

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**FRUIT QUALITY AND COMPOSITION, GROWTH,  
WATER RELATIONS, AND POSTHARVEST  
PERFORMANCE OF 'BRAEBURN' APPLES (*Malus  
Domestica* BORKH.) UNDER REDUCED IRRIGATION**

A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
**MASTER OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE**  
at  
**MASSEY UNIVERSITY**  
New Zealand

By  
**ANTHONY W. KILILI**

Massey University  
1996

## ABSTRACT

Benefits of reduced irrigation in apple production include decreased costs, control of vegetative growth, possible improvement in fruit quality, and reduced leaching of nutrients and pesticides into ground water. This study was on the effects of withholding irrigation at different times of the growing season on water relations, photosynthesis, growth, fruit quality and composition, and postharvest performance of 'Braeburn' apples (*Malus domestica* Borkh.).

Seven-year-old trees on MM. 106 rootstock were subjected to four irrigation treatments in a randomized complete block design. The treatments were: fully watered control (C); early withholding (EW) of irrigation from full bloom until 104 days after full bloom (DAFB); late withholding (LW) of irrigation from 104 DAFB up to final harvest at 194 DAFB; and nonirrigated (NI), where trees were not irrigated during the entire growing season.

Trees not receiving irrigation at any stage developed a lower predawn and midday leaf water potential relative to the well-watered control. For LW and NI trees towards the end of the growing season, water stress caused a reduction in the rate of photosynthesis ( $P_n$ ), stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ), and the rate of transpiration. The reduction in  $P_n$  was caused by non-stomatal factors in addition to a reduction in  $g_s$ . Withholding irrigation caused an increase in canopy temperature and canopy-air temperature difference in LW and NI possibly due to the reduction in the rate of transpiration.

Fruit growth and fruit growth rate measured from 42 DAFB up to harvest were not affected by the treatments although shoot growth and increase in trunk circumference were significantly reduced by withholding irrigation during the early and entire season. Mean fruit weight at harvest and return bloom were reduced in EW and NI relative to C and LW. The treatments had no effect on total yield per tree, crop density or yield efficiency.

At final harvest, total soluble solids, soluble sugars (fructose, sucrose, and sorbitol), flesh firmness, and red skin colour intensity were higher in NI and LW than in C. The concentration of glucose and minerals (N, P, Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, and K<sup>+</sup>) in the fruit was not affected by the treatments.

Withholding irrigation during the late and entire growing season resulted in more advanced fruit maturity as indicated by an earlier ethylene climacteric, more yellow background skin colour, and increased total soluble solids concentration. Firmness remained higher in LW and NI than in EW and C during a 12-week storage period at 1 °C. Weight loss was higher in C than in the reduced irrigation treatments. Skin permeance to water vapour was higher in C relative to EW and NI.

This study showed that withholding irrigation late in the season may be used in apple production with improved fruit quality in terms of increased total soluble solids, firmness, soluble sugars, and intensified red skin colour without adverse effects on fruit size and yield. For the control of vegetative growth, withholding irrigation early in the season is best but this treatment may adversely affect fruit size. Reduced irrigation is also potentially beneficial in terms of reduced weight loss and increased firmness in storage.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and sincere thanks to my supervisor Dr. M. Hossein Behboudian for his patient guidance, encouragement, and criticism throughout the course of this study. His advice was most helpful and friendly. I also wish to express my thanks to Ms Tessa M. Mills for all the help in planning and carrying out the experiment. Her time and commitment are most appreciated.

Thanks are extended to the following persons who reviewed and provided very useful criticisms to various aspects of this work: Mr. Jonathan Dixon and Dr. David Wood, both of Massey University, Dr. Horst Caspari and Dr. Richard Volz, both of HortResearch, and Dr. Rocky Renquist of the New Zealand Institute for Crop and Food Research.

I greatly appreciate the help from the staff of the Fruit Crops Unit and Plant Growth Unit, especially Mr. Shane Max and Mr. Ray Johnstone. The assistance of Ms Keri Allan and Ms Rosemary Watson in data collection and mineral analysis is gratefully recognised. The staff and postgraduate students of the Department of Plant Science provided a much needed friendly environment during the often difficult and sometimes frustrating times of this study.

I gratefully acknowledge the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade for awarding me the scholarship to undertake this study. I also acknowledge the Massey University Research Fund for financing the HPLC analysis.

And last, but certainly not least, my sincere thanks to all my friends and family both in New Zealand and abroad for their encouragement and understanding.

To all I say God bless you.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	v
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	x
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xii
<b>1.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 PHYSIOLOGICAL BASIS OF RDI .....	6
2.2.1 Phenological Separation of Shoot and Fruit Growth .....	7
2.2.2 Differential Sensitivities of Tissues, Organs and Processes .....	7
2.2.3 Functional Equilibrium Between Shoot and Root Growth .....	8
2.2 PLANT RESPONSES TO WATER STRESS .....	9
2.2.1 Leaf/xylem Water Potential .....	9
2.2.2 Physiological Processes .....	10
2.2.2.1 Stomatal Conductance .....	10
2.2.2.2 Transpiration .....	13
2.2.2.3 Canopy temperature and canopy-air temperature difference .....	15

---

2.2.2.4	Photosynthesis	16
2.2.3	Plant Growth	17
2.2.3.1	Vegetative growth	17
2.2.3.2	Reproductive growth	19
2.3	WATER STRESS AND APPLE FRUIT QUALITY	22
2.3.1	Skin Colour	22
2.3.2	Titrateable Acidity	24
2.3.3	Total Soluble Solids	25
2.3.4	Flesh Firmness	26
2.3.5	Ethylene Production	26
2.3.6	Fruit Mineral Composition	27
2.3.7	Keeping Quality	28
<b>3.0</b>	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1	EXPERIMENTAL SITE	30
3.2	ENVIRONMENT	30
3.2.1	Soil	30
3.2.2	Climate	30
3.3	PLANT MATERIAL	32
3.4	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND TREATMENTS	32
3.5	FRUIT THINNING	33
3.6	SOIL MOISTURE	33
3.7	LEAF WATER POTENTIAL ( $\Psi$ )	34
3.8	PHOTOSYNTHESIS AND STOMATAL CONDUCTANCE	35
3.9	CANOPY TEMPERATURE AND CANOPY-AIR TEMPERATURE DIFFERENCE	35
3.10	VEGETATIVE GROWTH	36
3.11	REPRODUCTIVE GROWTH	37

---

3.11.1	Fruit Diameter and Volume . . . . .	37
3.11.2	Yield . . . . .	38
3.11.3	Return Bloom . . . . .	38
3.12	<b>FRUIT QUALITY, COMPOSITION, AND MATURITY . . . . .</b>	<b>39</b>
3.12.1	Fruit Sampling . . . . .	39
3.12.2	Determination of Fruit Carbohydrates . . . . .	39
3.12.3	Titrateable Acidity . . . . .	40
3.12.4	Fruit Mineral Composition . . . . .	40
3.12.5	Dry Matter Content . . . . .	42
3.12.6	Flesh Firmness . . . . .	42
3.12.7	Total Soluble Solids (TSS) . . . . .	42
3.12.8	Skin Colour . . . . .	43
3.12.9	Internal Ethylene Concentration . . . . .	43
3.12.9.1	Taking gas measurements . . . . .	44
3.12.9.2	Gas liquid chromatography for ethylene analysis . . . . .	45
3.12.10	Weight Loss Susceptibility . . . . .	45
3.12.11	Skin Permeance to Water Vapour . . . . .	46
3.12.11.1	Theory . . . . .	46
3.12.11.2	Determination of skin permeance to water vapour . . . . .	47
3.13	<b>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS . . . . .</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>EFFECT OF IRRIGATION TREATMENT ON WATER RELATIONS, PHOTOSYNTHESIS, AND GROWTH . . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	49
4.2	RESULTS . . . . .	49
4.2.1	Climatic Conditions . . . . .	49

---

4.2.2	Soil Volumetric Water Content . . . . .	50
4.2.3	Leaf Water Potential . . . . .	55
4.2.4	Diurnal Pattern of Leaf Water Potential . . . . .	57
4.2.5	Photosynthesis and Stomatal Conductance . . . . .	57
4.2.6	Rate of Transpiration . . . . .	59
4.2.7	Canopy Temperature and Canopy-Air Temperature Difference . . . . .	63
4.2.8	Vegetative Growth . . . . .	66
4.2.9	Fruit Growth . . . . .	70
4.2.10	Yield and Yield Components . . . . .	70
4.3	DISCUSSION . . . . .	74
4.3.1	Plant Water Status . . . . .	74
4.3.2	Photosynthesis and Stomatal Conductance . . . . .	75
4.3.3	Canopy Temperature and Canopy-Air Temperature Difference . . . . .	81
4.3.4	Vegetative Growth . . . . .	82
4.3.5	Reproductive Growth . . . . .	84
4.3.6	Shoot Vs Fruit Growth . . . . .	86
4.4	SUMMARY . . . . .	87
<b>5.0</b>	<b>EFFECT OF IRRIGATION TREATMENT ON FRUIT QUALITY AND COMPOSITION . . . . .</b>	<b>89</b>
5.1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	89
5.2	RESULTS . . . . .	89
5.2.1	Fruit Carbohydrates . . . . .	89
5.2.2	Total Soluble Solids . . . . .	92
5.2.3	Titrateable Acidity . . . . .	92
5.2.4	Mineral Composition . . . . .	92
5.2.5	Skin Colour . . . . .	95

---

5.2.6	Dry Matter Concentration . . . . .	95
5.2.7	Flesh Firmness . . . . .	100
5.3	DISCUSSION . . . . .	100
5.3.1	Fruit Composition . . . . .	100
5.3.2	Skin Colour . . . . .	105
5.3.3	Flesh Firmness . . . . .	106
<b>6.0</b>	<b>EFFECT OF IRRIGATION TREATMENT ON MATURITY, RIPENING CHANGES, AND WEIGHT LOSS . . . . .</b>	<b>110</b>
6.1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	110
6.2	RESULTS . . . . .	111
6.2.1	Internal Ethylene Concentration . . . . .	111
6.2.2	Background Skin Colour . . . . .	113
6.2.3	Total Soluble Solids . . . . .	113
6.2.4	Firmness . . . . .	113
6.2.5	Weight Loss . . . . .	117
6.3	DISCUSSION . . . . .	117
6.4	SUMMARY . . . . .	123
<b>7.0</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION . . . . .</b>	<b>125</b>
7.1	WATER RELATIONS, PHOTOSYNTHESIS, GROWTH AND YIELD . . . . .	125
7.2	FRUIT QUALITY, COMPOSITION, AND POSTHARVEST PERFORMANCE . . . . .	129
7.3	CONCLUSION . . . . .	132
	REFERENCES . . . . .	135
	APPENDIX ONE . . . . .	156

# GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	- Surface area of the fruit ( $\text{m}^2$ )
ACC	- 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid
ANOVA	- Analysis of variance
C	- Control
CD	- Crop density (g of fruit per unit trunk cross sectional area)
$C_a$	- External $\text{CO}_2$ concentration ( $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ )
$C_i$	- Intercellular $\text{CO}_2$ concentration ( $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ )
DAFB	- Days after full bloom
ET	- Evapotranspiration
EW	- Early withholding of irrigation
FGR	- Fruit growth rate ( $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ , $\text{g day}^{-1}$ , or $\text{cm}^3 \text{ day}^{-1}$ )
$Ft_1$	- Fruit size at time 1 (mm, $\text{cm}^3$ , or g)
$Ft_2$	- Fruit size at time 2 (mm, $\text{cm}^3$ , or g)
FW	- Initial fresh weight
GLC	- Gas liquid chromatography
GLM	- General linear models
$g_s$	- Stomatal conductance ( $\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )
H	- Hue angle ( $^\circ$ )
HPLC	- High performance liquid chromatography
IR	- Infrared
L	- Lightness (%)
LW	- Late withholding of irrigation
MPa	- Mega Pascal (1 MPa = 10 bars)
n	- Number of observations
NI	- Nonirrigated
PAR	- Photosynthetically active radiation ( $\mu\text{mol quanta m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )
$Pn$	- Rate of photosynthesis ( $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )

$P'_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$	- Skin permeance to water vapour ( $\text{mol s}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{Pa}^{-1}$ )
RCBD	- Randomized complete block design
RDI	- Regulated deficit irrigation
RH	- Relative humidity (%)
$r'_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$	- Rate of water loss ( $\text{mol s}^{-1}$ )
SAM	- S-adenosylmethionine
SEM	- Standard error of the mean
T	- Rate of transpiration ( $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ )
TA	- Titratable acidity (% malic acid)
$T_a$	- Air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_c$	- Canopy temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_c - T_a$	- Canopy-air temperature difference ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_1$	- Time 1 (day)
$T_2$	- Time 2 (day)
TCA	- Trunk cross-sectional area
TDR	- Time domain reflectometry
TSS	- Total soluble solids
$\theta$	- Soil volumetric water content ( $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ )
VPD	- Vapour pressure deficit (kPa)
$VP_{\text{air}}$	- Actual water vapour pressure (kPa)
$VP_{\text{sat}}$	- Water vapour pressure at saturation (kPa)
YE	- Yield efficiency (g of fruit $\text{cm}^{-2}$ TCA)
$\Psi$	- Leaf water potential

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Cumulative growth of annual shoots and fruit of 'Braeburn' apples expressed as a proportion of the total seasonal growth. The trees in (B) were subjected to withholding of irrigation from full bloom to 104 days after full bloom. . . . .	3
Figure 3.1: Summary of the long-term climatic data (1964-1994) during the months of September to April (growing season) for the Manawatu region. . . . .	31
Figure 3.2: Arrangement of gas-sampling chamber on the fruit surface. (A) fruit core cavity; (B) lenticel; (C) glass chamber; (D) rubber septum; (E) plastic tube with water. . . . .	44
Figure 4.1: Summary of climatic data for the Manawatu region during the 1994-95 growing season. . . . .	51
Figure 4.2: A comparison of total windrun (A) and monthly rainfall (B) during the 1994-95 growing season and the normal based on a 30-year average. . . . .	52
Figure 4.3: A comparison of mean monthly temperature (A) and total sunshine hours (B) during the 1994-95 growing season and the normal based on a 30-year average. . . . .	53
Figure 4.4: Changes in soil volumetric water content at depths of 300 mm (A) and 1000 mm (B) during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Each point is a mean of four measurements. . . . .	54
Figure 4.5: Changes in predawn (A) and midday (B) leaf water potential during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early	

withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . 56

Figure 4.6: Diurnal changes in leaf water potential at 96 (A), 111 (B), 132 (C), and 151 (D) DAFB for 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments; C = control, EW = early withholding, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . . 58

Figure 4.7: Changes in the rate of photosynthesis (A) and stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ )(B) during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . . 60

Figure 4.8: Diurnal changes in stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ) (A), rate of photosynthesis (Pn) (B), rate of transpiration (T) (C), and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) (D) for well-watered and nonirrigated 'Braeburn' apple trees at 156 DAFB. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . . 61

Figure 4.9: Diurnal changes in leaf internal CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (A) and water vapour pressure deficit (VPD) (B) for well-watered and nonirrigated 'Braeburn' apple trees at 156 DAFB. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . 62

Figure 4.10: Changes in the rate of transpiration during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrow indicates the end of early withholding (EW) and the start

---

of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	64
Figure 4.11: Changes in canopy temperature (A) and canopy-air temperature differences (B) during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. The zero line in (B) represents air temperature. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. .	65
Figure 4.12: Diurnal changes in canopy temperature (A) and canopy-air temperature differences (B) at 111 DAFB for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. The zero line in (B) represents air temperature. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. .	67
Figure 4.13: Diurnal changes in canopy temperature (A) and canopy-air temperature differences (B) at 171 DAFB for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. The zero line in (B) represents air temperature. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. .	68
Figure 4.14: The effect of different irrigation treatments on the increase in trunk circumference for 'Braeburn' apple trees. C = control, EW = early withholding, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	69

- Figure 4.15: Changes in shoot length (A) and shoot extension rates (B) for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . . 71
- Figure 4.16: Cumulative fruit growth (A) and changes in fruit growth rate (B) of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . . 72
- Figure 4.17: The effect of different irrigation treatments on yield and yield components of 'Braeburn' apple trees. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent SEM. . . . . 73
- Figure 4.18: Relationship between soil volumetric water content and predawn (A) and midday (B) leaf water potential for 'Braeburn' apple trees. . . . . 76
- Figure 4.19: Relationship between stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ) and the rate of photosynthesis ( $P_n$ ) in control and nonirrigated 'Braeburn' apple trees. The linear equations are  $P_n = 4.635 + 22.349g_s$ ,  $n=67$ ,  $r^2 = 64.37\%$  and  $P_n = 1.84 + 24.49g_s$ ,  $n=67$ ,  $r^2=56.31$  for control and nonirrigated plants, respectively. . . . . 79
- Figure 4.20: Changes in leaf internal  $CO_2$  concentration ( $C_i$ ) (A) and air  $CO_2$ :internal  $CO_2$  ratio ( $C_a:C_i$ ) (B) during the season for 'Braeburn' apple trees under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start

---

of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	80
Figure 4.21: Relationship between leaf water potential and A) canopy temperature and B) canopy-air temperature difference ( $T_c-T_a$ ) for 'Braeburn' apple trees. . . . .	83
Figure 5.1: Changes in the concentration of total sugars (fructose+sucrose+sorbitol+glucose) in fruit of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on nine composite samples per treatment. . . . .	90
Figure 5.2: Changes in the concentration of sucrose, sorbitol, fructose, and glucose in fruit of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrow indicates the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on nine composite samples per treatment. . . . .	91
Figure 5.3: Total soluble solids concentration in fruit of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrow indicates the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	93
Figure 5.4: Titratable acidity expressed as % malic acid of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrow indicates the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding	

---

(LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	94
Figure 5.5: Changes in the concentration of Ca <sup>2+</sup> (A) and N (B) in fruit of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on nine composite samples per treatment. . . . .	96
Figure 5.6: Changes in the concentration of Mg <sup>2+</sup> (A), K <sup>+</sup> (B), and P (C) in fruit of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. Arrows indicate the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on nine composite samples per treatment. . . . .	97
Figure 5.7: Changes in red blush hue angle (H) and lightness (L) during the late season in 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	98
Figure 5.8: Changes in background skin colour hue angle (H) in 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	99
Figure 5.9: Fruit dry matter content of 'Braeburn' apples under different irrigation treatments at 194 DAFB. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of	

irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment. . . . .	101
Figure 5.10: Influence of irrigation treatment on flesh firmness of 'Braeburn' apples. Arrow indicates the end of early withholding (EW) and the start of late withholding (LW) of irrigation. C = control, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM based on three replicates per treatment .	102
Figure 5.11: Relationship between fruit density and flesh firmness in 'Braeburn' apples. . . . .	107
Figure 6.1: Changes in internal ethylene concentration after harvest in 'Braeburn' apples grown under different irrigation treatments. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent SEM. . . . .	112
Figure 6.2: Changes in background colour after harvest for 'Braeburn' apples grown under four irrigation treatments: C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. The fruit were kept at 1°C (A) and at 20°C (B). Each point is a mean of 30 fruit. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM. . . . .	114
Figure 6.3: Changes in total soluble solids concentration (A) and firmness (B) during storage for 'Braeburn' apples grown under four irrigation treatments: C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. Each point is a mean of 15 fruit. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM. . . . .	115
Figure 6.4: Weight loss of 'Braeburn' apples grown under four irrigation treatments: C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI =	

nonirrigated. The fruit were kept at 1 °C (A) and at 20 °C (B). Each point is a mean of 30 fruit. Vertical bars represent pooled SEM. . . . . 116

Figure 6.5: The relationship between weight loss (% of initial fresh weight) and weeks at 1 °C (A) and days at 20 °C (B) of 'Braeburn' apples grown under four irrigation treatments: C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, and NI = nonirrigated. The regression equations are given in Table 6.1. . . . . 121

Figure 6.6: Effect of different irrigation treatments on the skin permeance to water vapour ( $P'_{H_2O}$ ) of 'Braeburn' apples. C = control, EW = early withholding of irrigation, LW = late withholding of irrigation, NI = nonirrigated. Vertical bars represent SEM. . . . . 122