

## VARIABILITY IN REACTIONS OF GROUNDNUTS VARIETIES TO GROUNDNUT ROSETTE VIRUS ISOLATES FROM UGANDA

.ABSTRACT

**Aims:** was to assess the variability in reactions of groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates from Uganda

**Study design:** The experimental design was randomized complete block design arranged as a split plot with three replications. The main plots were the groundnut varieties while the sub-plot were the groundnut rosette virus isolates collected from central, western and eastern Uganda.

**Place and Duration of Study:** The study was conducted at the screen house, Kyambogo University, Kampala during 2011 and 2012, respectively

**Materials and methods:** Non-viliferous aphids obtained from Mukono zonal agricultural research and development institute (MUZARDI) fed on infected groundnut plants collected from central, western and eastern Uganda were used to infect 3 week old groundnut seedlings in a screen house.

**Results:** There were significant variation in reactions ( $P < 0.05$ ) among the groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates. Similarly, significant variety x isolate interactions were observed for incidence, leaf area index and plant height.

**Conclusion:** This study has shown that there were significant variations in reactions of groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates. In general, two groundnut rosette pathotypes exist in Uganda. Therefore, this is important in management of the disease.

**Keywords:** [Groundnuts, isolates, reactions, rosette virus, pathotypes, variability]

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Groundnut rosette disease (GRD) is the most widespread and devastating disease of groundnuts in all the major groundnut growing regions in sub-Saharan Africa including Madagascar. According to Naidu *et al* (1999), groundnut rosette disease manifests in two predominant forms namely, chlorotic and green rosette although, the variability in symptoms has been reported. However, chlorotic rosette is the most predominant symptoms in many sub-Saharan Africa countries whereas green rosette has limited geographic distribution reported only from west African countries, Uganda, northern Malawi and Angola. In fact, mild symptoms consisting of faint mottling of leaves, chlorosis of the young leaves and veins generally remain dark green than the intervenial tissues while severe symptoms is characterised by curling of leaves in some cultivars and shortening of the internodes. Accordingly, the most severe and obvious symptoms occur when plants are infected when still young and growth of internodes is almost completely inhibited producing extremely dwarf plants of rosette habit which are normally chlorotic. The severity of groundnut rosette disease varies to a greater extent depending on the time of infection, plant density, cultivar of groundnuts and amount of inoculums (NARO, 2001).

Groundnut rosette disease is regarded as a polycyclic disease because each infected plant serves as a source of inoculum for initiating subsequent spread in the field (Murant, 1990). According to Brook (1964), winged aphids bring the virus into the crop but spacing affects rosette incidence because of the influence of ground cover on the landing response of the winged aphids. Although, vectored by aphids, GRD requires the existence of three agents namely, groundnut rosette virus (GRV) genus *Umbravirus* (Murant *et al.*, 1995), satellite RNA (sat-RNA) (Blok *et al.*, 1995) and groundnut rosette assistor virus (GRAV) genus *Luteovirus* (Reddy *et al.*, 1985) to produce visible symptoms. Individually GRAV or GRV cause symptomless infection or transient mild mottle symptoms (Storey *et al.*, 1925). According to Murant and Kumar (1990), groundnut rosette disease symptoms and different symptom forms are largely due to sat RNA and its variants. Yet, the expression of disease symptoms does not necessarily indicate the presence of aphid-transmissible groundnut rosette assistor virus GRAV in infected plants. Consequently, plants that show symptoms but lack GRAV play no role in the spread of the disease because the coat protein of GRAV is needed for encapsidation and transmission of GRV and sat-RNA (Sreenivasulu *et al.*, 1988). In fact, it is only the number of plants containing all three agents that play a crucial role in the secondary spread of the disease in a given field whereas the total number of plants showing disease symptoms irrespective of having GRAV influences yield (Davies, 1975). Invariably, the nature and pattern of disease spread can be influenced by plant age, crop density,

timing and efficiency of transmission by viruliferous aphid vectors reaching the crop as well as the virus isolates. In addition, the proximity to the source of primary inoculum, climatic factors, predators and parasitoids of vector populations within the crop may also play a significant role in disease spread. Nonetheless, both types of groundnut rosette disease though sporadic and unpredictable cause significant yield losses amounting up to 100% (Dwiveli *et al.*, 2003).

Due to its devastating and unpredictable effects, various methods have been employed to manage groundnut rosette disease including chemical spraying to reduce aphid vector populations, cultural practices to delay the onset and spread of vector and disease as well as breeding for virus and vector resistance (Mukiibi, 2001). Although, some high-yielding, short, medium and long-duration genotypes with good levels of resistance to rosette disease and agronomically acceptable traits have been developed and made available to national programmes in different countries of sub-Saharan Africa, these always never last long and cannot be grown across environments due to the diversity of groundnut virus isolates which overcome the resistant genes. Therefore, the analysis of the genetic diversity structure and evolution of virus populations is critical for the development of efficient and stable control strategies. This is because the control strategies often fail due to the evolution of the resistant-breaking pathotypes/new pathogen population which overcomes resistance genes. Although, different approaches may be used to analyse the genetic diversity variation of plant viruses including biological properties such as the symptoms caused in different host plant species, host range or vector transmission properties, the choice of a given analytical technique depends on factors like the goal, sensitivity and cost of the analysis. However, in Uganda information on the variability of the reactions of groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates is scanty and limited. Therefore, the objective of this study was to assess the variability in reactions of groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates from different parts of Uganda.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in the screen house at Kyambogo University, 10km east of Kampala city during the period 2011 and 2012, respectively. Kyambogo University is located 32° 35'E and 0° 20'N., at an altitude of 1189 metres above sea level. Kyambogo lies in the equatorial climatic zone in the northern shores of Lake Victoria. The area is characterised by bimodal type of rainfall with a mean annual of 1000mm. The minimum and maximum annual temperatures range from 15°-18° and 27°- 30°C, respectively. The predominant soil type in Kyambogo hill is ferric soils with loamy sandy soils (Walugendo *et al.*, 1997). The experimental design was a randomised complete block design (RCBD) arranged as a split plot with three replications. The groundnut varieties were the main plots and the virus isolates constituted the subplots. Four groundnuts varieties of varying resistance including Serenut 1(susceptible), Serenut 3 (relatively resistant), Serenut 4 (highly resistant) and the local land race Egoromoit (very susceptible) were used for the study. The virus isolates used were obtained from Mukono (central), Serere (eastern) and Kyenjojo (western) Uganda. The groundnuts were planted on a 2 kg pots filled with soils obtained from Kyambogo university farm. The seeds were watered once until after germination. The aphid colony used for inoculation was obtained from the groundnut fields in Mukono zonal agricultural research and development institute (MUZARDI). A single colony of *Aphis craccivora* was maintained on healthy groundnut plant in the screen house at Kyambogo University at 30° C. The plants used for rearing the aphid colony were routinely monitored for freedom from groundnut rosette disease symptoms (Naidu *et al.*, 1999). The aphid colony used for inoculation was given 24 hours acquisition period on rosette disease infected groundnut plants obtained from the different regions of Uganda. The viruliferous aphid colonies reared on groundnut plants infected with groundnut rosette virus isolates from different regions of the country were transferred and confined onto a- ten (10) day old groundnut seedlings per pot. The aphids were given a 72 hour virus inoculation access period (IAP). Aphids were then killed by spraying groundnut seedlings

with Actellic 50EC (a.i 500g Pirimiphos methyl per litre) after 72 hrs. The inoculated groundnuts were maintained in insect free screen house.

Plants were assessed for disease reactions at harvest using 0-9 scale as described by Kalule and Puppala (2010). Prior to harvesting, data was taken on the leaf area index (LAI) and plant height. Leaf area indices were taken from individual plants in each replicate by measuring the length and width of one fully expanded leaf at the same position using a meter ruler (Kuhn and Smith, 1977). Plant height was measured from each individual plant using the meter ruler. At harvest the number of pods per pot, fresh roots and shoots biomass was also recorded. The number of seeds per pod was counted after drying of the pods. All the data was compiled, entered in excel spread sheet and analysed using GENSTAT computer package. Where there was significance, means were separated using LSD at 5% probability level.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 RESULTS

There was no significant variations ( $P>0.05$ ) in reactions of groundnut varieties to virus isolates during the two trials. However, the groundnut rosette virus isolates behave significantly different ( $P<0.001$ ) during both trials. Similarly, significant variety x virus isolates interactions ( $P=0.004$  and  $P=0.056$ ) were observed during the two trials. In addition, significant differences ( $P=0.001$ ) were observed in plant height, leaf area index and number of seeds for both the variety and virus isolates for the two trials. In fact, significant variety x virus isolates interactions ( $P=0.001$ ) were observed for plant height during the two trials. However, significant variety x virus isolates interactions were observed for leaf area index only during the second trial ( $P=0.001$ ) but not during the first trial ( $P=0.112$ ). Similarly, no significant variety x virus isolates interactions were observed for the number of seeds during the two trials ( $P=0.839$  and  $P=0.059$ ), respectively (Tables 1 and 2). Groundnut rosette virus disease manifested as yellowing, mottling and mosaic of the leaves, stunting and distortion of the shoots. In addition, induced bushy stunted growth characterised by a diversity of symptoms were observed in all virus isolates. In fact, during the first trials the most aggressive isolates was the one obtained from western Uganda whereas during the second trials, the most aggressive isolates were those from eastern Uganda (Table 1). Overall, all new symptoms appeared first on the top young leaves but later showed on older leaves. The effects of groundnut rosette disease on growth and yield of groundnut varieties is shown in Table 2. Egoromoit was the tallest variety as opposed to the varieties during the two trials. Similarly, Egoromoit had the largest leaf area index compared to the other varieties. However, the highest number of seeds was recorded from Egoromoit and Serenut 4, respectively. Overall, all the isolates had a similar effects on growth and yield of groundnut varieties (Table 3).

Table 1: Mean effects of groundnut rosette isolates on incidence and severity of 4 groundnut varieties grown at Kyambogo University, 2011/2012

| Isolate                          | Incidence (%) | Severity |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------|
| <b>First trial Sept-Dec 2011</b> |               |          |
| Central                          | 13.3          | 29.2     |
| East                             | 14.6          | 22.4     |
| West                             | 17.1          | 32.8     |
| Water                            | 0.0           | 0.00     |
| Mean                             | 25.0          | 25.00    |
| LSD (0.05)                       | 6.95          | 12.13    |
| <b>Second trial Feb-May 2012</b> |               |          |
| Central                          | 1.33          | 0.43     |
| East                             | 2.28          | 0.95     |
| West                             | 1.08          | 0.41     |
| Water                            | 1.00          | 0.20     |
| Mean                             | 1.42          | 0.50     |

|            |      |      |
|------------|------|------|
| LSD (0.05) | 0.34 | 0.24 |
|------------|------|------|

Table 2: Mean effects of groundnut rosette disease on the plant height, leaf area index and number of seeds of four groundnut varieties grown at Kyambogo University, 2011/2012

| Variety                           | Pant height | Leaf area index | Number of seeds |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>First trials Sept-Dec 2011</b> |             |                 |                 |
| Serenut 4                         | 14.56       | 4.79            | 2.92            |
| Serenut 1                         | 12.37       | 3.90            | 2.25            |
| Serenut 3                         | 13.63       | 4.46            | 1.25            |
| Egoromoit                         | 29.59       | 6.43            | 6.25            |
| Mean                              | 17.54       | 4.90            | 3.17            |
| LSD (0.05)                        | 4.80        | 1.02            | 3.80            |
| <b>Second trial Feb-May 2012</b>  |             |                 |                 |
| Serenut 4                         | 9.88        | 2.86            | 15.00           |
| Serenut 1                         | 10.76       | 4.05            | 7.17            |
| Serenut 3                         | 8.58        | 2.97            | 9.50            |
| Egoromoit                         | 23.67       | 8.04            | 13.00           |
| Mean                              | 13.22       | 4.48            | 3.17            |
| LSD (0.05)                        | 2.93        | 0.77            | 3.80            |

Table 3: Mean effect of groundnut rosette isolate on plant height, leaf area index and number of seeds of four groundnut varieties grown at Kyambogo University, 2011/2012

| Variety                           | Pant height | Leaf area index | Number of seeds |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>First trials Sept-Dec 2011</b> |             |                 |                 |
| Central                           | 9.63        | 3.37            | 0.67            |
| East                              | 14.61       | 3.82            | 0.92            |
| West                              | 13.43       | 3.79            | 1.58            |
| Water                             | 32.48       | 8.60            | 9.50            |
| Mean                              | 17.54       | 4.90            | 3.17            |
| LSD (0.05)                        | 4.03        | 1.18            | 3.16            |
| <b>Second trial Feb-May 2012</b>  |             |                 |                 |
| Central                           | 11.59       | 4.50            | 8.17            |
| East                              | 9.16        | 2.78            | 3.58            |
| West                              | 14.51       | 4.85            | 6.58            |
| Water                             | 17.62       | 5.78            | 8.25            |
| Mean                              | 13.22       | 4.48            | 6.65            |
| LSD (0.05)                        | 1.58        | 0.49            | 2.62            |

## 3.2 Discussion

This study assessed the reactions of groundnut varieties to groundnut rosette virus isolates as well as ascertained the most predominant groundnut rosette pathotypes in Uganda. In fact, groundnut varieties react differently to the groundnut rosette virus isolates. For instance, the improved varieties were more resistant to groundnut rosette disease compared to the local land race. Groundnut rosette isolates induced a variety of symptoms on the groundnuts including bushy stunted growth characterised by veinal chlorosis, greenish mosaic leaves, and small rosetted, twisted and curled leaves among others. Characteristically, both types of groundnut pathotypes were observed. Accordingly, the finding of this study is in contrary to the earlier reports which stated that green rosette is the most predominant pathotypes of groundnut rosette in Uganda, west African countries, Malawi and Angola (Naidu *et al*, 1999). The highest and lowest groundnut rosette disease severities were recorded on the local land race and Serenut 3, respectively. These results probably suggest differences in cultivar resistance to groundnut rosette disease. This is in line with earlier findings which indicated that improved groundnut varieties such as Serenut 3 have been developed and incorporated with the genes for resistance as opposed to the local land race varieties such as Egoromoit. Although, this may imply that host plant resistance is the most economical and sustainable way of managing groundnut rosette disease, sources of resistance may be lacking in most of the commonly grown cultivars such as Egoromoit. Besides, the evolution of more aggressive and virulent isolates always overcomes the existing sources of

resistance. Accordingly, this requires the continuous search for sources of resistance to identify genotypes which can resist the new strains of the rosette pathogens and other constraints limiting groundnut production as well as genotypes with improved agronomic traits. However, this study has shown there may be varying level of resistance among the improved varieties. For examples, Serenut 1 was the most susceptible among the improved varieties to groundnut rosette disease.

The impact of groundnut rosette disease on the growth and yield of groundnut was observed on plant height, leaf area indices and number of seeds per plant. In fact, groundnut rosette disease may express as a significant reduction in plant height due to shortened internodes, low leaf area indices or poor pod setting with no seeds per pods and subsequently zero yield per unit area. Besides, its sporadic and unpredictable nature, ground nut rosette disease is known to cause a significant yield loss amounting up to 100% (Dwelve *et al.*, 2003). Indeed, groundnut rosette disease has become a discouraging factor to many of the farmers growing groundnuts in sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, the implication of this study is that it is imperative to sensitize the stakeholders on the means of recognition, spread and control in order to facilitate the effective management of the disease. Indeed, this will promote increased groundnut production and reduced yield losses attributed to the disease attack. Basing on this study findings, groundnut rosette disease severity depends on the variety of groundnuts grown by the farmers and other factors. Therefore, it is imperative for the farmers to adopt improved groundnut varieties obtain higher yields as opposed to the yield from local land race such as Egoromoit that are susceptible to disease.

## 4. CONCLUSION

Groundnut varieties reacted different to the groundnut rosette virus isolates. In fact, groundnut rosette disease induced a variety of symptoms on the groundnuts including bushy stunted growth appearances characterised by veinal chlorosis, greenish mosaic leaves, and small rosetted, twisted and curled leaves among other symptoms. Overall, groundnut rosette disease expressed reduced plant height, low leaf area indices and poor seeds yield per plant.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

NO COMPETING INTEREST

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Both authors contributed equally. The second author collected and analysed the data while the first author wrote the paper. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## CONSENT (WHERE EVER APPLICABLE)

NA

## ETHICAL APPROVAL (WHERE EVER APPLICABLE)

NA

## REFERENCES

1. Bock KR, Murant AF Rajeshwari R. The nature of resistance in groundnuts to rosette disease, *Annals of Applied Biology*, 1990, 117; 379-384
2. Blok VC, Ziegler A, Scott K., Dangora D, Robinson DJ, Murant AF. Detection of groundnut rosette Umbravirus infection with radioactive and nonradioactive probes to its satellite RNA, *Annals of Applied Biology*, 1995, **127**: 321-328.
3. Davies, J.C. 1976. The incidence of rosette disease in groundnuts in relation to plant density and its effect on yield, *Annals of applied Biology* **82**:489-501.
4. Dwiveli, S.L., Gurtus, S., Chandra, S, Upadhyaya, H.D. and Nigams, S. 2003. AFLP diversity among selected rosette resistant groundnut germplasm int *Arachis newsletter* **23**:21-23.

5. Kalue D, Puppala N. Screening Groundnut Accessions for Rosette Virus and Leafspot Diseases in Uganda, Abstract, 2010
6. Kuhn. C.W. and Smith, T.H. (1977). Effectiveness of a disease index system in evaluating corn for resistance to maize dwarf mosaic virus *Phytopathology* **67**:288-291.
7. Murrant, A.F. and Kumar, I.K. 1990. Different variants of the satellite RNA of groundnut rosette virus are responsible for the chlorotic and greenforms of groundnut rosette disease *Annals of Applied Biology* **117**:85-92.
8. Mukibi, J.K, 2001. *Agriculture in Uganda*, Fountain publishers, Kampala, Uganda
9. Naidu, R. A., Kammins, F.M., Deom, C.M., Subrahmaniam, P., Chiyembekeza, A.J. and Van de Merwe, P.J.A. 1999. Groundnut rosette a virus disease affecting groundnut production in sub-Saharan Africa, *Plant Disease* **83**: 700-709.
10. Reddy, D.V.R., Murrant, A., Duncan, G.H., Ansa, O.A., Demski, J.W. and Kuhn, C.W. (1985) .Viruses associated with chlorotic rosette and green rosette diseases of groundnut in Nigeria, *Annals of Applied Biology* **107**:57-64.
11. Storey, H.H. and Reyland, A.K. 1955. Transmission of groundnut rosette virus, *Annals of Applied Biology* **43**: 423-432
12. Subrahmanyam, P., Van der merwe, P.J.A., Reddy, L.J. 2000. Identification of elite short duration rosette resistant lines in world germplasm collection, *International Arachis Newsletter* **20**: 46-50