

STANDARDIZATION OF POMEGRANATE (*PUNICA GRANATUM L.*) WINE WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF SUGAR CONCENTRATION

RAJAN SINGH, SAKET MISHRA, VIJAY BAHADUR, MITHUN TARAFDAR AND GAURAV SINGH VISHEN

Department of Horticulture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj 211 007, (U.P.), India

(Received 27 May, 2022; Accepted 3 July, 2022)

Key words: Wine, Pomegranate, Juice, fermentation, yeast, sugar.

Abstract– The present research work entitled “Standardization of pomegranate (*Punica granatum L.*) wine with different levels of sugar concentration”, the study was conducted in Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with 5 treatments replicated four times. The treatments were T₁ Pomegranate juice (500 ml) + 20°brix + wine yeast (0.133%), T₂ Pomegranate juice (500 ml) + 25°brix + wine yeast (0.133%), T₃ Pomegranate juice (500 ml) + 30°brix + wine yeast (0.133%), T₄ Pomegranate juice (500 ml) + 35°brix + wine yeast (0.133%), T₅ Pomegranate juice (500 ml) + 40°brix + wine yeast (0.133%) Total soluble solids, pH and Specific Gravity decreased while the alcohol content, Acidity and the Sensory Qualities increased with increasing length of fermentation. From the above treatments, it is concluded that treatment T₃ was found superior in respect of the parameters like Total Soluble Solids, Acidity, pH, Alcohol content, Specific gravity. With respectively Colour and Appearance, Taste, Aroma and Overall acceptability also T₃ was found the best. In terms of cost benefit ratio and the highest net return, Cost Benefit Ratio was found in T₃. Since Pomegranate contains good sugar proportion which makes it suitable for wine making, the production of wine from this fruit can help increase wine variety and reduce post-harvest losses. This study showed that acceptable wine can be produced from Pomegranate using yeast especially *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.

INTRODUCTION

Pomegranate (*Punica granatum L.*), Punicaceae is an ancient, beloved fruit crop. The name “pomegranate” follows the Latin name of the fruit *Malum granatum*, which means “grainy apple.” The generic name *Punica* refers to Phoenicia (Carthage) as a result of mistaken assumption regarding its origin. The pomegranate and its usage are deeply embedded in human history and utilization is found in many ancient human cultures as food and as a medical remedy. The development of industrial methods to separate the arils from the fruit and improvement of growing techniques resulted in an impressive enlargement of the extent of pomegranate orchards. Fruit juice is full of sugar, which could cause weight gain. Consumption of wine, to get the benefits better, should be limited to a glass or two a day, as yeast converts some of the sugar during fermentation into alcohol. But the net loss of carbons going from sugar to alcohol is small

(as carbon dioxide). These carbons gets burned in body or get converted into fat. 100 ml of wine contains around 70 kcal, whereas 100 ml of pressed pomegranate juice will contain around 60 kcal. The soluble polyphenolic content of pomegranate juice (0.2 to 1.0%) includes anthocyanins, catechins, tannins, and gallic and ellagic acids (Aviram *et al.*, 2000). Kulkarnai and others reported that the antibacterial action of pomegranate juice varied with variety and depended on the contents of phenolic compounds, pigments and citric acid. New orchards are now planted in the traditional growing regions as well as in the southern hemisphere in South America, South Africa, and Australia. Pomegranate is a multiple fruit and the brilliantly colored arils have many nutritional value hundred grams of edible portion conations (3.5g) energy 285kcl (68kcal), carbohydrates 17.17g, sugars 16.57g, dietary fiber 0.6g, fat 0.3g, protein 0.95g, thiamine (vit. B₁) 0.030 mg (2%), riboflavin (Vit.B₂) 0.063 mg (4%), niacin (Vit B₃) 0.300 mg (2%), pantothenic acid

(B₅) 0.0596 mg (12%), vitamin B₆ 0.105 mg (8%), flute (Vit. B₉) 6 mg (2%), Vitamin C 6.1 mg (10%), calcium 3 mg (2%), iron 0.30 mg (2%), magnesium 3 mg (1%), phosphorous 8 mg (5%), potassium 259 mg (6%) and zinc 0.12 mg (1%). (LaRue and James, 1980). Wine is an alcoholic beverage resulting from the fermentation of grape juice by yeast with proper processing and addition. Different varieties of grapes and strains of yeasts are used depending on the type of wine being produced. Although other fruits such as apples, berries can be also be fermented, the resultant wines are normally named after the fruit from which they are produced for example, (Pomegranate, Jamun and amla wine) are generally known as fruit wine or country wine. The utilization of such fruits by processing into value added products is one of the better managements of non-marketable Pomegranate fruits as wine is an alcoholic beverage resulting from the fermentation of fruits juices by yeast with proper processing and additional sugar. The natural sugars and control (0.2 to 0.1%) which includes anthocyanins, catechins, tannins gallic and ellagic is ideal for wine from sorted preparation similar to grapes. Keeping health benefits of Pomegranate in view a possible preparation of wine sorted Pomegranate arils with different concentrations of sugar syrup is attempted in the present investigation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Preparation of wine from Pomegranate arils prepared with 5 treatments and four replications were stored for 90 days under ambient room temperature. which were T₁ Pomegranate juice 500 ml+20^obrix +wine yeast 0.133 %, T₂ Pomegranate juice 500 ml+ 25^obrix +wine yeast 0.133 %, T₃ Pomegranate juice 500 ml+ 30^obrix +wine yeast 0.133 %, T₄ Pomegranate juice 500 ml+ 35^obrix+wine yeast 0.133 % T₅ Pomegranate juice 500 ml+ 40^obrix+wine yeast 0.133 % and four replications. After the preparation of wine that were stored for 90 days under ambient room temperature. The procedure of making Pomegranate wine is given below:

Preparation of juice

Preparation of Juice, the pomegranate was be washed, then peeled and cored. After chipping and pressing, add 0.1 mg/L pectin for enzymolysis and held for 2 hr. in water at 40 °C. The slurry was filtered through double folded cheese cloth. Adding SO₂ to the juice immediately to prevent the growth

of the bacteria. White sugar was added to the juice, for adjustment of sugar level and citric acid to pH enhance the flavor of the wine. Finally, the juice was pasteurized (65 °C, for 30 min).

Preparation of yeast

Prepared a specialized yeast medium 1 liter and autoclaved for 15 min at 121 °C. After cooling to room temperature, 0.133 % of active dry yeast was added and, activated for 24 hr. at 28 °C. Then the culture medium that was prepared by 1lit pomegranate juice was autoclaved for 15 min at 121 °C. Lastly, adding 5 % yeast has been activated for 24 hr at 28 °C after cooling to room temperature.

Fermentation of pomegranate Juice

The treated juice was added into the fermentation jar, then sugar is adjusted for 20^oBrix. The jar was inoculated with 5 % activated yeast and closed. Then the mixture was incubated at 20 °C for 7 days. The total sugar, total acid and alcohol content were monitored periodically during the fermentation. When the main fermentation finished, the upper liquid was transferred to the other clean container in order to remove impurities. Then the mixture continued to ferment at 20 °C for 10 days. After that, under the storage conditions of 20 °C aged for 2 months. The clarifying treatment of the fruit wine was followed by the gelatin tannin clarification method.

Clarification of wine

After completion of fermentation, the obtained wine was siphoned off and filtered thrice through 5 µ, 1 µ and 0.001 µ filters. Clarification is an important procedure in wine production as the fermented wine contains sediments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present investigation entitled Standardization of



Fig: Fermentation of wine under BOD Incubator (Bio-Oxygen Demand)

Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) wine with different levels of sugar concentration was carried out under the horticulture post-harvest laboratory in the department of Horticulture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during 2021 – 2022. The main objectives of the present investigation were to see the effect of different levels of sugar concentration on the production of best quality wine from pomegranate and to find out its acceptability during the storage.

Total Soluble Solids (TSS)

In terms of Total Soluble Solids, The lowest score of TSS (11.27, 9.92, 9.65, and 9.03^obrix) at Initial, 30, 60 and 90 days after storage was observed in treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 20^obrix+ Wine yeast 0.133%), followed by treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 25^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (11.73, 10.15, 9.88 and 9.16^obrix) at Initial, 30, 60 and 90 days after storage, whereas the maximum score was observed in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 40^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (13.01, 11.29, 10.83 and 10.06^obrix) during 90 days storage. The decrease in TSS content of wine indicates the utilization of the sugar present in the must during fermentation. Similarity has been seen in Sonar *et al.*, (2004) in jamun wine, Idise *et al.*, (2010) in pomegranate wine, Isitua *et al.*, (2010) in banana wine.

Alcohol content(%)

In terms of Alcohol content (%) The highest score of Alcohol content (10.58, 11.39 and 11.90) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage was observed in the treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) followed by treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 20^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (8.39, 9.45 and 10,17) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage, whereas the minimum score was observed in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 40^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (7.10, 7.73 and 6.37) during 90 days storage. The increase in Alcohol content of pomegranate wine with different levels of sugar concentration during storage may possibly due to the variation in performance of the yeast to utilize the fermentable sugars affecting the ferment ability, hence the varied alcohol product. The above results are similar with the findings of Chowdhury and Ray (2007) in jamun wine and Yadav *et al.*, (2009) in Mahua wine.

Titrateable acidity (TA)

In terms of Acidity The lowest score of Acidity (0.55, 0.57 and 0.59) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage was observed in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500ml + Sugar 40^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%), followed by treatment T₄ (Pomegranate juice 500ml + Sugar 35^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (, 0.58, 0.62 and 0.64) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage, whereas the maximum score was observed in treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500ml + Sugar 20^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (0.69, 0.76 and 0.80) during 90 days storage. The increase in acidity may be due to the increased alcohol production from the high initial sugar concentration. Attri (2005) reported that organic acids such as citric, malic, lactic, tartaric, oxalic and succinic acids were produced during fermentation in cocoa beans by *S. cerevisiae*. The increment of titrateable acidity during fermentation is attributed to the production of different organic acids as observed in kiwi wine (Akubor *et al.*, 2003) in banana wine, (Pratima *et al.*, 2006), who reported that level of inoculums had no effect on the TA of fermenting juice.

pH

In terms of pH The lowest score of pH (3.67, 3.31, 3.09 and 2.96) at initial, 30, 60 and 90 days after storage was observed in the treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) followed by treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 20^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (3.76, 3.54, 3.28 and 3.06) at initial, 30, 60 and 90 days after storage, whereas the maximum score was observed in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 40^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (4.11, 3.94, 3.21 and 3.29) during 90 days storage. The decrease in pH with increase in acidity of wine observed may be due to dissociation of parental acids and formation of hydrogen ions. The above results are similar with the findings of Reddy and Reddy, (2005) in mango fruit wine, (Panda *et al.*, 2014) in sapota wine. The pH of the wine depends on composition of the must, number of organic acids and sugars present in the wine.

Specific gravity

In terms of Specific gravity The lowest score of Specific gravity (1.23, 1.14 and 1.05) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage was observed in the treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 30^obrix+ Wine yeast 0.133%) followed by treatment T₁ (Pomegranate

juice 500 ml + 20^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (1.53, 1.29 and 1.20) at 30, 60 and 90 days after storage, whereas the maximum score was observed in treatment T₄ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 35^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (1.52, 1.44 and 1.34) during 90 days storage. The decrease in Specific gravity of pomegranate wine with different levels of sugar concentration during storage may possibly be due to the type of yeast used in the wine production. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* has been reported to reduce specific quality of fruit wines during fermentation. The above results are similar with the findings of (Okafor, 2018) and (Idise and Odoyo, 2011).

Sensory evolution

In terms of colour and appearance. The maximum score of colours (7.49, 7.58 and 7.88) at 30, 60 and 90 days respectively was observed in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%), followed by treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 25^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (6.35, 6.37 and 7.32) whereas the minimum score was observed in treatment T₄ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (6.47, 6.67 and 6.96) during 90 days storage.

In terms of taste, the maximum score of Taste (7.38, 7.41 and 7.95) at 30, 60 and 90 days respectively was observed in treatment T₃ (juice 500 ml + Sugar 30^obrix + Wine Yeast 0.133%) followed by treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 25^obrix + Wine

Yeast 0.133%) with (6.33, 6.38 and 7.33) whereas the minimum score was observed in treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500ml + Sugar 20^obrix+ Wine Yeast 0.133%) with (6.63, 6.82 and 7.07) during 90 days storage.

In terms of Aroma, the maximum score of Aroma (7.96, 7.72, and 7.58) at 30, 60 and 90 days respectively was observed in the treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) followed by treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 25^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (7.44, 6.37, and 6.42) whereas the minimum score was observed in treatment T₁ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 20^obrix+ Wine yeast 0.133%) with (6.58, 6.81 and 6.67) during 90 days storage.

In terms of Overall acceptability, the maximum score of Overall acceptability (7.46, 7.88 and 7.93) at 30, 60 and 90 days respectively was observed in treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 30^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%), followed by treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 25^obrix + Wine yeast 0.133%) with (6.37, 7.10, and 7.32) whereas the minimum score was observed in treatment T₄ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 35^obrix+ Wine yeast 0.133%) with (6.49, 7.05 and 6.98) during 90 days storage

Economical evolution

The Gross return of Rs.2250 and Rs.2100 is recorded in T₃ and T₂ respectively, but Highest Net Return Rs.1352.14, Cost Benefit Ratio 2.50 was recorded in

Table 1. Studies on different level of sugar on Colour and Appearance, Taste, and Aroma in pomegranate wine during storage.

Treatment	Treatment Combination	Colour and appearance			Taste			Specific Gravity (Pomegranate wine)		
		30 days	60 days	90 days	30 days	60 days	90 days	30 days	60 days	90 days
T ₁	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 20 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	6.62	6.85	7.05	6.63	6.82	7.07	1.53	1.29	1.20
T ₂	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 25 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	6.35	6.37	7.32	6.33	6.38	7.33	1.65	1.35	1.27
T ₃	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 30 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	7.42	7.58	7.88	7.38	7.41	7.95	1.23	1.14	1.05
T ₄	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 35 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	6.47	6.67	6.96	6.39	6.63	7.00	1.52	1.44	1.34
T ₅	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 40 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	6.18	6.43	7.18	6.17	6.41	7.20	1.51	1.37	1.22
	F test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
	C.D. @ 0.5	0.29	0.19	0.15	0.30	0.29	0.17	0.09	0.11	0.05
	S.Ed.	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.13	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.02

Table 2. Studies on different level of pH, overall acceptability, and TSS in pomegranate wine during storage.

Treatment	Treatment Combination	pH				overall acceptability			TSS			
		Initial	30 days	60 days	90 days	30 days	60 days	90 days	Initial	30 days	60 days	90 days
T ₁	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 20 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	3.76	3.54	3.28	3.06	6.64	7.05	7.06	11.27	9.92	9.65	9.03
T ₂	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 25 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	4.07	3.79	3.38	3.16	6.37	7.10	7.32	11.73	10.15	9.88	9.16
T ₃	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 30 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	3.67	3.31	3.09	2.96	7.46	7.88	7.93	12.13	10.50	10.21	9.46
T ₄	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 35 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	4.08	3.76	3.35	3.18	6.49	7.05	6.98	12.53	10.90	10.50	9.78
T ₅	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 40 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	4.11	3.94	3.21	3.29	6.21	7.11	7.19	13.01	11.29	10.83	10.06
	F test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
	C.D. @ 0.5	0.20	0.18	0.16	0.13	0.29	0.18	0.16	0.42	0.39	0.3	0.35
	S.Ed.	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.2	0.19	0.11	0.16





Table 3. Studies on different level of sugar on Alcohol, Acidity, and Aroma in pomegranate wine during storage.


Treatment	Treatment Combination	Alcohol			Acidity				Aroma		
		30 days	60 days	90 days	Initial	30 days	60 days	90 days	30 days	60 days	90 days
T ₁	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 20 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	8.39	9.45	10.17	0.54	0.69	0.76	0.80	6.67	6.81	6.58
T ₂	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 25 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	7.46	8.08	9.34	0.55	0.66	0.72	0.76	6.42	6.35	7.44
T ₃	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 30 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	10.58	11.39	11.90	0.32	0.62	0.66	0.69	7.58	7.72	7.96
T ₄	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 35 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	6.69	7.49	8.42	0.51	0.58	0.62	0.64	6.62	6.67	6.89
T ₅	Pomegranate juice (500ml) + 40 brix + wine yeast (0.133%)	7.10	7.73	6.37	0.47	0.55	0.57	0.59	6.29	6.51	7.21
	F test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
	C.D. @ 0.5	0.25	2.67	0.21	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.33	0.27	0.39
	S.Ed.	0.11	1.23	0.10	0.05	0.003	0.006	0.013	0.15	0.12	0.18

treatment T₃ (Pomegranate Juice 500 ml + Sugar 30 °brix + Wine Yeast 0.133%), followed by Treatment T₂ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + Sugar 25 °brix + Wine Yeast 0.133%) with Net Return of Rs.1204.39 and Cost Benefit Ratio 2.34 whereas lowest Gross

Return Rs.1800, Net Return Rs. 897.64 and Cost Benefit Ratio 1.99 was recorded in treatment T₅ (Pomegranate juice 500ml +40 °brix+ Wine Yeast 0.133%).

Table 4. Economics of different treatments and benefit cost ratio.

Treatment No.	Treatment	Total cost (Rs)	Pomegranate wine output (liter)	Sellingrate (Rs/liter)	Gross return (Rs)	Net return (Rs)	Cost benefit ratio
T ₁	Pomegranate juice(500ml) + 20 brix +Wineyeast(0.133%)	893.36	1.5	1300	1950	1056.64	2.18
T ₂	Pomegranate juice(500ml) + 25 brix +Wineyeast(0.133%)	895.61	1.5	1400	2100	1204.39	2.34
T ₃	Pomegranate juice(500ml) + 30 brix +Wineyeast(0.133%)	897.86	1.5	1500	2250	1352.14	2.50
T ₄	Pomegranate juice(500ml) + 35 brix +Wine yeast(0.133%)	900.11	1.5	1300	1950	1049.89	2.16
T ₅	Pomegranate juice(500ml) + 40 brix +Wineyeast(0.133%)	902.36	1.5	1200	1800	897.64	1.99



CONCLUSION

Based on findings of the present experiment it is concluded that treatment T₃ (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 30 brix + Wine Yeast 0.133%) was found superior in respect of the parameters like Total Soluble Solids, Acidity, pH, Specific gravity Alcohol content, with respectively Colour and Appearance, Taste, Aroma and Overall acceptability also T₃ was found best. In terms of cost benefit ratio, the highest net return Rs.1352.14, Gross return Rs. 2250 and Cost Benefit Ratio 2.50 was found in T3 (Pomegranate juice 500 ml + 30 brix + Wine Yeast 0.133%).

REFERENCES

Akubor, P.I., Obio, S.O., Nwodomere, K.A and Obiomah, E. 2003. Production and quality evaluation of banana wine. *Plant Foods for Human Nutrition*. 58(3): 1-6.

Chowdhury, P. and Ray, R.C. 2007. Fermentation of jamun (*Syzygium cumini* L.) fruit to form red wine. *ASEAN Food Journal* vol. 14: 15-23.

Idise, O.E and Odoyo, O. 2011. Studies on wine production from pawpaw (*Carica papaya*) *Journal of Brewing and Distilling* Vol. 2(4), pp. 56-62, ISSN 2141-2197

Idise, Emmanuel Okiemute, 2010. Studies of wine

produced from Pineapple (*Ananas comosus*). *International Journal of Biotechnology and Molecular Biology Research*. 2141-2154.

Isitua, C.C. and Ibeh, I.N. 2010. Novel method of wine production from banana (*Musa acuminata*) and Pineapple (*Ananas comosus*) wastes. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 9(44), ISSN 1684-5315.

Okafor, D.C., Ihediohanma, N.C., Abolude, D.S., Onuegbu, H.U., Osuji, C.M. and Ofoedu, D.M. 2014. Physico-chemical and Sensory Acceptability of Soursop (*Annona muricata*) Wine. *International Journal of Life Sciences*. 3(4): 163-169.

Okafor, U.C., Edeh, J.I. and Umeh, S.O. 2018. Table Wine Production from Mixed Fruits of Soursop and Pineapple (*Ananas comosus*) Using Yeast from Palm Wine. *Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology (IOSR-JESTFT)* e-ISSN: 2319-2402, p-ISSN: 2319-239.

Pratima, K. Kumar., Das, V. Niranjan and Tyagi, S.M. 2006. Development of a process for preparation of pure and blended kinnow mandarin juice. *Internet Journal of Food Safety*. 8: 24-29.

Reddy, L.V.A. and Reddy, O.V.S. 2005. Production and characterization of wine from mango fruit (*Mangifera indica* L.) *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*. DOI: 10.1007/s11274-005-4416-9.

Sandeep K. Panda, Umesh C. Sahu, Sunil K. Behera, Ramesh C. Ray, 2014. Fermentation of sapota (*Achras sapota* Linn.) fruits to functional wine. *Nutrafoods* (2014) © Springer – CEC Editore, DOI 10.1007/s13749-014-0034-1

Sonar, R.P., Masalkar, S.D., Garnade, V.K and Gaikwad, R.S. 2004. Influence of inoculum levels and pH of the must on the quality of jamun wine. *Beverage Food World*. 69-70.

Yadav, P., Garg, N. and Diwedi, D. H. 2009. Effect of location of cultivar, fermentation temperature and additives on the physico-chemical and sensory qualities on Mahua (*Madhuca indica* J. F. Gmel.) wine preparation. *Indian Journal of Natural Products and Resources*. 8(4): 406-418.