



# PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PARAMETERS OF EGGPLANTS (SOLANUM AETHIOPICUM L.) ACCORDING TO CONSERVATION TECHNIQUES

## \*DEFFAN Zranseu Ange Bénédicte<sup>1</sup>, YAPI Jocelyn Constant<sup>1</sup>, FAGBOHOUN Jean Bedel<sup>2</sup>, MASSE Diomandé<sup>1</sup>, BEUGRE Grah Avit Maxwell<sup>1</sup>

1 Agrovalorization Laboratory, Jean Lorougnon Guédé University, Daloa, (Ivory Coast) BP 150, Daloa, (Ivory Coast), <u>dezranbe@yahoo.fr</u>

2 Laboratory of Biochemistry-Genetics, Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University, Korhogo, Ivory Coast BP 1328 Korhogo, Ivory Coast.

\*Corresponding author Received 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021, accepted 5<sup>th</sup> September 2021

**Abstract**: In Côte d'Ivoire it is difficult to keep vegetables and fruits, especially eggplant, and this is due to a lack of proper storage techniques. The few processes used are expensive and inaccessible to most of the population. The purpose of this study is to determine appropriate eggplant conservation techniques. The aim is to determine some of the physico-chemical parameters including dry matter, oil content, protein and sugar content at different types of conservation (respective immersion in vinegar, kitchen salt and wood ash). Open air storage was used as a control. Analyzes were performed weekly during ten (10) weeks of storage. The results showed that the dry matter content reached the maximum values of 8.45% to 17.43% in saline preservation and 8.45% to 16.56% in ambient, the highest sugar content was observed in vinegar-based preservatives, 4.16, 4.33 and 4.66% in sugars total, and at the level of reducing sugars the highest levels are observed at the level of conservation with ash for a value of 3,90%. The highest protein concentrations were observed in vinegar 2.33% and ash 2.55%. However, the highest level of oil is observed in ash conservation 0.61% to twenty-four (24) days of preservation, the ash method also reveals the highest levels of minerals throughout conservation. The results therefore indicate that vinegar and ash conservation at the method level is positively different from that of the ambient environment and salt.

Keywords: preservation, methods, ash, vinegar, salt

## **1. Introduction**

Grown for its fruit and consumed as a fruit vegetable, eggplant is produced throughout the tropical regions of Africa, Latin America and Asia for the exploitation of its edible fruits [1]. These are ellipsoidal, ovoid or fusiform globose berries, which also have therapeutic virtues : sedative, carminative, anti-colic, antibacterial, antihypertensive, anti-tetanic [2]. Eggplant is consumed even less in Northern Europe and North America. It remains an Asian

DOI: https://doi.org/10.4316/fens.2021.020

vegetable with a production of 93% of the world and marginally Mediterranean [1]. In Côte d'Ivoire, its cultivation is carried out throughout the territory, using generally traditional techniques. Despite the economic and food potential of African eggplant, little work has been done to improve the production techniques of this crop in Côte d'Ivoire. If all peri-urban and rural production in the country is able to fully satisfy local demand, the surplus crop is often wasted by lack of knowledge of good processing, conservation and storage techniques. Several research studies have been carried out on the conservation of our food. However, apart from the studies carried on the appearance of the fruit during its preservation [3], no less expensive preservation process has been put in place which could guarantee the availability and the physico-chemical quality of eggplants during the off-season throughout the year. The rare or conservation techniques encountered are mostly artisanal and based on dehydration of vegetable However, these methods not only cause the loss of many volatile or thermosensitive compounds, but also affect the organoleptic quality of fruit; this drastically lowers their market value. Conventional methods in vogue (controlled atmosphere, use of additives cold conditioning, etc.) remain quite expensive and inaccessible to the majority of Ivorian consumers and producers. This study was proposed with a view to finding solutions to this problem. This will identify conservation processes that will allow the physicochemical properties of eggplants to be maintained at lower costs.

# 2. Materials and methods

# Materials

The plant material concerned the eggplant (*solanum aethiopicum* L.), cultivated on an experimental plot, carried out at the Jean Lorougnon Guédé University in Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire.

# Method

# Sampling

Healthy plants with no history of disease were selected and the species of eggplant used in this study was carefully harvested. Carefully transported to the laboratory, the selected fruits are stored in vinegar, kitchen salt, and wood ash. Open air storage will be used as a control treatment. For each treatment, four (04) batches of 500 grams of eggplants (including one batch per preservation technique) were treated. Also per batch, three (3) samples were formed thus giving twelve (12) samples per treatment. Analyzes (treatments) were carried out every three (3) days during one (1) month of storage. The treatments will be named T0, T1, T2, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9 and T10 for the thirty (30) days of conservation. A total of one hundred and twenty (120) samples will be analyzed during this study.

# Physico-chemical analysis

Dry matter and ash levels were determined using BIPEA methods [4]; the protein content was determined using the AOAC method [5] using Kjedhal; fat content according to BIPEA [4] using SOXHLET; the total sugar content according to Dubois and collaborators [6] using phenol and reducing sugar levels according to Benfeld [7] using 3,5-dinitro salicylic acid (DNS).

# Statistical Analyses

The data analysis was carried out using Microsoft Office Excel 2007 and STATISTICA 7 software, to determine the standard averages and deviations. One-factor variance analysis (ANOVA) was performed on the data to determine significant differences between averages during conservation. Then, the statistical differences were highlighted by the Duncan test at the threshold of  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

# 3. Results and discussion

# **Determination of dry matter content**

Dry matter levels generally increase throughout the storage except for the control (Table 1). Values increase continuously from 8.45 to 17.53% (Cooking Salt), to 12.01% (vinegar) and to 13.96% (ash). The method of preservation

with salt significantly reveals the highest values; then come the conservation with

ash and then vinegar (Table 1).

Table 1

| Treatments       | Witness                  | Cooking salt                 | Vinegar                          | Ash                                 | P intra<br>processing |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Т0               | 8.45±0.76 <sup>bA</sup>  | 8.45±0.76 <sup>aA</sup>      | 8.45±0.76 <sup>aA</sup>          | 8.45±0.76 <sup>aA</sup>             |                       |
| T1               | 9.88±0.21 cA             | 9.22±0.37 <sup>aA</sup>      | $8.70 \pm 0.84 \ ^{\mathbf{a}A}$ | 9.08±0.96 <sup>aA</sup>             | 0.080                 |
| T2               | 14.01±1.12 <sup>eB</sup> | 9.83±1.62 <sup>aA</sup>      | 9.01±0.21 <sup>aA</sup>          | 9.33±0.44 <sup>aA</sup>             | 0.002                 |
| Т3               | 16.56±1.08 <sup>fC</sup> | 12.33±0.87 b <sup>B</sup>    | 10.33±0.96 bA                    | 11.66±0.87 bA                       | 0.038                 |
| T4               | 15.94±0.26 <sup>fB</sup> | 13.42±1.25 bAB               | 11.25±1.00 <sup>bA</sup>         | 12.25±1.11 bA                       | 0.001                 |
| T5               | 15.03±0.33 <sup>aC</sup> | 14.66±1.06 <sup>abC</sup>    | 10.95±0.36 <sup>bA</sup>         | $12.88 \pm 0.86  {}^{\mathrm{bc}B}$ | 0.014                 |
| T6               | 11.10±0.86 dA            | $16.10 \pm 1.92 \text{ bc}C$ | 11.43±1.03 bA                    | 13.33±1.17 bcB                      | 0.024                 |
| Τ7               | 10.26±0.33 cdA           | $15.88 \pm 1.65 \ ^{bcC}$    | $12.19 \pm 0.76 \frac{bcB}{c}$   | $13.20 \pm 1.37 \text{ bc}^B$       | 0.031                 |
| T8               | 6.13±0.11 <sup>aA</sup>  | 16.35±0.75 <sup>cD</sup>     | 11.88±0.66 <sup>bB</sup>         | $14.11 \pm 1.16$ <sup>cdC</sup>     | < 0.001               |
| Т9               | 6.35±0.43 <sup>aA</sup>  | 17.33±1.18 °D                | $12.10 \pm 1.03 \text{ bc}^B$    | $14.53 \pm 0.93  {}^{\mathbf{cd}C}$ | < 0.001               |
| T10              | 5.42±0.55 <sup>aA</sup>  | 17.53±0.96 °D                | 12.01±1.10 <sup>bB</sup>         | 13.96±0.65 bcC                      | < 0.001               |
| P intra matérial | < 0.001                  | 0.044                        | 0.047                            | 0.038                               |                       |

#### Change in dry matter ratio

## **Determination of oil content**

Eggplant is found to be low in fat. However, variations were observed during storage with the highest T2 values of 0.51% (control), T4 values of 0.42% (salt), T5 values of 0.55% (vinegar) and then 0.61% for ash at T8. The highest rate, however, was observed preservation with ash (Table 2).

#### Table 2

## Change in oil content

| Treatments       | Witness                          | Cooking salt                  | Vinegar                           | Ash                               | P intra<br>processing |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| TO               | 0.23±0.00 eA                     | 0.23±0.00 <sup>aA</sup>       | 0.23±0.00 <sup>aA</sup>           | 0.23±0.02 <sup>a</sup>            |                       |
| T1               | $0.28 \pm 0.01^{fB}$             | 0.22±0.01 <sup>aA</sup>       | 0.23±0.02 <sup>aA</sup>           | 0.20±0.01 <sup>aA</sup>           | 0.040                 |
| T2               | $0.51 \pm 0.03 ^{iC}$            | $0.33 \pm 0.02 \text{ bc}^B$  | 0.26±0.01 bA                      | 0.33±0.01 bB                      | 0.002                 |
| Т3               | $0.36 \pm 0.00 ^{gB}$            | 0.33±0.00 bcA                 | 0.33±0.00 cA                      | 0.36±0.00 °B                      | 0.028                 |
| T4               | $0.44 \pm 0.02  {}^{\mathrm hB}$ | $0.42 \pm 0.02  d^B$          | $0.45 \pm 0.01 e^{B}$             | 0.35±0.01 bcA                     | 0.042                 |
| T5               | 0.23±0.01 eA                     | 0.33±.02 bcB                  | $0.55 \pm 0.03  {}^{\mathrm{fD}}$ | $0.44 \pm 0.03  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | < 0.001               |
| T6               | 0.20±0.00 dA                     | $0.40 \pm 0.00  \mathrm{d}^B$ | 0.43±0.01 eC                      | $0.43 \pm 0.02  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | 0.024                 |
| T7               | 0.16±0.00 cA                     | 0.30±0.00 bB                  | $0.49 \pm 0.04  {}^{\mathrm{f}C}$ | $0.49 \pm 0.03  \mathrm{deC}$     | 0.021                 |
| Т8               | 0.13±0.01 bA                     | 0.35±0.01 <sup>cB</sup>       | $0.38 \pm 0.02  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | $0.61 \pm 0.01  ^{\mathrm{cd}D}$  | < 0.001               |
| Т9               | $0.11 \pm 0.00 ^{\mathrm{a}A}$   | $0.33 \pm 0.02 \text{ bc}^B$  | $0.51 \pm 0.03  {}^{\mathrm{f}C}$ | $0.53 \pm 0.03  deC$              | 0.037                 |
| T10              | 0.11±0.00 <sup>aA</sup>          | $0.33 \pm 0.03 \text{ bc}^B$  | 0.43±0.01 eC                      | $0.46 \pm 0.00  {}^{\mathbf{D}d}$ | < 0.001               |
| P intra matérial | < 0.001                          | 0.008                         | < 0.001                           | 0.001                             |                       |

# Determination of raw the content of mineral

Ash also in small amounts in eggplant (<0.5%), shows different variations throughout conservation. The highest value (0.26%) was observed at T3 preservation

in ash. They are also raised at T2 in vinegar and salt, respectively (0.21%) and (0.23%), and then (0.24%) at the T4 control level. The ash-based method, however, reveals the highest rates throughout the shelf-life (Table 3).

| Change in raw ash content |                                 |                                   |                               |                                   |                       |  |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Treatments                | Witness                         | Cooking salt                      | Vinegar                       | Ash                               | P intra<br>processing |  |
| TO                        | 0.15±0.00 <sup>dA</sup>         | 0.15±0.00 bA                      | 0.15±0.00 bA                  | 0.15±0.00 aA                      |                       |  |
| T1                        | 0.12±0.00 bA                    | $0.22{\pm}0.00^{\text{ de}D}$     | 0.15±0.01 bB                  | $0.18 \pm 0.00  {}^{\mathrm{b}C}$ | < 0.001               |  |
| T2                        | 0.21±0.01 eA                    | 0.23±0.00 <sup>eB</sup>           | 0.21±0.01 <sup>dA</sup>       | $0.23 \pm 0.01  ^{\mathrm{d}B}$   | 0.042                 |  |
| Т3                        | $0.16 \pm 0.01  ^{\mathrm{d}B}$ | 0.13±0.01 <sup>aA</sup>           | 0.13±0.00 <sup>a</sup>        | $0.26 \pm 0.00  {}^{\mathrm{eC}}$ | < 0.001               |  |
| T4                        | $024 \pm 0.01  {}^{fC}$         | $0.12 \pm 0.00  {}^{\mathbf{a}A}$ | $0.15 \pm 0.00 \text{ b}^B$   | $0.25 \pm 0.01 \ deC$             | 0.014                 |  |
| T5                        | 0.13±0.00 cA                    | $0.16 \pm 0.01 \ ^{\mathrm{b}B}$  | $0.15 \pm 0.00 \text{ b}^{B}$ | 0.18±0.01 <sup>bC</sup>           | < 0.001               |  |
| T6                        | $0.20 \pm 0.01 e^{B}$           | $0.18 \pm 0.01  ^{cB}$            | 0.13±0.00 <sup>aA</sup>       | $0.23 \pm 0.01  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | 0.004                 |  |
| T7                        | 0.16±0.00 dA                    | $0.18 \pm 0.00  ^{cB}$            | $0.19 \pm 0.01 \ ^{cdBC}$     | $0.20 \pm 0.00  ^{cC}$            | 0.011                 |  |
| Τ8                        | $0.10 \pm 0.00 ^{\mathrm{a}A}$  | $0.15 \pm 0.00  {}^{\mathrm bB}$  | $0.20 \pm 0.00  \mathrm{d}D$  | 0.18±0.01 <sup>bC</sup>           | < 0.001               |  |
| Т9                        | 0.12±0.00 bA                    | 0.23±0.01 eC                      | 0.18±0.01 <sup>cB</sup>       | $0.23 \pm 0.01  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | < 0.001               |  |
| T10                       | 0.12±0.00 bA                    | $0.21 \pm 0.01  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | 0.13±0.00 <sup>aB</sup>       | $0.24 \pm 0.00  \mathrm{d}^{D}$   | < 0.001               |  |
| P intra matérial          | < 0.001                         | 0.001                             | < 0.001                       | 0.008                             |                       |  |

NB: the assigned values of the same letter in lowercase and bold are not significantly different between retention times. The assigned values of the same uppercase letter are not significantly different between retention modes

### **Determination of protein content**

levels Protein generally increased significantly from T0 to T3 (from 1.55 to 1.96%) and decreased to 1.22% in the control. Variations are rather different in other conservation methods. Indeed, the levels increase from 1.55 to 1.92 % (T4), 2.33 % (T3), 2.25 % (T4)

Table 3

Table 4

respectively for the storage using salt, vinegar and ash. The highest protein concentrations are observed significantly in vinegar and ash preservatives (Table 4).

Change in protein content

| Treatments       | Witness                            | Cooking salt                     | Vinegar                           | Ash                               | P intra<br>processing |
|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| T0               | 1.55±0.06 cA                       | 1.55±0.06 <sup>abA</sup>         | 1.55±0.06 <sup>aA</sup>           | 1.55±0.06 <sup>aA</sup>           |                       |
| T1               | $1.88 \pm 0.11  {}^{\mathrm{de}C}$ | 1.52±0.03 <sup>aA</sup>          | $1.70\pm0.04 \ ^{\mathbf{b}B}$    | 1.88±0.09 <sup>bC</sup>           | 0.022                 |
| T2               | 1.81±0.05 deA                      | $1.71 \pm .12^{bcA}$             | 2.01±0.11 dB                      | $1.83 \pm 0.14 {}^{\mathrm{b}AB}$ | 0.041                 |
| T3               | 1.96±0.10 e <sup>B</sup>           | 1.83±0.03 cA                     | 2.33±0.13 eC                      | 2.16±0.07 °C                      | 0.002                 |
| T4               | 1.84±0.02 <sup>dA</sup>            | $1.92 \pm 0.15  d^{AB}$          | 1.95±0.03 <sup>cB</sup>           | $2.25 \pm 0.11  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | < 0.001               |
| T5               | $1.73 \pm 0.10^{\mathrm{d}AB}$     | 1.66±0.06 bA                     | $1.83 \pm 0.10 \text{ bc}^B$      | 1.88±0.06 bB                      | 0.013                 |
| T6               | 1.60±0.01 cA                       | 1.70±0.02 bB                     | 2.13±0.03 <sup>dD</sup>           | 1.93±0.10 <sup>bC</sup>           | < 0.001               |
| Τ7               | 1.46±0.10 bcA                      | $1.88 \pm 0.11 \ ^{cdBC}$        | 2.19±0.16 deC                     | 2.00±0.13 bcC                     | 0.001                 |
| Т8               | 1.53±0.13 cA                       | 1.65±0.05 bA                     | $1.88 \pm 0.13 \text{ bc}^B$      | 2.11±0.11 °C                      | < 0.001               |
| Т9               | 1.33±0.02 <sup>aA</sup>            | $1.53 \pm 0.10 \text{ ab}B$      | $2.18 \pm 0.06  \mathrm{deD}$     | 1.93±0.03 <sup>bC</sup>           | < 0.001               |
| T10              | 1.22±0.11 <sup>aA</sup>            | $1.48 \pm 0.06 \ ^{\mathbf{a}B}$ | $2.01 \pm 0.10  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$ | $2.06 \pm 0.15 \ ^{bcC}$          | 0.021                 |
| P intra matérial | 0.001                              | < 0.001                          | < 0.001                           | 0.018                             |                       |

# **Determination of sugar content Total sugar content**

T3 is the storage time when the sugar concentrations are higher. Thus, the values are 4.16, 4.33 and 4.66%, respectively in the control, the vinegar and ash method. Concentrations observed at the saline method are rather lower. The values then

Change in total sugar content

vary inhomogeneously and significantly at the level of the four (4) storage methods up to T10. The highest levels of total sugars are observed in vinegar and ash preservatives (Table 5).

Table 5

| Treatments       | Witness                 | Cooking salt                   | Vinegar                          | Ask                       | P intra<br>processing |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| То               | 3.95±0.11 eA            | 3.95±0.11 dA                   | 3.95±0.11 dA                     | 3.95±0.11 <sup>bA</sup>   |                       |
| T1               | 3.88±0.22 <sup>eB</sup> | 3.22±0.13 cA                   | 3.70±0.14 <sup>cdB</sup>         | 3.83±0.16 <sup>bB</sup>   | 0.040                 |
| T2               | 4.01±0.26 efA           | 3.83±0.22 <sup>dA</sup>        | 4.01±0.21 <sup>dA</sup>          | 3.93±0.14 <sup>bA</sup>   | 0.052                 |
| Т3               | 4.16±0.33 efB           | 3.33±0.17 <sup>cA</sup>        | 4.33±0.26 <sup>eB</sup>          | 4.66±0.37 dBC             | 0.038                 |
| T4               | 3.74±0.21 eA            | 3.42±0.25 cA                   | 4.25±0.10 eB                     | 4.25±0.11 c <sup>B</sup>  | 0.026                 |
| T5               | 3.83±0.10 eB            | $3.66 \pm 0.06 \text{ cd}^{A}$ | 3.95±0.16 <sup>dB</sup>          | 3.88±0.20 bB              | 0.044                 |
| T6               | 2.60±0.20 dB            | 2.10±0.12 <sup>aA</sup>        | 3.43±0.23 °C                     | 3.33±0.17 <sup>aC</sup>   | 0.020                 |
| Τ7               | 1.46±0.10 abA           | $2.88 \pm 0.11 \text{ bc}^B$   | $4.19 \pm 0.26  deC$             | 4.20±0.30 °C              | 0.001                 |
| Т8               | 1.53±0.09 bA            | 2.35±0.15 abB                  | $3.88 \pm 0.33 \text{ cd}^{C}$   | $4.11 \pm 0.16  {}^{bcC}$ | 0.003                 |
| Т9               | 2.03±0.26 cA            | $2.33 \pm 0.18 \text{ abAB}$   | 2.48±0.16 bB                     | $3.53 \pm 0.33 \ ^{abC}$  | < 0.001               |
| T10              | 1.33±0.11 <sup>aA</sup> | 2.53±0.26 <sup>bC</sup>        | $2.01 \pm 0.10 \ ^{\mathbf{a}B}$ | 3.96±0.15 <sup>bD</sup>   | < 0.001               |
| P intra material | < 0.001                 | 0.001                          | < 0.001                          | 0.014                     |                       |

## **Reducing sugar content**

The reduced sugar levels of the eggplant studied are similar to those of total sugar. However, the highest values observed during retention are 2.83% (T3), 3.66% (T2), 3.75% (T4), 3.90% (T7); in the control and in the methods of conservation based on salt, vinegar and ash, respectively. The control records the lowest concentrations at T7 (1.00%). Ash and vinegar get the highest levels of reducing sugars during conservation (Table 6).

Table 6

| Treatments       | Witness                  | Cooking salt                      | Vinegar                            | Ash                     | P intra<br>processing |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| То               | 2.10±0.03 bA             | 2.10±0.03 cA                      | 2.10±0.03 bA                       | 2.10±0.03 <sup>aA</sup> |                       |
| T1               | 2.90±0.12 eC             | 2.10±0.10 cA                      | 2.60±0.10 °BC                      | 2.83±0.21 °C            | < 0.001               |
| T2               | 3.53±0.14 <sup>dB</sup>  | 2.83±0.11 eA                      | 3.41±0.23 dB                       | 3.43±0.24 deB           | 0.043                 |
| Т3               | 3.66±0.23 dBC            | 2.03±0.18 bA                      | 3.30±0.13 dB                       | 3.88±0.17 <sup>eC</sup> | < 0.001               |
| T4               | 2.44±0.21 <sup>cdB</sup> | 2.12±0.05 bcA                     | 3.75±0.10 °C                       | 3.75±0.11 eC            | 0.026                 |
| T5               | $2.73 \pm 0.09  deAB$    | 2.66±0.16 dA                      | $3.05 \pm 0.28  {}^{\mathrm{d}C}$  | 2.88±0.12 °B            | 0.002                 |
| T6               | $2.10\pm0.16^{bcAB}$     | 1.80±0.12 ªA                      | 2.33±0.23 cB                       | 2.50±0.19 bB            | 0.012                 |
| T7               | 1.00±0.02 <sup>aA</sup>  | $2.01 \pm 0.10  {}^{\mathrm{b}B}$ | 3.49±0.12 °C                       | 3.90±0.22 <sup>eD</sup> | < 0.001               |
| T8               | 1.03±0.01 <sup>aA</sup>  | $1.95 \pm 0.15 \ ^{abB}$          | $2.98 \pm 0.23  {}^{\mathrm{cd}C}$ | 3.81±0.17 <sup>eD</sup> | < 0.001               |
| Т9               | 1.77±0.03 bA             | 1.66±0.13 <sup>aA</sup>           | 2.00±0.11 bB                       | 2.43±0.23 bC            | < 0.001               |
| T10              | 1.01±0.06 <sup>aA</sup>  | $1.83 \pm 0.12 \ ^{aC}$           | $1.41 \pm 0.13 a^B$                | 3.02±0.26 °D            | < 0.001               |
| P intra matérial | 0.018                    | < 0.001                           | < 0.001                            | 0.034                   |                       |

Variation in reducing sugar content

*NB:* the assigned values of the same letter in lowercase and bold are not significantly different between retention times. The assigned values of the same uppercase letter are not significantly different between retention modes

Increases in the dry matter rate indicate that the methods used would be favorable.

This would be linked to the evaporation phenomenon (more intense with the saline

method) in dry storage cases and then to the phenomenon of osmosis during storage in the vinegar. Decreases in the dry matter rate in the control would be the cause of decay observed beyond the twelve (12) days of storage. Extending the green lifespan of eggplants in our study suggests that different treatments would positively alter the interactions of fruits with the surrounding environment [3].

The observed fat levels would indicate that oil would not be the main energy reserve in eggplants due to the low levels observed. However, their variations during conservation would be related to their uses in either catabolic activities resulting in the formation of carbohydrates or lipogenesis [8].

Low ash levels in eggplants also show higher values in the ash-based method. The constitution of the conservation environment may be at the origin of this difference [9]. The minerals would come from the wood ash used.

The different variations observed are due to the use of different ash constituents in biochemical activities during conservation [10].

The variations in the different percentages of protein observed could be due to the different hydrolysis and metabolic reactions. Synthetic responses would be earlier in open-air and vinegar preservation where aqueous medium (vinegar) would promote the resumption of metabolic activities [11]. Rather than in drier environments, however, the high values observed in ash conservation may be due to the involvement of the constituent mineral elements in different synthesis reactions.

The total sugar concentrations falling at the saline method could be related to the different interactions between the fruit and the medium. According to the work of El Jaafari [12], salinity led to the formation of aggregates in soil nutrients, resulting in pseudocimentation of the environment, severely impeding synthesis. Differences in the proportions of sugars observed at all times in other conservation conditions would be related to the different postharvest metabolic reactions that take place during conservation [13]. Retention in vinegar as well as the mineral elements that make up wood ash would further enhance glucid syntheses.

Studies show that eggplant fruits are mainly reduced sugars. According to Lewis [14], the major source of fructose in the plant is sucrose, which, after cleavage, releases equimolecular amounts of fructose and glucose. This carbohydrate source would be quickly catabolized at the harvest of fruits, resulting in a high concentration of reducing sugars, which constitute the crossroads of most biochemical activities. Sucrose and polysaccharides are used as precursors of synthesis, by conversion to glucose and fructose [8]. Thus the different variations observed would be the result of neoglucogenesis reactions of and/or glycolysis [15]. Vinegar and ash would be more beneficial for neoglucogenesis or non-reducing sugar cleavage activities, hence higher levels.

# 4. Conclusion

The objective of this study was to highlight the impact of different conservation methods on the green life of eggplants. To achieve this, the physicochemical characteristics were carried out on the fruits. The results therefore indicate that vinegar and ash conservation at the method level is positively different from that of the ambient environment and salt. However, further studies on organoleptic tests could clearly differentiate between these two conservation methods.

## 5. References

[1] CHEN W.. WU Z.. SU M.. ZHU J. (2000). Post-harvest technology. banana transport and marketing in China. *Agrociencia*. 36(2): 169-180.

[2] LÉPENGUE A.. MOUARAGADJA I.. DICK E.. M'BATCHI B. & AKÉ S. (2010). Improving the shelf life of plantains at room temperatures. *Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci.*. 4(3): 730-737.

[3] LEPENGUÉ A.. MOUARAGADJA I.. DICK E.. MBATCHI B.. AKE S.. (2012). Trial to improve the shelf life of eggplants at room temperatures in Gabon. *Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci.* ISSN 1991-8631. 6(2): 792-798.

[4] BIPEA. (1976) Recueil des Méthodes d'Analyse des communautés Européennes.

[5] AOAC (2000). Association of Official Analytical Chemical; official methods of analysis. 14th ED. Washington D.C USA. 201 p.

[6] DUBOIS M.. GILLES K.. HAMILTON J.. REBERS P. ET SMITH F.. (1965) Colorimetric methods for determination of sugars and related substances. *Anal. Chem.* 28 : 350- 356.

[7] BERNFELD P. 1955. Amylase  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$ . (Assay method). In Enzymology I. colowick and Kaplan. Eds.*Academic press*. New York. pp. 149-154.

[8] ASSA R. (2007) Diagnosis of the peasant coconut grove of the Ivorian coast: physicochemical study. microbiological and organoleptic of the water and the kernel of the fruits of four cultivars of the coconut palm (*Cocos nucifera* L.) according to the stages of maturity. Single Doctorate Thesis from the University of Cocody (Ivory Coast). 188 p. [9] LESTER R. & A. SECK. (2004). Solanum aethiopicum L. In : Grubben G. J. H. et O. A. Denton (Eds.). *Ressources végétales de l'Afrique tropicale* 2. Légumes. Fondation PROTA. Backhuys Publishers. Wageningen. Pays Bas : pp 530 - 536.

[10] PETTIGREW W. (2008) Potassium influences on yield and quality production for maize. wheat. soybean and cotton. *Physiology Plant*. 133. 670-681.

[11] GOFFNER D.. CAZALIR R.. PERCIE C.. CALMAS J. & CAVALIE G. (1988) 14C photoassimilate partitioning in developing sunflower seeds. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 39: 1411-1420

[12] EL JAAFARI S. (1993) Contribution to the study of the biophysical and biochemical mechanisms of drought resistance in wheat. Doctorate. Faculty of Agronomic Sciences of Gembloux. Belgium. 214p.

[13] PECH O.. MAY A.. MULLER H.. VIETH A.. SOLTE M & ELL C. (2002). Journal of experimental botany 53 (367). 201-206.

[14] LEWIS D. (1984) Physiology and metabolism of alditols. In Lewis D.H. ed. *Storage Carbohydrates in Vascular Plants*. Cambridge. UK. Cambridge University Press. 157–179.

[15] DUANGSRISAI S.. YAMADA K.. SHIRATAKE K.. KANAYAMA Y. & YAMAKI S.. (2007) Properties of sorbitol dehydrogenase in strawberry fruit and enhancement of the activity by fructose and auxin. *Journal of the Japanese Society for Horticultural Science* 77. 318–323.