

(1- MCP) -1

* *

Elberta (Prunus persica L.)
 20 (5 1 0.5) 1- MCP
 30
 1- MCP
 42 °C
 °21
 °1
 42

.1- MCP

1- MCP :

(Fan et al., 2002)

(Mitchell and Kader,1989)

5148

1996

42620

51607

6515

2005

(Eksteen, 1984; Von Mollendorf, 1987)

(2006)

)

(Von Mollendorf ,1987)

30621 . . *

1987

Von Mollendorf

.2009/2/1

2008/8/18

al., 2000; Xuon and Streif, 2003).

(Streif,2002; Streif, 2003a and b)

Von Mollendorf and De 1979 Anderson
1992 Villiers

(Watkins , 2002 ; Streif, 2003a)
(Hayama and Kashimura, 2005)

Controlled Atmosphere
O₂ CO₂

1 12
/ 1- MCP

(Ping *et al.*, 2005)

0.5 1- MCP *Qingzhoumitao*
°13 24³ /
°0.5 ± 0

(AVG)

(Kader *et al.*, 1982)

(Carlos *et al.*, 2004) (% 17) CO₂

(1 -MCP) -1

Summer Rich

24 1 1- MCP
72

(Sisler and
Blankenship,1996;Mathooko *et al.*, 2001)

(Dal Cin *et al.*, 2005)

(Fan *et al.*, 2002)

Elberta 1- MCP

Metabolism

(Burton, 1982)

(Murr and De
Shior

°5
Ell , 2003)

Ethylene Receptors

Fantasia
1- MCP

(Pech *et al.*, 1994 ; Sisler and

1- (Serek , 1997
MCP

:
Elberta

-
- (C₄H₆)

°1

(Watkins *et al.*, 2000; Streif, 2002;
Blankenship and Dole, 2003; Rupasinghe *et*

-1

10

-1

Prunus persica L.

:

. Elberta

-2

-

2007/9/9

2000

-3

0.1

2007/4/15

(Celso *et al.*, pH=8.2

2002)

-1

$$X\% = (a \times k / e) \times 100$$

0

(1

$$= X$$

0.5

(2

/ NaOH

$$= a$$

1

(3

$$= k$$

5

(4

$$= e$$

RQeasy

:C

-4

-1

.Ascorbic

° 21

20

% 5± 90

C° 1± 1

3

3-2

-

:

A4,A3,A2,A1

(0.5)

)] = %

B2,B1

/ (

.100 × [

Costat

.% 5

LSD

30

72 24

-1

(Hayama and Kashimura, 2005)

² / 6.4

1- MCP 'Akatsuki'

(1)

1 12

42

% 58

1- MCP

-2

5

(2)

+

5

1- MCP

² / 3.93 3.63)

42

42 (

% 70 <

1 0.5

1-MCP

28

0.5

5

()

1-MCP

1-MCP

42

% 0.37 0.4

/ 3.4 3.43

1-MCP

30

% 47

14 ²

42

1-MCP

42

1-MCP

1-MCP

(%0.15)

5 1 0.5

1-MCP

0.24

(Fan *et al.*,

% 0.27 0.22

'Elberta'

2002)

0

1-MCP

%0.40 0.31 0.37

°5

1-MCP

42 %0.24

(Dal Cin *et al.*, 2005)

1

1-MCP

'Summer Rich'

(4) 100 / C
 C 1-MCP
 (Balmush and Salkova, 1988)
 C
 :
 36.7 0.5
 5 1 100/
 100/ 35.43 33.2 (Fica, 1985)
 (TSS%) -3
 (3)
 C 12.78 %16.54 %16.83)
 42 100/ ()
 100 / 17.32
 (Schulz, 2000)
 (Schulz, 2000) . 0.5) 1-MCP
 C (5 1
 C 42
 17.57)
 .(4) 42 (%17.79 17
 .5 1-MCP TSS
 (5)
 TSS
 .(Liu et al., 2005)
 (3)
 TSS
 42 % 12.37
 % 2
 1-MCP
 .
 .(Weis and Bramlage , 2002)
 10 100 C .4
 . 42 19.73

%80 (Osterloh, 1980)

5

1-MCP

(%1.5)

42

(Little *et al.*, 1982)

(Zagory ,1998 ; Jobling ,2001)

(² /)

1- MCP

(1) :

	. °1								
	42		28		14		6.40		
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	
2.93	0.0	0.95	1.40	1.45	3.40	3.43	6.40	6.40	
4.63	3.53	3.03	4.28	4.25	4.03	5.13	6.40	6.40	0.5 ppm 1-MCP
4.81	3.32	3.23	3.93	4.50	5.80	4.88	6.40	6.40	1 ppm 1-MCP
4.19	3.63	3.93	3.78	4.15	5.28	5.25	6.40	6.40	5 ppm 1-MCP
4.35	2.62	2.79	3.35	3.90	4.63	4.67	6.40	6.40	
	2.71		3.63		4.65		6.40		

LSD 5% () = 0.409.

LSD 5% () = 0.673.

LSD 5% (X) = 1.156.

1-MCP : (2)

. °1

	42		28		14		PE	PE	
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE			
0.59	0.24	0.15	0.66	0.51	0.73	0.62	0.94	0.94	
0.66	0.37	0.24	0.69	0.55	0.78	0.77	0.94	0.94	0.5 ppm 1-MCP
0.68	0.31	0.22	0.70	0.61	0.92	0.76	0.94	0.94	1 ppm 1-MCP
0.66	0.40	0.27	0.56	0.53	0.78	0.84	0.94	0.94	5 ppm 1-MCP
0.62	0.33	0.22	0.65	0.55	0.80	0.75	0.94	0.94	
	0.28		0.60		0.78		0.94		

LSD 5% () = 0.033.
 LSD 5% () = 0.047.
 LSD 5% (X) = 0.729.

1-MCP : (3)

. °1

(%)

	42		28		14		PE	PE	
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE			
16.54	17.72	15.30	16.37	16.33	16.58	16.38	16.83	16.83	
17.57	19.65	16.70	18.48	17.05	17.90	17.13	16.83	16.83	0.5 ppm 1-MCP
17.00	18.65	16.70	17.00	16.75	17.88	15.38	16.83	16.83	1 ppm 1-MCP
17.79	19.65	16.60	16.75	17.58	18.20	16.95	16.83	16.83	5 ppm 1-MCP
17.14	18.92	16.33	17.15	16.93	17.64	16.46	16.83	16.83	
	17.63		17.04		17.05		16.83		

LSD 5% () = 0.424.
 LSD 5% () = 0.599.
 LSD 5% (X) = 0.771.

(100/) C . °1 1-MCP :(4)

	42		28		14				
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	
13.71	17.32	12.78	14.18	10.28	8.28	7.40	19.73	19.73	
21.32	25.88	36.70	17.20	28.23	12.20	10.88	19.73	19.73	0.5 ppm 1-MCP
20.67	33.20	22.87	11.43	25.43	19.73	13.25	19.73	19.73	1 ppm 1-MCP
20.63	35.43	23.65	20.43	20.90	11.95	13.23	19.73	19.73	5 ppm 1-MCP
19.08	27.96	24.00	15.81	21.21	12.95	11.19	19.73	19.73	
	25.98		18.51		12.07		19.73		

LSD 5% () = 2.957.
 LSD 5% () = 4.182.
 LSD 5% (X) = 6.256.

(%) . °1 1-MCP :(5)

	42		35		28		21		14		7		
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	
3.87	12.37	2.00	9.24	1.66	6.97	1.09	5.19	0.69	3.75	0.52	2.61	0.35	
3.62	11.35	1.63	8.50	1.40	7.08	0.82	5.36	0.74	3.57	0.43	2.12	0.40	0.5 ppm 1-MCP
3.69	10.61	1.86	10.27	1.54	7.50	0.55	5.44	0.34	3.65	0.18	2.17	0.14	1 ppm 1-MCP
3.48	11.40	1.50	8.50	1.14	6.73	0.27	5.79	0.18	3.92	0.06	2.22	0.05	5 ppm 1-MCP

	42		35		28		21		14		7	
	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE	PE
3.66	11.43	1.75	9.13	1.44	7.07	0.68	5.45	0.49	3.72	0.29	2.28	0.24
	6.59		5.29		3.88		2.97		2.01		1.26	

LSD 5% () = 1.03.

LSD 5% () = 1.189.

LSD 5% (X) = 0.96.

.2006 .

Anderson, R.E. 1979. The influence of storage temperature and warming during storage on peach and nectarine fruit quality. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 104:459-461.

Balmush, I.L. and Salkova, E.G. 1988. The effect of growing conditions on the activity and on molecular forms of malic enzyme in apple fruits during postharvest ripening. *Izv. Akad. Nauk Moldavskoi SSR, Biologicheskich i khimicheskich Nauk.* 24-27.

Biacs, P.A. and Czinkotai, A.1992.Factors affecting stability of colored substances in paprika powder. *American Chemical Society*, 40:363-367.

Blankenship, S. M. and Dole, J.M. 2003. 1-Methylcyclopropene a Review. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 28, 1-25.

Bourton, W. G. 1982. Postharvest physiology of food crops, Longman/London and New York, 339.

Carlos, H. C., Elizabeth, J. M. and Kader, A. A. 2004. Recommendation for maintaining postharvest quality of peach and nectarine. Postharvest Technology Research and Information Center, University of California, Davis.

Celso, L.M., Alessandra, L.A., Waldir, A.M. and

Washington, L. 2002. 1-MCP delays tomato fruit ripening. *Hortic.* No. 4. Brasilia, Dec., Bras.,Vol. 20.

Dal Cin, V., Rizzini, F.M., Botton, A., Ziliotto, F., Danesin, M. and Tonutti, P. 2005. Different response of apple and peach fruits to 1-MCP: A case of different sensitivity to ethylene? *Acta Horti (ISHS)*, 682:321- 328.

Dauny, P. T. and Joyce, D.C. 2002.1-MCP improves storability of "queen cox" and "bramley" apple fruit. *HortScience*, 37 (7): 1082-1085.

De Acceso, V. 2005. Post-harvest control of ripening and quality maintains of 'Fuyu' persimmon fruit by ethylene handling. *Rev.Bras. Frutic*, 27(3): 360-365.

De Ell, J.R., Murr, D.P., Porteous, M. D. and Rupasinghe, H. P. 2002. Influence of temperature and duration of 1-methylcyclopropene (1-MCP) treatment on apple quality. *Post-harvest Biology and Technology*, 24:349-353.

Duckworth, R. B. 1979. Fruit and Vegetables. Pergamon Press, Ltd., 306 P.

Eksteen, G.J. 1984. A summary of recent research on woolliness in locally grown nectarines. *Deciduous Fruit Grower*, 34: 389-392.

- Fan, L., Argenta, L. and Mattheis, J.P. 2002. Interactive effects of 1-MCP and temperature on 'elberta' peach quality. *HortScience*, 37(1):134-138.
- Fica, J. 1985. Ethylen bei der Apfellagerung. *Erwerbsobstbau*, 27, 18-21.
- Hayama, H., Ito, A. and Kashimura, Y. 2005. Effect of 1-MCP treatment under sub-atmospheric pressure of 'akatsuki' peach. *Journal of Japanese Society for Horticultural Science*, 74(5): 398-400.
- Jobling, J. 2001. Modified atmosphere packaging: not as simple as it seems. *Good Fruit and Vegetable Magazine*, 11(5).
- Kader, A. A., El-Goorani, M.A. and Sommer, N.F. 1982. Postharvest decay, respiration, ethylene, production and quality of peaches held in controlled atmospheres with added carbon monoxide. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 107: 856-859.
- Little, C.R., Fragher, J.D. and Taylor, H.J. 1982. Effects of initial oxygen stress treatments in low oxygen modified atmosphere storage of "granny smith" apples. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 107:320 – 323.
- Liu, H., Jiang, W., Zhou, L., Wang, B. and Luo, Y. 2005. The effects of methylcyclopropene on peach fruit (*Prunus persica* L. CV. *Jiudao*) ripening and disease resistance. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 40(1):1 – 7.
- Lurie, S. and Weksler, A. 2005. Effects of 1-MCP on stone fruit. *Acta Horticulturae*, 682:85-90.
- Mathooko, F.M., Tsunashima, Y., Owino, W.Z.O. and Inaba, A. 2001. Regulation of genes encoding ethylene biosynthetic enzymes in peach (*Prunus persica* L.) fruit by carbon dioxide and 1-methylcyclopropene. *Post-harvest Biol. Technol.*, 21:265-281.
- Mitchell, G.F. 1992. Post-harvest handling systems: small fruits (table grapes, strawberries, kiwi fruit). In: Kader, A.A., Post-harvest Technology of Horticultural Crops. Second Edition, Publication of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Oakland, California, 223-240.
- Mitchell, F.G. and A.A. Kader. 1989. Factors affecting deterioration rate. In: J.H. LaRue and R.S. Johnson (eds.). Peaches, Plums and Nectarines Growing and Handling for Fresh Market. Publication no. 3331. Publication of Div. of Agr. and Nat. Res., Univ. of California, Oakland, 65-178.
- Murr, D.P. and J.R. De Ell. 2003. 1-Methylcyclopropene: is it the answer? (Perspectives from apple research in Ontario), 97-111, In: Apple Handling and Storage, NRAES-153, Ithaca, New York.
- Osterloh, A. 1980. Obstlagerung. VEB Deutscher Landwirtschaftsverlag, Berlin, 236p.
- Pech, J.C., Balaque, C., Latache, A. and Bouzayen. 1994. Postharvest physiology of climacteric fruit: recent developments in the biosynthesis and action of ethylene. *Sciences des Aliments*, 14:3-15.
- Rupasinghe, H.P.V., Murr, D.P., Paliyath, G. and Skog, L. 2000. Inhibitory effect of 1-MCP on ripening and superficial scald development in 'mcintosh' and 'delicious' apple. *J. Hort. Sc. Biotech.*, 75: 271-276.
- Schulz. 1986. Physiologie der lagernden Frucht, In: Friedrich, G., Neumann, D. and Vogl, M.: Physiologie der Obstgehölze. Akademie-Verlag-Berlin, 475-540.
- Schulz. 2000. Physiologie der lagernden Frucht. In Friedrich, G. and Fischer, M. Physiologische Grundlagen des Obstbaues. Verlag Eugen Ulmer, Stuttgart, 372- 416.
- Sisler, E.C. and Blankenship, S.M. 1996. Method of counteracting an ethylene response in plants. U.S. Patent No. 5,518,988.
- Sisler, E.C. and Serek, M. 1997. Inhibitors of ethylene responses in plants at the receptor level: recent developments. *Physiol. Plant.*, 100:577-582.
- Streif, J. 2002. 1-Methylcyclopropene (1-MCP): Einsatzmöglichkeiten in der Obstlagerung? *Schweiz. Z. Obst-Weinbau*, 21(2): 550-553.

- Streif, J. 2003a. Die Bedeutung des Reifeinhibitors 1-MCP für die Kernobstlagerung. *BDGL-Tagungsband*, 21:170.
- Streif, J. 2003b. 1-MCP Auswirkung in der Apfellagerung. 23. Bundeskernobstseminar, Oppenheim, 50-57.
- Von Mollendorff, L.J. 1987. Woolliness in peach and nectarines: a review. 1. Maturity and external factors. *Hort. Sci.*, 5: 1-3.
- Von Mollendorff, L.J. and De Villiers, O. T.. 1992. Effect of temperature manipulation during storage and ripening on firmness, extractable juice and woolliness in nectarines, *J. Hort. Sci.*, 67:655-662.
- Watkins, C.B., Nock, B.D. and Whitaker, B.D. 2000. Responses of early mid and late season apple cultivar to postharvest application of 1-methylcyclopropene (1-MCP) under air and controlled atmosphere storage conditions. *Post-harvest Biology and Technology*, 19: 17-23.
- Watkins, C.B. 2002. Ethylene synthesis, mode of action, consequences and control. In: *Fruit Quality and its Biological Basis*, Chapter 8, P:180-224. M. (Ed.) Sheffield Academic Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Weis, S. A. and Bramlage, W.J. 2002. 1 – MCP: how useful can it be on New England apples? *Fruit Notes*, (67): 5-9.
- Xuan, H. and Streif, J. 2003. 1-MCP eine neue Dimension in der Obstlagerung? *Frische Logistik*, 2:30-33.
- Zagory, D. 1998. Modified atmosphere packaging of fresh produce. *Packaging International*, 117.

Effect of 1-Methylcyclopropene (1-MCP) and Polyethylene Packaging on Storability of "Elberta" Peach Fruits

Ahmad Hussein Younes and Hanan Mouafak Sharabi**

ABSTRACT

Fruits of the peach (*Prunus persica*) cv. Elberta, harvested at Surghia, were post-harvested, treated with three concentrations of 1-MCP [1-Methylcyclopropene] for 20 hours at 21°C and then packed in plastic boxes or polyethylene packs at a thickness of 3 microns. After that, they were stored at 1 °C for 42 days.

The treatment of 1-MCP showed a significant effect on saving the firmness of the fruits and decreased the rate of reduction of juice's Titratable Acidity (TA). Besides, it saved the Total Soluble Solids (TSS) and vitamin C content at high levels after 42 days of storage.

The results showed high significant superiority using polyethylene packs, as this reduced the rate of weight loss to about 6 times less than the control; while results didn't show any positive effect on the different quality parameters when polyethylene packs were used with 1-MCP.

KEYWORDS: Peach, 1-MCP, Polyethylene, Quality, Weight loss.

* Damascus University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Horticulture, P.O. Box 30621, Damascus, Syria.

Received on 8/8/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 1/2/2009.