Pre- and Post-Harvest

The quality and storage efficiency of some apple varieties as a function of picking date, area of production and duration of storage

Sass, P. and Lakner, Z.

University of Horticulture and Food Industry Villányi út 35-43, Budapest, H-1118, Hungary



Key words: Hungary, chemical properties, storage losses, biometrical analysis

Summary: Numerous apple varieties have been tested parallel with traditional Jonathan varieties during four years, 1990-1994 on three different geographical areas of Hungary. The picking time took place at three different times in a year: ten days before the probably optimal picking time, at close-to-optimal picking time, and ten days after the optimal picking time. The effect of storage on quality of fruits have been tested in February, March, and April under circumstances of a semi-industrial storage experiment.

The results of experience can contribute to answer numerous current, from point of view of practice important topics:

- · The stochastic relations between various fruit quality parameters at different varieties
- The change of fruit quality during storage
- · The effect of different picking date on storage losses
- The possibilities of storage loss predicting by the utilization of multiple regression analysis.

The most important results of experiences are as follows:

- 1. The starch degradation test and Streiff index are well applicable for practical purposes to determine the optimal harvest-date.
- 2. On base of analysis of various losses and physiological diseases the high importance of mass loss is obvious. In the variety Jonnee the earlier picking date considerably increased the mass loss. The effect of variety on mass loss is rather limited. In the Jonathan varieties the Jonathan spot was a rather important physiological disease. The late picking time increased the frequency of Jonathan spot. At optimal date of harvest at Jonnee the frequency of Jonathan -spot was lower, than at Jonathan M 41. In the Jonathan M41 and Jonnee the importance of scald was rather limited, but in the Wellspur Delicious and Smoothee this disease occurred relatively frequently. In the Smoothee the earlier picking time considerably increased the probability of scald.
- The multiple regression analysis yielded reliable results, fit for prediction of storage losses and diseases on the base of chemical and physical properties, determined at the time of picking.

Introduction

Fruit storage plays an important role in Hungarian horticulture. The modernization of variety- structure and post - harvest technology is a key question from point of The results of experience can contribute to answer numerous current topics, important from point of view of practice:

- stochastic relations between various fruit quality parameters at different varieties
- · change of fruit quality during storage
- · effect of different picking dates on storage losses
- possibilities of predicting storage loss by utilization of multiple regression analysis.

The stochastic relations between various fruit parameters are in the subject of much post - harvest research. Some results published in literature are shown in *Table 1*.

the time of picking (higher values of flesh firmness) but the difference between flesh firmness of apple sides diminished during storage.

Results

The basic characteristics of fruit quality parameters determined at harvest, in February and in April, as a function of picking time are shown in *Table 4*.

Table 1 Stochastic relations between various quality parameters of apple varieties according to various sources

| | QUALITY PA | RAMETERS | CORRELATION COEFFICIENT | VARIETY |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Lott (1961) | soluble solids | fruit mass skin coloring acidity | 0.75 0.61 -0.11 - +0.33 | Golden Delicious at picking varies as a function of pruning |
| Bühnemann (1963) | softening | fruit mass | -0.635 +0.286 | Cox Orange Boscoop |
| Lévaváry (1972) | flesh firmness | soluble solids | 0.01 | different varieties, after twomonth-long cool storage |
| | soluble solids | acidity acidity | 0.869 0.125 | |
| Aeppli (1984) | flesh firmness | Thieault index | 0.32 | results of an analysis of 57 apple varieties |
| | | acid content sugar content | 0.24 0,25 | |
| Stolle, Reichel, Schmidt (1985) | fruit mass | days of ripening | -0.55 | Golden Delicious |
| Tomcsányi (1987) | fruit mass | acidity soluble solids | 0.33 0.38 | different varieties after 1 month cool storage |
| | acidity | flesh firmness sugar-acid ratio | 0.54 0.92 | |
| | soluble solids | sugar-acid ratio flesh firmness | 0.52 0.39 | |

Material and methods

Numerous apple varieties have been tested parallel with traditional Jonathan varieties during four years, 1990–1994 on three different geographical sites of Hungary. The picking time took place at three different times in a year: ten days before the probably optimal picking time, at close-to-optimal picking time, and ten days after the optimal picking time. The effect of storage has been tested in February, March, and April under circumstances of a semi-industrial storage experiment. Fruit parameters, determined at harvest and during storage are shown in *Table 2*.

Table 2 The most important investigated varieties

| Investigated variety | Genetical background | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Jonathan M41 | Jonathan clone | | | |
| Smoothee | semispur mutant of Golden Delicious | | | |
| Wellspur Delicious | semispur mutant of Golden Delicious | | | |
| Jonnee | bud mutant of Blackjohn | | | |
| Redspur Delicious | spur type of Delicious | | | |

The flesh firmness of fruits have been tested by a penetrometer. The firmness have been separately measured on the shady and on the colored side of apples. The analysis of regression underlines that the two values slightly differ at

Table 3 The investigated properties and their methods of determination

| Investigated property | Method of investigation | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| intensity of covering color | special reference patterns (SASS,1993), empirical scale from 1 to 5 minimal intensity = 1 maximal intensity = 5 | | | | |
| ground color | special reference patterns empirical scale from 1 to 10 the values of color increase during ripening | | | | |
| flesh firmness | penetrometer | | | | |
| starch degradation | special reference patterns for determination of starch degradation, based on KJ test starch degradation begins = 1 no detectable starch = 5 | | | | |
| acid content | titration, expressed in % | | | | |
| soluble solid content (s.s.c.) | hand refractometer, expressed in % | | | | |
| Indices, ex | pressing the condition of fruits | | | | |
| Soluble solid content / acid content | | | | | |
| Thiault index | 10 * soluble solid content + 100*acidity | | | | |
| Streiff index | flesh firmness | | | | |
| | (starch degrad. level * soluble sol.cont.) | | | | |

The effect of picking time on storage losses are summarised on *Table 5*.

Table 4 Effect of picking time and storage duration on quality parameters of fruits.

| | | Jonatha | ın M41 | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|--|-------------|---|---|-------------|
| Harvest February April | | | | | | | | |
| | Picking time | | | Picking time | | Picking time | | |
| I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | | 1. | II. | III. |
| 3.6 | 4.4 | 5.0 | | 100000 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 1100 | 5.0 |
| 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| 9.5 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.2 |
| 13.1 | 14.0 | 15.1 | 14.1 | 14.6 | 15.3 | 14.3 | 14.9 | 15.6 |
| 0.98 | 0.70 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 050 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.36 |
| 2.5 | 3.6 | 4.3 | | | | | | |
| 13.2 | 19.9 | 24.1 | 24.8 | 27.9 | 30.7 | 31.4 | 37.4 | 43.8 |
| 229 | 210 | 213 | 198 | 198 | 203 | 189 | 189 | 192 |
| 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.08 | | | | | | |
| 0.5000000 | | Jon | nee | ** | | | | |
| | Harvest | (2.200) | | February | | | April | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | III. | | | III. | I. | | III. |
| | | | 1177 | 100000 | 100000 | | 25.504 | 4.2 |
| | -0.07 | | (7)(3)73) | 1100000 | | 10000000 | 1000000 | 4.8 |
| | | | 0.02561 | 10000 | | 0.316557.5 | 13.D/J Care | 4.8 |
| | (1000000) | | 2502-2 | | | | | 13.5 |
| | | | | | | 1411-3439-4 | | 0.41 |
| | | | 0.55 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.41 |
| | | | 25.1 | 25.0 | 206 | 35.0 | 21.0 | 33.3 |
| | 200 | | | | | 10000000 | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 176 |
| | 1 | | 185 | 184 | 181 | 175 | 179 | 170 |
| 0.21 | 0.10 | | | | | | | |
| | | Redspur | Delicious | | | | | |
| | | | | Control of the Contro | | | | |
| | Picking time | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | III. |
| 6.2 | | | | 6.6 | | | | 6.9 |
| 6.3 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 20000 | 1,000,000 | 4.3 |
| 13.9 | 14.4 | 14.8 | 14.1 | 14.6 | 15.1 | 13.9 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
| 0.39 | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.20 |
| 2.5 | 3.4 | 4.0 | | | | | | |
| 35.5 | 41.7 | 46.6 | 50.7 | 53.1 | 57.2 | 63.5 | 64.4 | 76.4 |
| | 178 | 179 | 169 | 175 | 177 | 161 | 176 | 172 |
| | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 120000000 | | Smoo | othee | | | | | |
| | Harvest | | | February | | | April | |
| | Picking time | | Picking time | | | Picking time | | |
| L | | | I. | | III. | I. | II. | III. |
| | | | | 31.00 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.5 |
| | | | 5775577 | 555700 | | 10000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 4.7 | 4.5 |
| | 1.000 | | 200000 | 767666 | | 2000 | | 14.5 |
| | (6) ARCH | | | | | | | 0.26 |
| | | | 0.71 | Ura G | W.J.T | 3/13/1 | | |
| | | | 22.2 | 37.6 | 42.4 | 46.5 | 51.8 | 55.8 |
| | | | 1 | S. 1000 | | 100000000 | | 171 |
| | FC44.54.76 | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 1// | 181 | 1/6 | 175 | 173 | 1.7.1 |
| 0.16 | 0.11 | | D-E-1 | | | | 1 | |
| | ₩1₩ 2000 NOO | Wellpsur | Delicious | T7_1 | | | A mell | |
| Picking time | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | . 111 | | | | |
| 0.7576 | 10.22 | | | | | | | III. |
| 5.2 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 7.4 |
| | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 6.5 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 4.6 | | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 2000000 | 4.4 |
| 13.4 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 13.7 | 13.7 | | 13.8 |
| 0.52 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| | 3.9 | 4.3 | 0.00011 | | | | | 0 |
| 3.2 | 67.10 | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 25.6 | 32.5 | | 29.6 | 35.3 | 36.5 | 34.2 | 35.7 | 36.8 |
| 25.6 186 | 20000 | 34.9 174 | 29.6 181 | 35.3 175 | 36.5 175 | 34.2 177 | 35.7 175 | 36.8 176 |
| | 3.6 4.2 9.5 13.1 0.98 2.5 13.2 229 0.28 1. 1.0 3.9 9.8 13.2 0.73 2.5 18.0 205 0.21 1. 6.2 6.3 13.9 0.39 2.5 35.5 178 0.07 1. 5.6 8.9 13.5 0.62 2.5 21.7 197 0.16 | Picking time I. II. 3.6 | Harvest Picking time I. | Dicking time | Harvest | Harvest Picking time Picking time | Harvest Picking time Picking time | Harvest |

Table 5 Effect of picking time and storage duration on storage losses (%), average values for various growing sites

| | | Enhancer | Jonatha | 1 | March | 7 | | April | | |
|--|------|--------------------------|-----------|---|--------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|--|
| | | February Biology time | | | | | | | | |
| | | Picking time | | | Picking time | 111 | | Picking time | | |
| | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | |
| Jonathan spot | 4.8 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 4.8 | 5.2 | |
| scald | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.18 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | |
| bitter pit | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | |
| breakdown | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.9 | |
| mass loss | 3.9 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 5.4 | |
| | | | Jon | nee | | | | April | | |
| | | February | | | March | | | | | |
| | | Picking time | | I | Picking time | | | Picking time | | |
| | 1. | II. | III. | I. | H. | III. | I. | II. | III. | |
| onathan spot | 3.6 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 6.3 | |
| cald | 0.15 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.5 | |
| pitter pit | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | |
| preakdown | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.2 | |
| nass loss | 4.1 | 3.4 | 4 | 6.2 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 4.7 | |
| *************************************** | | | Redspur I | 30000000 | 0/37.5 | (585) | | 0.0000 | 20/10 | |
| | | February | | | March | | | April | | |
| | | Picking time | | | Picking time | | Picking time | | | |
| | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III | |
| pitter pit | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | |
| 4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | |
| oreakdown | 2.5 | 3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.5 | |
| nass loss | 2.3 | 3 | Smoo | | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 7 | |
| | | F-1 | SHIO | T | March | | | April | | |
| | | February | | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | | | April | | | |
| | | Picking time | | | Picking time | | , | Picking time | | |
| | I. | II. | III. | 1. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | |
| scald | 4.5 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 7.4 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 9.8 | 4.9 | 5.8 | |
| pitter pit | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | |
| oreakdown | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | |
| nass loss | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 4.5 | |
| | | | Well | psur | | | | | | |
| | | February | | | March | | | April | | |
| | 7, | Picking time | | | Picking time | | | Picking time | | |
| | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | I. | II. | III. | |
| scald | 2.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 4.5 | 5.1 | |
| pitter pit | 0.89 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.16 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 | |
| breakdown | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | |
| mass loss | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 3.7 | |
| MATRICENS 200 ST | | | Average | values | | | | | | |
| lonathan anat | 4.2 | 2 | 4.7 | 5 | 3.7 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 5.7 | |
| Jonathan spot | | 1,000 | 2.1 | 2.71 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 2 | 2.6 | 2.4 | |
| scald | 1.71 | 1.47 | 1 | 1 | 0.74 | 0.9 | 1.56 | 0.94. | 1.1 | |
| pitter pit | 0.9 | 0.72 | 0.37 | 1.16 | 3000000 | 1500000 | 10-00-00 | 5-135-5-50, 107-5 | | |
| breakdown | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.34 | 0.42 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.5 | |
| mass loss | 3.36 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.36 | 3.46 | 4.16 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 4.6 | |

On base of our experimental data, predictions can be made between various quality parameters of fruits, determined at harvest, as well as storage losses.

The predictor - equations for Jonathan M41, determined by stepwise analysis of regression are as follows :

Mass loss = -2.75 - 0.002mass -0.460 ground color + 0.313 CC + 0.073 s.s.c. / acid +0.136 flesh firm. + 0.356 s.s.c. -0.008 starch degr.

 $R^2 = 0.52$

Bitter pit = 3.548-0.014 mass + 0.057 ground color -0.0007 CC -0.0133 s.s.c. / acid -0.001 flesh firm -0.094 s.s.c.+0.020 starch degr.

 $R^2 = 0.84$

Breakdown = 0.526 + 0.007 mass -0.081 ground colouring +0.077 CC +0.002 solu. sol / acid -0.0665 flesh firm-0.003 s.s.c.-0.119 starch degr. $R^2 = 0.62$

Discussion

The up-to-date Jonathan -type variety, Jonathan M41 has shown a comparatively high soluble solid- acid content ratio after storage. This ratio was rather high at Redspur Delicious and Smoothee. At these varieties the color was very intensive.

According to the analysis of various losses and physiological diseases the high importance of mass loss is obvious. At Jonnee the earlier picking date increased the mass loss considerably. The effect of variety on mass loss is rather limited. At the two Jonathan-type varieties the Jonathan spot was a rather important physiological disease. The late picking time increased the frequency of Jonathan spot. At optimal date of harvest in Jonnee the frequency of Jonathan spot was lower, than in Jonathan M41. In variety Jonathan M41 and Jonnee the importance of scald was rather limited, but in Wellspur Delicious and Smoothee this disease occurred relatively frequently. In Smoothee the earlier picking time considerably increased the probability of scald.

The bitter pit and breakdown was less important. This disease was relative frequent in Redspur Delicious.

The correlation between chemical properties of fruits and the storage losses were tested by simple and multiple regression analysis. The linear correlation coefficient seldom gave reliable results, because the processes investigated were quadratic in most cases. The multiple regression analysis yielded more reliable results, being fit for prediction of storage losses and diseases based on chemical and physical properties, being determined at the time of picking.

References

Aeppli, A. (1984) Qualität Neuer Apfelsorten, Zeitschrift für Obstund Weinbau 126 (15) 366–371.

Bühnemann O. (1963) Untersuchungen über die CO2 Lagerung der Sorten Jonathan und Golden Delicious, Erwerbsobstbau 5 (1) 5–7.

Lévaváry B. (1972) Some relations between the ripening and storability of Jonathan apple, Fruit and vegetable selling (Budapest, in Hungarian) 7 (9) 30–35.

Lott V.R. (1961) Relation of skin colour of Golden Delicious apples to quality changes during maturation and ripening, Proc. of the Amer. Soc. for Hort. Sci. 65 (1) 61–69.

Sass P. (1993) Fruit storage, Mezőgazda Publishing House, Bp.

Stolle G., Reichel M., Schmidt G. (1985) Der Einfluss von Erntetermin, Fruchtgrösse, Lagerungsverfahren und Lagerungsdauer auf den Geschmack zweier Apfelsorten I:, Arch. Gartenbau, Berlin 132 (4) 139–149.

Tomcsányi P.(1987) Foundations of marketing in food economy, Agtricultural Publishing House (in Hungarian) 425.