Residual Effect of Mulching on Soil Properties in Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna Agroecology of Nigeria

S. T. Wuese E. T. Agabi P. C. Daboro

ABSTRACT

The objective of this experiment is to examine the residual effect of mulching on soil properties in Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna Agroecology of Nigeria. This study is carried out in the 2016 cropping season as a follow-up research from the 2015 trials at the Teaching and Research Farm of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi. It involves the re-cultivation of an experimental set-up, which has five treatments, 2 and 4t/ha of both dead grasses and sawdust as well as a control which has been replicated three times in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). Soil samples from each treatment are analysed before and after the experiment and percentage changes in the parameters calculated. Results reveal that in addition to soil surface protection, the decomposition of the mulch applied from 4t/ha improved soil physical properties like bulk density and porosity. It also increases chemical properties such as pH, organic matter, nitrogen, phosphorus, cations and base saturation which could significantly improve crop performance. It has demonstrated that the effect of mulching at 4t/ha goes beyond the first season after it is applied on the farm. That when mulches decompose, they release their constituent nutrients into the soil and these can be made available in the succeeding season(s) for crop use.

Keywords: Soil, mulching, organic matter, residual effect and soil properties.

INTRODUCTION

Continuous cropping without addition of nutrients and organic matter is a major threat to sustainable crop production in sub-Saharan Africa (Anikwe, 1994). Mbah and Onweremadu (2009) state that about 70% of Nigeria's soils are derived from granite and have limited inherent agricultural potentials, with these soils being light textured, most often infertile and deficient in nitrogen, phosphorus and sulphur. Water holding capacity and organic matter status of these granite-derived

S. T. Wuese^{*} and *E. T. Agabi* are Lecturers in the Department of Soil Science, University of Agriculture, P. M. B 2373, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. *E-mail: kumedula@gmail.com.

P. C. Daboro is a Lecturer in the Department of Agricultural Technology, Plateau State College of Agriculture, PMB 001, Garkawa, Plateau State, Nigeria.

9

This article is Licenced under 😳 😳 😳 3.0 Unported License

soils are poor (Anikwe and Nwobodo, 2002). These low fertility soils are susceptible to degradation upon cultivation especially where management is not appropriate (Burt and Akamigbo, 1990). Infiltration and soil evaporation are among the key processes that determine soil water availability to crops in semiarid agriculture (Lal, 1975). He states further that the presence of crop residue mulch at the soil-atmosphere interface has a direct influence on infiltration of rainwater into the soil and evaporation from the soil. Mulch cover reduces surface runoff and holds rainwater at the soil surface thereby giving it more time to infiltrate into the soil. Trials conducted in certain parts of Nigeria between 1988 and 1995 indicated that mulching significantly reduced surface runoff and hence soil loss (Biswas and Khosla, 1971). Mulch cover shields the soil. Soil biota increases under mulched soil environment thereby improving nutrient cycling and organic matter build-up upon its decomposition in succeeding seasons (Chaudhry, Malik and Sidhu, 2004). Mulching with a biodegradable material improves soil physical properties and enhances soil microbial activities which result in release of nutrients and changes in other chemical properties of soil (Glab and Kulig, 2008).

There is therefore dire need for a critical assessment of the residual impact of mulching on soil properties in order to bring to the fore the after-effect usefulness of mulching with a view to maximize the full benefits of this important agronomic practice. This will further add to the efforts at enhancing food security in Nigeria at reduced inputs. The objective of the study was to assess the residual effect of mulching on soil properties in the study area.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Experiment was carried out at the Teaching and Research Farm of University of Agriculture Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna Agro ecological zone of Nigeria. It is located between latitude $7^{0} 41^{I}$ N to $7^{0} 42^{I}$ N and longitude $8^{0}37$ E to $8^{0}38$ E at the average elevation of 97m above mean sea level with slope ranging from 1 – 5%, with annual rainfall of about 1,250mm and a mean temperature of 25-30°C (Agber, Wuese and Ali, 2017). The soil is classified as Typic ustropepts based on the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) soil taxonomy (Fagbami and Akamigbo, 1986).

The experiment consisted of 5 treatments replicated 3 times in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). Sawdust and dead grasses previously used as mulching material the preceding cropping season (2015) was incorporated the proceeding season (2016) to serve as manure. The vegetative cover was manually cleared. Ridges were prepared 0.5m high and 0.75m wide on previously mulched plots. Soil samples were taken with auger and core samplers for soil physical and chemical analyses. Soil samples were collected before and after the experiment, one bulk samples was collected representing the initial state of the soil, but at the end of the experiment two (2) bulk samples were taken from each treatment and separately analyzed to cross check with that at the beginning of the experiment.

Soil analysis was carried out at the Advanced Analytical Soil Testing Laboratory of the Department of the Soil Science, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State in Nigeria. The soil samples were air dried, gently crushed using mortar and pestle and passed through a 2mm sieve. The sieved samples were collected and packed for laboratory analysis. The parameters were analysed using standard procedures as follows: Particle size distribution (Bouyoucos, 1951), bulk density (Core method), soil total porosity (% F) was calculated from the relation % Ft= (1-Bd/pd) x 100 where Bd is the bulk density and pd particle density, soil pH in water (1:1) was determined using the pH meter, organic matter from organic carbon (wet oxidation method of Walkley and Black, 1934): % organic matter in soil = organic carbon x 1.724, total nitrogen was determined by the Macro-kjeldahl digestion method (Jackson, 1965), Cation exchange capacity was determined by neutral ammonium acetate method, Available Phosphorus was determined by Bray -1 method (Bray and Kurtz, 1945), Exchangeable cations were determined by atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Mehlich, 1984), Base saturation was determined by dividing the sample of exchangeable bases by the cation exchange capacity and multiplying by 100.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the soil physical and chemical properties in 2015 and 2016 are presented on Tables 1 and 3, Tables 2 and 4 are the statuses of soil properties, while Table 5 presents the percentage changes in the soil properties between the 2015 and 2016 season after application of mulching. The result of the soil physical properties as presented on Table 1 shows that soil bulk density at 0-15cm depth ranged from 1.39-1.41g cm⁻³ at T₂ and T₄ to T₁ respectively. At 15-30cm, it was from 1.41gcm⁻³ at T₃ and T₄ to 1.48gcm⁻³ at T₁ and at T₅. The result of porosity shows that at 0-15cm, the lowest porosity is obtained from T₃ with 46.54% while the highest was at T₁ with 51.64%. The result of soil chemical properties is presented on Table 1. It shows that the pH at 0-15 ranged from 6.69 at T₃ to 6.72 at T₁. At 15-30cm, it ranged from 6.73 at T₁ and T₄ to 6.77 at T₅. Organic matter

International Journal of Water and Soil Resources Research Volume 4, Number 1, April 2018 ISSN: 2276-8823

at 0-15cm ranged from 1.34 at T₁ to 1.38 at T₂. At 15-30cm, it ranged from 1.19 at T₁ to 1.47 at T₅. Nitrogen at 0-15cm ranged from 0.033% at T₁ to 0.055% at T₅. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.024% at T₁ to 0.039% at T₅. Phosphorus at 0-15cm ranged from 3.00mgkg⁻¹ at T₁ to 4.80mgkg⁻¹ at T₅. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.20Cmol/kg⁻¹ at T₅. The result of cations, including potassium at 0-15cm ranged from 0.20Cmol/kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 0.39Cmol/kg⁻¹ at T₂ and T₃. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.20Cmol/kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 0.39Cmol/kg⁻¹ at T₂. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.23Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 0.37Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₂. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.22Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 0.34Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃. Magnesium at 0-15cm as ranged from 2.09Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 2.42Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃. At 15-30cm, it ranged from 2.03Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 2.16Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃, however at 15-30cm, it ranged from 2.29Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 2.34Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃.

The Exchangeable Acidity at 0-15cm ranged from 0.97Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₅ to 0.99Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₂ and T₃. While at 15-30cm, it ranged from 0.96Cmolkg⁻¹ at T₁, T₂, T₄ and T₅ to 0.97Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃. Total Exchangeable bases at 0-15cm ranged from 5.04Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 5.79Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃. At 15-30cm, it ranged from 4.63Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 5.53Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₄. The Cation Exchange Capacity at 0-15cm ranged from 5.79Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₅ to 6.79Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₃. At 15-30cm, it ranged from 5.59Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₁ to 6.48Cmol kg⁻¹ at T₄. The Base saturation at 0-15cm as ranged from 84.06% at T₁ to 85.35% at T₄, while at 15-30cm, it ranged from 83.57% at T₃ to 85.07% at T₄.

The result of soil analysis at the end of the 2016 season reveals that there was improvement in soil physical properties. There was decreased bulk density and increased porosity under the mulched plots opposed to the control. Improved porosity means increased infiltration and aeration. This will have effect on decomposition of soil organic matter, leading to higher availability of plant food (Nutrient elements) and increased crop performance. This is in agreement with the works of Lal (1975), who posits that application of surface crop residue at the rate of 4-6 t/ha increased infiltration, an indication of predominance of macropores in the profile. Tian, Kang and Brossard (1994) confirm that when organic mulches decompose, they increase soil organic matter content, CEC, enhance biological activity, improve soil structure and increase plant nutrients. Wuese (2018) obtains higher soil nutrients when much sawdust was applied at the rate of 4-8 t/ha in Makurdi under open and tied ridges as well as flat cultivation. There was decreased soil pH (tending towards neutrality), increased organic matter, Nitrogen, Phosphorus and cations as well as base saturation in the succeeding season. This means increased soil fertility which will eventually lead

to higher crop yield when compared to unmatched plots. Lal (1975) observes higher soil fertility status and cation exchange capacity in mulched plots. He concludes that mulched plots usually have higher concentration of divalent cations on the exchange complex, more total nitrogen and available phosphorus than unmulched plots. The decomposition of applied much materials such as chipped wood has been observed to increase soil fertility and maintain soil organic matter (Chiroma, Folorunsho and Alhassan, 2006; Hendrickson, 1987), and improve soil physical properties (Lalande, Furlan, Angers and Lemieux, 1998). Tiarks, Mazurak and Chesnin (1974) confirm that when mulches decompose, they release their inherent nutrient elements as seen in increased residual phosphorus in the succeeding season. They further state that mulch form *Gliricidia sepium* at 5t/ ha., significantly increased crude protein, carbohydrates, nitrogen, phosphorus and ash content of maize grain in both years of cropping season, thereby improving nutritional content of maize grain. The results of the data from this work suggest that in addition to soil surface to protection, when mulches decompose in the soil, they improve soil physical properties like bulk density, and porosity and increase chemical properties such as pH, organic matter, N, P, cation and base saturation. This leads to higher crop performance in the following seasons.

CONCLUSION

Residual Effect of Mulching on Soil Properties in Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna Agroecology of Nigeria was examined. It was conducted in the 2016 cropping season as a follow-up study from the 2015 trials at the Teaching and Research Farm of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi. The re-cultivation of an experimental set-up, which had five treatments, including control was replicated three times in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The result of soil analysis at the end of the 2016 season revealed that there was improvement in soil physical properties. There was decreased bulk density and increased porosity under the mulched plots opposed to the control. Improved porosity means increased infiltration and aeration. This will have effect on decomposition of soil organic matter, leading to higher availability of plant food (Nutrient elements) and increased crop performance. This study revealed that the effect of mulching at 4t/ha went beyond the first season after it is applied on the farm. That when mulches decompose, they released their constituent nutrients into the soil and these can be made available in the succeeding season(s) for crop use.

REFERENCES

- Agber P. I., Wuese S. T. and Ali A. (2017). Effect of tillage and mulching on soil moisture storage and yield of Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L. Moench) on an Inceptisol in Makurdi, Southern Guinea savanna of Nigeria. International Journal of Agricultural Research and Food Production, 2(4), 15-47.
- Anikwe, M. A. N. and Nwobodo, K. C. A. (2002). Long-term effect of municipal wastes disposal on soil properties and productivity of sites used for urban agriculture in Abakaliki, Nigeria. Bioresources Technology, 83, 241-250.
- Anikwe, M. A. N. (1994). Amelioration of a heavy clay loam with rice husk and its effect on soil physical properties and maize yield. Bioresources Technology, 74, 169-173.
- Biswas, T. D. and Khosla B. K. (1971). Building up Organic matter status and its relation to the soil physical properties (pp831-842), Volume 1. In: International Symposium on Fertilizer Evaluation. New Delhi, India.
- Bouyoucos, G. J. (1951). A Recalibration of the Hydrometer method for making Mechanical Analysis of Soils. Agronomy Journal, 43(9), 434-438.
- Bray, R. H. and Kurtz, L. T. (1945). Determination of Total, Organic and Available forms of phosphorus in Soils. Soil Science, 59(1), 39 - 45.
- Burt, C. L. A. and Akamigbo, F. O. R. (1990). Relative contribution of organic matter and clay fractions on cation exchange capacity of soils in southern Nigeria. Bamaeu Journal of Agricultural Research, 7, 17-23.
- Chaudhry M. R., Malik A. A. and Sidhu M. (2004). Mulching impact on moisture conservation, soil properties and plant growth. Pakistan Journal of Water Resources, 8 (2), 1-8.
- Chiroma A. M., Folorunso O. A. and Alhassan A. B. (2006). The Effects of Land Configuration and Wood-shaving Mulch on the Properties of a Sandy Loam soil in Northeast Nigeria. Changes in Physical properties. Tropicultura, 30, 101-121.
- Fagbami, A. and Akamigbo, F. O. R. (1986). Soils of Benue State their Capabilities. Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference of the Soil Science Society of Nigeria held in Makurdi between 4th – 7th November (pp 49 – 52).
- Glab, T. and Kulig, B. (2008). Effect of mulch and tillage system on soil porosity under wheat (Triticum aestivum). Soil and Tillage Research, 99 (2), 169-178.

- Hendrickson, O. (1987). Winter branch nutrients in northern conifers and hardwoods. Forest Science, 33 (4), 1068 - 1074.
- Jackson, B. N. (1965). In: Particle Size Analysis, Part 1. Physical and microbiological methods. Agronomy series, 9, ASA, ASSA, Madison, Wisconson Second edition. 1973. 14pp.
- Lal, R. (1975). Role of Mulching Techniques in Tropical Soil and Water Management. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan. Technical Bulletin, No.1. 35pp.
- Lalande R., Furlan V., Angers D. A. and Lemieux G. (1998). Soil Improvement following addition of clipped wood from twigs. American Journal of Alternative Agriculture, 13, 132 – 137.
- Mbah, C. N. and Onweremadu, E. U. (2009). Effect of organic and mineral fertilizer inputs on soil and maize grain yield in an Acid Ultisol in Abakaliki, South Eastern Nigeria. American-Eurasian Journal of Agronomy, 2(1), 7-12.
- Mehlich, A. (1984). Mehlich 3 soil test extractant: A modification of Mehlich 2 extractant. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 15 (12), 1409-1416.
- Tian G., Kang B. and Brossard L. (1994). Mulching Effects of Plant Residue with Chemically Contrasting Composition of Maize Growth and Nutrient accumulation. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture. Research Bulletin, 9, 7-11.
- Tiarks A. E., Mazurak A. P. and Chesnin, L. (1974). Physical and chemical properties of soils associated with heavy application of manure from cattle feedlots. Soil Science Society of America Proceedings, 38(5), 826-830.
- Walkley, A. and Black, I. A. (1934). An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid method. Soil Science, 37 (1), 29-38.
- Wuese, S. T. (2018). Consumptive and Water Use Efficiency of Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L. Moench) in Makurdi, Southern Guinea Savanna Agroecological zone of Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Department of Soil Science, University of Agriculture, Makurdi-Nigeria. 169pp.

Sample	Sample Depth Sand Silt	Sand	Silt	Clay	BD	ΠP	Ηd	MO	z	Р	K	Na	Mg	Ca	EA	EB	CEC	BS
	(cm)	(cm) (%)	(%)	(%)	(gcm^{-2})	(%)	(water)	(%)	(%)	(mgkg ⁻¹)				Cmolkg ⁻¹				(%)
T_1	0-15	0-15 79.28 13.07	13.07	7.64	1.43	51.64	6.72	1.34	0.033	0.30	0.20	0.23	2.09	2.29	0.98	5.04	5.79	84.06
	15-30	15-30 79.75 13.10	13.10	7.13	1.48	44.02	6.73	1.19	0.024	0.20	0.15	0.22	2.07	2.19	0.96	4.63	5.79	83.83
ŕ	0-15	0-15 79.24 13.09	13.09	7.67	1.39	46.66	6.71	1.38	0.040	0.38	0.39	0.36	2.34	2.58	0.99	5.68	6.67	85.11
a	15-30	15-30 76.61 13.15	13.15	7.23	1.42	46.10	6.74	1.23	0.031	0.30	0.24	0.32	2.03	2.32	0.96	4.91	5.87	83.65
Ţ	0-15	0-15 79.27 13.06	13.06	7.54	1.41	46.54	6.69	1.45	0.048	0.42	0.39	0.37	2.42	2.61	0.99	5.79	6.79	85.31
	15-30	15-30 76.60	13.11	7.28	1.41	46.54	6.75	1.22	0.035	0.37	0.21	0.34	2.04	2.34	0.97	4.93	5.90	83.57
Ĩ	0-15	0-15 79.68 13.06	13.06	7.24	1.39	47.44	6.70	1.50	0.045	0.43	0.37	0.32	2.32	2.57	0.98	5.58	6.56	85.35
	15-30	15-30 79.89 13.14	13.14	6.96	1.41	46.54	6.73	1.20	0.039	0.39	0.33	0.30	2.10	2.28	0.96	5.53	6.48	85.07
ŕ	0-15	0-15 79.50 13.07	13.07	7.42	1.40	46.92	6.70	1.67	0.055	0.48	0.36	0.30	2.37	2.56	0.97	5.64	6.61	85.27
2	15-30	15-30 79.87 13.08	13.08	7.04	7.04 1.48	44.02	6.72	1.47	0.039 0.42	0.42	0.29		0.31 2.16	2.23	0.96	4.96	5.92	84.50
BD :	= Bulk	densi	ity, TP	= Tot	al porc	sity, (M = 0	organ	ic matt	er, EA	= Exc	hange	sable a	BD = Bulk density, $TP = Total$ porosity, $OM = organic$ matter, $EA = Exchangeable$ acidity, $EB = exchangeable$ Bases,	a = exc	shang	eabl	e Base
CEC	C = Can	tion e:	vchang	eable	capac	ity anc	BS =	Base	saturai	tion, $T_{_{I}}$	<i>con</i> =	trol, 1	$T_2 = 2t/h$	$CEC = Cation exchangeable capacity and BS = Base saturation, T_1 = control, T_2 = 2t/ha dry grass, T_3 = 4t/ha dry grass,$	$1SS, T_3$	=4t/	ha dr	y gras
$T_4 = Sour$	$T_4 = 2t/ha \ saw \ dust, \ T_5 = 4t/ha$. Source: Field survey. 2015 - 2016	saw d Id surv	ust, T_5	= 4t/t	$T_4 = 2t/ha \ saw \ dust, \ T_5 = 4t/ha \ saw \ dust.$	dust.												

International Journal of Water and Soil Resources Research Volume 4, Number 1, April 2018 ISSN: 2276-8823

This article is Licenced under 3.0 Unported License

Ľ.	0-15		(%)		(%)	P (mg/kg)		K (Cmol/kg)	Cm (Cm	Na (Cmol/kg)	Mg (Cmol/kg)	/kg)	Ca (Cmol/kg)	/kg)	CEC (Cmol/kg)	'kg)	BS (%)	
11		Z	Very low	Ĺ	Very low	Low	Low	~	Low		Moderate	ate	Low		Very low	M	Very high	igh
	15-30	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Ver	Very low	Low		Moderate	ate	Low		Very		Very high	igh
\mathbf{T}_2	0-15	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Mo	Moderate	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Low		Very high	igh
	15-30	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Low	×	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Very low	M	Very high	igh
\mathbf{T}_3	0-15	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Mo	Moderate	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Low		Very high	lgh
	15-30	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Low	×	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Very low	M	Very high	igh
T_4	0-15	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Mo	Moderate	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Low		Very high	igh
	15-30	Z	Very low		Very low	Low	moe	moderate	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Low		Very high	lgh
Γ_5	0-15	z	Very low		Very low	Low	Mo	Moderate	Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Low		Very high	igh
	15-30	z	Very low		Very low	Low	low		Mod	Moderate	Moderate	ate	Low		Very low	M	Very high	igh
	(cm)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(gcm ⁻³)	(%)	(water)	(%)	(%)	(mgkg- ¹)	ţ			י ק	-			(%)♠
	х 7	r.	х 7	,)			r.	r.) ,				Cmolkg ⁻¹	lkg ⁻¹			х 7
	0-15	78.88	13.01	8.11	1.48	46.15	6.70	1.29	0.027	0.27	0.22	0.21	2.16	2.34	66.0	4.93	5.92	83.28
. 6	0-15	79.16	13.14	7.70	1.44	45.66	6.74	1.38	0.035	0.37	0.39	0.39	2.37	2.74	0.98	5.89	6.87	85.74
	0-15	78.89	13.13	7.98	1.47		6.70		0.038	0.39	0.41	0.36	2.42	2.65	0.99	5.84	6.83	85.51
_	0-15	79.44	13.11	7.45	1.43		6.71	1.46	0.047	0.45	0.43	0.36	2.33	2.62	0.98	5.74	6.72	85.42
	0-15	78.94	13.00	8.06	1.42	46.42	6.69	1.63	0.051	0.37	0.37	0.36	2.35	2.63	0.99	5.71	6.70	85.22
$D = B_1$	BD =Bulk density, TP Cation exchangeable c	ity, TF ?able	$\sigma = Tot$	al por	BD = Bulk density, $TP = Total porosity$, $OM = Organic matter$, $EA = Cation exchangeable capacity and BS = Base saturation,$	$I = Or_{i}$ e saturu	ganic n ation,	iatter, i	EA = A	Exchangeable acidity, EB	geable	acidi	ty, EB		= Exchangeable bases,	able	bases,	CEC
$\int_{I} = cot$	$T_1 = control, T_2 = 2 t/ha dry$ Source: Field survey. 2016	= 2 <i>t/</i> /. rvev.	ia dry § 2016	grass, 1	$T_{i} = control, T_{2} = 2 t/ha dry grass, T_{3} = 4 t/ha dry grass, T_{4} = 2 t/ha saw dust, T_{5} = 4 t/ha saw dust. Source: Field survey. 2016$	a dry g	rass, T_4	t = 2 t/t	ha saw	, dust, T	s = 4 t/	ha sav	v dust.					

International Journal of Water and Soil Resources Research Volume 4, Number 1, April 2018 ISSN: 2276-8823

This article is Licenced under 3.0 Unported License

17

(%) (%) (mgkg ⁻¹) ← Cmolkg ⁻¹ eutral Very low Very low Low Low Low Moderate Low Very low Very low Very low Very low Low Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Ve eutral Very low Very low Low Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Ve eutral Very low Very low Low Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Ve eutral Very low Very low Low Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Ve eutral Very low Very low Low Moderate Moderate Low Moderate Ve EA = Exchangeable acidity, EB = exchangeable Bases, CEC = Cation exchangeable capacity and	(mgk w Low w Low w Low w Low w Low w Low w w Low w y , $EB = e$	(mgkg-1) \leftarrow Low Low Low Low = exchan t = exchan Ss, $T_3 = 4t$	(cm) (%) (mgkg- ¹) Cmolkg ⁻¹ T ₁ 0-15 Neutral Very low Very low Low Moderate Low Woderate Low Very low	Low Moderate Moderate Moderate Moderate $rass, T_4 = 2$	Cmolkg ⁻¹ Modera ate Modera ate Modera ate Modera ate Modera $C = Cation \epsilon$	nolkg ⁻¹ Moderate Moderate Moderate <u>Moderate</u> <i>ation excha</i> <i>a saw dust</i> ,	Low Low Low Low Low $T_s = 4_1$	Very low Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>e capacity</i> <i>t/ha saw a</i>	Very high Very high Very high Very high Very high Very high <i>ust</i> .
Very lo Very lo Very lo Very lo Very lo Very lo	w Low w Low w Low w Low <u>w Low</u> <i>y</i> ; <i>EB</i> = (<i>y</i> ; <i>grass</i> , (exchan	Low Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>igeable Bc</i> <i>t/ha dry gi</i>	Low Modera Modera Modera <i>ases, CE(</i> <i>rass, T₄</i> =	Mo the Mo the Mo the Mo the Mo C = Cati	derate derate derate derate derate ion exchu saw dust,	Low Low Low Low Low $T_5 = 4$	Very low Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>le capacity</i>	Very high Very high Very high Very high Very high <i>ust.</i>
Very lo Very lo Very lo Very lo <i>v</i> ery lo <i>v</i> ery lo	w Low w Low w Low w Low <i>y</i> , <i>EB</i> =	$T_{3} = 4 t$	Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>igeable Bc</i> <i>t/ha dry g1</i>	Modera Modera Modera Modera <i>ases, CE(</i> <i>rass, T₄</i> =	the Mo the Mo the Mo the Mo $\frac{C = Cati}{C = t/ha s}$	iderate derate derate derate ion exchu saw dust,	Low Low Low $T_{s} = 4$	Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>E capacity</i> <i>t/ha saw a</i>	Very high Very high Very high Very high <i>very high</i> <i>ust.</i>
Very lo Very lo Very lo <i>:able acidi</i>	w Low w Low w Low $\frac{w}{by, EB = \frac{1}{2}}$	$\frac{v}{T_3} = 4 t$	Moderate Moderate Moderate <i>igeable Bu</i> <i>t/ha dry gi</i>	Modera Modera Modera $\underline{13es}, \underline{CE}$	the Mo the Mo the Mo C = Cati = 2 t/ha s	derate derate <u>ion exchr</u> saw dust,	Low Low $T_{5} = 4$	Moderate Moderate <u>Moderate</u> <i>le capacity</i> <i>t/ha saw a</i>	Very high Very high Very high <i>and</i> <i>ust.</i>
Very lo Very lo able acidi	w Low w Low $y, EB = \frac{1}{2}$	$T_{3} = 4 t$	Moderate Moderate <i>igeable Bc</i> <i>t/ha dry gi</i>	Modera Modera <i>ises, CE(</i> <i>rass, T₄</i> =	the Mo $\frac{1}{C} = Cati$ C = Cati C = 2 t/ha s	vderate vderate ion excha	Low Low $T_5 = 4$	Moderate Moderate <i>le capacity</i> t/ha saw d	Very high Very high <i>and</i> <i>ust</i> .
Very lo able acidi	$\frac{w Low}{ty, EB = c}$	$T_3 = 4 t$	Moderate <i>igeable Bc</i> <i>t/ha dry gy</i>	$\frac{Modera}{nses, CE(}$	the Mo C = Cati C = 2 t/ha s	derate ion excha	Low $T_5 = 4$	Moderate le capacity t/ha saw d	Very high and ust.
able acidi	ty, EB = c	$exchan T_3 = 4 t$	igeable Bo t/ha dry gi	rass, $T_4 =$	$C = Cati$ $\therefore 2 t/ha s$	on excha	$T_5 = 4$	le capacity t/ha saw d	and lust.
(%)	(%)	(%)	(mg/kg)	,		C)molkg ⁻¹		(%)
10.63 0.29	3.70	18.18	91.00	-10.00 8.			-91.02	2.18	-2.25 0.93
2.14 -0.45	00.0	12.50	2.63	0.00 -8			1.01	3.70	-2.99 -0.74
4.28 -0.15	1.38	20.83	7.14	-5.13 2.7		8 -9.50	0.00	-0.86	-0.59 -0.23
10.92 -0.15	2.67	4.44	4.65	-16.22 -1			0.00	-2.44	-2.44 -0.082
1.07 -0.15									
	il Proper TP pH (%) (%) (%) (%) (%) (%) (%) (%) (%) (%)	il Properties afte (P pH 0M %) (%) 0.63 0.29 3.70 1.14 -0.45 0.00 28 -0.15 1.38 0.92 -0.15 2.67 0.00	II Properties after the P pH OM N % (%) (%) (%) 0.53 0.29 3.70 18.18 .14 -0.45 0.00 12.50 .28 -0.15 1.38 20.83 0.92 -0.15 2.67 4.44	II Froperties atter tine Experiin PpH OM N P %0 (%0) (%0) (mg/kg) 0.63 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 1.4 -0.45 0.00 12.50 2.63 2.8 -0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 0.92 -0.15 2.67 4.44 4.65	il Properties after the Experiment 201 rP pH OM N F N %) (%) (%) (mg/kg) 4 N %) (%) (%) (mg/kg) 4 000 8 0.63 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8 0.14 -0.45 0.00 12.50 2.63 0.00 -8 0.28 -0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 -5.13 2 0.29 -0.15 2.67 4.44 -4.65 -16.22 -1	ill Properties after the Experiment 2016 at 0- P µH OM N P K Na Ca % (%) (%) (%) (mg/kg) 4 Ca % (%) (%) (mg/kg) 4 Ca % 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8.70 5.6 0.63 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8.70 7.2 0.28 -0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 -5.13 2.70 7.2 0.92 -0.15 2.67 4.44 4.65 -16.22 -12.50 9.3	il Properties after the Experiment 2016 at 0-15 cm l IP P K Na Ca Mg %0 (%0) (%0) mg/kg) C 00 %0 (%0) (%0) mg/kg) C 00 %1 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8.70 5.68 -11.96 %2 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8.70 7.28 -11.96 %2 0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 -5.13 2.70 7.28 9.50 %2 0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 -4.65 -16.22 -12.93 9.34 -12.93	Properties after the Experiment 2016 at 0-15 cm De pH OM N P K Na Ca Mg pH OM N P K Na Ca Mg $(%)$ $(\%)$ (mg/kg) \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet 0.29 3.70 18.18 91.00 -10.00 8.70 5.68 -11.96 0.45 0.00 12.50 2.63 0.00 8.33 8.14 -17.06 -0.15 1.38 20.83 7.14 -5.13 2.70 7.28 9.50 -0.15 2.67 4.44 -4.65 -16.22 -12.50 9.34 -12.93	0

International Journal of Water and Soil Resources Research Volume 4, Number 1, April 2018 ISSN: 2276-8823