Postharvest Quality of ‘Bing’ Cherries Following Preharvest Treatment with Hydrogen Cyanamide, Calcium Ammonium Nitrate, or Gibberellic Acid
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Abstract. During three consecutive years, ‘Bing’ sweet cherry (Prunus avium L.) trees were treated during dormancy with the dormancy-manipulating compounds, CH₂N₂ or CaNH₄NO₃, or were treated with the plant growth regulator GA₃ at straw color development. Fruit of a range of maturities, based on skin color, were evaluated for quality concealment possible treatment effects on these indices. GA₃ fruit contained fewer surface but ceased thereafter up to 11 days storage. Soluble solids and titratable acidity varied were larger than fruit of other treatments, but only marginally with respect to variation in fruit size between years. Contraction of fruit diameter occurred after 3 days storage, but ceased thereafter up to 11 days storage. Soluble solids and titratable acidity varied between years, storage regimes, and maturities. Strong interactions of treatment and year concealed possible treatment effects on these indices. GA₃ fruit contained fewer surface pits in one year while CH₂N₂ fruit suffered less shrivel in another. The earlier harvest date for CH₂N₂ fruit often avoided higher field temperatures and the resulting promotion of postharvest shrivel. Pitting and shrivel were more prevalent in stored fruit. Brown stem discoloration developed in storage, occurring most frequently in mature fruit, although methyl bromide-fumigated fruit were particularly susceptible. This disorder was more common in GA₃ fruit during years of high incidence. Chemical names used: gibberellic acid (GA₃); calcium ammonium nitrate (CaNH₄NO₃); hydrogen cyanamide (CH₂N₂).

The sweet cherry industry has recently experienced considerable growth in California. The production area of bearing cherry trees (predominantly ‘Bing’) has increased from ≃5000 ha in 1995 to 7500 ha in 1999, in part due to the development of new cultivars and expansion of plantings into non-traditional areas. Increased production has emphasized the importance of fruit quality and storage potential to increase consumption and increase market flexibility through short-term storage. Increased commercial utilization of compounds regulating the fruiting habits, growth habits, or both, of cherry trees has generated interest in the effects of these compounds on the postharvest life and quality of the treated fruit. California growers have applied hydrogen cyanamide (CH₂N₂) at late dormancy as a means to control dormancy and budbreak in sweet cherry due to marginal or insufficient chilling hour accumulation in some years. Researchers have investigated the effects of this compound and calcium ammonium nitrate (CaNH₄NO₃) applied in combination with surfactants or dormant oils on breaking dormancy, coordinating budbreak and flowering, and advancing maturation in sweet cherry (Weis et al., 1998, 1999). Cherry growers have also applied gibberellic acid (GA₃) at a late stage in fruit development following evidence of improved quality in treated fruit. Probsting et al. (1973) reported that GA₃ applied at 10 to 20 µL·L⁻¹ resulted in firmer cherries of the light-skinned ‘Rainier’, grown in the Pacific Northwest. Fruit size increased when treated at rates of 10 to 30 µL·L⁻¹, but soluble solids content (SSC) and titratable acidity (TA) were not affected. Facteau and Rowe (1979) showed improved size and firmness and reduced surface pitting after cold storage for ‘Lambert’ and ‘Bing’ sweet cherries treated with 10 µL·L⁻¹ of GA₃, compared to untreated fruit. In later studies on ‘Lambert’ and ‘Bing’ treated with 10 µL·L⁻¹ GA₃, SSC and fruit size increased with higher fruit firmness (Facteau, 1982; Facteau et al., 1985), while surface pitting in ‘Lambert’ decreased following cold storage (Facteau, 1982). In contrast, Looney and Lidster (1980) found no effects at harvest on fruit weight or SSC of ‘Lambert’ that had been treated with 15 µL·L⁻¹ of GA₃, but did report increased fruit firmness. They observed no treatment effects on ‘Van’ for fruit weight, SSC, and firmness. However, the authors stated that the GA₃ treatment reduced surface pitting in cold-stored ‘Van’ that were previously subjected to a postharvest bruising treatment, but reported no effects of GA₃ on pitting in ‘Lambert’ cherries.

Uncertainty persists concerning the effects of GA₃ on SSC, TA, size, and surface pitting of cherries, while evidence indicates consistently enhanced firmness of the fruit. Potential postharvest effects of CH₂N₂ and CaNH₄NO₃ on sweet cherry have not been reported. Expansion and further development of markets for California cherries necessitates a more conclusive understanding of the impact of GA₃, CH₂N₂, and CaNH₄NO₃ on postharvest fruit quality, especially when up to 12% losses have occurred at the retail and consumer level from quality-related problems (Ceponis and Butterfield, 1981). This study was undertaken to determine the effects of GA₃, CH₂N₂, and CaNH₄NO₃ on the quality attributes of ‘Bing’ sweet cherry fruits stored under three specific storage regimes typically required for marketing of sweet cherries.

Materials and Methods

Mature ‘Bing’ cherry trees of moderate crop load, grown on Mahaleb rootstock within relatively large and uniform plantings of commercial cherries were selected from a separate orchard located on a loam-textured soil in the Central Valley of Calif. for each of the 3 years of study (1998, 1999, and 2000). Trees from within the orchard for each of the years were formed into a randomized complete-block design comprising four treatments replicated across six blocks. Label rates of CH₂N₂ (Dormex, SKW Trostberg, Trostberg, Germany) at 7.8 kg·ha⁻¹ a.i. in 935 L of water and CaNH₄NO₃ (9% Ca and 17% N, w/w) (CAN17, Unocal Corp., El Segundo, Calif.) at 468 L·ha⁻¹ of solution in 1400 L of water were applied during dormancy in mid-January of all 3 years. A surfactant (Optima, Helena Chemical Co., Memphis, Tenn.) at 37 L·ha⁻¹ was incorporated with the application of CaNH₄NO₃. Gibberellic acid (ProGibb4%, Valent USA Corp., Walnut Creek, Calif.) at 60 g·ha⁻¹ a.i. in 1870 L of water was applied just prior to fruit straw color development in May of all 3 years. Untreated cherries represented the control treatment.

Harvest date for fruit of each treatment coincided with the main commercial harvest for such treated fruit, generally occurring when the majority of the cherries were at the red and mahogany stages of skin color development. Harvesting of CH₂N₂-treated cherries occurred on 25, 31, and 18 May; CaNH₄NO₃-treated cherries on 4 and 7 June, and 21 May; controls...
on 8 and 8 June, and 23 May, and GA 

-treated cherries on 9 and 9 June, and 29 May, for the years 1998, 1999, and 2000, respectively. At each harvest, proportionate samples of fruit from the upper and lower and inner and outer portions of the canopy for four distinctive skin color categories were obtained. Fruit color categories were salmon (1), red (3), mahogany (4), and dark mahogany (6), the numbers corresponding to color category chips (Centre Technique Interprofessional des Fruits et Legumes, Paris).

Fruit were segregated into four groups, three for storage, and one nonstorage group, with each group comprising 25 cherries of each color category per replicated block. Simulated storage regimes included an export air shipment (AIR), a domestic truck shipment (TRUCK), and a domestic truck shipment including retail storage (RETAIL). Export air shipment required fruit in cherry boxes to be fumigated at a commercial facility for 2 h with methyl bromide (Great Lakes Export Air shipment (AIR, 3 d storage), domestic truck shipment (TRUCK, 6 d storage), domestic truck shipment (RETAIL), and a domestic truck port air shipment (AIR), a domestic truck
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Nondestructive fruit firmness was measured by force/deformation in Newtons per millimeter (N/mm) and fruit skin color categories. Nondestructive fruit firmness was measured by force/deformation in Newtons per millimeter (N/mm) and fruit skin color categories. Nondestructive fruit firmness was measured by force/deformation in Newtons per millimeter (N/mm) and fruit skin color categories.

Table 1. Fruit quality attributes of ‘Bing’ cherry between preharvest treatments, years, storage regimes, and fruit skin color categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Skin color (<em>hue</em>)</th>
<th>Firmness (N/mm)</th>
<th>Diam (mm)</th>
<th>SSC (%)</th>
<th>TA (%)</th>
<th>Pinning (%)</th>
<th>Shrivel (%)</th>
<th>Decay (%)</th>
<th>Brown (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.10 a</td>
<td>26.5 16.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5 bc</td>
<td>5 c</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2N2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1.81 b</td>
<td>25.7 16.2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6 ab</td>
<td>18 a</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.13 a</td>
<td>25.5 16.1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4 c</td>
<td>12 b</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.02 b</td>
<td>24.3 19.3</td>
<td>0.88 a</td>
<td>3 b</td>
<td>27 a</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>13 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.76 c</td>
<td>24.0 15.6</td>
<td>0.84 a</td>
<td>10 a</td>
<td>7 b</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.12 c</td>
<td>29.0 15.0</td>
<td>0.78 b</td>
<td>4 b</td>
<td>2 c</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstored</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>2.12 a</td>
<td>26.0 16.2</td>
<td>0.88 a</td>
<td>2 c</td>
<td>0 d</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>2.19 b</td>
<td>25.0 16.4</td>
<td>0.87 a</td>
<td>5 b</td>
<td>8 c</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.86 c</td>
<td>25.7 16.5</td>
<td>0.80 c</td>
<td>8 a</td>
<td>15 b</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.88 d</td>
<td>25.0 16.4</td>
<td>0.77 d</td>
<td>9 a</td>
<td>23 a</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color category</td>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>25.7 a</td>
<td>2.17 a</td>
<td>25.4 13.0</td>
<td>0.85 a</td>
<td>4 c</td>
<td>11 bc</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>5 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany</td>
<td>15.8 c</td>
<td>2.87 c</td>
<td>26.0 17.8</td>
<td>0.81 b</td>
<td>1 b</td>
<td>12 b</td>
<td>0.2 b</td>
<td>11 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dk mahogany</td>
<td>12.6 d</td>
<td>1.87 c</td>
<td>26.2 20.6</td>
<td>0.85 a</td>
<td>5 b</td>
<td>15 a</td>
<td>0.8 a</td>
<td>14 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results and Discussion

Color. Cherry skin color (hue) was similar for treatment and year (Table 1) indicating that, overall, fruit were of comparable maturity between the four treatments and 3 years. Cherry selection using color chips resulted in small differences in color (≤1 hue) between treatments within years and storage regimes. Fruit skin color has generally been accepted as the most reliable maturity criterion for ‘Bing’ (Facteau et al., 1983; Proebsting and Mills, 1981) and, in general, most sweet cherries (Timm et al., 1995), and is often the basis for timing of commercial harvest. Therefore, contrasts between treatments and years within each of the remaining fruit quality parameters would, overall, result from effects other than the perceived fruit maturity based on skin color. Subjective partitioning of cherries into the four color categories at harvest reflected distinctive skin hue measurements with large proportion of statistical variance associated with color category (Table 1). Relatively distinctive skin hue measurements also existed between the storage regimes. In addition, cherry skin color changed during storage, intensifying 3 °hue or almost one color category between non-stored and RETAIL stored fruit. This was consistent across years as evidenced from the nonsignificant interaction between year and storage regime.

Firmness. Firmness is an important quality attribute of cherry that has been reported to enhance storage potential, improve resistance to decay organisms and mechanical injury, and appeal to consumer preferences (Brown and Bourne, 1988). At comparable stages of maturity, GA3-treated fruit were firmer than control fruit (Table 1), concurring with findings from other studies (Facteau, 1982; Facteau and Rowe, 1979; Facteau et al., 1985; Looney and Lidster, 1980; Proebsting et al., 1973). Overall, GA3- and CH2N2-treated fruit averaged similar firmness, being 12% to 22% firmer than control fruit across the years. However, CH2N2 fruit were slightly firmer than GA3 fruit in 1998 and 2000 (data not shown), both years of relatively firm cherries, yet 12% softer in 1999, a year of comparably softer cherries (Table 1). In contrast, GA, fruit was slightly firmer than CH2N2 fruit for nonstored and AIR cherries, yet comprised of firmer fruit, yet slightly softer for TRUCK cherries (Fig. 1). The GA3 cherries were also generally firmer than CH2N2 cherries at the salmon- and red-colored stages, but not at the softer mahogany and dark mahogany stages of maturity (Fig. 1). Interactions of treatment with year and storage regime were significant, yet together reflect inconsistency with respect to raw data.
were, on average, almost 4% larger in diameter (1979). Hydrogen cyanamide-treated cherries (Facteau et al. 1985) and Facteau and Rowe (1980), but in contrast to the fruit size, in agreement with Looney and Lidster (1980); a substantial proportion of variance occurred from treatment interactions with year (Table 1). The effect of treatment on these parameters remains uncertain, as possible effects were masked by a more dominant unidentified influence. The inconsistent effects of GA, on SSC and TA found in other studies support this conclusion (Facteau, 1982; Looney and Lidster, 1980; Proebsting et al., 1973). Iezzoni (1986) also attributed an unidentified factor as causing SSC in sour cherry to vary significantly between years but not between cultivars, yet interacting strongly between both. The author reported this inconsistency to be unique to SSC, although TA was not measured. In our study, a relatively large proportion of variance was associated with color category and storage regime for SSC and TA, respectively (Table 1). In each case, SSC increased as fruit matured and TA decreased during storage. However, SSC during storage and TA across fruit color categories did not reflect such consistent responses. Despite being statistically significant, both exhibited a small variance component for storage regime and color category, respectively.

**Pitting.** Surface pitting detracts from the appearance of cherry fruits, reflecting irregular shaped sunken areas. Cherries treated with GA, were less susceptible to pitting, but only in 1999, a year of relatively severe pitting (Table 1, Fig. 2). Other studies similarly indicated that this effect of GA, on surface pitting was more dramatic in years with increased incidence of the injury (Facteau and Rowe, 1979; Looney and Lidster, 1980). Facteau (1982b) found an association between firmer cherries and reduced surface pitting in ‘Bing’ and ‘Lambert’ and cited studies similarly showing an association with GA,–firmed cherries, but doubted that firmness alone was responsible for less pitting, Looney and Lidster (1980) likewise concluded that reduced surface pitting in cherry from GA, treatment was due to some effect other than increased fruit firmness. Our study supports this opinion. While GA,–treated cherries had reduced pitting in 1999, this was not evident in CH₂N₂–treated fruit (Fig. 2), which were also considerably firmer than control and CaNH₄NO₃ cherries. Although some pitting was evident at harvest, the majority of pitting developed during storage, being equally severe for TRUCK and RETAIL fruit (Table 1). Despite differences in fruit susceptibility, pitting was marginal between the color categories relative to year and storage regime, as indicated by the estimated proportions of variance (Table 1).

**Decay and shrivel.** Decay has been reported to be the major contributor to sweet cherry losses at market (Ceponis and Butterfield, 1981), but fruit subjected to our simulated shipping and retail storage regime had a relatively low incidence of decay (Table 1). There were no differences in decay between

---

**Firmness of ‘Bing’ cherries non-treated (control) or preharvest treated with hydrogen cyanamide (CH₂N₂), calcium ammonium nitrate (CaNH₄NO₃), or gibberellic acid (GA).** Firmness within treatments, storage regimes, and fruit maturities are averaged across 3 years. Vertical bars represent SE.

---

**Soluble solids and titratable acidity.** Overall, SSC and TA did not vary with respect to treatment, but did with respect to year, whereby SSC was relatively high in 2000 and TA was low in 1998. Inconsistent differences existed between treatments within years for SSC, and particularly for TA; a substantial proportion of variance occurred from treatment interactions with year (Table 1). The effect of treatment on these parameters remains uncertain, as possible effects were masked by a more dominant unidentified influence. The inconsistent effects of GA, on SSC and TA found in other studies support this conclusion (Facteau, 1982; Looney and Lidster, 1980; Proebsting et al., 1973). Iezzoni (1986) also attributed an unidentified factor as causing SSC in sour cherry to vary significantly between years but not between cultivars, yet interacting strongly between both. The author reported this inconsistency to be unique to SSC, although TA was not measured. In our study, a relatively large proportion of variance was associated with color category and storage regime for SSC and TA, respectively (Table 1). In each case, SSC increased as fruit matured and TA decreased during storage. However, SSC during storage and TA across fruit color categories did not reflect such consistent responses. Despite being statistically significant, both exhibited a small variance component for storage regime and color category, respectively.
fruit of the various treatments. Decay incidence was higher in 2000, largely in dark mahogany fruit. However, fruit shrivel was more prevalent, also predominantly occurring in 2000, where CH₂N₂-treated cherries suffered considerably less shrivel compared to the remaining treatments (Table 1, Fig. 3). The CaNH₄NO₃-treated fruit had a particularly high percentage with shrivel in 2000, yet differences between treatments for shrivel in 1998 and 1999 were negligible. Temperature during harvest likely contributed to this occurrence in 2000. Average orchard air temperature during the harvest of CaNH₄NO₃ and control fruit was 27 and 25 °C, respectively. For CH₂N₂ and GA₃ fruit, average orchard temperature was 18 °C, although the preharvest GA₃ fruit were also previously exposed to the high temperatures experienced by CaNH₄NO₃ and control fruit, possibly contributing to their increased shrivel compared to CH₂N₂ cherries. Nonetheless, signs of shrivel were negligible during harvest and subsequently developed in storage, becoming progressively worse during storage (Table 1, Fig. 3).

**Stem browning.** Stem browning typically develops during cherry storage, and is also associated with the methyl bromide fumigation required for insect disinfection by certain export markets. The incidence of brown stem was negligible in non-stored fruit, but increased in TRUCK and RETAIL fruit, which were stored for 6 and 11 d, respectively (Table 1). However, the greatest incidence of brown stem occurred in AIR fruit, which were fumigated and stored for only 3 d. Overall, GA₃ fruit appeared more susceptible to stem browning, although CH₂N₂ fruit were occasionally very susceptible—yet not consistently so between storage regimes and years (Table 1, Fig. 4). Differences in susceptibility of fruit between years also featured strongly. On average the disorder occurred in 1% of fruit in 1998 and in 14% and 13% of fruit in 1999 and 2000, respectively, possibly due to higher humidity from holding the fruit at 20 °C in open plastic
GA3 cherries were consistently rated with year for fruit consistency in air temperature and the relatively high temperatures of the 3 months prior to harvest were 1 to 2 °C higher in 2000 as compared to 1998. Differences in brown stem susceptibility also existed between fruit maturity, possibly influencing overall fruit firmness and other quality indices. Mean and maximum monthly temperatures for the 3 months prior to harvest were 1 to 2 °C higher in 2000 as compared to 1999, and 2 to 3 °C higher in 1999 as compared to 1998. In addition, air temperature during harvest of CH3N2, CaNH4NO3, and control fruit was 5, 10, and 10 °C higher, respectively, in 2000 than in 1999 and 1998. In spite of such inconsistency in air temperature and the relatively large proportion of statistical variance associated with year for fruit firmness, CH3N2 and GA3 cherries were consistently firmer than CaNH4NO3 and control fruit, which further attests to the influence of these compounds on fruit firmness. Furthermore, fruit treated with CH2N2 and GA, also maintained their higher firmness during storage.

Other factors affecting quality. With the exception of firmness, one of the most important quality indices of fresh market sweet cherries, the effects of the preharvest treatments on postharvest fruit quality were either nonexistent or small in comparison to differences between years. The extent to which environmental conditions, management practices, or other factors caused such yearly differences remains uncertain. An extensive study of ‘Bing’ revealed that SSC, fruit weight, and firmness at a standard skin color varied considerably across 9 years of evaluations, often without relationship to crop load (Proebsting and Mills, 1981). Yet Facteau (1982b) speculated that crop load, tree vigor, and environmental conditions were major factors affecting fruit firmness.

During our study, environmental conditions prior to and during harvest varied considerably between years, possibly influencing overall fruit firmness and other quality indices. Mean and maximum monthly temperatures for the 3 months prior to harvest were 1 to 2 °C higher in 2000 as compared to 1999, and 2 to 3 °C higher in 1999 as compared to 1998. Differences in brown stem susceptibility also existed between fruit maturity, while not in the least contributing to losses in quality for the parameters evaluated in this study. The exception was for brown stem disorder, where CH3N2 and GA3 appeared to augment this condition in years where cherries were particularly susceptible. The CaNH4NO3 treatment had little, if any, impact on postharvest quality of ‘Bing’ cherries. Although shrivel was higher in CaNH4NO3 fruit, this only occurred in 2000, and was most likely in response to relatively high air temperatures during the harvest of this treatment in 2000.

Conclusions

In general, CH3N2 and GA3 appeared beneficial in terms of enhancing postharvest fruit quality, while not in the least contributing to losses in quality for the parameters evaluated in this study. The exception was for brown stem disorder, where CH3N2 and GA3 appeared to augment this condition in years where cherries were particularly susceptible. The CaNH4NO3 treatment had little, if any, impact on postharvest quality of ‘Bing’ cherries. Although shrivel was higher in CaNH4NO3 fruit, this only occurred in 2000, and was most likely in response to relatively high air temperatures during the harvest of this treatment in 2000.
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