

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Adawyah, R. (2007). *Pengolahan dan Pengawetan Ikan*. PT bumi Aksara
- Aditya, R & Dewi, S. (2011). *10 Jurus Sukses Beragribisnis Jamur*. Penebar Swadaya
- Anonim (2001). Bahan Tambahan Pangan (BTP). Available;(https://www.ilmupangan.com)
- Anonymous (2009). *Jenis dan Manfaat Jamur*. <http://ikyners.blogspot.com/2008/12/jenis-dan-manfaat-jamur.html>. Diakses 20 Januari 2023
- Asmara, A. P., & Amungkasi, H. K. (2019). Kajian Kinetika Pengaruh Lama Penyimpanan Terhadap Kadar Vitamin C Pada Buah Apel Malang (Malus Sylvestris). *Al-Kimia*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.24252/al-kimia.v7i2.8125>
- Azizah & Utiya. (2009). Bentuk Polimer dalam Kehidupan. http://www.chemistry.org/materi_kimia/kimia-polimer/bentuk-polimer-dalam-kehidupan/bentuk-polimer-plastik/. Diakses 20 febuari 2023
- Henderson, E., & Townsend, R.J. (1971). *Biochemistry of foods*. Academic press
- Fajarwati, N. H., Parnanto, N. H. R., & Manuhara, G. J. (2017). Pengaruh konsentrasi asam sitrat dan suhu pengeringan terhadap karakteristik fisik, kimia dan sensoris manisan kering labu siam (*Sechium edule* Sw.) dengan pemanfaatan pewarna alami dari ekstrak rosela ungu (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.). *Jurnal Teknologi Hasil Pertanian*, X(1), 50–66.
- Fauziah, N. (2020). Perendaman menggunakan *Natrium Metabisulfit* ($Na_2S_2O_5$) pada pengalengan Jamur Kancing (*Agaricus Bisporus*) Jenis *Pieces and Stems* (PNS) *Regule*. PT Eka Timur Raya. Pasuruan, Jawa Timur
- Hasanah, Silvia Nuril (2023). Pengaruh Konsentrasi Garam dan Vitamin C Terhadap Sifak Fisik dan Kimia Jamur Kancing (*Agaricus Bisporus*) PT Eka Timur Raya, Undergraduate thesis, Politeknik Jember
- Gomez, K.A. & Gomez, A.A. (1984). *Prosesdur Statistik Penelitian*. Edisi ke 2, Jhon Wiley and Sons.

- Hung, P. V., & Nhi, N. N. Y. (2012). Nutritional composition and antioxidant capacity of several edible mushrooms grown in the southern Vietnam. *International Food Research Journal*, 19(2), 611–615.
- Institut of medicine (US) on Dietary Antioxidants Related Compounds. (2000). *Dietary Reference Intakes for Vitamin C, Vitamin E, Selenium, and Carotenoids*. The National Academis Press.
- Irianto, Yuli., Susilowati, A, & Wiryanto. (2004). Pertumbuhan, kandungan protein, dan sianida jamur kuping (*Auricularia polytricha*) pada medium tumbuh serbuk gergaji dan ampas tapioka dengan penambahan pupuk urea. *Bioteknologi*, 5 (2), 43-50.
- Jelani. (2008). *Jamur Berkhasiat Obat*. Pustaka Obor Popular.
- Jolivet, S., Arpin, N., Wichers, H. J., & Pellon, G. (1998). *Agaricus Bisporus browning: A riview*. *Mycological Research*, 102(12), 936-934
- Kuo. M. (2004). *Agaricus Bisporus : The buttom mushroom*. *MushroomExpert.com*
- Li, R., Wu, Z., Wangb, Y., Ding, L., & Wang, Y. (2016). Role of pH-induced structural change in protein aggregation in foam fractionation of bovine serum albumin. *Biotechnology Reports*, 9, 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.btre.2016.01.002>
- Luh , B.S & J.G Woodproof, J.G.(1975). *Comercial Vegetable Processing*. The Avi Ine. Gaithersburg.
- Maisyaroh, S., (2018). Pengukuran perfomansi sistem produksi pengalengan jamur kancing menggunakan metode *Overall Throughput Effectivenes (OTE)*. Tugas Akhir Jurusan Teknologi Industri Pertanian. Fakultas Teknologi Pertanian. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang
- Mau, J.L., Miklus M.B., & R.B. Beelman R. B.,. (1993). The Shelf Life of Agarius Mushroom in Shelf Life Study of Food and Beverages, Chemical, Biological, Physical and Nutritional Aspects. Charalambous. G Ed.Elseiver Science Publisher. Amsterdam
- Novitasari, R. (2018). Studi pembuatan pikel cabai keriting utuh (*Capsicum annum var.glabiusculum*). *Jurnal Teknologi Pertanian*, 7(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.32520/jtp.v7i1.111>

- Nurul, F. (2020). Perendaman Menggunakan *Natrium Metabisulfit* ($Na_2S_2O_5$) Pada pengalengan Jamur Kancing (*Agaricus Bisporus*) Jenis *Pieces and Stems* (PNS) *Reguler*. PT Eka Timur Raya. Pasuruan, Jawa Timur
- Shi, Q., Wang, X., Zhao, Y., & Fang, Z. (2012). Glass transition and state diagram for freeze-dried *Agaricus bisporus*. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 111(4), 667–674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2012.02.038>
- Siti, M. (2018). Pengukuran Performansi Sistem Produksi Pengalengan Jamur Kancing Menggunakan Metode *Overall Throughput Effectiveness (OTE)*. Tugas Akhir Jurusan Teknologi Industri Pertanian. Fakultas Teknologi Pertanian. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang
- Suharjo, E. (2007). *Budidaya Jamur Merang dengan Media Kardus*. PT Agromedia Pustaka.
- Sulistyoningsih. (2002). *Validasi Metode Pengujian*. Pusat Standarisasi dan Akreditasi Sekretariat Jendral Departemen Pertanian. Jakarta Publisher.
- Sweetman, S. C. (2005). *Martindale The Complete Drug Reference*. 34th ed. London: Phamacuetical press
- Tomasik, P. (2004). *Chemical and Functional Properties of Food Saccharides*. CRC Press LLC.

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran I. Prosedur penelitian

A. Analisis keasaman (pH) dilakukan dengan menggunakan alat yaitu pH meter dengan proses sebagai berikut :

1. Jamur yang berada dalam pouch di buka menggunakan gunting dengan lebar 2 cm.
2. Kemudian alat ph meter di kalibrasi menggunakan pH 4,5 dan 7,5.
3. Lalu di catat berada di angka berapa ph meter setelah di kalibrasi.
4. Kemudian alat pH meter di masukan kedalam jamur yang ada di dalam kemasan pouch.
5. Lalu di amati sampai angka nya tidak berubah. Dan di catat

Perlakuan	Kode	Ph
1	G ₁ V ₁	
	G ₁ V ₂	
	G ₁ V ₃	
	G ₂ V ₁	
	G ₂ V ₂	
	G ₂ V ₃	
	G ₃ V ₁	
	G ₃ V ₂	
	G ₃ V ₃	
	2	G ₁ V ₁
G ₁ V ₂		
G ₁ V ₃		
G ₂ V ₁		
G ₂ V ₂		
G ₂ V ₃		
G ₃ V ₁		
G ₃ V ₂		
G ₃ V ₃		

B. Analisis garam (*Salt Level*) di lakukan dengan menggunakan alat refractometer:

1. Buka kemasan pouch jamur kancing. Selebar 2 cm menggunakan gunting.
2. *Refractometer* di kalibrasi menggunakan air atau *Aquades*.
3. Lalu ambil larutan brine menggunakan pipet dan semprotkan ke *Refractometer*.
4. Lalu amati berapa hasil yang muncul. Dalam *refractometer* setiap garis memiliki nilai 0,2 dan setiap garis kelipatan 2.

Perlakuan	Kode	Refracto
1	G ₁ V ₁	
	G ₁ V ₂	
	G ₁ V ₃	
	G ₂ V ₁	
	G ₂ V ₂	
	G ₂ V ₃	
	G ₃ V ₁	
	G ₃ V ₂	
	G ₃ V ₃	
2	G ₁ V ₁	
	G ₁ V ₂	
	G ₁ V ₃	
	G ₂ V ₁	
	G ₂ V ₂	
	G ₂ V ₃	
	G ₃ V ₁	
	G ₃ V ₂	
	G ₃ V ₃	

C. Analisis garam (*Salt Level*) di lakukan dengan menggunakan alat salino :

1. Buka kemasan pouch jamur kancing. Selebar 2 cm menggunakan gunting.
2. Salt meter di kalibrasi terlebih dahulu menggunakan *Aquades*.
3. Lalu salt meter di masukkan kedalam larutan brine yang ada di dalam pouch.
4. Lalu di amati dengan berapa hasil yang muncul. Sampai tidak berubah.

Perlakuan	Kode	pH
1	G ₁ V ₁	
	G ₁ V ₂	
	G ₁ V ₃	
	G ₂ V ₁	
	G ₂ V ₂	
	G ₂ V ₃	
	G ₃ V ₁	
	G ₃ V ₂	
	G ₃ V ₃	
	2	G ₁ V ₁
G ₁ V ₂		
G ₁ V ₃		
G ₂ V ₁		
G ₂ V ₂		
	G ₂ V ₃	
	G ₃ V ₁	
	G ₃ V ₂	
	G ₃ V ₃	

Lampiran II. Data primer penelitian

A. Data primer hari ke 1

Hari	Perlakuan	Kode	Drain weight	Nett weight	pH	Salt level (Refracto)	Salt level (Salino)
		G1V1	127.9	250.5	5.04	1	0.69
		G1V2	129.9	253.5	4.96	1	0.69
		G1V3	128.2	248.2	4.91	1	0.64
		G2V1	134.6	242.2	5.07	1	0.93
	1	G2V2	137.7	264.3	4.91	1.2	0.94
		G2V3	131.4	247.9	4.85	1	0.96
		G3V1	131.3	239.7	5.01	1.4	1.25
1		G3V2	128.8	259	4.87	1.4	1.28
		G3V3	130.6	242.3	4.89	1.2	1.24
		G1V1	126.5	250.5	4.98	1	0.67
		G1V2	130.5	265.9	4.83	1	0.68
		G1V3	127.7	260.6	4.81	1	0.66
		G2V2	133.6	241.8	5.04	1	0.92
	2	G2V2	134.4	260.9	4.89	1.2	0.95
		G2V3	133.9	249.5	4.88	1.2	0.96
		G3V1	135.2	257.3	4.95	1.4	1.33
		G3V2	130.6	246.2	4.94	1.6	1.28
		G3V3	124.8	231	4.81	1.4	1.2

B. Data primer hari ke 7

Hari	Perlakuan	Kode	pH	Salt level (Refracto)	Salt level (Salino)
		G1V1	5.11	0.6	0.6
		G1V2	5.01	0.8	0.63
		G1V3	4.99	0.8	0.62
		G2V1	5.22	1	0.93
	1	G2V2	5.05	1	0.94
		G2V3	4.96	1	0.96
		G3V1	5.18	1.2	1.27
7		G3V2	5.05	1.2	1.24
		G3V3	4.96	1.2	1.32
		G1V1	5.14	0.8	0.63
		G1V2	5	0.8	0.63
		G1V3	4.93	0.8	0.64
		G2V2	5.12	1	0.81
	2	G2V2	5.05	1	0.93
		G2V3	4.95	1	0.91
		G3V1	5.1	1.4	1.28
		G3V2	5.06	1.6	1.29
		G3V3	4.5	2	1.75

C. Data hasil uji Tukey hari ke 1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 3

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: DW

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	9	160.2800000	17.8088889	3.98	0.0324
Error	8	35.8311111	4.4788889		
Corrected Total	17	196.1111111			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	DW Mean
0.817292	1.615800	2.116339	130.9778

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.5688889	0.5688889	0.13	0.7308
garam	2	106.7144444	53.3572222	11.91	0.0040
vitaminc	2	22.1211111	11.0605556	2.47	0.1461
garam*vitaminc	4	30.8755556	7.7188889	1.72	0.2374

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
--------	----	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

ulangan	1	0.5688889	0.5688889	0.13	0.7308
garam	2	106.7144444	53.3572222	11.91	0.0040
vitaminc	2	22.1211111	11.0605556	2.47	0.1461
garam*vitaminc	4	30.8755556	7.7188889	1.72	0.2374

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 4

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: NW

Source	DF	Sum of		F Value	Pr > F
		Squares	Mean Square		
Model	9	1058.071667	117.563519	2.10	0.1542
Error	8	447.144444	55.893056		
Corrected Total	17	1505.216111			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	NW Mean
0.702937	2.982976	7.476166	250.6278

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	14.4005556	14.4005556	0.26	0.6254
garam	2	242.3144444	121.1572222	2.17	0.1769
vitaminc	2	530.2877778	265.1438889	4.74	0.0438
garam*vitaminc	4	271.0688889	67.7672222	1.21	0.3770

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	14.4005556	14.4005556	0.26	0.6254
garam	2	242.3144444	121.1572222	2.17	0.1769
vitaminc	2	530.2877778	265.1438889	4.74	0.0438
garam*vitaminc	4	271.0688889	67.7672222	1.21	0.3770

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 5

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: PH

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	9	0.09306667	0.01034074	5.24	0.0145
Error	8	0.01577778	0.00197222		
Corrected Total	17	0.10884444			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	PH Mean
0.855043	0.901822	0.044410	4.924444

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
--------	----	-----------	-------------	---------	--------

ulangan	1	0.00802222	0.00802222	4.07	0.0784
garam	2	0.00247778	0.00123889	0.63	0.5580
vitaminc	2	0.07901111	0.03950556	20.03	0.0008
garam*vitaminc	4	0.00355556	0.00088889	0.45	0.7699

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.00802222	0.00802222	4.07	0.0784
garam	2	0.00247778	0.00123889	0.63	0.5580
vitaminc	2	0.07901111	0.03950556	20.03	0.0008
garam*vitaminc	4	0.00355556	0.00088889	0.45	0.7699

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 6

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: REF

Source	DF	Sum of		F Value	Pr > F
		Squares	Mean Square		
Model	9	0.62000000	0.06888889	13.78	0.0006
Error	8	0.04000000	0.00500000		
Corrected Total	17	0.66000000			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	REF Mean
0.939394	6.060915	0.070711	1.166667

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.02000000	0.02000000	4.00	0.0805
garam	2	0.52000000	0.26000000	52.00	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.04000000	0.02000000	4.00	0.0625
garam*vitaminc	4	0.04000000	0.01000000	2.00	0.1875

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.02000000	0.02000000	4.00	0.0805
garam	2	0.52000000	0.26000000	52.00	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.04000000	0.02000000	4.00	0.0625
garam*vitaminc	4	0.04000000	0.01000000	2.00	0.1875

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 7

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: SAL

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	9	1.06099444	0.11788827	209.58	<.0001
Error	8	0.00450000	0.00056250		
Corrected Total	17	1.06549444			

R-Square Coeff Var Root MSE SAL Mean

0.995777 2.471960 0.023717 0.959444

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.00005000	0.00005000	0.09	0.7732
garam	2	1.05254444	0.52627222	935.60	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.00241111	0.00120556	2.14	0.1797
garam*vitaminc	4	0.00598889	0.00149722	2.66	0.1113

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.00005000	0.00005000	0.09	0.7732
garam	2	1.05254444	0.52627222	935.60	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.00241111	0.00120556	2.14	0.1797
garam*vitaminc	4	0.00598889	0.00149722	2.66	0.1113

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 8

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
garam	3	G1 G2 G3
vitaminc	3	V1 V2 V3
ulangan	2	1 2

inter 9 G1V1 G1V2 G1V3 G2V1 G2V2 G2V3 G3V1 G3V2 G3V3

Number of Observations Read 18

Number of Observations Used 18

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 9

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for DW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	4.478889
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	3.4914

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	134.267	6	G2
B	130.217	6	G3
B			

B 128.450 6 G1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 11

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for NW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	55.89306
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	12.334

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
----------------	------	---	-------

A	254.867	6	G1
---	---------	---	----

A

A	251.100	6	G2
---	---------	---	----

A

A	245.917	6	G3
---	---------	---	----

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 12

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.001972
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.0733

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	4.94000	6	G2
A			
A	4.92167	6	G1
A			
A	4.91167	6	G3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 13

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.005
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.1167

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	1.40000	6	G3
B	1.10000	6	G2
B			
B	1.00000	6	G1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 14

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a

higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.000563
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.0391

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	1.26333	6	G3
B	0.94333	6	G2
C	0.67167	6	G1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 15

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for DW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	4.478889
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	3.4914

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitaminC
A	131.983	6	V2
A			
A	131.517	6	V1
A			
A	129.433	6	V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 17

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for NW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
-------	------

Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	55.89306
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	12.334

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitamin
A	258.300	6	V2
A			
A	247.000	6	V1
A			
A	246.583	6	V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 18

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.001972
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101

Minimum Significant Difference 0.0733

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitaminc
A	5.01500	6	V1
B	4.90000	6	V2
B			
B	4.85833	6	V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 19

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.005
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.1167

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitamin
A	1.23333	6	V2
A			
A	1.13333	6	V1
A			
A	1.13333	6	V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 20

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.000563
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.0391

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitamin
A	0.97000	6	V2
A			
A	0.96500	6	V1
A			
A	0.94333	6	V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 21

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for DW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	4.478889
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	8.6306

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
----------------	------	---	-------

A	136.050	2	G2V2
A			
B A	134.100	2	G2V1
B A			
B A	133.250	2	G3V1
B A			
B A	132.650	2	G2V3
B A			
B A	130.200	2	G1V2
B A			
B A	129.700	2	G3V2
B A			
B A	127.950	2	G1V3
B A			
B A	127.700	2	G3V3
B			
B	127.200	2	G1V1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 23

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for NW

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	55.89306

Critical Value of Studentized Range 5.76729

Minimum Significant Difference 30.488

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	262.600	2	G2V2
A			
A	259.700	2	G1V2
A			
A	254.400	2	G1V3
A			
A	252.600	2	G3V2
A			
A	250.500	2	G1V1
A			
A	248.700	2	G2V3
A			
A	248.500	2	G3V1
A			
A	242.000	2	G2V1
A			
A	236.650	2	G3V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 24

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.001972
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	0.1811

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	5.05500	2	G2V1
A			
B A	5.01000	2	G1V1
B A			
B A	4.98000	2	G3V1
B A			
B A	4.90500	2	G3V2
B A			
B A	4.90000	2	G2V2
B A			
B A	4.89500	2	G1V2
B			
B	4.86500	2	G2V3
B			

B	4.86000	2	G1V3
B			
B	4.85000	2	G3V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 25

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.005
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	0.2884

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	1.50000	2	G3V2
A			
B A	1.40000	2	G3V1
B A			
B A C	1.30000	2	G3V3

```

B      C
B D C   1.20000   2  G2V2
      D C
D C     1.10000   2  G2V3
      D
D       1.00000   2  G1V2
      D
D       1.00000   2  G1V3
      D
D       1.00000   2  G2V1
      D
D       1.00000   2  G1V1

```

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 26

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.000563
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	0.0967

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	1.29000	2	G3V1
A			
A	1.28000	2	G3V2
A			
A	1.22000	2	G3V3
B	0.96000	2	G2V3
B			
B	0.94500	2	G2V2
B			
B	0.92500	2	G2V1
C	0.68500	2	G1V2
C			
C	0.68000	2	G1V1
C			
C	0.65000	2	G1V3

D. Data Hail uji tukey hari ke 7

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 27

```

The GLM Procedure
Class Level Information
Class      Levels  Values
garam      3    G1 G2 G3
vitaminc   3    V1 V2 V3
ulangan    2    1 2
Number of Observations Read      18

```

Number of Observations Used 18

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 28

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: PH

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	9	0.31006667	0.03445185	3.04	0.0662
Error	8	0.09071111	0.01133889		
Corrected Total	17	0.40077778			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	PH Mean
0.773662	2.120730	0.106484	5.021111

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.02568889	0.02568889	2.27	0.1707
garam	2	0.02154444	0.01077222	0.95	0.4264
vitaminc	2	0.21021111	0.10510556	9.27	0.0083
garam*vitaminc	4	0.05262222	0.01315556	1.16	0.3960

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
--------	----	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

ulangan	1	0.02568889	0.02568889	2.27	0.1707
garam	2	0.02154444	0.01077222	0.95	0.4264
vitaminc	2	0.21021111	0.10510556	9.27	0.0083
garam*vitaminc	4	0.05262222	0.01315556	1.16	0.3960

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 29

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: REF

Source	DF	Sum of		F Value	Pr > F
		Squares	Mean Square		
Model	9	1.62222222	0.18024691	4.84	0.0184
Error	8	0.29777778	0.03722222		
Corrected Total	17	1.92000000			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	REF Mean
----------	-----------	----------	----------

0.844907	18.08725	0.192931	1.066667
----------	----------	----------	----------

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.14222222	0.14222222	3.82	0.0864
garam	2	1.37333333	0.68666667	18.45	0.0010
vitaminc	2	0.05333333	0.02666667	0.72	0.5174

garam*vitaminc	4	0.05333333	0.01333333	0.36	0.8317
----------------	---	------------	------------	------	--------

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.14222222	0.14222222	3.82	0.0864
garam	2	1.37333333	0.68666667	18.45	0.0010
vitaminc	2	0.05333333	0.02666667	0.72	0.5174
garam*vitaminc	4	0.05333333	0.01333333	0.36	0.8317

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 30

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: SAL

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	9	1.74474444	0.19386049	16.21	0.0003
Error	8	0.09570000	0.01196250		
Corrected Total	17	1.84044444			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	SAL Mean
0.948002	11.32749	0.109373	0.965556

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
--------	----	-----------	-------------	---------	--------

ulangan	1	0.00720000	0.00720000	0.60	0.4602
garam	2	1.63787778	0.81893889	68.46	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.04297778	0.02148889	1.80	0.2268
garam*vitaminc	4	0.05668889	0.01417222	1.18	0.3870

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
ulangan	1	0.00720000	0.00720000	0.60	0.4602
garam	2	1.63787778	0.81893889	68.46	<.0001
vitaminc	2	0.04297778	0.02148889	1.80	0.2268
garam*vitaminc	4	0.05668889	0.01417222	1.18	0.3870

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 31

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
garam	3	G1 G2 G3
vitaminc	3	V1 V2 V3
ulangan	2	1 2
inter	9	G1V1 G1V2 G1V3 G2V1 G2V2 G2V3 G3V1 G3V2 G3V3

Number of Observations Read 18

Number of Observations Used 18

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 32

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.011339
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.1757

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	5.05833	6	G2
A			
A	5.03000	6	G1
A			
A	4.97500	6	G3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 33

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a

higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.037222
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.3183

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
A	1.4333	6	G3
B	1.0000	6	G2
B			
B	0.7667	6	G1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 34

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.011963

Critical Value of Studentized Range 4.04101

Minimum Significant Difference 0.1804

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	garam
----------------	------	---	-------

A	1.35833	6	G3
---	---------	---	----

B	0.91333	6	G2
---	---------	---	----

C	0.62500	6	G1
---	---------	---	----

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 35

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha 0.05

Error Degrees of Freedom 8

Error Mean Square 0.011339

Critical Value of Studentized Range 4.04101

Minimum Significant Difference 0.1757

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitaminc
----------------	------	---	----------

A	5.14500	6	V1
---	---------	---	----

A			
---	--	--	--

B A 5.03667 6 V2
 B
 B 4.88167 6 V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 36

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha 0.05
 Error Degrees of Freedom 8
 Error Mean Square 0.037222
 Critical Value of Studentized Range 4.04101
 Minimum Significant Difference 0.3183

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitaminc
A	1.1333	6	V3
A			
A	1.0667	6	V2
A			
A	1.0000	6	V1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 37

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.011963
Critical Value of Studentized Range	4.04101
Minimum Significant Difference	0.1804

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	vitaminC
A	1.03333	6	V3
A			
A	0.94333	6	V2
A			
A	0.92000	6	V1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 38

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for PH

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
-------	------

Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.011339
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	0.4343

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	5.1700	2	G2V1
A			
B A	5.1400	2	G3V1
B A			
B A	5.1250	2	G1V1
B A			
B A	5.0550	2	G3V2
B A			
B A	5.0500	2	G2V2
B A			
B A	5.0050	2	G1V2
B A			
B A	4.9600	2	G1V3
B A			
B A	4.9550	2	G2V3
B			
B	4.7300	2	G3V3

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 39

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for REF

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	8
Error Mean Square	0.037222
Critical Value of Studentized Range	5.76729
Minimum Significant Difference	0.7868

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	1.6000	2	G3V3
A			
B A	1.4000	2	G3V2
B A			
B A	1.3000	2	G3V1
B A			
B A	1.0000	2	G2V3
B A			
B A	1.0000	2	G2V2
B A			
B A	1.0000	2	G2V1
B			
B	0.8000	2	G1V3
B			
B	0.8000	2	G1V2

B
 B 0.7000 2 G1V1

The SAS System 20:25 Thursday, February 23, 2023 40

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for SAL

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher

Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha 0.05
 Error Degrees of Freedom 8
 Error Mean Square 0.011963
 Critical Value of Studentized Range 5.76729
 Minimum Significant Difference 0.446




Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	inter
A	1.5350	2	G3V3
A			
B A	1.2750	2	G3V1
B A			
B A	1.2650	2	G3V2
B			

B	C	0.9350	2	G2V3
B	C			
B	C	0.9350	2	G2V2
B	C			
B	C	0.8700	2	G2V1
C				
C		0.6300	2	G1V3
C				
C		0.6300	2	G1V2
C				
C		0.6150	2	G1V1

Lampiran III. Dokumentasi Kegiatan

Gambar	Keterangan
	Jamur kancing segar
	Jamur kancing setelah di <i>blanching</i> dan melewati proses <i>slicing</i>
	Penimbangan jamur kancing ke dalam pouch

Gambar	Keterangan
 A photograph showing several clear plastic bags filled with sliced, light-colored mushroom pieces, arranged on a blue plastic tray in a kitchen or food processing area.	Jamur kancing yang sudah dikemas
 A photograph showing a person's hands sorting through sliced mushrooms on a metal tray. A digital scale is visible in the background, indicating a grading or weighing process.	General grading produk jadi jamur kancing
 A photograph showing a row of clear plastic bottles containing a yellowish liquid, likely a brine solution for mushrooms, lined up on a white surface.	Larutan brine jamur kancing

