

1

Original Research Article

2

Occurrence of Cassava Mosaic Disease Related to Agro-ecosystem in

3

Farmer's Fields located in Kongo Central Province, Democratic Republic of

4

Congo

5

6

ABSTRACT

Aim: To assess the Cassava Mosaic Disease (CMD) pressure by analyzing its incidence, severity and gravity, and to characterize agro-ecosystems where cassava farmers' fields are established.

Place and duration: The study was conducted in three different localities (Mvuazi, Ndembo and Pompage) in Kongo Central province, Democratic Republic of Congo, from June to December 2016.

Methodology: One hundred and fifty farmers' fields randomly selected were investigated during epidemiological survey, with 50 fields in each locality. In each field selected, 30 cassava plants randomly selected in a square of 10m x 10m were analyzed. The CMD incidence, severity and gravity were collected, and agronomic and environmental factors relatives to cassava fields were analyzed.

Results: In general, CMD was observed in the three localities, with pressure depending among localities and fields of the same locality. Pathological parameters show significant difference ($P = .05$) among fields for the same locality. The lowest pressure was recorded in Mvuazi locality (with 12.8% for incidence, score 2 for severity, and 15% for gravity), while the highest pressure was recorded in Pompage (with 20% for incidence, score 3 for severity, and 32% for gravity). Data recorded on agro-environmental factors demonstrate that farmers of the three localities used almost the same agricultural practices. Analysis of data reported in Table 2 suggest that origin and type of cassava material cuttings used can play a principal role in the propagation and development of CMD in most of cassava cultivation regions.

Conclusion: The results of the present study revealed that CMD was present in different localities surveyed, and its pressure varies among localities, and from one field to another for the same locality. Agricultural practices used by farmers can play an important role in the propagation of CMD in different regions of cassava cultivation.

Keywords: *Cassava Mosaic Disease, Farmers' fields, Agro-Ecosystem, Kongo Central province, DR-Congo.*

40 **1. Introduction**

41

42 Cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) is an important source of calories for thousands of people living
43 in sub-Saharan Africa [1, 2]. Plant with high potential and adapting to different environments [3],
44 cassava is however subject to the attacks of Cassava Mosaic Disease (CMD) which constitutes a
45 serious and persistent threat to the food security of populations mainly living of that food.

46

47 In Africa, various works of selection and improvement of cassava led to the development of varieties
48 containing acceptable agronomic and qualitative characteristics, and resistant to diseases such as
49 CMD and *Cassava Bacterial Blight* (CBB) [4, 5]. These varieties have often been introduced and
50 distributed in many regions to fight against the CMD pandemic. Despite these breeding, improvement
51 and extension efforts, it observed that the CMD continues to spread with high incidence and severity
52 degrees. One of causes that would be the basis for the CMD perpetuation in these regions is the low
53 adoption of improved varieties by farmers. Indeed, farmers felt that these varieties did not meet their
54 expectations and preferences [6, 7], which results in the widespread use of local varieties.

55

56 In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), studies conducted on the evaluation of the CMD
57 pressure indicate that the plant material constituting cassava germplasm is susceptible to this viral
58 disease. For examples, in Yangambi region (Eastern province), Monde [8] found that the majority of
59 local varieties showed severe symptoms of the disease, compared with improved varieties. In Bukavu
60 region (Sud Kivu province), Bisimwa [9] noted that all local cassava varieties grown in different agro-
61 ecosystems were susceptible to various biotic diseases identified on cassava. In Gandajika (Eastern
62 Kasai province), Muengula-Manyi *et al.* [10] observed that local varieties grown by farmers are
63 severely attacked by CMD compared to improved varieties.

64

65 Various other scientific studies have shown that local cassava varieties are severely attacked than
66 improved varieties. Jeremiah & Kulembeka [11] mentioned that all local cassava varieties available
67 are susceptible to CMD. In many countries, CMD would have reached a high severity degree on
68 farmers' fields, which may reduce the yield of cassava tuberous roots. The level of CMD infection
69 varying from agro-ecological systems ([12], and poor farming practices and marginal agro-
70 environmental conditions observed in farmers' fields are favorable for CMD development.

71

72 This study aimed to assess the CMD pressure by analyzing the disease incidence, severity and
73 gravity in Mvuazi, Ndembo and Pompage localities (in the Kongo Central province), and to
74 characterize agro-environmental factors where cassava farmers' fields are established.

75

76 **2. Materials and Methods**

77 **2.1. Sites Description and Field Sampling**

78

79 Epidemiological surveys were conducted in Mvuazi, Kimpese and Pompage localities (Kongo Central
80 province) in DRC. These regions fall within the Aw4 climate type according to Köppen classification
81 characterized with 4 months of dry season coupled 8 months of rainy season. Daily temperature
82 averages 22-24°C and can reach a maximum of 30°C. The average annual rainfall ranges around
83 1,522mm. The surveyed sites were characterized by the presence of savannah dominated by
84 herbaceous species such *Hyparrhenia diplandra*, *Mucuna* sp., *Panicum maximum* and *Pennisetum*
85 *purpureum*. In some places, it observed ragged forest where dominated shrub species such *Lussonia*
86 *angolensis* and *Hymenocardia acida*. According to Pauwels [13], soils of Kongo Central region are
87 varying types, and revealed the presence of sandy and clay soils.

88

89 Epidemiological surveys were conducted in cassava farmers' fields during the period from June to
90 December 2016. In each locality, 50 fields randomly selected were investigated. In each field
91 selected, 30 cassava plants randomly selected in a square of 10m x 10m were analyzed.

92

93 **2.2. Variables Studied**

94 **2.2.1. Pathological Variables**

95

96 During epidemiological investigations, pathological variables recorded were CMD incidence, severity
97 and gravity. The CMD incidence was appreciated by the proportion of diseased plants compared to
98 30 plants analyzed. CMD severity symptom was assessed using a scale ranging from 1 to 5
99 described by Hahn *et al.* [14], where 1 represents an asymptomatic cassava plant (apparently
100 healthy) and 5 a severely infected cassava plant with reduction of leaflets. The CMD gravity was
101 assessed in each diseased plant by the proportion of leaves with typical symptoms of the disease.

102

103 **2.2.2. Agronomic and Environmental Factors**

104

105 For each field surveyed, agronomic and environmental characteristics as described by Muengula-
106 Manyi *et al.* [10] were determined. They include field location, origin and type of cassava material
107 used, age of fields, topography of land, the practice of intercropping, type of crops mixed with
108 cassava, and the topping practice.

109

110

111 2.3. Data Analysis

112

113 Statistical analysis of data recorded was made possible through the R software and Statistix 8.0 (free
114 version). The recorded data were submitted to analysis of variance followed by multiple comparisons
115 by Tukey's HSD, to determine significant differences ($P = .05$) between the surveyed sites. CMD
116 incidence and gravity were previously submitted to a logarithmic transformation to base 10 (\log_{10}).
117 The comparison of means was made using the least significant difference test (LSD) at the 5%
118 probability.

119

120 3. Results

121 3.1. Incidence, Severity and Gravity of Cassava Mosaic Disease

122

123 Results obtained on CMD incidence, severity and gravity recorded in the 3 localities are reported in
124 Table 1.

125

126 Table 1. Incidence, severity and gravity of CMD recorded in Mvuazi, Ndembo and Pompage locality

127

Locality	Pathological variables recorded		
	Incidence (%)	Severity (scale 1 - 5)	Gravity (%)
Mvuazi	12.8 ^b	2	15 ^c
Ndembo	15.2 ^b	3	25 ^b
Pompage	20 ^a	3	32 ^a

128 *In the same column, means followed by the same letter are not significantly different at 5% of*
129 *probability.*

130

131 In general, CMD was present in all sites surveyed with levels of incidence, severity and gravity
132 varying between localities, and from one field to an other in the same locality. There were significant
133 differences for disease incidence and gravity among fields for the three sites (Table 1). Overall, the
134 mean incidence for all fields surveyed was 16%, severity score was 2.6, and gravity equal to 24%.
135 Details for each locality revealed that the incidence of CMD was 12.8% in Mvuazi, 15.2% in Ndembo
136 and 20% in Pompage. The mean of CMD severity was equal to 2 in Mvuazi, and 3 in Ndembo and
137 Pompage, and the gravity was respectively equal to 15, 25 and 32%.

138

139

140 3.2. Agronomic and Environmental Characteristics of Fields Investigated

141

142 The results of different agronomic and environmental factors analyzed for each cassava field
143 prospected in Mvuazi, Kimpese and Pompage localities are reported in Table 2.

144

145 Table 2. Frequency (%) of cassava fields characteristics in 3 localities investigated in Kongo Central
146 region

Characteristics of fields	Localities		
	Mvuazi	Ndembo	Pompage
Field location			
Secondary forest	40	70	64
Savannah	60	30	36
Site topography			
Flat land	70	24	60
Land with slope	30	76	40
Origin of cassava material used			
Research center	90	-	-
Old field	10	100	100
Type of cassava material used			
Local	14	90	96
Improved	86	10	4
Age of field			
1 to 6 months	8	10	8
7 to 12 months	86	70	72
Older than 12 months	6	20	20
Intercropping practice			
Yes	15	90	85
No	85	10	15
Crop mixed with cassava			
Legume	15	35	45
Cereal	75	25	25
Vegetable crop	10	40	30
Topping practice			
Yes	66	68	70
No	34	32	30

147

148 3.2.1. Field location and site topography

149 Cassava fields investigated were established either in secondary forest or savannah. In the 3
150 localities, cassava crop grown in secondary forest represented 58%, while those established in
151 savannah represented 42%. Farmers' fields were established either on flat land or on land with slope.
152 It was observed that 51.3% of cassava crops were grown on flat lands and 48.6% on lands with slope.
153 Details of cassava fields location and site topography for each locality are described in Table 2.

154 **3.2.2. Origin et type of cassava material used**

155 Analysis of data reported in Table 2 revealed that 30% of farmers used cassava cuttings obtained
156 from a Research Center, and 70% used cuttings obtained from their old fields. Farmers used local or
157 genetically improved cassava varieties. Local cassava varieties were grown in 66.6% of fields, while
158 improved varieties were planted in 33.3% of fields.

159 **3.2.3. Age of field**

160 According on the date of cassava plantation, fields investigated were classified in 3 groups. The first
161 group included 1 to 6 months old cassava field, the second group with 7 to 12 months, and the third
162 group with fields older than 12 months (Table 2). Results obtained revealed that 8.6% of cassava
163 fields were 1 to 6 months old, 76% were 7 to 12 months old, and 15.3% were older than 12 months.
164 Details of the three groups for each locality are described in Table 2.

165 **3.2.4. Intercropping practice and type of crops mixed with cassava**

166 The results of this study revealed that cassava was generally grown in association with other crops
167 such as legumes, cereal or vegetable crops. Analysis of these results indicated that 63.3% of cassava
168 were mixed with other crops, while in 36.6% of cases, cassava crop was grown alone. In general,
169 31.6% of cassava stands were grown in association with legumes (soybeans or beans), 41.6% with
170 cereal (principally maize) and 26.6% with vegetable crops (sweet potatoes). Frequency of
171 intercropping practice and crops mixed with cassava varied according to localities surveyed (Table 2).

172 **3.2.5. Topping practice**

173 It observed that field topping was generally practiced in the three localities surveyed. This suggest
174 that cassava leaves are appreciated such legume to meet household needs. Field topping was
175 practiced in 68% of cassava stands, while no topping was reported in 32% of fields investigated.
176

177 **4. Discussion**

178

179 This study revealed the presence of cassava mosaic disease (CMD) in different cassava farmers'
180 fields located in Mvuazi, Ndembo and Pompage localities in Kongo Central province. Overall, CMD
181 pressure assessed by the analysis of incidence, severity and gravity generally varies among localities,
182 and from one field to another in the same locality.

183

184 The analysis of pathological variables reported in Table 1 revealed significant difference ($P = .05$)
185 among localities. In general the CMD pressure was low in Mvuazi, whereas it was higher in Pompage
186 locality. The mean of pathological parameters recorded in the three localities surveyed was 16% for
187 incidence, 2.6 for severity score, and 24% for gravity. Results of this study show that CMD pressure is
188 slightly lower compared to data presented in previous studies. In other regions of DRC, Sseruwagi et
189 al. [15] revealed that the mean incidence of CMD during the period 2002-2003 was approximately
190 60%, with severity score equal to 3.1. According to Ariyo et al. [16] and Ntawuruhunga et al. [17],

191 usually the incidence and severity of CMD vary according to the year, and from one region to another.
192 Adjata et al. [18] mentioned that the level of CMD incidence probably changes with the pressure of
193 inoculum present, which varies from one site to another. Based on our findings and those of previous
194 studies, it is clear that pathological parameters (incidence, severity and gravity) fluctuate depending
195 on several factors such as agronomic, environmental and inoculum pressure prevailing in a region, as
196 well as time or period of observations. In addition, Sseruwagi et al. [15] mentioned that in some
197 moderately resistant varieties, symptoms of CMD can be localized or absent in some parts of cassava
198 plant. Muengula-Manyi et al. [10, 19] also observed on a diseased cassava plant that CMD symptoms
199 did not necessarily appeared on all leaves present on the plant. These observations explain the
200 variability of degree of gravity recorded on the diseased plants surveyed.

201

202 Results reported in Table 2 indicate in general that farmers use almost the same agricultural practices
203 in the cultivation of cassava. Based on characteristics of fields surveyed, it appeared that 90% of
204 farmers located in Mvuazi use cuttings obtained from the Research center, while all farmers (100%)
205 founded in Ndembo and Pompaga localities use cuttings from their previous fields. In addition, in
206 Mvuazi locality, 86% of cassava varieties planted are genetically improved, while 93% of cassava
207 material used in Ndembo and Pompaga localities are local varieties (Table 2). These observations
208 may explain the low CMD pressure noted in Mvuazi compared to the two others localities. The results
209 of this study corroborate findings reported by Bisimwa [9] who observed in Bukavu region, that
210 cassava farmers' fields heavily attacked by biotic diseases were planted from local varieties.
211 According to Hillocks & Thresh [20], in some regions the lack of improved varieties orient farmers
212 towards large-scale use of local varieties; and the high frequency of use of local varieties could also
213 be explained by the quest characteristics valued by farmers and by the cost of improved cassava
214 varieties cuttings. In addition, the use of cuttings without health guarantee, taken from previous fields
215 may explain the permanent presence of CMD in some cassava production regions.

216

217 Although the CMD was observed in the three localities, its incidence was overall lower compared to
218 data reported by Sseruwagi et al. [15], while the severity score reported in these two studies was
219 similar. The low level of CMD incidence reported in this study may be due to the use of intercropping
220 practice and the type of crop mixed with cassava. Indeed, there was different crops intercropped with
221 cassava in the three localities surveyed. For example, in Mvuazi, cassava was mixed with cereal in
222 75% of fields investigated, while in Ndembo it was mixed with vegetable crop in 40%, and in
223 Pompaga with legumes in 45% (Table 2). Our results corroborate observations made by Monde [8]
224 who observed in the Yangambi region, that incidence and severity of CMD were very lower in fields
225 where cassava was mixed with beans compared to fields where cassava was cultivated without crop
226 mixed.

227

228

229 **5. Conclusion**

230

231 The results of the present study revealed that CMD occurs in the three localities surveyed, and its
232 level pressure varies between localities, and between different fields in the same locality. In general,
233 results obtained showed that farmers used almost the same agricultural practices to establish their
234 cassava fields. Origin and type of cassava material used can play a significant role in the spread and
235 development of CMD. In the region where improved varieties were used, CMD pressure was very
236 lower, and where local varieties were used, the low level of incidence, severity and gravity of CMD
237 can be attributed to the use of intercropping practice and the type of crop mixed with cassava.

238

239 **References**

240

241 [1] Alabi OJ, Ogbe FO, Bandyopadhyay R, Lava Kumar P, Dixon AGO, Hughes Jd'A, Naidu RA.
242 Alternate hosts of African cassava mosaic virus and East African cassava mosaic Cameroon virus in
243 Nigeria. Arch. Virol. 2008; 153:1743-1747.

244 [2] FAOSTAT. FAO database. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy,
245 2009. <http://FAOSTAT.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx>.

246 [3] Kawano K, Daza P, Aruya A, Rios M, Gonzales WMF. Evaluation of cassava germplasm for
247 productivity. Crop Sci. 1978; 18:372-380.

248 [4] Cach NT, Pérez JC, Lenis JI, Calle F, Morante F, Ceballos H. Epistasis in the expression of
249 relevant traits in cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) for sub-humid conditions. J. of Heredity. 2005;
250 96:586-592.

251 [5] Pérez JC, Ceballos H, Jaramillo, G, Morante N, Calle F, Arias B, Bellotti AC. Epistasis in cassava
252 (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) adapted to mild-altitude valley environment. Crop Sci. 2005; 45:1491-
253 1496.

254 [6] Nweke FI. Farm level practices relevant to cassava plant protection. Afr. Crop Sc. J. 1994; 2:563-
255 582.

256 [7] Benesi IRM. Characterization of Malawian cassava germplasm for diversity, starch extraction and
257 its native and modified properties. PhD Thesis. Department of Plant Sciences: Plant Breeding, Faculty
258 of Natural and Agriculture Sciences, University of the Free State, South Africa; 2005.

259 [8] Monde G. Epidémiologie, diversité génétique et phylogéographie des virus de la mosaïque
260 africaine du manioc dans la région de Yangambi en République Démocratique du Congo. Thèse de
261 doctorat, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique; 2010. French.

- 262 [9] Bisimwa E. Epidémiologie, diversité génétique, distribution et contrôle des virus de la mosaïque
263 africaine du manioc et de son vecteur (*Bemisia tabaci*) dans la région du Sud-Kivu en République
264 Démocratique du Congo. Thèse de doctorat, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve,
265 Belgique; 2011. French.
- 266 [10] Muengula-Manyi M, Nkongolo KK, Bragard C, Tshilenge-Djim P, Winter S, Kalonji-Mbuyi A.
267 Incidence, severity and gravity of cassava mosaic disease in savannah agro-ecological region of DR-
268 Congo: analysis of agro-environmental factors. Am. J. of Plant Sci. 2012; 3:512-519.
- 269 [11] Jeremiah SC, Kulembeka HP. Screening of local cassava varieties against cassava mosaic
270 disease and cassava green mite. In: Proceedings of the 13th ISTRC Symposium, Arusha, Tanzania;
271 2007.
- 272 [12] Balyejusa KE, Bua A, Fregene M, Egwang T, Gullberg U, Westerbergh A. The effect of cassava
273 mosaic disease on the genetic diversity of cassava in Uganda. Euphytica. 2005; 146:45-54.
- 274 [13] Pauwels L. Catalogue des plantes cultivées au Jardin Botanique de Kisantu; 1977.
- 275 [14] Hahn SK, Terry ER, Leuschner ER. Breeding cassava for resistance to cassava mosaic disease.
276 Euphytica. 1980; 29:673-683.
- 277 [15] Sseruwagi P, Sserubombwe WS, Legg JP, Ndunguru J, Thresh JM. Methods of surveying the
278 incidence and severity of cassava mosaic disease and whitefly vector populations on cassava in
279 Africa: a review. Virus Research. 2004; 100:129-142.
- 280 [16] Ariyo AO, Dixon AGO, Atiri GI. Whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) infestation on
281 cassava genotypes grown at different Ecozones in Nigeria. J. of Econ. Entom. 2005; 98:611-617.
- 282 [17] Ntawuruhunga P, Okao-Okuja G, Bembe A, Obambi M, Mvila AJC, Legg JP. Incidence and
283 severity of cassava mosaic disease in Republic of Congo. Afr. Crop Sc. J. 2007; 15(1):1-9.
- 284 [18] Adjata KD, Muller E, Peterschmitt M, Aziadekey M, Gumedzoe YMD. Incidence of cassava viral
285 diseases and first identification of East cassava mosaic virus and Indian cassava mosaic virus by
286 PCR in cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) fields in Togo. Am. J. of Plant Physiol. 2008; 3:73-80.
- 287 [19] Muengula-Manyi M, Mukwa L, Nkongolo KK, Tshilenge-Djim P, Winter S, Bragard C, Kalonji-
288 Mbuyi A. Assessing reactions of genetically improved and local cassava varieties to cassava mosaic
289 disease (CMD) infection in a savannah region of the DR-Congo. Am. J. of Plant Sci. 2013; 4:824-837.
- 290 [20] Hillocks RJ, Thresh JM. Cassava mosaic and cassava brown streak virus diseases in Africa: A
291 comparative guide to symptoms and etiologies. Roots. 2000; 7(1):1-8.