www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277-7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; 11(12): 975-977 © 2022 TPI www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 01-09-2022 Accepted: 05-10-2022

K Venkatesan

Professor and Head, Department of Spices and Plantation Crops, Horticulture College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Corresponding Author: K Venkatesan Professor and Head, Department of Spices and Plantation Crops, Horticulture College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,

Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Standardization of suitable packaging material to increase shelf life and quality parameters of curry leaf *(Murraya koenigii* Sprenge)

K Venkatesan

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/tpi.2022.v11.i12m.17358

Abstract

Curry leaf, also known as *Murraya koenigii* Sprenge, is a member of the Rutaceae family and is an aromatic spice. In South India, leaves are primarily used for culinary purpose. An investigation was conducted to find the best packing material for the leaves of curry leaf in order to extend their shelf life and maintain their high-quality standards. In the present experiment, ply cardboard boxes with ventilation, sleeves of various gauges, jute cloth bags and polypropylene bags were used as treatments. Compressed packing in polypropylene bags performed well than other packaging materials in terms of least physiological weight loss, more shelf life, high chlorophyll, ascorbic acid and essential oil content and less percentage of senescence.

Keywords: Curry leaf, shelf life, packaging materials, physiological and quality traits

Introduction

Curry leaf is scientifically known as *Murraya koenigii* belonging to the family Rutaceae with a basic chromosome number of 2n = 18, cultivated commercially for its aromatic leaves which are majorly consumed in South India for culinary purpose. It is cultivated on a commercial scale in large areas in Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. The leaves have 66.3% moisture, 6.1% protein, 16% carbohydrates, 6.4% fibre, 600 mg phosphorus, 0.93 mg iron and 7.56 mg β - carotene per 100 g (Shankaracharya and Natrajan, 1971)^[7]. The essential oil of curry leaf is widely used in flavouring dishes and has high cosmetic value. It owns antimicrobial, anti-diabetic, anti-oxidant and anti-cancer property. It cures dysentery, asthma, vomiting, piles and influenza. As curry leaf is rich in iron, it is also been utilized in curing anaemia. The antioxidant and anti-carcinogenic effect of curry leaf have been studied and it has been reported curry leaf as a potential reducer of the toxicity of carcinogens (Khanum *et al.*, 2001)^[4].

Among the horticultural products, leafy vegetables are one that leads to spoilage rapidly. There will be a change in developmental, structural, physiological and biochemical process leading to senescence of the leaves. The most obvious symptoms of senescence in the leaves are loss of fresh weight, shrivelling, flavour changes *etc.*, (Halvey and Mayak, 1981)^[3]. One of the most common leafy spices in the world is curry leaf. In addition to being consumed domestically, the leaves have good export potential (Lathan Kumar *et al.*, 2003)^[5]. The leaves are available all year long. Leaves of curry leaf are prone to wilt and lose moisture quickly. They cannot be kept fresh for longer than a day because they are extremely perishable. Due to increased global demand, fresh curry leaves will have a better export market if their shelf life is extended. Also prepacking of fresh leaves helps in easy transportation and handling of the produce. Hence the present study is undertaken to identify the suitable packaging material to increase shelf life and quality parameters of curry leaf.

Material and Methods

The experiment was carried out at Department of Spices and Plantation crops and the experiment was laid out in completely randomized block design (CRD) with seven treatments and four replications. Different packaging material was fixed and the treatments were imposed as per the technical programme. The leaves were harvested during the early morning hours. Fresh curry leaves were washed and air-dried to remove the surface abnormalities like yellowing, pest damage was eliminated. These samples were packed in different packaging materials to study the shelf life and to observe the quality parameters such as physiological

loss in weight (%), shelf life (days), moisture content, relative water content (%), total chlorophyll content (mg/100g), ascorbic acid content (mg/100gm), essential oil content (%), colour value and percentage of senescence.

The treatment details followed in the experiment were as follows;

- T1: Control- 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation
- T₂: T₁ + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge
- T₃: T₁ + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge
- T₄: T₁ + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge + basal cotton
- T₅: T₁ + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge + basal cotton
- T₆: Compressed Packing in jute cloth bag
- T₇: Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags

Results and Discussion

Curry leaf kept under different packaging material were studied for the different parameters showed significant results. For physiological loss in weight, the treatment T₇-compressed packing in polypropylene bags was found to be the best with minimum physiological loss in weight of 13.55%, 16.20%, 20.20% and 25.96% at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively compared to T₁-control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (60% and 85.2% at 2 and 4 days, respectively). This might have been due to the barrier property of polyethylene which prevents moisture loss from the produce (Nasirin *et al.*, 2008) ^[6]. Treatments T₂, T₄, T₆ and T₇ observed to have maximum number of shelf life i.e., 8 days followed by treatment T₃ and T₅ (6 days), whereas treatment T₁ showed minimum number of shelf life i.e., 4 days.

Treatment T₇- Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags was found to be best with highest moisture content of 66.95%, 64.32%, 62.08% and 61.00% at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively when compared to T₁-Control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (57.09% and 38.30% at 2 and 4 days, respectively). Treatment T₇- Compressed Packing in

polypropylene bags was recorded the maximum relative water content of 93.72%, 89.03%, 85.55% and 82.32% at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively when compared to T_1 -Control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (77.71% and 30.22% at 2 and 4 days, respectively). Among the different packing treatment T₇- Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags with 3% ventilation recorded highest chlorophyll content of 6.895, 6.765, 6.652 and 6.590 mg/100g at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively when compared to T₁-Control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (6.541 and 6.425 at 2 and 4 days, respectively). The T₇- Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags was recorded highest ascorbic acid content 0.785, 0.770, 0.752 and 0.736 mg/100g at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively when compare to T_1 -Control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (0.545 and 0.521 at 2 and 4 days, respectively). From the study, highest essential oil content of 0.04%, 0.04%. 0.03% and 0.03% at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively was noticed in Treatment T_7 when compared to T_1 -control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (0.02%). similar results were reported by Dawn et al., 2015^[2].

Color of leaves noted from Royal Horticulture Society ranged from strong, brilliant and dark green to moderate olive green. The T₇-compressed packing in polypropylene bags was exhibited bright green, light green with yellowing or browning and light green with noticeable yellowing or browning at 2, 4, 6 and 8 days, respectively when compared to T₁-Control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (Light green with more yellowing or browning at 4 days). Barrett *et al.*, (2010) reported that the color change during storage might be due to the degradation of green pigments. Less percentage of senescence was observed in the treatment T₇-compressed @ packing in polypropylene bags (No senescence, 20%, 25% and 32% at 2, 4, 6, 8 days respectively) compared to T₁control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation (No senescence and 80% at 2 and 4 days, respectively).

| Treatment | | Physiological loss in | | | | Moisture content | | | | Relative water content | | | | | Percentage of | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| | | weight (%) | | | | (%) | | | | (%) | | | | | senescence (%) | | | |
| | | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | |
| | | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | |
| T_1 | Control- 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation | 60 | 85.2 | - | I | 57.09 | 38.30 | 1 | I | 77.71 | 65.20 | - | - | No | 80 | 1 | - | |
| T_2 | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge | 14.28 | 20.17 | 28.00 | 36.6 | 59.19 | 58.00 | 50.00 | 47.25 | 79.59 | 70.44 | 62.05 | 58.47 | No | 20 | 29 | 40 | |
| T 3 | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge | 39.29 | 48.20 | 57.20 | I | 54.30 | 53.05 | 47.25 | I | 76.34 | 72.46 | 67.44 | - | No | 25 | 45 | - | |
| T_4 | T ₁ + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge + basal cotton | 20.05 | 26.50 | 30.80 | 35.05 | 62.02 | 60.50 | 58.22 | 55.00 | 83.06 | 80.04 | 78.25 | 75.00 | No | 20 | 30 | 38 | |
| T 5 | T ₁ + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge + basal cotton | 38.25 | 42.05 | 46.05 | 1 | 66.92 | 59.60 | 54.20 | - | 73.22 | 70.69 | 65.07 | - | No | 24 | 32 | - | |
| T_6 | Compressed Packing in jute cloth | 15.68 | 20.08 | 24.55 | 26.82 | 63.57 | 62.00 | 61.08 | 60.00 | 89.61 | 85.10 | 81.50 | 78.66 | No | 25 | 38 | 36 | |
| T ₇ | Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags | 13.55 | 16.20 | 20.20 | 25.96 | 66.95 | 64.32 | 62.08 | 61.00 | 93.72 | 89.03 | 85.55 | 82.32 | No | 20 | 25 | 32 | |
| S.E.M. | | 0.68 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 0.62 | 1.05 | 1.44 | 0.60 | 0.98 | 0.63 | - | 1 | 1 | - | |
| C.D. | | 2.10 | 1.56 | 1.51 | 1.24 | 3.23 | 2.97 | 1.91 | 3.23 | 4.43 | 1.84 | 3.01 | 1.95 | - | - | - | - | |

Table 1: Effect of different packaging materials on physiological parameters of curry leaf

 Table 2: Effect of different packaging material on quality traits of curry leaf

| Treatment | | Total chlorophyll | | | | Ascorbic acid | | | | Essential oil | | | | Colour | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | content (mg/100 g) | | | | (mg/100 g) | | | | content (%) | | | | Colour | | | |
| | | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th | 2 nd | 4 th | 6 th | 8 th |
| | | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day | day |
| T ₁ | Control- 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation | 6.541 | 6.425 | - | - | 0.545 | 0.521 | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | - | I | 4 | 1 | - | - |
| T ₂ | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge | 6.891 | 6.750 | 6.650 | 6.488 | 0.485 | 0.480 | 0.476 | 0.452 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| T ₃ | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge | 7.021 | 6.965 | 6.852 | - | 0.636 | 0.622 | 0.615 | - | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | I | 4 | 2 | 1 | - |
| T_4 | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 100 gauge + basal cotton | 6.705 | 6.625 | 6.532 | 6.425 | 0.699 | 0.685 | 0.672 | 0.658 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| T ₅ | T_1 + Packing in sleeves of 50 gauge + basal cotton | 6.658 | 6.593 | 6.258 | - | 0.558 | 0.525 | 0.516 | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | - | 4 | 2 | 2 | - |
| T ₆ | Compressed Packing in jute cloth | 6.785 | 6.658 | 6.620 | 6.583 | 0.799 | 0.785 | 0.734 | 0.712 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| T 7 | Compressed Packing in polypropylene bags | 6.895 | 6.765 | 6.652 | 6.590 | 0.785 | 0.770 | 0.752 | 0.736 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| S.E.M. | | 0.084 | 0.114 | 0.099 | 0.059 | 0.022 | 0.013 | 0.008 | 0.007 | 1.44 | 0.60 | 0.98 | 0.63 | - | - | - | - |
| C.D. | | 0.256 | NS | 0.302 | 0.181 | 0.067 | 0.039 | 0.026 | 0.022 | 4.43 | 1.84 | 3.01 | 1.95 | - | - | - | - |

Conclusion

The study indicated that compressed packing of curry leaf in polypropylene bags was the best method for extending its shelf life and maintaining its quality criteria, followed by T6-compressed packing in jute cloth and T_1 -control @ 3 ply cardboard box with ventilation. Therefore, by prolonging the fresh curry leaf's shelf life by using polypropylene bags, we can expand its export market as a result of rising global demand.

Reference

- 1. Barrett D, Beaulieu JC, Shewfelt R. Color, flavour, texture and nutritional quality of fresh-cut fruits and vegetables: desirable levels, instrumental and sensory measurement and the effects of processing. Critical reviews in Food Science and Nutrition. 2010;50(5):369-389.
- 2. Dawn CP, Ambrose SJK, Annamalai, Ravindra Naik. Effect of packaging in extending shelf life of fresh curry leaves. Journal of Applied Horticulture. 2015;17(2):165-168.
- 3. Halevy AH, Mayak S. Senescence and post-harvest physiology of cut flower. Part II. Horticulture Review. 1981;3:59-143.
- Khanum FKR, Anilakumar KKR, Sudarshana, Viswanathan KR. Anti-carcinogenic effects of curry leaf in dimethyl-hydrazine – treated rats. Plant Foods for Human Nutrition. 2001;55:347-355.
- 5. Lathan Kumar KJ, Kakoli Dassharma, Mohandas A. Curry leaf: an inevitable spice of Indian cuisine. Spice India, August; c2003. p. 8-9.
- Nasirin T, Molla M, Hossaen MA, Alam M, Yasmin L. Effect of postharvest treatments on shelf life and quality of tomato. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research. 2008;33(4):579-585.
- Shankaracharya NB, Natarajan CP. Leafy spices: Chemical composition and uses. Indian Food Packer. 1971;25:29-40.