

Check for updates



Available Online at EScience Press

International Journal of Agricultural Extension

ISSN: 2311-6110 (Online), 2311-8547 (Print) https://esciencepress.net/journals/IJAE

EVALUATION OF EIGHT (08) SEEDING DENSITIES OF FIFTEEN (15) ACCESSIONS OF BAMBARA GROUNDNUT (*Vigna Subterranea* L. VERDCOURT) IN FAR NORTH-CAMEROON

^aWassouo F. Alain*, ^bZalkohieu Pierre, ^aYakouba Oumarou, ^cSadou Ismael, ^dMvondo A. J. Pierre, ^eNgakou Albert, ^aMadi Ali

^a Department of Agriculture, Animal, Husbandry and Derived Products, National Advanced School of Engineering, University of Maroua, Cameroon.

^b Department of Biological Sciences. Faculty of Sciences. University of Maroua, Cameroon.

^c Regional Center for Research and Innovation in Far North-Cameroon.

^d Départment of Agronomic and Applied Molecular Sciences. Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine. University of Buea, Cameroon.

^e Department of Biological Sciences. Faculty of Sciences. University of Ngaoundéré Cameroon.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History Received: April 05,2024 Revised: July 15,2024 Accepted: July 28,2024

Keywords

Accession Density Bambara groundnut Far North Region Cameroon

This study aims to identify between eight seeding densities based on fifteen accessions of Bambara groundnut to determine the best seeding densities in Far North Cameroon. The experimental design is a factorial block that includes eight seeding densities applied to fifteen accessions of Bambara groundnut, repeated four times. The treatments are combinations between accessions of Bambara groundnut and seeding densities. Total 480 experimental units were used for data collection. The trials were conducted successively over three years (2016, 2017, and 2018). The data collected were analyzed with Genstat Statistical Package, 12th edition software. The results show significant variations between the fifteen accessions of Bambara groundnut and within the eight seeding densities tested. High seeding densities (40x20cm; 40x25cm) made it possible to get better yields in terms of the average number of pods, and average weight of pods and seeds. For the average weight of seeds during the three years of cultivation: 26,66%; 40% and 53,33% accessions presented better yields at D1 (125 000 plants/ha); followed by D2 (100 000 plants/ha) which also presented during the three years of cultivation: 6,67%; 33,34% and 33,34% accessions with better yields in average seed weight. Thus, density 1 (125000 plants/ha) and density 2 (100000 plants/ha) corresponding respectively to spacings of 40cmx20cm and 40cmx25cm made it possible to group more accessions presenting better yields in terms of an average number of pods, the average weight of pods and seeds. Highly statistically significant interactions between seedling densities and accessions of Bambara groundnut are observed; suggesting that the performance of a density also depends on that of the accession.

Corresponding Author: Wassouo F. Alain Email: <u>felixalainwass@yahoo.fr</u> © The Author(s) 2024.

INTRODUCTION

In Cameroon, Bambara groundnut constitutes with

soybean (*Glycine max*), peanut (*Arachis hypogea*), common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) and cowpea (*Vigna*

unguiculata) the main grain legumes cultivated and consumed due to their importance in the eating habits of populations (Kouebou et al., 2013). Its production increased from 19630 tons in 2006 to 27007 tons in 2013, which made Cameroon the fourth producer in the world after Nigeria (100000 tons), Burkina Faso (65000 tons) and Niger (30000 tons). Unfortunately, this production did not change considerably and remained at 27864 tons in 2016 (INS, 2017). The Far North ranks first nationally with production estimated at 17645 tons (INS, 2017). Yields are extremely low, of the order of less than 1 ton per hectare from 2001 to 2016 (Agri-Stat, 2010 and 2012; INS, 2015 and 2017) compared to peanuts, cowpeas, common beans and soyabean, which benefits from a package of technologies and several international collaborations. However, work is being carried out on Bambara groundnut but mainly focus on the nutritional qualities of the seeds and post-harvest technologies (Nyabyenda, 2005; Amarteifio et al., 2006; Kapso, 2009; Ngamchut et al., 2010; Alene et al., 2011; Ngamo et al., 2016). The few agronomic studies carried out focus on characterization, but remain limited to the determination of a few morphological and agronomic traits (Onwubiko et al., 2011; Berchie et al., 2012; Touré et al., 2012; Ndiang et al., 2012, 2014; Sobda et al., 2013; Yaya et al., 2013; Ameded, 2015; Amadou et al., 2015). Few studies on plant science are known at the limit of our knowledge. Several other studies are currently underway, including that relating to the research of seeding densities of some accessions of Bambara groundnut cultivated in the Far North of Cameroon. Indeed, the accessions of Bambara groundnut encountered in the Far North are cultivated without knowledge of the spacing between plants which until now remains scientifically unknown. Producers continue with their farming practices resulting in low yields that are mostly unpredictable (IRAD, 2013; INS, 2015; INS, 2017). Several studies in various places around the world have shown that the production of a crop can be improved by spacing between plants (Ghardi et Maamouri, 1994; M'hedhbi et al., 1994; Pageau, 1996; Adekpe et al., 2007; Kouassi and Zoro, 2010; Khodadadi and Nosrati, 2012); hence the interest we have in this study which aims to evaluate eight seeding densities applied on fifteen accessions of Bambara groundnut with a view to improving production techniques and increasing the yields of producers in the Far North Region of Cameroon.

METHODOLOGY

Study site

The study was carried out at the experimental farm of the Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD) of Maroua, more precisely at "Guiring" which is located in the Djarengol-Kodek, in the council of Maroua 3rd subdivision. The site has geographical coordinates: 14°36' East and 10°62' North, and an altitude of 383 m. It is located near the Maroua-Bogo axis, approximately 10 km from the city center. The location map of the study site is shown in Figure 1. The rainfall that prevailed during the three years of cultivation on this site (2016, 2017 and 2018) is also represented in Table 1.

Table 1. Rainfall record of the city of Maroua from 2016 to 2018.

		2	016			2	017			2	018	
Months	1 st decade	2 nd decade	3 th decade	Total/ month (mm)	1 st decade	2 nd decade	3 th decade	Total/ month (mm)	1 st decade	2 nd decade	3 th decade	Total/ month (mm)
April					7.7			7.7				
May	1.2	10,4	62,8	74,4	4,3	2,5	10,2	17	3,25	21,50	35,10	59,85
June		14,5	42,3	56,8	47,2	73	13,5	133,7	90,25	56,50	23,50	170,25
July	20.5	113	32,75	166,25	110,8	45,3	103,2	259,3	41	78	89	208
August	54	51,5	90	195,5	55,75	50,80	42,75	149,3	109	157,70	83,40	350,10
September	72.3	65,25	75	212,75	26	58,2	14	98,2	109	53	74	236
October		4		4	3,5			3,5	4	21,50	15,75	19,75
Cumulative				709.7				668.7				1043.95
Days				53				53				66

Source: DRADER-EN. 2016, 2017 and 2018



Figure 1. Location map of the study site in Guiring (Djarengol-Kodek).

Plant material

The plant material consists of 15 accessions of Bambara groundnut from a selection of 36 accessions collected from farmers and traders in five division of the Far North region of Cameroon from November 2014 to June 2015. The 15 accessions selected are those that presented better agro-morphological characteristics and were appreciated by farmers (Wassouo et al., 2019). A number (code) identified each accession. Table 2 presents the areas of origin of the 15 accessions of Bambara groundnut and the geographical coordinates of the collection points of said accessions.

Table 2. Accessions of Bambara groundnut collected in Far North Cameroon.

N°	Accessions		Areas of collec	ction	Geogra	phical points	of collection
		Divisions	Subdivisions	Villages	N	Eo	Alt
1	Acc. 1	Mayo-Tsanaga	Bourha	Guili	10,34	13,56	755m
2	Acc. 2	Mayo-Tsanaga	Bourha	Guili	10,34	13,56	755m
3	Acc. 3	Mayo-Tsanaga	Roua	Madakonai 2	14,05	10,79	682m
4	Acc. 6	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Houdouwiyam-Malika	11,00	14,04	494m
5	Acc. 7	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Houdouwiyam-Malika	11,00	14,04	494m
6	Acc. 8	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Golda II	10,95	14,02	793m
7	Acc. 9	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Golda II	10,95	14,02	793m
8	Acc. 12	Mayo-Kani	Guidiguis	Guidiguis	10,13	14,71	369m
9	Acc. 18	Mayo-Kani	Porhi	Touloum	10,18	14,83	329m
10	Acc. 19	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Mémé	10,97	14,23	414m
11	Acc. 20	Mayo-Sava	Mora	Mémé	10,97	14,23	414m
12	Acc. 24	Mayo-Danay	Kar-Hay	Doukoula	10,11	14,97	332m
13	Acc. 25	Mayo-Danay	Kalfou	Bougaye	10,25	15,10	342m
14	Acc. 27	Mayo-Danay	Kalfou	Kalfou	10,28	14,93	347m
15	Acc. 36	Mayo-Danay	Datcheka	Zouaye	10,00	15,13	335m

Experimental plot design

The experimental design is a factorial block comprising 8 densities to be tested (Table 3) and 15 accessions, repeated 4 times. The different defined spacings are: 40cmx20cm, 40cmx25cm, 40cmx30cm, 40cmx40cm, 50cmx20cm, 50cmx25cm, 50cmx30cm, 50cmx40cm and correspond respectively to the densities D1 (125000 plants/ha), D2 (100000 plants/ha), D3 (83333 plants/ha), D4 (62500 plants/ha), D5 (100000 plants/ha), D6 (80000 plants/ha), D7 (66667 plants/ha) and D8 (50000 plants/ha). The treatments are therefore the combinations between accessions and densities. Four hundred and eighty (480) experimental units were used for data collection. The experimental units measure 1,6mx2,5m or 4 m² and 2mx2,5m or 5 m². A distance of 0,5 m separates the experimental units. The blocks are 1 m apart on either side.

Conduct of the trial

The trial was carried out on the study site in Guiring for three successive years (2016, 2017, and 2018) and performed during rainy season. The densities tested and the corresponding surface areas are recorded in Table 3. The previous crop on this site was rainy-season sorghum. Cleaning the plot consisted of collecting nonbiodegradable plastics. The plot was ploughed in the 1st vear of the trial on 18 July 2016, followed by sowing on 21 July 2016. In the 2nd year of the trial, ploughing was carried out on 11 July 2017, followed by sowing on 19 July 2017; in the 3rd year of the trial, ploughing was carried out on 13 July 2018 followed by sowing on 17 July 2018. The seeds were treated with MOMTAZ 45 WS (20% thiram + 25% imidacloprid). Two Bambara groundnut seeds were sown per pocket at a depth of 3-5 cm. Weeding was carried out three weeks after sowing using hoes, followed by one plant per hole thinning. The treatment against aphids and greenflies was carried out three times during the experiment using a broadspectrum systemic foliar insecticide: PACHA 25 EC, having the active ingredient constituted of Lambda-Cyhalothrin 15g/l and Acetamiprid 10g /L. The 1st treatment occurred at pre-flowering, the 2nd at flowering and the 3rd treatment at the beginning of pod formation. The harvest occurred on 17 November 2016 for the 1st year, 20 November 2017 for the 2nd year, and 10 November 2018 for the 3rd year.

Variables	Spacings between lin (cm)	es Spacings b pockets	etween N (cm)	lumber of plants/EU	Density/ha Plants/ha
D1	40	20		50	125000
D2	40	25		40	100000
D3	40	30		33	83333
D4	40	40		25	62500
D5	50	20		50	100000
D6	50	25		40	80000
D7	50	30		33	66667
D8	50	40		25	50000
D1=densit	y 1 D3=density 3	D5=density 5	D7=density 7	UE= Expérimental Unit	-

D8=density 8

Table 3. Densities and number of corresponding plants per experimental unit and per hectare

D6=density 6

Data collected

D2=density 2

The geographical coordinated point of the trial site and the marking of the points of collection of Bambara groundnut accession were carried out using the Global Positioning System, brand GARMIN, Oregon 300. To take the yield parameters, the harvest concerned the two central lines of each experimental unit according to the method described by Mustefa (2014). The average number of pods was obtained by physically counting the

D4=density 4

pods; the average weight yield of pods and seeds was obtained by weighing and reducing per square yield to $4m^2$ and $5m^2$ then extrapolating in kg/ha.

Results further indicate that the pods and seeds' dry weight was obtained by weighing and after receiving a constant dry weight using an electronic balance with a sensitivity of 0,001g such as ACCULAB GS 200. Vanounou (1997) and Touré (2016) proposed the following formulas for estimating yield.

Yield $\left(\frac{t}{ha}\right)$ = $\frac{\text{Obtained production}}{\text{surface area of an elementary plot}} X 10000$

Data analysis

The geographical coordinated points of the trial site and the different points of collection of Bambara groundnut were entered into the Microsoft Office Excel 2013 spreadsheet and loaded into the Quantum GIS software (QGIS 3.4). The Cameroon Shapefile was uploaded to SOGEFI and displayed on QGIS to extract the map of the Far North Cameroon region and certain administrative divisions. The layout of this data in QGIS allowed the export of the map as an image or pdf file. The raw yield data was entered and formatted using the Microsoft Office Excel 2013 spreadsheet. These data were subsequently imported as text files into the GenStat statistical package 12th edition software for analysis. For each yield trait measured, variance analyses were carried out when the conditions of Shapiro-Wilt normality and Bartlett's homogeneity of variances were previously verified. When a significant difference is noted between morphotypes for a given character, the DUNCAN test completes the ANOVA at the 1% significance level. This test made it possible to highlight homogeneous groups (Dagnelie, 1998; 2012).

RESULTS

Average number of Bambara groundnut pods on the different densities

Tables 4, 5 and 6 present the yields in an average number of Bambara groundnut pods according to densities during the three years of trials (2016, 2017 and 2018). Significant variations in the average number of pods are observed depending on the densities and accessions tested over the three years of cultivation.

The average number of pods in year 1 (2016) at D1 (40cmx20cm) varies from $395 \times 10^3 \pm 2,58^{aC}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $880 \times 10^3 \pm 13,89^{hD}$ pods/ha (Acc.6); in year 2 (2017) at D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from $105 \times 10^3 \pm 1,77^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $472 \times 10^3 \pm 1,20^{nG}$ pods/ha (Acc.7), and in year 3 (2018) at D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from $220 \times 10^3 \pm 2,04^{aE}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $699 \times 10^3 \pm 2,39^{IH}$ pods/ha (Acc.25).

In 2016 with D2 (40cmx25cm), it varied from $385x10^3 \pm 10,23^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $738x10^3 \pm 14,29^{gC}$

pods/ha (Acc.6); in 2017 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from $123x10^3\pm1,88^{aC}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $419x10^3\pm2,60^{1H}$ pods/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from $210x10^3\pm1,44^{aE}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $686x10^3\pm2,39^{1G}$ pods/ha (Acc.3).

In 2016 with D3 (40cmx30cm), it varied from $388x10^3\pm3,59^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $880x10^3\pm7,80^{hG}$ pods/ha (Acc.27); in 2017 at D3 (40cmx23cm), it varies from $110x10^3\pm1,77^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $411x10^3\pm3,61^{lG}$ pods/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D3 (40cmx30cm), it varies from $217x10^3\pm2,14^{aE}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $619x10^3\pm2,39^{lG}$ pods/ha (Acc.18).

In 2016 with D4 (40cmx40cm), it varied from $323x10^3 \pm 19,62^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.9) to $718x10^3 \pm 11,96^{hF}$ pods/ha (Acc.18); in 2017 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from $132x10^3 \pm 1,88^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $380x10^3 \pm 1,77^{1F}$ pods/ha (Acc.3), and in 2018 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from $182x10^3 \pm 1,57^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $526x10^3 \pm 1,61^{1F}$ pods/ha (Acc.18).

In 2016 with D5 (50cmx20cm), it varied from $268x10^3\pm7,79^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $824x10^3\pm11,82^{jD}$ pods/ha (Acc.20); in 2017 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varies from $124x10^3\pm1,41^{aC}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $370x10^3\pm2,06^{IF}$ pods/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varies from $181x10^3\pm1,71^{aD}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $408x10^3\pm1,50^{nF}$ pods/ha (Acc.25).

In 2016 with D6 (50cmx25cm), it varied from $254x10^3\pm5,35^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $638x10^3\pm12,50^{iD}$ pods/ha (Acc.7); in 2017 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varies from $84x10^3\pm1,71^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $310x10^3\pm1,41^{kD}$ pods/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varies from $110x10^3\pm1,41^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $398x10^3\pm1,83^{mD}$ pods/ha (Acc.18).

In 2016 with D7 (50cmx30cm), it varied from $256x10^3\pm4,19^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.8) to $674x10^3\pm4,97^{jE}$ pods/ha (Acc.7); in 2017 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from $104x10^3\pm1,71^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $306x10^3\pm2,22^{kF}$ pods/ha (Acc.12), and in 2018 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from $140x10^3\pm1,41^{aB}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $354x10^3\pm1,71^{nC}$ pods/ha (Acc.18). In 2016 with D8 (50cmx40cm), it varied from $320x10^3\pm4,50^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.1) to $550x10^3\pm1,26^{fA}$ pods/ha (Acc.20); in 2017 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from $100x10^3\pm0,82^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $302x10^3\pm1,83^{mC}$ pods/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from $91x10^3\pm0,50^{aA}$ pods/ha (Acc.19) to $321x10^3\pm1,71^{mC}$ pods/ha (Acc.24).

Table 4.	The avera	ige numbe	r of Bambar	a groundn	iut pods p	er hectare	e (ha) dep	ending or	n densitie:	s in 2016.					
Densities	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
D1	650x10	395x10 ³	697x10 ³ ±	573x10	880x10	868x10	443x10	685x10	578x10	$473x10^{3}$	630x10	698x10 ³	645x10 ³	648x10 ³	753x10 ³ ±
	³±3,59d	±2,58¤0	$23,06^{fD}$	³ ±2,14°	³ ±13,8	³±8,68h	3±7,79b	³ ±16,7	3±7,71c	±3,59bBC	³ ±5,10 ^d	±15,15e ^f	±10,63 ^{de}	±21,38 ^{de}	$19,91s^{\mu}$
	еE			D	04D	g	C	$1^{\rm eff}$	F		В	С	D	DE	
D2	578x10	435x10 ³	615x10 ³ ±	650x10	738x10	605x10	408x10	600x10	420x10	$570x10^{3}$	385x10	688x10 ³	555x10 ³	668x10 ³	693x10 ³ ±
	³ ±9,91°	$\pm 2,14^{hD}$	7,66 ^{deB}	³ ±24,9	³ ±14,2	³ ±16,2	³ ±7,24ª	³ ±2,58℃	³ ±4,45ª	±11,79 ^{cd}	³ ±10,2	±18,94 ^{fC}	±5,14cC	±8,90fE	$12,60^{ m fc}$
	đb			$2^{\rm eff}$	9 ^{8C}	1^{dCD}	bB	dF	bB	Е	3 aB				
D3	690x10	505x10 ³	475x10 ³ ±	578x10	568x10	580x10	388x10	450x10	565x10	390×10^3	410x10	615x10 ³	543x10 ³	565x10 ³	880x10 ³ ±
	³ ±8,028	±7,93cE	7,80bcA	³ ±11,2	³ ±16,0	³ ±11,5	³±3,59ª	³ ±9,07 ^b	³ ±10,6	$\pm 4,72^{aA}$	³ ±12,3	±21,43cB	±13,32 ^{dC}	±3,29dC	7,80hG
	ц			9deD	4^{dB}	OdefiC	в	D	6 ^{db}		1aC				
D4	568x10	400×10^{3}	658x10 ³ ±	600x10	728x10	470x10	458x10	323x10	520x10	$718x10^{3}$	410x10	563x10 ³	568x10 ³	705x10 ³	565x10 ³ ±
	³ ±8,10°	±3,87hC	6,578 ^C	³ ±10,0	³ ±9,40h	³ ±16,2	³ ±12,2	³ ±19,6	³ ±7,41 ^d	±11,96 ^{hF}	$^{3\pm7,71b}$	±12,35eA	±4,45eC	±9,21 ^{hF}	4,08eD
	D			010 8	c	1^{cB}	Sol	ZaA	Е		c				
DS	646x10	336x10 ³	598x10 ³ ±	694x10	552x10	714x10	268x10	536x10	366x10	480×10^{3}	498x10	824x10 ³	$500x10^{3}$	428x10 ³	532x10 ³ ±
	³ ±3,30h	±8,66 ^{hAB}	6,68 ^{gB}	³ ±18,4	³ ±10,6	³ ±12,6	3±7,79ª	³ ±12,8	³±4,32°	±10,50°C	³ ±10,2	±11,82 ^{ID}	±2,16 ^{eB}	±1,26 ^{dA}	3,30fcD
	Е			511	6 ^{fAB}	6 ^{IIF}	v	3œ	V		8cD				
D6	488x10	$316x10^{3}$	464x10 ³ ±	472x10	524x10	638x10	254x10	422x10	450x10	544x10 ³	348x10	536x10 ³	566x10 ³	630×10^{3}	430x10 ³ ±
	³ ±7,04 ^f	±15,17 ^{bA}	3,74efA	³ ±10,0	³ ±15,6	³ ±12,5	³±5,35ª	³ ±2,16 ^d	³ ±5,35 ^d	±2,50 _{6hD}	³±3,40°	±6,80®^	±10,20 ^{hC}	±6,60 ^{ID}	2,16 ^{dA}
	в			$3^{\rm efB}$	384	010	V	CD	ef.		А				
D7	524x10	$348x10^{3}$	470x10 ³ ±	380x10	536x10	674x10	256x10	382x10	630x10	464x10 ³	490x10	662x10 ³	$412x10^{3}$	436x10 ³	522x10 ³ ±
	³ ±3,56 ^h	$\pm 7,41^{\text{bB}}$	6,85fgA	³ ±3,27 ^c	³ ±6,55 ^h	³ ±4,97)	³±4,19ª	³ ±2,87∝	$3\pm4,11^{1}$	±8,64 ^{fBC}	$^{3\pm1,41_{8}}$	±6,02) ^C	±5,35 ^{dA}	±1,71eA	19,51 ^{hC}
	С			А	AB	н	A	в	g		Q				
D8	462x10	320×10^3	440x10 ³ ±	516x10	538x10	412x10	398x10	392x10	482x10	448x10 ³	324x10	550x10 ³	478x10 ³	522x10 ³	478x10 ³ ±
	³±3,69r	±4,50¤A	8,73cA	³±8,63°	³±4,23°	³±6,16 ^b	3 ±6,68 b	³ ±17,2	³ ±1,82 ^d	±6,34cB	³±6,95ª	±1,26 ^{tA}	±8,52 ^{dB}	±8,18 ^{eB}	4,99 ^{dB}
	γp			c	fAB	А	в	1 bBC	D		А				
Mean va	alues beari	ing the san	ne letters ar	e statistica	gomod ylla	geneous a	t p<0,01%	6 significa	ance						

Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0.014 % significance. Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities The capital letters following the columns compare the yield of an accession at different sowing densities

	0			0	1 1			0							
Dens	Acc.	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
ities	36														
D1	295x1	171x1	304x1	399x1	356x1	472x1	105x1	259x1	275x1	229x1	224x1	336x1	249x1	279x1	283x1
	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±1,2	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±0,7	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,2	0 ³ ±2,9	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,7
	7^{iDE}	1^{bE}	1^{jG}	1^{mG}	4 ^{1G}	0^{nG}	7 ^{aA}	$2^{\rm fD}$	7^{gE}	1^{dD}	1^{cE}	$0^{\rm kE}$	8^{eB}	$1^{\rm ghD}$	7^{hE}
D2	291x1	138x1	215x1	358x1	403x1	304x1	123x1	290x1	201x1	315x1	259x1	419x1	361x1	401x1	250x1
	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±2,2	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±2,2	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±2,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±3,4	0 ³ ±3,2
	7^{gD}	8^{bD}	2^{dD}	4 ^{jE}	$8^{\rm kH}$	1^{hC}	8 ^{aC}	2^{gF}	1^{cB}	7^{iG}	$1^{\rm fF}$	0 ^{1H}	1 ^{jF}	4^{kG}	3^{eC}
D3	299x1	110x1	208x1	324x1	251x1	374x1	168x1	280x1	365x1	206x1	256x1	411x1	236x1	325x1	331x1
	0 ³ ±0,7	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,2	0 ³ ±2,2	0 ³ ±1,2	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±3,6	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±2,5
	2^{gE}	7^{aB}	2^{cC}	7^{hC}	7 ^{eB}	$1^{\rm kF}$	0^{bE}	$8^{\rm fE}$	0 ^{jG}	7 ^{cB}	7 ^{eF}	1^{IG}	9 ^{dA}	$4^{\rm hF}$	8^{iG}
D4	335x1	175x1	240x1	380x1	336x1	345x1	209x1	219x1	205x1	269x1	132x1	281x1	240x1	298x1	319x1
	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±4,1	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±2,7	0 ³ ±2,6
	2 ^{jF}	7^{bE}	2^{eE}	7 ^{1F}	4jF	2^{kE}	1 ^{cF}	1^{dB}	7 ^{cB}	1 ^{fF}	8 ^{aB}	3^{gB}	4eA	7 ^{hE}	0 ^{iF}
D5	2 ^{jF} 185x1	7 ^{bE} 128x1	2 ^{eE} 249x1	7 ^{1F} 352x1	4 ^{jF} 326x1	2 ^{kE} 332x1	1 ^{cF} 124x1	1 ^{dB} 263x1	7 ^{cB} 230x1	1 ^{fF} 237x1	8 ^{aB} 148x1	3 ^{gB} 370x1	4 ^{eA} 333x1	7 ^{hE} 231x1	0 ^{iF} 270x1
D5	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3	7 ^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0	2 ^{eE} 249x1 0 ³ ±1,2	7 ^{IF} 352x1 0 ³ ±1,7	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4	2 ^{kE} 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8	1 ^{fF} 237x1 0 ³ ±1,9	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2	3 ^{gB} 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0	4 ^{eA} 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8
D5	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC}	7 ^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{aC}	2 ^{eE} 249x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{fF}	7^{lF} 352x1 $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD}	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE}	2 ^{kE} 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8 2 ^{jD}	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC}	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD}	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{dC}	$1^{\rm fF}$ 237x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{eE}	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{bC}	3gB 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{lF}	4eA 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9jE	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC}	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD}
D5 D6	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1	7 ^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{aC} 84x10 ³	2eE 249x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9fF 154x1	7 ^{IF} 352x1 0 ³ ±1,7 1 ^{kD} 234x1	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE} 283x1	2 ^{kE} 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8 2 ^{jD} 305x1	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD} 216x1	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{dC} 258x1	1 ^{fF} 237x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{eE} 267x1	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{bC} 145x1	3gB 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{lF} 310x1	4eA 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9jE 288x1	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1
D5 D6	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2	7^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{aC} 84x10 ³ ±1,71 ^a	2eE 249x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9fF 154x1 0 ³ ±1,4	7^{1F} 352x1 0 ³ ±1,7 1 ^{kD} 234x1 0 ³ ±0,9	$ \frac{4^{jF}}{326x1} \\ 0^{3}\pm1,4 \\ 1^{iE} \\ 283x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,9 $	2kE 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8 2 ^{jD} 305x1 0 ³ ±2,0	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD} 216x1 0 ³ ±1,2	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{dC} 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4	$ \begin{array}{r} 1^{fF} \\ 237x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{eE} \\ 267x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ \end{array} $	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{bC} 145x1 0 ³ ±2,0	3gB 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{lF} 310x1 0 ³ ±1,4	4eA 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{jE} 288x1 0 ³ ±0,9	7hE 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1 0 ³ ±1,2	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1 0 ³ ±2,0
D5 D6	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB}	7 ^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{aC} 84x10 ³ ±1,71 ^a A	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{eE} \\ 249x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,2 \\ 9^{fF} \\ 154x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,4 \\ 1^{dA} \end{array}$	7^{IF} 352x1 0 ³ ±1,7 1 ^{kD} 234x1 0 ³ ±0,9 6 ^{gA}	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE} 283x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{jC}	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{kE} \\ 332x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm0.8 \\ 2^{jD} \\ 305x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm2.0 \\ 8^{kC} \end{array}$	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB}	$\frac{1^{dB}}{263x1}$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 3^{gD} $216x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,2$ 6^{fB}	7cB 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3dC 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{hD}	$\begin{array}{c} 1^{\rm fF} \\ 237x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{\rm eE} \\ 267x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{\rm iF} \end{array}$	$\frac{8^{aB}}{148x1}$ $0^{3}\pm1,2$ 6^{bC} $145x1$ $0^{3}\pm2,0$ 8^{cC}	$\begin{array}{c} 3^{gB} \\ 370 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 2,0 \\ 6^{lF} \\ 310 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 1,4 \\ 1^{kD} \end{array}$	4 ^{eA} 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{jE} 288x1 0 ³ ±0,9 6 ^{jD}	7hE 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{eA}	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cdB}
D5 D6 D7	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB} 148x1	7 ^{bE} 128x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{aC} 84x10 ³ ±1,71 ^a A 104x1	2eE 249x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9fF 154x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{dA} 180x1	7^{IF} $352x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD} $234x1$ $0^{3}\pm0,9$ 6^{gA} $243x1$	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE} 283x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{jC} 292x1	2kE 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8 2i ^D 305x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{kC} 256x1	1cF 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB} 129x1	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD} 216x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{fB} 208x1	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{dC} 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{hD} 306x1	$ \begin{array}{r} 1^{\rm fF} \\ 237x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{\rm eE} \\ 267x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{\rm iF} \\ 220x1 \\ \end{array} $	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{bC} 145x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cC} 182x1	$\begin{array}{c} 3^{gB} \\ 370 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 2,0 \\ 6^{1F} \\ 310 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 1,4 \\ 1^{kD} \\ 255 x1 \end{array}$	4 ^{eA} 333x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{jE} 288x1 0 ³ ±0,9 6 ^{jD} 273x1	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{eA} 215x1	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cdB} 253x1
D5 D6 D7	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB} 148x1 0 ³ ±2,5	7^{bE} 128x1 $0^{3}\pm 2,0$ 6^{aC} 84x10 ³ $\pm 1,71^{a}$ A 104x1 $0^{3}\pm 1,7$	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{eE} \\ 249x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{fF} \\ 154x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{dA} \\ 180x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \end{array}$	7^{IF} $352x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD} $234x1$ $0^{3}\pm0,9$ 6^{gA} $243x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,1$	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{jF} \\ 326x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{iE} \\ 283x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{jC} \\ 292x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,8 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{kE} \\ 332x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 0,8 \\ 2^{jD} \\ 305x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 2,0 \\ 8^{kC} \\ 256x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,7 \end{array}$	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB} 129x1 0 ³ ±1,9	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD} 216x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{fB} 208x1 0 ³ ±1,7	7cB 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3dC 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{hD} 306x1 0 ³ ±2,2	$\frac{1^{\rm fF}}{237 \times 1}$ $0^{3} \pm 1.9$ $2^{\rm eE}$ 267×1 $0^{3} \pm 1.2$ $9^{\rm iF}$ 220×1 $0^{3} \pm 2.8$	$\frac{8^{aB}}{148x1}$ $0^{3}\pm1,2$ 6^{bC} $145x1$ $0^{3}\pm2,0$ 8^{cC} $182x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,5$	$\frac{3^{gB}}{370 x 1}$ $0^{3} \pm 2,0$ 6^{1F} $310 x 1$ $0^{3} \pm 1,4$ 1^{kD} $255 x 1$ $0^{3} \pm 1,2$	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{eA} \\ 333x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{jE} \\ 288x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 0,9 \\ 6^{jD} \\ 273x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,7 \end{array}$	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{eA} 215x1 0 ³ ±1,2	$\begin{array}{c} 0^{iF} \\ 270x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1.8 \\ 3^{hD} \\ 151x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm2.0 \\ 8^{cdB} \\ 253x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1.7 \end{array}$
D5 D6 D7	2)F 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB} 148x1 0 ³ ±2,5 0 ^{cA}	7^{bE} 128x1 $0^{3}\pm 2,0$ 6^{aC} 84x10 ³ $\pm 1,71^{a}$ A 104x1 $0^{3}\pm 1,7$ 1^{aB}	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{eE} \\ 249x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{fF} \\ 154x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{dA} \\ 180x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 6^{dB} \end{array}$	7^{IF} $352x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD} $234x1$ $0^{3}\pm0,9$ 6^{gA} $243x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,1$ 6^{gA}	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE} 283x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{jC} 292x1 0 ³ ±1,8 9 ^{jD}	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{\rm kE} \\ 332x1 \\ 0^3\pm 0,8 \\ 2^{\rm jD} \\ 305x1 \\ 0^3\pm 2,0 \\ 8^{\rm kC} \\ 256x1 \\ 0^3\pm 1,7 \\ 1^{\rm hA} \end{array}$	1cF 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB} 129x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bD}	$\frac{1^{dB}}{263x1}$ $\frac{0^{3}\pm1,7}{3g^{D}}$ $\frac{216x1}{0^{3}\pm1,2}$ $\frac{6^{fB}}{208x1}$ $\frac{0^{3}\pm1,7}{1^{eA}}$	$\begin{array}{c} 7^{cB} \\ 230x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,8 \\ 3^{dC} \\ 258x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{hD} \\ 306x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 2,2 \\ 2^{kF} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1^{\rm fF} \\ 237 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,9 \\ 2^{\rm eE} \\ 267 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{\rm iF} \\ 220 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 2,8 \\ 2^{\rm fC} \end{array}$	$\frac{8^{aB}}{148x1}$ $0^{3}\pm1,2$ 6^{bC} $145x1$ $0^{3}\pm2,0$ 8^{cC} $182x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,5$ 0^{dD}	$\begin{array}{c} 3^{gB} \\ 370 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 2,0 \\ 6^{1F} \\ 310 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 1,4 \\ 1^{kD} \\ 255 x1 \\ 0^{3} \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{hA} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{eA} \\ 333x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{jE} \\ 288x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 0,9 \\ 6^{jD} \\ 273x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,7 \\ 3^{iC} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 7^{hE} \\ 231x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{dC} \\ 203x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{eA} \\ 215x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{fB} \end{array}$	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cdB} 253x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{hC}
D5 D6 D7 D8	2)F 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB} 148x1 0 ³ ±2,5 0 ^{cA} 186x1	7^{bE} 128x1 $0^{3}\pm 2,0$ 6^{aC} 84x10 ³ $\pm 1,71^{a}$ A 104x1 $0^{3}\pm 1,7$ 1^{aB} 106x1	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{eE} \\ 249x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{fF} \\ 154x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{dA} \\ 180x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 6^{dB} \\ 152x1 \end{array}$	7^{IF} $352x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD} $234x1$ $0^{3}\pm0,9$ 6^{gA} $243x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,1$ 6^{gA} $292x1$	4 ^{jF} 326x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{iE} 283x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{jC} 292x1 0 ³ ±1,8 9 ^{jD} 217x1	2kE 332x1 0 ³ ±0,8 2i ^D 305x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{kC} 256x1 0 ³ ±1,7 1 ^{hA} 290x1	1cF 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB} 129x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bD} 122x1	1 ^{dB} 263x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{gD} 216x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{fB} 208x1 0 ³ ±1,7 1 ^{eA} 238x1	7 ^{cB} 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{dC} 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{hD} 306x1 0 ³ ±2,2 2 ^{kF} 172x1	$\begin{array}{c} 1^{\rm fF} \\ 237 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1.9 \\ 2^{\rm eE} \\ 267 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1.2 \\ 9^{\rm iF} \\ 220 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 2.8 \\ 2^{\rm fC} \\ 198 x1 \\ \end{array}$	8 ^{aB} 148x1 0 ³ ±1,2 6 ^{bC} 145x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cC} 182x1 0 ³ ±1,5 0 ^{dD} 100x1	3gB 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{IF} 310x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{kD} 255x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{hA} 302x1	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{eA} \\ 333x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{jE} \\ 288x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 0,9 \\ 6^{jD} \\ 273x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,7 \\ 3^{iC} \\ 270x1 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 7^{hE} \\ 231x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1.9 \\ 2^{dC} \\ 203x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1.2 \\ 9^{eA} \\ 215x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1.2 \\ 9^{fB} \\ 216x1 \\ \end{array}$	0 ^{iF} 270x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3 ^{hD} 151x1 0 ³ ±2,0 8 ^{cdB} 253x1 0 ³ ±1,7 3 ^{hC} 142x1
D5 D6 D7 D8	2 ^{jF} 185x1 0 ³ ±2,3 8 ^{cC} 157x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{dB} 148x1 0 ³ ±2,5 0 ^{cA} 186x1 0 ³ ±2,1	7^{bE} 128x1 $0^{3}\pm 2,0$ 6^{aC} $84x10^{3}$ $\pm 1,71^{a}$ A 104x1 $0^{3}\pm 1,7$ 1^{aB} 106x1 $0^{3}\pm 2,1$	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{eE} \\ 249x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 9^{fF} \\ 154x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{dA} \\ 180x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \\ 6^{dB} \\ 152x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,6 \end{array}$	7^{IF} $352x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,7$ 1^{kD} $234x1$ $0^{3}\pm0,9$ 6^{gA} $243x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,1$ 6^{gA} $292x1$ $0^{3}\pm1,5$	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{jF} \\ 326x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,4 \\ 1^{iE} \\ 283x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,9 \\ 2^{jC} \\ 292x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,8 \\ 9^{jD} \\ 217x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm 1,2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2^{\rm kE} \\ 332 {\rm x1} \\ 0^3 {\pm} 0, 8 \\ 2^{\rm jD} \\ 305 {\rm x1} \\ 0^3 {\pm} 2, 0 \\ 8^{\rm kC} \\ 256 {\rm x1} \\ 0^3 {\pm} 1, 7 \\ 1^{\rm hA} \\ 290 {\rm x1} \\ 0^3 {\pm} 2, 2 \end{array}$	1 ^{cF} 124x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{aC} 111x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bB} 129x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{bD} 122x1 0 ³ ±1,6	$\frac{1^{dB}}{263x1}$ $\frac{0^{3}\pm1,7}{3^{gD}}$ $\frac{216x1}{0^{3}\pm1,2}$ $\frac{6^{fB}}{208x1}$ $\frac{0^{3}\pm1,7}{1^{eA}}$ $\frac{238x1}{0^{3}\pm1,5}$	7cB 230x1 0 ³ ±1,8 3dC 258x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{hD} 306x1 0 ³ ±2,2 2 ^{kF} 172x1 0 ³ ±1,5	$\begin{array}{c} 1^{\rm fF} \\ 237 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,9 \\ 2^{\rm eE} \\ 267 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{\rm iF} \\ 220 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 2,8 \\ 2^{\rm fC} \\ 198 x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,8 \end{array}$	$\frac{8^{aB}}{148 \times 1}$ $0^{3}\pm 1,2$ 6^{bC} 145×1 $0^{3}\pm 2,0$ 8^{cC} 182×1 $0^{3}\pm 1,5$ 0^{dD} 100×1 $0^{3}\pm 0,8$	3gB 370x1 0 ³ ±2,0 6 ^{IF} 310x1 0 ³ ±1,4 1 ^{kD} 255x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{hA} 302x1 0 ³ ±1,8	$\begin{array}{c} 4^{eA} \\ 333x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,2 \\ 9^{jE} \\ 288x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 0,9 \\ 6^{jD} \\ 273x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 1,7 \\ 3^{iC} \\ 270x1 \\ 0^3 \pm 2,0 \\ \end{array}$	7 ^{hE} 231x1 0 ³ ±1,9 2 ^{dC} 203x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{eA} 215x1 0 ³ ±1,2 9 ^{fB} 216x1 0 ³ ±1,8	$\begin{array}{c} 0^{iF} \\ 270x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,8 \\ 3^{hD} \\ 151x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm2,0 \\ 8^{cdB} \\ 253x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,7 \\ 3^{hC} \\ 142x1 \\ 0^{3}\pm1,7 \end{array}$

Table 5. Average number of Bambara groundnut pods per hectare (ha) depending on densities in 2017.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0,01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

	C	,		0	1	1		. 0							
Dens	Acc.	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
ities	36														
D1	389x	394x1	303x1	634x1	374x1	656x1	220x1	486x1	406x1	506x1	339x1	315x1	514x1	699x1	409x1
	10 ³ ±2	0 ³ ±4,1	0 ³ ±2,7	0 ³ ±3,6	0 ³ ±3,7	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,0	0 ³ ±2,9	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±2,0	0 ³ ±2,6	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±3,7
	,60 ^{fF}	$5^{\rm fG}$	0^{bD}	1^{jF}	3^{eF}	9^{kG}	4 ^{aE}	5^{hE}	8^{gE}	9^{iE}	8^{dH}	4 ^{cC}	0^{iG}	9 ^{1H}	5^{gF}
D2	436x	413x1	378x1	686x1	383x1	575x1	387x1	338x1	332x1	634x1	210x1	339x1	601x1	378x1	456x1
	$10^{3} \pm 2$	0 ³ ±2,5	0 ³ ±2,7	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±3,1	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±2,5	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±3,2	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±2,1
	,60 ^{gG}	8^{fH}	7 ^{dF}	9 ^{1G}	3^{deG}	4^{iF}	8 ^{eF}	8^{bcD}	7 ^{bC}	$1^{\rm kH}$	4 ^{aE}	9cF	9jH	4 ^{dE}	7^{hG}
D3	445x	321x1	344x1	441x1	354x1	339x1	217x1	340x1	382x1	619x1	236x1	347x1	334x1	442x1	304x1
	10 ³ ±2	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±3,1	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,6	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±2,2	0 ³ ±2,7	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±2,9	0 ³ ±2,5	0 ³ ±2,9
	,04 ^{iH}	7 ^{dE}	$9^{\rm fE}$	3^{iE}	9^{gE}	$0^{\rm efC}$	4^{aE}	8^{efD}	7^{hD}	9jG	4^{bG}	7^{fgG}	5^{eD}	8 ^{iG}	8cC
D4	316x	335x1	287x1	384x1	331x1	496x1	182x1	222x1	499x1	526x1	220x1	281x1	358x1	363x1	391x1
	10 ³ ±2	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±2,6	0 ³ ±2,9	0 ³ ±4,2	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,6	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±3,0	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±2,7	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±2,3
	,39 ^{dE}	2^{eF}	4cC	0^{gD}	5^{eD}	7^{iE}	7 ^{aB}	7 ^{bA}	0^{iF}	1 ^{jF}	6 ^{bF}	9cA	0^{fE}	7^{fD}	9^{hE}
D5	215x	248x1	266x1	306x1	376x1	373x1	208x1	237x1	337x1	253x1	181x1	332x1	384x1	408x1	345x1
	10 ³ ±2	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±0,9	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,9	0 ³ ±1,9	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,0
	,63 ^{cC}	1^{eD}	0^{gB}	6^{hB}	3 ^{IFG}	0^{1D}	3pd	2^{dB}	2 ^{jC}	0^{fA}	1^{aD}	3^{iE}	0^{mF}	0^{nF}	$0^{\rm kD}$
D6	227x	175x1	344x1	367x1	230x1	340x1	184x1	298x1	210x1	398x1	110x1	325x1	293x1	353x1	217x1
	10 ³ ±1	0 ³ ±2,0	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±0,8	0 ³ ±1,3	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±2,0	0 ³ ±1,2	0 ³ ±0,9	0 ³ ±0,9
	,50 ^{fD}	6 ^{bC}	1 ^{jE}	9 1C	$1^{\rm fB}$	2 ^{jC}	5 ^{cB}	3^{hC}	1^{dB}	3^{mD}	1^{aB}	6 ^{iD}	6 ^{gA}	6 ^{kC}	6 ^{eA}
D7	196x	140x1	265x1	312x1	266x1	244x1	174x1	215x1	182x1	354x1	154x1	321x1	303x1	274x1	235x1
	10 ³ ±0	0 ³ ±1,4	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±2,4	0 ³ ±2,1	0 ³ ±0,9	0 ³ ±1,0	0 ³ ±1,8	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±0,8	0 ³ ±1,9	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±0,8	0 ³ ±2,2
	,96 ^{eB}	1 ^{aB}	0^{iB}	3 ^{1B}	5 ^{iC}	6 ^{hA}	7 ^{cA}	0^{fA}	3 ^{dA}	1 ^{nC}	2 ^{bC}	2^{mD}	3^{kB}	2 ^{jA}	2^{gB}
D8	120x	106x1	162x1	246x1	214x1	301x1	196x1	216x1	187x1	296x1	91x10 ³	288x1	321x1	317x1	211x1
	10 ³ ±0	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±1,6	0 ³ ±2,2	0 ³ ±2,3	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±0,8	0 ³ ±1,5	0 ³ ±0,9	±0,50 ^a	0 ³ ±0,0	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,7	0 ³ ±1,7
	,82 ^{cA}	1 ^{bA}	0 ^{dA}	3^{iA}	2^{ghA}	8 ^{1B}	$0^{\rm fC}$	2 ^{hA}	0 ^{eA}	6 ^{kB}	А	0 ^{jB}	1 ^{mC}	3^{mB}	1 ^{gA}

Table 6. Average number of Bambara groundnut pods per hectare (ha) depending on densities in 2018.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0,01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

The comparison of accessions according to densities during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017, and 2018) made it possible to determine the densities by

grouping accessions that present a fairly high number of pods (Table 7).

Table 7. Accessions presented a high number of pods during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017 and
2018) according to different densities.

Years			Dens	sities		
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D7
	697x10 ³ ±23,06 ^{fD}		690x10 ³	458x10 ³ ±12,25 ^c	694x10 ³ ±18,45 ⁱ	630x10 ³ ±4,11 ⁱ
	Acc.2		±8,02 ^{gF} Acc.36	^C Acc.8	^F Acc.3	^G Acc.12
2016	880x10 ³ ±13,89 ^h		505x10 ³ ±7,93 ^{cE}	718x10 ³ ±11,96 ^h	824x10 ³ ±11,82 ^j	
	^D Acc.6		Acc.1	FAcc.18	^D Acc.20	
	868x10 ³ ±8,68 ^{hG}		880x10 ³ ±7,80 ^{hG}	705x10 ³ ±9,21 ^{hF}		
	Acc.7		Acc.27	Acc.25		
	685x10 ³ ±16,71 ^{ef}					
	^G Acc.9					
	630x10 ³ ±5,10 ^{dE}					
	Acc.19					
	645x10 ³ ±10,63 ^{de}					
	^D Acc.24					
Acc.	40%		20%	20%	13,33%	6,67%
rate						
	304x10 ³ ±1,61 ^{jG} A	403x10 ³ ±2,28 ^k	365x10 ³ ±1,20 ^{jG}	335x10 ³ ±1,02 ^{jF}		
	cc.2	^H Acc.6	Acc.12	Acc.A		
	399x10 ³ ±1,61 ^{mG}	290x10 ³ ±1,02 ^{gF}	331x10 ³ ±2,58 ^{iG}	175x10 ³ ±1,57 ^{bE}		
2017	Acc.3	Acc.9	Acc.27	Acc.1		
	472x10 ³ ±1,20 ^{nG}	315x10 ³ ±1,77 ^{iG}		209x10 ³ ±1,61 ^{eF}		
	Acc.7	Acc.18		Acc.8		
		259x10 ³ ±1,61 ^{fF}				
		Acc.19				
		419x10 ³ ±2,60 ^{jH}				
		Acc.20				
		361x10 ³ ±1,61 ^{jF}				
		Acc.24				
		401x10 ³ ±3,44 ^k				
		^G Acc.25				
Acc.r	20%	46,67%	13,33%	20%		
ate						
	656x10 ³ ±2,39 ^{kG}	413x10 ³ ±2,58 ^{fH}	445x10 ³ ±2,04 ^{iH}	499x10 ³ ±2,60 ^{iF}		
	Acc.7	Acc.1	Acc.36	Acc.12		
	486x10 ³ ±2,95 ^{hE}	378x10 ³ ±2,77 ^d	347x10 ³ ±1,57 ^{tg}			
2018	Acc.9	^r Acc.2	^G Acc.20			
	339x10 ³ ±1,88 ^{dH}	686x10 ³ ±2,39 ^{IG}				
	Acc.19	Acc.3				
	699x10 ³ ±2,39 ^{IH} A	383x10 ³ ±3,13 ^{de}				
	cc.25	^G Acc.6				
		387x10 ³ ±1,88 ^{eF}				

		Acc.8			
		634x10 ³ ±	1,61 ^k		
		^H Acc.18			
		601x10 ³ ±	2,39 ^{jH}		
		Acc.24			
		456x10 ³ ±	2,17 ^h		
		GAcc.27			
Acc.	26,67	% 53,33	% 13,33%	6,67%	
rate					
D1=40cm	x20cm	D3=40cmx30cm	D5=50cmx20cm ;	Acc.=accession ;	
D2=40cm	x25cm	D4=40cmx40cm	D7=50cmx30cm	Acc. rate=accession rate	

In 2016, D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 40% of accessions (Acc.2, Acc.6, Acc.7, Acc.9, Acc.19 and Acc.24) which presents a total of 440x10³ pods/ha; followed by D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 20% of accessions (Acc.36, Acc.1, Acc.27) and which presents 2075x10³ pods/ha; D4 (62500 plants/ha) which grouped 20% of accessions (Acc.8, Acc.18, Acc.25) with 1881x10³ pods/ha; D5 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.3, Acc.20) with 1518x10³ pods/ha and D7 (66667 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% of accessions (Acc.12) with 630x10³ pods/ha.

In 2017, D2 (100000 plants/ha) brought together 46,67% of accessions (Acc.6; Acc.9; Acc.18; Acc.19; Acc.20; Acc.24; Acc.25) which presented a total of 2448x10³ pods/ha; followed by D1 (125000 plants/ha) which brought together 20% of accessions (Acc.2, Acc.3, Acc.7) with 1175x10³ pods/ha; of D4 (62500 plants/ha) which grouped 20% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.1, Acc.8) with 719x10³ pods/ha and D3 (83333 plants/ha) which grouped 13,33 % of accessions (Acc.12; Acc.27) with 696x10³ pods/ha. In 2018, D2 (100000 plants/ha) brought together 53,33% of accessions (Acc.1; Acc.2; Acc.3; Acc.6; Acc.8; Acc.18; Acc.24; Acc.27) with 3938x10³ pods/ha; followed by D1 (125000 plants/ha) which brought together 26,67% of accessions (Acc.7; Acc.9; Acc.19; Acc.25) with 2180x10³ pods/ha; of D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.20) with 792x10³ pods/ha and D4 (62500 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% of accessions (Acc.12) with 499x10³ pods/ha.

Average weight of Bambara groundnut pods on the different densities

Observation of tables 8, 9 and 10 shows significant variations in the average weight of the pods depending

on the densities and accessions during the three years of cultivation. The average weight of pods in year 1 (2016) at D1 (40cmx20cm), varies from $384,25\pm4,82^{aBC}$ kg/ha (Acc.3) to $814\pm9,33^{fF}$ kg/ha (Acc.19); in year 2 (2017) at D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from $87,5\pm4,56^{aA}$ kg/ha (Acc.8) to $290,6\pm4,13^{kF}$ kg/ha (Acc.3), and in year 3 (2018) to D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from $339,4\pm2,57^{aE}$ kg/ha (Acc.20) to $756\pm1,72^{iF}$ kg/ha (Acc.25).

In 2016 with D2 (40cmx25cm), it varied from $323\pm3,27^{aB}$ kg/ha (Acc.12) to $644,5\pm11,05^{fD}$ kg/ha (Acc.27); in 2017 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from $96,9\pm4,38^{aD}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to $262,5\pm5,10^{JF}$ kg/ha (Acc.6), and in 2018 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from $335,9\pm2,91^{aD}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to $686,3\pm2,00^{kH}$ kg/ha (Acc.18). In 2016 with D3 (40cmx30cm), it varied from $377\pm9,08^{aB}$ kg/ha (Acc.2) to $836,5\pm3,03^{gE}$ kg/ha (Acc.27); in 2017 at D3 (40cmx23cm), it varies from $75\pm4,90^{aB}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to $262,5\pm4,21^{hF}$ kg/ha (Acc.12), and in 2018 at D3 (40cmx30cm), it varies from $381,2\pm0.54^{fE}$ kg/ha (Acc.8) to $623,9\pm2,78^{nG}$ kg/ha (Acc.18).

In 2016 with D4 (40cmx40cm), it varied from 311,25±10,21^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.7) to 671±13,02^{gE} kg/ha (Acc.18); in 2017 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from 128,1±3,73^{aE} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 259,4±3,73^{gDE} kg/ha (Acc.3), and in 2018 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from 320±1,86^{aE} kg/ha (Acc.19) to 563,3±1,35^{jF} kg/ha (Acc.12). In 2016 with D5 (50cmx20cm), it varied from 222,8±6,68^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.12) to 641,2±8,48^{iF} kg/ha (Acc.20); in 2017 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varies from 90±1,83^{aCD} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 265±2,52^{kE} kg/ha (Acc.3), and in 2018 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varies from 168,8±1,36^{aBC} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 401,1±1,60^{kD} kg/ha (Acc.25). In 2016 with D6 (50cmx25cm), it varied from 281,6±3,22^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 675,8±24,28^{gE} kg/ha (Acc.24); in 2017 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varies from 62,5±2,22^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 215±1,92^{jE} kg/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varies from 151,8±1,06^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.19) to 421,4±1,82^{ID} kg/ha (Acc.3). In 2016 with D7 (50cmx30cm), it varied from 291,4±4,50^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.8) to 544±7,08^{gF} kg/ha (Acc.12); in 2017 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from 74,5±2,22^{aB} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 215±2,08^{iE} kg/ha (Acc.12), and in 2018 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from 142,2±1,23^{aB} kg/ha (Acc.19) to 316,1±0,94^{IB} kg/ha (Acc.3). In 2016 with D8 (50cmx40cm), it varied from 292±2,52^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 459±4,62^{gAB} kg/ha (Acc.6); in 2017 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from 80±2,45^{aBC} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 220±2,58^{jB} kg/ha (Acc.3), and in 2018 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from 124,9±1,18^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 305,8±1,95^{IC} kg/ha (Acc.24).

	Table 8. Avt	erage weig	ht of Bamb	ara groundr	ut pods (kg	g/ha) depe	nding on d	ensities in	2016.						
Densities	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
D1	599,75	389,25	520,75	384,25±	779,5±	603,75	521,25	658,5±	465±	406,5±	814±	591±	498±	541,5±	649,5±
	±4,49dD	±2,31aC	±20,56°	4,82aBC	16,19 ^m	±7,98dD	±4,15aD	16,42 ^{eE}	7,33bE	13,40 ^{aB}	9,33F	3,77dE	7,57bcC	22,37cE	24,46eD
			ш							J					
D2	544,5±	420±3,	505,5±	556,75±	611,25±	402,5±	416,5±	588,25	323±	509,25	493,5±	548,75±	448±	536,25±	644,5±
	8,17cdC	26 ^{bD}	7,30cDE	25,36cdE	17,11efC	13,24 ^{bB}	5,98 ^{bB}	±23,11 ^d	3,27ªB	±11,70°	17,01cD	21,04 ^{cdD}	9,52 ^{bB}	25,40cdD	11,05fD
								eD		р				ш	
D3	643,25	470±	377±	493,25±	489,75±	408,75	467,25	417,75	481±	421,25	501,75±	462,75±	536±	487,5±	836,5±
	±8,05E	8,01bE	9,08aB	14,16bcdD	27,34bcB	±8,85aB	±4,59bC	±9,58ªB	8,95bE	±6,30ac	2.2 bcdeCD	9,70bc	12,59œ	2,97bccD	3,03¢E
													D		
D4	591,75	401,5±	576±	478±	626,75±	311,25	609,5±	420,25	423±	671±	536,75±	400,25±	483±	460,25±	474,5±
	±11,34f	3,95bc	8,06F	10,10dD	14,86fC	±10,21ª	16,02fE	±19,79b	6,32bcD	13,02gE	12,25eDE	$11,42^{bAB}$	6,83dC	27,88cdBC	5,87dC
	D					A		8							
D5	593,8±	308,2±	480,4±	565,2±	491,6±	460,8±	285,2±	502,4±	222,8±	391,4±	570,6±	641,2±	350,4±	353,6±	422,6±
	5,44hD	7,11 ^{bB}	8,67fgD	26,20hE	8,08fgB	7,15fC	12,45 ^{bA}	10,64gC	6,68ªÅ	3,30dB	12,44hE	8,48i ^F	4,27cA	1,95cA	3,67 ^{eB}
D6D	460,6±	281,6±	334,4±	362±	423,8±	442,2±	290,4±	420,2±	338,8±	427,2±	438,2±	383±	675,8±	520,4±	350±
	7,49eB	3,22ªÅ	2,68 ^{bA}	14,37bcB	10,59 ^{dA}	9,82deC	9,75aA	2,93 ^{dB}	9,86 ^{bB}	6,12 ^{dC}	7,51deB	7,18cA	24,28gE	10,71 ^{fDE}	2,72 ^{bA}
D7D	461±	317±	425,4±	297,4±	461,6±	460,2±	291,4±	324,8±	544±	357,4±	454±	469,2±	355,8±	347,8±	442,4±
	7,70fB	5,66abcB	18,01 ^{eC}	1,64abA	10,89fAB	5,07fc	4,50aA	2,13bcdA	7,08aF	9,25 ^{dA}	9,31eBC	5,82fC	4,81 ^{dA}	4,41 cdA	26,37eBC
D8D	410,6±	292±	371,4±	408,2±	459±	307±	451,4±	340,8±	368,6±	390,8±	350,6±	420,8±	379,6±	424±	411±
	3,39efA	2,52ªÅ	8,31cdB	9,21efC	4,62gAB	5,44aA	6,24s ^c	18,85 ^{bA}	2,12cdC	7,21deB	10,77 ^{bcA}	2,23B	5,57 ^{dA}	6,19 ^B	5,37efB
	- Mean valu	es bearing	the same l	etters are st	atistically h	omogeneo	us at p<0,0	1% signifi	cance						
	- Lowercast	e letters fo	llowing the	lines compa	are the yield	l of accessi	ons at fixed	densities							
	- The capita	I letters fo	llowing the	e columns co	mpare the	yield of an	accession a	t different	sowing de	insities					

		0	0	0	•	(0,)		2							
Dens	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
ities															
D1	231,2±	131,2±	206,2±	290,6±	243,8±	256,2±	87,5±	187,5±	181,2±	146,2±	228,1±	203,1±	165,6±	196,9±	190,6±
	4,84 ^{hC}	3,31 ^{bE}	3,31 ^{gE}	4,13 ^{kF}	3,31 ^{iE}	4,27 ^{jF}	4,56 ^{aA}	3,54 ^{efB}	2,98 ^{eD}	2,60 ^{cB}	2,77 ^{hF}	2,14 ^{gD}	3,59 ^{dA}	$2,14^{\text{fgD}}$	2,58 ^{efC}
D2	228,1±	96,9±	140,6±	250,6±	262,5±	146,9±	118,8±	237,5±	125±	190,6±	237,5±	246,2±	250±	175±	165,6±
	6,72 ^{hC}	4,38 ªD	5,98 ^{cdC}	3,4 4 ^{ijD}	5,10 ^{jF}	4,13 ^{deB}	4,27 ^{bC}	3,68 ^{hiD}	3,23 ^{bcA}	3,73 ^{gF}	2,70 ^{hiG}	4,27 ^{hijF}	3,68 ^{ijE}	2,70 ^{fgC}	2,77 ^{efB}
D3	231,2±	75±	140,6±	234,4±	187,5±	203,1±	166,9±	206,2±	262,5±	134,4±	225±	253,1±	184,4±	221,9±	231,2±
	4,27 ^{fgC}	4,90 ^{aB}	4,38 ^{bC}	4,38 ^{gC}	4,21 ^{dB}	2,77 ^{eE}	4,49 ^{cE}	3,75 ^{eC}	4,21 ^{hF}	3,59 ^{bA}	2,28 ^{fgF}	2,77 ^{hF}	2,77 ^{dB}	2,77 ^{fF}	$3,31^{\text{fgE}}$
D4	234,4±	128,1±	171,9±	259,4±	256,2±	190,6±	231,2±	153,1±	137,5±	178,1±	130,6±	181,2±	181,2±	209,4±	225±
	3,73 ^{fC}	3,73ªE	3,73 ^{cD}	$3,73^{gDE}$	3,31 ^{gF}	3,73 ^{dD}	2,60 ^{fF}	5,53 ^{bA}	2,70 ^{abB}	2,58 ^{cdE}	1,57 ^{aB}	3,89 ^{cdB}	2,60 ^{cdB}	3,44 ^{eE}	$2,28^{efDE}$
D5	137,5±	90±	162,5±	265±	215±	164,5±	125±	210±	170±	160±	142,5±	247,5±	240±	152,5±	224±
	2,36 ^{cB}	1,83 ^{aCD}	2,22 ^{eD}	2,52 ^{kE}	2,08 ^{gD}	2,22 ^{efC}	2,52 ^{bCD}	1,63 ^{gC}	1,63 ^{fC}	2,71 ^{eD}	2,22 ^{cC}	1,71 ^{jF}	1,41 ^{iD}	1,50 ^{dB}	1,83 ^{hD}
D6	145±	62,5±	117,5±	165±	202,5±	165±	100±	157,5±	177,5±	182,5±	150±	215±	200±	130±	100±
	2,08 ^{eB}	2,22ªA	2,36 ^{cB}	1,92 ^{gA}	2,22 ^{iC}	2,08 ^{gC}	2,45 ^{bB}	1,71 ^{fA}	1,71 ^{hCD}	2,22 ^{hEF}	2,58 ^{eD}	1,92 ^{jE}	1,63 ^{iC}	0,82 ^{dA}	1,83 ^{bA}
D7	117,5±	74,5±	117,5±	170±	205±	137,5±	127,5±	157,5±	215±	157,5±	172,5±	137±	202,5±	132,5±	185,5±
	1,71 ^{bA}	2,22 ^{aB}	2,50 ^{bB}	2,45 ^{fA}	2,08 ^{hC}	2,22 ^{dA}	2,75 ^{cD}	1,71 ^{eA}	2,08 ^{iE}	1,50 ^{eCD}	0,96 ^{fE}	1,92 ^{dA}	0,96 ^{hC}	2,06 ^{cdA}	0,96 ^{gC}
D8	137,5±	80±	104,5±	220±	145±	160±	105±	195±	120±	150±	97,5±	190±	187,5±	156±	102±
	2,36 ^{eB}	2,45 ^{aBC}	1,71 ^{cA}	2,58 ^{jB}	2,65 ^{fA}	2,16 ^{gC}	2,08 ^{cB}	1,29 ^{iB}	2,45 ^{dA}	2,45 ^{fBC}	2,36 ^{bA}	1,41 ^{hiC}	0,96 ^{hB}	1,41 ^{gB}	1,41 ^{bcA}

Table 9. Average weight of Bambara groundnut pods (kg/ha) depending on densities in 2017.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0,01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

Dens	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
ities															
D1	502,8±	548,8±	476,9±	618,4±	618±2,	499,2±	387,5±	555,8±	591,6±	432,7±	446,5±	339,4±	625,4±	756±	619,9±
	1,25 ^{fG}	2,58 ^{gG}	2,67 ^{eG}	2,72 ^{iF}	67^{iF}	2,69 ^{fH}	3,14 ^{bEF}	2,68 ^{gG}	1,88 ^{hG}	2,73 ^{cF}	2,46 ^{dG}	2,57 ^{aE}	2,38 ^{iH}	1,72 ^{jF}	1,98 ^{iG}
D2	425,2±	335,9±	525,2±	683,2±	611,6±	472,4±	445,6±	471,3±	407,1±	686,3±	399,4±	617,9±	589,1±	458,4±	458,3±
	1,85 ^{dF}	2,91 ^{aD}	1,88 ^{hH}	2,94 ^{kG}	3,03 ^{jF}	3,12 ^{gG}	2,71 ^{eG}	2,52 ^{gF}	1,74 ^{cE}	2,00 ^{kH}	2,52 ^{bF}	1,47 ^{jH}	2,75 ^{iG}	2,21 ^{fE}	3,08 ^{fF}
D3	540,7±	410,8±	429,9±	421,9±	330,9±	344,4±	381,2±	473,4±	332,9±	623,9±	400,2±	373,7±	449,6±	298,9±	282,2±
	1,49 ^{mH}	1,84 ^{hF}	2,14 ^{jE}	1,27 ^{iD}	3,62°C	3,82 ^{dE}	0,54 ^{fE}	2,77 ^{1F}	3,04 ^{cC}	2,78 ^{nG}	2,64 ^{gF}	2,27 ^{eF}	1,80 ^{kF}	1,97 ^{bB}	2,76 ^{aD}
D4	410,8±	376,4±	440,2±	477,1±	340,5±	438,1±	395,3±	437±	563,3±	373,1±	320±1,	418±	416,1±	405,2±	452,8±
	1,10 ^{efE}	1,11 ^{cE}	3,67 ^{gF}	2,93 ^{iE}	2,33 ^{bD}	1,50 ^{gF}	2,46 ^{dF}	1,62 ^{gE}	1,35 ^{jF}	2,65 ^{ce}	86 ^{aE}	2,94 ^{fG}	2,21 ^{fE}	1,24 ^{eD}	1,55 ^{hF}
D5	300,1±	168,8±	303,4±	372,9±	376,4±	291,8±	299,2±	310,2±	374,3±	243,7±	253,5±	261,4±	368,6±	401,1±	318,2±
	1,49 ^{fC}	1,36 ^{aBC}	1,17 ^{fC}	2,15 ^{jC}	0,93 ^{jE}	0,21 eD	1,77 ^{fD}	1,31 ^{gC}	1,65 ^{jD}	1,53 ^{bA}	1,63 ^{cD}	1,11 ^{dB}	1,38 ^{iD}	1,60 ^{kD}	0,92 ^{hE}
D6	308,5±	170,3±	314,2±	421,4±	272,8±	265,5±	210,3±	349,3±	188,2±	255,7±	151,8±	286,8±	278,7±	352,1±	233,7±
	1,40 ^{jD}	1,35 ^{bC}	1,25 ^{jD}	1,82 ^{ID}	2,32 ^{hA}	1,46 ^{gC}	6,35 ^{dB}	1,10 ^{kD}	0,58 ^{cB}	1,25 ^{fB}	1,06 ^{aC}	1,24 ^{iC}	1,63 ^{hB}	0,15 ^{kC}	1,62 ^{eC}
D7	274,7±	163,9±	180±1,	316,1±	281,2±	196,4±	166,5±	247±	191,6±	307,8±	142,2±	304,9±	269,2±	303,2±	195,9±
	0,39 ^{hB}	2,16 ^{bB}	28 ^{cA}	0,94 ^{1B}	1,72 ^{iB}	1,70 ^{eA}	1,00 ^{bA}	1,62 ^{fA}	1,64 ^{dB}	1,50 ^{kD}	1,23 ^{aB}	1,55 ^{jD}	1,40 ^{gA}	1,25 ^{jB}	1,27 ^{eA}
D8	256,6±	124,9±	220,1±	291,1±	269,4±	245,4±	225,9±	262,5±	180,7±	293,3±	134,2±	253,7±	305,8±	221,1±	214,1±
	1,52 ^{hA}	1,18ªA	1,66 ^{eB}	1,67 ^{kA}	1,07 ^{jA}	1,60 ^{gB}	1,33 ^{fC}	2,39 ^{iB}	1,03 ^{cA}	1,86 ^{kC}	1,52 ^{bA}	0,85 ^{hA}	1,95 ^{1C}	1,15 ^{eA}	1,68 ^{dB}

Table 10. Average weight of Bambara groundnut pods (kg/ha) depending on densities in 2018.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0,01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

The comparison between the accessions according to densities during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017, and 2018) made it possible to group the

accessions which present a high weight of pods (Table 11).

Table 11. Accessions presented a high average weight of pods during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017	
and 2018) according to different densities.	

Years				Densities			
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7
	779,5±16,1 ^{fD} Ac		643,3±8,05 ^{fE} A	576±8,06 ^{fF} Ac	565,2±26,20 ^{hE}	675,8±24,28 ^{gE}	
	c.6		cc.36	c.2	Acc.3	Acc.24	44±7,0
20	603,8±7,98 ^{dD} A		470±8,01 ^{bE} Ac	609,5±16,02 ^{fE}	641,2±8,48 ^{iF} A		8^{gF}
16	cc.7		c.1	Acc.8	cc.20		Acc.12
	658,5±16,42 ^{eE}		836,5±3,03 ^{gE} A	671±1,02 ^{gE} Ac			
	Acc.9		cc.27	c.18			
	814±9,33 ^{fF} Acc.						
	19						
	514,5±22,37 ^{cE}						
	Acc.25						
Acc	33,33%		20%	20%	13,33%	6,67	6,67%
rate							
	$131,2\pm3,31^{bE}$	262,5±5,10 ^{jF}	166,9±4,49 ^{cE}	234,4±3,73 ^{fC}			
	Acc. 1	Acc. 6	Acc.8	Acc.36			
20	206,2±3,31 ^{gE}	237,5±3,68 ^{hiD}	262,5±4,21 ^{hF}	225±2,28 ^{efDE} A			
17	Acc. 2	Acc. 9	Acc.12	cc.27			
	290,6±4,13 ^{kF}	190,6±3,73 ^{gF}	253,1±2,77 ^{hF}				
	Acc. 3	Acc. 18	Acc.20				
	256,2±4,27 ^{jF}	237,5±2,70 ^{hiG}	221,9±2,77 ^{fF} A				
	Acc. 7	Acc. 19	cc.25				
		250±3,68 ^{ijE}					
		Acc. 24					
Acc.	26,67%	33,33%	26,67%	13,33%			
rate							
	548,8±2,58 ^{gG}	525,2±1,88 ^{hH}	540,7±1,49 ^{mH}				
	Acc.1	Acc.2	Acc.36				
	618±2,67 ^{iF}	683,2±2,94 ^{kG} A					
	Acc.6	cc.3					
20	499,2±2,69 ^{fH}	445,6±2,71 ^{eG} A					
18	Acc.7	cc.8					
	555,8±2,68 ^{gG}	686,3±2,00 ^{kH}					
	Acc.9	Acc.18					
	591,6±1,88 ^{hG}	617,9±1,47 ^{jH} A					
	Acc.12	cc.20					
	446,5±2,46 ^{dG}						
	Acc.19						
	625,4±2,38 ^{iH}						
	Acc.24						
	756±1,72 ^{jF}						

	Acc.25				
	619,9±1,98 ⁱ⁰	i			
	Acc.27				
Acc.	60%	33,33%	6,67%		
rate					
D1=4	40cmx20cm	D3=40cmx30cm	D5=50cmx20cm ;	Acc.=accession ;	
D2=4	40cmx25cm	D4=40cmx40cm	D7=50cmx30cm	Acc. rate =Accession rate	

In the 1st year of cultivation (2016), D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 33,33% of accessions (Acc.6; Acc.7; Acc.9; Acc.19; Acc.25) with 3397,25 kg/ha; followed by D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 20% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.1; Acc.27) with 1949,75 kg/ha; D4 (62500 plants/ha) which brought together 20% of accessions (Acc.2, Acc.8, Acc.18) with 1856,5 kg/ha; D5 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.3, Acc.20) with 1206,4 kg/ha; of D6 (80000 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% accession (Acc.24) with 675,8 kg/ha and D7 (66667 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% accession (Acc.12) with 544 kg/ha. D1 (125000 plants/ha) has the most accessions in the first year of cultivation (2016). In the 2nd year of cultivation (2017), D2 (100000 plants/ha) brought together 33,33% of accessions (Acc.6; Acc.9; Acc.18; Acc.19; Acc.24) with 1178,1 kg/ha; followed by D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 26,67% of accessions (Acc.12; Acc.20; Acc.25; Acc.27) with 968,7 kg/ha; of D1 (125000 plants/ha) which also brought together 26,67% of accessions (Acc.1; Acc.2; Acc.3; Acc.7) with 884,2 kg/ha and D4 (62500 plants /ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.8) with 465,6 kg/ha. D2 (100000 plants/ha) has the most accessions to the second year of cultivation in 2017.

In the 3rd year of cultivation (2018), D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 56,25% of accessions (Acc.1; Acc.6; Acc.7; Acc.9; Acc.12; Acc.19 ; Acc.24; Acc.25; Acc.27) with 5261,2 kg/ha; followed by D2 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 33,33% of accessions (Acc.2; Acc.3; Acc.8; Acc.18; Acc.20) with 2958,2 kg/ha and the D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 6,66% of accessions (Acc.36) with 540,7 kg/ha.

Average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds based on different densities

Tables 12, 13 and 14 present the yields in average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds according to

densities and accessions during three years of experimentation (2016, 2017 and 2018). Significant variations in the average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds are observed depending on densities and accessions over the three years of cultivation.

The average weight of seeds in year 1 (2016) at D1 (40 cmx 20 cm), varies from 269,5±2,77^{aB} kg/ha (Acc.3) to 611,75±8,21^{gE} kg/ha (Acc.19); in year 2 (2017) at D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from $78,1\pm3,73^{aAB}$ kg/ha (Acc.8) to 214,4±2,77^{iH} kg/ha (Acc.3), and in year 3 (2018) to D1 (40cmx20cm), it varies from 222,3±1,49^{aD} kg/ha (Acc.20) to 527,3±1,93^{IF} kg/ha (Acc.6). In 2016 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varied from 239,95±2,43^{aB} kg/ha (Acc.12) to 482,25±7,06^{fD}kg/ha (Acc.27); in 2017 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from 75±3,23^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 215,6±1,88^{hF} kg/ha (Acc.25), and in 2018 at D2 (40cmx25cm), it varies from 238,8±2,35^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 441,5±2,61^{nG} kg/ha (Acc.3). In 2016 at D3 (40cmx30cm), it varied from 266,25±6,86^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.2) to 604,5±2,34^{gE} kg/ha (Acc.27); in 2017 at D3 (40cmx23cm), it varies from $62,5\pm2,70^{aB}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to 196,9±2,14^{hE} kg/ha (Acc.12), and in 2018 at D3 (40cmx30cm), it varies from 211,1±2,87^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.12) to 442,1±1,57^{kG} kg/ha (Acc.18). In 2016 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varied from 240,53±7,30^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.7) to 463,25±10,37^{fC} kg/ha (Acc.6); in 2017 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from 101,9±3,44^{aD} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 193,8±3,31gE kg/ha (Acc.6), and in 2018 at D4 (40cmx40cm), it varies from 244,9±2,01^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.6) to 350,2±2,29^{jD} kg/ha (Acc.27).In 2016 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varied from 165,26±3,99^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.12) to 473,4±5,76^{iF} kg/ha (Acc.20); in 2017 at D5 (50cmx20cm), it varies from 72,5±1,50^{aC} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 202,5±2,22^{IG} kg/ha (Acc.3), and in 2018 at D5 (50 cmx 20 cm), it varies from $116,2\pm0,91^{\text{aB}}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to 269±1,47^{jD} kg/ha (Acc.6).

In 2016 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varied from $209\pm5,96^{aA}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to $490,6\pm18,35^{gF}$ kg/ha (Acc.24); in 2017 at D6 (50cmx25cm), it varies from $50\pm1,41^{aA}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to $162,5\pm2,22^{jC}$ kg/ha (Acc.20), and in 2018 at D6

(50cmx25cm), it varies from 101,1±2,04^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.19) to 263,1±1,66^{kC} kg/ha (Acc.3). In 2016 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varied from 214,6±1,30^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.3) to 401±5,69^{gF} kg/ha (Acc.12); in 2017 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from 57,5±0,96^{aAB} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 170±1,83^{jC} kg/ha (Acc.6), and in 2018 at D7 (50cmx30cm), it varies from 76,6±1,19^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.8) to 215,2±0,41^{jB} kg/ha (Acc.9). In 2016 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varied from 213,8±2,05^{aAB} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 389±14,77^{jCD} kg/ha (Acc.25); in 2017 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from $60\pm1,83^{aB}$ kg/ha (Acc.1) to 152,5±2.06^{jC} kg/ha (Acc.9), and in 2018 at D8 (50cmx40cm), it varies from 88,9±1,59^{aA} kg/ha (Acc.1) to 206,7±1,77^{kB} kg/ha (Acc.24).

Iat	IL I.C. AVEN	ige weignt or	bambara B	rounanut	seeus [Kg/1	naj dependi.	ing on dens	SILLES IN 20.	T 0.						
Densities	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
D1	355,75±	270,5±1,4	381,25±	269,5±	574,5±1	455,5±5,5	405,5±	499±	350,75	297,25	611,75±	442,25	360,25	394,75±	462,75±1
	7,35hA	7aC	15,23 ^{hoff}	$2,77^{aB}$	$1,17^{(l)}$	8dE	2,83cD	11,75 ^{eF}	±6,16 ^{hE}	±7,36aA	8,21 ^{gE}	±2,59dE	±5,47 ^{bD}	16,55 ^{cDE}	7,84 ^{dD}
										в			Ε		
D2	413,25±	305±	383±	402,75±	451,25±	302,25±1	312,5±	440,5±1	239,95	383,75	378,25±	401,5±	324,25	420±6,0	482,25±7,
	6,50 cdeB	$2,13^{\mathrm{bD}}$	4,16°C	17,63 ^{cdD}	11,90°C	1,69 ^{bB}	4,60 ^{bB}	6,79 ^{deE}	±2,43ª ^B	±8,78cC	14,24cC	16,09cd	±7,05 ^{bC}	2cdeE	06 ^{fD}
												4			
D3	484±	334,5±	266,25±	355,5±	364±	322,25±6,	359,5±	308±	353,75	312,25	380,25±	341±7,	379,25	362,25±	604,5±2,3
	6,01 ^{fb}	6,37bcdE	6,86 ^{aA}	8,13cdeC	20,23 ^{deB}	48hcBC	2,99cdeC	3,17 ^{bC}	±6,94 ^{cd}	±3,99 ^{hB}	17,04eC	26hedeC	±7,98eE	$2,12^{deC}$	48 ^E
									eE						
D4	440,5±	293,75±	412,75±	342,5±	463,25±	240,53±7,	461,75±	310,75±	314,75	375,25	413,25±	286,75	350,5±	451,75±	363±3,50
	8,95 efc	2,85 ^{bD}	5,04 ^{cD}	7,37 odC	10,37fC	30aA	$15,06^{fE}$	15,20hof.	±4,89hc	±15,90	8,94cD	±7,86 ^{hA}	4,29 ^{dD}	$11,06^{fF}$	dC
									ŋ	dC					
D5	445,4±	216,8±	345,8±	405±	368,2±5,	345,2±4,9	221,8±	366,2±7,	165,26	287,6±	327,8±7,	473,4±	253,2±	299,6±9,	309,6±2,4
	4,48 ^{ilC}	4,38 ^{bAB}	5,93fgB	18,02 ^{hD}	91^{8B}	6 ^{fgCD}	9,45 ^{bA}	28 ⁸⁰	±3,99aA	3,12 ^{dAB}	39efB	5,76 ^{1F}	3,00 ^{cA}	45^{dB}	2 deB
D6D	341,8±	209±	253,2±	269,4±	318,8±7,	340,6±7,5	223,4±	287,6±1	247,4±	313,6±	339,6±6,	287±4,	490,6±	384±5,3	254±2,36
	6,09eA	5,96 ^{aA}	1,64 ^{bA}	9,76 ^{bcB}	72deA	8eCD	7,55 ^{aA}	0,31 ^{cAC}	6,56 ^{bB}	5,47 ^{dB}	48 ^{eB}	10^{ch}	$18,35^{g\mu}$	6 ^{6CD}	γų
D7	352,8±	228,8±	323±	214,6±	342,2±7,	353,2±3,5	228,2±	252,2±1,	401±5,	262,6±	348,6±7,	347,8±	262,2±	236,4±1,	361,2±17,
	4,02 th	$4,31^{\rm abB}$	12,96 ^{eB}	$1,30^{ah}$	50efAB	$1^{\rm eff}$	3,56ahA	80hcdA	698 ^F	6,64 ^{cdA}	81eBC	4,69efC	3,48 ^{dAB}	46ahcA	63 ^{fC}
D8	357,8±	213,8±	272,6±	296,4±	343±	238,4±3,9	328±	253,8±	271,2±	280,4±	270,4±8,	311,4±	281,8±	389±14,	302,2±3,8
	7,84	2,05 ^{aAB}	5,51 cdA	6,43 ^{defB}	3,41 ^{hiAB}	4b∆	3,59ghBC	$13,72^{hcA}$	1,06cdC	5,20cdeA	21 ^{cdA}	$1,61^{\mathrm{fgB}}$	4,29cdeB	77)CD	5 efB
										В					
- M	ean values b	earing the sa	ime letters	are statisti	ically homo	geneous at	p<0,01% s	significance							
-1.	tel escreve	ters following	a the lines (-omnare th	e vield of a	icressions a	t fived den	sities							
ΪĒ	to control lot	tone following	a the colum	n o mdimoo	to the relation	of on one of a	din at diff	Formet court	ine donot						

228

		0 0		0			1 0								
Dens	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
ities															
D1	175±	106,2±	159,4±	214,4±	184,4±	206,2±	78,1±	137,5±	137,5±	121,9±	184,4±	156,2±	128,1±	153,1±	150±
	2,28 ^{fE}	4,27 ^{bD}	3,73 ^{eE}	2,77 ^{iH}	2,77 ^{gD}	2,60 ^{hF}	3,73 ^{aAB}	2,70 ^{dB}	2,28 ^{dC}	2,58 ^{cB}	2,77 ^{gF}	2,60 ^{eC}	2,77 ^{cA}	2,77 ^{eD}	2,28 ^{eD}
D2	159,4±	75±	103,1±	193,8±	181,2±	112,5±	103,1±	187,5±	106,2±	156,2±	184,4±	193,8±	184,4±	215,6±	134,4±
	3,13 ^{eD}	3,23 ^{aC}	2,77 ^{bBC}	2,60 ^{gF}	3,89 ^{fD}	2,04 ^{cA}	2,77 ^{bC}	2,04 ^{fgE}	2,60 ^{bcB}	3,31 ^{eD}	2,77 ^{fF}	3,89 ^{gE}	2,58 ^{fE}	1,88 ^{hF}	2,77 ^{dC}
D3	175±	62,5±	109,4±	175±	171,9±	177,5±	140,6±	162,5±	196,9±	109,4±	125±	181,2±	143,8±	175±	175±
	3,23 ^{fgE}	2,70 ^{aB}	2,14 ^{bC}	2,04 ^{fgD}	2,77 ^{fC}	2,28 ^{fgE}	3,13 ^{dD}	2,04 ^{eD}	2,14 ^{hE}	2,77 ^{bA}	3,23 ^{cD}	1,61 ^{gD}	2,60 ^{dBC}	2,28 ^{fgE}	2,70 ^{fgG}
D4	153,1±	101,9±	131,2±	184,4±	193,8±	145,6±	181,2±	121,9±	106,2±	121,9±	103,1±	146,9±	134,4±	134,4±	168,8±
	2,77 ^{dD}	3,44 aD	3,61 ^{cD}	2,77 ^{fE}	3,31 ^{gE}	2,14 ^{dD}	2,98 ^{fE}	2,14 ^{bA}	3,31ªB	2,14 ^{bB}	2,14 ^{aB}	1,88 ^{dB}	2,95 ^{cAB}	2,14 ^{cC}	2,60 ^{eF}
D5	107,5±	72,5±	127,5±	202,5±	167,5±	142,5±	102±	157,5±	135±	122,5±	115±	182,5±	156±	117,5±	157,5±
	1,71 ^{cC}	1,50 ^{aC}	1,50 ^{fD}	2,22 ^{1G}	0,96 ^{jC}	1,71 ^{hCD}	1,63 ^{bC}	1,26 ^{iCD}	1,92 ^{gC}	1,71 ^{eB}	1,92 ^{dC}	1,71 ^{kD}	1,41 ^{iD}	1,71 ^{dB}	1,26 ^{iE}
D6	99,5±	50±	82,5±	125±	160±	137,5±	72,5±	125±	134±	130±	125±	162,5±	155±	105±	75±
	1,71 ^{dB}	1,41 ^{aA}	1,71 ^{cA}	2,08 ^{fB}	1,41 ^{jB}	0,96 ^{hC}	1,50 ^{bA}	1,29 ^{fA}	1,41 ^{ghC}	1,63 ^{gC}	1,29 ^{fD}	2,22 ^{jC}	1,29 ^{iD}	1,92 ^{eA}	1,29 ^{bA}
D7	82,5±	57,5±	95±	132,5±	170±	112,5±	105±	120±	167,5±	125±	152±	117,5±	152,5±	102,5±	132,5±
	1,71 ^{bA}	0,96 ^{aAB}	1,29 ^{cB}	1,71 ^{hC}	1,83 ^{jC}	1,50 ^{eA}	1,73 ^{dC}	2,16 ^{fA}	1,50 ^{jD}	2,08 ^{gBC}	1,63 ^{iE}	0,96 ^{fA}	1,50 ^{iCD}	2,22 ^{dA}	1,71 ^{hC}
D8	112,5±	60±	82,5±	117,5±	117,5±	127,5±	85±	152,5±	95±	105±	70±	145±	152,5±	120±	82,5±
	1,71 ^{fC}	1,83ª ^B	1,71 ^{cA}	2,50 ^{fgA}	1,71 ^{fgA}	1,71 ^{hB}	2,38 ^{cB}	2,06 ^{jC}	1,29 ^{dA}	2,08 ^{eA}	1,83 ^{bA}	1,92 ^{iB}	1,71 ^{jCD}	1,41 ^{gB}	0,06 ^{cB}

Table 13. Average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds (kg/ha) depending on densities in 2017.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0,01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

				-			-	_							
Densities	Acc. 36	Acc. 1	Acc. 2	Acc. 3	Acc. 6	Acc. 7	Acc. 8	Acc. 9	Acc. 12	Acc. 18	Acc. 19	Acc. 20	Acc. 24	Acc. 25	Acc. 27
D1	353,5±	365,7±	341,6±	345,8	527,3	354,7	334,2±	389,3	403,8±	265,9±	308,3±	222,3±	416,6±	521,4±	363,6±2,0
	1,59 ^{fF}	0,57 ^{gF}	2,62 ^{eF}	±1,96 ^e F	±1,93 ^{IF}	±2,76 ^{fF}	2,62 ^{dF}	±2,42 ^h н	1,73 ^{iF}	1,73 ^{bD}	1,91 ^{cF}	1,49 ^{aD}	1,48 ^{jG}	1,40 ^{kG}	4^{gE}
D2	361,8±	238,8±	353,9±	441,5	413±	342,5	400,3±	355,3	277,3±	423±	305,8±	382,8±	391,3±	321,3±	375±
	1,08 ^{gG}	2,35 ^{aC}	3,46 ^{fG}	±2,61 ⁿ G	2,72 ^{IE}	±2,17 ^e E	3,20 ^{kH}	±2,36 ^f G	2,58 ^{bD}	1,91 ^{mF}	2,40 ^{cF}	2,07 ^{iG}	1,24 ^{jF}	1,77 ^{dF}	2,04 ^{hF}
D3	401,1±	284,1±	321,7±	332,3	263,9	222,1	315,3±	334,1	211,1±	442,1±	272,2±	254±	304,1±	273,8±	253±
	2,27 ^{jH}	1,67 ^{fE}	2,56 ^{hE}	±2,80 ⁱ E	±1,76 ^d D	±2,51 ^ь с	1,60 ^{hE}	±2,78 ^{iF}	2,87 ^{aC}	1,57 ^{kG}	2,47 ^{eD}	0,99 ^{cE}	1,88 ^{gE}	2,70 ^{eE}	2,18 ^{cC}
D4	294,9±	257,9±	299,3±	305,5	244,9	322±	339,8±	309,7	337,5±	330,5±	278,3±	288,8±	293,2±	245±	350,2±2,2
	3,23 ^{deE}	1,62 ^{bD}	2,29 ^{eD}	±1,98 ^f D	±2,01 ª C	1,77 ^{gD}	1,19 ^{iG}	±2,04 ^f E	2,15 ^{iE}	0,78 ^{hE}	1,33 ^{cE}	1,50 ^{dF}	1,76 ^{deD}	1,96 ^{aD}	9 jD
D5	228,5±	116,2±	201,5±	245,8	269±	183,7	208,8±	225,1	211,4±	204,9±	168,1±	186,7±	254,2±	227,5±	203,7±0,5
	2,11 ^{gC}	0,91 ^{aB}	1,94 ^{dC}	±2,29 ^h ^B	1,47 ^{jD}	±1,59 ^с в	1,58 ^{efD}	±1,05 ^g с	1,42 ^{fC}	1,12 ^{deC}	0,51 ^{bC}	1,32 ^{cB}	1,04 ^{iC}	1,45 ^{gC}	1 ^{dB}
D6	236,8±	113,3±	198±	263,1	200,7	151,1	144,5±	246,9	170,9±	180,4±	101,1±	184,7±	191,6±	225,9±	173,1±0,7
	1,34 ^{iD}	1,42 ^{bB}	1,98 ^{gC}	±1,66 ^к с	±1,75 ^g A	±1,83° A	1,48 ^{cB}	±1,22 ^j D	1,53 ^{dB}	0,73 ^{deA}	2,04ªA	1,79 ^{efB}	9,62 ^{fgA}	0,92 ^{hC}	8dA
D7	205,2±	117±	165,4±	194,4	209,4	151,8	76,6±	215,2	173,2±	197,1±	120,3±	207,3±	186,1±	192,6±	170,2±0,7
	0,86 ^{iB}	1,70 ^{bB}	2,04 ^{dB}	±1,82g	±0,76 ^і ^в	±0,96 ^c A	1,19 ^{aA}	±0,41 ^ј в	1,04 ^{eB}	1,01 ^{hB}	0,99 ^{bB}	0,99 ^{iC}	1,71 ^{fA}	1,68 ^{gB}	5eA
D8	190,2±	88,9±	152±	193,6	197,3	182,4	153,1±	186,9	162,9±	195,7±	97±	169,8±	206,7±	164,4±	175,2±0,7
	1,13 ^{hiA}	1,59ªA	1,86 ^{cA}	±1,41 ^{ij} A	±0,85 ^j A	±0,68 ^g ^B	1,42 ^{cC}	±0,63 ^h A	1,26 ^{dA}	1,64 ^{jB}	0,86 ^{bA}	0,92 ^{eA}	1,77 ^{kB}	1,15 ^{dA}	0 ^{fA}

Table 14. Average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds (kg/ha) depending on densities in 2018.

- Mean values bearing the same letters are statistically homogeneous at p<0.01% significance

- Lowercase letters following the lines compare the yield of accessions at fixed densities

Years				Densities			
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7
	574,5±11,17 ^{fD} A	383,75±8,78 ^{cC} Acc	484±6,01 ^{fD} Acc.A	412,75±5,04 ^{eD} Acc	405±18,02 ^{hD} Acc	490,6±18,3	
	cc.6	.18	334,5±6,37 ^{bcdE} A	.2	.3	5gF Acc.24	01±5,69 ^g
2016	55,5±5,58 ^{dE} Acc		cc1	461,75±15,06 ^{fE} Ac	473,4±5,76 ^{jF} Acc		F Acc.12
	.7		604,5±2,34 ^{gE} Acc	c.8	.20		
	499±11,75 ^{eF} Ac		27	451,75±11,06 ^{fE} Ac			
	c.9			c25			
	611,75±8,21 ^{gE} A						
	cc19						
Acc.	26,66%	6,67%	20%	20%	13,33%	6,67%	,67%
rate							
	175±2,28 ^{fE}	187,5±2,04 ^{fgE}	196,9±2,14 ^{hE}	193,8±3,31 ^{gE}			
	Acc.A	Acc.9	Acc.12	Acc.6			
2017	106,2±4,27 ^{bD}	156,2±3,31 ^{eD}	$175 \pm 2,70^{fgG}$	181,2±2,98 ^{fE}			
	Acc.1	Acc.18	Acc.27	Acc.8			
	159,4±3,73 ^{eE}	193,8±3,89 ^{gE}					
	Acc.2	Acc.20					
	214,4±2,77 ^{iH}	184,4±2,58 ^{fE}					
	Acc.3	Acc.24					
	206,2±2,60 ^{Hf}	215,6±1,88 ^{hF} Acc.					
	Acc.7	25					
	184,4±2,77 ^{gF}						
	Acc.19						
Acc.	40%	33,34%	13,33%	13,33%			
rate							
	365,7±0,57 ^{gF}	353,9±3,46 ^{fG}	401,1±2,27 ^{jH}				
	Acc.1	Acc.2	Acc.A				
	527,3±1,93 ^{iF}	441,5±2,61 ^{nG}	442,1±1,57 ^{kG} Acc				
2018	Acc.6	Acc.3	18				
	354,7±2,76 ^{fF}	400,3±3,20 ^{kH}					
	Acc.7	Acc.8					
	389,3±2,42 ^{hH}	382,8±2,07 ^{iG} Acc.					
	Acc.9	20					
	403,8±1,73 ^{iF}	375±2,04 ^{hF}					
	Acc.12	Acc.27					
	308,3±1,91 ^{cF}						
	Acc.19						
	416,6±1,48 ^{jG}						
	Acc.24						
	521,4±1,40 ^{kG}						
	Acc.25	22.2.40/	40.000/				
Acc.	53,33%	33,34%	13,33%				
rate	0 20 5	2 40 20 5	F F0 00	A .			
D1=4	UCMX20CM D	3=40cmx30cm D	5=50cmx20cm;	Acc.=accession			
D2=4	Ocmx25cm D	4=40cmx40cm D	7=50cmx30cm	Acc. rate=accessic	on rate		

Table 15. Accessions presented a high average weight of seed during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017 and 2018) according to different densities.

In 2016, D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 26,66% of accessions (Acc.6; Acc.7; Acc.9; Acc.19) with 2140,75 kg/ha; followed by D3 (83333 plants/ha) which

brought together 20% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.1; Acc.27) with 1,423 kg/ha; D4 (62500 plants/ha) which also included 20% of accessions (Acc.2; Acc.8; Acc.25)

with 1326,25 kg/ha; D5 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.3; Acc.20) with 878,4 kg/ha. D6 (80000 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% of accessions (Acc.24) with 490,6 kg/ha; D7 (66667 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% of accessions (Acc.12) with 401 kg/ha and D2 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 6,67% of accessions (Acc. 18) with 383,75 kg/ha.

In 2017, D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 40% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.1; Acc.2; Acc.3; Acc.7; Acc.19) with 1045,6 kg/ha ; followed by D2 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 33,34% of accessions (Acc.9; Acc.18; Acc.20; Acc.24; Acc.25) with 937,5 kg/ha; D4 (62500 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.6; Acc.8) with 375 kg/ha and D3 (83333 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.12; Acc.27) with 371,9 kg/ha.

In 2018, D1 (125000 plants/ha) brought together 53,34% of accessions (Acc.1; Acc.6; Acc.7; Acc.9; Acc.12; Acc.19; Acc.24; Acc.25) with 3287,1 kg/ha; followed by D2 (100000 plants/ha) which brought together 33,33% of accessions (Acc.2; Acc.3; Acc.8; Acc.20; Acc.27) with 1953,5 kg/ha and the D3 (83300 plants/ha) which brought together 13,33% of accessions (Acc.36; Acc.18) with 843,2 kg/ha.

D1 (125000 plants/ha) followed by D2 (100000 plants/ha) were the densities that grouped the most accessions with better yields in average seed weight over the three consecutive years. Accessions 1, 6, 7, 9 and 19 presented better yields in average seed weight successively for at least two years of cultivation at D1 (125000 plants/ha); followed by accession 20 which presented a better yield in average seed weight successively for two years of cultivation at D2 (100000 plants/ha) and finally accessions 36 and 27 which offered better performance in average seed weight successively for two years of cultivation at D3 (83333 plants/ha).

DISCUSSION

Average number of Bambara groundnut pods on the different densities

The variance analysis results concerning the average number of Bambara groundnut pods show very significant differences (p=.001<.01) between the accessions at fixed densities. This suggests the existence of a strong heterogeneity within the accessions which could be explained by the genetic material which would differ from one accession to another; similarly, the environmental conditions due to the origin of the accessions could explain this observed variation. Furthermore, very significant differences (p=.001<.01) between the eight densities are observed; this shows that the densities differ. The variation observed between densities could be explained by the different defined spacing. Although the average number of pods differed between accessions at fixed densities, some were statistically homogeneous over the three years of cultivation. It is the same with the eight densities tested, some of which were statistically homogeneous. Very highly significant interactions (p=.001<.01) between accessions and seeding densities are also observed during the three years. This suggests that the performance of a density also depends on that of the accessions. We cannot consider the classification of a density without considering those of the accessions. However, no accession kept a constant yield in an average number of pods whatever the density practised during the three years of cultivation; this is explained by environmental fluctuations, and particularly the quantity and distribution of rainfall which were not constant during the three years of experimentation (Table 1). Likewise, a very highly significant interaction (p=.001<.01) is observed between the three years of cultivation; this suggests that the years differ in their pedoclimatic characteristics. Low rainfall and its poor distribution recorded during the year (2017) has created a sensitivity of the plants to drought explain the drop in yield observed in 2017, unlike in 2016 and 2018. Sharma and Lavanya (2002) have shown that drought constitutes one of the main factors limiting crop production in the world. It emerges from the comparison of accessions according to densities (Table 7) during the three years of experimentation (2016, 2017 and 2018) that D2 (100000 plants/ha), and D1 (125000 plants/ha) were the densities having grouped more accessions presenting a fairly high number of Bambara groundnut pods during the three years of culture. Furthermore, accessions 2, 7, 9 and 19 presented better yields in an average number of pods successively for at least two years of cultivation at D1 (125000 plants/ha); followed by accessions 6, 18 and 24 which presented better yields in average number of pods successively for at least two years of cultivation with D2 (100000 plants/ha); then accessions 36 and 27 which also presented better performances successively during two years of

cultivation with D3 (83333 plants/ha) and finally accession 8 which presented better performance at D4 (62500 plants/ha) during two years of cultivation. These results clearly show that Bambara groundnut produces more pods at high seeding densities. The same observations were made by Konlan et al. (2013) in Ngana, Ahmad et al. (2007) in Pakistan, Mayeux and Maphanyane (1989) in Botswana and Mayeux (1990) in Botswana who obtained high yields in average number of pods at high seeding density. These results differ from those of Awal and Lija Aktar (2015) and Touroumgaye et al. (2017) who showed that yields in average number of pods increase. The observations of Touroumgave et al. (2017) are rather similar to the results we obtained. Indeed, the four densities that they experimented with, namely 125751 plants/ha; 167417 plants/ha; 143286 plants/ha and 133934 plants/ha are all higher than the eight densities tested in this study. They obtained better yields in an average number of pods with a density of 125751 plants/ha, corresponding to the highest seeding density used in this study.

Average weight of Bambara groundnut pods on the different densities

Significant variations are observed for the average weight of the pods over the three years of cultivation. As for the average number of pods, we observe very significant differences (p=.001<.01) between the accessions at fixed densities, suggesting strong heterogeneity within the accessions. This strong heterogeneity could be explained by the nature of the genotypes of the plants, which differ from one accession to another. Very highly significant differences (p=.001<.01) are also observed between the densities experienced over the three years. During the three years of cultivation, the average weight of pods was statistically homogeneous with others depending on densities and accessions. The results also showed very highly significant interactions (p=.001<.01) between accessions and seeding densities, and very highly significant interactions (p=.001<.01) between years of culture. During the three years of cultivation, the potential average pod weigt fluctuated within the different densities; this could be explained by environmental fluctuations, particularly the rainfall that was not constant during the three years of cultivation. The highly significant interactions (p=.001<.01) observed between the years suggest that the years differ

in soil and climatic characteristics. It also emerges from the comparison of accessions according to densities (Table 11), concerning the average weight of Bambara groundnut pods during the three vears of experimentation (2016, 2017 and 2018) that, D1 (125000 plants/ha) gathered more accessions, followed by D2 (100000 plants/ha). Accessions 1, 6, 7, 9, 19 and 25 also presented better yields in average weight of pods successively for at least two years of cultivation at D1 (125000 plants/ha); followed by accession 18 which presented better yield in average weight of pods successively during two years of cultivation with D2 (100000 plants/ha) and accession 36 which presented better performances successively during two years of cultivation with D3 (83333 plants/ha). These densities can be considered optimal, because they present better yields in average pod weight.

Average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds on the different densities

The results of the analysis of variance concerning the average weight of Bambara groundnut seeds revealed very significant differences (p=.001<.01) between the accessions according to densities, and between the densities themselves during the three years of experimentation. Likewise, a highly significant interaction is observed between accessions and seedling densities (p=.001<.01); this shows that the different factors interact. A very significant interaction is also observed between the years (p=.001<.01); this shows that the years differ from each other due to their pedoclimatic conditions, particularly the rainfall which fluctuated considerably during the three years of experimentation. Indeed, in North Cameroon, several studies (Lienou, 2007; Djoufack et al., 2012; Aretouyap et al., 2014) have shown that the region has experienced significant fluctuations in rainfall for several years. M'biandoum and Olina (2006), working on rainfall in the Sudano-Sahelian region in northern Cameroon using climatic data from four stations, have shown that this area has a rainfall characterized by a great variability in space and time, a strong aggressiveness of the rains, a poor distribution of this rainfall, rainfall deficits which can occur in June, July and August and a possibility of early end of the rains. These rainfall disturbances have serious consequences on populations and crops, given that they are more than 80% rural with agriculture as their main activity (Benoît and Seydou, 2011). The drop

in yield observed in the second year of cultivation (2017) could be explained by this irregularity of precipitation and its poor distribution in time and space unlike in 2016 and 2018. Overall, D1 (125000 plants/ha) and D2 (100000 plants/ha) made it possible to group more accessions with better yields in average weight of pods and seeds over three years of cultivation (Table 11 and 15). This study shows that the average weight of pods and seeds increases at high seeding densities. Virender and Kandhola (2007), Abdullah et al. (2007) and Virk et al. (2005) who obtained an increase in yield at high seeding densities made the same observations. Similarly, Muneer et al. (2017) and Mustefa (2014) significantly improved crop yield by increasing seeding densities. These results differ from those of Sumarno and Adie (1995); Konlan et al. (2013) and Yadeta (2014) who observed an increase in seed weight at low seeding densities. Likewise, Nasraoui et al. (2005) showed that seed weight is higher at low seeding density. For these authors, low densities allow plants to explore more living space. Their results are similar to those of Niringiye et al. (2005), who showed that increasing densities contributes to the reduction of seed weight and the quantities of total seeds produced by plants. These authors explain this by the large population of plants, which unfortunately, is conducive to the development of fungal diseases, which quantitatively and qualitatively affect production. Others, however, like Gharbi and Maamouri (1994), M'hedhbi et al. (1994) and Touroumgaye et al. (2017) reported the absence of a significant difference in seeding density on seed weight. Vidya (2013), Mustefa (2014) and Muneer et al. (2017) reported that seeding density has a significant effect on growth and yield parameters. For these authors, yields increase at high seeding density. Tesfu and Yamoah (2010), working on the effect of seeding density on carrots recorded high yields at high seeding densities. This result is similar to the observations of Azam Ali (2003) in Nigeria, where he obtained better yields in seed weight at a density of 250000 plants/ha in pure Bambara groundnut culture. Adekpe et al. (2007) and Khodadadi and Nosrati (2012) showed no single seeding density. Mustefa (2014) and Muneer et al. (2017) showed that it varies according to plant genotypes, the fertility state of the plots, cultural practices and environmental conditions. Regarding environmental conditions, Sharma and Lavanya (2002) showed that drought is one of the main factors limiting crop production worldwide; these authors show that water stress could indeed cause strong competition between plants and lower production in the case of high seeding densities. Laouar et al. (2001) showed that water deficit affects not only the growth; but also the yield of legumes. The rainfall distribution varied considerably over the three years of cultivation (Table 1). The precipitation recorded in 2016 was 709.7 mm distributed over 53 days, compared to 668.7 mm distributed over 53 days in 2017. In 2018, 1043.95 mm of precipitation distributed over 66 days was recorded. The low amount of precipitation recorded in 2017, and their poor distribution over time coincided with the flowering and fruiting phases causing disturbances. Indeed in 2017, at the time of sowing and just after emergence (July 2017), the young seedlings did not yet experience a high-water requirement (259,3 mm), unlike the other development phases where they received less of water as in August (149,3 mm) and September (98,2 mm) when the majority of plants were flowering. The critical periods for water requirements of Bambara groundnut are flowering and fruiting. Linnemann and Craufurd (1994) and Linnemann et al. (1995) showed that fruiting could be delayed by drought and photoperiod. The lack or insufficiency of water and/or light during these development phases would have had consequences on the formation and filling of the pods. Indeed, when a plant is subjected to a water deficit, it suffers a significant loss of water at the cell level, which causes a dysfunction of photosynthesis and growth and, consequently, a reduction in yield. This could explain the drop in yields observed in 2017. Despite the amount of precipitation observed in 2018 (1043,95 mm), a drop in yield was recorded compared to 2016. Indeed, although the host crop is a legume, it was cultivated successively during three agricultural seasons on the same site, without amendment. Sánchez-Coronado et al. (2007), and Solomon (2012) show that water and nutritional deficits (phosphate deficiency) are among the main causes of reduced crop yields. Morel et al. (2006) showed that phosphate is after nitrogen, the essential element for the proper functioning of plants because of their low availability in the soil. Lynch and Deikman (1998) and Vance et al. (2003) show that phosphate constitutes a limiting factor for crop yield on more than 30% of the planet's arable land. The low yields obtained in 2018 could be attributable to the drop in this element (phosphate) in the soil. D1 (125000 plants/ha), and D2 (100000 plants/ha) corresponding to the spacing (40cmx20cm) and (40cmx25cm) significantly improve the yield of Bambara groundnut cultivation. They could be recommended to farmers to improve their farming techniques and effectively increase yields. Ali (2003) observed densities of 2500 plants in mixed cultivation in Botswana. This suggests that loose densities could be used in the context of cultural associations with other species in order to optimize yields on the plots. Touré et al. (2012) have shown that the association of legumes with cereals constitutes an interesting nutritional supplement for many populations. This means that sowing density is an important parameter to consider when determining crop yields.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the sowing densities depending on the accessions showed significant yield variations. The best yield in an average number of pods, and average weight of pods and seeds was obtained at high densities. Thus, the density D1(125000 plants/ha) and D2(100000 plants/ha) corresponding respectively to the spacing of 40cmx20cm and 40cmx25cm make it possible to group more Bambara groundnut accessions presenting better yields that could help producers increasing their yield. Significant interactions were also observed between the different years; this also shows that the years differs.

Future Research

Because of the knowledge of the agro morphological characteristics of the fifteen (15) Bambara groundnut accessions, and taking into account the knowledge of the best crop densities obtained during this study, we recommend multi-local trials to determine locality that occurs best performances in an average number of pods, an average weight of pods and seeds in the Far North Region of Cameroon.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, T., Rahmianna, A.A., Hardaningsih, S. and Rozi, F. 2007. Increasing groundnut yield on dry land Alfisols in Indonesia, Journal of Agricultural Research, 5 (1):
- Adekpe, D. I., Shebayan, J. A. Y., Chiezey, U. F. and Miko, S. 2007. Yield responses of garlic (Allium sativum L.) to oxidation, date of planting and plant spacing underirrigation at Kadawa, Nigeria. Crop Protection, 26(12): 1785-1789.

- Agri-Stat, 2010. Annuaire des statistiques du secteur agricole, Campagne 2007 et 2008. N° 16. 98p.
- Agri-Stat, 2012. Annuaire des statistiques du secteur agricole, Campagne 2009 et 2010. N° 17. 123p.
- Ahmad, N., Mohammad, R. and Ulas, K., 2007. Evaluation of different varieties seed rates and row spacing of groundnut, planted under agroecological conditions of Mala Kand Division, Journal of inter-academia, 9(4): 178-183.
- Alene, L., Avah, A. A., Noumchue, R. D. 2011. Etude de l'activité insecticide de quatre plantes vis-à-vis de Callosobrochus maculatus (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) pour la conservation du voandzou (Voandzea subterranea) stocké. Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention du Diplôme de Professeur d'Enseignement Secondaire Général de second grade (DIPES II) au Département de Sciences de la Vie et de la Terre (SVT) de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure (ENS) de l'Université de Maroua. 51P.
- Amadou, H.I., Doumma A., Katsilero A., Zoubeirou A.M., and Nourou S.S.M. 2015. Agro-morphological variability in fourteen bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranean (L.) Verdc.) morphotypes cultivated in Niger. Scholars Academic Journal of Biosciences, 3(9):774-781.
- Amarteifio, J.O., Tibe O. and Njogu R.M. 2006. The mineral composition of Bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdc) grown in Southern Africa. African Journal of Biotechnology, 5: 2408-2411.
- Ameded, D., 2015. Caractérisation agronomique des accessions de voandzou (Voandzea subterranea (L.) verdc) en zone soudano-guinéenne du Cameroun. Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention du Diplôme de Master en Biologie des Organismes Végétaux. Département des sciences biologiques/Université de Ngaoundéré-Cameroun. 50p.
- Aretouyap, Z., Njandjock, N. P., Bisso, D., Nouayou, R., Lengue, B. Lepatio, T. 2014. Climate variability and its possible interactions with water resources in Central Africa, Journal of applied sciences, 14: 2219-2233.
- Awal, M. A. and Lija-Aktar. 2015. Effect of row spacing on the growth and yield of peanut (Arachis hypogaea L.) stands, International Journal of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, 3(1): 7-11.

- Azam-Ali, S.N. 2003. Proceedings of the international Bambara groundnut symposium Botswana, 8-12 September 2003. Botswana College of Agriculture, Botswana 360 pp.
- Benoît, S. and Seydou T. 2011. Impacts des changements climatiques sur l'agriculture. Centre Régional AGRHYMET, Numéro spécial, pp. 22-24.
- Berchie, J. N., Opoku, M., Adu-Dapaah, H., Agyemang, A., Sarkodie-Addo, J., Asare, E., Addo, J., Akuffo, H.
 2012. Evaluation of five bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdc.) landraces to heat and drought stress at Tono-Navrongo, Upper East Region of Ghana. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 7(2): 250-256.
- Dagnelie, P. 1998. Statistique théorique et appliquée (Tome 1). Bruxelles : De Boeck et Larcier.
- Dagnelie, P. 2012. Principe d'expérimentation. Planification des expériences et analyse de leurs résultats. Presses agronomiques de Gembloux.
- DRADER-EN, 2016. Délégation Régionale de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rurale de l'Extrême-Nord., 2016. Relevés pluviométriques décadaire. Bureau des statistiques.
- DRADER-EN, 2017. Délégation Régionale de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rurale de l'Extrême-Nord., Relevés pluviométriques décadaire. Bureau des statistiques.
- DRADER-EN, 2018. Délégation Régionale de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rurale de l'Extrême-Nord., Relevés pluviométriques décadaire. Bureau des statistiques.
- Djoufack, V., Fontaine, B., Martiny, N., Tsalefack, M. 2012. Climatic and demographic determinants of vegetal cover in Northern Cameroon, International Journal of Remote sensing, 33: 6904-6926.
- Gharbi, M. S. and Maamouri, A. R. 1994. Essai de comparaison de densité de semis sous complément d'irrigation. Muktatafat, 12: 25.
- I.N.S., 2015. Annuaire Statistique du Cameroun, édition 2015. Chapitre 4. 54-63p.
- I.N.S., 2015. Annuaire Statistique du Cameroun, édition 2015. Chapitre 14. 232-255p.
- I.N.S., 2017. Annuaire Statistique du Cameroun, édition 2017. Chapitre 13. 184-207p.
- IRAD, 2013. Contribution de la recherche à l'amélioration de la production et la consommation des légumineuses alimentaires au Cameroun. C2D/Programme d'Appui à la

Recherche Agronomique, Projet 6: Légumineuses, 57p.

- Kaptso, K. G. 2009. Production de la farine de niébé (Vigna unguiculata) et de voandzou (Vigna subterranea) pour la préparation du koki. Thèse soutenue au Département de Sciences Alimentaires et Nutrition de l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Sciences Agro-Industrielles (ENSAI) pour l'obtention du grade de Docteur / Ph.D. 283p.
 - Khodadadi, M. A. E. and Nosrati. 2012. Effect of sowing date and planting density on yield and yield components of white garlic of hamadan. Seed and Plant Production Journal, 3(27): 491-500
 - Konlan, S., Sarkodie-Addo J., Asare E., Adu-Dapaah H. and Kombiok M.J. 2013. Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L) varietal response to spacing in the humid forest zone of Ghana, ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science, 8(9): 642-651.
- Kouassi, N. J. and Zoro, B. I. 2010. Effect of sowing density and seedbed type on yield and yield components in bambara groundnut (Vigna subterraneay in woodland savannas of Ivory Coast. Experimental Agriculture, 46(1): 99- 110
- Laouar, M., Kies, N., Abdellaoui, K., Bennour, A., Bettahar, N., Kadi, S., Bouzza, L., Abdelguerfi, A. 2001. Effet du stress hydrique sur le comportement physiologique de dix populations de Medicago intertexta. Ciheam-iamz, 45: 167-171.
- Lienou G. 2007. Impacts de la variabilité climatique sur les ressources en eau et les transports de matières en suspension de quelques bassins versants représentatifs au Cameroun, Thèse Doctorat, Université de Yaoundé I, 405p.
- Linnemann, A. R. and Craufurd, P. Q. 1994. Effects of temperature and photoperiod on phonological development in three genotypes of bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranea). Annals of Botany, 74: 675-681.
- Linnemann, A. R., Westphal, M. and Wessel, E. 1995. Photoperiod regulation of development and growth in bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranea). Field Crops Research, 40: 39-47.
- Lynch, J. P. and Deikman, J. 1998. Phosphorus in plant biology: regulatory roles in molecular, cellular, organismic, and ecosystem processes. In: eds. Current Topics in plant Physiology, American Society of Plant Physiologists. 19: 148-156.

- M'biandoun, M. and Olina J. P. 2006. Pluviosité en région soudano-sahélienne au Nord du Cameroun: conséquences sur l'agriculture. Agronomie Africaine, 18 (2): 95-103.
- Mayeux, A. and Maphanyane, G. S., 1989. Groundnut cultivation under low rainfall conditions in Bostwana In: Proc. 3rd Reg. Groundnut Workshop for Southern Africa, 13-18 March, Lilongwe, Malawi. International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Patancheru, India. pp. 149-155.
- Mayeux, A. 1990. Effect of plant density on groundnut yield in Botswana, 167-175, 1990.
- M'hedhbi, K., Boubaker, M., Yahyaoui, A. 1994. Effet de trois régimes hydriques et de trois densités de semis sur la performance de trois cultivars de blé dur. Revue de l'INAT, 9 :149-161.
- Morel, C., Le Clech, B., Linères, M., Pellerin, S. 2006. Gare à la baisse de la biodisponibilité du phosphore. Agronomie, 79: 21-23.
- Muneer, N., Muhammad, H., Muhammad, J. A., Nadra, K., Nasir, H. and Babar, H. 2017. Effect of planting density on growth, yield and quality of Garlic at Rawalakot, Azad Kashmir. International Journal of Agronomy and Agricultural Research (IJAAR), 10(1): 43-49
- Mustefa, A. 2014. Effect of size and plant population on growth and build yield of garlic (Allium sativum L.) at chiro, west hararge zone. A Thesis submitted to the college of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, School of Plant Sciences, School of Graduate Studies-Hamara University, Ethiopia 1, 7-8p.
- Nasraoui, B., Adami, R., Samaali, R., Aloui, S., Nasr, K., Khammassi M. et., Ben-Hammouda, M. 2005. Influence de la densité de semis sur l'oïdium, la rhynchosporiose, la rayure réticulée et la production de l'orge : Résultats de trois campagnes (2002/03-2003/04-2004/05). Ecole Supérieure d'Agriculture du Kef, Tunisie. Actes des 12^{ème} Journées Scientifiques sur les Résultats de la Recherche Agricoles-Hammamet, 08 et 09 Décembre 2005.
- Ndiang, Z., Bell, J.M., Missoup, A.D., Fokam, P.E., Amougou, A. 2012. Etude de la variabilité morphologique de quelques variétés de voandzou au Cameroun. Journal of Applied Biosciences, 60: 4394-4409.
- Ndiang, Z., Bell, J. M., Fokam, P. E., Ouattara, B., Simo, C. and Dibong, D. S. 2014. Agro-morphological variability in twelve Bambara groundnut (Vigna subterranea (L.)

Verdc) accessions in Cameroon. Science, Technology and Development, 16:38-45.

- Ngamchut, G., Polom, D., Soulemanou, A. and Wassile, L. 2010. Evaluation de la sensibilité de neuf variétés locales de Voandzou (Voandzea subterranea) vis-à-vis de Callosobrochus maculatus (Coleoptera : Bruchidae) à l'Extrême-Nord Cameroun. Mémoire de Dipes II, Université de Maroua (Cameroun), 60 p.
- Ngamo-Tinkeu, L. S., Goudoum, A., Watching, D. and Madou, C. 2016. Les bruches du voandzou (Vigna subterranea L.) et les outils de protection post récolte dans le Nord du Cameroun. Entomologie Faunistique-Faunistic Entomology, 69: 83-89.
- Niringiye, C. S., Ssekabembe, C. S., Kyamanywa, S. and 2005. Effect of plant population on yield of maize and climbing beans grown in an intercropping system. African Crop Science Journal, 13: 83-93.
- Nyabyenda, P. 2005. Les plantes cultivées en régions tropicales d'altitude d'Afrique : généralités, légumineuses alimentaires, plantes à tubercules et racines et les céréales. Les presses Agronomiques de GEMBLOUX. 223p.
- Onwubiko, N. I. C., Odum, O. B., Utazi, C. O. and Poly-Mbah, P. C., 2011. Studies on the adaptation of Bambara Groundnut [Vigna Subterranea (L.) Verdc] in Owerri Southeastern Nigeria. New York Science Journal, 4(2): 60-67.
- Pageau, D. 1996. Effet de la dose de semis et de l'écartement entre les rangs de l'orge sur la répression du chiendent. Canadian Journal of Plant Science, 76: 921-926.
- Sánchez-Coronado, M. E., Coates, R. and Castro-Colina, L. 2007. Improving seed germination and seedling growth of Omphalea oleifera (Euphorbiaceae) for restoration projects in tropical rain forests. Forest Ecology and Management, 243(1): 144-155.
- Sharma, K. K., and Lavanya, M. 2002. Recent developments in transgenics for abiotic stress in legumes of the semi-arid tropics, JIRCAS Working Report, 23(23): 61-73.
- Sobda, G., Wassouo, F. A. and Koubala, B. B. 2013. Assessment of Twenty Bambara Groundnut (Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdcourt) Landraces using Quantitative Morphological Traits. International Journal of Plant Research, 3(3): 39-45.

- Solomon, G. A. 2012. Breeding cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L. Walp) for phosphorus use efficiency in Ghana. Thesis submitted to the university of Ghana, Legon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of doctor of philosophy plant breeding degree. P. 225.
- Tesfu, M. and Yamoah, C. 2010. Effect of sowing date and planting density on seed production of carrot (Daucus carota var. sativa) in Ethiopia. African Journal of Plant Science, 4(8): 270-279.
- Touré, Y., Koné, M., Kouakou, T.H. and Koné, D. 2012.
 Agromorphological and Phenological Variability of 10 Bambara Groundnut [Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdc. (Fabaceae)] landraces cultivated in the Ivory Coast, Tropicultura, 30(4): 216-221.
- Touré, Y. 2016. Caractérisation agromorphologique des morphotypes de voandzou [Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdc. (Fabaceae)] cultivées dans deux régions aux caractéristiques climatiques et pédologiques contrastées de la Côte d'Ivoire. Thèse de Doctorat de l'Université Nangui Abrogoua. Pp 325.
- Touroumgaye, G., Mariama, D. D., Guiguindibaye, M., Ali M. Z. and Aliou, G. 2017. Détermination de la densité optimale de semis sur la productivité d'arachide (Arachis hypogea L.) en zone soudanienne du Tchad. European Scientific Journal, 13(9).
- Vance, C. P., Uhde-Stone, C. and Allan, D. L. 2003. Phosphorus acquisition and use: Critical adaptations by plants for securing a non renewable resource. New Phytologist, 157: 423-447.
- Vanounou, E., 1997. Cultures légumières, la technique de production de semences au Congo, tome 2, 2^{ème} édition, Kinshasa, ministère de l'agriculture et de *l'élevage, 1-48p.*
- Verdcourt, B., 1980. The correct name for the bambara groundnut. Kew Bulletin, 35(33): 474.

- Vidya, G. 2013. Effect of planting time and plant densities on growth, yield and quality of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) CV. Jamnagar. Asian Journal of Horticulture, 8(2): 552-554.
- Virender, S. and Kandhola, S. S. 2007. Productivity of semi-spreading and bunch type varieties of groundnut as influenced by sowing dates, Journal of SAT Agricultural Research, 5(1).
- Virk, A. S., Kaul, J. N., Bhangoo, B. S. and Singh, A. 2005. Influence of planting techniques and plant population on biology and pod productivity of summer groundnut varieties. Research on Crops, 6(1): 173-174.
- Wassouo, F. A., Madi, A., Sobda, G., Koubala, B. B. and Mvondo-Awono, J. P. 2019. Diversités agro morphologiques de trente-six accessions de voandzou [*Vigna subterranea* (L.) Verdc] cultivées à l'Extrême-Nord Cameroun. *Journal of Applied Biosciences* 140: 14227–14234
- Yadeta, M. G. 2014. Effect of planting density on growth, yield and yield components of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) varieties at Abeya, Borana zone southern Ethiopia, A thesis submitted to the college of Agriculture, school of plant ssciences, school of graduate studies, Haramaya University, 45p.
- Yaya, T., Mongomaké, K., Souleymanou, S. and Yatty, J.K., 2013. Prospection, collecte et caractérisation agromorphologique des morphotypes de voandzou [*Vigna subterranea* (L.) Verdc. (Fabaceae)] de la zone savanicole en Côte d'Ivoire. European Scientist Journal, 9(24): 1857-7881.
- Kouassi, N.J. and Zoro, Bi I. 2010. Effect of sowing density and seedbed type on yield and yield components in bambara groundnut *(Vigna subterraneay* in woodland savannas of Ivory Coast. Experimental Agriculture, 46 (1): 99- 110.

Publisher's note: EScience Press remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and

indicate if changes were made. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</u>.