

Original Research Article

Evaluation of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) varieties for resistance to bean fly (*Ophiomyiaspp.*) in Kenya.

Abstract

Common bean is the most important pulse crop in Kenya, though small scale farmers involved in its farming have limited access to quality seeds resistant to pests such as bean fly, thereby limiting its production. This study aimed at determining effective ways of managing bean fly through identification and selection of resistant commercial varieties for enhanced host resistance. This was achieved through screening levels of resistance among commercial varieties and determining severity and incidence of bean fly infestations. The study was conducted in Kakamega, Njoro and Uasin-gishu. The varieties were planted together with two local checks; KK 8, Tasha, KK 15 (Resistant check), Chelalang, Wairimu dwarf, Ciankui, GLP 585, Miezi mbili, GLP 2 (susceptible check), GLP 1004, GLP 24, and GLP 1127. A score of 1-9 scale was used. The experimental design used was a RCBD with three replicates. Data collected was subjected to ANOVA considering varieties as fixed and replicates as random factors. The results showed that the bean varieties resistant to bean fly were; Chelalang, Tasha, GLP 1004, KK 8, GLP 585 and KK 15. The resistant varieties deter bean fly attack and are recommended for use by farmers in the country.

Key words: *Ophiomyia spp*, *Phaseolus vulgaris*, Resistant, Susceptible

Introduction

Common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) is the most common grain legumes consumed worldwide and is the most important grain legumes and source of proteins for most Kenyan households (Munyasa *et al.*, 2013). It is the world's most important food legume and ranks second after the cereal maize as a staple food crop grown by more than a thousand households in Kenya (Mureithi *et al.*, 2003). It is a popular crop among small scale farmers mainly for subsistence, nitrogen fixation and marketing of the surplus (Bitocchi *et al.*, 2012; Katungi *et al.*, 2010). Additionally, its short growth cycle and moderate rainfall requirements permit production even in seasons when rainfall is erratic (Bitocchi *et al.*, 2012).

The production of common bean is hampered with many challenges including pest and parasites, with bean fly (*Ophiomyia spp*) being a common pest in all common bean producing countries (Kamneria, 2007; Peter *et al.*, 2009). On the other hand, the most common bean seed varieties, developed by international and national research agencies in the 1990s, have been passed from farmer to farmer and saved from season to season, reducing the purity of the stock and increasing susceptibility to the pest (Kamneria, 2007). Generally, the major biotic constraints to bean production in Kenya and other Sub-Saharan countries include insect pests

such as bean fly among others, which cause significant yield losses (Ochilo & Nyamasyo, 2011). The bean fly occurs more frequently in association with the root rot diseases than alone and is a major cause of low bean yields, causing up to 100% losses especially in dry seasons (Letourneau & Msuku, 1992; Kamneria, 2007)

Use of resistant cultivars is a major pest management practice and crops grown in fertile soils also exhibit resistance to pests (Abawi *et al.*, 2000). Therefore, development of resistant cultivars is promising as a means of control, but sustained research is needed. Reports on resistance have been put out by, among others, Wagara (2007) and Ojwang' (2010). Despite the current effort, much research is still needed for elaborate conclusions to be drawn. This study focused on devising the effective management of bean fly through identification and selection of resistant commercial varieties of common beans, for enhanced host resistance and hence increased yield.

Materials and methods

The study was conducted in Njoro, Uasin-Gishu and Kakamega Counties during the short rainy seasons between the months of August to December in the year 2014, for one season each. The KALRO Thika program developed varieties for the medium and high potential areas. Thika varieties used included GLP 2, GLP 24, GLP 1004, GLP 92 and GLP 585. Egerton University varieties were; Chelalang, Tasha and Ciankui and other varieties were sourced from KALRO Kakamega which included; KK 8, KK 15, Wairimu dwarf and Miezi mbili, all of which were evaluated for bean fly. Two varieties, KK 15 and GLP 2 were used as resistant and susceptible control respectively.

Screen house Experiment

Each of the twelve varieties were planted in polythene bags and replicated three times in a RCBD design. At seven days post planting, they were infested with bean flies (*Ophiomyia spp.*) which were collected from bean fields in Uasin-Gishu County. Bean fly screening was done after 7, 14, 21 and 28 days after infestation and scoring done according to CIAT, 1978.

Severity and incidence of bean stem maggot infestation

The varieties were laid in a RCBD design with sowing done in 3 m rows, 3 m long and replicated three times. Spacing was done at 30 cm x 15 cm inter and intra-row spacing respectively, ten plants from the two middle rows of each plot tagged randomly for evaluation. The numbers of

dead plants were recorded from two weeks after emergence up to the fifth week for the plots subjected to natural bean flyinfestation. During the same period, the pupae and larvae in the stems of all selected and sampled plants from each plot were removed and counted. Days to 50% flowering, days to physiological maturity, 100-seed weight and seed yield which were recorded on naturally infested plots.

Results and discussion

Level of resistance among commercial varieties of common bean

The resistant varieties were KK 8, Tasha, KK 15 (resistant control), Chelalang, GLP 585, and GLP 1004 while the susceptible ones were Wairimu dwarf, Ciankui, Miezi mbili, GLP 2 (susceptible control), GLP 24 and GLP 1127 as illustrated in Table 1. Resistant varieties had larvae means of between 6.33 and 8.33 and the pupae means between 7.33 and 9.33 while the susceptible varieties had means of larvae count between 16.67 and 20.00 and pupae count of between 17.33 and 20.00. After the screen house experiment, the varieties which were confirmed to be resistant to bean fly attack were; Chelalang, Tasha, GLP 1004, KK 8, GLP 585 and KK 15 (Resistant check) while the susceptible varieties were; Wairimu dwarf, Ciankui, GLP 1127, Miezi mbili, GLP 24 and GLP 2 (Susceptible control).

Table 1: Means of bean fly larvae and pupae in screen house experiment

Varieties	Larvae	Pupae	(1-9 scale) Score
KK 8	6.67 ^{de}	19.33 ^{cd}	1- (Resistant)
Tasha	7.33 ^{cd}	7.67 ^e	1- (Resistant)
KK 15 – Resistant check	7.67 ^{cd}	9.33 ^{cd}	1- (Resistant)
Chelalang	6.33 ^e	8.67 ^d	1- (Resistant)
Wairimu dwarf	17.33 ^{abc}	20.67 ^a	9- (Susceptible)
Ciankui	20.00 ^a	19.67 ^{ab}	9- (Susceptible)
GLP 585	8.33 ^c	7.33 ^e	1- (Resistant)
Miezi mbili	19.00 ^{ab}	17.33 ^{bc}	9- (Susceptible)
GLP 2 – Susceptible check	16.67 ^{bc}	17.67 ^{bc}	9- (Susceptible)
GLP 1004	6.67 ^{de}	8.67 ^d	1- (Resistant)
GLP 24	19.00 ^{ab}	18.33 ^b	9- (Susceptible)
GLP 1127	18.00 ^{abc}	18.33 ^b	9- (Susceptible)
MEAN	8.42	13.22	
CV	19.15	10.53	
LSD	2.72	2.35	
Varieties	0.220 *	<0.001 ***	

Means with the same letters within the column are not significantly different at ($p < 0.05$), * significance at $P < 0.05$, ** significance at $P < 0.01$, *** is significance at $P < 0.001$, scores of 1 is resistant and 9 is susceptible.

The score of 1-9 scale (CIAT, 1978) used in the study showed that six out of the twelve varieties tested, were resistant and could be used by farmers to improve production. Increased common bean yield in the fields would therefore ensure increased food for farmers for consumption or sold locally to generate income. This findings are in agreement with Kimiti *et al.* (2009).

Enough bean production for consumption relates to sufficient supply of protein diet and hence malnutrition challenges are avoided and solved. The resistant varieties could also be used by growers to organically grow common beans free from pesticides as they resisted attack from bean flies and also resistance as a trait could form a basis for enhanced bean production (Bitochi *et al.*, 2012). The varieties that farmers could rely upon were Chelalang, Tasha, GLP 1004, KK 8, GLP 585 and KK 15.

Severity and incidence of bean fly infestation

Incidence of bean fly infestation was high in Kakamega (8.64), followed by Uasin-Gishu (7.75) and Njoro (7.11). Larvae count was high in Kakamega with a mean of 8.42, then Uasin-Gishu (7.56) and finally Njoro (7.53). Number of pupae count was high in Uasin-Gishu, followed by Kakamega and finally Njoro (Table 2). There was also a site and variety interaction, with bean fly pupae having highest interaction with means of 1.00, larvae had 0.99 and infested plants had 0.4.

Table 2. Means of severity and incidence of bean fly in the twelve varieties of beans

Varieties	No. of infested plants	No. of Larvae	No. of pupae
KK 8	7.67 ^{bcd}	6.78 ^d	23.11 ^{cd}
Tasha	8.44 ^{bcd}	8.33 ^{abc}	21.33 ^d
KK 15 – Resistant control	6.44 ^d	6.78 ^d	28.22 ^{bcd}
Chelalang	9.33 ^{abc}	7.78 ^{bcd}	23.56 ^{cd}
Wairimu dwarf	3.67 ^e	7.44 ^{cd}	46.56 ^a
Ciankui	7.78 ^{bcd}	6.78 ^d	35.22 ^{abc}
GLP 585	8.11 ^{bcd}	7.78 ^{bcd}	24.33 ^{bcd}
Miezi mbili	6.11 ^{ed}	8.22 ^{abc}	29.67 ^{bcd}
GLP 2 – Susceptible control	11.78 ^a	9.22 ^a	30.44 ^{bcd}
GLP 1004	6.89 ^{cd}	9.11 ^{ab}	27.56 ^{bcd}
GLP 24	7.89 ^{bcd}	8.56 ^{abc}	35.67 ^{ab}
GLP 1127	9.89 ^{ab}	7.22 ^{cd}	32.22 ^{bcd}
EMS	8.44	2.156	159.06
LSD	2.73	1.38	11.85
KAKAMEGA	8.64 ^a	8.42 ^a	29.58 ^a
NJORO	7.11 ^b	7.53 ^b	28.83 ^a
Uasin-Gishu	7.75 ^{ab}	7.56 ^b	31.06 ^a
EMS	8.44	2.15	159.06
LSD	1.36	0.69	5.92

Varieties	<0.001***	0.016**	0.05 *
Environment	0.0886	0.0179	0.7497
Var*Env	0.4056	0.9869	1.0000

Means with the same letters within the column are not significantly different.

The three sites of study were significantly different in response to severity and incidence of bean fly to common bean production. Kakamega had the highest bean fly incidence among the three sites of study. The bean fly incidences being high in Kakamega could be attributed to the fact that, Kakamega has two seasons in a year for planting legumes and therefore since *Ophiomyia spp.* attacks a variety of legumes, the main ones being species of *P. vulgaris* (Ochilo *et al.* 2011), then definitely its population will continue to build up since its lifecycle is very short. Also in warm weather, the eggs hatch within short period of between two to four days but as temperatures drop towards the end of the season, the life cycle takes longer (Ojwang' *et al.*, 2010). The total life cycle from egg to adult emergence varies under different environmental conditions (Kamneria *et al.*, 2007) and therefore the incidences for the three sites were different.

Severity cases of bean fly in Njoro, was high and this could be attributed to the type of species of the bean fly, abiotic factors and the fact that Njoro has only one planting season of legumes in a year. The abiotic factors includes: soil fertility, climate, location and season (Toomsan *et al.*, 2000). Damage is more severe in plants growing under poor conditions such as in infertile soils and drought (Bitochi *et al.*, 2012). Also the population dynamics of bean fly species, composition and patterns of infestation vary with location and season (Abawi *et al.*, 2000). However, of the three species, *O. phaseoli* and *O. spencerella* are the most important; this is because *O. centrosemantis* only occurs rarely in small numbers (Abate & Ampofo, 1996; Abate *et al.*, 2000). Within a growing season, *O. phaseoli* is known to attack the earlier planted crops compared to *O. spencerella* which destroys the late planted crops (Songa & Ampofo, 1999) hence low bean fly infestation because seasonality of occurrence in bean fly species is common (Songa & Ampofo, 1999).

In as much as Njoro had high severity cases of bean fly attack but it was realized that, it had the lowest incidence of larvae and pupae among the three sites. It could also be expected that low population of tryon (*O. phaseoli*) could have resulted from larvae mortality that fed on resistant beans which affected the successful pupation (Ojwang *et al.*, 2010).

Pod length, number of pods per plant, plant height and 100 seed weight

The longest pod lengths (cm) were observed in Chelalang, Ciankui and KK 8 common bean varieties with mean values of 12 cm each, while the shortest pod lengths were observed in GLP 1127 and Wairimu dwarf having 8cm (Table 3). Varieties which had highest number of pods

were; KK 8 and GLP 585 with mean of 16 pods per plant and the least number of pods were observed in Miezi mbili variety with mean of 8 pods per plant. The varieties with highest plant height were; Wairimu dwarf and Ciankui bean varieties with mean values of 40 cm each while the least height was observed in Tasha varieties with mean value of 21 cm (Table 3). Chelalang variety had the highest 100 seed weight of mean values of 41.11, and Wairimu dwarf variety had the least with mean values of 23.44. Parameter variations between the different locations are also presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Means of Grain yield (Kg ha⁻¹) and yield related components of the twelve varieties of common beans within the period of August to December, 2014 across the three sites.

Varieties	Pod length (cm)	No. of pods per plant	Plant height	100 Seed weight	Grain Yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)
KK 8	12.11 ^a	16.89 ^a	34.22 ^{bc}	30.00 ^d	1741.33 ^{ab}
Tasha	10.67 ^b	10.56 ^{cde}	21.22 ^f	37.44 ^{abc}	1675.00 ^b
KK 15 – control	10.44 ^{cb}	9.11 ^{de}	28.22 ^{de}	37.56 ^{abc}	1833.33 ^a
Chelalang	12.11 ^a	12.56 ^{bcd}	37.11 ^{ab}	41.11 ^a	1750.00 ^{ab}
Wairimu dwarf	8.67 ^{ed}	16.22 ^{ab}	40.67 ^a	23.44 ^e	866.67 ^e
Ciankui	12.00 ^a	11.00 ^{cde}	40.56 ^a	41.00 ^a	1000.00 ^d
GLP 585	9.44 ^{cd}	16.67 ^{ab}	31.89 ^{cd}	36.56 ^{bc}	1260.00 ^{cd}
Miezi mbili	7.89 ^e	8.00 ^e	25.56 ^{ef}	36.78 ^{bc}	1018.00 ^d
GLP 2 – control	9.33 ^{cd}	14.11 ^{abc}	31.89 ^{cd}	33.56 ^{cd}	850.33 ^e
GLP 1004	9.67 ^{cbd}	13.78 ^{abc}	32.44 ^{bcd}	31.00 ^d	1323.33 ^c
GLP 24	10.22 ^{cb}	12.89 ^{abcd}	37.22 ^{ab}	39.33 ^{ab}	1158.33 ^{cd}
GLP 1127	8.00 ^e	13.44 ^{abc}	34.67 ^{bc}	35.33 ^{bc}	1320.00 ^c
EMS	1.62	19.84	29.82	19.68	125.00
LSD	1.19	4.19	5.13	4.17	8.34

Pod length and 100 seed weight were significantly different in Kakamega, Njoro and Uasin-Gishu. It was observed that, Chelalang variety had high 1000 seed weight and hence a high yielding variety. The longest pod lengths were observed in Chelalang and KK 8 varieties which were resistant to bean fly pest and also high yielding. This could be because the longer pods had space to accommodate many seeds, the more the number of seeds the more yields expected from the variety and hence more weight. The varieties which had tallest plants by measurements of 40 cm were Wairimu dwarf and Ciankui which are also known to be susceptible to bean fly attack. The Tasha variety was realized to be short with a height of 21 cm, and was also found to be resistant to bean fly attack. Differences in plant height, also affects the expression of resistance to insects; oviposition is greatest on tall plant varieties (Hillocks *et al.*, 2006).

Initial plant stand was not significantly different in Western Kenya (Kakamega), Central Rift (Njoro) and North Rift (Uasin-Gishu) at $p < 0.05$. This may have been because, the bean seeds

had just emerged (germinated) from the soil after getting water from the rains but had not interacted much with soil nutrients, environmental climate, and the pest and diseases (biotic and abiotic factors), hence they were still in their natural normal state (Allen *et al.*, 1996).

Stand count at 2 weeks and at 4 weeks were significantly different in the three sites at $p < 0.05$, this could be attributed due to biotic and the abiotic factors that the common bean plants interact with in the environment. The resistance of plant tissues to insect damage varies markedly during the life of the plant and is age-specific. In some crops, plants are less resistant to insects in the early stages of development (Nzungize *et al.*, 2012).

Final plant stand count was significantly different in Central Rift (Njoro) but was not significantly different in Western Kenya (Kakamega) and North Rift (Uasin-Gishu) at $p < 0.05$, this might be due to regional location and distance relationship. Western Kenya (Kakamega) and North Rift (Uasin-Gishu) are closer to each other hence may not differ much in their environmental factors and other factors affecting common bean crop like pests and diseases and therefore the two sites are closely related. It was therefore noted from the observation that, Western Kenya (Kakamega) and North Rift (Uasin-Gishu) had higher bean fly infestation than Central Rift (Njoro).

There was no significance different for days to 50% flowering and 75% maturity at $p < 0.05$. KK 8 and Wairimu dwarf were the first to attain flowering stage hence early maturing. Chelalang, Tasha and KK 15 varieties were observed to have attained flowering stage late hence late maturing varieties. The resistant check (KK 15) was observed to have determinate growth habit which is characteristic of a bunch and the susceptible variety (GLP 2) to have its growth habit as determinate and indeterminate as classified by CIAT. Wairimu dwarf variety which is susceptible to bean fly (*Ophiomyia* spp.) and low yielding, was found to have indeterminate growth habit.

Conclusion

The resistant varieties were; Chelalang, Tasha, GLP 1004, KK 8, GLP 585 and KK. Therefore these varieties should be used by farmers to improve bean production in the farms. On the other hand the susceptible varieties should not be neglected but instead an improvement should be made on them by plant breeders and biotechnologist through modern methods and techniques like making crosses between the resistant and susceptible varieties to attain vigor of interest. Among the three regions of study, it was realized that Kakamega in western Kenya is a hot spot for common bean production despite the fact of having high incidence of bean fly. Therefore, farmers in Kakamega County are advised to use the resistant varieties to manage the bean fly attack in their bean fields hence boost their bean production.

193 **REFERENCES.**

- 194 Abate, T. Van Huis, A. and Ampofo, J. K. (2000). Pest management strategies in traditional
195 agriculture an African perspective. *Journal of Annual Review Entomology*, 94, 27-32.
- 196 Abate, T., Ampofo, J. (1996). Insect pests of beans in Africa: Their ecology and management.
197 *Annual Review of Entomology*, 41, 45-73.
- 198 Abawi, G., and Widmer, T. (2000). Impact of soil health management practices on soil borne
199 pathogens, nematodes and root diseases of vegetable crops. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 15,
200 37–47.
- 201 Allen, D., Ampofo, J., Wortmann, C. (1996). Pests, diseases and nutritional disorders of the
202 common bean in Africa: A field guide. Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
203 (CIAT); Wageningen, NE: Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
204 (TCA), Cali, CO. 132 p. (CIAT Publication no. 260)
- 205 Bitocchi E, Nanni L, Bellucci E, Rossi M, Giardini A, Rossi M, Spagnoletti Zeuli P, Logozzo G,
206 Stougaard J, McClean P, Attene G. (2012) Logozzo G, Stougaard J, Mesoamerican
207 origin of the common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) is revealed by sequence data.
208 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109,
209 788-796
- 210 CIAT. (1978). CIAT Annual Report. Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Cali, Colombia.
- 211 Hillocks, R. J., Madata, S. C., Chirwa, R., Minja, M. E., & Msolla, S. (2006). Phaseolus bean
212 improvement in Tanzania 1956-2005. *Euphytica*, 150, 215-231.
- 213 Kamneria, J. (2007). Study of Incidence and damage by bean fly (*Ophiomyia spp*) and grain
214 yield of common and climbing beans. (MSc Thesis). Egerton University, Kenya.
- 215 Katungi, E., Farrow, A., Chianu, J., Sperling, L. and Beebe, S. (2009) Common bean in Eastern
216 and Southern Africa: A situation and outlook analysis. ICRISAT, Nairobi, Kenya.
- 217 Kimiti, J., Odee, D., Vanhauwe, B. (2009). Grain legumes cultivation and problems faced by
218 small holder farmers in legume production in the semi-arid Eastern Kenya. *Journal of*
219 *Sustainable Development in Africa*, 11, 305-315.

- 220 Leteourneau, D., Msuku, W. (1992). Enhanced *Fusarium solanif.sp. phaseoli*infections by bean
221 fly in Malawi. *Plant Diseases*, 76, 1253-1255.
- 222 Munyasa, A.J. (2013) Evaluation of Drought Tolerance Mechanisms in Mesoamerican Dry Bean
223 Genotypes. (MSc. Thesis) University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
- 224 Mureithi, J., Gachene, C., Wamuongo, J. (2003) Legume cover crops research in Kenya.
225 Experiences of the legume research network Project. KARI Technical Note Session. No
226 12, Nairobi, Kenya.
- 227 Nzungize, J. R., Lyumugabe, F., Busogoro, J-P. and Baudoin, J-P. (2012) *Pythium* root rot of
228 common bean: biology and control methods. A review. *Biotechnology, Agronomy,*
229 *Society and Environment*, 16, 405-413.
- 230 Ochilo, W., Nyamasyo, G. (2011). Pest status of bean stem maggot (*Ophiomyia* spp.) and black
231 bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) in Taita district, Kenya. *Tropical and Subtropical*
232 *Agroecosystems*, 13, 91-97.
- 233 Ojwang', P., Melis, R., Songa, J., Githiri, M. (2010). Genotypic response of common bean to
234 natural field populations of bean fly (*Ophiomyia phaseoli*) under diverse environmental
235 conditions. *Field Crops Research*, 117, 139-145.
- 236 Peter, K., Swella, G., Mushobozy, M. (2009) Effect of plant populations on the incidence of bean
237 stem maggot (*Ophiomyia* spp) in common bean intercropped with maize. *Plant*
238 *Protection*, 45, 148–155.
- 239 Songa, J.M. and J.K. Ampofo, 1999. Ecology of the bean stem maggot attacking dry bean
240 (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) in the semi-arid areas of eastern Kenya. *International Journal of*
241 *Pest Management* 45, 35-40.
- 242 Toomsan, B., Cadisch, G., Srichantawong, M., Thongsodsaeng, M., Giller, C., Limpinuntana,
243 V.(2000) Biological nitrogen fixation and residual N benefit of pre-rice leguminous crops
244 and green manures. *Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*, 48, 19-29.
- 245 Wagara, I., Kimani, P. (2007). Resistance of nutrient-rich bean varieties to major biotic
246 constraints in Kenya. *Africa Crop Science Conference Proceedings*, 8, 2087-2090.