

## PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF SOME WHITE YAM (*Dioscorea rotundata* Poir) LINES FOR MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERS, YIELD AND RESISTANCE TO INSECT PESTS AND YAM LEAF MOSAIC VIRUS IN AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA

Bassey<sup>1</sup>, E. E., Nwankwo<sup>2</sup>, I. I. M. and Eke-Okoro<sup>2</sup>, O. N.

### ABSTRACT

<sup>1</sup>Department of Crop Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Uyo, Nigeria. <sup>2</sup>National Root Crops Research Institute, Umudike, Nigeria. emmanuelessien@rocketmail.com; emmanuelbas\_129@yahoo.com +2348024686153, +2349081333872

Field experiments were conducted in two locations, Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria in 2016 cropping season to evaluate fourteen advanced guinea white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*) lines vis-à-vis the national and local checks for morphological characters, yield and resistance to insect pests and yam leaf mosaic virus so as to identify superior ones for advancement to Uniform Yield Trial (UYT). The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Results indicated significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) in all the morphological characters and yield and local components in both locations. Three advanced guinea white yam lines: 98/00933, 07/00168 and Obiauturugo were superior over the national (89/02665) and local (UL-A-1) checks in all characters studied as well as resistance to insect pests and yam leaf mosaic virus. The 98/00933 genotype was superior over others in eight characters, namely, tuber length (27.79 cm, 27.62 cm), number of ware yam per plot (4.36, 4.37), number of ware yam per hectare (2073.3, 2068.5), fresh weight of ware yam per plot (2.193 kg, 2.192 kg), fresh weight of ware yam ( $t\ ha^{-1}$ ) (19.166, 19.158) and total fresh tuber yield (21.372  $t\ ha^{-1}$ , 21.370  $t\ ha^{-1}$ ) and resistance to insect pests [(yam beetle (1) and leaf beetle (2)] and leaf mosaic virus (2), followed by 07/00168 in three characters, namely, circumference of tubers (20.72cm, 21.02cm), fresh weight of seed yam per plot (3.026kg, 3.025kg) and fresh weight of seed yam (6.052  $t\ ha^{-1}$ , 6.050  $t\ ha^{-1}$ ), while Obiauturugo was superior in two, namely, fresh weight of seed yam per plot (2.666 kg, 2.664 kg) and fresh weight of seed yam (5.480  $t\ ha^{-1}$ , 5.332  $t\ ha^{-1}$ ). The three yam lines could be advanced to the Uniform Yield Trial in the area.

**Keywords:** Guinea white yam, morphological characters, yield, insect pests, leaf mosaic virus, resistance.

### INTRODUCTION

The guinea white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*) belongs to the family, *Dioscoreaceae*, (Aighewi et al., 2001). It is considered to be indigenous to West Africa (Degras, 2000) and the Niger-Benue trough is pin pointed as the probable Centre of domestication (Hahn et al., 1987). Yam is a major staple food in many tropical countries particularly West Africa, the Caribbean, South America, India, South East Asia and South Pacific (IITA, 2014). Yam is produced in 5 million hectares in about 47 countries in tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world (Nweke et al., 1991). It is also a cash as well as a socio-cultural crop in Nigeria. It is the only crop which is usually celebrated during and after harvest, called yam festivals (Ugwu, 1996). Yam is also highly regarded in Jamaican ceremonies and many West African countries. In many yam producing areas in Nigeria, "yam is food and food is yam". Nigeria is the largest world producer of yam with more than 45.004 million tonnes annually and the largest consumer of yam (Ezulike et al., 2006), with Ghana (7.119 mmt), Cote d' Voire (5.808 mmt), Benin (3.220 mmt) and Ethiopia (1.448 mmt) (FAO, 2014) following that order. Yam may be barbecued, roasted, fried in oil, grilled, boiled, baked, smoked, pounded into paste (fofoo) or grated and produced into a dessert recipe. It may be cooked with rice, beans, plantain, sweet potato, lamb, chicken and butter nut as squash soup (Umar et al., 2006). It can also be boiled, roasted and eaten with oil, vegetable (Ubo) or sauce (IITA, 2004; Timothy and Bassey, 2009). The tubers may be peeled and sliced into tiny pieces and dried to very low moisture content and ground into flour and flakes (Udoh et al., 2005). The tubers may be peeled and prepared into porridge with traditional spices and served to the sick and aged as appetizer (Nwankwo and Bassey, 2013).

Yam prices have been increasing in recent years because of a strong demand for the crop in Africa, and even in Europe and the United States of America where rapidly growing West African migrant communities still have a big appetite for their traditionally preferred staple. Nigeria exported US \$27.7 million worth of yam to the United State of America in 2011. Average yam consumption per capital per day is highest in Benin (364 kcal) followed by Cote d'Ivoire (342 kcal), Ghana (296 kcal) and Nigeria (258 kcal) (IITA, 2009). Yields are about 11  $tha^{-1}$  on average in major yam producing countries of West Africa and 11-14  $tha^{-1}$  in West Indies (Anuebunwa, 2002). However, higher yields of more than 29.6  $t / ha$  under good management have been reported (Adeniji et al., 2001). Yam production is labour intensive and pest/disease incidence increases production costs and may reduce yields (Ugwu, 1996). Collaborative evaluation of IITA derived breeding lines with the National Root Crops Research Institute, Umudike, Nigeria and the Crop Research Institute, Ghana resulted in the release of ten varieties of *D. rotundata* between 2001 and 2009 in Nigeria and 1(one) in 2007 in Ghana. More lines have been released by research institutes in Nigeria, Ghana, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Sieria Leone, Togo and Liberia with

multiple pest and disease resistance, wide adaptability, higher yields and good organoleptic attributes (IITA, 2013). Therefore, the study was conducted to evaluate fourteen advanced guinea white yam lines vis-à-vis the national and local checks for morphological characters, yield performance and resistance to insect pests and yam leaf mosaic virus so as to identify superior ones for advancement to Uniform Yield Trial (UYT).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in 2016 cropping seasons in two locations (Itu and Uyo) in Akwa Ibom State. The areas situate within latitude 15° 02' north and longitude 07° 56' east of the Greenwich meridian, and altitude 38m above sea level. It lies in the humid high rainfall area of southeastern Nigeria with average rainfall of over 2500mm per annum and mean daily sunshine of 3 hours, 31 minutes. The temperature is generally high, ranging from 23°C to 34°C throughout the year. The average humidity is about 76 percent with the lowest and highest in January/December and July, respectively. The sites had fairly flat terrain. Soil samples were randomly collected using soil auger at depths 0-15cm and 15-30cm. The samples were air dried, crushed gently with wooden pestle in a porcelain mortar and sieved through a 2mm sieve. The samples were bulked and a representative sample of each site was analysed for physico-chemical properties as an aid to fertilizer application.

The treatments were sixteen guinea white yam genotypes. Fifteen (15) were advanced guinea white yam lines supplied by the National Root Crops Research Institute, Umudike, Nigeria for 2016 National Co-ordinated Trial, namely: 99AMO/XA, 89/02665 (National Check), 99/AMO/116, 98/00933, Nwarpoko, 07/00168, Obiauturugo, 99/AMO/109, Adaka, 99/AMO/095A, 99/AMO/114, 00606, 99/AMO/60, AME and 07/00033. A local genotype "Akpedu" UL-A-1 obtained from Uyo yam farmers served as local check. The tubers of the yam genotypes were cut into minisets of 40g; each genotype comprised 30 yam minisets which were properly labeled and spread in a cool dry shed for two days before being taken to the field for planting (Timothy and Bassey, 2009; Ezulike *et al.*, 2006). Each site required 480 minisets and a total of 960 minisets for the two experimental sites. Each experimental site measured 17 m x 16 m which was mechanically ploughed, harrowed and ridged 1 m apart and 0.5 m high.

The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Each ridge measured 5 m long and the blocks (replicates) were separated by 1 m paths. One yam minisett was planted per stand at 0.5 m by 1.0 m, giving 10 plants per ridge (plot) and 480 plants in one experimental site, equivalent to 20,000 plants per hectare. Staking was done 25 days after planting using the Indian bamboo which measured 2 m in height (Uguru, 2015). Weeding was done manually using the West African weeding hoe at 1, 3 and 5 months after planting. Fertilizer NPK (15:15:15) was applied 1 MAP at 400 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, 10cm away from the plant (NRCRI, 2016), using the ring method (Timothy and Bassey, 2009; Udealor and Ezulike, 2009). Four plants were tagged at the centre of each plot for data collection. Growth characters studied were stand count at harvest, vine length, number of leaves per plant, number of branches per plant and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>). Leaf area was calculated as L x W x 0.43 (Rabi and Roy, 1989), where L = mean length of yam leaves, W = mean of widest portion of yam leaves, and 0.43 = the correction factor. Yield and yield components studied were tuber length (cm), circumference of tubers (cm), number of seed yam per plot, number of seed yam per hectare, fresh weight of seed yam per plot (kg), fresh weight of seed yam (t ha<sup>-1</sup>), number of ware yam (above 1 kg) per plot, number of ware yam per hectare, fresh weight of ware yam (t ha<sup>-1</sup>) and fresh tuber yield (t ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Insect pest incidence and severity in-ground and above ground at 8 weeks after planting (WAP) were estimated using the scale:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | = | clean tubers;                                       |
| 2 | = | < 20% of each genotype (tubers) damaged per plot    |
| 3 | = | 21-50% of each genotype (tubers) damaged per plot   |
| 4 | = | 51-80% of each genotype (tubers) per plot damaged   |
| 5 | = | > 80% each genotype damaged per plot (NRCRI, 2016). |

Similarly, disease severity of yam leaf mosaic virus (YLMV) was determined at 8 WAP, using the scale:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | = | No visible YLMV symptoms on all plants in the plots    |
| 2 | = | Very mild symptoms on susceptible/infected plants      |
| 3 | = | Moderate symptoms on infected plants                   |
| 4 | = | Severe symptoms on infected plant, and                 |
| 5 | = | Very severe symptoms on infected plants (NRCRI, 2016). |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were observed among the sixteen guinea white yam genotypes for all the characters studied. The highest number of leaves per plant for all the months and locations was produced by Obiauturugo, followed by Adaka, 89/02665 (national check), 07/00168 and 99/AMO/114, in that order while the lowest was from 99/AMO/109 (Table 1). Obiauturugo produced the longest vines followed by Adaka, 98/00933, 89/02665 and AME while the shortest vines were observed in 99/AMO/109 in all the months and locations. However, no significant difference in vine length was observed between 99/AMO/95A and 07/0033 (Table 2).

Similarly, significant differences were observed for number of branches per plant ( $p < 0.05$ ) among the yam genotypes. The highest number of branches was produced by 00604, followed by 99/AMO/109, 99/AMO/60, 07/00168, Obiauturugo, Nwakpoko, Adaka and 98/00933. However, 99/AMO/114, 99/AMO/116 and 89/02665 were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) in number of branches (Table 3).

Table 1: Number of Functional Leaves of Advanced Guinea White Yam Lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam genotype | Number of functional leaves per plant months after planting |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|--------------|---|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|              | 1   |        | 2       |         | 3       |         | 4       |         | 5       |         |
|              | A   | B      | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       |
| UCL-A-1      | 0h  | 0h     | 55.13k  | 56.02k  | 86.88k  | 87.09k  | 102.73j | 103.20j | 102.94i | 103.42i |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 10.70d  | 11.02d | 78.23i  | 78.56i  | 106.29i | 106.84i | 131.74h | 131.89h | 132.75h | 132.74h |
| 89/02665     | 20.73b  | 20.96b | 208.33b | 208.91b | 246.95c | 247.28c | 266.69c | 266.84c | 269.47c | 271.06c |
| 99/AMO/116   | 8.30e   | 9.01e  | 48.46i  | 48.72i  | 69.00i  | 70.10i  | 97.73j  | 98.20j  | 97.38j  | 98.22j  |
| 98/00933     | 13.53c  | 13.68c | 131.83g | 132.40g | 169.65g | 169.86g | 187.01f | 187.96f | 187.75f | 187.98f |
| Nwakpoko     | 8.43e   | 8.69e  | 64.33j  | 64.80j  | 97.12ij | 98.05ij | 122.13i | 122.68i | 122.42i | 122.72i |
| 07/00168     | 45.50a  | 46.20a | 191.53c | 191.75c | 229.08d | 230.20d | 248.33d | 248.76d | 248.98d | 248.99d |
| Obiauturugo  | 21.33b  | 22.16b | 216.76a | 217.19a | 267.88a | 268.11a | 297.42a | 298.21a | 297.98a | 299.16a |
| 99/AMO/109   | 11.40d  | 11.85d | 32.50m  | 32.76m  | 55.52m  | 56.02m  | 76.55k  | 77.66k  | 76.71k  | 77.92k  |
| Adaka        | 7.73e   | 8.17e  | 216.80a | 217.10a | 256.65b | 256.76b | 281.07b | 282.40b | 281.95b | 282.72b |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 5.26f   | 6.22f  | 159.86e | 159.87e | 170.96g | 171.05g | 190.91f | 191.10f | 191.22f | 191.74f |
| 99/AMO/114   | 11.20d  | 11.28d | 144.86f | 145.12f | 198.76e | 198.92e | 208.10e | 209.16e | 208.71e | 209.70e |
| 00604        | 11.26d  | 12.11d | 102.86h | 103.16h | 142.69h | 143.28h | 166.07g | 167.11g | 166.00g | 167.45g |
| 99/AMO/60    | 2.16g   | 3.04g  | 160.90e | 161.03e | 182.39f | 184.22f | 202.20e | 203.28e | 202.29e | 203.82e |
| AME          | 2.73g   | 3.50g  | 62.80j  | 63.0j   | 93.45j  | 94.76j  | 120.02i | 120.76i | 120.66i | 120.94i |
| 07/00033     | 13.53c  | 13.65c | 77.73i  | 78.05i  | 100.64i | 101.22i | 125.74h | 125.98h | 126.62h | 126.76h |

\* A = Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ )

Table 2: Vine length of advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam genotype | Vine Length (cm)     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|--------------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|              | Month After Planting |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|              | 1                    |         | 2       |         | 3       |         | 4       |         | 5       |         |
| A            | B                    | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       |         |
| UL-A-1       | 4.70i                | 4.79i   | 36.24i  | 36.74i  | 86.14i  | 86.76j  | 117.46k | 118.03k | 118.59j | 119.01j |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 72.69b               | 73.18b  | 94.19e  | 94.85e  | 105.73i | 106.20i | 139.19j | 139.72j | 146.26h | 146.68h |
| 89/02665     | 65.76c               | 66.12c  | 107.94c | 108.42c | 148.09d | 149.24d | 206.86d | 207.11d | 210.40d | 210.78d |
| 99/AMO/116   | 46.58e               | 46.78e  | 68.02g  | 69.24g  | 108.03i | 108.76i | 186.92f | 187.06f | 189.60f | 189.86f |
| 98/00933     | 69.95b               | 70.36b  | 117.48b | 118.06b | 165.55c | 166.10c | 222.16c | 222.75c | 224.90c | 224.98c |
| Nwakpoko     | 40.64f               | 41.22f  | 52.14h  | 52.94h  | 66.11i  | 66.82i  | 79.90m  | 80.22m  | 83.13i  | 83.62i  |
| 07/00168     | 57.52d               | 57.86d  | 74.94fg | 75.42fg | 112.32h | 112.74h | 136.97j | 137.16j | 141.96i | 142.36i |
| Obiauturugo  | 78.29a               | 78.74a  | 164.29a | 164.85a | 232.41a | 233.20a | 296.36a | 296.84a | 298.82a | 298.95a |
| 99/AMO/109   | 25.27h               | 25.96h  | 39.01i  | 40.18i  | 45.18m  | 46.70m  | 69.06n  | 69.75n  | 70.12m  | 70.76m  |
| Adaka        | 40.68f               | 41.40f  | 101.93d | 102.24d | 207.90b | 208.10b | 265.56b | 266.20b | 268.68b | 268.98b |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 22.06h               | 22.68h  | 81.81f  | 82.08f  | 141.49e | 142.18e | 176.23g | 176.86g | 178.68g | 178.84g |
| 99/AMO/114   | 46.31e               | 47.10e  | 90.58e  | 91.24e  | 125.35g | 125.92g | 165.40h | 166.24h | 167.00h | 167.65h |
| 00604        | 52.37d               | 52.84d  | 67.02g  | 67.86g  | 76.34k  | 77.08k  | 110.05i | 110.86i | 111.81k | 111.92k |
| 99/AMO/60    | 18.32hi              | 18.89hi | 69.66g  | 69.84g  | 107.10i | 107.80i | 146.14i | 146.73i | 162.85h | 162.86h |
| AME          | 31.53g               | 32.16g  | 78.76f  | 79.32f  | 149.72d | 150.21d | 194.57e | 195.32e | 194.82e | 195.18e |
| 07/00033     | 78.41a               | 78.69a  | 92.09e  | 92.65e  | 136.56f | 137.03f | 171.20g | 171.90g | 172.98g | 172.99g |

\* A = Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ )

The sixteen guinea white yam genotypes showed significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) for leaf area per plant throughout the months and locations. The largest leaf area per plant was produced by Adaka, followed by 99/AMO/109, 07/0033, 07/00168 and 98/00933 while the smallest leaf area per plant was found in UCL-A-1. However, no significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was observed between 07/00168 and 98/00933 for the character. Also, 99/AMO/116 and 89/02665 were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) in leaf area per plant (Table 4).

The guinea white yam genotypes were significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) for all the yield and yield components studied. The longest tubers were produced by 98/00933, followed by Adaka, 07/00168, Obiauturugo, 89/02665, 99/AMO/95<sup>A</sup>, 00604 and 07/0033, while the shortest tubers were found in 99/AMO/109 and Nwakpoko. However, no significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was observed between 07/00168 and Obiauturugo for the character. Similarly, AME, 99/AMO/60, 99/AMO/XA and 99/AMO/116 were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) in tuber length. Also, 99/AMO/114 and UL-A-1 were not significantly different in tuber length ( $p < 0.05$ ). The guinea white yam genotypes were significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) in circumference of tubers in both locations. The largest tuber circumference was produced by 07/00168, followed by Obiauturugo, 98/00933, 00604, 89/02665, Adaka and 99/AMO/95<sup>A</sup>, while the smallest tuber circumference was produced by UL-A-1. However,

Obiauturugo and 98/00933 were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ). Similarly, significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were not observed among the yam genotypes 99/AMO/114, 99/AMO/109, 99/AMO/60, Nwkpoko, AME and 99/AMO/XA for circumference of tubers. Also, 99/AMO/116, and UL-A-1 were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) in tuber circumference (Table 5).

Table 3: Number of Branches Per Plant of Advanced Guinea White Yam Lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam genotype | Number of branches per plant month after planting |        |         |         |        |        |         |         |         |         |
|--------------|---|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|              | 1   |        | 2       |         | 3      |        | 4       |         | 5       |         |
|              | A   | B      | A       | B       | A      | B      | A       | B       | A       | B       |
| UCL-A-1      | 0.0e  | 0.0e   | 1.93f   | 1.92f   | 7.70h  | 7.72h  | 16.25h  | 16.27h  | 16.25h  | 16.27h  |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 0.0e  | 0.0e   | 7.19e   | 7.20e   | 10.90g | 10.84g | 19.20g  | 19.22g  | 19.20g  | 19.22g  |
| 89/02665     | 5.93b   | 5.89b  | 8.0e    | 8.06e   | 19.16e | 19.20e | 27.48e  | 27.50e  | 27.48e  | 27.50e  |
| 99/AMO/116   | 4.06c   | 4.10c  | 16.70c  | 16.63c  | 17.23e | 17.22e | 26.25e  | 26.27e  | 26.25e  | 26.27e  |
| 98/00933     | 5.20b   | 5.16b  | 24.03ab | 24.05ab | 24.68c | 24.70c | 31.62c  | 31.65c  | 31.62c  | 31.65c  |
| Nwkpoko      | 1.23d   | 1.40d  | 8.60e   | 8.56e   | 25.46c | 25.44c | 32.98c  | 32.96c  | 32.98c  | 32.96c  |
| 07/00168     | 3.73c   | 3.80c  | 27.13a  | 27.16a  | 28.00b | 27.98b | 35.20bc | 35.30bc | 35.20bc | 35.30bc |
| Obiauturugo  | 7.53a   | 7.52a  | 25.28a  | 25.63c  | 25.64c | 23.22c | 33.20c  | 33.20c  | 33.22c  | 33.20c  |
| 99/AMO/109   | 3.30c   | 3.36c  | 8.70e   | 8.78e   | 30.63b | 30.65b | 37.46b  | 37.48b  | 37.46b  | 37.48b  |
| Adaka        | 2.63cd  | 2.60cd | 22.73b  | 22.70b  | 22.46c | 25.48c | 32.24c  | 32.25c  | 32.24c  | 32.25c  |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 0.0e  | 0.0e   | 14.76c  | 14.74c  | 16.26f | 16.28f | 25.91ef | 25.90ef | 25.91ef | 25.90ef |
| 99/AMO/114   | 4.40c   | 4.42c  | 15.32c  | 15.22c  | 19.53e | 19.52e | 27.96e  | 27.95e  | 27.96e  | 27.95e  |
| 00604        | 3.60c   | 3.64c  | 23.56ab | 23.58ab | 36.50a | 36.48a | 40.96a  | 40.94a  | 40.96a  | 40.94a  |
| 99/AMO/60    | 1.06d   | 1.17d  | 27.83a  | 27.85a  | 28.16b | 28.16b | 35.74b  | 35.72b  | 35.74b  | 35.72b  |
| AME          | 2.20d   | 2.20d  | 6.76e   | 6.78e   | 15.50f | 15.49f | 24.92f  | 24.95f  | 24.92f  | 24.95f  |
| 07/00033     | 4.54b   | 4.55b  | 13.06d  | 13.02d  | 22.80d | 22.78d | 30.68d  | 30.66d  | 30.68d  | 30.66d  |

\* A = Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ )

Table 4: Leaf area ( $\text{cm}^2$ ) of advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam genotype | Leaf Area ( $\text{cm}^2$ ) Month After Planting |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|--------------|--|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|              | 1  |        | 2       |         | 3       |         | 4       |         | 5       |         |
|              | A  | B      | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       | A       | B       |
| UL-A-1       | 0  | 0      | 16.51g  | 16.50g  | 17.73i  | 17.72i  | 17.42i  | 17.41i  | 17.39i  | 17.38i  |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 16.56f   | 16.58f | 34.20e  | 34.19e  | 30.35e  | 30.36e  | 28.35e  | 28.34e  | 28.32e  | 28.32e  |
| 89/02665     | 29.03e   | 29.36e | 22.16f  | 22.18f  | 23.49b  | 24.48b  | 24.10f  | 24.08f  | 24.01f  | 24.03f  |
| 99/AMO/116   | 15.88f   | 15.90f | 24.29f  | 24.28f  | 26.77g  | 26.79g  | 25.36f  | 25.37f  | 25.12f  | 25.14f  |
| 98/00933     | 12.30g   | 12.46g | 36.37e  | 36.39e  | 42.95d  | 42.84d  | 40.17d  | 40.19d  | 40.03d  | 40.0d   |
| Nwkpoko      | 3.11d  | 35.26d | 32.60ef | 32.62ef | 24.80g  | 24.82g  | 22.46g  | 22.48g  | 21.96g  | 21.94g  |
| 07/00168     | 28.69e   | 28.71e | 54.22b  | 54.21b  | 41.49d  | 41.48d  | 40.28d  | 40.26d  | 40.06d  | 40.02d  |
| Obiauturugo  | 51.84b   | 51.87b | 35.55e  | 35.57e  | 28.64f  | 28.62f  | 26.50ef | 26.49ef | 26.24ef | 26.21ef |
| 99/AMO/109   | 6.57h  | 6.59h  | 20.46f  | 20.45f  | 50.19b  | 50.20b  | 48.66b  | 48.58b  | 48.20b  | 48.21b  |
| Adaka        | 16.98f   | 16.96f | 50.92c  | 50.89c  | 54.50a  | 54.51a  | 52.25a  | 52.27a  | 50.18a  | 50.16a  |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 15.71f   | 15.76f | 32.20ef | 32.21ef | 23.63gh | 23.65gh | 21.61g  | 21.68g  | 20.74g  | 20.69g  |
| 99/AMO/114   | 30.99e   | 30.84e | 36.37e  | 36.38e  | 21.07h  | 21.05h  | 19.80h  | 19.78h  | 19.65h  | 19.64h  |
| 00604        | 47.11c   | 47.16c | 47.32d  | 47.30d  | 28.17f  | 28.19f  | 27.06e  | 27.03e  | 27.0e   | 27.01e  |
| 99/AMO/60    | 2.49i  | 2.50i  | 22.08f  | 22.10f  | 31.51e  | 31.56e  | 29.18e  | 29.20e  | 29.12e  | 29.12e  |
| AME          | 3.91i  | 3.92i  | 16.60g  | 16.56g  | 21.83h  | 21.76h  | 20.10gh | 20.08gh | 20.01gh | 20.02gh |
| 07/00033     | 59.26a   | 59.22a | 59.89a  | 59.69a  | 46.91c  | 46.93c  | 43.75c  | 43.69c  | 43.46c  | 43.44c  |

\* A = Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ )

Significant differences were observed among the guinea white yam genotypes for number of seed yam per plot, number of seed yam per hectare and fresh weight of seed yam per plot. The highest number of seed yam per plot was produced by 99/AMO/60, followed by AME, 99/AMO/XA, 99/AMO/109, 07/00168, Adaka, Obiauturugo, 99/AMO/116, 89/02665 and 00604. Significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) were not observed among the following yam genotypes: 99/AMO/60, AME and 99/AMO/XA. Similarly, 07/00168, Adaka, Obiauturugo, 89/02665 and 00604 were not significantly different in number of seed yam per plot. The number of seed yam per hectare produced by the yam genotypes followed a similar trend with number of seed yam per plot. The highest number of seed yam per hectare was produced by 99/AMO/60, followed by AME, 99/AMO/XA, 99/AMO/109, 07/00168, Obiauturugo, 89/02665 and 00604, while the lowest seed yam was produced by UL-A-1 (Table 5). However, no significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) was observed between 89/02665 and 00604 for number of seed yam per hectare.

The highest fresh weight of seed yam per plot (kg) was produced by 07/00168, followed by Obiauturugo, Adaka, 89/02665, 99/AMO/95A and 99/AMO/114 while the lowest fresh weight of seed yam per plot (kg) was found in 99/AMO/116. A similar trend was observed for fresh weight of seed yam (t/ha) with 07/00168 producing the

highest fresh weight of seed yam per hectare, followed by Obiauturugo, Adaka, 89/02665, 99/AMO/95<sup>A</sup>, 99/AMO/114 while the lowest fresh weight of seed yam per plot was found in UL-A-1 (Table 5).

Table 5: Tuber length, circumference of tubers and seed yam characteristics of advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam Genotype | Tuber length (cm) |         | Circumference of Tubers (cm) |         | No. of Seed Yam/Plot |         | No. of Seed Yam/ha |          | Fresh Weight of Seed Yam/Plot (kg) |        | Fresh Weight of Seed Yam (ha) |         |
|--------------|-------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|--------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|---------|
|              | A                 | B       | A                            | B       | A                    | B       | A                  | B        | A                                  | B      | A                             | B       |
| UL-A-1       | 16.87de           | 17.14de | 12.78e                       | 12.82e  | 5.43d                | 5.45d   | 10.867m            | 10.900m  | 0.793m                             | 0.793m | 1.586g                        | 1.582g  |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 14.93e            | 14.97e  | 14.32d                       | 14.46d  | 10.63a               | 10.59a  | 21.267c            | 21.180c  | 1.313j                             | 1.316j | 2.626e                        | 2.632e  |
| 89/02665     | 19.11cd           | 20.06cd | 17.98c                       | 17.92c  | 9.23b                | 9.42b   | 18.407f            | 18.840f  | 2.190d                             | 2.192d | 4.386c                        | 4.380c  |
| 99/AMO/116   | 14.67e            | 14.64e  | 12.83e                       | 12.78e  | 6.30d                | 6.34d   | 12.933k            | 12.680k  | 0.856i                             | 0.854i | 1.713g                        | 1.708g  |
| 98/00933     | 27.79a            | 27.62a  | 18.63b                       | 18.78b  | 5.70d                | 5.72d   | 11.400i            | 11.440i  | 1.103k                             | 1.106k | 2.206f                        | 2.212f  |
| Nwkpoko      | 12.95f            | 13.05f  | 14.42d                       | 14.64d  | 8.36c                | 8.44c   | 16.733h            | 16.880h  | 1.086k                             | 1.083k | 2.173f                        | 2.166f  |
| 07/00168     | 20.87c            | 20.85c  | 20.72a                       | 21.02a  | 9.73b                | 9.72b   | 19.467e            | 19.440e  | 3.026a                             | 3.025a | 6.052a                        | 6.050a  |
| Obiauturugo  | 20.65c            | 20.46c  | 19.47b                       | 19.52b  | 9.50b                | 9.48b   | 19.000ef           | 18.960ef | 2.666b                             | 2.664b | 5.480b                        | 5.332b  |
| 99/AMO/109   | 12.59f            | 12.66f  | 15.65d                       | 15.69f  | 10.40ab              | 10.44ab | 20.333d            | 20.350d  | 1.470i                             | 1.471i | 2.940de                       | 2.942de |
| Adaka        | 22.09b            | 22.14b  | 17.04c                       | 17.10c  | 9.63b                | 9.68b   | 19.267e            | 19.360e  | 2.380c                             | 2.382c | 4.760c                        | 4.764c  |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 18.01d            | 18.26d  | 16.81c                       | 16.76c  | 7.50c                | 7.54c   | 15.000i            | 15.008i  | 1.826e                             | 1.825e | 3.652d                        | 3.650d  |
| 99/AMO/114   | 16.79de           | 16.71de | 15.82d                       | 15.94d  | 8.73bc               | 8.71bc  | 17.467g            | 17.450g  | 1.763f                             | 1.762f | 3.520d                        | 3.524d  |
| 00604        | 18.49d            | 18.58d  | 18.11bc                      | 18.08bc | 9.20b                | 9.22b   | 18.400f            | 18.440f  | 1.663g                             | 1.661g | 3.326d                        | 3.322d  |
| 99/AMO/60    | 15.04e            | 15.09e  | 14.85d                       | 14.92d  | 11.46a               | 11.44a  | 22.933a            | 22.888a  | 1.693g                             | 1.694g | 3.386d                        | 3.388d  |
| AME          | 15.52e            | 15.68e  | 14.41d                       | 14.36d  | 11.16a               | 11.14a  | 22.333b            | 22.288b  | 1.583h                             | 1.584h | 3.166de                       | 3.168de |
| 07/00033     | 17.68d            | 17.62d  | 16.57cd                      | 16.51cd | 6.80cd               | 6.76cd  | 13.600i            | 13.540i  | 1.350j                             | 1.351j | 2.700e                        | 2.702e  |

\* A =Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different (p<0.05)

Table 6: Yield and ware yam characteristics of advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam Genotype | No. of Ware Yam/Plot |       | No. of Ware Yam/ha |         | Fresh Weight of Ware Yam/Plot (kg) |        | Fresh Weight of Ware Yam (tha <sup>-1</sup> ) |         | Total Fresh Tuber Yield (tha <sup>-1</sup> ) |         |
|--------------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|---------|------------------------------------|--------|---|---------|--|---------|
|              | A                    | B     | A                  | B       | A                                  | B      | A   | B       | A  | B       |
| UL-A-1       | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 1.586k                                       | 1.582k  |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 2.626ij                                      | 2.632ij |
| 89/02665     | 1.34e                | 1.36e | 716.6e             | 719.5e  | 1.056e                             | 1.058e | 3.001e  | 3.049e  | 7.387e                                       | 7.429e  |
| 99/AMO/116   | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 1.713k                                       | 1.708k  |
| 98/00933     | 4.36a                | 4.37a | 2073.3a            | 3068.5a | 2.193a                             | 2.192a | 19.166a                                       | 19.158a | 21.372a                                      | 21.370a |
| Nwkpoko      | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 2.173j                                       | 2.166j  |
| 07/00168     | 3.94b                | 3.92b | 1073.3b            | 1067.8b | 1.670b                             | 1.668b | 13.158b                                       | 13.077b | 19.210b                                      | 19.127b |
| Obiauturugo  | 2.44c                | 2.45c | 1066.6c            | 1082.5c | 1.293c                             | 1.291c | 6.309c  | 6.325c  | 11.805c                                      | 11.648c |
| 99/AMO/109   | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 2.940i                                       | 2.942i  |
| Adaka        | 2.06d                | 2.05d | 1036.6d            | 1030.0d | 1.120d                             | 1.121d | 4.350d  | 4.337d  | 9.110d                                       | 9.101d  |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 3.700f                                       | 3.650f  |
| 99/AMO/114   | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 3.520g                                       | 3.524g  |
| 00604        | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 3.326h                                       | 3.322h  |
| 99/AMO/60    | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 3.386h                                       | 3.388h  |
| AME          | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 3.166h                                       | 3.168h  |
| 07/00033     | 0f                   | 0f    | 0f                 | 0f      | 0.0f                               | 0f     | 0f  | 0f      | 2.700i                                       | 2.702i  |

\* A =Itu, B = Uyo; Means with the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different (p<0.05)

The highest number of ware yam per plot, number of ware yam per hectare, fresh weight of ware yam per plot and fresh weight of ware per hectare were produced by 98/00933, followed by 07/00168, Obiauturugo, Adaka and 89/02665. The other genotypes UL-A-1, 99/AMO/XA, 99/AMO/116, Nwkpoko 99/AMO/109, 99/AMO/95A, 99/AMO/114, 00604, 99/AMO/60, AME and 07/00033 did not produce ware yam at all. Similarly, the highest total fresh tuber yield (tha<sup>-1</sup>) was produced by 98/00933, followed by 07/00168, Obiauturugo, Adaka, 89/02665, 99/AMO/95A and 99/AMO/114 while the lowest was found in UL-A-1 (Table 6). It was observed that besides being high yielding, the genotypes 98/00933, Adaka, 98/02665 and 99/AMO/95 also showed high resistance to pests notably yam beetle (*Heteroligus meles*), leaf beetle as well as yam leaf mosaic virus which are desirable characteristics of a good yam. For example, 98/00933 was ranked first (high resistance) to insect pests and second to yam leaf mosaic virus. Adaka came second while Obiauturugo was rank 3<sup>rd</sup> (moderately resistant) to yam beetles and 2<sup>nd</sup> in resistance to leaf beetles and yam leaf mosaic virus. Genotype 07/00168 which was ranked second in tuber yield (tha<sup>-1</sup>) was relatively susceptible to yam beetles and yam leaf mosaic virus (Table 7). However, the low resistance of this genotype could be improved through breeding.

Variability in one or several characters observed among the advanced guinea white yam lines is a desirable characteristic which fosters selection of suitable genotypes for the environment (Nwankwoet et al., 2011) and also provides guide post for further breeding in yam. In spite of the fact that the yam lines were planted in June, some of them displayed unique characteristics for selection. For example, 98/00933 showed superior performance in six characters which include tuber length, number of ware yam per plot, number of ware yam per hectare, fresh tuber

yield ( $\text{tha}^{-1}$ ), fresh weight of ware yam per plot, fresh weight of ware yam per hectare as well as high resistance to pests and leaf mosaic virus. This was followed by 07/00168 in three characters, namely circumference of tubers, fresh weight of seed yam per plot and fresh weight of seed yam per hectare while 99/AMO/60 showed outstanding performance in two characters, namely, number seed yam per plot and number of seed yam per hectare. The result also showed 07/00168 as the second best yielding line, followed by Obiauturugo, Adaka and 89/02665. In terms of total fresh tuber yield, 98/00933 was ranked first, in the two locations, followed by 07/00168, Obiauturugo, Adaka and 89/02665. The three yam lines (98/00933, 07/00168 and Obiauturugo) which out yielded the national check (89/02665) and the local check (UL-A-1) could be selected and advanced to the uniform yield trial. Yield is an important factor which determines choice of a genotype for cultivation (Nwachukwu *et al.*, 2009). The result showed that yield was significantly influenced by genotypic variations among the yam lines (Gooding, 1987). The three advanced guinea white yam lines namely, (98/00933, 07/00168 and Obiauturugo) besides out yielding the national and local check also produced tuber yields within 5 months higher than  $11 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  which is considered average in major yam producing countries of West Africa (Anuebunwa, 2002).

## CONCLUSION

Three advanced guinea white yam lines 98/00933, 07/00168 and Obiauturugo out yielded both the national (89/02665) and local (UL-A-1) checks, also produced tuber yield higher than  $11.0 \text{ (t ha}^{-1}\text{)}$  average for West Africa. For example, 98/00933 produced  $21.371 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$ , 07/00168 had  $19.168 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  while Obiauturugo produced  $11.776 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  (averages of two locations). Also, 98/00933 was superior in eight characters namely, tuber length, number of ware yam per plot, number of ware yam per hectare, fresh weight of ware yam per plot, fresh weight of ware yam ( $\text{t ha}^{-1}$ ), total fresh tuber yield ( $\text{t ha}^{-1}$ ) and also possessed high resistance to insect pests and yam leaf mosaic virus. The genotype 07/00168 was superior in three characters namely, circumference of tubers, fresh weight of seed yam per plot (g) and fresh weight of seed yam ( $\text{t ha}^{-1}$ ), while Obiauturugo came third in two characters namely, number of seed yam per plot and number of seed yam per hectare. The three yam lines could be recommended for advancement to Uniform Yield Trial (UYT) in the area.

Table 7: Number of stands planted, number of stands at harvest and pest and disease severity in advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

| Yam Genotype | No. of stands planted per plot | Stands at harvest per plot | Severity of Yam Beetle | Severity of Leaf Beetle | Disease Severity (YLMV) |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| UCL-A-1      | 30                             | 15                         | 5                      | 5                       | 4                       |
| 99/AMO/XA    | 30                             | 30                         | 1                      | 1                       | 1                       |
| 89/02665     | 30                             | 30                         | 1                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| 99/AMO/116   | 30                             | 18                         | 2                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| 98/00933     | 30                             | 21                         | 1                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| Nwakpoko     | 30                             | 24                         | 3                      | 3                       | 2                       |
| 07/00168     | 30                             | 30                         | 5                      | 3                       | 4                       |
| Obiauturugo  | 30                             | 30                         | 3                      | 2                       | 3                       |
| 99/AMO/109   | 30                             | 30                         | 4                      | 3                       | 3                       |
| Adaka        | 30                             | 30                         | 2                      | 2                       | 1                       |
| 99/AMO/95A   | 30                             | 21                         | 3                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| 99/AMO/114   | 30                             | 24                         | 4                      | 3                       | 4                       |
| 00604        | 30                             | 24                         | 1                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| 99/AMO/60    | 30                             | 24                         | 3                      | 2                       | 4                       |
| AME          | 30                             | 30                         | 2                      | 2                       | 2                       |
| 07/00033     | 30                             | 18                         | 3                      | 2                       | 3                       |
|              | 480                            | 399                        | NA                     | NA                      | NA                      |

\* Scaling for pest or disease severity in advanced guinea white yam lines in Itu and Uyo. NA = Not applicable

## REFERENCES

- Adeniji, M. O. Obigbesan, G. O, Asiedu, R. and Bokanga, M. 2001. Influence of fertilizers on yield, storage and food qualities of yam, Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> Triennial Symposium of the International Society for Tropical Root Crops-African Branch (Akoroda, M. O. & Ngeve, J. M. eds) held at the Centre International des Conférences, Cotonou, Benin, 11-17 October, 1998.
- Aighewi, B. A., Asiedu, R and Akoroda, M. O. 2001. Producing seed yams (*Dioiorea rotundata*) from sprouts. Root crop in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> Triennial symposium of the international society for tropical root crops- African Branch, held, Centre International des Conference, Cotonou, Benin, 11-17 October, 1998, PP. 297-299.
- Aniebunwa, F. O. 2002. A structural analysis of yam flow into Abia state of Nigeria. *Nigerian Agricultural Journal*, 33:17-22.

- Degras, L. 2000. *The yam: A tropical root crop*. The Technical centre for Agricultural and Rural cooperation (CTA). The Macmillan press, London, P. 408.
- Ezulike, T. O., Udealor, A., Nwosu, K. I. and Asumugha, G. N. 2006. Rapid multiplication of seed yam by minisett technique, Extension Guide, No.15, Extension Service Programme, National Root Crop Research Institute, Umudike, Nigeria, PP.1-10.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) 2014. FAOSTAT: Top 10 Yam Producing Countries in the World. FAO, Rome. FAOSTAT, Available at <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en#data>.
- Gooding, E. G. B. 1987. Reports on crops. TDRI Crop and Product Digest No. 2. Second Edition, pp. 200-214.
- Hahn, S. K., Osiru, D. S. O., Akoroda, M. O. and Otoo, J. A. 1987. Yam production and its future aspects. *Outlook on Agriculture*, 16:109-118.
- IITA (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture) 2004. Annual Report, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria, PP.8-10.
- IITA 2009. IITA Annual Report, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- IITA (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture) 2013. Report, Achievements, Challenges and Prospects of yam production in Nigeria, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- IITA (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture) 2014. IITA Annual Report. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- NRCRI (National Root Crops Research Institute) 2016. Yam Research Guide National Root Crops Research Institute, Umudike, Abia State, pp1-2.
- Nwachukwu, E. C. 2009. Field evaluation of 24 top white hybrid yam in Umudike and Otobi. Proceedings of the 45<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria held at Abuja, Nigeria, pp. 88-90.
- Nwankwo, I. I. M. and Bassey, E. E. (2013). A study of variability and heritability for yield and yield related traits in guinea white yam (*Dioscorea rotundata*, Poir) genotypes in Umudike, South-eastern Nigeria. *Wudpecker Journal of Agricultural Research*, 2(4): 122-127.
- Nwankwo, I. M., Eka, M. J., Bassey, E. E. and Nwachukwu, E. C. 2011. Flowering behavior and physiological characteristics of interspecific hybrids of *Dioscorea rotundata* Poir in humid environment of Southeastern Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*, 7(1): 16-21.
- Nweke, F. I., Ugwu, B. O., Asedu, C. L. A. and Ay, P. 1991. Production cost of yam based cropping in southeastern Nigeria, RCMD Research Monograph No.6., IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Ravi, B. and Roy, C. S. 1989. A method of leaf area determination in *Dioscorea*. *Journal of Root Crops*, 15: 54-48.
- Timothy, G. E and Bassey, E. E. 2009. Preliminary study on the effect of tuber sett weight derived from regions of seed yam on growth and yield of yam in south eastern Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Technology*, 2:32-40.
- Udealor, A. and Ezulike, T. O. 2009. On-farm evaluation of the performance of new yam minisett sizes for increased adoption. *The Nigerian Agricultural Journal*, 40(1): 100-103.
- Udoh, D. J., Ndaeyo, N. U., Asuquo, P. E. and Ndon, B. A. 2005. *Crop production Techniques for the tropics*. Concept Publication, Lagos, PP 182-187.
- Uguru, M. I. 2011. Crop Production: Tools, Techniques and Practice. Fulladu Publishing Co., Nsukka, Nigeria, pp. 40-48.
- Ugwu, B. O. 1996. Yam and cassava production as income generating activities for households. African evaluation of the performance of new yam minisett sizes for increased adoption. *The Nigerian Agricultural Journal*, 40(10): 100-103.
- Umar, A. G., Nwator, M. S., Likita, S. and Adoko, S. 2006. The indeginous yam storage technology and post-harvest losses in Nigeria: The Benue State perspective. *International Journal of Food and Agricultural Research*, 5(2): 113-139