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ABSTRACT

As in all cashew producing areas, anthracnose causes enormous production losses in cashew agroforestry farms in Côte d’Ivoire. To overcome this problem, the use of anthracnose-resilient production plant material in cashew forest agrosystems is becoming a necessity for sustainable

*Corresponding author: E-mail: brookouassiguy@gmail.com;
development. Thus, this study was carried out with the aim of evaluating the behavior of genotypes of cashew trees cultivated in peasant agroforestry systems in the north of Côte d’Ivoire. To do this, peasant agroforestry cashew orchards were prospected, cashew trees were marked, codified and geolocated. The incidence and severity of anthracnose were then assessed on the marked and geolocated cashew leaves, twigs, inflorescences and fruits. Descriptive analysis of the incidence and severity data revealed that more than 50% of the genotypes studied were resilient to anthracnose with an incidence on nuts in the order of $0.00 \pm 5.75\%$. The ACP explained 52.96% of the total variability observed with the first two axes. The CAH made it possible to structure these genotypes into four groups. MANOVA showed that genotypes in groups 2 and 4 exhibited traits of resilience against anthracnose disease. Group 2 was characterized by a relative absence of disease in the fruits ($0.00 \pm 0.00$) and by very severe infections in the twigs ($88.19 \pm 2.98$). Groups 4 were differentiated by low fruit infections ($1.32\pm0.32$) and low incidence on fruits ($2.17\pm1.09$). These results should help promote the agroecological management of anthracnose disease, enhance and intensify agroforestry practices in Côte d’Ivoire.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Native to northeastern Brazil [1,2] the cashew tree (*Anacardium occidentale* L.) was introduced by the Spanish and the Portuguese in the colonies of Africa and Asia [3,4,5]. Africa alone accounts for 55% of global cashew production [6]. West Africa, led by the Ivory Coast, is the newest and most dynamic production area in the world. Indeed, it provides 88% of African production [7]. In Côte d’Ivoire, the cashew tree was introduced in 1951 as a species for reforestation [8]. Thus orchards were created in the North of Côte d’Ivoire by the Technical Assistance Company for the Modernization of Agriculture in Côte d’Ivoire (SATMACI) and the Forestry Development Society (SODEFOR) in the 1960s [9]. These orchards were intended to fight against erosion and deforestation in the northern regions of Côte d’Ivoire.

Nowadays, the cashew tree has become a cash crop for this country agroforestry system as in Tanzania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Guinea Bissau and Benin [10,11,12,13]. Since 2015, Côte d’Ivoire has been the world’s leading producer and exporter of raw cashew nuts [14] with a national production of 738,000 tonnes of raw cashew nuts marketed in 2018. Despite the importance of Ivorian cashew production, the average yield of Ivorian peasant orchards remains low, in the order of 350 to 500 kg / ha [15]. This low production is mainly due to the use of plant material from all sources combined with high pest pressure [15,16]. Indeed, these orchards are faced with attacks from diseases including anthracnose [17,18]. In Tanzania, anthracnose is one of the four diseases responsible for declining cashew yields [19]. In 2000, anthracnose in Brazil caused a drop in production of around 40% [20]. Based on this observation, the use of resilient cashew genotypes for the development of agroforestry operations would be the best agroecological management approach for parasites in order to permanently curb anthracnose disease. In addition, it would help build a more resilient, less costly and environmentally friendly farming system.

To achieve this, the authors propose to evaluate, at different stages of development, the behavior of cashew genotypes developed in an agroforestry system and to structure them according to the severity and incidence of anthracnose disease.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Expérimentation Site

The peasant orchards of the departments of Korhogo, Sinématiali and Boundiali were the sites of the study. These departments are all located in the north of the Ivory Coast. The climate there is Sudanese and is marked by two seasons including a short rainy season which starts from May to October and a long dry season which extends from November to April with a dry wind from November to March. The average annual rainfall varies between 1000 and 1400 mm. The vegetation consists of wooded savannah and the soils are ferralitic, moderately to strongly denatured [4].

2.2 Plant Material

The plant material used is composed of 30 genotypes of cashew trees from the peasant
orchards of the departments surveyed (Korhogo, Sinématiali and Boundiali). The cashew trees of these peasant orchards have a planting period of 10 years and have the particularity of being developed, in an agroforestry system, in cultural association with the shea tree and the mango tree (Table 1).

2.3 Méthodes

2.3.1 Orchard prospection and choice of genotypes

The prospecting was carried out in the peasant orchards of the departments of Sinématiali, Korhogo and Boundiali. It consisted in looking for genotypes all coming from high producer cashew tree (between 20 and 50 kg), having a planting period of 10 years of age and developed in an agroforestry system which associates them with the mango tree and the shea tree. These tree populations were surveyed using the traveling inventory method combined with the diagonals and medians method. Each tree or individual has been marked / colored, numbered and geo-referenced using GPS. This approach was inspired by the strategies developed by Maxted et al. [21] to conduct eco-geographic surveys and those of Diouf et al. [22] to carry out ethnobotanical surveys. During surveys, the incidence and severity of anthracnose disease on the populations of shea tree, cashew tree and mango tree were realized.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data were collected on each side of the North-South and East-West axes of the tagged cashew tree. These data focused on the incidence and severity of anthracnose disease in leaves, twigs, inflorescences and fruits.

2.4.1 Evaluation of the severity index (Is) of anthracnose disease

Severity was assessed every two weeks on the leaves, fruits and panicles of the ten (10) branches marked on either side of the N-S and E-W axes. The evaluation approach resulted in a visual rating scale ranging from 0 to 9 [23,24,25].

The anthracnose disease severity index was determined according to the formula of Kranz [26] cited by Dianda et al. [27] according to the following formula.

\[
Is = \sum \left( \frac{X_i \times n_i}{N \times Z} \right) \times 100
\]

Is : severity index; Xi : severity i of the disease on the organ; ni : number of organ of severity i; N : total number of the organ observed; Z : highest severity scale (9).

2.4.2 Assessment of the incidence (Ic) of anthracnose disease

The incidence was determined as the ratio of the number of sick individuals to the total number of individuals observed as a percentage. The impacts were determined according to the following formula [28,29]:

\[
Ic = \frac{\text{Number of organs attacked on the date of observation}}{\text{Total number of organs in the plot orbit}} \times 100
\]

A scale adapted to that used by Bhagwat et al. [30] for the discrimination of mango varieties infected with anthracnose allowed to qualify the level of incidence of anthracnose disease. This six-grade scale (0-5) is defined as follows: 0 (no symptoms); grade 1 (1-10%: low incidence); grade 2 (11-20%: moderate incidence); grade 3 (21-30%: medium or intermediate incidence); grade 4 (31-50%: high incidence); grade 5 (>50%: very high incidence).

This evaluation focused on ten (10) branches marked on each side of the N-S and E-W axes to be seen and carried by hand.

2.4.3 Statistical analysis of the data collected

Data entry and graphs were performed with Excel 2013 software. Statistica 7.1 software was used to perform descriptive analyzes of the data and tests of homogeneity of the means in the event of a significant difference. Multivariate tests such as principal component analysis (PCA), ascending hierarchical classification (CHA) and multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) were carried out with Statistica 7.1 software in order to discriminate genotypes in according to their behavior towards anthracnose.
### Table 1. Different cashew genotypes and the geographic location of the orchards

| Genotypes | Geographic Coordinates | Genotypes | Geographic Coordinates | Genotypes | Geographic Coordinates |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| BKKY      | N: 09°33.136' O: 06°26.243' | KTY1      | N: 09°29.984' O: 05°43.309' | KBSD      | N: 09°35'15'' O: 005°21'019 |
| BBY       | N: 09°27.798' O: 06°29.779' | KTY2      | N: 09°30.168' O: 05°34.716' | KOMC      | N: 09°36.505' O: 005°20.710' |
| BKA       | N: 09°38.382' O: 06°21.127' | KTYY      | N: 09°31.162' O: 05°38.626' | KLYN      | N: 09°36.354' O: 005°20.627' |
| SST       | N: 09°37.438' O: 06°20.229' | KKSNI     | N: 09°31.674' O: 05°38.783' | KT3       | N: 09°33'721' O: 005°25.396' |
| SYD       | N: 09°24.667' O: 06°21.871' | KKSS      | N: 09°17.491' O: 05°32.697' | BAK       | N: 09°34'751' O: 005°25.302' |
| SFA       | N: 09°27.935' O: 06°25.350' | KBT       | N: 09°19.103' O: 05°34.223' | SSS       | N: 09°34.751' O: 005°28.030' |
| SWSZ      | N: 09°31.733' O: 006°25.921' | KSC      | N: 09°23.008' O: 05°33.643' | STSL      | N: 09°36.669' O: 005°22.204' |
| SLLC      | N: 09°32.295' O: 006°30.356' | KC3       | N: 09°19.033' O: 05°38.441' | SYDN      | N: 09°33.345' O: 005°24.330' |
| SDYY      | N: 09°28.861' O: 06°32.693' | KCP2      | N: 09°19.643' O: 05°39.207' | STSE      | N: 09°32.789' O: 005°23.864' |
| SDYN      | N: 09°39.932' O: 06°29.327' | KCP1      | N: 09°29.919' O: 05°48.486' |           |                        |

### Table 2. Anthracnose disease severity index following the evolution of the cashew tree

| Genotype | Vegetative stage | Flowering stage | Fruiting stage |
|----------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| SST      | (IsFe) 26,85±5,63abcd | (IsRam) 46,29±4,45bcdef | (IsFlg) 46,29±7,26abcde |
| STSL     | 59,25±6,19def     | 63,88±4,24ghij   | 50,92±11,33abcde |
| BKA      | 44,44±9,93bcdef   | 77,77±6,87hijk   | 81,48±6,19e    |
| SSS      | 55,55±4,96def     | 81,48±6,02ijk    | 67,59±5,55abcde |
| SLYM     | 35,18±5,62bcdef   | 43,51±7,51bdef   | 74,07±10,31cde |
| SFA      | 29,62±5,10abced   | 81,48±5,80ijk    | 80,55±5,37e    |
| BBY      | 24,07±5,67abcd    | 88,88±6,57jk     | 51,85±9,36abcde |
| KOMC     | 20,37±6,02abc     | 74,07±3,70fgij   | 40,74±6,8abcde |
| BAK      | 19,44±9,80abc     | 97,08±2,45k      | 69,44±5,8bcde  |
| KSCK     | 15,74±8,29abc     | 89,58±6,02jk     | 39,81±4,16abcde |
| KLYN     | 46,29±11,53cdef   | 96,25±2,39k      | 42,59±7,81abcde |
| SYD      | 36,11±10,11bcdef  | 90,41±4,97jk     | 60,10±14,65abcde |
| KTYY     | 0,00±0,00a        | 94,16±4,50k      | 62,96±6,8abcde |
| KVSS     | 0,92±0,06a        | 75,00±6,08ghij   | 77,77±5,73de   |
| KBSD     | 11,11±0,00ab      | 95,00±2,50k      | 68,51±10,40abcde |
| KBT      | 11,11±0,00ab      | 77,08±2,84ghij   | 34,25±9,55abcde |
| STSB     | 64,81±4,45f       | 42,59±6,7bcde    | 74,07±6,19cde  |
| BKKY     | 21,37±1,17abc     | 31,48±5,30abcde  | 34,25±10,67abcde |
| KKSNI    | 11,11±0,00ab      | 55,5±4,05dghi    | 24,07±4,68a    |
| SWSZ     | 42,59±5,80bcdef   | 46,29±3,41bcdef  | 30,55±7,82abc  |
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| Genotype | Vegetative stage (IsFe) | Flowering stage (IsInflo) | Fruiting stage (IsFr) |
|----------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| SDYN     | 42.59±8.32bcdef         | 35.18±10.89abcd           | 40.74±13.65bcde       |
| SDYY     | 20.37±6.02abc           | 33.33±9.51abcd           | 0.00±0.00a            |
| SLLC     | 16.66±3.79abc           | 27.77±4.75ab             | 9.20±6.52ab           |
| SYDN     | 20.37±3.41abc           | 42.59±8.44abcde          | 0.00±0.00a            |
| KCP1     | 40.37±9.85bcdef         | 63.25±5.55abcde          | 22.67±6.63abcd        |
| KCP2     | 48.80±7.09cdef          | 52.75±2.98abcde          | 0.00±0.00a            |
| KCP3     | 48.11±11.45cdef         | 38.21±11.02abcde         | 0.00±0.00a            |
| KTY1     | 53.03±6.51def           | 43.50±12.63abcde         | 23.95±9.88abcd        |
| KTY2     | 50.14±2.45cdef          | 36.94±9.34abcd           | 0.00±0.00a            |
| KTY3     | 53.01±3.43def           | 23.75±7.54a              | 33.17±13.77bcde       |
| Average  | 32.31±5.58              | 67.5±5.54                | 13.27±3.92            |
| P-value  | 0.000                   | 0.000                    | 0.000                 |
| CV(%)    | 17.27                   | 8.21                     | 15.94                 |

The numbers assigned the same letters in the columns are not statistically different according to Turkey’s HSD tests at the 5% level.

CV: coefficient of variability; IsFe: severity index on leaves; IsRam: severity index on twigs; IsInflo: severity index on inflorescences; IsFr: severity index on fruits.
3. RESULTS

3.1 Descriptive Profile of the Severity and Severity Index of Anthracnose Disease

The severity indices (Table 1 and Fig. 1) revealed a strong variability between the genotypes. Infections range from medium to very severe, including severe infections. Mild severe infections (ranging from 11 to 25%) were observed in four genotypes, namely SLLC, SDYY, BKKY, and KKSN.

18 genotypes presented severe infections (between 25 and 50%); these are the genotypes SYDN, SST, SWSZ, KBT, SDYN, KSCK, KCP3, BBY, SGYM, KVSS, KTY3, KTY2, KBSD, KOMC, SYD, STSL, KCP2, and STSB.

Eight genotypes have presented very severe infections (> 50%); they are: the SFA; the BKA, the KCP1, the BAK, the KTYY, the SSS, the KTY1, and the KLYN.

3.2 Descriptive Analysis of the Incidence of Anthracnose Disease

Averages were taken with incidence data at each stage of the disease. The results showed variation between genotypes (Fig. 1). All trees all exhibited mean incidences greater than 25%; thus, eighteen (18) genotypes (KBT, KSCK, KBSD, SYD, KVSS, BBY, KTYY, BAK, KKSN, SST, KTY1, BKKY, SYDN, KCP3, KCP2, SDYY, SLLC, SWSZ) presented between 25 and 50%.

The other twelve genotypes, namely; STSL, SSS, KOMC, SGYM, BKA, KLYN, SFA, KTY2, KTY3, KCP1, STSB, SDYN showed incidences of over 50%.

3.3 Principal Component Analysis (ACP) of the Incidence and Severity of Bacterial Disease

ACP was defined by the first two axes which explained 52.96% of the total variability observed (Figs. 3 and 4). The most eccentric variables of the factorial plane, and the most distant from the axes are those which expressed the strongest correlations of said axes. Axis 1, which expressed 29.49% of the total variability, was positively correlated with the severity index of anthracnose on twigs (IsRam) with the KTYY, KVSS, and BAK genotypes, and negatively correlated with the incidence of anthracnose on leaves (IcFe) with genotypes SDYN and STSB.

Axis 2, expressing 23.47% variability, was positively correlated with incidence and severity index on fruits (IcFe and IsFe) with the KLYN genotype.

![Fig.1. Histogram of anthracnose mean severity indices](image-url)
Table 3. Incidence of anthracnose disease following the course of the cashew tree

| Genotype | Vegetative stage | Flowering stage | Fruiting stage |
|----------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
|          | IcFe             | IcRam           | IcInflo       | IcFr          |
| SST      | 16,18±6,05abcde  | 76,25±7,46ab    | 86,12±3,84ghi | 0,00±0,00a    |
| STSL     | 22,96±3,91abcde  | 95,00±1,70cd    | 57,11±18,53bcd| 25,00±9,55ab  |
| BKA      | 27,87±6,92bcde   | 85,00±7,24bc    | 92,68±4,08i   | 0,00±0,00a    |
| SSS      | 23,01±6,63abcde  | 90,83±4,11c     | 86,95±8,72ghi | 0,00±0,00a    |
| SGYM     | 19,89±4,79abcde  | 90,00±1,11c     | 78,12±2,12efghi| 16,07±7,59ab  |
| SFA      | 6,43±1,88abc    | 88,75±4,90bcd   | 86,4±5,43ghi  | 30,55±16,33ab |
| BBY      | 9,32±4,44abcd   | 94,16±2,00cd    | 47,55±7,90abcde| 0,00±0,00a    |
| KOMC     | 2,67±1,06ab     | 88,33±3,74bcd   | 60,97±8,78cdefghi| 52,08±11,27b  |
| BAK      | 1,84±0,85a      | 97,08±2,45cde   | 46,66±1,59abcd| 20,15±10,90ab |
| KSCK     | 0,34±0,19a      | 89,58±8,02bcd   | 36,25±8,77abcde| 0,00±0,00a    |
| KLYN     | 31,81±11,27cde  | 96,25±2,39cde   | 33,5±10,82abcd| 46,26±18,14ab |
| SYD      | 8,62±1,83abc    | 90,41±4,97c     | 33,41±9,14abc | 0,00±0,00a    |
| KTYY     | 1,28±1,28a      | 94,16±4,50cd    | 40,83±7,06abcd| 23,33±10,54ab |
| KVSS     | 3,20±2,51ab     | 75,00±8,08ab    | 19,58±2,08abc | 40,47±20,00ab |
| KBSD     | 17,30±1,64abcde | 95,00±2,50cd    | 16,66±3,57ab  | 0,00±0,00a    |
| KBT      | 19,23±1,98abcde | 77,08±8,48abc   | 11,25±2,1a    | 0,00±0,00a    |
| STSB     | 77,02±4,87g     | 97,08±2,45cde   | 90,41±6,78hi  | 16,36±8,38ab  |
| BKKY     | 40,39±2,43ef    | 89,58±8,02bcd   | 56,66±13,71bcdefghi| 0,00±0,00a    |
| KKSN     | 29,91±3,17cde   | 96,25±2,39cde   | 48,75±5,46bcdefghi| 0,00±0,00a    |
| SWSZ     | 35,60±4,21e     | 90,41±4,97c     | 70,00±6,35defghi| 0,00±0,00a    |
| SDYN     | 63,67±5,21fg    | 94,16±4,50cd    | 95,83±2,71i   | 50,81±17,20b  |
| SDYY     | 34,55±11,50de   | 75,00±8,08ab    | 84,16±6,79fgghi| 0,00±0,00a    |
| SLLC     | 20,42±1,87abcde | 95,00±2,50cd    | 64,75±9,05defghi| 15,25±11,25ab |
| SYDN     | 23,94±2,38ab    | 77,08±8,48abc   | 88,33±9,39ghi | 0,00±0,00a    |
| KCP1     | 43,15±2,27ef    | 76,06±9,12ab    | 63,41±9,14defghi| 28±8,34ab     |
| KCP2     | 52,14±1,57fg    | 95,25±2,39cd    | 47,85±7,05abcdefghi| 0,00±0,00a    |
| KCP3     | 2,87±1,08ab     | 70,16±5,0a      | 57,12±9,23bcdefghi| 23,66±11,09ab |
| KTY1     | 3,9±2,51ab      | 78,74±7,24abc   | 85,63±9,39fgghi| 46,69±18,20ab |
| KTY2     | 32,24±1,57de    | 90,41±4,97c     | 90,03±7,8hi   | 0,00±0,00a    |
| KTY3     | 63,3±8,33fg     | 96±7,20cd       | 40,83±7,06abcdefghi| 15,25±11,25ab |
| Moyenne  | 24,50±3,67      | 88±13±5,11      | 60,59±7,50    | 14,99±6,33    |
| P-value  | 0,000            | 0,02322         | P= 0,000      | P= 0,000      |
| CV%      | 14,97            | 5,79            | 12,38         | 42,24         |

The numbers assigned the same letters in the columns are not statistically different according to Turkey’s HSD tests at the 5% level.

CV: coefficient of variability; IcFe: impact on leaves; IcRam: incidence on twigs; IcMoy: average incidence; IcInflo: incidence on inflorescences; IcFr: impact on fruits.
Fig. 2. Histogram of anthracnose mean incidences

Fig. 3. Projection of the variables in the factorial plane
The Ascending Hierarchical Classification (CAH) made it possible to structure the genotypes studied into 4 groups (Fig. 5) according to the method of Ward (1963). Group 1 containing six genotypes includes KVSS, KTYY, BAK, KLYN, KTY1 and KOMC. Group 2 consisted of five genotypes namely KBT, KBSD, KSCK, SYD and BBY. The third group with 12 individuals comprised the genotypes KCP1, SFA, SGYM, SSS, BKA, SDYN, STSB, KCP2, KCP3, KTY3, KTY2, STSL. Group 4 contained seven genotypes including SLLC, SDYY, KKSN, SWSZ, BKKY, SYDN, SST.

4. DISCUSSION

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) (Table 1) showed a significant difference between these groups (F> 4 or P <0.005). This significant difference was observed in the incidence of anthracnose on inflorescences, leaves and fruits and the level of severity indices on twigs, leaves and fruits.

Thus, group 1 was characterized by the highest incidences of disease (30.39 ± 6.72) and severe infections in the fruits (39.28 ± 10.20). Group 2 was characterized by an absence of disease in the fruits (0.00 ± 0.00) and by very severe infections in the twigs (88.19 ± 2.98). Group 3 was distinguished by higher incidences on inflorescences (73.33 ± 5.85) and relatively strong incidences on the leaves (34.28 ± 6.51). Group 4 was differentiated by low fruit infections (1.32 ± 0.32) and low incidence on fruits (2.17 ± 1.09).

The results of the descriptive analysis revealed that anthracnose disease affects all 30 genotypes observed. Just like Silué et al. [25] pointed out, the disease was diagnosed at the vegetative stage on leaves, at the flowering stage on inflorescences and at the fruiting stage on fruits. In addition to this result, which is similar to that of Silué et al. [25], the present study noted that anthracnose disease affected young, leafless twigs. Even though all genotypes have contracted anthracnose disease, there is a diversity in the level of severity and incidence depending on the genotype and stage of development of the genotype. This diversity in expression of anthracnose disease could be explained by 52.96% of the total variability observed in the analysis of the principal components of diversity. These results are similar to those of Banganingwa [31] who also highlighted differences in severity depending on the cassava cultivars used, in the face of cassava mosaic. Likewise, Mestries et al. [32] revealed differences in severity between
Table 4. Descriptive analysis of the different groups of cashew trees formed by the CAH

| Variables         | GI               | GII              | GIII             | GIV               | F      | P-value    | significance |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------|------------|--------------|
| IcINFLO           | 48.51±8.78ab     | 29.02±6.64a      | 73.33±5.85b      | 71.25±5.86b       | 7.94785| 0.000636   | oui          |
| IcFe              | 12.73±5.10a      | 10.96±3.39a      | 34.28±6.51b      | 28.71±3.33ab      | 4.10453| 0.016443   | oui          |
| IcRam             | 88.46±3.03a      | 89.25±3.21a      | 85.39±1.60a      | 85.65±3.50a       | 0.41766| 0.741802   | non          |
| IcFr              | 30.39±6.72b      | 0.00±0.00a       | 27.01±5.33b      | 2.17±1.09a        | 8.93639| 0.000331   | oui          |
| IsINFLO           | 60.63±6.28c      | 50.92±6.31b      | 52.95±7.53b      | 34.12±2.98a       | 2.53973| 0.078354   | non          |
| IsFe              | 21.65±6.95a      | 19.62±4.75a      | 43.41±4.36b      | 22.61±3.77a       | 5.65316| 0.004044   | oui          |
| IsRam             | 84.97±3.93c      | 88.19±2.98c      | 62.59±5.87b      | 37.03±6.41a       | 14.98363| 0.000007   | oui          |
| IsFr              | 39.28±10.20c     | 0.00±0.00a       | 24.79±5.00b      | 1.32±0.32a        | 8.71107| 0.000362   | oui          |

The numbers assigned the same letters on the lines are not statistically different depending on the test HSD of Turkey at the 5% threshold

IcFe: impact on leaves; IcRam: incidence on twigs; IcMoy: average incidence; IcInflo: incidence on inflorescences; IcFr: impact on fruits; IsFe: severity index on leaves; IsRam: severity index on twigs; IsMoy: average severity index; IsInflo: severity index on inflorescences; IsFr: severity index on fruits

Fig.5. Dendrogram of genotypes
sunflower varieties with respect to phoma. Thus, the total variability at axis 1, which expressed 29.49%, was positively correlated with the severity index of anthracnose on twigs (IsRam) with the genotypes KTTY, KVSS and BAK negatively correlated with the incidence of anthracnose on leaves (IcFe) with the genotypes SDYN and STSB. In addition, axis 2, which produced 23.47% of the variability, was positively correlated with the incidence and severity index on fruits (IcFe and IsFe) with the KLYN genotype. These results clearly illustrate a strong diversity in the behavior of genotypes towards anthracnose disease and could explain the fact that cashew anthracnose is the most important disease due to its high presence in orchards. Cashew farmers in Côte d’Ivoire. These results also corroborate those of Wonni et al. [18] who reveal that anthracnose is a serious disease in all cashew producing areas. These authors noted in their study of cashew tree diseases in Burkina Faso that anthracnose is the predominant disease in orchards. This diversity of behavior is explained by the fact that each genotype has intrinsic capacities, in terms of passive and active defense mechanisms, which would allow to defend against aggression [33]. These defense mechanisms can therefore differ from one plant to another, which would lead to a variation in severity and incidence depending on the behavior of the genotypes. This result is in agreement with those of Désanlis [34]. Indeed, this author showed during his study of fungal diseases of sunflower in France that the defense mechanisms put in place during an attack could differ from one genotype to another. Thus, the incidence on inflorescences, incidence on leaves, severity index on twigs, incidence on fruits, severity index on fruits and severity index on inflorescences have were the most discriminating in the behavior of the genotypes observed. These results join those of Chetouhi, [35] and, Benhamou and Rey [36] on the differential behavior of genotypes which would be dependent on the effectiveness of the defense mechanisms that are phytoalexins and phytoanticipins brought into play by the plant. Thus, this differential screening revealed that group 1 is characterized by the highest incidences of disease (30.39 ± 6.72) and severe infections in the fruits (39.28 ± 10.20). Group 2 was characterized by a relative absence of disease in the fruits (0.00 ± 0.00) and by very severe infections in the twigs (88.19 ± 2.88). Group 3 was distinguished by higher incidences on inflorescences (73.33 ± 5.85) and relatively strong incidences on the leaves (34.28 ± 6.51). Finally, group 4 was differentiated by weak infections in fruits (1.32 ± 0.32) and by weak incidences on fruits (2.17±1.09). According to Lecompte [37], the distribution of these genotypes in these four groups is attributable to the different levels of their intrinsic resistance.

5. CONCLUSION

In short, the diagnosis of anthracnose made it possible to demonstrate a diversity of behavior of the 30 genotypes studied. The structuring of these genotypes revealed four categories of genotypes according to their behavior at the different stages of their development. Thus, this study made it possible to structure and characterize these genotypes into four groups. Group 2 genotypes (BBY, SYD, KSCK, KBSD and KBT) and group 4 genotypes (SST, SYDN, BKKY, SWSZ, SDYY and SLLC) exhibited resilience against anthracnose disease. Group 2 was characterized by a relative absence of disease in the fruits and by very severe infections in the twigs. Group 4 cashew trees showed low fruit infections and low fruit incidence. These results could promote the agroecological management of anthracnose disease, enhance and intensify agroforestry practices in cashew cultivation in Côte d’Ivoire.
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