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Abstract

Quince fruit has many benefits to human health and is an excellent source of pectin for jellies and jam industry. The objective of the present research was to study fruit physiochemical attributes of some quince genotypes at harvest and their changes during cold storage. The fruit of 15 genotypes were harvested at optimum maturity and stored for 0, 30, 60, 90 and 120 days in cold storage and some parameters were measured. The range of 13.00-18.76% for Soluble Solid Content (SSC), 0.38-0.95% for titratable acidity, 2.55-3.75 for pH, 52.16-91.00 N for firmness, 0.89-0.98 g cm⁻³ for density, 255.39-349.56 mg 100 g⁻¹ DM for carbohydrate, 7.28-23.02% for pectin and 11.66-33.30% for fruit fibers were observed across genotypes at harvest time. Negative correlations were found between weight loss and both firmness and density, while firmness had positive correlation with pectin and Ca content. Generally, significant changes (P ≤ 0.05) for measured characters were observed across genotypes and during cold storage, but the rate of changes varied according to genotypes. It was found that each studied genotype had one or more unique character such as lowest weight loss in ‘Paveh 1’, highest fruit firmness retaining in ‘Marivan1’, highest pectin in ‘Marivan 1’ and highest SSC in ‘Marivan 2’, that are promising for fruit breeding in future programs.
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Introduction

Quince (Cydonia oblonga Mill) fruit is very fragrant and has a balanced sweet-tart flavor that is excellent for jellies and preserves. Quince is a shrub or small tree (Sharma et al., 2011), classified in Rosaceae family, pomoideae subfamily (Bell and Leitao, 2011), grows at cold temperate regions (Thomidis and Michailides, 2004) and cooler site in subtropical area (Razavi et al., 2000), and needs cultural practices similar to that of apples and pears. Despite reports of quince benefits to human health (Legua et al., 2013; Wojdylo et al., 2013; Szychowski et al., 2014) and increased demand in recent years, consumption remains low and few data are available about cultivars and their behaviors in cold storage. Generally, low temperatures can substantially reduce the rate of many metabolic processes, which lead to fruit senescence, deterioration, and quality losses. Pome fruits, especially apples and pears, responses to cold storage are widely studied but have rarely been studied in quince fruit.

According to available literature, quince fruit quality attributes, physiological changes, and postharvest losses have not been extensively studied, probably because quince is not a widely cultivated crop. However, the beneficial effects of quince as a source of pectin (Forni et al., 1994; Thomas et al., 2003, Moradi et al., 2016) and bioactive compound (Alesiani et al., 2010; Fiorentino et al., 2008;...
Khoubnasabjafari and Jouyban, 2011; Wojdyło et al., 2013) have been previously reported. In addition to bioactive compounds, some quince fruit quality attributes may affect consumers and food industry attitude including: Firmness, Soluble Solid Content (SSC), Titratable Acidity (TA), color, pectin, fiber and shrinkage (weight loss) (Tu et al., 2000). Firmness and SSC are two important quality parameters in determining fruit maturity and harvest time, and they are also key parameters in assessing and grading the postharvest quality of pome fruit. Moisture loss during long-term storage of apples causes direct economic loss because of a decrease in saleable weight (Veraverbeke et al., 2003). Excessive weight loss causes the surface to shrivel or the wax to change structure and become greasy or glossy (Maguire et al., 1999). The storage life, quality, and susceptibility of fruit to disease and physiological disorders can be affected strongly by cultivars (Gautier, 1984). Development of cultivars with superior traits and tolerance to various postharvest environmental conditions would be beneficial. New cultivars or genotypes must be characterized by high fruit quality attributes which satisfy the consumers demand.

As one of the centers of origin of genus *Cydonia*, Iran is rich in quince germplasm resources, some quince genotypes are distributed in different areas of Iran. However, traditional cultivars have been threatened with extinction by the changes that have occurred in urbanization and modern fruit industry and just few cultivars are cultivated. The objective of our study was to evaluate and compare the fruit quality attributes of fifteen quince genotypes to figure out constituent and quality characterization of quince fruit of those available genotypes, and the postharvest fruit quality changes across genotypes during cold storage were also monitored. Furthermore, we aimed to determine which of the chemically analyzed compounds in quince fruit correlate best with physical and chemical traits.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Plant Source and Sampling**

Fifteen quince fruit genotypes including: ‘KVD1’, ‘KVD3’, ‘KVD4’, ‘NB2’, ‘PH2’, ‘Raghah Kordi’, ‘Esfahan’, ‘Tehran’, ‘Asgari’, ‘Paveh1’, ‘Paveh2’, ‘Torsah beh’, ‘Shakarah beh’ ‘Marivan1’, and ‘Marivan2’ were harvested at commercial maturity stage in west part of Iran with temperate climate. In general, harvest begins when fruits change their ground color from deep-green to a lighter-green (Kader, 1996). After harvest, fruits were immediately transferred to postharvest lab and graded to ensure that fruits were of uniform size and free of blemishes. Fruits of each genotype were divided into five groups each containing 30 fruits, packed in boxes and stored in cold storage at 2±1°C with 80-90% relative humidity. Three replicates of 10 fruits per genotype were assessed at 0, 30, 60, 90 and 120 days.

**Weight Loss (%)**

The weight of all fruits was measured before storage (W₀) and at each sampling time (Wᵢ). Weight loss expressed as percentage of fresh weight using the following equation:

\[ \text{Weight loss} \% = \frac{(W₀-Wᵢ)}{W₀} \times 100 \] (1)

**SSC, TA and pH Measurements**

TA was measured using a bulked sample of all 10 fruit with 1/8th of each fruit juiced together and analyzed. Aliquots of 10 mL were titrated to pH 8.1 with 0.1 N NaOH and expressed as % malic acid (Roussos et al., 2011). The juice was also used to measure Soluble Solids Content (SSC) using an Atago digital refractometer (Brix 0–32%,
Atago, Tokyo, Japan) (Arzani and Koushesh-Saba, 2005).

Fruit Flesh Firmness and Density

Fruit flesh firmness was measured on opposite peeled sides of each fruit using a penetrometer (FDK, Vagner, USA) fitted with an 11.1 mm probe. Values were expressed as Newtons (N). The fruit density in each sampling time was measured based on water displacement method using the following equation and expressed as g cm$^{-3}$.

\[
\text{Fruit density} = \frac{M}{V} \times 100 \quad (2)
\]

Where, \(M\) is the mass of fruit and \(V\) is the volume of fruit.

Total Pectin

Total pectin content was determined as described previously (Ruck, 1969). Six g of fruit sample was boiled in 100 mL of distilled water for 1 hour. The volume of the sample was made up to 250 mL and filtered through Wathman No.4. Then, 125 mL of water and 2.5 mL NaOH were added to 100 mL of the aliquot while stirring constantly, and left to stand for one night. Also, 12.5 mL 1N acetic acid and 6.5 mL of 1.0N CaCl$_2$ solution were added while stirring, and allowed to stand for 1 hr, followed by heating to boiling for 5 minutes and, then, filtered through paper. The precipitates were washed with distilled water to make them free from chloride ion, then, few drops of silver nitrate solution was added. Remaining white materials were oven dried and weighted. Total pectin was calculated as in Equation (3):

\[
\text{Pectin (\%)} = \frac{(W_t \text{ of Ca pectate})}{(W_t \text{ of the sample})} \times 100 \quad (3)
\]

Total Carbohydrate and Fiber Assay

The total carbohydrate content was estimated using the Anthrone method (Hedge and Hofreiter, 1962). Briefly, 100 mg of sample was hydrolyzed in pre-warmed HCl for 3 hours in boiling water bath, then neutralized with sodium carbonate. One mL of aliquots of the supernatant was added to 4 mL of freshly prepared Anthrone reagent, heated in water bath for 8 min, cooled, and reading for absorbance were taken at 630 nm. Fruit total fiber was measured as previously describe (Lee et al., 1992).

Ca and Mg Measurement

To determine the calcium content, a wet oxidation procedure was applied (Emami, 1996). The wedges of fresh fruit were oven-dried at 70°C and then ground to a powder. Later, 0.3 g grounded fruit samples were digested in HNO$_3$/HClO$_4$, and the calcium and magnesium were measured by atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Shimadzu, Japan). The results were expressed as mg kg$^{-1}$ dry weight (mg kg$^{-1}$ DM).

Statistical Analysis

Data for the analytical determinations were subjected to Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA). Sources of variation were storage duration (days) and cultivars. Least Significant Difference (LSD) test at \(P \leq 0.05\) was used to compare means between genotypes or cultivars at each sampling. Pearson correlation was used to evaluate relationship between measured parameters. All data from each sample individually was used for correlations. All analyses were performed with MSTATC software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fruit Flesh Firmness

The fruit flesh firmness average varied among quince genotypes such that the highest (71 N) and lowest (42 N) firmness
were observed in ‘Marivan 1’ and ‘Paveh 1’, respectively (Figure 1-a). For all the genotypes, there was a steady decrease in fruit firmness over storage time, however, the rate of this decrease differed according to the genotypes (Figure 2-a). It can be noted that ‘Shakareh beh’ showed a lower rate of loss of firmness (29.8%) compared to ‘NB2’ (58.8%) after 120 days of cold storage (Table 1). Fruit firmness is an important criterion for edible quality and market value of pome fruit (DeEll et al., 2001) and loss of fruit firmness is a serious problem resulting in quality losses (Kovacs et al., 2005). In the current study, fruit flesh firmness had a positive correlation with the density and pectin content, but a negative correlation with carbohydrate content (Table 2). It has been previously reported that fruit firmness depends on their pectin composition, the rate of evapotranspiration, respiration, turgor pressure and water loss (Billy et al., 2008; Cosgrove et al., 1997; Ghafir et al., 2009; Van den Berg, 1981). Genotypes like ‘Shakareh’ that retained firmness are more suitable for long-term cold storage, especially in areas that equipped storage system is unavailable.

**Weight Loss**

The value of weight loss, measured on the first month of cold storage, ranged from 1.9% for ‘KVD4’ to 7.2% for the ‘Marivan1’. The overall average of fruit weight loss was different among quince genotypes and the range was from 3.2% in
Figure 2. Mean value changes of firmness (a), weight loss (b), pectin (c) and fruit density (d) in 15 quince genotypes during cold storage at 2˚C. Values represent means±standard error (n=3).

‘Paveh 1’ to 7.5% in ‘Marivan1’ (Figure 1-b). The fruit weight loss increased after 120 days of cold storage (Figure 2-b) and the highest (13.0%) and lowest (6.8%) weight losses were observed in ‘Marivan1’ and ‘Esfahan’, respectively (Table 1). The weight loss in fruit increased linearly with increase in storage time due to water loss and respiration (Ghafir et al., 2009). The apparent quality of the fruit is reduced by the loss of moisture, which leads to loss of turgidity and subsequently softening of the fruit (Tu et al., 2000). Fruit weight loss varied among quince genotypes, which may be related to various factors including the skin structure, the suberization extent in periderm, and nature of the waxes on the surface of the fruit. Percentage of weight loss had a negative correlation with the firmness, density, and pectin, such that the high levels of weight loss were in low levels of fruit firmness, density, and pectin (Table 2). ‘Paveh 1’ had the lowest rate of weight loss and can be used in breeding program and also for long-term cold storage.

**Pectin**

Fruit pectin content showed a wide variation across the studied genotypes: from 7.28% in ‘Asgari’ to 23.02% in ‘Marivan 1’ at harvest (Table 1). The overall pectin content decreased during fruit cold storage (Figure 2-c) and difference in the pectin among the genotypes at harvest persisted during storage, and ‘Marivan1’ had the highest pectin (14.26%) after 120 days cold storage (Figure 1-c). High pectin content may be beneficial for human health. However, few studies have been carried out on quince fruit and fruit derivatives (Silva et al., 2000). Fruit pectin of 7.40% has been reported for ‘Kalecik’ quince genotype (Dumanoglu et al., 2010) that is similar to the overall pectin content in all genotypes.
### Table 1. Soluble Solid Content (SSC), Titratable Acidity (TA), pH, density (g cm⁻³), weight loss (%), firmness (N), pectin (%) and carbohydrate (mg 100 g⁻¹ DM) of 15 quince genotypes at harvest (T1) and after 120 days cold storage at 2°C (T5).

| Genotypes | Time | KVD1      | KVD3      | KVD4      | NB2      | PH2      | Rughah kordi | Esfahan | Tehran | Asgari | Paveh1 | Paveh2 | Torshah beh | Shakara beh | Maivan1 | Marivan2 | LSD⁷ |
|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------------|-----------|---------|----------|------|
| SSC       | T1   | 13.00     | 16.80     | 14.50     | 15.13    | 13.96    | 15.86        | 13.40    | 12.56  | 13.73  | 13.83  | 14.30  | 17.30    | 14.30        | 14.50    | 18.76   | 1.08    |
|           | T5   | 18.70     | 19.56     | 17.90     | 17.50    | 17.76    | 18.93        | 17.10    | 16.53  | 16.43  | 15.96  | 16.76  | 19.26    | 17.46        | 18.26   | 21.23   |         |
| TA        | T1   | 0.43      | 0.48      | 0.38      | 0.38     | 0.63     | 0.62         | 0.54     | 0.60   | 0.58   | 0.42   | 0.70   | 0.94     | 0.52         | 0.95    | 0.94    | 0.07    |
|           | T5   | 0.23      | 0.20      | 0.14      | 0.37     | 0.30     | 0.30         | 0.21     | 0.22   | 0.20   | 0.49   | 0.53   | 0.24     | 0.50         | 0.44    |         |
| pH        | T1   | 3.55      | 3.78      | 2.76      | 3.68     | 3.20     | 3.55         | 3.75     | 3.41   | 3.61   | 3.25   | 3.00   | 2.55     | 3.25         | 3.19    | 0.07    |         |
|           | T5   | 4.21      | 4.44      | 3.81      | 4.19     | 3.98     | 4.23         | 4.20     | 4.20   | 4.22   | 4.12   | 3.90   | 3.63     | 4.02         | 4.11    | 4.10    |         |
| Density   | T1   | 0.98      | 0.92      | 0.89      | 0.90     | 0.94     | 0.89         | 0.97     | 0.90   | 0.95   | 0.93   | 0.97   | 0.95     | 0.98         | 0.99    | 0.92    | 0.03    |
|           | T5   | 0.93      | 0.88      | 0.81      | 0.86     | 0.83     | 0.82         | 0.88     | 0.86   | 0.88   | 0.89   | 0.93   | 0.88     | 0.90         | 0.81    | 0.82    |         |
| Weight loss | T1 | 0.00      | 0.00      | 0.00      | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00     | 1.45         |         |         |         |
| Firmness  | T1   | 76.66     | 72.66     | 72.33     | 85.00    | 72.00    | 91.00       | 64.33    | 72.00  | 61.66  | 58.00  | 73.66  | 68.66    | 52.16        | 90.00   | 89.00   | 10.82   |
|           | T5   | 33.33     | 38.33     | 33.00     | 35.00    | 36.66    | 52.00       | 30.66    | 32.66  | 30.66  | 30.66  | 38.66  | 31.66    | 36.66        | 52.66   | 48.33   |         |
| Pectin    | T1   | 8.50      | 8.50      | 9.58      | 8.70     | 10.76    | 12.67       | 11.06    | 3.30   | 7.28   | 9.98   | 10.36  | 8.64     | 14.29        | 23.02   | 17.57   | 0.77    |
|           | T5   | 5.15      | 5.90      | 6.08      | 5.76     | 7.86     | 9.43        | 7.70     | 6.43   | 4.76   | 5.49   | 6.39   | 5.95     | 8.68         | 14.26   | 13.40   |         |
| Carbohydrate | T1 | 244.44    | 149.21    | 226.30    | 226.68   | 180.95   | 165.46      | 290.91   | 184.36 | 241.41 | 163.95 | 238.83 | 136.37   | 178.69       | 165.46  | 121.63  | 33.79   |
|           | T5   | 388.03    | 365.73    | 394.45    | 394.94   | 390.29   | 395.20      | 408.43   | 321.90 | 406.54 | 418.26 | 363.46 | 419.77   | 402.39       | 416.37  | 450.38  |         |

⁷ Least Significant Difference (LSD) value (P ≤ 0.05) represents means differences in the same row.

### Table 2. Pearson’s simple correlation coefficient among the fruit characteristics of the 15 quince genotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight loss</th>
<th>Firmness</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>Carbohydrate</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Pectin</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss</td>
<td>-0.61**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.52**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.83**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmness</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>-0.83**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pectin</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
after 120 days cold storage in this study. Pectin content in ‘Marivan1’ is higher than all of the other genotypes in the current study or previous reports, which is favorable for fruit processing as jam or jelly.

### Density of Fruit

Fruit density decreased over storage periods (Figure 2-d). The average fruit density varied among quince genotypes and the maximum density was observed in genotypes ‘KVD1’ and ‘Pavehe2’ with 0.96 g cm\(^{-3}\), while the minimum density of fruit was observed in genotype ‘KVD4’ with 0.85 g cm\(^{-3}\) (Table 3). The density of fruit can be used as a maturity index in many fruit and vegetables such as apricot, strawberry, tomato, and peas. It has been reported that fruit density decreases because of collapse of intercellular spaces and loss of moisture (Mitropoulos and Lambrinos, 2000). A negative correlation was observed between density and weight loss, SSC, pH and carbohydrate (Table 2). The decrease in fruit density may be due to biochemical changes and water loss during storage.

### SSC, TA and pH

SSC of the studied quince genotypes were significantly different. At harvest, ‘Marivan2’ had the highest SSC (18.8%) while ‘KVD1’ had the lowest (13.0%) (Table 1). The overall SSC increased during fruit cold storage (Figure 3a) and difference in the SSC among the genotypes at harvest persisted during storage. After 120 days cold storage, ‘Marivan2’ had the highest SSC (21.2%), ‘Marivan1’, ‘Marivan2’ and ‘Torshah beh’ had the highest TA percentage (0.94%), while ‘NB2’ had the lowest (0.38%) at harvest (Table 1). TA and pH were different in quince genotypes. TA decreased during fruit storage (Figure 3-b) while, inversely, pH increased (Figure 3-c).

The increase in SSC can be due to conversion of starch to sugar or the hydrolysis of cell wall polysaccharides (Jan and Rab, 2012). SSC of quince genotypes

---

### Table 3. The overall mean value of density (g cm\(^{-3}\)), pH, SSC (%Brix), titratable acidity (% malic acid), fiber (%), Ca (mg g\(^{-1}\) dry matter) and Mg (mg g\(^{-1}\) dry matter) of the 15 quince genotypes during cold storage at 2°C for 120 days.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Density (g cm(^{-3}))</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>SSC (%Brix)</th>
<th>TA (% Malic acid)</th>
<th>Fiber (%)</th>
<th>Ca (mg g(^{-1}) DM)</th>
<th>Mg (mg g(^{-1}) DM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KVD1</td>
<td>0.96 a</td>
<td>3.91 bc</td>
<td>15.67 e</td>
<td>0.33 i</td>
<td>25.43 bc</td>
<td>42.00 g</td>
<td>5.28 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVD3</td>
<td>0.90 c-e</td>
<td>4.11 a</td>
<td>18.41 b</td>
<td>0.34 i</td>
<td>25.83 bc</td>
<td>33.80 jk</td>
<td>5.97 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVD4</td>
<td>0.85 g</td>
<td>3.33 b</td>
<td>16.44 d</td>
<td>0.67 b</td>
<td>18.75 e-g</td>
<td>39.27 h</td>
<td>5.23 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB2</td>
<td>0.89 d-g</td>
<td>3.93 bc</td>
<td>16.48 d</td>
<td>0.27 j</td>
<td>22.08 c-e</td>
<td>37.90 i</td>
<td>6.04 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH2</td>
<td>0.88 e-g</td>
<td>3.60 f</td>
<td>15.86 e</td>
<td>0.50 e</td>
<td>25.42 bc</td>
<td>34.49  j</td>
<td>6.77 cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragah kordi</td>
<td>0.86 fg</td>
<td>3.88 cd</td>
<td>17.19 c</td>
<td>0.46 f</td>
<td>22.08 c-e</td>
<td>38.59 hi</td>
<td>7.04 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esfahan</td>
<td>0.91 ed</td>
<td>3.97 b</td>
<td>15.12 fg</td>
<td>0.43 g</td>
<td>21.25 d-f</td>
<td>33.12 k</td>
<td>6.04 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehran</td>
<td>0.89 c-f</td>
<td>3.83 d</td>
<td>14.53 h</td>
<td>0.43 g</td>
<td>22.92 cd</td>
<td>44.74 f</td>
<td>8.34 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asgari</td>
<td>0.92 b-d</td>
<td>3.94 bc</td>
<td>15.11 fg</td>
<td>0.40 gh</td>
<td>17.50 fg</td>
<td>39.27 h</td>
<td>2.48 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paveh1</td>
<td>0.91 c-e</td>
<td>3.72 e</td>
<td>14.76 gh</td>
<td>0.32 i</td>
<td>18.33 e-g</td>
<td>73.44 b</td>
<td>10.05 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paveh2</td>
<td>0.96 a</td>
<td>3.49 g</td>
<td>15.46 ef</td>
<td>0.57 d</td>
<td>23.75 b-d</td>
<td>52.52 e</td>
<td>5.95 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torshah beh</td>
<td>0.92 bc</td>
<td>3.11 i</td>
<td>18.39 b</td>
<td>0.75 a</td>
<td>15.00 g</td>
<td>42.00 g</td>
<td>4.39 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakara beh</td>
<td>0.95 ab</td>
<td>3.66 ef</td>
<td>15.60 e</td>
<td>0.38 h</td>
<td>20.42 d-f</td>
<td>61.82 d</td>
<td>6.54 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marivan1</td>
<td>0.89 c-e</td>
<td>3.65 ef</td>
<td>16.62 d</td>
<td>0.74 a</td>
<td>30.00 a</td>
<td>113.08 a</td>
<td>6.52 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marivan2</td>
<td>0.89 c-f</td>
<td>3.64 f</td>
<td>20.08 a</td>
<td>0.63 c</td>
<td>27.50 ab</td>
<td>65.24 c</td>
<td>8.54 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Different letters in each column indicates significant difference among genotypes according to LSD test (P \(≤\) 0.05).
increased during cold storage as previously reported by others (Rivera-Lopez et al., 2005). SSC had a positive correlation with weight loss and carbohydrate, in contrast, it had a negative correlation with firmness and density. SSC in quince ranging from 13.6 to 14.6% has been reported by Gunes (2008) while SSC in ‘Marivan2’ is higher than the other genotypes in the current study or previous reports. Genotypes with higher SSC are promising and potentially can be used for both processing and desert fruit. The pH of the fruit depends mainly on organic acid in the fruit and the rate of TA changes that are affected by metabolism (Clark et al., 2003). Organic acids are consumed in respiration, resulting in lower acidity and higher pH with increasing storage duration (Ghafrir et al., 2009; Rivera-Lopez et al., 2005). In the current study, TA of ‘Torshah beh’ was twofold that of ‘NB2’ and had a sour taste that is more suitable for fresh use than processed forms like jam.

**Total Carbohydrate (TC) and Fiber**

The highest TC was observed in ‘Marivan2’ and ‘Esfahan’ with 349.6 and 348.9 mg g⁻¹ dry matter, respectively, whereas the lowest fruit carbohydrate was in genotype ‘KVD3’ and ‘Tehran’ with 257.2 and 255.4 mg g⁻¹ dry matter, respectively (Figure 1-d). TC content significantly increased during storage times such that the overall TC was twofold that of harvest time after 120 days cold storage (Figure 3-d). Fruit fiber content was significantly different across genotypes and the highest and lowest was in ‘Marivan1’ and ‘Torshah beh’, respectively (Table 3).
Mineral Content

Calcium and magnesium content had significant differences among genotypes. The highest Mg and Ca were in ‘Paveh 1’ and ‘Marivan 1’, respectively (Table 3). A positive correlation was found between fruit Ca and pectin content with firmness (Table 2). ‘Marivan 1’ and ‘Paveh 1’ with highest Ca level were firmer than the other genotypes. Fruit firmness at harvest was related to fruit Ca but not to the rate of softening, after 120 days of cold storage. The involvement of Ca in the regulation of fruit maturation and ripening process has been well established (Ferguson, 1984). Ca interacts with pectin compounds and forms cross-linked polymer network which makes cell wall constituents firmer.

CONCLUSIONS

A wide range of variation in fruit quality and biochemical composition exists in quince genotypes in Iran, but just a few commercial cultivars are available. Fruit weight loss, pH, SSC, and carbohydrate increased, while firmness, density, pectin, and TA decreased during quince fruit storage; but the rate of changes varied according to genotypes. ‘Marivan 1’, ‘Ragha’, and ‘Marivan 2’ genotypes had the highest firmness during storage. The lowest percentage weight loss was observed in ‘Paveh 1’, ‘KVD4’ and ‘Esfahan’ genotypes. The highest pectin was observed in ‘Marivan 1’, ‘Marivan2’, ‘Ragha kordi’ and ‘Shakara beh’ genotypes. In this study, firmness had positive correlation with pectin and Ca content and negative correlation was found between weight losses and both firmness and density. This finding indicates that fruit constituents can affect quality changes during storage. Finally, more research is needed to evaluate the quince germplasm to find out the genotypes which can be considered as promising for further evaluation in breeding programs for releasing new cultivars to satisfy consumers’ demand and provide valuable samples in processing industry.
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(Cydonia oblonga Mill)

تغییرات فیزیکی و بیوشیمیایی میوه برخی زنوتیب های به ایران در طول نگهداری در سردخانه

س. مرادی، م. کوشش صباع، ع. مظفری، و ح. عبداللیهی

چکیده

میوه به اثرات سودمند سیبی در برای انسان داشته و منبع سیبی خویی برای پیگین جهت تولید زله و صنعت مربا می باشد. تحقیق حاضر با هدف مطالعه و بررسی شیوه، و ویژگیهای فیزیکی و شیمیایی برخی زنوتیب های به در زمان برداری و در طول نگهداری در سردخانه صورت گرفت. برای این منظور میوهای 15 زنوتیب به در زمان پلیوگ برداری شده و ارزیابی ها در زمان برداری 120 روز بعد از نگهداری در دمای 2 درجه سانتی‌گراد انجام شد. در زمان برداری میزان املاح محلول از 13 تا 18 درجه بیترکس، اسیدهای قابل تیراندازی از 0/95 تا 21/69، اسید مالیک، ب، هاشی از 0/25 تا 15/64، میزان سفتی بهت از 6/25 تا 51/89، گرم در سانتی مترا مکعب، میزان کریوهیدرات از 31/56 تا 42/3 میلی گرم در 100 گرم وزن خشک، میزان پیگین از 7/8 تا 27/0 درصد و میزان فیبر میوه از 7/1 تا 32/56 در ذیلات. همیستگن منفی بین کاهش وزن و دو صفت سفید و جگالی مشاهده شد در حالیکه سفیدی میوه با محکم کلایم و پیگین میوه همیستگی منفی داشت. به طور کلی تغییرات معنی داری در صفات مورد ارزیابی در طول نگهداری در سردخانه مشاهده شد اما میزان تغییرات در ارقام متفاوت بود. برخی زنوتیب ها دارای ویژگی منحصر به فرد به طوریکه کنترل کاهش
وزن در طول گله‌داری در زنویع "پاوه ۱"، بیشترین میزان حفظ سفتی بافت و یکپارچه میوه در زنویع "میوان ۱" و بیشترین میزان فند در زنویع "میوان ۲" مشاهده شد که این زنویع‌ها به عنوان نمونه‌های امید بخش در برنامه‌های اصلاحی قابل استفاده خواهند بود.