

1 Evaluation of Sweet Potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) for early blast disease (*Alternaria solani*).

3 Abstract

4 **Aims:** Early blight disease (*Alternaria solani*) is one of the main biotic factors limiting sweet potato
5 production in the tropics. A multi-locational research was carried out to screen and identified sweet potato
6 accessions that are resistant to the disease. **Methodology:** 21 sweet potato accessions were collected
7 from different agro-ecological zones of Nigeria and screen against *Alternaria solani* by artificial inoculation
8 of the pathogen in three diverse agro-ecological conditions. The accessions were named against their
9 place of condition. The research were laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three
10 replications. Data were collected on days to 50% flowering, fresh root weight per plant, number of root per
11 plant, number of main branches per plant, and above ground fresh biomass yield per plant at 15 weeks
12 after planting (WAP). Disease scoring was done using rating scale of 0-9 and analyzed with IRRIS STAR
13 software. **Results:** The result revealed that there are variations in the 21 accessions studied. Offa
14 performed best across the three environments followed by Umudike while Ado-Ekiti had the least
15 performance in term of root yield. The screening shows that none of the 21 accessions is highly resistant.
16 Four of the accessions were resistant, six accessions were moderately resistant, four accessions were
17 susceptible, and three accessions were moderately susceptible while 4 accessions were highly
18 susceptible to the pathogen. **Conclusion:** The findings concluded that the resistant accessions that gave
19 high number roots could be used as a gene pool for *Alternaria solani* resistance breeding for cultivar
20 improvement. The use of the identified resistant accessions with high root yield by farmers is
21 encouraged pending the time commercial *Alternaria solani* resistant cultivars will be readily available and
22 accessible.

23
24 Keywords: *Alternaria solani*, Improvement, Nigeria, Resistant, Susceptible, Sweet potato.

26 Introduction.

27 *Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam popularly called Sweet potato in English Language is one of the most valued
28 food crop globally. The crop produce tuberous roots that serve as food for humans, feed for livestock and
29 used as industrial raw material for various industries [1]. The utilization of the plant's roots and leaves has
30 helped in securing food security and assist in reducing health challenges that arose due to high level of
31 malnutrition particularly in children and pregnant women [2-3]. According to [4], there are more than 400
32 sweet potato species with different flesh and skin colour. The average composition of sweet potato flesh
33 has 43.5% total starch, 2% protein, 0.4% lipids, 4.4% ash, and 49.7% total dietary fiber [5]. Orange flesh
34 sweet potato is very rich in bioactive compounds such as phenolic acids and carotenoids [6]. Researches

35 had reported the beneficial effects of sweet potato on human and animal metabolisms, such as anti-
36 inflammatory, anticancer, antidiabetic effect [7-9].

37
38 Various biotic and abiotic factors affect the crop production globally especially where modern farming
39 techniques is adopted. Poor or improper harvesting, storage and transportation methods also affect crop
40 quality [10]. Moreover, the Sweet potato is not exempted from other crops that the mentioned factors
41 affect. Early blight is a major biotic factor affecting sweet potato production on the field. The disease
42 attacked the plant foliage and vines [11]. Early blight disease is caused by *Alternaria solani*. The disease
43 could cause significant roots and leaves yield reduction which will invariably lead to poor farmers' income
44 or total loss of investment. Roots losses due to early blight disease ranges between 50-90% [12] and
45 100% in severe outbreak [13]. The effects of early blight slow down photosynthetic rate in the plant [14].
46 The disease continue as rot on the roots in storage resulting to root spoilage and degradation of essential
47 nutrients in the plant edible roots [15].

48
49 Several management approaches have been developed to manage early blight disease of sweet potato
50 including farm hygiene, and any of these approaches or its combination were adopted the growers based
51 on the resources available at his or her disposal or based on technical know-how. Amongst the
52 management approaches include the use chemicals, biological and cultural approaches, and the use of
53 resistant varieties. The use of chemicals seems to be more effective in managing the disease, thus the
54 approach has been the most widely used. The chemicals are detrimental to human and livestock health
55 and the environment at large. Moreover, it is expensive thus increase the cost of production.

56 The outcry of environmental conservative scientists have called for the development of pests and
57 diseases control measures that will not tamper with the environment. Growing of crop cultivars that are
58 diseases resistant, adopting excellent agronomic practices and proper nutritional management or
59 integration of any of these methods are good measures in controlling the diseases without hampering the
60 environment [16]. The development of cultivars that are resistance to early blight will serve as the most
61 suitable approach for farmers as it does not required any additional resources to procure or need a special
62 skill to adopt. However, the need to screen and identified cultivars with genes that resistant to the blast
63 disease amongst the local germplasm becomes paramount [17].

64 This research aimed at screening Sweet potato accessions and identify the accession(s) that are resistant
65 to early blast disease (*Alternaria solani*) in agro-ecological zones in southern Nigeria to be recommended
66 for farmers to cultivate and used for further breeding work for crop improvement

67

68

69 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

70 **The study locations**

71 The research was conducted at the Biotechnology Laboratory, Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin, Nigeria,
72 and three field environments; Ekiti State University Teaching and Research Farm, Ado-Ekiti, University of
73 Medical Sciences Biological Gardern, Ondo-City and Oke-Ako/Irele Farm Settlement, Oke-Ako Ekiti
74 Nigeria. Ondo City and Oke Ako-Ekiti is located in Evergreen forest and derived guinea savanna agro-
75 ecological zone of Nigeria respectively while Ado-Ekiti is located in the vegetation that is intermediate
76 between the forest and savannah zone. The three experimental locations have two distinct seasons.
77 (Rain and dry).

78 **Experimental materials**

79 The experimental materials used for this work comprised 21 sweet potato accessions collected from
80 different agro-ecological zones of Nigeriato ensure genetic diversity. The collected sweet potato vines
81 were properly sterilized to get rid any form of pathogen(s) probably if there is any.

82 **Isolation, purification of the *Alternaria solani* inoculum and its pathogenicity test**

83 Diseased sweet potato (petioles and vines) with typical symptoms of early blight was obtained from
84 endemic sweet potato farm in Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State. The diseased plant parts (petioles and vines) were
85 taken to the Biotechnology Laboratory, Elizade University, Ilara Mokin Nigeria for the pathogen isolation,
86 characterization and purification according to [18]. The pathogenicity of the isolates were established
87 according to Koch's postulates. The agar slants with the Petri dishes containing *Alternaria solani* inoculum
88 were stored at 5°C [19].

89 **Soil sampling and analysis**

90 12 soil samples were randomly obtained at the depth of about 0-30 cm from each of the experimental
91 field to form one composite sample before land preparation in all the experimental locations. The soil
92 samples were collected with sterilized soil auger and packed into a sterilized enveloped and well labelled.
93 The composite soils were well air-dried, grinded, and sieved using a 2 mm sieve. The composite soil
94 samples were analyzed for the determination of the selected physio-chemical properties of the soil.

95 **Field experimental design and cultivation condition**

96 The research was laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replicates across
97 the three environments. The vegetation were manually sliced with cutlasses and packed. Ridges were
98 made with hoes. A spacing of 1 m x 1 m was adopted. The vine planted comprises of 4-5 nodes for all the
99 accessions. Good agronomics practices were adopted to ensure excellent crop performance.

100

101 **Inoculum preparation and inoculation**

102 The isolated, characterized and purified *Alternariasolani* inoculum preserved at 5⁰C was re-cultured for
 103 multiplication in Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA) medium. The preparation of conidial suspension, adjustment
 104 of final inoculum concentration for good sporulation stimulationand proper inoculation was carried out
 105 using [10] procedure. Tween 20 was applied to the gelatin (0.02% Tween 20 in 0.25% gelatin) to the
 106 prepared suspension to enhance a good adherence of conidia to the sweet potato aerial parts [20].

107 At six weeks after planting (WAP), the plants were uniformly inoculated at 18:00 hour of the day with
 108 suspension of the characterized pathogen (1 x 10⁵ spores/ml of distilled water) containing 0.02% Tween
 109 20 in 0.25% gelatin per plot using a knapsack sprayer to run-off. After inoculation, the fields were sprayed
 110 with water at 8:00 hour of the day the next morning. Watering continues with knapsack sprayer on the
 111 plants six times at two hours intervals after 15 hours of inoculation.

112 **Disease assessmentanddata collection**

113 Data were taken on the number of sweet potato plants that came down with *Alternaria solaniper* replicate
 114 at 15 WAP across the three environments.The severity of the diseasewas determined based on the
 115 formula adopted by [15]. Percentage incidencewas determined using [21]. Data were collected at Days to
 116 50% flowering, fresh root weight per plant, number of roots per plant, number of main branches per plant,
 117 and above ground fresh biomass yield per plant at15 WAP. The data collected were analyzed using IRR
 118 STAR software [22]. Means were separated by Duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) (P = 0.05).

119 **Table 1:List of sweet potato accessions showing their source of collection**

S/N	Location	Agro ecological zone	S/N	Location	Agro ecological zone
1	Sokoto	NGS	12	Kano	NGS
2	Ilorin	SGS	13	Iresi	FZ
3	Mokwa	SGS	14	Ondo-city	FZ
4	Kujama	NGS	15	Abeokuta	FZ
5	Randa	NGS	16	Markurdi	DS
6	Suleja	SGS	17	Omua-Aran	DS
7	Jalingo	NGS	18	Okenne	DS
8	Anyingba	SGS	19	Umudike	FZ
9	Uromi	FZ	20	Ado-Ekiti	FZ
10	Offa	DS	21	Gboko	DS
11	Zaria	NGS			

120 **Note: NGS: Northern Guinea Savanna; SGS: Southern Guinea Savanna; DS: Derived Savanna;**
 121 **FZ: ForestZone**

122

123 **Table 2:Disease severity rating scale 0-9**

Grade	Disease severity	Host response
0	No lesion observed	Highly Resistant
1	Small brown specks of pin point size	Resistant
2	Small roundish to slightly elongated, necrotic gray spots, about 1-2 mm in diameter, with a distinct brown margin. Lesions are mostly found on the lower leaves	Moderately Resistant
3	Lesion type same as in 2, but significant number of lesions on the upper leaves	Moderately Resistant
4	Typical susceptible blast lesions, 3 mm or longer infecting less than 4% of leaf area	Moderately Susceptible
5	Typical susceptible blast lesions of 3mm or longer infecting 4-10% of the leaf area	Moderately Susceptible
6	Typical susceptible blast lesions of 3 mm or longer infecting 11-25% of the leaf area	Susceptible
7	Typical susceptible blast lesions of 3 mm or longer infecting 26-50% of the leaf area	Susceptible
8	Typical susceptible blast lesions of 3 mm or longer infecting 51-75% of the leaf area many leaves are dead	Highly Susceptible
9	Typical susceptible blast lesions of 3 mm or longer infecting more than 75% leaf area affected	Highly Susceptible

124

125 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

126 **Soil Properties of Experimental Sites**

127 The nature and state of soil has a great influence on the growth and development of plant grown on it.
 128 The soil physiochemical properties of the experimental sites is shown in Table 3. The soils in the three
 129 experimental environments are slightly acidic. The pH ranges for the soil across three experimental sites
 130 will still permissible for plant nutrients uptake [23]. The textural class of the soil at the three environments
 131 was sandy loam. This class of soil has ability to hold water and allow easy penetration of plant roots. The
 132 total N, organic matter content and available phosphorus values were low at the three locations compared
 133 to the 1.5-2.0 g kg⁻¹, 25-30 g kg⁻¹ and 10-15 mg kg⁻¹ critical ranges of total N, organic matter and available
 134 phosphorus respectively as established for soils in Nigeria [24].

135

136

137 **Table 3: The soil physiochemical properties of the experimental sites.**

Properties	Environments		
	Ondo-City	Ado-Ekiti	Oke-Ako
Sand (%)	59.4	64.3	60.6
Clay (%)	19.6	18.4	21.2
Silt (%)	21.0	18.3	18.1
Textural Class	Sandy loam	Sandy loam	Sandy loam
pH (H ₂ O)	5.78	5.66	5.71
Carbon (%)	0.91	0.80	0.84
Organic Matter (%)	1.50	1.43	1.63
Nitrogen (%)	0.11	0.09	0.09
Phosphorus (mgkg ⁻¹)	9.17	7.19	9.19
Ca ²⁺ (cmolk ⁻¹)	1.21	1.69	1.73
Mg ²⁺ (cmolk ⁻¹)	0.66	0.63	0.66

138

139 Table 4 presents the mean performance of the parameters taken for the 21 sweet potato accessions
140 evaluated against early blight disease across the three environments. The result shows that Offa (4.88)
141 had the highest mean number of roots per plant followed by Umudike, Jalingo, Uromi and Okenne with
142 the mean number of roots per plants of 3.16, 3.01, 3.00 and 2.96 respectively while Ado-Ekiti recorded
143 the least mean number of roots per plant followed by Markurdi and Kano accordingly. It was also
144 observed that Ayingba had the highest mean above ground fresh biomass yield per plant (3,226.40g)
145 followed by Omu-aran, Suleja and Umudike respectively. The differences observed among the traits
146 studied within the accessions could be a result of variability in the genetic make-up of the accessions
147 [25]. The accessions with high above ground fresh biomass yield could serve as a multipurpose crop for
148 both fodder and food crop.

149 Table 5 present the analysis of variance for the parameters taken for the 21 sweet potato accessions
150 evaluated across the three environments against early blight disease. The accessions were significantly
151 different from each other ($P < 0.05$) for all the parameters taken. The level of significant indicated the level
152 of genetic variability among the accessions [25]. The degree of variability among the accessions shows
153 that improvement can be made in these accessions. Similar report was made by [26] in number of roots
154 per plants in sweet potato. For the environments, the parameters studied were significant though at
155 different levels except for days to 50% flowering. The level of significant across the environments could
156 be a result of differences in the soil properties and the climate variables across the different agro-
157 ecological zones (Ibiride, 2019). [27] reported some levels of significance in with the grain yield, number
158 of leaves per plant, 50% days to flowering and number of pods per plant in some African yam bean
159 grown in different environments. The result shows that accession x environment for all the parameters
160 studied were significantly different ($P < 0.05$). This shows that these accessions were not consistent across

161 the environments. The finding from this research is in agreement with the finding of [28] who reported
 162 accessions instability in cowpea.

163 **Table 4: Mean performance of parameters taken from 21 Sweet Potato accessions**
 164 **screened against Early Blight disease.**

S/n	Accession	D50%F	FRWP ⁻¹	NRP ⁻¹	NMBP ⁻¹	AGRBYP ⁻¹
1	Sokoto	127.28 ^a	332.54 ^b	4.84 ^a	4.89 ^{bcd}	1400.75 ^{fg}
2	Ilorin	108.44 ^{bcdde}	97.51 ^e	2.03 ^{ef}	4.00 ^{cd}	1663.61 ^{ef}
3	Mokwa	117.24 ^{abc}	187.46 ^d	2.41 ^{cde}	3.22 ^d	1586.50 ^{efg}
4	Kujama	125.06 ^a	216.46 ^d	2.40 ^{de}	3.15 ^d	1245.08 ^{gh}
5	Randa	106.06 ^{cde}	39.77 ^{fg}	1.57 ^{fgh}	3.36 ^d	1030.49 ^h
6	Suleja	115.76 ^{abc}	39.86 ^{fg}	1.29 ^{gh}	8.08 ^a	3058.96 ^{ab}
7	Jalingo	110.97 ^{bcd}	450.39 ^a	3.00 ^b	4.69 ^{bcd}	2640.01 ^{cd}
8	Ayugba	100.83 ^{de}	276.30 ^c	2.84 ^{bcd}	6.24 ^{ab}	3226.40 ^a
9	Uromi	123.64 ^a	303.90 ^{bc}	3.00 ^{bc}	4.76 ^{bcd}	2313.50 ^d
10	Anyingba	118.39 ^{ab}	51.55 ^f	1.88 ^{efg}	3.21 ^d	2774.99 ^{bc}
11	Zaria	108.50 ^{bcdde}	189.50 ^d	2.04 ^{ef}	5.14 ^{bcd}	2832.68 ^{bc}
12	Kano	103.77 ^{de}	36.95 ^{fg}	1.22 ^h	5.96 ^{abc}	2789.92 ^{bc}
13	Iresi	98.80 ^e	11.63 ^g	0.48 ⁱ	3.09 ^d	1806.69 ^e
14	Ondo City	116.28 ^{abc}	218.11 ^d	2.39 ^{de}	3.12 ^d	2316.33 ^d
15	Abeokuta	124.12 ^a	296.23 ^{bc}	2.92 ^{bc}	5.09 ^{bcd}	1673.71 ^{ef}
16	Markurdi	103.28 ^{de}	40.18 ^{fg}	1.21 ^h	7.06 ^a	2891.93 ^{bc}
17	Omu-Aran	109.38 ^{bcd}	186.11 ^d	2.01 ^{ef}	3.9 ^{bcd}	3201.41 ^a
18	Okenne	126.01 ^a	220.11 ^d	2.96 ^{bcd}	6.11 ^{ab}	2672.23 ^{cd}
19	Umudike	107.02 ^{bcdde}	219.11 ^d	3.16 ^b	4.63 ^{bcd}	3056.38 ^{ab}
20	Ado-Ekiti	119.11 ^{ab}	39.38 ^{fg}	1.14 ^h	4.63 ^{bcd}	1009.80 ^h
21	Gboko	102.97 ^{de}	53.19 ^f	1.56 ^{fgh}	3.34 ^d	1036.32 ^h

165 Means with the same letter(s) in each Column are not significantly different (P<0.05) according to
 166 Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

167 SoV: Source of Variance; D50%F: Days to 50% flowering; FRWP⁻¹: Weight of fresh root per plant;
 168 NRP⁻¹: Number of root per plant; NMBP⁻¹: Number of branches per plant; AGRBYP⁻¹: Above ground
 169 fresh biomass yield per plant

170

171 Table 5: Analysis of variance for parameters taken for the 21 sweet potato accessions across
 172 the three environments.

SoV	Df	D50%F	FRWP-1	NRP-1	NMBP-1	AGFBYP-
Rep	2	59.09	106.47	0.01	0.64	24674.53
Accessions	20	522.01**	1165.99**	8.82**	13.59**	340492.08**
Env.	2	36.65	1540.77 ^{xx}	0.71 ^x	1.35	148283.46**
Acc. X Env.	20	25.32**	471.05**	0.21**	1.44**	2456.98 ^{xx}
Total	144					

173 *; ** *significant at 5% and 1% level respectively*

174 SoV: Source of Variance; D50F: Days to 50% flowering;FRWP-1:Weight of fresh root per plant;NRP-1:
175 Number of root per plant; NMBP-1: Number of branches per plant; AGRBYP-1 Above ground fresh
176 biomass yield per plant
177

178 The level of early blight disease severity recorded for the 21 sweet potato accession studied is shown in
179 Table 6 and summarized in Table 7. The results shows that none of the accessions screened is highly
180 resistant while four of the accessions were resistant ,six (6), three (3) and four (4) accession were found
181 to be moderately resistant, susceptible, moderately susceptible and highly susceptible accordingly as
182 shown in table 7. The different levels of these sweet potato accessions susceptibility to early blight
183 disease could be a result genetic composition of each accession. These indicated that some accession
184 carries gene(s) that are resistant to the disease. This findings is in agreement with the work of [29] who
185 screened 25 Uganda's sweet potato accessions and observed that none of the accession is highly
186 resistant while some are resistant, moderately resistant, susceptible, moderately susceptible and highly
187 susceptible.

188 The resistant accessions can be exploited in a breeding programme for the development of early blight
189 disease-resistant for commercial cultivars. According to [30] development of a new cultivar during a plant
190 breeding programme involves hybridization of accessions with desired traits.

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200 **Table 6: Summary of Sweet Potato accessions blast severity recorded in Ado Ekiti using**
201 **standard evaluation system of international potato centre**

Accessions	Host Response	Accessions	Host Response
Sokoto	Highly Susceptible	Kano	Susceptible
Ilorin	Moderately Resistant	Iresi	Resistant
Mokwa	Highly Susceptible	Ondo City	Moderately Susceptible
Kujama	Moderately Susceptible	Abeokuta	Moderately Susceptible
Randa	Highly Susceptible	Markurdi	Moderately Resistant
Suleja	Highly Susceptible	Omu-Aran	Susceptible
Jalingo	Moderately Resistant	Okenne	Moderately Resistant
Ayugba	Moderately Resistant	Umudike	Resistant
Uromi	Moderately Resistant	Ado-Ekiti	Susceptible
Offa	Resistant	Gboko	Moderately Resistant
Zaria	Resistant		

202

203

204 **Table 7 Summary of Sweet Potato accessions blast severity recorded in Ado Ekiti using**
 205 **standard evaluation system of international potato centre**

Score rating	Disease reaction	Accessions
0	Highly resistant	-
1	Resistant	Offa, Zaria, Iresi, Umudike.
2-3	Moderately resistant	Ilorin, Jalingo, Ayingba, Uromi, Okenne, Goko.
4-5	Susceptible	Kano, Markurdi, Omu-Aran, Ado-Ekiti.
6-7	Moderately susceptible	Kijama, Ondo City, Abeokuta.
8-9	Highly Susceptible	Sokoto, Mokwa, Randa, Suleja.

206

207

208

209 **Conclusion.**

210 This research revealed that that none of the prominent sweet potato growing different part of Nigeria were
211 highly resistant to *Alternaria solani* disease under field artificial inoculation in three diverse savanna agro-
212 ecological zones. Only four of the 21 accessions were resistant while six were moderately resistant.
213 Moreover, two of the accessions that were resistant gave high root yield (Offa and Umudike) while the
214 other two accessions gave low root yield. The resistant and moderately resistant accessions with high
215 mean root yield could be exploited in disease resistance breeding programs for the development of sweet
216 potatoes cultivars and hybrids that are resistant to *Alternaria solani* with high root. Sweet potato growers
217 should be growing the accessions from Offa and Umudike which are resistant to *Alternaria solani* with
218 high root yield to reduce the cost of production and increase yield pending the time sweet potato that are
219 resistant to *Alternaria solani* be readily available and affordable.

220
221 **Author's contribution:** Gbenga Oluwayomi Agbowuro conceived the idea, analysis the data and did
222 the final editing. Moses Jimoh Falade set up the experiment, collected data and work on the research
223 article write up.

224
225 **Acknowledgments**
226 We would like to appreciate the Department of Crop, Horticulture and Landscape Design, Ekiti State
227 University, Ado-Ekiti for using their visual library.

228
229 **Declarations**

230
231 **Limitations of the study**
232 None

233
234 **Competing Interests**
235 The authors declared that no conflict of interest exists.

236
237 **Funding source**
238 None

239
240 **REFERENCES**

- 241 1. Singh, G. Plant Systematics: An Integrated Approach. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2019; 568.
- 242 2. Mwangi ROM, Odongo B, Ocitti p_Obwoya C, Gibson RW, Smit NEJM, Carey EE.
243 Release of five sweetpotato cultivars in Uganda. Hort. Science 2001; 36:385–386.
- 244 3. Amagloh FC, Yada B, Tumuhimbise GA, Amagloh FK, Kaaya AN. The potential of sweet
245 potato as a functional food in sub-saharan Africa and its implications for health: a review.
246 Molecules. 2021; 26: 2971. doi: 10.3390/ molecules26102971
- 247 4. Ecocrop (2010). Ecocrop database. FAOweb.<http://ecocrop.fao.org/ecocrop/srv/ey/home>.
- 248 5. Mu T, Singh J. Sweet Potato: Chemistry, Processing, and Nutrition. London: Academic Press,
249 2019;400. doi: 10.1016/C2016-0-05204-X
- 250 6. Alam MK. A comprehensive review of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* [L.] Lam): revisiting
251 the associated health benefits. Trends Food Sci. Technol. 115, 2021:512–529.
- 252 7. Chen H, Sun J, Liu J, Gou Y, Zhang X, Wu X. Structural characterization and anti-inflammatory
253 activity of alkali-soluble polysaccharides from purple sweet potato. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 2019;
254 131, 484–494. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2019.03.126

- 255 8. Yuan B, Yang XQ, Kou M, Lu CY, Wang YY, Peng J. Selenylation of polysaccharide from the
256 sweet potato and evaluation of antioxidant, antitumor, and antidiabetic activities. *J. Agric. Food*
257 *Chem.* 2017; 65: 605–617. doi: 10.1021/acs.jafc.6b04788
- 258 9. Kim HJ, Koo KA, Park WS, Kang DM, Kim HS, Lee BY. (2020). Anti-obesity activity of
259 anthocyanin and carotenoid extracts from color-fleshed sweet potatoes. *J. Food Biochem.* 2020;
260 44: e13438. doi: 10.1111/jfbc.13438
- 261 10. Agbowuro GO, Ayeyo ME, Awoyemi SO, Aigbokhan OF. Screening of upland-rice
262 landraces for resistance to rice blast disease (*Magnaporthe oryzae*). *Journal of Pure and Applied*
263 *Agriculture*, 2021;6(2):9-16.
- 264 11. Chalwe JM, Adebola P, Pillay M. Assessing the genetic diversity of *Alternaria bataticola* in South
265 Africa using molecular markers. *Asia J Appl Sci.* 2017; 5(2).
- 266 12. Osiru M, Adipala E, Olanya OM, Lemaca E. Occurrences of *Alternaria* leaf petiole and stem blight
267 on sweet potato in Uganda. *Plant Pathol J.* 2007; 6(2):112-119.
- 268 13. Anginyah TJ, Nark RD, Caray EE, Njeru R. Etiology, effect of soil pH and sweet potato varietal
269 reaction to *Alternaria* leaf petiole and stem blight in Kenya. *Afr J Crop Sci.* 2001; 9(1):287-299.
- 270 14. Ilondu EM. Etiology and assessment of leaf spot disease of sweet potato (*Ipomea batatas* L.)
271 Lam. In selected farms in Nigeria. *Agric Biol J Am.* 2012; 4(4):474-484.
- 272 15. Amadioha AC, Kenkwo PC, Markson AA. Fungitoxic potentials of extracts of plant origin against
273 fungal root rot of cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) in storage. *Ann Res Rev Biol.* 2019;
274 31(1):1-9.
- 275 16. Agbowuro GO, Afolabi MS, Olamiriki EF, Awoyemi SO. Rice blast disease (*Magnaporthe oryzae*):
276 A menace to rice production and humanity. *International Journal of Pathogen.* 2020; 4(3):32- 39.
- 277 17. Jimoh FM, Oluwayomi AG. (2023). Breeding for Late Blight Disease Resistance Varieties in
278 Potato: A Strategic Approach for Food Security and Sustainability. *International Journal of*
279 *Pathogen Research*, 2023; 12(6): 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpr/2023/v12i6250>
- 280 18. Namrata RPS, Verma R, Bisen R, Singh R, Teli B. Inheritance of blast disease resistance in the
281 cross hur 3022 x tetep of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) *Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural*
282 *Sciences*, 2019; 7(6):529 – 535.
- 283 19. Harlapur SI, Kulkarni MS, Wali MC, Kulkarni S. Evaluation of plant extracts, bio-agents and
284 fungicides against *Exserohilum turcicum* (Pass.) Leonard and Suggs. causing turcicum leaf blight
285 of maize. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 2007;20: 541-544.
- 286 20. Jia Y, Valent B, Lee FN. Determination of host responses to *Magnaporthe grisea* on detached
287 rice leaves using a spot inoculation method. *Plant Disease*, 2003; 87:129– 133.
- 288 21. Enyikwu DN, Amadioha AC, Ononuju CC. Significance of cowpea leaves for human
289 consumption. *Greener Trends Food Sci Nutr.*, 2018;1(1):001-010.
- 290 22. STAR, version 2.0.1. Biometrics and Breeding Informatics, PBGB Division, International Rice
291 Research Institute, LosBaños, Laguna, 2014.
- 292 23. Golla AS. Soil acidity and its management options in Ethiopia: A review. *International*
293 *Journal of Scientific Research and Management.* 2019; 7(11):1429- 1440.
- 294 24. Agboola AA, Corey RB. The relationship between soil pH, organic matter, available P,
295 exchangeable K, Ca, Mg and nine elements in maize tissue. *Soil Science*, 1973;115: 367-357.
- 296 25. Akinyosoye ST, Adetumbi JA, Amusa OD, Agbeleaye A, Anjorin F, Olowolafe MO, Omodele T.
297 Bivariate analysis of the genetic variability among some accessions of African yam bean
298 (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa* (Hochst ex A. Rich) Harms). *Acta agriculturae Slovenica*,
299 2017;109.3.02.
- 300 26. Thiyagn D, Rafii MY, Mahmud TMM, Latif MA, Malek MA, Sentor G. Genetic variability in Sweet
301 potato (*Ipomea batatas* Lam.) genotypes selected for vegetable use. *Journal of Food,*
302 *Agriculture and Environment.* 2013; 11(2): 340-344
- 303 27. Agbowuro GO, Salami AE, Aluko M, Olajide OO. Phenotypic variability among African yam bean
304 landrace accessions from different agro-ecologies of Nigeria. *Nigerian Agricultural Journal* 2021;
305 52 (1): 70-76.
- 306 28. Ajayi AT, Gbadamosi AE. Genetic variability, character association and yield potentials of twenty
307 five accessions of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp). *Journal of Pure and Applied Agriculture.*
308 2020;5(2): 1-16.

309 29. Sseruwu G, Mary N, Agnes A, George K, Ian B. Evaluation of Sweetpotato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L.)
310 Lam.) Genotypes for Resistance to Alternaria Leaf Petiole and Stem Blight (*Alternaria* spp.) in
311 Uganda. *Journal of Agricultural Science*. 2020;12 (10): 263-274.
312 30. Joshi BK, Bimb HP, Parajuli G, Chaudhary B. (2009). Molecular tagging, allele mining and marker
313 aided breeding for blast resistance in rice. *BSN e-Bulletin*, 2009; 1: 1-23.
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322