UNDER PEER REVIEW

Fungi associated with post-harvest storage losses in some Nigerian varieties of *Dioscorea* species

ABSTRACT

Aims: To study storage rots in yam varieties cultivated in South East Nigeria and to determine under conditions of experimental storage, the influence of fungal rot on their post harvest storage losses.

Place and Duration of Study: Laboratories, Department of Applied Microbiology & Brewing, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria between January 2012 and July 2013.

Methodology: Five yam varieties; *Dioscorea dumentorum*, two varieties each of *D. alata,* and *D. rotundata,* obtained immediately after harvest were stored in an experimental barn (30 °C and 95% RH) and examined at intervals for storage rots. Fungal causative agents of rots were isolated and identified using the partial ITS rDNA sequencing analysis and a BLAST search using the GenBank sequence database. Post harvest storage losses in terms weight loss and reduction of shelf life among the varieties were determined.

Results: All varieties of yams studied suffered fungal rots, predominantly, dry rots during storage. Seven distinct fungal isolates, which caused these rots, were fully characterized. The isolates were *Aspergillus tamari*, *Fusarium solani*, *Lasiodiplodia theobromae, Aspergillus niger, Mucor circinelloides, Aspergillus flavus* and *Aspergillus* sp. In all the yams, storage rots reduced shelf life and aggravated weight loss. Post harvest storage losses varied among the different varieties of yams.

Conclusion: The varieties of yams studied suffer rots from various fungi, which are similar to those reported in other parts of the world. Severity of post harvest losses resulting from fungal rots varies among different varieties of yams. This should be taken into consideration in the development of storage techniques.

Key words: *Dioscorea* sp., Fungi, storage rots, post-harvest losses

1. INTRODUCTION

Yams are second to cassava as the most important tropical root crop and are a staple crop in many parts of Africa and Southeast Asia. In 2005, 48.7 million tones of yam were produced world wide. West and Central Africa account for about 94% of world production, Nigeria being the major producer [1]. Beyond their importance to the tropical and subtropical world, yams are becoming increasingly well-known in Europe, where in addition to imports, they have recently been cultivated experimentally in Greece [2]. In addition to their importance as food source, yams also play a significant role in the socio-cultural lives of many African societies. Thus, yams also serve as indices of wealth and essential components of many traditional rites.

Several methods have been developed for the storage of yams [3]. However, the traditional yam barn, in spite of its inadequacies, remains the most popular among farmers. As a consequence, post harvest storage losses remain an impediment in the production of this important crop. Losses during storage are known to be high and, depending on the species and the storage environment, may be of the order of 30-60% during the course of 3-6 months [4]. Amusa et al. [5] have estimated losses of up to 50% of the fresh matter. The causes of yam tuber loss during storage are associated with mechanical damage, probably caused by insects, nematodes and poor handling before, during and after harvest. Physiological changes

UNDER PEER REVIEW

within the tuber as well as storage rots due to microorganisms are also very important contributors. Yam tuber loss during storage manifests as weight loss, mechanical damage, discolorations and shriveling, making it unfit for consumption.

Fungi are the primary causal agents of storage rots, which contribute to post harvest storage losses of yam. Amusa and Baiyewu [6] have categorized storage rots of yams into three groups namely: dry rot, caused by among other fungi, *Botryodiplodia theobromae, Aspergillus tamari* and *Penicillium oxalicum*; soft rot, usually involving *Rhizopus nigricans, Sclerotium rolfsii,* and *Muccor circinelloides* and wet rot, which results from secondary infection by *Erwinia carotovora.* There are several reports in the literature about the fungal causal agents of yam rots [7, 8, 9]. However, yam varieties cultivated in different regions of the world vary among themselves. It is also known that different varieties of yams may vary in their intrinsic properties, which determine the types of microorganisms they support their growth. Data specific about different varieties will help improve techniques adopted for their storage.

The objectives of this work are to contribute to knowledge on storage rots with respect to yam varieties cultivated in South East Nigeria and then, to determine under conditions of experimental storage, the influence of fungal rot on post harvest storage losses in terms weight loss and reduction of shelf life among these varieties.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Yam varieties

Five varieties of yams cultivated in the South Eastern parts of Nigeria were used in this study. The yams, their local names and a brief description of their characteristics are given below.

Dioscorea dumentorum, also called trifoliate yam (var. “ona”), bitter yam or cluster yam is considered inferior in quality and has not been studied extensively [10]. *Dioscorea alata* also called water yam’ winged yam’ or ‘greater yam’ is characterized by possession of a loose watery texture [11]. The interior of the water yam tuber is white or reddish, on the basis of which farmers differentiate them into two varieties, var. “abana ọcha” and var. “abana mmei” respectively. *Dioscorea rotundata* also called Guinea yam or white yam are varieties, which the interior of the tuber is white and firm in texture. Two varieties of white yams used in this study are differentiated as follows: the tuber of var. “adaka” is rough-skinned, while that of var. “abị” is relatively smooth, containing a green pigment in its mesoderm [11].

The yam varieties were obtained from farmers in Agwbu, Orumba North Local Government of Anambra State, Nigeria about two weeks after their harvest. Yams were selected on the basis of their good health, absence of cuts on their skin and fair uniformity of weight. Each tuber was given a specific code for purposes of identification.

2.2 Storage conditions

Fifty tubers of each variety of yam were stored in a partially shaded yam barn consisting of separate wooden shelves [12]. The barn was constructed near our laboratories at the Department of Applied Microbiology & Brewing, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria and employed for this study between January 2012 and July 2013. The barn was well ventilated and protected from insect pests using wire netting. Temperature and relative humidity of the barn were averages of 30 °C and 95% RH respectively, during the period of storage. Yams were de-sprouted on observation to minimize the effects of this process on deterioration of tubers.

2.3 Examination of tubers for rot

This was done by hand feel and visual examination, followed by examination of the interior of suggestive tubers on a bi-weekly basis. Rots were categorized using the scheme of Amusa *et al*. [5] as follows: Dry rot; the infected tissues became hard and dry with varying discolourations depending on the causative agent. Soft rot; the infected tissues became soft and ramified by the fungal mycelium. Wet rot; this was typified by the exudation of whitish fluid from the infected yam tissue when pressed between the fingers. All tubers, which were rotted were removed from the barn and kept separately.

2.4 Determination of shelf life of yams

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Yam tubers, which did not become susceptible to storage rot were deemed to have reached the end of their shelf lives when they became shriveled and cooked samples became unacceptable to tasters accustomed to yam meals using acceptance tests on the 7-point hedonic scale. This type of shelf life was designated "Shelf life-Auto spoilage". Shelf life influenced by storage rots, termed "Shelf life-Fungal rot" was considered to have been attained for any variety when up to 10 out of 50 tubers stored showed obvious symptoms of storage rot. Results reported are means (weeks) of measurements for all rotted tubers. Reduction of shelf life (%) due to storage rots was calculated from the ratio of Shelf life-Fungal rot to Shelf life-Auto spoilage.

2.5 Isolation and characterization of storage rot fungi

A slight modification of the method described by Ogaraku and Usman, [8] was used for this study. Small portions of the rotted yam tissues contiguous to healthy tissue were surface sterilized by cleaning with cotton wool soaked in 0.1 % silver nitrate solution. The excess sterilant was then blotted out with cotton wool. With the aid of a sterile knife and forceps the interior of the rotted tuber portion was obtained and plated asceptically on Saboraud's dextrose agar (SDA). Incubation was done at room temperature until there was visible growth. The isolates were further purified by repeated subculture on SDA plates and then subjected to pathogenicity tests (see below). Isolates confirmed to be pathogenic to yams were characterized by the slide culture technique and reference to Fungal Atlases [13, 14] in our laboratory. The identities of isolates were confirmed by the Microbial Identification Service, CABI E-UK, Bakeham Lane, Egham, Surrey, TW20 9TY, England, UK. using the partial ITS rDNA sequencing analysis and a BLAST search using the GenBank sequence database.

2.6 Pathogenicity test

Pathogenicity test was carried out by inoculating healthy yams with pure cultures of each fungal isolate according to the method described by Okafor [15]. An isolate was confirmed pathogenic if it caused rot similar to that observed on the diseased yam from where it was isolated.

2.7 Determination of weight loss

Weight loss (%) was calculated from a comparison of the weight of individual yam samples at the commencement and at the end of storage. End of storage was defined by either type of shelf life as appropriate. Results reported are means of measurements from ten individual tubers.

2.8 Statistical analyses

All measurements were carried out in appropriate replicates and data subjected to Analyses of Variance (ANOVA).

3. RESULTS

Seven distinct fungal isolates considered pathogenic to the yams were fully characterized. The report of molecular identification showed that five of these isolates, *Aspergillus tamari*, *Fusarium solani*, *Lasiodiplodia theobromae, Aspergillus niger* and *Mucor circinelloides* showed 100% identity to multiple ITS sequences reported from their respective species using the GenBank sequence database. *Aspergillus flavus* shared 100% identity to multiple ITS sequences also reported from *Aspergillus oryzae.* This isolate was distinguished from *A. oryzae* on the basis of its smaller conidia (up to 6µm, whereas those of *A. oryzae* are larger, up to 8µm). The seventh isolate *Aspergillus* sp., was identified as a member of the genus *Aspergillus* from examination of morphology because the sample consistently failed to amplify probably due to impurity in our original sample.

All varieties of yams studied suffered fungal rots, predominantly of the dry rot category. The types of rots caused by the different fungal isolates are shown in Table 1. In all the yams, storage rots drastically reduced shelf life (Table 2) and aggravated weight loss (Table 3) albeit, at different rates in the different varieties.

Table 1: Categories of rots observed on the yam varieties during storage and their fungal causative agents

Yam variety	Category of rot	Isolate
D. dumetorum var. "ona"	Dry rot	*Aspergillus tamarii*
D. alata var. "abana mmei"	Dry rot	*Fusarium solani*
	Dry rot	*Aspergillus* sp.
D. alata var. "abana ocha"	Dry rot	*Lasiodiplodia theobromae*

UNDER PEER REVIEW

	Dry rot	*Aspergillus tamarii*
D. rotundata var. "adaka"	Dry rot	*Aspergillus niger*
	Dry rot	*Aspergillus flavus*
D. rotundata var. "abi"	Soft rot	*Mucor circinelloides*

Table 2: Mean shelf life of yams in the absence and under the influence of fungal rot

	Dioscorea dumentorum (var. "ona")	*Dioscorea alata* (var. "abana mmei")	*Dioscorea alata* (var. "abana ocha")	*Dioscorea rotundata* (var. "adaka")	*Dioscorea rotundata* (var. "abi")
Shelf life-Auto spoilage (weeks)	31.12 ± 1.35 [a]	26.83 ± 1.74 [b]	31.64±1.28 [a]	35.93 ±1.24 [c]	39.73 ±1.34 [d]
Shelf life-Fungal rot (weeks)	11.30 ± 1.0 [a]	9.00 ± 1.3 [b]	11.00 ± 1.7 [a]	14.8 ± 1.3 [c]	16.42 ± 0.1 [d]
% Reduction in shelf life	63.7	66.5	63.4	58.8	58.7

Means on the same row with different suffixes are significantly different at *P*= 0.05

Table 3: Mean percentage weight loss in yam tubers at the end of their shelf lives

	Dioscorea dumentorum (var. "ona")	*Dioscorea alata* (var. "abana mmei")	*Dioscorea alata* (var. "abana ocha")	*Dioscorea rotundata* (var. "adaka")	*Dioscorea rotundata* (var. "abi")
Tubers, which did not suffer fungal storage rot (%)	52.09 ± 13.94 [a]	40.97 ± 4.29 [b]	39.30 ± 3.84 [b]	43.04 ± 4.13 [c]	35.60 ± 6.73 [d]
Tubers, which suffered fungal storage rot (%)	64.38 ± 6.19[a]	56.00 ± 8.21[b]	42.24 ± 3.55[c]	44.28 ± 4.96[c]	42.49 ± 17.05[c]

Means on the same row with different suffixes are significantly different at *P*= 0.05

4. DISCUSSION

The storage rot fungi isolated during this study are similar to those reported previously [7, 8, 9]. It is interesting to note that the types of rots caused by our isolates are in complete agreement with the categorization of Amusa and Baiyewu [6]. Dry rot is the predominant category of rot observed during this study, while wet rot was not observed at all. Wet rot arises from secondary infection with *Erwinia carotovora* [6], chances of which may have been very low in our experimental barn. Ogaraku and Usman [8] also reported the predominance of dry rot (54.2%) over soft rot (36.1%) and a low incidence (9.6%) of wet rot in similar studies on yams collected from farmers barns.

Besides the causation of rots, the presence of isolates such as *A. flavus*, many strains of which produce both B and G aflatoxins, and *A. tamarrii*, which produces the mycotoxin cyclopiazonic acid, may pose health risks to handlers and consumers of yams [16].

Shelf life is the length of time that a commodity may be stored without becoming unfit for use or consumption (Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed.). The shelf life of yams, even in the absence of fungal rots varied significantly (*P*= 0.05) according to variety. Storage rots drastically reduced shelf life (Table 2) in all the yams but at significantly (*P*= 0.05) different rates in different varieties. The *D. alata* and *D. dumentorum* species, particularly var. "abana mmei" suffered the highest rate of reduction in their shelf lives due to fungal rots. *Dioscorea alata* varieties of yams are usually characterized by high moisture composition and a loose watery texture while the *D. rotundata* species have lower moisture contents and are firm in texture [11]. The higher moisture content and watery texture of the tissues of *D. alata* may have enhanced fungal growth and hence, the severity of accompanying rots. The mechanism of fungal rot

UNDER PEER REVIEW

development involves the production of a variety of extracellular enzymes and a host of metabolites by which they degrade cell wall polymers, resulting in maceration of parenchymatous tissues [17].

It is well known that yams undergo weight loss during storage. This arises from water loss by transpiration and loss of dry matter through the physiological changes of respiration and sprouting [18]. The overall effects of these changes are the shriveling, as well as loss of the food quality of the tuber. Different varieties of yams suffered significantly (P= 0.05) different rates of weight loss during storage. Among tubers which did not suffer fungal storage rot, *D. dumentorum* (var. “ona”) lost the greatest while *D. rotundata* (var. “abi”) the least weight at the end of storage. Fungal rots aggravated weight loss in all the yams with *D. dumentorum* (var. “ona”) again suffering the greatest effect. These differences are perhaps attributable to the differences in moisture content and texture of the tissues of the different varieties. Furthermore, major differences occur in the alteration of cell wall carbohydrates in *D. dumentorum* compared with *Dioscorea rotundata* during storage. The *D. dumentorum* tuber undergoes hardening during storage, characterized by the deposition in its cell walls, of a xylose-containing polymer and additional cellulose and by the lignification of the tubers [19].

5. CONCLUSION

The varieties of yams cultivated in South Eastern Nigeria suffer rots from various fungi, which are similar to those reported in other parts of the world. Fungal rots exacerbate post harvest storage losses in yams by reducing their shelf lives and accelerating weight loss. Severity of post harvest loss appears to vary among the different varieties of yams studied. Development of storage techniques should in the future take the chemical and physical differences among yam varieties into consideration.

6. REFERENCES

1. IITA. Yam, research for development, IITA Publication. 2007; 1: 1-10.

2. Passam HC. The curing of yam (*Dioscorea* sp.) tubers for improved storage. In: Gerasopou los D. (Ed.). Post-harvest losses of perishable horticultural products in the Mediterranean region. Chania :CIHEAM. 1999; p. 57 -62.

3. FAO. Storage and Processing of Roots and Tubers in the Tropics. 1998 http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5415e/x5415e00.htm. Accessed 20 July 2012

4. Proctor FJ, Goodliffe JP, Coursey DG. Post-harvest losses of vegetables and their control in the tropics. In "Vegetable Productivity", Ed. C.R.W. Spedding, MacMillan, London. 1981; 139: (1) 72.

5. Amusa NA, Adegbite AA, Muhammed S, Baiyewu RA. Yam diseases and its management in Nigeria. African J Biotechnol. 2003; 2 (12): 497-502.

6. Amusa NA, Baiyewu RA. Storage and market disease of yam tubers in southwestern Nigeria. Ogun J Agric Res (Nig). 1999; 11: 211-225.

7. Ray RC, Nedunzhiyan M, Balagopalan C. Microorganisms associated with post harvest spoilage of yams. Annals of Tropical Res.2000; 22: 31 – 40.

8. Ogaraku AO, Usman HO. Storage Rot of Some Yams (*Dioscorea* sp.) in Keffi and environs, Nasarawa State, Nigeria. Production Agric Technol. 2008; 4(2): 22-27.

9. Akrasi KO, Awuah RT. Tuber rot of yam in Ghana and evaluation of some yam rhizosphere bacteria for fungitoxicity to yam rot fungi. Int J Agri Sci. 2012; 2(7): 571-582.

10. Ogbuagu MN. Nutritive and Anti-Nutritive Composition of the Wild (Inedible) Species of *Dioscorea bulbifera* (Potato Yam) and *Dioscorea dumentorum* (Bitter Yam). Pacific Journal Sci Technol. 2008; 9(1):203-207.

11. Opara LU. YAMS: Post-Harvest Operation FAO. 2003. http://www.fao.org/, Accessed: 11 July, 2013.

12. Akoroda MO, Hahn SK. Yams in Nigeria: status and trends. African J. Root and Tuber Crops. 1995; 1(1):38-41.

13. Smith G. An Introduction to Industrial Mycology. Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, London. 1971.

14. Watanabe T. Pictorial Atlas of Soil and Seed Fungi: Morphologies of Cultured Fungi and Key to Species. 2002; 2nd edn. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

18. Passam HC, Read SJ, Rickard JE. The respiration of yam tubers and its contribution to storage losses. Tropical Agric. 1978; 55:207-214.

15. Okafor N. Microbial rotting of stored yams (*Dioscorea* sp.) in Nigeria. Exp. Agric. 1966; 2: 179-182.

16. Wild CP, Gong YY. Mycotoxins and human disease: a largely ignored global health issue. Carcinogenesis. 2010; 31:71-82.

17. Ikuton T. Post harvest microbial rot of yam tuber in Nigeria. Fitopatologia Brasileira.1983; 8 (1): 1-7.

19. Brillouet JM, Treche S, Sealy L. Alterations in cell wall constituents of yams *Dioscorea dumetorum* and *D. rotundata* with maturation and storage conditions. Relation with post-harvest hardening of *D. dumetorum* yam tubers. J. Food Sci. 1981; 46(6):1964-1967.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors are grateful to Microbial Identification Service, CABI E-UK, Bakeham Lane, Egham, Surrey, TW20 9TY, England, UK for the identification of fungal isolates.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Ogbo FC, Supervisor, project

Agu KC, Student carried out project as component of requirements for M.Sc. of our University