Improvement of Yield and Quality of Banana (Musa sp) Grand "Nain" cv. Through Bunch Coverage Color and Trimming

Alv. M. A. M.¹, Ezz. T. M.¹, E. G. Ibrahim² and A.R.M. Mohamed³ ¹Plant Production Dept., Faculty of Agriculture (Saba Basha), Alexandria University ²Hort. Res. Institute, Agric. Res. Center, Giza Egypt. ³Postgraduate student

ABSTRACT: This investigation was conducted during two successive seasons 2015 and 2016 on (Musa sp.) cv. Grand Nain plants grown in in private orchard in Badr center. Behira governorate, Egypt, to study the effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on growth, yield and fruit quality of banana. A split plot designed experiment was carried out where the four bunch covers (untreated, white, blue and double bags) were arranged in main plots, four bunch trimming (untreated, removing one, two and three hands) were arranged in sub plots. Results revealed that the treatment of double bags and removing three hands gave the highest mean values of yield and fruit quality as (finger length, diameter and weight, earliness of harvesting time (days), yield, pulp weight, pulp (%),number of finger/ hand, bunch and hand weights compared with control and other treatments during both seasons. Also, results indicated that, the treatment of bunch trimming (removing three hands) gave the maximum mean values of (finger length, diameter and weight, earlier time of harvesting (days), yield, pulp weight, pulp (%),number of fingers/ hand, bunch and hand weights) compared with control and other treatments during both seasons.

Keywords: banana, bunch covers, bunch trimming, yield, fruit quality, chemical composition

INTRODUCTION

Banana (*Musa* sp.) is the most consumed fruit in the world. Bananas are also an important part of the smallholder farming communities and families living in rural areas. Edible bananas (Musa sp.) are believed to have originated from Asia and were distributed throughout the world during early migration of Polynesians (Lorenzen, 2010). It is grown in gardens and smallholdings in some 120 countries, mainly in the tropics and subtropics (Amani, 2005 & 2007 and Jones, 2000). Major banana growing areas of the world are geographically situated in the tropics between the equator and latitudes 20°North and 20°South (Robinson, 1993).

There are several different species of bananas that are cultivated today, all of which belong to the family Musaceae, and the genus Musa. The most commonly cultivated one (the one that is found in grocery stores) is the Cavendish cultivar. This banana (Musa acuminate) makes up 95% of all banana sales in North America (Koeppel, 2010). Although none of them are nearly as popular as Cavendish, there are of course many other cultivars produced. The 'Lady Finger' and 'Orito' varieties are much shorter and stubbier. There are also the 'Apple' Bananas, 'Pisang Raja', 'Red' and 'Plantains', the last of which actually belong to the species *M. paradisiaca* and are much starchier and less sweet than the other bananas (Nsabimana, 2014).

The effect of banana bunch covering especially in the tropics has demonstrated inconsistent results on the size of fruit. Double covering increased finger weight of the top six hands by 4% (Johns, 2005). Trimming to

Vol. 23 (2), 2018

10, 8 and 6 hands increased the yield per bunch of extra grade fruit by 18%, 23% and 39% (Jones, 2005) maturity. Double covering did not affect the yield of extra-large fruit significantly (Jones, 2005).

Bunch covers of various colors and conditions (perforated and nonperforated) have been extensively used in both tropical and subtropical banana growing countries with the aim of improving yield and quality (Robinson, 1996). Improved quality includes appealing skin color, reduced sunburn, and reduced fruit splitting, increased finger length and bunch weight among others (Amarante *et al.*, 2002). Bunch covers have also been used to protect bunches from low temperatures, especially in temperate countries (Gowen, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Harhash and Al-Obeed, 2010). Indeed bagging has been shown to reduce winter stress under supra-optimal condition which resulted in early fruit maturation (Jia *et al.*, 2005).

The removal of the 3 lower hands from the immature racemes significantly reduced bunch mean weight and total yield. However, both removal of lower hands and bunch bagging increased size of individual fruits in the distal hand, thus up-grading fruit quality. In addition, these practices also reduced the number of days required from bunch-shooting to harvest (Irizarry *et al.*, 1992). Accordingly, the aims of this study are as follows:

- 1. Finding an ideal protocol that determines the color of the appropriate cover and the number of hands required to reduce the impact on the banana crop.
- 2. Improving productivity and quality recipes of bananas to increase export rates.
- 3. Protecting banana plants from low temperatures and from bad effects on the bunches by choosing the appropriate cover for the bunch.
- 4. Increasing the productivity of the banana crop by relaxing the hands and providing food
- 5. Improving the quality and quantity of bananas grown on sandy soil in the Arab Republic of Egypt.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was carried out during two successive seasons 2015 and 2016 on (*Musa* spp.) cv. Grand Nain cultivar plants grown in private orchard in Badr center, Behira governorate, Egypt. The treatment of covering the bunch with transparent polypropylene skirt bag was compared against the normal farmers' practice without covering the bunch. The bunches under the first treatment were covered at the time of opening of first hand. One ends of the bag was tied with a thread and the lowers end was open. The bunch trimming with removing one, two and three hands of bunches. The experiment followed the spilt plot design. The treatments can be illustrated as follows:

A) Main plots (bunch covers)

- Untreated.
- White bags.
- Blue bags.
- Double bags (white and blue).

B) Sub-plots (bunch trimming)

- Untreated
- Removing one hand.
- Removing two hands.
- Removing three hands.

So, the experiment included four cover and four bunch trimming treatments (4x4=16) with 4 blocks for each treatment.

Data recorded:

Samples of five plants of each experimental plot were taken to determine growth parameters at the end of the season as follows:

A) Yield and fruit quality

The produced fruit yield on each replicate tree resulting from the applied treatments was expressed as:

• Finger length (cm)

Finger length was measured by using foot scale from the top of a finger to the pedicel; the mean length of finger was recorded and expressed in centimeters.

• Finger diameter (cm)

Finger diameter was measured at the middle of finger by using vernier calipers and mean diameter of finger was recorded and expressed in centimeters.

• Finger weight (g)

Fingers were weighed by using electronic balance and the mean weight of fingers was recorded and expressed in grams.

- Time of harvesting (days)
- Yield (ton/fed.)
- Pulp weight (g)
- Number of fingers/ hands.
- Bunch weight (kg)

Were determined at harvest stage.

B) Chemical fruit characteristics:

Regarding chemical fruit characteristics, samples of 10 fruits from each replicate plant, i.e., fruits for each of the applied treatment were selected randomly at harvest to determine the following parameters:

- Total soluble solids of fruit juice (TSS %): The juice extracted by squeezing the homogenized fruit pulp through muslin cloth was used to measure the TSS by hand refractometer according to Chen and Mellenthin (1981).
- The percentage of total acidity: was determined in fruit juice according to (Chen and Mellenthin, 1981). A known weight of fruit pulp (5g) was homogenized with distilled water and filtered using muslin cloth followed by Whatman No. 1 filter paper. An aliquot of 10 ml was taken and titrated against standard 0.1N NaOH using phenolphthalein indicator. The appearance of light pink colour was marked as the end point. The value was expressed in terms of malic acid as per cent titratable acidity of juice. Five milliliters from the obtained juice were used to determine the titratable acidity. The titratable acidity was expressed as grams malic acid / 100 milliliters fruit juice.

- •**TSS**/ acidity ratio: were calculated for each replicate of the applied treatments.
- **Total sugars:** were determined in fresh fruit samples according to Malik and Singh (1980). Sugars were extracted from 5 g fresh weight and determined by phenol sulfuric and Nelson arsenate –molybadate colorimetric methods for total and reducing sugars, respectively. The non-reducing sugars were calculated by difference between total sugars and reducing sugars.

• Vitamin C (Ascorbic acid):

The ascorbic acid content of the juice was determined by titration with 2, 6 dichloro phenol-indo-phenol (AOAC,1985) and calculated as milli-grams per 100 ml of juice.

Statistical analysis:

Results of the measured parameters were subjected to computerized statistical analysis using MSTAT package for analysis of variance (ANOVA) and means of treatments were compared using LSD at 0.05 probability level according to Snedecor and Cochran (1990).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A) Yield and fruit quality

Results recorded in Tables (1, 2 and 3) revealed that double covering bunches significantly increased fruit quality characters such as finger length (21.55 and 23.75 cm), finger diameter (3.23 and 3.55 cm), finger weight (168.30 and 185.15 g), earliness of harvesting (114.50 and 109.33 days), yield (34.87 and 38.36 t/fed), pulp weight (124.63 and 136.81 g), number of finger/ hand (20.44 and 22.47) and bunch weight (30.68 and 47.33 kg), respectively, during both seasons, compared to the control treatment which gave the lowest mean values of finger length (16.58 and18.24 cm), finger diameter (2.41 and 2.64 cm), finger weight (149.24 and 164.26 g), untreated plants recorded the highest number of days to maturity (128.50 and 141.00 days), also, gave the lowest mean values of yield (25.82 and 30.23 kg), pulp weight (101.45 and 111.59 g), number of fingers/ hand (17.71 and 19.48) and bunch weight (24.18 and 25.42 kg), during 2015 and 2016 seasons, respectively.

On the other hand, data presented in Table (1) indicated that bunch trimming (remove three hands) caused a significant increase of finger length (22.26 and 24.14 cm), finger diameter (3.16 and 3.39 cm), finger weight (169.38 and 186.35 g), earliness of harvesting time (113.00 and 124.25 days), yield (35.56 and 39.17 t/fed), pulp weight (131.36 and 144.49 g), number of fingers/ hand (24.39 and 26.83) and bunch weight (30.98 and 32.38 kg), respectively, in 2015 and 2016 seasons, compared the control treatment which gave the lowest mean values of finger length (17.78 and 19.53 cm), finger diameter (3.69 and 2.96 cm), finger weight (145.75 and 160.41g), yield (24.75 and 29.05 kg), pulp weight (89.76 and 105.07g), pulp % (67.32 and 67.52 %) and decreased the time of harvesting (127.00 and 139.50 days), number of fingers/ hand (15.04 and 16.54) and bunch weight (23.96 and 42.38 kg), respectively, in 2015 and

2016 seasons. These results are in agreement with those obtained by Aba *et al.* (2009), Baiyeri *et al.* (2009), Kassem *et al.* (2010), Vargas-Calvo and Valle-Ruiz (2011), Amani and Avagyan (2014) and Sharma (2014) on banana.

٦	Freatments		length m)	Finger diameter (cm)		Finger weight (g)	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	
A) Bunch co	vers						
Untreated		16.58	18.24	2.41	2.64	149.24	164.26
White bags		20.28	21.96	2.62	2.88	156.21	173.61
Blue bags		21.39	23.53	3.14	3.36	159.73	180.50
Double bags LSD(0.05)		21.55 2.01 **	23.75 0.06**	3.23 0.06**	3.55 0.151 **	168.30 0.375 **	185.15 0.186 **
B) Bunch tri	amina	2.01	0.00	0.00	0.151	0.375	0.100
Untreated	mmig	17.78	19.53	3.69	2.96	145.75	160.41
Removing one	hand	19.49	21.04	2.64	2.90	145.75	175.26
Removing two		20.27	22.77	2.90	3.19	165.00	181.50
Removing thre		22.26	24.14	3.16	3.39	169.38	186.35
LSD (0.05)		ns	0.06**	0.06**	0.15**	0.37**	0.19**
Interaction effect (AXB)							
Untreated	Untreated	14.82	16.30	2.03	2.21	141.35	155.86
	Removing one hand	15.92	17.50	2.33	2.56	145.71	160.28
	Removing two hands	17.12	18.83	2.56	2.81	151.32	166.45
	Removing three hands	18.47	20.32	2.71	2.98	158.60	174.46
	Untreated	18.08	19.62	2.34	2.57	144.15	158.56
White bags	Removing one hand	20.62	21.07	2.46	2.70	152.43	174.79
	Removing two hands	18.91	22.68	2.75	3.02	162.33	178.56
	Removing three hands	23.52	24.47	2.94	3.23	165.94	182.53
	Untreated	18.90	20.79	3.59	3.95	147.11	161.82
Blue bags	Removing one hand	20.44	22.48	2.75	3.02	148.90	182.99
0	Removing two hands	22.16	24.37	2.95	3.24	170.35	187.38
	Removing three hands	24.07	26.48	3.28	3.24	172.55	189.80
Double bags	Untreated	19.31	21.42	2.82	3.10	150.38	165.42
	Removing one hand	21.01	23.10	3.02	3.32	166.36	182.99
	Removing two hands	22.90	25.19	3.36	3.69	176.00	193.60
	Removing three hands	23.00	25.30	3.73	4.10	180.45	198.61
Interaction AXB		**	**	**	**	**	**

Table (1). Effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on finger length,
diameter and weight of Grand Nain banana plants in sandy soil
(2015 and 2016 seasons)

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability. ns: not significant

Table (2). Effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on time of
harvesting, yield, pulp weight and pulp (%) of Grand Nain
banana plants in sandy soil (2015 and 2016 seasons)

Treatments		harve	e of esting ys)		Yield (Ton/fed)		Pulp weight (g)		Pulp (%)	
		2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	
A)Bunch covers										
Untreated		128.50	141.00	25.82	30.23	101.45	111.59	67.70	67.72	
White bags		118.25	130.25	30.70	33.82	102.08	118.88	71.59	71.74	
Blue bags		116.00	127.50	32.38	35.62	117.35	129.09	72.94	76.01	
Double bags		114.50	129.33	34.87	38.36	124.63	136.81	75.99	79.08	
LSD (0.05)		2.04**	ns	2.80*	0.01**	ns	0.01**	ns	0.10**	
B)Bunch trin	nming									
Untreated		127.00	139.50	24.75	29.05	89.76	105.07	67.32	67.52	
Removing on		121.25	133.50	29.11	32.02	106.40	117.04	69.70	71.78	
Removing two		116.00	120.83	34.35	37.78	117.98	129.77	71.76	75.82	
Removing thr	ee hands	113.00	124.25	35.56	39.17	131.36	144.49	79.43	79.43	
LSD (0.05)		2.33**	ns	2.80**	0.01**	8.67**	0.01**	ns	0.10**	
Interaction e	ffect (AXB)									
	Untreated	139	152	15.79	24.70	86.02	94.62	60.70	60.69	
Untreated	Removing one hand	132	145	25.41	27.95	95.58	105.13	65.59	65.60	
onnoutou	Removing two hands	124	136	30.00	33.00	106.20	116.82	70.11	70.18	
	Removing three hands	119	131	32.06	35.26	118.00	129.79	74.40	74.40	
	Untreated	126	139	25.34	27.87	67.85	101.03	65.07	65.69	
White bags	Removing one hand	118	130	28.40	31.24	102.06	112.27	69.69	69.69	
J. J	Removing two hands	116	128	33.77	37.15	112.41	123.63	73.79	73.79	
	Removing three hands	113	124	35.29	39.03	126.00	138.59	77.80	77.80	
	Untreated	123	135	27.25	29.97	99.51	109.47	70.02	70.02	
Blue bags	Removing one hand	119	131	30.73	33.80	110.56	121.62	74.25	74.25	
Ũ	Removing two hands	112	123	35.25	38.77	122.85	135.12	78.20	78.30	
	Removing three hands	110	121	36.30	39.93	136.50	150.14	81.47	81.47	
Double bags	Untreated	120	132	30.59	33.65	105.67	115.13	73.51	73.67	
	Removing one hand	116	128	31.91	35.09	117.42	129.14	77.51	77.58	
	Removing two hands	112	156	38.38	42.22	130.46	143.51	56.69	81.03	
	Removing three hands	110	121	38.61	42.47	144.96	159.44	84.06	84.06	
Interaction AXB		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability. ns: not significant

	Treatment		of finger and		weight g)	Hand weight (kg)	
		2015	2015	2015	2016	2015	2016
A)Bunch co	vers						
Untreated		17.71	19.48	24.18	25.42	2.70	2.66
White bags		19.05	20.96	26.75	28.25	3.00	3.21
Blue bags		19.83	21.78	28.73	32.15	3.25	3.53
Double bags		20.44	22.47	30.68	47.33	3.47	3.82
LSD(0.05)		0.06**	0.02**	0.22**	ns	0.07**	0.45*
B)Bunch trin	nming						
Untreated		15.04	16.54	23.96	24.38	2.20	2.38
Removing on	e hand	17.22	18.92	26.46	27.16	2.72	2.98
Removing two	o hands	20.37	22.39	28.93	31.23	3.36	3.70
Removing three hands		24.39	26.83	30.98	32.38	4.14	4.17
LSD(0.05)		0.06**	0.02**	0.22**	ns	0.07**	0.45*
Interaction effect (AXB)							
	Untreated	12.98	14.28	20.42	20.76	1.84	2.02
Untreated	Removing one hand	15.35	16.88	23.10	24.51	2.35	2.57
	Removing two hands	19.56	21.51	25.70	27.27	2.96	3.25
	Removing three hands	22.95	25.24	27.50	29.12	3.64	2.80
	Untreated	14.57	16.03	22.84	23.54	2.10	2.31
White bags	Removing one hand	17.32	19.05	25.82	26.50	2.64	2.90
	Removing two hands	20.70	22.77	28.91	30.70	3.36	3.69
	Removing three hands	23.60	25.98	29.42	32.26	3.92	3.97
	Untreated	15.48	17.03	24.77	96.54	2.28	2.35
Blue bags	Removing one hand	1.20	19.93	27.94	27.73	2.88	3.17
5	Removing two hands	19.96	21.92	29.23	32.05	3.40	3.74
	Removing three hands	25.70	28.24	33.00	33.00	4.43	4.87
Double bags	Untreated	17.15	18.85	27.81	28.69	2.58	2.84
	Removing one hand	18.03	19.83	29.01	29.91	3.00	3.30
	Removing two hands	21.25	23.37	31.90	34.89	3.74	4.11
	Removing three hands	25.32	27.85	34.00	35.09	4.57	5.03
Interaction A	XB	**	**	**	**	**	**

Table (3). Effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on number of finger,
bunch weight and hand weight of Grand Nain banana plants in
sandy soil (2015 and 2016 seasons)

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability. ns: not significant

B) Chemical fruit characteristics

The results of the chemical composition of Grand Nain banana are shown in (Tables 4 and 5) as affected by bunch cover and bunch trimming. Regarding the chemical composition, the double bags covering significantly increased all the studied chemical compositions parameters i.e. TSS (21.94 and 23.68 %), acidity (0.330 and 362 %), TSS/Acidity (64.87 and 66.66), VC (6.62 and 7.04 mg/100 g FW), total sugars (22.47 and 24.97%), reducing sugars (15.52 and 18.93 %) and non-reducing sugars (6.93 and 5.39%), while, control treatment gave the lowest mean values of TSS (15.80 and 20.84 %), acidity (0.255 and 0.259 %), TSS/Acidity (61.81 and 59.91), VC (4.40 and 4.71 mg/100 g FW), total sugars (15.97 and 17.46 %), reducing sugars (9.98 and 12.02 %) and non-reducing sugars (6.00 and 5.42), during 2015 and 2016 seasons. Regarding to bunch trimming, data presented in (Tables 4 and 5) indicated that bunch trimming caused significant increase of fruit chemical composition parameters, where, the removal of three hands gave the maximum values of TSS (21.41 and 22.98 %), acidity (0.322 and 0.369 %), TSS/Acidity (63.17 and 61.20 %), VC (6.18 and 6.99 mg/100 g FW), total sugars (22.21 and 24.27 %), reducing sugars (15.46 and 18.61 %) and non-reducing sugars (6.70 and 5.66), compared with untreated treatment which gave the minimum values of TSS (15.63 and 20.20 %), acidity (0.235 and 0.269 %), TSS/Acidity (61.15 and 63.17), VC (4.61 and 5.10 mg/100 g FW), total sugars (15.67 and 17.69 %), reducing sugars (11.23 and 13.56 %) and non-reducing sugars (4.87 and 4.10), respectively, during both seasons. These results are in agreement with those reported by Irizarry *et al.* (1992), Daniells *et al.* (1994), Goenaga and Irizarry (2006), Hassan *et al.* (2007), Wanichkul and Boonma (2009), Bugaud *et al.* (2012), Kutinyu *et al.* (2015) and Sarkar (2015) on banana.

Table (4). Effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on TSS (%), acidity (%),TSS/Acidity (%) and VC (mg/100 g FW) of Grand Nain banana plants in sandy soil (2015 and 2016 season)

Treatments		TSS	6 (%)	Acidity (%)		TSS/Acidity		VC (mg/100 g FW)	
Ire	Treatments		2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
A)Bunch cov	ers								
Untreated		15.80	20.84	0.255	0.259	61.81	59.91	4.40	4.71
White bags		17.42	20.92	0.280	0.297	61.79	62.62	4.91	5.67
Blue bags		18.55	22.70	0.303	0.330	61.64	61.27	5.68	6.62
Double bags		21.94	23.68	0.330	0.362	64.87	66.66	6.62	7.04
LSD(0.05)		0.38**	0.02**	0.01**	0.03**	ns	0.02**	0.17**	0.03**
B)Bunch trim	ming								
Untreated		15.63	20.20	0.235	0.269	61.51	63.17	4.61	5.10
Removing one		17.37	22.91	0.281	0.300	62.51	63.14	5.12	5.66
Removing two		19.30	22.05	0.312	0.310	62.91	62.96	5.69	6.29
Removing thre	e nands	21.41 0.38**	22.98	0.322	0.369 0.03**	63.17	61.20	6.18 0.17 **	6.99
LSD(0.05)		0.38**	0.02**	0.01**	0.03^^	ns	0.02**	0.17**	0.03**
Interaction eff	fect (AXB)								
	Untreated	13.39	19.14	0.216	0.238	61.81	59.96	3.73	3.99
Untreated	Removing one hand	14.88	21.44	0.240	0.265	61.84	60.11	4.14	4.46
	Removing two hands	16.53	21.00	0.267	0.207	61.78	59.80	4.61	4.93
	Removing three ands	18.37	21.78	0.297	0.328	61.80	59.79	5.12	5.48
	Untreated	14.79	20.20	0.253	0.251	63.15	62.83	4.29	4.81
White bags	Removing one hand	16.44	20.05	0.290	0.284	59.57	61.79	4.76	5.33
0	Removing two ands	18.27	21.34	0.322	0.310	62.74	62.90	5.30	5.94
	Removing three ands	20.18	22.11	0.255	0.344	61.68	62.95	5.30	6.60
	Untreated	15.73	20.46	0.264	0.280	61.63	61.46	4.81	5.61
Dhua haara	Removing one hand	17.47	24.63	0.283	0.311	61.63	61.51	5.35	6.24
Blue bags	Removing two ands	19.42	22.11	0.315	0.346	61.64	61.41	5.94	6.93
	Removing three ands	21.58	23.62	0.350	0.385	61.64	60.72	6.61	7.70
Double bags	Untreated	18.60	21.01	0.279	0.307	59.44	68.43	5.61	5.97
	Removing one hand	20.67	25.54	0.310	0.341	66.98	68.44	6.23	6.63
	Removing two ands	22.97	23.74	0.345	0.379	66.52	68.44	6.93	7.37
	Removing three ands	25.52	24.42	0.385	0.421	66.53	61.33	7.70	8.19
Interaction AXB		0.10	**	**	0.41	0.34	**	0.01	**

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability. ns: not significant

Table (5). Effect of bunch covers and bunch trimming on total sugars (%), reducing sugars (%), TSS/Acidity (%) and non-reducing sugars of Grand Nain banana plants in sandy soil (2015 and 2016 seasons)

Treatments		Total s (%	sugars %)		ucing rs (%)	Non-reducing sugars (%)	
		2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
A) Bunch of	covers						
Untreated		15.97	17.46	9.98	12.02	6.00	5.42
White bags		18.04	19.44	12.90	15.45	5.07	3.99
Blue bags		19.35	21.75	14.83	17.68	5.01	4.06
Double bags		22.47	24.97	15.52	18.93	6.93	5.39
LSD(0.05)		0.33**	ns	0.26**	0.04**	0.23**	0.03**
B) Bunch tr	imming						
Untreated		15.67	17.69	11.23	13.56	4.87	4.10
Removing on	e hand	17.99	19.65	12.56	15.09	5.42	4.57
Removing two	o hands	19.95	21.99	13.97	16.81	6.02	4.54
Removing three hands		22.21	24.27	15.46	18.61	6.70	5.66
LSD(0.05)		0.33**	ns	0.26**	0.04**	0.23**	0.03**
Interaction e	ffect (AXB)						
	Untreated	13.54	14.80	8.45	10.13	5.09	4.59
Untreated	Removing one hand	15.05	16.45	9.39	11.31	5.65	5.14
	Removing two hands	16.72	18.28	10.50	12.75	6.28	5.53
	Removing three hands	18.58	20.32	11.59	13.90	6.98	6.42
	Untreated	15.30	16.50	10.71	13.10	4.30	3.40
White bags	Removing one hand	16.99	18.29	12.21	14.55	4.78	3.77
-	Removing two hands	18.89	20.35	13.57	16.18	5.13	4.17
	Removing three hands	20.99	22.61	15.08	17.97	5.90	4.64
	Untreated	14.78	18.43	12.57	14.99	4.25	3.44
Plue here	Removing one hand	18.75	20.49	13.97	16.66	4.72	3.83
Blue bags	Removing two hands	20.77	22.77	15.53	18.51	5.24	4.26
	Removing three hands	23.08	25.30	17.25	20.57	5.83	4.73
Double bags	Untreated	19.07	21.04	13.19	16.04	5.85	5.00
	Removing one hand	21.19	23.38	14.65	17.83	6.53	5.54
	Removing two hands	23.43	26.58	16.29	19.82	7.26	4.19
	Removing three hands	26.17	28.87	17.93	22.02	8.07	6.85
Interaction AXB		**	**	**	**	**	**

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability. ns: not significant

REFERENCES

- Aba, S.C., K.P. Baiyeri and A. Tenkouano (2009). Factorial combination of manure rates and bunch pruning intensities influenced bunch physical traits of two plantain (Musa spp. ABB) genotypes. Int. Agroph., 23: 207-213.
- Amani, M. (2005). Effects of bunch covers on pests and diseases control of banana (*Musa acuminata* L.) in Baluchestan. Sistan & Baluchestan Organization of Jahad-E- Agriculture. 284-291.
- Amani, M. (2007). Effects of bunch covers on yield of Banana (*Musa acuminata* L.) cv. "Wallery". 5th Conference Iran. Hort. Sci. Congress. 114-119.
- Amani, M. and G. Avagyan (2014). Effect of polyethylene bunch cover on fungal diseases control of banana (*Musa acuminata* L.) in Iran. Int. J. Farming and Allied Sci., 3(10):1054-1057.
- Amarante, C., N. H. Banks and S. Max (2002). Effect of preharvest bagging on fruit quality and postharvest physiology of pear (*Pyrus communis*). New Zealand J. Crop Hort. Sci., **30:** 99-107.

- **AOAC (1985).** Official Methods of Analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists Washington, D.C. pp 490-510
- Baiyeri, K.P., S.C. Aba, B.O. Faturoti and A. Tenkouano (2009). Effects of poultry manure and bunch pruning management on fruit size, shelf life and pulp colour of 'PITA 24' and 'Mbi-Egome' plantains (Musa sp. AAB group). J. Animal & Plant Sci., 3 (2): 215 – 226.
- Bugaud, C., M. Daribo, M. Beauté, N. Telle and C. Dubois (2012). Relative importance of location and period of banana bunch growth in carbohydrate content and mineral composition of fruit. Fruits, 64: 1–12.
- Chen, B.M. and W.M. Mellenthin (1981). Effect of harvest date on ripening capacity and post-harvest life of Anjou pears. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., 106: 38-42.
- Daniells, J. W., A. T. Lisle and N. J. Bryde (1994). Effect of bunch trimming and leaf removal at flowering on maturity bronzing, yield, and other aspects of fruit quality of bananas in North Queensland. Aust. J. Exp. Agric., 34(2): 259-265.
- Goenaga, R. and H. Irizarry (2006). Yield performance of two French-type plantain clones subjected to bunch pruning. J. Agric. Univ. P.R., 90(3-4):173-182.
- Gowen, S. (1995). Bananas and Plantains. Chapman and Hall, London,
- Harhash, M. M. and R. S. Al-Obeed (2010). Effect of bunch bagging color on yield and fruit quality of date palm. Am.-Eur. J. Agric. Env. Sci., 7: 312-319.
- Hassan, M. A., R. Ray Chowdhury, S. Sarkar and S. Mathew (2007). Effect of bunch-trimming on yield and quality in banana. J. Hort. Sci., 2 (2): 159-161.
- Irizarry, H., E. Rivera and J. A. Rodriguez (1992). Bunch and ratoon management for profitable production of high quality bananas. J. Agri. Univ. Puerto Rico, **76**:119-129
- Jia, H., M. Araki and G. Okamato (2005). Influence of fruit bagging on aroma volatiles and skin coloration of "Hakuho" peach (*Prunus persica* Batsch). Post.Biol. Techn., 35: 61-68.
- Jones DR. (2000). Diseases of Banana: Abaca & Enset. CAB Int., 544pp.
- Jones, D. R. (2005). Plant viruses transmitted by thrips. European J. Plant Pathology 113: 119-157
- Kassem , H.A., T.M. Ezz and H.A. Marzouk (2010). Effect of Bunch Bagging on productivity, ripening speed and postharvest fruit quality of 'Zaghloul' Dates Acta Hort., 882: 1091- 1098.
- Koeppel, D. (2010). Banana Varieties. Saveur 129.
- Kutinyu, R., C. Fraiser, W. Ngezimana and F. N. Mudau (2015). Evaluation of banana bunch protection materials for optimum fruit production on cultivars grown in Mozambique. South Africa Private Bag X6, Florida, 1710.
- **Lorenzen, M. (2010).** Production and R&D of banana in China , Proceedings of the 21st BASNET steering committee , Jakarta , Indonesia, pp. 49-59.
- Malik, C.P. and M.B. Singh (1980). Plant Enzymology and Histoenzymology. A Text Manual, Kalyani publishers, New Delhi.
- **Nsabimina, A. (2014).** The local Nomenclature of the East African Highland bananas (Musa AAA) in Rwanda and its challenges, in: Anana Cultivar

Names, Synonyms and Their Usage in East Africa. Bioversity Int. pp 1– 250

- **Robinson, J. C. (1996).** Bananas and Plantains. Institute for Tropical and Subtropical Crops, University Press, Cambridge
- **Robinson, J.C.** (**1993**). Hand Book of Banana Growing in South Africa. Institute for Tropical and Subtropical Crops, Nelspruit, South Africa. 138: 5-6.
- Sarkar, S. (2015). Dehanding in improving fruit quality of banana. Int. J. Bio-Resource & Stress Manag., 6(2): 198-201.
- Sharma, R.R. (2014). Pre-harvest fruit bagging: a useful approach for plant protection and improved post-harvest fruit quality – a review. J. Hort. Sci. Biotech., 89 (2): 101–113.
- **Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran (1990).** Statistical Methods. Oxford and J.B.H. Bub. Com. 6th Edition.pp:507.
- Vargas-Calvo, A. and H. Valle-Ruiz (2011). Effect of two banana (*Musa* AAA) bunch covers on fruit quality. Agronomia Mesoamericana, 22: 81-89.
- Wanichkul, K. and S. Boonma (2009). Influence of hand thinning on yield and fruit quality of banana [Musa (ABB group) 'Kluai Namwa Kom']. Agricultural Science Journal 40(1): 185-188

الملخص العربى

تحسين محصول وجودة الموز صنف "جراند نان" من خلال لون غطاء السباطة وخف الكفوف

^(۱) محمود أحمد علي ^(۱) ثناء مصطفى عز ^(۲)السيد جمعه ابراهيم ^(۳)ايه رضوان محمد غزال ^(۱) أستاذ الفاكهه المتفرغ – قسم الإنتاج النباتي – كلية الزراعة (سابا باشا) – جامعة الأسكندرية ^(۲) رئيس بحوث بقسم بحوث الفاكهه الاستوائيه – بمعهد بحوث – البساتين ^(۳) طالبة دراسات عليا

أجريت هذه الدراسة خلال موسمين متتاليين ٢٠١٥ و ٢٠١٦ على نباتات الموز صنف (جراند نان) في مزرعة بمركز بدر بمحافظة البحيرة بمصر لدراسة تأثير تغطيه وخف الكفوف على المحصول وجود ثمار الموز، وأستخدم في التجربة تصميم القطع المنشقة مرة واحدة حيث تم ترتيب معاملات: التغطية في القطع الرئيسية ورتبت اربعة مستويات الخف (بدون خف، خف كف واحد و خف كفين، خف ثلاثة كفوف) في القطع تحت الرئيسية. اظهرت النتائج ان معاملة التغطية المزدوجة (الأبيض + الأزرق) مع از الة ثلاثة كفوف/سباطة اعطت اعلى القيم لكل من المحصول ومكوناته (وزن وطول وقطر الأصبع، عدد الايام حتي التزهير، وزن الكف، وزن السباطة، عدد الاصابع/كف، وزن اللب، % للب، المحصول (بالطن/فدان)، كذلك أعطت أفضل محتوي من التركيب الكيميائي (% للسكريات الكلية والمختزلة وغيوير المخنزلة والحموضة والمواد الصلبة الذائبة الكلية، محتوي فيتامين ج) وذلك مقارنة بالمعاملات الأخرى والكنترول.