# 1Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on the Organoleptic Properties of2Value Added Ready-To-Serve (RTS) Beverage from Starfruit

3

#### ABSTRACT

5 The experiment was carried out to study the effect of storage conditions and period on the organoleptic properties of starfruit RTS beverage with the objective to evaluate the shelf life 6 of starfruit RTS beverage. The prepared starfruit RTS beverages were stored at ambient room 7 temperature condition and refrigerated condition for a period of 30 days. During the storage, 8 the change in organoleptic properties viz. colour, taste, flavour and overall acceptability was 9 recorded to evaluate the shelf life of the starfruit RTS beverage. The shelf life studies 10 11 revealed that although there was a change in the organoleptic properties of starfruit RTS 12 beverage samples after 30 days of storage, the changes were less remarkable in the refrigerated storage condition compared to those of the ambient room temperature storage 13 14 condition. The refrigeration extended the shelf life of the starfruit RTS beverage up to 30 days. 15

16 Keywords: Beverage, Organoleptic properties, Shelf life, Starfruit, Storage

17

#### 18 INTRODUCTION

India's diverse climate indeed contributes to the availability of a wide variety of fresh fruits 19 and vegetables throughout the year. The country's geographical diversity, with regions 20 21 ranging from tropical to temperate, allows for the cultivation of a vast array of produce. Star 22 fruit is one such tropical fruit that can be found in India (Maurya et al. 2023). Carambola also 23 commonly known as star fruit (Averrhoa carambola L.) is an underutilized attractive fruit of 24 the family Oxalidaceae. It is a subtropical evergreen tree, usually 6 to 9 m in height. The fruit 25 has distinctive ridges running down its sides which in cross section appear in form of a star 26 hence called as 'Star fruit' having light to dark yellow in colour and smooth with a waxy 27 cuticle while the flesh is light yellow, translucent, crisp and very juicy, with or without fiber 28 (Margen, 1992).

29 Starfruit can be consumed in two stages - when it is still green and unripe, it can be used in

30 savory dishes, often cooked or pickled as a vegetable. When it ripens, it turns yellow and is enjoyed as a sweet and juicy fruit. Starfruit is indeed a versatile fruit with various culinary 31 32 and potential medicinal uses. Starfruit is rich in nutrients such as vitamin C, vitamin A, 33 potassium, and dietary fiber. It is low in calories, making it a healthy addition to your diet 34 (Maurya et al. 2023). This fruit has the potential to be a great source of antioxidants due to its 35 high levels of phenolic antioxidants (Saghir et al. 2013). This fruit has anti-inflammatory activity, anti-ulcer activity, hypoglycaemichypoglycemic activity as well as antimicrobial 36 activity. Incorporating this fruit into our diet can provide approximately 30% of our daily 37 38 requirement of Vitamin C in just 100g (Cabrini et al. 2011 and Ferreira et al. 2008).

The shelf life of a food can be defined as the time period within which the food is safe to consume and/or has an acceptable quality to consumers (Fu and Labuza, 1997). Shelf-life of food products can be regarded as the period of time during which a product could be stored until it becomes unacceptable from safety, nutritional, or sensory perspectives. Shelf-life estimation of food products and beverages has become increasingly important in recent years due to technological developments and the increase in consumer interest in eating fresh, safe and high quality products (Giménez *et al.* 2012).

46 The present study aimed to evaluate the effect of storage conditions and period on the 47 organoleptic properties of value-added starfruit RTS beverage and to assess its shelf life by 48 storing it under refrigerated and ambient conditions for 30 days.

#### 49 MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted in the Post Harvest Technology Laboratory, Department of Horticulture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India, during the year 2022-2024. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with seven treatments and three replications. The treatments were  $T_0$  (Control),  $T_1$  (Starfruit Juice + Ginger Juice 2%),  $T_2$  (Starfruit Juice + Mint Juice 2%),  $T_3$  (Starfruit Juice + Aloe vera Juice 2%),  $T_4$  (Starfruit Juice + Lemongrass Juice 2%),  $T_5$  (Starfruit Juice + Basil Juice 2%),  $T_6$  (Starfruit Juice + Rosemary Juice 2%).

#### 57 Methodology for Evaluation of Shelf Life of Starfruit RTS Beverage

58 Six values added starfruit RTS beverages along with the control were filled into 250\_ml

- plastic bottles and stored at ambient room temperature condition (15-30°C) and refrigerated
- 60  $\,$  condition (4-6°C) for a period of 30 days. The stored starfruit RTS beverage were analyzed at

an interval of 15 days for a period of 30 days. During the storage, the change in organoleptic
properties *viz.* colour, taste, flavour and overall acceptability was recorded to evaluate the

63 shelf life of the starfruit RTS beverage.

#### 64 Methodology for Evaluation of Organoleptic Properties of Starfruit RTS Beverage

The starfruit RTS beverages were evaluated for various organoleptic properties *viz.* colour, taste, flavour and overall acceptability. The samples were analyzed using the 9-point hedonic scale rating method by a panel of five judges at an interval of 15 days for a period of 30 days. Each sample was assessed and given a score by the <u>panelistspanellists</u> on a scale of 1-9 for each parameter. The mean scores of all samples from all five <u>panelistspanellists</u> were tabulated and statistically analyzed to evaluate effect of storage conditions and period on organoleptic properties of value added RTS beverage from starfruit.

- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- , ,
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79
- 80

#### 81 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 82 Shelf Life of Starfruit RTS Beverage

The significant changes in organoleptic properties were observed over an increased storage period under ambient room temperature conditions, whereas no remarkable changes were observed over the same period under refrigerated conditions. The starfruit RTS beverage stored at ambient room temperature exhibited decreased acceptability after 15 days, becoming unacceptable by 30 days. The starfruit RTS beverage stored in refrigerated conditions maintained acceptability after 15 days but showed decreased acceptability by 30 days. The refrigeration extended the shelf life of the starfruit RTS beverage up to 30 days.

Similar findings were reported by Goyal and Kumar (2017) reported that the RTS beverage
was found superior under refrigeration condition as compared to room temperature; Behera *et*

92 al. (2017) reported that the changes were less remarkable in refrigerated storage as compared

volume 53 to those of ambient storage; Shagiwal and Deen (2022) reported that the organoleptic quality

94 was decreased during storage under both ambient and refrigerated temperatures; Das et al.

95 (2021) reported that the organoleptic characters showed a gradual decreasing during storage

96 due to the increasing time, temperature and enzymes activity at room temperature; Hamid et

97 al. (2017) reported that the sensory scores of drink decreased significantly during storage and

98 retained better in refrigerated storage conditions than ambient conditions.

#### 99 Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Colour of Starfruit RTS Beverage

100 The data recorded on the effect of storage conditions and period on colour of strafruitstarfruit 101 RTS beverage is presented in table 1. The organoleptic score for colour showed significant differences among different treatments during storage at 0, 15, and 30 days. The maximum 102 103 organoleptic score for colour 8.3 was reported to be reduced to 3.7 for ambient conditions 104 and 7.3 for refrigerated conditions after 30 days of storage. As the storage period increased, a 105 notable decline in organoleptic score for colour was observed in ambient conditions, whereas 106 a slight decline in organoleptic score for colour was observed in refrigerated conditions. Similar results were reported by Ram et al. (2011) during storage of blended aonla and bael 107 108 RTS beverage.

### 109 Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Taste of Starfruit RTS Beverage

110 The data recorded on the effect of storage conditions and period on taste of strafruitstarfruit RTS beverage is presented in table 2. The organoleptic score for taste showed significant 111 112 differences among different treatments during storage at 0, 15, and 30 days. The maximum organoleptic score for taste 8.7 was reported to be reduced to 3.3 for ambient conditions and 113 8.0 for refrigerated conditions after 30 days of storage. As the storage period increased, a 114 115 significant decrease in organoleptic score for taste was observed in ambient conditions, whereas a subtle decrease in organoleptic score for taste was observed in refrigerated 116 conditions. Similar results were reported by Jain and Khurdiya (2004) during storage of 117 Indian gooseberry blended RTS beverage. 118

#### 119 Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Flavour of Starfruit RTS Beverage

120 The data recorded on the effect of storage conditions and period on flavour of 121 strafruitstarfruit RTS beverage is presented in table 3. The organoleptic score for flavour 122 showed significant differences among different treatments during storage at 0, 15 and 30 123 days. The maximum organoleptic score for flavour 8.3 was reported to be reduced to 3.3 for 124 ambient conditions and 7.3 for refrigerated conditions after 30 days of storage. As the storage period increased, a marked decrease in organoleptic score for flavour was observed in
ambient conditions, whereas a modest decrease in organoleptic score for flavour was
observed in refrigerated conditions. Similar results were reported by Kumar *et al.* (2008)
during storage of musambi RTS beverage.

## 129 Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Overall acceptability of Starfruit RTS130 Beverage

131 The data recorded on the effect of storage conditions and period on overall acceptability of 132 strafruitstarfruit RTS beverage is presented in table 4. The organoleptic score for overall acceptability showed significant differences among different treatments during storage at 0, 133 134 15 and 30 days. The maximum organoleptic score for overall acceptability 8.7 was reported 135 to be reduced to 3.7 for ambient conditions and 8.0 for refrigerated conditions after 30 days 136 of storage. As the storage period increased, a notable decrease in organoleptic score for 137 overall acceptability was observed in ambient conditions, whereas a marginal decrease in organoleptic score for overall acceptability was observed in refrigerated conditions. Similar 138 results were reported by Pandey et al. (2004) during storage of guava RTS beverage. 139

- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- 144

| COLOUR                |                    |            |            |                                |            |            |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--|
|                       | Ambient Conditions |            |            | <b>Refrigerated Conditions</b> |            |            |  |
| Treatment             | 0 DAYS             | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS | 0 DAYS                         | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS |  |
| T <sub>0</sub>        | 6.0                | 3.3        | 2.3        | 6.0                            | 5.7        | 5.0        |  |
| T <sub>1</sub>        | 8.3                | 5.3        | 3.7        | 8.3                            | 8.0        | 7.3        |  |
| $T_2$                 | 7.7                | 5.0        | 3.0        | 7.7                            | 7.3        | 7.0        |  |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub> | 6.3                | 4.3        | 2.7        | 6.3                            | 6.7        | 6.3        |  |
| T <sub>4</sub>        | 7.3                | 4.3        | 2.7        | 7.3                            | 7.0        | 7.0        |  |
| <b>T</b> 5            | 7.0                | 4.7        | 2.7        | 7.0                            | 7.0        | 6.7        |  |
| T <sub>6</sub>        | 6.7                | 5.0        | 2.3        | 6.7                            | 6.3        | 6.3        |  |
| F-test                | S                  | S          | S          | S                              | S          | S          |  |

145 Table 1: Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Colour of Starfruit RTS Beverage

| <u>SD</u> S.Ed<br>(+/-) | 0.51 | 0.50  | 0.35  | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.36 |
|-------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| CV                      | 8.85 | 13.36 | 15.47 | 8.85 | 7.90 | 6.69 |
| CD at 5%                | 1.11 | 1.09  | 0.76  | 1.11 | 0.96 | 0.78 |

147 Table 2: Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Taste of Starfruit RTS Beverage

| TASTE                   |                    |            |            |                         |            |            |
|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|
|                         | Ambient Conditions |            |            | Refrigerated Conditions |            |            |
| Treatment               | 0 DAYS             | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS | 0 DAYS                  | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS |
| T <sub>0</sub>          | 5.3                | 3.7        | 1.7        | 5.3                     | 5.0        | 4.7        |
| $T_1$                   | 8.7                | 6.0        | 3.3        | 8.7                     | 8.3        | 8.0        |
| $T_2$                   | 7.7                | 6.0        | 3.0        | 7.7                     | 7.3        | 7.0        |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>   | 6.3                | 5.0        | 3.0        | 6.3                     | 6.0        | 6.0        |
| <b>T</b> 4              | 7.3                | 5.3        | 2.7        | 7.3                     | 7.0        | 6.7        |
| <b>T</b> 5              | 6.7                | 4.7        | 2.3        | 6.7                     | 6.3        | 6.3        |
| T <sub>6</sub>          | 7.7                | 5.7        | 2.7        | 7.7                     | 7.3        | 7.0        |
| F-test                  | S                  | S          | S          | S                       | S          | S          |
| <u>SD</u> S.Ed<br>(+/-) | 0.64               | 0.52       | 0.42       | 0.64                    | 0.38       | 0.33       |
| CV                      | 11.09              | 12.26      | 19.48      | 11.09                   | 6.85       | 6.11       |
| CD at 5%                | 1.40               | 1.13       | 0.92       | 1.40                    | 0.82       | 0.71       |

Table 3: Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Flavour of Starfruit RTS Beverage

| FLAVOUR               |        |            |            |                                |            |            |  |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|--|
|                       | Amb    | ient Condi | tions      | <b>Refrigerated Conditions</b> |            |            |  |
| Treatment             | 0 DAYS | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS | 0 DAYS                         | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS |  |
| T <sub>0</sub>        | 6.0    | 4.3        | 2.0        | 6.0                            | 5.7        | 5.3        |  |
| $T_1$                 | 8.3    | 5.7        | 3.3        | 8.3                            | 8.0        | 7.3        |  |
| $T_2$                 | 8.0    | 5.7        | 2.7        | 8.0                            | 7.7        | 7.0        |  |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub> | 6.3    | 5.3        | 2.3        | 6.3                            | 6.0        | 5.7        |  |
| T <sub>4</sub>        | 7.3    | 5.3        | 2.7        | 7.3                            | 6.7        | 6.3        |  |
| <b>T</b> 5            | 6.7    | 5.7        | 2.3        | 6.7                            | 6.3        | 6.0        |  |
| <b>T</b> <sub>6</sub> | 7.3    | 5.3        | 2.3        | 7.3                            | 7.0        | 6.7        |  |

| F-test                  | S     | S    | S     | S     | S    | S    |
|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| <u>SD</u> S.Ed<br>(+/-) | 0.61  | 0.40 | 0.38  | 0.61  | 0.50 | 0.40 |
| CV                      | 10.51 | 9.83 | 17.36 | 10.51 | 9.13 | 7.83 |
| CD at 5%                | 1.34  | 0.88 | 0.82  | 1.34  | 1.10 | 0.88 |

151

#### 152 Table 4: Effect of Storage Conditions and Period on Overall acceptability of Starfruit RTS

#### 153 Beverage

| OVERALL ACCEPTABILITY   |                    |            |            |   |            |            |  |
|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|---|------------|------------|--|
|                         | Ambient Conditions |            |            | <b>Refrigerated Conditions</b>  |            |            |  |
| Treatment               | 0 DAYS             | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS | ABILITY<br>Refrige<br>0 DAYS<br>5.7<br>8.7<br>7.7<br>6.7<br>7.3<br>7.0<br>7.7<br>8<br>0.67<br>11.41<br>1.47 | 15<br>DAYS | 30<br>DAYS |  |
| T <sub>0</sub>          | 5.7                | 4.0        | 2.0        | 5.7   | 5.3        | 5.0        |  |
| $T_1$                   | 8.7                | 5.7        | 3.7        | 8.7   | 8.3        | 8.0        |  |
| $T_2$                   | 7.7                | 5.3        | 2.7        | 7.7   | 7.3        | 7.0        |  |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>   | 6.7                | 5.0        | 3.0        | 6.7   | 6.3        | 6.3        |  |
| T <sub>4</sub>          | 7.3                | 4.7        | 2.7        | 7.3   | 7.0        | 6.7        |  |
| <b>T</b> 5              | 7.0                | 4.3        | 2.7        | 7.0   | 6.7        | 6.3        |  |
| T <sub>6</sub>          | 7.7                | 4.7        | 2.3        | 7.7   | 7.3        | 7.0        |  |
| F-test                  | S                  | S          | S          | S   | S          | S          |  |
| <u>SD</u> S.Ed<br>(+/-) | 0.67               | 0.40       | 0.41       | 0.67  | 0.43       | 0.33       |  |
| CV                      | 11.41              | 10.31      | 18.57      | 11.41   | 7.63       | 6.02       |  |
| CD at 5%                | 1.47               | 0.88       | 0.90       | 1.47  | 0.94       | 0.71       |  |

154

#### 155 CONCLUSION

156 The shelf life studies observed significant changes in organoleptic properties over an increased storage period under ambient room temperature conditions. The starfruit RTS 157 beverages stored at ambient room temperature exhibited decreased acceptability after 15 158 159 days, becoming unacceptable by 30 days. However, no remarkable changes in organoleptic properties were observed over an increased storage period under refrigerated conditions. The 160 starfruit RTS beverage stored in refrigerated conditions maintained acceptability after 15 161 days but showed decreased acceptability by 30 days. The shelf life studies revealed that 162 refrigeration extended the shelf life of the starfruit RTS beverage up to 30 days. Therefore, it 163 is recommended to store the starfruit RTS beverage in refrigerated conditions to achieve 164

165 maximum shelf life and sensory acceptability.

| 166 | REFERENCES  |                             |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 167 | Behera, G., Panigrahi, S. S. and Rayaguru, K. (2017). Effect of storage conditions on           |                             |
| 168 | quality of ready-to-serve beverage from residual osmotic solution of star                       |                             |
| 169 | fruit. Advances in Food Science and Engineering, $1(4)_{2}$ : 144-151.                          |                             |
| 170 | Cabrini, D. A., Moresco, H. H., Imazu, P., Silva, C.D., and Pietrovski, E. F. (2020).           |                             |
| 171 | Analysis of the Potential Topical AntiInflammatory Activity of Averrhoa carambola               |                             |
| 172 | L. in Mice; <u>c2011. Retrieved April 23, 2020, from, 2011.</u>                                 | Formatted: Font color: Red  |
| 173 | Das, A., Bahadur, V., Prasad, V. M. and Mishra, S. (2021). Standardization, physico-            |                             |
| 174 | chemical & organoleptic assessment during storage of ready to serve blended kinnow-             |                             |
| 175 | aonla beverage. The Pharma Innovation Journal, 10(12), 700-706.                                 |                             |
| 176 | Ferreira, E. B., Fernandes, L. C., Galende, S. B., Cortez, D. A. G., Bazotte, R. B. (2008).     |                             |
| 177 | Hypoglycemic effect of the hydroalcoholic extract of leaves of Averrhoa carambola               |                             |
| 178 | L. (Oxalidaceae). Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia, 182: 339-343.                            |                             |
| 179 | Fu, B., & Labuza, T. P. (1997). Shelf-life testing: procedures and prediction methods.          |                             |
| 180 | In Quality in frozen food (pp. 377-415). Boston, MA <sub>2<sup>+</sup></sub> Springer US.       |                             |
| 181 | Goyal, S. K. & and Kumar, A. (2017). Preparation of Ready-To-Serve (RTS) Beverage               |                             |
| 182 | from multi-fruit juice and storage study at room and refrigeration condition. Journal of        |                             |
| 183 | Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 6(6S): 461-464.   |                             |
| 184 | Hamid, T. N., Kumar, P. & and Thakur, A. (2017). Studies on preparation and                     |                             |
| 185 | preservation of ready-to-serve (RTS) beverage from underutilized mulberry (Morus                |                             |
| 186 | alba L.) fruits and its quality evaluation during storage. International Journal of             |                             |
| 187 | Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 6(9),÷ 1067-1079.                                    |                             |
| 188 | Jain, S. K., & Khurdiya, D. S. (2004). Vitamin C enrichment of fruit juice based ready-to-serve |                             |
| 189 | beverages through blending of Indian gooseberry (Emblica officinalis Gaertn.) juice. Plant      |                             |
| 190 | Foods for human nutrition, 59, 63-66.   | Formatted: Font: Not Italic |
| 191 | Kumar, K., Sharma, A., & Barmanray, A. (2008). Storage stability of musambi (Citrus             |                             |
| 192 | sinensis) RTS Beverage in different storage conditions. Beverage and Food Beverage              |                             |
| 193 | World, 35, 47-48.   | Formatted: Font: Not Italic |

| Margen S. (1922). Carambola. In: The Wellness Encyclopedia of Food and Nutrition, Health   |  |
|--|--|
| Letts Assoc. New York, 1992, 271_, 272.  |  |
| Maurya, P., Gupta, V., Verma, A., & and Maurya, A. (2023). Formulation of star fruit   |  |
| (Averrhoa carambola L.) powder unified digestive food products and their quality   |  |
| evaluation. <i>The Pharma Innovation Journal</i> , 12(9) <sub>2</sub> : 2950-2956.   |  |
| Pandey, A. K. (2004). Study about the storage stability of guava beverages. Progressive  |  |
| Horticulture, 36(1), 142-145.  | Formatted: Font: Not Italic  |
| Ram, R. B., Meena, M. L., Sonkar, P., Lata, R., & Upadhyay, A. K. (2011). Standardization  |  |
| and evaluation of blended aonla (Emblica officinalis Gaertn.) and bael (Aegle marmelos   |  |
| Correa) RTS beverages. Plant Arch, 11, 205-208.  | Formatted: Font: Not Italic  |
| Saghir S. A. M. (2013). Averrhoa carambola L.: from traditional uses to pharmacological activities. Boletín Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Plantas Medicinales y Aromática, |  |
| $12_{a^{+}} 209-219.$  |  |
| Shagiwal, M. & and Deen, B. (2022). Studies on development of ready-to-serve (RTS)   |  |
| beverage from strawberry (Fragaria ananassa Duch), ginger (Zingiber officinale Rosc)   |  |
| and aloe vera (Aloe barbadensis Miller) blend. The Pharma Innovation Journal, 11(7),   |  |
| 2308-2317.   |  |
|  | <ul> <li>Margen S. (1922). Carambola. In: The Wellness Encyclopedia of Food and Nutrition, Health Letts Assoc. New York, 1992, 271<sub>27</sub>-272.</li> <li>Maurya, P., Gupta, V., Verma, A., <u>&amp; and</u> Maurya, A. (2023). Formulation of star fruit (<i>Averrhoa carambola</i> L.) powder unified digestive food products and their quality evaluation. <i>The Pharma Innovation Journal</i>, 12(9)<sub>2</sub>: 2950-2956.</li> <li>Pandey, A. K. (2004). Study about the storage stability of guava beverages. <i>Progressive Horticulture</i>, <u>3</u>6(1), 142-145.</li> <li>Ram, R. B., Meena, M. L., Sonkar, P., Lata, R., &amp; Upadhyay, A. K. (2011). Standardization and evaluation of blended aonla (<i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn.) and bael (<i>Aegle marmelos</i> Correa) RTS beverages. <i>Plant Arch</i>, <u>11</u>, 205-208.</li> <li>Saghir S. A. M. (2013). Averrhoa carambola L.: from traditional uses to pharmacological activities. Boletín Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Plantas Medicinales y Aromática, 12<sub>2</sub>: 209-219.</li> <li>Shagiwal, M. <u>&amp; and</u> Deen, B. (2022). Studies on development of ready-to-serve (RTS) beverage from strawberry (<i>Fragaria ananassa</i> Duch), ginger (<i>Zingiber officinale</i> Rosc) and aloe vera (<i>Aloe barbadensis</i> Miller) blend. <i>The Pharma Innovation Journal</i>, 11(7)<sub>2</sub>: 2308-2317.</li> </ul> |

9