www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; 10(9): 608-615

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 13-07-2021
Accepted: 15-08-2021

Sangeeta HK Panigrahi
Department of Fruit Science, College of Agriculture, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Dipti Patel
Department of Fruit Science, College of Agriculture, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Corresponding Author:
Sangeeta HK Panigrahi
Department of Fruit Science, College of Agriculture, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Standardization of recipe and shelf-life studies of strawberry crush

Sangeeta HK Panigrahi and Dipti Patel

Abstract
Strawberry is one of the most important temperate fruit, belongs to the family Rosaceae. Strawberry plant is treasured in garden as well as in commercial field for its beautiful red fruit that has a tantalizing aroma. Strawberry is a small fruit having 98% edible portion. The mature fruits are quite delicious, refreshing, and attractive with distinct and pleasant aroma and healthy composition. It is widely consumed, both as fresh fruit and as an ingredient in processed products. Fruits are highly perishable, efficient post-harvest management has become an absolute necessity. The alternate way of extending their shelf life, availability in off-season and reduction of post-harvest losses is processing. These losses can be reduced by developing techniques for the preparation of different value-added products. A research trial was conducted at Horticulture Processing Laboratory in the Department of Fruit Science, IGKV, Raipur (C.G.) during the year 2019-20 and 2029-21 to standardize the recipe for strawberry crush and shelf-life studies of the processed product. The experiment was carried out in Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD) with 9 treatment combinations of 3 levels of pulp (20, 25 and 30% pulp) and 3 levels of TSS% (50, 55 and 60% TSS) with three replications. Result regarding organoleptic evaluation of strawberry crush revealed that recipe T_5 (25% Pulp + 55% TSS + 2% Acidity) recorded maximum score for all the sensory parameters, while the minimum was recorded in recipe T_1 (20% Pulp + 50% TSS + 2% Acidity). During entire storage period of strawberry crush, the minimum decrease in organoleptic scores and the maximum storability was found in the treatment or recipe T_5 (25% Pulp + 55% TSS + 2% Acidity) whereas, the maximum decrease in scores during storage and the minimum shelf-life was recorded under treatment T_1 (20% Pulp + 50% TSS + 2% Acidity).

Keywords: standardization, strawberry, crush, organoleptic, storability, shelf-life etc.

Introduction
Strawberry is one of the most important temperate fruit, belongs to the family Rosaceae. The strawberry is a fruit characterized by a fantabulous aroma and a sweet taste. Strawberry is a small fruit having 98% edible portion. It is widely consumed, both as fresh fruit and as an ingredient in processed products. It is a very rich source of bioactive compounds including vitamin C, E and phenolic compounds. Nutritionally, it contains more vitamin C than oranges. It is an excellent source of anthocyanin and have tonic, depurative, diuretic, re-mineralizing and astringent properties (Hannum, 2004) [3]. The chemical composition of strawberry is ascorbic acid (64.0mg), water (91.75g), protein (0.61g), fat (0.37g), carbohydrate (7.02g), fiber (2.3g), calcium (14.0mg), potassium (166.0 mg/160g) and vitamin-A (27 IU) (Han *et al.*,2005) [2]. The fruit of strawberry is good for those people suffering from anemia biliousness and indigestion.

Fruits are highly perishable, efficient post-harvest management has become an absolute necessity. It is also important for effective exploitation of the export potential of fruits. Fruit losses are estimated at 10-55% due to improper post-harvest management. The utilization of fruits for processing is estimated to be around 2-20 per cent of the total production. About 10-15% fresh fruits shrivel and decay, lowering their market value and consumer acceptability. Minimizing these losses can increase their supply without bringing additional land under cultivation. Postharvest processes include the integrated functions of harvesting, cleaning, grading, cooling, storing, packaging, transporting and marketing.

As the shelf-life of fresh produce is limited to 1-2 days at room temperature, the fresh fruits of strawberry can't be stored for long time due to their inherent compositional and textural characteristics. The alternate way of extending their shelf life, availability in off-season and reduction of post-harvest losses is processing. These losses can be reduced by developing techniques for the preparation of different value-added products either in the form of whole fruit or pulp during peak harvesting season.

To extend the shelf life of fruits and increase their market value, they are processed into suitable products like jams, jellies, marmalades, squashes, crushes and cordials etc. The products prepared from strawberry having characteristics flavor and taste is more remunerative. Therefore, in order to explore the perishability of utilizing the fruits for making different quality products which can be stored for longer period an investigation has been carried out in the Horticulture Processing Laboratory of the Department of Fruit Science, IGKV, Raipur (C.G.) during the year 2019-20 and 2020-21 to standardize the recipe for strawberry crush and shelf-life studies of the processed product.

Methods and Materials

The research trial was conducted at the Horticulture Processing Laboratory of the Department of Fruit Science, IGKV, Raipur (C.G.) during the year 2019-20 and 2020-21. The experiment was carried out in Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD) with 9 treatment combinations of 3 levels of pulp (20, 25 and 30% pulp) and 3 levels of TSS% (50, 55 and 60% TSS) with three replications. Crush means the product prepared from unfermented but fermentable fruit juice obtained from any suitable fruit by blending it with nutritive sweeteners and water. It is more or less similar to squash and is diluted before serving. Ripe, healthy and fresh strawberry fruits were used for the preparation of the crush.

Selected fresh mature strawberries were weighted and washed them thoroughly with cold water. Washed fruits were crushed using mixer-grinder and sieved with the help of a muslin cloth to obtain a fine fruit juice devoid of pulp and seeds. For formulation of recipe, the total soluble solids and total acidity present in the juice were first determined and then remaining amount of sugar and citric acid were adjusted. 500 ml of crush of each recipe was prepared by mixing the calculated amount of juice into the syrup (Prepared by heating just to dissolve the calculated amount of sugar, water and citric acid). After mixing the fruit juice, sodium benzoate (preservative 1g/l crush) is added. TSS% (taken as treatments) of crush recipes was tested by Refractometer. The finished product was filled into sterilized bottles.

The processed products (crush) were subjected to sensory evaluation by a panel of judges following the Hedonic rating test as described by Ranganna (1997) [8]. The products were evaluated for colour, appearance, flavour and aroma and taste. The samples were presented to the judges the way they are normally consumed. The characters with mean scores of 5 or more out of 9 marks were considered acceptable. The overall acceptability of products was based upon the mean scores obtained from all these characters studied under the test. The mean scores obtained by different products were calculated and analyzed.

Results and Discussion

The results of trial pertaining to various aspects of organoleptic evaluation of strawberry crush are summarized as follows:

Organoleptic evaluation of Strawberry crush

In the present investigation fresh strawberry fruits were processed into crush. After processing, organoleptic evaluation of strawberry crush was done at 0, 30, 60, 90, 120 and 150 days of storage and the data were recorded for different variables namely colour, appearance, flavour and aroma, taste, overall acceptability *etc*. They are presented in Table 1 to 5

Colour

The data pertaining to organoleptic score for the colour of different treatments of strawberry crush recorded during the entire storage period during both the years and the pooled mean data are presented in Table 1

The data showed that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the colour of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. The initial organoleptic score for the colour of different treatments of strawberry crush varied from 7.61 to 9.38 and at the end of storage period it was 5.20 to 7.78 during both the years and over pooled data mean. Organoleptic scores for the colour of crush decreased during storage but still remained in the acceptable range even by three months of storage at room temperature.

It is revealed from the data recorded that among different pulp% in crush treatments, P_2 (25% pulp) treatment obtained the maximum score for colour (8.72), followed by P_3 (30% pulp) treatment having 8.30 score for colour, while P_1 (20% pulp) treatment obtained the minimum score (7.74) just after processing of crush during both the years and over pooled data mean. After 5 months of storage, organoleptic score for the colour of strawberry crush was found to be decreased and varied significantly. At the end of 5 months of storage the highest organoleptic score for the colour was found in the treatment P_2 (6.93) followed by P_3 (6.44), and the lowest organoleptic score for colour in P_1 treatment (5.49) during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for colour of strawberry crush was noted in P_1 (2.25) followed by P_3 (1.86), while the minimum decrease (1.79) in P_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among different TSS% in crush treatments, at 0 days of storage organoleptic score for colour of strawberry crush was the maximum (8.69) in TSS_2 (55% TSS) followed by TSS_3 (60% TSS) having 8.30 organoleptic score for colour and at 150 days of storage it became 6.83 and 6.40 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for the colour (7.77) was recorded in treatment TSS_1 (50% TSS), which decreased to 5.61 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for colour was noted in TSS_1 (2.16) followed by TSS_3 (1.90), while the minimum reduction (1.86) in TSS_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among interaction between pulp% and TSS% in crush treatments, the initial (at 0 days of storage) organoleptic score for the colour of strawberry crush was the maximum in T_5 (9.38) followed by T_6 (9.03) and at the end of storage period (at 150 days of storage) it became 7.78 and 7.35 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for colour of strawberry crush was recorded in T_1 (7.61), which decreased to 5.20 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the colour was noted in T_1 (2.41) followed by T_2 (2.24), while the minimum reduction (1.60) in T_5 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

It is evident from the result obtained that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the colour of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period.

It might be due to the browning reaction between reducing sugars and amino acids, accelerated by high temperature and oxidation of phenolic compounds. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2012) [4], Khan *et al.* (2014) [5], Sharma (2014) [8], Priyanka *et al.* (2015) [7], Bishnoi *et al.* (2016) [1], Parihar *et al.* (2018) [6] *etc*. in different processed products.

Table 1: Changes in Organoleptic Score for Colour of Strawberry Crush during storage.

Organoleptic Score for Colour of Strawberry Crush																			Decrease in score during storage		
	0 DAP			30 DAP			60 DAP			90 DAP			120 DAP			150 DAP					
Treatments	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled**
Pulp (%)																					
P_1: 20% Pulp	7.68	7.80	7.74	7.41	7.49	7.45	7.19	7.23	7.21	6.98	6.98	6.98	6.54	6.47	6.51	5.52	5.45	5.49	2.16	2.35	2.25
P_2: 25% Pulp	8.66	8.78	8.72	8.48	8.57	8.53	8.35	8.42	8.38	8.22	8.27	8.24	7.95	7.95	7.95	6.93	6.93	6.93	1.73	1.85	1.79
P_3: 30% Pulp	8.24	8.36	8.30	8.05	8.14	8.10	7.90	7.97	7.93	7.76	7.80	7.78	7.46	7.45	7.46	6.44	6.43	6.44	1.8	1.93	1.86
SEm ±	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.10	0.13	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.12			
TSS (%)																					
TSS_1: 50% TSS	7.71	7.83	7.77	7.45	7.53	7.49	7.25	7.29	7.27	7.06	7.07	7.06	6.66	6.61	6.64	5.64	5.59	5.61	2.07	2.24	2.16
TSS_2: 55% TSS	8.63	8.75	8.69	8.45	8.54	8.49	8.30	8.36	8.33	8.15	8.19	8.17	7.86	7.85	7.86	6.84	6.83	6.83	1.79	1.92	1.86
TSS_3: 60% TSS	8.24	8.36	8.30	8.05	8.14	8.10	7.89	7.96	7.93	7.74	7.78	7.76	7.43	7.42	7.43	6.41	6.40	6.40	1.83	1.96	1.90
SEm ±	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.19	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.13			
Interaction																					
T_1	7.55	7.67	7.61	7.24	7.31	7.27	6.99	7.02	7.00	6.75	6.74	6.75	6.27	6.18	6.22	5.25	5.15	5.20	2.3	2.52	2.41
T_2	7.73	7.85	7.79	7.45	7.53	7.49	7.24	7.28	7.26	7.03	7.04	7.03	6.61	6.54	6.57	5.59	5.52	5.55	2.14	2.33	2.24
T_3	7.78	7.90	7.84	7.54	7.62	7.58	7.34	7.39	7.37	7.15	7.17	7.16	6.76	6.71	6.73	5.73	5.68	5.71	2.05	2.22	2.13
T_4	7.69	7.81	7.75	7.43	7.51	7.47	7.25	7.29	7.27	7.07	7.09	7.08	6.71	6.66	6.69	5.68	5.64	5.66	2.01	2.17	2.09
T_5	9.32	9.44	9.38	9.19	9.29	9.24	9.09	9.17	9.13	8.99	9.06	9.02	8.79	8.82	8.81	7.77	7.80	7.78	1.55	1.64	1.60
T_6	8.97	9.09	9.03	8.82	8.92	8.87	8.71	8.78	8.74	8.59	8.65	8.62	8.36	8.38	8.37	7.34	7.36	7.35	1.63	1.73	1.68
T_7	7.89	8.01	7.95	7.68	7.77	7.72	7.51	7.57	7.54	7.35	7.38	7.36	7.02	6.99	7.00	5.99	5.97	5.98	1.9	2.04	1.97
T_8	8.85	8.97	8.91	8.69	8.78	8.74	8.56	8.63	8.60	8.44	8.49	8.46	8.19	8.20	8.19	7.16	7.17	7.17	1.69	1.8	1.74
T_9	7.98	8.10	8.04	7.79	7.88	7.83	7.64	7.70	7.67	7.49	7.53	7.51	7.19	7.17	7.18	6.16	6.15	6.16	1.82	1.95	1.88
SEm ±	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.17	0.28	0.32	0.30	0.27	0.25	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.17			

*DAP – Days after processing

Appearance

The data pertaining to organoleptic score for the appearance of different treatments of strawberry crush recorded during the entire storage period during both the years and the pooled mean data are presented in Table 2.

The data showed that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the appearance of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. The initial organoleptic score for the appearance of different treatments of strawberry crush varied from 7.47 to 9.25 and at the end of storage period it was 5.06 to 7.21 during both the years and over pooled data mean. Organoleptic scores for the appearance of crush decreased during storage but still remained in the acceptable range even by three months of storage at room temperature.

It is revealed from the data recorded that among different pulp% in crush treatments, P_2 (25% pulp) treatment obtained the maximum score for appearance (8.58), followed by P_3 (30% pulp) treatment having 8.17 score for appearance, while P_1 (20% pulp) treatment obtained the minimum score (7.61) just after processing of crush during both the years and over pooled data mean. After 5 months of storage, organoleptic score for the appearance of strawberry crush was found to be decreased and varied significantly. At the end of 5 months of storage the highest organoleptic score for the appearance was found in the treatment P_2 (6.79) followed by P_3 (6.30), and the lowest organoleptic score for appearance in P_1 treatment (5.35) during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for appearance of strawberry crush was noted in P_1 (2.26) followed by P_3 (1.87), while the minimum decrease (1.79) in P_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among different TSS% in crush treatments, at 0 days of storage organoleptic score for appearance of strawberry crush was the maximum (8.56) in TSS_2 (55% TSS) followed by TSS_3 (60% TSS) having 8.17 organoleptic score for appearance and at 150 days of storage it became 6.70 and 6.27 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for the appearance (7.63) was recorded in treatment TSS_1 (50% TSS), which decreased to 5.58 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for appearance was noted in TSS_1 (2.15) followed by TSS_3 (1.90), while the minimum reduction (1.86) in TSS_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among interaction between pulp% and TSS% in crush treatments, the initial (at 0 days of storage) organoleptic score for the appearance of strawberry crush was the maximum in T_5 (9.25) followed by T_6 (8.90) and at the end of storage period (at 150 days of storage) it became 7.65 and 7.21 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for appearance of strawberry crush was recorded in T_1 (7.47), which decreased to 5.06 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The

maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the appearance was noted in T_1 (2.41) followed by T_2 (2.24), while the minimum reduction (1.60) in T_5 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

It is evident from the result obtained that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the appearance of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. It might be due to the browning reaction between reducing sugars and amino acids, accelerated by high temperature and oxidation of phenolic compounds. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2012) [4], Khan *et al.* (2014) [5], Sharma (2014), Priyanka *et al.* (2015) [7], Bishnoi *et al.* (2016) [1], Parihar *et al.* (2018) [6] *etc*. in different processed products.

Table 2: Changes in Organoleptic Score for Appearance of Strawberry Crush during storage.

Organoleptic Score for Appearance of Strawberry Crush																			Decrease in score during storage		
	0 DAP			30 DAP			60 DAP			90 DAP			120 DAP			150 DAP					
Treatments	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled**
Pulp (%)																					
P_1: 20% Pulp	7.56	7.65	7.61	7.29	7.34	7.31	7.06	7.08	7.07	6.85	6.83	6.84	6.42	6.32	6.37	5.40	5.30	5.35	2.16	2.35	2.26
P_2: 25% Pulp	8.54	8.63	8.58	8.36	8.42	8.39	8.22	8.27	8.24	8.09	8.12	8.10	7.83	7.80	7.82	6.81	6.78	6.79	1.73	1.85	1.79
P_3: 30% Pulp	8.12	8.21	8.17	7.93	7.99	7.96	7.78	7.82	7.80	7.63	7.65	7.64	7.34	7.30	7.32	6.32	6.28	6.30	1.8	1.93	1.87
SEm ±	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.03			
TSS (%)																					
TSS_1: 50% TSS	7.58	7.68	7.63	7.33	7.38	7.35	7.12	7.14	7.13	6.93	6.92	6.93	6.54	6.46	6.50	5.52	5.44	5.48	2.06	2.24	2.15
TSS_2: 55% TSS	8.51	8.60	8.56	8.32	8.39	8.35	8.17	8.21	8.19	8.03	8.04	8.04	7.74	7.70	7.72	6.71	6.68	6.70	1.8	1.92	1.86
TSS_3: 60% TSS	8.12	8.21	8.17	7.93	7.99	7.96	7.77	7.81	7.79	7.62	7.63	7.62	7.31	7.27	7.29	6.29	6.25	6.27	1.83	1.96	1.90
SEm ±	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03			
Interaction																					
T_1	7.42	7.52	7.47	7.11	7.16	7.13	6.86	6.87	6.87	6.63	6.59	6.61	6.14	6.03	6.08	5.12	5.00	5.06	2.3	2.52	2.41
T_2	7.60	7.70	7.65	7.33	7.38	7.35	7.11	7.13	7.12	6.91	6.89	6.90	6.48	6.39	6.44	5.46	5.37	5.41	2.14	2.33	2.24
T_3	7.65	7.75	7.70	7.42	7.47	7.45	7.22	7.24	7.23	7.03	7.02	7.02	6.63	6.56	6.59	5.61	5.53	5.57	2.04	2.22	2.13
T_4	7.56	7.66	7.61	7.31	7.36	7.33	7.12	7.14	7.13	6.95	6.94	6.94	6.58	6.51	6.55	5.56	5.49	5.53	2	2.17	2.08
T_5	9.20	9.29	9.25	9.07	9.14	9.11	8.97	9.02	8.99	8.87	8.91	8.89	8.67	8.67	8.67	7.64	7.65	7.65	1.56	1.64	1.60
T_6	8.85	8.94	8.90	8.70	8.77	8.73	8.58	8.63	8.61	8.47	8.50	8.48	8.24	8.23	8.23	7.21	7.21	7.21	1.64	1.73	1.69
T_7	7.77	7.86	7.82	7.56	7.62	7.59	7.39	7.42	7.40	7.22	7.23	7.23	6.89	6.84	6.86	5.87	5.82	5.84	1.9	2.04	1.98
T_8	8.73	8.82	8.77	8.57	8.63	8.60	8.44	8.48	8.46	8.31	8.34	8.33	8.06	8.05	8.05	7.04	7.02	7.03	1.69	1.8	1.74
T_9	7.86	7.95	7.91	7.67	7.73	7.70	7.51	7.55	7.53	7.36	7.38	7.37	7.06	7.02	7.04	6.04	6.00	6.02	1.82	1.95	1.89
SEm ±	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.15	0.08	0.12	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.15	0.08	0.12	0.05	0.06	0.06			

*DAP – Days after processing

Flavour and Aroma

The data pertaining to organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of different treatments of strawberry crush recorded during the entire storage during both the years and the pooled mean data are presented in Table 3.

The data showed that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. The initial organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of different treatments of strawberry crush varied from 7.43 to 9.20 and at the end of storage period it was 5.02 to 7.61 during both the years and over pooled data mean. Organoleptic scores for the flavour and aroma of crush decreased during storage but still remained in the acceptable range even by three months of storage at room temperature.

It is revealed from the data recorded that among different pulp% in crush treatments, P_2 (25% pulp) treatment obtained the maximum score for flavour and aroma (8.54), followed by P_3 (30% pulp) treatment having 8.13 score for flavour and aroma, while P_1 (20% pulp) treatment obtained the minimum score (7.56) just after processing of crush during both the years and over pooled data mean. After 5 months of storage, organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of strawberry crush was found to be decreased and varied significantly. At the end of 5 months of storage the highest organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma was found in the treatment P_2 (6.75) followed by P_3 (6.26), and the lowest organoleptic score for flavour and aroma in P_1 treatment (5.31) during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for flavour and aroma of strawberry crush was noted in P_1 (2.25) followed by P_3 (1.87), while the minimum decrease (1.79) in P_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among different TSS% in crush treatments, at 0 days of storage organoleptic score for flavour and aroma of strawberry crush was the maximum (8.52) in TSS_2 (55% TSS)

followed by TSS_3 (60% TSS) having 8.13 organoleptic score for flavour and aroma and at 150 days of storage it became 6.66 and 6.23 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma (7.59) was recorded in treatment TSS_1 (50% TSS), which decreased to 5.44 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for flavour and aroma was noted in TSS_1 (2.15) followed by TSS_3 (1.90), while the minimum reduction (1.86) in TSS_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among interaction between pulp% and TSS% in crush treatments, the initial (at 0 days of storage) organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of strawberry crush was the maximum in T_5 (9.20) followed by T_6 (8.86) and at the end of storage period (at 150 days of storage) it became 7.61 and 7.17 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for flavour and aroma of strawberry crush was recorded in T_1 (7.43), which decreased to 5.02 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma was noted in T_1 (2.41) followed by T_2 (2.24), while the minimum reduction (1.59) in T_5 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

It is evident from the result obtained that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the flavour and aroma of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. It might be due to that butyl acetate, ethyl hexanate, and ethyl propionate are the main flavoring volatiles in strawberry in addition to other alcohols. The continuous decline in sensory scores during storage can be attributed to the loss and/or modification of many chemical constituents of the product, especially the flavorants. The slow change in sensory attributers during storage under refrigerated conditions is attributed to the decrease in the rate of these deteriorative reactions at low temperature. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2012) [4], Khan *et al.* (2014) [5], Sharma (2014) [8], Priyanka *et al.* (2015) [7], Bishnoi *et al.* (2016 [1], Parihar *et al.* (2018) [6] *etc*. in different processed products.

Table 3: Changes in Organoleptic Score for Flavour and Aroma of Strawberry Crush during storage.

Organoleptic Score for Flavour and Aroma of Strawberry Crush																			Decrease in score during storage		
	0 DAP			30 DAP			60 DAP			90 DAP			120 DAP			150 DAP					
Treatments	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled**
Pulp (%)																					
P_1: 20% Pulp	7.52	7.61	7.56	7.25	7.30	7.27	7.02	7.04	7.03	6.81	6.79	6.80	6.38	6.28	6.33	5.36	5.26	5.31	2.16	2.35	2.25
P_2: 25% Pulp	8.50	8.59	8.54	8.32	8.38	8.35	8.18	8.22	8.20	8.05	8.07	8.06	7.79	7.76	7.78	6.77	6.74	6.75	1.73	1.85	1.79
P_3: 30% Pulp	8.08	8.17	8.13	7.89	7.95	7.92	7.74	7.78	7.76	7.59	7.61	7.60	7.30	7.26	7.28	6.28	6.24	6.26	1.8	1.93	1.87
SEm ±	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.02			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.18	0.05	0.13	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.05	0.19	0.05	0.13	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.05			
TSS (%)																					
TSS_1: 50% TSS	7.54	7.64	7.59	7.29	7.34	7.31	7.08	7.10	7.09	6.89	6.88	6.89	6.50	6.42	6.46	5.48	5.40	5.44	2.06	2.24	2.15
TSS_2: 55% TSS	8.47	8.56	8.52	8.28	8.34	8.31	8.13	8.17	8.15	7.99	8.00	8.00	7.70	7.66	7.68	6.67	6.64	6.66	1.8	1.92	1.86
TSS_3: 60% TSS	8.08	8.17	8.13	7.89	7.95	7.92	7.73	7.77	7.75	7.58	7.59	7.58	7.27	7.23	7.25	6.25	6.21	6.23	1.83	1.96	1.90
SEm ±	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.03			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.03	0.09	0.16	0.13	0.14	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.03	0.09			
Interaction																					
T_1	7.38	7.48	7.43	7.07	7.11	7.09	6.82	6.83	6.82	6.59	6.55	6.57	6.10	5.98	6.04	5.08	4.96	5.02	2.3	2.52	2.41
T_2	7.56	7.66	7.61	7.29	7.34	7.31	7.07	7.09	7.08	6.87	6.85	6.86	6.44	6.35	6.40	5.42	5.33	5.37	2.14	2.33	2.24
T_3	7.61	7.70	7.66	7.38	7.43	7.41	7.18	7.20	7.19	6.99	6.98	6.98	6.59	6.52	6.55	5.57	5.49	5.53	2.04	2.21	2.13
T_4	7.52	7.61	7.57	7.27	7.32	7.29	7.08	7.10	7.09	6.91	6.90	6.90	6.54	6.47	6.51	5.52	5.45	5.49	2	2.16	2.08
T_5	9.16	9.25	9.20	9.03	9.10	9.07	8.93	8.98	8.95	8.83	8.87	8.85	8.63	8.63	8.63	7.60	7.61	7.61	1.56	1.64	1.59
T_6	8.81	8.90	8.86	8.66	8.73	8.69	8.54	8.59	8.57	8.43	8.46	8.44	8.20	8.19	8.19	7.17	7.17	7.17	1.64	1.73	1.69
T_7	7.73	7.82	7.78	7.52	7.58	7.55	7.35	7.38	7.36	7.18	7.19	7.19	6.85	6.80	6.82	5.83	5.78	5.80	1.9	2.04	1.98
T_8	8.69	8.78	8.73	8.53	8.59	8.56	8.40	8.44	8.42	8.27	8.30	8.29	8.02	8.00	8.01	7.00	6.98	6.99	1.69	1.8	1.74
T_9	7.82	7.91	7.87	7.63	7.69	7.66	7.47	7.51	7.49	7.32	7.33	7.33	7.02	6.98	7.00	6.00	5.96	5.98	1.82	1.95	1.89
SEm ±	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.11	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.24	0.16	0.21	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.21	0.06	0.12	0.33	0.16	0.21	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.21	0.06	0.12			

*DAP – Days after processing

Taste

The data pertaining to organoleptic score for the taste of different treatments of strawberry crush recorded during the entire storage period during both the years and the pooled mean data are presented in Table 4.

The data showed that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the taste of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. The initial organoleptic score for the taste of different treatments of strawberry crush varied from 7.98 to 9.76 and at the end of

storage period it was 5.84 to 8.27 during both the years and over pooled data mean. Organoleptic scores for the taste of crush decreased during storage but still remained in the acceptable range even by three months of storage at room temperature.

It is revealed from the data recorded that among different pulp% in crush treatments, P_2 (25% pulp) treatment obtained the maximum score for the taste (9.10), followed by P_3 (30% pulp) treatment having 8.68 score for the taste, while P_1 (20% pulp) treatment obtained the minimum score (8.12) just after processing of crush during both the years and over pooled data mean. After 5 months of storage, organoleptic score for the taste of strawberry crush was found to be decreased and varied significantly. At the end of 5 months of storage the highest organoleptic score for the taste was found in the treatment P_2 (7.45) followed by P_3 (6.97), and the lowest organoleptic score for the taste in P_1 treatment (6.10) during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the taste of strawberry crush was noted in P_1 (2.02) followed by P_3 (1.71), while the minimum decrease (1.65) in P_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among different TSS% in crush treatments, at 0 days of storage organoleptic score for the taste of strawberry crush was the maximum (9.07) in TSS_2 (55% TSS) followed by TSS_3 (60% TSS) having 8.68 organoleptic score for the taste and at 150 days of storage it became 7.37 and 6.95 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for the taste (8.14) was recorded in treatment TSS_1 (50% TSS), which decreased to 6.21 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the taste was noted in TSS_1 (1.93) followed by TSS_3 (1.73), while the minimum reduction (1.70) in TSS_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among interaction between pulp% and TSS% in crush treatments, the initial (at 0 days of storage) organoleptic score for the taste of strawberry crush was the maximum in T_5 (9.76) followed by T_6 (9.41) and at the end of storage period (at 150 days of storage) it became 8.27 and 7.85 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for the taste of strawberry crush was recorded in T_1 (7.98), which decreased to 5.84 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for the taste was noted in T_1 (2.14) followed by T_2 (2.00), while the minimum reduction (1.49) in T_5 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

It is evident from the result obtained that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for the taste of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. It might be due to the oxidative and other deteriorative reactions occurring within the product during its storage accompanied with the degradation of ascorbic acid and furfural production. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2012) [4], Khan *et al.* (2014) [5], Sharma (2014) [8], Priyanka *et al.* (2015) [7], Bishnoi *et al.* (2016) [1], Parihar *et al.* (2018) *etc*. in different processed products.

Table 4: Changes in Organoleptic Score for Taste of Strawberry Crush during storage.

Organoleptic Score for Taste of Strawberry Crush																			Decrease in score during storage		
	0 DAP			30 DAP			60 DAP			90 DAP			120 DAP			150 DAP					
Treatments	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled**
Pulp (%)																					
P_1: 20% Pulp	8.07	8.16	8.12	7.84	7.93	7.88	7.64	7.73	7.69	7.46	7.55	7.50	7.08	7.17	7.12	6.05	6.14	6.10	2.02	2.02	2.02
P_2: 25% Pulp	9.05	9.14	9.10	8.90	8.99	8.94	8.78	8.87	8.82	8.66	8.75	8.71	8.43	8.52	8.48	7.41	7.50	7.45	1.64	1.64	1.65
P_3: 30% Pulp	8.63	8.72	8.68	8.47	8.56	8.51	8.34	8.43	8.38	8.21	8.30	8.25	7.95	8.04	8.00	6.93	7.02	6.97	1.7	1.7	1.71
SEm ±	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.22	0.06	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.22	0.06	0.13			
TSS (%)																					
TSS_1: 50% TSS	8.10	8.19	8.14	7.87	7.96	7.92	7.70	7.79	7.74	7.53	7.62	7.57	7.18	7.27	7.23	6.16	6.25	6.21	1.94	1.94	1.93
TSS_2: 55% TSS	9.02	9.11	9.07	8.86	8.95	8.90	8.73	8.82	8.77	8.60	8.69	8.65	8.35	8.44	8.39	7.33	7.42	7.37	1.69	1.69	1.70
TSS_3: 60% TSS	8.63	8.72	8.68	8.47	8.56	8.51	8.33	8.42	8.37	8.20	8.29	8.24	7.93	8.02	7.97	6.90	6.99	6.95	1.73	1.73	1.73
SEm ±	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.03			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.17	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.17	0.08	0.10			
Interaction																					
T_1	7.94	8.03	7.98	7.67	7.76	7.71	7.45	7.54	7.49	7.24	7.33	7.29	6.82	6.91	6.86	5.80	5.89	5.84	2.14	2.14	2.14
T_2	8.12	8.21	8.16	7.88	7.97	7.92	7.69	7.78	7.73	7.51	7.60	7.55	7.14	7.23	7.18	6.12	6.21	6.16	2.00	2.01	2.00
T_3	8.17	8.26	8.21	7.96	8.05	8.01	7.79	7.88	7.83	7.62	7.71	7.66	7.27	7.36	7.32	6.25	6.34	6.30	1.92	1.92	1.91
T_4	8.08	8.17	8.12	7.85	7.94	7.90	7.69	7.78	7.74	7.54	7.63	7.58	7.22	7.31	7.26	6.20	6.29	6.24	1.88	1.88	1.88
T_5	9.71	9.80	9.76	9.60	9.69	9.64	9.51	9.60	9.55	9.42	9.51	9.47	9.25	9.34	9.29	8.22	8.31	8.27	1.49	1.49	1.49
T_6	9.36	9.45	9.41	9.23	9.32	9.28	9.13	9.22	9.17	9.03	9.12	9.08	8.83	8.92	8.87	7.81	7.90	7.85	1.55	1.55	1.56
T_7	8.28	8.37	8.33	8.10	8.19	8.14	7.95	8.04	7.99	7.81	7.90	7.85	7.52	7.61	7.56	6.49	6.58	6.54	1.79	1.79	1.79
T_8	9.24	9.33	9.29	9.10	9.19	9.15	8.99	9.08	9.03	8.88	8.97	8.93	8.66	8.75	8.70	7.64	7.73	7.68	1.6	1.6	1.61
T_9	8.37	8.46	8.42	8.20	8.29	8.25	8.07	8.16	8.11	7.94	8.03	7.99	7.68	7.77	7.72	6.65	6.74	6.70	1.72	1.72	1.72
SEm ±	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.05			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.30	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.30	0.13	0.15			

*DAP – Days after processing

Overall Acceptability

The data pertaining to organoleptic score for overall acceptability of different treatments of strawberry crush recorded during the entire storage period during both the years and the pooled mean data are presented in Table 5.

The data showed that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for overall acceptability of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. The initial organoleptic score for overall acceptability of different treatments of strawberry crush varied from 7.62 to 9.40 and at the end of storage period it was 5.28 to 7.82 during both the years and over pooled data mean. Organoleptic scores for overall acceptability of crush decreased during storage but still remained in the acceptable range even by three months of storage at room temperature.

It is revealed from the data recorded that among different pulp% in crush treatments, P_2 (25% pulp) treatment obtained the maximum score for overall acceptability (8.74), followed by P_3 (30% pulp) treatment having 8.32 score for overall acceptability, while P_1 (20% pulp) treatment obtained the minimum score (7.76) just after processing of crush during both the years and over pooled data mean. After 5 months of storage, organoleptic score for overall acceptability of strawberry crush was found to be decreased and varied significantly. At the end of 5 months of storage the highest organoleptic score for overall acceptability was found in the treatment P_2 (6.98) followed by P_3 (6.49), and the lowest organoleptic score for overall acceptability in P_1 treatment (5.56) during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for overall acceptability of strawberry crush was noted in P_1 (2.20) followed by P_3 (1.83), while the minimum decrease (1.76) in P_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among different TSS% in crush treatments, at 0 days of storage organoleptic score for overall acceptability of strawberry crush was the maximum (8.71) in TSS_2 (55% TSS) followed by TSS_3 (60% TSS) having 8.32 organoleptic score for overall acceptability and at 150 days of storage it became 6.89 and 6.46 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for overall acceptability (7.78) was recorded in treatment TSS_1 (50% TSS), which decreased to 5.68 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for overall acceptability was noted in TSS_1 (2.10) followed by TSS_3 (1.86), while the minimum reduction (1.82) in TSS_2 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

Among interaction between pulp% and TSS% in crush treatments, the initial (at 0 days of storage) organoleptic score for overall acceptability of strawberry crush was the maximum in T_5 (9.40) followed by T_6 (9.05) and at the end of storage period (at 150 days of storage) it became 7.82 and 7.39 respectively, while the minimum organoleptic score for overall acceptability of strawberry crush was recorded in T_1 (7.62), which decreased to 5.28 at the end of the storage period during both the years and over pooled data mean. The maximum reduction in organoleptic score for overall acceptability was noted in T_1 (2.34) followed by T_2 (2.18), while the minimum reduction (1.58) in T_5 after 5 months of storage during both the years and over pooled data mean.

It is evident from the result obtained that there was a sharp decrease in organoleptic score for overall acceptability of different treatments of strawberry crush with increase in storage period. It might be due to the browning reaction between reducing sugars and amino acids, accelerated by high temperature and oxidation of phenolic compounds. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2012) [4], Khan *et al.* (2014) [5], Sharma (2014) [8], Priyanka *et al.* (2015) [7], Bishnoi *et al.* (2016) [1], Parihar *et al.* (2018) [6] *etc*. in different processed products.

Table 5: Changes in Organoleptic Score for Overall Acceptability of Strawberry Crush during storage.

Organoleptic Score for Overall Acceptability of Strawberry Crush																			Decrease in score during storage		
	0 DAP			30 DAP			60 DAP			90 DAP			120 DAP			150 DAP					
Treatments	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled Mean**	**2020**	**2021**	**Pooled**
Pulp (%)																					
P_1: 20% Pulp	7.71	7.81	7.76	7.45	7.51	7.48	7.23	7.27	7.25	7.03	7.04	7.03	6.60	6.56	6.58	5.58	5.54	5.56	2.13	2.27	2.20
P_2: 25% Pulp	8.69	8.79	8.74	8.51	8.59	8.55	8.38	8.44	8.41	8.26	8.30	8.28	8.00	8.01	8.01	6.97	6.99	6.98	1.72	1.8	1.76
P_3: 30% Pulp	8.27	8.37	8.32	8.09	8.16	8.12	7.94	8.00	7.97	7.80	7.84	7.82	7.51	7.51	7.51	6.49	6.49	6.49	1.78	1.88	1.83
SEm ±	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.10	0.13	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.12			
TSS (%)																					
TSS_1: 50% TSS	7.73	7.83	7.78	7.48	7.55	7.52	7.29	7.33	7.31	7.10	7.12	7.11	6.72	6.69	6.71	5.70	5.67	5.68	2.03	2.16	2.10
TSS_2: 55% TSS	8.66	8.76	8.71	8.48	8.55	8.52	8.33	8.39	8.36	8.19	8.23	8.21	7.91	7.91	7.91	6.89	6.89	6.89	1.77	1.87	1.82
TSS_3: 60% TSS	8.27	8.37	8.32	8.08	8.16	8.12	7.93	7.99	7.96	7.78	7.82	7.80	7.48	7.48	7.48	6.46	6.46	6.46	1.81	1.91	1.86
SEm ±	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.19	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.13			
Interaction																					
T_1	7.57	7.67	7.62	7.27	7.33	7.30	7.03	7.06	7.05	6.80	6.80	6.80	6.33	6.27	6.30	5.31	5.25	5.28	2.26	2.42	2.34
T_2	7.75	7.85	7.80	7.49	7.55	7.52	7.28	7.32	7.30	7.08	7.09	7.09	6.67	6.63	6.65	5.64	5.60	5.62	2.11	2.25	2.18
T_3	7.80	7.90	7.85	7.58	7.65	7.61	7.38	7.43	7.40	7.19	7.22	7.21	6.81	6.79	6.80	5.79	5.76	5.77	2.01	2.14	2.08

T_4	7.71	7.81	7.76	7.47	7.53	7.50	7.29	7.33	7.31	7.12	7.14	7.13	6.76	6.74	6.75	5.74	5.71	5.73	1.97	2.1	2.03
T_5	9.35	9.45	9.40	9.22	9.31	9.26	9.12	9.19	9.16	9.03	9.09	9.06	8.83	8.86	8.85	7.81	7.84	7.82	1.54	1.61	1.58
T_6	9.00	9.10	9.05	8.85	8.94	8.90	8.74	8.81	8.77	8.63	8.68	8.66	8.40	8.43	8.42	7.38	7.40	7.39	1.62	1.7	1.66
T_7	7.92	8.02	7.97	7.71	7.79	7.75	7.55	7.60	7.57	7.39	7.42	7.41	7.07	7.06	7.06	6.04	6.03	6.04	1.88	1.99	1.93
T_8	8.88	8.98	8.93	8.72	8.80	8.76	8.60	8.66	8.63	8.48	8.53	8.50	8.23	8.25	8.24	7.21	7.22	7.22	1.67	1.76	1.71
T_9	8.01	8.11	8.06	7.82	7.90	7.86	7.67	7.73	7.70	7.53	7.57	7.55	7.24	7.23	7.24	6.21	6.21	6.21	1.8	1.9	1.85
SEm ±	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06			
CD (P = 0.05)	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.17	0.28	0.32	0.30	0.27	0.25	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.17			

*DAP – Days after processing

Conclusion

Based on the results of the present investigation, it can be concluded that the recipe for preparation of strawberry crush treatment T_5 (25% pulp + 55% TSS + 2% Acidity) was found best regarding all the aspects of sensory parameters and storability.

References

1. Bishnoi C, Godara AK, Panda AK, Sharma VK. Evaluation of Shelf Life of Crush Prepared from the Stored Fruits and Pulp of Strawberry. Advances in Life Sciences 2016, 5(12). Print: ISSN 2278-3849, 5232-5239.
2. Han C, Lederer C, Mcdaniel M, Zhao Y. Sensory evaluation of fresh strawberries coated with chitosan-based edible coatings. J Food Sci 2005;70:172-S178.
3. Hannum SM. Potential impact of strawberries on human health. Critical Review of Food Science 2004;44:1-17.
4. Khan RU, Afridi SR, Ilyas M, Sohail M, Abid H. Development of strawberry jam and its quality evaluation during storage. Pak. J Biochem. Mol. Biol 2012;45(1):23-25.
5. Khan U, Ullah J, Saeed B, Ali F. Effect of Potassium Sorbate and Sodium Benzoate on the Quality and shelf life of Strawberry Jam during Storage. ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science 2014;9(12):454-458.
6. Parihar P, Panigrahi HK, Sangeeta. Standardization of Recipes of Custard Apple Jam and Analysis of Physico-Chemical Characteristics, Sensory Quality and Storage Behaviour. Int. J Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci 2018;7(12):1536-1546.
7. Priyanka N, Dorajeerao AVD, Sudhavani V, Umakrishna K. Physico-chemical Characters and Sensory Evaluation of Jamun based blended squash beverages during storage. Plant Archives 2015;15(2):939-946
8. Ranganna S. Handbook of analysis and quality control for fruit and vegetable products. Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi 1997.
9. Sharma DS. Quality evaluation and storage stability of jamun-mango blended jam. The Bioscan 2014;9(3):953-957.