

Estimation of area and dry mass of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale*) leaves: Effect of tree position within a plantation near Parakou, Benin

Abstract.

Accurate and non-destructive methods to determine individual leaf areas and dry mass of plants are very important because they are key parameters linked to plant production and they are used in functional–structural plant models to simulate plant growth. This paper describes an investigation of the variation in cashew leaf dimensions at different sites within a plantation with the aim of developing a model for calculating leaf area and dry mass. Five positions (South, Central, North, East and West) were considered in an eight years old cashew plantation, with rectangular plot and with an area of 3.5 ha. Two trees were selected randomly by location. Their crown was divided vertically into three zones. Within each zone, 60 leaves were collected randomly on different categories of axis of the tree. The length, width, area, and the dry mass of each leaf were measured. The longest leaves were obtained in the North, Center and South of the plantation (15.27 cm). The leaves of trees located in the South of plantation were the largest (9.6 cm) and had the largest areas (109.1 cm²). The largest quantities of dry mass were obtained from the leaves of the trees located in the South and in the east of the plantation (1.35 g per leaf). The best models according to adjustment and prediction qualities were in all cases as such $S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$ for leaf area and $m^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$ for dry mass. The results indicated an important variation in leaf size and dry mass according to a tree position in the plantation. Therefore, it is important to take into account this variability in the sample constitution when trying to estimate leaf area and dry mass.

Key words: Leaf area, dry mass, tree position, sunlight, cashew, models, Benin.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leaves are important plant components involved in plant biomass production through photosynthesis [1]. On an individual plant scale, the leaf area and specific leaf area, i.e. the ratio between leaf area and dry biomass, have been shown to be good indicators of plant productivity, for instance on poplar clones [2]. Leaf area therefore, is an important variable for most ecophysiological studies in terrestrial ecosystems concerning light interception, evapotranspiration, photosynthetic efficiency, fertilizers, and irrigation response and plant growth [3]. The leaf area is also required for assessment of fruit growth, evaluation of training and pruning systems, and estimation of pest population densities [4, 5]. Functional-structural plant models (FSPM) can facilitate the understanding of the functional links among leaf characteristics, carbon production and allocation [6]. Consequently, the easy, economic and precise estimate of leaf area or dry mass of leaf has been a concern to plant scientists for a long time. The most common approach is to develop ratios and regression estimators by using easily measured leaf parameters such as length and width [7]. Comparing several non-destructive models of leaf area of taro, Lu *et al.*, [8] proposed that the simple and linear relationships between leaf area and leaf dimensions (length, width) could be useful for non-destructive estimation of leaf area. Thus, non-destructive models for leaf area determination have been established for many species such as maize [9], bean [10], taro [8], kiwi [11], ginger [12] and watermelon [13]. Similarly within the framework of fruit trees, several combinations of measurements and models relating length and width to area have been developed for several fruit trees, such as grape [14, 15] and avocado [16]. However, models to estimate the leaf area of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale*) are almost absent in the literature.

The cashew tree is native to the Caribbean and the North-eastern Brazil. It is now widely cultivated in all tropical areas, such as Africa, Caribbean, Brazilian Northeast, Southeast Asia

52 and India. The economic importance of this plant lies mainly in its fruit (cashew nuts). For
53 example, in Benin, cashew nuts are the second export crop after cotton and its importance is
54 increasingly growing in agricultural production systems [17]. Cashew accounted for 8% of
55 the total value of exports in 2008, 7% of agricultural GDP and 3% of GDP [18].

56 The predictive accuracy of non-destructive models of leaf area or biomass depends on the
57 variation of the leaf shape within the same plant and between accessions [19]. This variation
58 may also be related to environmental factors including the quantity of sunlight captured by
59 the plant. Indeed, plants produce several types of leaves during their development. The first
60 few true leaves produced are usually smaller, simpler, and anatomically different from leaves
61 produced later in development [20]. Change in shape and size of successive leaves on a plant
62 are related to physiological changes associated with increasing age of the plant [21],
63 interaction between the shoot apical meristem and the developing leaf primordial [22],
64 genetically controlled shape maturation and a variety of environmental factors [20].
65 Therefore a good estimate of the production model requires accurate estimation of the area
66 and mass of leaves taking into account any possible variability.

67

68 The aim of this study is therefore to develop a non-destructive estimation model of the area
69 and dry mass of leaves of cashew taking into account the trees location within a plantation for
70 a better understanding of the variability of dry matter production by photosynthesis.

71

72 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

73 2.1 Data collection

74 The cashew plantation selected for the study was 8 years old planted in a rectangular form
75 and with an area of 3.5 ha with a density of 400 trees/ha. It is located near the city of
76 Parakou, Benin (9°20 'North latitude and 2°35' East longitude) where the climate is of

77 Sudanese type with a rainy season (June to November) and a dry season (December to May).
78 The average annual rainfall varies from 1100 to 1200 mm per year and the average annual
79 temperature varies between 26° C and 30° C. The warmest month of the year is February
80 while the coolest is August. The relative humidity varies from 15% in the dry season
81 (January-February) to 99% in the rainy season (August-September) while the annual average
82 insolation varies between 2,200 and 2,400 hours. In the study area, the soil is of tropical
83 ferruginous type. The relief is characterized by a plateau.

84 The plantation was divided into five zones (South, Central, North, East and West) according
85 the direction of solar radiation movement. In each zone two trees were randomly selected.
86 Selected trees have an average diameter at breast height (DBH) of 20.68 cm and an average
87 height of 5.15 m. In order to have different categories of leaves (young and mature, leaves
88 exposed to sun light and some shade), the crown of each tree was divided vertically into three
89 zones. In each zone, 60 leaves were collected from random manner taking into account the
90 possible wide range of dimensions for the categories of axes. A total of 180 leaves were
91 collected per tree. On each leaf, the following data were collected:

- 92 - the length of the leaf representing the distance between the top of the leaf blade and
93 stipule of the leaf; it was measured using a doubling rule in cm and mm with a
94 maximum length of 30 cm;
- 95 - the width of the leaf corresponding to the leaf width measured at half of the length; it
96 also was measured using a doubling rule in cm and mm with a maximum length of 30
97 cm;
- 98 - the leaf area representing the entire area occupied by the blade. Each leaf was
99 photographed with a digital resolution of 18 Mega pixel camera. The leaf area

100 corresponding to each image obtained was determined using the Mesurim Pro version
101 3.4 software;

102 - the dry mass is the mass of the leaf when it is free of all the amount of water it
103 contains. To determine the mass, each leaf was dried in an oven at 103 °C for 24
104 hours and then stored in a room heated closed storage for 24 hours. They were then
105 weighed using a balance.

106

107 2.2 Data analysis

108 The effect of tree position on the dimensions of the cashew leaf was evaluated using analysis
109 of variance method with factors for the position (five modalities: South, Central, North, West
110 and East) and the trees. The Newman-Keuls test [23, 24, 25] was also used to structure the
111 mean in case of significant difference. Covariance method was used to test the effect of the
112 position on the estimation of the leaf area and dry mass. The estimation models of leaf area
113 and dry mass were established using the linear regression method. In this context, different
114 types of models were tested (Table 1). The Box and Cox transformation was applied to the
115 response variable in order to make valid the conditions of application of the method. The
116 Box-Cox transformation is indeed a transformation of the dependent variable that can be
117 closer to the normal distribution and make constant variances.

118

119 The prediction quality of the models was evaluated by the cross-validation method [26] in
120 order to limit problems like overfitting. The model is constructed using the observations of
121 the training dataset, and the predictive power is tested using observations from the testing
122 dataset. The prediction error is estimated by calculating the mean square error on the testing
123 dataset. Since, the sample size in this study was not large enough, the approach used was

leave-on-out cross validation method which divide the original sample in n samples (n is the sample size); then select one of the n samples as the validation set and uses the $(n-1)$ remaining samples as the training set. The mean square error was calculated. The operation was repeated n times by selecting another validation sample from the $(n-1)$ samples which have not yet been used for model validation. The average of n mean square errors were calculated to estimate the prediction error.

Table 1

3. RESULTS

3.1 Description of data

The average leaf length ranged between 13.70 cm and 15.49 cm, with an average error of 0.12 cm and 0.15 cm (Table 2). The longest length occurred on the leaves of the trees situated at the northern part of the plantation, while the shortest length occurred in the west section. The average leaf width ranged from 8.37 cm to 9.60 cm, on trees in the south and west sections, respectively. As for the leaf area, the average ranged between 66.77 cm² (obtained in the east) and 109.14 cm² (obtained in the south). The mean dry mass of the leaves ranged from 1.03, (obtained in the west) to 1.29 g (obtained in the south).

Table 2

3.2 Effect of the trees position on the characteristics of the leaves

Evaluation of the effect of the tree position in the planting with respect to the solar radiation on the features of the cashew leaf showed that the leaves having larger dimensions and

greater dry weight were obtained from trees located in the south area of the plantation (Table 3). Whereas, the leaves of the trees from the west side of the plantation are small and have the lowest value of dry mass. There was a slight gradient to lower values from south to North and east to West.

Table 3

3.3 Estimation of leaf area and dry mass

The results of analysis of variance demonstrated that tree position influenced the area and dry mass of the leaves. These effects were confirmed by analysis of covariance whose results have not been presented in the paper for brevity. Indeed, the results of covariance analysis showed that the dummy variable had a significant effect ($p < 0.05$) in each model, thus suggesting that estimating the leaf area and dry mass must be performed by tree position in the plantation.

Regardless of the tree position, results showed that the best models from the point of view of fit quality and prediction quality were in the form $S^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$ for leaf area (Table 4) and in the form $m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$ for dry mass (Table 5). The adjusted R^2 values for these models are highest, indicating that they were relatively well adapted to the data. In addition, in terms of prediction, the mean square errors obtained by cross-validation were lowest.

The diagnostic results of the model's residuals (Figures 1 and 2) comply with the conditions of applications of the method, thereby indicating no potential outliers in the data. The normal probability plot of the residuals were almost linear, which is consistent with a normal distribution. Diagrams of the residual values based on the adjusted values displayed a random pattern, suggesting that the residuals had constant variance. Graphs of residuals with the predicted and the observed values showed no particular pattern. Therefore, these models were

those that best predicted the area and the dry mass of a new leaf from a tree located at a given position of the planting.

Although the models of form $S^{\lambda} = aLW + b$, $S^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$ and $S^{\lambda} = aW^2 + b$ for leaf area and form $m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$, $m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$ and $m^{\lambda} = aW^2 + b$ for dry mass, had relatively high adjustment qualities near to that of the selected models, they nevertheless presented poorer predictive qualities. The models $S^{\lambda} = aL + b$, $S^{\lambda} = aW + b$, $S^{\lambda} = a\ln(L) + b$ and $S^{\lambda} = a\ln(W) + b$ for leaf area and $m^{\lambda} = aL + b$, $m^{\lambda} = aW + b$, $m^{\lambda} = a\ln(L) + b$ and $m^{\lambda} = a\ln(W) + b$ for dry mass, gave only intermediate results.

Table 4

Table 5

Figure 1

Figure 2

4. DISCUSSION

In this study, the effect of the cashew tree location in the plantation was evaluated on the estimation of leaf area and of the dry mass of the leaves was evaluated. In the literature, several models were described to estimate the leaf area of different species which were generally functions of the length and width, but very little information was available for cashew.

The average values obtained in this study for the foliage dimensions for different tree location in the plantation were consistent with those reported in the literature for cashew (the length ranged from 10 to 20 cm and the width ranged from 6 to 10 cm). Similarly the values of the

leaf area are consistent with those reported by Archak *et al.* [27] for cashew (leaf size ranged from 51.4 to 174.3 cm²). Assessing the effect of the trees location on the characteristics of the leaf showed a significant effect on both leaf dimensions and dry mass. The heaviest and largest leaves were occurred in the South, whereas the lightest and smallest leaves were occurred in the east and west sections of the plantation. The type of soil is homogeneous in the plantation and the entire plantation received the same silvicultural treatment. Therefore, the fact that trees located in the south section of the plantation produce more dry mass is because it receives more sunlight. A leaf subjected to a given illumination (useful quantum light for photosynthesis) will absorb a given quantity of carbon dioxide from the air (CO₂) and produce carbohydrate base compounds for plant growth [28]. A key feature which influences the interception of photosynthetic radiation of a vegetation canopy is the inclination and azimuth of the leaves [28]. The total incident radiation at a given time on a first canopy comes from all directions in varying quantities according to each of these directions [29], and the interception is different for each incidence angle of the radiation [28]. In addition the angular distribution of the incident radiation intensities also vary over time depending on the height of sun in the sky [29]. Furthermore, observations of the surrounding landscape of the studied plantation showed that natural vegetation located south of the plantation was more open with the presence of yam fields in particular. Niinemets *et al.* [30] reported that variation in leaf size is associated with major changes in the within-leaf and in large modifications in integrated leaf chemical and structural characteristics.

The leaf area and dry mass varies by position of the tree in plantation, displaying a coefficient of variation of 30%. This is consistent with other studies [21, 31, 19]. Other authors like Verwijst and Wen [32] and De Swart *et al.* [19] also mentioned a difference in shape between the leaves on the main stem and those made by the lateral branches respectively in *Salix viminalis* and *Capsicum annum*. However, Tondjo *et al.* [1] did not detect a difference

218 between the shape of the leaves on the stem and on the branches of teak, but they did find
 219 differences between the dry mass of the leaves from the stems and those of the branches.
 220 Leroy *et al.* [33] mentioned also the existence of the variability in leaf mass and leaf area
 221 linked to the architectural position and the axis category of the parent shoots.
 222 The influence of tree location on leaf area and dry mass was a significant. In fact, the
 223 comparison in pairs of the five estimation models for each characteristic (leaf area and dry
 224 mass of the leaf) showed that different models should be used for each location. Regardless
 225 the location, the models that best predict the leaf area and dry mass of a new leaf in a
 226 plantation of cashew are logarithmic models of $S^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$ for leaf area and $m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW)$
 227 $+ b$ for dry mass. In terms of fit, the models obtained are significant ($p < 0,001$) and generally
 228 satisfactory (R^2 varies from 0.51 to 0.86, for leaf area and 0.30 to 0.80 for the dry mass).
 229 Moreover, the prediction errors obtained by cross-validation are rather low and vary from
 230 0.0001 to 0.2978 for leaf area and from 0.0001 to 0.0116 for dry mass. Prediction accuracy of
 231 leaf area of a new leaf are more accurate for models established in tree positions in the North,
 232 Center and East. It is less accurate for those in tree location of South and West. In regard to
 233 the leaf dry mass, all models obtained predict efficiently the dry mass of a new leaf, although
 234 a number of these models have a relatively poorer fitting quality. Accordingly leaf area and
 235 dry mass can be estimated with good accuracy from the maximum length and width of the
 236 leaf blade. Unlike the logarithmic models obtained in this study, Murthy *et al.* [34] had
 237 determined a linear relationship between leaf area and the product of the length and width for
 238 cashew. The differences our models and the models of Murthy *et al.* [34] can be linked
 239 especially to the fact that Murthy *et al.* [34] did not used to select their models, a criterion
 240 based on the assessment of the prediction accuracy. Non-destructive estimation models of
 241 leaf area based on the measurement length and width have been established for many species
 242 such as avocado [16], banana [35], kiwi [16], maize [9] and sunflower [36]. Other authors

have developed the power function models of length and/or width as most suitable for plants such as black pepper [37], vines [15], the dwarf coconut [38], jatropha [39] and teak [1]. Others models have been developed from a single characteristic of the leaf (length or width). Thus, Reynolds [40] proposed two models based on each of the two characteristics (length or width) to predict leaf area of a cocoa leaf, Kobayashi [41] used the length to predict leaf area of a guava leaf, and Willaume *et al.*, [42] estimated leaf area of the apple leaf from only the length of the leaf. In this study, power function models and models based on the use of a single characteristic (length and width) do not perform well in terms of prediction quality. The differences between the models are due to differences in the conditions of the study environment and the specificity of the leaf shape of the species studied. The same types of models were obtained for all plantation locations, suggesting that cashew leaves retain their shape regardless of the location. The results of this study are consistent with those of Tondjo *et al.* [1], who claimed on the basis of the relationship between the leaf area and the product of the length and width that leaves have expand without change in shape. We therefore conclude that both length and width measurements are necessary to estimate leaf area and dry mass accurately of cashew leaves, and the tree location in the plantation affects the quantity of sunlight intercepted by the trees.

5. CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to assess the effect of the tree location in the plantation on the characteristics (length, width, area, dry mass) of the cashew leaves, and to develop models to estimate with good accuracy leaf area and dry mass of the leaves. The tree location in the plantation had an influence on the morphological characteristics of the leaf, and the leaf area and dry mass. The best models for estimating the leaf area and the dry mass of cashew leaves were function of the logarithm of the product of the length and width, and the model

coefficients varied according to the tree location in the plantation. It therefore appears necessary to consider the trees location in the sample design for estimating area and dry mass of the leaves in a plantation, and the specific model coefficients for each trees location in relation to the incidence of the solar radiation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Tondjo K, Brancheriau L, Sabatier SA, Kokutse AD, Akossou A, Kokou K, Fourcaud T. Non-destructive measurement of leaf area and dry biomass in *Tectona grandis*. *Trees*, 2015, 29(5): 1625–1631.
2. Marron N, Villar M, Dreyer E, Delay D, Boudouresque E, Petit J-M, Delmotte FM, Guehl J-M, Brignolas F. Diversity of leaf traits related to productivity in 31 *Populus deltoides* x *Populus nigra* clones. *Tree Physiol*, 2005, 25: 425–435.
3. Blanco FF, Folegatti MV. Estimation of leaf area for greenhouse cucumber by linear measurements under salinity and grafting. *Agricultural Science*, 2005, 62(4): 305–309.
4. Lang GA. Precocious, dwarfing and productive – How will new cherry rootstocks impact the sweet cherry industry? *HortTechnol.*, 2000, 10: 719–725.
5. Lang GA. Underlying principles of high density sweet cherry production, *Acta Hortic.* 2005, 667: 325–335.

- 290 6. Fourcaud T, Zhang XP, Stokes A, Lambers H, Koerner C. Plant growth modelling
291 and applications: the increasing importance of plant architecture in growth models.
292 *Ann. Bot.* 2008, 101: 1053–1063.
- 293 7. Kvet J, Marshall JK. Assessment of leaf area and other assimilating plant surfaces. In
294 Z. Sestak, J. Catsky, and P. G. Jarvis, Eds., *Plant Photosynthetic Production*, Manual
295 of Methods, Junk Publishers, The Hague, The Netherlands, 1971, 517–555.
- 296 8. Lu HY, Lu CT, Wei ML, Chan LF. Comparison of different models for non-
297 destructive leaf area estimation in taro. *Agronomy Journal*, 2004, 96(2): 448–453.
- 298 9. Stewart DW, Dwyer LM. Mathematical characterization of leaf shape and area of
299 maize hybrids. *Crop Science*, 1999, 39(2): 422–427.
- 300 10. Bhatt M, Chanda SV. Prediction of leaf area in *Phaseolus vulgaris* by non-destructive
301 method. *Bulgarian Journal of Plant Physiology*, 2003, 29(2): 96–100.
- 302 11. Mendoza-de Gyves E, Roupael Y, Cristofori V, Mira FR. A non-destructive, simple
303 and accurate model for estimating the individual leaf area of kiwi (*Actinidia*
304 *deliciosa*). *Fruits*, 2007, 62(3): 171–176.
- 305 12. Kandiannan K, Parthasarathy U, Krishnamurthy KS, Thankamani CK, Srinivasan V.
306 Modelling individual leaf area of ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Roscoe) using leaf length
307 and width. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2009, 120(4): 532–537.
- 308 13. Roupael Y, Mouneimne AH, Rivera CM, Cardarelli M, Marucci A, Colla G.
309 Allometric models for non-destructive leaf area estimation in grafted and ungrafted
310 watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* Thunb), *Journal of Food, Agriculture and*
311 *Environment*, 2010, 8(1): 161–165.
- 312 14. Montero FJ, De Juan Cuesta JA, Brasa A. Non-destructive methods to estimate leaf
313 area in *Vitis vinifera* L. *HortScience*, 2000, 35(4): 696–698.

- 314 15. Williams L, Martinson III TE, Non-destructive leaf area estimation of “Niagara” and
315 “Dechaunac” grapevines. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2003, 98(4) : 493–498.
- 316 16. Uzun S, Celik H. Leaf area prediction models for different horticultural plants.
317 *Tropical Journal and Agricultural Forest*, 1999, 23(6): 645–650.
- 318 17. Projet d’Amélioration et de Diversification des Systèmes d’Exploitation (PADSE).
319 Diagnostic global de la filière anacarde au Bénin. *Rapport*, MAEP/PADSE, Bénin,
320 2003.
- 321 18. Tandjiékpon AM. *Analyse de la chaine de valeur du secteur anacarde du Bénin.*
322 *Rapport d’étude*, Initiative du Cajou Africain (ICA/GIZ), Bénin, 2010.
- 323 19. De Swart EAM, Groenwold R, Kanne HJ, Stam P, Marcelis LFM, Voorrips RE. Non-
324 destructive estimation of leaf area for different plant ages and accessions of *Capsicum*
325 *annuum* L. *Journal of Horticultural Science & Biotechnology*, 2004, 79 (5): 764–770.
- 326 20. Poethig RS. Leaf morphogenesis in flowering plants. *The Plant Cell*, 1997, 9: 1077–
327 87.
- 328 21. Esau K. The leaf. In: Esau, K., eds. *Plant anatomy*. John Wiley and sons. New York,
329 London, Sidney, 1965, 467–80.
- 330 22. Byrne M, Timmermans M, Kidner C, Martienssen R. Development of leaf shape.
331 *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 2001, 4: 38–43.
- 332 23. Browne MW. 2000. Cross-Validation Methods. *J Math Psychol.* 44(1):108-132.
- 333 24. Student (1927). Errors of routine analysis. *Biometrika* 19 (1/2): 151-164. Doi:
334 10.2307/2332181.
- 335 25. Newman D., 1939. The distribution of range in samples from a normal population
336 expressed in terms of an independent estimate of standard deviation. *Biometrika* 31
337 (1): 20-30. Doi: 10.1093/biomet/31.1-2.20.

- 338 26. Keuls M. 1952. The use of the studentized range in connection with an analysis of
339 variance. *Euphytica* 1: 112-122. Doi: 10.1007/bf1908269.
- 340 27. Archak S, Ambika B, Gaikwad D, Gautam EV, Rao VB, Swamy KRM, Karihaloo JL.
341 DNA fingerprinting of India cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.), varieties using
342 RAPD and ISSR techniques, *Euphytica*, 2003, 130: 397-404.
- 343 28. Jones HG. *Plants and microclimate. A quantitative approach to environmental plant*
344 *physiology*. 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- 345 29. Deneroy P, Thiebeau P, Goss G. Une méthode pour estimer l'interception du
346 rayonnement par un couvert bas: application au colza avant montaison. *Oléagineux,*
347 *Corps Gras, Lipides*, 2002, 9(1): 54-63.
- 348 30. Niinemets Ü, Portsmouth A, Tena D., Tobias M, Matesanz S, Valladares F. Do we
349 underestimate the importance of leaf size in plant economics? Disproportional scaling
350 of support costs within the spectrum of leaf physiognomy, *Annals of Botany*, 2007,
351 100 (2): 283-303.
- 352 31. Wardlaw CW. Leaves and buds: further observations. In: Wardlaw, CW, eds.
353 *Morphogenesis in plants. A contemporary study*. Methuen & Co TLD, London, UK,
354 1968, 181–225.
- 355 32. Verwijst T, Wen DZ. Leaf allometry of *Salix viminalis* during the first growing
356 season. *Tree Physiology*, 1996, 16: 655–60.
- 357 33. Leroy C, Guérault M, Wahyuni NS, Escoute J, Céréghino R, Sabatier S, Auclair D.
358 Morphogenetic trends in the morphological, optical and biochemical features of
359 phyllodes in *Acacia mangium* Willd (Mimosaceae). *Trees Struct Funct*, 2008, 23(1):
360 37–49.

34. Murthy KN, Kumar KV, Bhagavan S, Subbaiah CC, Kumaran PM. A rapid non-destructive method of estimating leaf area in cashew. *Acta Horticulturae*, 1985, 108: 46-48.
35. Potdar MV, Pawar KR. Non-destructive leaf area estimation in banana, *Sci. Hortic.* 1991, 45: 251–254.
36. Bange MP, Hammer GL, Milroy SP, Rickert KG. Improving estimates of individual leaf area of sunflower. *Agronomy Journal*, 2000, 92: 761–5.
37. Kandiannan K, Kailasam C, Chandaragiri KK, Sankaran N. Allometric model for leaf area estimation in black pepper (*Piper nigrum* L.). *J. Agric. Crop. Sci.*, 2002, 188:138–140.
38. Souza EF, Araújo MC, Posse RP, Detmann E, Bernardo S, Berbert PA, Santos PA. Estimating the total leaf area of the green dwarf coconut tree (*Cocos nucifera* L.). *Sci. Agric.*, 2005, 62: 597-600.
39. Pompelli MF, Antunes WC, Ferreira DTRG, Cavalcante PGS, Wanderley-Filho HCL, Endres L. Allometric models for non-destructive leaf area estimation of *Jatropha curcas*. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2012, 36: 77-85.
40. Reynolds SGA. A note on estimation of leaf areas of Cacao (*Theobroma cacao* L.) from three leaf parameters, *Trop. Agric.* 1971, 48: 177–179.
41. Kobayashi KD. Estimating leaf area of ‘Beaumont’ guava, *Trop. Agric.* 1988, 65: 173–175.
42. Willaume M, Lauri PE, Sinoquet H. Light interception in apple trees influenced by canopy architecture manipulation. *Trees*, 2004, 18:705–713

Table 1: The different forms of regression models tested to estimate leaf area and dry mass for cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) near Parakou, Benin.

Model	Equation	
	Leaf area	Dry mass
1	$S^\lambda = aLW + b$	$m^\lambda = aLW + b$
2	$S^\lambda = a\ln(LW) + b$	$m^\lambda = a\ln(LW) + b$
3	$S^\lambda = aL + b$	$m^\lambda = aL + b$
4	$S^\lambda = a\ln(L) + b$	$m^\lambda = a\ln(L) + b$
5	$S^\lambda = aW + b$	$m^\lambda = aW + b$
6	$S^\lambda = a\ln(W) + b$	$m^\lambda = a\ln(W) + b$
7	$S^\lambda = aL^2 + b$	$m^\lambda = aL^2 + b$
8	$S^\lambda = aW^2 + b$	$m^\lambda = aW^2 + b$

387 S = leaf area, m = quantity of dry mass, L = length of leaf, W = width of leaf, λ = coefficient maximizing Box-Cox transformation, $\ln$ =
388 natural logarithm, a , b = constant to be estimated.

389

Table 2: Description of the leaf characteristics of cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) according to the tree location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.

Characteristics	Tree position	Mean	Mean error	Coefficient of Variation	Minimum	Maximum
Length (cm)	Center	15.28	0.15	18.80	4.50	25.00
	East	14.06	0.14	18.59	4.80	20.60
	North	15.49	0.14	16.71	7.50	22.30
	West	13.70	0.12	16.32	2.50	20.30
	South	15.02	0.15	18.40	8.80	24.00
Width (cm)	Center	8.45	0.08	17.70	5.30	14.00
	East	8.57	0.08	18.75	3.80	13.80
	North	8.44	0.08	16.87	3.90	12.20
	West	8.37	0.07	15.38	5.70	12.20
	South	9.60	0.09	18.56	5.20	14.70
Area (cm ²)	Center	96.42	1.88	36.98	32.44	234.18
	East	66.77	1.29	36.34	12.73	155.80
	North	91.79	1.70	34.81	29.36	198.78
	West	71.41	1.19	31.30	17.52	139.17
	South	109.14	2.11	36.66	34.61	251.49
Dry mass (g)	Center	1.19	0.02	31.78	0.50	2.47
	East	1.24	0.03	40.01	0.18	3.47
	North	1.19	0.02	32.44	0.38	2.49
	West	1.03	0.02	32.81	0.21	2.06
	South	1.29	0.02	35.02	0.35	2.90

Table 3: The average values of the leaf characteristics of cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) by trees location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.

Position	Length (cm)	Width (cm)	Area (cm ²)	Dry mass (g/leaf)
South	15 ^a	9.6 ^a	109.1 ^a	1.3 ^a
Center	15.3 ^a	8.5 ^b	96.4 ^b	1.2 ^b
North	15.5 ^a	8.4 ^b	91.9 ^b	1.2 ^b
East	14.1 ^b	8.6 ^b	66.7 ^c	1.2 ^{ab}
West	13.7 ^b	8.4 ^b	71.4 ^c	1.0 ^c

For a given characteristic, mean sharing no letter are significantly different at the 5% level.

Table 4: Prediction models for leaf area of cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) by tree location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.

Tree Position in plantation	Model	λ max	Parameters		Adjustment parameters			Prediction error
			a	b	F	p	Raj	
Center	$S^2 = aLW + b$	0.274	0.006	2.657	734.1	0.00	0.67	0.0385
	$S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.032	0.033	0.996	818.2	0.00	0.70	0.0001
	$S^2 = aL + b$	0.087	0.013	1.281	615.3	0.00	0.63	0.0008
	$S^2 = a \ln(L) + b$	-0.041	-0.054	0.975	620.3	0.00	0.63	0.0001
	$S^2 = aW + b$	0.171	0.069	1.581	540.0	0.00	0.60	0.0071
	$S^2 = a \ln(W) + b$	0.081	0.187	1.043	549.3	0.00	0.61	0.0007
	$S^2 = aL^2 + b$	0.211	0.002	2.184	577.4	0.00	0.62	0.0151
East	$S^2 = aW^2 + b$	0.248	0.008	2.499	497.0	0.00	0.58	0.0319
	$S^2 = aLW + b$	0.428	0.016	3.931	495.70	0.00	0.59	0.3541
	$S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.119	0.145	0.948	473.00	0.00	0.57	0.0021
	$S^2 = aL + b$	0.256	0.076	1.826	412.20	0.00	0.54	0.0334
	$S^2 = a \ln(L) + b$	0.092	0.182	0.985	394.50	0.00	0.53	0.0011
	$S^2 = aW + b$	0.295	0.165	2.001	381.80	0.00	0.52	0.0640
	$S^2 = a \ln(W) + b$	0.174	0.484	1.027	371.00	0.00	0.51	0.0083
North	$S^2 = aL^2 + b$	0.389	0.007	3.593	419.20	0.00	0.54	0.2327
	$S^2 = aW^2 + b$	0.401	0.020	3.814	378.10	0.00	0.52	0.2891
	$S^2 = aLW + b$	0.437	0.025	3.839	1886.00	0.00	0.84	0.1922
	$S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$	-0.088	-0.062	0.974	2249.00	0.00	0.86	0.0001
	$S^2 = aL + b$	0.334	0.187	1.566	1473.00	0.00	0.81	0.0546
	$S^2 = a \ln(L) + b$	0.110	0.348	0.688	1510.00	0.00	0.81	0.0008
	$S^2 = aW + b$	0.097	0.033	1.262	1074.00	0.00	0.75	0.0007
West	$S^2 = a \ln(W) + b$	-0.135	-0.137	0.839	1181.00	0.00	0.77	0.0002
	$S^2 = aL^2 + b$	0.536	0.023	5.322	1372.00	0.00	0.79	0.9056
	$S^2 = aW^2 + b$	0.293	0.014	2.699	931.70	0.00	0.72	0.0414
	$S^2 = aLW + b$	0.555	0.037	6.199	354.30	0.00	0.50	1.7200
	$S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.418	1.894	-3.046	372.90	0.00	0.51	0.2978
	$S^2 = aL + b$	0.419	0.237	2.676	258.50	0.00	0.42	0.3593
	$S^2 = a \ln(L) + b$	0.362	2.216	-1.142	265.80	0.00	0.43	0.1623
South	$S^2 = aW + b$	0.534	0.908	2.076	370.20	0.00	0.51	1.3046
	$S^2 = a \ln(W) + b$	0.462	4.880	-3.208	368.80	0.00	0.51	0.5283
	$S^2 = aL^2 + b$	0.469	0.011	5.142	243.00	0.00	0.41	0.7021
	$S^2 = aW^2 + b$	0.602	0.078	7.338	359.60	0.00	0.50	2.9732
	$S^2 = aLW + b$	0.485	0.026	5.787	401.00	0.00	0.53	1.4494
	$S^2 = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.314	1.054	-0.899	407.50	0.00	0.53	0.1238
	$S^2 = aL + b$	0.434	0.309	2.885	337.30	0.00	0.48	0.7835
South	$S^2 = a \ln(L) + b$	0.354	2.520	-1.603	325.30	0.00	0.48	0.2537
	$S^2 = aW + b$	0.388	0.328	2.932	272.00	0.00	0.43	0.4551
	$S^2 = a \ln(W) + b$	0.322	1.836	0.339	271.90	0.00	0.43	0.1697
	$S^2 = aL^2 + b$	0.516	0.018	6.968	332.70	0.00	0.48	2.3817
	$S^2 = aW^2 + b$	0.448	0.025	5.631	255.00	0.00	0.42	1.0869

S= area, L = length, W = width, λ = coefficient maximizing the Box-Cox transformation, $\ln$ = natural logarithm, a , b = constant estimate.

Table 5: Prediction models for leaf dry mass of cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) by tree location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.

Tree position in plantation	Model	λ max	Parameters		Adjustment parameters			Prediction error
			a	b	F	p	Raj	
Center	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.399	0.001	0.871	593.10	0.00	0.63	0.00186
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.075	-0.043	1.199	688.50	0.00	0.66	0.00011
	$m^{\lambda} = aL + b$	0.097	-0.002	1.023	465.60	0.00	0.57	0.00002
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(L) + b$	-0.061	-0.204	1.535	495.70	0.00	0.58	0.00100
	$m^{\lambda} = aW + b$	0.328	0.027	0.793	510.90	0.00	0.59	0.00115
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(W) + b$	0.188	0.069	0.860	519.00	0.00	0.59	0.00010
	$m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$	0.228	0.000	0.953	417.80	0.00	0.54	0.00043
East	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.451	0.002	0.859	475.60	0.00	0.57	0.00322
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.515	0.004	0.551	912.90	0.00	0.73	0.0134
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.037	0.247	-0.136	1020.00	0.00	0.75	0.0028
	$m^{\lambda} = aL + b$	0.268	0.049	0.374	682.30	0.00	0.67	0.0081
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(L) + b$	0.026	0.417	-0.057	691.60	0.00	0.67	0.0033
	$m^{\lambda} = aW + b$	0.343	0.090	0.300	764.80	0.00	0.69	0.0093
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(W) + b$	0.149	0.544	-0.112	782.40	0.00	0.69	0.0049
North	$m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$	0.450	0.002	0.625	637.30	0.00	0.65	0.0146
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.510	0.006	0.609	698.80	0.00	0.67	0.0155
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.454	0.005	0.405	779.40	0.00	0.69	0.0221
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.122	0.493	-1.302	771.20	0.00	0.69	0.0116
	$m^{\lambda} = aL + b$	0.332	0.070	0.018	569.30	0.00	0.62	0.0195
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(L) + b$	0.194	0.921	-1.424	568.70	0.00	0.62	0.0146
	$m^{\lambda} = aW + b$	0.287	0.128	0.019	627.10	0.00	0.64	0.0181
West	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(W) + b$	0.131	0.888	-0.797	611.00	0.00	0.64	0.0134
	$m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$	0.454	0.003	0.500	550.40	0.00	0.61	0.0255
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.431	0.009	0.488	607.30	0.00	0.63	0.0243
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.687	0.006	0.309	1320.00	0.00	0.79	0.0115
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.352	0.530	-1.500	1403.00	0.00	0.80	0.0060
	$m^{\lambda} = aL + b$	0.405	0.069	0.050	835.80	0.00	0.71	0.0092
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(L) + b$	0.239	0.799	-1.084	865.80	0.00	0.72	0.0062
South	$m^{\lambda} = aW + b$	0.572	0.145	-0.204	1029.00	0.00	0.75	0.0116
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(W) + b$	0.447	1.085	-1.288	1026.00	0.00	0.75	0.0091
	$m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$	0.547	0.003	0.473	767.50	0.00	0.69	0.0128
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.695	0.009	0.356	969.00	0.00	0.74	0.0149
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.431	0.002	0.854	138.10	0.00	0.28	0.0152
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(LW) + b$	0.390	0.200	0.084	155.80	0.00	0.30	0.0116
	$m^{\lambda} = aL + b$	0.391	0.024	0.709	130.10	0.00	0.27	0.0125
South	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(L) + b$	0.368	0.340	0.153	141.30	0.00	0.28	0.0106
	$m^{\lambda} = aW + b$	0.444	0.041	0.694	108.60	0.00	0.23	0.0177
	$m^{\lambda} = a \ln(W) + b$	0.431	0.367	0.262	110.40	0.00	0.23	0.0166
	$m^{\lambda} = aL^2 + b$	0.412	0.001	0.890	115.60	0.00	0.24	0.0146
	$m^{\lambda} = aLW + b$	0.456	0.002	0.888	100.60	0.00	0.22	0.0192

m = mass, L = length, W = width, λ = coefficient maximizing the Box-Cox transformation, $\ln$ = natural logarithm, a , b = constant estimate.





Figure 1. Diagnostics of residuals from the regression of cashew trees (*Anacardium occidentale*) leaf area models by tree location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.



409

410 Figure 2. Diagnostics of residuals from the regression of cashew trees (*Anacardium*
 411 *occidentale*) leaf dry mass models by tree location in a plantation near Parakou, Benin.

412