

Original Research Article

DIALLEL ANALYSIS OF SWEET POTATO [*IPOMOEA BATATUS* (L.) LAM] GENOTYPES FOR COMBINED BETA CAROTENE AND DRY MATTER CONTENT IN SOUTHERN GUINEA SAVANNA, NIGERIA

Abstract

Roots of orange-fleshed sweet potato varieties currently available in Nigeria contain high quantities of β -carotene or pro-vitamin A but have high moisture content. These varieties have been found to be a cheap and crucially important remedy for vitamin A deficiency. The cream or white-fleshed varieties, on the other hand, have a sweet taste with high dry matter content, giving a dry texture, a quality trait preferred in Nigeria. Development of sweet potato genotypes that can combine these two important quality traits is the objective of this breeding work. A diallel experiment using six parental sweet potato genotypes crossed in all possible combinations were carried out and thirty progenies were evaluated for beta carotene (β -carotene) and dry matter content in Landmark University, Omu Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria. The 30 F_1 progenies along with their parental lines were planted in the same field trial. The trial was laid out in 6 x 6 triple lattice in two replications. Highly significant ($P \leq 0.01$) differences were observed among the genotypes for the traits. The average β -carotene content among the progenies was 2.86 (mg/100g.f.w) while the dry matter content had a mean value of 31.89%. The cross progenies 199024.2 x Excel had the highest beta carotene (14.37mg/100g.f.w) content with the highest dry matter content (40.10%) and are therefore recommended for further evaluation.

Key words: Diallel analysis; dry matter; Southern Guinea Savanna; sweet potato; Vitamin A, β -carotene.

27 INTRODUCTION

28 Sweet potato [*Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam] is the seventh most important crop in the world
29 with an estimated 124 million metric tons produced annually. In the tropics, sweetpotato ranks
30 fifth in terms of caloric contribution after rice, wheat, maize, and cassava [1,2]. In many
31 developing countries, sweet potato is a staple because they are easy to propagate and maintain
32 and yield well under a variety of adverse conditions, including drought. The potential of this crop
33 as a food and a carbohydrate source is widely recognized [3].

34 Sweet potato is one of the most under exploited of the developing world's major crops
35 [4] as evidenced by its breeding initiatives that are at relatively early stages compared to other
36 crops. The need to identify local germplasm with desirable traits has long been recognised by
37 breeders [4]. It has been long known that many sweetpotato traits are mainly quantitatively
38 inherited [5]. To meet the quality needs there is a need to take into account the farmer and
39 consumer preferences when developing and selecting sweetpotato varieties and in most cases,
40 this can be addressed through participatory variety selection. Fortunately, the attributes
41 considered most important by farmers and consumers were already identified and ranked by [4].
42 Given the enormous genetic diversity of sweet potato in Uganda [6], the possibility for
43 sweetpotato improvement to accommodate specific uses is expected to be rapid [4]. There is
44 wide genetic variability for vitamin A occurring naturally in sweetpotato. This means
45 conventional breeding techniques can be employed to combine β -carotene and dry matter into
46 sweetpotato varieties.

47 Diallel mating designs have been widely used in genetic research to investigate the
48 inheritance of important traits in a set of genotypes [7, 8]. Diallel mating designs were devised,

49 specifically to investigate the combining ability of the parental lines for the purpose of
50 identification of superior parents for use in hybrid development programmes. A diallel cross is a
51 set of p^2 possible single crosses and selfs between p homozygous [9,10,11,12] or heterozygous
52 [13] parents; it provides a powerful method for investigating the relative genetic properties of
53 these parents. It is possible to partition treatment variation into components due to general
54 combining ability (GCA) and specific combining ability (SCA) [14, 7, 16, 17]. General
55 combining ability (GCA) is the average performance of a genotype in hybrid combination while
56 Specific combining ability (SCA) are those cases in which certain combinations perform
57 relatively better or worse than expected on the average [18]. The estimates of the relative
58 magnitude of the variances of GCA and SCA indicate the type of gene action determining the
59 traits. Variance due to GCA indicates the predominance of additive gene action while that of
60 SCA indicates the predominance of non-additive gene action arising largely from dominance and
61 epistatic deviations [19]. Evaluation of dry matter, starch and beta-carotene content in orange-
62 fleshed sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) genotype tested in three agro-ecological zones of
63 Malawi has been described by Kathabwalika et al. [20]. The present research examined the
64 quantitative inheritance of important traits in sweet potato by means of a diallel analysis with a
65 view to estimating the GCA and SCA components of genetic variance, and to determine the
66 associated type of gene action controlling β -carotene content and root dry mass.

67

68 **2. Materials and Methods**

69 **2.1. Description of the Study Area**

70 A field experiment was conducted on six sweet potatoes genotypes (three orange flesh
71 and three white flesh) at the Teaching and Research Farm of Landmark University, Omu Aran,
72 Nigeria. The experimental site is located at the Southern Guinea Savanna agro-ecological zone of
73 Nigeria with distinct wet and dry seasons. The land had been used continuously for the

74 cultivation of arable crops like maize, melon, cowpea and vegetables for more than three years.
75 Soil samples were collected from the trial site before cropping and were analyzed in the
76 laboratory for physical and chemical properties (Table 2). The soil texture was loamy sand.

77

78 **2.2. Treatments and Experimental Design**

79 The parent's materials used for the experiment were obtained from the germplasm
80 collection centre of the Department of Agronomy, the University of Ibadan which was originally
81 from the listed sources in Table 1. The parents were selected on the basis of being cross-
82 compatible. Hand crosses were carried out in a 6 x 6 full diallel, excluding selfs from 2010 to
83 2011 at the Teaching and Research Farm of Landmark University, Omu Aran, Nigeria. Fruits
84 were harvested between 30-50 days after pollination in the early morning to prevent scattering.
85 The fruits were further air dried, shelled, put in a labelled envelope and kept in desiccators. The
86 harvested seeds were soaked in water over night and planted into polythene bags filled with
87 loamy soil. Once the plants were about 30cm tall, they were transplanted to well-prepared ridges
88 for further growth and development. Twenty cuttings of a 25cm length of the sweet potato vines
89 from F₁ progeny were made to represent each cross. The selected 30 F₁ progeny along with their
90 parental lines were planted in the same field trial. The trial was laid out in 6 x 6 triple lattice in
91 two replications. The plot size used was 3m x 1m in two rows. Each plot comprised the 20
92 cuttings from each progeny of a cross. Each vine was inserted at a slant, with two-third buried
93 below the soil surface. Weeding was done 4, 6 and 8 weeks after planting, using small hoes. No
94 herbicides or fertilizers were applied. Appropriate agronomic practices were followed to raise a
95 good crop.

96 **2.3. Data Collection**

97 All data were recorded on an individual plant basis and then averaged across the 20
98 progeny of each F₁ cross. The quantitative traits were evaluated as follows: β- carotene content
99 expressed as mg 100 g⁻¹ and dry matter content (g) expressed as a percentage of root fresh mass
100 (g).

101 **2.4 Statistical analysis of triple lattice**

102 Data collected on the two traits were subjected to diallel analysis using Griffing (1956)
103 Method II (parents and crosses together), Mixed I (fixed effects). Both general and specific
104 combining abilities were computed using [20] for the parent and crosses.

105 Diallel analysis

106 To test the null hypothesis of no genotypic differences among parents and crosses, one-
107 way analysis of variance was performed. Treatment sum of squares was partitioned into three
108 components, parents (P), crosses (C), and parent vs. crosses (P. vs. C.). General Combining
109 Ability and Specific Combining Ability variance components of the cross mean square was
110 computed according to Griffing's (1956) fixed-effects model I. Reciprocals were defined as
111 being below the diagonal, adopting [14] notation the following genetic statistical model for
112 analysis within one environment.

113 **3. Results**

114 **3.1 Analysis of variance for β-carotene and dry matter content**

115 β-carotene content and dry matter content means squares were both significant (p<0.01) among
116 the parents and their 30F1 families, this shows that there is genetic variation among the parents
117 and their crosses as shown in table 4. Crosses out-performing their parents can be attributed to
118 transgressive segregation which is desirable for improving β-carotene content and dry matter
119 content. The results of average performances of some of the crosses presented in table 5 show
120 that the performances of crosses are significantly higher than the two parents for the traits. Cross
121 1 x 3 had the highest values in term of β-carotene and dry matter content with means of 14.37 mg

122 100 g⁻¹ and 40.10% respectively followed by 1 x 4 for β-carotene content with means of 12.39
123 mg 100 g⁻¹ and dry matter content with a mean of 30.05% while 2 x 4 had the least β-carotene
124 content and dry matter content with a means square values of 0.03 mg 100 g⁻¹ and 31.15%.

125

126 **3.2 General and specific combining ability analysis for β-carotene content and dry matter** 127 **content**

128
129 General combining ability and Specific combining ability mean the sum of squares for β-
130 carotene content and dry matter content were highly significant (p<0.01) across the parents,
131 parent x cross and the crosses as presented in Table 6. The mean squares for reciprocals of β-
132 carotene content were significant (p<0.01) whereas mean squares for the dry matter for the
133 reciprocal is not significant.

134 **3.3 COMBINING ABILITY EFFECTS**

135

136 **3.3.1 Beta-carotene content**

137 Table 7 presented estimates of GCA effects for β-carotene content and dry matter content of six
138 sweet potato parents. The GCA effects for β-carotene content of parent 1, 2 and 3 were positively
139 and highly significant (p<0.01). The GCA effects for parent 5 is significant (p<0.01) but
140 negative. The GCA effect for parent 4 and 6 was negative and was not significant. The SCA
141 effects of crosses 1 x 2, 1 x 4, 1 x 5 1 x 6, 2 x 3, 2 x 5, 2 x 6 and 3 x 5 were positive and highly
142 significant (p<0.01)(Table 8) whereas cross 3 x 6, 4 x 6 is also significant but negative. The rest
143 of the crosses are positive and not significant, apart from 1 x 3 which was negative and is not
144 significant (p<0.01). Four reciprocals (5 x 2, 5 x 4, 6 x 5 and 6 x 2) were not significant (p<0.01)
145 and negative except cross 6 x 2 which is positive. Crosses 3 x 1 and 3 x 2 were highly significant
146 although they were negative. The rest crosses were positive and highly significant (p<0.01)
147 (Table 8).

148 **3.3.2 Dry Matter Content**

149
150 The GCA effects for parent 2, 4 and 6 were positively and highly significant ($p < 0.01$). The GCA
151 effects for parent 1 is also significant ($p < 0.01$) but negative. The GCA effect for parent 5 was not
152 significant but positive (Table 7). Crosses 1 x 2 and 3 x 5 were positive although not significant
153 (Table 8). This is against crosses 2 x 3, 3 x 4, 4 x 5 and 4 x 6 which were negative and not
154 significant ($p < 0.01$). SCA effect for the rest of the crosses was significant ($p < 0.01$) and positive
155 (Table 8). For reciprocal, crosses 6 x 1 and 6 x 2 are the only crosses that were positively and
156 highly significant ($p < 0.01$).

157 **4 Discussion and conclusion**

158 **4.1 General and specific combining ability for β -carotene content and dry matter content**

159 Both GCA and SCA variances were significantly (Table 5), this suggests that both additive and
160 non-additive gene effects played a major role in the inheritance of β -carotene and dry matter
161 content. The GCA and SCA mean squares for the β -carotene and dry matter content were
162 significant ($p < 0.01$). This implies that both additive and non-additive gene action were involved
163 in their expression. This study indicates that additive gene action was relatively more
164 predominant than non-additive gene action in controlling the expression β -carotene content and
165 dry matter content. Hence, predicting progeny performance based on GCA for the traits will be
166 largely successful. The highly significant ($p < 0.01$) reciprocal mean squares for β -carotene and
167 dry matter content indicates that maternal effects can play a major role in the inheritance of these
168 traits and consequently the performance of a parent in a cross is dependent on whether it is used
169 as a female or a male.

170 **4.2 β - carotene content**

171 The GCA effects for parent 1 (1.33) and (1.12) were significant ($p < 0.01$) and positive indicating
172 that additive gene action contributed positively to the expression β -carotene content consequently,
173 their cross 1 x 2 is positive (3.28) and significant ($p < 0.01$) SCA effect. This means
174 that the interaction between the parent for the non-additive gene action resulted in the cross
175 performing above the expectation based on additive effects. The crosses that had positive and
176 significant ($p < 0.01$) SCA effects were 1 x 4, 1 x 5, 1 x 6, 2 x 3, 2 x 5, 2 x 6 and 3 x 5 indicating
177 that the non-additive gene action arising from the interaction of the parents contributed positively
178 to the expression of the trait. Parents 5 that had negative GCA effects (- 0.44) produced a cross
179 with a positive (0.022) and highly significant ($p < 0.01$) SCA effect (Table 6). This shows that
180 parents cannot be disqualified solely on the basis of negative GCA effects. In other word, parents
181 with high positive GCA effects did not necessarily produce crosses with the desired
182 performance. The parents used in this study, as well as the crosses, generated exhibit different
183 level of significant and desirable crosses were obtained from crossing parents with high GCA
184 effects with parents with low GCA effects that is 1 x 5, 2 x 5 and 3 x 5.

185 **4.3 Dry Matter Content**

186 The GCA and SCA mean squares for dry matter content were significant ($p < 0.01$), but the
187 reciprocal mean square was not significant. For the specific combiners for dry matter content
188 parent 3 had a positive GCA and their crosses with parent 1 and 2 given dry matter content of
189 40.01% and 38.20%.

190 **5. Recommendation**

191 It is, therefore, recommend that:

- 192 1. The parent 1 and 3 identified to be good general and specific combiners of β - carotene
193 and dry matter content should be further intrigressed into other proven cultivated in the
194 improvement of β - carotene and dry matter content in sweet potato.

195 2. The identified crosses with the highest dry matter and β - carotene content could be
 196 incorporated into an on-farm trial for proof.

197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203

Table 1: Parental genotypes and their traits used in a 6x6 full diallel excluding selfs

No	Genotype	Root flesh colour	Root Dry mass (%)	Source
1	199024.2	Orange	31.02	CIP Kenya
2	440034	Orange	26.92	CIP Kenya
3	Excel	Orange	28.53	South Africa
4	W-151	Yellow	34.29	CIP Kenya
5	TIS 87/0087	White	30.67	IITA Ibadan
6	440168	White	32.31	CIP Kenya

204

205 **Table 2. Physical and chemical characteristics of the experimental site soil at Landmark**
 206 **University, Omu Aran.**

207 **Physical characteristics properties**

208

Texture	Loamy sand
pH 1:1 (H ₂ O)	5.4
Sand %	84.1
Clay %	8.02
Silt %	6.42
Chemical characteristics	
Exchangeable Ca ²⁺ (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	1.12
Exchangeable Mg ²⁺ (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	1.62
Exchangeable Na ⁺ (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	0.19
Exchangeable K ⁺ (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	0.01
Total acidity H ⁺ (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	0.05
Cation exchange capacity (C. mol kg ⁻¹)	2.83
% Organic Carbon	0.24
% Soil organic matter	1.03
% Total Nitrogen	0.24
Available Phosphate (mg kg ⁻¹)	20.31

209

210

211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222

Table 3 Analysis of variance for Griffing’s (1956b) Model I, Method I and the expected mean squares for a full diallel.

Source	Df	sum of squares	of mean squares	Expected squares	mean	F-ratio
GCA	p-1	S_g	M_g	$\delta^2 + 2p[1/p-1]\Sigma g_i^2$		M_g/M_e
SCA	p(p-1)/2	S_s	M_s	$\delta^2 + 1/p(p-1) \Sigma_i \Sigma_j S_{ij}^2$		M_s/M_e
Reciprocal effects	p(p-1)/2	S_v	M_v	$\delta^2 + 2[2/p(p-1)] \Sigma_i \Sigma_j r_{ij}^2$		M_r/M_e
Error	M	S_e	M_e	δ^2		

223
224
225
226
227
228

Table 4: ANOVA for six sweet potato parents and their 30 F₁ families evaluated in a triple lattice design

Source	Df	Mean squares	
		β -carotene content(mg 100 g-1)	Dry Matter content (%)
Rep	1	0.75 ^{ns}	7.85 ^{ns}
Treatment	35	38.39**	34.28**
Block within reps	35	14.1	29.60
Intra-block error	70	0.32	5.10
Total	141		

229 *, ** Significant at (p<0.05) and (p<0.01) (F-probability) respectively; ns=not significant

230
231
232
233
234
235

236
237
238
239
240

Table 5: Block corrected means for six sweet potato parents and their diallel evaluated

Parents/Crosses	β -carotene content (mg 100 g ⁻¹)	Dry Matter content (%)
1 x 2	1.5	33.00
1 x 3	14.37	40.10
1 x 4	12.39	30.5
1 x 5	1.32	31.88
1 x 6	3.37	28.43
2 x 3	5.49	38.67
2x 4	0.03	31.15
2 x 5	0.03	27.38
2x 6	1.74	27.27
3 x 4	1.5	29.49
3 x 5	0.12	31.67
3 x 6	1.38	35.71
4 x 5	0.02	37.04
4 x 6	0.03	38.89
5 x 6	1.38	34.15
Reciprocal		
2 x 1	11.03	33.82
3 x 1	4.92	31.86
4 x 1	4.41	29.73
5 x 1	0.12	34.00
6 x 1	1.38	34.78
3 x2	4.92	25.86
4 x 2	0.13	35.00
5 x 2	1.66	32.69
6 x 2	1.50	34.72
4 x 3	6.12	32.56
5 x 3	4.92	28.30
6 x 3	0.03	33.33
5 x 4	1.38	24.49
6 x 4	1.5	33.94
6 x 5	0.03	27.47
Parent 1	13.38	36.25
Parent 2	0.15	32.00

Parent 3	5.49	26.47
Parent 4	0.00	25.86
Parent 5	0.03	29.73
Parent 6	0.12	28.30
Mean	2.86	31.89
s.e	0.39	5.38
CV (%)	15.1	7.01
LSD _{0.05}	0.85	6.04

241

242 **Table 6: Combining ability ANOVA for β -carotene content and dry matter content**

243

Source	Df	Mean squares	
		β -carotene content(mg 100 g ⁻¹)	Dry Matter content (%)
Rep	1	0.65**	7.85 ^{ns}
Parent	5	31.39**	134.28**
Parent x cross	1	11.1**	29.60**
Crosses	11	62.32**	25.10**
GCA	5	83.98**	54.76**
SCA	6	53.76**	10.80**
Reciprocal	12	54.23**	6.9ns
Error	100	0.032	7.63
Total	141		

244 ** Significant at $p < 0.01$ (by F -probability); ns=not significant; GCA=variation due to general
 245 combining ability, SCA=variation due to specific combining ability, reciprocal=variation
 246 between reciprocal

247

248

249

250 **Table 7 Estimates of GCA effects for β -carotene content and dry matter content of six**
251 **sweet potato parents**

Parent	β -carotene content	Dry Matter Content
1	1.33**	-3.41**
2	1.12**	4.38**
3	0.50**	- 2.88**
4	-2.13ns	2.05**
5	-0.44**	0.12ns
6	-0.355ns	1.04**

252 ** Significant at $p < 0.01$ (by F -probability); ns=not significant.

253

254

255

256

257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269

Table 8: Estimates of SCA effects for the Diallel analysis for β -carotene content and dry matter content

Crosses	β -carotene content (mg 100 g ⁻¹)	Dry content (%)	Matter
1 x 2	3.28**	1.64ns	
1 x 3	-2.14ns	3.10**	
1 x 4	5.16**	0.78**	
1 x 5	0.022**	1.88**	
1 x 6	3.37**	3.43**	
2 x 3	5.49**	-8.67ns	
2x 4	0.03ns	1.15**	
2 x 5	4.03**	2.38**	
2x 6	1.74**	2.92**	
3 x 4	1.27ns	-2.49ns	
3 x 5	0.12**	1.67ns	
3 x 6	-1.38**	3.76**	
4 x 5	-0.02ns	-3.04ns	
4 x 6	-7.03**	-3.89ns	
5 x 6	-1.38ns	3.15**	
Reciprocal			
2 x 1	11.03**	-3.82ns	
3 x 1	-4.92**	-1.86**	
4 x 1	-6.41**	2.73**	
5 x 1	-3.12**	3.00ns	
6 x 1	1.38**	3.73**	
3 x2	-4.92**	-2.06ns	
4 x 2	0.13**	-3.00ns	
5 x 2	-1.66ns	2.69Ns	
6 x 2	5.50ns	3.72**	
4 x 3	6.12**	-3.56	
5 x 3	4.92**	2.30ns	
6 x 3	0.02**	-3.33	
5 x 4	-1.38ns	-2.49	
6 x 4	1.5ns	-3.94ns	

6 x 5

-5.03ns

2.47ns

270

271 *, ** Significant at ($p < 0.05$) and ($p < 0.01$) (F -probability) respectively; ns=not significant

272

273

274

275

276 References

277 1. FAO. The global potato economy. Int. Year Potato 2008, Trade and Markets Division,
278 FAO, Rome, Italy. 2008; <http://www.fao.org/potato-2008/en/potato/IYP-3en.pdf>

279

280 2. Reddy UK, Bates GT, Ryan-Bohac J, Nimmakayala P. Sweetpotato. In: KOLE, C (ed.)
281 Genome mapping and molecular breeding in plants. New York: Springer. 2007; pp.
282 237-239.

283

284 3. Jarret RL, Gawel N, and Whitemore A. Phylogenetic relationship of sweetpotato
285 [*Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam.]. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.* 1992; 117: 633-637.

286

287 4. Rees D, van Oirschot Q.E.A, Amour R, Rwiza E, Kapinga R, Carey T. Cultivar
288 variation in keeping quality of sweet potatoes. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.*, 2003;
289 28: 313-325.

290

291 5. Jones A, Steinbauer CE, Pope DT. Quantitative inheritance of ten root traits in sweet
292 potatoes. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 1969; 94: 271-275.

293

294

295 6. Mukasa, SB, Rubaihayo, PR, Valkonen, JTP. Incidence of viruses and viruslike disease
296 of sweetpotato in Uganda. *Plant Disease* 2003;87:329-335

297

298 7. Collins WP. Analysis of growth in Kennebec with emphasis on the relationship
299 between stem number and yield. *American Potato Journal* 1977; 54:33-40.

300

301 8. Mwanga ROM, Yencho GC, Moyer JW. Diallel analysis of sweetpotato for resistance
302 to sweetpotato virus disease. *Euphytica* 2002; 128: 237-248.

303

303 9. Hayman BI. The analysis of variance of diallel table. *Biometrics* 1954a; 10: 235-244.

304

304 10. Hayman BI. The theory and analysis of diallel crosses. *Genetics* 1954b; 39: 789-809.

305

305 11. Hayman BI. The theory and analysis of diallel crosses. II. *Genetics* 1958; 43: 63-85.

306 12. Hayman BI. The theory and analysis of diallel crosses. III. *Genetics* 1960; 45: 155-172.

307 13. Dickinson AG, Jinks JL. A generalised analysis of diallel crosses. *Genetics* 1956; 41:

308 65-78.

309 14. Griffing B. Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to

310 diallel crossing systems. *Aust. J. Biol. Sci.*, 1956; 9: 463-493

311

312 15. Mihovilovich E, Mendoza HA, Salazar LF. Combining ability for resistance to

313 sweetpotato feathery mottle virus. *Hort. Science* 2000;35: 1319-1320.

314 16. Yan W, Hunt LA. Biplot analysis of diallel data. *Crop Science* 2000;42: 21-30.

315 17. Salami AE, Agbowuro GO. Gene Action and Heritability Estimates of Grain Yield

316 and Disease Incidence Traits of Low-N Maize (*Zea mays* L.) Inbred lines *Agriculture*

317 *And Biology Journal Of North America* 2016;Vol. 7 (2) pg 50-54,

318 doi:10.5251/abjna.2016.7.2.50.54

319 18. Rojas BA, Sprague GF. A comparison of variance components in corn yield trials: III.

320 General and specific combining ability and their interaction with locations and years.

321 *Agron. J.* 1952; 44: 462-6.

322 19. SAS Institute. SAS/STAT user's guide. Version 6, 4th ed. 1995 Vol. I and II. SAS Inst.

323 Inc. Cary N.C., U.S.A.

324 20. Kathabwalika, D. M., Chilembwe, E. H. C., & Mwale, V. M. (2016). Evaluation of dry

325 matter, starch and beta-carotene content in orange-fleshed sweet potato (*Ipomoea*

326 *batatas* L.) genotypes tested in three agro-ecological zones of Malawi. *African Journal*

327 *of Food Science*, 10(11), 320-326.

328 21.

329