



Study on Physico-Chemical Properties of Value Added Guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) Toffee during Storage

Arvind Saini ^{a++*}, V. M. Prasad ^{a#} and Saket Mishra ^{a†}

^a Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, U.P., 211007, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i183312

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/103296>

Original Research Article

Received: 15/05/2023

Accepted: 17/07/2023

Published: 19/07/2023

ABSTRACT

The present experiment was carried out during June 2022 to September 2022 in post-harvest laboratory of Department of Horticulture, SHUATS, Prayagraj. The experiment was conducted in (CRD) completely randomized design, with ten treatments which were replicated thrice. The treatments were T₀: (Blanching) Control, T₁: (Blanching) Sugar 70% + Chocolate 10% + Mango 0.5%, T₂: (Blanching) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% + Strawberry 0.5%, T₃: (Blanching) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% + Orange 0.5%, T₄: (Blanching) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%, T₅: (Sulphitation) control, T₆: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% + Mango 0.5%, T₇: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% + strawberry 0.5%, T₈: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% +Orange 0.5%, T₉: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%. The Guava toffee was stored for 45 days at ambient temperature. From the present investigation it is found that treatment T₄ is superior in respect of physico-chemical parameters like total soluble solids, acidity, ascorbic acid, pH and total sugar.

⁺⁺M.Sc. Scholar;

[#] Professor;

[†] Assistant Professor;

*Corresponding author: E-mail: saini.arvind11301@gmail.com;

Treatment T₄ is also found superior in organoleptic scoring of Guava toffee. In terms of benefit cost ratio the net return, was also found T₄ and minimum was recorded in T₀ in all the parameters.

Keywords: Guava; toffee; physico-chemical properties; economics.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Guava (*Psidium guajava* L.) is one of the most important subtropical fruit crops. It belongs to family myrtaceae. Guava is a native tropical America perhaps from Mexico and Peru. It is widely distributed all over the equatorial regions of the tropical and sub-tropical climate. It is commonly called poor man’s fruit” [1]. “It is a big source of Vitamins C, A, B (riboflavin) and minerals like calcium, phosphorus and iron. It contains about 180-300 mg of vit. per 100 g of pulp” [2]. “Its juice is used to blend the pear and peach juice. Guava fruits are used as mixed fruit chats in parties”. [3]. “It is a big source of Vitamins C, A, B (riboflavin) and minerals like calcium, phosphorus and iron. It contains about 180-300 mg of vit. per 100 g of pulp. Ripe guava fruits contain 14 percent TSS; 0.3 percent acidity and 7 percent fiber. Guava fruits are used for Jam and Jelly and toffee making” [4]. “Guava is considered to be one of the exquisite, nutritionally valuable and remunerative crops, bears heavy crop every year and give good economic returns. This has prompted several farmers to take up guava orcharding on a commercial scale. In recent years, guava is gaining popularity in the international trade due to its nutritional value and processed products. Guava is rich source of vitamin A, 250 I.U. and vitamin B, 0.7 mg. niacin 1.2 mg., Vitamin C, 302 mg. Calcium 30mg. phosphorous 29 mg. carbs 17.1 gm., protein 1.0 gm. Calories. The ripe fruit is usually eaten as desert, it can also utilize in many ways for making jellies, jam, paste, juice, toffee, baby food, syrup and other processed products” [5].

"Fruit toffee are made from pulpy fruit like banana, mango, jackfruit, guava etc. fruit are grown seasonally and are perishable in nature. Fruit preservation technique enable the mankind to enjoy fruit during even off-season fruit toffee are one such product. Fruit toffee are highly nutritious products compared to sugar boiled confectionaries. The prerequisite for this project is availability of fruit all round the year. The state of Uttaranchal produces many fruit and thus availability round the year would not be a problem. The technology is easy and

standardized and the capital cost of the project is also not very high” [6].

“Among the different products of guava toffee is preferred by all groups of people but standardized recipe of a good quality toffee has not yet been reported. Undoubtedly this product holding all the characteristics of guava will not have a good market value with longer shelf life than its other products” [7].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present investigation entitled “Study on physico-chemical properties of value added guava toffee during storage” was laid out in the Post Harvest Lab Department of Horticulture, Prayagraj for a period of 6 months (Sept 2022-Feb 2023). In respect of physico-chemical parameters like total soluble solids, acidity, ascorbic acid, pH and total sugar. The treatments were T₀: (Blanching) Control, T₁: (Blanching) Sugar 70%+Chocolate 10% + Mango 0.5%, T₂: (Blanching) Sugar 70%+chocolate 10% + Strawberry 0.5%, T₃: (Blanching) Sugar 70%+chocolate 10% +Orange 0.5%, T₄: (Blanching) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%, T₅: (Sulphitation) control, T₆: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% +Mango 0.5%, T₇: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% +strawberry 0.5%, T₈: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70%+chocolate 10% + Orange 0.5%, T₉: (Sulphitation) Sugar 70% + chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Total Soluble Solids (TSS) of guava toffee was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. The total soluble solid of Guava toffee differed significantly in all the treatments as well as during storage period at 0, 15, 30, and 45 Days. The highest total soluble solid (⁰Brix) observed was (78.9) with the treatment T₉ followed by T₄ While the lowest total soluble solid (⁰Brix) observed was (71.6) with the treatment. This findings correlates the findings of Ahmad and Tariq [8], Manivasagan et al. [9] and Mall and Tandon [10].

pH of was guava toffee observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under

ambient storage conditions lowest pH observed was (3.75) with the treatment T₂, followed by treatment T₁, the lowest pH highest was (5.58) with the treatment T₄. This findings correlates the findings of Braimwelland Badrie [11], Siddiqui [12] and Khushbu et al. [13].

Acidity of guava toffee was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions lowest acidity (%) observed was (0.18) with the treatment, T₀, T₃, While the maximum acidity (%) observed was (.288) T₆ This findings correlates the findings of Rathoreet al. [14] and Khushbu et al. [13].

Ascorbic acid (mg/100g) of guava toffee was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. maximum ascorbic acid (mg/100 g) observed was (19.02) with the treatment T₄, followed by T₃, T₂. While the lowest ascorbic acid (mg/100 g) observed was (13.87) with the treatment T₀. Similar results were reported by Daisy and Gehlot [15] in Aonla preserve, singh) et al. [16]

Reducing sugar (%) of guava toffee was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. maximum reducing sugar observed was (10.30) with the treatment T₀ (Blanching) Control, followed by treatment, T₁, T₅, While the maximum Reducing sugar (%) observed was (14.50) with the treatment T₄. Similar results were reported by Daisy and Gehlot [15] in Aonla preserve.

Non-reducing sugar (%) of guava toffee was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. lowest non-reducing sugar observed was (6.1) with the treatment T₀ Control followed by treatment, T₅, T₁ While the minimum Non-Reducing sugar (%) observed was (3.89) with the treatment T₄. Non-reducing sugar in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its shelf life. Usually, high sugar content makes the moisture unavailable for the growth of microorganisms, thus improves the shelf life of food. Similar results were reported by Daisy and Gehlot [15] in Aonla preserve.

Total sugar (%) of guava toffee was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. maximum total sugar maximum total sugar (%) observed was (18.39) with the treatment T₄ followed by treatment, T₈, T₂ While the lowest total sugar (%) observed was (16.40) with the treatment T₀.

Similar results were reported by Krishnaveni et al. (2001) in jack fruit RTS, Jain et al. [17] in papaya cubes.

Colour and Appearance (sensory score) of guava toffee was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. highest score of colour was noted (8.62) with the T₃ treatment followed by treatment T₉, While least score of colour was noted (6.7) with the treatment T₀. Colour and in any food commodity plays important role in deciding its market value. colour is an attribute of food quality and loss of colour by osmotic dehydration process is one of the most significant changes. Similar results were reported by mondal et al., in aonla candy [18].

Flavour (sensory score) of guava toffee was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions highest score of Flavour was noted (8.63) with the treatment T₄ followed by treatment, T₃, T₂ While least score of Flavour was noted (6.4) with the treatment T₀ This findings correlates the findings of Rathore et al. [14], Shakti et al. [19] and Khushbu et al. [13].

Taste (sensory score) of guava toffee was observed to decrease continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. flavour was noted (8.54) with the treatment T₃ followed by treatment, T₂ While least score of Taste was noted (6.45) with the treatment T₀. This might be due to degradation of volatile substance and flavor constituents. Similar results were reported by Ames [20] and Chavan [21] in Jackfruit products.

Consistency (sensory score) of guava toffee was decrease continuously up to end of research under ambient storage condition the , highest score of Consistency was noted (7.39) with the treatment T₂ followed by treatment T₁, While least score of Consistency was noted (6.8) with the treatment T₀ Control. The finding correlates the findings of Nidhi, Prasad, V. M. et al. [22].

Overall acceptability (sensory score) of guava toffee was observed to increase continuously up to the end of research under ambient storage conditions. highest score of overall acceptability was noted (8.54) with the treatment T₃ followed by treatment T₄ While least score of overall acceptability was noted (6.4) with the treatment T₀ Control, This findings correlates the findings of Vikram and Singh [23] and Rekha et al. [24].

Table 1. Effect of flavour on TSS (^oBrix), p^H and Acidity % of guava toffee during storage

| S.No. | Treatment | Total soluble solid (^o Brix) | | | | pH | | | | Acidity (%) | | | |
|-------|---------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days |
| 1 | T0 | 74.150 | 72.963 | 73.700 | 74.041 | 5.047 | 5.092 | 5.135 | 5.793 | 0.226 | 0.225 | 0.233 | 0.195 |
| 2 | T1 | 72.883 | 73.630 | 74.580 | 74.840 | 4.550 | 4.660 | 5.223 | 5.371 | .189 | 0.256 | 0.247 | 0.243 |
| 3 | T2 | 73.103 | 74.310 | 74.643 | 74.970 | 3.757 | 4.893 | 5.193 | 5.583 | 0.268 | 0.259 | 0.255 | 0.244 |
| 4 | T3 | 71.603 | 75.413 | 75.633 | 75.473 | 5.020 | 5.077 | 5.077 | 5.290 | 0.250 | 0.247 | 0.256 | 0.239 |
| 5 | T4 | 76.927 | 71.713 | 72.517 | 72.843 | 5.589 | 5.329 | 5.239 | 5.679 | 0.263 | 0.257 | 0.251 | 0.267 |
| 6 | T5 | 73.573 | 72.400 | 72.103 | 71.820 | 5.550 | 5.400 | 5.127 | 5.027 | 0.285 | 0.269 | 0.278 | 0.257 |
| 7 | T6 | 74.980 | 77.073 | 77.327 | 77.640 | 4.850 | 5.083 | 4.933 | 5.365 | 0.288 | .271 | 0.278 | 0.270 |
| 8 | T7 | 73.893 | 75.013 | 75.580 | 75.907 | 4.792 | 4.860 | 4.997 | 5.202 | 0.275 | 0.282 | 0.275 | 0.252 |
| 9 | T8 | 76.277 | 75.000 | 75.680 | 75.567 | 5.280 | 5.070 | 5.367 | 5.771 | 0.274 | 0.271 | 0.261 | 0.226 |
| 10 | T9 | 78.990 | 76.447 | 76.983 | 76.760 | 4.893 | 5.020 | 5.160 | 5.370 | .250 | 0.264 | 0.249 | 0.210 |
| | F-Test | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| | S.EM | 0.257 | 0.307 | 0.219 | 0.200 | .220 | 0.241 | 0.249 | 0.251 | 0.348 | 0.256 | 0.008 | 0.025 |
| | C.D. at 0.5% | 0.763 | 0.913 | 0.652 | 0.593 | 0.654 | 0.865 | 5.490 | 0.634 | .032 | .0176 | 0.025 | .0187 |

Table 2. Effect of flavour on ascorbic acid (mg/100 g) reducing sugar % and non-reducing sugar % of guava toffee during storage

| S.No. | Treatment | Ascorbic acid (mg/100 g) | | | | Reducing sugar (%) | | | | Non- reducing sugar (%) | | | |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days |
| 1 | T0 | 13.873 | 13.807 | 13.753 | 13.443 | 10.307 | 11.543 | 12.593 | 13.580 | 6.100 | 6.125 | 6.867 | 7.062 |
| 2 | T1 | 17.539 | 17.363 | 17.297 | 17.307 | 11.203 | 12.690 | 13.690 | 15.570 | 5.400 | 5.627 | 5.840 | 5.910 |
| 3 | T2 | 18.113 | 17.553 | 17.260 | 17.413 | 12.517 | 13.613 | 14.683 | 16.383 | 4.817 | 4.887 | 5.600 | 5.097 |
| 4 | T3 | 18.443 | 18.203 | 18.277 | 18.247 | 13.437 | 14.580 | 15.677 | 16.653 | 4.047 | 4.790 | 4.723 | 5.783 |
| 5 | T4 | 19.022 | 18.567 | 18.233 | 18.323 | 14.507 | 15.653 | 16.727 | 18.447 | 3.892 | 4.782 | 4.639 | 4.919 |
| 6 | T5 | 14.757 | 14.973 | 14.650 | 14.500 | 11.527 | 12.663 | 14.233 | 15.397 | 5.522 | 5.829 | 5.362 | 5.876 |
| 7 | T6 | 15.267 | 15.757 | 14.943 | 14.580 | 11.630 | 12.710 | 13.820 | 15.257 | 5.441 | 5.771 | 5.746 | 5.994 |
| 8 | T7 | 16.980 | 16.043 | 15.357 | 15.913 | 11.947 | 13.350 | 14.490 | 15.620 | 5.167 | 5.220 | 5.213 | 5.893 |
| 9 | T8 | 17.287 | 16.820 | 15.673 | 16.910 | 12.140 | 13.397 | 14.547 | 15.623 | 5.256 | 5.286 | 5.112 | 5.849 |
| 10 | T9 | 14.747 | 14.323 | 14.057 | 13.960 | 11.617 | 12.587 | 13.407 | 14.703 | 4.943 | 5.700 | 6.053 | 5.740 |
| | F-Test | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| | S.EM | 0.329 | 0.394 | 0.380 | 0.216 | 0.178 | 0.087 | 0.139 | 0.118 | 0.26 | 0.135 | 0.197 | 0.153 |
| | C.D. at 0.5% | 0.976 | 1.170 | 1.128 | 0.643 | 0.529 | 0.260 | 0.414 | 0.351 | 0.800 | 0.402 | 0.584 | 0.455 |

Table 3. Effect of flavour on total sugar, colour and flavour of guava toffee during storage

| S.No. | Treatment | Total sugar % | | | | Colour | | | | Flavour | | | |
|-------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days |
| 1 | T0 | 16.407 | 17.668 | 19.460 | 20.642 | 6.700 | 6.363 | 6.437 | 6.063 | 6.413 | 6.487 | 6.353 | 5.977 |
| 2 | T1 | 16.603 | 18.317 | 19.530 | 21.480 | 8.603 | 8.317 | 8.477 | 7.670 | 8.427 | 8.587 | 8.410 | 8.170 |
| 3 | T2 | 17.333 | 18.500 | 20.283 | 21.480 | 8.617 | 8.457 | 8.527 | 8.167 | 8.537 | 8.607 | 8.467 | 8.220 |
| 4 | T3 | 17.483 | 19.370 | 20.400 | 22.437 | 8.627 | 8.450 | 8.530 | 8.440 | 8.550 | 8.630 | 8.493 | 8.230 |
| 5 | T4 | 18.399 | 20.436 | 21.366 | 23.366 | 8.523 | 8.543 | 8.270 | 8.387 | 8.633 | 8.360 | 8.440 | 8.237 |
| 6 | T5 | 17.049 | 18.492 | 19.596 | 21.272 | 7.793 | 7.403 | 7.477 | 7.387 | 7.513 | 7.587 | 7.557 | 7.563 |
| 7 | T6 | 17.071 | 18.481 | 19.566 | 21.251 | 8.333 | 7.900 | 7.657 | 7.707 | 7.997 | 7.753 | 7.757 | 7.707 |
| 8 | T7 | 17.113 | 18.570 | 19.703 | 21.513 | 8.297 | 8.170 | 7.597 | 7.604 | 8.270 | 7.697 | 8.143 | 7.643 |
| 9 | T8 | 17.396 | 18.682 | 19.659 | 21.472 | 8.333 | 8.377 | 7.577 | 7.633 | 8.457 | 7.657 | 8.374 | 7.757 |
| 10 | T9 | 16.560 | 18.287 | 19.460 | 20.443 | 7.787 | 7.543 | 7.557 | 7.350 | 7.623 | 7.637 | 7.517 | 7.517 |
| | F-Test | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| | S.EM | 0.193 | 0.107 | 0.116 | 0.150 | 0.079 | 0.084 | 0.172 | 0.171 | 0.130 | 0.189 | 0.119 | 0.115 |
| | C.D. at 0.5% | 0.574 | 0.319 | 0.344 | 0.446 | 0.235 | 0.249 | 0.512 | 0.509 | 0.386 | 0.562 | 0.353 | 0.342 |

Table 4. Effect of flavour on score of taste, consistency and overall acceptability and benefit cost ratio of guava toffee during storage

| S.No. | Treatment | Taste | | | | Consistency | | | | overall acceptability | | | | B:C Ratio |
|-------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| | | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | 0 Day | 15 Days | 30 Days | 45 Days | |
| 1 | T0 | 6.457 | 5.833 | 5.730 | 5.257 | 6.883 | 6.510 | 6.013 | 5.363 | 6.413 | 6.277 | 5.813 | 5.420 | 1.08 |
| 2 | T1 | 8.383 | 7.730 | 7.663 | 7.457 | 7.557 | 7.393 | 7.067 | 6.480 | 8.430 | 8.197 | 7.797 | 7.373 | 1.46 |
| 3 | T2 | 8.510 | 8.487 | 7.753 | 7.563 | 7.396 | 7.370 | 6.623 | 6.550 | 8.270 | 8.117 | 8.480 | 7.533 | 1.40 |
| 4 | T3 | 8.543 | 8.343 | 7.657 | 7.550 | 6.877 | 7.250 | 6.973 | 6.547 | 8.540 | 8.313 | 8.323 | 7.817 | 1.45 |
| 5 | T4 | 8.307 | 8.210 | 8.257 | 7.537 | 6.904 | 6.853 | 6.687 | 6.583 | 8.507 | 8.193 | 8.173 | 8.087 | 1.63 |
| 6 | T5 | 7.390 | 7.367 | 6.953 | 6.577 | 6.851 | 6.787 | 6.610 | 6.540 | 7.703 | 7.533 | 7.437 | 7.420 | 1.53 |
| 7 | T6 | 7.543 | 7.380 | 7.247 | 6.973 | 7.323 | 7.147 | 6.890 | 6.480 | 7.690 | 7.570 | 7.460 | 7.393 | 1.51 |
| 8 | T7 | 7.483 | 7.290 | 7.313 | 6.763 | 7.020 | 6.613 | 6.803 | 6.613 | 7.983 | 7.876 | 7.363 | 7.220 | 1.51 |
| 9 | T8 | 7.280 | 6.867 | 6.860 | 6.953 | 6.941 | 6.937 | 6.943 | 6.660 | 8.047 | 7.557 | 7.070 | 7.203 | 1.56 |
| 10 | T9 | 7.490 | 6.890 | 6.777 | 6.403 | 6.750 | 6.773 | 6.787 | 6.387 | 7.597 | 7.283 | 6.937 | 6.823 | 1.59 |
| | F-Test | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | |
| | S.EM | 0.174 | 0.128 | 0.103 | 0.197 | 0.121 | 0.174 | 0.121 | 0.150 | 0.112 | 0.147 | 0.148 | 0.146 | |
| | C.D. at 0.5% | 0.518 | 0.380 | 0.305 | 0.586 | 0.359 | 0.517 | 0.359 | 0.447 | 0.332 | 0.436 | 0.440 | 0.435 | |

4. CONCLUSION

Based on present investigation, it is concluded treatment T₄ [(Blanching) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% +Pineapple 0.5%] was best in terms of best recipe with value addition for preparation of papaya candy. The same treatment T₄ [(Blanching) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%] was found best in terms of quality changes in papaya candy during storage. The maximum B:C ratio was observed in T₄ [(Blanching) Sugar 70%+ chocolate 10% + Pineapple 0.5%].

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. AOAC. Official method of Analysis, (17 th ed.). Washington DC, USA; 2002.
2. S. Bhattarai, and R. Kusma, Preparation and quality evaluation of sugar and honey based beetroot candies, sustainability in Food and Agriculture. 2022;3(1):15-18. Available:<http://doi.org/10.26480/sfna.01.2022.15.18>.
3. Borokini TI. Ethnomedical significance, mineral composition and phytochemicals constituents of Carica Papaya in Oyo state, International Journal of Current Research. 2012;4(3):43-48. Available:<http://www.journalcra.com>
4. Chaudhary V, Kumar V, Singh J, Kumar R. Effect of Hot Air Oven Drying on the Moisture Kinetics and Drying Rate of Osmo-Dried Papaya (*Carica papaya* L.) Slices, International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8(2):1945-1951. Available:<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2019.802.226>
5. CIHAR Standard. Carbohydrate and sweetness of honey. 2017;11:07. Retrieved 06 26, 2022. Available:https://cdn.agclassroom.org/media/uploads/2017/11/07/Carbohydrates_and_the_Sweetness_of_Honey.pdf
6. Durrani AM, Srivastava P, Verma S. Development and quality evaluation of selected honey based carrot candy, Journal of Food Science and Technology. 2009;48(4):502-505. Available:<http://hdl.handle.net/10603/57546>
7. FAO-Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations FAOSTAT. Available:<http://www.fao.org/faostat/es/#data/QC/visualize> Accessed 22 Oct 2018, 2016.
8. Ahmad Tariq. Effect of different levels of sugar and citric acid on the physico-chemical properties of Apple jam, Thesis, M.Sc., Horticulture, AAIDU. 2004;18.
9. Manivassagan S, Rana GS, KumarS, Joon MS. Qualitative changes in karonda (*Carissa carandus* Linn.) candy during storage at room temperature. Haryana J. Hort. Sci. 2006;35(1&2):19-21.
10. MallIP, Tondon DK. Development of guava-aonla blended beverage. Acta Hort. 2007;(735):555-560.
11. Braimwell MG, Badric N. Processing and quality evaluation of banana cheese, J. Food. Sci. & Tech. (Indian). 2002;39:94-95.
12. Siddiqui AR. Effect of different levels of sugar and citric acid on the physico-chemical properties of pear jam. Thesis, M.Sc. horticulture Fruit Production and PHT AAIDU. 2004;34-35.
13. Khushbu, Vijay Bahadur, Prasad VM, Mishra Saket, Paul V. Study on Preparation and Characterization of Value Added Herbal Beverage of Anonla (*Embllica officinales* Gaertn.) cv. NA-6. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2017;6(9):2373-2379.
14. RathoreHA, Sammi TMS, Soomro AH. Effect of storage on physico-chemical composition and sensory properties of mango. Pk. J. Nutrition. 2007;6(2):143-148.29.
15. Daisy, Gehlot R. Physical and bio-chemical changes in fresh aonla fruits and preserve of cvs. Banarasi and Chakaiya. Haryana Journal of Horticulture Sciences. 2006; 35(1):57-9.
16. Singh, Arvind, Devi Singh, Lakshmi Bala K. Postharvest impact of different sugar levels on dragon fruit (*Hylocereus undatus*) Candy. International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. 2023;35(16):302-309.
17. Jain SK, Verma RC, Mathur AN, Murdia LK. Studies on osmotic dehydration of papaya cubes. Journal of Interacademia. 2004;8(2):221-9.
18. Mondal SC, Kamal MM, Mumin MIA, Hosain MM, Ali MR. Effect of sucrose on the physicochemical properties, organoleptic qualities and shelf-life stability of aonla (*Embllica officinalis*) candy. IOSR

- J Environ Sci Toxicol Food Technol. 2017; 11:85-94.
19. Shakti Chandra Mondal, Md. Mostafa Kamal, Mustafshak Ali Mumin, Md.Mojaffor Hosain, Md. Rahmat Ali. Effect of Sucrose on the Physicochemical Properties, Organoleptic Qualities and Shelf-Life Stability of Aonla (*Emblica officinalis*) Candy. IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology (IOSR-JESTFT). 2017; 85-94.
 20. Ames JM. Browning. Encyclopedia of Food Science and Nutrition (2nd). Elsevier; 2003.
 21. Chavan UD, Prabhukhanolkar AE, Panwar VD. Preparation of osmotic Dehydration ripe banana slices. Journal of Food Sciences and Technology. 2010;47(4):380-6.
 22. Nidhi Prasad R, Prasad VM, Sheikh S. Development of carrot cheese through value addition with guava, The Allahabad Farmer. 2011;LXVI(2):132-135.
 23. Vikram Balaji, Singh Purnima Sikarwar. Studies on Preparation of Value Added Herbal Kinnow –Aonla Beverages (RTS and Squash) during Storage. Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 2018;6(1):758-765.
 24. Rekha Kailey, Kajal Dhawan, Prasad Rasane, Jyoti Singh, Sawinder Kaur, Bhanu Pratap Singh, et al. Utilization of Foeniculumvulgarein herbal candy preparation and analysing its effect on the physico-chemical and sensory properties. Current Science. 2019;116:12,25.

© 2023 Saini et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/103296>