Core ideas:

- Data synthesis generated new insights by bringing together heterogeneous *Musa* crop trial data
- The novel method converts disease scores to ranks and uses environmental data
- *Musa* genotypes react differently to black leaf streak disease with different dry spell lengths

Rank-based data synthesis of heterogeneous trials to identify the effects of climatic factors on the reaction of *Musa* genotypes to black leaf streak disease

David Brown ^{a b *}, Sytze de Bruin ^a, Kauê de Sousa ^{c d}, Catherine Abadie ^{e f g}, Sebastien Carpentier ^h, Lewis Machida ⁱ, Jacob van Etten ^c

^a Laboratory of Geo-Information Science and Remote Sensing, Wageningen University & Research, Droevendaalsesteeg 3, 6708 PB, Wageningen, The Netherlands
^b Digital Inclusion, Bioversity International, 30501, Turrialba, Costa Rica
^c Digital Inclusion, Bioversity International, Parc Scientifique Agropolis II, 34397, Montpellier Cedex 5, France
^d Department of Agricultural Sciences, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, 2318 Hamar, Norway
^e CIRAD, UMR Plant Health Institute Montpellier, 34398, Montpellier Cedex 5 France
^f CATIE - Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza, 30501, Turrialba, Costa Rica
^g UMR Plant Health Institute Montpellier, Univ Montpellier, INRAe, CIRAD, Montpellier SupAgro, 34398 Montpellier, France
^h Biodiversity for Food & Agriculture, Bioversity International, c/o KU Leuven, Willem Decroylaan 42, P.O. Box 2455, 3001, Leuven, Belgium
ⁱ Biodiversity for Food & Agriculture, Bioversity International, c/o National Agricultural

Research Laboratories (Kawanda), P.O. Box 24384, Kampala, Uganda

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the <u>Version of Record</u>. Please cite this article as <u>doi:</u> 10.1002/agj2.21436.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author: David Brown, david.brownfuentes@wur.nl

Accepted Article

Abbreviations: BLSD, black leaf streak disease; DDT, disease development time; DII, disease infection index; NFL, number of functional leaves; NSL, number of standing leaves; YLS, youngest leaf spotted.

ABSTRACT

Synthesis of crop trial data can generate insights that are not available from the analysis of individual studies, but such synthesis is often constrained by the heterogeneity of data among studies. Rank-based data synthesis provides the flexibility to combine data of heterogeneous types and from different sources. We demonstrate the application of rank-based data synthesis of heterogeneous trial data to assess the effect of climatic factors on the reaction of several Musa genotypes to black leaf streak disease (BLSD; caused by Pseudocercospora *fijiensis* [sexual morph: *Mycosphaerella fijiensis*]). We aggregated data from the main public repositories of Musa trial data. We applied model-based recursive partitioning with the Plackett-Luce model, using climatic data as covariates. The model identified the maximum length of the dry spell as the main variable influencing differences in genotypic response to BLSD, dividing the aggregated trial dataset into humid and dry environments. We found differences in the reaction of genotypes to BLSD between these environments. In humid environments, NARITA 8 was found to be the most resistant genotype, while in dry environments FHIA-01 was the best performing improved genotype. We also assessed reliability, which is the probability of outperforming the reference genotype (Calcutta 4). In humid environments NARITA 2, NARITA 8 and FHIA-01 had the highest reliability, while in dry environments only the landrace Saba surpassed 50% reliability. The information generated by our data synthesis approach supports selecting *Musa* genotypes for further evaluations at new locations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Accepted Article

Crop variety trial data are essential for producing relevant information to support critical decision making in agronomy and crop science. These data are expensive to obtain, since field trials require a significant investment of time and resources. Research synthesis of heterogeneous studies can help to generalize conclusions and to better account for environmental variability, compared to the analysis of individual studies (Makowski, 2021). Furthermore, appropriate data synthesis methodologies can add value to existing crop trial data, by (1) integrating results from trials with different types of data and from different sources, (2) comparing a higher number of genotypes than would be feasible in individual field experiments, and (3) adding environmental data that were not available at the time at which each individual trial was conducted, providing new insights on the effect of environmental factors (genotype × environment interaction).

Current data synthesis methods often encounter obstacles related to poor data standardization (Eagle et al., 2017). Combining data from multiple trials with different experimental designs, measurement scales and data quality poses problems for data management and for subsequent statistical analysis (Simko & Pechenick, 2010). Simko and Pechenick (2010) proposed the use of rank-aggregation methods to allow for the combination of heterogeneous plant breeding data from different experiments. By converting diverse numerical measurements into rankings, trial data can be aggregated in one dataset and analyzed with appropriate statistical methods. Brown et al. (2020) suggested that the rank-aggregation approach could be extended to analyze heterogeneous data from crop trial evaluations under different environmental conditions by using climatic data to account for effects of abiotic stress on genotypic performance. van Etten, de Sousa, et al. (2019) analyzed farmer-participatory crop experiments in which field data were collected by farmers as rankings, following the 'tricot' approach (van Etten, Beza, et al., 2019), and then combined with environmental data. Brown

et al. (2022) demonstrate that data synthesis of tricot trial data of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) genotypes in Central America provides new insights to climate adaptation by predicting the performance of varieties beyond the locations in which they were tested.

Black leaf streak disease (BLSD), also known as black Sigatoka, is a fungal disease that affects banana leaves, causing necrotic lesions which gradually reduce the plant's photosynthetic capacity (Churchill, 2011). BLSD is caused by the fungus *Pseudocercospora fijiensis* (sexual morph: *Mycosphaerella fijiensis*) (Guzman et al., 2018). It is the most destructive leaf disease of bananas and is considered to be among the 10 most destructive diseases in global agriculture (Pennisi, 2010). BLSD both reduces yields and fruit quality, and affects the wider environment because its control currently relies heavily on frequent applications of chemical fungicides (De Lapeyre de Bellaire et al., 2010). The cultivation of BLSD-resistant varieties is considered to be the most sustainable disease control method. Thus, the selection and release of such BLSD-resistant varieties have become crucial for banana producers. Location-specific information on how different genotypes perform under different climatic conditions can support decision making that considers genotype by environment interactions (G × E) and is useful for *Musa* breeding programs.

Accepted Article

Here, we apply the data synthesis approach (Brown et al., 2020) to a combination of data from various evaluations of *Musa* genotype reactions to BLSD and climatic data that are used as model covariates. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first application of such an approach to BLSD data originally collected in a non-ranking format. Multi-environment trials of *Musa* genotypes are complex to conduct because of their intricate requirements of space and time (Tenkouano et al., 2012). Our main objective is to demonstrate application of the data synthesis approach to unveil the effect of climatic factors on the reaction of several *Musa* genotypes to BLSD. Our interest is to explain rather than to predict a genotype's reaction to BLSD; the models are fitted and validated accordingly. The specific objectives are

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Musa trial data

Accepted Article

We retrieved data from the three main public data repositories currently storing field evaluation data on *Musa* genotypes: AgTrials, MusaBase and the *Musa* Germplasm Information System (MGIS) (Bauchet et al., 2018; Hyman et al., 2017; Ruas et al., 2017). From each repository, we selected data that fulfilled the following criteria:

- 1) Contains evaluations of Musa genotype reactions to BLSD
- 2) Contains geographic coordinates of trial locations
- Contains the start and end dates of the evaluation period (i.e., planting date, and either shooting or harvesting date)
- Genotypes evaluated at least partially overlap among trials (see connectivity in Section 2.5)

Table 1 presents the studies and projects in which the selected data were originally produced, the number of evaluated genotypes, number of locations, temporal extent and the data repository from which we retrieved the data.

)645, j
	ja, Dov
	vnloac
	led fro
	m http
	ps://ac
	sess.oi
	linelit
	orary.v
	viley.c
	om/dc
	1/10.1
	002/ag
	g2.214
	136 by
	Cochi
	rane C
	osta R
	ica, W
	iley O
	nline I
	ubrary
	on [U
	4/08/2
	023 J.
	See the
	e Tern
	is and
	Condi
	tions (J
	https:/.
	/online
	library
	/.wiley
	.com/i
	terms-
	and-cc
	nditio
	no (st
	Wiley
	Unline
	Libra
	ry for
	rules o
	of use;
	UA ar
	ticles ;
	are go:
	verned
	1 by th
	e apph
	tcable v
	Creati
	ve Cor
	nmons
	Ē

1435

ct ¹	Data repositor y ²	Numbe r of location s ³	Experiment al design	Numbe r of blocks	Numbe r of cycles	Number of genotype s	Tempor al extent	Number of generate d rankings
IMTP-1	AgTrials	6	Observation plots without replication		2	17	1990- 1992	4
IMTP-2	AgTrials	8	RCBD	5	1	19	1995- 1997	13
IMTP-3	AgTrials	7	RCBD	3-5 4		40	1999- 2003	26
Orlando Narváez (2004)	AgTrials	3	CRD		1	13	2003- 2004	3
Irish et al. (2013)	MGIS	1	RCBD	4	2	19	2008- 2009	2
Irish et al. (2019)	MGIS	1	RCBD	4	2	15	2014- 2016	2
WP4-BBB- Project	MusaBas e	5	RCBD	4	3	32	2016- 2019	60
¹ IMTP, In Bananas Pro but provides locations are within the s for data synt	ternational I oject. ² MGIS a curated s repeated ac ame study; in thesis (e.g., c	Musa Test S, <i>Musa</i> G election of ross studie nformation one cycle m	ing Program; fermplasm Info f literature on s; unique locat corresponds t hissing).	WP4-BB ormation S phenotypi tions are p to the orig	B, Worki System, cu c evaluati resented i inal desig	ng Packag urrently doe ons of <i>Mus</i> n Figure 1. n but not al	e 4 Breed s not store <i>a</i> genotype ⁴ Varies ar l data were	ing Better trial data, es. ³ Some nong trials e available
Figure 1 shows the 22 unique locations of the trials. To provide a general description of the								
Figure I sh	nows the 22	unique lo	ocations of th	e trials. 7	Fo provid	e a genera	l descript	ion of the
climatic co	ows the 22 onditions at	the trial	ocations of th locations, T	e trials. T able 2 p	Γο provid resents t	e a genera he yearly	l descript mean ten	ion of the
rigure 1 sr climatic cc precipitatio	nows the 22 onditions at n and relat	the trial	ocations of th locations, T lity, averaged	e trials. T Table 2 p I from m	Fo provid resents t onthly cl	e a genera he yearly imatologie	l descript mean ten es for the	ion of the nperature, reference
rigure 1 sr climatic cc precipitatio period 199	nows the 22 onditions at n and relat 1 to 2020	the trial the trial ive humic (Hersbach	locations of th locations, T lity, averaged n et al., 2018	e trials. T Table 2 p I from m 3), which	To provid resents t onthly cl roughly	e a genera he yearly imatologie covers th	l descript mean ten es for the e time sp	ion of the nperature, reference an of the
rigure 1 sh climatic cc precipitatio period 199 aggregated	onditions at on and relat 1 to 2020 dataset (19)	the trial the trial ive humic (Hersbach 90-2019, '	ocations of th locations, T dity, averaged n et al., 2018 Table 1).	e trials. 7 Table 2 p I from m 3), which	Fo provid resents t onthly cl roughly	e a genera he yearly imatologie covers th	l descript mean ten es for the e time sp	ion of the nperature, reference an of the

Table 1. Description of the trials included in the data synthesis.

Article



Figure 1. Unique locations of trials included in the aggregated data set.

Table 2. Location name, geographic coordinates, and yearly mean climatic data (temperature, annual precipitation and relative humidity) for the period 1991–2020 at unique trial locations. Climatic data from Hersbach et al. (2018).

Country	Location	Longitude	Latitude	Temperature	Precipitation	Relative humidity
-		(°)	(°)	(°C)	(mm)	(%)
Bangladesh	Ishurdi	89.033	24.133	25.57	1996.97	77.04
Cameroon	Njombe	9.650	4.583	25.83	4889.37	87.46
Colombia	Zabaletas	-76.517	3.817	19.40	2607.82	88.99
Costa Rica	La Rita	-83.450	10.267	25.01	3311.83	85.91
Ecuador	Pichilingue	-79.483	-1.100	23.84	1608.95	90.27
Ecuador	El Carmen	-79.317	-0.233	23.32	3019.01	87.61
Ecuador	Pagua	-79.769	-3.074	22.04	1436.69	89.27
Honduras	La Lima	-87.933	15.417	24.42	1769.74	86.89
Nicaragua	Rivas	-85.799	11.356	26.35	1707.09	80.97
Nigeria	Abuja	7.333	9.267	26.45	1756.53	64.04
Nigeria	Onne	7.167	4.767	26.20	1471.82	87.43
Nigeria	Ibadan	3.900	7.433	26.09	2874.01	80.79
Philippines	Davao	125.600	7.083	26.65	1888.76	80.27
Philippines	Kidapawan	125.154	7.014	25.27	6103.88	83.60
Puerto Rico	Isabela	-67.051	18.472	25.75	2789.3	80.92
Tanzania	Mitalula	33.000	-8.500	24.57	6581.55	55.59
Tanzania	Maruku	31.500	-1.333	20.93	1125.93	82.07
Tanzania	TaCRI	37.246	-3.244	17.41	1805.36	79.42
Tonga	Vaini	-175.167	-21.167	24.14	851.55	76.80
Uganda	Kawanda	32.600	0.417	21.08	614.2	86.99
Uganda	Mbarara	30.617	-0.933	20.91	1095.14	72.74
Vietnam	На Тау	105.983	21.300	24.20	2406.38	78.95

License

14350645, ja, Downloaded from https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://anlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons

2.2 Converting data to rankings

Accepted Article

To analyze the data using the Plackett-Luce model (Luce, 1959; Plackett, 1975), the data were transformed from numerical BLSD measurements to a ranking format. Five different metrics for BLSD evaluation were used in the original trial data (Table 3). The scores for these metrics were used to rank the genotypes within each trial, where the order of the ranking depended on the metric used in a trial. For instance, in evaluations where the youngest leaf spotted (YLS) was reported, genotypes with the highest values were ranked first. Conversely, for rating scales such as disease infection index (DII), representing the diseased surface per plant, genotypes with the lowest values were ranked first. If multiple measurements were made in the same evaluation, we selected the metric for which the most data were available and which resulted in a more homogeneous aggregated dataset (i.e., higher possible number of rankings are derived from the underlying variable YLS, 3 from disease development time (DDT), 41 from DII, 24 from the number of standing leaves (NSL), and 9 from the number of functional leaves (NFL).

Table 3. Description of metrics commonly used for BLSD evaluations, adapted from Bauchetet al. (2018), Jones and Tézenas du Montcel (1994) and Orjeda (1998).

Metric	Description
Disease development time (DDT)	Number of days from infection (occurring at the appearance of the unfolded leaf) to the appearance of 10 or more necrotic mature lesions.
Disease infection index (DII)	$DII = \frac{\sum nb}{(N-1)T} 100$
	N = number of grades in the scale
	n = number of leaves in each grade
	b = grade
	T = total number of leaves scored
Number of functional leaves (NFL)	Total number of leaves per plant with more than 50%

green area.

Number of standing leaves (NSL)

Youngest leaf spotted (YLS)

Accepted Article

Total number of standing leaves per plant, starting from the highest unfolded leaf, regardless of infection status. The first (from top to bottom) fully unfolded leaf with 10 or more necrotic lesions.

If the trial data were reported at plant or block level, we treated each block as an individual experiment and the summarized results at block level generated a ranking. On the contrary, where trial data were available only as summarized results, the ranking was constructed using the averaged values. Each evaluation cycle generated a separate ranking. For example, trials evaluating over two cycles (i.e., mother and first ratoon) produced two separate rankings. The evaluation also depends on decisions made when the trial was designed. For instance, YLS is usually registered at shooting but in some cases, it may have been registered only at harvest or at both. These differences were considered in order to define the period for which climatic data were obtained for modelling (see Section 2.3). In the aggregated dataset, the evaluation period for all YLS, DDT, and NFL and for one DII was from planting to shooting. For the rest of the data, where the BLSD metric was DII and NSL, the evaluation period was from planting to harvest.

To convert the data from numerical measurements to ranks, we used the function *rank_numeric()* from the R package *gosset* (de Sousa, Brown, et al., 2023). The rankings were constructed separately for each evaluation and then aggregated into a sparse matrix, where the columns are the evaluated genotypes, and the rows correspond to the evaluations. After aggregating all the evaluations, the number of rankings was 110, with 62 genotypes evaluated. Information about the evaluated genotypes is presented in Table 4. There are three types of genotype: (1) a crop wild relative, (2) landraces, and (3) improved genotypes either through breeding (hybrids) or selection of somaclonal variants.

Guzman et al. (2018) described two types of reactions and three types of interactions of *Musa* genotypes to and with BLSD:

- Incompatible interaction characterized by high resistance (HR) or hypersensitivity (phenotype 1). This expression of high resistance is characterized by the blockage of disease development at an early stage and YLS is not observed.
- 2) Compatible interaction with two types of reaction:

Accepted Article

- 2.1 Partial resistance (phenotype 2) expressed by slow disease evolution (from first streak symptoms to spots) and a reduction in pathogen reproduction. The YLS is high. There is a large progression of response with phenotype 2 from resistance to almost complete susceptibility.
- 2.2 Susceptibility (phenotype 3) expressed by rapid disease evolution; YLS is low.

The BLSD reactions indicated in Table 4 follow the types of reaction described above. The classification of any genotype into one of the three phenotypes results from evaluating the host reaction under field conditions in comparison with references of known resistance phenotypes. We used Calcutta 4 as the reference in our analysis; it is frequently used as a highly resistant reference in BLSD evaluations.

Table 4. Main characteristics of Musa genotypes included in the data synthesis.

Nama	Status	DISD	Conomo	Subgroup/Type	Droading	Information source
Name	Status	BLSD 1	Genome	Subgroup/Type	program	Information source
		reaction			program	
Agbagba	Landrace	S	AAB	Plantain	NA	(Ferris et al., 1999)
BITA-2	Hybrid	PR	ABBB	Plantain	IITA	(Ning et al., 2007); (Noupadja & Tomekpé, 2001)
BITA-3	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Plantain	IITA	(Bakry et al., 2009); (Ortiz & Vuylsteke, 1998)
Burro Cemsa	Landrace	PR	ABB	Bluggoe	NA	(Alvarez, 1997)
Cachaco	Landrace	PR	ABB	Bluggoe	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Calcutta 4	Wild	HR	AAw	<i>M. acuminata</i> subsp. <i>burmannicoides</i>	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
CRBP-39	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Plantain	CARBAP	(Cohan et al., 2003)
EMB 403	Hybrid	PR	AAAB		EMBRAPA	(Hernández Núñez, 1995)

O
\mathbf{O}
•
+
1
\mathbf{O}
+
()

FHIA-01	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Pome	FHIA	(Irish et al., 2013)
FHIA-02	Hybrid	PR	AAAA		FHIA	(Karamura et al., 2012)
FHIA-03	Hybrid	PR	AABB		FHIA	(Karamura et al., 2012)
FHIA-17	Hybrid	PR	AAAA		FHIA	(Irish et al., 2013)
FHIA-18	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Pome	FHIA	(Irish et al., 2013)
FHIA-20	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Plantain	FHIA	(Sakyi-Dawson et al., 2008)
FHIA-21	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Plantain	FHIA	(Irish et al., 2013)
FHIA-23	Hybrid	PR	AAAA		FHIA	(Orjeda, 2000)
FHIA-25	Hybrid	PR	AAB		FHIA	(Njukwe et al., 2010)
French Sombre	Landrace	S	AAB	Plantain	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Grande Naine	Landrace	S	AAA	Cavendish	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Gros Michel	Landrace	S	AAA	Gros Michel	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Kisansa	Landrace	S	AAA	EAHB	NA	(Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021); (Nyombi et al., 2009)
Lakatan	Landrace	U	AA		NA	IMTP-2 data
Mbwazirume	Landrace	S	AAA	EAHB	NA	(Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021)
Nakitembe	Landrace	S	AAA	EAHB	NA	(Karamura & Karamura, 1994); (Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021)
NARITA 2	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021)
NARITA 4	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021)
NARITA 6	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021)
NARITA 7	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 8	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 9	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 10	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 11	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 12	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 13	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 14	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 15	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 16	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 18	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 19	Hybrid	S	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 20	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)

(D	
(5	
(
(U U	

NARITA 21	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 22	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 23	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 24	Hybrid	S	AAA	ЕАНВ	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021; Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 25	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 26	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Tushemereirwe et al., 2015)
NARITA 27	Hybrid	PR	AAA	EAHB	NARO-IITA	(Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021)
Ndizi Uganda	Landrace	S	AAA	ЕАНВ	NA	(Karamura et al., 2012); (Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021)
Niyarma Yik	Landrace	S	AA		NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
PA 03-22	Hybrid	S	AAAB	Pome	EMBRAPA	(Irish et al., 2013)
Pisang Berlin	Landrace	S	AA	Inarnibal	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Pisang Ceylan	Landrace	PR	AAB	Mysore	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Pisang Jari Buaya	Landrace	S	AA	Pisang Jari Buaya	NA	(Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021)
PITA-16	Hybrid	S	AAB	Plantain	IITA	(Irish et al., 2013)
PV 03-44	Hybrid	PR	AAAB	Pome	EMBRAPA	(Irish et al., 2013)
Rose	Landrace	PR	AA	<i>M. acuminata</i> subsp. <i>malaccensis</i>	NA	(Kimunye, Were, et al., 2021)
Saba	Landrace	PR	ABB	Monthan	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
SH-3436-9	Somaclonal variant	PR	AAAA	Highgate	INIVIT	(Orjeda, 2000)
SH-3640	Hybrid	S	AAAB		FHIA	(Irish et al., 2013)
Valery	Landrace	S	AAA	Cavendish	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Williams	Landrace	S	AAA	Cavendish	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)
Yangambi Km5	Landrace	HR	AAA	Ibota Bota	NA	(Guzman et al., 2018)

¹ HR, highly resistant; PR, partially resistant; S, susceptible; U, unknown; *NA*, not applicable. EAHB landraces were assumed to be susceptible. NARITAs were assumed to be partially resistant following Tushemereirwe et al. (2015), except those indicated as susceptible by Kimunye, Jomanga, et al. (2021).

2.3 Climatic data

To account for climatic effects on the plant host reaction to BLSD, we used climatic data retrieved from the AgERA5 database (Boogaard & van der Grijn, 2020; Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2020). We downloaded the following variables: daytime maximum temperature, nighttime minimum temperature, daily precipitation flux, and relative humidity at 06:00, 09:00, 12:00, 15:00 and 18:00. The initial set of climatic covariates (temperature, precipitation and relative humidity) were chosen based on guidelines for *Musa* disease

evaluation (Orjeda, 1998) and previous studies relating BLSD to climatic factors (Churchill, 2011; Jacome & Schuh, 1992; Yonow et al., 2019). The climatic data were extracted for the period of each evaluation that generated a ranking. This corresponds to either the time from planting to shooting or from planting to harvest, depending on what was reported in each evaluation. If more than one cycle was reported, the start time for the ratoon cycle was computed as the end time of the previous crop cycle. For example, for a second cycle in which YLS at shooting is reported, the evaluation period of the mother is from planting to shooting of the first ratoon cycle the evaluation time is from the shooting of the mother to the shooting of the first ratoon cycle. All relative humidity variables were averaged over the evaluation period of each trial (i.e., either planting to shooting or planting to harvest). Precipitation and temperature variables were used as inputs with R package *climatrends* (de Sousa, van Etten, et al., 2023) to compute climatic indices (Table 5).

Table 5. Climatic variables and indices used as model covariates. Indices were calculated for the evaluation period of each trial (e.g., planting to shooting).

Variable	Description	Unit
MLDS	Maximum length of dry spell (consecutive days with precipitation < 1 mm)	day
MLWS	Maximum length of wet spell (consecutive days with precipitation ≥ 1 mm)	day
r10mm	Number of heavy precipitation days ($10 \le rain \le 20 \text{ mm}$)	day
r20mm	Number of very heavy precipitation days (rain ≥ 20 mm)	day
R95p	Total precipitation when rain > 95 th percentile	mm
R99p	Total precipitation when rain > 99th percentile	mm
Rtotal	Total precipitation (mm) on wet days (rain ≥ 1 mm)	mm
Rx1day	Maximum 1-day precipitation	mm
Rx5day	Maximum 5-day precipitation	mm
SDII	Simple daily intensity index (total precipitation divided by the number of wet	mm/day
	days)	
rhum_06h	Daily relative humidity at 06:00, averaged over the evaluation period	%
rhum_09h	Daily relative humidity at 09:00, averaged over the evaluation period	%
rhum_12h	Daily relative humidity at 12:00, averaged over the evaluation period	%
rhum 15h	Daily relative humidity at 15:00, averaged over the evaluation period	%

rhum_18h	Daily relative humidity at 18:00, averaged over the evaluation period	%
CSDI	Cold spell duration index (maximum consecutive nights with temperature	day
	<10th percentile)	
DTR	Diurnal temperature range (mean difference between daily maximum	°C
	temperature and daily minimum temperature)	
maxDT	Maximum daytime temperature	°C
maxNT	Maximum nighttime temperature	°C
minDT	Minimum daytime temperature	°C
minNT	Minimum nighttime temperature	°C
SU	Summer days (number of days with maximum temperature > 30 °C)	°C
T10p	10th percentile of night temperature	°C
Т90р	90th percentile of day temperature	°C
TR^1	Tropical nights (number of nights with maximum temperature > 25 °C)	°C
WSDI	Warm spell duration index (maximum consecutive days with temperature	day
	>90th percentile)	

Removed from the model because it has near zero variability.

2.4 Plackett-Luce trees

The Plackett-Luce model (Luce, 1959; Plackett, 1975) is a statistical model for ranking data. Its implementation in the R package *PlackettLuce* (Turner et al., 2020) is an extension of the original model that allows ties and partial rankings, although ties of order four or higher are difficult to analyze. Given a set S of J items $S = \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_j\}$, the probability of selecting an item i_j from S is represented by:

$$P(i_j | S) = \frac{\alpha_{i_j}}{\sum_{i \in S} i}$$

where $\alpha_i \ge 0$ is the worth of item i (Turner et al., 2020). An item with a higher worth values is more likely to be selected (Turner et al., 2020). To account for context-specific differences among rankings, the *PlackettLuce* package is coupled with the model-based recursive partitioning framework of the R package *partykit* (Hothorn & Zeileis, 2015; Zeileis et al., 4350645; ja, Downloaded from https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons

2008). The combination of the recursive partitioning algorithm (Zeileis et al., 2008) and the Plackett-Luce model (Turner et al., 2020) produce a Plackett-Luce tree. Accordingly to Zeileis et al. (2008) and (Turner et al., 2020), the algorithm proceeds as follows:

1) The Plackett-Luce model is fitted to the entire dataset.

Accepted Article

- 2) The influence of each covariate on the stability of worth parameters is assessed.
- 3) If instability exceeds a given minimum threshold, the dataset is split into two partitions (also referred to as 'nodes'). The split is generated by selecting a split value of a certain covariate with the strongest parameter instability. Samples above and below this value are assigned to different partitions (categorical variables can also be used to create partitions). To each partition, a Plackett-Luce model is fitted separately.
- 4) The algorithm stops either when no significant instabilities are detected or when the resulting partitions are smaller than a pre-specified minimum size. Otherwise, steps 1-3 are repeated, analyzing stability for each of the data partitions separately, and splitting them further.

The threshold in step 3 is specified by the α parameter in the Plackett-Luce tree model function, which defines the threshold significance level at which to admit a split (Zeileis et al., 2008). We used a Bonferroni-corrected α value of 0.05. In step 4, the threshold refers to the minimum number of observations required in a node. In our case, we set the minimum node size as 35% of the aggregated dataset. In predictive mode, this threshold might be considered as too conservative. However, we are modelling in explanatory mode and very small nodes might be uninformative. Furthermore, the model requires some level of connectivity among compared items, which might not be feasible with very few observations per node. Further details about connectivity are provided in Section 2.5.

2.5 Network connectivity

Accepted Article

To compute finite maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) and standard errors with PlackettLuce, the network of items should be strongly connected, which means that a winlose relationship should exist between each pair of items included in the rankings (Hunter, 2004; Turner et al., 2020). From the initial aggregated dataset, we removed genotypes that were weakly connected to others. To guarantee the representativeness of genotypes among trials and avoid extremely biased comparisons, we only kept genotypes that were present in at least 5% of the trials. This threshold was defined through an iterative search of the minimum amount of data that guarantees model convergence and minimizes data loss. It resulted in 37% of the genotypes being discarded. When a Plackett-Luce tree is fitted, a network that is initially strongly connected might become weakly connected if the dataset is divided by the recursive partitioning algorithm. The *PlackettLuce* package provides a solution for networks that are not strongly connected, through the inclusion of pseudo-rankings (Turner et al., 2020). These are symmetric wins and losses between an artificial item and each of the real items, which make the network strongly connected. Even though our initial network was strongly connected (Figure 2) after removing the weakly connected genotypes, we used the pseudo-rankings mechanism to guarantee the connectivity of the network after partitioning splits. The use of pseudo-rankings also reduces the variance and bias of the worth parameter estimators (Turner et al., 2020). The number of pseudo-rankings to the artificial item is set by the *npseudo* parameter in the Plackett-Luce model; we set *npseudo* = 2. Network connectivity is also important to guarantee tree stability, as detailed in Section 2.7. Cultivars Williams and Gros Michel are commonly used as susceptible references in BLSD evaluations. Pisang Ceylan is often used as a partially resistant reference. Figure 2 shows how these reference genotypes enabled the comparison of genotypes which were not compared to each other in the same trial. For instance, the FHIAs and NARITAs were not compared directly in any of the aggregated trials.



Figure 2. Network of win (outgoing arrows) and lose (incoming arrows) relationships between each pair of evaluated Musa genotypes. Incoming and outgoing arrows between the same pair indicate different outcomes at independent evaluations.

2.6 Handling tied ranks

In the present analysis, we found many cases in which the evaluated genotypes were tied, especially in lower rank positions. The Plackett-Luce model implemented in the R package *PlackettLuce* can handle ties up to an order of four (Turner et al., 2020). Unfortunately, the large number of ties in our data prevented model convergence. Therefore, from the subset of tied genotypes in a single rank, we removed all except one of the tied genotypes. For instance, if six items are tied in the low part of a single ranking, we remove five genotypes and keep one from the tied subset. To avoid bias, the genotype to be retained was randomly

selected. We found that changing which genotype was retained had a negligible influence on the overall results.

2.7 Stability assessment of the Plackett-Luce tree

Accepted Article

A well-known limitation of recursive partitioning as used in Plackett-Luce trees is model instability, which means that a small change in the input data can cause large changes in the output (Breiman, 1996; Philipp et al., 2018; Strobl et al., 2009). Stability is fundamental in the explanatory models to guarantee that similar model results (i.e., semantic similarity of the learned predictor-response relationship) are obtained using the same algorithm on a different random sample from the same data generation process (Philipp et al., 2018). We assessed stability through data sampling using the framework proposed by Philipp et al. (2018) and implemented in the R package stablelearner (Philipp et al., 2016). The method consists of fitting an ensemble of trees, each with a resampled instance of the original dataset, and counting the number of times each variable generates a split (Philipp et al., 2016). If the variables selected for splitting in the original tree are consistently selected across the ensemble of trees, then the original tree is considered stable (Philipp et al., 2016). We created 1000 subsamples, each using 80% of the original data (sampling without replacement). We selected this sampling method to generate sufficiently large learning samples and to ensure strong network connectivity (see Section 2.5). We fitted a Plackett-Luce tree to each of the 1000 subsamples and recorded for each variable how many times it was used to generate a split. To facilitate interpretation, we report the relative frequencies per variable using a histogram.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Plackett-Luce tree

Tticle

The model selected the variable MLDS (maximum length of dry spell, consecutive days with precipitation < 1 mm) as the best splitting variable, partitioning the dataset in two. While MLDS is a rainfall-derived index, it is only very weakly correlated with rainfall indices such as Rtotal (r = -0.06) and r10mm (r = -0.03). However, MLDS has a strong negative correlation with rhum_09 (r = -0.75). Figure 3 shows how the environments of the two nodes selected by the model differ in terms of length of dry spell and relative humidity, expressed by the variables MLDS and rhum_09. There are no major differences between the environments in terms of rainfall variables such as r10mm and Rtotal. Therefore, the Plackett-Luce model discriminated two main environmental conditions, humid environments (node 2) and dry environments (node 3).



Figure 3. Differences between the two nodes resulting from the Plackett-Luce tree model, in terms of relative daily humidity at 09:00 (rhum_09), maximum length of dry spell (MLDS), number of days with heavy precipitation (r10mm) and total precipitation on wet days (Rtotal).

The Plackett-Luce tree model that resulted from fitting the aggregated data is presented in Figure 4.





Figure 4. Plackett-Luce tree of *Musa* genotypes split into two nodes by variable MLDS (maximum length of dry spell) during the BLSD evaluation period. The worth estimates of each genotype are presented on the *x*-axis on a logarithmic scale. The worth estimate for Calcutta 4 is set to zero as it served as the BLSD-resistant reference. The vertical gray lines show the zero intercept. Horizontal black bars represent quasi-standard errors of each estimated worth. The *y*-axis shows genotype names, with color indicating genotype status (blue, wild; red, landrace; gray, improved genotype). Node 2 = humid environments; node 3 = dry environments.

Figure 5 presents a visualization of the Plackett-Luce tree model that is complementary to Figure 4. While some genotypes seem to outperform the reference (Calcutta 4), only NARITA 8 does so in humid environments with statistical significance (Tables 6 and 7). However, there are statistically significant differences among genotypes.



Figure 5. Worth estimates (on logarithmic scale) of each genotype in each of the nodes from the Plackett-Luce tree model. Color indicates genotype status (blue, wild; red, landrace; gray, improved genotype).

rticle

Accepted



Figure 6. Number of times that each genotype has been evaluated in each environment (node 2 = humid; node 3 = dry).

The (log) worth estimates for the Plackett-Luce tree model are presented in Table 6 for node 2 (humid environments) and in Table 7 for node 3 (dry environments). In addition to the difference in estimated worth values, we calculated reliability, which is the probability of each genotype outperforming the check or reference genotype (Eskridge & Mumm, 1992). The reliability estimates are conservative because of the shrinkage effect of using pseudo-rankings (Section 2.5).

Table 6. Worth estimates and reliability for the top ten ranked genotypes in humid environments (node 2). The worth estimates are presented in the logarithmic scale. The worth of genotype Calcutta 4 is zero as it serves as the reference.

	Genotype	Estimate	Std. error	z value	Pr(> z)	quasiSE	quasiVar	Reliability	relSE
	NARITA 8	1.496	0.810	1.848	0.065	0.415	0.172	0.817	0.070
	FHIA-01	1.193	0.800	1.492	0.136	0.511	0.262	0.767	0.103
	NARITA 2	0.956	0.851	1.123	0.261	0.489	0.240	0.722	0.108
	EMB 403	0.314	1.140	0.275	0.783	0.959	0.920	0.578	0.234
	NARITA 14	0.309	0.785	0.394	0.693	0.365	0.133	0.577	0.091
	NARITA 23	0.201	0.786	0.256	0.798	0.364	0.133	0.550	0.091
V	Calcutta 4	0.000	0.000	NA	NA	0.657	0.432	NA	0.159
	PHIA-25	-0.148	0.738	-0.200	0.841	0.377	0.142	0.463	0.091
	NARITA 9	-0.216	0.865	-0.249	0.803	0.514	0.265	0.446	0.121
	Pisang Ceylan	-0.225	0.679	-0.332	0.740	0.222	0.049	0.444	0.054

Significance levels ***, 0.001; **, 0.01; *, 0.05; relSE, standard error of reliability.

rticle

Table 7. Worth estimates and reliability for the top ten ranked genotypes in dry environments (node 3). The worth estimates are presented in the logarithmic scale. The worth of genotype Calcutta 4 is zero as it serves as the reference.

Genotype	Estimate	Std. error	z value	Pr(> z)	quasiSE	quasiVar	Reliability	relSE
Saba	0.036	1.394	0.026	0.979	0.677	0.458	0.509	0.164
Calcutta 4	0.000	0.000	NA	NA	1.285	1.651	NA	0.283
FHIA-03	-0.060	1.586	-0.038	0.970	0.964	0.929	0.485	0.221
NARITA 24	-0.117	1.350	-0.087	0.931	0.341	0.116	0.471	0.083
FHIA-01	-0.294	1.455	-0.202	0.840	0.729	0.531	0.427	0.163
FHIA-02	-0.322	1.705	-0.189	0.850	1.146	1.313	0.420	0.233
FHIA-21	-0.325	1.413	-0.230	0.818	0.705	0.497	0.419	0.156
FHIA-18	-0.411	1.496	-0.275	0.783	0.813	0.661	0.399	0.171
Rose	-0.680	1.589	-0.428	0.669	0.962	0.925	0.336	0.174
Pisang Ceylan	-0.685	1.299	-0.527	0.598	0.258	0.066	0.335	0.055

Significance levels ***, 0.001; **, 0.01; *, 0.05; relSE, standard error of reliability.

The results of fitting 1000 Plackett-Luce trees by subsampling 80% of the data are presented in Figure 7. In 855 of the 1000 Plackett-Luce trees, the splitting variable was MLDS, as shown in the case of the single tree presented in Figure 4. Therefore, the original tree can be considered stable.



Figure 7. Relative frequencies with which a variable is selected for a split in each of the 1000 runs of the ensemble of trees. The red bar indicates the variable selected in the original tree. Only variables that were selected at least once are shown. See Table 5 for variables description.

DISCUSSION 4

The Plackett-Luce tree model (Figure 4) identified the maximum length of dry spell (MLDS) as the most important climatic variable determining Musa genotypes' reactions to BLSD. MLDS is a rainfall-derived climatic index, expressed as the number of days with precipitation less than 1 mm. While it is derived from rainfall, it is strongly negatively correlated with relative humidity (r = -0.75). The Plackett-Luce model partitioned the aggregated dataset into two contrasting environments: humid environments (node 2) in which the dry spell is less than or equal to 13 days, and dry environments (node 3) with a dry spell of more than 13 days. Humid environments (node 2) are assumed to be more favorable than dry environments (node 3) to BLSD development (Churchill, 2011; Guzman et al., 2018). Humidity is indeed required during various steps in the BLSD infection cycle, such as for infection efficacy (spore penetration in stomates), lesion growth on leaves and fungus sporulation (Guzman et al., 2018). Therefore, humid environments (node 2) are considered appropriate climatic conditions in which to evaluate differences in BLSD (Perez-Vicente et al., 2021). However, dry environments cannot be considered to be disease-free, as differences were found among genotypes. Environmental conditions act on both the host (banana plant) and the pathogen (*P. fijiensis*). From our results, it is not possible to discriminate between the two but only to formulate plausible hypotheses to be further investigated or considered in future research.

From the Plackett-Luce tree, we identified a contrasting reaction of genotypes across environments. For example, NARITAS 8 and 24 have relatively extreme and opposite responses to BLSD in humid (node 2) and dry (node 3) environments. In these cases, it might be that the genetic component of resistance in these genotypes has a different expression in different environments (Craenen & Ortiz, 1997) or at a particular stage (e.g., sporulation) of the disease cycle (Abadie et al., 2003). In the case of NARITA 8, its seems that its resistance component is expressed in humid (node 2) but not in dry (node 3) environments. On the other hand, NARITA 24 appeared susceptible in humid environments (node 2), while in dry environments (node 3) its performance did not differ from that of the reference, Calcutta 4. Our results might help to explain the contradictory results among previous studies in which NARITA 24 was evaluated. For instance, in evaluations of NARITAs by (Tushemereirwe et al., 2015), NARITA 24 was among the best performing genotypes with respect to BLSD reaction. In contrast, it performed poorly in two locations in Uganda in evaluations conducted by (Kimunye, Jomanga, et al., 2021). Another contrasting result between environments is FHIA-03, which performed better in dry environments than in humid environments. We concur with Kimunye, Were, et al. (2021) that the effect of environmental factors on the reaction of genotypes to BLSD should be further investigated at different locations.

While Calcutta 4 was used as the highly resistant reference, failure of a genotype to outperform Calcutta 4 cannot be considered poor performance. Calcutta 4 has qualitative resistance, which blocks disease development at an early stage (Guzman et al., 2018). In contrast, quantitative resistance allows disease development but seems to be more durable than qualitative resistance (Guzman et al., 2018). Therefore, we advise against interpreting our results through dichotomization of whether or not a genotype outperforms the resistant reference. In dry environments (node 3), differences between the reference, Calcutta 4, and each of the genotypes included in the top ten are not statistically significant (Table 7). Hence, we cannot say that the top ten genotypes performed differently from the reference, but they did perform better than the rest of the genotypes.

Accepted Article

Water is a major limiting abiotic factor for banana growth (Turner, 1995). We hypothesize that plant growth could be negatively affected in dry conditions (node 3), as banana plants react very early to water deficit (Eyland et al., 2022) and require constant rainfall for normal development (Turner et al., 2007). The genotype FHIA-01 performed well in both humid and dry environments, which is in agreement with both its partial resistance to BLSD and its tolerance of extended periods of deficient rainfall (Rowe & Rosales, 1993). Furthermore, of the top ten best performing genotypes in dry environments, six contain the *Musa balbisiana* (B) genome, which has been identified to contribute to drought tolerance (Thomas et al., 1998; van Wesemael et al., 2019; Vanhove et al., 2012). Abiotic stresses can affect plant reaction to diseases (Bostock et al., 2014). In the case of *Musa*, there is evidence that nutritional deficiencies and poor soil conditions predispose BLSD infection (Guzman et al.,

2018). Our results suggest that predisposition to BLSD caused by drought should be further explored.

Evaluation metrics based on leaf number (e.g., YLS) strongly depend on plant growth (Guzman et al., 2018). Slower plant growth in dry environments could induce some bias in rankings in which the disease variable is linked to leaf number, such as YLS, NFL and NSL. In spite of this potential bias, the Plackett-Luce tree model seems to adequately detect the different reactions of genotypes with partial resistance among environments ($G \times E$), while it is also consistent with the expected performance of susceptible genotypes, such as Grand Naine, Gros Michel and Niyarma Yik.

Our results could help to select genotypes of interest to breeders for further testing. For example, NARITA 8, FHIA-01 and NARITA 2 were not only the best performing genotypes in humid environments, but also the most reliable in outperforming the reference Calcutta 4 (Table 6). This can provide impetus for breeding programs to include certain genotypes in new evaluations, based on their overall reliability in addition to their worth (ranking probability). In humid environments, only genotypes EMB 403, FHIA-01, and NARITAS 2, 8, 14, 20 and 23 have more than 50% reliability, while in dry environments, only the landrace Saba marginally surpassed 50% reliability. Reliability is especially relevant given the lengthy process of developing and releasing a *Musa* genotype. For instance, FHIA-21 took 30 years from crossing to release (Tenkouano et al., 2019). Our results support the use of both ranking-probabilities and reliability as criteria for selecting genotypes for further testing in new locations, minimizing the risk of investment.

Accepted Article

5 CONCLUSIONS

Our work presents the first application of the data synthesis approach in combining heterogeneous trial data and using climatic data as model covariates to discover *Musa*

genotypes' reactions to BLSD. We aggregated data from 110 evaluations in 31 heterogeneous trials evaluating Musa genotypes for reaction to BLSD. The rank-based data synthesis methodology enabled the comparison of 62 genotypes, aggregated from trials established at 22 unique locations, with a temporal range from 1990 to 2019. The large number of banana genotypes analyzed in our study would typically be challenging to compare in a single advanced multi-location testing trial. We have demonstrated how field trial environmental conditions can be reconstructed using publicly available climate datasets even where locallysensed weather data are lacking. In our work, the large temporal range for which the AgERA5 data is available (1979 to present) allowed the addition of climatic data as model covariates for all the data selected for the study. The MLDS, a precipitation-derived climatic index, was found to be the best splitting variable in the Plackett-Luce tree model. We found that humidity is the main climatic factor driving differential reactions of genotypes to BLSD. Our results support previous evidence that genetic components of resistance to BLSD are triggered under different environmental conditions, leading to different genotypic response patterns. We have provided insights to support the use of reliability in selecting genotypes for further evaluation.

One limitation of our study is the inherent information loss from the transformation of metric data to rankings. In the present case, information loss is reduced by the documented knowledge about different reactions of genotypes to BLSD. This supports the importance of considering expert knowledge in the implementation of the data synthesis approach (Brown et al., 2020).

Another limitation of our study is that despite the aggregation of several trials, the sample size of the aggregated dataset is still relatively small, due to the relative scarcity of *Musa* evaluation data in public repositories. Increased availability of trial data in public repositories is therefore required for further applications of the data synthesis approach to efficiently

License

(re)use crop trial data. We expect our findings to motivate plant breeding programs to share their data in public repositories, to enable future reanalysis with extended versions of the dataset used in our study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Harri Washington, consultant to Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT Science Writing Service, for language editing of this paper.

Funding sources

Accepted Article

This research was undertaken as part of, and funded by, the CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB) and supported by CGIAR Trust Fund contributors https://www.cgiar.org/funders/.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID

David Brown Sytze de Bruin Kauê de Sousa Catherine Abadie Sebastien Carpentier Lewis Machida Jacob van Etten https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2859-1618 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6884-2832 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7571-7845 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5075-6338 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7389-6405 https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0012-3997 https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7554-2558

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

David Brown	Conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; software; visualization; validation; writing—original draft; writing—review and editing
David Diowii	and cutting.
Sytze de Bruin	Conceptualization; formal analysis; methodology; supervision; writing-

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

	review and editing.
Kauê de Sousa	Data curation; formal analysis; methodology; software; writing—review and editing.
Catherine Abadie	Formal analysis; investigation; writing—review and editing.
Sebastien Carpentier	Formal analysis; investigation; writing—review and editing.
Lewis Machida	Data curation; formal analysis; investigation; writing-review and editing.
	Conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; funding
	acquisition; methodology; software; supervision; visualization; validation;
Jacob van Etten	writing—review and editing.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All the R code and data required to reproduce the analysis are publicly available in the public repository https://github.com/AgrDataSci/Data_Synthesis_Musa_Trials_BLSD

SUPPORTING SOFTWARE

4350645; ja, Downloaded from https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons

We used the following R (R Core Team, 2022) packages for data management and preparation: *readr, readxl, janitor, dplyr, gosset* and *caret* (de Sousa, Brown, et al., 2023; Firke, 2021; Kuhn, 2022; Wickham & Bryan, 2022; Wickham, François, et al., 2022; Wickham, Hester, et al., 2022). Climatic variables were obtained using the packages *ag5Tools* and *climatrends* (Brown et al., 2023; de Sousa, van Etten, et al., 2023). The statistical modelling was performed with the packages *PlackettLuce, stablelearner, gosset* and *qvcalc* (de Sousa, Brown, et al., 2023; Firth, 2020; Philipp et al., 2016; Turner et al., 2020). The figures were made with packages *ggplot2, ggparty, patchwork, GGally and tmap* (Borkovec & Madin, 2019; Pedersen, 2020; Schloerke et al., 2021; Tennekes, 2018; Wickham, 2016). The geospatial data were handled with packages *sf* and *terra* (Hijmans, 2021; Pebesma, 2018).

REFERENCES

- Abadie, C., Elhadrami, A., Fouré, E., & Carlier, J. (2003). *Efficiency and durability of partial resistance against black leaf streak disease* Mycosphaerella leaf spot diseases of bananas: present status and outlook, San Jose, Costa Rica.
- Alvarez, J. (1997). Introduction, evaluation, multiplication and dissemination of FHIA hybrids in Cuba. Infomusa.
- Bakry, F., Carreel, F., Jenny, C., & Horry, J.-P. (2009). Genetic Improvement of Banana. In S. M. Jain & P. M. Priyadarshan (Eds.), *Breeding Plantation Tree Crops: Tropical Species* (pp. 3-50). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71201-7_1
- Bauchet, G. J., Morales, N., Karanja, M., Ogbonna, A. C., Ellerbrock, B., Crichton, R., Tumuhimbise, R., Uwimana, B., Brown, A., & Shah, T. (2018). Musabase: A Phenotyping and Breeding Database for Banana. Plant and Animal Genome XXVI Conference (January 13-17, 2018),

Articl

ccepted

- Boogaard, H., & van der Grijn, G. (2020). Agrometeorological indicators from 1979 to present derived from reanalysis Copernicus Climate Change Service. https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.6c68c9bb
- Borkovec, M., & Madin, N. (2019). ggparty: "ggplot" Visualizations for the "partykit" Package. In (Version 1.0.0) https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggparty
- Bostock, R. M., Pye, M. F., & Roubtsova, T. V. (2014). Predisposition in Plant Disease: Exploiting the Nexus in Abiotic and Biotic Stress Perception and Response. *Annual Review of Phytopathology*, 52(1), 517-549. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-081211-172902
- Breiman, L. (1996). Heuristics of instability and stabilization in model selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(6), 2350-2383, 2334. https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1032181158
- Brown, D., de Bruin, S., de Sousa, K., Aguilar, A., Barrios, M., Gómez, M., Hernandez, J. C., Chaves, N., Madriz, B., Machida, L., Mejía, P., Mercado, L., Pavón, M., Rosas, J. C., Steinke, J., Suchini, J. G., Zelaya, V., & van Etten, J. (2022). Rank-based data synthesis of common bean on-farm trials across four Central American countries. *Crop Science*. https://doi.org/10.1002/csc2.20817
- Brown, D., de Sousa, K., & van Etten, J. (2023). ag5Tools: An R package for downloading and extracting agrometeorological data from the AgERA5 database. *SoftwareX*, *21*, 101267. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2022.101267
- Brown, D., Van den Bergh, I., de Bruin, S., Machida, L., & van Etten, J. (2020). Data synthesis for crop variety evaluation. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 40(4), 25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-020-00630-7
- Churchill, A. C. L. (2011). Mycosphaerella fijiensis, the black leaf streak pathogen of banana: progress towards understanding pathogen biology and detection, disease development, and the challenges of control. *Molecular Plant Pathology*, 12(4), 307-328. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1364-3703.2010.00672.x
- Cohan, J.-P., Abadie, C., Tomekpé, K., & Tchango Tchango, J. (2003). Agronomic performance and resistance to black leaf streak of the hybrid 'CRBP-39'. *InfoMusa*, 12(1), 29-32.
- Copernicus Climate Change Service. (2020). Agrometeorological indicators from 1979 to present derived from reanalysis AgERA5. https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.6c68c9bb
- Craenen, K., & Ortiz, R. (1997). Effect of the bs1 gene in plantain-banana hybrids on response to black sigatoka. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, 95(3), 497-505. https://doi.org/10.1007/s001220050589
- De Lapeyre de Bellaire, L., Fouré, E., Abadie, C., & Carlier, J. (2010). Black Leaf Streak Disease is challenging the banana industry [Article]. *Fruits*, 65(6), 327-342. https://doi.org/10.1051/fruits/2010034

- de Sousa, K., Brown, D., Steinke, J., & van Etten, J. (2023). gosset: An R package for analysis and synthesis of ranking data in agricultural experimentation. SoftwareX, 22, 101402. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2023.101402 de Sousa, K., van Etten, J., Neby, M., & Solberg, S. Ø. (2023). Climate variability indices for ecological and crop models in R: the climatrends package. Journal of Open Source Software, 8(85), 4405. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.04405 Artic
 - Eagle, A. J., Christianson, L. E., Cook, R. L., Harmel, R. D., Miguez, F. E., Qian, S. S., & Ruiz Diaz, D. A. (2017). Meta-Analysis Constrained by Data: Recommendations to Improve Relevance of Nutrient Management Research. Agronomy journal, 109(6), 2441-2449. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2017.04.0215
 - Eskridge, K. M., & Mumm, R. F. (1992). Choosing plant cultivars based on the probability of outperforming a check [journal article]. Theoretical and Applied Genetics, 84(3), 494-500. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00229512
 - Eyland, D., Luchaire, N., Cabrera-Bosquet, L., Parent, B., Janssens, S. B., Swennen, R., Welcker, C., Tardieu, F., & Carpentier, S. C. (2022). High-throughput phenotyping reveals differential transpiration behaviour within the banana wild relatives highlighting diversity in drought tolerance. Plant, Cell & Environment, 45(6), 1647-1663. https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14310
 - Ferris, R. S. B., Ortiz, R., & Vuylsteke, D. (1999). Fruit quality evaluation of plantains, plantain hybrids, and cooking bananas. Postharvest Biology and Technology, 15(1), 73-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5214(98)00067-2
 - Firke, S. (2021). janitor: Simple Tools for Examining and Cleaning Dirty Data. In https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor
 - Firth, D. (2020). qvcalc: Quasi Variances for Factor Effects in Statistical Models. In (Version 1.0.2) https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=qvcalc
 - Firth, D., & De Menezes, R. X. (2004). Quasi-variances. Biometrika, 91(1), 65-80. https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/91.1.65
 - Guzman, M., Pérez Vicente, L., Carlier, J., Abadie, C., de Lapeyre de Bellaire, L., Carreel, F., Marin, D., Romero, R., Gauhl, F., & Pasberg-Gauhl, C. (2018). Black leaf streak. In D. R. Jones (Ed.), Handbook of Diseases of Banana, Abacá and Enset. CABI.

Accepted

- Hernández Núñez, R. (1995). Selección in vitro e invernadero de clones de Musa sp. para la evaluación de su resistencia a la Sigatoka negra (Mycosphaerella fijiensis, Morelet) CATIE]. https://repositorio.catie.ac.cr/handle/11554/3945
- Hersbach, H., Muñoz Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Rozum, I., Simmons, A., Vamborg, F., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Biavati, G., Buontempo, C., Horányi, A., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Soci, C., Dee, D., & Thépaut, J.-N. (2018). Essential climate variables for assessment of climate variability from 1979 to present Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S)
- Hijmans, R. J. (2021). terra: Spatial Data Analysis. R package version. In (Version 1.4-9) https://rspatial.org/terra/
- Hothorn, T., & Zeileis, A. (2015). partykit: A modular toolkit for recursive partytioning in R. The Journal Machine Learning Research. 16(1), 3905-3909. of https://www.jmlr.org/papers/v16/hothorn15a.html
- Hunter, D. R. (2004). MM algorithms for generalized Bradley-Terry models. Ann. Statist., 32(1), 384-406. https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1079120141
- Hyman, G., Espinosa, H., Camargo, P., Abreu, D., Devare, M., Arnaud, E., Porter, C., Mwanzia, L., Sonder, K., & Traore, S. (2017). Improving agricultural knowledge management: The AgTrials experience [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. F1000Research, 6(317). https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11179.2

- Irish, B. M., Goenaga, R., Montalvo-Katz, S., Chaves-Cordoba, B., & Van den Bergh, I. (2019). Host Response to Black Leaf Streak and Agronomic Performance of Banana Genotypes in Puerto Rico. *HortScience horts*, 54(10), 1808. https://doi.org/10.21273/hortsci13876-19
- Irish, B. M., Goenaga, R., Rios, C., Chavarria-Carvajal, J., & Ploetz, R. (2013). Evaluation of banana hybrids for tolerance to black leaf streak (Mycosphaerella fijiensis Morelet) in Puerto Rico. Crop Protection, 54, 229-238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2013.09.003
- Jacome, L. H., & Schuh, W. (1992). Effects of leaf wetness duration and temperature on development of Black Sigatoka disease on banana infected by Mycosphaerella fijiensis var. difformis. *Phytopathology*, 82(5), 515-520.
- Jones, D., & Tézenas du Montcel, H. (1994). Final Report for UNDP/World Bank on the Results of the International Musa Testing Programme (Phase I). INIBAP.

Artic

C

ccepte

- Karamura, D., & Karamura, E. (1994). A provisional checklist of banana cultivars in Uganda. INIBAP.
- Karamura, D., Karamura, E., & Tinzaara, W. (2012). Banana cultivar names, synonyms and their usage in East Africa. *Bioversity International, Uganda*.
- Kimunye, J., Jomanga, K., Tazuba, A. F., Were, E., Viljoen, A., Swennen, R., & Mahuku, G. (2021). Genotype X Environment Response of 'Matooke' Hybrids (Naritas) to Pseudocercospora fijiensis, the Cause of Black Sigatoka in Banana. *Agronomy*, 11(6), 1145. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11061145
- Kimunye, J., Were, E., Swennen, R., Viljoen, A., & Mahuku, G. (2021). Sources of resistance to Pseudocercospora fijiensis, the cause of black Sigatoka in banana. *Plant Pathology*, 70(7), 1651-1664. https://doi.org/10.1111/ppa.13408
- Kuhn, M. (2022). *caret: Classification and Regression Training*. In (Version 6.0-91) CRAN. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caret
- Luce, R. D. (1959). *Individual choice behavior: a theoretical analysis*. Dover Publications. https://doi.org/10.1037/14396-000
- Makowski, D. (2021). Editorial of the special issue "Evidence synthesis in agronomy". *European Journal of Agronomy*, *122*, 126183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2020.126183
- Ning, S.-P., Xu, L.-B., Lu, Y., Huang, B.-Z., & Ge, X.-J. (2007). Genome composition and genetic diversity of Musa germplasm from China revealed by PCR-RFLP and SSR markers. *Scientia Horticulturae*, *114*(4), 281-288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2007.07.002
- Njukwe, E., Amah, D., Ndango, R., & Tenkouano, A. (2010). Fast-Track Release of Black Leaf Streak Resistant Banana and Plantain (Musa spp.) Hybrids and Related Technologies to Farmers in Cameroon: a Strategy to Enhance Food Security. *Acta Horticulturae*, 879, 577-584. https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2010.879.64
- Noupadja, P., & Tomekpé, K. (2001). Agronomic performance of IITAs improved Musa germplasm at CRBP, Njombé, Cameroon. *Afr. Crop Sci. J*, *9*(3), 481-486. http://www.bioline.org.br/request?cs01067
- Nyombi, K., Van Asten, P. J. A., Leffelaar, P. A., Corbeels, M., Kaizzi, C. K., & Giller, K. E. (2009). Allometric growth relationships of East Africa highland bananas (Musa AAA-EAHB) cv. Kisansa and Mbwazirume. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 155(3), 403-418. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7348.2009.00353.x
- Orjeda, G. (1998). Evaluation of Musa germplasm resistance to Sigatoka diseases and Fusarium wilt. *INIBAP technical guidelines*.
- Orjeda, G. (2000). Evaluating Bananas: A Global Partnership: Results of IMTP Phase II. Bioversity International.

- Ortiz, R., & Vuylsteke, D. (1998). 'BITA-3': A Starchy Banana with Partial Resistance to Black Sigatoka and Tolerance to Streak Virus. *HortScience HortSci*, 33(2), 358-359. https://doi.org/10.21273/hortsci.33.2.358
- Pebesma, E. (2018). Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *The R journal*, *10*(1), 439--446. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-009
- Pedersen, T. L. (2020). *patchwork: The Composer of Plots*. In (Version 1.1.1) https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=patchwork
- Pennisi, E. (2010). Armed and Dangerous. *Science*, *327*(5967), 804-805. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.327.5967.804
- Perez-Vicente, L., Carreel, F., Roussel, V., Carlier, J., & Abadie, C. (2021). Guidelines for the evaluation of Pseudocercospora resistance to leaf spots of banana. In M. Dita (Ed.), *Practical guidelines for early screening and field evaluation of banana against Fusarium wilt, Pseudocercospora leaf spots and drought.* Bioversity International.
- Philipp, M., Rusch, T., Hornik, K., & Strobl, C. (2018). Measuring the Stability of Results From Supervised Statistical Learning. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 27(4), 685-700. https://doi.org/10.1080/10618600.2018.1473779
- Philipp, M., Zeileis, A., & Strobl, C. (2016). A toolkit for stability assessment of tree-based learners. http://hdl.handle.net/10419/146128
- Plackett, R. L. (1975). The Analysis of Permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. *Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 24(2), 193-202. https://doi.org/10.2307/2346567

Accepted Articl

- R Core Team. (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/
- Rowe, P., & Rosales, F. (1993). Diploid breeding at FHIA and the development of Goldfinger (FHIA-01). *InfoMusa*, 2(2), 9-11.
- Ruas, M., Guignon, V., Sempere, G., Sardos, J., Hueber, Y., Duvergey, H., Andrieu, A., Chase, R., Jenny, C., Hazekamp, T., Irish, B., Jelali, K., Adeka, J., Ayala-Silva, T., Chao, C. P., Daniells, J., Dowiya, B., Effa effa, B., Gueco, L., . . . Rouard, M. (2017). MGIS: managing banana (Musa spp.) genetic resources information and highthroughput genotyping data. *Database*, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1093/database/bax046
- Sakyi-Dawson, E., Asamoah-Bonti, P., & Amponsah Annor, G. (2008). Biochemical changes in new plantain and cooking banana hybrids at various stages of ripening. *Journal of* the Science of Food and Agriculture, 88(15), 2724-2729. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.3399
- Schloerke, B., Cook, D., Larmarange, J., Briatte, F., Marbach, M., Thoen, E., Elberg, A., & Crowley, J. (2021). GGally: Extension to 'ggplot2'. In https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=GGally
- Simko, I., & Pechenick, D. A. (2010). Combining partially ranked data in plant breeding and biology: I. Rank aggregating methods. *Communications in Biometry and Crop Science*, 5(1), 41-55. http://agrobiol.sggw.waw.pl/~cbcs/articles/CBCS_5_1_7.pdf
- Strobl, C., Malley, J., & Tutz, G. (2009). An Introduction to Recursive Partitioning: Rationale, Application and Characteristics of Classification and Regression Trees, Bagging and Random Forests. *Psychological methods*, 14(4), 323-348. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016973
- Tenkouano, A., Lamien, N., Agogbua, J., Amah, D., Swennen, R., Traoré, S., Thiemele, D., Aby, N., Kobenan, K., Gnonhouri, G., Yao, N., Astin, G., Sawadogo-Kabore, S., Tarpaga, V., Issa, W., Lokossou, B., Adjanohoun, A., Amadji, G. L., Adangnitode, S., . . . Ortiz, R. (2019). Promising High-Yielding Tetraploid Plantain-Bred Hybrids in

West Africa. International Journal of Agronomy, 2019, 3873198. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/3873198

- Tenkouano, A., Ortiz, R., & Nokoe, S. (2012). Repeatability and optimum trial configuration for field-testing of banana and plantain. *Scientia Horticulturae*, *140*, 39-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2012.03.023
- Tennekes, M. (2018). tmap: Thematic Maps in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 84(6), 1 39. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v084.i06
- Thomas, D. S., Turner, D. W., & Eamus, D. (1998). Independent effects of the environment on the leaf gas exchange of three banana (Musa sp.) cultivars of different genomic constitution. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 75(1), 41-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4238(98)00114-9
- Turner, D. W. (1995). The response of the plant to the environment. In S. Gowen (Ed.), *Bananas and Plantains* (pp. 206-229). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0737-2 9
- Turner, D. W., Fortescue, J. A., & Thomas, D. S. (2007). Environmental physiology of the bananas (Musa spp.). *Brazilian Journal of Plant Physiology*, 19, 463-484. http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1677-04202007000400013&nrm=iso
- Turner, H. L., van Etten, J., Firth, D., & Kosmidis, I. (2020). Modelling rankings in R: the PlackettLuce package. *Computational Statistics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-020-00959-3
- Tushemereirwe, W., Batte, M., Nyine, M., Tumuhimbise, R., Barekye, A., Tendo, S., Talengera, D., Kubiriba, J., Lorenzen, J., Swennen, R., & Uwimana, B. (2015). *Performance of NARITA banana hybrids in the preliminary yield trial for three cycles in Uganda.* I. NARO. http://www.iita.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=1500c39e-7c05-4219-b649-85cdb1bd73f6&groupId=25357

14350645, ja, Downloaded from https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acsess.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acses.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acses.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acses.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acses.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library on [04/08/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://acses.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/agj2.21436 by Cochrane Costa Rica, Wiley Online Library.wi

- van Etten, J., Beza, E., Calderer, L., van Duijvendijk, K., Fadda, C., Fantahun, B., Kidane, Y. G., van de Gevel, J., Gupta, A., Mengistu, D. K., Kiambi, D. A. N., Mathur, P. N., Mercado, L., Mittra, S., Mollel, M. J., Rosas, J. C., Steinke, J., Suchini, J. G., & Zimmerer, K. S. (2019). First experiences with a novel farmer citizen science approach: crowdsourcing participatory variety selection through on-farm triadic comparisons of technologies (tricot). *Experimental Agriculture*, 55(S1), 275-296. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479716000739
- van Etten, J., de Sousa, K., Aguilar, A., Barrios, M., Coto, A., Dell'Acqua, M., Fadda, C., Gebrehawaryat, Y., van de Gevel, J., Gupta, A., Kiros, A. Y., Madriz, B., Mathur, P., Mengistu, D. K., Mercado, L., Nurhisen Mohammed, J., Paliwal, A., Pè, M. E., Quirós, C. F., . . . Steinke, J. (2019). Crop variety management for climate adaptation supported by citizen science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(10), 4194-4199. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1813720116
- van Wesemael, J., Kissel, E., Eyland, D., Lawson, T., Swennen, R., & Carpentier, S. (2019). Using Growth and Transpiration Phenotyping Under Controlled Conditions to Select Water Efficient Banana Genotypes [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00352
- Vanhove, A.-C., Vermaelen, W., Panis, B., Swennen, R., & Carpentier, S. (2012). Screening the banana biodiversity for drought tolerance: can an in vitro growth model and proteomics be used as a tool to discover tolerant varieties and understand homeostasis [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 3. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2012.00176

https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl Article of Computational and

Accepted

- Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis Springer-Verlag.
- Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2022). readxl: Read Excel Files. In (Version 1.4.0)
- Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2022). dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation. In (Version 1.0.8) https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr
- Wickham, H., Hester, J., & Bryan, J. (2022). readr: Read Rectangular Text Data. In (Version 2.1.2) https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr
- Yonow, T., Ramirez-Villegas, J., Abadie, C., Darnell, R. E., Ota, N., & Kriticos, D. J. (2019). Black Sigatoka in bananas: Ecoclimatic suitability and disease pressure assessments. PLoS ONE, 14(8), e0220601. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220601
- Zeileis, A., Hothorn, T., & Hornik, K. (2008). Model-Based Recursive Partitioning. Journal Graphical Statistics, 17(2), 492-514. https://doi.org/10.1198/106186008X319331