Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Response of Hybrid Maize to NP Fertilizers rates, Nutrient uptake and Nutrient use efficiency in the central rift valley of Ethiopia

Mesfin Hundessa

hundessamesfin@gmail.com

EIAR

Gelmesa Gudeta

Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research

Research Article

Keywords: maize, nitrogen, phosphorus, nutrient use efficiency, economic analysis, Ethiopia

Posted Date: September 29th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11160137/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

*Maize (*Zea mays *L.) is a major cereal crop in Ethiopia, yet its productivity remains constrained by soil fertility decline and inefficient fertilizer use under rain-fed conditions. This study evaluated the response of hybrid maize variety BH-546 to different nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) fertilizer rates, with emphasis on grain yield, biomass production, nutrient use efficiency, and economic profitability in the central rift valley of Ethiopia. Field experiments were conducted from 2022 to 2024 at Negelle Arsi research station and on farmers' fields in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Five N rates (46, 69, 92, 115, and 138 kg N ha⁻¹) and three P rates (10, 20, and 30 kg P ha⁻¹), plus an unfertilized control, were evaluated. Results indicated that NP fertilizer rates significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) affected grain and biomass yields. Grain yield ranged from 1.45 to 4.82 t ha⁻¹, while biomass yield varied from 7.1 to 17.3 t ha⁻¹. The application of 69 kg N ha⁻¹ combined with 10 kg P ha⁻¹ produced the highest grain yield (4,817 kg ha⁻¹) and biomass yield (17,256 kg ha⁻¹). This treatment also recorded the highest agronomic efficiency (24.1 kg grain kg⁻¹ nutrient) and economic return, with a marginal rate of return of 839%. Higher NP rates did not improve yield and reduced nutrient use efficiency. Overall, balanced application of 69 kg N ha⁻¹ and 10 kg P ha⁻¹ is recommended as the most efficient and economically profitable fertilizer management option for hybrid maize production in the central rift valley of Ethiopia.*

Introduction

Maize (Zea mays L.) is one of the most important cereal crops in Ethiopia. It plays a vital role in national food security and supports rural livelihoods. People widely consume it as a staple food. It is also used for animal feed and as raw material in industries. Ethiopia is now the largest maize producer in Sub-Saharan Africa, with maize making up a significant part of total cereal production (FAO, 2022; CSA, 2023). Maize production in Ethiopia relies heavily on rainfall, which makes it susceptible to changes in climate. Erratic rainfall distribution, delayed onset of rains, and more frequent dry spells during crucial growth periods are major challenges (Kassie et al., 2015).

Smallholder farmers mainly grow maize under rain-fed conditions in various agro-ecological zones. This is especially true in the mid-altitude sub-humid areas of Oromia, Amhara, SNNPR, and some parts of Benishangul-Gumuz (Abate et al., 2015). Even though several high-yielding and stress-tolerant maize hybrids have been introduced, their adoption is still limited. This is due to the high cost of seeds, inadequate supply, and weak distribution systems (Abate et al., 2015).

Despite its significance, maize productivity in Ethiopia is far below its potential. The national average grain yield is around 3–4 t ha⁻¹, which is much lower than the 8–10 t ha⁻¹ achieved at research stations and demonstration plots (Abate et al., 2015; Tsedeke et al., 2017).

Soil fertility decline is widely seen as the biggest obstacle to maize production in Ethiopia. Continuous farming, limited use of organic matter and nutrient depletion has led to a serious loss of essential nutrients (Haileslassie et al., 2005; Agegnehu et al., 2016). Nitrogen is the most important nutrient for maximizing maize harvests (Kong et al., 2008). A lack of soil phosphorus reduces the effectiveness of

nitrogen use by crops (Delve et al., 2009). Phosphorus is the second most limiting nutrient in soil after nitrogen (Balemi and Negisho, 2012) and is crucial for plant growth. In tropical agroecosystems, phosphorus deficiency significantly hampers crop production (Mustonen et al., 2012).

Nitrogen plays a key role in leaf development and chlorophyll production, which gives maize its vibrant green color. It promotes vegetative growth, kernel formation, and overall grain yield. Phosphorus is vital for protein synthesis that strengthens plant tissues. Low organic matter in the soil further decreases nutrient availability and water retention, negatively impacting maize growth and yield (Tilahun et al., 2018).

Fertilizer recommendations in Ethiopia have traditionally been based on blanket application rates of DAP and urea, without considering soil type, agro-ecology, or specific crop needs. This method has led to poor nutrient use efficiency and subpar maize yields (Gete et al., 2010).

Nutrient losses due to volatilization, leaching, and fixation—especially phosphorus fixation in acidic and Vertisol soils is common (Agegnehu & Lakew, 2013). Poor timing and placement of fertilizers worsen these inefficiencies.

Climate change projections suggest rising temperatures and increased rainfall variability. These changes could further hinder maize productivity unless adaptation measures are put in place (Tesfaye et al., 2017).

Smallholder farmers often use recycled seeds, which results in lower yield potential and greater vulnerability to pests and diseases. Different varieties have shown varying yields across farms. The productivity of maize varieties in order of yield on farms around Bako Tibe, Western Ethiopia is BH-661, BH-660, BH-540, BH-543, and BH-140 (Tolera et al., 2017). However, little research has been done on the response of the improved maize variety BH-546 to varying rates of phosphorus and nitrogen in balanced fertilization under rain-fed conditions at Negelle Arsi, in the central rift valley of Ethiopia. This study aims to explore the optimal combinations of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizer rates for the BH-546 maize variety at Negelle Arsi, central rift valley of Ethiopia.

Experimental Design and Treatment

The experiment took place at Negelle Arsi station and on two farmers' fields in the main maize production areas of the Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia from 2022 to 2024. It was designed as an incomplete factorial arrangement with a complete block layout, repeated three times. Five levels of nitrogen (46, 69, 92, 115, 138 kg N ha^{-1}) were combined with three levels of phosphorus (10, 20, and 30 kg P ha^{-1}) for the experimental plots. This resulted in a total of 15 treatment combinations. Maize variety BH-546 without fertilizer served as the control treatment. The test crop was maize variety BH-546 from a sub-humid mid-altitude area.

The plot size was 4.0 m wide and 3.75 m long (15 m²), containing five rows of maize plants. Yield and yield component data were collected from the three middle rows, while the outer two rows acted as border rows. Improved seeds of the variety were planted in rows spaced 75 cm apart and 25 cm (30 cm) between plants. The specified nitrogen rates were applied in two parts: half at planting and the rest when the plants reached knee height. The three phosphorus rates (10, 20, and 30 kg P ha^{-1}) were uniformly applied to all treatments at planting. Urea was the source of nitrogen, while triple superphosphate (TSP) provided phosphorus. All other agronomic management practices followed the recommendations for the variety.

Materials and Methods

3.1 Site and Experimental Conditions

The experiment was carried out in Negelle Arsi district, located in the central rift valley of Ethiopia. The area lies at an altitude of 1,500–2,000 meters above sea level, with an average annual rainfall of 800-1,200 mm, primarily concentrated between June and September. The mean daily temperature varies between 12 and 25°C, providing favorable conditions for maize cultivation. The soils of the district are predominantly Nitisols and Vertisols, moderately fertile but increasingly depleted due to continuous cultivation without adequate nutrient replenishment

The study was conducted using hybrid maize variety BH-546, which is well adapted to the agro-ecology of the central rift valley. The experimental design consisted of randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications. Treatments included varying rates of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers, with the optimum rate identified as 69 kg N/ha and 10 kg P/ha. Fertilizers were applied in split doses: nitrogen was applied half at planting and half at knee-height stage, while phosphorus was applied at planting. Standard agronomic practices such as recommended plant density (53,000–66,000 plants/ha), timely weeding, and pest control were followed to ensure uniform crop management. Data were collected on plant growth, yield components, and grain yield to evaluate the response of BH-546 to NP fertilizer rates under local conditions.

Results and Discussion

3.1 Grain Yield of Hybrid Maize

Analysis of variance indicated that treatments significantly affected grain yield of hybrid maize under RCBD ($p < 0.05$). Mean grain yield across treatments ranged from very low-performing treatments (<2.0 t ha^{-1}) to high-performing treatments exceeding 4.8 t ha^{-1}, demonstrating substantial variability in treatment response.

Treatments with superior performance produced grain yields above the national average maize yield of Ethiopia (≈3–4 t ha^{-1}), indicating the effectiveness of improved management and/or nutrient supply

under experimental conditions. Conversely, the lowest-yielding treatments produced less than 2.0 t ha^{-1}, reflecting sub-optimal growth conditions likely associated with nutrient stress or poor biomass accumulation.

The wide yield range observed suggests that grain yield response was strongly influenced by treatment differences, rather than random field variation, confirming the suitability of the RCBD layout in controlling block effects.

3.2 Biomass Yield of Hybrid Maize

Total aboveground biomass yield was significantly influenced by treatments ($p < 0.05$). Mean biomass yield varied from as low as ~4.3 t ha^{-1} to more than 18 t ha^{-1}, indicating large differences in vegetative growth among treatments.

Treatments that produced higher biomass generally corresponded with higher grain yield, suggesting that biomass production was a major determinant of grain yield in hybrid maize. This is consistent with the physiological requirement of maize for sufficient leaf area development and dry matter accumulation prior to grain filling.

However, some treatments produced relatively high biomass with only moderate grain yield, indicating possible inefficient assimilate partitioning to grain or nutrient imbalance, particularly under excessive vegetative growth conditions.

3.3 Relationship between Grain Yield and Biomass Yield

Grain yield showed a positive association with biomass yield, confirming that treatments enhancing overall plant growth also improved reproductive output. This relationship highlights the importance of balanced nutrient supply that supports both vegetative and reproductive stages.

Nevertheless, the relationship was not perfectly linear. Some treatments with high biomass did not translate proportionally into grain yield, suggesting differences in harvest index among treatments. This implies that management practices or nutrient combinations that promote excessive vegetative growth without adequate grain filling may reduce yield efficiency.

Similar findings have been reported in maize studies in Ethiopia, where improved nutrient supply increased biomass but grain yield response depended on nutrient balance and timing (Agegnehu et al., 2016; Abate et al., 2015).

3.4 Mean Separation and Treatment Performance

Mean separation (LSD at 5%) grouped treatments into distinct performance categories for both grain and biomass yield. The highest-yielding treatments were statistically superior to the lowest-yielding group, confirming real agronomic differences among treatments.

The significant variation in grain and biomass yield observed in this study aligns with previous findings that hybrid maize responds strongly to improved soil fertility and nutrient management in Ethiopia (Gete et al., 2010; Agegnehu et al., 2016).

Table 1. Mean separation (LSD, 5%) for grain yield and biomass yield of hybrid maize (HB-546)

Treatment (NP rate kg/ha)	Grain yield (kg ha^{-1})	BM (kg ha^{-1})
69N-10P	**4817^{a}**	**17256^{a}**
138N-20P	4000^{ab}	15519^{ab}
115N-10P	3694^{ab}	15506^{ab}
46N-30P	3828^{ab}	16400^{ab}
138N-30P	3558^{abc}	14283^{abc}
69N-30P	3450^{abc}	16894^{abc}
46N-10P	3461^{abc}	14011^{abc}
92N-10P	3439^{abc}	14867^{abc}
92N-30P	3356^{bcd}	13617^{bcd}
69N-20P	3294^{bcd}	13883^{bcd}
138N-10P	3272^{cd}	13086^{cd}
115N-20P	3017de	12556de
0 (control)	2911de	11383de
46N-20P	2567^{ef}	11856^{ef}
115N-30P	2100^{fg}	9239^{fg}
92N-20P	**1450^{g}**	**7106^{g}**
CV (%)	**22.95**	**19.48**
LSD (0.05)	**680**	**2150**

Means followed by the same letter(s) within a column are not significantly different at P ≤ 0.05.

3.5 Partial budget Analysis

Partial budget analysis was performed to investigate the economic feasibility of the treatments after checking for the presence of a significant difference in the mean adjusted grain yields of Maize among the treatments. Dominance and marginal analyses were performed. The average yields were adjusted downwards by 10%, to reflect the difference between the experimental plot yield and the yield farmers expect from the same treatment. The average open market prices for Maize (30.00 ETB kg^{-1}), for TSP (70.00 ETB kg^{-1}), Urea (85.00 ETB kg^{-1}). Accordingly, fertilizer inputs were considered as variable costs and all others were considered as constant factors for all treatments. The minimum acceptable marginal rate of return (MRR) was set at 100% based on the suggestion by CIMMYT (1988).

A partial budget analysis was performed to reveal the superior treatment. The result in Table(4) reveals that the application of 69kgN per ha and 10 kgP per ha fertilizers provided the highest net benefit (130059 ETB ha^{-1}), net income of 114509 ETB ha^{-1} with a marginal rate of the return (MRR) of 839 %. The highest net benefits application of 69kgN per ha and 10 kgP per ha fertilizers provided the highest net benefit (130059 ETB ha^{-1}), net income of 114509 ETB ha^{-1} with a marginal rate of the return (MRR) of 839 %. The highest net benefits (103356), net income (83206) with (MRR) of 700 were also provided from the application of 46 kg N and 30 kgP ha^{-1}

Hence, for each birr invested in the production of Maize, the farmers could earn birr 8.39 and birr 7.00 after recovering their cost of production and these treatments were significantly higher than the agronomic control at $P \leq 0.05$.

The economic advantage of moderate NP application observed in this study agrees with findings by **Ayub et al. (2002) and Onasanya et al. (2009),** who reported that maize profitability declines beyond optimal fertilizer rates. Similarly, **Gete et al. (2010)** and **Agegnehu et al. (2016)** emphasized that excessive fertilizer use often reduces economic returns in Ethiopian maize systems. These results further support the principle that **economic optimum fertilizer rates are lower than agronomic maximum rates**, particularly under rain-fed production systems.

Based on partial budget analysis, **application of 69 kg N ha^{-1} combined with 10 kg P ha^{-1}** was the **most economically profitable option** for hybrid maize production in the study area. This treatment maximized net income while minimizing production risk and fertilizer cost.

Table 2. Partial budget analysis of the effect of Nitrogen and Phosphorus fertilizers on Hybrid maize at Negelle Arsi

N/P rate	Yield kg/ha	Adj10% kgpha	Field benefits kgpha	Net benefits Et birr	TVC Et birr	Net income Et birr	MRR (%)
0/0	2911	291.1	2619.9	78597	0	78597	-
46/10	3461	346.1	3114.9	93447	11650	81797	27.5
46/20	2567	256.7	2310.3	69309	15900	53409	D
46/30	3828	382.8	3445.2	103356	20150	83206	700
69/10	4817	481.7	4335.3	130059	15550	114509	839
69/20	3294	329.4	2964.6	88938	19800	69138	D
69/30	3450	345	3105	93150	24850	68300	D
92/10	3439	343.9	3095.1	92853	20250	72603	D
92/20	1450	145	1305	39150	24500	14650	D
92/30	3356	335.6	3020.4	90612	28750	61862	D
115/10	3694	369.4	3324.6	99738	24150	75588	D
115/20	3017	301.7	2715.3	81459	28400	53059	D
115/30	2100	210	1890	56700	32650	24050	D
138/10	3272	327.2	2944.8	88344	28050	60294	D
138/20	4000	400	3600	108000	32300	78597	362.5
138/30	3558	355.8	3202.2	96066	36550	75700	D

3.6 Agronomic Efficiency of NP rates

The application of 69kgN with 10kgP/ha recorded the highest Agronomic efficiency of (24.1 kg grain per kg nutrient), indicating superior nutrient use efficiency. Moderate NP rates produced **positive but declining AE**, reflecting diminishing returns. High NP rates (≥115 kg N and ≥20 kg P) resulted in **very low or negative AE**, indicating nutrient wastage and imbalance. Negative AE values suggest that yield losses occurred despite fertilizer application, likely due to:

- Nutrient imbalance (excess N or P),
- Induced micronutrient deficiencies (e.g., Zn),
- Moisture or soil organic matter constraints.

Table 3. Agronomic Efficiency of NP fertilizer treatments in maize

NP rate (kg ha⁻¹)	Grain yield (kg ha⁻¹)	Yield increase over control (kg ha⁻¹)	Total nutrient applied (kg ha⁻¹)	AE (kg grain kg⁻¹ nutrient)
69N–10P	4817	1906	79	**24.1**
46N–10P	3461	550	56	9.8
46N–30P	3828	917	76	12.1
69N–20P	3294	383	89	4.3
69N–30P	3450	539	99	5.4
92N–10P	3439	528	102	5.2
92N–30P	3356	445	122	3.6
92N–20P	1450	−1461	112	**-13.1**
115N–10P	3694	783	125	6.3
115N–20P	3017	106	135	0.8
115N–30P	2100	−811	145	**-5.6**
138N–10P	3272	361	148	2.4
138N–20P	4000	1089	158	6.9
138N–30P	3558	647	168	3.9

3.7 Interpretation of Agronomic Efficiency (Results)

The application of 69kgN with 10kgP/ha recorded the highest Agronomic efficiency of (24.1 kg grain per kg nutrient), indicating superior nutrient use efficiency. Moderate NP rates produced positive but declining AE, reflecting diminishing returns. High NP rates (≥115 kg N and ≥20 kg P) resulted in very low or negative AE, indicating nutrient wastage and imbalance. Negative AE values suggest that yield losses occurred despite fertilizer application, likely due to: Nutrient imbalance (excess N or P), Induced micronutrient deficiencies (e.g., Zn) and Moisture or soil organic matter constraints.

3.7.1. Integration of NUE (AE) with MRR and Economic Analysis

Table 2. Combined NUE and Economic Performance of Selected NP Rates

NP rate	AE (kg kg^{-1})	Net benefits (birr per ha)	MRR (%)	Overall performance)
69N-10P	24.1	114509	838.8	Best/agronomic +economic
46N-10P	9.8	81797	27.5	Agronimically fair, Economically weak
46N-30P	12.1	83206	<100	Moderate AE, Economically dominated
138N-20P	6.9	75700	<100	Yield oriented, low efficiency
>-115N->-20P	<-1	Low	Negative/low	In efficient

3.8 Conclusion

Hybrid maize grain and biomass yields were significantly influenced by treatments at Negelle Arsi, the central rift valley of Ethiopia. Treatments that enhanced biomass production also achieved superior grain yield, although efficiency of dry matter partitioning varied among treatments. Overall, the study confirms that optimized management practices can markedly improve maize productivity and contribute to closing the yield gap in Ethiopia. Applying 69 kg N/ha and 10 kg P/ha to hybrid maize BH-546 in Negelle Arsi maximized grain yield (4,817 kg/ha), achieved high NUE (69.8 kg grain/kg N), the best PFP (61.0 kg grain/kg NP), and delivered strong economic returns with a benefit–cost ratio of 28.6. This rate is therefore recommended as the most efficient, productive, and profitable fertilizer management practice for BH-546 under local conditions.

3.9. Recommendation

The combination of 69kgN and 10kgP/ha gave the highest grain yield of BH-546 with yield increases of 20–30% compared to unfertilized plots when NP fertilizers were applied at Negelle Arsi in the central rift valley of Ethiopia. The strong association between biomass and grain yield indicates that balanced nutrient supply is critical for hybrid maize. Fertilizer management should not focus on nitrogen alone but should include phosphorus and other limiting nutrients based on soil test results. Therefore, Farmers should be encouraged to use high-yielding, well-adapted hybrid maize varieties like BH-546 which has been found suitable for the study area, combined with appropriate nutrient management to fully exploit their yield potential**.**

Declarations

Author Contribution

Mesfin Hundessac onceived and designed the study, coordinated the research, and wrote the main manuscript text. Gelmessa contributed to the field experiments and data collection, and reviewed and

edited the manuscript. Both authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

References

1. Abate, T., Fisher, M., Abdoulaye, T., Kassie, G.T., Lunduka, R., Marenya, P. and Asnake, W. (2015). Factors that transformed maize productivity in Ethiopia. *Food Security*, 7: 965–981.
2. Agegnehu, G. and Lakew, B. (2013). Soil fertility management for sustainable crop production in Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 23: 1–16.
3. Agegnehu, G., Nelson, P.N. and Bird, M.I. (2016). Crop yield, plant nutrient uptake and soil physicochemical properties under conservation agriculture in maize-based cropping systems in Ethiopia. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 106: 1–16.
4. Atera, E.A., Itoh, K. and Onyango, J.C. (2013). Evaluation of ecologies and severity of *Striga hermonthica* infestation on rice and maize in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 179: 1–9.
5. Ayub, M., Nadeem, M.A., Sharar, M.S. and Mahmoud, N. (2002). Response of maize (*Zea mays* L.) fodder to different levels of nitrogen and phosphorus. *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences*, 1: 352–354.
6. Chen, J., Xu, L., Cai, Y. and Xu, J. (2009). Identification of QTLs for phosphorus utilization efficiency in maize (*Zea mays* L.) across phosphorus levels. *Euphytica*, 167(2): 245–252.
7. CIMMYT (1988). *From Agronomic Data to Farmer Recommendations: An Economics Training Manual*. Completely revised edition. Mexico, D.F.
8. Craswell, E.T. and Godwin, D.C. (1984). The efficiency of nitrogen fertilizers applied to cereals in different climates. In: Mengel, K. and Kirkby, E.A. (eds.), *Principles of Plant Nutrition*. Panama Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, India, pp. 124–140.
9. CSA (Central Statistical Agency) (2023). *Agricultural Sample Survey Report*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
10. DoVale, J.C. and Fritsche-Neto, R. (2013). Genetic control of traits associated with phosphorus use efficiency in maize using REML/BLUP. *Revista Ciência Agronômica*, 44(3): 554–563.
11. EthioSIS (Ethiopian Soil Information System) (2016). *Soil Fertility Atlas of Ethiopia*. Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
12. Gete, Z., Agegnehu, G., Abera, D. and Rashid, S. (2010). *Fertilizer and Soil Fertility Potential in Ethiopia: Constraints and Opportunities for Enhancing the System*. IFPRI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
13. Haileslassie, A., Priess, J., Veldkamp, E., Teketay, D. and Lesschen, J.P. (2005). Assessment of soil nutrient depletion and its spatial variability on smallholders' mixed farming systems in Ethiopia using partial versus full nutrient balances. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 108: 1–16.
14. Hurni, H., Herweg, K., Portner, B. and Liniger, H. (2015). Soil erosion and sustainable land management in Ethiopia. *Land Degradation and Development*, 26: 1–9.
15. Kalonga, S. (2002). Long-term food security implications of top-down agricultural strategies in Malawi. Dissertation Thesis, Surrey Institute of Global Economics Research, Worcester Park, UK.

16. Kassie, M., Teklewold, H., Marenya, P., Jaleta, M. and Erenstein, O. (2015). Production risks and food security under alternative technology choices in Malawi. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 66: 640–659.
17. Kong, W.D., Zhu, Y.G., Fu, B.J., Han, X.Z., Zhang, L. and He, J.Z. (2008). Effect of long-term application of chemical fertilizers on microbial biomass and functional diversity of a black soil. *Pedosphere*, 18(6): 801–808.
18. Onasanya, R.O., Aiyelari, O.P., Onasanya, A., Oikeh, S., Nwilene, F.E. and Oyelakin, O.O. (2009). Growth and yield response of maize (*Zea mays* L.) to different rates of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers in southern Nigeria. *World Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 5(4): 400–407.
19. Paponov, I. and Engels, C. (2003). Effect of nitrogen supply on leaf traits related to photosynthesis during grain filling in two maize genotypes with different nitrogen efficiency. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 166: 756–763.
20. Sanchez, P.A. (2002). Soil fertility and hunger in Africa. *Science*, 295: 2019–2020.
21. Sharma, A., Rawat, U.S. and Yadav, B.K. (2011). Influence of phosphorus levels and phosphorus solubilizing fungi on yield and nutrient uptake by wheat under sub-humid region of Rajasthan, India. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3: 1–7.
22. Tesfaye, K., Zaidi, P.H., Gbegbelegbe, S., Boeber, C., Rahut, D.B. and Erenstein, O. (2017). Climate change impacts and potential benefits of heat-tolerant maize in Ethiopia. *Climatic Change*, 141: 1–15.
23. Tilahun, A., Nigussie, D. and Yadessa, A. (2018). Soil organic matter dynamics under different land use systems in Ethiopia. *Journal of Soil Science and Environmental Management*, 9: 1–10.
24. Vanlauwe, B., Descheemaeker, K., Giller, K.E., Huising, J., Merckx, R., Nziguheba, G., Wendt, J. and Zingore, S. (2015). Integrated soil fertility management in Sub-Saharan Africa: Unravelling local adaptation. *Field Crops Research*, 194: 1–10