Arif M, Ali K, Jan MT, Shah Z, Jones DL & Quilliam R (2016) Integration of biochar with animal manure and nitrogen for improving maize yields and soil properties in calcareous semi-arid agroecosystems, *Field Crops Research*, 195, pp. 28-35.

DOI: 10.1016/j.fcr.2016.05.011

Integration of biochar with animal manure and nitrogen for improving maize yields and soil properties in calcareous semi-arid agroecosystems

Muhammad Arif[a], Kawsar Ali[a], M.T. Jan[a], Z. Shah[b], Davey L. Jones[c], Richard S. Quilliam[d*]

[a]*Department of Agronomy, University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan*

[b]*Department of Soil and Environmental Sciences, University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan*

[c]*Environment Centre Wales, Bangor University, Bangor, LL57 2UW, UK*

[d]*Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK*

[*] Corresponding author: Richard Quilliam

Email: Richard.Quilliam@stir.ac.uk

Tel: 0044 1786 467769

ABSTRACT

Declining soil quality is commonplace throughout Southern Asia and sustainable strategies are required to reverse this trend to ensure food security for future generations. One potential solution to halt this decline is the implementation of integrated nutrient management whereby inorganic fertilisers are added together with organic wastes. These organic materials, however, are often quickly broken down in soil and provide only a transitory improvement in soil quality. Biochar, which can potentially persist in soil for centuries, may offer a more permanent solution to this problem. To address this, we undertook a 2-year field trial to investigate the interactions between conventional NPK fertilisers, farmyard manure (FYM) and biochar in a maize cropping system. Biochar application to the nutrient poor soil increased maize yields after year one by approximately 20% although the yield increase was lower in the second year (ca. 12.5%). Overall, there was little difference in grain yield between the 25 t ha^{-1} and the 50 t ha^{-1} biochar treatments. In terms of soil quality, biochar addition increased levels of soil organic carbon, inorganic N, P and base cations and had no detrimental impact on pH and salinity in this calcareous soil. Overall, this field trial demonstrated the potential of biochar to induce short-term benefits in crop yield and soil quality in maize cropping systems although the long-term benefits remain to be quantified. From a management perspective, we also highlight potential conflicts in biochar availability and use, which may limit its adoption by small scale farming systems typical of Southern Asia.

Keywords: calcareous soil; crop production; integrated nutrient management; Pakistan; soil organic matter

1. Introduction

Progressive declines in soil quality and poor nutrient use efficiency continue to hamper agricultural productivity and food security in many developing countries (Vagen et al., 2005; Jones et al., 2013). These problems are further exacerbated by increasing pressures on agronomic systems posed by increases in human population growth and urbanization, uncertainties in the global climate and the need for agriculture to deliver a range of other ecosystem services in addition to food production (e.g. carbon sequestration, biodiversity, flood risk mitigation, water quality; Lal, 2009). There is therefore an urgent need to redesign agroecosystems to rectify the wide range of inefficiencies that exist in the system including disconnects in nutrient supply, demand and recycling as well as those in water use efficiency (Lal et al., 2013). One potential solution includes the recycling of organic nutrients back to land which can help sustain soil organic matter levels which in turn typically brings about improvements in soil biological functioning, aeration, moisture retention, reduced compaction, pollutant attenuation and nutrient supply (Girmay et al., 2008). The types of organic matter that can be potentially added to soil are diverse ranging from crop residues, green manures, industrial wastes, animal wastes and household waste (Ali et al., 2011; Quilty and Cattle, 2011). However, their addition can have a range of benefits or even negative effects depending on the quality of waste added and the level of contaminants present (Jones and Healey, 2010). It is also likely that synergies may exist between the different organic wastes and thus co-application may represent the best option for maximizing the delivery of a range of ecosystem services.

The application of pyrolysed organic matter (biochar) to soils is currently gaining considerable interest worldwide due to its potential to improve soil nutrient retention capacity (through the sorption or stabilisation of nutrient ions), water holding capacity and to sequester carbon in a largely recalcitrant form from decades to possibly thousands of years (Downie et al., 2009; Spokas et al., 2012). Although there is strong economic and social competition from the use of charcoal as a domestic fuel source (Maes and Verbist, 2012), there is no doubt that it is applicable for use in arable systems where it can be readily incorporated into soil. However, before we can advocate the wide-scale adoption of biochar to resource poor farmers in developing countries, we must first provide the evidence base to show that it is beneficial in both agronomic and economic terms. A number of studies have reported positive effects of biochar amendments on maize yields and soil properties (Cornelissen et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2012), whilst others have reported no net effect (Jones et al., 2012) suggesting that the response may be to some extent specific to particular environmental conditions and soil types, or agronomic practices, e.g. differences in crop cultivar or fertiliser and pesticide applications. Compared to biochar research in the temperate soils of Europe and North America, relatively little work has been undertaken on the potential use of biochar and its effects on the behaviour of organic and inorganic nutrients in semi-arid regions of the world where improvements in soil quality and food security remain critical. Although there are a growing number of studies investigating the effect of biochar application to tropical soils, many of these focus on acidic soils and the liming effect of biochar (Major et al., 2010). Subsequently, there is a significant lack of data on biochar amendment of agronomic calcareous soils in semi-arid areas such as regions of northern Pakistan.

As the supply of fertilizers in Pakistan is limited by a range of socioeconomic, political and geographical constraints, alternative sustainable strategies are required to optimize fertiliser integration (Gandah et al., 2003; Schlecht et al., 2006). Low fertilizer-use-efficiency and losses to the environment, e.g. through leaching, are major environmental problems both in Pakistan and globally, and there is an urgent need for research that aims to improve fundamental efficiencies of crop nutrient use (Tilman et al., 2002; Sanchez, 2002; Arif et al., 2015). The aim of the present study was therefore to determine the effectiveness of biochar, farmyard manure (FYM) and mineral nitrogen alone and in various combinations on aspects of crop yield and soil quality in maize cropping systems. Maize was chosen as the trial crop as it contributes >10% of the total agricultural produce and 15% of agricultural employment in Pakistan, the major share of which (over 50%) originates from small land-holding farmers, who produce mostly for their own food needs (FAO, 2014). Within these farming systems, the intrinsically low fertility of the soil and increasing prices of chemical fertilizers represent the major constraints to increasing maize yields (Khan and Shah, 2011). The need to simultaneously increase yields, decrease production costs and maintain soil health has therefore become a major challenge in semi-arid agroecosystems (Anjum et al., 2010).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Experimental site

The trial site was located at the New Developmental Farm of the University of Agriculture, Peshawar (34°1’21”N, 71°28’5”E) and the experiment was started in the summer of 2011. The site has a warm to hot, semi-arid, sub-tropical, continental climate with mean annual rainfall of 360 mm. Summer (May–September) has a mean maximum temperature of 40°C and mean minimum temperature of 25°C. Winter (December to the end of March) has mean minimum temperature of 4°C and a maximum of 18.4°C. The average winter rainfall is higher than that of the summer. The highest winter rainfall has been recorded in March, while the highest summer rainfall is in August. %. The soil is a silty clay loam, well drained and strongly calcareous (pH 8.23 ±0.09), with an electrical conductivity (EC) of 166 ±28.5 µS cm^{-1} and an organic matter content of less than 1%. The soil is deficient in nitrogen (23.72 ±1.75 mg kg^{-1}) and phosphorus (3.20 ±0.50 mg kg^{-1}) but has adequate potassium (85.80 ±6.56 mg kg^{-1}).

2.2. Experimental design

The study consisted of three levels of biochar (0, 25 and 50 t ha^{-1}), two levels of FYM (5 and 10 t ha^{-1}) and two levels of fertilizer-N (urea) (75 and 150 kg ha^{-1}) together with a control treatment (no biochar, FYM or fertilizer-N). A summary of the treatments and their abbreviations are provided in Table 1. Biochar and FYM were applied at the time of sowing at the beginning of year 1, and reflected typical FYM doses for the region. Half of the fertilizer-N was applied at sowing and the remaining half applied at the 8 leaf stage (V8). Single super phosphate (SSP) was applied at the rate of 90 kg ha^{-1} as a basal dose. Diary cattle FYM was obtained from the Peshawar University of Agriculture dairy farm and the biochar was produced from Acacia (e.g. *A. nilotica* (Linn.) Delile) using traditional methods employed in the region (Amur and Bhattacharya, 1999). No commercial biochar production takes place in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa region of Pakistan; however, a limited amount is produced domestically using small biochar furnaces. The biochar was prepared in an enclosed dome shaped room, with several small holes made in the roof which were sealed after about 12 h burning. The feedstock was composed of cuttings from the main stem and branches of > 3 y old Acacia trees with a trunk diameter greater than 15 cm. The highest temperature reached during pyrolysis was between 400 to 500 ^{O}C, and the final ash content of the biochar was 27 %. Characteristics of the FYM and biochar are shown in Table 2.

The experiment had four replicates per treatment, and was laid out in a randomized complete block design. The treatment plots were 4.0 m x 4.5 m in size with strong ridges placed around each plot for delineation and to prevent biochar migration. Between row and within row distance was 75 cm and 20 cm, respectively. The field was ploughed twice down to a depth of 30 cm, followed by planking to break the clods and level the field taking care not to disturb the ridges and to facilitate biochar movement from one plot to another. Biochar was crushed and sieved to pass 2 cm, spread uniformly on the surface of the soil of each sub plot and then ploughed-in with a rotivator, which thoroughly mixed the biochar into the soil surface to a depth of about 15 cm. Maize (*Zea mays* L.) cv. 'Azam' (Cereal Crops Research Institute, Nowshera, Pakistan) was sown at a rate of 30 kg ha^{-1} on July 1^{st}, 2011 and thinned about 15 days after emergence to maintain plant to plant distance of 20 cm and a density of 60,000 to 70,000 plants ha^{-1}. The crop was irrigated ten days after sowing and then again usually every 15 days with adjustment according to rainfall. The crop was specifically irrigated at the critical growth stages of tasseling, silking, cob and grain development. The volume of water applied during irrigation was 340 m^3 per ha^{-1}. Weeds were controlled manually by hoeing between the ridges with a blade digger about 20 days post emergence. Pesticides were applied at the eight leaf stage (Lorsban® 40EC-(Chlorpyriphos, OP at 5 ml l^{-1}) to protect against stem borer.

2.3. Crop harvest

At harvest (Oct 1^{st}, 2011), the following maize yield components were recorded: total aboveground biomass, grain yield, number of ears m^{-2}, number of grains per ear and the thousand grain weight. To determine total above-ground yield (t ha^{-1}), the plants from the four central rows in each plot were harvested, sun dried (until constant weight) and weighed. The ears from these harvested plants were then removed, threshed and grain yield (t ha^{-1}) calculated. Ears were counted in the four central rows of the standing maize crop in each plot. Thousand grain weight was calculated from a sub-sample from of each plot.

2.4. Soil quality analysis

Three replicate soil samples were taken from 0-15 cm depth within a week of harvest. Soil carbon was determined by the Walkley-Black procedure (Nelson and Sommers, 1996). Carbonates were not removed before soil C determination, but an excess amount of dichromates was used to oxidize all possible organic C. Total mineral N in the soil samples was determined after KCl extraction by the steam distillation method as described in Mulvaney (1996). Soil pH and EC were measured in a saturated soil-water (1:1 w:v) paste extract under vacuum (Rhoades, 1996), using a pH meter (InoLab pH 720, WTW Series, Germany) and an EC meter (EC Meter 4510, Jenway, UK). Plant-available P and K in soil were determined in an ammonium bicarbonate-DTPA extract (1 M NH_4HCO_3, 0.005 M DTPA; pH 7.6) either colorimetrically (P) or by flame photometry (K) according to the procedure outlined in Soltanpour and Schwab (1977). Ca and Mg were determined in the saturation paste extracts by Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometry (Model 2380, Perkin Elmer Corp., Waltham, MA, USA).

2.5. Statistical analysis

Differences between each treatment (biochar, FYM and N fertiliser) in each year were compared by analysis of variance (three-way ANOVA) for each yield and soil quality parameter. The difference between year 1 and year 2 for yield and each soil quality parameter was compared by Student's t-test (Minitab 12.0 software, Minitab Inc., PA, USA).

3. Results

3.1. Yield and yield components

The addition of FYM and N fertiliser significantly increased the yield of maize compared to the unamended control plots (Fig. 1; Tables 3 and 4). Biochar application significantly increased the grain yield in both years ($P < 0.001$), although there was little difference in grain yield between the 25 t ha^{-1} and the 50 t ha^{-1} biochar treatments (Fig. 1; Tables 3 and 4). Biological yield was significantly higher in both years in plots treated with biochar, although the number of grains per ear was only higher in the first year ($P < 0.001$) and an increase in the thousand grain weight was only significantly higher in the second year (Table 5). The addition of FYM in the treated plots made no significant difference to grain yield in either year (Table 5), although it did significantly increase the grains per ear, the thousand grain weight and the biological yield in year 1. Nitrogen fertiliser significantly increased the grain yield and grains per ear in the first year ($P < 0.001$), but this was not repeated in the second year (Table 5). Two-way interactions between the biochar, FYM and the N fertiliser significantly increased grain yield in the first year ($P < 0.05$), but not the second year (Table 5), when there was no significant interaction between all three treatments on any of the yield parameters measured.

3.2. Soil properties

Overall, the addition of biochar made a significant difference to soil quality parameters in both cropping cycles (Table 6). There was a significant increase in soil pH (P < 0.05) following biochar application, i.e. 7.18 ±0.11; 7.43 ±0.10; 7.65 ±0.20 for 0, 25 and 50 t ha^{-1} biochar addition respectively (data from both cropping cycles combined).

By year 2, soil organic carbon was significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) in plots amended with biochar in year 1 (Tables 3 and 4;), with between 40 – 75 % more soil organic carbon in the plots containing 50 t ha^{-1} biochar compared to the plots containing 25 t ha^{-1} (Fig. 2a). Soil mineral N remained at a similar concentration from year 1 to year 2 for each treatment (Fig. 2b), and was not affected by the rate of N fertiliser that had been applied (half rate, 75 kg ha^{-1} or full rate, 150kg ha^{-1}). Although the concentration of soil N after the second year was significantly higher in plots amended with biochar at both 25 and 50 t ha^{-1} compared to the unamended plots (Table 4), overall, there was no significant interaction between biochar and the application of N fertiliser (Table 6). The addition of biochar at both rates increased the concentration of soil P in the first year (Fig. 2c; Table 3). In the 50 t ha^{-1} biochar plots there was significantly more soil P compared to the plots containing 25 t ha^{-1} ($P < 0.01$), and in the plots with 50 t ha^{-1} biochar the highest concentration of soil P was coupled with the full rate of FYM (Table 6). By year 2 however, in the biochar-amended plots the concentration of soil P had significantly declined (P < 0.01) compared to the concentration in year 1 (Fig 2c). In contrast, the increase in soil Ca/Mg was significantly higher after year 2 in plots amended with 50 t ha^{-1} biochar (Fig. 3a). Although there was a significant interaction effect between biochar, the FYM and the N (either singly or in combination with biochar) in year 1; by year 2 the concentration of soil Ca/Mg was not affected by either organic or inorganic fertilisers (Table 6). For K, the application of FYM and inorganic N fertiliser to the non-biochar-amended soil was no different to the control soil which contained neither fertiliser nor biochar (Fig. 3b), although there were significantly higher levels after the second year (P < 0.01). The application of 50 t ha^{-1} biochar significantly increased the concentration of K in the soil (Fig. 3b); particularly in the first year (Table 3) when there was a significant interaction between the biochar and the FYM and the N fertiliser (Table 6). Consequently, the effect of an increased concentration of ions in the biochar-amended soil generated a significant increase in soil EC (Fig. 3c) in both year 1 and year 2 (Tables 3 and 4).

4. Discussion

There is a significant lack of data on biochar amendment of agronomic calcareous soils in semi-arid areas such as regions of northern Pakistan, but this study has shown that the application of FYM and synthetic N in combination with biochar had an overall positive effect on soil properties, and increased maize yield in the first year after application. While the short term impacts of biochar application are becoming clearer for temperate agricultural soils, we absolutely lack an adequate understanding of the longer-term impacts and implications of biochar use in the cereal cropping systems commonly used in South Asia. Following biochar application to temperate soils an initial transient flush of labile compounds into the rhizosphere can enhance nutrient cycling and increase crop yield (Quilliam et al., 2012). Similarly, biochar application to the nutrient poor soils of Pakistan used in these field trials increased maize yields after year one by approximately 20% although this magnitude of yield increase was not replicated in the second year, and the potential benefits of biochar addition to this semi-arid calcareous agricultural soil appears to be short term or transient.

In tropical acidic soils, biochar application can have a liming effect which is often associated with increased nutrient availability, e.g. phosphorus, and ultimately improved crop yield. Applying biochar to the alkaline soils used in this study increased the pH from 7.18 to 7.43 and 7.63 respectively for the two biochar applications, which may have influenced the availability of some soil nutrients. In applied terms however, the increase of 0.30 to 0.45 pH units probably made little difference to the availability of soil nutrients at this near neutral pH. None of the nutrients we measured decreased with the increasing pH, and as the total yield was not negatively affected our data also suggests that the increasing pH did not facilitate plant toxicity of any other soil nutrients.

Biochar application to agricultural soil can facilitate the sorption or stabilisation of solutes and nutrient ions, and reduce nutrient loss from leaching (Asai et al., 2009; Laird et al., 2010), and the maintenance of elevated levels of soil P and N after the second year harvest suggests that biochar can mediate the slow release of these nutrients (Mukherjee and Zimmerman, 2013). Depending on pyrolysis conditions, the total surface area and pore volume of biochar can be orders of magnitude greater than soil (Calvelo Pereira et al., 2011; Quilliam et al., 2013). Subsequently, biochar can provide multiple planar sites to strongly sorb soil mineral and organic compounds (Joseph et al., 2010), although cation exchange capacity and the hydrophobicity of the biochar surface can also significantly affect its sorptive ability (Pignatello, 2013). Absorption of nutrients contained within the inorganic N fertiliser and the FYM onto the surface of the biochar would effectively reduce bioavailability for microbial utilisation and prevent bound nutrients from being leached away following rainfall or irrigation and may reduce volatilization of NH_3.

After the second year, the biochar amended plots (at both application rates) had higher concentrations of P and N. Therefore, these macronutrients are not being retained in the soil for as long when applied in just a mix of FYM and synthetic N compared with when they were applied in tandem with biochar. As the yield was higher (or no different) in the biochar-amended soil compared to the soil containing the FYM and N, it is not plant uptake and subsequent harvest that is removing these nutrients in the non biochar-amended soils. Reports from tropical acidic soil show that biochar can bind nutrients to its surface, which allows them to remain in the soil for longer, e.g. not being leached away after a single cropping season, and despite the higher pH of the calcareous soil used in this study, our results also suggest that biochar can retain nutrients such as P and N. Over time, these nutrients will slowly be released back into the soil resulting in a more sustainable use of the farmer's original investment in synthetic fertiliser (Asai et al., 2009). In addition to the increased efficiency of nutrient input, incorporating biochar into agroecosystems has the potential to enhance wider ecosystem service delivery, for example, by reducing nutrient and pesticide mobilisation and transfer from soil into aquatic systems (Jeffery et al., 2013).

For this study we have applied fairly high rates of biochar in order to clearly demarcate potential differences between our treatments; however, there are also recent reports of lower biochar application rates being beneficial in calcareous soils (Zhang et al., 2012; Ippolito et al., 2014). To produce such high quantities of biochar requires large volumes of feedstock, and there is justifiable concern about the implications of overharvesting existing forests for biochar production, as progressive deforestation in semi-arid ecosystems has already led to the deterioration of a range of ecosystem services. In Pakistan, nearly 62% of the population live in rural areas and are reliant on agriculture for their livelihoods. Consequently, there is a significant dependence on fuelwood as a source of energy, and in a country that already has low forest cover (of about 4.80%), the high consumption rate of fuelwood per household per day (6.70 kg) is contributing to the unsustainable use of the country's wood resources (Butt et al., 2013). In the rain-fed areas of Pakistan, e.g. the southern districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, wild-growing Acacia is already seasonally pruned to make charcoal; however, any potential benefits of biochar application to agricultural soil are accompanied by some important trade-offs, such as the potential for deforestation and land degradation (Anjum et al., 2010), together with the behavioural and cultural implications associated with using a primary source of fuel as a soil amendment (Maes and Verbist, 2012).

Environmental degradation in semi-arid regions, as a consequence of biochar production, is obviously not a sustainable strategy for improving soil nutrient use efficiency and delivering increased food security (Woolf et al., 2010). However, biochar can be produced from any organic material, and the pyrolysis of non-virgin feedstocks would allow the production of significant volumes of biochar without exacerbating the existing pressures on forest resources. Whilst there is the potential to produce biochar from 'on-farm' organic wastes, e.g. stover or maize cobs, in semi-arid agricultural systems much of this 'waste' biomass is already fully utilised, for example as animal feed, mulch or for constructing fences and roofs. Thus, short-term cycling of these streams of organic matter back through the agricultural chain is probably more beneficial than taking them out of the loop by converting them into biochar (Jones et al., 2013).

Our results have demonstrated that the integration of biochar with inorganic N fertiliser and FYM application at the field-scale can improve the productivity of maize and could provide a more sustainable input of N and P to soil. The soil used in this study has low levels of organic matter (Arif et al., 2015) therefore, augmenting the soil organic matter content with FYM can also promote nutrient cycling and the water holding capacity, and adding biochar to soil in Pakistan could improve yield responses to inorganic N and P fertilizers. For resource-poor farmers living with soil of intrinsically low fertility, the cost and availability of chemical fertilizers is often the most prohibitive constraint to increasing crop yields; therefore the sustainable management of nutrients is critical for maximising the efficiency of crop nutrient use. Incorporating FYM and biochar into an integrated nutrient management regime could be an important strategy for improving the overall farm productivity of cereal-based cropping systems in Pakistan. However, this needs critical evaluation in a sustainable agricultural context. Central to this are participatory-based approaches to assess whether biochar can really make a practical contribution to agriculture in Pakistan by providing farmers with a sustainable solution to help alleviate the constraints driven by poor soil fertility (Arif et al., 2015). Crucially, an evaluation of the wider ecosystem services linked to the trade-offs associated with producing biochar in semi-arid ecosystems needs both careful consideration and robust evidence before it can be promoted as a sustainable option for optimising fertiliser use efficiency.

Acknowledgments

Funding for this project was provided by The Higher Education Commission, Pakistan and the Welsh European Funding Office under the SEREN programme.

References

Ali, K., Munsif, F., Zubair, M., Hussain, Z., Shahid, M., Din, U.I., Khan, N., 2011. Management of organic and inorganic nitrogen for different maize varieties. Sarhad Journal of Agriculture 27, 525-529.

Amur, G.Q., Bhattacharya, S.C., 1999. A study of biomass as a source of energy in Pakistan. International Energy Journal 21, 25-36.

Anjum, S.A., Wang, L.C., Xue, L.L., Saleem, M.F., Wang, G.X., Zou, C.M., 2010. Desertification in Pakistan: causes, impacts and management. Journal of Food Agriculture and Environment 8, 1203-1208.

Arif M., Jalal, F., Jan, M.T., Muhammad, D., Quilliam, R.S., (2015). Incorporation of biochar and legumes into the summer gap: improving productivity of cereal-based cropping systems in Pakistan. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems 39, 391-398.

Asai, H., Samson, B. K., Stephan, H. M., Songyikhangsuthor, K., Homma, K., Kiyono, Y., Horie, T., 2009. Biochar amendment techniques for upland rice production in Northern Laos: 1. Soil physical properties, leaf SPAD & grain yield. Field Crops Research 111, 81-84.

Butt, S., Hartmann, I., Lenz, V., 2013. Bioenergy potential and consumption in Pakistan. Biomass and Bioenergy 58, 379-389.

Calvelo Pereira, R., Kaal, J., Camps Arbestain, M., Pardo Lorenzo, R., Aitkenhead, W., Hedley, M., Macías, F., Hindmarsh, J., Maciá-Agulló, J.A., 2011. Contribution to characterisation of biochar to estimate the labile fraction of carbon. Organic Geochemistry 42, 1331-1342.

Cornelissen, G., Martinsen, V., Shitumbanuma, V., Alling, V., Breedveld, G.D., Rutherford, D.W., Sparrevik, M., Hale, S.E., Obia, A. Mulder, J., 2013. Biochar effect on maize yield and soil characteristics in five conservation farming sites in Zambia. Agronomy 3, 256-274.

Downie, A., Crosky, A. Munroe, P., 2009. Physical properties of biochar. In 'Biochar for Environmental Management: Science and Technology'. Eds J. Lehmann, S. Joseph. pp. 13-32. Earthscan, London, UK.

FAO, 2014. Pakistan. www.fao.org/countryprofiles/index/en/?iso3=PAK (accessed May 14th, 2014).

Gandah, M., Bouma, J., Brouwer, J., Hiernaux, P., van Duivenbooden, N., 2003. Strategies to optimize allocation of limited nutrients to sandy soils of the Sahel: a case study from Niger, West Africa. Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment 94, 311-319.

Girmay, G., Singh, B.R., Mitiku, H., Borresen, T., Lal, R., 2008. Carbon stocks in Ethiopian soils in relation to land use and soil management. Land Degradation & Development 19, 351-367.

Ippolito, J.A., Stromberger, M.E., Lentz, R.D., Dungan, R.S., 2014. Hardwood biochar influences calcareous soil physicochemical and microbiological status. Journal of Environmental Quality 43, 681-689.

Jeffery, S., Bezemer, T.M., Cornelissen, G., Kuyper, T.H.W., Lehmann, J., Mom-mer, L., Sohi, S., van de Voorde, T.F.J., Wardle, D.A. and van Groenigen,J.W., 2015. The way forward in biochar research: targeting trade-offs between the potential wins. Global Change Biology: Bioenergy 7, 1-13.

Jones, D.L., Healey, J.R., 2010. Organic amendments for remediation: putting waste to good use. Elements 6, 369-374.

Jones, D.L., Rousk, J., Edwards-Jones, G., DeLuca, T.H., Murphy, D.V., 2012. Biochar-mediated changes in soil quality and plant growth in a three year field trial. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 45, 113-124.

Jones, D.L., Cross, P., Withers, P.J., DeLuca, T.H., Robinson, D.A., Quilliam, R.S., Harris I, Chadwick D.R., Edwards-Jones, G., 2013. Nutrient stripping: the global disparity between food security and soil nutrient stocks. Journal of Applied Ecology 50, 851-862.

Joseph, S.D., Camps-Arbestain, M., Lin, Y., Munroe, P., Chia, C.H., Hook, J., van Zwieten, L., Kimber, S., Cowie, A., Singh, B.P., Lehmann, J., Foidl, N., Smernik, R.J., Amonette, J.E., 2010. An investigation into the reactions of biochar in soil. Australian Journal of Soil Research 48, 501-515.

Khan, M.A., Shah, S.A.A., 2011. Food insecurity in Pakistan: causes and policy response. Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics 24, 493-509.

Laird, D.A., Fleming, P., Davis, D.D., Horton, R., Wang, B., Karlen, D.L., 2010. Impact of biochar amendments on the quality of a typical Midwestern agricultural soil.

Geoderma 158, 443-449.

Lal, R., 2009. Soils and food sufficiency: a review. Agronomy and Sustainable Development 29, 113-118

Lal, R., 2013. Food security in a changing climate. Ecohydrology and Hydrobiology 13, 8-21.

Lentz, R.D., Ippolito, J.A., 2012. Biochar and manure affect calcareous soil and corn silage nutrient concentrations and uptake. Journal of Environmental Quality 41, 1033-1043.

Maes, W.H., Verbist, B., 2012. Increasing the sustainability of household cooking in developing countries: policy implications. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 16, 4204-4221.

Major, J., Rondon, M., Molina, D., Riha, S.J. Lehmann, J., 2010. Maize yield and nutrition during 4 years after biochar application to a Colombian savanna oxisol. Plant & Soil 333, 117-128.

Mukherjee, A., Zimmerman, A.R. 2013. Organic carbon and nutrient release from a range of laboratory-produced biochars and biochar-soil mixtures. *Geoderma*, 193, 122-130.

Mulvaney, R.L., 1996. Nitrogen – Inorganic forms. p. 1123-1184. In D. L. Sparks et al. (ed.) Methods of soil analysis. Part 2. Chemical properties. SSSA Book Series 5., Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA.

Nelson, D.W., Sommers, L.E., 1996. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In: Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2, 2nd ed., A.L. Page et al., Ed. Agronomy. 9:961-1010. American Society of Agronomy Inc., Madison, WI, USA.

Pignatello, J.J., 2013. Adsorption of Dissolved Organic Compounds by Black Carbon. In: Xu, J., Sparks, D.L. (Eds.), Molecular Environmental Soil Science. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 359-385.

Quilliam, R.S., Marsden, K., Gertler, G., Rousk, J., DeLuca, T.H., Jones, D.L., 2012. Nutrient dynamics, microbial growth and weed emergence in biochar amended soil are influenced by time since application and reapplication rate. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 158, 192-199.

Quilliam, R.S., Glanville, H.C., Wade, S.C., Jones, D.L., 2013. Life in the 'charosphere' – does biochar in agricultural soil provide a significant habitat for microorganisms? Soil Biology & Biochemistry 65, 287-293.

Quilty, J.R., Cattle, S.R., 2011. Use and understanding of organic amendments in Australian agriculture: a review. Soil Research 49, 1-26.

Rhoades, J.D., 1996. Salinity: electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids. In Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 3. Chemical Methods. 3rd Ed., D.L. Sparks., Ed., pp 417-435. American Society of Agronomy Inc. Madison, WI. and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI,

Sanchez, P.A., 2002. Soil fertility and hunger in Africa. Science 295, 2019-2020.

Schlecht, E., Buerkert, A., Tielkes, E., Bationo, A., 2006. A critical analysis of challenges and opportunities for soil fertility restoration in Sudano-Sahelian West Africa. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 76, 109-136.

Soltanpour, P.N., Schwab, A.P., 1977. A new soil test for simultaneous extraction of macro- and micro-nutrients in alkaline soils. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 8, 195–207.

Spokas, K.A., Cantrell, K.B., Novak, J.M., Archer, D.W., Ippolito, J.A., Collins, H.P., Boateng, A.A., Lima, I.M., Lamb, M.C., McAloon, A.J., Lentz, R.D., Nichols, K.A., 2012. Biochar: a synthesis of its agronomic impact beyond carbon sequestration. Journal of Environmental Quality 41, 973-989.

Vagen, T.G., Lal, R., Singh, B.R., 2005. Soil carbon sequestration in sub-Saharan Africa: A review. Land Degradation and Development 16, 53-71

Whalen, J.K., Chang, C., Clayton, G.W., Carefoot, J.P., 2000. Cattle manure amendments can increase the pH of acid soils. Soil Science Society of America Journal 64, 962-966.

Tilman, D., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Naylor, R., Polasky, S., 2002. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. Nature 418, 671-677.

Woolf, D., Amonette, J. E., Street-Perrott, F. A., Lehmann, J., Joseph, S., 2010. Sustainable biochar to mitigate global climate change. Nature Commications 1, 56.

Zhang, A., Liu, Y., Pan, G., Hussain, Q., Li, L., Zheng, J., Zhang, X., 2011. Effect of biochar amendment on maize yield and greenhouse gas emissions from a soil organic carbon poor calcareous loamy soil from Central China Plain. Plant Soil 351, 263–275.

Zingore, S., Delve, R.J., Nyamangara, J., Giller, K.E., 2008. Multiple benefits of manure: The key to maintenance of soil fertility and restoration of depleted sandy soils on African smallholder farms. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 80, 267-282.



Fig. 1. Yield of maize in year 1 (grey bars) and year 2 (black bars) fertilised with FYM at either 5 t ha^{-1} (half manure; HM) or 10 t ha^{-1} (full manure; FM) and N fertiliser, at either 75 kg ha^{-1} (half fertiliser; HF) or 150 kg ha^{-1} (full fertiliser; FF). All plots were amended with biochar at the application rates of 0, 25 or 50 t ha^{-1}. Control, 0 t ha^{-1} FYM, 0 kg ha^{-1} N fertiliser, and 0 t ha^{-1} biochar. Asterisks indicate a significant difference between year 1 and year 2 data for each treatment at the $^{*}P < 0.05$, $^{**}P < 0.01$ and $^{***}P < 0.001$ level (T-test). Data points represent the mean of three replicates +SE.



Fig. 2. Soil organic carbon (a), mineral nitrogen (b) and extractable phosphorus following the harvest of maize in year 1 (grey bars) and year 2 (black bars). Plots had been fertilised with FYM at either 5 t ha^{-1} (half manure; HM) or 10 t ha^{-1} (full manure; FM) and N fertiliser, at either 75 kg ha^{-1} (half fertiliser; HF) or 150 kg ha^{-1} (full fertiliser; FF). All plots were amended with biochar at the application rates of 0, 25 or 50 t ha^{-1}. Control, 0 t ha^{-1} FYM, 0 kg ha^{-1} N fertiliser, and 0 t ha^{-1} biochar. Asterisks indicate a significant difference between year 1 and year 2 data for each treatment at the *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$ and ***$P < 0.001$ level (T-test). Data points represent the mean of three replicates +SE.



Fig. 3. Soil extractable Ca/Mg (a), extractable potassium (b) and soil electrical conductivity following the harvest of maize in year 1 (grey bars) and year 2 (black bars). Plots had been fertilised with FYM at either 5 t ha^{-1} (half manure; HM) or 10 t ha^{-1} (full manure; FM) and N fertiliser, at either 75 kg ha^{-1} (half fertiliser; HF) or 150 kg ha^{-1} (full fertiliser; FF). Plots were amended with biochar at the application rates of 0, 25 or 50 t ha^{-1}. Control, 0 t ha^{-1} FYM, 0 kg ha^{-1} N fertiliser, and 0 t ha^{-1} biochar. Asterisks indicate a significant difference between year 1 and year 2 data for each treatment at the *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$ and ***$P < 0.001$ level (T-test). Data points represent the mean of three replicates +SE.

Table 1:

Description of treatment combinations used for each replicated (*n* = 3) experimental plot.

Biochar (t ha^{-1})	FYM (t ha^{-1})	Feriliser N (kg ha^{-1})	Abbreviation[a]
0	0	0	Control
0	5	75	B0-HM-HF
0	5	150	B0-HM-FF
0	10	75	B0-FM-HF
0	10	150	B0- FM-FF
25	5	75	B25-HM-HF
25	5	150	B25-HM-FF
25	10	75	B25-FM-HF
25	10	150	B25-FM-FF
50	5	75	B50-HM-HF
50	5	150	B50-HM-FF
50	10	75	B50-FM-HF
50	10	150	B50-FM-FF

[a]HM, half manure rate (5 t ha^{-1}); FM, full manure rate (10 t ha^{-1}); HF, half fertiliser rate (75 t ha^{-1}); FF, full fertiliser rate (150 t ha^{-1})

Table 2:

Chemical properties of the fresh biochar and Farmyard manure (FYM) prior to application to soil.

	Biochar	Farmyard manure
pH	7.01	8.65
EC (dS m^{-1})[a]	1.57	2.44
C (g kg^{-1})	578	486
P (g kg^{-1})	11.4	35.2
N (g kg^{-1})	10.2	15.6
Ca (g kg^{-1})	2.68	1.86
Mg (mg kg^{-1})	10.0	112.6

[a]EC, electrical conductivity

Table 3: Multiple pairwise comparisons (Tukey's HSD) for each treatment for year 1 data

	Yield	Soil C	Soil N	Soil P	Ca/Mg	Soil K	Soil EC
Control	e	b	a	d	g	e	d
B0-HM-HF	d	b	a	d	f	e	d
B0-HM+FF	b,c,d	a,b	a	d	f	e	d
B0-M+HF	d	b	a	d	d,e	d	d
B0-M+FF	a	b	a	d	e,f	e	d
B25-HM-HF	a,b,c	b	a	c	d	c	b,c,d
B25-HM+FF	a,b,c	b	a	c	d	c	c,d
B25-M+HF	c,d	a,b	a	c	b,c,d	c	b,c,d
B25-M+FF	a,b	a,b	a	c	c,d	c	b,c,d
B50-HM-HF	a,b,c	a,b	a	b	b,c	b	a,b
B50-HM+FF	a,b,c	a,b	a	b	b,c	a	a,b,c
B50-M+HF	a,b,c	a	a	a	b	a	a
B50-M+FF	a,b,c	a	a	a	a	a	a,b

Different letters within the same column indicates that the mean significantly differs from each other (one-way ANOVA, P < 0.001; Tukey multiple comparison test, P < 0.05).

Table 4: Multiple pairwise comparisons (Tukey's HSD) for each treatment for year 2 data

	Yield	Soil C	Soil N	Soil P	Ca/Mg	Soil K	Soil EC
Control	e	f	e	f	e	e	d
B0-HM-HF	d	f	e	d,e	e	c,d,e	d
B0-HM+FF	b,c,d	f	e	d,e	d,e	d,e	d
B0-M+HF	c,d	e,f	d,e	e	d,e	c,d,e	d
B0-M+FF	c,d	d,e,f	c,d	c,d,e	c,d,e	b,c,d,e	c,d
B25-HM-HF	a,b,c,d	d,e	a,b	c,d,e	b,c,d	c,d,e	a,b,c
B25-HM+FF	a,b,c,d	d	a,b,c	c,d	a,b,c	c,d,e	a,b
B25-M+HF	a,b,c,d	c	b,c	c,d	b,c	b,c,d,e	b,c,d
B25-M+FF	a,b	c	a,b	c	b,c	a,b,c,d	b,c,d
B50-HM-HF	a,b,c	a,b	a,b	b	a,b	a,b,c,d	a
B50-HM+FF	a	a,b	a,b	a,b	a,b	a,b	a,b,c
B50-M+HF	a,b	a	a,b	a	a,b	a	a,b,c,d
B50-M+FF	a,b,c	b	a	a,b	a	a,b,c	a,b,c

Different letters within the same column indicates that the mean significantly differs from each other (one-way ANOVA, $P < 0.001$; Tukey multiple comparison test, $P < 0.05$).

Table 5:

Statistical *P* values for three-way ANOVA comparing differences in yield parameters.

	Grain yield		Grains per ear		Thousand grain weight		Biological yield	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
Biochar	***	***	***	*NS*	*NS*	***	*	***
FYM	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	**	*NS*	**	*NS*
N fertiliser	***	*NS*	***	*NS*	*	*NS*	***	*NS*
Biochar*FYM	*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*
Biochar*N fertiliser	**	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*
FYM*N fertiliser	**	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*
Biochar*FYM*N fertiliser	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*

Asterisks indicate a significant difference at the *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$ and ***$P < 0.001$ level; *NS*, not-significant.

Table 6:

Statistical *P* values for three-way ANOVA comparing differences in soil quality parameters.

	Organic C		Mineral N		Phosphorus		Ca/Mg		Potassium		EC		pH	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
Biochar	***	***	*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	*
FYM	**	***	**	***	***	**	***	*NS*	***	*	*NS*	*	***	***
N fertiliser	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	**	*NS*
Biochar*FYM	**	***	*	*	*	*	*	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	***	***	***
Biochar*N fertiliser	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*
FYM*N fertiliser	*NS*	**	*NS*	**	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*
Biochar*FYM*N fertiliser	*NS*	*	*NS*	*	*NS*	*NS*	***	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*	*NS*

Asterisks indicate a significant difference at the *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$ and ***$P < 0.001$ level; *NS*, not-significant. EC, electrical conductivity.