Fruit retention (%)	Days required for harvesting after bagging
Brown paper bag	92.92±0.50 a[z]	78.67±0.33 a
White paper bag	90.97±0.58 ab	77.00±0.58 ab
Polythene bag	53.67±1.86 d	70.00±0.58 c
Muslin cloth bag	89.00±0.58 b	76.00±0.58 b
No bagging (control)	80.00± 00 c	76.00±0.58 b

[z]Means± standard error within a column followed by different letter(s) are significantly different (DMRT, p <0.05)

Pre-harvest bagging with brown paper bag improved physical parameters *viz*: weight of fruit, length of fruit, diameter of fruit, pulp weight and stone weight over control fruits, and the variation was statistically significant (Table 2). The fruits bagged in polythene produced the

smallest fruit having fruit weight (166.55 g), diameter (5.49 cm) over control (205.84 g, and 5.49 cm, respectively). The brown paper bag exhibited the fruits with best pulp to stone ratio (5.73).

Table 2.Effects of pre-harvest bagging on physical parameters of mango cv. Langra

Treatments	weight of fruit (g)	Length of fruit (cm)	Diameter of fruit (cm)	Pulp weight (g)	Stone weight (g)	Pulp:Stone ratio
Brown paper bag	205.04±0.29 a[z]	8.35±0.02 a	6.87±0.02 a	152.63±2.90 a	26.30±1.18 a	5.73±0.22 a
White paper bag	204.15 ±0.00 a	8.24±0.40 ab	6.90±0.00 a	119.69±1.76 b	24.39±1.70 a	5.56±0.20 a
Polythene bag	166.55±0.00 b	7.91±0.13 ab	5.49±0.00 d	107.28±0.00 d	25.87±0.47 a	4.23±0.00 c
Muslin cloth bag	191.58±2.7 ab	7.61±0.05 b	6.13±0.00 c	112.57±0.29 c	26.28±0.64 a	4.28±0.09c
No bagging	205.84±20.35 a	6.90±0.05 c	6.63±0.02 b	109.40±0.00 cd	23.03±0.51 a	4.75±0.00 b

[z]Means±standard error within a column followed by different letter(s) are significantly different (DMRT, p <0.05)

The pre-harvest bagging at harvest stage had significant effect on ascorbic acid, reducing sugars, total sugars and β-carotene content of fruits (Table 3). The non-bagged control fruits recorded the highest acidity (15.83 %) and TSS (6.28^{o}Brix) which were significantly superior over all bagging treatments. The fruits of treatment white paper bag had significantly highest total sugars (2.06 %) and β-carotene (131.36 µg/100g) content over control while brown paper bag showed the highest ascorbic acid (1387.44 mg/100g) and reducing (0.90 %) sugars (Table 3).

147 Table 3.Effects of pre-harvest bagging on chemical composition of mango cv. Langra during the harvest

Treatments	Ascorbic acid (mg/100 g)	TSS (^{0}Brix)	Citric acid (%)	Reducing sugars (%)	Total sugars (%)	β-carotene (µg/100 g)
Brown paper bag	138.44±0.01 a[z]	5.66±0.01 b	15.39±0.05 a	0.90±0.00 a	1.53±0.03 c	120.58±0.53 b
White paper bag	123.12±0.03 b	5.78±0.14 ab	14.71±0.14 a	0.94±0.03 a	2.06±0.03 a	131.36±0.68 a
Polythene bag	120.52±0.02 c	2.72±0.23 c	15.35±0.9 a	0.74±0.02 bc	1.01±0.02 e	115.86±0.03 d
Muslin cloth bag	108.81±0.68 d	5.30±0.20 b	15.09±0.05 a	0.73±0.01 c	1.14±0.01 d	120.83±0.14 b
No bagging	107.09±0.34 e	6.28±0.05 a	15.83±0.10 a	0.81±0.03 b	1.75±0.03 b	118.26±0.01 c

148 [z]Means±standard error within a column followed by different letter(s) are significantly different (DMRT, p <0.05)

149 In Table 4, fruits of brown paper bag exhibited the maximum TSS (14.14 ^{o}Brix), acidity
150 (4.32%), reducing sugars (0.90 %), total sugars (4.42 %) and β-carotene (1218.83 µg/100g) at
151 ripe stage while the control fruit was showed higher content of ascorbic acid (108.67 mg/100g
152).All chemical parameters were non-significant difference in between the polythene and muslin
153 cloth bag fruits(Table 4).

154 Table 4. Effects of pre-harvest bagging on chemical composition of mango cv. Langra during ripe stage

Treatments	Ascorbic acid (mg/100 g)	TSS (^{0}Brix)	Citric acid (%)	Reducing sugars (%)	Total sugars (%)	β-carotene (µg/100 g)
Brown paper bag	85.43±0.11c[z]	14.14±0.03 a	4.32±0.03 a	0.90±0.01a	4.42±0.01 a	1218.83±0.10 a
White paper bag	100.35±0.33 b	12.60±0.03 c	3.19±0.01 c	0.73±0.01 b	3.56±0.01 b	1207.69±0.37 b
Polythene bag	99.33±0.56 b	11.26±0.14 d	4.12±0.16 d	0.70±0.01 b	3.13±0.08 c	1152.80±0.16 d
Muslin cloth bag	99.33±1.45 b	11.33±0.35 d	4.13±0.15 d	0.72±0.03 b	3.20±0.11 c	1132.29±0.20 e
No bagging	108.67±0.07 a	13.39±0.08 b	4.26±0.02 b	0.85±0.02 a	3.21±0.01 c	1153.92±0.50 c

155 [z]Means ±standard error within a column followed by different letter(s) are significantly different (DMRT, p <0.05)

156 Sensory evaluation with respect to colour, texture, appearance, and overall expression were
157 significant variation among various treatments while flavor was non-significant. Beside, brown

paper bag showed less sweetness compared to control. It indicated that the organoleptic qualities of fruits were affected by pre-harvest bagging in mango (Fig.1).

The non-bagged control fruits of Langrahad shelf life of 15 days (Table 5). The fruits of brown paper bag (17.00 days), white paper bag (17.33 days), polythene bag (14.33 days) and muslin cloth bag (15.67 days) had greater shelf life than control (15days). Polythene and muslin cloth bag treatments showed fewer incidences of mealy bugs as compared to control whereas the fruits bagged in brown paper and white paper bags were totally free from mealy bugs as well as spongy tissue (Table 5). The maximum incidence of mealy bugs (9.33 %) and spongy tissue content (6.17 %) was recorded in control.

Table 5. Effect of pre-harvest bagging on shelf life, mealy bug incidence and spongy tissue content of mango cv. Langra

Treatments	Shelf life (days)	Mealy bugs (%)	Spongy tissue (%)
Brown paper bag	17.00±0.00 a[z]	0.00±0.00 c	0.00±0.00 c
White paper bag	17.33±0.33 a	0.00±0.00 c	0.00±0.00 c
Polythene bag	14.33±0.33 c	5.33±0.33 b	2.39±0.96 b
Muslin cloth bag	15.67±0.33 b	6.67±0.33 b	1.72±0.48 b
No bagging	15.00±0.58 bc	9.33±0.88 a	6.17±1 a

[z]Means±standard error within a column followed by different letter(s) are significantly different (DMRT, p <0.05)

4. DISCUSSION

The practice of pre-harvest bagging has been extensively used in several fruit crops, such as mango [15,16,4,17,3,18,19], apple [20], pear [21,22], peach [23], longan [24], to improve the commercial value of the fruit, namely, improving fruit coloration [25], reducing mechanical damage [26] and sunburn [27] of the skin. Pre-harvest bagging also reduces pesticide in the fruit

176 [26] and improves insect [28], disease [29] and bird damage control [26]. Therefore, pre-harvest
177 bagging had been an important technical measure in improving the commercial value and
178 promoting the export of the fruit [30].

179 This research showed that all different bagging materials especially brown paper double
180 layered bag and white paper single layered bag were promising application as a pre-harvest
181 technique in mango fruits through improve physio-chemical properties and shelf life as
182 compared with control (without bagging) due to microenvironment around fruits [5] and
183 accumulated heat might induce higher respiration rates and CO_2 accumulation within bags might
184 lead to more acetaldehyde production and removal of astringency [31,24,29].

185 Previous studies on effects of fruit bagging on fruit size and weight opined that it may be due
186 to differences in the type of bag used, fruit and cultivar responses [5].Bagging 'Nam Dok Mai 4'
187 mango fruit with two-layer paper bags, newspaper, or golden paper bags increased fruit weight
188 [32]. Bagging increased fruit weight, size over control fruits. [33].Bagging promoted longan fruit
189 development, resulting in larger-sized fruit [24]. Microenvironment created by brown paper bag,
190 white paper bag, muslin cloth bag and polythene bag might have congenial effect on fruit growth
191 of mango.

192 Pre-harvest bagging could effectively improve fruit quality such as chemical properties [34].
193 The variation observed in chemical composition of mango fruits can be attributed to the changed
194 microenvironment around fruit during its growth and development. The bagged fruits recorded
195 highest content of vitamin C, sucrose, glucose and fructose over control in Zillmango [35]. The
196 bagging of date palm fruits improved the total sugars [36]. Bagging enhanced carotenoid content
197 in mango [37]. The bagging led to lower contents of chemical components such as sugar,

phenols and organic acids in most of peach varieties [38]. Fruit firmness was slightly increased by bagging treatments, whereas soluble solids content was decreased in apple [39].

The longer shelf life of bagged fruits indicated that the effect of bagging persisted after ripening. Bagging provided physical barrier between fruit and pests and protection against both which helped in reducing occurrence of spongy tissue in fruits. So, bagging fruits was one of necessary techniques for producing high quality fruits, which had been universally adopted in some fruit production [40].

5. CONCLUSION

The results of this study clearly demonstrate that pre-harvest fruit bagging has emerged as a novel technology in practice, which is simple, grower friendly, safe and beneficial for production of quality fruits. It is advisable to use brown paper bag for getting colored fruits i.e., yellow color since white paper bag for retains original colour of each variety. Both bags showed their potentiality against major insect-pests and diseases attack. Bagging fruits have a good shelf life which is important criteria for exportable mango. On the other hand, bagging fruits having attractive color, farmer will get more market prices for their mangoes. Therefore, farmers might be used this technology for commercial mango cultivation.

REFERENCES

1. Sharma, R. R. Fruit Production: Problems and Solutions. International Book Distributing Company, Lucknow, India. 2009; 649 pp.
2. Sharma, R. R., Singh, D. and Singh, R. . Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits and vegetables by microbial antagonists. Biological Control. 2009; 50: 205-221.

3. Jakhar, M. S. and Pathak, S. Effect of pre-harvest nutrients application and bagging on quality and shelf life of mango (*Mangifera indica*L.) fruits *cv*. amrapali. Journal Agicultural. Science and Technology. 2016; 18: 717-729.

4. Nagaharshitha, D., Khopkar, R. R., Haldankar, P. M., Haldavanekar, P. C. and Parulekar, Y. R. Effect of bagging on chemical properties of mango (*Mangifera indica*L.) cv. alphonso. Agrotechnology. 2014; 3: 1000124.

5. Sharma, R. R., Reddy, S. V. R. and Jhalegar, M. J. Preharvest fruit bagging a review. Journal Horticultural Science and Biotechnology. 2014;89: 101-113.

6. Xu, H. X., Chen, J. W. and Xie, M. Effect of different light transmittance paper bags on fruit quality and anti-oxidant capacity in loquat.Journal of Science, Food Agriculture. 2014; 90: 1783-1788.

7. A.O.A.C. Official Methods of Analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists (12th Edition) Washington, D. C. 2004.1980.

8. Moffett Jr. TM, Pater DrE. Determination of Citric Acid in Fruit Juice. SUNY Plattsburgh. 2007.

9. Haq, I.U. and Rab, A. Characterization of physico-chemical attributes of litchi fruit and its relation with fruit skin cracking. Journal of Animal Plant and Science. 2012;22: 142-147.

10. Santini, A., Romano, R., Meca, G. and Raiola, A. Antioxidant activity and quality of apple juices and puree after in vitro digestion. Journal of Food Research. 2014;3: 1-50.

11. AOAC 17th edition. Official method 920. 183 (b) sugars (reducing sugar) in Honey/ I. S. I. Hand book of Food Analysis (part 2)-1984: p-36. 2000.

12. McHenry, E.W., Graham, M. Observation on the estimation of ascorbic acid by filtration. Biochemistry Journal, 29(9): 2013-2019. 1935.

13. Nagata, M. and Yamashita, I. Simple method for simultaneous determination of chlorophylland carotenoids in tomato fruit. Journal Japan Society of Food Science Technology. 1992;39: 925-928.

14. Amerine, M. A., Pangborn, R. M. and Rocssler E. B. Principles of sensory evaluation of food. London: Academic Press. 1965;http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-4832-0018-7.50011-8.

15. Senghor, A. L., Liang, W. J. and Ho W. C. Integrated control of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* on mango fruit in Taiwan by the combination of *Bacillus subtilis* and fruit bagging. Biocontrol of Science and Technology.2007;**17**: 865-870.
16. Wu, H. X., Wang, S. B., Shi, S. Y., Ma, W. H., Zhou, Y. G. and Zhan, R. L. Effects of bagging on fruit quality in Zill Mango.Journal of Fruit Science. 2009;26: 644-648.
17. Haldankar, P. M., Parulekar, Y. R., Alwala, Kireeti., Kad, M. S., Shinde, S.M. and Lawande, K. E. Studies on influence of bagging of fruits at marble stage on quality of mango cv. alphonso. Journal of Plant Studies. 2015;4: 12-20.
18. Islam, M.T., Rahman, M.S., Shamsuzzoha, M., Chowdhury, A.K.M.M.B., Alom, R. Influence of pre-harvest bagging on fruit quality of Mango (Mangifera indica L.) cv. Mishribhog. International Journal of Biosciences. 2017a;11(3): 59-68.
19. Islam, M.T., Shamsuzzoha, M., Rahman, M.S., Haque, M.M. and Alom, R. In fluence of pre-harvest bagging on fruit quality of mango (Mangifera indica L.) cv. Mollika. Journal of Bioscience and Agriculture Research. 2017b;15(1): 1246-1254.
20. Hao G.Y., Lucero M.E., Sanderson S.C., Zacharias E.H., Holbrook N.M.: Polyploidy enhances the occupation of heterogeneous environments through hydraulic related trade-offs in Atriplex canescens (Chenopodiaceae). New Phytologist. 2013;197: 970–978.
21. Feng, S., Huang, J., Wang, J. Loss of the Polycomb group gene polyhomeotic induces non-autonomous cell overproliferation. EMBO Rep. 2011;12(2): 157--163.
22. Hudina, M., Stampar, F., Orazem, P., Petkovsek, M. M. and Veberic, R. Phenolic compounds profile, carbohydrates and external fruit quality of the 'Concorde' pear (*Pyruscommunis*L.) after bagging. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 2012;92: 67-75.
23. Wang, Y. J., Yang, C. X., Liu, C. Y., Xu, M., Li, S. H., Yang, L. and Wang, Y. N. Effects of Bagging on Volatiles and Polyphenols in 'Wanmi' Peaches during Endocarp Hardening and Final Fruit Rapid Growth Stages. Journal of Food Science. 2010; 75: 455-460.
24. Yang, W. H., Zhu, X. C., Bu, J. H., Hu, G. B., Wang, H. C. and Huang, X. M. Effects of bagging on fruit development and quality in cross-winter off-season longan.Scientia Horticulture. 2009;120: 194-200.
25. Kim, Y. K., Kang, S. S., Cho, K. S. and Jeong, S. B. Effects of bagging with different pear paper bags on the color of fruit skin and qualities in 'manpungbae'. Korean Journal of Horticultere Science and technology. 2010;28: 36-40.

281 26. Amarante, C., Banks, N. H., and Max, S. Pre-harvest bagging improves pack out and fruit
282 quality of pears (*Pyruscommunis*). New Zealand Journal of Crop science and
283 Horticulture. 2002;30:93-98.
284 27. Muchui, M. N., Mathooko, F.M., Njoroge, C. K., Kahangi, E. M., Onyango, C. A. and
285 Kimani, E. M. Effect of perforated blue polyethylene bunch covers on selected
286 postharvest quality parameters of tissue cultured bananas (Musa spp.) cv. Williams in
287 Central Kenyaa Journal of Stored Product and Postharvest Research. 2010;**1**: 29-41.
288 28. Sarker, D., Rahman, M. M. and Barman, J. C. Efficacy of different bagging materials for the
289 control of mango fruit fly. Bangladeshi Journal of Agricultural Research. 2009;34: 165-
290 168.
291 29. Wang, Y. T., Li, X., Li, Y., Li, L. L. and Zhang, S. L. Effects of bagging on browning spot
292 incidence and content of different forms of calcium in 'huangguan' pear fruits. Acta
293 Horticulture sinica. *2011;*38: 1507-1514.
294 30. Hao, Y. Y., Ren, H. W. and Guo, P. Y. Effects of bagging on the accumulation and
295 transformation of photo synthates in apple fruits. Acta Horticulture sinica**.** 2011;38: 233-
296 239.
297 31. Awad MA. Increasing the rate of ripening of date palm (Phoenix dactylifera L.) cv. Helali by
298 preharvest and postharvest treatments. Postharvest Biollogy and Technology. 2007;43,
299 121-127.
300 32. Watanawan, A., Watanawan, C. and Jarunate, J. Bagging 'Nam Dok Mai' mango during
301 development affects color and fruit quality. Acta Horticulture sinica**.** 2008;787: 325-330.
302 33. Chonhenchob, V., Kamhangwong, D., Kruenate, J., Khongrat, K., Tangchantra, N., Wichai,
303 U., and Singh, S. P. Pre-harvest bagging with wavelength-selective materials enhances
304 development and quality of mango (*Mangifera indica*L.) cv. Namdokmai. Journal of the
305 Science of Food and Agriculture. 2011;91:664-671.
306 34. Fan, X.T. and Mattheis, J. P. Bagging 'fuji' apples during fruit development affects color
307 development and storage quality. Horticultural Science. 1998; 33:1235-1238.
308 35. Hongxia, W., Wang, S. B., Shi, S. Y., Ma, W. H., Zhou, Y. G. and Zhan, R. L. Effects of
309 bagging on fruit quality in Zill mango.Journal Fruit Science. 2009;26: 644-648.

310 36. Harhash, M. M.and Al-Obeed, R. S. Effect of bunch bagging color on yield and fruit quality
311 of date palm. American-Eurasian Journal Agricultural and Environmental Science.
312 2010;**7**:312-319.
313 37. Zhao, J. J., Wang, J. B., Zhang, X. C., Li, H. L. and Gao, Z. Y. Effect of bagging on the
314 composition of carbohydrate, organic acid and carotenoid contents in mango fruit. Acta
315 Horticulture sinica. 2013;992: 537-54.
316 38. Lima, J. B., Angelo, A. A., Marcelo, R. M., Deyse, G.and Elisa, B. L. Chemical evaluation
317 and effect of bagging new peach varieties introduced in southern Minas Gerais-Brazil.
318 Food Science Technology. 2013;33:434-440.
319 39. Feng, F., Mingjun, Li., Fengwang, M. and Lailiang, C. The effects of bagging and debagging
320 on external fruit quality, metabolites, and the expression of anthocyanin biosynthetic
321 genes in 'Jonagold' apple (*Malus domestica* Borkh.).Scientia Horticulture. 2014;165:
322 123-131.
323 40. Zhai, H., Ren, C., Li, E. M., Shi, D. C., Lin, G. Y. and Shu, H. R. Influence of bagging on the
324 structure of apple production investment as well as its resultant problem of shading. Acta
325 Horticulture sinica. 2006;33:921-926.