# Salicylic Acid and Chitosan Effects on Fruit Quality When Applied to Fresh Strawberry or During Different Periods of Cold Storage

Khalid F. Almutairi,<sup>a,\*</sup> Abdulaziz R. Alharbi,<sup>a</sup> Mohamed Ewis Abdelaziz,<sup>b,c</sup> and Walid F. A. Mosa<sup>d</sup>

One of the biggest problems that threaten the production of strawberry in the world is the rapid damage and high rate of deterioration after harvest or during cold storage. Therefore, the current study was conducted to investigate the possibility of decreasing the post-harvest damage percentages and increasing the fruit quality of Fragaria x ananassa cv. 'Estavana' after harvest immediately or during the cold storage period. The strawberry plants were dipped for 3 to 5 minutes at 25 °C in a solution of 10 L made from distilled water and containing salicylic acid (SA) at 0, 250. 500, and 1000 mg/L or chitosan (CHIT) at 0, 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L during the period of 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, and 16 days after harvesting. The results showed that the fruit firmness was notably decreased, and the loss and decay percentages were increased by increasing the period of storage, but it could be decreased by using SA or CHIT. Fruit content from soluble solids, total sugars and anthocyanin was significantly increased in the 16 days stored fruits treated with 500 mg/L SA or 50mg/L CHIT. Treating the fresh harvested without or with SA or CHIT increased the fruit content from vitamin C. The highest fruit content from titratable acidity was in the fresh harvested fruits compared with treated fruits with SA or CHIT.

DOI: 10.15376/biores.19.3.6057-6075

Keywords: Cold storage; Strawberry; Biostimulants; Fruit quality

Contact information: a: Department of Plant Production, College of Food Science and Agriculture, King Saud University, P.O. Box 2460, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia; b: The National Research and Development Center for Sustainable Agriculture (Estidamah), Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; c; Department of Vegetable Crops, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, Giza, 12613, Egypt; d: Plant Production Department (Horticulture-Pomology), Faculty of Agriculture, Saba Basha, Alexandria University, Alexandria 21531, Egypt; \*Corresponding author: almutairik@ksu.edu.sa

# INTRODUCTION

Strawberry fruit is a popular food and is rich in many different bioactive compounds and antioxidants, including terpenoids, flavonoids, carotenoids, anthocyanins, and vitamin E (Pang *et al.* 2020; Kim *et al.* 2021). Strawberries are susceptibile to mechanical damage, dehydration, and microbial deterioration, and as a result, present a challenging post harvest protocol (Benavides and Franco 2023). Because strawberries are highly perishable and susceptible to fungal infections, their shelf life is usually fewer than five days at room temperature, and their quality properties deteriorate quickly after harvest (Cordenunsi *et al.* 2005; Feliziani and Romanazzi 2016; Barkaoui *et al.* 2021). It has been investigated whether bioactive edible coatings with CHIT can reduce or eliminate fungal and mechanical fruit damage (Benavides and Franco 2023). Edible coating treatments can provide a protective layer on the product's surface (Deng *et al.* 2017). When applied to fresh fruit, these coatings can prevent microbial attack and help maintain the fruit's desirable composition and marketability. Additionally, coatings can prevent moisture loss, create a modified internal atmosphere, and regulate the concentration of gases such as O<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, and fragrance compounds to more desirable levels (Gutiérrez and Álvarez 2017). Edible coatings are a suitable replacement for preserving postharvest crops (No *et al.* 2007). Coatings have been demonstrated to slow down the rates of carbohydrate breakdown, which delays maturity (Yan *et al.* 2019), and to function as moisture and gas barriers, controlling microbial growth and preserving colour and texture (Chaudhary *et al.* 2020).

CHIT, an environmentally safe and non-toxic edible polymer with antifungal properties, stimulates plant defense mechanisms. It is frequently used to preserve postharvest fruits and vegetables as a food additive and a successful replacement for synthetic fungicides (Romanazzi *et al.* 2017). Moreover, CHIT coating can alter the internal atmosphere of the fruit by lowering oxygen levels and/or increasing carbon dioxide levels. This leads to reduced respiration rates and metabolic activity, delays in sugar accumulation and starch degradation, and potential initiation of fermentation processes (Silva *et al.* 2017). Furthermore, CHIT has a number of special advantages, including the capacity to form films, biocompatibility, biodegradability, antibacterial activity, and non-toxicity (Jiang *et al.* 2018a,b).

The coating of fruit with CHIT has been demonstrated to have higher total soluble solids and antioxidant activity while decreasing hardness, decay, and weight loss (Adiletta et al. 2019). By minimizing losses in weight, soluble solids, vitamin C, titratable acidity, and firmness, CHIT coating preserves fruit quality during storage (Lin et al. 2020). By lowering the postharvest respiration rate of fruits, the coating's use of polysaccharides such as CHIT acts as an effective oxygen and moisture barrier, delaying the deterioration of the product (Jung et al. 2020). An edible coating of CHIT can preserve the fruit freshness by minimizing microbial degradation, softening, and oxidative stress (Ghosh et al. 2021). Besides, CHIT works as an antimicrobial and antitranspirant agent, elicitor, and stimulator for both plant growth and beneficial microorganisms (Kipkoech et al. 2021). Additionally, the use of CHIT in coating mango fruit reduces the weight loss and the fruit content from TSS percentages, as well as preserves the peel firmness (Limon et al. 2021). Furthermore, CHIT is a great film-forming agent and biocompatible material for usage in the perishable fruit product sector. Fresh fruit coated with CHIT is thought to be safe for ingestion by humans because of its antibacterial and non-toxic qualities (Zhang et al. 2021). CHIT edible coating effectively reduces moisture loss, respiration rates, ethylene production, fruit ripening, softening, and decomposition, while preserving fruit quality and extending the postharvest life of various crops (Kumarihami et al. 2022).

Salicylic acid (SA) is a relatively basic phenolic molecule that can be utilized as a safe and natural substitute chemical to regulate horticulture crops' postharvest quality, and it is a naturally occurring substance that has the potential to significantly delay the fruit ripening (Mo *et al.* 2008). The application of SA effectively controls ethylene production, the respiration process, and enhances ascorbic acid content in fruits (Huang *et al.* 2008), lowering the post-harvest damages in horticultural crops (Asghari and Aghdam 2010), inducing the disease resistance (Shafiee *et al.* 2010), the preservation of post-harvest quality (Champa *et al.* 2015), and an extension of horticultural crop storage life. Additionally, it is frequently used to manage the firmness of crops to prolong their postharvest life (Kazemi *et al.* 2011). The preharvest treatment with SA significantly mitigates the harmful effects of heat and high light stress on photosystem, and it induces

the photosynthesis process (Zhao et al. 2011). Furthermore, Khan et al. (2012) documented that SA is essential for the organization of several plant physiological systems, including proline metabolism, antioxidant defense system, nitrogen absorption, photosynthesis, plant-water connections, and resistance to abiotic stressors. Besides, it was documented by many authors that SA is included in the improving resistances to various biotic and abiotic stresses, including heat, heavy metals toxicity, pathogens, and oxidative decomposition (Agnihotri et al. 2018; Ali et al. 2023), and cell wall enforcement (Jia et al. 2021). Treating peach cv. 'Flordaking' with SA at concentrations of 1, 2, and 3 mM improved fruit quality attributes such as flesh firmness, titratable acidity, and ascorbic acid content during storage. Conversely, these treatments reduced fruit weight loss, soluble solids content, membrane seepage, chilling injury, ethylene production, color deterioration, disease incidence, decomposition, and delayed the ethylene climacteric peak after six weeks of lowtemperature storage (Ali et al. 2021). Besides, SA plays vital roles in raising the plant stress tolerance by activation the plant defense mechanisms (Alam et al. 2022), improvement of photosynthesis (George et al. 2022), the enhancing the plant tolerance to drought (Balfagón et al. 2022), cold (Raza et al. 2023), heat (Lafuente, and Romero 2022), and diseases (Khan et al. 2023). Besides, SA regulates the protein pattern, enhances the antioxidative system, growth and photosynthesis process, and Superoxide dismutase (SOD), Catalase (CAT), and Peroxidase (POD) activities under cold stress (Hernanz et al. 2023; Raza et al. 2023; Singh 2023).

Therefore, the current study was conducted to increase the shelf life and maintain the strawberry fruits during storage and reduce their decay and fungal attack by the application of CHIT and SA.

#### EXPERIMENTAL

The current work was performed to study the effect of the dipping of strawberry fruits (*Fragaria* x *ananassa* cv. 'Estavana') for 3 to 5 min at 25 °C with SA (LHCHEM company, Jinan City, Shandong Province, China) at 0, 250, 500, and 1000 mg/L and CHIT (Realfine Chemicals (Shanghai) Co., Ltd., Wuxi, Jiangsu, China) at 0, 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L during the period of 0, 3, 6, 9, 12 and 16 days after harvesting. The volume of the used solution was 10 L from distilled water. Split-Plot design was used to perform this experiment where the time was the main factor, and SA or CHIT was the sub main factor in eight replicates were used as blocks. During the storage periods, several parameters were measured.

# **Physical Fruit Characteristics**

A total of 40 fruits for each treatment (10 fruits as a replicate) were chosen to perform the study during the experiment times and the fruit quality was measured as follows: Fruit firmness (lb/inch<sup>2</sup>) was assessed by using a Magness and Taylor pressure tester (mod. FT 02 (0-2 lb, Alfonsine, Italy). The number of strawberry fruits that had rotted and showed signs of pitted peel or pathogen incidence relative to the overall quantity of strawberries was used to calculate the percentage of fruit decay, which was then represented as a percentage following each storage period (Huang *et al.* 2023). By comparing the difference between the fruits' original and final weights using an electronic balance, the percentage of fruit weight loss was calculated (PA4102 OHAUS Corporation, USA) and expressed in percentage (%).

#### **Fruit Chemical Characteristics**

Total soluble solids (TSS) were assessed by triplicate with a digital refractometer (Atago N1; Atago Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) at 20 °C and expressed as %.

#### Total Titratable Acidity (TA)

The TA was determined according to an AOAC method (AOAC 2005) by triplicate using an automatic titration device (877 Titrino plus, Metrohm ion analyses CH9101, Herisau, Switzerland) with 0.1 N NaOH up to pH 8.1, using 1 mL diluted juice in 25 mL distilled H<sub>2</sub>O, and the results were expressed as g malic acid per 100 g fw (Celikel *et al.* 2008). Malondialdehyde (MDA) content was assayed using the TBA method, where 2.0 g of frozen juice sac was extracted with 5 mL of 10% (m/v) TCA solution and centrifuged (10000 × g at 4 °C for 20 min). Afterwards, 2.0 mL of the supernatant was mixed by adding the same volume of 0.67% TBA (dissolved in 50 mM NaOH) solution, followed by a boiling water bath for 20 min, and then quickly cooled in an ice bath. Finally, the absorbance of the supernatant was recorded at three specific wavelengths (450 nm, 532 nm, and 600 nm) using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer (model: TU-1950, Persee General Instrument Co., Ltd., Beijing, China), with the results were reported as millimole per gram fruit weight (Bakpa and Zhang 2022).

# **Fruit Total Sugars**

The quantity was determined by using phenol sulfuric acid, and fruit reducing sugars content was determined calorimetrically (Nielsen 2010). The content of Vitamin C mg/100 mL juice was determined by the titration of 2,6-dichlorophenol-indo-phenol (Huang *et al.* 2023).

#### Antioxidant Enzyme Activity Assays

A 10 g fruit sample was chosen and homogenized using a Kinematica tissue processor (Kinematica AG Werkstrasse 7 c-d Switzerland) in 25 mL of ice-cold extraction buffer and 0.5 g of polyvinyl-polypyrrolidone (PVPP) (Crl-6010, Kriens-LU, Switzerland). For the catalase (CAT) and superoxide dismutase (SOD) estimation, the extraction buffer used was 50 mM sodium phosphate with a pH of 7.8. The homogenized mixture was centrifuged at 27,000 g for 50 min at 4 °C, and the resulting supernatants were used to measure CAT and SOD activity (Wang *et al.* 2005).

The reaction combination for CAT analysis consisted of 2.8 mL H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (40 mM in 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer, pH 7.0) and 0.2 mL enzyme extract. The decrease of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (substrate) was determined by measuring the decrease in absorbance at 240 nm during a 120-s period using a spectrophotometer (Model UH4150AD UV-Vis-NIR Spectrophotometer Hitachi, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). The activity was expressed as unit g<sup>-1</sup> FW, where one unit of catalase equals one molecule of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> per mass of fruit per minute at 30 °C. For the SOD activity assay, a volume of approximately 3 mL in the SOD activity experiment comprised 65 mM sodium phosphate cradle (pH 7.8). Finally, 13 mM methionine, 75 mM nitro-blue tetrazolium (NBT), 10 mM EDTA, and 2 mM riboflavin were mixed, along with 0.1 mL of the enzyme extract. After illumination of the combinations for 10 minutes with light (60 Mol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>), the absorbance at 560 nm was evaluated using a spectrophotometer. The reaction solution took 3 min to settle. The reaction was measured in units of g<sup>-1</sup> FW, where one unit represented the amount of chemical that caused a 50% reduction in the SOD-inhibitable NBT per mass per hour.

#### **Total Phenols Content**

Phenol content was measured by the reduction of phosphotungstic-phosphomolybdic acid to blue pigments in an alkaline solution, following the Folin method as described by Salem *et al.* (2018). A 100  $\mu$ L aliquot of the diluted sample (1/100) in ethanol was mixed with 400  $\mu$ L of 1/10 diluted Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. After 5 minutes, 500  $\mu$ L of a 10% (w/v) sodium carbonate solution was added. Following a 1-hour incubation at room temperature, the absorbance was measured at 765 nm in triplicate. The total polyphenol content was expressed as mg gallic acid equivalents per g dry weight of fruit (mg GAE/g DW).

# **Total Anthocyanin Content (TAC)**

One mL of each fruit extract sample was separately added to 980  $\mu$ L of KCl buffer (pH 1.0) and NaOAc buffer (pH 4.5). After a 15-min incubation at room temperature, the absorbance was measured at 510 nm and 700 nm using a spectrophotometer, with 50% ethanol as a blank. The total anthocyanin content (TAC) was calculated using Eq. 1, and the results were expressed as mg of cyanidin-3-glucoside equivalents per 100 g of dry weight.

$$TAC = (A*MW*DF*1000/\mathcal{E}*L)$$
 (1)

where, A: Absorbance =  $[(A 510 \text{ nm to } A 700 \text{ nm})] \text{ pH } 1.0 - [(A 510 \text{ nm to } A 700 \text{ nm})] \text{ pH } 4.5; \text{ MW: molecular weight (449.2 g mol<sup>-1</sup>); DF: dilution factor; L: is the cell path length (1 cm); <math>\mathcal{E}$ : molar absorptivity coefficient of cyanidin- 3-glucoside (26900 L mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) (Jakobek *et al.* 2007).

#### **Statistical Analysis**

The obtained results were statistical analysis using Split-Plot Design by using CoHort Software (Pacific Grove, CA, USA), and the Least Significant Difference (LSD) at 0.05% was used to compare the means of treatments (Mishra *et al.* 2019).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data in Table 1 show that the fruit firmness was significantly increased in the fresh harvested fruits, especially when they were treated with 1000 SA. On the contrary, the fruit firmness was decreased by increasing the period of the storage. For 9 days stored fruits, the the statistical analysis indicated that there are no significant differences between the treatments. Additionally, the treating the stored fruits for 3 or 12 days with CHIT show that there are no significant differences between the different concentrations.

The results in Table 2 show that fruit decay percentages in the fresh fruits were zero. However, the decay percentages were significantly increased by increasing the time of storage, where the period of 16 or 12 days registered the highest percentages. The usage of SA or CHIT decreased the decay percentages in the stored fruits. Moreover, the percentage of decay was also minimized by raising the used concentration from SA or CHIT.

Table 1. Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on	
Fruit Firmness	

Fruit Firmness (lb/inch <sup>2</sup> )								
Trootmont	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)					
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16	
	0	2.47 <sup>ab</sup>	2.27 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.00 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.77 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.60 <sup>de</sup>	1.67 <sup>b-e</sup>	
54	250	2.40 <sup>a-d</sup>	2.32 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.00 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.75 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.72 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.80 <sup>a-e</sup>	
SA	500	2.35 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.75 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.85 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.37 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.77 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.82 <sup>a-e</sup>	
	1000	2.52 <sup>a</sup>	1.92 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.20 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.45 <sup>a-c</sup>	1.77 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.77 <sup>a-e</sup>	
	0	2.32 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.35 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.07 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.57 <sup>de</sup>	2.25 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.55 <sup>e</sup>	
0. UT	2.5	2.32 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.10 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.75 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.75 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.22 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.62 <sup>c-e</sup>	
CHIT	5	2.37 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.20 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.00 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.37 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.52 <sup>a</sup>	1.60 <sup>de</sup>	
	10	2.37 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.37 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.07 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.20 <sup>a-e</sup>	2.05 <sup>a-e</sup>	1.92 <sup>a-e</sup>	
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.41						

The treatments that have the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

**Table 2.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 the Fruit Decay Percentage

	Decay %									
Treatment	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)							
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16			
	0	0 x	4.57 <sup>t</sup>	8.57°	14.34 <sup>k</sup>	25.15 <sup>c</sup>	33.83 <sup>a</sup>			
54	250	0 x	3.75 <sup>u</sup>	5.99 <sup>r</sup>	11.78 <sup>m</sup>	20.65 <sup>f</sup>	27.37 <sup>b</sup>			
SA	500	0 x	3.19 <sup>uv</sup>	5.93 <sup>r</sup>	10.02 <sup>n</sup>	17.57 <sup>h</sup>	23.29 <sup>d</sup>			
	1000	0 x	2.76 <sup>vw</sup>	5.12 <sup>st</sup>	8.65°	13.35 l	20.10 <sup>g</sup>			
	0	0 x	4.58 <sup>t</sup>	8.65°	14.36 <sup>k</sup>	25.20 <sup>c</sup>	34.13 <sup>a</sup>			
СШТ	2.5	0 x	3.23 <sup>uv</sup>	6.97 <sup>q</sup>	10.12 <sup>n</sup>	17.75 <sup>h</sup>	23.52 <sup>d</sup>			
CHIT	5	0 x	2.90 <sup>vw</sup>	5.39 <sup>rs</sup>	9.11°	15.98i	21.17 <sup>e</sup>			
	10	0 x	2.43 <sup>w</sup>	4.50 <sup>t</sup>	7.61 <sup>p</sup>	15.17j	17.69 <sup>h</sup>			
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.50								

The treatments that have the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

# **Table 3.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on the Fruit Loss Percentage

Loss %									
	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	0v	1.15 <sup>rs</sup>	1.52 <sup>op</sup>	2.08 <sup>n</sup>	6.93 <sup>ef</sup>	8.91 <sup>a</sup>		
SA	250	0v	1.26 <sup>qr</sup>	1.71°	2.31 <sup>m</sup>	6.73f	7.69 <sup>d</sup>		
SA	500	0v	1.167 <sup>rs</sup>	1.58 <sup>op</sup>	2.16 <sup>n</sup>	6.18 <sup>g</sup>	8.19 <sup>b</sup>		
	1000	0v	1.13 <sup>rs</sup>	1.53 <sup>op</sup>	2.10 <sup>n</sup>	5.92 <sup>h</sup>	7.84 <sup>cd</sup>		
	0	0v	1.13 <sup>rs</sup>	1.53 <sup>op</sup>	2.09 <sup>n</sup>	7.03 <sup>e</sup>	7.90 <sup>c</sup>		
CUIT	2.5	0v	0.94 <sup>stu</sup>	1.27 <sup>qr</sup>	1.74°	5.09j	6.74 <sup>f</sup>		
CHIT	5	0v	0.86 <sup>tu</sup>	1.17 <sup>rs</sup>	1.60 <sup>op</sup>	4.57 <sup>k</sup>	6.05 <sup>gh</sup>		
	10	0v	0.77 <sup>u</sup>	1.04 <sup>rst</sup>	1.42 <sup>pq</sup>	4.16 <sup>i</sup>	5.52 <sup>i</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.17							

The treatments that have the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

Table 3 shows that the loss percentages were significantly enhanced by the storage of the strawberry fruits. The highest percentage was observed in 16 days of stored fruits. The percentage of fruit loss was increased by increasing the period of the storage and using SA or CHIT played a good role in decreasing the fruit loss percentage. The efficacy of SA or CHIT was increased in parallel to increasing the used concentration.

As shown in Table 4, the storage of strawberry fruits increased the fruit content from TSS % where the period of 16 days registered the highest percentage from TSS in particularly when 500 mg/L SA or 10 mg/L CHIT. Increasing the used concentration from SA or CHIT was more effective in improving the fruit content from soluble solids during the storage period. In the 16 days stored fruits, the differences between the effect of 250 and 1000 mg/L SA or between 2.5 and 5 mg/L CHIT were not significant.

TSS%									
Treatment	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	8.07 <sup>r</sup>	8.40 <sup>o-r</sup>	8.55 <sup>n-r</sup>	9.35 <sup>jk</sup>	10.45 <sup>e-h</sup>	11.57 <sup>bc</sup>		
SA	250	8.15 <sup>qr</sup>	8.82 <sup>k-q</sup>	9.00 <sup>j-o</sup>	9.87 <sup>hi</sup>	10.75 <sup>d-g</sup>	11.72 <sup>ab</sup>		
SA	500	8.12 <sup>r</sup>	8.65 <sup>m-r</sup>	8.72 <sup>I-r</sup>	9.55 <sup>ij</sup>	10.72 <sup>d-g</sup>	12.12 <sup>a</sup>		
	1000	8.22 <sup>qr</sup>	8.67 <sup>m-r</sup>	9.32 <sup>j-l</sup>	10.15 <sup>gh</sup>	10.77 <sup>d-g</sup>	11.50 <sup>bc</sup>		
	0	8.10 <sup>r</sup>	8.07 <sup>r</sup>	8.20 <sup>qr</sup>	8.92 <sup>k-p</sup>	10.05 <sup>h</sup>	10.95 <sup>de</sup>		
СШТ	2.5	8.07 <sup>r</sup>	8.45 <sup>o-r</sup>	8.65 <sup>m-r</sup>	9.27 <sup>j-m</sup>	10.42 <sup>e-h</sup>	11.47 <sup>bc</sup>		
CHIT	5	8.27 <sup>p-r</sup>	8.30 <sup>p-r</sup>	8.42 <sup>o-r</sup>	9.12 <sup>j-n</sup>	10.30 <sup>f-h</sup>	11.15 <sup>cd</sup>		
	10	8.20 <sup>qr</sup>	8.75 <sup>k-r</sup>	8.90 <sup>k-p</sup>	10.20 <sup>h</sup>	10.82 <sup>d-f</sup>	12.12 <sup>a</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.38							

**Table 4.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT onTSS %

The treatments that have the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

Table 5 shows that when the strawberry fruits were stored, anthocyanin was increased in parallel to increasing the period of the storage, where the highest concentration of anthocyanin was in the 16 days stored fruits. The SA and CHIT helped to improve the fruit coloring by increasing the content of anthocyanin, where the 250, 500, and 1000 SA or 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT in 16 days stored fruits gave the highest concentrations.

**Table 5.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 Anthocyanin Content

	Anthocyanin (mg/100g)								
Treatment	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Heatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	30.72 <sup>p</sup>	35.32 <sup>m-o</sup>	37.675 <sup>I-n</sup>	42.17 <sup>h-j</sup>	48.82 <sup>de</sup>	51.95 <sup>a-c</sup>		
SA	250	31.37 <sup>p</sup>	35.67 <sup>m-o</sup>	39.52 <sup>kl</sup>	42.92 <sup>h-j</sup>	49.82 <sup>cd</sup>	51.90 <sup>a-c</sup>		
SA	500	31.75 <sup>p</sup>	34.77 <sup>no</sup>	38.10 <sup>Im</sup>	43.12 <sup>hi</sup>	52.10 <sup>a-c</sup>	52.25 <sup>a-c</sup>		
	1000	31.45 <sup>p</sup>	36.20 <sup>m-o</sup>	41.80 <sup>h-k</sup>	46.72 <sup>ef</sup>	47.65 <sup>d-f</sup>	52.77 <sup>ab</sup>		
	0	30.62 <sup>p</sup>	34.50°	36.67 <sup>m-o</sup>	40.40 <sup>jk</sup>	45.75 <sup>fg</sup>	50.07 <sup>b-d</sup>		
СШТ	2.5	31.70 <sup>p</sup>	35.47 <sup>m-o</sup>	37.40 <sup>1-0</sup>	40.60 <sup>i-k</sup>	46.05 <sup>fg</sup>	51.45 <sup>a-c</sup>		
CHIT	5	31.55 <sup>p</sup>	34.87 <sup>no</sup>	36.95 <sup>m-o</sup>	40.72 <sup>i-k</sup>	46.50 <sup>e-g</sup>	50.15 <sup>b-d</sup>		
	10	31.15 <sup>p</sup>	36.67 <sup>m-o</sup>	44.17 <sup>gh</sup>	47.17 <sup>ef</sup>	48.70 <sup>de</sup>	53.62 <sup>a</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		1.80							

Treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

The results in Table 6 show that the storage of the strawberry fruits gradually increased the fruit content from the total sugars percentages and the highest percentages were noticed when the fruits were treated with SA or CHIT. The differences between the effects of the different concentrations of SA or CHIT were not significant. The fruit content from total sugars was significantly low in fresh harvested fruits and when the fruits were stored for 3, 6 and 9 days after harvested.

Total sugars %									
Tractmont	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	6.62 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.77 <sup>j-n</sup>	7.22 <sup>i-l</sup>	7.6 <sup>f-i</sup>	8.40 <sup>a-d</sup>	8.71 <sup>ab</sup>		
SA	250	6.55 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.82 <sup>j-n</sup>	6.82 <sup>j-n</sup>	7.45 <sup>g-j</sup>	8.35 <sup>b-d</sup>	8.99 <sup>a</sup>		
SA	500	6.52 <sup>I-n</sup>	6.57 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.70 <sup>k-n</sup>	7.37 <sup>h-k</sup>	8.13 <sup>b-f</sup>	9.00 <sup>a</sup>		
	1000	6.27 <sup>n</sup>	6.42 <sup>mn</sup>	6.50 <sup>l_n</sup>	7.227 <sup>i-l</sup>	7.93 <sup>c-h</sup>	8.70 <sup>ab</sup>		
	0	6.50 <sup>I-n</sup>	6.80 <sup>j-n</sup>	6.87 <sup>j-n</sup>	7.65 <sup>f-i</sup>	8.30 <sup>b-e</sup>	8.53 <sup>a-c</sup>		
СШТ	2.5	6.55 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.52 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.87 <sup>j-n</sup>	7.20 <sup>i-l</sup>	8.01 <sup>c-g</sup>	8.77 <sup>ab</sup>		
CHIT	5	6.45 <sup>mn</sup>	6.55 <sup>l-n</sup>	6.50 <sup>I-n</sup>	7.147 <sup>i-m</sup>	7.80 <sup>d-i</sup>	9.01 <sup>a</sup>		
	10	6.45 <sup>mn</sup>	6.27 <sup>n</sup>	6.30 <sup>n</sup>	6.85 <sup>j-n</sup>	7.72 <sup>e-i</sup>	8.44 <sup>a-c</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.40							

Table 6. Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on	1
Total Sugars Content %	

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

The data in Table 7 show that treating fresh fruits with 500 mg/L SA significantly increased their Vitamin C (VC) content. Additionally, treating fruits with 500 or 1000 mg/L SA and also by 2.5, 5, or 10 mg/L CHIT also greatly improved the VC. The results showed that the storage of strawberry fruits for 3, 6, 12, and 16 days solely or by treating them with 250, 500, and 1000 SA or by 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L decreased VC. Additionally, there is an inverse relationship between the vitamin C content in the fruit and the storage duration, with the lowest values observed after 12 or 16 days of storage. This trend was noted whether the fruit was untreated or treated with 250, 500, and 1000 mg/L SA or 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT.

**Table 7.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 Vitamin C Levels

Vitamin C (mg/100 mL)									
Treatment	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	58.20 <sup>b</sup>	51.42 <sup>f</sup>	45.02 <sup>k</sup>	42.00 <sup>n</sup>	35.32 <sup>s</sup>	36.47 <sup>qr</sup>		
51	250	57.90 <sup>b</sup>	50.65 <sup>fg</sup>	46.57 <sup>i</sup>	42.60 <sup>mn</sup>	36.32 <sup>qr</sup>	36.32 <sup>qr</sup>		
SA	500	59.27 <sup>a</sup>	52.37 <sup>e</sup>	48.20 <sup>h</sup>	44.20 <sup>1</sup>	37.87 <sup>p</sup>	36.70 <sup>qr</sup>		
	1000	58.15 <sup>b</sup>	53.00 <sup>e</sup>	48.90 <sup>h</sup>	44.90 <sup>kl</sup>	38.32 <sup>p</sup>	36.90 <sup>q</sup>		
	0	57.97 <sup>b</sup>	51.40 <sup>f</sup>	46.62 <sup>i</sup>	42.85 <sup>m</sup>	35.80 <sup>rs</sup>	36.47 <sup>qr</sup>		
СШТ	2.5	58.27 <sup>b</sup>	52.60 <sup>e</sup>	48.45 <sup>h</sup>	44.12 <sup>1</sup>	37.9 <sup>p</sup>	36.62 <sup>qr</sup>		
CHIT	5	58.27 <sup>b</sup>	54.47 <sup>d</sup>	50.12 <sup>g</sup>	45.72 <sup>j</sup>	39.37°	37.57 <sup>p</sup>		
	10	58.00 <sup>b</sup>	55.22°	50.70 <sup>fg</sup>	46.25 <sup>ij</sup>	39.65°	37.97 <sup>p</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.67							

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

The results in Table 8 show that the fresh harvested fruits were characterized by a high content of titratable acidity. Fresh fruit treated with 250, 500, and 1000 SA or with 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L contained high quantities of titratable acidity. Additionally, the 3 and 6 days stored fruit contained higher titratable acidity than fruits stored for 9, 12, and 16 days, only or after treatment with 250, 500, and 1000 mg/L SA and 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT. Additionally, the results showed that as the period of storage increased, the percentage of titratable acidity decreased.

Titratable acidity %									
Tractmont	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	0.87 <sup>a</sup>	0.83 <sup>e</sup>	0.82 <sup>ef</sup>	0.79 <sup>ij</sup>	0.77 <sup>I-n</sup>	0.71 <sup>q</sup>		
64	250	0.85 <sup>cd</sup>	0.83 <sup>e</sup>	0.81 <sup>e-g</sup>	0.78 <sup>jk</sup>	0.76 <sup>m-o</sup>	0.70 <sup>qr</sup>		
SA	500	0.86 <sup>a-c</sup>	0.82 <sup>ef</sup>	0.81 <sup>f-h</sup>	0.78 <sup>j-l</sup>	0.76 <sup>n-p</sup>	0.70 <sup>qr</sup>		
	1000	0.87 <sup>ab</sup>	0.81 <sup>e-g</sup>	0.80 <sup>gh</sup>	0.77 <sup>k-n</sup>	0.75 <sup>op</sup>	0.69 <sup>r</sup>		
	0	0.87 <sup>a</sup>	0.83 <sup>e</sup>	0.81 <sup>e-g</sup>	0.78 <sup>jk</sup>	0.77 <sup>m-o</sup>	0.70 <sup>qr</sup>		
CUIT	2.5	0.86 <sup>b-d</sup>	0.82 <sup>ef</sup>	0.81 <sup>f-h</sup>	0.78 <sup>j-l</sup>	0.76 <sup>n-p</sup>	0.70 <sup>qr</sup>		
CHIT	5	0.85 <sup>d</sup>	0.82 <sup>e-g</sup>	0.80 <sup>gh</sup>	0.77 <sup>I-n</sup>	0.75 <sup>op</sup>	0.70 <sup>r</sup>		
	10	0.85 <sup>d</sup>	0.81 <sup>f-h</sup>	0.80 <sup>hi</sup>	0.77 <sup>k-m</sup>	0.75 <sup>p</sup>	0.69 <sup>r</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.01							

**Table 8.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 the Fruit Titratable Acidity

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

The results in Table 9 show that the fruit content from phenol was significantly increased in the 3 days of stored fruits. Additionally, fruits stored for 3 days after treatment with 250, 500, and 1000 SA or with 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT also contained a high quantity of phenols. Moreover, the 6 or 9 days of stored fruits solely or after treatment with SA or CHIT are characterized by a high phenol content. By increasing the storage period, the fruit content from phenols was decreased even with using SA or CHIT.

<b>Table 9.</b> Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on
Phenols

Phenols (mg/g dry weight)									
Treatment	Concentration		Time of the storage (days)						
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16		
	0	106.00 <sup>op</sup>	165.50 <sup>a</sup>	153.00 <sup>b</sup>	141.25 <sup>e</sup>	121.50 <sup>i</sup>	108.00 <sup>op</sup>		
64	250	106.75 <sup>op</sup>	156.00 <sup>b</sup>	145.00 <sup>cd</sup>	138.00 <sup>f</sup>	125.00 <sup>k</sup>	112.50 <sup>n</sup>		
SA	500	105.75 <sup>op</sup>	153.00 <sup>b</sup>	141.75 <sup>de</sup>	137.00 <sup>fg</sup>	127.00 <sup>jk</sup>	115.75 <sup>m</sup>		
	1000	104.75 <sup>p</sup>	148.00 <sup>c</sup>	136.00 <sup>fg</sup>	131.00 <sup>hi</sup>	130.75 <sup>hi</sup>	116.00 <sup>m</sup>		
	0	105.5 <sup>op</sup>	164.25 <sup>a</sup>	147.75°	142.50 <sup>de</sup>	121.50 <sup>i</sup>	108.75°		
СШТ	2.5	108.00 <sup>op</sup>	153.75 <sup>b</sup>	142.50 <sup>de</sup>	135.75 <sup>fg</sup>	127.00 <sup>jk</sup>	115.25 <sup>m</sup>		
CHIT	5	106.00 <sup>op</sup>	147.50°	136.50 <sup>fg</sup>	131.00 <sup>hi</sup>	132.00 <sup>h</sup>	116.25 <sup>m</sup>		
	10	105.25 <sup>op</sup>	142.50 <sup>de</sup>	133.75 <sup>gh</sup>	128.50 <sup>ij</sup>	134.25 <sup>gh</sup>	116.50 <sup>m</sup>		
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		2.44							

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

The data in Table 10 show that a high significant concentration of MDA was in fruits stored for 16 days. Moreover, fruit stored for 16 days and treated with 250, 500, and

1000 mg/L SA and also with 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT were characterized by a high content of MDA. Its content was also significantly increased in the 12 days solely or after the treatment with 250, 500, and 1000 SA or with 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT. In the fresh harvest fruits, MDA concentration was less than that after the storage, whereas when the storage time increased, the concentration of MDA in the fruit increased.

Table 10. Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT or	I.
MDA Enzyme	

MDA ((µmol/g fruit weight)							
Tractmont	Concentration	Time of the storage (days)					
Treatment	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16
SA	0	40.40 <sup>z</sup>	51.90 <sup>n</sup>	55.60 <sup>j</sup>	61.5 <sup>f</sup>	65.70 <sup>b</sup>	68.70 <sup>a</sup>
	250	40.57 <sup>yz</sup>	46.72 <sup>s</sup>	52.45 <sup>m</sup>	56.67 <sup>i</sup>	62.47 <sup>e</sup>	65.62 <sup>b</sup>
	500	40.60 <sup>yz</sup>	44.55 <sup>u</sup>	50.55 <sup>p</sup>	55.42 <sup>j</sup>	60.62 <sup>g</sup>	64.27 <sup>c</sup>
	1000	41.00 <sup>y</sup>	43.95 <sup>v</sup>	48.85 <sup>q</sup>	53.40 <sup>1</sup>	63.57 <sup>d</sup>	63.57 <sup>d</sup>
СНІТ	0	40.70 <sup>yz</sup>	51.50°	55.50 <sup>j</sup>	61.55 <sup>f</sup>	65.60 <sup>b</sup>	68.52 <sup>a</sup>
	2.5	40.32 <sup>z</sup>	44.92 <sup>t</sup>	50.50 <sup>p</sup>	55.60 <sup>j</sup>	61.57 <sup>f</sup>	65.40 <sup>b</sup>
	5	40.62 <sup>yz</sup>	43.47 <sup>w</sup>	48.87 <sup>q</sup>	54.57 <sup>k</sup>	60.45 <sup>g</sup>	64.45 <sup>c</sup>
	10	40.67 <sup>yz</sup>	42.72 <sup>×</sup>	47.55 <sup>r</sup>	53.72 <sup>1</sup>	58.57 <sup>h</sup>	63.57 <sup>d</sup>
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.34					

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

At 6 days, stored fruits were characterized by the high significant content of catalase enzyme (CAT), followed by 3 or 9 days stored fruits solely or after the usage of SA or CHIT (Table 11). The lowest concentrations of CAT enzyme were noticed in the 16 days stored fruits or even after the usage of SA or CHIT. The amount of CAT enzyme was significantly different in the fresh fruits compared to fruits treated with SA or CHIT.

**Table 11.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 CAT Enzyme

CAT (U/Fruit weight)							
Treatment	Concentration	Time of the storage (days)					
	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16
SA	0	48.60i	55.50 <sup>b</sup>	58.55 <sup>a</sup>	54.67 <sup>bc</sup>	40.45 <sup>k</sup>	30.62 <sup>r</sup>
	250	48.57 <sup>i</sup>	53.67 <sup>cd</sup>	55.60 <sup>b</sup>	52.70 <sup>d-f</sup>	41.65 <sup>k</sup>	33.65 <sup>op</sup>
	500	48.52 <sup>i</sup>	52.70 <sup>d-f</sup>	54.62 <sup>bc</sup>	50.5 <sup>gh</sup>	38.60 <sup>1</sup>	32.70 <sup>pq</sup>
	1000	48.50 <sup>i</sup>	51.42 <sup>fg</sup>	53.72 <sup>cd</sup>	52.02 <sup>e-g</sup>	36.62 <sup>m</sup>	31.42 <sup>qr</sup>
СНІТ	0	48.62 <sup>i</sup>	55.65 <sup>b</sup>	58.67 <sup>a</sup>	54.62 <sup>bc</sup>	40.55 <sup>k</sup>	30.57 <sup>r</sup>
	2.5	48.77 <sup>i</sup>	52.65 <sup>d-f</sup>	55.45 <sup>b</sup>	51.65 <sup>fg</sup>	43.60 <sup>j</sup>	35.50 <sup>n</sup>
	5	48.57 <sup>i</sup>	50.62 <sup>gh</sup>	53.47 <sup>c-e</sup>	50.57 <sup>gh</sup>	41.55 <sup>k</sup>	34.60 <sup>no</sup>
	10	48.52 <sup>i</sup>	49.67 <sup>hi</sup>	51.70 <sup>fg</sup>	48.67 <sup>i</sup>	38.55 <sup>1</sup>	31.62 <sup>qr</sup>
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		1.11					

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

Treating the 3, 6 and 9 days stored fruits with 250, 500, and 1000 mg/L SA or with 2.5, 5, and 10 mg/L CHIT increased the superoxide dismutase (SOD) enzyme (Table 12). The superior concentration of SOD was noticed in the 6 days stored fruits after treatment of 1000 mg/L SA and in the 3, 6 and 9 days stored fruits treated with 10 mg/L CHIT. It was noticed also that SOD decreased gradually by increasing the storage period where its

concentration in the 12 and 16 stored fruits was significantly decreased particularly when the fruits were not treated with SA or CHIT.

SOD (U/Fruit weight)							
Treatment	Concentration	Time of the storage (days)					
	(mg/L)	0	3	6	9	12	16
SA	0	10.77 <sup>ef</sup>	9.65 <sup>g</sup>	8.55 <sup>i</sup>	7.65j	7.60 <sup>j</sup>	6.90 <sup>k</sup>
	250	10.42 <sup>f</sup>	11.57 <sup>d</sup>	12.67 <sup>b</sup>	11.65 <sup>d</sup>	10.42 <sup>f</sup>	8.60i
	500	10.55 <sup>ef</sup>	12.62 <sup>b</sup>	12.87 <sup>b</sup>	12.02 <sup>cd</sup>	10.95 <sup>ef</sup>	9.12 <sup>h</sup>
	1000	10.52 <sup>ef</sup>	12.75 <sup>b</sup>	13.65 <sup>a</sup>	12.72 <sup>b</sup>	11.55 <sup>d</sup>	9.62 <sup>g</sup>
CHIT	0	10.70 <sup>ef</sup>	9.57 <sup>g</sup>	8.65i	7.65j	7.35j	7.40 <sup>j</sup>
	2.5	10.50 <sup>ef</sup>	11.57 <sup>d</sup>	12.50 <sup>b</sup>	12.35 <sup>bc</sup>	10.67 <sup>ef</sup>	9.57 <sup>g</sup>
	5	10.45 <sup>f</sup>	12.62 <sup>b</sup>	12.72 <sup>b</sup>	12.77 <sup>b</sup>	11.02 <sup>e</sup>	10.50 <sup>ef</sup>
	10	10.57 <sup>ef</sup>	13.47 <sup>a</sup>	13.42 <sup>a</sup>	13.42 <sup>a</sup>	11.60 <sup>d</sup>	10.80 <sup>ef</sup>
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>		0.34					

**Table 12.** Effect of Storage Time and Postharvest Treatment of SA and CHIT on

 SOD Enzyme

The treatments that take the same letters mean that there are no significant differences between them.

# DISCUSSION

The results showed that the post-implementation of CHIT on strawberry increased their fruit shelf life, and decreased the percentage of decay and fungal diseases. These results were in agreement with Wang and Gao (2013); they reported that untreated strawberry fruits with CHIT may have low anthocyanin concentrations due to pigment degradation and accelerated fruit senescence. Because of its propensity to produce semipermeable membranes, the CHIT-coated film on the fruit surface can block epidermal stomata and lenticels (Hosseinnejad and Jafari 2016), which decreases water and nutrient loss from the fruit and prevents respiration (Xu et al. 2018). Treating kiwifruit with CHIT after harvesting increased the fruit firmness as a result of the creation of a semipermeable layer on the fruit surface, which functions as a protective barrier to minimise the respiration rate, hence reducing metabolic activity and textural changes (Drevinskas et al. 2017; Zheng et al. 2017). Besides, CHIT may create an altered environment surrounding the fruit surface, which inhibits the breakdown of pectin and postpones the fruit's loss of firmness (He et al. 2018). CHIT-based coatings have been effectively applied to a range of fresh fruits and vegetables. They can function as barriers, slow down senescence and maturation, lessen dehydration, and postpone microbiological and fungal decomposition (Pagno et al. 2018; Kabanov and Novinyuk 2020). CHIT is a good edible coating material due to its outstanding film-forming properties, high mechanical strength, and antibacterial qualities (Jiao et al. 2019). CHIT treatment inhibited fungal and bacterial growth, implying that pathogens grew more slowly in these settings (Youssef and Hashim 2020). Wantat et al. (2022) described a CHIT-montmorillonite nanocomposites coating that might lower ethylene generation and respiration rates, hence preserving banana storage quality.

The results of this experiment showed that the usage of SA on strawberry increased their fruit shelf life and decreased decay percentages and fungal diseases. These results are in the same line with those documented by Barman *et al.* (2016). They reported that SA plays a significant function in different physiological processes such as fruit ripening,

minimizing fruit damage by increasing ethylene production, and preserving the fruit firmness and color. Additionally, SA has been reported to enhance disease resistance (Zhang et al. 2010), reduce chilling (Luo et al. 2011), increase the storability of horticultural crops (Valero et al. 2011), and have antisenescence properties, delaying the postharvest ripening process (Gimenez et al. 2017). These effects lead to improving the fruit content from TSS percentage (Ahmad et al. 2013). According to García-Pastor et al. (2020), the application of SA resulted in a more intense red hue by raising the concentration of anthocyanins, hence boosting pomegranate profits on the global market. SA can reduce the metabolic activity and transpiration of fruit, thereby inhibiting weight loss (Amiri et al. 2021), which is a crucial quality parameter for commercial fruit, as it directly impacts visual quality and freshness (Koyuncu et al. 2019; Madhav et al. 2021). Batool et al. (2022) reported that postharvest treatments with SA significantly preserved total soluble solids, titratable acidity, color profile, ascorbic acid content, and total phenolic content in apricot varieties. These treatments also enhanced antioxidant activity and texture, maintained the visual color of apricots compared to the control, and reduced chilling injury index, weight loss, and decay percentage. The use of SA has been shown to improve storage quality by lowering respiration rates and ethylene production, preventing changes in fruit color and softening, preserving sugars and organic acids, reducing chilling injury, and boosting both pathogen resistance and the antioxidant system (Chen et al. 2023).

# CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The percentages of fruit loss and decay were significantly increased in parallel to increasing the period of the storage while, the fruit firmness was high in the fresh harvested fruits particularly, the fruits treated with 1000 mg/L salicylic acid (SA).
- 2. Treating strawberry fruits with salicylic acid (SA) or chitosan (CHIT) increased the total soluble solids (TSS), total sugars, vitamin C, and anthocyanin content. It was noticed that after 3 days storage, the phenol content was increased especially when they were not treated with SA or CHIT.
- 3. The CAT and SOD enzyme contents were decreased during the storage period, and the treatment of SA and CHIT increased their content, while malondialdehyde (MDA) was increased by increasing the time of the storage while its concentration was decreased after treatment of SA or CHIT.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to extend their gratitude to the Saudi Arabia Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture for providing financial, technical, and administrative support to fund this work through the initiative of encouraging the agricultural "Applied research project in the field of Promising Crops no. 220011487". The authors also extend their thanks and appreciation to The National Research and Development Center for Sustainable Agriculture (Estidamah) for overcoming the difficulties and facilitating the tasks to achieve this study.

# **REFERENCES CITED**

- Adiletta, G., Zampella, L., Coletta, C., and Petriccione, M. (2019). "Chitosan coating to preserve the qualitative traits and improve antioxidant system in fresh figs (*Ficus carica* L.)," *Agriculture* 9(4), article 84. DOI: 10.3390/agriculture9040084
- Agnihotri, A., Gupta, P., Dwivedi, A., and Seth, C. S. (2018). "Counteractive mechanism (s) of salicylic acid in response to lead toxicity in *Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern. cv. Varuna," *Planta* 248, 49-68. DOI. 10.1007/s00425-018-2867-0
- Ahmad, S., Singh, Z., Khan, A. S., and Iqbal, Z. (2013). "Pre-harvest application of salicylic acid maintains the rind textural properties and reduce fruit rot and chilling injury of sweet orange during cold storage," *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 50(4), 559-569.
- Alam, M. U., Fujita, M., Nahar, K., Rahman, A., Anee, T. I., Masud, A. A. C., Amin, A. K. M. R., and Hasanuzzaman, M. (2022). "Seed priming upregulates antioxidant defense and glyoxalase systems to conferring simulated drought tolerance in wheat seedlings," *Plant Stress* 6, article 100120.
- Ali, E., Hussain, S., Jalal, F., Khan, M.A., Imtiaz, M., Said, F., Ismail, M., Khan, S., Ali, H.M., Hatamleh, A.A. and Al-Dosary, M.A. (2023). "Salicylic acid-mitigates abiotic stress tolerance via altering defense mechanisms in *Brassica napus* (L.)," *Frontiers in Plant Science* 14, article 1187260. DOI: 10.3389/fpls. 2023.1187260
- Ali, I., Wang, X., Tareen, M.J., Wattoo, F.M., Qayyum, A., Hassan, M.U., Shafique, M., Liaquat, M., Asghar, S., Hussain, T. and Fiaz, S. (2021). "Foliar application of salicylic acid at different phenological stages of peach fruit cv. 'Flordaking' improves harvest quality and reduces chilling injury during low temperature storage," *Plants* 10(10), article 1981. DOI: 10.3390/plants 10101981
- Amiri, S., Nicknam, Z., Radi, M., Sayadi, M., Bagheri, F., Karimi Khorrami, N., and Abedi, E. (2021). "Postharvest quality of orange fruit as influenced by salicylic acid, acetic acid, and carboxymethyl cellulose coating," *Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization* 15(5), 3912-3930. DOI: 10.1007/s11694-021-00966-y
- Asghari, M., and Aghdam, M. S. (2010). "Impact of salicylic acid on post-harvest physiology of horticultural crops," *Trends in Food Science and Technology* 21(10), 502-509. DOI: 10.1016/j.tifs.2010.07.009
- Association of Official Analytical Chemist (AOAC) (2005). *Official Methods of Analysis*, 18<sup>th</sup> Edition, AOAC International, Gaithersburg, MD, USA.
- Bakpa, E. P., and Zhang, J. (2022). "Storage stability of nutritional qualities, enzyme activities, and volatile compounds of "Hangjiao no. 2" chili pepper treated with different concentrations of 1-methyl cyclopropene," *Frontiers in Plant Science* 13, article 838916. DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2022.838916
- Balfagón, D., Rambla, J. L., Granell, A., Arbona, V., and Gómez-Cadenas, A. (2022). "Grafting improves tolerance to combined drought and heat stresses by modifying metabolism in citrus scion," *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 195, article 104793. DOI: 10.1016/j.envexpbot.2022.104793
- Barman, K., Sharma, S., Kumari, P., Siddiqui, M.W. (2016). "Salicylic acid," in: *Postharvest Management Approaches for Maintaining Quality of Fresh Produce*, M. Siddiqui, J. Ayala Zavala, and C. A. Hwang (eds.), Springer, Cham. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-23582-0\_4
- Barkaoui, S., Mankai, M., Miloud, N. B., Kraiem, M., Madureira, J., Verde, S. C., and Boudhrioua, N. (2021). "Effect of gamma radiation coupled to refrigeration on

antioxidant capacity, sensory properties and shelf life of strawberries," *LWT- Journal* of Food Science and Technology 150, article 112088. DOI: 10.1016/j.lwt.2021. 112088

- Batool, M., Bashir, O., Amin, T., Wani, S.M., Masoodi, F.A., Jan, N., Bhat, S.A. and Gul, A., (2022). "Effect of oxalic acid and salicylic acid treatments on the postharvest life of temperate grown apricot varieties (*Prunus armeniaca*) during controlled atmosphere storage," *Food Science and Technology International* 28(7), 557-569. DOI: 10.1177/10820132211032074
- Benavides, S., and Franco, W. (2023). "Innovative integration of arrayan (*Luma apiculata*) extracts in chitosan coating for fresh strawberry preservation," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 24(19), article 14681. DOI: 10.3390/ijms241914681
- Celikel, G., Demirsoy, L., and Demirsoy, H. (2008). "The strawberry tree (*Arbutus unedo* L.) selection in Turkey," *Scientia Horticulturae* 118(2), 115-119. DOI: 10. 1016/j.scienta.2008.05.028
- Champa, W. H., Gill, M., Mahajan, B., and Arora, N. (2015). "Preharvest salicylic acid treatments to improve quality and postharvest life of table grapes (*Vitis vinifera* L.) cv. Flame Seedless," *Journal of Food Science and Technology* 52, 3607-3616. DOI: 10.1007/s13197-014-1422-7
- Chaudhary, S., Kumar, S., Kumar, V., and Sharma, R. (2020). "Chitosan nanoemulsions as advanced edible coatings for fruits and vegetables: Composition, fabrication and developments in last decade," *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules* 152, 154-170. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2020.02.276
- Chen, C., Sun, C., Wang, Y., Gong, H., Zhang, A., Yang, Y., Guo, F., Cui, K., Fan, X. and Li, X. (2023). "The preharvest and postharvest application of salicylic acid and its derivatives on storage of fruit and vegetables: A review," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 312, p.111858. DOI: 10.1016/j.scienta.2023.111858
- Cordenunsi, B. R., Genovese, M. I., do Nascimento, J. R. O., Hassimotto, N. M. A., dos Santos, R. J., and Lajolo, F. M. (2005). "Effects of temperature on the chemical composition and antioxidant activity of three strawberry cultivars," *Food Chemistry* 91(1), 113-121. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.05.054
- Deng, Z., Jung, J., Simonsen, J., and Zhao, Y. (2017). "Cellulose nanomaterials emulsion coatings for controlling physiological activity, modifying surface morphology, and enhancing storability of postharvest bananas (*Musa acuminate*)," *Food Chemistry* 232, 359-368. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.04.028.
- Drevinskas, T., Naujokaitytė, G., Maruška, A., Kaya, M., Sargin, I., Daubaras, R., and Česonienė, L. (2017). "Effect of molecular weight of chitosan on the shelf life and other quality parameters of three different cultivars of *Actinidia kolomikta* (kiwifruit)," *Carbohydrate Polymers* 173, 269-275. DOI: 10.1016/j.carbpol.2017.06.002
- Feliziani, E., and Romanazzi, G. (2016). "Postharvest decay of strawberry fruit: Etiology, epidemiology, and disease management," *Journal of Berry Research* 6(1), 47-63. DOI: 10.3233/JBR-150113
- García-Pastor, M. E., Zapata, P. J., Castillo, S., Martínez-Romero, D., Guillén, F., Valero, D., and Serrano, M. (2020). "The effects of salicylic acid and its derivatives on increasing pomegranate fruit quality and bioactive compounds at harvest and during storage," *Frontiers in Plant Science* 11, article 668. DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2020.00668.

George, S., Aswathi, K. P. R, and Puthur, J.T. (2022). "Photosynthetic functions in plants

subjected to stresses are positively influenced by priming," *Plant Stress* 4, article 100079. DOI: 10.1016/j.stress.2022.100079

- Ghosh, A., Saha, I., Debnath, S. C., Hasanuzzaman, M., and Adak, M. K. (2021). "Chitosan and putrescine modulate reactive oxygen species metabolism and physiological responses during chili fruit ripening," *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* 163, 55-67. DOI: 10.1016/j.plaphy.2021.03.026
- Giménez, M. J., Serrano, M., Valverde, J. M., Martínez-Romero, D., Castillo, S., Valero, D., and Guillén, F. (2017). "Preharvest salicylic acid and acetylsalicylic acid treatments preserve quality and enhance antioxidant systems during postharvest storage of sweet cherry cultivars," *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 97(4), 1220-1228. DOI: 10.1002/jsfa.7853
- Gutiérrez, T. J., and Álvarez, K. (2017). "Transport phenomena in biodegradable and edible films," in: *Biopackaging*, Ed. 1, Chapter 4, CRC Press, Taylor Francis. DOI: 10.1201/9781315152349-4
- He, Y., Bose, S. K., Wang, W., Jia, X., Lu, H., and Yin, H. (2018). "Pre-harvest treatment of chitosan oligosaccharides improved strawberry fruit quality," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 19(8), article 2194. DOI: 10.3390/ijms19082194
- Hernanz, D., Jara-Palacios M. J., Santos J. L., Pajuelo A. G., Heredia, F. J., and Terrab A. (2023). "The profile of phenolic compounds by HPLC-MS in Spanish oak (*Quercus*) honeydew honey and their relationships with color and antioxidant activity," *LWT* 180, article 114724. DOI: 10.1016/j.lwt.2023.114724
- Hosseinnejad, M., and Jafari, S. M. (2016). "Evaluation of different factors affecting antimicrobial properties of chitosan," *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules* 85, 467-475. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2016.01.022
- Huang, R., Xia, R., Lu, Y., Hu, L., and Xu, Y. (2008). "Effect of pre-harvest spray treatment on post-harvest antioxidant in the pulp and peel of 'Cara Cara' navel orange (*Citrus sinenisis* L. Osbeck)," *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 88, 229-236. DOI: 10.1002/jsfa.3076
- Huang, Z., Omwange, K. A., Saito, Y., Kuramoto, M., and Kondo, N. (2023).
  "Monitoring strawberry (*Fragaria* × ananassa) quality changes during storage using UV-excited fluorescence imaging," *Journal of Food Engineering* 353, article 111553. DOI: 10. 1016/j.jfoodeng.2023.111553
- Jakobek, L., Seruga, M., Medvidovic-Kosanovic, M., and Novak, I. (2007). "Anthocyanin content and antioxidant activity of various red fruit juices," *German Food Review* 103(2), 58.
- Jia, H., Wang, X., Wei, T., Wang, M., Liu, X., Hua, L., Ren, X., Guo, J. and Li, J. (2021). "Exogenous salicylic acid regulates cell wall polysaccharides synthesis and pectin methylation to reduce Cd accumulation of tomato," *Ecotoxicology and environmental safety*, 207, p.111550. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111550
- Jiang, X., Lin, H., Lin, M., Chen, Y., Wang, H., Lin, Y., Shi, J. and Lin, Y., (2018a). "A novel chitosan formulation treatment induces disease resistance of harvested litchi fruit to Peronophythora litchii in association with ROS metabolism," *Food Chemistry* 266, 299-308. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.01.095
- Jiang, X., Lin, H., Shi, J., Neethirajan, S., Lin, Y., Chen, Y., Wang, H. and Lin, Y. (2018b). "Effects of a novel chitosan formulation treatment on quality attributes and storage behavior of harvested litchi fruit," *Food Chemistry* 252, 134-141. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.01.095

- Jiao, W., Shu, C., Li, X., Cao, J., Fan, X., and Jiang, W. (2019). "Preparation of a chitosan-chlorogenic acid conjugate and its application as edible coating in postharvest preservation of peach fruit," *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 154, 129-136. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2019.05.003
- Jung, J., Deng, Z., and Zhao, Y. (2020). "A review of cellulose nanomaterials incorporated fruit coatings with improved barrier property and stability: Principles and applications," *Journal of Food Science and Technology* 43(2), article e13344. DOI: 10.1111/jfpe.13344
- Kabanov, V. L., and Novinyuk, L. V. (2020). "Chitosan application in food technology: A review of rescent advances," *Food Systems* 3(1), 10-15. DOI: 10.21323/2618-9771-2020-3-1-10-15
- Kazemi, M., Aran, M., and Zamani, S. (2011). "Effect of calcium chloride and salicylic acid treatments on quality characteristics of kiwifruit (*Actinidia deliciosa* cv. Hayward) during storage," *American Journal of Plant Physiology* 6(3), 183-189. DOI: 10.3923/ajpp.2011.183.189
- Khan, M. I. R., Syeed, S., Nazar, R., and Anjum, N. A. (2012). "An insight into the role of salicylic acid and jasmonic acid in salt stress tolerance," in: *Phytohormones and Abiotic Stress Tolerance in Plants*, N. Khan, R. Nazar, N. Iqbal, and N. Anjum (eds.), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-25829-9\_12
- Khan, M. S. S., Ahmed, S., Ikram, A. U., Hannan, F., Yasin, M. U., Wang, J., Zhao, B., Islam, F., and Chen, J. (2023). "Phytomelatonin: A key regulator of redox and phytohormones signaling against biotic/abiotic stresses," *Redox Biology* 64, article 102805. DOI:10.1016/j.redox.2023.102805
- Kim, A.-N., Lee, K.-Y., Jeong, E. J., Cha, S. W., Kim, B. G., Kerr, W. L., and Choi, S.-G. (2021). "Effect of vacuum–grinding on the stability of anthocyanins, ascorbic acid, and oxidative enzyme activity of strawberry," *LWT- Journal of Food Science and Technology* 136, article 110304. DOI: 10.1016/j.lwt.2020.110304
- Kipkoech, C., Kinyuru, J. N., Imathiu, S., Meyer-Rochow, V. B., and Roos, N. (2021).
  "*In vitro* study of cricket chitosan's potential as a prebiotic and a promoter of probiotic microorganisms to control pathogenic bacteria in the human gut," *Foods* 10(10), article 2310. DOI: 10.3390/foods10102310
- Koyuncu, M. A., Erbas, D., Onursal, C. E., Secmen, T., Guneyli, A., and Sevinc Uzumcu, S. (2019). "Postharvest treatments of salicylic acid, oxalic acid and putrescine influences bioactive compounds and quality of pomegranate during controlled atmosphere storage," *Journal of Food Science and Technology* 56(1), 350-359. DOI: 10.1007/s13197-018-3495-1
- Kumarihami, H. P. C., Kim, Y.-H., Kwack, Y.-B., Kim, J., and Kim, J. G. (2022).
  "Application of chitosan as edible coating to enhance storability and fruit quality of kiwifruit: A review," *Scientia Horticulturae* 292, article 110647. DOI: 10.1016/j.scienta.2021.110647
- Lafuente, M. T., and Romero, P. (2022). "Hormone profiling and heat-induced tolerance to cold stress in citrus fruit," *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 194, article 112088. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2022.112088
- Limon, T., Birke, A., Monribot-Villanueva, J.L., Guerrero-Analco, J.A., Altúzar-Molina, A., Carrión, G., Goycoolea, F.M., Moerschbacher, B.M. and Aluja, M. (2021).
  "Chitosan coatings reduce fruit fly (*Anastrepha obliqua*) infestation and development of the fungus *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* in Manila mangoes," *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 101(7), 2756-2766. DOI: 10.1002/jsfa.10903

- Lin, Y., Li, N., Lin, H., Lin, M., Chen, Y., Wang, H., Ritenour, M.A. and Lin, Y. (2020). "Effects of chitosan treatment on the storability and quality properties of longan fruit during storage," *Food Chemistry* 306, article 125627. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem. 2019.125627
- Luo, Z., Chen, C., and Xie, J. (2011). "Effect of salicylic acid treatment on alleviating postharvest chilling injury of 'Qingnai' plum fruit," *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 62(2), 115-120. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2011.05.012
- Madhav, J. V., Sethi, S., Sharma, R. R., Nagaraja, A., Arora, A., and Varghese, E. (2021). "Influence of bilayer coating of salicylic acid and edible wax on chilling injury and functional attributes of guava," *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation* 45(7), article e15601. DOI: 10.1111/jfpp.15601
- Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Keshri, A., and Sabaretnam, M. (2019). "Selection of appropriate statistical methods for data analysis," *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia* 22(3), 297-301. DOI: 10.4103/aca.ACA\_248\_18
- Mo, Y., Gong, D., Liang, G., Han, R., Xie, J., and Li, W. (2008). "Enhanced preservation effects of sugar apple fruits by salicylic acid treatment during post-harvest storage," *J. of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 88(15), 2693-2699. DOI: 10.1002/jsfa.3395
- Nielsen, S. S. (2010). "Phenol-sulfuric acid method for total carbohydrates," in: Food Analysis Laboratory Manual, S. S. Nielsen (ed.), Food Science texts series, Springer, Boston, MA. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1463-7\_6
- No, H., Meyers, S. P., Prinyawiwatkul, W., and Xu, Z. (2007). "Applications of chitosan for improvement of quality and shelf life of foods: A review," *Journal of Food Science* 72(5), R87-R100. DOI: 10.1111/j.1750-3841.2007.00383.x
- Pang, L., Wu, Y., Pan, Y., Ban, Z., Li, L., and Li, X. (2020). "Insights into exogenous melatonin associated with phenylalanine metabolism in postharvest strawberry," *Postharvest Biology and Technology Journal* 168, article 111244. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2020.111244
- Pagno, C.H., Castagna, A., Trivellini, A., Mensuali-Sodi, A., Ranieri, A., Ferreira, E.A., Rios, A.D.O., and Flôres, S.H. (2018). "The nutraceutical quality of tomato fruit during domestic storage is affected by chitosan coating," *Journal of Food Processing* and Preservation 42(1), p. e13326. DOI: 10.1111/jfpp.13326Citations: 18
- Raza, A., Charagh, S., Najafi-Kakavand, S., Abbas, S., Shoaib, Y., Anwar, S., Sharifi, S., Lu, G., and Siddique, K. H. M. (2023). "Role of phytohormones in regulating cold stress tolerance: Physiological and molecular approaches for developing cold-smart crop plants," *Plant Stress* 8, article 100152.
- Romanazzi, G., Feliziani, E., Baños, S. B., and Sivakumar, D. (2017). "Shelf-life extension of fresh fruit and vegetables by chitosan treatment," *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 57(3), 579-601. DOI: 10.1080/10408398.2014.900474
- Salem, I. b., Ouesleti, S., Mabrouk, Y., Landolsi, A., Saidi, M., and Boulilla, A. (2018). "Exploring the nutraceutical potential and biological activities of *Arbutus unedo* L. (Ericaceae) fruits," *Industrial Crops and Products* 122, 726-731. DOI: 10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.06.024
- Shafiee, M., Taghavi, T., and Babalar, M. (2010). "Addition of salicylic acid to nutrient solution combined with postharvest treatments (hot water, salicylic acid, and calcium dipping) improved postharvest fruit quality of strawberry," *Scientia Horticulturae* 124(1), 40-45. DOI: 10.1016/j.scienta.2009.12.004

- Silva, S. S., Mano, J. F., and Reis, R. L. (2017). "Ionic liquids in the processing and chemical modification of chitin and chitosan for biomedical applications," *Green Chemistry* 19(5), 1208-1220. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.05.123
- Singh, S. (2023). "Salicylic acid elicitation improves antioxidant activity of spinach leaves by increasing phenolic content and enzyme levels," *Food Chemistry Advances* 2, article 100156. DOI: 10.1016/j.focha.2022.100156
- Valero, D., Diaz-Mula, H. M., Zapata, P. J., Castillo, S., Guillen, F., Martinez-Romero, D., and Serrano, M. (2011). "Postharvest treatments with salicylic acid, acetylsalicylic acid or oxalic acid delayed ripening and enhanced bioactive compounds and antioxidant capacity in sweet cherry," *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 59(10), 5483-5489. DOI: 10.1021/jf200873j
- Wang, S. Y., and Gao, H. (2013). "Effect of chitosan-based edible coating on antioxidants, antioxidant enzyme system, and postharvest fruit quality of strawberries (*Fragaria x aranassa* Duch.)," *LWT- Journal of Food Science and Technology* 52(2), 71-79. DOI: 10.1016/j.lwt.2012.05.003
- Wang, Y.-S., Tian, S.-P., and Xu, Y. (2005). "Effects of high oxygen concentration on pro-and antioxidant enzymes in peach fruits during postharvest periods," *Food Chemistry* 91(1), 99-104. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.05.053
- Wantat, A., Seraypheap, K., and Rojsitthisak, P. (2022). "Effect of chitosan coatings supplemented with chitosan-montmorillonite nanocomposites on postharvest quality of 'Hom Thong'banana fruit," *Food Chemistry* 374, article 131731. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2021.131731
- Xu, D., Qin, H., and Ren, D. (2018). "Prolonged preservation of tangerine fruits using chitosan/montmorillonite composite coating," *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 143, 50-57. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2018.04.013
- Yan, J., Luo, Z., Ban, Z., Lu, H., Li, D., Yang, D., Aghdam, M. S., and Li, L. (2019).
  "The effect of the layer-by-layer (LBL) edible coating on strawberry quality and metabolites during storage," *Postharvest Biology and Technology* 147, 29-38. DOI: 10.1016/j.postharvbio.2018.09.002
- Youssef, K., and Hashim, A. F. (2020). "Inhibitory effect of clay/chitosan nanocomposite against penicillium digitatum on citrus and its possible mode of action," *Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences* 13(3).
- Zhang, X., Ismail, B. B., Cheng, H., Jin, T. Z., Qian, M., Arabi, S. A., Liu, D., and Guo, M. (2021). "Emerging chitosan-essential oil films and coatings for food preservation-A review of advances and applications," *Carbohydrate Polymers* 273, article 118616. DOI: 10.1016/j.carbpol.2021.118616
- Zhang, Y., Xu,S., Ding, P., Wang, D., Cheng, Y.T., He, J., Gao, M., Xu, F., Li, Y., Zhu, Z., Xin Li, and Zhang, Y. (2010). "Control of salicylic acid synthesis and systemic acquired resistance by two members of a plant-specific family of transcription factors," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107(42), 18220-18225. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1005225107
- Zhao, H. J., Zhao, X. J., Ma, P. F., Wang, Y. X., Hu, W. W., Li, L. H., and Zhao, Y. D. (2011). "Effects of salicylic acid on protein kinase activity and chloroplast D1 protein degradation in wheat leaves subjected to heat and high light stress," *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 31(5), 259-263. DOI: 10.1016/j.chnaes.2011.06.006

Zheng, F., Zheng, W., Li, L., Pan, S., Liu, M., Zhang, W., Liu, H., and Zhu, C. (2017).
"Chitosan controls postharvest decay and elicits defense response in kiwifruit," *Food and Bioprocess Technology* 10, 1937-1945. DOI: 10.1007/s11947-017-1957-5

Article submitted: April 4, 2024; Peer review completed: June 8, 2024; Revised version received and accepted: July 7, 2024; Published: July 17, 2024. DOI: 10.15376/biores.19.3.6057-6075