Annals Of Agric. Sc., Moshtohor, Vol. 44(3) 1253-1270, (2006).

# COMPARING THE EFFECT OF NATURAL AND CHEMICAL TREATMENTS ON POSTHARVEST DECAY DISEASES CONTROL OF ALPHONSO MANGO FRUITS DURING COLD STORAGE BY

#### Ekbal, Z. Ali

Sabahia Research Station, Alexandria, Ministry of Agriculture, Egypt

#### **ABSTRACT**

The present study was done during 2004 and 2005 seasons to evaluate the effect of postharvest treatments of seven oils extracted from the following plants, peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, radish roots and leaves, blue gum leaves, as well as TBZ solution as dipping treatments at the concentration of 1000 ppin and forced hot air treatment at 48°C and RH 90–95% on physical and chemical properties of Alphonso mango fruits and calculated the percentage of decayed fruits during cold storage at 13°C and RH at 90–95% for one month. The obtained results showed that total soluble solids, ascorbic acid., soluble pectien and pigments were not affected by all dipping treatments. Heat treatment increased the percentage of fruit weight loss, firmness, carotene and reduced V.C., acidity, soluble pectien and peel chlorophyll content in treated fruits. Meanwhile, TBZ fruit treatment increased fruit weight loss percentage. Cinnamon, peppermint, blue gum and TBZ dipping treatments and air heated fruits reduced respectively decay fruit percentage. In meanwhile, baresly, radish root, leaves, and onion bulbs had no significant effect on fruit decay percentage.

Key words: Mango fruits, decay, forced hot air, plant oil extraction and TBZ

#### INTRODUCTION

Mango trees are widely grown in tropical and mild subtropical climates and their fruits are very important in many countries including Egypt. Mango fruits are of high export potential in Egypt. Governmental strategies in the agricultural sector include the gradual extension of mango plant ages specifically in the newly reclaimed soil. In addition, more efforts are exerts to raise the export potential of the existing markets, beside opening new international markets for export of the local mango fruits production. In order to realize these goals, more attention should be directed to solve problems facing production, handling and marketing processes.

Mango fruits are commonly exposed to unfavourable environmental conditions in addition to infection with many diseases during the growing season and storage. Common diseases and disorders that are predominantly related to harvesting and handling include mold rot. Mold diseases in mango are controlled primarily by applications of chemical fungicides in commercial handling. The most fungicides used are orthophenyl-phenate, imazolil and thiabendazole (D'Hallewin et al., 1996)

New methods of control are needed because pathogen resistance to these chemicals has developed, and regulatory tissues and public concerns about health risks of ingesting fungicide residues threaten the continued use of fungicides in the future. In order to minimize such problems, many investigators in the postharvest field of fresh fruit production (Schirra and Mulas, 1995 and Schirra et al., 1995) are trying to develop nonchemical means to treat fruits to improve their postharvest shelf life and to protect them from decay.

Hot air treatment controls organisms that have already penetrated the fruit as well as on the surface. The treatment also leaves no residue of chemicals on the product. However, the absence of residues also leaves the fruits vulnerable to spoilage, if it later becomes contaminated with pathogens. Consequently, for maximum efficacy, heat treatment must be combined with sanitation procedures during subsequent handling and storage. The antagonistic effect of some plant extracts and essential oils against fruit-decaying pathogens was also investigated (Hussein *et al.*, 1996).

However, the application of these substances has not been used yet in practice. Bearing in mind all the above points, the present study was conducted to: (1) Determine the optimal heat thipendazole and some plant extraction treatments of mango fruits to control mold disease, (2) Comparing the effect of above treatments on the incidence of rot decay and their effect on some chemical and physical fruit properties in Alphonso mango fruits during cold storage.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present investigation was conducted during the second week of August of the two successive seasons 2004 and 2005, on healthy, sound mature and completely injury – free green mango Alphonso fruits.

Sixty mango Alphonso trees as uniform as possible, were chosen for this study. The selected trees were grown in a private orchard at Daraneet-orchard, Kafr El-Dawar Behira Governorate. At the harvest time, of both experimental seasons, medium sized fruits were randomly selected from the yield of 54 trees out of the 60 chosen ones.

#### Extraction of tested plants oils

The leaves of peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley leaves, cinnamon leaves, garden rocket leaves radish roots and leaves were collected from the farm of medicinal and aromatic plants at El-Tarh-Alex oils of the tested plants were extracted by steam distillation as mentioned by Cleavenger (1982). The essential oils were collected in cold trap, then separated to its components and finally dried over anhydrous sodium sulphate. The oils were filtrated then kept quickly in a dark bottle at 7°C according to Guenther (1961).

# Comparing The Effect Of Natural & Chemical Treatments...1255

Identification and determination of the chemical constituents of different plant oils extracts (Table 1).

Table (1): Chemical components of the tested plants oil extracts

Table (1). Chemical components of the tested plants of extracts											
Components (%)	Peppe -rmint leaves	Onion bulbs	Parsley leaves	Cinnamo n leaves	Garde n rocket leaves	Radish roots and leaves	Blue gum leaves				
Thujene		1.68		0.50	0.11		15.60				
Tricyclene	1.40					0.16					
α-Pinene		12.18	11.2	14.11	6.40						
Camphene	23.11		0.3			10.10	11.20				
Sabinene			13.5	***			20.13				
α-Terpinoi		22.06		28.10	10.2						
Limonen				-	2.10	1.40					
Linalool	50.1			ŧ		1.40	17.01				
Cineole	1.10			32.10	19.11		6.51				
Linalyl acetate		15.11	20.21		14.26						
Eguenol acetate	10.01					18,40	15.11				
Borneol			1304	2.01		34.01					
Myrcene	0.51			***		10.60	2.02				
γ-Carene			20.12	11.00	16.89	0.50					
Citronellol	0.31	28.14		12.00	0.22						
Nerol			11.11		17.40		1.12				
β-Citral					12.6		0.53				
α-Citral			10.01			***					
Geranyl acetate	13.21	20.01				23.01	10.07				

The GLC analysis was carried out in the central laboratory of Faculty of Agriculture, Alexandria University. The conditions are described in:

PRO – Gcpye Unicom Colume : PEGA 10% Tem. Programming:

Initial temp. 70°C
Rate 4°C/min
Final temp. 190°C
Final time 20 min
Detector temp. 300°C
Injection temp. 250°C
Char speed 2 min/cm

Flow rate of grasses

N2 30 ml / min H2 33 ml / min Air 330 ml / min The harvest yield of every two trees was used as a single replicate. Fruits selected from each replicate (two trees) were divided into 3 groups, 20 fruits of each and then every 3 groups (60 fruits) were dipped for 3 minutes in one of the following solutions and then dried in both experimental seasons:

- T<sub>1</sub> (water "control").
- T<sub>2</sub> (Oil extract of peppermint leaves "Menth apiperita") at 10 % in water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- Γ<sub>3</sub> (Oil extract of onion bulbs "Allium cepa") at 10% in water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- T<sub>4</sub> (Oil extract of parsley leaves "Petroselinum sativus") at 10% in water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- T<sub>5</sub> (Oil extract of cinnamon Cinnamomum sp. bark) at 10% in water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- T<sub>6</sub> (Oil extract of garden rocket leaves "Eruca sativa") at 10% in water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- T<sub>7</sub> (Oil extract of radish roots and leaves "Raphanus sativus") at 10% water emulsion with 0.2% tween surfactant.
- T<sub>8</sub> (Oil extract of blue gum leaves "Eucalyptus globules") at 10% water emulsion with 0.2% tween 80 surfactant.
- To (Thiabenzadole "TBZ" solution at 1000 ppm, with 0.2 % tween 80 surfactant
- T<sub>10</sub> (fruits were exposed to forced hot air at 48°C and 90-95% RH for (2 hours). Sound medium sized fruits were randomly select from the yield of remained selected trees (two trees were used as a single replicate).

The fruits from each replicate were weighed washed and dried. then divided into 3 groups, 20 fruits of each were then placed in plastic rings inside plastic pans containing 75 ml water and covered with polyethylene sheet to maintain relative humidity (RH). Forced hot air was carried out by using a small unit with a heater and air motor, which forced hot air through the fruits and air temperature at 48°C (RH from 90–95%). This temperature was monitored in the cores of 10 fruits every 60 sec. Using type T copper constant thermocouples (Sharp et al., 1991).

All treated fruits were placed in plastic boxes (60 x 40 x 18 cm) cold storage at 13°C and 90–95% (RH) in the exporters union refrigerator in Abis, Alexandria for one month and fruit samples were taken at 10 days intervals from cold storage for physical and chemical determinations. Firmness was determined using the Effegi firmness tester with an eight mm plunger (Effegi 48011 Alfonsine Italy). The average flesh firmness of each sample of fruits was estimated. Fruit firmness was expressed as pounds/ square inch. Total soluble solids (TSS) percentages were estimated by a hand refractometer while acidity was determined by titration against 0.1 N NaoH. Acid percentage was estimated as citric acid. Ascorbic acid (V.C.%) was determined according to the (A.O.A.C., 1980).

Peel pigments were extracted by direct immersion of 0.9 gram of peel into solvent N, N dimethyl formamide using Moran and Porath (1980) method. However, the determination of peel pigments contents were determined

according to the method of Grodzinsky and Grodzinsky (1973). The total chlorophyll and carotene content were expressed as mg per 100 gm fresh weight.

The percentage of soluble pectin was determined according to Care and Haynes (1922) through extraction with HCL 0.020, 0.050 N and followed by precipitation as the calcium salt by using calcium chloride solution. The precipitate was washed with boiled distilled water until it becomes free from chloride, dried and weighted as calcium pectate. For calculating the percentage of physiological fruit weight loss, 15 fruits from each replicate were labeled and periodically weighted and the loss in weight was calculated. In addition on each sampling date, fruit showing decay were counted and discarded. Then the percentage of decayed fruits was estimated on total fruit number basis.

The data collected throughout the course of this study were statistically analyzed using analysis of variance method and using the randomized complete blocks design with 10 treatments 3 replicates as described by Snedecor and Cochran (1971). The L.S.D. method at (0.05 level) was used to compare the effects of treatments (T), storage period by days (D) and their interaction (TxD)

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

# A- Effect of different treatments on physical changes during storage Alphonso mango fruits at 13°C±1

#### 1- Fruit weight loss percentage

During storage period the data in Table (2) indicated that fruits treated by different plant extracts (peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, blue gum and radish root) showed significantly lower physiological weight loss than control treatment and there was no significant differences between different plant extraction treatments during both storage seasons. However, weight loss % was significantly increased by increasing storage period and reached to the highest percentage when stored to the largest period (30 days). Meanwhile, using storage for % days in combination with onion bulbs treatment encouraged the lowest significant water loss % compared with the other interactions.

Such observation could be due to that plant extractions and vegetable oil, formed a layer that restricted transpiration of fruits. Although fruit coatings plug lenticals and create a barrier of  $O_2$  and  $Co_2$  exchanges (Banks, 1984). Water loss occurs via the cuticle, coating material improved water retention capability of fruit during storage and marketing period (Elson, et al., 1985). On the other hand, heated fruits and fruit treated with thiabendazole (TBZ), showed the highest significant weight loss percentage respectively, comparing with control. In line with these results those reported by D' Hallewin et al. (1996). They found that fruit weight loss was highest in the thiabendazole treated fruits, as well as, Attia (2003), they pointed out that heat treatment caused increased water weight loss percentage in peach fruits. They added that heat treatment causing stress condition on peach fruits resulted in more water loss like was observed in the present work.

Table (2): The effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on Alphonso mango fruits weight loss % for different storage periods (days) during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons

during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons										
		Store	ge period	(days)						
Treatments		Season 2004								
TI OUT MOULD	0	10	20	30	Means					
		Fruit weight loss %								
Control T <sub>1</sub>	0.00	1.89	2.52	5.20	2.40					
Peppermint T <sub>2</sub>	0.00	1.65	2.11	4.22	2.00					
Onion bulbs T <sub>3</sub>	0.00	1.62	2.12	4.12	1.97					
Parsley T <sub>4</sub>	0.00	1.65	2.10	4.16	1.98					
Cinnamon T <sub>5</sub>	0.00	1.66	2.13	3.99	1.95					
Garden rocket T <sub>6</sub>	0.00	1.65	2.00	3.97	1.91					
Radish root T7	0.00	1.66	2.14	4.11	1.98					
Blue gum T <sub>8</sub>	0.00	1.67	2.11	4.21	2.00					
<b>TBZ</b> $T_9$	0.00	2.00	2.79	5.91	2.68					
Forced hot air T <sub>10</sub>	0.00	2.28	3.98	6.46	3.18					
Means	0.00	1.77	2.31	4.65						
L.S.D. 0.05	T = 0	.26	D= 0.10	T×	D= 0.35					
			Season 200	5						
Control T <sub>1</sub>	0.00	1.93	2.51	6.11	2.64					
Peppermint T <sub>2</sub>	0.00	1.61	2.00	3.96	1.89					
Onion bulbs T <sub>3</sub>	0.00	1.59	2.00	3.99	1.90					
Parsley T <sub>4</sub>	0.00	1.70	1.98	4.11	1.95					
Cinnamon T <sub>5</sub>	0.00	1.63	1.96	4.02	1.90					
Garden rocket T <sub>6</sub>	0.00	1.72	2.11	4.07	1.98					
Radish root T7	0.00	1.60	2.00	4.00	1.90					
Blue gum T <sub>8</sub>	0.00	1.67	1.99	3.96	1.91					
TBZ T <sub>9</sub>	0.00	2.16	2.75	7.10	3.00					
Forced hot air T <sub>10</sub>	0.00	2.38	3.00	7.66	3.26					
Means	0.00	1.80	2.23	4.90						
L.S.D. 0.05	T = 0		D= 0.08		D= 0.27					

T = Treatments

D = Storage period (days)

 $T \times D = Interaction$ 

#### 2- Firmness (Ib/inch<sup>2</sup>)

The data in Table (3) generally indicated that fruit flesh firmness was significantly higher in heated fruits during both seasons comparing with control and other treatments (peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, radish roots, blue gum and thiobendazol "TBZ") which has no significant effect on fruit firmness. However, fruit firmness showed a significant decrease by increase of storage period to reach the lowest significant level at the end of storage period in both experimental seasons.

Table (3): Effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on fruit firmness (Ib/in) of Alphonso mango fruits for different storage period

(days) of during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons										
11:000 N 18:000 N 18:				ge period (						
Treatments	Season 2004									
ricathenta		0	10	20	30	Means				
			Fruit	firmness (I	b/in²)					
Control	Tı	10.60	8.90	5.90	4.20	7.40				
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	10.60	8.92	5.91	4.30	7.43				
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	10.60	8.98	5.93	4.43	7.49				
Parsley	T <sub>4</sub>	10.60	8.99	5.81	4.55	7.46				
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	10.60	9.14	5.77	4.53	7.51				
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	10.60	8.99	5.73	4.22	7.39				
Radish root	T <sub>7</sub>	10.60	8.96	5.99	4.28	7.46				
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	10.60	8.96	5.80	4,40	7.44				
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	10.60	8.99	5.80	4.30	7.44				
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	10.60	9.91	7.01	5.00	8.13				
Means		10.60	9.07	5.97	4.42					
L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0.	50	D= 0.20	T×	D= 0.67				
		,		Season 200	5					
Control		10.10	8.76	6.02	3.94	7.21				
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	10.10	8.77	6.00	4.00	7.22				
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	10.10	8.66	5.92	3.96	7.16				
Parsley	T <sub>4</sub>	10.10	8.75	5.96	3.92	7.19				
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	10.10	8.74	6.00	3.01	6.96				
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	10.10	9.00	5.99	3.95	7.26				
Radish root		10.10	8.71	5.89	3.97	7.17				
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	10.10	8.75	5.86	3.96	7.17				
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	10.10	8.74	5.76	4.00	7.15				
Forced hot air	Tio	10.10	9.61	6.89	4.99	7.90				
Means		10.10	8.85	6.03	3.97					
L.S.D. 0.05		T=0.	45	D= 0.18	T×1	D= 0.60				

T = Treatments

D = Storage period (days)

 $T \times D = Interaction$ 

The increment in flesh firmness values due to heat treatments in the present study go in line with the results of Paull (1990) who found that heat treatments for insect disinfestations or to control disease could sometimes disrupt fruit ripening. The fruit softening enzymes are sometimes not produced following heating, while the other processes associated with ripening are not apparently influenced to the same extent or soon recover. The sensitivity is modified by differences in response to seasons, cultivars and rates of heating. The sensitivity can be related to the heat shock response and the presence of heat shock proteins. Also, Huang-Wanrong et al. (1993) and El-Zayat (1996) investigated the effect of heat treatment on storage behaviour of Okuba peach fruits. They showed that fruits heat treatments maintained significantly the flesh hardness during storage comparing with control. Hassanein and Desheesh (1997) found that plant extracts or oils may exhibit no effect on fruit metabolism mechanism.

#### **B- Chemical fruit composition**

#### 1- Total soluble solids

The data in Table (4a) showed that no consistent trend was observed in TSS percentages as a result of the all treatments in this study. However, TSS percentage was significant increased by increasing storage periods in both seasons. The results of the present investigation were in line with those found by El-Zayat (1996) who worked on peach and plum varieties and pointed out that fruits heat treatment did not showed clear effective total soluble solids percentage as compared with control. Also, Paull (1990) found that heat treatments for insect disinfestations or to control disease can sometimes disrupt fruit ripening. As well as, Hassanein and Desheesh (1997) found that fruit dipping treatments for control postharvest decay in plant extracts or oils may exhibit no effect on fruit metabolism mechanism.

#### 2- Titratable acidity (TA) percentage

The data of Table (4b) showed that the lowest significant percentages of malic acid were detected with heated fruit treatment compared with the other treatments. Meanwhile, there was an indirect relationship between an increase of storage period and titratable acidity content. On the other hand, using of heated treatment during the end of storage period induced the lowest titratable acidity comparing with control and other treatments, in both experimental seasons. The results of the present study were in a complete agreement with those previously reported by Klein et al. (1990) who reported that heated fruits of Anna apple cultivars Golden Delicious and Granny Smith resulted in a decrease in titratable acidity of apple flesh and increase in respiration of whole apple. There may be connection between the enhanced respiration and decrease in the titratable acidity. Acidity reflects the level of organic acid in fruit tissues particularly malic acid. These acids are the substrate for respiratory cycle and enhanced respiration would lead to decrease their level. The results also indicated that all dipping treatments (peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, blue gum, radish root and thiabendazole "TBZ") had no significant effects on fruit acid content and there is no significant differences between all dipping treatments during and the end of storage period in both experimental season of study. In line with these results those reported by Hassanein and Desheesh (1997) found that fruit dipping treatments for control postharvest decay in plant extracts or plant oils extracts may exhibit no effect on fruit metabolism mechanism

#### .3- Ascorbic acid (V.C.)

Present data (Table 4) of both storage seasons showed significant reduction in ascorbic acid content in heat treatment of mango fruits comparing with the control However, reduction of ascorbic acid due to the effect of heat treatment on the activation of the degradation effect of enzymes, particularly ascorbic acid due to the effect of heat treatment on the activation of the degradation effect of enzymes, particularly ascorbic acid oxidase (Gosh et al., 1964). On the other hand, negative results were obtained with all dipping treatments (peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, blue gum, radish root and thiobendazol "TBZ") In line with these results those reported by Airas et al. (1996), they pointed out that the

thiabendazole (TBZ) dipping treatments as 1000 ppm concentration had no effect on V.C. content in Avana mandarin fruits. In the main time Qamar and Chaudhary (1994) and Jiratko (1995). They reported that many plant extracts and essential oils where shown to have high antifungal activity against a wide range of fungi had no significant effect on ascorbic acid content in treated citrus fruits Meanwhile, there was an indirect relationship between an increase of storage period and titratable acidity content.

#### 4- Water soluble pectin percentage

The present data in Table (5) generally indicated that the average percentages of water soluble pectin of the heated fruit were lower than that of all other treatments and control where as the differences between dipping treatments, were not significant during and the end of storage period in both experimental seasons. These results were in agreement with those obtained by Attia (2003) who heated three varieties of peaches. He found that the insoluble pectin contents of cortical tissues were higher in hot treated fruits than in the control while soluble pectin levels were lower. Also, Han Tao et al., (1996) they worked on peaches concluded that heat shock treatment inhibits some physiological changes maintaining fruit quality there by increasing storability. However, water soluble pectin % were significantly increased by increasing storage period in both seasons.

#### 5- Fruit pigments

The data in Table (6) generally indicated that the effect of the various dipping treatments (peppermint, onion bulbs, parsley, cinnamon, garden rocket, blue gum, radish root and leaves and thiabendazole "TBZ") on peel total chlorophyll and carotene content of Alphonso mango fruits had no significant effect and there were no significant differences between the effect of different dipping treatments during and the end of storage period in both experimental seasons of study. In line with these results those recorded by many authors using different antagonistic plant extracts such as Davidson and Parish (1989), Siveropoulou et al. (1995) and Hassanein and Desheesh (1997). As well as, D'Hallewin et al. (1996) dipped mandarin fruits in 1000 ppin TBZ solution. They found no significantly differ between treatment and control on peel pigments content. On the other hand, under the prevailing conditions of this study, heated treatment resulted in significantly lower peel total chlorophyll and higher peel carotene content than control and other various dipping treatments during and the end of the storage period in both experimental season in line with these result those reported by Williams et al. (1994). They worked on Valencia oranges, they found that heated treatment enhanced color development and little effect on structure of surface. However, peel total chlorophyll content slowed significantly decrease while carotene content significantly period.

#### C- Fruit decay percentage

Obtained data (Table 7) showed that the tested plant materials (cinnamon, peppermint and blue gum oil plant materials extractions exhibited a variable degree of antimicrobial activity, they significantly had highly reduction

in the incidence of decayed fruits percentage comparing with control and other treatments and there were no significant differences between three mentioned treatments during and at the end of the storage period in both experimental seasons. Successful control of fruit decay was also recorded by many others using different antagonistic plant extracts and essential oils were shown to have antifungal activity against wide range of fungi (Davidson and Parish, 1989). In addition, other plants extracts and essential oils proved to be effective in controlling many phytopathogenic bacteria i.e. cinnamon, clove and eucalyptus oils against Erwinia Emylovora (Hassanein and Desheesh, 1997). Mint essential oils against pseudomonas spp. And many other phytopathogenic bacteria (Siveropoulou et al., 1995) and monoterpene, carvone and caraway. chenopodium and peppermint extracts against Agrobacterium tumefaciens. Plant extracts oils may exhibit its effect throughout a positive effect on the metabolism mechanism, an effect know from extracts of Reynoutria sacchalinenis on host plants succeptible to powdery mildew (Herger et al., 1988) Hussein et al. (1996) investigated that alleochemical(s) from some plant extracts may have a potential to develop natural products that may act as bactericides and fungicides. Our results also (Table 7) indicated that heat or chemical (TBZ) treatments of the tested mangos had a significant reduction effects on the incidence of fruit decay comparing with control At the end of the storage periods chemical and heat treatments reduced the percentage of decayed fruits as much as by 65.6 and 63.9% in 2004 season and 61.3 and 58.0% in 2005 season respectively, however. numerous investigators such as Ben-Yehoshua et al (1990). Barkai-Golan and Philips (1991); Lanza et al. (1994). Williams et al. (1994) and Mulas et al. (1995) reported that different heat treatments gave a good control for mold decay in different fruits species. Mild heat treatment at high atmospheric relative humidity may develop resistance to infection by some fungi in fruits (Baudoin and Ecket 1985) This treatment increase the activity of phenyl-ammonium lyase and thus elicit the biosynthesis of lignin and its phenolic precursor in the outer pericarp of the fruit reducing the growth of fungi. These phenolic materials may prevent penetrations of germinating spores into peel tissue or interfere with the action of pectolytic enzymes of the pathogen (Baudoin and Eckert, 1985) Moreover, Kim et al (1991) found that scoparone phytoalexin plays an important role in the increased resistance of heat treated lemon fruit to infection by P digitatum It was also suggested that the effect of post harvest heat treatment on fruit decay might be related to the modulation of endogenous disease resistance of fruit via influence on the changes of performed antifungal materials such as citral (Ben-Yehoshua et al., 1996) Successful chemical control of fruits mold decay were achieved using thiabendazol (TBZ) (D'Hallewin et al 1996) On the other hand, reduction in infection % due to TBZ may not significantly differ from that of heat treatment of mandarin fruit (D'Hallewin et al. 1996) In the meantime, the application of other plant extracts (Parsley, Radish and Onion bulbs) did not result in any significant appreciable reduction comparing with control during and at the end of the storage period. However, fruit decay percentage, generally increase by increase of storage period in both experimental seasons (Table 7)

Table (4): The effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on chemical composition of Alphonso mange fruits for different storage period (days) during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons

- Storag	c pu s	od (days) o	MI IEE MOO	<b>TAME 200</b> 3	storage se						-
Treatment	t	├──		Season 20		Storage pe	rioe (Gay)	<u> </u>	Season 20	NA.E	
		0	10	20	30	Means	-	10	20	30	Means
		<u> </u>	10	20	(4a)		_		20	30	MICHES
Control	Tı	9.10	11 12	14 10	17.11	1286	9.60	12.00	15.00	16.96	13.39
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	9.10	11.10	14.15	17.20	12.89	9.60	11.87	14.96	17.00	13.36
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	9.10	10.99	14.01	16.82	12.73	9.60	12.01	14.90	17.00	13.38
Parsiey	T.	9.10	11.13	14.00	17.30	12.88	9.60	12.00	14.98	16.87	13.34
Cinnamon	T,	9.10	11.20	13.93	16.95	12.80	9.60	11.85	15.01	16.89	13.34
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	9.10	11 15	13.95	17.00	12.80	9.60	11.92	14.92	17.01	13.36
Radish root	T <sub>2</sub>	9.10	11.23	14.20	17.05	12.89	9.60	11.88	15.06	17.02	13.39
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	9.10	11.13	14 15	16.88	12.82	9.60	12.02	14.79	17.03	13.41
TBZ	T.	9.10	11.20	14.10	16.90	12.83	9.60	11.90	15.03	16.95	13.37
Forced hot air	Tio	9.10	11.30	14.06	17.01	12.87	9.60	12.03	15.00	17.18	13.45
Means	- 10	9.10	11.16	14.07	17.02		9.60	11.95	14.97	17.01	1
L.S.D. 0.05		T = N		D= 0.31		T×D= 1.0	T = 1		D= 0.35		Γ×D≃ 1.17
•		_	(4b) Effect on (								
Control	T,	2.62	1 90	0.90	0.24	1.42	2.90	2.10	1.32	0.27	1.65
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	2.62	1.91	0.93	0.22	1.42	2.90	2.11	1.33	0.25	1.65
Onion bulbs	T,	2.62	1.98	0.95	0.24	1.43	2.99	2.11	1.32	0.28	1.65
Paraley	T4	2.62	1.89	0.93	0.25	1.43	2.90	2.10	1.31	0.26	1.64
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	2.62	1.90	0.92	0.24	1.42	2.90	2.10	1.30	0.27	1.64
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	2.62	1.92	0.93	0.22	1.42	2.90	2.11	1.29	0.28	1.65
Radish root	T-	2.62	1 90	0.92	0.23	1.42	2.90	2.09	1.32	0.26	1.64
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	2.62	1.90	0.90	0.22	1.42	2.90	2.11	1.33	0.28	1.66
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	2.62	1.90	0.90	0.24	1.42	2.90	2.11	1.28	0.27	1.64
Forced hot air	T10	2.62	1.37	0.50	0.13	1.16	2.90	1.62	0.66	0.16	1.34
Means		2.62	1.85	0.88	0.23		2.90	2.06	1.25	0.26	
L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0	.04	D= 0.010		×D= 0.16	T = 0		D= 0.02	4 '	Γ×D= 0.24
						ct on V. C. co					
Control	Τι	0.40	0.28	0.19	0.11	0.25	0.46	0.30	0.22	0.12	0.29
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	0.40	0.26	0.17	0.11	0.24	0.46	0.32	0.21	0.13	0.28
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	0.40	0.27	0.16	0.09	0.23	0.46	0.33	0.19	0.14	0.28
Parsley	T <sub>4</sub>	0.40	0.26	0.19	0.09	0.24	0.46	0.30	0.18	0.11	0.26
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	0.40	0.25	0.18	0.10	0.23	0.46	0.32	0.20	0.12	0.28
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	0.40	0.26	0.19	0.11	0.24	0.46	0.29	0.21	0.11	0.27
Radish root	Ţ۶	0.40	0.29	0.17	0.10	0.24	0.46	0.29	0.22	0.13	0.27
Blue gum	<u>T</u> 8	0.40	0.28	0.16	0.12	0.24	0.46	0.31	0.19	0.10	0.27
TBZ	T,	0.40	0.26	0.16	0.09	0.23	0.46	0.32	0.20	0.11	0.27
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	0.40	0.19	0.12	0.05	0.19	0.46	0.20	0.13	0.06	0.21
Means		0.40	0.26	0.17	0.10	1 - 5	0.46	0.30	0.20	0.11	
L.S.D. 0.05		T=0	.05.	D= 0.02	T×L	-0.070	T = 0	0.06	D= 0.02	4 7	7× <b>D=0.08</b> 0

T = Treatments

D = Storage period (days)

 $T \times D = Interaction$ 

Table (5): The effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on water soluble pectin % of Alphonso mango fruits for different storage periods (days) during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons

perious (days) during 2004 and 2003 storage seasons									
Treatments		Storage period (days)							
		Season 2004							
		0	10	20	30	Means			
			Water	r soluble pe	ectin (%)				
Control	Tı	0.400	0.483	0.492	0.850	0.556			
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	0.400	0.484	0.483	0.862	0.557			
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	0.400	0.482	0.494	0.851	0.557			
Parsley	T_4	0.400	0.481	0.496	0.860	0.559			
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	0.400	0.483	0.492	0.850	0.556			
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	0.400	0.473	0.493	0.841	0.552			
Radish root	T <sub>7</sub>	0.400	0.482	0.492	0.843	0.554			
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	0.400	0.471	0.481	0.852	0.551			
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	0.400	0.472	0.486	0.851	0.553			
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	0.400	0.406	0.436	0.517	0.440			
Means		0.400	0.471	0.485	0.818				
L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0	.32	D = 0.01	3	T×D=0.043			
				Season 20	05				
Control	T,	0.380	0.441	0.569	0.829	0.555			
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	0.380	0.442	0.579	0.845	0.562			
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	0.380	0.439	0.576	0.842	0.559			
Parsley	T₄	0.380	0.436	0.581	0.833	0.558			
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	0.380	0.440	0.581	0.843	0.561			
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	0.380	0.429	0.590	0.825	0.556			
Radish root	<b>T</b> <sub>7</sub>	0.380	0.437	0.588	0.827	0.558			
Blue gum	T <sub>8</sub>	0.380	0.436	0.571	0.840	0.557			
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	0.380	0.432	0.561	0.842	0.554			
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	0.380	0.383	0.436	0.536	0.434			
Means		0.380	0.432	0.563	0.806				
L.S.D. 0.05		T=0.	035	D= 0.01	4	$T \times D = 0.047$			

T = Treatments

D = Storage period (days)

 $T \times D = Interaction$ 

During cold storage in general the data in Tables (2, 3, 5, 6 and 7) showed that in 2004 and 2005, TSS%, weight loss %, decay % fruit, peel carotene content and water soluble pectin were increased. In the meantime the acid %, V.C. %, fruit firmness and fruit peel chlorophyll content were decreased by increase of storage period (Tables 3, 4 and 6). In line with these results those reported by Mitra (1997) working on mango fruits, Ismail (1998) working on apples and Atiaa (2003) working on peaches.

Table (6): The effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on Alphonso mango fruits peel pigments content during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons

		230113				Ctomore -	oriod (dans						
Treatments	8			Season 200		Storage p	period (days) Season 2005						
		0	10	20	30	Manna					Means		
	_		10	20		Means	0	10	20	30	MERUS		
Cambral	T <sub>1</sub>	10.0	7.10	2.10		phyll (mg/			2.02	1.00	716		
Control		10.0	7.10	3.10	1.90	5.53	9.90	6.16	3.03	1.56	5.16		
Peppermint		10.0	7.11	3.20	1,92	5,56	9.90	6.16	2.98	1.55	5.15		
Onion bulbs	<u>T</u> 3	10.0	7.13	3.14	1.88	5,54	9.90	6.30	2.99	1.50	5.17		
Parsley	<u>T</u> 4	10.0	7.22	3.09	1.79	5.53	9.90	6.22	3.01	1.64	5.19		
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	10.0	6.98	2.99	1.89	5.47	9.90	6.33	3.00	1.56	5.20		
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	10.0	6.96	2.98	1.78	5.43	9.90	6.11	2.90	1.50	5.10		
Radish root	<b>T</b> <sub>7</sub>	10.0	7.11	3.14	1.76	5.50	9.90	6.15	2.89	1.52	5.12		
Blue gum	T <sub>\$</sub>	10.0	7.00	305	1.77	5.46	9.90	6.17	3.00	1.50	5.14		
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	10.0	7.01	3.00	1.87	5.47	9.90	6.18	2.98	1.51	5.14		
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	10.0	5.00	2.01	0.79	4.45	9.90	3.46	1.82	0.63	3.95		
Means		10.0	6.86	2.97	1.74		9.90	5.92	2.86	1.45			
L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0.	30	D= 0.12	T×	D= 0.4	T = 0	27	D= 0.11	' T×	D= 0.36		
						Car	otene						
Control	Tı	2.10	6.06	10.11	13.60	7.97	2.26	6.36	11.11	14.08	8.45		
Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	2.10	6.07	10.20	13.75	8.03	2.26	6.40	11.22	14.05	8.48		
Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	2.10	6.11	10.12	13.77	8.03	2.26	6.45	11.25	14.06	8.51		
Parsley	T <sub>4</sub>	2.10	6.15	10.16	13.63	8.01	2.26	6.38	11.20	14.11	8.49		
Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	2.10	5.99	10.11	13.73	7.98	2.26	6.41	11.13	14.17	8.49		
Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	2.10	5.98	10.01	13.55	7.91	2.26	6.44	11.21	14.00	8.48		
Radish root	T <sub>7</sub>	2.10	6.00	9.99	13.61	7.93	2.26	6.47	11.23	14.15	8,53		
Blue gum	T <sub>s</sub>	2.10	6.01	10.00	13.60	7.93	2.26	6.38	11.16	14.13	8.48		
TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	2.10	5.96	10.14	13.76	7.99	2.26	6.41	10.98	13.98	8.41		
Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	2.10	8.12	15.60	17.00	10.71	2.26	8.20	17.11	19.01	11.65		
Means		2.10	6.25	10.64	14.00		2.26	6.59	11.76	14.57			
L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0.	40	D= 0.16	T×D=	0.53	T = 0	44	D= 0.18	T×	D= 0.31		

T = Treatments

D = Storage period (days)

Table (7): The effect of dipping treatments and forced hot air on fruits decay percentage of Alphonso mango fruits for different storage

periods (days) during 2004 and 2005 storage seasons

Control   T1   0.0   3.86   9.11   15.00   6.99	periou	s (uays)	during 20	V4 Allu ZV	us storage	SCASUIIS					
Control				Stora	ge period	(days)					
Control   T1   0.0   3.86   9.11   15.00   6.99	Treatments		2004								
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11Catiment.	0	10	20	30	Means					
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				L. L							
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Control	T <sub>1</sub>	0.0	3.86	9.11	15.00	6.99				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	0.0	3.60	8.95	14.96	6.88				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Parsley	T <sub>4</sub>	0.0	3.81	9.03	15.01	6.96				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	0.0	3.90	8.88	14.82	6.90				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Radish root	T <sub>7</sub>	0.0	3.66	8.90	15.11	6.92				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Blue gum	T <sub>s</sub>	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	0.0	1.28	3.35	5.16	2.45				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Forced hot air	T <sub>10</sub>	0.0	1.44	4.14	5.80	2.85				
Control         T1         0.0         4.15         9.80         16.66         7.65           Peppermint         T2         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.10         0.00           Onion bulbs         T3         0.0         3.96         9.71         16.90         7.64           Parsley         T4         0.0         4.02         9.99         16.60         7.65           Cinnamon         T5         0.0         0.0         0.0         0.00         0.00           Garden rocket         T6         0.0         4.11         9.86         17.63         7.60           Radish root         T7         0.0         4.20         9.60         16.76         7.64           Blue gum         T8         0.0         0.0         0.02         0.20         0.06           TBZ         T9         0.0         1.91         4.60         6.00         3.13           Forced hot air         T10         0.0         2.11         5.11         7.00         3.56	Means		0.0	2.16	5.24	8.60	4.00				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0	43	D = 0.17	D= 0.17 T×D=0.57					
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					2005						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Control	$T_1$	0.0	4.15	9.80	16.66	7.65				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Peppermint	T <sub>2</sub>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.10	0.00				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Onion bulbs	T <sub>3</sub>	0.0	3.96	9.71	16.90	7.64				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Parsley	T₄	0.0	4.02	9.99	16.60	7.65				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cinnamon	T <sub>5</sub>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00				
Blue gum         T <sub>8</sub> 0.0         0.0         0.02         0.20         0.06           TBZ         T <sub>9</sub> 0.0         1.91         4.60         6.00         3.13           Forced hot air         T <sub>10</sub> 0.0         2.11         5.11         7.00         3.56	Garden rocket	T <sub>6</sub>	0.0	4.11	9.86	17.63	7.60				
TBZ         T <sub>9</sub> 0.0         1.91         4.60         6.00         3.13           Forced hot air         T <sub>10</sub> 0.0         2.11         5.11         7.00         3.56	Radish root	T <sub>7</sub>	0.0	4.20	9.60	16.76	7.64				
Forced hot air T <sub>10</sub> 0.0 2.11 5.11 7.00 3.56	Blue gum	Tg	0.0	0.0	0.02	0.20					
	TBZ	T <sub>9</sub>	0.0	1.91	4.60	6.00	3.13				
	Forced bot air	T <sub>10</sub>	0.0	2.11	5.11	7.00	3.56				
1VICAUS 0.0 2.43 3.03 9.70 4.30	Means		0.0	2.45	5.85	9.76	4.50				
<b>L.S.D. 0.05</b> $T = 0.54$ $D = 0.22$ $T \times D = 0.73$	L.S.D. 0.05		T = 0.	54	D= 0.22	T×I	D= 0.73				

T = Treatments D = Storage period (days)

 $T \times D = Interaction$ 

We can conclude that from above results it can be recommended to treated mango fruits by each of the cinnamon, peppermint and blue gum oil plant materials extractions and forced hot air to reduced the incidence of fruit decay. Heat treatment improve fruit quality and firmness during cold storage but it is not advisable to store the fruits treated with parsley, Radish and onion bulb oil plant materials extractions because it did not result in any significant appreciable reduction in the incidence of fruit decay. As well as we can not adviser by using TBZ as a chemical production for keeping healthy, if we can use natural production.

## Comparing The Effect Of Natural & Chemical Treatments...1267

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is greatly thankful to all the staff members of Medical and Aromatic Plant Department, Faculty of Agricultural, University of Alexandria for their and help.

#### REFERENCES

- Arras, G. (1996): Mode of action of an isolate of *Candida famata* in biological control of *Penicillium digitatum* in orange fruits. Postharvest Biology and Technology 8 (3): 191-198 (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 75: 7492).
- Arras, G.; Piga, A. and D'Hallewin, G. (1996): Effectiveness of *Thymus capitatus* aerosol application at sub-atmospheric pressure to control green mold on "Avana" mandarin fruit. Acta Horticulturae No. 368, 382-386 ISBN 90-6605-236-8 [Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 75: 4684).
- Association of Official Agricultural Chemists "A.O.A.C." (1980): Official methods of analysis 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Association of official analytical chemists. Washington D.C., U.S.A.
- Attia, M.M. (2003): Response of three peach varieties to prestorage heat treatments. Alex. J. Agric. Res. 48(1): 93-101.
- Banks, N.H. (1984): Some effects of TAL prolong coating in ripening bananas. J. Exp. Bot. 35: 127-137.
- Barkai-Golan, R. and Phillips, D.J. (1991): Postharvest heat treatment of fresh fruits and vegetables for decay control. Plant Dis. 75 (11): 1085-1089.
- Baudoin. A.B.A.M. and Eckert, J.W. (1985): Development of resistance against Geotrichum candidum in lemon peel injuries. Phyto-pathology 75: 174-179.
- Ben-Yehoshua, S.; Rodov, V.; Fang, D.Q. and Kim, J.J. (1996): Preformed antifungal compounds of citrus fruit. Effect of postharvest treatments with heat and growth regulators. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 43 (4): 1062-1066 (Hort. Abst. 66 (1): 846).
- Ben-Yehoshua, S.; Shem-Tov, N.; Shapiro, B.; Moran, R. and Sharoni, J. (1990): A. Optimizing conditions for curing of pummelo fruit in order to reduce decay and extend its keeping qualities. In citriculture. Proceedings of the Sixth international citrus Congress Middle-East. Tel. Aviv., Israel Vol. 3. Pests and their management, integrated control in citrus growth, postharvest physiology and pathology
- Ben-Yehoshua, S.; Shapiro, B.; Kim, J.J.; Sharoni, J.; Carmeli, S. and Kamsman, Y. (1990): b. Resistance of citrus fruit to pathogens and its enhancement by curing. Citriculture, proceedings of the Sixth International Citrus Congress Middle-East, Tel. Aviv, Israel, Vol. 3. Pests and their management, integrated control in citrus growth, Postharvest physiology and pathology 1371-1379 (Horticultural-Abstracts 61: 775).
- Care, M.H. and Hayens, S. (1922): Estimation of pectic substances. Cited from Ranganna S. (1979): Mannual of Analysis of Fruit and Vegetables Products. New Delhi, Tate McGraw-Hill Publishing, Company, Chapter 2: 29-33.

- Clevenger, G.F. (1982): Apparatus for the determination of volatile oil. J. Pharm. Assoc., 71: 346-349.
- Couey, H.M. 1989. heat treatment for control of postharvest discesses and insect pests of fruits. Hort. Science, 24: 198-200.
- Davidson, P.M. and Parish, M.E. (1989): Methods for testing the efficacy of food antimicrobials. Food Technol. 43: 148-155.
- D'Hallewin, G.; Arras, G.; Castia, T. and Piga, A. (1996): Reducing decay of Avana mandarin fruit by the use of UV, heat and thiabendazole treatments. Acta Horticulturae No. 368: 387-394 (Rev. of Plant Path. 75: 4685).
- Elson, C.M.; Hayes, E.R. and Lidster, P.D. (1985): Development of the differentially permeable fruit coating nutri- save for the modified atmosphere storage of fruit p. 248-259. In S.M. Blankenship (ed.) Proc. 4<sup>th</sup> Nath C.A. Res. Conf. North Carolina State Univ. Raleigh. Hort. Rpt. 126.
- E-Zayat, H.E. (1996): Effects of some antidecay treatments on peaches and plumes quality after old storage. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 21 (8): 2935-2945.
- Gosh, A.K.; Tandon, R.N.; Bilgrami, K.S. and Srivastava, M.P. (1964): Studies on fungal diseases of some tropical fruits. II. Post infection changes in the sugar contents of some fruits. Phytopath. Z. 50: 283-288.
- Grodzinsky, A.M. and Grodzinsky, D.M. (1973): Short reference in plant physiology. Naukova Domka Riev. R.U.R., 433-434.
- Guenther, E. (1961): The essential oil. Vol. 1, 111, IV 4th Ed. Van Nastrabd Company. Inc. Prin Ceton, New Jersey Toronto New York, London.
- Han Tao, Li Liping and Gexing (1996): Physiological effect of heat shock treatment on peach fruit stored at low temperature. Plant Physiology Communications, 32(3) 184. [Hort-Abst. 67 (7): 5686].
- Hassanein, F.M. and Desheesh, M.A. (1997): Bacterial activity of some natural compounds and plant oils in comparison with streptomycin against pear. Fire blight disease (*Erwinia amylovoral*). Alex. Sci. Exch. Vol. 19(1): 25-37.
- Herger, G.; Klingauf, F.; Mangold, D.; Pommer, E. und Scherer, M. (1988): Die wirkung von Auszügen aus dem Sachalin- Staudenknöterich, Reynoutria sachalinensis (F. Schmidt) Naki, gegen Pilzkrankheiten, insbesondere Echte Mehltau-Pilze. Nachrichtenbl. Deutsch. Pflanzenschutzd (Braunschweing) 40: 56-60.
- Huang-Wanrong, Bai-Jiyun and hana-Tao (1993): Effect of temporary heat treatment the storage behaviour of "Okuba" peach fruits. Journal of Fruit-Science 10 (2): 73-76.
- Hussein, H.; Soliman, F.; Al-Rajhi, D. and Al-Frhan, A. (1996): Plant extracts as an alternative tool for pest control. Alex. Sci. Exch., 17 (2): 167-174.
- Ismail, H.A. (1998): Effect of semperfresh coating on apple fruit at storage. XXV International Horticultural Congress (IHC) Abs. 377 pp2/04/B-8.
- Jiratko, J. (1995): Effect of plant extracts on blue mould of citrus fruit (*Penicillium italicum* Wehmer) and grey mould (*Botrytis cinerea* Pres.). Ocrana Rostlin 30 (4): 273-282. Research Institute of Plant Production, 16100 prague-Ruzyne, Czech Republic. (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 74: 801).

### Comparing The Effect Of Natural & Chemical Treatments...1269

- Kim, J.J., Ben Yehoshua, S., Shapiro, B., Henis, Y and Carmeli, S. (1991): a. Accumulation of scoparone in heat-treated lemon fruit inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* Sacc. Plant Physiology 97 (3): 880-885.
- Klein, D.J.; Lurie, S. and Ben-Arie, R. (1990): Quality and cell wall components of "Anna" and "Granny Smith" apple treatment with heat, calcium and ethylene. J. Amer. Soc. Hert. Sci., 115 (6): 954.
- Lanza, C.M.; Russo, C.; Tomaselli, F.; Lanza, G. and Aleppo, E. DIM. (1994): Induction of scoparone in heat-treated "Tarocco" orange fruits inoculated with *Penicillium digitatum* Sacc. Agricoltura Mediterranea 124 (2-3): 154-158 (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 73: 1203).
- Mitra, S.K. (1997): Post Harvest Physiology and Storage of Tropical and Subtropical Fruits. CAP International, USA.
- Mulas, M.; Schirra, M. and Chessa, I. (1995): Responses of "Marsh Seedless" grapefruit to prestorage CaCl<sub>2</sub> treatments with or without fungicides. In postharvest physiology, pathology and technologies for horticultural commondities: recent advances. Proceedings of an international symposium held at Agadir, Morocco, 16-21 January (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 73: 4680).
- Moran, R. and D. Porath (1980): Chlorophyll determination in intact tissues using N, N-Dime-thyl formamide. Plant Physiol, 65-478-479.
- Paull, R.E. (1990): Postharvest heat treatments and fruit ripening. Postharvest News Info. 1, 355-363.
- Phillips, D.J. and Austin, R.K. (1982): Changes in peaches after hot water treatment. Plant Dis. 66: 487-488.
- Qamar, S. and Chaudhary, C.L. (1994): Antifungal activity of some essential oils from local plants. Pakistan Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research 34(1: 30-31. (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 73: 1941).
- Schirra, M. and Mulas, M. (1995): Influence of postharvest hot water dip and imazalil-fungicide treatments on cold-stored "DiMassa" lemons. Advances in Horticultural Science 9 (1): 43-46 (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 74: 6537).
- Schirra, M.; Agabbio, M.; Continella, g. and D'Aquino, S. (1995): Extension of kumquat fruit storage life by postharvest hot dip treatments in water and freshening agent. Advances in Horticultural Science, 9 (2): 83-86 (Hort. Abst., 66(1): 845.
- Sharp, J.L.; Gaffiney, J.J.; Moss, J.I. and Gould W.P. (1991): Hot-air treatment device for guarantine research. J. Econ. Entomol. 84: 520-527.
- Singh, A.K.; Dickshit, A. Sharma, M.L. and Dixit, S.N. (1980): Fungitoxic activity of some essential oils. Econ. Bol. 34: 186-190.
- Siveropoulou, A.; Kokkini, S.; Lanaras, T. and Arsenakis, M. (1995): Antimicrobial activity of mint essential oils. J. Agirc. Food. Chem. 43 (9): 2384-2388.
- Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. (1971): Statistical methods. 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Fourth Printing the Iowa State Univ. Press Ames., Iowa, U.S.A.
- Williams, M.H.; Brown, M.A., Vesk, M. and Brady, C (1994): Effect of postharvest heat treatments on fruit quality, surface structure, and fungal disease in Valencia oranges. Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture, 34 (8): 1183-1190 (Rev. of Plant Path. Vol. 73: 1876).

مقارنة تأثير بعض المعاملات الطبيعية والكيماوية على السيطرة على أمراض ما بعد الحصاد الفطرية لثمار المانجو القونس خلال التخزين المبرد

إقبال زكريا على أحمد محطة بحوث البساتين بالصبحية – الإسكندرية – مركز البحوث الزراعية – مصر.

أجريت هذه الدراسة خلال موسمي ٢٠٠٤ و٢٠٠٥ لمقارنة تأثير معاملات ما بعد الحصاد باستخدام الزيوت النباتية المستخلصة من أوراق الفلفل والبصل والبقدونس والقرفة والنعناع والفجل والكافور بتركيز ١٠% وكذلك المبيد الفطري TBZ لمعاملات غمر الثمار بتركيز ١٠٠٠ جزء في المليون وكذلك استخدام هواء ساخن مدفوع على درجة حرارة ٤٨°م (لمدة ساعتين) ورطوبة نسبية ٩٠ – ٩٠% على خواص المانجو الكيميانية والطبيعية والحسية وكذلك حساب النسبة المئوية للثمار المصابة بالأمراض الفطرية خلال تخزين الثمار لمدة شهر على درجة حرارة ١٣°م ورطوبة نسبية ٩٠% 90% أظهرت النتائج المتحصل عليها خلال عامي ٢٠٠٤ – ٢٠٠٥ أن محتوى الثمار من الس T.S.S. وفيتامين جد والبكتين الذائب والصبغات لم تتأثر بجميع معاملات الغمر (زيوت النباتات المستخلصة). بينما معاملة الحرارة أنت إلى زيادة سبة الفقد في الوزن والصلابة ونسبة الكاروتين وقللت فيتامين جــ ونسبة الحموضة ومحتوى جلد الثمار من الكلوروفيل. بينما معاملة الثمار بالـــ TBZ أنت إلى زيادة نسبة الفقد في الوزن. وكذلك أدت معاملة الثمار بكل من زيت الفلفل أوالقرفة أوالكافور والسد TBZ والحرارة بالتتابع إلى تقليل نسبة الإصابة بالأمراض الفطرية وفي نفس الوقت معاملة الثمار بالزيوت المستخلصة من البصل أوالبقدونس أوالنعناع أوالفجل لم يكن لها أي تأثير معنوى على نسبة الإصابة بالأمراض الفطرية.