American Journal Of Agriculture And Horticulture Innovations

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue05 2026
PAGE NO. 1-14

Integrated Management of Yam Tuber Rot and Value-Added Utilization of Pumpkin for Functional Food Development: A Postharvest, Phytopathological, And Nutraceutical Perspective

Dr. Helena M. Duarte

Department of Plant Science and Food Systems, University of Porto, Portugal

Received: 09 March 2026; **Accepted:** 07 April 2026; **Published:** 01 May 2026

Abstract: Background: Yam is one of the most important staple tuber crops in many tropical regions, especially in West Africa, yet postharvest losses caused by fungal and bacterial rot continue to reduce storage life, market value, and food security. At the same time, pumpkin and related cucurbits are increasingly recognized for their compositional richness, processing versatility, seed oil value, antioxidant potential, and application in functional food development. The reference base supplied for this article spans plant pathology, yam storage rot, antimicrobial plant extracts, fungitoxic treatments, pumpkin chemistry, pumpkin seed bioactivity, dehydration technology, and value-added food product development.

Objective: This article develops an original, publication-ready research narrative that integrates two ordinarily separate lines of scholarship: postharvest pathology of yam tubers and value-added processing of pumpkin into nutritionally enhanced foods. The central objective is to construct a unified analytical framework explaining how postharvest crop loss reduction and food product innovation can jointly support agricultural sustainability, nutritional improvement, and rural livelihoods.

Methodology: A text-based integrative research design was employed using only the references provided. The article synthesizes evidence from plant disease diagnostics, crop pathology, crude plant extract antifungal studies, microbial preservation logic, cucurbit classification, pumpkin compositional and technological studies, and processed food applications.

Results: The analysis indicates that yam tuber rot is a multifactorial postharvest problem driven by pathogen diversity, storage conditions, handling injury, and insufficient protective interventions. Botanical extracts and selected chemical agents show promise for disease suppression, but practical management must be integrated rather than single-factor in orientation. The pumpkin literature demonstrates parallel opportunities in crop diversification and product development, including dehydrated pumpkin products, seed-based nutrient enrichment, antioxidant-bearing foods, and bakery or beverage applications.

Conclusion: The study argues that postharvest protection of staple tubers and value-added transformation of nutrient-rich crops should be treated as complementary pillars of agricultural development. An integrated approach linking yam loss reduction with pumpkin-based functional food processing can improve storage efficiency, dietary diversity, and farm-level resilience.

Keywords: Yam tuber rot, pumpkin processing, postharvest pathology, plant extracts, functional foods, crop loss reduction, nutraceutical potential.

Introduction: Yam and pumpkin occupy very different cultural, agronomic, and nutritional spaces, yet the references provided for this article reveal that both crops are deeply relevant to a broader agricultural question: how can biological production systems be made more resilient, more profitable, and more beneficial to human nutrition under conditions of postharvest vulnerability and changing food demand? Yam is a major staple food, especially in tropical production zones, where it contributes substantially to household food security, farm income, and cultural food systems. However, its value is persistently threatened by tuber rot and postharvest deterioration, particularly during storage and distribution (Aidoo, 2007; Ajayi & Olorundare, 2014; Gwa et al., 2015). Pumpkin, by contrast, is frequently discussed not through loss alone but through compositional richness, product development, seed-derived bioactive compounds, oil recovery, bakery applications, and nutraceutical potential (Dhiman et al., 2009; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2013; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2011). When considered together, these two literature streams provide an opportunity to rethink the relationship between crop protection and food innovation.

In most conventional academic treatment, postharvest disease management and functional food development are separated into distinct disciplines. Plant pathology focuses on infection, inoculum, host susceptibility, and disease control, while food science emphasizes processing, sensory characteristics, nutrient retention, shelf stability, and product acceptability. Yet in real agricultural systems, these domains are inseparable. A farmer who loses yams in storage does not experience that loss as a strictly pathological event; it is simultaneously a food security issue, an economic issue, and a systems failure in postharvest handling. Likewise, the development of value-added pumpkin products is not merely a food technology exercise; it has implications for crop utilization, market diversification, and nutritional strategy. The supplied references therefore support a more integrative research agenda in which disease reduction and food processing are not treated as isolated pursuits but as mutually reinforcing strategies of agricultural modernization and resilience.

Yam tuber rot is one of the clearest examples of how postharvest pathology can erode the value of primary production. Several studies in the supplied references point to fungi and bacteria associated with yam rot, as well as comparable postharvest diseases in cassava, cocoyam, sweet potato, and related crops (Ajayi & Olorundare, 2014; Amadioha & Markson, 2007; Amienyo & Ataga, 2006; Eze, 1984; Gwa et al., 2015). These works collectively indicate that rot is not an incidental or rare outcome, but a recurring postharvest phenomenon connected to biological agents, environmental conditions, storage systems, and host vulnerability. Aidoo (2007), working on yam tuber rot fungi in storage systems at Kumasi Central Market, adds an important applied dimension: postharvest losses are not confined to laboratory pathology but arise within real market infrastructures. This is significant because it locates the problem in the interface between production, storage, and commercialization.

Plant pathology as a field offers the conceptual structure needed to understand this problem. Agrios (2004) emphasizes the multi-causal logic of plant disease, where host, pathogen, and environment interact dynamically. This framework is directly applicable to yam tuber rot. The yam tuber is not diseased simply because pathogens exist; infection becomes damaging when entry points, storage humidity, temperature, tissue injury, and host physiological conditions converge in favor of microbial colonization. Such a framework also discourages overly simplistic solutions. If rot is treated as the presence of a pathogen alone, control efforts may overemphasize fungicides while neglecting handling injury, sanitation, and storage ecology. The references in this article repeatedly suggest that successful management must be broader and more integrated.

At the same time, the literature on plant-derived antimicrobial and fungitoxic extracts introduces an important alternative to exclusive reliance on conventional synthetic chemicals. Amadioha (2001) reported fungitoxic effects of plant extracts against Rhizopus oryzae causing potato rot. Amadioha and Obi (1998, 1999) studied botanical extracts and their control potential in other plant diseases. Banso et al. (1999, 2007) investigated antimicrobial and antibacterial properties of plant-derived substances, while Bobbarala et al. (2009) examined selected plant extracts against phytopathogenic fungi. Gwa and colleagues further extended this domain into yam tuber rot control through crude plant extracts and comparative antifungal testing (Gwa & Akombo, 2016; Gwa & Nwankiti, 2017; Gwa et al., 2017). These references suggest that botanical disease control is not merely a folkloric or peripheral topic. It is a serious research direction with particular relevance where cost, accessibility, environmental concerns, and food safety perceptions make low-residue plant-based interventions attractive.

Nevertheless, the history of yam rot management also includes chemical control approaches. Bonire (1985) discussed organotin compounds for yam rot prevention, and Emua and Fajola (1983) addressed chemical control in yam leaf spot diseases. These references show that crop protection has long relied, at least in part, on targeted chemical strategies. But they also invite critical reflection. Chemical control can be effective, yet it may raise issues of cost, residue concern, resistance selection, or limited availability to smallholder farmers. Brull and Coote (1999), in discussing preservative agents in foods and microbial resistance mechanisms, provide a broader warning relevant beyond processed foods: any antimicrobial strategy must consider not only immediate efficacy but also mechanisms of action and long-term implications. This is especially important when moving from controlled experimental settings into farm and market realities.

The second major thematic block in the supplied references concerns pumpkin and the broader cucurbit family. Bates et al. (1990) and Whitaker and Davis (1962) provide classification and foundational context for cucurbits, while Taylor and Brant (2002) discuss world cucurbit production trends. FAO-related references and South African production guidelines indicate that pumpkin and squash are globally relevant production crops rather than regionally marginal vegetables (Anonymous, 2014a, 2014b; South Africa Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2011). This production significance matters because value-added food development requires a crop base that is available, adaptable, and scalable. Pumpkin clearly meets these conditions.

The pumpkin literature also reveals why this crop has become increasingly attractive in food science. Dhiman et al. (2009) review functional constituents and pumpkin processing. Noelia et al. (2011) and Biesiada et al. (2011) discuss chemical and physicochemical characterization and composition variation depending on cultivar and storage. Salgın and Korkmaz (2011) and Nikolovski et al. (2012) examine seed oil recovery and phytosterol content. Lestari and Meiyanto (2018) review the emerging nutraceutical potential of pumpkin seeds. Abd El-Aziz and El-Kalek (2011) study antimicrobial proteins and oil seeds from pumpkin. These references collectively portray pumpkin as a crop of unusual dual value: the flesh supports food processing and nutrient enrichment, while the seeds contribute oil, bioactive compounds, and higher-value nutraceutical prospects. In contrast to crops that are valued only for one edible fraction, pumpkin offers a near-whole-crop utilization model.

This multi-component value is especially important in the context of food product development. Kulkarni and Joshi (2013) explore pumpkin powder substitution in biscuits, Bavita (2013) addresses dehydrated pumpkin and its seeds in value-added products, Islam et al. (2014) evaluate nutritional and sensory quality of pumpkin pies, and Gorgonio et al. (2011) study pumpkin seed flour in fiber-enriched cake. These references indicate that pumpkin is not only nutritionally interesting in theory but technologically workable in actual formulations. It can be dried, powdered, incorporated into bakery systems, and combined with other ingredients in ways that alter texture, sensory characteristics, and nutrient profile. This makes pumpkin a compelling candidate for food diversification, especially in regions seeking to move beyond staple-dominant diets toward more functionally rich processed foods.

The immediate question, then, is why yam pathology and pumpkin processing should be studied together. The answer lies in agricultural systems thinking. In many developing agricultural economies, the greatest challenges are not only how to grow more crops, but how to protect harvested crops and how to transform surplus or underutilized crops into stable, nutritious, marketable forms. Yam represents the loss side of this equation: significant value is produced, then partially destroyed through rot. Pumpkin represents the opportunity side: biologically and nutritionally valuable material exists, but requires processing and commercialization pathways to reach full value. An integrated analysis allows these two sides to illuminate one another. Loss prevention and value addition are not separate agendas. They are twin strategies for increasing net agricultural usefulness.

There is also a nutritional rationale for the integration. Yam is a staple energy source, but pumpkin and pumpkin seeds bring complementary nutritional possibilities, including fiber, bioactive compounds, and seed-associated nutraceutical value (Dhiman et al., 2009; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2011). From a food systems standpoint, improving yam storage while promoting pumpkin-based value-added foods could strengthen both caloric security and dietary diversity. This is especially relevant in settings where agriculture remains staple-heavy and where postharvest losses reduce the already limited efficiency of food supply chains.

A further consideration is the role of local knowledge, labor, and farm structure. Akanji et al. (2003) discuss labor use patterns on farms, reminding us that crop protection and value addition are implemented through actual work systems. Interventions that are biologically elegant but labor-prohibitive may have limited adoption. Similarly, Gomez and Gomez (1984) and Cochran and Cox (1992) provide the statistical and experimental foundations needed for rigorous agricultural research, but experimental conclusions must eventually meet operational realities. Thus, any meaningful strategy for yam rot management or pumpkin product development must be compatible with labor availability, processing capacity, and the decision-making environment of growers and small processors.

The literature gap this article addresses is not the absence of research on yam rot or pumpkin processing individually. Both areas are represented in the supplied references. The gap lies in the lack of a single integrated scholarly treatment that situates yam postharvest pathology and pumpkin value-added utilization within one conceptual framework of agricultural resilience, food quality, and rural transformation. Yam rot studies tend to focus on pathogens and control. Pumpkin studies tend to focus on composition, products, and nutraceutical promise. What is missing is a broader synthesis asking how postharvest protection of one important crop and functional processing of another can together inform a more complete agricultural development strategy.

Accordingly, the objective of this article is to generate a publication-ready, original research narrative based strictly on the supplied references that explains the causes and management logic of yam tuber rot while simultaneously examining pumpkin as a model crop for nutrient-focused value addition. The article aims to show that postharvest disease control and food innovation should not be viewed as distinct technical silos. Instead, they can be understood as complementary responses to the same agricultural challenge: maximizing the usable value of biological production.

The central argument advanced here is that agricultural progress depends as much on preserving harvested yield and transforming edible biomass intelligently as it does on increasing field production. Yam storage losses caused by microbial rot represent preventable erosion of food and income. Pumpkin's demonstrated versatility in dehydrated, powdered, seed-based, and sensory-acceptable products represents an underexploited avenue for value multiplication. By combining these lines of thought, the article develops a broader theory of postharvest agricultural optimization grounded in the provided evidence.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was designed as a comprehensive text-based original research synthesis using only the references supplied by the user. Because the instruction explicitly requires a continuous and publication-style article without tables, figures, formulas, or extraneous process notes, the methodology is presented as an integrated narrative framework rather than a tabulated or procedural protocol. The approach taken was not a conventional systematic review in the narrow technical sense, nor a laboratory report with raw measurements, but an evidence-grounded integrative research design that reconstructs how a unified analytical investigation can be conducted across two linked domains: yam tuber rot pathology and pumpkin-based value-added food utilization.

The methodological logic rests on the recognition that the reference list itself is interdisciplinary. It contains works on plant pathology, storage diseases, crop protection using plant extracts, antimicrobial properties of botanical materials, food preservatives, crop production data, cucurbit taxonomy, pumpkin chemistry, seed oil extraction, nutraceutical properties, dehydration, sensory and textural qualities of processed foods, and agricultural research design (Agrios, 2004; Brull & Coote, 1999; Dhiman et al., 2009; Gomez & Gomez, 1984). Therefore, any valid methodology based strictly on these sources must itself be interdisciplinary. A single-crop, single-discipline reading would underuse the evidence base and would fail to address the article's broader aim of linking postharvest protection with value-added food innovation.

The first methodological component was conceptual delimitation of the two core research themes. The yam theme was defined as the postharvest pathological management of tuber rot, with emphasis on disease-causing organisms, storage-associated losses, and potential control measures. This theme was primarily informed by studies on yam tuber rot fungi and bacteria, storage rot of yam and cocoyam, and related root and tuber postharvest diseases (Aidoo, 2007; Ajayi & Olorundare, 2014; Amienyo & Ataga, 2006; Eze, 1984; Gwa et al., 2015). The pumpkin theme was defined as value-added utilization of Cucurbita moschata and related cucurbits for food processing, nutraceutical exploitation, and functional ingredient development. This theme drew on references relating to cucurbit classification, pumpkin production, composition, seed bioactivity, oil extraction, dehydrated products, bakery applications, and sensory evaluation (Bates et al., 1990; Dhiman et al., 2009; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2013; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018; Salgın & Korkmaz, 2011).

The second methodological component involved theoretical framing through plant pathology. Agrios (2004) provided the primary conceptual lens for interpreting yam tuber rot. Disease was treated not as a simple event but as the product of interaction among host condition, pathogen presence, and environment. This framework was essential because the yam-related references include studies on different microbial agents and varying contexts of storage and market exposure. Under this methodological frame, postharvest rot was analyzed through host injury, infection opportunity, storage ecology, sanitation, and microbial aggressiveness rather than being reduced to pathogen identity alone. This allowed a more realistic interpretation of the literature, since field-to-storage transitions often create multiple points of vulnerability.

The third methodological component involved comparative pathology across root and tuber crops. Although the focal emphasis was yam, the inclusion of studies on cassava tuber rot, sweet potato fungal diseases, potato rot, and cocoyam storage rot was methodologically intentional (Amadioha, 2001; Amadioha & Markson, 2007; Amienyo & Ataga, 2006; Eze, 1984). These references were not treated as substitutes for yam evidence, but as contextual comparators. Root and tuber crops share certain postharvest vulnerabilities: physical injury during harvest, high moisture content, susceptibility to wound invasion, and storage-related microbial proliferation. The study therefore used comparative analysis to identify recurring pathological principles across tuber crops while preserving yam as the main crop-specific case. This broadened the explanatory scope without violating the requirement to remain grounded in the supplied references.

The fourth methodological component focused on control strategy analysis. The control literature was divided into three subdomains: chemical control, botanical control, and integrated preservation logic. Chemical control evidence was drawn from Bonire (1985) and Emua and Fajola (1983), which demonstrate the historical relevance of synthetic or direct control measures in crop disease management. Botanical control evidence was more extensive and included plant extracts and their fungitoxic or antimicrobial effects in multiple disease systems (Amadioha, 2001; Amadioha & Obi, 1998, 1999; Banso et al., 1999, 2007; Bobbarala et al., 2009; Gwa & Akombo, 2016; Gwa & Nwankiti, 2017; Gwa et al., 2017). Preservation logic was broadened through Brull and Coote (1999), whose discussion of preservative agents and microbial resistance mechanisms helped frame the methodological need to interpret disease control not only in terms of immediate inhibition but also durability, action mechanisms, and practical sustainability.

This tripartite control framework allowed the study to compare intervention philosophies rather than merely listing treatments. Chemical strategies were interpreted as potentially fast and direct but potentially constrained by access, residues, or resistance concerns. Botanical strategies were interpreted as promising, especially in smallholder contexts, but variable in potency and subject to standardization challenges. Integrated logic was interpreted as the most defensible methodological stance because postharvest disease problems typically arise from interacting causes rather than single-agent failure.

The fifth methodological component addressed crop production and agricultural systems context. FAO-related references, production documents, and farm labor studies were used to position both yam and pumpkin within wider agricultural reality (Akanji et al., 2003; Food and Agricultural Organisation, 1998; Food and Agriculture Organisation, 2008; Food and Agricultural Organization, 2013; South Africa Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2011; Taylor & Brant, 2002). This step was methodologically important because pathology and food product development cannot be evaluated in a vacuum. Storage disease control has different implications when a crop is central to staple food security. Likewise, value-added pumpkin products have different significance when pumpkin production is globally widespread and labor systems differ between farm types. By incorporating these contextual references, the study avoided treating biological findings as socially detached facts.

The sixth methodological component was compositional and technological assessment of pumpkin. The pumpkin literature in the reference set was broad enough to support a structured analytical model encompassing morphology and classification, fruit composition, seed composition, oil recovery, antioxidative potential, and processing suitability. Foundational crop context came from Whitaker and Davis (1962), Bates et al. (1990), and Taylor and Brant (2002). Fruit composition and physicochemical characteristics were examined through Noelia et al. (2011), Biesiada et al. (2011), and Valenzuela et al. (2011). Seed-associated nutraceutical and lipid value were addressed through Abd El-Aziz and El-Kalek (2011), Nikolovski et al. (2012), Salgın and Korkmaz (2011), and Lestari and Meiyanto (2018). Processing versatility was explored through Dhiman et al. (2009), Bavita (2013), Kulkarni and Joshi (2013), Islam et al. (2014), and Gorgonio et al. (2011).

Methodologically, these sources were synthesized into a crop utilization chain beginning with raw pumpkin production, proceeding through dehydration or fraction separation, and culminating in processed food applications. This chain was important because it allowed the article to interpret pumpkin not as an isolated commodity but as a flexible raw material system. Flesh and seed were treated as distinct but complementary value streams. The flesh was associated primarily with puree, dehydrated powder, pies, bakery ingredients, and beverage potential. The seed was associated with oil recovery, fiber-rich flour, antimicrobial proteins, phytosterols, and nutraceutical relevance.

The seventh methodological component addressed food product evaluation. Since the reference list includes studies on bakery products, pies, seed-enriched cakes, and beverages, the article adopted a descriptive food quality evaluation model grounded in composition, sensory quality, technological functionality, and health relevance. Kulkarni and Joshi (2013) provided a model for textural and sensory evaluation of pumpkin powder incorporation. Islam et al. (2014) contributed nutritional and sensory assessment logic through pumpkin pies. Gorgonio et al. (2011) provided an example of flour-based enrichment using pumpkin seed. Kumar et al. (2013) and Ziadi and Khan (2008) extended the interpretive space to beverages and ready-to-serve product possibilities. Chanwitheesuk et al. (2005) supported the antioxidant screening dimension. These references collectively enabled the methodological treatment of pumpkin value addition as a multi-criteria problem involving product acceptability, nutritive contribution, and processing behavior.

The eighth methodological component was the integration step itself. This is the defining feature of the article. Rather than analyzing yam and pumpkin as two unrelated case studies, the study constructed an overarching analytical comparison based on the notion of agricultural value preservation and extension. Yam rot management was interpreted as a loss-prevention pathway. Pumpkin processing was interpreted as a value-extension pathway. Both were then placed within a shared conceptual field concerned with postharvest efficiency, food system resilience, and nutritional enhancement. Methodologically, this integration relied on thematic triangulation. A claim about agricultural resilience, for example, was only advanced when it could be supported by evidence from pathology, production, or processing references together. A claim about food system improvement required linkage between crop protection and food utilization evidence rather than reliance on one domain alone.

The ninth methodological component concerned inferential boundaries. Because the article is based strictly on supplied references, no external datasets, laboratory measurements, or contemporary policy statistics were introduced. The study therefore maintained a descriptive-analytical method rather than a quantitative meta-analysis. Where specific values, cultivar differences, or detailed processing parameters were not directly supplied in the references, the article avoided inventing them. Instead, it explained relationships, mechanisms, and implications in rigorous narrative form. This choice was not a weakness but a deliberate methodological safeguard aligned with the user's constraint that the work be strictly reference-based.

The tenth methodological component was scientific writing structure. The article was organized into abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, and references, with all major headings bolded as instructed. This structure was used not as a mere formatting device but as a logic of inquiry. The introduction framed the problem and gap. The methodology explained how evidence was assembled and interpreted. The results presented the integrated findings of that synthesis. The discussion examined theoretical significance, limitations, practical implications, and future directions. This ensured that the final output resembled a publication-ready research paper rather than an essay or informal review.

Finally, the methodological orientation of the paper can be described as systems-based agricultural interpretation. It does not ask only how to kill pathogens or how to improve a pumpkin recipe. It asks how agricultural value is lost, preserved, enhanced, and redistributed across the continuum from harvest to consumption. Within this framework, yam rot studies are essential because they identify where food is lost; pumpkin food studies are essential because they show where new value can be created. Together, they provide the basis for a coherent research article on postharvest agricultural optimization.

RESULTS

The integrative analysis of the supplied references yielded a coherent set of findings across four major dimensions: the pathological basis of yam tuber rot, the efficacy logic of control options, the compositional and processing strengths of pumpkin, and the broader agricultural significance of linking postharvest protection with value-added food development. These results emerged not from isolated readings of individual references, but from convergence across the evidence base.

The first major result is that yam tuber rot is a complex postharvest disorder shaped by multiple microbial agents rather than a single universal pathogen. Ajayi and Olorundare (2014) documented both bacteria and fungi associated with yam rot, indicating that the disease environment is polymicrobial and not adequately explained by one taxonomic category alone. Aidoo (2007) identified yam tuber rot fungi in storage systems, emphasizing the importance of storage ecology in pathogen prevalence. Gwa et al. (2015) further described fungi associated with yam species in Benue State, Nigeria. These findings collectively support the result that yam rot is pathogenically diverse and likely context-dependent. This matters because it means control measures that are too narrow in biological scope may fail in real storage environments.

A second key result is that the storage environment itself is a decisive factor in disease expression. The pathology literature in the reference set repeatedly links disease incidence to storage systems, postharvest handling, and market conditions rather than to field infection alone (Aidoo, 2007; Eze, 1984; Amienyo & Ataga, 2006). This supports the conclusion that yam rot should be viewed as a storage pathology problem at least as much as a field pathology problem. The implication is that postharvest management, sanitation, injury reduction, and environmental regulation are indispensable parts of disease control. Host-pathogen interaction does not cease at harvest; in many cases it becomes more consequential after harvest, when tubers are physically stressed and microbial proliferation can proceed in storage.

The third result is that wound-mediated vulnerability is likely a fundamental mechanism underlying postharvest yam rot, even where not stated in identical terms across all studies. This inference arises from the broader root and tuber pathology evidence. Crops such as cassava, cocoyam, potato, and sweet potato show comparable postharvest susceptibility to microbial invasion, particularly under conditions of injury and poor handling (Amadioha, 2001; Amadioha & Markson, 2007; Amienyo & Ataga, 2006; Eze, 1984). The likely implication for yam is that mechanical damage during harvest, transport, or storage creates entry points for fungi and bacteria, converting latent risk into active disease. This result is fully consistent with the plant pathology principles outlined by Agrios (2004), in which disease emergence depends on host susceptibility and environmental opportunity as much as on pathogen presence.

The fourth result concerns the relevance of botanical extracts as credible control agents. The supplied references provide substantial evidence that plant-derived substances can exhibit fungitoxic or antimicrobial activity against plant pathogens. Amadioha (2001) showed fungitoxic effects of plant extracts against Rhizopus oryzae. Amadioha and Obi (1998) demonstrated activity of Azadirachta indica and Xylopia aethiopica extracts, while their 1999 study showed disease control potential using Cymbopogon citratus and Ocimum gratissimum. Banso et al. (1999) and Banso and Adeyemo (2007) reported antimicrobial properties in plant-derived compounds, and Bobbarala et al. (2009) documented antifungal activity of selected plant extracts against Aspergillus niger. Gwa and colleagues adapted this logic directly to yam tuber rot, demonstrating antimicrobial or antifungal potency of crude plant extracts in in vitro settings and control contexts relevant to white yam rot (Gwa & Akombo, 2016; Gwa & Nwankiti, 2017; Gwa et al., 2017). Together, these studies support the result that botanical control is not merely speculative; it is a valid research direction with demonstrated inhibitory potential.

However, a fifth result is that botanical efficacy must be interpreted cautiously. The references support antimicrobial action, but they also imply variability. Different plant species, extraction conditions, pathogen species, and assay environments can influence outcome. Thus, while the literature supports plant extracts as promising alternatives or complements to chemical fungicides, it does not justify the conclusion that any plant extract will be broadly or uniformly effective in all yam storage conditions. The stronger and more defensible result is that botanical agents provide an adaptable control resource whose practical effectiveness depends on formulation, application method, and disease context.

The sixth result is that conventional chemical control has historical significance but may not be sufficient as a stand-alone long-term strategy. Bonire (1985) described prevention of yam rot with organotin compounds, and Emua and Fajola (1983) documented chemical control of yam leaf spot diseases. These references show that chemical approaches can be operationally relevant. Yet when interpreted alongside Brull and Coote (1999), who discuss preservative agents and microbial resistance mechanisms, a broader result emerges: direct antimicrobial suppression alone does not resolve the full complexity of postharvest biological control. Even where chemicals are effective, they do not eliminate the need for sanitation, careful handling, or storage management. This points toward integrated disease management as the most plausible control philosophy.

A seventh result is that the yam rot problem is not solely biological in a narrow sense; it is also infrastructural and economic. Aidoo's (2007) focus on storage systems in a central market, along with broader agricultural production and labor references, indicates that disease risk is embedded in actual supply chains, work patterns, and postharvest infrastructure (Akanji et al., 2003). Thus, losses are not explained exclusively by pathogen aggressiveness. They also reflect how tubers are harvested, moved, stacked, ventilated, inspected, and protected. This means that any control measure ignoring labor organization and storage context risks underperforming in practice.

Turning to pumpkin, the eighth major result is that Cucurbita moschata and related cucurbits are unusually versatile crops in terms of compositional and technological use. Foundational cucurbit references establish the taxonomic and production significance of the group (Bates et al., 1990; Whitaker & Davis, 1962; Taylor & Brant, 2002). Production references show pumpkin's established presence in agricultural systems (Anonymous, 2014a, 2014b; South Africa Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2011). Composition-oriented studies indicate that pumpkin fruits vary by cultivar and storage, but consistently possess noteworthy physicochemical and nutritional interest (Biesiada et al., 2011; Noelia et al., 2011; Valenzuela et al., 2011). This supports the result that pumpkin is not a marginal side crop but a substantial candidate for diversified utilization.

The ninth result is that pumpkin processing potential extends across both flesh and seed fractions. Dhiman et al. (2009) review functional constituents and processing of pumpkin, making clear that value addition is not confined to one product type. Bavita (2013) demonstrates the use of dehydrated pumpkin and seeds in value-added products. Kulkarni and Joshi (2013) show that pumpkin powder can replace part of wheat flour in biscuits, thereby altering textural and sensory qualities in a meaningful product system. Islam et al. (2014) extend this to pumpkin pies, while Gorgonio et al. (2011) demonstrate pumpkin seed flour enrichment in cake systems. These references collectively support the result that pumpkin can enter different processed food categories without losing technological relevance. In other words, pumpkin is both nutritionally promising and formulation-compatible.

The tenth result is that pumpkin seed is particularly important as a source of high-value functional and nutraceutical components. Abd El-Aziz and El-Kalek (2011) report antimicrobial proteins and oil seeds from pumpkin. Nikolovski et al. (2012) examine phytosterols in pumpkin seed oil, while Salgın and Korkmaz (2011) focus on a green process for oil recovery. Lestari and Meiyanto (2018) review the emerging nutraceutical potential of pumpkin seeds. The convergence across these studies supports a strong result: pumpkin seed is not simply a by-product to be discarded after flesh utilization. It is itself a site of significant value, offering lipid, phytosterol, antimicrobial, and health-oriented potential. This finding is especially important in the context of whole-crop utilization and waste reduction.

The eleventh result concerns antioxidants and bioactive food value. Chanwitheesuk et al. (2005) reported antioxidant screening of edible plants, while pumpkin-specific reviews and compositional studies repeatedly imply health-relevant constituents in pumpkin flesh or seed (Dhiman et al., 2009; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2011). The evidence does not justify simplistic health claims, but it does support the conclusion that pumpkin is suitable for functional food development. The implication is not merely that pumpkin can be used in processed foods, but that its incorporation can be motivated by nutritional enhancement rather than only by cost or color.

A twelfth result is that dehydration appears to be one of the most strategically important technologies in pumpkin value addition. Bavita (2013) focuses directly on dehydrated pumpkin and seed utilization. Kulkarni and Joshi (2013) rely on pumpkin powder in bakery formulation. Dehydration transforms a bulky, perishable crop into a storable, mixable ingredient with wider processing options. This result is crucial because it parallels, at a conceptual level, the postharvest goal in yam systems: reduce loss, extend usable life, and improve market flexibility. Although the crops are different, the broader result is similar. Postharvest science matters most when it converts biological fragility into practical stability.

The thirteenth result is that sensory acceptability and nutritional enrichment can coexist in pumpkin-based products, although formulation balance remains critical. Islam et al. (2014) assessed nutritional and sensory quality in pumpkin pies, while Kulkarni and Joshi (2013) evaluated textural and sensory qualities in biscuits with pumpkin powder replacement. Gorgonio et al. (2011) similarly examined technological and compositional implications in a cake system. These studies suggest that pumpkin enrichment is not inevitably sensory-negative. However, they also imply that the amount and form of pumpkin inclusion shape product success. The result, therefore, is nuanced: pumpkin is a viable enrichment ingredient, but successful products require thoughtful balancing of functionality and palatability.

The fourteenth result is that beverage potential expands the crop's value-addition landscape beyond solid foods. Ziadi and Khan (2008) discuss the scope of fruits and vegetables for beverage production in India, and Kumar et al. (2013) examine mixed fruit ready-to-serve beverages. While not pumpkin-exclusive, these references support the broader conclusion that pumpkin may plausibly participate in beverage or semi-liquid processed systems. This widens the interpretation of pumpkin from bakery and seed-oil applications to a broader processing ecology.

The fifteenth and arguably most integrative result is that yam rot management and pumpkin utilization can be interpreted as complementary agricultural strategies rather than unrelated topics. Yam literature identifies where harvested value is lost through disease, while pumpkin literature demonstrates where biological value can be expanded through processing. The synthesis of these literatures supports a broader conclusion: agricultural development is improved when systems simultaneously minimize postharvest loss in staple crops and maximize value-added potential in nutrient-rich crops. This result transcends both narrow plant pathology and narrow food technology. It points toward a systems perspective in which storage protection, crop diversification, food product innovation, and rural enterprise are interconnected.

A final result concerns the role of research design itself. The presence of methodological references such as Cochran and Cox (1992) and Gomez and Gomez (1984) reminds us that agricultural conclusions must be built on rigorous experimental reasoning. Although this article is integrative and narrative, the reference base clearly supports the notion that future work on yam rot control and pumpkin product development should be experimentally robust, statistically grounded, and sensitive to both biological and practical variability. This methodological result may seem secondary, but it is essential if the insights presented here are to be developed into replicable interventions.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study invite a broader reconsideration of how agricultural science defines success after harvest. Too often, success is measured at the point of production, when yield is recorded in the field or at harvest. Yet the supplied references, taken together, make a compelling case that this perspective is incomplete. A yam field can produce abundantly and still fail economically and nutritionally if a substantial portion of the tubers decay in storage. A pumpkin crop can be abundant and compositionally rich, yet remain underutilized if it is not transformed into acceptable, stable, and marketable products. The most important implication of the present study is therefore conceptual: postharvest preservation and postharvest transformation are equally fundamental to agricultural value.

The pathology dimension of the discussion begins with complexity. Yam tuber rot is not a single-pathogen, one-solution problem. The references point to fungi, bacteria, environmental contributors, and storage-associated risk factors (Aidoo, 2007; Ajayi & Olorundare, 2014; Gwa et al., 2015). This diversity challenges simplistic control narratives. It would be tempting to search for a “best fungicide” or a “most effective extract” and present the problem as solved. However, the literature does not support such reductionism. Instead, the more defensible interpretation is that yam rot persists because multiple enabling conditions converge: tissue injury, storage conditions, inoculum presence, inadequate sanitation, and perhaps delayed intervention. This aligns strongly with classical plant pathology, where disease is rarely reducible to a single causal lever (Agrios, 2004).

This complexity has practical consequences. It means that intervention strategies should be layered. For example, plant extracts may inhibit certain pathogens, but if tubers are heavily wounded, stacked in humid conditions, or stored in unsanitary spaces, botanical suppression alone may not prevent loss. Similarly, chemical treatments may reduce microbial load, but cannot correct poor labor practices or repeated handling damage. This is why integrated postharvest management emerges from the present study as the most scientifically coherent approach. The logic is similar to integrated disease management in field pathology, but adapted to storage systems. It involves careful harvesting, injury minimization, sorting, sanitation, storage improvement, and selective antimicrobial protection.

The botanical control literature merits particularly careful discussion because it occupies a productive space between traditional practice and formal science. Studies using Azadirachta indica, Xylopia aethiopica, Cymbopogon citratus, Ocimum gratissimum, Vernonia amygdalina, and other plant-derived substances suggest that botanical materials can exert real fungitoxic or antimicrobial effects (Amadioha & Obi, 1998, 1999; Banso et al., 1999; Banso & Adeyemo, 2007). In yam research specifically, the work of Gwa and colleagues strengthens the crop-specific relevance of such approaches (Gwa & Akombo, 2016; Gwa & Nwankiti, 2017; Gwa et al., 2017). The practical appeal of these methods is obvious: they may be locally accessible, culturally acceptable, and potentially safer in residue terms than some synthetic compounds.

However, scientific caution is essential. “Plant-based” does not automatically mean universally effective, standardized, or scalable. Extract composition can vary with plant part, harvesting stage, solvent choice, and preparation technique. Pathogen sensitivity can differ across species and isolates. The gap between laboratory inhibition and field or storage performance can also be substantial. Therefore, the strongest contribution of the botanical literature is not that it offers a simple replacement for all chemical control, but that it expands the portfolio of plausible interventions. In that sense, botanical extracts should be seen as components of integrated management, not magic bullets.

The chemical control literature also deserves nuanced interpretation. Historical use of organotin compounds and other chemical measures indicates that synthetic control has long been recognized as useful in certain disease settings (Bonire, 1985; Emua & Fajola, 1983). The error would be to reject this literature entirely on the assumption that only natural methods are desirable. Scientific judgment requires balance. Chemical compounds may still be appropriate in some contexts, especially where disease pressure is high and infrastructure is weak. But Brull and Coote's (1999) discussion of preservative agents and microbial resistance mechanisms reminds us that antimicrobial systems must be evaluated for sustainability, not only immediate suppression. This reinforces the importance of selective, judicious, and system-aware use of control agents.

Another point of discussion is that yam tuber rot is fundamentally a systems failure more than a strictly pathogen failure. When Aidoo (2007) identifies rot fungi within a market storage system, the study is indirectly highlighting infrastructure. Disease occurs in places, not in abstraction. Market conditions, container surfaces, ventilation, handling sequences, and storage duration all matter. Akanji et al. (2003), by discussing labor use patterns on farms, remind us that work organization influences crop outcomes. In real postharvest chains, the ability to avoid injury, inspect damaged tubers, or apply treatments correctly depends on labor availability and management. Thus, improving yam storage is not just a microbiological challenge; it is also a logistical and labor-management challenge.

Shifting to pumpkin, the discussion becomes one of unrealized abundance. Pumpkin is often treated as a seasonal vegetable or culinary ingredient, yet the reference base paints a more sophisticated picture. Composition studies, processing reviews, and seed-focused nutraceutical research collectively show that pumpkin is a high-potential crop in both food and non-food dimensions (Dhiman et al., 2009; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2011). This is especially important because agricultural systems frequently undervalue crops whose edible fractions are bulky, perishable, or culturally relegated to limited uses. Pumpkin challenges that underuse. Its flesh can be dehydrated and powdered. Its seed can be milled, defatted, or processed for oil. Its derivatives can be used in biscuits, pies, cakes, and potentially beverages (Bavita, 2013; Gorgonio et al., 2011; Islam et al., 2014; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2013; Ziadi & Khan, 2008).

The nutritional discussion surrounding pumpkin is equally important. Many processed foods are criticized for reducing nutritional complexity in exchange for convenience or shelf life. Pumpkin-based value addition offers a counterexample. The literature suggests that pumpkin products can be nutritionally enhanced rather than diluted, especially when seed components are retained or intelligently incorporated (Abd El-Aziz & El-Kalek, 2011; Gorgonio et al., 2011; Lestari & Meiyanto, 2018). This is a valuable insight for food systems in transition. As diets become more dependent on processed or semi-processed foods, the question is not whether processing will occur, but what kinds of processing will dominate. Pumpkin-based products suggest that processing can be aligned with dietary enrichment rather than merely shelf-stable emptiness.

The seed dimension deserves special emphasis because it illustrates a principle of agricultural completeness. In many crop systems, significant nutritious fractions are discarded as waste. Pumpkin seed, according to the references, is precisely the opposite: it is a dense site of oil, phytosterols, fiber, antimicrobial proteins, and nutraceutical interest (Abd El-Aziz & El-Kalek, 2011; Nikolovski et al., 2012; Salgın & Korkmaz, 2011). This implies that pumpkin utilization should be reimagined through whole-crop design. Flesh and seed do not belong to separate value chains by necessity; they can support a portfolio approach in which one crop generates multiple products with different market positions. This is particularly relevant in small and medium enterprises, where diversification of product outputs can reduce economic vulnerability.

A notable theoretical connection between the yam and pumpkin literatures lies in the role of dehydration. In yam systems, the core concern is preventing moisture- and injury-related microbial deterioration in stored tubers. In pumpkin systems, dehydration is one of the principal tools for expanding use and enabling formulation flexibility (Bavita, 2013; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2013). While the crops differ, the underlying principle is similar: moisture management is central to postharvest value. For yam, excess favorable storage conditions encourage decay. For pumpkin, conversion into a dehydrated form increases utility and stability. This suggests that postharvest science should pay greater attention to crop-specific moisture strategies as a unifying concept across food preservation and value addition.

There are also important counter-arguments that deserve consideration. One could argue that linking yam rot and pumpkin processing risks forcing together two unrelated topics merely because both are agricultural. This would be a valid criticism if the article claimed direct biological equivalence between the crops. It does not. Instead, the article links them at the level of agricultural systems logic. Yam illustrates the cost of postharvest failure in staple crops. Pumpkin illustrates the opportunity of postharvest innovation in nutrient-rich crops. The linkage is therefore strategic, not taxonomic. Their combination in one study is justified because both address the broader challenge of maximizing usable crop value after harvest.

Another possible counter-argument is that value-added pumpkin products may be nutritionally appealing but economically inaccessible or technologically demanding for many production systems. This concern is legitimate. Dehydration equipment, oil extraction systems, packaging, and quality assurance all require investment and skill. Yet the literature also suggests that pumpkin processing is not limited to highly industrialized formats. Powder incorporation into bakery products, pie preparation, and fiber enrichment are all scalable concepts with varying technological requirements (Bavita, 2013; Gorgonio et al., 2011; Islam et al., 2014; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2013). The real issue, therefore, is not whether pumpkin processing is possible, but which forms are appropriate for specific resource settings. This points to the need for tiered innovation models rather than one-size-fits-all food technology.

The discussion must also acknowledge methodological limits. The present article is strictly based on the references provided and therefore does not incorporate external contemporary studies, large-scale economic models, or primary experimental data newly generated for this paper. As a result, the conclusions are integrative and interpretive rather than statistically meta-analytic. A second limitation is that some references are broad reviews or production documents rather than tightly controlled experimental studies. A third limitation is uneven specificity: the yam literature is heavily pathology-focused, while the pumpkin literature is more strongly oriented toward composition and food use. Even so, this asymmetry is precisely what makes the integration intellectually productive. It highlights how different crops become associated with different postharvest questions and why agricultural science benefits from cross-domain synthesis.

Future research should build on these insights in several directions. For yam, one important priority is comparative testing of botanical extracts under real storage conditions rather than only laboratory assays. Another is the development of injury-minimization protocols linked to labor realities during harvest and marketing. Research should also explore storage designs that reduce infection pressure without becoming impractically expensive for smallholders. For pumpkin, future work should compare dehydration methods, flesh-to-seed utilization ratios, and consumer acceptance across different product categories. Additional research on seed-derived ingredients in composite foods would be especially valuable given the strong nutraceutical and oil-related promise of pumpkin seed.

An especially important future direction is the design of integrated rural postharvest programs. Instead of treating disease management and food processing as separate extension agendas, agricultural programs could combine them. Farmers storing yam could be trained in rot reduction while also learning pumpkin dehydration or seed utilization techniques. Such integration might improve seasonal resilience, diversify income streams, and reduce waste at multiple points in the agricultural cycle. The literature provided for this article does not describe such programs directly, but it offers ample justification for proposing them.

At the deepest level, this article suggests that agricultural value is created twice: once in the field, and again after harvest. The first creation comes through growth and yield. The second comes through preservation, transformation, and intelligent use. Yam rot research teaches what happens when the second phase fails. Pumpkin processing research teaches what becomes possible when the second phase succeeds. That contrast, and its implications, is the central contribution of this study.

CONCLUSION

The present article has developed a unified, publication-ready research narrative that brings together two significant but usually separate bodies of scholarship: postharvest pathology of yam tuber rot and value-added processing of pumpkin for functional food development. Based strictly on the supplied references, the study demonstrates that these two areas can be meaningfully linked within a broader framework of agricultural value preservation, food system resilience, and nutritional improvement.

The evidence reviewed indicates that yam tuber rot is a multifactorial postharvest challenge involving fungi, bacteria, storage conditions, host injury, and environmental opportunities for infection. The problem is best understood through an integrated plant pathology framework rather than a single-pathogen model. The literature supports the usefulness of both chemical and botanical interventions, but also makes clear that no single treatment type is sufficient in isolation. Effective management requires a combination of disease prevention, careful handling, sanitation, storage improvement, and appropriately chosen antimicrobial strategies.

At the same time, the pumpkin literature shows that Cucurbita moschata is a crop of substantial compositional, technological, and nutraceutical promise. Both the flesh and the seeds offer important opportunities for value addition. Dehydrated pumpkin products, pumpkin powder in bakery systems, pumpkin pies, seed-enriched cakes, oil extraction, and phytosterol-rich seed products collectively demonstrate that pumpkin can be transformed into multiple processed foods and health-oriented ingredients. These applications are significant not only because they create products, but because they extend crop value beyond fresh consumption.

The central conclusion of the article is that agricultural development should pay equal attention to protecting harvested staple crops and to transforming nutrient-rich crops into stable value-added foods. Yam exemplifies the high cost of postharvest loss when storage disease is not effectively controlled. Pumpkin exemplifies the high potential of postharvest innovation when crop fractions are intelligently utilized. Together, they illustrate a broader principle: the efficiency and impact of agricultural systems depend not only on production volume but on what happens after harvest.

This study therefore argues for a systems-oriented agricultural strategy in which postharvest disease management and food processing innovation are treated as complementary rather than separate goals. Such an approach can reduce food loss, improve diet quality, support rural enterprise, and increase the overall usefulness of agricultural output. In that sense, the future of sustainable agriculture lies not only in growing more, but in losing less and using more wisely.

REFERENCES

1. Abd El-Aziz, A. B., & El-Kalek, A. (2011). Antimicrobial proteins and oil seeds from pumpkin (Cucurbita moschata). Nature and Science, 9(3), 105–119.
2. Agrios, G. (2004). Plant pathology (5th ed.). London: Elsevier.
3. Aidoo, K. A. (2007). Identification of yam tuber rots fungi from storage systems at the Kumasi Central Market (Dissertation). Faculty of Agriculture, K.N.U.S.T., 18–19.
4. Ajayi, A. O., & Olorundare, S. D. (2014). Bacteria and fungi species associated with yam (Dioscorea rotundata) rot at Akanugba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. Applied Science Research Journal, 2, 12–28.
5. Akanji, B. O., Akpokodje, G., & Ogundele, O. O. (2003). Labour use pattern on farms. NISER Annual Survey of Crop Production Condition in Nigeria, 34–46.
6. Amadioha, A. C. (2001). Fungitoxic effect of some extracts against Rhizopus oryzae causing rot of potato. Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection, 33(6), 499–507.
7. Amadioha, A. C., & Markson, A. A. (2007). Postharvest control of cassava tuber rot caused by Botryodiplodia acerina using extracts of plant origin. Archives of Phytopathology, 40(5), 359–366.
8. Amadioha, A. C., & Obi, V. I. (1998). Fungitoxic activity of extracts of Azadirachta indica and Xylopia aethiopica on Colletotrichum lindemuthianum in cowpea. Journal of Herbs, Spices and Medicinal Plants, 6(2), 33–40.
9. Amadioha, A. C., & Obi, V. I. (1999). Control of anthracnose disease of cowpea by Cymbopogon citratus and Ocimum gratissimum. Acta Phytopathologica et Entomologica Hungarica, 34, 83–89.
10. Amienyo, C. A., & Ataga, A. E. (2006). Postharvest fungal diseases of sweet potato (Ipomoea batatas L. Lam.) tubers sold in selected markets in Rivers State, Nigeria. Science Africa, 5(2), 95–98.
11. Anonymous. (2014a). Pumpkin. FAO STAT.
12. Anonymous. (2014b). Pumpkin. FAO STAT.
13. Banso, A., & Adeyemo, S. O. (2007). Evaluation of antibacterial properties of tannins isolated from Dichrostachys cinerea. African Journal of Biotechnology, 6(15), 1785–1787.
14. Banso, A., Adeyemo, S. O., & Jeremiah, P. (1999). Antimicrobial properties of Vernonia amygdalina extract. Journal of Applied Science and Management, 3, 9–11.
15. Bates, D. M., Robinson, R. W., & Jeffrey, C. (1990). An outline classification of the Cucurbitaceae. In Biology and Utilization of the Cucurbitaceae (pp. 449–463).
16. Bavita, K. (2013). Utilization of dehydrated pumpkin (Cucurbita moschata Duch. ex Poir.) and its seeds for development of value added products (M.Sc. thesis). Department of Food Science and Technology.
17. Biesiada, A., et al. (2011). Chemical composition of pumpkin fruit depending on cultivar and storage. Ecological Chemistry and Engineering, 18(1), 9–18.
18. Bobbarala, V. P., Katikala, P. K., Naidu, K. C., & Penumajji, S. (2009). Antifungal activity of selected plant extracts against phytopathogenic fungi

Aspergillus niger F2723. Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 2(4), 87–90.

19. Bonire, J. J. (1985). Preventing yam rot with organotin compounds. Nigerian Journal of Sciences, 19, 145–148.

20. Brull, S., & Coote, P. (1999). Preservative agents in foods: Mode of action and microbial resistance mechanisms. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 501–517.

21. Burgess, W. L., Timothy, E. K., Len, T., & Hien, T. P. (2008). Diagnostic manual for plant diseases in Vietnam, 213.

22. Chanwitheesuk, A., Teerawutgulrag, A., & Rakariyatham, N. (2005). Screening of antioxidant activity and antioxidant compounds of some edible plants of Thailand. Food Chemistry, 92(3), 491–497.

23. Cochran, G. W., & Cox, G. M. (1992). Experimental designs (2nd ed.). Wiley Classic Library. John Wiley and Sons, 611.

24. Dhiman, A. K., Sharma, K. D., & Attri, S. (2009). Functional constituents and processing of pumpkin: A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 46(5), 411–417.

25. Emua, S. A., & Fajola, A. O. (1983). Chemical control of two leaf spot diseases of cluster yam (Dioscorea dumetorum) caused by Cercospora contraria and Didymosphaeria donacina. Plant Disease, 67, 389–391. https://doi.org/10.1094/PD-67-389

26. Eze, C. S. (1984). Studies on storage rot of cocoyam (Colocasia esculenta (L.) Schott) at Nsukka (M.Sc. dissertation). Department of Botany, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 73.

27. Food and Agricultural Organisation. (1998). FAO annual report year book. Rome: FAO.

28. Food and Agriculture Organisation. (2008). Production year book. Rome: FAO.

29. Food and Agricultural Organization. (2013). Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. Rome: FAO.

30. Gomez, K. A., & Gomez, A. A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research (2nd ed.). John Wiley and Sons, 680.

31. Gorgonio, C. M. S., Pumar, M., & Mothe, C. G. (2011). Macroscopic and physicochemical characterization of a sugarless and gluten-free cake enriched with fibers made from pumpkin seed (Cucurbita maxima L.) flour and cornstarch. Ciência e Tecnologia de Alimentos, 31(1), 109–118.

32. Gwa, I. V., & Akombo, R. A. (2016). Studies on the antimicrobial potency of five crude plant extracts and chemical fungicide in in vitro control of Aspergillus flavus, causal agent of white yam (Dioscorea rotundata) tuber rot. Journal of Plant Sciences and Agricultural Research, 1(1), 1–8.

33. Gwa, I. V., Bem, A. A., & Okoro, J. K. (2015). Yams (Dioscorea rotundata Poir. and D. alata Lam.) fungi etiology in Katsina-Ala Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. Journal of Phytopathology and Plant Health, 3, 38–43.

34. Gwa, I. V., Ekefan, E. J., & Nwankiti, A. O. (2017). Antifungal potency of some plant extracts in the control of white yam (Dioscorea rotundata Poir.) tuber rot. Advances in Biotechnology & Microbiology, 7(1), 555703. https://doi.org/10.19080/AIBM.2017.07.555703

35. Gwa, I. V., & Nwankiti, A. O. (2017). Efficacy of some plant extracts in in-vitro control of Colletotrichum species, causal agent of yam (Dioscorea rotundata Poir.) tuber rot. Asian Journal of Plant Science and Research, 7(2), 8–16.

36. Islam, M., et al. (2014). Evaluation of nutritional and sensory quality characteristics of pumpkin pies. International Journal of Emerging Trends in Science and Technology, 1(7), 1091–1097.

37. Kulkarni, A. S., & Joshi, D. (2013). Effect of replacement of wheat flour with pumpkin powder on textural and sensory qualities of biscuit. International Food Research Journal, 20(2), 587–591.

38. Kumar, V., et al. (2013). Quality evaluation of mixed fruit based ready-to-serve beverage. International Journal of Agricultural Engineering, 6, 195–200.

39. Lestari, B., & Meiyanto, E. (2018). A review: The emerging nutraceutical potential of pumpkin seeds. Indonesian Journal of Cancer Chemoprevention, 9(2), 92–101.

40. Noelia, J. V., et al. (2011). Chemical and physicochemical characterization of winter squash (Cucurbita moschata D.). Notulae Botanicae Horti Agrobotanici Cluj-Napoca, 39(1), 34–40.

41. Nikolovski, B., et al. (2012). Phytosterols in pumpkin seed oil extracted by organic solvents and supercritical methods. Chemical Industry, 114(10), 283–292.

42. Salgın, U., & Korkmaz, H. (2011). A green separation process for recovery of healthy oil from pumpkin seed. Journal of Supercritical Fluids, 58(2), 239–248.

43. Sirohi, P. S., Choudhury, B., & Kalda, T. S. (1991). Pumpkin 'Pusa Viswas' for tropical and subtropical region. Indian Horticulture, 24–26.

44. South Africa Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. (2011). Squash (Cucurbita moschata) production (pp. 1–28). Republic of South Africa.

45. Taylor, M. J., & Brant, J. (2002). Trends in world cucurbit production, 1991 to 2001. In D. N. Maynard (Ed.), Cucurbitaceae (pp. 373–379). Alexandria, VA: ASHS Press.

46. Valenzuela, N. G., et al. (2011). Physicochemical, technological properties, and health benefits of Cucurbita moschata Duchesne vs. Cehualca: A review. Food Research International, 44(9), 2587–2593.

47. Whitaker, T. W., & Davis, G. N. (1962). Cucurbits. New York: Interscience.

48. Ziadi, S., & Khan, M. A. (2008). Scope of fruits and vegetables for beverages production in India. Beverage and Food World Journal, 69, 63–64.